



Ulysses

Exploring the acceptability of high-tech tools for enabling social interaction in a cross-cultural context: methodological considerations

Sanmei Chen, Kiyooki Matsumoto, Clare Thetford, Dulce Rodrigues

Outline

- Why this area?
- Scope
- Potential Impact
- Partnership with industry, government, voluntary organization
- Proposed methodologies
- Considerations
- Plan after the workshop

Why this area?

Aging society



Increasing demands for carers



Lack of social interaction



Reduced well-being and quality of life

→ Technological response

➤ Development of interactive robots

We don't know if high tech tools are acceptable to promote social interaction in different social contexts



Scope

- Acceptability of use of high-tech tools, e.g., Paro, and how it is being used
- Aged 65+
- With and without dementia
- In a variety of care setting
- In UK and Japan

Potential impact

- To inform social care provision policy and practice
- Old people, care service providers and families (acceptable, affordable, effective?)
- Industry:
 - identification of potential users
 - inform development of future technologies
 - diffusion of high-tech for social interaction in the community
 - potentially engaging wider industry in care provision
- UK and Japan learning from each other's experience

Partnership with industry, government, academics

- Industry (e.g. robot company, nursing home)
- Government
- Academics (health economists)



- Research fund
- Provision of data (sales, market research)
- Facilitate the research using their connections

Proposed methodologies: mixed method

- Qualitative methods: non-participant observation, semi-structural interview
 - service users (older people)
 - family member
 - service providers
- Quantitative methods: questionnaire survey, case-control observational study, randomized clinical trials
 - older people (including existing users)
 - attitude and knowledge about high-tech tools, potential associated factors (e.g. SES, socio-demography, religious belief, care burden)
 - health economics analysis/effectiveness-cost assessment

Considerations

- Lack of existing evidence
- Interdisciplinary evidence base
- Interdisciplinary collaboration
- Culture difference in working practice
- Language and communication
- Distance and time zones
- Ethics (e.g. use of incentives to participants, approval of protocol from the local ethical board)
- Acceptability of research methods (e.g. use of video recording)
- Cost: more expensive, travel/ interpreters, time, translation

Plan after workshop

- Write peer-review journal article
- Supportive remote international collaboration
- **Innovative and challenging!**



- *Review existing literature
- *Identify further future collaboration
- *Review progress in Liverpool

The 2015 RENKEI Interdisciplinary Workshop on Living with an Aging Society

