



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

The ideal application of surveillance technology in residential care for people with dementia

Niemeijer, A.R.; Frederiks, B.J.M.; Depla, M.F.I.A.; Legemaate, J.; Eefsting, J.A.; Hertogh, C.M.P.M.

DOI

[10.1136/jme.2010.040774](https://doi.org/10.1136/jme.2010.040774)

Publication date

2011

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

Journal of Medical Ethics

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Niemeijer, A. R., Frederiks, B. J. M., Depla, M. F. I. A., Legemaate, J., Eefsting, J. A., & Hertogh, C. M. P. M. (2011). The ideal application of surveillance technology in residential care for people with dementia. *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 37(5), 303-310. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jme.2010.040774>

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

UvA-DARE is a service provided by the library of the University of Amsterdam (<https://dare.uva.nl>)

The ideal application of surveillance technology in residential care for people with dementia

Alistair R Niemeijer,¹ Brenda J M Frederiks,² Marja F I A Depla,¹ Johan Legemaate,³ Jan A Eefsting,¹ Cees M P M Hertogh¹

¹Department of Nursing Home Medicine, EMGO Institute for Health and Care Research, VU University Medical Center, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

²Department of Public and Occupational Health, EMGO Institute for Health and Care Research, VU University Medical Center, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

³Department of Social Medicine, Academic Medical Center, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Correspondence to

Alistair R Niemeijer, Department of Elderly Care Medicine, EMGO Institute for Health and Care Research, VU University Medical Center, Van der Boechorststraat 7, 1081 BT Amsterdam, The Netherlands; a.niemeijer@vumc.nl

Received 8 October 2010
Revised 17 November 2010
Accepted 10 December 2010
Published Online First
2 February 2011

ABSTRACT

Background As our society is ageing, nursing homes are finding it increasingly difficult to deal with an expanding population of patients with dementia and a decreasing workforce. A potential answer to this problem might lie in the use of technology. However, the use and application of surveillance technology in dementia care has led to considerable ethical debate among healthcare professionals and ethicists, with no clear consensus to date.

Aim To explore how surveillance technology is viewed by care professionals and ethicists working in the field, by investigating the ideal application of surveillance technology in the residential care of people with dementia.

Methods Use was made of the concept mapping method, a computer-assisted procedure consisting of five steps: brainstorming, prioritising, clustering, processing by the computer and analysis. Various participants (ranging from ethicists to physicians and nurses) were invited on the basis of their professional background.

Results The views generated are grouped into six categories ranging from the need for a right balance between freedom and security, to be beneficial and tailored to the resident, and clearly defined procedures to competent and caring personnel, active monitoring and clear normative guidance. The results are presented in the form of a graphic chart.

Conclusions There appears to be an inherent duality in the views on using surveillance technology which is rooted in the moral conflict between safety and freedom. Elaboration of this ethical issue has proved to be very difficult.

INTRODUCTION

As we live in an increasingly ageing society, nursing homes are continually battling with an expanding population of patients with dementia and a decreasing workforce. One potential answer to this problem might lie in the use of technology. Sophisticated technological devices, in particular those aimed at monitoring and safeguarding residents, could not only support and assist staff but might also alleviate the growing pressures on an already overburdened care system.^{1 2}

However, the use and application of surveillance technology (ST) in dementia care has led to considerable ethical debate among healthcare professionals and ethicists. There are those, for instance, who view the use of ST as either an infringement of human rights or as contrary to human dignity, as it reduces or infringes privacy

and removes personhood, not to mention its stigmatising effects.^{2–4} Furthermore, resorting to technology in general might result in a reduction in the essential human contact between caregivers and residents and could lead to a further decrease in staff in long-term care facilities.^{5–8} On the other hand, proponents of ST have stressed that usage will not only create a more secure environment (thereby reducing caregiver stress), but also increase liberty and dignity when compared with a policy of incarceration.^{7 9 10}

What can be discerned by some of the contrasting views, and is also corroborated by an extensive literature review by Niemeijer *et al*,¹¹ is that no ethical consensus has yet been reached, underlining the need for clear(er) policies and guidelines.

In advance of a guideline that can count on support from within the field, it is important to consult actual users and ethicists on their views on an ethically sound and responsible application of ST.

The main aim of this article is therefore to explore how ST is viewed by care professionals working in the field by investigating what the ideal application of ST in the residential care for people with dementia might entail.

METHODS

Concept mapping

Use was made of the concept mapping method as developed by Trochim.¹² Concept mapping is a computer-assisted procedure that enables a divergent group of 10–20 people to elucidate a complex subject in a short amount of time. It involves a bottom-up procedure which consists of five steps: brainstorming, prioritising, clustering, processing by the computer and analysis. This procedure directs participants from concrete statements to more abstract concepts, thereby conveying both different and correlative aspects of a given subject. The use of concept mapping for the identification of groups of related statements and specifying the nature of their interrelationship within a nominated topic area is well established and has been applied to a range of subjects.^{13–15} In the Netherlands, concept mapping has been used to bring into focus aspects of coping with illness¹⁶ and small-scale nursing home care.¹⁷

Participants

The researchers invited two categories of experts: professional carers (n=9) and academics (n=6). The aim was to hear from a group of direct users of ST

Research ethics

(ie, the professional carers) what their views are on working with these technologies, and from a group of academics more familiar with the ethical aspects that can arise with the application of ST. This bottom-up arrangement with a large group of carers and a smaller group of academic thinkers was intentional as it was thought necessary to provide a counterweight towards the more vocal group of academic thinkers. They were approached through consultation conferences and via the Academic Workplace for Nursing Home Medicine (Universitair Netwerk Ouderenzorg, UNO) affiliated with the VU University Medical Center in Amsterdam. The final 15 participants comprised two elderly care physicians, two psychologists, two ethicists, three registered nurses and six certified nurse assistants.

Procedure

The concept mapping session took place under the supervision of an independent chair from the Trimbos Institute who is specialised in working with the concept mapping method. The following procedure was used.

Step 1 (brainstorming) entailed the participants being requested to make statements in response to the following sentence: 'The ideal application of ST in the (residential) care for people with dementia would entail that ...'. Participants could make statements freely. They were not allowed to engage in any discussion unless the statements needed to be clarified. All the statements were then dealt out in sets of cards to all participants.

Step 2 (prioritising) consisted of arranging all the statements in order of importance. This had to be carried out individually. The statements had to be divided evenly into five categories, ranging from the least important (1) to the most important (5), thus preventing all statements from being valued as equally important. Through the separate cards, participants could make small piles for each category.

For step 3 (clustering), the participants were asked to cluster the statements that, in their view, were compatible with regard to content. This again had to be carried out individually. All the statements had to be categorised and a statement could only be used once; however, participants were allowed to create as many numbers of clusters as they wished.

This is where the participants' active involvement ended and where the researchers continued steps 4 and 5. During step 4 (processing) a special computer program combined all the individual arrangements of steps 2 and 3 into a 'group product'. The results of this group product have the shape of a so-called 'concept map' which is delineated through a multidimensional scaling technique. Through hierarchal cluster analysis, statements

were joined together in clusters of interrelatedness which were in close proximity to each other on the land map. The choice of the number of clusters was determined by the researchers and the independent chair.

The value of each cluster was subsequently calculated on the basis of the average score of the priorities (step 2) allocated by the participants to each statement of the cluster. This is expressed on the land map by the differences in height between the clusters.

In step 5 (interpretation) the land map was interpreted by the researchers in a separate research meeting. Each cluster was named and the axes were given a significance (see figure 1).

RESULTS

Brainstorming and prioritising

The focus sentence "The ideal application of ST in the (residential) care for people with dementia would entail that ..." was completed 63 times (see appendix 1). The 10 statements that were given the highest priority are listed in table 1. These statements all bear relation to the effects on the resident, whereas other aspects such as the functioning of the system, the role of the family or the effects on the personnel were given lower priority.

Analysis of clusters

Based on the sorting of the 63 statements, the following six clusters were created in step 4 of the concept map procedure (in order of priority):

Cluster 1: Balance between freedom and security (3.9)

Although this cluster is the most important, it contains only two statements where the emphasis is on the importance of ST in the struggle against freedom restrictions. The ideal application implies that it should give people with dementia more individual freedom without risking their safety. Consequently, the statement that puts forward the notion that the ideal application of ST would entail there being a right balance between freedom and individual security has been chosen as the name of this cluster.

Cluster 2: Beneficial and tailored to the individual resident (3.7)

This cluster consists of 23 statements, of which the first 10 can all be found in the list of most important statements (table 1). The statements in this cluster appear to bear most relation to the fact that ST should be beneficial and suited to the individual

Figure 1 Concept map: the ideal application of surveillance technology in residential care for people with dementia.




Table 1 The 10 most important statements of the concept mapping session

Mean item preferences (sorted) Item	(Mean; SD)
1. It supports good care on an individual level	(4.57; 0.53)
2. It contributes to the experience of freedom of those concerned	(4.43; 0.67)
3. It is interwoven with the individual needs of the resident	(4.36; 0.66)
4. It increases residents' freedom of movement	(4.36; 0.66)
5. The care demand/care need is the basis of its use (problem analysis)	(4.29; 1.35)
6. Self-independence is supported	(4.21; 1.31)
7. The individual application is starting point	(4.21; 0.88)
8. It suits the individual living environment of the residents	(4.07; 1.35)
9. It is not a replacement for human closeness	(4.07; 2.35)
10. Residents are respected as human beings	(4.07; 1.49)

resident (who might also reject it). The basis of its use should be the individual care needed. The fact that technology should be tailored to the individual resident is signified by terms such as 'need', 'opportunities', 'individual application' or that it should link up with the individual living environment.

The term 'beneficial' should be interpreted here as including both something of benefit and something that does not harm, as several statements indicate that it should both 'improve' freedom of movement/safety/social contacts and 'guarantee' or 'respect' autonomy/privacy/self-determination or bodily integrity.

Cluster 3: Clearly defined practical procedures (3.1)

This cluster has only one statement which states that the ideal application of ST would entail procedures being clearly defined for personnel who have to use it. The term 'practical' could be seen here as something that can give concrete instruction and guidance to staff rather than remain somewhat elusive.

Cluster 4: Competent and caring personnel (2.9)

This cluster consists of nine statements and all are about personnel, particularly their competence with regard to using ST. This is clearly reflected in the statements 'personnel are competent', 'personnel are sufficiently equipped' and 'personnel are continuously schooled'. However, other statements are also about finding the right balance between the use of technology and care for the residents—that is, the use of ST should not come at the cost of less care. Accordingly, the most important statement asserts that the ideal application of ST would entail that 'it does not result in a reduction of staff'. However, the statement that 'carers should have affinity with the residents' also suggests that good care should be one of the primary conditions in the application of ST.

Cluster 5: Actively monitored application (2.8)

This cluster contains 17 statements and these are predominantly about the system. On the one hand, the statements concern the reliability of the system itself as the most important statement in this cluster declares that the ideal application of ST would entail that 'the system works, is 99.9% reliable'. On the other hand, the majority of the statements are mainly about handling the system in a conscious way and, in particular, that the system is applied in a monitored manner (eg, through evaluation), so it is the caregiver who masters the system rather than the other way round. Terms expressed which signify reliable and actively monitored application are: 'evaluated', 'deliberation and decision-making', 'has been thought through well', 'adequate emergency plan', 'part of the care plan' and 'attention to attuning'.

Cluster 6: Clearly defined normative guidance (2.6)

This cluster has 11 statements with an emphasis on the need for normative guidance. Most statements in this cluster indicate this need, as they either are about rethinking or questioning certain laws and policies, or about what should be registered and what should not. However, the most important statement in this cluster—which states that the individual rights and privacy of the resident are not invaded—is also an expression of the need for normative guidance.

Interpretation

Figure 1 (in combination with appendix 1) shows on the left side of the x-axis the conditions to which the ideal application of ST should adhere in order to achieve the goals stated on the right side of the x-axis. These goals are primarily those that bear a relation to the effects on the individual resident. Under the y-axis are statements that should be interpreted at a societal level. Similarly, above the y-axis are statements made with regard to care within the nursing home. The y-axis thus represents the continuum between the nursing home (ie, internal) and society (ie, external) while the x-axis represents the continuum between conditions and goals.

Looking at their position on the map, each distinct cluster corresponds most thematically to the cluster which is in closest proximity. Accordingly, clusters 1 and 2 both appear to be about the (potential) effects of ST on the resident. Clusters 3 and 4 are similar in that they are both about the conditions for personnel to work with ST. Clusters 5 (its application is reliable and monitored) and 6 (it is rightly positioned within law and policy) also appear to share a mutual theme—namely, that both ST and its related policies are regularly examined.

Although in theory a combination of both dimensions would lead to four typical ways of viewing ST in an ideal way, the uneven distribution of the clusters suggests that the participants appear to think in terms of three dimensions:

1. ST should be of benefit to and respect the individual resident (clusters 1 and 2).
2. The personnel should be well instructed and well trained (clusters 3 and 4).
3. People should account for the risks of the system (clusters 5 and 6).

Difference between professional carers and academics

Of interest are the differences in prioritisation between the professional carers and academics (table 2). One of the most significant differences is how safety and freedom have been prioritised. Accordingly, two statements that are directly about resident safety have been included in the top 10 by the professional carers (numbers 7 and 8), while the academics put these statements at numbers 38 and 43, respectively. The experience of freedom, however, is listed as the number one statement for the academics while the professional carers put this statement at number 11 (see appendix 2).

DISCUSSION

This study shows that the ideal application of ST in the residential care of people with dementia would entail that:

1. It provides a right balance between freedom and security.
2. It is beneficial and tailored to the individual resident.
3. There are clearly defined practical procedures.
4. It is used by competent and caring personnel.
5. It is actively monitored.
6. There is clear normative guidance.

Research ethics

Table 2 The 10 most important statements of the groups of professional carers and academics

Mean item preferences (sorted)		Mean item preferences (sorted)	
Item		Item	
Professional carers	(Mean; SD)	Academics	(Mean; SD)
1. It is interwoven with the individual needs of the resident	(4.88; 0.11)	It contributes to the experience of freedom of those concerned	(4.67; 0.22)
2. Residents are respected as human beings	(4.75; 0.19)	It supports good care on an individual level	(4.50; 0.58)
3. Self-independence is supported	(4.63; 0.48)	The individual application is starting point	(4.33; 1.22)
4. It supports good care on an individual level	(4.63; 0.48)	It increases residents' freedom of movement	(4.33; 0.89)
5. It suits the individual living environment of the residents	(4.38; 0.73)	The resident can say 'no thank you'	(4.20; 0.56)
6. It increases the autonomy	(4.38; 0.73)	It is not a replacement for human closeness	(4.17; 1.47)
7. Guarantees the safety of the resident	(4.38; 0.73)	People are aware that being able to monitor does not lead to monitoring	(4.17; 0.47)
8. It increases the safety of the resident	(4.38; 0.98)	The care demand/care need is the basis of its use (problem analysis)	(4.17; 2.14)
9. The care demand/care need is the basis of its use (problem analysis)	(4.38; 0.73)	People will not walk into closed doors	(4.00; 1.00)
10. It increases residents' freedom of movement	(4.38; 0.48)	It is regularly evaluated	(4.00; 0.33)

Consequently, these clusters reflect the following three dimensions:

1. It should be of benefit to and respect the individual resident (clusters 1 and 2).
2. The personnel should be well instructed and well trained (clusters 3 and 4).
3. People should account for the risks of the system (clusters 5 and 6).

In other words, ST should not be implemented unless the end users are well trained and truly understand how these technologies work, which also includes being aware of the fact that all technology can be fallible. What is more, it should be clear who is responsible when it does go wrong and there should be a clear benefit for the resident when using these technologies, thereby being fundamentally responsive to the interests of each individual resident.

The most important statement 'it supports good care on an individual level' shows that ST is not something that should be applied collectively—for example, 'equip every room with a sensor and, while it is there, we might as well turn it on'. Rather, technology should be suited and catered to each individual, with his or her specific needs. This view is corroborated by the ethical literature where it is often stated that technology should be person-centred.^{11 18}

With regard to the valuation of these six clusters, there appears to be a discrepancy between the high valuation and elaboration of certain clusters. In other words, the items valued as the most important have hardly been explained by participants. For instance, despite the fact that finding the right balance between freedom and security (cluster 1) is considered the most important aspect in the application of ST, the cluster only contains two statements, which means that participants have elaborated only minimally on this very important theme as far as they are concerned. This is also the case with privacy. Even though (respect for) privacy is always named as a key consideration when it comes to using ST,^{7 11} in this concept mapping it has only been mentioned once. Similarly, with regard to cluster 3, in stating that (pragmatic) procedures are desirable, participants have again hardly elaborated on what these procedures should entail apart from the fact that they should be clearly defined. It appears that it is very difficult for participants to explain what a certain concept such as balancing freedom means, let alone which procedures should follow suit.

What are the reasons for this? It could be that the concept mapping method might not be the ideal method for expansion and might furthermore be susceptible to a certain form of social desirability response bias. What is more, part of the technology

that was discussed is still in the experimental (ie, theoretical) phase and has not yet been applied fully, thereby making it hard for the study participants to expound.

Another explanation might be that the several ethical concepts to which participants refer are very difficult to delineate, especially when it comes to applying them to the context of a person with dementia. A central question then arises—namely, to what extent do concepts such as autonomy, privacy and freedom retain any practical value, particularly if these ethical concepts are never clearly defined?

If we take into account the differences in prioritisation between the two groups of participants, the emphasis by the professional carer group appears to lie on safety and that of the academic group on freedom. This would suggest that people who are more involved directly with the care of residents (ie, professional carers) are inherently more concerned about the safety of residents than those who are involved from a distance (ie, the academics). In other words, how much does the ideology of using technology in an ethically viable way (more freedom and/or autonomy) differ from what carers actually want? Landau *et al*¹⁹ found that caregivers' views on the use of tracking technology change according to the locus of responsibility for the safety of people with dementia. Caregivers gave preference to patient safety more than autonomy when they were responsible for the patients. However, when the patients were under the responsibility of other caregivers, they gave preference to autonomy.¹⁹

Consequently, our findings suggest a duality similar to Landau's findings as both providing more safety and freedom are rated highly. With regard to ST in dementia care, the safety versus freedom dichotomy has often been presented as an ethical dilemma whereby safeguarding residents through the use of technology is perceived as an encroachment on the freedom of the resident. However, this approach appears to focus solely on what the consequences of technology would be on freedom as a form of negative freedom—that is, the absence of (extraneous) interference or meddling. This proves to be a difficult concept for carers because 'care' as an activity consists inexorably as the opposite of 'forbearance' and in fact always contains an element of meddling.²⁰ It could be for this reason that finding the right balance between freedom and security is seen as the top priority by all the participants. However, as cluster 3 ranks higher than cluster 6, it would appear that the need is greater for practical solutions in the form of concrete procedures rather than the more theoretical (and abstract) normative guidance.

Our study has some limitations. As has been mentioned previously, there was a difference in the number of participants

between the professional carers and academics (n=9 and n=6, respectively). This not only influenced the overall average prioritisation—which will always be skewed towards the average prioritisation of the larger group—but also influenced the differences in prioritisation between the groups. This bottom-up dichotomy with a larger group of carers versus a smaller group of academic thinkers was chosen because it was thought necessary to provide a counterweight towards the group of (presumably more vocal) academic thinkers, and also to avoid the swaying of opinion through reverence towards the academics.²¹ In addition, all individual participants were placed with each other, which might have influenced the statements as participants will automatically tend to react to each other. We could have opted to separate all participants, asking them to finish the focus sentence on their own. However, this would have been too time-consuming and might also have generated either too similar or too few results.

Reliability at each stage of the process is also a concern. Consequently, we view concept mapping primarily as an exploratory method which can provide a starting point to explore a topic in more detail and as a tool to assist in research, planning and evaluation.¹² As De Ridder *et al*¹⁶ have stated, concept mapping is a method which can provide relevant insights but should ideally be corroborated by similar results available from other studies. In view of this, it should be noted that we did find very similar results with regard to categorisation and prioritisation in an additional concept mapping session we conducted for the care of people with intellectual disabilities (article in preparation).

In conclusion, it is our opinion that, despite these limitations, this study provides useful insights into creating the ideal conditions when applying ST to the care of people with dementia. With regard to the views on using technology, there appears to be an inherent duality rooted in the moral conflict between safety and freedom. What is more, elaboration of this ethical issue has proved to be very difficult. In our opinion this does not mean that these ethical concepts have become ineffectual and/or obsolete in dementia care; certainly, respect for autonomy, for instance, has often been invoked rightly as a safeguard against threats of paternalism.

However, a different approach to specific ethical concepts—including, for instance, a more positive account of freedom—would be advisable. While the concept of negative freedom refers to what healthcare professionals have to forbear in order to respect the autonomy of the care recipient (the freedom of ...), the concept of positive freedom is more linked to what they have to do to facilitate and support care recipients in their possibilities and remaining capabilities (the freedom to ...).²⁰ As the specific reality of care relationships is characterised by asymmetry, vulnerability and dependency, it might be more helpful in the case of people with dementia to allow a degree of what Agich calls 'parentalism': 'Parentalism has its roots in a phenomenon essential to being a human person—namely, that a human person does not spring into being fully formed as an independent agent but develops through psychosocial relations with human parents. Parentalism signals the essential interconnectedness of all human persons and is rooted in the basic response to the needy other that such relationships engender'.²² Ultimately, a further delineation of

ethical concepts is desirable, where safety and freedom are not viewed as antagonists but are unified in a positive account of freedom where safety can be ensured.

As the views of people with dementia (whom the use of ST will most affect) and of family caregivers and cognitively intact elderly were not included in this study, we recommend further ethical and empirical research specifically focused on these perspectives.

Acknowledgements The authors thank Ineke Kok and Kathy Oskam from the Trimbos Institute for their technical advice and support regarding the Concept Mapping method. Ineke Kok also chaired the concept mapping session.

Funding This study was funded by ActiZ, Nuts Ohra, RVVZ, 'Stichting Dioraphte', 'Stichting Regionale Zorgverlening Zeeland', 'Vereniging Gehandicaptenzorg Nederland' and 'Vereniging Het Zonnehuis'.

Competing interests None.

Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

REFERENCES

1. **Agree EM**, Freedman VA, Cornman JC, *et al*. Reconsidering substitution in long-term care: when does assistive technology take the place of personal care? *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci* 2005;**60**:272–80.
2. **Astell AJ**. Technology and personhood in dementia care. *Qual Ageing* 2006;**7**:15–25.
3. **Cahill S**. Electronic tagging of people with dementia: technologies may be enabling. *BMJ* 2003;**326**:282.
4. **O'Neill DJ**. Tagging should be reserved for babies, convicted criminals, and animals. *BMJ* 2003;**326**:281.
5. **Cassidy J**. Electronic tag plan attacks civil rights. *Nurs Times* 1994;**90**:5.
6. **Penhale B**, Manthorpe J. Using electronic aids to assist people with dementia. *Nursing and Residential Care* 2001;**3**:586–9.
7. **Welsh S**, Hassiotis A, O'Mahoney G, *et al*. Big brother is watching you—the ethical implications of electronic surveillance measures in the elderly with dementia and in adults with learning difficulties. *Ageing Ment Health* 2003;**7**:372–5.
8. **Hughes JC**, Newby J, Louw SJ, *et al*. Ethical issues and tagging in dementia: a survey. *J Ethics Ment Health* 2008;**3**:1–6.
9. **Hughes JC**, Louw SJ. Electronic tagging of people with dementia who wander: ethical considerations are possibly more important than practical benefits. *BMJ* 2003;**325**:847–8.
10. **Bail KD**. Electronic tagging of people with dementia: devices may be preferable to locked doors. *BMJ* 2003;**326**:281.
11. **Niemeijer AR**, Frederiks BJ, Riphagen II, *et al*. Ethical and practical concerns of surveillance technologies in residential care for people with dementia or intellectual disabilities: an overview of the literature. *Int Psychogeriatr* 2010;**22**:1129–42.
12. **Trochim WMK**. An introduction to concept mapping for planning and evaluation. *Eval Program Plann* 1989;**12**:1–16.
13. **Johnsen JA**, Biegel DE, Shafran R. Concept mapping in mental health: uses and adaptations. *Eval Program Plann* 2000;**23**:67–75.
14. **Markham KM**, Mintzes JJ, Jones GM. The concept map as a research and evaluation tool: further evidence of validity. *J Res Sci Teach* 1994;**31**:91–101.
15. **Trochim WMK**. Reliability of concept mapping. *Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Evaluation Association*, Dallas, Texas, 1993.
16. **De Ridder D**, Depla M, Severens P, *et al*. Beliefs on coping with illness: a consumer's perspective. *Soc Sci Med* 1997;**44**:553–9.
17. **Te Boekhorst S**, Depla M, De Lange J, *et al*. Kleinschalig wonen voor ouderen met dementia: een begripsverheldering. *Tijdschr Gerontol Geriatr* 2007;**38**:15–23.
18. **Plastow NA**. Is big brother watching you? Responding to tagging and tracking in dementia care. *Br J Occup Ther* 2006;**69**:525–7.
19. **Landau R**, Auslander GK, Werner S, *et al*. Families' and professional caregivers' views of using advanced technology to track people with dementia. *Qual Health Res* 2010;**20**:409.
20. **Hertogh CMPM**. Towards a more adequate moral framework: elements of an 'ethic of care' in nursing home care for people with dementia. In: Burns A, ed. *Standards in dementia care — European Dementia Consensus Network (EDCON)*. London/New York: Taylor & Francis, 2005:371–8.
21. **Ellis RB**, Gates RJ, Kenworthy N. *Interpersonal Communication in Nursing: Theory and Practice*. London: Churchill Livingstone, 2006.
22. **Agich GJ**. *Dependence and Autonomy in Old Age: An Ethical Framework for Long Term Care*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Research ethics

APPENDIX 1

Clusters with corresponding statements

Cluster 1. It provides a right balance between freedom and security (3.9)

No.	Mean	SD	Item
47	3.93	1.21	It provides a right balance between security and individual freedom
45	3.86	1.55	It reduces freedom restrictions
Mean: 3.89			

Cluster 2. It is beneficial and tailored to the individual resident

No.	Mean	SD	Item
6	4.57	0.53	It supports good care on an individual level
2	4.43	0.67	It contributes to the experience of freedom of those concerned
8	4.36	0.66	It is interwoven with the individual needs of the resident
44	4.36	0.66	It increases residents' freedom of movement
28	4.29	1.35	The care demand/care need is the basis of its use (problem analysis)
4	4.21	1.31	Self-independence is supported
26	4.21	0.88	The individual application is starting point
1	4.07	1.35	It suits the individual living environment of the residents
5	4.07	2.35	It is not a replacement for human closeness
60	4.07	1.49	Residents are respected as human beings
3	3.93	1.64	It increases the autonomy of the resident
33	3.92	1.46	The resident can say 'no thank you'
24	3.86	1.12	Someone can use the toilet in private
9	3.71	1.49	It guarantees the safety of the resident
10	3.64	1.66	It increases the safety of the resident
59	3.57	1.82	The bodily integrity of the resident is respected
36	3.36	1.52	It increases the possibilities of daytime activities
7	3.14	1.41	People will not walk into closed doors
13	3.14	2.41	The resident has agreed to it (in agreement with the resident)
35	2.93	2.64	It improves or increases the social contacts of the resident
61	2.86	1.12	The ability to live under all circumstances until the resident dies is guaranteed
52	2.79	1.60	It reduces resistance of the client to taking up residence
11	2.43	0.67	That the client does not notice that it is present (it is natural)
Mean: 3.73			

Cluster 3. There are clearly defined practical procedures (3.14)

No.	Mean	SD	Item
22	3.14	0.84	Procedures are clearly defined for personnel who have to use them
Mean: 3.14			

Cluster 4. It is used by competent and caring personnel (2.95)

No.	Mean	SD	Item
30	3.57	2.53	It does not result in a reduction of staff
32	3.43	1.24	The carer maintains a good balance between individual care and surveillance technology
20	3.21	1.17	Personnel are competent
17	3.14	1.12	Personnel are sufficiently equipped
18	2.86	1.12	Personnel are properly instructed
19	2.64	0.80	Personnel are able to explain it well to the resident
38	2.64	2.52	Carers have affinity with the residents
46	2.64	0.66	Personnel are continuously schooled
37	2.43	2.10	Carers have affinity with surveillance technology
Mean: 2.95			

Cluster 5. It is actively monitored (2.78)

No.	Mean	SD	Item
39	3.71	0.92	The system works, is 99.9% reliable
25	3.64	1.09	People are aware that being able to monitor does not lead to monitoring
12	3.62	1.16	We have thought carefully in advance about what we wish to achieve
40	3.43	1.53	The system works as intended
14	3.36	1.94	It is part of the individual care plan
23	3.36	1.66	We (people) are fully aware that it is only used for what was originally intended (and not: it exists and therefore it should be used)
27	3.21	1.45	It is regularly evaluated
29	3.14	1.27	Deliberation and decision-making takes place in multidisciplinary care planning
21	2.79	1.31	There is special attention to the attuning of care and technology
41	2.79	1.60	There is an adequate emergency plan
51	2.79	1.17	The relatives have been well informed of the possibilities of surveillance technology
31	2.14	1.55	It is clear who is responsible for the system
42	2.00	1.29	The technology is understood by the residents
49	2.00	1.29	That relatives /friends can enter as well
58	2.00	1.29	The system is not obtrusive
50	1.93	1.21	Relatives would not feel monitored or spied on when visiting
48	1.50	1.25	You can use and adapt it to your home situation
Mean: 2.78			

Cluster 6. There is clear normative guidance (2.60)

Nr	Mean	SD	Item
16	3.86	1.98	The individual rights and privacy of the resident are not invaded
15	3.07	2.07	An integral vision of care is the basis
55	3.07	1.92	There is clarity about listening in and the impact of this
43	2.64	1.66	It is part of the Special Admission to Psychiatric Hospitals Act (BOPZ)

Continued

Continued

Nr	Mean	SD	Item
57	2.64	1.66	Close consideration is given to a new definition of freedom restriction
63	2.57	0.67	It invokes once more careful consideration of the desirability of certain rules and regulations
56	2.50	2.39	It protects the legal security of the client
62	2.43	0.96	The question of what should be monitored and what not (by sensors) can be answered
34	2.29	1.35	There is evidence of proper registration of enforcement at all levels
53	1.93	1.21	Work is being done on an adaptation of the regulations
54	1.64	1.23	Close consideration is given to whether the Dutch Data Protection Act (WBP) can be of use
Mean: 2.60			

APPENDIX 2

Difference prioritisation professional carers versus prioritisation academics

No.	Mean	SD	Item
Mean item preferences (sorted): professional carers			
8	4.36	0.66	It is interwoven with the individual needs of the resident
60	4.07	1.49	Residents are respected as human beings
4	4.21	1.31	Self-independence is supported
6	4.57	0.53	It supports good care on an individual level
1	4.07	1.35	It suits the individual living environment of the residents
3	3.93	1.64	It increases the autonomy of the resident
9	3.71	1.49	It guarantees the safety of the resident
10	3.64	1.66	It increases the safety of the resident
28	4.29	1.35	The care demand/care need is the basis of its use (problem analysis)
44	4.36	0.66	It increases residents' freedom of movement
2	4.43	0.67	It contributes to the experience of freedom of those concerned
39	3.71	0.92	The system works, is 99.9% reliable
45	3.86	1.55	It reduces freedom restrictions
47	3.93	1.21	It provides a right balance between security and individual freedom
16	3.86	1.98	The individual rights and privacy of the resident are not invaded
26	4.21	0.88	The individual application is starting point
5	4.07	2.35	It is not a replacement for human closeness
24	3.86	1.12	Someone can use the toilet in private
59	3.57	1.82	The bodily integrity of the resident is respected
33	3.92	1.46	The resident can say 'no thank you'
12	3.62	1.16	We have thought carefully in advance about what we wish to achieve
20	3.21	1.17	Personnel are competent
32	3.43	1.24	The carer maintains a good balance between individual care and surveillance technology
22	3.14	0.84	Procedures are clearly defined for personnel who have to use it
23	3.36	1.66	We (people) are fully aware that it is only used for what was originally intended (and not: it exists and therefore it should be used)

Continued

No.	Mean	SD	Item
40	3.43	1.53	The system works as intended
17	3.14	1.12	Personnel are sufficiently equipped
18	2.86	1.12	Personnel are properly instructed
30	3.57	2.53	It does not result in a reduction of staff
25	3.64	1.09	People are aware that being able to monitor does not lead to monitoring
13	3.14	2.41	The resident has agreed to it (in agreement with the resident)
15	3.07	2.07	An integral vision of care is the basis
14	3.36	1.94	It is part of the individual care plan
41	2.79	1.60	There is an adequate emergency plan
43	2.64	1.66	It is part of the Special Admission to Psychiatric Hospitals Act (BOPZ)
51	2.79	1.17	The relatives have been well informed of the possibilities of surveillance technology
55	3.07	1.92	There is clarity about listening in and the impact of this
36	3.36	1.52	It increases the possibilities of daytime activities
38	2.64	2.52	Carers have affinity with the residents
19	2.64	0.80	Personnel are able to explain it well to the resident
29	3.14	1.27	Deliberation and decision-making takes place in multidisciplinary care planning
52	2.79	1.60	It reduces resistance of the client to taking up residence
21	2.79	1.31	There is special attention to the attuning of care and technology
27	3.21	1.45	It is regularly evaluated
46	2.64	0.66	Personnel are continuously schooled
7	3.14	1.41	People will not walk into closed doors
35	2.93	2.64	It improves or increases the social contacts of the resident
57	2.64	1.66	Close consideration is given to a new definition of freedom restriction
61	2.86	1.12	The ability to live under all circumstances until the resident dies is guaranteed
11	2.43	0.67	The client does not notice that it is present (it is natural)
56	2.50	2.39	It protects the legal security of the client
37	2.43	2.10	Carers have affinity with surveillance technology
63	2.57	0.67	It invokes once more careful consideration of the desirability of certain rules and regulations
31	2.14	1.55	It is clear who is responsible for the system
34	2.29	1.35	There is evidence of proper registration of enforcement at all levels
62	2.43	0.96	The question of what should be monitored and what not (by sensors) can be answered
49	2.00	1.29	That relatives/friends can enter as well
53	1.93	1.21	Work is being done on an adaptation of the regulations
58	2.00	1.29	The system is not obtrusive
42	2.00	1.29	The technology is understood by the residents
50	1.93	1.21	Relatives would not feel monitored or spied on when visiting
54	1.64	1.23	Close consideration is given to whether the Dutch Data Protection Act (WBP) can be of use
48	1.50	1.25	You can use and adapt it to your home situation
Mean item preferences (sorted): academics			
2	4.43	0.67	It contributes to the experience of freedom of those concerned

Continued

Research ethics

Continued				Continued			
No.	Mean	SD	Item	No.	Mean	SD	Item
6	4.57	0.53	It supports good care on an individual level	15	3.07	2.07	An integral vision of care is the basis
26	4.21	0.88	The individual application is starting point	21	2.79	1.31	There is special attention to the attuning of care and technology
44	4.36	0.66	It increases residents' freedom of movement	39	3.71	0.92	The system works, is 99.9% reliable
33	3.92	1.46	The resident can say 'no thank you'	59	3.57	1.82	The bodily integrity of the resident is respected
5	4.07	2.35	It is not a replacement for human closeness	63	2.57	0.67	It invokes once more careful consideration of the desirability of certain rules and regulations
25	3.64	1.09	People are aware that being able to monitor does not lead to monitoring	9	3.71	1.49	It guarantees the safety of the resident
28	4.29	1.35	The care demand/care need is the basis of its use (problem analysis)	17	3.14	1.12	Personnel are sufficiently equipped
7	3.14	1.41	People will not walk into closed doors	34	2.29	1.35	There is evidence of proper registration of enforcement at all levels
27	3.21	1.45	It is regularly evaluated	52	2.79	1.60	It reduces resistance of the client taking up residence
36	3.36	1.52	It increases the possibilities of daytime activities	57	2.64	1.66	Close consideration is given to a new definition of freedom restriction
14	3.36	1.94	It is part of the individual care plan	10	3.64	1.66	It increases the safety of the resident
30	3.57	2.53	It does not result in a reduction of staff	20	3.21	1.17	Personnel are competent
1	4.07	1.35	It suits the individual living environment of the residents	22	3.14	0.84	Procedures are clearly defined for personnel who have to use it
4	4.21	1.31	Self-independence is supported	37	2.43	2.10	Carers have affinity with surveillance technology
8	4.36	0.66	It is interwoven with the individual needs of the resident	46	2.64	0.66	Personnel are continuously schooled
24	3.86	1.12	Someone can use the toilet in private	56	2.50	2.39	It protects the legal security of the client
29	3.14	1.27	Deliberation and decision-making takes place in multidisciplinary care planning	11	2.43	0.67	The resident does not notice that it is present (it is natural)
12	3.62	1.16	We have thought carefully in advance about what we wish to achieve	19	2.64	0.80	Personnel are able to explain it well to the resident
16	3.86	1.98	The individual rights and privacy of the resident are not invaded	41	2.79	1.60	There is an adequate emergency plan
35	2.93	2.64	It improves or increases the social contacts of the resident	42	2.00	1.29	The technology is understood by the residents
47	3.93	1.21	It provides a right balance between security and individual freedom	50	1.93	1.21	Relatives would not feel monitored or spied on when visiting
3	3.93	1.64	It increases the autonomy of the resident	51	2.79	1.17	The relatives have been well informed of the possibilities of surveillance technology
40	3.43	1.53	The system works as intended	31	2.14	1.55	It is clear who is responsible for the system
45	3.86	1.55	It reduces freedom restrictions	38	2.64	2.52	Carers have affinity with the residents
61	2.86	1.12	The ability to live under all circumstances until the resident dies is guaranteed	49	2.00	1.29	That relatives/friends can enter as well
13	3.14	2.41	The resident has agreed to it (in agreement with the resident)	58	2.00	1.29	The system is not obtrusive
23	3.36	1.66	We (people) are fully aware that it is only used for what was originally intended (and not: it exists and therefore it should be used)	18	2.86	1.12	Personnel are properly instructed
32	3.43	1.24	The carer maintains a good balance between individual care and surveillance technology	43	2.64	1.66	It is part of the Special Admission to Psychiatric Hospitals Act (BOPZ)
55	3.07	1.92	There is clarity about listening in and the impact of this	48	1.50	1.25	You can use and adapt it to your home situation
60	4.07	1.49	Residents are respected as human beings	53	1.93	1.21	Work is being done on an adaptation of the regulations
62	2.43	0.96	The question of what should be monitored and what not (by sensors) can be answered	54	1.64	1.23	Close consideration is given to whether the Dutch Data Protection Act (WBP) can be of use

Continued



The ideal application of surveillance technology in residential care for people with dementia

Alistair R Niemeijer, Brenda J M Frederiks, Marja F I A Depla, et al.

J Med Ethics 2011 37: 303-310 originally published online February 2, 2011

doi: 10.1136/jme.2010.040774

Updated information and services can be found at:

<http://jme.bmj.com/content/37/5/303.full.html>

These include:

References

This article cites 18 articles, 3 of which can be accessed free at:

<http://jme.bmj.com/content/37/5/303.full.html#ref-list-1>

Email alerting service

Receive free email alerts when new articles cite this article. Sign up in the box at the top right corner of the online article.

Topic Collections

Articles on similar topics can be found in the following collections

[Psychology and medicine](#) (165 articles)

Notes

To request permissions go to:

<http://group.bmj.com/group/rights-licensing/permissions>

To order reprints go to:

<http://journals.bmj.com/cgi/reprintform>

To subscribe to BMJ go to:

<http://group.bmj.com/subscribe/>