

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**Delirium in the older adult: A critical gerontological
approach**

A thesis presented in fulfilment of requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
in
Nursing

at Massey University, Palmerston North,
New Zealand

Stephen John Neville

2005

Abstract

The purpose of this thesis has been to explore the discursive production of delirium in people over the age of 65 years. The philosophical approaches underpinning the study were derived from the field of critical gerontology, postmodernism and the utilisation of a Foucauldian understanding of discourse and power/knowledge. Data sources included published documents on delirium, interviews with people over the age of 65 years who had been delirious (as well as their clinical notes), family members, registered nurses and a doctor.

Textual analysis revealed the presence of two contesting and contradictory discourses that impacted on being an older person who had delirium. These were identified as the discourse of delirium as a syndrome and a personal discourse of delirium. The discourse of delirium as a syndrome is underpinned by the biomedicalisation of the ageing process. This process utilises scientific methods as the foundation from which to understand, research and provide a health service to older people with delirium. Any personal perspectives on delirium are rendered unimportant and relegated to marginalised positions. Nursing through its vicarious relationship to medicine is interpellated into deploying the discourse of delirium as a syndrome and has largely ignored the personal dimensions associated with this phenomenon. Consequently, the older delirious 'body' is known and inscribed as unruly, problematic, physically unwell, cognitively impaired and at risk.

Conversely, a personal discourse of delirium privileges the individual narratives of people who have been delirious and provides a different perspective of delirium. The deployment of a personal discourse of delirium offers another position that views this group of older people as bringing to the health care setting a rich tapestry of life experiences that are more than a cluster of signs and symptoms. It is these varied life experiences that need to be included as a legitimate source of knowledge about delirium. This thesis demonstrates how nursing needs to espouse a critical gerontological position when working with older people who have delirium. Critical gerontology provides nurses with the theoretical tools to challenge the status quo and uncover the multiple, varied, contradictory and complex representations of delirium in older people.

Acknowledgments

This thesis is the culmination of several years work and signifies the closing of one door, while simultaneously celebrating the opening of many more. During my time as a doctoral student I have learnt a tremendous amount not only about the research process but also about myself. The route to completion has been a creative, absorbing and challenging journey.

In the process of completing this piece of work I have come into contact with many people who have influenced both my personal and professional life. It is these people who I would like to acknowledge and thank. Firstly, my sincerest thanks go out to every older person and their family members who so generously shared quite personal and at times painful aspects of their lives with me. I valued the time, willingness and energy each person contributed as we explored the different and at times differing experiences of being delirious.

Thank you to each my three supervisors, Professor Jenny Carryer, Professor Julie Boddy and Dr Sally Keeling. I have appreciated your patience, knowledge and expertise in successfully challenging me through the process of completing doctoral work. Jenny over the years you have not only been my supervisor, but also my friend and an inspirational mentor, who has always believed in my ability, and as a result has shaped the development of my career. I am eternally grateful. Julie, your skill in being able to critically overview and provide timely feedback on my work in the latter stages has been much appreciated and valued. Sally, your anthropological and social gerontological focus has forever influenced my thinking, writing and practice as a nurse. Each of you have been honest, supportive and have always tactfully guided me in the right direction which I have appreciated.

I would like to express my gratitude and appreciation to my previous and current employers, Christchurch Polytechnic Institute of Technology and Massey University at Albany. I have appreciated the institutional support given to me in the form of payment of fees, operational grants, library resources, computer

support and time to undertake my doctoral journey. Finally, I wish to acknowledge and thank my professional colleagues, family and friends. Each of you has contributed to the completion of thesis in a variety of ways, from intellectual challenge and critique, to just being there for me. Thank you all for being understanding about my preoccupation with this project.

Stephen Neville,

September 2005.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Abstract | i |
| Acknowledgements | ii |
| Table of Contents | iv |
| Chapter One Introduction – framing the study | 1 |
| 1.1 Overview of the chapter | 1 |
| 1.2 Background to the study | 1 |
| 1.3 Outlining the field of inquiry | 6 |
| 1.4 The key focus of the arguments presented in this thesis | 9 |
| 1.5 Study aims | 11 |
| 1.6 Structure of the thesis | 11 |
| 1.7 Summary | 14 |
| Chapter Two: The philosophical location of the study | 15 |
| 2.1 Introduction | 15 |
| 2.2 Critical gerontology | 15 |
| 2.3 Modernism | 17 |
| 2.3.1 The modern subject | 19 |
| 2.3.2 Modernism, nursing and health | 20 |
| 2.4 Postmodernism | 22 |
| 2.5 Poststructuralism | 25 |
| 2.6 Foucault, discourse, power and knowledge | 27 |
| 2.6.1 Foucault | 27 |
| 2.6.2 Discourse | 28 |
| 2.6.3 Power | 30 |
| 2.6.3.1 The genealogy of knowledge as a tool of investigation | 32 |
| 2.6.3.2 Power, resistance and the body | 34 |
| 2.7 The postmodern subject | 38 |
| 2.8 The utilisation of Foucault within nursing | 40 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 2.9 The critical gerontological approach used in this study | 41 |
| 2.9.1 Critical gerontology and nursing | 43 |
| 2.10 Summary | 44 |
| Chapter Three: Research methods | 46 |
| 3.1 Introduction | 46 |
| 3.2 Reflexivity | 46 |
| 3.3 Participant selection | 47 |
| 3.4 Ethical and legal considerations | 50 |
| 3.4.1 Confidentiality | 51 |
| 3.4.2 Potential harm to participants | 52 |
| 3.4.3 Use of information | 52 |
| 3.4.4 Conflicts of interest | 52 |
| 3.5 Interviewing as a means of gathering data | 53 |
| 3.6 The process of transcription | 54 |
| 3.7 Data analysis | 55 |
| 3.7.1 First level analysis | 56 |
| 3.7.2 Second level analysis | 56 |
| 3.8 To validate or not validate | 59 |
| 3.9 Reflections on the method | 61 |
| 3.10 Summary | 63 |
| Chapter four: The emergence of delirium as a stable medical entity | 64 |
| 4.1 Introduction | 64 |
| 4.2 Biomedicalisation | 64 |
| 4.3 Creating the discursive object delirium | 67 |
| 4.4 The emergence of delirium as a stable medical entity | 70 |
| 4.5 The classification of delirium as a medical entity | 73 |
| 4.6 Problems with the DSM classification system | 75 |
| 4.7 The positioning of delirium in the DSM-IV-TR | 77 |
| 4.7.1 Diagnostic criteria | 77 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| 4.8 The creation of research agendas through the DSM | 81 |
| 4.9 Summary | 83 |
| Chapter Five: The discursive field of delirium | 85 |
| 5.1 Introduction | 85 |
| 5.2 Biomedical discourses and the discourse of delirium as a syndrome | 85 |
| 5.2.1 The positioning of delirium as an economic and clinical problem | 86 |
| 5.2.2 The discursive practices associated with the discourse of delirium as a syndrome | 91 |
| 5.3 Management of the problems associated with being delirious | 93 |
| 5.3.1 Pharmacological management | 94 |
| 5.3.2 Non-pharmacological management | 97 |
| 5.3.3 Summary of management strategies | 100 |
| 5.4 Nursing and resistance to the biomedical discourse on delirium: The emergence of a personal discourse of delirium | 101 |
| 5.4.1 Overview of the publications supporting a personal discourse of delirium | 102 |
| 5.4.2 Analysis of the nursing response | 104 |
| 5.5 Summary | 107 |
| Chapter Six: Promoting a personal discourse of delirium | 108 |
| 6.1 Introduction | 108 |
| 6.2 I was different once | 109 |
| 6.2.1 The contextualization of the older adult through clinical notes | 114 |
| 6.3 How I came to be where I am now | 116 |
| 6.4 Why contextualize a person anyway? | 121 |
| 6.5 Visual representations of people with delirium | 122 |
| 6.6 Summary | 128 |
| Chapter Seven: The ageist terrain of delirium | 129 |
| 7.1 Introduction | 129 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| 7.2 Overview of the ageist sub-discourse | 129 |
| 7.3 The subject position of a second childhood | 131 |
| 7.4 The subject position of dependency | 136 |
| 7.5 The subject position of older people have diminished value | 139 |
| 7.6 Problematising resistance to the ageist sub-discourse | 142 |
| 7.7 Summary | 148 |
| Chapter Eight: In from the margins, unmasking delirium | 149 |
| 8.1 Introduction | 149 |
| 8.2 Silencing the madness discourse | 149 |
| 8.3 A reliable mind | 155 |
| 8.4 Unmasking delirium | 162 |
| 8.5 Mad but not mad | 163 |
| 8.6 Re-masking delirium | 165 |
| 8.7 Summary | 169 |
| Chapter Nine: Repositioning nursing care | 170 |
| 9.1 Introduction | 170 |
| 9.2 The contested terrain of who is the expert | 170 |
| 9.3 The specialist nature of working with older people | 176 |
| 9.4 Appropriate and suitable staff | 180 |
| 9.5 The (mis)communication of communication | 184 |
| 9.6 The discursive practice of being labeled ‘at risk’ | 190 |
| 9.7 Summary | 194 |
| Chapter Ten: Final reflections and concluding comments | 195 |
| 10.1 Introduction | 195 |
| 10.2 Revisiting the research aims | 195 |
| 10.3 The predominant discourse influencing the discursive construction of delirium | 196 |
| 10.3.1 The discourse of delirium as a syndrome | 197 |
| 10.3.2 A personal discourse of delirium | 199 |
| 10.4 Possibilities for improving nursing practice | 200 |

