



Contents

List of figures, lists and tables *xiii*

List of practice focus boxes *xv*

Preface to the fourth edition *xvii*

Acknowledgements *xxiv*

Introduction 1

The current context of social work 1

Terminology: 'social work', 'social workers' and
'service users' 2

Terminology: 'ethics' and 'values' 4

Ethics, religion and politics 9

Rationale and aims of the book 11

The structure of the book 15

1 Ethical challenges in social work 17

Introduction 17

The ethical, the technical and the legal 18

Ethical issues, problems and dilemmas 19

What are the ethical challenges in social work? 20

Social work as a human services profession 26

Social work and state welfare systems 27

Blame and guilt in social work 30

Conclusions 34

2 Principle-based approaches to social work ethics 39

Introduction 39

The place of religious ethics 40

Principles 41

Respect and autonomy in the social work relationship:
duty-based principles 42

Promoting welfare and justice in society: utilitarian
principles 49

Commitments to emancipation and social justice: the
challenge of radical and anti-oppressive
principles 53

'Common morality' approaches to ethics 55

Conclusions 65

3 Character and relationship-based approaches to social work ethics 69

Introduction 69

The importance of character in the professional role:
virtue-based approaches 71

The caring relationship between professional and
service user: the 'ethics of care' 77

Responding to the call of the other: the ethics of
proximity 82

Diversity, narrative and constructionism: postmodern
ethics? 84

The fragmentation of value 87

Elements of professional ethics: principles, character,
care and relationships 89

Towards a situated ethics of social justice 92

Conclusions 95

4 Principles into practice: professionalism and codes of ethics 102

Introduction 102

The traditional model of professionalism and trait
theory 102

Professional codes of ethics for social work 108

The components of codes of ethics 110

The functions of codes of ethics 114

Some limitations and critiques of codes of ethics 116

Conclusions 121

- 5 Service users' rights: clienthood, citizenship, consumerism and activism 126**
 Introduction 126
 Rights as valid claims 127
 Human rights 129
 Universal versus particular and absolute versus conditional rights 132
 Relational rights and responsibilities 134
 Democratic professionalism, consumerism or radicalism? 147
 Conclusions 155
- 6 Social workers' responsibilities: policies, procedures and managerialism 159**
 Introduction 159
 Duties 160
 'Relational duties' or responsibilities 161
 Social work as a 'role-job' with specific duties 163
 Conflicting responsibilities 164
 The professional is personal: vocation and commitment in social work 166
 The professional is political: challenging injustices and 'blowing the whistle' 169
 The separation of personal, professional and agency values and life 173
 Committed/radical, professional, technical-bureaucratic and quasi-business models of practice 178
 The growth of managerialism, authoritarianism and marketization: the case of Britain 186
 Ethics in bureaucratic and quasi-business settings: defensive, reflective and reflexive practice 189
 Conclusions 191
- 7 Ethical problems and dilemmas in practice 196**
 Introduction 196
 Ethical judgements 197
 Ethical judgements in context 200

Ethical decision-making and 'ethics work' 202
Practitioners' accounts of ethical difficulties 205
Developing the reflective and reflexive practitioner:
case examples from trainee social workers 207
When is blame and guilt justified? Case examples
from experienced practitioners 218
Courage and commitment in multiprofessional
working: a team manager's case 228
Conclusions 236

References 242

Index 269

Ethical challenges in social work

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

This chapter explores how we conceive of the domain of the 'ethical', including discussion of the distinctions and relationships between ethical, technical and legal matters. It then discusses the nature of the ethical challenges inherent in social work, and how and why questions of ethics arise, linked to the place of social work as a human services profession largely within state-organized systems of welfare. Finally, consideration is given to the guilt and anxiety often felt by social workers and whether the blame allocated to them for outcomes of what are essentially moral decisions is justified. The chapter ends with an exercise to encourage identification of ethical issues and a case for discussion from Austria about a social worker who received a suspended sentence and fine for neglecting to perform her professional duties in relation to safeguarding a child.

Introduction

There is general agreement among social work practitioners and academics that questions of ethics, morals and values are an inevitable part of social work. The majority of social workers, when asked, have no difficulty in offering examples of ethical problems and dilemmas. The literature of social work is also very clear: 'Moral issues haunt social work', says Jordan (1990, p. 1); according to Reamer (1999, p. 3): 'social work is among the most value based of all professions'; while Healy (2001, p. 101) comments: 'value commitments and ethical principles are at the core of social work as a profession'.

In the Introduction, I discussed the meanings of the terms 'ethics' and 'values' and offered working definitions. I discussed the fact that religious and political values often form part of our sets of

personal values and professional social work values. Before examining the nature of the ethical challenges that are inherent in social work, I will first consider how we demarcate the realm of the 'ethical' from related domains covering technical and legal matters.

The ethical, the technical and the legal

Frequently in the social work literature values are distinguished from knowledge, and ethical/moral issues from legal and technical matters. Such distinctions can be useful, as long as it is not implied that knowledge can be value-free, or that legal and technical decisions can be made without recourse to ethics. For example, when considering what action to take in relation to a person with a severe psychiatric problem, a social worker might say: 'It is essentially a legal question whether to detain this person in hospital under the mental health legislation.' Yet, as Braye and Preston-Shoot (2010) point out, the law is rarely clear, and has to be interpreted by the social worker. The law in Britain and many other countries tells us that if we make the technical (and ethical) judgement that the person concerned is suffering from a 'mental disorder', such that it is in the person's interest to be detained in hospital, then we have the legal powers to bring that about. Laws do not tell us what we ought to do, just what we can do. The laws in operation nationally and internationally themselves reflect the particular values and norms prevalent in the societies where they apply, some of which we may regard as immoral, for example in the case of laws that regulate immigration, abortion or human cloning. Most decisions in social work involve a complex interaction of ethical, political, technical and legal issues, all of which are interconnected. Our values will influence how we interpret the law.

Giving another example, when asked to assess the needs of an older person with mobility problems for home care support with shopping and cleaning, a social worker might say: 'It is a technical matter to decide whether this person is eligible for the home care service.' The social worker assesses the person according to the defined criteria and makes a judgement using her professional skill and knowledge. The social worker might only consider that ethical issues were involved if she had to consider whether she ought to recommend a particular service even though the person did not quite meet the criteria. This is a helpful distinction between the

technical and the ethical. However, a judgement might be regarded as a technical one not because only technical questions of measurement and assessment were involved, but because the social worker chose to see it in that way, as she might if it were a relatively straightforward case that did not present any ethical problems or dilemmas. However, the process of assessing needs for a home care service is not devoid of ethical content. The criteria of need that determine who should get the service will be based on ethical judgements about social duties to reduce some of the disadvantages caused by disability, or about how to distribute a scarce resource efficiently and fairly, for example. The social worker may judge that the criteria are not fair or do not result in resources being allocated to the most needy people. This is what Jordan (1990, p. 1) means when he says that moral issues haunt social work.

Ethical issues, problems and dilemmas

The preceding discussion suggests that all aspects of social work have ethical dimensions, even if they are not always identified as such. It is important that social workers recognize this and are aware not only of their own power in relation to service users, but also of the source of their power and their contradictory roles within society. Very often we associate professional ethics with dilemmas and problems – the making of difficult judgements and decisions in cases where the rights, needs and interests of different parties conflict. But it is also important to see ethical issues as deeply embedded in the construction of social work as an occupation, its location within state systems of welfare and the everyday practice of its members. Thompson et al. (2000, pp. 6–9), writing about nursing ethics, distinguish ethical problems (difficult choices have to be made, but it is clear what is the right action to take) and ethical dilemmas (difficult choices have to be made and it is not clear what is the right course of action). Many of the case examples in this book are constructed as problems and dilemmas. However, I would argue that it is important also to see the whole of social work as comprising ethical dimensions and to focus on the ethical issues in practice as much as the ethical problems and dilemmas (Banks, 2009a).

In the light of the discussion above, it may be useful to distinguish between ethical issues, ethical problems and ethical dilemmas, as outlined in List 1.1.

List 1.1 Ethical issues, problems and dilemmas

1. *Ethical issues* pervade the social work task (including what appear to be 'legal' or 'technical' matters), in that social work frequently takes place in the context of state systems of welfare, premised on principles of social justice and public good, where social workers have professional power in the relationship with service users. So, although making a judgement about whether to recommend home care services for a person with a disability in a case that is straightforward may not involve a social worker in agonizing over an ethical dilemma, it is not devoid of ethical content.
2. *Ethical problems* arise when a social worker sees a situation as involving a difficult moral decision, but is clear what is the right course of action, for example when she decides to turn down the application of a very needy person for home care services because this person does not fit the criteria.
3. *Ethical dilemmas* occur when a social worker sees herself as facing a choice between two equally unwelcome alternatives, which may involve a conflict of ethical values, and it is not clear which choice will be the right one. For example, should the social worker bend the criteria for allocating home care services in order to help a very needy person, or stick to the rules and refuse the application of someone who really needs support. She is faced with a conflict between the interests of this individual and the public interest in having rules and criteria that apply to everyone.

What is regarded as a technical matter for one person (simply applying the rules) may be an ethical problem for another (a difficult choice, but it is clear what action should be taken) or a dilemma for a third person (there appears to be no solution). It depends on how each person sees the situation, how experienced they are at making ethical judgements and decisions and how they prioritize different values (see Banks and Williams, 2006 for a detailed discussion of practitioners' accounts of ethical issues, problems and dilemmas).

What are the ethical challenges in social work?

In collecting examples of ethical difficulties experienced by qualified and trainee social workers in Britain and various countries across the world, I identified four main themes, as summarized in List 1.2.

List 1.2 Ethical challenges in social work

1. *Individual rights and welfare*: service users' rights to make their own decisions and choices; social workers' responsibilities to promote the welfare of service users.
2. *Public welfare*: the rights and interests of parties other than service users; social workers' responsibilities to their employing agencies and to society; the promotion of the greatest good for the greatest number of people.
3. *Equality, difference and structural oppression*: balancing the promotion of equality with due regard to diversity; the social worker's responsibility to challenge oppression and to work for changes in agency policy and in society; managing religious and cultural differences and conflicts.
4. *Professional roles, boundaries and relationships*: deciding what role the social worker should take in particular situations (counsellor, controller, advocate, assessor, campaigner, ally or friend); considerations of issues of boundaries between personal, professional and political life.

Any categorization is obviously artificial, and does not do justice to the complexity of the issues within each category and the overlap between them. Frequently there are conflicts between rights, responsibilities and interests both within and between these categories. However, this framework may be a useful starting point for exploring issues of values and ethics in social work practice. Short case examples from four practitioners talking about everyday issues in their practice may illuminate our discussion.

Rights and welfare of the individual

Practice focus

Case example 1.1: Should I persuade Mrs Brown to accept help?

Mrs Brown, an 80-year-old woman, was referred to a social work agency by a local hospital after a fall at home. A student social worker visited her in her home to assess her needs and felt that Mrs Brown was finding it hard to look after herself – her house was dirty and untidy and it was clear that she was not eating much. She

lived alone, and her son visited twice a week to deliver shopping. The social worker suggested to Mrs Brown that she should consider having a home care assistant to help her on a daily basis, but she categorically refused. The social worker met the son and it was clear he was not willing to offer any more support to his mother. The social worker visited Mrs Brown a second time, but Mrs Brown was still adamant she did not want any help. The social worker commented:

It was difficult to know how far to try to persuade or even coerce Mrs Brown to accept the offer of a home care assistant, or whether just to leave her alone and hope she would manage to survive. This was one of my first cases as a student social worker and I felt very concerned for Mrs Brown's safety.

Here the focus of the student social worker's concern is the service user's welfare. The social worker wants to respect Mrs Brown's own choices about how to live her life, yet the worker also wants to ensure that Mrs Brown feeds herself properly and is checked on regularly in case she falls again. The social worker experiences a conflict between the promotion of Mrs Brown's welfare and her right to make her own choices.

Public welfare

Practice focus

Case example 1.2: Should we help the police to catch a sexually exploitative man?

Sally was a 12-year-old girl who looked much older. She had recently come into a care home because her parents felt her behaviour was out of control. She had been having sexual relations with a 50-year-old man who supplied her with money in return for sexual favours. On arrival at the residential care home, restrictions were placed on Sally's movements to prevent her from meeting this man. One day two police officers visited the care home to ask the staff to assist them in their attempt to arrest the man. One of the residential care workers made the following comment:

The police were near to catching the man, and asked staff to lift restrictions on Sally leaving the [residential care] unit in the hope of catching him in the act. Should we have refused because we were allowing Sally to put herself at risk, or was catching the culprit and preventing further risk to herself and other girls a priority?

The care worker sees that it will be in the best interests of everyone if this man is caught, yet feels uneasy about using the young girl in this way, both because of the deception involved, and the responsibility if any harm comes to Sally when she is allowed out of the care home. This case is presented as involving making a decision about whether the public interest in catching the man outweighs the deception involved and the short-term risk to Sally.

Equality, difference and structural oppression

Practice focus

Case example 1.3: How can we ensure young Bangladeshi men have equal access to our services?

The staff of a drop-in centre for young people based in a small rural town in Wales were concerned that the young Bangladeshi people living in the neighbourhood were not using the centre. They made big efforts to make contact with the young people and eventually quite a large group of young men of Bangladeshi origin (from Muslim families) started to use the project, which offered a range of services including an IT suite, summer projects, outreach work and sexual health advice. The sexual health provision, which offered confidential advice, information and free condoms, was the most well-used service at the centre. The staff team was aware of potential issues with the use of this service by the young Bangladeshi men, as their religion forbids sex outside marriage and the service might be viewed as promoting promiscuous behaviour. However, they felt that young people from any background should be entitled to services that support their needs and issues.

According to one of the youth workers:

It was the consensus among the staff that denial of any service to a young person who wanted to access it was a denial of their human rights and against the moral, ethical, theoretical and practical notions of anti-oppressive youth work. It was thus agreed that working towards what was right for a young person was a greater concern than respecting a community's religion or culture.

However, after a year, the young Bangladeshi men stopped coming. The sexual health worker received a complaint from the parents of one young man, as they had found condoms in his school bag. A community meeting was called at the mosque and all young Bangladeshi people were banned from accessing the project. A review was held at the youth centre, as there was concern that a whole community of young people were now not able to access the drop-in centre. Speaking about the situation four years later, the same youth worker commented:

The main discussion was about what could have been done differently. At the time an agreed new strategy was never formulated and the dilemma about how to resolve the situation has remained ever since.

The staff team at this youth project was clearly committed to promoting equality of access and supporting all young people, regardless of their ethnic origin or religion, in exercising their rights to make their own choices and decisions. Yet, despite their best intentions and a brief period of 'success', no young Bangladeshi people are currently using the project. From the information given, it sounds like the approach of the youth workers – to support and promote the young people's freedom of choice – was too simplistic, given that the young people lived in a fairly tightknit community, where adherence to Muslim values was paramount. This case highlights the complexities of working with ethnic and religious diversity and the need for long-term neighbourhood work based on dialogue, bridge-building and compromise.

Professional boundaries and relationships

Practice focus

Case example 1.4: How can I maintain my professional boundaries without being too harsh?

A student social worker was undertaking a fieldwork placement in an agency working with families and children in the UK. A recently arrived Ethiopian woman with two young children was referred to the agency by the asylum seekers unit in the local social services department. This woman had recently been relocated to the area as part of a government policy of dispersal of asylum seekers, and seemed very depressed and isolated. Her seven-year-old daughter was reported to be withdrawn and unhappy at school and both mother and daughter cried during most of the first home visit. The student also felt that the family was being subjected to 'low level racism in the area' where they lived. The student visited the family at least once a fortnight over the next three months, during which time the situation improved and mother and daughter appeared much happier. When the student's placement was due to end, she reported feeling some discomfort about how the family viewed their relationship with her:

I was aware that the woman viewed me as a friend, and although she was aware that I was a worker, when I told her that I would be finishing the placement soon, she became upset. She made a number of comments on numerous occasions asking me to visit her whenever I was in the area and invited me to her son's birthday party in four months time. I felt that I did not deal with this effectively, as I tended to use the fact that I did not live in the same city as an excuse for not being able to maintain contact, and I felt that this blurred the professional boundaries. I found it extremely difficult to maintain these boundaries and although I felt guilty for giving the impression of being a family friend, I also felt that it would be extremely harsh to tell her that she was a 'service user' rather than a friend.

This student obviously developed a good relationship with a very vulnerable family. As a student, she may have had a relatively small caseload and so could afford to spend time and energy with this family and to develop what was perceived (and/or desired) by the woman as

a close and caring relationship. This case highlights the dangers of the caring role of the social worker being misunderstood and misinterpreted by service users and the importance of clarity at the outset and honesty during the course of a relationship. This situation was still concerning the student after the placement ended and had clearly caused her to reflect on what she might have done differently, as she commented: ‘I didn’t sit down and explain in an honest way.’

The above descriptions have simplified the issues arising in each case. In many cases, issues in all four categories arise. Some of the problems and dilemmas workers face are about balancing different sets of rights, interests, responsibilities and commitments. Social work is a complex activity, with many layers of duties and responsibilities, for example to one’s own professional integrity, to service users, to the agency and to society. These often conflict and have to be balanced against each other. There are no easy answers to such ethical challenges. They are part of the everyday life of social workers. Some will handle them more easily than others, depending on experience, moral sensitivity and their own value positions. Often, it helps to discuss difficult cases with colleagues, or in supervision sessions, to gain a range of different perspectives on the issues involved and possible courses of action. For example, in discussing Case example 1.2, many students have said that the dilemma identified (whether to respond to the request of the police) would not arise for them, as it would be clear that the strategy proposed by the police was inappropriate (it could be regarded as ‘entrapment’ and hence might not stand up in court) and/or unethical (it involved treating Sally as a means to an end and breached the social work relationship of trust with her). Vignettes like the short case examples given here and longer cases like those at the end of each chapter can be useful as a focus for reflection and student discussions, to encourage rehearsal of issues and actions (see also the cases in Chapter 7; Banks, 2001a, 2005; Banks and Nøhr, 2012; Banks and Williams, 1999).

In the remaining sections of this chapter we will explore how and why questions of ethics are an integral part of social work practice.

Social work as a human services profession

Social work may be regarded as a ‘human services’ profession along with other occupations that focus on human relationships such as

those in the field of healthcare, teaching and the law. Social workers have special powers, knowledge and expertise and must be trusted by service users to act in their best interests. The relationship between social workers and service users is an unequal one, in that social workers are more powerful. Social work, therefore, along with law, medicine, nursing, counselling and other similar professions, has a code of ethics that is designed, among other things, to protect service users from exploitation or misconduct. Some commentators have described the relationship between social workers and service users as ‘fiduciary’, that is, based on trust (Kutchins, 1991; Levy, 1976, pp. 55ff.).

While there are many similarities between social work and professions such as law and medicine, there are also several ways in which social work is different. The degree of individual autonomy exercised by social workers over how to perform their work and the scope of the decisions they can make tends to be more limited than that of doctors and lawyers. Many social workers are employed either directly or indirectly by local authorities or municipalities; they may have a social control function and therefore their primary aim is not straightforwardly to work in the best interests of the service user. In many countries, social work is part of a ‘welfare state’ or at least a state-organized system of welfare, which is itself based on contradictory principles and undergoing a process of questioning and change, as is the role of the profession generally.

Social work and state welfare systems

Social work may be delivered by public, voluntary/not-for-profit or private sector organizations or by individuals in private practice. Its services may be offered as part of the provision of state welfare or control, as services motivated by independent philanthropic concern, or as services to be purchased directly by customers/service users. In the UK and many other countries in the global North and West, from its charitable origins in the nineteenth century, social work grew rapidly in the mid-twentieth century largely as part of a state-organized and state-funded system for distributing goods and services to meet certain types of social need of individuals, families, groups and communities, and to cure, contain or control behaviour that was regarded as socially problematic or deviant. It became part of a state-sponsored welfare system that included a range of other social services, including education, health, social security and

housing. These are collective services that, in principle, benefit the whole community. However, social services are often regarded as different from other public services (such as police, army, roads and refuse collection), in that they are seen as a means of transferring resources to people who are not able to meet their own needs independently, through, for example, sickness, old age, childhood, unemployment or disability. They are also a way of attempting to redress, in small-scale ways, the inequalities, social exclusion and discrimination faced by people in poverty and people whose differences and social circumstances are not well tolerated in society.

Developed state welfare systems are allied to capitalist economies and have a redistributive role through taxation, compulsory social insurance and the direct provision of services. They can be seen as compensating for defects in the market system in the allocation of goods and services. Even in countries like the USA and Japan with relatively weak welfare states, state social workers are employed in a range of settings from welfare offices to hospitals and courts of law. As state welfare systems contract, this results in more self-help, private sector and non-governmental organization (NGO) provision, although many of these organizations still rely on public funding or contracts with public bodies to deliver services.

Many commentators have analysed the nature of welfare states in terms of contradictions. Marshall (1972) saw the tensions inherent in welfare capitalism between the values of social justice and equality and the competitive individualism of the market, although he recognized that the aim of the welfare state was not to remove inequality of income, rather it was to eradicate poverty and give everyone equal status as citizens in society. According to O'Connor (1973, p. 6), welfare states have two contradictory functions in capitalist societies – accumulation (enabling private capital to remain profitable) and legitimation (of the existing economic and social order). Moon (1988, p. 12) succinctly summarizes the contradictory principles upon which the welfare state is based:

The welfare state embraces the market, but at the same time seeks to limit and control it; it incorporates ideas of rights, especially rights to property and the fruits of one's labor, but asserts a right to welfare, a right to have one's basic needs met; it is based on a conception of the person as a responsible agent but recognizes as well that many of the conditions of one's life are due to circumstances beyond one's control; it is premised upon sentiments of sociability and common interest, but its very success

may undermine those sentiments; it seeks to provide security, but embraces as well a commitment to liberty.

Moon suggests that this is one reason why the concept of the welfare state appears to be so vulnerable to criticism. Others might disagree that it is the contradictions per se that make it vulnerable (Offe, 1984, Ch. 5), but there is no doubt that the whole concept of the welfare state – its aims, functions, methods and outcomes – is the subject of questioning and criticism from various quarters, both right and left (Pierson, 2006; Roger, 2000). The economic recession of the mid-1970s gave rise to a sustained critique of state welfare provision from rightwing politicians and theorists, and this was reinforced by the recession of the late 1980s/early 1990s and the economic crisis of the late 2000s. First, the burden of taxation and regulation imposed on capital was claimed to serve as a disincentive to investment. Second, welfare benefits and the collective power of trade unions were said to amount to a disincentive to work. The argument has also been made from a communitarian perspective that family values and responsibilities, a sense of community and moral obligation may, in fact, be undermined by systematic state welfare provision (Etzioni, 1995, 1997). Criticisms from the left tend to focus on the ineffectiveness and inefficiency of the welfare bureaucracies, which have done little to redistribute income between classes and do not tackle the fundamental causes of poverty and unemployment. Feminist and anti-racist critiques have been increasingly vocal as many aspects of the state welfare system have been shown to reinforce gender and race stereotyping, discrimination and oppression. The welfare state is also seen as a repressive instrument of social control, through individualizing problems and distinguishing between people who are deserving and undeserving.

These various critiques, along with fiscal pressures and demographic constraints, especially the increasing proportion of older people in the global North, have led to changes in welfare systems, often resulting in an increasing role for markets, private provision and new forms of management and governance, including service user and citizen involvement (see Clarke, 2004 and Chapters 5 and 6 for further discussion).

This account of social work as part of the state-organized welfare provision is important as it helps us understand how some of the ethical issues are inherent in the role of the social worker. Insofar as social work is what Johnson (1972) called a 'state-mediated profession', it is based on contradictions and societal ambivalence. Social

work contributes towards expressing society's altruism (care) and enforcing societal norms (control); it champions individual rights as well as protecting the collective good. Social workers are regarded as wimps (caring for those who do not deserve it) and as bullies (wielding too much power over individuals and families). As the welfare state is questioned, undermined and reformed, so the role of social work is also subject to question and change. While systems of state welfare vary enormously in different parts of the world, and in some countries the majority of social workers are not employed by the state, social work is very often at least partially funded and hence controlled through government sources. Social work is intimately connected with politics, as resources for welfare services and the role of welfare professionals are linked to policies and programmes for the distribution of wealth, taxation and the conferring of citizenship.

Blame and guilt in social work

Social workers are often at the interface between the state and civil society, working with people who are needy, vulnerable, socially excluded or marginalized. In this position they frequently bear the brunt of blame for certain unpalatable societal problems such as child abuse. One of the most publicized areas of social work is child protection or safeguarding. In this context, if a bad outcome occurs, social workers usually get the blame. A bad outcome can be either that children left at home suffer or die, or that children are removed from home unnecessarily. Franklin (1989) demonstrates how the press often portray social workers either as indecisive wimps who fail to protect children from death, or as authoritarian bullies who unjustifiably snatch children from their parents. Either way, the social workers are to blame. As Franklin (1989, p. 1) comments:

Press reporting of child abuse, paradoxically, rarely focuses upon the abuse of children. It quickly regresses into an attack on welfare professionals, particularly social workers who, in their turn, seem to have become a metaphor for the public sector.

Social workers can be seen as symbols of state welfare, simultaneously representing two of its much criticized facets – bungling inefficiency and authoritarian repression. All professionals are blamed, but social workers offer a soft target when their interventions fail and they are often pilloried in the press (Aldridge 1994,

p. 70; Butler and Drakeford, 2005). This may be connected partly with the more ambivalent and morally charged role that social workers play in society. For example, doctors treat people who are sick; and sickness might be regarded as an unfortunate state that generally affects individuals through no fault of their own. Social workers often work with people whom society regards as 'undeserving', idle, feckless or deviant. Social workers have a control as well as a care function. It is their job to protect society from deviant or morally dangerous people; if they fail to do this job, they are committing a moral crime. Physical and sexual abuse of children, particularly by their parents, is a threat to social stability and the idea of the family as a good and caring setting. Child abuse in families, therefore, must not happen. It must either be prevented by social workers (and therefore barely exist) or not exist at all. Social workers' vilification by the press and public is partly due to their role as welfare professionals in a society that is ambivalent about state welfare. It also reflects the particular role they play within state welfare systems, which includes both the care and the control of people whom the family or other state agencies cannot help and who may be regarded as difficult or deviant.

Taking the child protection role of social workers as an example, social workers tend to feel that they should not always take the blame in cases where children are abused or die. The situation is complex: resource constraints mean that social workers cannot always provide the services required; decisions regarding how to handle children at risk are usually taken by interprofessional groups at case reviews and are a shared responsibility; and assessing the nature of risk of child abuse is an uncertain art and even the most skilled and competent professionals who follow all the guidelines and procedures may find that a child dies. Obviously, if workers fail to follow the procedures correctly or neglect to carry out specified duties, then they are culpable. Yet if a worker does the best she can in the circumstances, surely she should not be blamed?

In a provocative article, Hollis and Howe (1990) argue that taking on the job of a social worker is rather like being asked to drive a car in the knowledge that its brakes are faulty. If someone takes on the role of social worker, then she must expect and accept moral blame when bad outcomes occur (as they inevitably will). Yet this analogy does not capture the complexity of social work practice. First, while this may not exonerate the social worker, it is important to note that it is not her job to service the car. Second, while she may be in the driving seat, there are plenty of others in the

car map-reading or directing. Third, while objective observers like Hollis and Howe may claim that the brakes are faulty, the rest of society regards such a state as the norm, and is certainly not prepared to pay to improve the brakes. If social workers take moral responsibility, they are, in effect, allowing others to scapegoat them and avoid taking blame, and hence to avoid recognizing the variety of contributing factors that cause a child's death and the need to change some of these factors. Also, if social workers always take the blame for outcomes that are largely outside their control, they become personally and professionally undermined and stressed. It may be appropriate to take some responsibility, and hence blame, but certainly not all of it. Otherwise the retreat into 'defensive' social work (following rules and procedures) becomes even more necessary and appealing as a survival strategy.

One of the purposes of this book is to enable social workers to gain an understanding of the nature of ethical decision-making and hence to feel less unnecessary guilt and blame for the outcomes of decisions and actions with which they are involved. Very often in connection with ethical challenges in social work (and indeed the caring professions generally), the term 'dilemma' is used. As has already been noted, a dilemma is usually defined along the lines of 'a choice between two equally unwelcome alternatives', which seems to sum up quite well how it often feels to be a professional in a 'no-win' situation. Let us consider a child protection case, as briefly outlined in Case example 1.5.

Practice focus

Case example 1.5: A case review meeting about a child at risk

The father of a young baby has been violent to his partner (the baby's 17-year-old mother) on several occasions in the past. Recently the baby has suffered bruising three times. The mother explains that the baby fell from his cot twice and on one occasion her partner accidentally dropped him. Despite input from a social worker and health visitor, it has not proved possible to support the parents to any great extent in coping with looking after the baby. The social worker has been working with the mother for over a year, during which time the couple have split up several times. When the father is not present, the mother seems to cope quite well. The social worker is keen to give the young mother a chance to look

after the baby, but is concerned about the risk to the child from the father. A case review meeting with the parents and the various professionals involved is called to consider what to do to ensure the baby is protected.

Very many factors will be taken into account during the case review in coming to a decision about what level of intervention is necessary and possible as well as legally and ethically justified in order to protect the baby. The professionals will be mindful of the infringement of parental rights and the potential damage and unhappiness that may be caused if the child is removed from the family. Yet if the child remains with the family, there is a chance that the child will suffer physical abuse from the father and may be injured or even die. The way to resolve the dilemma as identified above is to try to work out whether one of the alternatives is more unwelcome than the other and then act on that. Of course, participants in the case review also need to try to work out how likely it is that each of the unwelcome outcomes will occur, using various protocols and procedures for assessing and predicting risk. They might decide that it is more unwelcome (indeed, it would be tragic) for the child to die, than to be unhappy.

However, let us assume that the consensus of opinion at the case review is that it is highly unlikely that the father will seriously injure or kill the child. Participants also judge that there is scope for more intensive work with the parents to improve their parenting skills and to cope with some of the pressures that may lead to the baby suffering further harm. So it is decided to leave the child with the family. The professionals involved know it is a risk – a moral risk as well as a technical one – which is why the situation is described as a dilemma. There are not welcome outcomes, only less unwelcome ones; when the choice is the lesser of two evils, whichever one chooses is an ‘evil’. This is a constant problem for the social workers and other professionals involved such cases. If the professionals have carefully thought through all aspects of the dilemma, and made a decision to act in order to try to avoid the worst outcome, then they have acted with professional integrity.

I will return to the issue of the guilt and blame felt by social workers in Chapter 7, in the light of the more detailed discussion of ethical and value issues in the next few chapters. In the meantime, the case for discussion at the end of this chapter gives an account of

a case from Austria where a child died and the lead child protection social worker was found guilty by a court of neglecting her professional duties, given a suspended sentence and fined.

Conclusions

This chapter has set the scene for the discussion of questions of ethics in social work. I have argued that ethical problems and dilemmas are inherent in the practice of social work. The reasons for this arise from its role as a public service profession dealing with vulnerable and marginalized service users who need to be able to trust the worker and be protected from exploitation; and also from its position in many countries as part of state welfare provision, which is itself based on contradictory aims and values – care and control, capital accumulation and legitimation, protection of individual rights and promotion of public welfare – which cause tensions, dilemmas and conflicts. The current ‘crises’ of welfare capitalism, which entail a questioning of the role of state welfare, are increasing the tensions and dilemmas for social workers, who often find themselves the victims of media attacks and public blame. It was argued that this blame is often unjustified and it is important that social workers both understand the essential tensions in their role and consider how moral decisions are actually made in social work, in order that they are not consumed by unnecessary guilt about the unfortunate, tragic, or unwanted outcomes of cases in which they have been involved.

Putting it into practice

Identifying ethical issues

Aims of the exercise: to encourage readers to identify ethical issues in their own practice and to reflect on and clarify their own ethical stance.

1. Briefly describe a situation/incident/event in your experience as a practitioner that raised ethical challenges for you.
2. List the ethical issues involved in this situation.
3. What does your view of this situation/event tell you about the important values and ethical principles that underpin your practice as a social worker?

Practice focus**Case for discussion 1: A social worker is fined in a high-profile child abuse case in Austria¹**

A 17-month-old boy died of a brain oedema (swelling) in a hospital in Austria. Several months before his death, the boy was given medical treatment in two different hospitals. Suspicions were aroused that he might be subject to ill-treatment and sexual abuse. So the child protection team based in one of the hospitals, in accordance with its legal responsibility, informed the local childcare agency about its concerns. The childcare agency has a responsibility to assess and monitor cases where children are thought to be at risk.

When the childcare agency is informed about a case of suspected child abuse or neglect, it then follows prescribed standards for risk assessment. Two social workers have to contact the parent(s). Following this meeting, the case must be discussed with a supervisor at the start and at the end of the casework process, as a minimum. The social worker on the case must have personal contact with the child (at least once) and with the legal guardians (at least once). In the case of children under six years old, compulsory home visits have to be made. All children under three years old must be referred to a physician. The casework process must be accurately documented.

In this case, meetings were organized between childcare social workers and the boy, his mother and his mother's new boyfriend. The boyfriend lived in another district, which meant that a second childcare agency was also involved. This complicated the assessment process. There was some exchange of information with the hospitals involved and between the two childcare agencies in order to manage the risk assessment.

The boy's father, who was living separately from the family, had contact on several occasions with the childcare agency because he had a suspicion that the boy was being ill-treated by the mother's new boyfriend.

The doctors at the hospitals to which the boy had been sent, at the request of the mother, on two previous occasions did not

1. I am grateful to Gertraud Pantucek and Maria Maiss for providing this case and to Maria Moritz of Österreichischen Berufsverbands für SozialarbeiterInnen (OBDS, Austrian Association of Professional Social Workers) for additional information. Further details can be found at <http://tirol.orf.at/stories/364104/> and the OBDS website: www.sozialarbeit.at/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=312&Itemid=427.

confirm the suspicion of ill-treatment by the new boyfriend. The boy's mother denied the suspicion. She explained that her son's wounds were caused by accidents.

The leading childcare agency decided that the risk for the child was not high enough to remove the child from the family. Instead, the mother was forbidden to visit her new boyfriend with the child, but the boyfriend was allowed to visit them both at their home.

This relatively 'mild' condition placed on the family was based on what is written down in the Austrian child protection law, which forms the basis of two core values followed within the childcare assessment process:

- Safeguarding the endangered child in an effective way by using the mildest method of intervention, in order to protect the parents' rights as legal guardians.
- Using the mildest method is judged necessary in order not to endanger cooperation between the social worker and parent(s) and others involved (new partners, grandparents).

Nevertheless, even the 'mildest method' (the condition that the mother and child should not visit the new boyfriend together) has to be monitored. This puts pressure on the family and endangers the cooperation built primarily on trust. It is not known how closely the condition was monitored in this case.

When the boy was hospitalized for the third time, he was so seriously injured that he died two days later. Following the court case, the boyfriend was sentenced to life imprisonment in an institution for mentally disordered offenders, for sexually abusing and causing the death of the boy. The boy's mother was sentenced to one year in prison for child neglect. Finally, for the first time in Austria, the social worker from the childcare agency who had worked with the family also stood trial and was given a suspended sentence and a fine of €1,200 for 'neglecting' to provide the professional help required. The social worker's supervisor appeared in court as a witness and confirmed that the social worker had followed all the steps of the assessment process correctly.

In the media reports on the verdicts, the Austrian Association of Professional Social Workers argued against charging social workers, denied that social workers were guilty, asked for the responsibility of other professionals involved to be taken into account and demanded additional resources in order to establish better working conditions.

As a direct consequence of this case, more crisis intervention centres, child protection teams in hospitals, and an obligatory period of fieldwork for young lawyers in childcare agencies have been installed. Furthermore, the childcare agency introduced a workshop for social workers on the following topic: how to protect and defend yourself in case of being on trial. This is a consequence of the fact that the pressure caused by negative and one-sided media reports led to a growing fear among social workers of being made publicly responsible for mistakes concerning the selection of interventions that could be judged to be too mild. This led to a significant increase in the removal of children from their families too quickly.

Afterword

After an appeal, the case was then heard by the supreme court. This process took almost a year. The social worker was found 'not guilty' by the higher court and the sentence imposed on the social worker was cancelled. There was very little coverage of this decision in the media.

Questions for discussion

1. What ethical issues does this case raise?
2. Do you think social workers who are judged to have neglected to fulfil their professional responsibilities in the way described here should be subject to fines and (potentially) prison sentences? What do you think should be counted as 'neglect of professional responsibilities'?
3. Do you agree with all or some of the arguments and demands of the Austrian Association of Professional Social Workers?
4. Why do you think there was little media coverage when the social worker was found 'not guilty'?
5. Although this case happened in Austria, do you recognize common features with similar cases in your own country?

Further resources

Dominelli, L. (2004) *Social Work: Theory and Practice for a Changing Profession*, Oxford, Polity Press.

Overview of the nature of social work, taking a global perspective, in the context of current uncertainties and challenges. Argues for a new relationship between social workers and service users based on ideas of citizenship, solidarity and reciprocity.

Smith, R. (2005) *Values and Practice in Children's Services*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.

Offers a useful discussion of the different value positions inherent in laissez-faire and interventionist approaches to child protection, an account of practice dilemmas and a framework for action.

Warnock, M. (1998) *An Intelligent Person's Guide to Ethics*, London, Duckworth.

Written by a moral philosopher, who has herself been involved in the UK public policy-making process, and designed to introduce the layperson to ethical thinking covering topics such as death, birth, rights and freedom.



Index

A

A National Voice 145
abduction of children 193
abortion 156–7, 176–7
absolute rights 132–4
abuse 171, 210–11
 child abuse *see* child abuse; child protection
acceptance 46, 47, 48
accountability 160
act utilitarianism 51
action, reflection and 208
active citizenship 141
activism
 collective action by social workers and service users 154–5
 service users as activists 144–7
adoption 156–7
adult social care 154–5, 188–9
advocacy 150–1, 181
agency, employing *see* employing agency
Akademikerförbundet SSR 73, 74
Alayón, N. 194
allies, service users as 144–7
American Association of Social Workers 109
anti-foundationalism 85–6
anti-oppressive social work 53–5, 153
Aotearoa New Zealand Association of Social Workers 113, 115
appeal, right to 140
Argentina 171, 193–5
Argentinian Association of Social Workers 194
Aristotle 11, 27
Asian women's project 226–8
Asquith, S. 132–3, 134
Association nationale des assistants de service social (ANAS) 123–5
asylum seekers 25, 138–40, 170
attentiveness 81
Australia 170–1
Australian Association of Social Workers 108

 code of ethics 117
Australian College of Social Work 108
Austria 35–7
Austrian Association of Professional Social Workers 36
authoritarianism 186–9
autonomy 234
 common morality approaches 57, 58, 61–2
 duty-based principles 42–9
 relational 93
 see also self-determination

B

bad outcomes
 guilt over 220, 220–2
 no guilt, due to sticking to a deeply held principle 220, 222–4
bad practices, challenging 210–11, 212–13
Baldwin, M. 188
Bangladeshi young men 23–4
Banks, S. 73, 74–5, 170–1, 204, 205
basic needs 130–1
Bauman, Z. 6–7, 84, 167, 168
Beauchamp, T. 41, 55, 57–8, 76–7, 89
behavioural problems 12–13
beliefs 7
beneficence 57, 58
Bentham, J. 50, 51
Beresford, P. 146–7
best interests 62–3
Biestek, F. 45–9
biomedical ethics, principles of 57–8
black practitioners
 black male student working with vulnerable women 212–13
 needs of black children vs 'betrayal' of the black community 226–8
blame 11, 30–4, 35–7
 codes of ethics and individualization of 120–1
 ethical problems and dilemmas in practice 218–28

- boundaries
 - professional 21, 25–6
 - separation of personal, professional and agency values 173–7
- Bouquet, B. 6
- Bowles, W. 73, 74
- Briskman, L. 170
- British Association of Social Workers (BASW) 108
 - code of ethics 109, 115
- Brock, D. 150
- Brookfield, S. 208
- Buber, M. 162
- Buchanan, A. 150
- Buddhism 40, 135
- Bulgaria 97–101, 114
- bureaucracies 29
 - technical-bureaucratic model of practice 178–91
- Burkitt, I. 162
- C**
- capabilities 131–2
- capitalism 28–9
- care 30, 75
 - and control 30, 31
 - ethics of 77–82, 92, 162
 - unconditional caring 167–8
- care manager for the elderly 183, 184, 185
- caring professions 26–7, 104, 105
- case review meeting 32–3
- ‘cash for care’ schemes *see* personalized care
- categorical imperative 43
- Catholicism 175
- challenging bad practices 210–11, 212–13
- challenging injustice 169–73
- change 1
 - social 2–3, 53–5
- character, moral 201, 202
- character-based approaches 15, 69–101
 - comparison with the principle-based approach 70–1
 - fragmentation of value 87–9, 120
 - postmodern ethics 84–7
 - situated ethics of social justice 92–5
 - virtue-based approaches 71–7, 90–1, 112
- Chenoweth, L. 203
- child abuse 11
 - disclosure and confidentiality 215–16, 222–4
 - using deception to remove a child 66–7
- child protection
 - ‘betrayal’ of the black community 227–8
 - blame and guilt 30–1, 32–4, 35–7
 - Bulgarian child protection department 97–101
 - growth of managerialism, authoritarianism and deprofessionalization 187–8
 - Munro review 187–8
 - and respecting the mother’s rights 229–35
 - scandals 187
- Childress, J. 55, 57–8, 76–7, 89
- choice 141–2, 143
- Christianity 10, 40, 175, 176–7
- citizenship 137–41
- civil and political rights 130, 131
- claims, valid 127–9
- Clark, C. 132–3, 134
- codes of ethics 5–6, 15, 94–5, 103, 106, 108–22, 163
 - components 110–14
 - differences and commonalities 112–14
 - functions of 114–16
 - limitations and critiques of 116–21
 - virtue-based ethics 73, 74, 76
- codes of practice 109–10, 163
- collective action 154–5
- collective responsibility for resistance 93–4
- collective rights 130–1, 134–47
- college of social work 107–8
- commitment 166–8
 - caring as 92
 - in multiprofessional working 228–35
 - to one’s own projects and undertakings 88
- committed/radical practitioner model 178–86, 189
- common morality approaches 55–64, 120
 - dignity and worth 60, 61–2
 - Kantian-utilitarian principles 55–8
 - Kantian-utilitarian-radical principles 58–64
 - social justice 60, 63–4
 - welfare or wellbeing 60, 62–3
- communitarianism 29, 135, 140–1
- community-based care for older people 150–1
- community development work 13–14, 146, 154, 184, 184–5, 185
- competence 81
- complaints 211
- complexity

overwhelming for trainee social workers 209, 217–18
 working in and with 94
 compromise
 and guilt feelings 220, 225–6
 and prioritization of values 220, 226–8
 conditional rights 132–4
 confidence, low levels of 209, 210–11
 confidentiality 47, 47–8, 48, 160, 183–4, 213–14
 and child abuse disclosure 215–16, 222–4
 and service user self-determination vs service user's interests 222–4
 conflicting interests 62–3
 conflicting responsibilities 164–6
 Congress, E. 204
 considered judgements 57–8
 consistency 43
 ethical judgements and 199
 constructionism 84–7
 consumerism 186
 democratic professionalism, radicalism and 147–55
 consumers, service users as 141–4, 181
 context
 current context of social work 1–2
 ethical judgements and 199
 contradictions 28–30
 working in and with 94
 control 143–4
 social 29, 30, 31, 214
 controlled emotional involvement 46
 co-production 145–6
 counselling 181
 courage 73, 74, 75
 moral 94, 231
 in multiprofessional working 228–35
 critical reflection 191, 207–8
 critical reflexivity 191, 207–8
 customers, service users as 141–4, 181
 cuts in services 154–5

D

Dawson, A. 117
 deception 66–7
 decision-making
 capacity 149–50
 ethical 202–5
 service user participation 148, 149–52
 deconstruction 86
 defensive practice 32, 189–91
 democratic professionalism 106, 137–8
 consumerism, radicalism and 147–55

deprofessionalization 180, 187
 descriptive ethics 5
 Deverell, K. 181–2
 difference 21, 23–4
 dignity, respect for 60, 61–2
 direct payments *see* personalized care
 disabilities, people with 154–5, 225–6
 discourse ethics 44–5
 dispositional care 80
 disruptive behaviour 12–13
 distance, professional 173
 distributive justice 64, 185
 diversity 1–2, 84–7
 Downie, R. 49, 53, 56–7, 163–4
 drop-in centre for young people 23–4
 Du Gay, P. 189
 duties 160–1
 duty-based principles 42–9
 social work as a 'role-job' with specific duties 163–4
 see also responsibilities

E

economic crisis 29, 148
 economic recessions 29
 ecospiritual social work 148–9
 education 27–8
 Eichmann, A. 201
 emancipation 53–5
 empathic solidarity 93
 employing agency 150–1, 164
 separation of personal, professional and agency values 173–7
 service user's interests vs agency role constraints 220–2
 social worker's responsibilities to 164–6
 empowerment 2–3
 of service users 152–5
 engrossment 79
 enhancement of professional status 114, 115
 equality 63–4, 231, 234
 ethical challenge 21, 23–4
 of opportunity 63–4
 of result 63–4
 of treatment 63–4
 ETHIC model 204
 ethical challenges 15, 17–38
 blame and guilt 30–4, 35–7
 equality, difference and structural oppression 21, 23–4
 ethical issues, problems and dilemmas 19–20
 ethical, technical and legal issues 18–19

- individual rights and welfare 21, 21–2
 - professional roles, boundaries and relationships 21, 25–6
 - public welfare 21, 22–3
 - social work as a human services profession 26–7
 - social work and state welfare systems 27–30, 31
 - ethical decision-making 202–5
 - models 202–4
 - ethical issues, problems and dilemmas 19–20
 - ethical judgements 196–202
 - in context 200–2
 - nature of 198–200
 - ethical problems and dilemmas 12–15, 16, 196–241
 - courage and commitment in multiprofessional working 228–35
 - ethical decision-making and ‘ethics work’ 202–5
 - experienced practitioners 218–28
 - practitioners’ accounts 205–7
 - trainee social workers 206, 207–18
 - ethics 4–7
 - definition 7
 - politics and 10–11
 - religion and 9–10
 - ETHICS framework 203–4
 - ‘ethics work’ 204–5
 - Etzioni, A. 135
 - evidence-based practice 180–1
 - exit 141–2, 143
 - experience
 - experienced workers’ ethical problems and dilemmas 218–28
 - expertise by 145–6
 - trainee social workers’ limited knowledge and 209, 214–16
 - expert knowledge 105–6
 - expertise, service users’ 144–7
 - expertise by experience 145–6
 - eXperts by eXperience 145
- F**
- family centre 213–14
 - Feinberg, J. 130–1
 - fellow citizens 137–41
 - Ferguson, I. 146
 - fiduciary relationship 27
 - first generation rights 130, 131
 - formalism 44
 - Foucault, M. 86
 - fragmentation 85, 87
 - of value 87–9, 120
 - France 123–5
 - Franklin, B. 30
 - fraud 98–100
 - freedom 53
 - see also* autonomy; self-determination
 - Freidson, E. 106
 - Freire, P. 208, 236–7
- G**
- Gallagher, A. 73, 74–5, 203–4
 - gender issues 212–13
 - general rights 88
 - General Social Care Council 110
 - generality 116–17
 - Gilligan, C. 77–8
 - goals/ends, religious 40
 - good judgement (practical wisdom) 88–9
 - Goovaerts, H. 203
 - Graham, M. 79
 - green social work 148–9
 - Greenwood, E. 103
 - guidance, codes of ethics and 114, 115
 - guilt 11, 30–4, 35–7
 - ethical problems and dilemmas in practice 218–28
- H**
- Habermas, J. 44–5
 - happiness 50–1, 56
 - Hayes, D. 138
 - health 27–8
 - Healy, L. 2
 - hedonistic utilitarianism 50–1
 - HIV/AIDS counsellor 183, 184, 185
 - HIV prevention outreach workers 181–2
 - Hohfeld, W. 127–8
 - Hollis, M. 31
 - home care services 18–19, 21–2
 - hospital, committal to 220–2
 - housing 27–8
 - Howe, D. 31, 187
 - Hugman, R. 92, 105
 - human rights 3, 129–32
 - social work as human rights profession 126, 134
 - human services profession 26–7
 - Hursthouse, R. 72
 - Husband, C. 167
- I**
- ideal utilitarianism 51
 - identity, professional 114, 115–16

- Ife, J. 87, 131
 IFSW/IASSW
 definition of social work 2–3, 7, 129, 133
 statement of principles 60, 108, 129, 133
 illegal residency 124–5
 Illich, I. 106
 immunities 128
 indigenization 2
 individual rights 21, 21–2, 134–6
 individual welfare 21, 21–2
 individualism 53
 individualization 46, 47
 of social problems 120–1
 informants, social workers as 193–5
 injustice, challenging 169–73
 integrity
 of care 81
 professional 75, 76, 231
 International Association of Schools of Social Work (IASSW) *see* IFSW/IASSW
 International Federation of Social Workers (IFSW) 108, 113
 Latin America and Caribbean region 194
 see also IFSW/IASSW
 interprofessional working 118–19
 see also multiprofessional working
 intersubjective communication 44–5
 Iran 66–7
 Islam 40
 young Bangladeshi men and sexual health services 23–4
- J**
 Japan 28, 113–14
 public welfare office 237–40
 Jones, P. 133
 Judaism 10, 42
 judgements
 considered 57–8
 ethical 192–202
 good judgement (practical wisdom) 88–9
 professional 234
 justice 57, 58, 75, 231, 234
 challenging injustice 169–73
 distributive 64, 185
 ethics of care and 77–8, 82
 promoting in society 49–53
 social *see* social justice
 justification for ethical judgements 199–200
- K**
 Kant, I. 61, 130
 and respect for persons 42–4
 Kantian ethics 42–9, 50, 160
 Kantian-utilitarian principles 55–8
 Kantian-utilitarian-radical principles 58–64
 knowledge
 expert 105–6
 service user's expertise 144–7
 trainee social worker's limited experience and 209, 214–16
 Koehn, D. 104
 Kuhse, H. 80
- L**
 Lansdown, G. 149
 law
 dilemmas about clients who break the law 213–14
 ethical, technical and legal issues 18–19
 learning disabilities, man with 225–6
 legal duties 163
 legal proceedings
 Austrian child abuse case 36–7
 social workers as informants in Argentina 193–5
 legal rights 127, 163
 Leighton, N. 174–5
 Levinas, E. 82, 83–4, 162, 167
 liberation 2–3
 liberties/privileges 128
 limited experience and knowledge, trainee social worker's 209, 214–16
 Line 123 (Iran) 66–7
 Llewelyn, J. 83–4
 Loudfoot, E. 163–4
- M**
 McAuliffe, D. 203
 McDonald, C. 147
 MacIntyre, A. 72
 Machin, S. 169–70
 Macklin, R. 61
 managerialism 186–9
 manipulation 174
 Māori/Tangata Whenua 113
 marketization 186–9
 Marshall, T. 28, 138
 Martin, M. 169
 Marx, K. 53, 130
 media 217–18
 medicine 103, 104
 mental capacity 149–50

- Mental Capacity Act 2005 150
 mental health 18, 220–2
 meta-ethics 5
 mildest method 36
 Mill, J.S. 50, 51
 Millerson, G. 108–9
 models of practice 178–86
 committed/radical 178–86, 189
 professional 178–86, 189
 quasi-business 178–91
 technical-bureaucratic 178–91
 Moon, D. 28–9
 moral absolutism 44
 moral behaviour, components of 200–2
 moral character 201, 202
 moral courage 94, 231
 moral distress 172–3, 210–11
 moral duties and responsibilities 163
 moral education 90–1
 moral impulse 7, 84, 167
 moral motivation 201, 202
 moral norms/standards 4, 5–7
 moral perception 201–2
 moral philosophy 4–5
 moral reasoning 201, 202, 205
 see also ethical judgements
 moral rights *see* rights
 moral sensitivity 200–1, 202
 morality, compared with ethics 6–7
 mothers
 respecting the rights of and protecting
 a child 229–35
 single-parent families 176–7, 238–40
 motivation, moral 201, 202
 multiprofessional working
 ethical problems and dilemmas 228–35
 inhibited by codes of ethics 118–19
 Munro, E. 187
 mutual obligations 140–1
- N**
 Nagel, T. 88–9
 narrative 84–7
 narrow focus 209, 216–17
 National Association of Social Workers
 (NASW) code of ethics 109, 113–14,
 117
 natural rights 130
 negative self-determination 48, 61
 neglect 227–8
 neoliberalism 148
 new public management (NPM) 186
 New Zealand 107, 110, 113, 115
 newspapers, boycotting 217–18
- Noddings, N. 77, 79, 80
 Nøhr, K. 170–1
 nonjudgementalism 46, 47, 48
 nonmaleficence 57, 58
 normative ethics 5, 9
 norms/standards, ethics as 4, 5–7
 nursing 79–80, 104
 Nussbaum, M. 132
- O**
 O'Connor, J. 28
 older people 150–2
 needs assessment 21–2
 participation in decision making 150–2
 right to choose and residential care
 216–17
 screening for personalized care 171–3
 social worker/care manager for 183,
 184, 185
 suffering from confusion 197–201
 O'Neill, M. 140
 opportunity, equal 63–4
 oppression 153, 212–13
 anti-oppressive practice 53–5, 153
 structural 21, 23–4, 29, 153
 Osborne, T. 6
 'Other' 83–4, 162
 outreach workers 181–2
- P**
 parents 225
 see also mothers
 participation in decision-making 148,
 149–52
 particular rights 132–4
 Parton, N. 232
 people with disabilities 154–5, 225–6
 People's Inquiry into Detention 170–1
 perfectionist ends 88
 personal life 166–8, 173–7
 personal values 8–9, 173–7
 personalized care 142–3
 screening older people for 171–3
 persons
 respect for 42–9, 56–7, 61, 136–7
 service users as 136–7
 philosophical incoherence 119–20
 Plato 11
 police 123–5
 political ethics of care 92
 political rights 130, 131
 political struggle 236–7
 political theory of care 80–1
 politics 10–11

- positional indifference 64
- positive self-determination 48, 61
- postmodern ethics 84–7
- power
- professionalism and 105–6
 - rights as powers 128
 - trainee social workers' lack of in relation to the supervisor/practice teacher 209, 211–13
- practical wisdom (good judgement) 88–9
- practice teacher/supervisor, trainee social worker's lack of power in relation to 209, 211–13
- praxis 53, 208
- preference utilitarianism 52
- pregnancy
- respecting a mother's rights and protecting an unborn child 229–35
 - single pregnant women in Taiwan 176–7
 - teenage pregnancies in Turkey 156–7
- pre-reflective self-consciousness 83
- prescription
- codes of ethics and 117–18
 - ethical judgements and 198
- Preston-Shoot, M. 169
- prima facie principles 58
- principle-based approaches 15, 39–68, 69, 89–92, 235
- codes of ethics and 111–12, 119–20
 - common morality approaches 55–64, 120
 - comparison with character- and relationship-based approaches 70–1
 - critiques of 69
 - defining a principle 41
 - duty-based principles 42–9
 - ethic of justice 77–8
 - guilt and compromising a principle 220, 225–6
 - no guilt about a bad outcome due to sticking to a principle 220, 222–4
 - principles vs rules 41–2
 - principles and values 7, 8
 - radical and anti-oppressive principles 53–5
 - religious ethics 40–1
 - utilitarian principles 49–53, 226
- principled autonomy 44
- prioritization of values 220, 226–8
- privileges/liberties 128
- procedural rights and duties 164
- professional associations 107–8
- ANAS in France 123–5
 - see also* British Association of Social Workers (BASW); codes of ethics
- professional conduct 108–9
- professional discipline 114, 116
- professional distance 173
- professional ethics 7, 108–9
- elements of 89–92
- professional identity 114, 115–16
- professional integrity 75, 76, 231
- professional judgement 234
- professional model of practice 178–86, 189
- professional practice 108–9
- professional rights and duties 163
- professional values 8–9
- separation from personal and agency values 173–7
- professional wisdom 74
- professionalism 15, 102–25, 180–1
- democratic 106, 137–8, 147–55
 - and power 105–6
 - responsibilities to the profession 164–6
 - roles, boundaries and relationships 21, 25–6
 - traditional model and trait theory 102–8
 - vocation, commitment and personal life 166–8
 - see also* codes of ethics
- promise-keeping 43
- protection of service users 114, 115
- proximity, ethics of 82–4, 161–2
- psychiatric social work 220–2
- public pledge 103, 104
- public welfare 21, 22–3
- public welfare office, Japan 237–40
- purposeful expression of feelings 46
- Q**
- quasi-business model of practice 178–91
- R**
- race issues 212–13, 226–8
- radical principles 53–5
- Kantian-utilitarian-radical principles 58–64
- radical social justice 93
- radical social work 53–5, 146, 169–70
- committed/radical practitioner model 178–86, 189
 - democratic professionalism, consumerism and 147–55
- Raphael, D. 51
- rationality 42, 43, 44
- Rawls, J. 57, 58, 64
- reasoning, ethical 201, 202, 205

- see also* ethical judgements
 - redistribution 28
 - reflective equilibrium 58
 - reflective practice 189–91
 - development of the reflective practitioner 207–18
 - reflexive practice 189–91
 - development of the reflexive practitioner 207–18
 - reflexivity 86–7, 205
 - regulation, professional 114, 116
 - regulatory bodies 107–8
 - codes of practice 109–10, 163
 - relational autonomy 93
 - relational responsibilities 93–4, 134–47, 162
 - relational rights 134–47, 162
 - relationship-based approaches 15, 69–101
 - comparison with the principle-based approach 70–1
 - ethics of care 77–82, 92, 162
 - ethics of proximity 82–4, 161–2
 - fragmentation of value 87–9, 120
 - postmodern ethics 84–7
 - situated ethics of social justice 92–5
 - see also* social work relationship
 - religion 8–9, 9–10, 166
 - place of religious ethics 40–1
 - separation of personal and professional values 175, 176–7
 - see also* under individual religions
 - religious organizations 40, 182
 - residential care 216–18
 - challenging bad practice 210–11
 - resource allocation 143, 189
 - respect
 - for dignity and worth of all human beings 60, 61–2
 - for persons 42–9, 56–7, 61, 136–7
 - respectfulness 75
 - response 161–2
 - responsibilities 16, 159–95
 - challenging injustices and whistleblowing 169–73
 - codes of ethics and individualization of 120–1
 - conflicting 164–6
 - relational 93–4, 134–47, 162
 - relational duties 161–2
 - separation of personal, professional and agency values 173–7
 - social work as a ‘role-job’ with specific duties 163–4
 - vocation and commitment 166–8
 - responsibility for care 81
 - responsiveness 81
 - Rest, J. 200–1
 - result, equality of 63–4
 - Rhodes, M. 73, 74, 189
 - rights 15–16, 126–58
 - absolute vs conditional 132–4
 - collective 130–1, 134–47
 - components of 127–8
 - democratic professionalism, consumerism or radicalism 147–55
 - general 88
 - human rights 3, 126, 129–32, 134
 - individual 21, 21–2, 134–6
 - natural 130
 - other parties 231, 233–4
 - particular 132–4
 - relational 134–47, 162
 - respecting a mother’s rights and protecting a child 229–35
 - social work as a ‘role-job’ 163–4
 - universal 129, 130, 132–4
 - valid claims 127–9
 - rioting 13–14
 - risk assessment 32–3, 35–6, 163, 187–8, 232, 232–3
 - ‘role-job’, social work as 163–4
 - roles
 - constraints of the agency role vs the service user’s interests 220–2
 - lack of role clarity 209, 213–14
 - professional 21, 25–6
 - Ronnby, A. 167
 - Rossiter, A. 84
 - rule utilitarianism 51
 - rules 91
 - bureaucracy and 189
 - codes of ethics 111
 - principles vs 41–2
 - Rummery, K. 142
- ## S
- Schön, D. 190, 208
 - Schweiker, W. 9
 - screening 171–3
 - second generation rights 130, 131
 - secrecy, professional 123–5
 - Seedhouse, D. 7
 - self-determination 46–7, 48, 61–2, 136
 - and confidentiality vs service user’s interests 222–4
 - negative and positive 48, 61

- participation in decision-making 148, 149–52
- primacy of 184–5
- vs service user's interests 225–6
see also autonomy
- Sen, A. 132
- sensitivity, moral 200–1, 202
- service user organizations 144–5
- service users 4, 15–16, 136–47
 - as activists, experts and allies 144–7
 - confidentiality and self-determination vs interests of 222–4
 - as consumers and customers 141–4, 181
 - empowerment 152–5
 - as fellow citizens and active citizens 137–41
 - interests vs constraints of the agency role 220–2
 - interests and welfare 231, 233
 - participation in decision-making 148, 149–52
 - as persons 136–7
 - primacy of choices and interests of 184–5
 - protection of 114, 115
 - rights *see* rights
 - self-determination *see* self-determination
 - social worker's responsibilities to 164–6
 - values neglected by codes of ethics 119
- Sevenhuijsen, S. 81
- sexual exploitation 22–3
- sexual health services 23–4
- Shaping Our Lives 145
- Sikhism 42
- Singer, P. 52
- single-parent families 176–7, 238–40
- situated ethics 202
 - of social justice 92–5
- social change 2–3
 - radical and anti-oppressive principles 53–5
- social control 29, 30, 31, 214
- social duties and responsibilities 164
- social, economic and cultural rights 130, 131
- social justice 3, 60
 - promotion of 60, 63–4
 - radical and anti-oppressive principles 53–5
 - situated ethics of 92–5
- social problems, individualization of 120–1
- social security 27–8
- social work 16, 159–95
 - current context 1–2
 - definitions 2–3
 - as a human services profession 26–7
 - managerialism, authoritarianism and marketization 186–9
 - models of practice *see* models of practice
 - as a 'role-job' with specific duties 163–4
 - and state welfare systems 27–30, 31
see also social workers
- Social Work Action Network (SWAN) 54, 146–7
- social work employing agency *see* employing agency
- social work relationship 136–7, 144, 231, 234
 - professional roles, boundaries and 21, 25–6
 - respect for persons and 45–9
- Social Work Task Force 107
- social work values, defining 8
- social workers 3–4, 16
 - challenging injustice and whistleblowing 169–73
 - codes of ethics and location of responsibility and blame 120–1
 - defensive practice 32, 189–91
 - as informants in Argentina 193–5
 - reflective and reflexive practice 189–91, 207–18
 - responsibilities *see* responsibilities
 - separation of personal, professional and agency values 173–7
 - vocation and commitment 166–8
- society
 - moral code 176–7
 - social workers' responsibilities to 164–6
- solution-focused approaches 86
- South African Council for Social Service Professions (SACSSP) 107
- specific obligations 88
- specificity of codes of ethics 117–18
- standards/norms, ethics as 4, 5–7
- state welfare 10
 - claiming welfare benefits while working 213–14
 - Japan 237–40
 - systems 27–30, 31
- Statman, D. 71, 72, 90
- status
 - enhancement of professional status 114, 115

trainee social worker's low levels of confidence in 209, 210–11
 structural injustice 64
 structural oppression 21, 23–4, 29, 153
 suicide 223–4
 supervisor/practice teacher, trainee social worker's lack of power in relation to 209, 211–13

T

Taiwan 176–7
 Tangata Whenua (Māori) 113
 targets 172, 186, 188
 Tascón, S. 84
 Taylor, D. 138
 team manager 228–35
 technical-bureaucratic model of practice 178–91
 technical issues 18–19
 teenage pregnancies 156–7
 Telfer, E. 49, 53, 56–7
 theories in use 208
 third generation universal rights 130–1
 third parties' rights, interests and welfare 231, 233–4
 Thompson, I. 19, 209
 Thompson, N. 153
 Timms, N. 7
 trainee social workers 206, 207–18
 trait theory of professionalism 103–5
 treatment, equal 63–4
 Treaty of Waitangi 113
 Tronto, J. 78, 79, 80–1, 92
 trustworthiness 75
 Turkey 113, 156–7

U

unconditional caring 167–8
 United Kingdom (UK) 27, 107
 asylum seekers and citizenship rights 138–40
 BASW 108, 109, 115
 codes of ethics/practice 109, 110, 115
 college of social work 107–8
 growth of managerialism, authoritarianism and marketization 186–9
 United Nations (UN) 136
 Declaration of the Rights of the Child 130, 133, 157
 declarations and conventions 130–1, 133

Universal Declaration of Human Rights 61, 133
 universal rights 129, 130, 132–4
 universalizability 43
 utilitarianism 49–53, 226
 Kantian-utilitarian principles 55–8
 Kantian-utilitarian-radical principles 58–64
 utility 88

V

valid claims 127–9
 validity 45
 value, fragmentation of 87–9, 120
 values 7–9, 111
 prioritization and compromise 220, 226–8
 professional and personal 8–9
 separation of personal, professional and agency values 173–7
 Van Ewijk, H. 141
 Vetlesen, A. 83, 201
 virtue ethics 71–7, 90–1, 112
 vocation 166–8

W

welfare
 ethical judgements and 198
 individual 21, 21–2
 other parties' 231, 233–4
 promotion of 49–53, 60, 62–3
 public 21, 22–3
 service users' 231, 233
 state welfare systems 27–30, 31
 welfare cuts 148, 154–5
 wellbeing, promotion of 60, 62–3
 whistleblowing 169–73
 Whitley, C. 160
 Woodward, R. 146
 work, caring as 92
 work settings 182–6
 worth, respect for 60, 61–2

Y

Young, I. 64
 youth development work 13–14, 184, 185, 222–4
 drop-in centre and young Bangladeshi men 23–4