

Designing for lived informatics in out-of-clinic physical rehabilitation.

Naveen L. Bagalkot¹, Tomas Sokoler²,

¹Srishti Institute of Art, Design and Technology Bangalore, ²IT University of Copenhagen

Authors' Mini-bios:

Naveen L. Bagalkot (naveen@srishti.ac.in) is an interaction design researcher with an interest in personal informatics, out-of-clinic physical rehabilitation, and research-through design; he is a researcher and faculty member at the Srishti Institute of Art, Design and Technology, Bangalore, India.

Tomas Sokoler, (sokoler@itu.dk) is an interaction design researcher with an interest in explorative design and construction-oriented research in the broader intersection of interaction design and ubiquitous computing; he is an associate professor in the People and Computational Things section at the IT University of Copenhagen, Denmark.

Notes

Background. This article is based on and draws from the Ph.D thesis of the first author, and from the series of design explorations that have been published before (Bagalkot, 2012; Bagalkot & Sokoler, 2013, 2012, 2011; Bagalkot, Sokoler, & Shaikh, 2012). In this paper we revisit these explorations and the theories shaping the explorations to explicitly focus on the use of personal rehabilitation data.

Acknowledgments. We thank all the rehabilitees and rehabilitators who worked with us as co-explorers.

Funding. The work was funded as part of the Ph.D studies by internal funding of the IT University of Copenhagen

HCI Editorial Record. First received on <date>. Revisions received on <date>, <date>, and <date>. Accepted by <action-editor-name>. Final manuscript received on <date>. – *Editor*

Designing for lived informatics in out-of-clinic physical rehabilitation.

Running Head: Designing for lived informatics in out-of-clinic physical rehabilitation.

ABSTRACT

In this paper we focus on how rehabilitees make use of personal data as part of performing their prescribed physical therapy in out-of-clinic settings (e.g. home). Over the past five years we have been extensively involved in the design of pervasive & mobile technologies to support out-of-clinic physical rehabilitation. Two strands guide our work: Situated and embodied interaction, and the practice and theory of physical rehabilitation. In particular we draw upon the latter's practice of integrating therapy with the lived everyday settings and the model of Person-Environment-Occupation (PEO).

In this paper we revisit this work from the emerging perspective of lived informatics to bring forward multiple instances of rehabilitees using personal rehabilitation data to make sense of their physical rehabilitation process. We present these instances under four categories: Becoming your own standard of reference; marking your life as a rehabilitee; articulating with therapists, partners, and peers; and incorporating exercising with everyday activities. We put forward the PEO model as a generative entry point for designing digital technology in support of lived informatics in out-of-clinic physical rehabilitation. Through this paper we invite researchers in the field of lived informatics to engage in the design of digital technologies for out-of-clinic physical rehabilitation.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	1
CONTENTS	2
1. INTRODUCTION	4
2. BACKGROUND	7
2.1. Physical Rehabilitation: Working Hypothesis	7
2.2. Person-Environment-Occupation Model	9
3. METHODOLOGY	11
3.1. Construction Oriented Research-through-design	11
Gathering data for synthesis and reflection	12
Revisiting the Design Explorations	13
4. EMBODIED SELF-MONITORING: DESIGNING FOR PHYSICAL REHABILITATION IN CONTEXT	13
4.1. Embodied & Situated Interaction	13
4.2. Embodied acts of rehabilitation-in-context	14
4.3. Exploring the design in different settings of out-of-clinic rehabilitation	14
MagicMirror	14
ReSwing and ReWall	15
ReExercise	16
4.4. Embodied Self-Monitoring: The Definition	17
5. REVISITING: LIVED INFORMATICS IN OUT-OF-CLINIC PHYSICAL REHABILITATION	18
5.1. Becoming Your Own Standard of Reference	19
5.2. Marking your Life as a Rehabilitee	20
5.3. Articulating with Therapists, Partners, and Peers	21
5.4. Incorporating Exercising with Everyday Activities	23
6. DISCUSSION	25
6.1. Reframing Physiotherapists' Working Hypothesis as an Interaction Design Challenge	25
6.2. Designing for Lived Informatics for Out-of-Clinic Physical Rehabilitation: An	

Invitation.	26
Person	26
Environment	27
Occupation	27
6.3. Unboxing: A Direction for Design	28
7. CONCLUSION	29
REFERENCES	30

1. INTRODUCTION

Rehabilitation: A goal-oriented, cooperative process involving a member of the public, his/her relatives, and professionals over a certain period of time. The aim of this process is to ensure that the person in question, who has, or is at risk of having, seriously diminished physical, mental and social functions, can achieve independence and a meaningful life. Rehabilitation takes account of the person's situation as a whole and the decisions he or she must make, and comprises co-ordinated, coherent, and knowledge based measures. (Definition from the National Danish Whitepaper on Rehabilitation, 2004)

Positioned in the intersection of ubiquitous computing and interaction design we have, over a period of five years, conducted a series of interaction design research explorations seeking to unfold ways in which digital technology can be designed in support of out-of-clinic physical rehabilitation. Using design interventions as the primary research vehicle and working closely with rehabilitees and rehabilitators we have in parallel sought to gain an understanding of the existing practices of physical rehabilitation as well as an understanding of the forward pointing opportunities for technology design. As such, our work and the findings we present is the result of a constant movement back and forth between today's established practices of physical rehabilitation and enactments of what could be the practices of tomorrow. Our research is strongly influenced by the theory of embodied interaction (Dourish, 2001) emphasizing the situated and circumstantial nature of human action throughout our design. In the paper at hand, we revisit our work while keeping a particular eye on the multiple roles played by personal rehabilitation data as part of physical rehabilitation practices - existing and envisioned.

As pointed to by the definition, rehabilitation implies that a rehabilitee (the person undergoing rehabilitation) through a process of rehabilitation, in a very broad sense can reclaim their abilities to participate in everyday life and society. As such rehabilitation processes and therapeutic interventions addresses a vast range of conditions and circumstances of the individual rehabilitee with overall improvements of the rehabilitees quality of life as the top-level measure of a success. As will be discussed further in this paper we have throughout our close collaboration with practitioners and researchers in the field of rehabilitation encountered a strong constructive alignment between our theoretical foundation in the phenomenologically informed theory of embodied interaction, and the theoretical foundation underlying the approach of analysis and intervention carried out as key to the work of occupational and physiotherapists.

In particular, we experienced a shared 'worldview' and perspective on the interplay between humans, the activities they perform and the particularities of the social and physical setting embedding these activities. This alignment of worldviews across disciplines, allowed for a shared holistic understanding of what it means to intervene in a

rehabilitée's life world when looking to improve quality of life and in turn a shared understanding of how and what the role of mobile and pervasive digital technologies might be as part of such interventions. We will discuss this alignment further and how it made way for a fruitful collaboration with rehabilitation therapist. Firstly, we outline how we, through our interactions with the physiotherapists, encountered a 'working hypothesis' that focuses on integrating the prescribed therapy with the particular everyday settings of the rehabilitees. Towards the end of the paper we will present a reframing of this working hypothesis as an interaction design challenge. Secondly, we outline how the tools for analysis and intervention in the field of physical rehabilitation are rooted in the Person-Environment-Occupation (PEO) model (Law et al, 1996), a transactional model emphasizing a dynamic interplay between an individual's everyday activities, the aspirations to increase her quality of life and the physical and social conditions embedding the rehabilitation process. We will towards the end of this paper put forward the PEO model of rehabilitation therapy as a generative entry point for researchers in the field of lived informatics looking to engage in the design of digital technologies for out-of-clinic physical rehabilitation.

Our work in particular concerns the smaller subset of rehabilitation processes directed towards physical rehabilitation. Even if only a subset, physical rehabilitation processes still encompass a diverse set of conditions. Some physical rehabilitation processes are framed as short term physical training aimed at helping the rehabilitees cope with a temporary disability and perform activities of daily living, such as for example the 12-week rehabilitation programs aimed at helping rehabilitees regain their walking capacity after hip replacement surgery. Others imply learning how to cope with activities of daily living and other larger aspects such as active participation in civic democracies despite a chronic physical condition such as lower back pain, the loss of a limb or inborn physical disabilities. In general, the success of physical rehabilitation processes relies on rehabilitee adherence to perform a prescribed set of physical exercises and incorporates strong elements of self-monitoring and self-reflection. While some exercises are to be carried out within the highly structured supervised settings of a clinic, others are to be performed in the differently structured unsupervised home settings of the rehabilitees.

Regardless of the setting and the physical conditions addressed, the recording and management of personal data is already considered a key part of existing rehabilitation practices. Whether it is the simple jotting down of numbers to keep track during a particular exercise, the keeping of records to self-reflect and/or discuss long-term progress with others, or the authoring of diaries with its rich descriptions of how the rehabilitation process is experienced as part of everyday living, recording and management of data is an inherent part of physical rehabilitation. What we find is that both rehabilitees and rehabilitators have experience with and a well articulated appreciation of, the role and management of personal rehabilitation data. As we will elaborate further in this paper, this provides a rather unique point of departure when co-exploring, with rehabilitates and rehabilitators, the design of digital technologies in

support of physical rehabilitation. In particular, it sets the design of personal informatics systems for physical rehabilitation somewhat aside from other ‘living-by-numbers’ projects where the motivation to engage with personal data in the first place, needs to be somehow established and argued as part of the projects.

Whether part of established practices or demonstrated by rehabilitee and rehabilitator enactments of future practices we soon realise that the role played by personal rehabilitation data in rehabilitation is multifaceted. Drawing on the theory of embodied interaction we find that the role of personal rehabilitation data is better viewed as part of the interactive processes of meaning-making strongly influenced by, and in turn influencing, the particularities of the physical and social setting in which the rehabilitation processes are embedded. Furthermore, we find that the kind of engagement with personal rehabilitation data we see in our work cuts across any attempt to make a distinct segmentation into production and use of data or as we often see it discussed in literature on personal informatics systems as a segmentation into the five stages of preparation, recording, processing, display and reflection (Li, Dey, & Forlizzi, 2010). As such we add to the work on ‘lived informatics’ (Rooksby, Rost, Morrison, & Chalmers, 2014; Epstein, Ping, Fogarty, & Munson, 2015) arguing the need for more nuanced ways to describe how the management of personal data is worked into the mundane activities of everyday living.

In particular, we revisit our design explorations, using anecdotes that resonate with the notion of lived informatics, and identify different roles of personal rehabilitation data all pointing to the rich and entangled ways that this data is ‘used’ as part of the ‘lived’ physical rehabilitation processes we have encountered. Our examples highlight how the rehabilitees participating in our design explorations enacted and envisioned multiple uses of their personal rehabilitation data. Namely, these multiple uses were, a) to make sense of the rehabilitees’ efforts in relation to their bodies and settings of out-of-clinic rehabilitation; b) as visual and material markers part of the rehabilitees’ living environments that reminded them not only about their exercises, but also in general about their life as people undergoing physical rehabilitation; c) to sift, sort, and select aspects of their lives as rehabilitees and share with their therapists, family members, and peers; and d) to turn their everyday activities into an opportunity for performing the exercises prescribed as part of their rehabilitation. We present the instances of the multiple uses of personal rehabilitation data in four categories, namely, 1) becoming your own standard of reference; 2) marking your life as a rehabilitee; 3) articulating with therapists, partners, and peers; and 4) incorporating exercising with everyday activities.

Our contribution is threefold:

1. By revisiting our work from the perspective of lived informatics we bring forward a nuanced understanding of lived informatics in the context of current and future practices of out-of-clinic physical rehabilitation.

2. By reframing the working hypothesis of the physiotherapists as an interaction design challenge, we open a space for technology design interventions aligned with the lived practice of out-of-clinic physical rehabilitation, in turn calling for the support of collaborative and individualized rehabilitation practices.
3. And finally, by positioning the PEO model as a generative entry point for technology design we invite the researchers in the field of lived informatics to engage in the design of digital technologies for out-of-clinic physical rehabilitation.

The paper is structured as follows. Firstly, we outline the working hypothesis and the PEO model as the background knowledge establishing the grounds for the practice and theory of physical rehabilitation. We present the methodology that originally guided our works discussed in this paper as well as the method of revisiting that we now employ to relate to the emerging perspective of lived informatics. We then give a brief presentation of the parts of our design work that we draw from in this paper, before presenting the analysis of revisiting in the form of the four categories mentioned above. In the discussion section we outline how we as interaction designers reframe the working hypothesis as an interaction design challenge, and put forward the PEO model as generative entry point for design.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1. Physical Rehabilitation: Working Hypothesis

In general, a physical rehabilitation process involves consultations with professional physiotherapists, who recommend exercise therapies based on the particular diagnosis of the injury. The rehabilitation process also involves periodic sessions at the clinic where the rehabilitees perform the exercises under the guidance of the physiotherapists. In between these periodic sessions, the rehabilitees are encouraged to adhere with the treatment by performing a set of prescribed exercises at home on a daily basis. Performing the exercises at home is considered a key element of becoming successfully rehabilitated.

Despite the key role that adhering with the prescribed treatment holds for a successful rehabilitation, the therapists, however, report a lack of adherence amongst the rehabilitees when at home. Research (Sluijs, Kok, & Zee, 1993; Campbell, Evans, Tucker, Quilty, Donovan, 2001; Petursdottir, Arnadottir, & Halldorsdottir, 2010) has found that it is difficult for the rehabilitees to adhere with their treatment and perform the exercises at home consistently. These studies find that adherence is influenced by multiple factors, including the individual attitudes towards illness and exercises, support from physiotherapists, feedback about progress made, ability to integrate the exercises with everyday routines within the broader social and physical environments of the individuals.

When rehabilitees find it difficult to adhere with a physical rehabilitation regimen, it leads to an increased cost to the society, particularly, in cases where healthcare is supported and funded by the state (Campbell, Evans, Tucker, Quilty, Donovan, 2001). A failed rehabilitation process leads to various costs to the society. Of particular interest to this paper, retired senior citizens may require additional care and support from the public health system for performing their activities of daily living if they are not successfully rehabilitated. The costs to the society may also be in the form of transportation that the clinic has to organize to pick-up and drop the rehabilitees for their periodic treatment sessions. In addition, the state's investment on setting up and running a good infrastructure for physical rehabilitation including, physiotherapists, equipment, transportation, etc., will not yield expected returns if the rehabilitation process is not successful. Hence, the challenge is to reduce these costs to society incurred due to lack of adherence with a prescribed rehabilitation process.

Furthermore, in response to an ever-growing number of people in need for physical rehabilitation, we see a strong societal demand for more cost effective rehabilitation solutions. In particular, there is currently a strong push towards out-of-clinic physical rehabilitation programs where larger portions of the rehabilitation process are moved from the clinic to the private homes of the rehabilitees. This furthers the importance of rehabilitees taking more responsibility and initiative towards adhering to their prescribed rehabilitation process. To address low levels of adherence to prescribed physical rehabilitation (for e.g., Campbell, Evans, Tucker, Quilty, Donovan, 2001), works in the field of physiotherapy (for e.g., Mastos, Miller, Eliasson, & Imms, 2007; McClain, 2005; Nicholls & Gibson, 2010) call for more involvement and engagement of rehabilitees in defining their own rehabilitation regimes and plans.

Turning to the practice of physiotherapists we observed how their work is guided by a working hypothesis: Integration of physical rehabilitation exercises with rehabilitee's everyday activities will lead to better adherence and hence, in turn more successful out-of-clinic rehabilitation. We observed the practices of integration during our work with physiotherapists. Broadly, the physiotherapists prescribe rehabilitation therapy that are conducive for the individual rehabilitee to integrate the therapy with their specific everyday activities, spaces and objects. An example of the individualized approach, observed from our interactions with professional physiotherapists, is how the rehabilitees are suggested to turn everyday artifacts as tools for exercising, such as, filled water bottles to be used as weights, or a chair to be used as support for sit-stand exercises. These therapy procedures are arrived at in close collaboration with the individual rehabilitee (McClain, 2005) to understand the specific situation of the rehabilitee while exercising at home. The therapists work closely with the rehabilitee to identify specific objects and activities of everyday used by the rehabilitee, and suggest therapy exercises that better suits them.

Mastos, Miller, Eliasson, and Imms (2007) describe how having specific, achievable

goals that are close to an individual's everyday environment will increase the motivation of the individual to engage in the therapy. They identify four components of a goal-oriented physical therapy process, one of which is the setting of goals that are meaningful for the individuals—goals that are tuned to the Activities of Daily Living (ADL) such as walking to the store, picking up a towel, or wearing socks. Notably, a fast growing area for physical rehabilitation is related to conditions of aging and hence, physical rehabilitation is often a component of aging-in-place programs enabling senior citizens to stay longer in their private homes by sustaining their capability to carry out ADL.

As we will discuss in more detail in this paper, the push to move from the highly structured supervised settings at the clinic to the unsupervised home settings of the rehabilitees has not only challenges, but also and more importantly, novel opportunities for the design of personal informatics systems in the domain of physical rehabilitation. Opportunities that we suggest are pursued by employing state-of-art pervasive & mobile technologies as enablers in support of lived practice of out-of-clinic physical rehabilitation.

2.2. Person-Environment-Occupation Model

As mentioned, all the design explorations we report in this paper were conducted in close collaboration with experts in the area of physical rehabilitation including practitioners as well researchers in this field. We encountered the working hypothesis through our collaboration with the therapists. But we soon realized that this hypothesis in fact is informed by a foundational theoretical world-view captured in the form of the person-environment-occupation model (Law et al, 1996) guiding both research, education and practice in the area of physical rehabilitation.

As we started engaging the therapists in the co-design of digital technologies for physical rehabilitation we kept being surprised about how positive and without much friction the ideas that we brought to this collaboration were received and further developed by the therapists. At first, we attributed this to coincidence of working with the particular group of therapists. Later on however, when we started working closer with researchers and educators in the field of physical rehabilitation we came to realise that the ease of engagement that we had experienced from the therapists was all but a coincidence, and how it was caused by a much more profound pre-existing alignment of worldviews that we shared across the disciplines of rehabilitation and the design for embodied interaction.

It was a shared world view grounded in a holistic ecological perspective foregrounding the interwovenness and interdependence of the individual's ability to perform everyday activities and the physical and social setting embedding this performance. Our worldview was informed by the phenomenologically grounded theoretical framework of embodied interaction and the therapists' by the Person-

Environment-Occupation (PEO) model at the heart of therapist work when analysing and devising interventions for the individual rehabilitees in the meeting with their life worlds.

The International Classification of Functioning, Disability, and Health (ICF) model put forward by World Health Organization (2001) is considered as a more comprehensive model utilized by the academic field of rehabilitation and disability studies. However, an in-depth comparative analysis of which model is better aligned to the problem at hand is beyond the scope of this paper. The physiotherapists we interacted with referred to the PEO model, employing it to guide their practice. And it was their grounding in the PEO model that helped in informing our shared worldview guiding the design explorations. Therefore, in this paper we engage with the PEO model as an entry point for design, without getting into the merits or lack-of as compared to the ICF model.

In brief, the PEO model encapsulates a transactive approach to analysis and intervention in physical rehabilitation and emphasises the situated nature of human action and how these actions are fully entangled with the setting - a model reflecting a worldview that clearly resonates with what we as interaction design researchers in the area of pervasive&mobile digital technologies consider a key part of our foundation.

The person-environment-occupation model as put forward by Law et al (1996) has the notion of ‘occupational performance’ at its heart, addressing how an individual with unique capabilities and life experiences perform her occupations in a dynamic interplay with the particular physical, social and cultural settings embedding this performance. Of particular interest to our work is the distinction between activities, tasks, and occupation. Activities, or rather Activities of Daily Living (ADL), are generic actions that people do on a daily basis, such as writing, cooking, walking, lifting weights, etc. Tasks are purposeful activities, such as writing a report, cooking a meal for four, etc. Occupation are “groups of self directed, functional tasks and activities in which a person engages over a lifespan” (ibid, pg. 8). For example, being an accountant, a novelist, or a chef.

The PEO model reflects the dominant therapist perspective on the dynamic transactional relationship between the three constituent components - Person, Environment and Occupation. The model is used throughout therapist practice and training to foreground how the overall ambition is to increase the individual's occupational performance and how the three components can be used as the ‘entry points’ through which the therapist engages in analysis of the individual rehabilitees current life world. In turn, this analysis leads to a series of recommendations for intervention that in most cases are negotiated with the rehabilitees in order to induce a level of ownership, commitment and, not the least, adherence to the regimen decided on. In this sense we see how the working hypothesis we encountered in our collaboration with therapist was nothing but the PEO model unfolded as part of therapeutic practice. What we experienced could be explained as examples of how the PEO model helps frame

the discussion and evaluation of the suggested interventions providing the therapist with a tool for communication.

In terms of methodology, the underlying change-orientation reflected in our research-through-design approach (to be discussed below) found its parallel in the intervention perspective governing the work of the therapists. The therapists were already attuned to a process of dialogic engagement with the particularities of the situation at hand when looking to change the occupational performance of an individual rehabilitee to the better. The familiarity with the setting up of ad-hoc experiments to explore, understand and decide on the appropriate intervention, made it straightforward to include the therapists as co-explorers in the type of design oriented explorative research processes that we were after. We will elaborate further on how the PEO model and the match that we have found in terms of worldviews and approaches to engagement can be articulated as generative entry points inviting researchers in the field of lived informatics who want to join research efforts towards the design of pervasive&mobile digital technologies for physical rehabilitation.

3. METHODOLOGY

Firstly we present the methodology that drove our design explorations. Secondly, we discuss the method of revisiting our work from the emerging perspective of lived informatics we employ in this paper.

3.1.Construction Oriented Research-through-design

Our work follows a construction oriented research-through-design method (Koskinen, Zimmerman, Binder, Redstrom, & Wensveen, 2012). Each of the explorations was driven by in-situ interactive sketching (Buxton, 2007). We sketched in different forms, including software/hardware, video, photomontages, and Wizard-of-Oz. The sketches were intended as early evocative suggestions of possible solutions to help inspire further co-exploration with the rehabilitees, their spouses, and therapists. We took these interactive sketches to the homes of the rehabilitees, asking them to engage in a series of in-situ enactments (Brandt & Grunnet, 2000) of how our sketches could become part of their ongoing rehabilitation processes. Also, the sketches were presented to and constantly critiqued by the professional therapists involved in the particular rehabilitation processes in question during the entire process of our design explorations.

Though the design explorations were driven by the in-situ process of sketching, our intention was not primarily to address the specific problems of the practices of rehabilitation but rather to theorize about the design of digital technology in support of the self-monitoring practices in out-of-clinic physical rehabilitation. Our focus was to explore if and how digital tools could become a part of the everyday settings of out-of-clinic physical rehabilitation and theorise about this more general question, rather than

point to specific technological solutions. In some cases, for example in ReWall and ReExercise, it may appear as if the piece of technology we designed was not really 'needed' and in fact may complicate the situation. However, the artifacts, or rather interactive sketches, were just that: sketches through which we collaboratively sketched the possibilities of technologies becoming a part of the everyday settings. We do not propose them as solutions, but rather as probes for research that bring forward aspects about current and future practices of out-of-clinic rehabilitation and the possibilities of making digital technologies an integrated part of these practices. We were informed by the approach termed as 'concept-driven interaction design research' (Stolterman & Wiberg, 2010).

As we outline in the next section, we began our design explorations informed by the theories of embodied and situated interaction, and as the explorations progressed we became clear about what it means to design digital technology in support of the lived, everyday practices of self-monitoring in out-of-clinic physical rehabilitation. This clarity lead us to propose and define a theoretical concept, namely, 'embodied-self-monitoring'. In other words, the theoretical concept and the concrete design artifacts emerged together throughout, and as a result of, our explorations.

Gathering data for synthesis and reflection

The explorations we discuss in this paper were driven by closely working with the individual rehabilitees in the very settings of their physical rehabilitation. In total we worked with four rehabilitees individually. In each exploration, we interacted with the rehabilitees, and their therapists or family members over a period ranging between two to three months. In the initial sessions, lasting about two to three hours and using methods such as field-based observation and semi-structured interviews, we observed how each rehabilitee engaged with the particularities of their everyday life in order to perform their therapy. We focused on what kind of objects, activities and social relations the individual rehabilitee engaged with while exercising at home and outside the boundaries of a clinic. We followed the observation sessions with enactment with interactive sketches at the sites of their rehabilitation, namely the clinic and home. During the enactment with the sketches, we video-recorded how the rehabilitee engaged with the interactive sketches in combination with other objects, activities and social relations for performing the exercises. We also recorded what the rehabilitees imagined and enacted about the possible scenarios of engaging with digital technology to shape their ways of performing the prescribed exercises. Each exploration had two to three such sessions of enactment, each lasting two to three hours.

We then synthesized these scenarios across the explorations to articulate our understanding of embodied self-monitoring, and how this understanding may guide the design of self-monitoring technologies for out-of-clinic physical rehabilitation. We focused on one rehabilitee per design situation as an opportunity for exploring unique

possibilities leading to a range of examples of the prospects offered by designing for embodied-self-monitoring. We sought uniqueness in each design situation to drive this exploration leading to a range of possible scenarios. In this sense, the four explorations discussed in this paper, in their totality, make up the ‘sample size’ for the synthesis.

Revisiting the Design Explorations

To relate Embodied Self-monitoring to the field of personal informatics, we in particular draw from the more recent notion of ‘lived informatics’. We revisit our explorations to discuss and highlight the multiple roles played by personal rehabilitation data, when engaged with as an integral part of the social and physical settings of out-of-clinic physical rehabilitation. We draw parallels from lived informatics to highlight how our work with embodied self-monitoring can be easily recast as a case of designing for lived informatics in the domain of out-of-clinic physical rehabilitation. As we revisit our work we in particular focus on the diverse ways of using personal rehabilitation data that we encountered as part of the physical rehabilitation processes that we have studied and designed for. We take a renewed look at the rich set of field notes, videos and images collected during the design explorations. We then pick episodes that explicitly concern the role of personal rehabilitation data as part of the existing as well as envisioned and enacted future practices of physical rehabilitation we have explored.

4. EMBODIED SELF-MONITORING: DESIGNING FOR PHYSICAL REHABILITATION IN CONTEXT

4.1. Embodied & Situated Interaction

As physical rehabilitation moves from a clinic and into homes, the ways in which rehabilitees perform their prescribed exercises as part of the settings of a home takes on an important role (Axelrod et al, 2009; Balaam et al, 2011). How self-monitoring is and could become a part of the everyday settings at home becomes important too. Informed by embodied & situated interaction we focused on how self-monitoring is not a feature to be imbued by digital technology, but an ongoing, enacted practice to be designed for.

The theories of embodied interaction (Dourish, 2001) and situated action (Suchman, 2007) informed our work. When seen from the perspective of embodied & situated interaction, a context comes to being, and constantly evolves, due to the interplay between the particular ongoing actions of people and the particularities of the setting within which these actions happen. Embodied interaction is “the creation, manipulation, and sharing of meaning through engaged interaction with artifacts” (Dourish, 2001; p. 126). We read it as a call to explicitly focus on the ongoing action—creation, manipulation and sharing—as it unfolds, rather than any preconceived mental representation of the action.

Based on this understanding in our design explorations, we focused on the actions performed by the rehabilitees to incorporate the prescribed therapy exercises as part of their everyday activities and settings at home. Furthermore we focused on the interrelationship of the actions and their settings: how the actions that the rehabilitees perform in order to adhere to the prescribed treatment—such as, measuring, recording, observing, reflecting, sharing, etc.—are shaped by the particularities of a setting within which these actions are performed, and in turn how these actions shape the setting.

4.2. Embodied acts of rehabilitation-in-context

Taking an embodied interaction perspective when looking at physical rehabilitation activities carried out across home and clinic, we were prompted to focus on the particularities of these settings and how they become very distinct contexts for physical rehabilitation. We focused on how the particular social and material setting at hand become part in shaping how the rehabilitation process unfolds. We focused on the ways the rehabilitees understand their current condition, what they need to do in order to get better, and how to get there through engaging with the prescribed measures, not in isolation, but as part of a larger social & material fabric. We understood the rehabilitees' engagement with exercise instructions and tools as situated and circumstantial actions (Suchman, 2007) with which the rehabilitees take advantage of the opportunities for adoption and appropriation of the prescribed measures in context. Hence, exercise instructions and tools are enacted in-situ and in concert with the many other resources for action (e.g. using the particular curve of a chair as a support, or a flight of stairs to perform stepping exercises) that the rehabilitees engage with, in a given setting.

This understanding of rehabilitation-in-context immediately points out the fundamental challenges faced by any attempt to simply box and move collection of tools, prescriptions and routines from the structured and supervised setting of a clinic to an unsupervised setting of home (Bagalkot & Sokoler, 2012).

4.3. Exploring the design in different settings of out-of-clinic rehabilitation

In this paper we draw from four explorations, namely, MagicMirror, ReSwing, ReWall, and ReExercise. While we have reported on these explorations before (Bagalkot, 2012; Bagalkot & Sokoler, 2013, 2012, 2011; Bagalkot, Sokoler, & Shaikh, 2012), in this paper we present a brief outline of each exploration, which will be used in section 5 as the basis for revisiting.

MagicMirror

The MagicMirror explorations were set in the out-of-clinic physical rehabilitation as practiced in and around Copenhagen, Denmark. We focused on exploring the design of

digital tools for the rehabilitees to self-record their own exercises at the clinic and home and engage with these recorded videos as references for exercising and collaboration with their therapists.

(Figure 1 about here)

In the first version, we worked with Anita, who was undergoing rehabilitation for chronic back condition. We video recorded one of Anita's exercises, namely, upper arm stretches, as she performed them with her physiotherapists at the clinic. We took an edited version of this video, overlaid with visual cues about the range of her stretching and balance, to Anita's home two days later. We asked Anita to perform the exercise by watching this video on the laptop, in her living room. We video recorded her home exercises, and brought them back to the clinic, where Anita and her therapists looked at both the videos to discuss about the progress made by Anita (see figure 1).

In the subsequent study, we worked with Anna, who was undergoing a short-term 12-week rehabilitation post hip-replacement surgery, and her therapists. Here we used the Arduino platform to build an interactive version of MagicMirror. Our interactive hardware and software sketch for this study consisted of a balance board with pressure sensors measuring the weight balance, a belt with an accelerometer for vertical position, a wearable EMG sensor called as 'e-patch'¹, and a digital counter for counting the number of repetition of the exercise. Anna performed three kinds of exercises under guidance of Rasmus, her therapist at the clinic. We video-recorded these exercises, and we designed a software application to collect the sensor data and overlay on the video to give real-time feedback. We followed the same cycle as in the earlier study: We took the in-clinic videos to Anna's home, video-recorded her doing the same exercises at home, and brought the home exercise videos to the clinic as materials for discussion with her therapist (see figure 2).

(Figure 2 about here)

ReSwing and ReWall

ReSwing and ReWall were both set in the context of Gita, a 75-year-old woman who lives in a village in central India. Gita was undergoing rehabilitation post knee-replacement surgery. She underwent the surgery five years prior in a hospital in Pune, the nearest city, which is a 4-hour bus ride from her town. Since her surgery she has been actively performing the rehabilitation exercises prescribed to her just after her surgery in the hospital, and over time these exercises took the nature of fitness exercises that enable her to be mobile and active rather than corrective therapy exercises. As there is no physiotherapy care near where she lives, she performs the exercises without professional supervision. We chose two of her exercises to explore the design of digital self-monitoring technology that Gita can engage with as an integral part of her rehabilitation

¹ <http://epatch.madebydelta.com/>

practice.

(Figure 3 about here)

(Figure 4 about here)

In ReSwing, we focused on a unique exercise that Gita performs. She sits in her garden swing, and moves back and forth, flexing her knees, for about 30 minutes daily (see figure 3). She has invented this way of exercising and based on how it has reduced the pain in her knees and how active she has been in performing her household work, she continued to perform the exercise². Because of Gita's ingenuity and her success of being active and independent, her doctor in Pune suggests other prospective patients to visit Gita and understand how they could live with new knee-joints. Gita is a leader of a 'bhajan mandal', a local folk music group that sings devotional hymns, and has won many awards and trophies that she displays in her living room (see figure 3). In ReSwing, we explored with Gita if and how she could record aspects of her swing exercise, and make it a dedicated part of her living room, in similar lines to that of her musical trophies. We built a mat with an accelerometer that Gita could place on the swing and sit on while exercising (see figure 4). An Arduino and a Zigbee module sent the accelerometer data to a 'trophy' to trigger three LEDs to light up. The LEDs light up for 8 hours after the use of the mat, and then gradually fade off. Text on the trophy congratulated Gita and Kumar, her husband, for successful rehabilitation. Gita experienced the interactive sketch for a week and we had in-depth discussion about her experiences.

(Figure 5 about here)

ReWall focuses on another of Gita's exercise. Gita places her back to a portion of a wall in her living room, and gently bends her knees to move down and move back up, repeating this for 20 times. She performs this exercise at the same spot everyday. Gita is also a knitter and has knit many decorative artifacts that adorn her living room. In ReWall we explored with Gita if and how she could record the degree of bending she does on a daily basis and display this data as a physical, decorative part of her living room. We took as decorative textile wall-piece and fixed two Force Sensing Resistors (FSRs) projecting out of the wall-piece. These were connected to a Lilypad Arduino along with an RGB LED. During her exercise, as Gita brushes across each sensor it registers her touch and lights up the LED in different colors—green for touching the top sensor and orange for touching the bottom sensor (see figure 5). We asked Gita to experience this interactive sketch by performing 10 reps of her exercises, and followed this experience with a discussion.

ReExercise

² When we met with her doctor in Pune, he did confirm that the exercise is actually beneficial.

ReExercise focused on the rehabilitation of Prabhakar, a 78-year-old man who suffered from a stroke two years prior to our exploration. Prabhakar lives with his wife in a two-room apartment in a senior citizen colony in a Mumbai sub-urban area. Prabhakar's mobility is restricted within his apartment, and he has to perform exercises twice a day to strengthen his back and upper body. He performs these exercises on a bed in the living-cum-bedroom, which also acts as a couch for seating visitors and as his bed at night. We observed that Lakshmi, his wife is constantly around him, supporting him, and reminding him, when he exercises. During our exploration we encountered, in a somewhat dramatic fashion (refer Bagalkot, 2012 for more details) how the couple are distressed by the fact that their four sons do not talk to them. We observed how the couple have become ever more religious as a way to deal with their distress; they prayed twice daily, watched religious TV channels, and the walls were adorned with images of gods and goddesses.

(Figure 6 about here)

Guided by embodied self-monitoring we embraced the way the couple practiced their religion. In particular, we explored if and how the couple could integrate exercising with praying. We built an exercise mat with a Force Sensing Resistor (FSR) connected to a LilyPad Arduino. We connected a LED to the Arduino and fixed it on a small idol of Ganesha (see figure 6), the elephant god worshipped by the couple. The FSR measured the force exerted by Prabhakar's elbow while exercising, and displayed it in the form of varying brightness of LED. The LED lit up every time Prabhakar exercised and faded off after 8 hours, which mimicked the act of praying by lighting a lamp in front of god's idol. We asked the couple to experience the sketch, followed by a discussion of the experience.

4.4. Embodied Self-Monitoring: The Definition

During these explorations, our understanding of embodied self-monitoring became clear. In particular we realized that the rehabilitees perform the actions of self-monitoring (and performing their exercises) not in isolation, but as an integral part of the social and material settings of their everyday life. Based on this understanding, we defined embodied-self-monitoring as: *Measuring, recording, observing, and performing other such self-monitoring actions for adhering to a prescribed treatment or therapy in concert with the physical and social settings embedding these actions.*

Embodied-self-monitoring basically calls for an 'unboxing' of the tools of physical rehabilitation as they move from the structured and supervised settings of a clinic to the unsupervised settings of a home. As we discuss the notion of unboxing later in this paper, it suggests a move away from the design of monolithic digital systems. Foregrounding the embodied nature of physical rehabilitation suggests a focus to facilitate rehabilitee engagement with the designed technology as a part of the everyday settings of their rehabilitation. In particular it suggests a focus on facilitating engagement with technology as one of the resources that works-in-concert with how the rehabilitees engage with their everyday spaces, objects and people in order to shape their adherence.

5. REVISITING: LIVED INFORMATICS IN OUT-OF-CLINIC PHYSICAL REHABILITATION

On revisiting the explorations from the emerging perspective of lived informatics we came across a range of examples of how the rehabilitees used their personal rehabilitation data for multiple purposes, broadly towards making sense of their physical rehabilitation process. Lived informatics has emerged as a critique and response to the 5-stage Personal Informatics model (Li, Dey, & Forlizzi, 2010), which has become a somewhat canonical model guiding the design and development of personal informatics systems. Recent works (e.g. Harrison, Marshall, Bianchi-Berthouze, & Bird, 2015; Yang, Shin, Newman, & Ackerman, 2015) critique the stage-based PI model particularly highlighting how the model foregrounds the stages as being isolated from their context. Rooksby, Rost, Morrison, and Chalmers (2014) suggest the term ‘lived informatics’ to highlight how people use self-tracked data in multiple ways as part of their everyday life. The authors critique the stage-based model as being too technology-centered disregarding how people actively ‘interweave’ tracking and the tools for tracking as part of their everyday life and not in the form of clearly delineated stages. Epstein, Ping, Fogarty, and Munson (2015) build on the notion of lived informatics and propose a model that is more reflective of the way people engage in self-tracking as part of their everyday life. Both these works propose alternative models for the design and development of personal informatics systems. However, we read these works in more general terms, as basically calling for an explicit focus on understanding and designing for the lived aspects of data.

We realised how well aligned our work was with this broader call when revisiting our explorations. What emerged, when revisiting our work with a focus on the production and use of data, was a nuanced understanding of how personal rehabilitation data takes on multiple roles as part of a rehabilitees lived, everyday settings. For example, rehabilitees imagined personal rehabilitation data as a physical prop in conversation between friends and as a physical marker in a living room subtly reminding of the exercises performed. Some also enacted how recording and reading personal rehabilitation data could be an opportunity for the spouse of the rehabilitee to be involved in the activity of exercising. In this section, we elaborate on these examples particularly focusing on reporting how the rehabilitees envisioned and enacted multiple roles of their personal rehabilitation data as part of their out-of-clinic physical rehabilitation efforts.

We present our examples of the multiple roles of personal rehabilitation data into four categories, which are as follows:

1. Becoming your own standard of reference
2. Marking your life as a rehabilitee
3. Articulating with therapists, partners, and peers

4. Incorporating exercising with everyday activities

5.1. Becoming Your Own Standard of Reference

The two MagicMirror explorations looked into the design of systems that would allow the rehabilitees to self-record their exercises at clinic and at home and use these videos as ‘mirrors’ to see their progress in rehabilitation.

During both MagicMirror explorations, we observed how the participating rehabilitees envisioned and enacted multiple uses of their personal rehabilitation data to turn their bodies and the social & physical settings of their physical rehabilitation into a reference point for understanding their rehabilitation process. Below we present the specific instances across both the explorations that bring forward how the rehabilitees used their personal rehabilitation data.

Anita and Anna, the participating rehabilitees in the MagicMirror explorations, envisioned and enacted how by video recording their own exercises they could engage with their body as an index for seeing how they have healed over time and across the different settings where they exercised. Anita and Anna decided what to record, how and where to record, and how to view and make sense of the video records based on the purpose of doing so. These purposes were, for example, to monitor their progress while performing the exercises, and to know of the progress they make over time in managing activities of daily living (ADL), such as picking the towel from the floor, etc. However, both Anita and Anna enacted these possibilities in different ways.

(Figure 7 about here)

Anita was more receptive to the idea of simultaneously viewing on her TV the reference video and the video of her current exercise, while she is performing the exercise in her living room. The reference video showed her performing the exercise for the first time at the clinic. When the video of her current exercise was overlapped on this reference video, Anita got the immediate visual feedback of how much more she could stretch her hands above her head, as compared to the first day of her treatment (see figure 7). She mentioned how by looking at the current video of how much she stretches her arms with reference to her original video she could visualize the progress she made over time. Anita also imagined how, if she could go through the daily videos of the exercises, she could see for herself how she has progressed over the days.

(Figure 8 about here)

Meanwhile, during the exploration at Anna’s home, we found that she moves about her house when she performs her exercise. She performs the sit-stand exercise with the help of the dining chair, and the stepping exercise on the small flight of stairs that lead from the living room to the dining room (see figure 8). In particular, Anna did not use the stepper given to her by the rehab center, instead used the flight of stairs, as the stepper

was “ugly” and she hid it in her garage. Here, guided by embodied self-monitoring we embraced the way Anna actively uses her physical settings in order to exercise and envisioned a more portable version of the video recording and playing device, which we termed as MyReDiary (see figure 9).

(Figure 9 about here)

Additionally, Anna felt that the overlapping of the reference video with the current video would confuse her. She said, “It will confuse me. Looking at what I did and what I am doing now... it is difficult! I would like to see what I did at the rehab center separately, maybe when I am relaxing in the afternoon.” She mentioned how she would prefer to look at the reference exercise video before she begins her exercises, while relaxing in the living room. She also mentioned that she would look at the videos of the exercises she performed in the home after she has performed them, in order to gauge for herself how she has made a progress.

(Figure 10 about here)

Furthermore, during the enactment of the discussion of the home videos with the therapist at the clinic, Anna gave us a demonstration of how frustrating it is to manage even simple everyday tasks, picking up a towel from the floor for instance, when she is dealing with a new hip joint (see figure 10).

She had brought with her the pincher to pick up the towel and other things to help articulate her everyday difficulties. She mentioned how to be able to video-record these instances and sharing with her therapists and family will help her to talk about her everyday situations. Furthermore, she mentioned how recording a series of such videos of her doing her everyday activities, and not just about her exercises, could also give her an overview of her progress that she has made in her life as a rehabilitee over time.

In summary, these instances highlight how both Anita and Anna envisioned and enacted multiple ways to use their self-recorded videos to refer to their own bodies and the settings of their out-of-clinic physical rehabilitation and make sense of their efforts.

5.2. Marking your Life as a Rehabilitee

We found how the rehabilitees enacted and envisioned different ways through which their personal rehabilitation data could become a marker or a token of their life as a rehabilitee and become a part of the physical and social settings of their physical rehabilitation. We present instances from MagicMirror, ReSwing, and ReWall explorations to elaborate on this finding.

In the MagicMirror exploration, Anna imagined how video-recording the home exercises and carrying them back to the rehabilitation center acts as a physical reminder for her to exercise at home. She said, “It is like a whip! You know, they (the

rehabilitation center) send this van to pick me up to the rehabilitation center. I am tired and lazy to go sometimes, but as soon I see the van, I have to go. I guess this (video recording) will be something similar.” Here, Anna imagined how she could use the activity of recording exercises as reminder her of the exercises that she has to perform. Guided by embodied self-monitoring, we embraced Anna’s vision and gave a physical form to the videos, by sketching the MyReDiary as a portable, dedicated, and personal video and data journal (see figure 9). The MyReDiary tablet gave a physical form to Anna’s videos and other rehabilitation data. Anna imagined how merely looking at the physical device itself, without even looking into the data, could act as a reminder to perform her prescribed exercises and record them to take them to the clinic.

Along similar lines, Gita in the ReWall exploration, imagined how she could use the colored LED on the decorative wall hanging as a subtle reminder of her daily exercises. Gita imagined how she could see and understand the data (on how much she bent her knee on a given day) in very personal and subtle manner as the LED display was integrated with the textile and only she knew what it meant. She mentioned how for visitors, it is just a decorative piece a part of her living room. Meanwhile, in ReSwing, Gita enacted and experienced how she could use the data presented in the form of LEDs on the trophy not as a visual reminder of her exercise but as one part of the constellation of awards adorning her living room. For her, and her husband, the trophy was just another addition to the other trophies; while the others displayed Gita’s expertise in music, the ReSwing trophy displayed her expertise as a rehabilitee in general and specifically her ingenuity in integrating the exercises with her everyday settings.

In both the ReWall and ReSwing explorations Gita mentioned how even as she was cleaning and dusting the living room, she could see the LEDs on both the trophy and the decorative wall-hanging, which could trigger her to think about her exercises and rehabilitation in general. Similarly Gita could use the trophy in her living room in an impromptu manner as a prop to discuss her life as a rehabilitee when people visit her (please refer the next finding for a detailed discussion about this aspect).

In summary, these instances highlight how the rehabilitees enacted possibilities of personal rehabilitation data as visual and material markers part of their living environments that reminded them not only about their exercises, but also in general about their life as people undergoing physical rehabilitation.

5.3. Articulating with Therapists, Partners, and Peers

We found how the rehabilitees enacted and experienced multiple possibilities of using personal rehabilitation data as a resource to shape and inform their conversation with their therapists and also peers and other visitors. Furthermore, we also found instances of how the activity of recording and reading personal rehabilitation data became an opportunity for the spouse of the rehabilitee to be actively involved in the rehabilitation

process. We draw from the MagicMirror, ReSwing, and ReExercise explorations to elaborate on this finding.

In the MagicMirror exploration we took videos of Anna's home exercises back to the clinic and staged a discussion between Anna and Rasmus, her physiotherapist. However, Anna could not articulate to Rasmus how she performed the exercises at home, and he had to encourage her by asking leading questions. This pointed to us the possibility of Anna working with the recorded videos at home so that she can be prepared to share and articulate how she performed the exercises at home, what goals she can achieve, and how to modify or set new goals with her therapist. Furthermore, Anna demonstrated how it is only about working with previously recorded exercise videos, but also important for her to decide on what to record at home, such as her ADLs of picking a towel or watering the plants so as to discuss with her physiotherapists if she is doing them in the right manner. Anna also imagined how she could share these self-recorded videos with her friends and family as a way to talk about her life as a rehabilitee.

Guided by embodied self-monitoring, we envisioned that through the MyReDiary tablet (see figure 9) Anna could record data in the form of videos and images, annotate them with audio or text, and carry these annotated videos or images to the clinic to articulate her questions, experiences and insights during the meeting with her therapist.

Meanwhile, in the ReSwing exploration, we observed how Gita used the awards and trophies and other decorative objects that she makes as resources to tell her life stories (see figure 3). We embraced this observation and speculated if and how Gita can similarly use her personal rehabilitation data as a resource to share stories about her rehabilitation process to prospective rehabilitees visiting her for advice. ReSwing by displaying data about Gita's exercise on the swing in the form of LEDs on the trophy opens an opportunity for Gita to use the rehabilitation trophy as a prop in conversation with her friends and family. Gita mentioned how, during the deployment week, she talked about her exercises with the swing by showing the trophy to her visiting daughter.

Furthermore we encountered, quite accidentally, the possibility of how Gita could involve Kumar, her husband, as a person who reads the data about her exercise and gives real-time feedback. During our visit to Gita's home after a week, the couple demonstrated how they interacted with the ReSwing sketch. Gita was on the swing in the garden pushing her knees back and forth. Kumar, who was in the living room looking at the LEDs on the trophy, kept instructing Gita to increase or decrease the speed of her movements. We wondered how he came to know about the speed as he was not able to see Gita. Kumar mentioned that he came to know based on how fast the LEDs were flickering. Gita mentioned that this has been the routine for a week now, with her husband fixing the speed of her exercise based on the speed of flickering of the LEDs on the trophy. However, we had not built the sketch with this purpose! In fact, the flickering of LEDs was due to faulty coding on our part, and was an accidental effect.

This accidental and surprising encounter opened us to consider how closely Kumar was involved in the rehabilitation of his wife, particularly as a person who reads the data, and uses it to give real-time feedback to his wife so that she can pace her exercise. During the interview post experiencing the ReSwing sketch, Kumar pointed at the trophy and said, “Thank you for mentioning my name on the trophy. I have done a lot of work to get her on her feet... close friends and family knew about my efforts, but now you have given me something to make it permanent.” He recounted the details about his active role in the rehabilitation of his wife, telling stories about staying in the hospital in Pune during Gita’s surgery, encouraging Gita to keep exercising everyday, and modifying her exercises to suit their home environment.

In ReExercise we took on a more deliberate focus to explore the role of spouse in the rehabilitation process. We had observed how Lakshmi was always present to help Prabhakar exercise in the right manner, and her presence acted as a motivation for Prabhakar to consistently perform his exercises. We built this aspect into the ReExercise sketch (as detailed before). While experiencing the sketch, Prabhakar laid down on the exercise mat, while Lakshmi placed his elbows on the FSR. Prabhakar being a Hindu cannot show his feet towards the idol of Ganesha and the idol was kept behind his head. Lakshmi read the feedback from the LED and communicated it to him, “Keep this (his elbow) straight, it (LED) has to be brighter.” After the exercise, we showed Prabhakar the video of the exercise he did, telling him the relation between the right posture of his elbow and the brightness of LED on Ganesha. He smiled when Lakshmi pointed out, “See you really lit it bright.” This interaction between Lakshmi and Prabhakar was close to what happened between Gita and Kumar. Here integrating religious practices with the activity of self-monitoring and exercising offered an opportunity for both Prabhakar and Lakshmi to continue the way they performed the exercises together (see figure 11).

(Figure 11 about here)

In summary, these instances highlight how the rehabilitees envisioned and enacted the possibilities of picking and capturing specific kind of data to share, articulating their concerns by using the data in the form of annotated video and images, and using the data in an impromptu manner as props in conversation with their therapist and peers. The rehabilitees also envisioned and enacted how the activities of recording and monitoring the data about exercises could be an opportunity for the spouse to be closely involved in the rehabilitation process.

5.4. Incorporating Exercising with Everyday Activities

We found how the rehabilitees envisioned and enacted the different modes of using their personal rehabilitation data as a resource to turn their mundane everyday activities into opportunities for performing rehabilitation exercises. We will elaborate this finding by drawing on the MagicMirror, ReSwing, and ReExercise explorations.

(Figure 12 about here)

During our work we came across multiple instances of rehabilitees turning their mundane everyday activities into opportunities for exercising. For example, a 92-year-old man we met demonstrated how he exercised at home while listening to a classical music on the radio (see figure 12). As he warmed up to the music, his the hand and shoulder stretches he did as exercises no more remain to appear as exercises, but turn to the hand motions of a music conductor. This instance acted as an inspiration for us to explore how could physiological data could become a part of and facilitate the rehabilitees to incorporate exercising with their other everyday physical activities?

(Figure 13 about here)

(Figure 14 about here)

During the MagicMirror exploration, Anna offered us an inspiring insight about how she had reconfigured brushing her teeth into an opportunity for performing weight balance exercises prescribed as part of her therapy. One of the electronic-sketches that Anna experienced during the MagicMirror exploration was a balance-board-hack with a digital counter fixed on to count the number of steps, which was displayed on the screen (see figure 13). After the performance, Anna mentioned that the counter reminded her of how she exercised while brushing her teeth: She performed the exercises by standing on one leg and counting to ten before shifting to the next leg, as she brushed her teeth. Anna took advantage of the rhythm of brushing teeth—an otherwise mundane, everyday activity—in order to keep pace of her exercises. Inspired, we speculated if and how Anna’s brushing-as-exercising can be enhanced with digital technology. We envisioned ReBrush as an example of a simple technology that can help Anna to place simple timers or counters on her tooth-brush, through which she can keep pace of their exercises while brushing her teeth everyday (see figure 14). While Anna felt that she would not use such a brush as she had already got a hang of the timing, the sketch pointed to a larger possibility, which we utilized to further inform our exploration in ReSwing (refer Bagalkot, Sokoler, and Shaikh, 2012 for a detailed reflection).

We have mentioned before how Gita had already turned her swing activity into an opportunity to exercise her knees. During the ReSwing exploration, Gita took the ReSwing mat and placed it on the foot-operated sewing machine, and as she flexed her knees to operate the machine, the accelerometer recorded her knee movements and presented it on the trophy. In this sense, Gita used the mat to not only record data about one everyday activity, but enacted how she could actively collect data about other activities that involved her flexing the knees, turning them into rehabilitation exercises.

Meanwhile, in the ReExercise exploration, Prabhakar and Lakshmi experienced how by exercising they could light up the LED, which when placed in front of the Ganesha idol turns the activity of exercising into praying by lighting a lamp thereby blurring the distinction between exercising and praying (see figure 6). As Lakshmi mentioned just after the enactment with the sketch, “It is good (to see the feedback as a LED in front of Ganesha), we can keep this Ganesha here in the living room and keep lighting it (the

LED) up; we light the lamp in front of idols (that they keep in the prayer alcove in the kitchen) twice everyday.”

In summary these instances highlight how the rehabilitees envisioned and enacted the possibilities of instrumenting the objects—a toothbrush or a sewing machine—that they use to perform an everyday activity to gather body and physiological data while involved in the activity. The rehabilitees used this data to turn the everyday activity into an opportunity for performing the exercises prescribed as part of their rehabilitation.

6. DISCUSSION

The multifaceted roles that personal rehabilitation data takes on points to how embodied self-monitoring orients the designer to foreground the situated and embodied acts of physical rehabilitation in design for lived informatics systems in support of out-of-clinic physical rehabilitation. However, a lived informatics designer is still left with the question of how and where to begin their design? In this section we return to the earlier introduced Transactional PEO Model as a frame to suggest entry points into designing for lived informatics in the domain out-of-clinic physical rehabilitation. We structure our discussion into three sections. In the first section we reframe the working hypothesis of physiotherapists into an interaction design challenge. In the second section we discuss the three circles of the PEO model as entry points for design for lived informatics in support of out-of-clinic physical rehabilitation. And finally we outline the opportunities for lived informatics researchers in the domain of out-of-clinic physical rehabilitation guided by the notion of unboxing.

6.1. Reframing Physiotherapists’ Working Hypothesis as an Interaction Design Challenge

Previously we discussed how the practice of physiotherapy works with a working hypothesis that the integration of physical rehabilitation exercises with mundane everyday activities will lead to better adherence and hence, in turn more successful out-of-clinic rehabilitation. Based on our research background and interest in the intersection of interaction design and mobile&pervasive computing, and experiences of engaging in the design explorations, we reframe the the field of physiotherapy’s working hypothesis as a design challenge. Namely, *how to design mobile&pervasive digital technologies to help rehabilitees and rehabilitators in turning Activities of Daily Living, and their settings into parts of a prescribed regimen for physical rehabilitation?*

To briefly recollect Anna in the MagicMirror exploration and Gita in the ReSwing exploration had already turned their everyday activities of brushing teeth and enjoying the swing, respectively, into opportunities to perform their rehabilitation exercises. And we explored if and how we could instrument the toothbrush and the swing to open up opportunities for Anna and Gita to engage with their personal rehabilitation data in

multiple ways.

We find that from our experience that Activities of Daily Living (ADL) offer a very unique opportunity for exploring the design of novel pervasive and mobile technologies in support of lived informatics within the context of out-of-clinic physical rehabilitation. In particular, we find that focusing on instrumenting how a rehabilitee performs an ADL can open up an opportunity for the rehabilitee to turn the ADL into an exercise prescribed as part of his/her therapy. This focus on designing for turning ADL into opportunities to exercise opens up a new space of design of digital technologies in support of lived informatics in out-of-clinic physical rehabilitation.

6.2.Designing for Lived Informatics for Out-of-Clinic Physical Rehabilitation: An Invitation.

As described before the PEO model focuses on the transactions between a person, their occupation, and the environment where this occupation happens. During our explorations we encountered multiple instances of the therapists using the model to plan their interventions. Meanwhile, because of our grounding in embodied and situated interaction, we explicitly focused on observing and designing for how the rehabilitees engaged with their particular social and physical settings in order to adhere with and perform their prescribed therapy. Based on this experience, we claim that the PEO model offers entry points for design work aimed at designing lived informatics tools in support of out-of-clinic rehabilitation. We position the circles as entry points for design, but as the design work progresses a designer must embrace the relationships between the rehabilitee, their activities, tasks, and occupations, and their environment. That is, the PEO model also calls for a design methodology that is situated and collaborative, as reflected by both our work, and the practice of experienced physiotherapists.

Person

A person undergoing rehabilitation seems to be an obvious starting point. A straightforward possibility is to begin thinking about how to instrument the person's body with sensors and actuators to measure, track, and give real-time feedback while the person is performing their prescribed exercises.

For example, in the MagicMirror exploration we began by instrumenting Anna's body with wearable sensors, namely, the e-patch, the accelerometer, and the pressure sensor under her feet so as to give her real-time feedback on the video while she performs her prescribed exercises. As per early scenario, Anna had to stand in-front of a television instrumented with a webcam to be able to video-record and play-back her exercises at the clinic and at her home. However, when we moved to her house we soon understood that the video-recording has to work with the way Anna exercises across multiple spaces in her home. MyReDiary as a resulting design idea from the in-situ collaborative

exploration envisions Anna to continue to use the stairs rather than the stepper as the place to perform her stepping exercise, and does not restrict her to perform her exercises in front of her television.

Environment

The PEO model defines environment broadly as the cultural, socio-economic, institutional, physical, and social considerations that form the particular and unique settings for a person's occupation. In other words, the model focuses on how a unique individual engages with the settings as part of performing their activities, tasks, and occupation, and in turn how the settings shape the person's performance. Physiotherapists consider the environment as another place to intervene in rehabilitation. For example, they suggest the rehabilitees to make use of pillows and cushions as obstacles in a balance-training exercise (see figure 15), to use filled water bottles as weights to increase resistance in exercises, etc. Following a similar approach in design, sensing and actuating technologies could be made part of the settings where a rehabilitee performs his/her exercises to support embodied self-monitoring of the exercises.

(Figure 15 about here)

For example, in the ReSwing exploration we leveraged the way Gita engaged with her swing to perform her exercises, and the awards and trophies in her living room as props to narrate and share aspects of her life as a musician. The ReSwing sketch brought the two physical and social aspects of Gita together to open opportunities for Gita to engage with the swing not only to continue her exercises, but also utilize the 'rehabilitation trophy' to talk about her life as a rehabilitee. In ReExercise, we continued our stance of embracing the way a rehabilitee engages with their environment, and explored how Prabhakar could continue to engage with Lakshmi as a motivator, along with opening the possibility for engaging with exercising as also performing a spiritual practice of praying.

Occupation

As discussed before, the PEO model discusses the concepts of activities, tasks, and occupation in relation to each other. While tasks and occupation are broader categories and are not so easy to grasp in design, in our experience, daily activities offer a more concrete starting point for design. Physiotherapists train the rehabilitees to perform Activities of Daily Living (ADL) so that they either regain or cope with their abilities to perform ADLs. The ADLs, such as walking, cooking, bathing, could be instrumented with sensing and actuating technologies to track and monitor the rehabilitee's performance of the activities and possibly share with their therapists.

To recollect, in MagicMirror we encountered how Anna combines brushing her teeth and performing balance exercises and sketched ReBrush. We further explored the

possibility in ReSwing, with a focus on what if we instrument Gita's daily activity of exercising on the swing while listening to music with sensing mechanism that will make the data about the time she spends on the activity available as part of her social setting. Here, it soon became apparent that what matters for Gita is not a measure of how much time she spends, but a physical representation of her exercises to be part of her living room conversations. These examples may not appear to be strongly representing the focus on occupation as an entry point for design. However, they do point towards how design could piggyback on the rehabilitee's ongoing efforts towards combining exercising and ADLs.

6.3.Unboxing: A Direction for Design

Considering the PEO model as a generative entry-point, also opens up 'unboxing' as a direction for the design of digital technologies in support of lived informatics in out-of-clinic physical rehabilitation. Previously we mentioned how embodied self-monitoring calls for the unboxing of the physical rehabilitation tools, prescriptions and recipes as they are moved out of the structured and supervised settings of a clinic and into unsupervised settings of a home. The approach to unbox is also reflected in how occupational and physical therapists, informed by the PEO model, not only acknowledge, but also embrace the fact that the rehabilitees will have to modify both the therapy prescriptions and tools, and their own activities and environments at home to integrate the therapy with their everyday life. For example, while exploring the interactive sketch in Anna's home, her therapist saw that Anna uses the stairs and not the stepper to exercise. Rather than ask her to use the stepper, he suggested some modification to the exercise to suit the change in the step rise between the stair and the stepper.

We call for designers to take a similar direction of unboxing while designing the digital tools. In line with the physiotherapy practice, for us unboxing is a move away from the prevailing notion of basically boxing the tools, prescriptions and routines of the clinic and placing these in private homes. Technologies such as advanced wearable or portable sensors, actuators, smartphones, embedded low-energy bluetooth devices, advanced personal area networks, etc., are ready to be engaged with as enabling technologies in the process of unboxing. What is required is situated and collaborative explorations of how the technologies could be put forward not as a stand-alone monolithic boxed up system, but as more open-ended resources designed to work-in-concert with how the rehabilitees engage with their everyday spaces, objects and people in order to shape their lived rehabilitation. Sokoler (2004) discussed with examples more broadly how digital technology could be designed as non-monolithic solutions presenting themselves as nothing but one of many resources available for human action and interaction in a given situation. The interactive sketches we discuss in this paper are early examples of such non-monolithic tools (a more detailed argument is presented in Bagalkot and Sokoler (2012)).

Imagine this scenario: Anna undergoes a hip-replacement surgery and visits a therapist for post-surgical rehabilitation. The therapist discusses with Anna, and visits her home with a suite of sensors, actuators, and displays. They together figure-out which and how the everyday objects and activities that Anna engages in can be instrumented/augmented in order to sense and display data from Anna's rehabilitation process. Anna then in turn starts to engage with the data as part of her everyday life, and in collaboration with her therapist figures-out specific exercises that work for her condition and settings. This sets of a number of iterations where Anna and her therapist identifies modifications to the ADL she performs, the sensor-display configuration chosen and her environment.

Recent advances in pervasive and mobile technologies make it ever more easier to explore the possibilities of designing the tools for such ad-hoc, in-situ reconfiguration of activities and environments. We invite the community to explore the possibilities towards supporting ad-hoc reconfiguration as a novel area of application. Focusing on unboxing of the digital tools will firstly open the space for designing digital tools in support of lived informatics in out-of-clinic physical rehabilitation. And secondly, just as important, it will at the same time aid the physiotherapy objectives of encouraging more inclusion and participation of the rehabilitee in shaping their own rehabilitation regime.

Having said that, we acknowledge that there will be challenges of costs and scalability. However, we believe that addressing these challenges may involve a reconsideration of the role of the physiotherapists. What the scenario highlights is how the therapist is not merely prescribing individualized therapy, but rather collaboratively designing (reconfiguring) the intervention with the individual rehabilitee over time. The focus of design then must be to enable and facilitate the therapist and rehabilitee to collaboratively reconfigure the exercises and their everyday settings.

7. CONCLUSION

In this paper we revisited our work of exploring the design of digital technology in support of out-of-clinic physical rehabilitation. The physical rehabilitation domain is informed by the PEO model and guided by a working hypothesis that integration of physical rehabilitation exercises with mundane everyday activities will lead to better adherence and hence, in turn more successful out-of-clinic rehabilitation. Informed by the theory of embodied and situated interaction, and closely aligned with physiotherapeutic practice, we have been exploring the design of digital technologies in support of self-monitoring as part of out-of-clinic physical rehabilitation over the past five years.

We revisited this work from the emerging perspective of lived informatics, and brought forward multiple instances of rehabilitees using personal rehabilitation data in unique ways to make sense of their physical rehabilitation process. We presented how in our work we turn the working hypothesis of physiotherapists into an interaction design

challenge. This in turn pointed to opportunities for rehabilitees and rehabilitators in turning ADL and their settings into parts of a prescribed regimen for physical rehabilitation with the support of digital technologies as a resource to be integrated in emerging out-of-clinic rehabilitation practices. We presented the PEO model and suggested that it may act as a generative entry point to the design of lived informatics systems for out-of-clinic physical rehabilitation. We discussed how aligning with the PEO model also calls for adopting the notion of unboxing the digital tools - a design direction that draws our attention to the design of mobile&pervasive digital technology in support of in-situ collaborative negotiation of rehabilitation regimen through ad-hoc reconfiguration of activities and environments by rehabilitees and rehabilitators.

We drew on a deep-understanding of the PEO Model as experienced through our close work with therapists and rehabilitees in numerous interaction design research projects over the past five years. We present our experiences in this paper as an invitation for researchers in the field of lived informatics to engage in the design of digital technologies for out-of-clinic physical rehabilitation.

REFERENCES

- Axelrod, L., Fitzpatrick, G., Burridge, J., Mawson, S., Smith, P., Rodden, T., & Ricketts, I. (2009). The reality of homes fit for heroes: design challenges for rehabilitation technology at home. *Journal of Assistive Technologies*, 3(2), 35–43.
- Bagalkot, N., & Sokoler, T. (2016 – under review). Watching your back while riding your bike: Exploring the design for everyday preventive self-care. *Under review for publication in NordiCHI 2012 Nordic Conference on Human-Computer Interaction: Making Sense Through Design*. New York: ACM.
- Bagalkot, N. L., & Sokoler, T. (2013). Embodied-self-monitoring: Embracing the context for adherence to physical rehabilitation in the design for self-monitoring. In *2013 7th International Conference on Pervasive Computing Technologies for Healthcare (PervasiveHealth)* (pp. 192–199).
- Bagalkot, N. L. (2012). Embodied-self-monitoring. PhD Thesis. IT-Universitetet i København
- Bagalkot, N. L., Sokoler, T., & Shaikh, R. (2012). Integrating physiotherapy with everyday life: exploring the space of possibilities through ReHandles. *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Tangible, Embedded and Embodied Interaction* (pp. 91–98). ACM.
- Bagalkot, N., & Sokoler, T. (2012). Unboxing the tools for physical rehabilitation: embracing the difference between the clinic and home. *Proceedings of NordiCHI 2012 Nordic Conference on Human-Computer Interaction: Making Sense*

- Through Design*. New York: ACM.
- Bagalkot, N., & Sokoler, T. (2011). MyReDiary: Co-Designing for Collaborative Articulation in Physical Rehabilitation. *ECSCW 2011: Proceedings of the 12th European Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work*, London: Springer London.
- Bagalkot, N., Nazzi, E., & Sokoler, T. (2010). Facilitating Continuity: Exploring the Role of Digital Technology in Physical Rehabilitation. In *Proceedings of the 6th Nordic Conference on Human-Computer Interaction: Extending Boundaries*. New York: ACM.
- Balaam, M., Rennick Egglestone, S., Fitzpatrick, G., Rodden, T., Hughes, A. M., Wilkinson, A., Nind, T., et al. (2011). Motivating mobility: designing for lived motivation in stroke rehabilitation. *Proceedings of the 2011 annual conference on Human factors in computing systems*. New York: ACM.
- Brandt, E. & Grunnet, C. (2000). Evoking the future: Drama and props in user centered design. *Proceedings of Participatory Design Conference (PDC 2000)* (pp. 11–20).
- Buxton, B. (2007) *Sketching User Experiences: Getting the Design Right and the Right Design*. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc.
- Campbell R, Evans M, Tucker B, Quilty B, Donovan JL. (2001). Why don't patients do their exercises? Understanding non-compliance with physiotherapy in patients with osteoarthritis of the knee. *J Epidemiol Commun Health*, 55:132–8.
- Dourish, P. (2001) *Where the Action Is: the Foundations of Embodied Interaction*. MIT Press
- Epstein, D. A., Ping, A., Fogarty, J., & Munson, S. A. (2015). A Lived Informatics Model of Personal Informatics. In *Proceedings of the 2015 ACM International Joint Conference on Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing* (pp. 731–742). New York: ACM.
- Harrison, D., Marshall, P., Bianchi-Berthouze, N., & Bird, J. (2015). Activity Tracking: Barriers, Workarounds and Customisation. In *Proceedings of the 2015 ACM International Joint Conference on Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing* (pp. 617–621). New York: ACM.
- Koskinen, I., Zimmerman, J., Binder, T., Redstrom, J., & Wensveen, S. (2012). *Design Research Through Practice: From the Lab, Field, and Showroom*. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc.

- Law, Mary, Barbara Cooper, Susan Strong, Debra Stewart, Patricia Rigby, and Lori Letts (1996), "The Person-Environment-Occupation Model: A Transactive Approach to Occupational Performance." *Canadian Journal of Occupational Therapy* 63 (1): 9–23. doi:10.1177/000841749606300103.
- Li, I., Dey, A., & Forlizzi, J. (2010). A Stage-based Model of Personal Informatics Systems. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (pp. 557–566). New York, NY, USA: ACM.
- Mastos, M., Miller, K., Eliasson, A. C., & Imms, C. (2007). Goal-Directed Training: Linking Theories of Treatment to Clinical Practice for Improved Functional Activities in Daily Life. *Clinical Rehabilitation*, 21(1), 47–55.
- McClain, C. (2005) Collaborative Rehabilitation Goal Setting, *Topics in Stroke Rehabilitation*, Volume 12, Issue 4.
- National Danish Whitepaper on Rehabilitation, (2004), http://www.marselisborgcentret.dk/fileadmin/filer/Publikationer/PDF_er/Hvidbog.pdf Last accessed April 22, 2016.
- Nicholls, D.A. & Gibson, B.E., (2010). The body and physiotherapy. *Physiotherapy Theory and Practice*, 26(8), pp.497-509.
- Petursdottir, Unnur, Solveig A Arnadottir, and Sigridur Halldorsdottir, (2010), "Facilitators and Barriers to Exercising Among People With Osteoarthritis: A Phenomenological Study." *Physical Therapy* 90 (7): 1014–25. doi:10.2522/ptj.20090217.
- Rooksby, J., Rost, M., Morrison, A., & Chalmers, M. C. (2014). Personal Tracking As Lived Informatics. In *Proceedings of the 32Nd Annual ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. New York: ACM.
- Sluijs, E. M., Kok, G. J., & Zee, J. van der. (1993). Correlates of Exercise Compliance in Physical Therapy. *Physical Therapy*, 73(11), 771–782.
- Sokoler, T. (2004). *Going beyond the desktop computer with an attitude* (Doctoral dissertation, Blekinge Institute of Technology). Dissertation Series no. 2004:04. Available through www.bth.se/fou.
- Stolterman, E. & Wiberg, M., (2010), Concept-Driven Interaction Design Research. *Human Computer Interaction*, 25(2), p.95-118.
- Suchman, L., (2007), *Human-Machine Reconfigurations: Plans and Situated Actions*, Cambridge University Press, New York.

World Health Organization. (2001) International Classification Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF). Geneva: World Health Organization

Yang, R., Shin, E., Newman, M. W., & Ackerman, M. S. (2015). When Fitness Trackers Don'T "Fit": End-user Difficulties in the Assessment of Personal Tracking Device Accuracy. In *Proceedings of the 2015 ACM International Joint Conference on Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing*. New York: ACM.

Figure 1. Sketching and exploring video recording exercises at clinic, at home, and back at clinic with Anita



Figure 2. Sketching and exploring video recording exercises at clinic, at home, and back at clinic with Anna




Figure 3. Gita in her living room with awards and trophies, and exercising on the swing in her garden



Figure 4. Gita placing the ReSwing mat on the swing to record data about her exercise, which is displayed in the form of three LEDs on the trophy placed above the television in her living room.



Figure 5. Gita exercising at the wall in her living room, and then experiencing the ReWall sketch while exercising.



Figure 6. Prabhakar experiencing exercising with the ReExercise sketch where the feedback is in the form of LED that is placed in front of the idol of Ganesha.



Figure 7. Video of Anita exercising overlaid with information to give her real-time feedback.



Figure 8. Anna exercising on the stairs with the MagicMirror interactive sketch.




Figure 9. Paper sketch and scenarios of MyReDiary.




Figure 10. Anna enacting the possibilities of recording data about her ADLs and sharing with her therapists.



Figure 11. Prabhakar and Lakshmi exercising on the bed in the living room.



Figure 12. 92-year-old Man exercising at home



Figure 13. Anna's video that shows the count of her exercises, which prompted her to share her toothbrush story



Figure 14. The ReBrush Paper Sketch



Figure 15. Therapist asking a rehabilitee to lay the pillows on the floor as obstacles to perform balance exercises in the rehabilitee's living room. Even the activity of laying the pillows acts towards therapy.



