

2012

Crucial Design Issues for Special Access Technology

Pearl O'Rourke

Technological University Dublin, pearl.orourke@tudublin.ie

Ray Ekins

Technological University Dublin, ray.ekins@tudublin.ie

Bernard Timmins

Technological University Dublin, bernard.timmins@tudublin.ie

Fiona Timmins

Trinity college, timminsf@tcd.ie

Siobhan Long

Enable Ireland, slong@enableireland.ie

Follow this and additional works at: <https://arrow.tudublin.ie/engschmanconn>



next page for additional authors
Part of the [International Product Design Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

O'Rourke, Pearl; Ekins, Ray; Timmins, Bernard; Timmins, Fiona; Long, Siobhan; and Coyle, Eugene, "Crucial Design Issues for Special Access Technology" (2012). *Conference Papers*. 30.

<https://arrow.tudublin.ie/engschmanconn/30>

This Presentation is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Manufacturing and Design Engineering at ARROW@TU Dublin. It has been accepted for inclusion in Conference Papers by an authorized administrator of ARROW@TU Dublin. For more information, please contact yvonne.desmond@tudublin.ie, arrow.admin@tudublin.ie, brian.widdis@tudublin.ie.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-Share Alike 3.0 License](#)

Authors

Pearl O'Rourke, Ray Ekins, Bernard Timmins, Fiona Timmins, Siobhan Long, and Eugene Coyle

RAatE 2012

Crucial Design Issues for **Special Access Technology;** A Delphi Study

Pearl O' Rourke, Dr. Ray Ekins, Mr. Bernard Timmins, Prof. Fiona Timmins, Ms. Siobhan Long and Prof. Eugene Coyle



IRISH RESEARCH COUNCIL
An Chomhairle um Thaighde in Éirinn

> Background and Significance

> Goal and Objectives

> Research Design

> Key Results

> Conclusions

> **Background and Significance**

> Goal and Objectives

> Research Design

> Key Results

> Conclusions

DISABILITY

> 15% of the population*

> The Social Model of Disability**

> Barriers hinder participation

*World Health Organisation (2011)

**Oliver & Sapey (2006)

ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY

> Helps people to overcome barriers to independence, participation and activity accomplishment.*

> When used appropriately, AT can improve quality of life.**

> AT ranges in complexity and functionality.

*Hersh & Johnson (2008)

**National Council on Disability (1993),

Pennsylvania's Initiative on Assistive Technology (1995)

> Problems

> **High costs** hinder access to AT.*

*Alper & Raharinirina (2006) and Taylor (2004)

> **30-80%** of AT is **abandoned.****

*Riemer-Reiss & Wacker (2000) and Philips & Zhao (1993)



* Alper & Raharinirina (2006) and Taylor (2004)

**Riemer-Reiss & Wacker (2000) and Philips & Zhao (1993)

> Cause

> Poor product design.*


*Philips & Zhao (1993), Gitlin (1995), Luborsky (1993),
Kintsch and dePaula (2002).

> Solutions

> **Universal design***
(by **mass customisation****).



> **User Involvement in
the design process.*****



*Hersh (2011)

**Robinson et al. (2009)

***Bridgelal Ram et al. (2008)

> Mass Customisation

- > Aims to provide **customised products at mass production prices***.
 - > Mass customisation is based on **modular product architectures...**
-

*[12] Pine (1993)


**CUSTOM
ELEMENTS**




MODULE



MODULE



MODULE



PRODUCT
MODULE

MODULE




MODULE



**UNIVERSAL
ELEMENT**



PRODUCT PLATFORM



MORE
FLEXIBILITY



LESS
COST

> Background and Significance

> **Goal and Objectives**

> Research Design

> Key Results

> Conclusions

> The Gap and Goal

GAP

GOAL

> Methods for designing customisable AT are not available, nor are clear processes for involving a variety of stakeholders in their design.*




> The goal of this research is to develop a framework of **adaptable tools**, which **involve users**, to generate **actionable design specifications** for **customisable AT** devices...

...through the development of a new **Special Access Technology (SAT) device**.

*Allsop (2010) and Bridgelal Ram et al. (2008)

> Special Access Technology

- > Include **switches, joysticks, trackball and touch panels.**
- > Present the problems of **high cost and abandonment.**
- > Require more **universal** solutions.*



*Chen et al. (2006)




> Background and Significance

> Goal and Objectives

> **Research Design**

> Results

> Conclusions



Initial Design Framework

STUDY 1

Professionals working
with people with
disabilities

PRODUCT PLATFORM



Information Sheet

What's this all about?

You are invited to take part in a research study due to your professional experience and interaction with people who have motor/communicative impairments.

Before you decide whether or not to take part, it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information. It is up to you to decide whether or not to take part.

STUDY 1
Title of study: The general usability of work user-centred assistive technology (AT) design through the development of a computer input device.

DELPHI STUDY
To inform a set of actionable design recommendations for the development of computer input devices for individuals with motor and communicative impairments.

Ethics approval: June 2011

Study duration: Sep-Dec 2011

For people with severe motor and communication impairments, computer access options are limited. AT such as augmentative and alternative communication aids, power wheelchairs, personal computers and environmental controls are examples of such computers.

For individuals who cannot use a standard keyboard and mouse, scanning software may be accessed via AT devices such as switches, joysticks, trackballs and head-pointers. The design and functionality of these items vary vastly as different devices aim to satisfy different needs. Products target relatively small, niche markets and this leads to high costs being placed on the funding body or, increasingly, the disabled client. Additionally, the outdated culture of obtrusive, cold and clinical aesthetics has been found to inflict a stigmatising effect on the service-user. Subsequently there is a high rate of abandonment associated with generic products on the market.



The large and varied array of people involved in the provision and use of AT products further makes it difficult to get the balance of design solution correct. Stakeholders may include the service-user and their carer, a rehabilitation engineer, an occupational therapist, a speech therapist, a physiotherapist and a doctor. Others who may contribute include psychologists, educationalists and, perhaps, fund-holders.

User-centred design aims to create products that fit well with the user instead of forcing them to change the way they act in order to utilize the product. The approach involves users in the whole design process in order to match the product to the requirements and to increase practical use. This initial questionnaire based study aims to reach a consensus on professional opinion about the important qualities of assistive technology computer input devices. Subsequently, a device will be prototyped and a piece of research involving service-users will take place.

How you can help

The research method used here will be the Delphi method, a technique used to formulate group consensus from an expert panel. It will be composed of two questionnaires and will call for a combined time commitment of up to one and a half hours. The first should take about 45 minutes to complete. You will be asked seven short questions related to you and your experience and six longer questions about certain aspects of AT. You will be contacted in five to six weeks to complete the second questionnaire, which will be developed from the results of the first.

If you take part, you will;

- contribute to a new body of important and applicable information on AT in Ireland,
- help identify key criteria for AT computer input devices,
- aid in the design of a new, low-cost computer input device for individuals with motor and communicative impairments, and
- upon completion of the study, receive a summary of the findings.

Extra Information


Due to the nature of the Delphi method, your responses will be anonymous and of equal value to other participants'. A code will be assigned to you for the purpose of tracking received questionnaires and will be used in subsequent mailings. The code list linking your name to your code will be secured in an encrypted file and a hard copy will be stored in a secure locker. Your name will be deleted from the code list when your final questionnaire is received or if you decide to withdraw from the study. At such point, all information provided will become anonymous.

Should you require any further information on the study or your participation, please do not hesitate to contact the researcher. Details are on the consent form. This study is funded by the Irish Research Council for Science and Technology.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

References

1. Bradley M, Poppen W. Assistive technology, computers and internet may decrease sense of isolation for homebound elderly and disabled persons. *Technology and Disability*. 2003;15(1):19-25.
2. Houlahan BV, Drannon ML, Warner G, Neathair S, Wierzbicki J, Williams S. The impact of internet access for people with spinal cord injuries: A descriptive analysis of a pilot study. *Disability and Rehabilitation*. 2003;25(8):422-31.
3. Brodwin MG, Star T, Cardoso E. Computer assistive technology for people who have disabilities: Computer adaptations and modifications. *Journal of Rehabilitation*. 2004;70(3):38-33.
4. Wong AWK, Chan CCK, Li-Tsang CWY, Lam CS. Competence of people with intellectual disabilities on using human-computer interface. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*. 2009;30(1):107-23.
5. Davies TC, Mudge S, Amerasingh S, Skott NS. Enabling self-directed computer use for individuals with cerebral palsy: A systematic review of assistive devices and technologies. *Developmental Medicine and Child Neurology*. 2010;52(6):510-6.
6. Lubornik MR. Sociocultural factors shaping technology usage: Fulfilling the promise. *Technology and Disability*; 1993. p. 71-8.
7. Buurman RD. User-centred design of smart products. *Ergonomics*. 1997;40:1259-60.



> Delphi questions

- | | | |
|----------|---|--|
| 1 | Prevalent parts of ATCIDs that malfunction. | <i>Problems that require attention</i> |
| 2 | Primary reasons for ATCID malfunction. | <i>Reasons for these problems</i> |
| 3 | Characteristics of client associated with ATCID selection. | <i>Highlights features which need to be customisable</i> |
| 4 | Client needs regarding ATCID use and training. | <i>Ideas to enrich whole product package</i> |
| 5 | Desirable traits of ATCIDs. | <i>Overarching criteria for design specification</i> |
| 6 | Clinicians' frustrations with ATCIDs. | <i>Real-life use contexts</i> |

> 2nd Delphi questionnaire

Code: 6_103

QUESTIONNAIRE 2

Delphi Questionnaire: Round 2 of 2

Participants: Professionals with assistive technology (AT) experience

Thank you so much for your continued participation. The results of this second and final questionnaire will contribute valuable information to a larger research project concerned with user-centred AT development. This study is focused on AT computer input devices (ATCIDs). ATCIDs include joysticks, switches, trackballs, track-pads and other products which support a service-user with motor disabilities in accessing PC's, communication devices, power mobility aids or environmental controls.

To complete this questionnaire, please read the statement (numbered 1-6) and then indicate what you believe to be the importance of each issue in relation to that statement using the scale shown here.

I believe the issue is:

1	2	3	4	5
not important at all	not so important	something I feel neutral about	important	very important

For example, in statement 1, if you believe the issue of **USB and other ports breaking** is **important** in relation to **malfunctioning ATCIDs**, please click on box 4, like this:

USB and other ports break

N.B. if you feel that an issue does not apply in any way to your experience, please mark box 3, indicating that this is something you feel neutral about.

Also, please don't feel that you must balance out your responses along the scale; if you believe every issue is very important/not important at all, please indicate as such.

1. These issues relate to prevalent parts of an ATCID which malfunction.

	1	2	3	4	5
USB and other ports break	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Connections between the cable and the ATCID wear	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
De-soldered joints break	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Touch screens stop being responsive	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Monitors break/crack	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cables wear/break/twist/fray/tear	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Internal electrical switch contacts fail	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sensors fail	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Page 1 of 5

Code: 6_103

Fuses have defects	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Devices have calibration problems or are difficult to calibrate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Conflicts exist between the computer and ATCID driver	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Software becomes corrupted (e.g. cursor on screen moves without deflection of joystick)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Movement of ATCID becomes restricted due to dirt build-up	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Keys/buttons lift away from ATCID	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Switches stick in a closed/open position	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lightweight switches are continuously accidentally activated and break	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Small parts get lost (e.g. clamping screws)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Plugs break	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Joysticks become loose	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unexplained/unclear reasons cause device failure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Magnetic devices interfere with controls	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Batteries fail	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Mounts become damaged	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mounts loosen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

2. These issues relate to the reasons ATCIDs malfunction or fail.

	1	2	3	4	5
No articulating joint on USB connections	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Weak joints from cable to device	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Poor ergonomic design	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Battery life/charge is insufficient	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Battery fails	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Memory board (i.e. central processing unit of host computer) fails	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Software updates conflict with device drivers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Electrical components short circuit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ATCID falls/is knocked or banged	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Inappropriate/rough/overuse of device	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
General wear and tear (i.e. ATCID is not robust enough)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cables get caught or are pulled roughly from ports	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Constant activation of a device with force	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Movement of client causes stress on the ATCID	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Movement of client causes mounts to loosen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lack of policy in relation to regular service of ATCID's	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Poor maintenance of ATCID	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Poor care of ATCID when not in use (e.g. during transport)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Poor battery conditioning practice	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Incorrect device set-up by carers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Poor routing of cables exposing them to damage	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dirt, spills and dust contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Page 2 of 5

> Background and Significance


> Goal and Objectives

> Research Design

> **Key Results**

> Conclusions

> Participants



> Ranked Responses

Delphi Study Results

Q1: ISSUES RELATING TO PREVALENT PARTS OF AN ATCID WHICH MALFUNCTION

The designer can now generate design solutions around each key issue.

- Cables wear/break/twist/fray/tear
- USB and other ports break
- Internal electrical switch contacts fail
- Sensors fail
- Movement of ATCID becomes restricted due to dirt build up
- Keys/buttons lift away from ATCID
- Lightweight switches are continuously accidentally activated and break
- Small parts get lost (e.g. clamping screws)
- Mounts loosen
- Switches stick in a closed/open position

Q2: ISSUES RELATING TO REASONS THAT CAUSE AN ATCID TO FAIL OR MALFUNCTION

The designer can now generate design solutions around each key issue.

- ATCID falls/is knocked or banged
- Cables get caught or are pulled roughly from ports
- Weak joints from cable to device
- Software updates conflict with device drivers
- Movement of client causes mounts to loosen
- Poor routing of cables, exposing them to damage
- Dirt, spills and dust contamination
- Poor care of ATCID when not in use (e.g. during transport)
- Poor ergonomic design
- Constant activation of a device with force

Q3: ISSUES RELATING TO CHARACTERISTICS OF A SERVICE USER ASSOCIATED WITH ATCID SELECTION

These criteria inform the designer about which elements need to be customisable.

- Range of motion (i.e. of the anatomy which could control an ATCID)
- Spasticity/muscle tone
- Control of movement (i.e. ability to make precise movements)
- Ability to repeat a movement without strain
- Motivation and level of interest
- Posture/positioning
- Wrist/finger function (i.e. dexterity, sensory perception, proprioception)
- Condition progression (improving/degenerating)
- Type of wheelchair being used, if one is used
- What the ATCID will be mounted on (plus requirements for clamps and mounts)

Q4: ISSUES RELATING TO SERVICE USER NEEDS REGARDING ATCID USE AND TRAINING

The designer can use this information to enrich the product package.

- Correct positioning and mounting of the ATCID
- Access to ATCIDs for trial period
- Instilling the motivation to practice, explore and use the technology
- Set-up of regular meetings with the service-user
- Simple written instructions for ATCID set-up and use
- Pictorial instructions for ATCID set-up and use
- Maintenance and care instructions
- How to adapt ATCID for the service user's changing needs
- Contact details of supplier and technical support
- Instilling confidence in the service-user

Q5: ISSUES RELATING TO DESIRABLE TRAITS FOR AN ATCID


These provide the designer with building blocks for concept generation.

- A good match between service-user's goals and ATCID solution
- Comfortable to use/does not cause strain
- Does not impede movement of service-user
- Adaptable to service-user's specific needs
- Easy to set up and dismantle
- Easily rechargeable battery
- Easy to operate
- Appropriate size
- Tactile characteristics
- Low cost

Q6: ISSUES RELATING TO PARTICIPANTS' FRUSTRATIONS ASSOCIATED WITH ATCIDS










This informs the designer about real-life contexts and their associated issues.

- High cost of ATCIDs and access to funding for purchasing
- Device drivers need to be loaded from CDs
- System is not easily adaptable to suit exact service-user needs
- Time needed to assess and train service-user
- Products are specialist/niche; they should be mainstream/universal
- USB connections are non-articulating/non-extended
- Lack of instructions around decontamination procedures
- Multiple parts need to be unscrewed and dismantled for decontamination
- Positioning in multi care environment
- Infection control








**Translating
issues into
conceptual
design
solutions.**

> Morphological Matrix

Design Issue	Relevant Component	Definition/Function	Design Solutions				
<p>Question 1: These issues relate to prevalent parts of SAT which malfunction.</p> <p>Cables wear/break/twist/fray/tear.</p>			<p><u>Ways to reduce or negate the design issue</u></p>				
Cables	Cables	Transfer power and transfer signal.	 <p>Solar cell</p> <p>Take out cables & use wireless technologies (rechargeable batteries/ solar power/infrared transmitter and receiver).</p>	 <p>Thick elastomeric material around</p> <p>Use robust insulating materials to reduce likelihood of damage to cables.</p>	 <p>Make cables very rigid/flexible to reduce likelihood of torsion and breakage.</p>	 <p>Spring-loaded disk retracts excess cable</p> <p>Eliminate loose excess cable by retracting or winding/tucking it into a clip.</p>	 <p>Port and jack along cable</p> <p>Have purposeful 'breaking point' along cable which can be reconnected; cable is less likely to tear or damage ports and jacks at the computer interface.</p>
<p>Question 2: These issues relate to the reasons SAT malfunctions or fails.</p> <p>SAT falls/is knocked or banged.</p>			<p><u>Ways to reduce or negate the design issue</u></p>				
Housing/Casing	Housing/Casing	Protects internal components and affords aesthetic qualities to the product.	<p>Protect SAT in robust casing.</p>	 <p>Delicate components in elastomeric skin</p> <p>Use a flexible material with low Young's modulus for casing to endure bangs.</p>	<p>Fix SAT on mount to reduce the likelihood of an accidental fall.</p>	<p>Make all individual parts robust for disassembly, i.e. build in the ability for the SAT to be broken apart and easily put back together.</p>	
<p>Question 3: These issues relate to the characteristics of a user associated with selecting SAT.</p> <p>Range of motion (ROM) of the anatomy which could control SAT.</p>			<p><u>Ways to make the product customisable with regard to the design issue</u></p>				
Physical interface where human movement is required to activate device; joystick lever, switch button, trackball etc.	Physical interface where human movement is required to activate device; joystick lever, switch button, trackball etc.	Distance hardware component needs to travel through to activate device.	<p>Use various materials with different rigidity for adaptive customisation. (Work = Force X Distance)</p>  <p>Joystick levers of different lengths; longer lever requires great ROM but less force.</p> <p>Forms requiring different activation distances.</p>	<p>Touch panel/switch</p>  <p>Use different base devices which require either a small ROM (touch-pad) or a large ROM (selection of switches).</p>	<p>Use an easily maneuverable mount which can position the SAT at various distances from the individual.</p>		
<p>Question 4: These issues relate to service-user needs regarding SAT use and training.</p> <p>Correct positioning and mounting of the SAT.</p>			<p><u>Ways to enrich the product package</u></p>				
Mount and mount-interface	Mount and mount-interface	How the therapist arranges the SAT in proximity to the user.	 <p>Oblivate need for mount - user wears SAT.</p>	<p>Provide an easily adjustable and re-adjustable mount. Use quick release levers and colour/number coded shafts.</p>	<p>Use shape memory alloys for mount material.</p>		
<p>Question 5: These issues relate to desirable traits of SAT.</p> <p>A good match between disabled user's goals and SAT solution.</p>			<p><u>Ways to enrich the product package</u></p>				
Whole product package	Whole product package	How well the SAT satisfies the user's goals.	<p>Make the device adaptable/customisable.</p>	<p>Find out goals and provide solution using observation and team participation.</p>	<p>Use list of questions and tests to determine best SAT.</p>	<p>Provide a trialling period for new SAT.</p>	<p>Facilitate follow-up sessions and online feedback forums.</p>
<p>Question 6: These issues relate to your frustrations associated with SAT.</p> <p>High cost of SAT and access to funding for purchasing</p>			<p><u>Ways to reduce or negate the frustration</u></p>				
Whole product package	Whole product package	Monetary cost of the SAT.	<p>Increase lifetime of product, i.e. build in the ability for the SAT to adapt with user's changing requirements.</p>	<p>Use off the shelf parts; examine other devices for component lists.</p>	<p>Increase market share by mass customisation or universal design.</p>	<p>Reduce overall cost of AT to the user by reducing abandonment.</p>	<p>Implement Design For Manufacture and Assembly guidelines (DFMA).</p>

> Morphological Matrix

Design Issue	Relevant Part	Definition/ Function	Design Solutions				
<p>Question 1: These issues relate to prevalent parts of SAT which malfunction.</p>			<p>Ways to reduce or negate the design issue</p>				
<p>Cables wear/break/twist/fray/tear.</p>	<p>Cables</p>	<p>Transfer power and transfer signal.</p>	<p>Solar cell</p>  <p>Take out cables & use wireless technologies (rechargeable batteries/ solar power/infrared transmitter and receiver).</p>	<p>Thick elastomeric material around wire cable</p>  <p>Use robust insulating materials to reduce likelihood of damage to cables.</p>	 <p>Make cables very rigid/flexible to reduce likelihood of torsion and breakage.</p>	<p>Spring-loaded disk retracts excess cable</p>  <p>Eliminate loose excess cable by retracting or winding/tucking it into a clip.</p>	<p>Port and jack along cable</p>  <p>Have purposeful 'breaking point' along cable which can be reconnected; cable is less likely to tear or damage ports and jacks at the computer interface.</p>

> Background and Significance

> Goal and Objectives

> Research Design

> Key Results

> **Conclusions**


IMPLICATIONS

> This method supports the development of new, low-cost AT products, which satisfy a broad range of consumers' needs.


> It structures the establishment of consensus on crucial design issues for a specified AT domain, and subsequently facilitates the application of these issues to the product design process.

> This research presents crucial design issues for the SAT domain, in order to assist future work.

> This research supports and provides validation for past studies about desirable criteria for AT.



Design framework and future work



Design framework and future work

Many Thanks.

Contact: pearl.orourke@dit.ie

> References

1. WHO WHO. Disability and Health Fact Sheet No. 352. 2011.
2. Oliver M, Sapey B. Social work with disabled people. Palgrave Macmillan; 2006.
3. Hersh MA, Johnson, MA. On modelling assistive technology systems – Part I: Modelling framework. *Technology & Disability* 2008;20(3):193-215.
4. National Council on Disability. Study on the Financing of Assistive Technology Devices and Services for Individuals with Disabilities. Washington 1993. [cited 2012 Sep 26]; Available from: <http://www.ncd.gov/publications/1993/Mar41993>
5. Pennsylvania's Initiative on Assistive Technology. Preliminary Report on Assistive Technology: Use, Needs and Experiences of Pennsylvanians with Disabilities. Pennsylvania: Institute on Disabilities/UAP, Temple University; 1995.
6. Alper S, Raharinirina, S. Assistive Technology for Individuals with Disabilities: A Review and Synthesis of the Literature. *Journal of Special Education Technology* 2006;21(2):47-64.
7. Riemer-Reiss ML, Wacker RR. Factors Associated with Assistive Technology Discontinuance Among Individuals with Disabilities. *Journal of Rehabilitation* 2000;66(3):44-50.
8. Phillips B, Zhao H. Predictors of assistive technology abandonment. *Assistive Technology* 1993;5(1):36-45.
9. Gitlin LN. Why older people accept or reject assistive technology. *Generations* 1995;19(1):41-7.
10. Luborsky MR. Sociocultural factors shaping technology usage: Fulfilling the promise. *Technology and Disability*; 1993;2(1):71-78.
11. Kintsch A, DePaula RA. A Framework for the Adoption of Assistive Technology. In: Bodine C, editor: SWAAAC 2002: Supporting Learning Through Assistive Technology 2002.
12. Hersh MA. The Design and Evaluation of Assistive Technology Products and Devices Part 1: Design. In: Stone H, & Blouin, mM, editor. *International Encyclopedia of Rehabilitation* 2011.
13. Robinson L, Brittain K, Lindsay S, Jackson D, Olivier P. Keeping In Touch Everyday (KITE) project: developing assistive technologies with people with dementia and their carers to promote independence. *International Psychogeriatrics* 2009;21(3):494.
14. Bridgelal Ram M, Grocott PR, Weir HCM. Issues and challenges of involving users in medical device development. *Health Expectations* 2008;11(1):63-71.
15. Pine BJ. *Mass Customization: The New Frontier in Business Competition*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press 1993:48.
16. Allsop MJ, Holt RJ, Levesley MC, Bhakta B. The engagement of children with disabilities in health-related technology design processes: Identifying methodology. *Disability and Rehabilitation: Assistive Technology* 2010;5(1):1-13.
17. Chen CL, Chen HC, Cheng PT, Chen CY, Chen HC, Chou SW. Enhancement of Operational Efficiencies for People With High Cervical Spinal Cord Injuries Using a Flexible Integrated Pointing Device Apparatus. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation* 2006;87(6):866-873.