

# UNIVERSITY *of* York

This is a repository copy of *Intelligent support technologies for older people : an analysis of characteristics and roles*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:  
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/137805/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

## **Proceedings Paper:**

Petrie, Helen [orcid.org/0000-0002-0100-9846](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0100-9846), Darzentas, Jennifer Siobhane and Carmien, Stefan (2018) Intelligent support technologies for older people : an analysis of characteristics and roles. In: Langdon, Pat, Lazar, Jonathan, Heylighen, Ann and Dong, Hua, (eds.) Breaking down barriers: usability, accessibility and inclusive design. Springer , Cham, Switzerland , pp. 89-97.

---

## **Reuse**

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

## **Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

# Intelligent Support Technologies for Older People: An Analysis of Characteristics and Roles

H. Petrie, J.S. Darzentas and S. Carmien

**Abstract:** For almost two decades there have been many developments in using intelligent technologies to support older people, with many different terms proposed to describe these technologies including assistive robots, embodied conversational agents and relational agents. Many technologies have been proposed in many different configurations and many assistance roles have been explored. Characteristics of these technologies include tangible or virtual; anthropomorphic, biomorphic, creature or object-like; level of visual realism; paralinguistic abilities; interactivity; adaptability; movement; and positioning. The assistive roles proposed include providing information, advice and reminders, helping with physical tasks, monitoring, providing companionship and emotional support. This paper provides an overview of the characteristics and roles of these technologies and attempts to clarify some of the terminology used. It aims to provide a guide for researchers from the wide range of disciplines working on such technologies for supporting older people.

## 1 Introduction

Intelligent support technologies (ISTs) is the term we have chosen to describe the many forms of technologically-based assistance that have been proposed to support older people. The interest in intelligent support for older people has been driven by the growing need for such assistance as a consequence of demographic and societal changes. It is well-known that the population throughout the world is aging. The United Nations (UN) estimates that in 2015 there were 901 million people aged 60 or over (60 years is an inaccurate, but widely accepted threshold for old age; both 60 and 65 years are typically used as the threshold), by 2050 the UN estimates there will be 2.1 billion older people. As a proportion of the population, that is a rise from 12% to 25%. Currently, Japan, Italy, Finland, France, Germany and Greece and

---

H. Petrie (✉) · J.S. Darzentas · S. Carmien  
Human Computer Interaction Research Group, Department of Computer Science,  
University of York, York, UK  
Email: helen.petrie@york.ac.uk

© Springer International Publishing Switzerland 2018  
P. Langdon et al. (eds.), XXXXX  
DOI XXXXX

some of the Baltic and East European countries have the highest proportions of older people (over 25% of the population in all cases), but by 2050 it is estimated that the “oldest” countries will be Japan, Korea, Spain, Greece and Singapore (with over 40% of the population) (UN 2015). So it is not surprising that there is considerable research interest in Europe in this area, but also in Japan, Korea and Singapore. Along with this aging population, the ratio of people of working age to older people (known as the Potential Support Ratio, PSR), important both in terms of those active in producing wealth and of those available to care for the older generations is changing. Europe currently has an overall PSR of approximately 4 younger people for each older one, although many European countries have a PSR of less than 3.0. Japan currently has the lowest PSR in the world at 2.1. As the number of older people increases and the number of younger people decreases, these ratios will decrease and create a major societal issue concerning the availability of people to care for older members of society.

Technological support, in many forms, is widely seen as offering solutions to the growing lack of human power to care for older people. A particular feature of such technological support, beyond performing specific tasks, is that of providing social interaction and emotional support, to overcome the increasing social isolation and loneliness amongst older people. This may explicitly be the purpose of the technology, or it may be epiphenomenal to performing tasks, meaning it is a byproduct of the task-based support. One way that much research has addressed the social interaction and emotional support issues, as well as those of the general acceptability of support technology by older people, is by creating technologies which have a tangible or virtual embodiment – whether that is as a humanoid robot, a animal-like robot, a digital pet or an avatar on a screen who converses with the older person. One reason for listing these examples is that there is such a variety of support technologies, and although they share many aims, they have a very wide variety of terminology to describe them. Even a term such as *embodiment* is problematic. There are very many definitions of embodiment (Ziemke 2001, Lee et al. 2006). Some researchers (e.g. Fong et al. 2003) use a cybernetics-derived definition: “that which establishes a basis for structural coupling by creating the potential for mutual perturbation between system and environment” (Fong et al. 2003, p48). Other researchers, coming from a psychological or communications background argue that embodiment is not about a relationship between technology and user, but a property of the technology, and whether it has a tangible or visible representation to encourage the user to think of it as a *sentient being* (Reeves and Nass 1996), which is the the meaning of embodiment used by researchers in the area of *embodied conversational agents* (e.g., Cassell et al. 2000). This problem of terminology clearly arises from the fact that research on intelligent support technologies for older people is a highly interdisciplinary area of study, bringing together researchers from disciplines as diverse as artificial intelligence, computer science, cognitive science, communications, geriatrics, gerontology, human-computer interaction, psychology, and robotics. Thus there is a great need to explain terms across disciplines.

## 2 Terminology

Two terms on which there is good agreement is *robot* to refer to tangible technologies, that is objects in the real world, and *agent* to refer to virtual instantiations, often avatars on screens. However, there are many terms within these broad categories (Table 1 illustrates nearly 30 terms we have encountered in relation to technologies for older people), and often the functionality crosses over between terms. For example, Sabelli, Kanda and Hagita evaluated a *conversational robot* which was a human-like physical object, but its functionality was actually identical to an *embodied conversational agent* as defined by Cassell et al (2000). Even within a particular segment of the research area there has been considerable fluidity in terminology. Breazeal (2002) coined the term *sociable robots*, but in a subsequent paper noted:

*‘Traditionally, the term “social robots” was applied to multi-robot systems where the dominant inspiration came from the collective behavior of insects ... For this reason, the author coined the term “sociable” to distinguish an anthropomorphic style of human-robot interaction from this earlier insect-inspired work. The author has learned (after recent discussion with Terry Fong) that the term “social” has apparently changed over the years to become more strongly associated with anthropomorphic social behavior. Hence, we shall adopt this more modern use of the term “social” ... but still distinguish “sociable” as a distinct subclass of social robots’*

(Breazeal 2003, p. 168)

Thus beyond these broad terms such as *robot* and *agent*, there are many terms used for ISTs and it may not be clear to new researchers what characteristics or roles they are attempting to distinguish. In the next section we set out a classification of some of the key characteristics and roles that should be considered and discuss how these terms map onto those characteristics and roles.

But first let us consider some of the commonly used terms listed in Table 1. *Service robots* are defined by ISO 8373:2012 as robots that “perform useful tasks for humans” (ISO 2012). Fong et al. (2003) divided *service robots* into *assistive robots* which assist with physical tasks and *socially interactive robots* which interact with humans (but not necessarily to assist them with tasks). Seil-Feifer and Matarić (2006) defined *socially assistive robots* (SARs) as the intersection of these two types of robot. The purpose of SARs is to assist humans, but to do this in a socially interactive way. The assistance might be by doing physical tasks but it might also be by providing information.

However, in another often cited definition, Broekens et al. (2009) use the terms *social robot* and *assistive social robot*. They distinguish these types of robots from *service robots*, which aid in physical tasks such as helping people to move around, and *companion robots*, such as PARO the robotic seal which was developed purely to imitate a real pet (Wada and Shibata 2007).

Researchers interested in *sociableness* of robots can search using the term SARs (Feil-Seifer and Matarić 2006, Johnson et al. 2014, Louis et al. 2014, Tapus et al. 2014, Pino et al. 2015), recognising that one of the main application areas for these

has been for older people. In addition, the search term *social robot* (Breazeal 2003, Lee et al. 2006, Broekens et al. 2009, Heerink et al. 2010) is still very current.

**Table 1** Terms for intelligent support technologies (ISTs) for older people

<b>Term</b>	<b>Used by</b>
Affective communication robot	Khosla and Chu (2013)
Affective embodied agent	Tsiourti et al. (2014)
Assistive robot	Fong et al. (2003)
Assistive social robot	Broekens et al. (2009)
Assistive social agent	Heerink et al. (2010)
Conversational robot	Sabelli et al. (2011)
Companion robot	Broekens et al. (2009) Dautenhahn et al. (2007)
Conversational agent-based system	Ring et al (2013)
Embodied conversational agent (ECA)	Cereghetti et al. (2015), Tsiourti et al. (2014, 2016)
Healthcare robot	Sabelli et al. (2011)
Listener agent	Sakai et al. (2012)
Relational agent	Bickmore et al. (2005)
Relational artefact	Turkle et al. (2006)
Robotic companion	Sidner et al. (2014)
Screen agent	Heerink et al. (2010)
Service (type) robot	Broekens et al. (2009) Pearce et al (2012)
Sociable robot	Breazeal (2002)
Social agent	Lee et al. (2006), Heerink (2010)
Socially assistive robot (SAR)	Feil-Seifer and Matarić (2006), Johnson et al. (2014), Tapus et al. (2007)
Social embodied agent	Spiekeman et al. (2011)
Socially intelligent robot	Fong et al. (2003) Dautenhahn (2007)
Socially intelligent virtual agent	Tsiourti et al. (2016)
Socially interactive robot	Fong et al. (2003)
Social robot	Breazeal (2003), Fong et al. (2003) Bartneck and Forlizzi (2004), Lee et al. (2006), Broekens et al. (2009)
Virtual assistive companion	Tsiourti et al. (2014, 2016)
Virtual carer	Garner et al. (2016)
Virtual companion	Sidner et al. (2014)
Virtual (support) partner	Cereghetti et al. (2015)

Turning to virtual ISTs, *embodied conversational agent* (ECA) is a term that has been inherited from earlier research for wider audiences (Cassell et al. 2000). These refer to screen-based computer-animated characters, usually human-like, which simulate a conversation with the user. ECAs were originally conceived to be easier to interact with than a graphical user interface, but as they have been developed in ISTs for older people, the social and emotional roles that these may play has come to the fore. Thus, Bickmore and colleagues (2005a, b) proposed the term *relational agent* to indicate ECAs that are designed to “build and maintain long term social-emotional relationships with users” (Bickmore et al. 2005b, p712). Other researchers have used terms such as *virtual partners* (Cereghetti et al. 2015) and *virtual assistive companions* (Tsiourti et al. 2014, 2016) for ECAs with very similar goals. Further terms are used to indicate different goals, such as *virtual carer* (Garner et al. 2016) to indicate caring and communicative goals and *listener agent* (Sakai et al. 2012) to indicate an ECA which can detect the cognitive status of older people with dementia.

This wide variety of terminology may be confusing for researchers when trying to understand the literature and does not clarify the important similarities and distinctions between different ISTs. Therefore we have created a classification of both robot and virtual ISTs to try to highlight some of the important properties of these technologies.

### 3 A Classification of Intelligent Support Technologies (ISTs) for Older People

Although robots and agents seem very different as ISTs for older people, they share many characteristics and roles. A classification of these characteristics and roles is useful for research as the question being investigated is often what is the most acceptable, useful and usable form of IST for older people. Both when discussing particular studies and when comparing different studies, it is useful to have a clear picture of what characteristics and roles the technology has and what properties and roles have been manipulated.

We have found the following characteristics useful when considering ISTs. In each case, any IST will have a value on each of these characteristics, as illustrated in Fig. 1 (which does not show all possible combinations, it illustrates some combinations):

*Tangible vs Virtual*: As mentioned above, many ISTs are instantiated as tangible objects in the world (*Tangible*, terms in brackets refer to nodes in Fig. 1), usually termed *robots*, while others are *virtual agents* on a computer screen or *smart speakers* which are simply a voice (e.g. Siri or Alexa) (*Virtual*).

*Type of Representation*: Some ISTs attempt to be human-like (anthropomorphic, *Anthro*), some attempt to be animal-like (biomorphic, *Bio*), some represent new creatures which are not like any known animal (*Creature*), and some represent other non-biological real world objects (*Object*). Many robots and agents are designed to look human, and many robots look like animals (e.g., the seal-like PARO robot, Wada and Shibata 2007). Examples of “new creatures” include the Reeti robot (www.reeti.fr), (Sidner et al. 2014) and ElliQ

(<https://www.intuitionrobotics.com/elliq/>) which is a featureless, moving “head”. An example of a non-biological object is the IST investigated by Iwamura et al. (2011) who compared an anthropomorphic robot which carried a shopping basket to assist older shoppers in the supermarket with a robot which consisted simply of the shopping basket on a column. So the latter makes no attempt to look like any kind of human, animal or other creature.

*Level of visual realism:* For the anthropomorphic and biomorphic ISTs, the level of visual realism varies greatly. This is a deliberate strategy, presumably to deal with the problem of the “uncanny valley” (Mori 2012). Some ISTs strive to create a very realistic representation, for example the *virtual assistive companion* developed by Tsiourti et al (2014 2016). Other ISTs use more cartoon-like or schematic representations, whether it is of a human (e.g. Bickmore et al.’s 2013 exercise coach for older people or Yasuda et al.’s 2013 cartoon-like grandchild for older people with dementia) or an animal. Clearly this characteristic is a continuum from totally realistic to a cartoon, but for purposes of simplicity, in Fig 1 we indicated a dichotomy (*Realistic* and *Cartoon*).

*Paralinguistic behaviour including gestures:* A further property related to realism is the extent to which ISTs use human or animal-like paralinguistic behaviour. This can include a number of visual and verbal behaviours such as making appropriate gestures when speaking, moving the eyes (if relevant) or other features appropriately and using realistic pitch changes (e.g. for questions) and tone of voice. Clearly this characteristic could be broken down into a number of more specific categories, depending on the interest of researchers. Often it is hard to understand from research papers how much paralinguistic behaviour an IST is capable of. Tsiourti et al. (2016) mentioned that a set of facial expressions have been integrated into their *virtual assistive companion* and the Nao robot in the KSERA Project (Johnson et al. 2014) used a range of paralinguistic phenomena to attract the user’s attention and make its recommendations more persuasive (in Fig. 1 we indicate simply *Paraling* or *NonPL*).

*Interactivity:* most ISTs now aim to be interactive, that is accept input from the user and react to it appropriately. Some ISTs do this only in a limited way, and often it is not clear from research papers what the level of sophistication of the interaction is. For example, the evaluation of a robot by Sabelli et al. (2011), involved a Wizard-of-Oz-like implementation of interactivity, with a human operator using both pre-scripted and improvised interactions, but these appear to have been only single responses to questions and comments from older people (again in Fig. 1 we indicate simply *Interactive* or *NonInter*).


*Adaptive and adaptable behaviour:* the behaviour of the IST may be adaptive or adaptable. Adaptable technologies can be tailored by the user (or in the case of older users, a family member or carer) to suit the needs and personal preferences of the user. Adaptive technologies alter their behaviour by learning from the user’s behaviour (van Velsen et al. 2007). For example, Bickmore et al.’s (2005b) virtual exercise coach used a simple process of adaptive behaviour in that the coach became more friendly the more times the user undertook exercises.

The final two properties are only applicable to the robot ISTs:

*Movement:* the IST may move around the environment. The classic idea of a robot is that it does move, but numerous studies have recently investigated robots

which are static. For example, Brian (McColl et al. 2013, Louie et al. 2014) is a robot with just a head, torso and arms which sits in front of the user. Some IST robots also move in a manner to entertain, rather than to perform tasks. For example, Matilda can dance for users to entertain them (Khosla and Chu 2013).

Position: the robot ISTs can be floor-standing objects, which typically move around the environment, but not always; Sabelli's floor-standing robot was moved from place to place by human operators. Other robot ISTs sit on a table or other surface such as Matilda (Khosla and Chu 2013) or the iCAT (Herrink et al. 2010) standing 38 cm tall. Other robots, such the Nao, are not too tall to stand on a table at 58cm, but can also be floor- standing. Finally, there are robots that are designed to be held, particularly robot pets, such as PARO (Wada and Shibata 2007).



**Fig. 1** Classification of characteristics of intelligent support technologies for older people

Turning to roles, we make a distinction between social roles as used by Dautenhahn et al. (2005) such as that of a butler, and described using the sociological



model of social roles (Huber et al. 2014) and task-based roles. The main task-based roles are as follows:

*Providing information, advice and reminders:* the iCat was programmed to initiate conversation, to set reminders, get directions to the supermarket and provide next day weather forecasts (Heerink et al. 2008); Karen (a virtual agent) and Reeti (a robot) were programmed to offer nutrition and health tips (both from Sidner et al. 2014).

*Motivational support or coaching:* for example encouraging people to take physical exercise by a virtual agent (Bickmore et al. 2013) or robot (Fasola and Matarić 2012).

*Monitoring:* working in co-operation with sensors in the environment, or worn on clothing, potentially risky behaviours can be detected, such as wandering or not drinking, and the agent, for instance the CareOBot (Sorrell and Draper 2014), can warn the older person.

*Providing companionship and entertainment:* playing card games with Brian (McColl et al. 2013), and Bingo with Matilda (Khosla and Chu 2014), while Karen and Reeti offered short humorous anecdotes to the user (Sidner 2014).

*Providing emotional support:* interaction with PARO improved people's moods, making them more active and more communicative, both with each other and their caregivers (Moyle et al. 2017, Wada and Shibata 2007).

### 3 Conclusions

In studying robotic and virtual ISTs developed for older people, we were aware of the many questions regarding the nature of robots and virtual agents, and whether the latter can in fact be considered as robots. Other questions concern the tasks that these technologies are designed to carry out, the style of interaction, and what are the technologies, or aspects of technologies, that make the interaction successful. The field has long been aware that it is difficult to draw meaningful distinctions between their characteristics and roles. In our paper, we expose some of problems that raise barriers to understanding, such as the proliferation of terminology and confusing distinctions. Our current contribution is to offer a conceptualisation with which to categorise and understand these technologies, that isolates characteristics and roles that are generic to both robotic and virtual agents. We believe that this contributes a working tool for thinking about these questions.

### References

- Bartneck C, Forlizzi J (2004) A design-centred framework for social human-robot interaction. In: Proceedings of the IEEE International Workshop on Robot and Human Interactive Communication, pp. 591–594, Kurashiki, Okayama, Japan, 20–22 September 2004
- Bedaf S, Gelderblom GJ, Syrdal DS, Lehmann H, Michel H, Hewson D et al. (2014) Which activities threaten independent living of elderly when becoming problematic: Inspiration

- for meaningful service robot functionality. *Disability Rehabilitation and Assistive Technologies* 9(6): 445–52
- Bickmore TW, Caruso L, Clough-Gorr K (2005a) Acceptance and usability of a relational agent interface by urban older adults. In: *Proceedings of CHI'05*, pp. 1212–1215. Portland, OR, US, 2–7 April 2005
- Bickmore TW, Caruso L, Clough-Gorr K, Heeren T (2005b) It's just like you talk to a friend: Relational agents for older adults. *Interacting with Computers* 17(6): 711–735
- Bickmore TW, Simmiman RA, Nelson K, Cheng DM, Winter M, Henault L et al. (2013) A randomized controlled trial of an automated exercise coach for older adults. *Journal of American Geriatrics Society* 61(10): 1676–83
- Broekens J, Heerink M, Rosendal H (2009) Assistive social robots in elderly care: A review. *Gerontechnology* 8(2): 94–103
- Breazeal CL (2002) *Designing sociable robots*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, US
- Breazeal CL (2003) Toward sociable robots. *Robotics and Autonomous Systems* 42: 167–175
- Cassell J, Sullivan J, Prevost S, Churchill E (eds.) (2000) *Embodied conversational agents*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, USA
- Cereghetti D, Kleanthous S, Christophorou C, Tsiourti C, Wings C, Christodoulou E (2015) Virtual partners for seniors: Analysis of the users' preferences and expectations on personality and appearance. In: *Proceedings of European Conference on Ambient Intelligence 2015 (AmI-15)*, Athens, Greece, 11–13 November 2015
- Dautenhahn K, Woods S, Kaouri C, Walters ML, Koay KL, Werry I (2005) What is a robot companion-friend, assistant or butler? In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS'05)*, pp. 1192–1197, Alberta, Canada
- Dautenhahn K (2007) Socially intelligent robots: Dimensions of human-robot interaction. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 362(1480): 679–704
- Fasola J, Mataric MJ (2012) Using socially assistive human-robot interaction to motivate physical exercise for older adults. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE, Special Issue on Quality of Life Technology*, pp. 2512–2526
- Fong T, Nourbakhsh I, Dautenhahn K (2003) A survey of socially interactive robots. *Robotics and Autonomous Systems* 42(3–4): 143–166
- Garner TA, Powell W, Carr V (2016) Virtual carers for the elderly: A case study review of ethical responsibilities. *Digital Health* 2: 1–14
- Heerink M, Kröse B, Wielinga B, Evers V (2008) Enjoyment intention to use and actual use of a conversational robot by elderly people. In: *Proceedings of HRI '08*, pp. 113–12, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 12–15 March 2008
- Heerink M, Kröse B, Evers V, Wielinga B (2010) Assessing acceptance of assistive social agent technology by older adults: The Almere Model. *International Journal of Social Robotics* 2: 361
- Huber A, Lammer L, Weiss A, Vincze M (2014) Designing adaptive roles for socially assistive robots: A new method to reduce technological determinism and role stereotypes. *Journal of Human-Robot Interaction* 3(2): 100–11
- ISO (2012) *ISO 8373:2012 – Robots and robotic devices – Vocabulary*. International Organization for Standardization, Geneva, Switzerland
- Johnson DO, Cuijpers RH, Juola JF, Torta E, Simonov M, Frisiello A et al. (2014) Socially assistive robots: A comprehensive approach to extending independent living. *International Journal of Social Robotics* 6: 195
- Khosla R and Chu M-T (2013) Embodying care in Matilda: An affective communication robot for emotional wellbeing in older people in Australian residential care facilities. *ACM Transactions on Management Information Systems* 4(4): Article 18
- Lee KM, Jung Y, Kim J, Kim SR (2006) Are physically embodied social agents better than disembodied social agents? The effects of physical embodiment, tactile interaction, and

- people's loneliness in human-robot interaction. *International Journal of Human Computer Studies* 64(10): 962-973
- Louie WG, McColl D, Nejat G (2014) Acceptance and attitudes towards a human-like socially assistive robot by older adults. *Assistive Technology* 26: 140-150
- McColl D, Louie WG, Nejat G (2013) Brian 2.1: A socially assistive robot for the elderly and cognitively impaired. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Magazine* 20(1): 74-83
- Mori M (2012) The uncanny valley (translated by MacDorman KF, Kageki N). *IEEE Robotics and Automation* 19(2): 98-100
- Moyle W, Beattie ER, Draper B, Shum D, Thalib L, Jones C (2017) A social robot called Paro and its effect on people living with dementia. *Innovation in Aging* 1: 344
- Pearce AJ, Adair B, Miller K, Ozanne E, Said C, Santamaria N et al. (2012) Robotics to enable older adults to remain living at home. *Journal of Aging Research* 2012: Article 538169
- Reeves B, Nass C (1996) *The media equation: How people treat computers, television, and new media like real people and places*. Cambridge University Press
- Ring L, Barry B, Totzke K, Bickmore T (2013) Addressing loneliness and isolation in older adults. In: *Proceedings of ACII'13*, pp. 61-66, Geneva, Switzerland, 2-5 September 2013
- Sakai Y, Nonaka Y, Yasuda K, Nakano YI (2012) Listener agent for elderly people with dementia. In: *Proceedings of HRI'12*, Boston, MA, US, 5-8 March 2012
- Sidner C, Rich C, Shayganfar M, Behrooz M, Bickmore T, Ring L et al. (2014) Robotic and virtual companions for isolated older adults. *AAAI Fall Symposium: Artificial Intelligence for Human-Robot Interaction*, Arlington, VA, US, 15-17 November 2014
- Sorrell T, Draper H (2014) Robot carers, ethics and older people. *Ethics and Information Technology* 16(3): 183-195
- Spiekeman ME, Haazebroek P, Neerinx, M (2011) Requirements and platforms for social agents that alarm and support elderly living alone. In Mutlu et al. (eds.): *ICSR 2011*, LNAI 7072: pp. 226-235
- Tapus A, Matarić MJ, Scassellati B (2007) Socially assistive robotics [Grand challenges of robotics]. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Magazine* 14(1): 35-42
- Turkle S, Taggart W, Kidd CD, Daste O (2006) Relational artifacts with children and elders: the complexities of cybercompanionship. *Connection Science* 18(4): 347-361
- UN (2015) *World population prospects: Key findings and advance tables (2015 revision)*. United Nations, New York, NY, US
- van Velsen L, van der Geest T, Klaassen R, Steehouder M (2007) User-centered evaluation of adaptive and adaptable systems: A literature review. *The Knowledge Engineering Review* 23(3): 261-281
- Yasuda K, Aoe J-I, Fuketa M (2013) Development of an agent system for conversing with individuals with dementia. In: *Proceedings of JSAI 2013*, Toyama, Japan, 4-7 June 2013
- Wada K, Shibata T (2007) Living with seal robots - Its sociopsychological and physiological influences on the elderly at a care house. *Transactions on Robotics* 23(5): 972-980
- Ziemke T (2001) Are robots embodied? In: Balkenius C et al. (eds.) *Proceedings of the first international workshop on epigenetic robotics: Modeling cognitive development in robotic systems*, Lund University Cognitive Studies, vol. 85, Lund, Sweden