

XR for All: Understanding Developers' Perspectives on Accessibility Integration in Extended Reality

DANIEL KILLOUGH, University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA

TIGER F. JI, University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA

KEXIN ZHANG, University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA

YAXIN HU, University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA

YU HUANG, Vanderbilt University, USA

RUOFEI DU, Google Research, USA

YUHANG ZHAO, University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA

As immersive technologies enable unique, multimodal interaction methods, developers must also use tailored methods to support user accessibility, distinct from traditional software practices. Therefore, we interviewed 25 industry extended reality (XR) developers, including freelancers, startups, midsize, and big tech companies about their motivations, techniques, barriers, and attitudes towards incorporating accessibility features in their XR apps. Our study revealed a variety of challenges, including conflicting priorities between application and platform developers regarding accessibility infrastructure; startups' rapid development culture prohibiting accessible development; and the lack of accessible interaction design considerations at the ideation, design, and early prototyping stages. As a comprehensive set of XR accessibility guidelines has yet to be established, we also compiled and evaluated a set of accessibility guidelines for 3D virtual worlds and addressed their limitations when applied to XR. Finally, we inform the creation of effective support methods for industry developers.

CCS Concepts: • **Human-centered computing** → **Accessibility**; **Mixed / augmented reality**; **Virtual reality**.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Accessibility, A11y, AR, VR, augmented and virtual reality, extended reality, XR, developer interviews

ACM Reference Format:

Daniel Killough, Tiger F. Ji, Kexin Zhang, Yaxin Hu, Yu Huang, Ruofei Du, and Yuhang Zhao. 2024. XR for All: Understanding Developers' Perspectives on Accessibility Integration in Extended Reality. 1, 1 (December 2024), 36 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

1 Introduction

As advances in extended reality (XR) blur the boundaries between physical and virtual worlds, these technologies are reshaping human interaction, communication, and collaboration. XR—an umbrella term encompassing augmented reality (AR), virtual reality (VR), and mixed reality (MR)—utilizes egocentric visual, audio, and haptic feedback to

Authors' Contact Information: Daniel Killough, contact@dkillough.com, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, Wisconsin, USA; Tiger F. Ji, reatreify@gmail.com, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, Wisconsin, USA; Kexin Zhang, kzhang284@wisc.edu, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, Wisconsin, USA; Yaxin Hu, yaxin.hu@wisc.edu, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, Wisconsin, USA; Yu Huang, yu.huang@vanderbilt.edu, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee, USA; Ruofei Du, me@durofei.com, Google Research, San Francisco, California, USA; Yuhang Zhao, yuhang.zhao@cs.wisc.edu, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, Wisconsin, USA.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for third-party components of this work must be honored. For all other uses, contact the owner/author(s).

© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).

Manuscript submitted to ACM

Manuscript submitted to ACM

1

create increasingly immersive experiences. XR technologies are maturing and growing in popularity in recent years, revolutionizing sectors like education [111, 164], healthcare [77, 191], and architecture [79, 151]. The XR industry reached an estimated \$142.39 Billion USD in 2023 and is projected to grow at a compound annual rate of 32.9% from 2024 to 2030 [174], with more conservative estimates still predicting an over \$500B valuation by 2031 [14, 140, 174]. Moreover, XR availability is no longer heavily constrained by hardware limitations, as high-resolution VR/MR headsets like Meta Quest 3 and 3S become more affordable [36, 88, 186] and AR apps run on smartphones that consumers already own (“zero-cost” devices) [26].

Despite XR platforms offering unique, embodied experiences, XR adoption growth hinges on technology availability and inclusion [173]. However, current XR applications pose unique accessibility (commonly abbreviated as a11y [30]) barriers for people with disabilities, a large population of more than 1.3 billion people worldwide [167]. For example, XR devices do not support system-level a11y, such as 3D screen readers for people with visual impairments or bespoke input devices for people with motor impairments. As a result, users with visual impairments may lose out on essential information conveyed exclusively through visual cues [196], and users with motor impairments may lack the ability to use necessary inputs [142]. To promote XR a11y, researchers have designed software- [108, 112, 198, 207, 213] and hardware-based [35, 180, 210] assistive technologies for XR. While effective, most of these technologies remain research prototypes and have yet to be widely adopted by industry.

XR designers and developers play a vital role incorporating a11y to XR applications—specifically, they must be *able* and *motivated* to implement a11y in their projects. Traditional software development (e.g., web, mobile, and game development) cites a lack of knowledge, guidance, and organizational structure to properly implement accessibility for PWD [18, 23, 138], which has critically hindered accessibility integration in consumer products. For web development specifically, researchers have established comprehensive guidelines [56, 193] and automatic accessibility assessments [34, 168] to assist developers with implementing a11y into their apps; however, no such work exists for XR developers. XR development is currently fragmented, with no standard device infrastructure for developers to easily implement a11y features into their apps [109]. Further, standardized a11y support methods for developers and users do not yet exist for XR, such as widespread 3D screen reader support, standard a11y procedures, nor post-hoc automation tools. With XR platforms continually improving, we must understand developers’ current perspectives on a11y, motivating and supporting them to effectively integrate accessible development practices into their workflow.

In this work, we seek to identify XR developers’ current practices, challenges, attitudes, and needs unique to implementing a11y features in their XR apps. To do so, we seek to answer the following questions:

- RQ1.** What challenges do XR developers face against developing XR a11y features?
- RQ2.** What current XR development practices do developers follow, and how would their practice affect the implementation of XR a11y features?
- RQ3.** How applicable are existing state-of-the-art guidelines for 3D virtual worlds to XR, and what support methods would best enable XR developers to implement XR a11y features?

To answer these questions, we conducted semi-structured interviews with 25 professional XR developers to observe their programming practices via example project, uncover their perceptions of state-of-the-art guidelines informed by a number of accessibility organizations in games and 3D virtual worlds [2, 56, 104, 137, 165, 194], and understand how a11y experts could best support them in creating accessible apps. Our participants represented wide coverage in XR development, ranging from freelancers and startup employees to big tech companies and XR engine platforms, providing a comprehensive view of XR developers’ experiences and needs. Our research revealed unique challenges

towards incorporating XR a11y, uncovering workplace attitudes towards a11y that limit developers' agency in developing accessible features. Our guideline evaluation found recommendations like colorblindness support to be widely understood and implementable, but others (e.g., "Include an option to adjust the game speed" [67]) largely inhibit immersion in simulation apps and compromise competitive integrity in multiplayer titles. These findings highlight unique tensions between developer attitudes and needs of the community, and emphasize the importance of educating developers on the social model of disability [179, 189]. Finally, we derive implications for actionable a11y support methods, including recommendations for effective services and tools, to best support XR developers in making their apps more accessible.

2 Related Work

Accessibility in traditional software development has been extensively studied, with XR recently emerging as a new medium through which to interact with immersive experiences. Here we define disability, examine existing a11y techniques for XR, a11y guidelines for platforms within and beyond XR contexts, and additional related work supporting a11y integration in XR projects.

2.1 Impairments Don't Disable People—Emerging Technologies Do

Disability is medically defined as a physical or biological condition impairing people's ability to perform "normal" tasks [120]. This definition frames disability as a personal trait, marginalizing people with disabilities and perpetuating stigma against them [201]. Recent HCI research has redefined disability as a social construct, emphasizing social exclusion caused by the mismatch between a user's ability and their contexts (e.g., social infrastructure and technology design)—whether or not that person has a medical impairment [179]. Our research applies this *social model of disability* to highlight socio-technical needs to make XR more accessible for PWD.

Prior work notes that developers often appeal to the "majority" of users; over time we have seen PWD's experiences downplayed in favor of the "normal" individual, causing systems to fail when people's situations lay outside the "norm" (e.g., transgender people [37], autistic people [181, 120], people with ADHD [183]). Recently highlighted in Spiel et al.'s CHI 2020 workshop [182], this phenomenon impacts people's experiences in the workplace [40, 170], education [120], and social wellbeing [37]. For example, mainstream technology design for apps like Microsoft Excel have been marginalizing users with disabilities (e.g., blind users) and those simply unfamiliar with the technology [54]. Power dynamics in workplaces can further stigmatize disability, with workers feeling unable to advocate for a11y-related accommodations due to job insecurity and set workplace practices, which leads many to struggle silently with inaccessible collaborative tools rather than seeking support [40]. As XR technologies continue to rise in use, particularly as a medium for remote work and socialization, it is critical to address a11y early on and include PWD in discussion [208] to promote equitable access for everyone.

2.2 Technology to Enhance XR A11y

PWD face different challenges in XR, including navigating VR environments for wheelchair users [86], identifying and evaluating apps for a11y features [121], and audio processing when combining real-world and virtual audio sources [33]. Existing literature to make XR apps accessible to PWD has largely targeted methods to aid people with visual and motor impairments: For people with visual impairments, prior work has used 3D audio to explore 2D objects [98] and interfaces [42], convey 3D virtual environments [118, 146, 147, 19], support avatar awareness [108], and simulate real-world scenarios [195]. Notably, Ji et al. [108] designed an audio-based interaction technique that notified users

of surrounding avatars based on physical distances. Waters and Abulala [196] simulated echolocation to explore VR environments. Nair et al. [146] reimagined looking around 3D worlds; instead of rotating the camera, tilting a right controller's joystick announced objects in that direction through spatial audio descriptions. Nair et al. further iterated on this prototype, comparing the directional joystick with other directional audio methods, including a smartphone companion app, echolocating from the player, and a simple navigation menu [147]. Herskovitz et al. [97] designed prototypes to make representative mobile AR tasks more accessible to visually impaired users. In addition to audio feedback, researchers also utilized haptics to enable people with visual impairments to communicate more effectively in VR [110] and explore and navigate virtual spaces, or interact with the objects within [107, 177, 178, 187, 188, 198]. For example, Jung et al. [110] combined a series of haptic and audio cues to notify blind and low vision people of nonverbal social cues like eye contact, head nodding, and head shaking. Zhao et al. [210] created a wearable VR controller based on a brake mechanism to simulate the white cane interaction for users with visual impairments in VR. Siu et al. [180] further improved the controller and provided audio feedback to emulate echolocation, creating one physical manifestation of Waters and Abulala's work [196].

For users with motor impairments, researchers have explored how motor impairments impact a user's interaction within virtual spaces [86, 93, 175, 206]. For example, Mott et al. [142] conducted a survey of 16 people with mobility limitations to understand what barriers they faced in VR, and how VR systems might be improved for those users. They identified issues with both VR interactions and the hardware needed for VR. Technologies have also been created to support people with motor disabilities using XR [35, 94, 117]. For example, Choi et al. [35] designed a haptic controller that detected input and generated feedback using motion from only one finger. Harada et al. [94] used voice input to draw hands-free within a virtual environment and created insights for mapping voice input to other continuous motions.

Despite a myriad of assistive technologies developed to facilitate XR a11y, most of these works remain prototypes in the research field without integration into mainstream XR applications or platforms. Although some 2D games like Vampire Survivor [39] and Loop Hero [80] have accessibility features, to our knowledge only a small number of 3D games, much less XR titles, have incorporated accessibility features outside of basic text size or colorblind settings (e.g. The Last of Us Part II [53], God of War: Ragnarök [139], Mortal Kombat 11 [197], Age of Empires IV [202]). Some commercial titles have accommodated users with disabilities, either as games specifically made for people with disabilities [82, 169, 172] or games for the general public with a notable amount of accessibility features. However, XR applications do not commonly incorporate many accessibility features. Therefore, one primary goal of our study is to understand if, how, and why developers in the XR industry incorporate accessibility into their applications, as well as how accessibility techniques might best be translated from research into XR developer workflows.

2.3 Immaturity of XR A11y Guidelines versus 2D and 3D

Accessibility guidelines are important resources that direct developers how to integrate accessibility in their workflows. Standard accessibility guidelines have been constructed for various conventional software platforms, such as web [28, 115, 143, 193] and mobile devices [192]. For example, the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) [193] have been maintained by the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C), providing developers and designers with guidelines to make their sites accessible to people with diverse disabilities, such as motor, visual, cognitive, and hearing impairments. Moreover, W3C also created a set of guidelines for mobile accessibility [192], addressing mobile-specific concerns such as form factor and potential use in different settings, such as public spaces or in bright sunlight. These guidelines have been used in various studies evaluating mobile platforms [20, 51, 199].

2.3.1 Guidelines for 3D Virtual Worlds. Although both display on 2D screens, guidelines for 2D web applications aren't fully applicable to 3D applications. Dedicated a11y guidelines for 3D apps have been previously constructed [2, 56, 137], with the Game Accessibility Guidelines (GAG) [56] widely referenced as a comprehensive collection of guidelines separated into categories based on the type of disability. Research efforts have also refined the guidelines [122, 144, 171, 200] for more specific use cases. For example, Mason et al. [122] studied challenges faced in movement-based games by wheelchair players, presenting interviewees with eight different game concepts and condensing guidelines, focusing on designing from the player's perspective and avoiding physical barriers.

2.3.2 XR-specific Guideline Creation. In comparison, XR development is a newer and more fragmented field with no widely-agreed standard. Desktop 3D applications share some similarities with XR applications, primarily as they both—in a computer graphics context—render 3D applications out to a 2D screen (or, for head-mounted displays, two 2D screens). But XR apps aim to embody their user into the experience—not just control a character. While researchers have come up with general guidelines to support immersive XR experiences, they do not usually consider accessibility [32, 84]. For example, Catak et al. [32] analyzed five VR games to create guidelines according to [human perception, consistent and intuitive interaction, and reliable navigation] as core to VR game design and immersion. Fracaro et al. [84] studied how to design effective and engaging training experiences for chemical operators in VR.

Recently, both researchers [96, 123, 141, 166] and organizations [17, 89, 116, 165] have started deriving XR guidelines that target XR experiences. For example, Heilemann et al. [96] surveyed existing accessibility guidelines for traditional video games, such as GAG, and compiled a set of guidelines that were translatable to VR games and interactions. The University of Melbourne [166] also created a page summarizing some disabilities that cause barriers in VR and listed some relevant papers for each disability. XR organizations have also paid more attention to accessibility guidelines. Oculus [165] made a set of general accessibility guidelines to advise developers creating accessible applications for their VR devices. Similarly, Magic Leap [116] has provided guidelines for its AR device, focusing on potential hearing, subtitle, visual, and mobility barriers for its user-base. Some accessibility interest groups have also created their own sets of considerations for accessible XR design [17] or applied usability heuristics to XR [89], but are typically more limited in scope and do not attempt to cover the entirety of an XR experience. Alternatively, Fracaro et al. [84] studied how to design effective and engaging training experiences for chemical operators in VR, but despite the goals of creating guidelines to support a general audience, these works did not consider accessibility for users with disabilities.

However, unlike the widely-followed Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) [193], current XR accessibility guidelines are in their infancy, without rigorous validation or broad agreement. Moreover, they mostly focus on accommodating an end user, and they generally lack technical guidance to developers in how to implement these guidelines. Therefore, it was important for our study to obtain the perspective of developers in existing XR accessibility guidelines to understand their interpretation, barriers, and needs if applying the guidelines in their projects.

2.4 Development Support for A11y Integration

2.4.1 In Traditional Development. A11y integration in industry is not easy. Researchers have explored challenges of incorporating accessibility into traditional development [18, 23, 22, 138]. For example, Bai et al. [18] found extensive difficulty when trying to add user testing for PWD into the web development loop. Moreover, Bi et al. [23] interviewed 15 participants and surveyed 365 participants worldwide to understand what elements of accessibility posed barriers to

developers and their attitudes towards those problems. They found substantial variance in accessibility development and design quality across developers, creating suggestions for how to equalize these gaps.

To better incorporate accessibility, development tools have been created to assist developers at various phases of traditional software development, such as drop-in functionalities during development [15, 83] or post-hoc accessibility support [24, 25, 34, 168]. For example, the UI Accessibility Plugin [83] is a Unity plugin that allows developers to attach a component to 2D UI elements to enable screen reader support on smartphones and computers. Automatic accessibility checking tools also exist, such as Accessibility Checker [34] and Pa11y [168], which can analyze a website to ensure compliance with web accessibility guidelines such as ADA and WCAG. However, there are barely any research or tools focusing on accessibility integration for XR applications.

2.4.2 XR Development Research Outside A11y. While not accessibility focused, some research explored the challenges that developers faced in XR development [27, 113, 114, 145, 211]. Ashtari et al. [16] examined the barriers of entry to becoming an XR developer, with participants of varying experience having significant challenges locating learning resources and keeping up with evolving platforms and tools. Krauß et al. [113] approached the collaborative aspect of XR development, interviewing developers about their roles and engagement with collaborators during their projects. They found that XR developers tended to take on multiple roles and face many challenges in collaboration, particularly when communicating XR prototypes.

To support XR development, a variety of tools have been created, usually aimed at simplifying or automating common functionalities [152, 190]. For example, Normcore [152] provided automatic multiplayer functionality for VR, and Unity's XR Interaction Toolkit [190] provides prefabs that automate XR controller and camera setup, cross platform compatibility with various devices, and scripts for basic VR interactions such as object selection or haptic feedback. Nebeling [148] also reviewed recent XR development tools, noting trends in provided functionalities and interfaces showing increasing approachability for designers and developers familiar with non-XR tools.

However, very limited research has explored the challenges, practices, and tool usage of XR developers in accessibility integration. The only work, to our knowledge, is Zhao et al.'s SeeingVR [211], which designed and evaluated a developer toolkit comprising 14 low vision tools to help developers incorporate visual a11y features in their VR applications. However, this work mainly focused on the creation and evaluation of the toolkit itself; more in-depth investigations are needed to explore XR developers' experiences, barriers, and needs in accessibility integration. These insights will inform the design of more suitable support to motivate and facilitate this process.

3 Method

3.1 Participants

We started to recruit participants using a convenience sampling method through general recruitment on AR and VR forums (e.g., Reddit, Unity). Based on the distribution of our participants, we then conducted expert purposive sampling [184, 185] with a more targeted recruitment message to developers on LinkedIn, contributors to AR or VR-related projects on GitHub with publicly-available email addresses, and personal connections. Seventeen participants were recruited through online methods. Eight participants were personal connections. Participants were eligible if they were at least 18 years old and had at least 1 year of industry experience in XR development. All participants completed a pre-survey to verify their experience, and we prioritized participants who had contributed to publicly-released XR projects. To verify participant qualifications, we evaluated their public LinkedIn accounts (if available) and examined their response quality in our interviews and analysis following face validity [150].

Ultimately, we recruited 25 participants (23 identified as male; 2 female) from diverse work environments, from freelancers working on individual personal projects to large companies working on many projects with diverse teams. To protect participant privacy, we have categorized their work experiences into either “freelance”, “startup”, “midsize”, and “big tech”:

- We consider “freelance” to be individuals working for a particular client until the scope of that project is fulfilled, or those self-describing as a “freelancer” or “contractor”.
- We consider “startups” to be independent companies of multiple employees with specified roles, but one developer often shares multiple responsibilities. Startups produce a specific product (or line of products) but lack established a11y or legal teams.
- We consider “midsize” to be a catch-all term between mature companies, game engines (e.g. Unity, Unreal Engine), universities, and medical facilities. Midsize companies shared some characteristics between startups and big tech but had their own restrictions, like a budding a11y team, as outlined further in Section 4.
- We consider “big tech” to be established, large technology companies, e.g. “MAMAA” (Meta, Apple, Microsoft, Amazon, Alphabet), or similarly sized companies. Big tech companies often have mature, dedicated a11y and legal teams.

24 of 25 participants had rich XR development experience ranging from two to nine years ($\mu = 4.92, \sigma = 1.94$). The other participant (P17) had little XR development experience, but worked on an a11y team at a major XR game engine. We detail participants’ demographic information, including individuals’ years of experience and preferred platform(s), in table 1. Though all participants gave valuable insight, we reached saturation for freelance and startup perspectives after approx. 20 participants. We recruited a few additional participants to round out the data for big tech and midsize companies.

3.2 Apparatus: Guideline Selection

While there’s still no commonly-agreed, mature XR accessibility standards, we collected existing preliminary guidelines distilled by researchers and accessibility organizations to understand developers’ interpretations and needs for guidelines that can best support accessibility integration. To achieve a comprehensive collection, we conducted a systematic online search using combinations of the keywords “Augmented Reality (or AR),” “Virtual Reality (or VR),” “Mixed Reality (or MR),” “Extended Reality (or XR),” with “accessibility guidelines,” and took results found on the first five pages of Google and Google Scholar results. Since XR titles often relate to volumetric multimedia content and share many design paradigms with 3D games, particularly in the tools used to make them (e.g., Unity), we also included “game” in our search [92]. From this search, we focused on resources that provided accessibility guidelines or design requirements relevant to XR or 3D games.

Our search yielded 12 guideline resources [2, 51, 56, 83, 96, 104, 116, 137, 165, 166, 192, 194]. To narrow down the scope and identify a small set of guideline examples for participants to examine in our study, we focused on relatively mature, comprehensive guideline resources. We thus manually examined all resources and removed the guidelines that only focused on a narrow range of disabilities (e.g., [83, 116]), did not pose specific accessibility issues and guidelines to address them (e.g., [166]), could not be easily applied to 3D games or XR content (e.g., [51]), or were a subset of other guidelines (e.g., [96, 192]). As a result, we narrowed down to six resources, including the Game Accessibility Guidelines (GAG) [56], the W3C XR Accessibility User Requirements [194], Designing Accessible VR instructions from Meta Quest [165], the Accessible Player Experiences guidelines [2], the Xbox Accessibility Guidelines [137], and

Table 1. Abridged Participant Demographic Information. Participants with multiple “Company Size” listings shared insight from experiences as employees at multiple company sizes, for example as a former employee at a midsize game engine who now is a freelancer. Company sizes are ordered with largest company size first getting smaller, i.e. big tech is greater than midsize > startup > freelance. The “XR Dev Exp & Primary Roles” column notes the duration in years XR developers have experienced and what their primary roles or responsibilities are. Roles are listed with any management positions first, then any design roles, research roles, then developer, if applicable. Primary Dev Platform(s) notes the top development platforms or integrated development environment (IDE) used. If a developer mentioned two platforms as tied, they are both listed. P17’s platform was redacted for privacy as it lists their direct place of employment and they work on a small team. The final column outlines developers’ prior accessibility experience, categorized into the type of accessibility impairment their features or solutions addressed (visual, motor, cognitive, or speech & hearing). We also indicate whether participants have experience creating XR a11y tools, e.g., P3’s mobile AR screenreader.

PID	Gender	Company Size	XR Dev Exp & Primary Role(s)	Primary Dev Platform(s)	Prior A11y Exp?
P1	Male	startup, freelance	5y: designer, writer, developer	Unity	yes; XR motor, cognitive
P2	Female	startup, freelance	6.5y: developer	Unity	yes; XR visual, motor
P3	Male	big tech	4y: manager, researcher, developer	BabylonJS Playground	yes; XR visual; XR tools
P4	Male	startup, freelance	4y: manager, designer, developer	Unity	yes; XR visual, motor
P5	Male	big tech, freelance	3y: designer, animator, developer	Unity	yes; XR speech, hearing (s&h)
P6	Male	startup, freelance	2.5y: manager, developer	Glitch	yes; webXR tools
P7	Male	midsize	5y: researcher, developer	Unity	yes; XR visual, cognitive
P8	Male	startup, freelance	9y: designer, developer	Custom Engine ; Unity	no
P9	Male	midsize	2y: developer	Glitch	no
P10	Female	midsize	3y: developer	Unity	no
P11	Male	startup, freelance	5y: developer	Unreal	no
P12	Male	startup	3.5y: designer	Unity	yes; XR hearing
P13	Male	startup	2y: developer	Unity	yes; XR motor
P14	Male	midsize, freelance	3y: researcher, developer	PlayCanvas	yes; XR visual
P15	Male	big tech	5.5y: designer, developer	Unity	yes; XR visual; XR tools
P16	Male	midsize, startup	4y: designer, researcher, developer	Unity	yes; XR cognitive; XR tools
P17	Male	midsize	<1y: developer	<i>Redacted XR Engine</i>	yes; on a11y team at engine
P18	Male	startup	6y: executive, designer, researcher	Unity	no
P19	Male	big tech	8y: developer	Unity	yes; XR visual, motor
P20	Male	startup	7y: team lead, developer	Unity	yes; XR visual
P21	Male	big tech, startup	5y: developer	Unity	yes; XR motor
P22	Male	startup, freelance	5y: team lead, developer	Unity	yes; XR cognitive
P23	Male	big tech, startup, freelance	8y: designer, developer	Unity	yes; XR visual, motor, speech
P24	Male	big tech, midsize	7y: developer	Unity	yes; XR visual
P25	Male	big tech	5y: team lead, developer	Custom Engine ; Unreal	yes; XR cognitive, s&h

the IGDA GASIG Top Ten guidelines [104]. We then synthesized a common subset across most resources using GAG as an anchor, matching its guidelines with other resources, adding new guidelines and labeling duplicate guidelines. We organized the guidelines based on different types of disabilities—motor, visual, cognitive, and speech & hearing disabilities—and selected the most commonly mentioned guidelines for each group. *We merged the guidelines for speech and hearing disabilities as both emerged as highly relevant to communication, and they had smaller number of guidelines than other disability types. Some resources already merged these guidelines; for example, the GAG cited text chat as benefiting d/Deaf and non-verbal users together [74].* Our comprehensive search resulted in four disability groups with each group consisting of five most reoccurring guidelines across all resources. A full overview of these guidelines can be found in Table 2, and we have linked the original wording for each guideline in the references in each row. We acknowledge that the guidelines selected still do not fully translate to all XR applications due to the immaturity of XR platforms and how these a11y guidelines were written. However, we tried to narrow down to the most relevant guidelines and use them as probes to inspire future XR a11y guidelines.

Table 2. Selected XR Accessibility Guidelines, grouped by disability type (Visual, Motor, Cognitive, and Speech & Hearing). Disability types are listed in (and guidelines are numbered in) the same order as presented to participants. Guidelines are abbreviated as Visual—Vis, Motor—Mot, Cognitive—Cog, and Speech & Hearing—SH. **Original wording for each guideline’s source** are bracketed (“[]”), included next to each guideline as relevant and hyperlink directly to the specific guideline referenced. As used as an anchor, references to the GAG—Game Accessibility Guidelines [56] are listed first, then all subsequent resources are listed in alphabetical order: APX—the Accessible Player Experiences guidelines [2]; IGDA—the IGDA GASIG Top Ten guidelines [104]; Quest—Meta Quest’s Designing Accessible VR [165]; W3CXR—the W3C XR Accessibility User Requirements [194]; Xbox—the Xbox Accessibility Guidelines [137]. Some guidelines cite the same source in cases where the source either lists a large number of guidelines and does not have section headers (e.g., [104, 105]) or includes multiple related guidelines (e.g., [7, 130]). These guidelines are still divided by their GAG [56] anchor and citations are listed multiple times below.

Disabilities	Guidelines
Visual Impairments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Vis-1.</i> Ensure no essential information is conveyed by a color alone. (GAG [65], APX [5], IGDA [103], Quest [99], Xbox [126]) • <i>Vis-2.</i> Allow interfaces to be resized. (GAG [58], APX [10], IGDA [103], W3CXR [162], Xbox [132]) • <i>Vis-3.</i> Use an easily readable default font. (GAG [75], APX [4], Quest [47], Xbox [125]) • <i>Vis-4.</i> Provide an audio description track. (GAG [68], APX [12], W3CXR [163], Xbox [131]) • <i>Vis-5.</i> Provide pre-recorded voiceovers for all text, including menus and installers. (GAG [71], IGDA [103], Quest [45], W3CXR [155], Xbox [129])
Motor Impairments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Mot-1.</i> Allow controls to be remapped/reconfigured. (GAG [57], APX [11], IGDA [105], Quest [48], W3CXR [154], Xbox [130]) • <i>Mot-2.</i> Support more than one input device. (GAG [73], APX [7], IGDA [105], W3CXR [154], Xbox [130]) • <i>Mot-3.</i> Do not rely on motion tracking of specific body types. (GAG [62], APX [7], Quest [48], W3CXR [160], Xbox [130]) • <i>Mot-4.</i> Ensure controls are as simple as possible, or provide a simpler alternative. (GAG [63], APX [6], IGDA [102], Quest [50], W3CXR [162], Xbox [130]) • <i>Mot-5.</i> Do not make precise timing essential to gameplay—offer alternatives, actions that can be carried out while paused, or a skip mechanism. (GAG [61], APX [9], IGDA [102], W3CXR [156], Xbox [130, 133])
Cognitive Impairments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Cog-1.</i> Avoid flickering images and repetitive patterns. (GAG [60], APX [3], Quest [49], W3CXR [157], Xbox [135]) • <i>Cog-2.</i> Ensure no essential information is conveyed by text alone, reinforce with visual and/or speech. (GAG [64], APX [12], IGDA [101], Quest [47], W3CXR [161], Xbox [126]) • <i>Cog-3.</i> Use symbol-based chat (smileys, etc.). (GAG [76], APX [8], IGDA [101], W3CXR [161], Xbox [136]) • <i>Cog-4.</i> Include an option to adjust the game speed. (GAG [67], APX [13], IGDA [105], W3CXR [156], Xbox [133]) • <i>Cog-5.</i> Provide an option to turn off/hide all non-interactive elements. (GAG [69], APX [5], IGDA [105], W3CXR [161], Xbox [134])
Speech & Hearing Impairments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>SH-1.</i> Provide captions or visuals for significant background sounds. (GAG [70], APX [12], IGDA [100], Quest [47], W3CXR [158], Xbox [127]) • <i>SH-2.</i> Support text chat as well as voice for online multiplayer. (GAG [74], APX [8], IGDA [100], W3CXR [154], Xbox [136]) • <i>SH-3.</i> Ensure no essential information is conveyed by sounds alone. (GAG [66], APX [12], IGDA [100], Quest [45], W3CXR [153], Xbox [126]) • <i>SH-4.</i> Provide separate volume controls or mutes for effects, speech, and background/music. (GAG [72], APX [3], IGDA [100], Quest [46], W3CXR [161], Xbox [128]) • <i>SH-5.</i> Allow subtitle/caption presentation to be customized. (GAG [59], APX [4], IGDA [100], Quest [47], W3CXR [159])

3.3 Procedure

We conducted a semi-structured, remote interview via Zoom video with each participant. Studies were conducted in English between October 2022 and July 2023. Each study lasted approximately two hours, split over one or two sessions,

and we compensated participants at \$50/hr. We separated each interview into four distinct sections: (1) Demographic and Past Development Experience in XR and A11y; (2) Specific Examples of Past XR and/or A11y Projects; (3) Evaluating one set of XR A11y Guidelines: Visual, Motor, Cognitive, or Speech & Hearing; and (4) Perspectives and Challenges of XR A11y Implementation, including opinions on 3rd party mod support. We detail each section as follows:

3.3.1 Demographic & Past XR/A11y Development Experience. We first asked participants' demographic and background information, including gender identification, education formally (e.g., university) and informally (e.g., self-taught), work organization, job position, and how long they have worked as XR developers. We then asked about their XR development experience and to describe the typical design and development cycle of an XR project in their organization.

3.3.2 Specific XR/A11y Projects. To understand XR developers' a11y experience and attitudes toward a11y integration in XR projects, we asked participants about their general a11y knowledge and experiences across target platforms (including but not limited to XR platforms, e.g. applications for web, mobile, or desktop). We then asked whether they had XR-specific accessibility experience; and if so, to detail the features developed and the development cycle, including motivations, design, tools used, and testing. If not, we asked what prevented them from considering or incorporating a11y features in their XR apps. If a participant had experience developing both XR and non-XR accessibility features, we asked them to discuss the differences between implementing accessibility features for XR versus non-XR applications.

We then asked participants to screen-share one XR project, garnering insight towards a11y support methods that leverage or best fit their existing practices. While participants screen-shared or discussed their practices, we evaluated topics like how they set up their development environment, how they organize their scene hierarchy, and what naming practices they follow when creating virtual elements. We also asked participants' affinity towards 3rd party packages, including what packages they had installed (if any).

3.3.3 Guideline Evaluation. After discussing their project, we presented a selection of existing XR accessibility guidelines and asked participants to discuss their interpretations, potential implementation plans, and concerns. We asked each participant to discuss one group of guidelines that focused on one specific type of disability. We first asked participants to choose two disability types that they were most interested in, then selected one disability from the participant's selections as the final group for discussion. Participants largely chose particular disability groups due to: Past experience developing solutions for that group (e.g., aligning with P7's target audience); they had a friend or personal identity with that group (e.g., P6 having a colorblind friend); or they were interested in building future solutions for that disability group (e.g., P2 and audio-only XR experiences). This strategy ensured that (1) participants had the chance to evaluate the guidelines that they prefer, and (2) all types of disabilities were approximately equally discussed. We discussed guidelines individually with our participants (i.e., speech & hearing guidelines were not discussed simultaneously). Our total count for each group was seven visual impairments, four motor impairments, seven cognitive impairments, and seven speech & hearing impairments. *We discussed motor impairments with two additional participants but removed them for low data quality. We still believe we reached saturation with this count.*

3.3.4 Perspectives and Challenges. After evaluating the guidelines, we closed the interview by asking participants their overall perspectives on integrating XR accessibility features into their projects. We asked roughly how much time and effort participants felt was viable to dedicate to accessibility for their industry projects, what were the greatest barriers to accessibility implementation, and what assistance method (e.g., guidelines, development tools, plugins) would best support them, including at what development phase such assistance could be best applied. We also asked developers' thoughts on supporting 3rd party modification of their XR applications with accessibility tools. We closed the interview

asking how much effort developers would want to put towards supporting a11y features, and how much they expect 3rd party support methods to contribute.

3.4 Analysis

Interviews were recorded with Zoom and transcribed by a professional online service approved by our University’s Institutional Review Board (IRB). Researchers reviewed each transcript to correct errors. We analyzed transcripts using two rounds of thematic analysis [29], starting with two researchers open coding the same set of three participants independently. They generated an initial list of 1,202 codes, narrowing down to an initial codebook of 829 codes in 172 categories and 21 themes upon their agreement. One researcher then manually coded the remaining 22 transcripts according to the codebook. After coding, the researcher used Claude 3.5 Sonnet to condense codes into a single document. *We ensured participant confidentiality by only sharing researcher-generated codes with the large-language model. No direct transcripts or quotes were uploaded. This method was approved by our University’s IRB.* We included our prompt in Appendix B. The resulting csv file **generated a list of 3,977 unique codes**, which we separated into 1,293 “guidelines” codes (specific to guideline evaluation) and 2,684 “main” codes (for the remaining transcript content). Researchers then met to derive themes and sub-themes from the codes using axial coding. Many themes appeared, particularly those related to common challenges in traditional software engineering roles. To stay within reasonable length, we prioritized themes relevant to the intersection of both XR development and a11y. We also prioritized findings that seemed particularly novel compared to prior work. After identifying an initial set of themes, researchers cross-referenced the original data, the codebook, and the themes to make final adjustments and ensure consistency. Our codebook with themes, sub-themes, and some representative codes can be found in Table 3 in Appendix A.

3.5 Positionality Statement

We recognize that our personal identities and cultural backgrounds inevitably intersect with our roles as researchers and may influence our interpretation of our data. It is crucial to acknowledge these intersections to ensure transparency and a comprehensive understanding of the study’s context and potential biases. Our research team is comprised of researchers with diverse backgrounds in both industry and academia. All researchers have rich experience working with people with disabilities and have different specialties, including accessibility, XR, and general software engineering. The first author also has a chronic, “invisible” disability that does not necessarily impact *their* use of consumer XR hardware, but their experience with disability brings a unique lens to communicating technology accessibility. Ultimately we believe everyone should be viewed as an expert of their own lived experience [44], and accessible XR solutions should be available to accommodate users of all needs.

4 Findings

We present our key findings, outlining the unique XR features that make a11y challenging, the developers’ practices in XR development, their attitudes towards XR a11y, interpretation on existing a11y guidelines for games and 3D virtual worlds, and their preferred tools to assist their XR a11y implementation.

4.1 Why is it Difficult to Integrate A11y in XR?

Our study reveals unique characteristics of XR applications that bring additional a11y development challenges compared to conventional 2D interfaces.

4.1.1 Sacrificing A11y for Immersion. Nearly half of our participants (12 out of 25) found accessibility features difficult to incorporate without losing a core component of their app’s immersion. We found developers prioritize their game’s *feel* rather than their users’ a11y needs. For example, flickering effects in XR may affect people with cognitive disabilities (e.g., triggering a seizure for epilepsy)—therefore, developers should limit flickering images in their apps. However, some XR developers (e.g., P4, P20) hesitate to remove such visual effects despite the potential risks; developers feel such effects are a core component of the associated “stress” (P20) necessary to convey the app’s theme, even if they detract from a11y: *“For some app designs, just trying to incorporate certain accessibility guidelines is going to be a **cursed problem that you cannot solve**. And just to be aware of those problems at a design stage and conscientiously make that trade off, like—we care enough about developing this app that we are willing to exclude this chunk of potential players”* (P4).

4.1.2 A11y Issues and Needs in XR Interactions. XR applications use unique interactions that enable powerful experiences, but we found that many developers often fight aspects of XR that enable these interactions. In this section, we outline a variety of a11y challenges around different XR interactions.

Text Resolution Harms Legibility. Reading text on XR platforms poses a variety of challenges, largely due to screen size and resolution. As a result, many developers (7 participants) try to limit the use of text as much as possible, instead prioritizing graphics and large virtual objects to convey information. However, making graphics accessible brings more complex technical solutions, such as alt text or ARIA labels, alongside a platform-supported 3D screen reader to read the descriptions—neither of which have standards in XR (5 participants). Five participants cited screen legibility issues as why not to include text. Even for users without visual impairments, display resolution and small screen sizes impact many XR applications, making text-based communication difficult to interpret: *“One day I can get the headset to sit on my head just right and all the text is clear and I can read things and its great. But then the next day for whatever reason, it’s just is not sitting just right and everything’s blurry. ... I have 20-20 vision. So if that’s a problem for me, it’s a problem for everyone else”* (P4).

Some big tech developers (e.g., P23, P25) believe XR screens are in an “unacceptable” (P23) middle ground, where text illegibility greatly detracts from immersion (P25)—users are aware what they are looking at is text, but they spend a long time trying to read it. P23 highlighted this issue: *“When things are in the middle, people spend more time, they spend more strain, they’re more distracted as a more taxing task.”* This XR text illegibility issue also poses barriers to some potential a11y features. For example, P25 developed a head-worn AR transcription and translation feature, but users had to perpetually concentrate on the device’s small screen instead of their outside environment, missing details when another person is speaking. This missing context is particularly problematic if the AR user needs both transcription and lip-reading to understand others. *“It’s really hard for them to [focus] on other people, right, other activities, because you can only focus on one thing and do it right. ... And it’s also very tiring, because you needed to fully focus on it for quite a long time”* (P25).

Leveraging Directional Audio for A11y. Developers believe that spatial audio afforded by XR headsets is a key to making apps more immersive (e.g., P18, P19). Therefore, 2D a11y hearing solutions such as closed caption and subtitle systems must be thoughtfully reconsidered for XR. For instance, P19 offered a spatial-based caption solution where developers add captions to their audio sources, displaying a caption (e.g., “people chatting”) within that range. However, participants disparaged attaching anything to users’ heads as obtrusive and hard to focus on (e.g., P6, P10): *“[It’s like] putting a sticky note on somebody’s face”* (P10).

Kinesthetic Interactions in XR. Many interactions in XR require physical movements that pose a11y issues. Since many VR apps would span multiple rooms in real-life, apps enable users to teleport across environments without

moving their legs. Although we found that this solution accommodates users with motor impairments who are unable to walk (P13), it can often be disorienting, particularly for users with visual impairments who need to be realigned to where they're facing after a teleportation action (P1, P16). Furthermore, many XR apps require precise hand movements, which are often not accommodated by XR platforms—particularly for users unable to operate the standard controllers (P13, P14). XR apps that require advanced, two-handed interactions could be challenging to users with motor disabilities (5 participants) even if they are able to perform the app's base interactions. As P11 indicated, *"I can definitely imagine if someone is in a wheelchair or maybe only has one arm...like in Tilt Brush, one arm was the UI, and one arm was the actual painting brush...in terms of accessing certain features that make it more fun, you probably need both hands, but you can definitely still, like get some of the basics, like by using just one hand."*

4.1.3 Representing Disabilities in XR. Developers expressed concerns that many systems can be used by PWD but lack support for suitable user representation. Prior work has explored disability representation in avatars to help destigmatize PWD using XR platforms [90, 119, 209], and these works should extend into self-viewable, OS-level interfaces. For example, VR headsets (e.g., Meta Quest 3) overlay holographic hands tracking the user's real-world hand position, allowing users to see their hands in front of virtual objects. However, these hands show a "typical" representation of a hand, and headsets have difficulty tracking users' missing limbs or fingers (e.g., P14, P19). As P14 explained, *"[VR] has this normative view of what would be a hand, how do you interact with your hand, whereas not necessarily all people have the same level of ability in the hands or other body parts...The design of headsets and controllers—they're specifically made with some kind of user in their mind"*.

4.1.4 Performance Limitations of Standalone HMDs Limit Accessibility. Eleven participants expressed concerns about the performance requirements of their XR applications, particularly as many users move from desktop-based VR systems to standalone, mobile devices with lower computational power. Five participants noted that adding logic for PWD-exclusive a11y features would affect performance overhead (e.g., P19, P21, P24), especially for the XR apps that need high-quality visual effects (P11). Developers also expressed concerns that performance issues may introduce additional a11y problems, like flickering images, if the headset cannot keep up with the application (P21).

4.1.5 Onboarding First-Time Users. XR platforms often require learning curves, as many XR interaction techniques are unique from any of users' prior device experience. Five developers considered first-time VR users as people with accessibility needs, particularly given that unfamiliarity may cause users to not recognize objects as interactive or become confused when trying to interact with static objects (e.g., P12). Although video tutorials may help *developers* learn XR tools, *users* need a **hands-on** tutorial to teach them each interaction and correlate them to a specific action (P18)—which may not be feasible after app distribution.

4.2 How do Current XR Development Practices Affect A11y Integration?

Next, we present participants' current development practices, including general practices for XR development in their preferred platforms and what barriers they face, to better inform how XR a11y support methods should be produced.

4.2.1 Developers Lack Formal XR Training. XR developers commonly learn XR development practices outside of conventional settings. We found most of our participants (17 out of 25) had little to no formal XR training, instead learning through online resources (14 participants), on the job (8), or from personal projects (3). Participants lamented their self-taught experience left gaps in their knowledge, which proves challenging when finding best practices to implement a feature. Formal training for XR A11y is even more rare; no participants even indicated formal non-XR a11y

training, and six participants mentioned lacking knowledge on guidelines, existing tools, best practices, and appropriate terminology to use when discussing a11y.

4.2.2 Practitioners’ Diverse Responsibilities. Although all 25 participants considered themselves ‘developers,’ we found that their work included many responsibilities (as opposed to traditional software development where developers commonly have one clear responsibility). Participants covered everything from programming (e.g., software developer), to management (e.g., CEO), design (e.g., asset designer), research, and animation. *Quantity* of job responsibilities varied slightly by company size, with freelance and startup employees spread out over many roles, while midsize and big tech employees typically had one programming-related role and up to two secondary roles (e.g., software engineer, interaction designer, and team manager). These multifaceted team responsibilities lead to unclear responsibility assignment for a11y tasks, restricting developers’ ability and willingness to effectively learn and implement accessible XR solutions. We have included developers’ primary roles alongside their years of experience in Table 1.

4.2.3 Dynamic Code Generation. To enable easy version control and code merging, instead of using Unity prefabs (drag-and-droppable object templates) or Unreal Blueprints, we found that multiple big tech developers prefer to dynamically generate their scenes and virtual objects at runtime through code (e.g., P3, P15, P25). As P3 explained, “*It’s far easier to deal with merge conflicts when you can see the code that’s building out your scene, right? ... When working on HoloLens apps in Unity, [if] someone changed the prefab, now my day’s work is hosed. Because the stuff I did in the GUI with clicking buttons in 12 different places is gone.*” However, this process makes adding a11y support additionally challenging, as 3rd party a11y supports often interface through the Unity Editor in the form of prefabs [211].

4.2.4 Reusing Code Between Projects. Developers have a variety of considerations when starting new projects, including what packages to install, whether they start from a template or an empty scene, and what packages to include. These findings help inform a11y support methods to ensure compatibility and reveal how willing developers are to start from an “accessible” design template or incorporate a11y packages into their workflow. Most participants start new projects from scratch (7 developers), with P10 arguing against the use of templates to keep her projects lean and reduce per-project development time by only adding components she needs. Five participants commonly start from template scenes that include existing prefabs or packages that they customize to fit their needs, with P12’s startup having a premade, base template scene they base all projects on. Although participants varied in the exact prefabs they used when starting their projects, most participants started with a player component (e.g., P1, P8, P13) and an XR camera and tracking prefab (e.g., Unity XR Interaction Toolkit’s XRRig, 7 participants).

However, even developers who start from scratch reuse code between projects (7 developers), particularly existing components like a customized player class. For freelancers specializing in a particular area, like P1 making custom VR video applications, they often use the same base scripts with slight customization based on preferred input methods for their target platform, writing reusable components to save them time in the future (P6). Some big tech companies maintain an internal knowledge base for employees to reference (P25)—their maturity enables them to move more quickly on certain 2D a11y features like screen reading or alternate language fields by applying reusable templates and technologies (P23). However, such a11y feature templates do not yet exist for XR development (e.g., P6, P15, P22).

4.2.5 Testing with PWD. We report developers’ practices and challenges with a11y-related app testing.

Lack of A11y-Focused Feedback for XR. Multiple developers noted user feedback as vital to informing new features (e.g., P2, P23, P25), but developers as a whole lack dedicated testing with PWD, opting instead for a general sample of users (6 participants) or no user feedback at all (P19). General samples do produce some testers with disabilities, as P2

explained: “If [you] have 100 people try something you’re usually going to see...some wheelchairs, you’re gonna have small children. And you’re going to have people with limited usage of both hands, right. So those sort of things sort of naturally come up,” (P2) but developers do not seek PWD-specific testing groups for their apps.

Lack of Standardized Prototyping Method. Prototyping tools are very common in game design, but we found 2D methods like Figma are significantly less effective for XR apps (e.g., P14, P18), and XR interaction design lacks a standardized equivalent besides “working it all out inside Unity” (P14). P14 has seen coworkers attempt to use long strips of paper rolled into cylinders with limited success.

Triage Systems and User Accessibility Fatigue. Companies have ranking systems that determine the urgency level of each support ticket (e.g., P23, P25), with managers and developers currently ranking a11y tickets as low priority. P23 argues for a dedicated a11y support category in apps’ bug report forms, with a11y support tickets likely being more critical than other user feedback. Notably, most users submitting bug reports are not likely to have barriers using the app as a whole—but people with core a11y issues simply stop playing or return the game. P23 argues that for those users, a11y challenges are “as big a blocker ... as an application causing crash,” and are often much easier to fix than other types of issues: “[To solve this issue] we need to use a different, like, color palette [because] 10% of our users have this type of color deficiency and they can’t disambiguate these things. Oh, let’s use some iconography. That took our designer 20 minutes and our engineer two hours to implement it. We pushed it to live.”

4.3 What Motivates and Hinders XR Developers to Integrate A11y?

We not only asked developers to describe a11y features they’ve already made, but also what would encourage them to implement new a11y features in their apps. Developers concerned that the overall financial **cost** of implementing a11y features was “worth it” to their organization (15 participants). As such, they would primarily be motivated by knowing that a large **number of users** with disabilities would use the features addressed (21). Developers seek hard data on how many users they would gain or benefit by addressing each feature, as well as how many users they *could* reach via positive **reviews** on online marketplaces (e.g., P1, P17). Developers would also benefit by knowing the estimated **time** necessary to implement features (19), or an approximate metric of difficulty vs. value of each system (e.g., P6, P12, P19). Finally, some companies face **legal** concerns by not incorporating accessibility into their apps, leading to a11y feature additions not by developer choice (6). We outline each of these motivations as follows, distinguished by the unique differences of how they affect developers at companies of each size, from freelancers to big tech:

4.3.1 Freelancers. Freelancers seem mixed on implementing a11y features, but are generally more apt to do so than startup developers. However, spending time implementing a11y features is largely dependent on their clients’ wishes, particularly whether those features serve the client’s target audience (5 participants). For example, P1 created a video player for a church pastor, who’s primary audience was older, first time VR users. Therefore, they preferred a more simple UI as “more usable to the target audience.” (P1)

4.3.2 Startups. Startups are constantly in “survival mode,” not targeting PWD (5 participants). We found that startup developers cannot directly convince their clients of accessibility needs like freelancers can, instead reporting to a project manager who assigns goals (5). Startup developers were more cynical to incorporating a11y into their XR apps, not only questioning the number of users with disabilities it would support, but also using dismissive language: “How many of them **want** to engage in VR games?”—said P13—“[It’s] not fair to expect somebody to literally take like three years of their life and make it completely not valuable to them in any way just to allow the access of **these other people**.” Other developers outside of startups also talked down about startups’ lack of a11y implementation, referencing startups’

reliance on good reviews as a motivator: *“In a sense, accessibility won’t be done until someone complains about it, I mean, sues or just can’t use it”* (P3).

4.3.3 Midsize. Companies like XR engines, universities, and medical facilities don’t have the same high-profile legal teams as big tech companies, but also don’t have to worry about poor reviews from users as startups do since they’ve already established themselves. Midsize companies also lack or only have limited a11y teams. P17 was notably the only employee with an accessibility team at a midsize company, but the size of their team at the time of our interview was only two people. In an effort to encourage developers to take more agency, P17’s dedicated a11y team reassigned a11y bugs back to the developers that sent them out: *“So they took ownership of the accessibility changes that they need to make, even if ended up being more effort in the long run to get them to do that”* (P17).

4.3.4 Big tech. Developers at big tech companies appear to care about a11y the most, with full dedicated a11y teams in their organization to ensure compliance with base standards. Although big tech companies have relatively mature a11y teams and standards for **2D** development, similar practices do not fully extend to XR platforms. While big tech has internal, automated tooling for a11y compliance, they appear rather surface level, such as checking if a button performs its expected action when pressed. But these tools lack proper user evaluation for scenarios unique to XR, where a button is out of reach or the user can’t see the button due to objects in front of it (P21). P3 simplified the rationale for caring about a11y to be a fear of being sued, with a11y teams primarily sticking to a bare minimum to ensure compliance. P23 noted big tech companies creating offshoot “incubation teams” to rapidly develop minimum viable products (MVPs) in a manner similar to startups—not focused on a11y due to tight deadlines—and big tech companies that *do* provide resources to perform a11y-specific testing often move too slowly for the feedback to be useful (P3): *“Every time we’ve tried to do user studies, unrelated to mixed reality, it’s like, two months later, we get the data back, and [by then] the entire feature’s changed ... and is not useful anymore. So I think it’s just the speed of a big company.”*

4.3.5 Everyone has a responsibility to be an a11y developer. Some developers did believe that XR a11y was a critical matter of justice and equity (e.g., P25), with the criticality of accuracy of accessible XR implementations increasing with the severity of their end user’s impairment, but many participants (10) focused on XR a11y features benefitting the “normal” user’s convenience (e.g., P10) and comfort (e.g., P21). Even those with prior a11y experience (e.g., P14) seemed to hold a “normative” view of PWD, for example referring to people without speech & hearing impairments as “normal people” (P3) perpetuating existing stigma against PWD as “non-XR users”.

However, echoing prior work [43], we found that best design considerations for XR often correlate with best practices for XR a11y (10 participants), and many end users may need help even if they don’t have a medically-defined impairment (P1). For example, developers considered their app being one-handable to be a proper design consideration (e.g., P2, P24) rather than an a11y feature, particularly after users with such needs appear in general testing groups (P2). As P12 states: *“[The] best argument for accessibility is usability. The fact that like, good accessibility isn’t just for people with impairments, it also makes the product better”* (P12).

4.4 How do XR Developers Implement A11y Solutions?

Developers have already implemented a variety of accessibility features in past projects, offering the following as implementable with some considerations:

4.4.1 Incorporating Alternative Input. Developers use a variety of custom input and output methods to enable accessible features in their XR apps to make up for lacking sensors or inaccessible controllers. For example, they use the Xbox

Kinect (P3), Nintendo Switch JoyCon (P3), the Xbox Adaptive Controller (P20), and the Merge Cube (P4) to enable alternate input methods in their XR apps for users with motor impairments. Use of alternate input methods introduce challenges with standardizing input across devices, which some developers mitigated using toolkits like Rewired [78] (P5) and Unity’s XR Input to standardize input across platforms. In an effort to make their platform more accessible to alternate input methods, P17’s team incorporated keyboard navigation into their platform’s controller system, “*So any game that already had controller support, now suddenly had keyboard support. So this is a big feature for instantly opening up keyboard control to, you know, 1000s, millions of games that already had controller support.*”

4.4.2 Hooking into System A11y Support. As opposed to “high-fidelity” XR development platforms (e.g., Unity) [149], some developers noted advantages with “Native” frameworks (e.g., Babylon Native, P3) as able to convert programs to OS-native commands, thus enabling the a11y supports (e.g. VoiceOver and Android Talkback) on mobile device. For example, P3 used Babylon Native to create a visually impaired accessible, mobile MR measurement and 3D model visualization tool. The app enabled users to measure distances in a room by moving their phone outward, but it was also fully compatible with the platform’s native screen reader by adding invisible 2D buttons on 3D objects: “*These invisible buttons, you could cycle through just as you would any other button. And they could kind of highlight with the screen reader focus indicator, ... And it would ... give you an object, or it’ll basically tell you the manipulation of the 3D objects that you would do. And it was directly in line with like that other buttons on the screen. And so it kind of was, hopefully, it was an intuitive way to basically have buttoned controls to move 3D objects in space.*”

4.4.3 Examples of Existing A11y Solutions. Colorblindness (7), one-handed mode (5), and closed captions/subtitles (6) were among the most common existing a11y features developers implement in their projects. This section outlines accessible XR solutions developed to address particular conditions, sorted by disability type mirroring our guidelines.

Solutions to Address Visual A11y. *Colorblindness* was the most common impairment addressed by developers (7 participants), with 3 participants (P4, P20, P23) using both shape and color to demonstrate essential objects. P15 and P23 recommended implementing colorblind-accessible color palettes, offering systems that change colors application-wide on the fly, similar to how Beat Saber [21] supports custom color options (Appendix C) *Besides colorblind features*, developers have incorporated a variety of a11y solutions for their XR apps, including text size (e.g. P2, P22), legible fonts (e.g., P9), magnification (e.g., P2, P3, P22), and window resizing (e.g., P2). P3 implemented their own AR screenreader using a system of on-screen invisible buttons. Developers also emphasized a need for *Depth Cues* in VR, including non-interactive elements like fog, to provide a sense of 3D space (e.g., P1, P15). In this regard, we also found that some VR hardware affordances innately provide disability *solutions*, as stereoscopic HMDs have enabled users without depth perception to experience depth for the first time: “[*My user*] was able to have a sense of depth through this VR experience. And for the first time, he said forever in his life” (P1).

Solutions to Address Motor A11y. Five participants developed solutions for one-handed modes, enabling all required functions on their app to be useable by only one hand. We found that one-handed modes were useful for people with permanent and situational a11y needs—to make up for situational one-handedness [43] in manufacturing, P23 incorporated their HoloLens’ eyetracking capabilities to enable remote selections. Additionally, although locomotion in XR is a continually researched problem [52], P4 notably avoided the problem entirely by making their app stationary—“*so we don’t need to worry about smooth versus teleportation locomotion, or people being able to physically get up and ambulate around. So someone in a wheelchair can use this [app] just as well as anybody else.*”

Solutions to Address Cognitive A11y. We found that some developers implemented a variety of a11y suggestions, many of which could be considered good general accessible design practices. Some participants incorporated conventional cognitive a11y solutions, including P1’s use of little animation and few moving parts and P4’s pause button to halt their app’s execution. P1 also emphasized the use of simple UI design to aid first time VR users, and P18 echoed this sentiment with simple UX interactions in their MR apps.

Solutions to Address Speech & Hearing A11y. To address hearing difficulties in real-life and virtual environments, six participants developed subtitles or closed captions for their XR applications, with P25 developing AR and VR transcription applications that reads out audio from sources around the user. Additionally, VR headsets like the Meta Quest have downward-firing speakers located near users’ ears but do not fully encapsulate them. Therefore, P1 expressed concerns with being able to hear their application at an adequate volume in a busy hospital environment, which they solved by pitching up their narration to boost their app’s volume.

4.5 How Applicable are 3D Guidelines to XR A11y?

We further report developers’ understandings and implementation suggestions for the a11y guidelines for 3D virtual worlds, investigating the applicability of these guidelines to XR.

4.5.1 Knowledge of Existing Guidelines and 3D Applicability in XR. Developers knew of some existing guidelines, but each lacked knowledge of how to apply them to their apps. For example, Microsoft’s MR Accessibility Standards [124] are not considered “fleshed out” by P3 nor P20, and the W3C’s Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) [193] only apply to 2D interfaces (P3, P17). XR remains a lot less mature than web interfaces (P24), lacking simple system-wide a11y features like zoom despite prior work demonstrating their feasibility (e.g., SeeingVR’s magnifier tool [211]).

Participants understood most of our presented guidelines (e.g., Vis-1, Cog-2, SH-1, SH-3), with many developers correlating their understanding to prior solutions they’ve seen or personally developed in and outside of XR (e.g., referencing Fortnite’s visual radial sound indicator [41] to satisfy SH-1; P17, P18). However, some guidelines seemed less applicable to XR apps. **Timing** (Cog-4) for example seemed *possible* to implement but not applicable to many XR apps, as real-time interactions (e.g., P20’s firefighting simulator) seemed necessary to maintain immersion (§4.1.1). Developers also argue this guideline would severely impact multiplayer apps, with additional design considerations needed to adjust fairness among players (e.g., Beat Saber [21] reducing players’ score for playing at a slower speed). To best implement a range of appropriate speeds, P8 recommended developing “*toward your extremes, low and high, and then everything else will kind of modulate in place.*”

Guidelines Lack Sufficient Detail. We found that participants need more XR-specific and a11y-specific **context** in their guidelines. Some guidelines are too broad or use ambiguous language, e.g. when to use text, symbols, icons; or subtitles versus closed captions, and how each should appear in their XR apps. Cog-1 and SH-1 in particular confused P1 and P19, respectively, with P1 elaborating: “*When I think of like a flickering image, I think of a number of things. ... If I [had] the context of like, ‘Hey, this is for seizures’, I’d be like, oh, yeah, like that. ... I interpreted [this guideline] as more aesthetic direction than, you know, you could cause somebody to fall out, hit their head and seriously injure themselves.*”

4.5.1 Knowledge of Existing Guidelines and 3D Applicability in XR. Most participants agreed that a11y considerations should occur as early as possible, with **every** developer (25 out of 25) specifically mentioning that at least one guideline should be considered at the design phase, early prototyping stage, or up to a designer to implement.

When should a11y be implemented? From our interviews, we identified six phases of development, including (1) early ideation, (2) the design phase, (3) early development, (4) the development phase, (5) testing, and (6) post-hoc. Participants overwhelmingly felt a11y features should be considered and implemented at the design phase (12 participants) or project start (4), with three participants indicating early development (P9, P11, P15), and only one at the development phase (P10 for SH-1, SH-2), testing (P5 for Mot-4), or post hoc (P5 for Mot-3). This timing could shift based on the size of the project; as someone also assuming design responsibilities, P5 emphasized a need for a11y implementation in the design phase for big tech projects, but a11y may be implemented post-hoc for freelance projects after feedback. Participants also noted certain guidelines as particularly important to develop as early as possible, with guidelines like Mot-5, Vis-2, and Vis-5 becoming “prohibitively expensive” late in development. As P6 put Vis-5, “*Trying to patch it on after the fact sounds like a disaster.*”

Who should implement a11y features? Similarly, participants mostly agreed (18 participants) that *designers* should be primarily responsible for implementing or enforcing accessibility features, with every guideline cited as a designer’s responsibility or should be considered during the design phase by at least one participant (including by participants that identified themselves as designers). In some cases, designers should be less involved in favor of developers (P19 for SH-2) or direct feedback from testers (P18 for SH-3). Fourteen participants agreed that *developers* should be primarily responsible for implementing accessibility features, with Mot-4, all five SH guidelines, and four out of five Cog and Vis guidelines (not Cog-3 nor Vis-3) covered in these responsibilities. P3 in particular indicated that developers should do everything, no matter the guidelines asked, as standard for their big tech MR team. Additional responsibilities mentioned include artists (P1 and P4 for Cog-1 and Cog-5), the project manager (P16 for Cog-2), creative director (P2 for Vis-2 and Vis-4), or testers (P5 and P24 for Mot-4 and Vis-2). Some developers like P8 mentioned responsibilities lie halfway on the developer and halfway on the designer, but since nine of our participants had both design and development roles, feature implementation may still be managed by the same individual.

Another guideline that is hard to apply to XR is Vis-2 (UI resizing). Some developers noted that UI scaling would be implementable (P17, P23) with some caveats like pagination (P23), just needing to iron out design considerations. However, P2 and P17 both noted supporting UI *reorganization* would be a “*huge nightmare*” in XR (P2), potentially requiring a “*recreation [of] the entire GUI system itself*” (P17).

Who should enforce compliance with a11y features? Developers generally preferred XR-specific automation tools be implemented due to their use in 2D work (11 participants). P2 and P22 also recommended that the project manager (P2 for Vis-5), technical designer, or technical lead (Cog-1, P22) manually review projects for a11y compliance should automated tools be insufficient.

When should a11y be shown to users? Developers largely agreed that a11y should be shown to users at first time setup, not buried behind option menus. As P1 outlines, “*Having people dig through menus, like, you’re only really inclined to do that when you’re experiencing the discomfort already*” (P1), which isn’t reasonable for Cog-1 if it directly affects a life-threatening condition (e.g., epileptic seizures). As a simple interaction default for subtitle customization in SH-5, P18 would offer participants a simple option on startup—“*Can you see this text clearly? And if it is, click Yes.*” P22 also suggested an a11y rating in the XR platform’s app store, similar to Meta’s comfort rating in the quest store.

How should we prioritize guidelines? Developers rated guidelines as having varying importance, with those like Cog-1 rated as “*vitaly important*” by P8: “*It’s literally everything. Because if you have a bad experience like this, number one, it could physically hurt somebody.*” Other guidelines like SH-5 seemed up to the platform to implement (P3), not the developers, with developers just passing through preferences from the user’s settings.

4.6 What XR A11y Support Methods do XR Developers Prefer?

Developers used a variety of support methods at various stages of development. We provide the following framework to guide a11y tool development: A downloadable, free of charge, open-source 3rd party a11y package or set of reusable components is most preferred by developers (21 participants), however many considerations need to occur before organizations are willing to incorporate them into their projects.

4.6.1 Standard Platform SDKs. Most developers used platform-specific SDKs and toolkits based on the development platform they're using and the target device they're developing for. Many participants used a platform-specific toolkit for XR development, with a nearly even split between OpenXR (7 participants), Unity XR Interaction Toolkit (6), and Microsoft's Mixed Reality Toolkit (MTRK) (6). Despite differences in the toolkits used, developers highlighted a desire for compatibility between multiple common XR devices. P8 praised OpenXR, as it enables them to ensure device compatibility without the "nightmare" of designing the same feature for each platform from scratch. Participants P19 and P22 referenced OpenXR as a standard to target if an a11y support method did interface with a particular toolkit.

4.6.2 Concerns Against Outside Direct Development Assistance. Many developers have concerns against outside influence on their code unless strongly compelled to, wanting to maintain control of their software, with some exceptions for freelancers and those with existing mod experience.

Third Party Packages. Although many developers leveraged 3rd party components and libraries (11 participants), developer support methods like a11y packages for XR platforms often require specific incentives for developers to adopt. These packages are often quickly disregarded by some startups (P2, P12) and need to be cleared by big tech legal teams, even if open source. P2 mentioned startup developers having "*not invented here syndrome*" (P2)—developers at these companies feel personal attachment to their projects, with a philosophy that they "*[already] know everything*," not wanting to involve consultants nor code written outside their organization. Other startups may be more likely to pick up 3rd party tools, quickly evaluating their "worth" (P23) towards speeding up their development time (P19). Big tech companies also seem to be more hesitant to use 3rd party packages, preferring to use internal tools if they exist, or requiring packages that are open source if they do not have an internal equivalent. Some big tech developers even offered to rewrite custom versions of packages to only include the features they need, citing build time as a need for lightweight packages (P15).

Automated A11y Checking Tools vs. Consulting. Most developers did prefer an automated tool for a11y compliance checking (12 participants). Six developers appreciated personalized consulting support, either by a dedicated role at their company or by hiring an external service. P2 noted strong sentiment at their workplace against any outside consulting, fueled by the "*philosophy that they [already] know everything*".

Game Modification. Developers, particularly those at midsize and big tech companies, generally disapprove of adding 3rd party game modification ("mods") support, i.e., allowing community members to modify their games, due to concerns about security (e.g., P24), legal problems (e.g., P25), platform integration (e.g., P17), or unfair advantages in multiplayer (e.g., P1). Only five developers directly supported implementing mod integration into their apps, all of whom either have preexisting modding experience (e.g., P5) or outlined strict stipulations of the data that mods would be allowed to access—like exposed metadata parameters but not feature code (e.g., P22).

4.6.3 Feature & Code Examples. Developers want specific examples of a11y features to implement. These examples should include the "best" implementation for each a11y feature (P15) and be presented in a manner that's easy digestible. "Easily digestible" includes providing accessible and inaccessible examples (e.g., safe and unsafe flash rates in Cog-1,

with a warning presented over the unsafe option); videos or GIFs of PWD unable to use an app until the support method is added; and code snippets, including downloadable projects and Unity scenes. Four developers preferred to view a11y feature examples or support in the form of blog posts, with each post containing best implementations, descriptions of performance costs, and relative importance at each phase of development.

4.6.4 Developers Prefer Directly Implementable Solutions. Ultimately, we found that developers want an open source, drag & droppable package that enables them to directly implement XR guideline-compliant a11y features according to the following framework: This package should be easy-to-use (e.g., P3, P16), well documented (9 participants), have its own UI (P19), and be able to automatically verify compliance with accessibility standards, providing warnings or errors in their platform’s developer console (P22). This package may provide a skeleton structure for XR apps (P5) but should be functional at all stages of development. P23 provided an overview of the needs for an approachable a11y package or toolkit for XR, uniquely noting concerns associated with the time it takes to implement the toolkit itself, even if the toolkit benefits many accessibility features:

“You think the tool is providing you the time to implement it. Good software tools are very minimal in terms of their implementation time. If a tool takes 25 hours to implement into your application, that’s misery. If it takes 25 minutes, that’s an actually good tool—a tool needs to be able to be picked up and used quickly. So XR toolkit stuff would need to be very immediately approachable, and very usable. So your guideline descriptions and stuff needs to be like, popcorn easy to consume, easy to understand. ... You’re constantly fighting an attention warfare; having good visual content that draws them in and immediately communicates the ideas, ... putting some images in there is going to be really helpful for getting people to overcome their initial attention of like, oh, I should pay more attention to this. Okay, I will watch you know, the tutorial video on how to implement the toolkit or oh, here’s the link to the toolkit SDK docs” (P23).

5 Discussion

In this work, we interviewed 25 XR developers from four types of organizations, ranging from freelancers and startups to employees at XR platforms and big tech companies, developing a comprehensive understanding of their practices, attitudes, and challenges towards developing accessibility features in their apps. We sought to answer three research questions as proposed in the introduction, which we do so as follows: Firstly, developers face challenges incorporating accessibility features without sacrificing visual effects and interactions that they believe make their app immersive (§ 4.1.1). As XR applications utilize unique interaction methods, developers have difficulty onboarding first-time users (§ 4.1.5), resolving input (§ 4.4.1) and performance considerations (§ 4.1.4) associated with some a11y features, and evaluating the time/cost necessary to implement a11y features (§ 4.3; RQ1). Secondly, a lack of formal XR training (§ 4.2.1) combined with a multitude of responsibilities (freelance, startups) or lack of control over what you implement (midsize, big tech) leads users away from implementing a11y features (§ 4.3). Practices of reusing code would make future a11y implementations easier after the first project (§ 4.2.4), but starting developers is challenging, particularly if a lack of prototyping standards doesn’t easily permit accessible design (§ 4.2.5; RQ2). Lastly, we evaluated state-of-the-art guidelines for 3D virtual worlds and applied them to XR, determining that guidelines need more XR-specific context to be understood (§ 4.5.1) and developers need sufficient motivation to implement them (§ 4.3). Developers also desire easily implementable, open source toolkits to help them implement a11y features (§ 4.6; RQ3). In this section we discuss implications for creating effective XR a11y support methods informed by industry XR developers. We also discuss limitations of this work and opportunities for future work, including developing the support methods offered.

5.1 Systemic Deprioritization of Accessibility Integration

Our findings reveal how existing development practices overlook a11y as a core requirement of XR development. Developers we interviewed noted a dependency on big tech companies to publicize a11y features, with many celebrated a11y examples being AAA titles like *God of War: Ragnarök* [139] and *The Last of Us Part II* [53]. Many startups in “survival mode” believe they lack the ability to compete with these projects, and those that do rely on post-launch feedback rather than integrating a11y features from the start. Independent XR game studios *are* capable of implementing a11y features—limited indie developers like Owlchemy Labs have been heralded for their accessibility features in games like *Job Simulator* and *Cosmonious High* (P1, P24) [31]—But our participants point to the most popular VR applications like *Beat Saber*, *Rec Room*, and *VRChat* (e.g., P2, P18) as standards for a11y implementation. Innovative solutions can also emerge from external sources; P16 for example emulated tunnel vision motion sickness support from *The Elder Scrolls V* into their toolkit. But as a whole, developers systemically deprioritizing a11y features reveals a structural challenge in XR development, where business pressure limits a11y development and creates a false divide between profit and inclusivity—while in reality a11y feature development improves the experience for all users ([43], § 4.3.5). Transforming this systemic issue requires reconceptualizing accessibility not as an add-on, but as a fundamental aspect of XR development, acknowledging our responsibility to create truly inclusive digital experiences.

5.2 Developing Accessible XR Solutions and their Benefactors

5.2.1 Impacting the Software Development Lifecycle. Despite evaluating many company sizes, we found most of our developers cited similar experiences in their XR development lifecycles, having self-taught XR development and holding many responsibilities within their swiftly-moving teams. Many of our participants were executives of their companies or asset and interaction designers alongside developers, fulfilling roles that encompass the entire software development lifecycle. We mention in §4.5.1 the need for a11y implementation as early in the development process as possible. However, with participants diverse responsibilities outside of pure development (§4.2.2) leaves little time to develop a11y features nor test with PWD (§4.2.5). Freelancers and startup developers believe their workplaces would be less receptive to a11y development until after their app releases (e.g., P12, P16), even if it’s more difficult (P4), unless their client requests it (e.g., P1, P5, P20–P22). Therefore, pushing against workplace power dynamics may be more difficult. Midsize and big tech developers *including designers* (e.g., P15) appear more receptive to urgently improving their XR apps’ a11y at the start of development, but due to the scale of big tech projects, participants may not want to add to existing projects if the project has already scaled past a terminal point (e.g., P9). Since developers believe guidelines like *Vis-5* become prohibitively expensive late in development, they encourages startup developers to start as soon as possible (P6); however, guidelines should also be formatted in a way that implementing them does not become an insurmountable task. We maintain our recommendation for drag-and-drop toolkits, which may significantly reduce overhead while encouraging early a11y feature implementation—allowing even late-in-development projects to effectively include accessibility features without overwhelming designers and developers. We also note that although platforms like *Babylon Native* enable unique benefits like device-native screenreader integration 4.4.2, we recommend prioritizing efforts for future drag-and-droppable a11y toolkits to *Unity*, given *Unity*’s widespread adoption (as 23 of our 25 participants used it) and its position as a “go-to tool for creating XR applications in practice” [148].

5.2.2 Need for Automated Tools. One frequently requested feature for a11y support was an automatic scene scanner for a11y compliance. However, the implementation of such a feature may prove challenging for developers that dynamically generate their scenes—we found that at least five developers dynamically created objects in their scene.

This practice would likely make some a11y checking impossible before runtime, such as z-fighting (P4) or performance limitations (P21) potentially violating Cog-1. Support methods like an XR a11y toolkit are very important for people lacking a11y resources, enabling significantly more a11y consideration in XR apps (P25). Toolkits that fit developers' recommendations outside of XR a11y do exist, like Sarmah et al.'s *Geno* [176], which provided a high-level interface to implement voice commands into web applications. Developers indicated that support systems should be able to take one step further and recognize programs like screen readers on your XR system and import their settings.

5.2.3 Maintaining Tools Over Time. Another concern mentioned by developers (e.g., P7, P9) that we share is a lack of maintenance of support methods over time. Prior work in computer science theory and software engineering emphasizes a need for modular, easy to read code; clear and quality documentation; dedicated code reviewers; and an active todo list to motivate continued contribution to the project [1, 38, 87, 91]. Additional programs like the XR Association [204] and XRAccess [203] that aggregate XR a11y development resources (e.g., [205]) may help publicize toolkits for continued development, but this would require a11y research systems to open-source their code for further iteration or re-implementation (unlike [94, 108, 146]). Accessible systems should consider establishing sustainable maintenance frameworks that balance code quality and 3rd party collaboration opportunities. Projects like SeeingVR [212] require submitting an additional license agreement to contribute, which may deter developers from submitting their changes. Given that at least 18 of our participants were already familiar with established software engineering version control practices or platforms like GitHub, we believe such systems could be made available for reuse by the research community and include clear contribution guidelines that support external maintenance. Ultimately, reducing these contribution barriers while encouraging standard practices may be vital to extend accessibility tools' lifespan.

5.2.4 Exposing Data for A11y. However, we recognize that end-user XR application developers are rather protective of their projects, so providing direct access to their files in a manner similar to 3rd party game modifications is unlikely. Past systems like SeeingVR [211] and RealityCheck [95] implement post-hoc a11y plugins by "hacking in" to projects. Developers should expect conventions similar to Unity defaults; however, we cannot predict this behavior for projects with procedurally generated content as we do not have access to metadata not exposed by the project—particularly if procedurally generated scene graphs become industry standard due to their perceived scalability. Furthermore, if the end goal of a research project is for mass adoption of the system in industry, we find it unlikely that developers would install post-hoc methods at the sacrifice of their perceived security, even if it would benefit a11y as a whole. We do also note concerns that developers late in the development cycle would become discouraged by increased performance costs, choosing to continue avoiding a11y implementation as a result. Developers appeared to prefer a package or toolkit similarly structured to SeeingVR, i.e., in the form of a platform-specific package (in SeeingVR's case, a GameObject template prefab which automatically added all tools to the VR app and controlled through their Accessibility Manager [211]). Additionally, developers *did* seem open to exposing particular metadata from their projects to external programs, much like 2D screenreaders like NVDA and JAWS read from alt text labels on websites for images, but this practice may require more work from developers and a separation between the emitting program (e.g., a Unity package) and a receiving program (e.g., a system-level XR screenreader).

5.2.5 Engaging PWD in XR A11y Teams. A simple lack of knowledge on how to develop accessibility features deters many developers we interviewed, with developers appearing more willing to incorporate accessible features if they can quantify their input costs (time/monetary cost) against measurable output (increased userbase, positive reviews, and

lack of legal disputes) (§ 4.3). Compounding this issue, systemically excluding PWD from XR development perpetuates existing stigma and barriers to a11y. While developers like P14 cited a “lack of access to testers with disabilities”, this comment implies a deeper issue: PWD are not being consulted in the development process, despite designers often overlooking what their users think is important (P18). Engagement with PWD must address workplace power dynamics by establishing PWD as equal stakeholders in development teams; however, technical integration alone is insufficient—we must recognize how disability intersects with other aspects of identity such as race, gender, class, and sexuality to create unique experiences of marginalization [37, 85] and address solutions that consider their diverse needs [55]. This approach not only improves accessibility but challenges the traditional power structures that have historically excluded PWD from technological development.

5.3 Limitations and Future Work

Our study has certain limitations. Although we tried our best to encompass a diverse range of XR organizations, the current XR industry is so fragmented that almost every company has their own practices covering a large variety of types of apps. A survey targeting a broader range of developers may yield different perspectives on accessibility in XR, providing new insights into guidelines and tool design. Additionally, as we attempted to equalize the coverage of guideline discussion between participants, we may have chosen guidelines more or less familiar to developers, which may have provided different insight. These guidelines may have also been more or less relevant to the XR apps our participants create. Our guideline evaluation focuses on XR-relevant guidelines, but we acknowledge that non-3D a11y guidelines could be expanded and applied to XR. We recommend future work explore this connection. Future work evaluating a11y guidelines should separate speech and hearing guidelines or provide justification for their grouping. Furthermore, we acknowledge the possibility of recruitment bias, since our topic potentially attracted a higher proportion of developers already supportive of accessibility. Although our study focused on developers, future work may expand to non-engineering roles and stakeholders, including project owners and clients.

6 Conclusion

We present our insights from interviewing 25 XR developers across a range of organizations about their perspectives and practices towards accessibility. We presented them with existing accessibility guidelines and discussed their implementation of them, as well as the tools they would need to implement them into their projects. Our findings provide potential strategies for enhancing the feasibility of accessibility implementation across the XR industry. Many participants demonstrated their practices founded from a software development background, demonstrating a need to develop new solutions that are specifically targeted towards XR applications. We found that developer support methods for XR developers include written materials like guidelines, but most developers would prefer platform-targeted, open-source packages they can drag-and-drop into their projects or pull specific features from. Further research is needed to establish robust accessibility standards that provide more comprehensive developer support. Additionally, the ease of incorporating people with disabilities, particularly from the design phase, needs to be better conveyed to XR developers, and to demonstrate a “worth” for developers to benefit a large number of users. After all, if “XR is *already an answer for an accessibility issue*” (P21), why create new barriers?

References

- [1] Mark Aberdour. 2007. Achieving quality in open-source software. *IEEE software*, 24, 1, 58–64.
- [2] AbleGamers. 2022. Accessible Player Experiences (APX). Retrieved Sep 20, 2022 from <https://accessible.games/accessible-player-experiences/>.

- [3] AbleGamers. 2022. Clear Channels. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://accessible.games/accessible-player-experiences/access-patterns/clear-channels/>.
- [4] AbleGamers. 2022. Clear Text. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://accessible.games/accessible-player-experiences/access-patterns/clear-text/>.
- [5] AbleGamers. 2022. Distinguish This from That. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://accessible.games/accessible-player-experiences/access-patterns/distinguish-this-from-that/>.
- [6] AbleGamers. 2022. Do More With Less. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://accessible.games/accessible-player-experiences/access-patterns/do-more-with-less/>.
- [7] AbleGamers. 2022. Flexible Controllers. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://accessible.games/accessible-player-experiences/access-patterns/flexible-controllers/>.
- [8] AbleGamers. 2022. Flexible Text Entry. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://accessible.games/accessible-player-experiences/access-patterns/flexible-text-entry/>.
- [9] AbleGamers. 2022. Improved Precision. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://accessible.games/accessible-player-experiences/access-patterns/improved-precision/>.
- [10] AbleGamers. 2022. Personal Interface. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://accessible.games/accessible-player-experiences/access-patterns/personal-interface/>.
- [11] AbleGamers. 2022. Same Controls But Different. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://accessible.games/accessible-player-experiences/access-patterns/same-controls-but-different/>.
- [12] AbleGamers. 2022. Second Channel. Retrieved December 2024 from https://accessible.games/accessible-player-experiences/access-patterns/second_channel/.
- [13] AbleGamers. 2022. Slow It Down. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://accessible.games/accessible-player-experiences/challenge-patterns/slow-it-down/>.
- [14] Thomas Alsop. 2024. Spatial computing market revenue worldwide from 2022 to 2032. (May 2024). Retrieved December 2024 from <https://www.statista.com/statistics/1462122/spatial-computing-market-revenue-worldwide/>.
- [15] Apple. 2022. Apple Accessibility. Cross-platform. (2022).
- [16] Narges Ashtari, Andrea Bunt, Joanna McGrenere, Michael Nebeling, and Parmit K. Chilana. 2020. Creating Augmented and Virtual Reality Applications: Current Practices, Challenges, and Opportunities. In *CHI '20: Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (CHI '20). Association for Computing Machinery, Honolulu, HI, USA, 1–13. ISBN: 9781450367080. DOI: 10.1145/3313831.3376722.
- [17] XR Association. 2020. XRA'S DEVELOPERS GUIDE, CHAPTER THREE: Accessibility & Inclusive Design in Immersive Experiences - XR Association — xra.org. Retrieved August 2024 from <https://xra.org/research/xra-developers-guide-accessibility-and-inclusive-design/>.
- [18] Aleksander Bai, Heidi Mork, and Viktoria Stray. 2017. A Cost-Benefit Analysis of Accessibility Testing in Agile Software Development - Results From a Multiple Case Study. *International Journal On Advances in Software*, 10, 1-2, (Mar. 2017), 96–107. <http://urn.nb.no/URN:NBN:no-73911>.
- [19] Harshadha Balasubramanian, Cecily Morrison, Martin Grayson, Zhanat Makhataeva, Rita Faia Marques, Thomas Gable, Dalya Perez, and Edward Cutrell. 2023. Enable blind users' experience in 3d virtual environments: the scene weaver prototype. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1–4.
- [20] Mars Ballantyne, Archit Jha, Anna Jacobsen, J. Scott Hawker, and Yasmine N. El-Glaly. 2018. Study of Accessibility Guidelines of Mobile Applications. In (MUM 2018). Association for Computing Machinery, Cairo, Egypt, 305–315. ISBN: 9781450365949. DOI: 10.1145/3282894.3282921.
- [21] Beat Games. [n. d.] Beat Saber. (). <https://www.beatsaber.com>.
- [22] Tingting Bi, Xin Xia, David Lo, and Aldeida Aleti. 2021. A First Look at Accessibility Issues in Popular GitHub Projects. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance and Evolution (ICSME)*, 390–401. DOI: 10.1109/ICSME52107.2021.00041.
- [23] Tingting Bi, Xin Xia, David Lo, John Grundy, Thomas Zimmermann, and Denae Ford. 2022. Accessibility in Software Practice: A Practitioner's Perspective. *ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol.*, 31, 4, Article 66, (July 2022), 26 pages. DOI: 10.1145/3503508.
- [24] Jeffrey P Bigham, Ryan S Kaminsky, Richard E Ladner, Oscar M Danielsson, and Gordon L Hempton. 2006. WebInSight: Making Web Images Accessible. In *Proceedings of the 8th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility*, 181–188. DOI: 10.1145/1168987.1169018.
- [25] Jeffrey P Bigham, Craig M Prince, and Richard E Ladner. 2008. WebAnywhere: A Screen Reader On-the-Go. In *Proceedings of the 2008 International Cross-Disciplinary Conference on Web Accessibility (W4A)*. ACM, 73–82. DOI: 10.1145/1296843.1296884.
- [26] Mike Boland. 2023. How many mobile devices are ar-compatible? (2023). Retrieved December 2024 from <https://arinsider.co/2023/07/17/mobile-ar-users-break-the-billion-barrier/>.
- [27] Ingo Börsting and Volker Gruhn. 2020. Towards Efficient Interdisciplinary Authoring of Industrial Augmented Reality Applications. In *Conference Companion of the 4th International Conference on Art, Science, and Engineering of Programming*, 65–68. DOI: 10.1145/3397537.3398474.
- [28] Giorgio Brajnik. 2009. Validity and Reliability of Web Accessibility Guidelines. In *Proceedings of the 11th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility* (Assets '09). Association for Computing Machinery, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA, 131–138. ISBN: 9781605585581. DOI: 10.1145/1639642.1639666.
- [29] Virginia Braun and Victoria Clarke. 2012. *Thematic Analysis*. American Psychological Association.
- [30] Bureau of Internet Accessibility. 2017. What is a11y? (May 2017). <https://www.boia.org/blog/what-is-a11y>.

- [31] Jazmin Cano. 2023. How we incorporate accessibility in development. (2023). <https://owlchemylabs.com/blog/how-we-incorporate-accessibility-in-development>.
- [32] Guven Catak, Server MASALCI, and Seray Şenyar. 2020. A Guideline Study for Designing Virtual Reality Games. *AJIT-E: Online Academic Journal of Information Technology*, 11, (Dec. 2020), 12–36. doi: 10.5824/ajite.2020.04.001.x.
- [33] Rueil-Che Chang, Chia-Sheng Hung, Bing-Yu Chen, Dhruv Jain, and Anhong Guo. 2024. Soundshift: exploring sound manipulations for accessible mixed-reality awareness. In *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM Designing Interactive Systems Conference (DIS '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, Copenhagen, Denmark, 116–132. ISBN: 9798400705830. doi: 10.1145/3643834.3661556.
- [34] Accessibility Checker. 2022. Accessibility Checker - ADA & WCAG Compliance (Free Scan). Retrieved Sep 20, 2022 from <https://www.accessibilitychecker.org/>.
- [35] Inrak Choi, Eyal Ofek, Hrvoje Benko, Mike Sinclair, and Christian Holz. 2018. Claw: A Multifunctional Handheld Haptic Controller for Grasping, Touching, and Triggering in Virtual Reality. In *Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1–13. doi: 10.1145/3173574.3174228.
- [36] Clique Games. 2024. Meta quest 3S: finally, an affordable mixed reality device. (Sept. 2024). <https://www.clique.games/post/meta-quest-3s-finally-an-affordable-mixed-reality-device>.
- [37] Sasha Costanza-Chock. 2018. Design justice, ai, and escape from the matrix of domination. *Journal of Design and Science*, 3, 5, 1–14.
- [38] Kevin Crowston, Kangning Wei, James Howison, and Andrea Wiggins. 2008. Free/libre open-source software development: what we know and what we do not know. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 44, 2, 1–35.
- [39] Laura Dale. 2023. Vampire survivors co-op switch accessibility review. Access-Ability. Blog post. (Aug. 2023). Retrieved December 2024 from <https://access-ability.uk/2023/08/17/vampire-survivors-co-op-switch-accessibility-review/>.
- [40] Maitraye Das, Darren Gergle, and Anne Marie Piper. 2019. "it doesn't win you friends" understanding accessibility in collaborative writing for people with vision impairments. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 3, CSCW, 1–26.
- [41] Mark Delaney. 2021. How to use visualize audio effects in Fortnite. (Nov. 2021). Retrieved December 2024 from <https://www.gamespot.com/articles/how-to-use-visualize-audio-effects-in-fortnite/1100-6498314/>.
- [42] Patricia A. de Oliveira, Erich P. Lotto, Ana Grasielle D. Correa, Luis G. G. Taboada, Laisa C. P. Costa, and Roseli D. Lopes. 2015. Virtual Stage: An Immersive Musical Game for People With Visual Impairment. In *2015 14th Brazilian Symposium on Computer Games and Digital Entertainment (SBGames)*, 135–141. doi: 10.1109/SBGames.2015.26.
- [43] Microsoft Inclusive Design. [n. d.] Inclusive 101 Guidebook. (). Retrieved August 2024 from <https://inclusive.microsoft.design/tools-and-activities/Inclusive101Guidebook.pdf>.
- [44] Design Justice Network. 2016. Design justice network principles. (2016). <https://designjustice.org/read-the-principles>.
- [45] Oculus Developer. 2022. Design Accessible VR. Retrieved Sep 20, 2022 from <https://developer.oculus.com/resources/design-accessible-vr-design/>.
- [46] Oculus Developer. 2022. Design Accessible VR Audio. Retrieved Sep 20, 2022 from <https://developer.oculus.com/resources/design-accessible-vr-audio/>.
- [47] Oculus Developer. 2022. Design Accessible VR Captions. Retrieved Sep 20, 2022 from <https://developer.oculus.com/resources/design-accessible-vr-captions/>.
- [48] Oculus Developer. 2022. Design Accessible VR Controls. Retrieved Sep 20, 2022 from <https://developer.oculus.com/resources/design-accessible-vr-controls/>.
- [49] Oculus Developer. 2022. Design Accessible VR UI/UX. Retrieved Sep 20, 2022 from <https://developer.oculus.com/resources/design-accessible-vr-ui-ux/>.
- [50] Oculus Developer. 2022. Minimize the Complexity of Your Controller Scheme. Retrieved Sep 20, 2022 from <https://developer.oculus.com/resources/design-accessible-vr/#minimize-the-complexity-of-your-controller-scheme>.
- [51] Google Developers. 2021. Make Apps More Accessible. Retrieved Sep 20, 2022 from <https://developer.android.com/guide/topics/ui/accessibility/apps>.
- [52] Massimiliano Di Luca, Hasti Seifi, Simon Egan, and Mar Gonzalez-Franco. 2021. Locomotion vault: the extra mile in analyzing vr locomotion techniques. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '21)* Article 128. Association for Computing Machinery, Yokohama, Japan, 10 pages. ISBN: 9781450380966. doi: 10.1145/3411764.3445319.
- [53] Naughty Dog. 2020. Accessibility Options for the Last of Us Part II. last accessed 15 Jun 2022. (2020). <https://www.playstation.com/en-us/games/the-last-of-us-part-ii/accessibility/>.
- [54] Iyad Abu Doush and Enrico Pontelli. 2013. Non-visual navigation of spreadsheets: enhancing accessibility of microsoft excel™. *Universal access in the information society*, 12, 143–159.
- [55] John Dudley, Lulu Yin, Vanja Garaj, and Per Ola Kristensson. 2023. Inclusive immersion: a review of efforts to improve accessibility in virtual reality, augmented reality and the metaverse. *Virtual Reality*, 27, 4, 2989–3020.
- [56] Barrie Ellis, Gareth Ford-Williams, Lynsey Graham, Dimitris Grammenos, Ian Hamilton, Ed Lee, Jake Manion, and Thomas Westin. 2012. A Straightforward Reference for Inclusive Game Design. Retrieved Sep 20, 2022 from <https://gameaccessibilityguidelines.com/>.
- [57] Barrie Ellis, Gareth Ford-Williams, Lynsey Graham, Dimitris Grammenos, Ian Hamilton, Ed Lee, Jake Manion, and Thomas Westin. 2012. Allow controls to be remapped / reconfigured. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://gameaccessibilityguidelines.com/allow-controls-to-be-remapped-reconfigured/>.

- [58] Barrie Ellis, Gareth Ford-Williams, Lynsey Graham, Dimitris Grammenos, Ian Hamilton, Ed Lee, Jake Manion, and Thomas Westin. 2012. Allow interfaces to be resized. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://gameaccessibilityguidelines.com/allow-interfaces-to-be-resized/>.
- [59] Barrie Ellis, Gareth Ford-Williams, Lynsey Graham, Dimitris Grammenos, Ian Hamilton, Ed Lee, Jake Manion, and Thomas Westin. 2012. Allow subtitle/caption presentation to be customised. Retrieved December 2024 from <http://gameaccessibilityguidelines.com/allow-subtitlecaption-presentation-to-be-customised/>.
- [60] Barrie Ellis, Gareth Ford-Williams, Lynsey Graham, Dimitris Grammenos, Ian Hamilton, Ed Lee, Jake Manion, and Thomas Westin. 2012. Avoid flickering images and repetitive patterns. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://gameaccessibilityguidelines.com/avoid-flickering-images-and-repetitive-patterns/>.
- [61] Barrie Ellis, Gareth Ford-Williams, Lynsey Graham, Dimitris Grammenos, Ian Hamilton, Ed Lee, Jake Manion, and Thomas Westin. 2012. Do not make precise timing essential to gameplay – offer alternatives, actions that can be carried out while paused, or a skip mechanism. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://gameaccessibilityguidelines.com/do-not-make-precise-timing-essential-to-gameplay-offer-alternatives-actions-that-can-be-carried-out-while-paused-or-a-skip-mechanism/>.
- [62] Barrie Ellis, Gareth Ford-Williams, Lynsey Graham, Dimitris Grammenos, Ian Hamilton, Ed Lee, Jake Manion, and Thomas Westin. 2012. Do not rely on motion tracking of specific body types. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://gameaccessibilityguidelines.com/do-not-rely-on-motion-tracking-of-specific-body-types/>.
- [63] Barrie Ellis, Gareth Ford-Williams, Lynsey Graham, Dimitris Grammenos, Ian Hamilton, Ed Lee, Jake Manion, and Thomas Westin. 2012. Ensure controls are as simple as possible, or provide a simpler alternative. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://gameaccessibilityguidelines.com/ensure-controls-are-as-simple-as-possible-or-provide-a-simpler-alternative/>.
- [64] Barrie Ellis, Gareth Ford-Williams, Lynsey Graham, Dimitris Grammenos, Ian Hamilton, Ed Lee, Jake Manion, and Thomas Westin. 2012. Ensure no essential information (especially instructions) is conveyed by text alone, reinforce with visuals and/or speech. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://gameaccessibilityguidelines.com/ensure-no-essential-information-especially-instructions-is-conveyed-by-text-alone-reinforce-with-visuals-and-or-speech/>.
- [65] Barrie Ellis, Gareth Ford-Williams, Lynsey Graham, Dimitris Grammenos, Ian Hamilton, Ed Lee, Jake Manion, and Thomas Westin. 2012. Ensure no essential information is conveyed by a fixed colour alone. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://gameaccessibilityguidelines.com/ensure-no-essential-information-is-conveyed-by-a-fixed-colour-alone/>.
- [66] Barrie Ellis, Gareth Ford-Williams, Lynsey Graham, Dimitris Grammenos, Ian Hamilton, Ed Lee, Jake Manion, and Thomas Westin. 2012. Ensure no essential information is conveyed by sounds alone. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://gameaccessibilityguidelines.com/ensure-no-essential-information-is-conveyed-by-sounds-alone/>.
- [67] Barrie Ellis, Gareth Ford-Williams, Lynsey Graham, Dimitris Grammenos, Ian Hamilton, Ed Lee, Jake Manion, and Thomas Westin. 2012. Include an option to adjust the game speed. Retrieved December 2024 from <http://gameaccessibilityguidelines.com/include-an-option-to-adjust-the-game-speed/>.
- [68] Barrie Ellis, Gareth Ford-Williams, Lynsey Graham, Dimitris Grammenos, Ian Hamilton, Ed Lee, Jake Manion, and Thomas Westin. 2012. Provide an audio description track. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://gameaccessibilityguidelines.com/provide-an-audio-description-track/>.
- [69] Barrie Ellis, Gareth Ford-Williams, Lynsey Graham, Dimitris Grammenos, Ian Hamilton, Ed Lee, Jake Manion, and Thomas Westin. 2012. Provide an option to turn off / hide background movement. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://gameaccessibilityguidelines.com/provide-an-option-to-turn-off-hide-background-movement/>.
- [70] Barrie Ellis, Gareth Ford-Williams, Lynsey Graham, Dimitris Grammenos, Ian Hamilton, Ed Lee, Jake Manion, and Thomas Westin. 2012. Provide captions or visuals for significant background sounds. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://gameaccessibilityguidelines.com/provide-captions-or-visuals-for-significant-background-sounds/>.
- [71] Barrie Ellis, Gareth Ford-Williams, Lynsey Graham, Dimitris Grammenos, Ian Hamilton, Ed Lee, Jake Manion, and Thomas Westin. 2012. Provide pre-recorded voiceovers for all text, including menus and installers. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://gameaccessibilityguidelines.com/provide-pre-recorded-voiceovers-for-all-text-including-menus-and-installers/>.
- [72] Barrie Ellis, Gareth Ford-Williams, Lynsey Graham, Dimitris Grammenos, Ian Hamilton, Ed Lee, Jake Manion, and Thomas Westin. 2012. Provide separate volume controls or mutes for effects, speech and background / music. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://gameaccessibilityguidelines.com/provide-separate-volume-controls-or-mutes-for-effects-speech-and-background-music/>.
- [73] Barrie Ellis, Gareth Ford-Williams, Lynsey Graham, Dimitris Grammenos, Ian Hamilton, Ed Lee, Jake Manion, and Thomas Westin. 2012. Support more than one input device. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://gameaccessibilityguidelines.com/support-more-than-one-input-device/>.
- [74] Barrie Ellis, Gareth Ford-Williams, Lynsey Graham, Dimitris Grammenos, Ian Hamilton, Ed Lee, Jake Manion, and Thomas Westin. 2012. Support text chat as well as voice for multiplayer. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://gameaccessibilityguidelines.com/support-text-chat-as-well-as-voice-for-multiplayer/>.
- [75] Barrie Ellis, Gareth Ford-Williams, Lynsey Graham, Dimitris Grammenos, Ian Hamilton, Ed Lee, Jake Manion, and Thomas Westin. 2012. Use an easily readable default font size. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://gameaccessibilityguidelines.com/use-an-easily-readable-default-font-size/>.
- [76] Barrie Ellis, Gareth Ford-Williams, Lynsey Graham, Dimitris Grammenos, Ian Hamilton, Ed Lee, Jake Manion, and Thomas Westin. 2012. Use symbol-based chat (smileys etc). Retrieved December 2024 from <https://gameaccessibilityguidelines.com/use-symbol-based-chat-smileys-etc/>.

- [77] Paul MG Emmelkamp and Katharina Meyerbröker. 2021. Virtual Reality Therapy in Mental Health. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 17, 495–519. doi: 10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-081219-115923.
- [78] Guavaman Enterprises. 2014. Rewired. (2014). Retrieved September 2024 from %5Curl%7Bhttps://guavaman.com/projects/rewired/%7D.
- [79] Oğuzcan Ergün, Şahin Akin, İpek Gürsel Dino, and Elif Surer. 2019. Architectural Design in Virtual Reality and Mixed Reality Environments: A Comparative Analysis. In *2019 IEEE Conference on Virtual Reality and 3D User Interfaces (VR)*. IEEE. IEEE, 914–915. doi: 10.1109/VR.2019.8798180.
- [80] Family Gaming Database. 2024. Loop Hero accessibility report. Family Gaming Database. (2024). Retrieved December 2024 from <https://www.familygamingdatabase.com/en-gb/accessibility/Loop+Hero>.
- [81] Nuša Faric, Henry WW Potts, Adrian Hon, Lee Smith, Katie Newby, Andrew Steptoe, and Abi Fisher. 2019. What players of virtual reality exercise games want: thematic analysis of web-based reviews. *Journal of medical Internet research*, 21, 9, e13833.
- [82] Evil Dog Games. 2014. Blind Swordsman. last accessed 18 Jan 2014. (2014). <https://devpost.com/software/blind-swordsman>.
- [83] Metal Pop Games. 2022. UI Accessibility Plugin. Retrieved Sep 20, 2022 from <http://www.metalpopgames.com/assetstore/accessibility/doc/index.html>.
- [84] Sofia Garcia Fracaro et al. 2021. Towards Design Guidelines for Virtual Reality Training for the Chemical Industry. *Education for Chemical Engineers*, 36, 12–23. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iece.2021.01.014>.
- [85] Lorena Gauthereau, Jessica Linker, and Emma Slayton. 2020. Tagged accessibility. *The Journal of Interactive Technology & Pedagogy*, 17. <https://jitp.commons.gc.cuny.edu/tag/accessibility/>.
- [86] Kathrin Gerling, Patrick Dickinson, Kieran Hicks, Liam Mason, Adalberto L Simeone, and Katta Spiel. 2020. Virtual Reality Games for People Using Wheelchairs. In *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1–11. doi: 10.1145/3313831.3376265.
- [87] Saul Greenberg. 2007. Toolkits and interface creativity. *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, 32, 139–159.
- [88] Rory Greener. 2024. Meta connect '24: industry expert discusses quest 3s, ar smart glasses, reality labs r&d. (Sept. 2024). <https://www.xrtoday.com/event-news/meta-connect-24-industry-expert-discusses-quest-3s-ar-smart-glasses-reality-labs-rd-aruvr/>.
- [89] Nielsen Norman Group. 2021. 10 Usability Heuristics Applied to Virtual Reality. Retrieved Sep 20, 2022 from <https://www.nngroup.com/articles/usability-heuristics-virtual-reality/>.
- [90] Ria J Gualano, Lucy Jiang, Kexin Zhang, Andrea Stevenson Won, and Shiri Azenkot. 2023. “invisible illness is no longer invisible”: making social vr avatars more inclusive for invisible disability representation. In *Proceedings of the 25th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility*, 1–4.
- [91] André LS Guimarães, Helaine J Korn, Namchul Shin, and Alan B Eisner. 2013. The life cycle of open source software development communities. *Journal of Electronic Commerce Research*, 14, 2, 167.
- [92] Simon Gunkel, Emmanouil Potetsianakis, Tessa Klunder, Alexander Toet, and Sylvie Dijkstra-Soudarissanane. 2021. Immersive experiences and xr: a game engine or multimedia streaming problem? In *IBC*. (Dec. 2021).
- [93] Rongkai Guo, Gayani Samaraweera, and John Quarles. 2014. The Effects of Avatars on Presence in Virtual Environments for Persons With Mobility Impairments. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Artificial Reality and Telexistence and the 19th Eurographics Symposium on Virtual Environments*. The Eurographics Association, 1–8. doi: 10.2312/ve.20141357.
- [94] Susumu Harada, Jacob O Wobbrock, and James A Landay. 2007. Voicedraw: A Hands-Free Voice-Driven Drawing Application for People With Motor Impairments. In *Proceedings of the 9th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility*, 27–34. doi: 10.1145/1296843.1296850.
- [95] Jeremy Hartmann, Christian Holz, Eyal Ofek, and Andrew D Wilson. 2019. Realitycheck: blending virtual environments with situated physical reality. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1–12.
- [96] Fiona Heilemann, Gottfried Zimmermann, and Patrick Münster. 2021. Accessibility Guidelines for VR Games - a Comparison and Synthesis of a Comprehensive Set. *Frontiers in Virtual Reality*, 2, 9 pages. doi: 10.3389/frvir.2021.697504.
- [97] Jaylin Herskovitz, Jason Wu, Samuel White, Amy Pavel, Gabriel Reyes, Anhong Guo, and Jeffrey P Bigham. 2020. Making mobile augmented reality applications accessible. In *The 22nd International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility*, 1–14.
- [98] Wilko Heuten, Daniel Wichmann, and Susanne Boll. 2006. Interactive 3D Sonification for the Exploration of City Maps. In *Proceedings of the 4th Nordic Conference on Human-Computer Interaction: Changing Roles (NordiCHI '06)*. Association for Computing Machinery, Oslo, Norway, 155–164. ISBN: 1595933255. doi: 10.1145/1182475.1182492.
- [99] Meta Horizon. 2022. Accessibility. Retrieved Sep 20, 2022 from <https://developers.meta.com/horizon/design/accessibility/#color>.
- [100] IGDA-GASIG. 2019. On Auditory Guidelines. (June 2019). Retrieved December 2024 from <https://igda-gasig.org/get-involved/sig-initiatives/resources-for-game-developers/sig-guidelines/on-auditory-disabilities/>.
- [101] IGDA-GASIG. 2019. On Cognitive Guidelines. (June 2019). Retrieved December 2024 from <https://igda-gasig.org/get-involved/sig-initiatives/resources-for-game-developers/sig-guidelines/on-cognitive-disabilities/>.
- [102] IGDA-GASIG. 2019. On Mobility Guidelines. (June 2019). Retrieved December 2024 from <https://igda-gasig.org/get-involved/sig-initiatives/resources-for-game-developers/sig-guidelines/on-mobility-disabilities/>.
- [103] IGDA-GASIG. 2019. On Visual Disabilities. (June 2019). Retrieved December 2024 from <https://igda-gasig.org/get-involved/sig-initiatives/resources-for-game-developers/sig-guidelines/on-visual-disabilities/>.
- [104] IGDA-GASIG. 2019. SIG Guidelines. (June 2019). <http://igda-gasig.org/get-involved/sig-initiatives/resources-for-game-developers/sig-guidelines>.

- [105] IGDA-GASIG. 2019. SIG guidelines Top ten, expanded list, and full exploration. (June 2019). Retrieved December 2024 from <https://igda-gasig.org/get-involved/sig-initiatives/resources-for-game-developers/sig-guidelines/>.
- [106] National Eye Institute. 2023. Types of color vision deficiency. <https://www.nei.nih.gov/learn-about-eye-health/eye-conditions-and-diseases/color-blindness/types-color-vision-deficiency>.
- [107] Gunnar Jansson, Helen Petrie, Chetz Colwell, Diana Kornbrot, J Fänger, H König, Katarina Billberger, Andrew Hardwick, and Stephen Furner. 1999. Haptic Virtual Environments for Blind People: Exploratory Experiments With Two Devices. *International Journal of Virtual Reality*, 4, 1, 8–17.
- [108] Tiger Ji, Brianna R. Cochran, and Yuhang Zhao. 2022. VRBubble: Enhancing Peripheral Awareness of Avatars for People With Visual Impairments in Social Virtual Reality. In *The 24th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility (ASSETS '22)* number 3. Association for Computing Machinery, Athens, Greece, 17 pages. DOI: 10.1145/3517428.3544821.
- [109] Philip Johannesson and Julia Karlsson. 2023. The early stages of extended reality: An analysis of the opportunities and challenges faced by early stage businesses within the extended reality (XR) industry. Master's thesis, Malmö University. Supervisor: Jay Bolter. Malmö, Sweden, (2023). <https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1798250/FULLTEXT02>.
- [110] Crescentia Jung, Jazmin Collins, Ricardo E Gonzalez Penuela, Jonathan Isaac Segal, Andrea Stevenson Won, and Shiri Azenkot. 2024. Accessible nonverbal cues to support conversations in vr for blind and low vision people. In *Proceedings of the 26th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility*, 1–13.
- [111] Sam Kavanagh, Andrew Luxton-Reilly, Burkhard Wuensche, and Beryl Plimmer. 2017. A Systematic Review of Virtual Reality in Education. *Themes in Science and Technology Education*, 10, 2, 85–119. DOI: 10.1109/ICWT47785.2019.8978263.
- [112] Kamran Khawaja, Bilikis Banire, Dena Al-Thani, Mohammed Tahrì Sqalli, Aboubakr Aqle, Asadullah Shah, and Siti Salwah Salim. 2020. Augmented Reality for Learning of Children and Adolescents With Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD): A Systematic Review. *IEEE Access*, 8, 78779–78807. DOI: 10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2986608.
- [113] Veronika Krauß, Alexander Boden, Leif Oppermann, and René Reiners. 2021. Current Practices, Challenges, and Design Implications for Collaborative AR/VR Application Development. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '21)* Article 454. Association for Computing Machinery, Yokohama, Japan, 15 pages. ISBN: 9781450380966. DOI: 10.1145/3411764.3445335.
- [114] Veronika Krauß, Michael Nebeling, Florian Jasche, and Alexander Boden. 2022. Elements of XR Prototyping: Characterizing the Role and Use of Prototypes in Augmented and Virtual Reality Design. In *CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1–18. DOI: 10.1145/3491102.3517714.
- [115] Sri Kurniawan and Panayiotis Zaphiris. 2005. Research-Derived Web Design Guidelines for Older People. In *Proceedings of the 7th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility (Assets '05)*. Association for Computing Machinery, Baltimore, MD, USA, 129–135. ISBN: 1595931597. DOI: 10.1145/1090785.1090810.
- [116] Magic Leap. 2018. Accessibility. Retrieved Sep 20, 2022 from <https://ml1-developer.magicleap.com/en-us/learn/guides/bp-for-accessibility>.
- [117] Jaeyeon Lee, Mike Sinclair, Mar Gonzalez-Franco, Eyal Ofek, and Christian Holz. 2019. TORC: A Virtual Reality Controller for In-Hand High-Dexterity Finger Interaction. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1–13. DOI: 10.1145/3290605.3300301.
- [118] T. Lokki and M. Grohn. 2005. Navigation With Auditory Cues in a Virtual Environment. *IEEE MultiMedia*, 12, 2, 80–86. DOI: 10.1109/MMUL.2005.33.
- [119] Kelly Mack, Rai Ching Ling Hsu, Andrés Monroy-Hernández, Brian A Smith, and Fannie Liu. 2023. Towards inclusive avatars: disability representation in avatar platforms. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1–13.
- [120] Jennifer Mankoff, Gillian R Hayes, and Devva Kasnitz. 2010. Disability studies as a source of critical inquiry for the field of assistive technology. In *Proceedings of the 12th international ACM SIGACCESS conference on Computers and accessibility*, 3–10.
- [121] Jesse J Martinez, Jon E Froehlich, and James Fogarty. 2024. Playing on hard mode: accessibility, difficulty and joy in video game adoption for gamers with disabilities. In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1–17.
- [122] Liam Mason, Kathrin Gerling, Patrick Dickinson, Jussi Holopainen, Lisa Jacobs, and Kieran Hicks. 2022. Including the Experiences of Physically Disabled Players in Mainstream Guidelines for Movement-Based Games. In *Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '22)* Article 86. Association for Computing Machinery, New Orleans, LA, USA, 15 pages. ISBN: 9781450391573. DOI: 10.1145/3491102.3501867.
- [123] Owen McGrath. [n. d.] XR Accessibility | Universal Design for Learning — udl.berkeley.edu. Retrieved August 2024 from <https://udl.berkeley.edu/accessibility/xr-accessibility>.
- [124] Microsoft. 2022. Accessibility—mrtk3. (June 2022). <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/windows/mixed-reality/mrtk-unity/mrtk3-accessibility/packages/accessibility/overview>.
- [125] Microsoft. 2023. Xbox Accessibility Guideline 101: Text display. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/gaming/accessibility/Xbox-accessibility-guidelines/101>.
- [126] Microsoft. 2023. Xbox Accessibility Guideline 103: Additional channels for visual and audio cues. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/gaming/accessibility/Xbox-accessibility-guidelines/103>.
- [127] Microsoft. 2023. Xbox Accessibility Guideline 104: Subtitles and captions. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/gaming/accessibility/Xbox-accessibility-guidelines/104>.

- [128] Microsoft. 2023. Xbox Accessibility Guideline 105: Audio accessibility. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/gaming/accessibility/Xbox-accessibility-guidelines/105>.
- [129] Microsoft. 2022. Xbox Accessibility Guideline 106: Screen narration. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/gaming/accessibility/Xbox-accessibility-guidelines/106>.
- [130] Microsoft. 2023. Xbox Accessibility Guideline 107: Input. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/gaming/accessibility/Xbox-accessibility-guidelines/107>.
- [131] Microsoft. 2023. Xbox Accessibility Guideline 111: Audio descriptions. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/gaming/accessibility/Xbox-accessibility-guidelines/111>.
- [132] Microsoft. 2022. Xbox Accessibility Guideline 112: UI navigation. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/gaming/accessibility/Xbox-accessibility-guidelines/112>.
- [133] Microsoft. 2023. Xbox Accessibility Guideline 116: Time limits. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/gaming/accessibility/Xbox-accessibility-guidelines/116>.
- [134] Microsoft. 2022. Xbox Accessibility Guideline 117: Visual distractions and motion settings. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/gaming/accessibility/Xbox-accessibility-guidelines/117>.
- [135] Microsoft. 2022. Xbox Accessibility Guideline 118: Photosensitivity. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/gaming/accessibility/Xbox-accessibility-guidelines/118>.
- [136] Microsoft. 2022. Xbox Accessibility Guideline 120: Communication experiences. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/gaming/accessibility/Xbox-accessibility-guidelines/120>.
- [137] Microsoft. 2023. Xbox Accessibility Guidelines V3.2. Retrieved 2024 from <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/gaming/accessibility/guidelines>.
- [138] Darliane Miranda and João Araujo. 2022. Studying Industry Practices of Accessibility Requirements in Agile Development. In *Proceedings of the 37th ACM/SIGAPP Symposium on Applied Computing (SAC '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, Virtual Event, 1309–1317. ISBN: 9781450387132. DOI: 10.1145/3477314.3507041.
- [139] Santa Monica. 2022. God of War Ragnarok Accessibility Options. last accessed 15 Jun 2022. (2022). <https://www.playstation.com/en-us/games/god-of-war-ragnarok/accessibility/>.
- [140] Mordor Intelligence. 2024. Extended reality market size & share analysis - growth trends & forecasts (2024-2029). (2024). Retrieved December 2024 from <https://www.mordorintelligence.com/industry-reports/extended-reality-xr-market>.
- [141] Martez Mott, Edward Cutrell, Mar Gonzalez Franco, Christian Holz, Eyal Ofek, Richard Stoakley, and Meredith Ringel Morris. 2019. Accessible by Design: An Opportunity for Virtual Reality. In *2019 IEEE International Symposium on Mixed and Augmented Reality Adjunct (ISMAR-Adjunct)*, 451–454. DOI: 10.1109/ISMAR-Adjunct.2019.00122.
- [142] Martez Mott, John Tang, Shaun Kane, Edward Cutrell, and Meredith Ringel Morris. 2020. “I Just Went Into It Assuming That I Wouldn’t Be Able to Have the Full Experience”: Understanding the Accessibility of Virtual Reality for People With Limited Mobility. In *The 22nd International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility (ASSETS ’20)* Article 43. Association for Computing Machinery, Virtual Event, Greece, 13 pages. ISBN: 9781450371032. DOI: 10.1145/3373625.3416998.
- [143] Mozilla. 2022. Understanding the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines. last accessed 15 Jun 2022. (2022). https://developer.mozilla.org/en-US/docs/Web/Accessibility/Understanding_WCAG.
- [144] Florian Mueller and Katherine Isbister. 2014. Movement-Based Game Guidelines. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI ’14)*. Association for Computing Machinery, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, 2191–2200. ISBN: 9781450324731. DOI: 10.1145/2556288.2557163.
- [145] Emerson Murphy-Hill, Thomas Zimmermann, and Nachiappan Nagappan. 2014. Cowboys, Ankle Sprains, and Keepers of Quality: How Is Video Game Development Different From Software Development? In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE 2014)*. Association for Computing Machinery, Hyderabad, India, 1–11. ISBN: 9781450327565. DOI: 10.1145/2568225.2568226.
- [146] Vishnu Nair, Jay L Karp, Samuel Silverman, Mohar Kalra, Hollis Lehv, Faizan Jamil, and Brian A Smith. 2021. NavStick: Making Video Games Blind-Accessible Via the Ability to Look Around. In *The 34th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*, 538–551. DOI: 10.1145/3472749.3474768.
- [147] Vishnu Nair, Shao-en Ma, Ricardo E Gonzalez Penuela, Yicheng He, Karen Lin, Mason Hayes, Hannah Huddleston, Matthew Donnelly, and Brian A Smith. 2022. Uncovering visually impaired gamers’ preferences for spatial awareness tools within video games. In *Proceedings of the 24th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility*, 1–16.
- [148] Michael Nebeling. 2022. XR Tools and Where They Are Taking Us: Characterizing the Evolving Research on Augmented, Virtual, and Mixed Reality Prototyping and Development Tools. *XRDS*, 29, 1, (Oct. 2022), 32–38. DOI: 10.1145/3558192.
- [149] Michael Nebeling and Maximilian Speicher. 2018. The trouble with augmented reality/virtual reality authoring tools. In *2018 IEEE international symposium on mixed and augmented reality adjunct (ISMAR-Adjunct)*. IEEE, 333–337.
- [150] Baruch Nevo. 1985. Face validity revisited. *Journal of educational measurement*, 22, 4, 287–293.
- [151] Mojtaba Noghbaei, Arsalan Heydarian, Vahid Balali, and Kevin Han. 2020. Trend Analysis on Adoption of Virtual and Augmented Reality in the Architecture, Engineering, and Construction Industry. *Data*, 5, 1, 26.
- [152] Normcore. 2022. Normcore. last accessed 15 Jun 2022. (2022). <https://normcore.io/>.

- [153] Joshue O'Connor, Janina Sajka, Jason White, Scott Hollier, and Michael Cooper. 2021. XR Accessibility User Requirements: 3.2 XR and supporting multimodality. W3C. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://www.w3.org/TR/xaur/%5C#xr-and-supporting-multimodality>.
- [154] Joshue O'Connor, Janina Sajka, Jason White, Scott Hollier, and Michael Cooper. 2021. XR Accessibility User Requirements: 3.5 XR Controller Challenges. W3C. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://www.w3.org/TR/xaur/#xr-controller-challenges>.
- [155] Joshue O'Connor, Janina Sajka, Jason White, Scott Hollier, and Michael Cooper. 2021. XR Accessibility User Requirements: 4.1 Immersive Semantics and Customization. W3C. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://www.w3.org/TR/xaur/#immersive-semantics-and-customization>.
- [156] Joshue O'Connor, Janina Sajka, Jason White, Scott Hollier, and Michael Cooper. 2021. XR Accessibility User Requirements: 4.15 Interaction Speed. W3C. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://www.w3.org/TR/xaur/#interaction-speed>.
- [157] Joshue O'Connor, Janina Sajka, Jason White, Scott Hollier, and Michael Cooper. 2021. XR Accessibility User Requirements: 4.16 Avoiding sickness triggers. W3C. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://www.w3.org/TR/xaur/#avoiding-sickness-triggers>.
- [158] Joshue O'Connor, Janina Sajka, Jason White, Scott Hollier, and Michael Cooper. 2021. XR Accessibility User Requirements: 4.17 Spatial audio tracks and alternatives. W3C. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://www.w3.org/TR/xaur/#spatial-audio-tracks-and-alternatives>.
- [159] Joshue O'Connor, Janina Sajka, Jason White, Scott Hollier, and Michael Cooper. 2021. XR Accessibility User Requirements: 4.19 Captioning, Subtitling and Text: Support and customization. W3C. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://www.w3.org/TR/xaur/#captioning-subtitling-and-text-support-and-customization>.
- [160] Joshue O'Connor, Janina Sajka, Jason White, Scott Hollier, and Michael Cooper. 2021. XR Accessibility User Requirements: 4.2 Motion Agnostic Interactions. W3C. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://www.w3.org/TR/xaur/#motion-agnostic-interactions>.
- [161] Joshue O'Connor, Janina Sajka, Jason White, Scott Hollier, and Michael Cooper. 2021. XR Accessibility User Requirements: 4.3 Immersive personalization. W3C. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://www.w3.org/TR/xaur/#immersive-personalization>.
- [162] Joshue O'Connor, Janina Sajka, Jason White, Scott Hollier, and Michael Cooper. 2021. XR Accessibility User Requirements: 4.4 Interaction and Target Customization. W3C. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://www.w3.org/TR/xaur/#interaction-and-target-customization>.
- [163] Joshue O'Connor, Janina Sajka, Jason White, Scott Hollier, and Michael Cooper. 2021. XR Accessibility User Requirements: 4.9 Gestural Interfaces and Interactions. W3C. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://www.w3.org/TR/xaur/#gestural-interfaces-and-interactions>.
- [164] Patrick M O'Shea and Jennifer B Elliott. 2016. Augmented Reality in Education: An Exploration and Analysis of Currently Available Educational Apps. In *International Conference on Immersive Learning*. Springer. Springer, 147–159. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-41769-1_12.
- [165] Oculus. 2022. Designing Accessible VR. Retrieved Sep 20, 2022 from <https://developer.oculus.com/resources/design-accessible-vr/>.
- [166] The University of Melbourne. 2022. Accessibility of Virtual Reality Environments. Retrieved Sep 20, 2022 from <https://www.unimelb.edu.au/accessibility/virtual-reality>.
- [167] World Health Organization. 2023. WHO Newsroom Fact Sheets: Disability. Retrieved September 2024 from <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/disability-and-health>.
- [168] Pa11y. 2022. Pa11y. last accessed 15 Jun 2022. (2022). <https://github.com/pa11y/pa11y>.
- [169] Jamie Pauls. 2020. Vintage Games Series, Part 4: Immerse Yourself in the World of Shades of Doom. last accessed 18 Jan 2022. (2020). <https://www.afb.org/aw/21/12/17336>.
- [170] Ruth Pinder. 1996. Sick-but-fit or fit-but-sick? ambiguity and identity at the workplace. *Exploring the divide*, 135–156.
- [171] John R Porter and Julie A Kientz. 2013. An Empirical Study of Issues and Barriers to Mainstream Video Game Accessibility. In *Proceedings of the 15th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility*, 1–8. DOI: 10.1145/2513383.2513444.
- [172] Aaron Preece. 2018. A Review of a Hero's Call, an Accessible Role Playing Game From Out of Sight Games. last accessed 18 Jan 2022. (2018). <https://www.afb.org/aw/19/3/15113>.
- [173] Mustafa Ayobami Raji, Hameedat Bukola Olodo, Timothy Tolulope Oke, Wilhelmina Afua Addy, Onyeka Chrisanctus Ofodile, and Adedoyin Tolulope Oyewole. 2024. Business strategies in virtual reality: a review of market opportunities and consumer experience. *International Journal of Management & Entrepreneurship Research*, 6, 3, 722–736.
- [174] Grand View Research. 2023. Extended reality market size, share & trends analysis report by component (hardware, software, services), by application, by industry vertical, by enterprise size, by region, and segment forecasts, 2024 - 2030. (2023). <https://www.grandviewresearch.com/industry-analysis/extended-reality-xr-market-report>.
- [175] Gayani Samaraweera, Rongkai Guo, and John Quarles. 2013. Latency and Avatars in Virtual Environments and the Effects on Gait for Persons With Mobility Impairments. In *2013 IEEE Symposium on 3D User Interfaces (3DUI)*. IEEE. IEEE, 23–30. DOI: 10.5555/2854457.2854459.
- [176] Ritam Jyoti Sarmah, Yunpeng Ding, Di Wang, Cheuk Yin Phipson Lee, Toby Jia-Jun Li, and Xiang'Anthony' Chen. 2020. Geno: A Developer Tool for Authoring Multimodal Interaction on Existing Web Applications. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*, 1169–1181. DOI: 10.1145/3379337.3415848.
- [177] Daisuke Sato, Uran Oh, João Guerreiro, Dragan Ahmetovic, Kakuya Naito, Hironobu Takagi, Kris M. Kitani, and Chieko Asakawa. 2019. NavCog3 in the Wild: Large-Scale Blind Indoor Navigation Assistant With Semantic Features. *ACM Trans. Access. Comput.*, 12, 3, Article 14, (Aug. 2019), 30 pages. DOI: 10.1145/3340319.
- [178] David W Schloerb, Orly Lahav, Joseph G Desloge, and Mandayam A Srinivasan. 2010. BlindAid: Virtual Environment System for Self-Reliant Trip Planning and Orientation and Mobility Training. In *2010 IEEE Haptics Symposium*. IEEE. IEEE, 363–370. DOI: 10.1109/HAPTIC.2010.5444631.
- [179] Tom Shakespeare et al. 2006. The social model of disability. *The disability studies reader*, 2, 3, 197–204.

- [180] Alexa F. Siu, Mike Sinclair, Robert Kovacs, Eyal Ofek, Christian Holz, and Edward Cutrell. 2020. Virtual Reality Without Vision: A Haptic and Auditory White Cane to Navigate Complex Virtual Worlds. In *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (CHI '20). Association for Computing Machinery, Honolulu, HI, USA, 1–13. ISBN: 9781450367080. doi: 10.1145/3313831.3376353.
- [181] Katta Spiel, Christopher Frauenberger, Os Keyes, and Geraldine Fitzpatrick. 2019. Agency of autistic children in technology research—a critical literature review. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction (TOCHI)*, 26, 6, 1–40.
- [182] Katta Spiel, Kathrin Gerling, Cynthia L Bennett, Emeline Brulé, Rua M Williams, Jennifer Rode, and Jennifer Mankoff. 2020. Nothing about us without us: investigating the role of critical disability studies in hci. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1–8.
- [183] Katta Spiel, Eva Hornecker, Rua Mae Williams, and Judith Good. 2022. Adhd and technology research—investigated by neurodivergent readers. In *Proceedings of the 2022 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems*, 1–21.
- [184] Maria Dolores C Tongco. 2007. Purposive sampling as a tool for informant selection. *Ethnobotany Research & Applications*.
- [185] Marc-Adelard Tremblay. 1957. The key informant technique: a nonethnographic application. *American anthropologist*, 59, 4, 688–701.
- [186] Alan Truly. 2024. Meta quest 3S review: the perfect introduction to VR gaming. (Nov. 2024). <https://www.digitaltrends.com/computing/meta-quest-3s-review/>.
- [187] Dimitrios Tzovaras, Konstantinos Moustakas, Georgios Nikolakis, and Michael G Strintzis. 2009. Interactive Mixed Reality White Cane Simulation for the Training of the Blind and the Visually Impaired. *Personal and Ubiquitous Computing*, 13, 1, 51–58.
- [188] Dimitrios Tzovaras, Georgios Nikolakis, George Fergadis, Stratos Malasiotis, and Modestos Stavrakis. 2002. Design and Implementation of Virtual Environments Training of the Visually Impaired. In *Proceedings of the Fifth International ACM Conference on Assistive Technologies*, 41–48. doi: 10.1145/638249.638259.
- [189] Union of the Physically Impaired Against Segregation and The Disability Alliance. 1975. Fundamental principles of disability. Summary of the discussion held on 22nd November, 1975. Electronically scanned and reformatted by Mark Priestley, Vic Finkelstein and Ken Davis in October 1997. (Nov. 1975). Retrieved December 2024 from <https://disability-studies.leeds.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/40/library/UIPIAS-fundamental-principles.pdf>.
- [190] Unity. 2022. XR Interaction Toolkit. last accessed 15 Jun 2022. (2022). <https://docs.unity3d.com/Packages/com.unity.xr.interaction.toolkit@2.2/manual/index.html>.
- [191] Rosanna Maria Vigliaro, Sara Condino, Giuseppe Turini, Marina Carbone, Vincenzo Ferrari, and Marco Gesi. 2021. Augmented Reality, Mixed Reality, and Hybrid Approach in Healthcare Simulation: A Systematic Review. *Applied Sciences*, 11, 5, 2338.
- [192] W3C. 2015. Mobile Accessibility: How WCAG 2.0 and Other W3C/WAI Guidelines Apply to Mobile. Retrieved Sep 20, 2022 from <https://www.w3.org/TR/mobile-accessibility-mapping/#wcag-2.0-and-mobile-content-applications>.
- [193] W3C. 2018. Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.1. Retrieved Sep 20, 2022 from <https://www.w3.org/TR/WCAG21/>.
- [194] W3C. 2020. XR Accessibility User Requirements. Retrieved Sep 20, 2022 from <https://www.w3.org/TR/xaur/>.
- [195] Bruce N. Walker and Jeffrey Lindsay. 2006. Navigation Performance With a Virtual Auditory Display: Effects of Beacon Sound, Capture Radius, and Practice. *Human Factors*, 48, 2, 265–278.
- [196] Dean A. Waters and Husam H. Abulula. 2001. The Virtual Bat: Echolocation in Virtual Reality. In *Proceedings of the 2001 International Conference on Auditory Display*. Espoo, Finland, 6 pages.
- [197] WB Games Support. 2024. Accessibility options. Mortal Kombat Games Support Documentation. Warner Bros. Games, (Aug. 2024). <https://mortal-kombatgamesupport.wbgames.com/hc/en-us/articles/360023370494-Accessibility-Options>.
- [198] Ryan Wedoff, Lindsay Ball, Amelia Wang, Yi Xuan Khoo, Lauren Lieberman, and Kyle Rector. 2019. Virtual Showdown: An Accessible Virtual Reality Game With Scaffolds for Youth With Visual Impairments. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1–15. doi: 10.1145/3290605.3300371.
- [199] Zhuxiaona Wei and James A. Landay. 2018. Evaluating Speech-Based Smart Devices Using New Usability Heuristics. *IEEE Pervasive Computing*, 17, 2, 84–96. doi: 10.1109/MPRV.2018.022511249.
- [200] Thomas Westin, JaEun Jemma Ku, Jérôme Dupire, and Ian Hamilton. 2018. Game Accessibility Guidelines and Wcag 2.0-A Gap Analysis. In *International Conference on Computers Helping People With Special Needs*. Springer, Springer, 270–279. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-94277-1_43.
- [201] Jerry Alan Winter. 2003. The development of the disability rights movement as a social problem solver. *Disability Studies Quarterly*, 23, 1.
- [202] World's Edge studio and Relic Entertainment. 2024. Age IV accessibility features. Age of Empires Official Website. Xbox Game Studios, (2024). <https://www.ageofempires.com/age-iv-accessibility/>.
- [203] XR Access. 2024. Xr access. A community committed to making virtual, augmented, and mixed reality (XR) accessible to people with disabilities. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://xraccess.org/>.
- [204] XR Association. 2024. XR Association. Leading the way for the responsible development and adoption of XR. Retrieved December 2024 from <https://xra.org/>.
- [205] XR Association and XRAccess. 2024. The XRAccessibility project. (2024). Retrieved December 2024 from <https://github.com/XRAccessibility/xraccessibility.github.io>.
- [206] Momona Yamagami, Sasa Junuzovic, Mar Gonzalez-Franco, Eyal Ofek, Edward Cutrell, John Porter, Andrew Wilson, and Martez Mott. 2021. Two-in-One: A Design Space for Mapping Unimanual Input Into Bimanual Interactions in Vr for Users With Limited Movement. *ACM Transactions on Accessible Computing*, 15, 3, 1–25. doi: 10.1145/3510463.

- [207] Zi-Ming Ye, Jun-Long Chen, Miao Wang, and Yong-Liang Yang. 2021. PAVAl: Position-Aware Virtual Agent Locomotion for Assisted Virtual Reality Navigation. In *2021 IEEE International Symposium on Mixed and Augmented Reality (ISMAR)*. IEEE. IEEE, 239–247. doi: 10.1109/ISMAR52148.2021.00039.
- [208] Anon Ymous, Katta Spiel, Os Keyes, Rua M Williams, Judith Good, Eva Hornecker, and Cynthia L Bennett. 2020. " i am just terrified of my future"—epistemic violence in disability related technology research. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1–16.
- [209] Kexin Zhang, Elmira Deldari, Zhicong Lu, Yaxing Yao, and Yuhang Zhao. 2022. “it’s just part of me:” understanding avatar diversity and self-presentation of people with disabilities in social virtual reality. In *Proceedings of the 24th international ACM SIGACCESS conference on computers and accessibility*, 1–16.
- [210] Yuhang Zhao, Cynthia L. Bennett, Hrvoje Benko, Edward Cutrell, Christian Holz, Meredith Ringel Morris, and Mike Sinclair. 2018. Enabling People With Visual Impairments to Navigate Virtual Reality With a Haptic and Auditory Cane Simulation. In *Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '18)*. Association for Computing Machinery, Montreal QC, Canada, 1–14. isbn: 9781450356206. doi: 10.1145/3173574.3173690.
- [211] Yuhang Zhao, Edward Cutrell, Christian Holz, Meredith Ringel Morris, Eyal Ofek, and Andrew D. Wilson. 2019. SeeingVR: A Set of Tools to Make Virtual Reality More Accessible to People With Low Vision. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '19)*. Association for Computing Machinery, Glasgow, Scotland Uk, 1–14. isbn: 9781450359702. doi: 10.1145/3290605.3300341.
- [212] Yuhang Zhao, Edward Cutrell, Christian Holz, Meredith Ringel Morris, Eyal Ofek, and Andrew D. Wilson. 2019. SeeingVR: A Set of Tools to Make Virtual Reality More Accessible to People With Low Vision. (2019). <https://github.com/microsoft/SeeingVRtoolkit>.
- [213] Yuhang Zhao, Sarit Szpiro, Jonathan Knighten, and Shiri Azenkot. 2016. CueSee: Exploring Visual Cues for People With Low Vision to Facilitate a Visual Search Task. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM International Joint Conference on Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing (UbiComp '16)*. Association for Computing Machinery, Heidelberg, Germany, 73–84. isbn: 9781450344616. doi: 10.1145/2971648.2971730.

A Themes

Table 3. Non-Exhaustive Summary of Themes, Sub-themes, and Corresponding Example Codes

Themes	Sub-Themes	Example Codes
Difficulties of Feature Integration	Sacrificing A11y for Immersion	balance a11y and immersion
	A11y Issues and Needs in XR Interactions	text illegible due to resolution; need XR equivalent of ARIA label; AR small display; spatial audio for BLV; spatial audio difficult; AD from spatial audio location; captions; caption implementation difficult; prefer subtitles; locomotion; stationary; locomotion challenging for PVI; thumbstick turning harms mental map
	Disability Representation in XR	normative view
	Performance Limitations of Standalone HMD's	vr performance considerations; performance overhead to add a11y feature; game stores have performance requirements
	Onboarding First-Time Users	tag objects as interactable; video tutorial insufficient
Current Development Practices	Lack of Formal XR Training	no formal XR training; on-the-job XR training; self-taught; online courses; online forums; personal projects; YouTube; Udemy; Udacity; documentation; Reddit; Discord
	Developers' Diverse Responsibilities	developers wear many hats
	Dynamic Code Generation	code easier to merge vs prefabs
	Reusing Code Between Projects	reusing code; reuse a11y subsequent projects
	Testing with PWD	PWD appear in general testing; no PWD testing; direct user feedback from PWD
Motivations	Motivations	time; money; number of users; reviews; legal
	Hindrances	survival mode; MVP
	Everyone has a responsibility to be an a11y developer	accessible design; also just best design practices; including accessible design lowers costs
Developers' Current XR A11y Solutions	Incorporating Alternate Input	rewired; merge cube; xbox a11y controller
	Hooking into System A11y Support	custom hooks; Unity lacks a11y hooks; hook into platform functionality
	Examples of Existing A11y Solutions	colorblindness filters; one-handed mode; text size; UI magnification
Applicability of 3D Virtual World Guidelines to XR	Overall Knowledge of Guidelines	current guidelines broad; WCAG; Microsoft's MR Accessibility Standards
	Understanding Guidelines	not applicable for real-time gaming
	When to Implement a11y	a11y in design phase
Preferred XR A11y Support Methods	SDK's/Toolkits	toolkits; hardware-bound SDK; use platform-specific SDK's
	3rd Party Packages	use of 3rd party packages
	Game Modification	modding security concerns; offload responsibility to modding community; multiplayer modding concerns
	Automated A11y Checking	lacking automated a11y checks for 3D
	Consulting	consulting
	Provide Examples	provide examples; sample scenes; GIFs; videos
	Need to be Directly Implementable	easy to implement; drag and droppable plugin

B Prompt

The prompt provided to Claude 3.5 Sonnet to assist with generating the codebook is as follows, with csv files pre-formatted by the researcher to , remove personally identifying information. Transcripts were attached 1 to 5 at a time.

I am working on a qualitative research study to evaluate developer perspectives on accessibility in extended reality (XR) platforms like Meta Quest (virtual reality or “VR” head-mounted display “HMD”), Microsoft HoloLens (mixed reality “MR”), or iOS ARKit (augmented reality or “AR”). I have already conducted 25 interviews with developers, transcribed them, and open coded them. Attached is a csv file. The first row of the file has a participant number. All subsequent rows include a list of “codes”. Multiple codes in one cell are separated by a semi-colon (“;”). Break up any multiple-code cells into independent codes.

For each csv file, 1. Parse the file, formatting each code with its own line and attaching the participant number on line 1 to each code. 2. Combine into a new CSV file and output that file. As an example,

Given the input csv file: “ P4,, Non-CS MS , PhD Student, VR teaching application,, student, Contractor, startup platform:hololens,, time:4+ years,, Unity , SteamVR , HTC Vive “

A resulting csv file would look like this: “ Non-CS MS (P4) PhD Student (P4) VR teaching application (P4) student (P4) Contractor (P4) startup (P4) platform:hololens (P4) time:4+ years (P4) Unity (P4) SteamVR (P4) HTC Vive (P4) “

Combining with a second input csv file: “ P3333, Non-CS PhD, VR teaching application, Unity , student,big tech platform:hololens, time:5 years, runs linux “

Would output: “ P3333 Non-CS MS (P4) Non-CS PhD (P3333) "VR teaching application (P4, P3333)" "student (P4, P3333)" Contractor (P4) startup (P4) big tech (P3333) "platform:hololens (P4, P3333)" time:4+ years (P4) time:5 years (P3333) "Unity (P4, P3333)" SteamVR (P4) HTC Vive (P4) runs linux (P3333) “ or similar. Do not forget quotation marks where applicable.

As you go through each csv file: Preserve the original order that which the codes first appear, as possible. Ask for clarification if needed. Don’t repeat codes you already listed. Also, treat codes as non-case-sensitive only when comparing for duplicates. Only remove duplicates if they’re within the same csv file. Otherwise add them to the existing code list export, appending a “, P#”, as in the example above with P3333. In other words, if “student” appears in multiple files, only maintain one “student” listing in the output file, but also mark each file in which it displays, e.g. in P4 and P3333.

Think before you respond, separating your <think> from your <answer> with XML tags. No yapping.

After multiple iterations including future prompts with “Please continue” upon reaching the maximum output length, Claude produced files that, when combined, listed over 4,000 codes. Researchers then manually verified and cleaned the output, including removing duplicates. An example of the first 25 lines of output is as follows:

“edu:MS Non-CS (P1, P4, P12)” “edu:MS CS-related (P3, P9, P10, P11, P15, P23)” “edu:PhD CS-related (P10, P16, P22)” “edu:BS CS-related (P2, P7, P12, P14, P17, P19, P20, P24)” “edu:BS non-CS (P8, P12, P13)” “edu:HS dropout w/ GED (P6)” “edu:some college, incomplete (P6, P21)” “school-taught XR (P15, P16, P19, P25)” “self-taught (P1, P2, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, P10, P11, P12, P13, P15, P16, P17, P20, P22)” “no formal XR training (P7)” “on-the-job XR training (P1, P7, P8, P11, P12, P17, P19, P25)” “cs bootcamps (P6)” “certification (P5, P13)” “online courses (P5, P13, P20, P22)” “Udemy (P5, P13)” “UDacity VR (P5) STAR (P18) STAR-adv:focus on one thing (P18) STAR-disadv:lack of haptic feedback (P18) STAR-disadv:visual only (P18)” “Unity (P1, P2,

P3, P4, P5, P7, P8, P9, P10, P11, P12, P13, P14, P15, P16, P18, P19, P20, P21, P22, P23, P24, P25)” “Unreal (P1, P2, P5, P8, P11, P12, P16, P19, P23, P24, P25)” “Aframe (P2, P6, P9, P18)” Android studio (P3) “Senior SWE (P3, P19, P24)”

C Beat Saber Color Options




Fig. 1. We show an example from one of the most popular [81] VR games, Beat Saber [21], which offers custom color settings for a variety of virtual objects. Selecting an object (Right) like notes, lights, or wall, then picking a color from the picker, will cause the respective virtual object to change to that color. Users can create up to four custom color palettes (Left, labeled Custom 0 through Custom 3) or choose from a variety of presets themed from in-game collections (e.g., “The First”, “Origins”). As of November 2024 there do not exist built-in presets for common color vision deficiencies (e.g., protanopia, deuteranopia, tritanopia [106].)