

S. FRENERT. *Older people meet robots: Lessons learned from three case studies.* *Gerontechnology* 2016;15(suppl):15s; doi:10.4017/gt.2016.15.s.873.00 **Purpose** There is a longstanding interest in understanding how robots can cure, care for and/or support older people at home. Researchers have focused on, for example, attitudes¹, human-robot interaction⁵, social behaviours⁷, caregiving^{2,3,13} and companionship^{9,12}. Still there is a need for an overarching theoretical and methodological framework for understanding how to design a robot that fits into the everyday life of older people. This paper is one effort to provide such framework, which evolved during four years of research on older peoples involvement in the development and domestication of three robots. It is derived from a synthesis of domestication theory^{4,6}, modern social practice theory^{8,10,11} and empirical material. **Method** Case studies on the domestication of one current technology (robotic vacuum cleaners) and the development of two emergent technologies' (an eHealth system including a telepresence robot and an assistive robot) are used as empirical basis. **Results & Discussion** The potential of robots to support autonomy and independence in old age cannot be fully understood without observing robots in the everyday life of older people. The results show a discrepancy between the participants' perceptions of the robot in terms how the participants talked about the robot and the participants' actual usage of the robot. The empirical findings in this thesis indicate that valuable insights can be gained by applying a practice-oriented design approach and by involving the potential users. The main challenges, though, lie in the power struggle of who initiates and makes the technical decisions; who defines the potential users and the intended meaning of the robot. In addition, when interpreting the users' input, an understanding of their motivation for participating is crucial. The meaning the participants ascribe to their role as participants and how they situate themselves and others in relation to robots has an impact on what they say and how they construct meaning, use and make sense of the robots.

References

1. Broadbent E, Tamagawa R, Patience A, Knock B, Kerse N, Day K, MacDonald BA. Attitudes towards health-care robots in a retirement village. *Australasian Journal on Ageing* 2012;31(2):115-120; doi:10.1111/j.1741_6612.2011.00551
2. Broekens J, Heerink M, Rosendal H. Assistive social robots in elderly care: a review. *Gerontechnology* 2009;8(2):94-103; doi:10.4017/gt.2009.08.02.002.00
3. Burton A. Dolphins, dogs, and robot seals for the treatment of neurological disease. *Lancet Neurology* 2013;12(9):851-852; doi:10.1016/S1474-4422(13)70206-0
4. Hirsch E, Silverstone R. Consuming technologies: Media and information in domestic spaces. London: Routledge; 2003
5. Kidd CD, Breazeal C. Robots at home: Understanding long-term human-robot interaction. IROS 2008; IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems; 2008; pp 3230-3235; doi:10.1109/iros.2008.4651113
6. Lie M, Sørensen KH. Making technology our own?: domesticating technology into everyday life. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press; 1996
7. Mataric MJ. Socially assistive robotics: Personalized machines that (Provide) care. International Conference on Pervasive Computing and Communications (PerCom), IEEE; 2015; pp 1-1; doi:10.1109/PERCOM.2015.7146502
8. Reckwitz A. Toward a Theory of Social Practices A development in culturalist theorizing. *European Journal of Social Theory* 2002;5(2):243-263; doi:10.1177/1368431022225432
9. Robinson H, MacDonald B, Kerse N, Broadbent E. The psychosocial effects of a companion robot: a randomized controlled trial. *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association* 2013;14 (9):661-667; doi:10.1016/j.jamada.2013.02.007
10. Schatzki TR, Knorr-Cetina K, Savigny E von. The practice turn in contemporary theory. New York: Psychology Press; 2001
11. Shove E, Pantzar M, Watson M. The dynamics of social practice: everyday life and how it changes. Thousand Oaks: Sage; 2012
12. Turkle S. Alone together: Why we expect more from technology and less from each other. Chicago: Basic books; 2012
13. Wynsberghe A van. Designing robots for care: Care centered value-sensitive design. *Science and Engineering Ethics* 2013;19(2):407-433; doi:10.1007/s11948-011-9343-6

Keywords: robots, older people, everyday life, practice, domestication

Address: Lund University, Design Sciences, Lund, Sweden;

E: Susanne.frenert@certec.lth.se