

Contents

<i>List of figures, tables and lists</i>	x
<i>Preface to the third edition</i>	xi
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xix
Introduction	1
Current context of social work	1
Terminology: ‘social work’, ‘social workers’ and ‘service users’	2
Terminology: ‘ethics’ and ‘values’	4
Rationale and aims of the book	8
1 Ethical issues in social work	11
The ethical, the technical and the legal	11
What are the ethical issues in social work?	13
Social work as a human services profession	17
Social work and state welfare systems	18
Blame and guilt in social work	20
Conclusions	25
Putting it into practice	26
Further reading	26
2 Principle-based approaches to social work ethics	27
Principles	27
Respect and autonomy in the social work relationship: Kantian principles	29
Promoting welfare and justice in society: utilitarian principles	35
Commitment to emancipation and social justice: the challenge of radical and anti-oppressive principles	37
‘Common morality’ approaches to ethics	39
Conclusions	51

	Putting it into practice	52
	Further reading	52
3	Character- and relationship-based approaches to social work ethics	54
	Importance of character in the professional role: virtue-based approaches	54
	The caring relationship between professional and service user: the ‘ethics of care’	58
	Diversity, narrative and constructionism: postmodern ethics?	63
	Fragmentation of value: moral pluralism	66
	Conclusions	71
	Putting it into practice	72
	Further reading	73
4	Professionalism and codes of ethics	74
	Professionalism, professions and power	74
	Professional codes of ethics	77
	Why have a code of ethics?	79
	Form and content of codes of ethics	81
	‘Professional autonomy’ and codes of ethics in bureaucracies	92
	How useful are codes of ethics?	96
	Conclusions	100
	Putting it into practice	101
	Further reading	102
5	Service users’ rights: clienthood, citizenship and consumerism	103
	Rights	103
	Individual rights as valid claims	104
	Classifications of individual rights	105
	Relational rights and responsibilities	107
	The service user as a person (in a relationship of clienthood)	109
	The service user as fellow citizen, equal and ally	110
	The service user as a consumer	113
	Democratic professionalism or consumerism?	116
	Involvement and participation of service users in decision-making	118
	Empowerment	120

Conclusions	122
Putting it into practice	122
Further reading	123
6 Social workers' responsibilities: policies, procedures and managerialism	124
Duties	125
'Relational duties' or responsibilities	126
Social work as a 'role-job' with specific duties	127
Conflicting responsibilities	128
Unity of personal and professional values and life	130
The professional is political: challenging injustices and 'blowing the whistle'	133
Separation of personal, professional and agency values and life	134
Committed/radical, professional and technical–bureaucratic models of practice	136
Growth of managerialism and authoritarianism: the case of the UK	143
Ethics in bureaucracies: defensive, reflective and reflexive practice	148
Conclusions	151
Putting it into practice	152
Further reading	152
7 Ethical problems and dilemmas in practice	154
Ethical judgements	154
Ethical judgements in context	156
Developing the reflective and reflexive practitioner: case studies from trainee social workers	159
When are blame and guilt justified? Case studies from practitioners	168
Courage and commitment in multi-professional working: a team manager's case	177
Conclusions	184
Putting it into practice	184
Further reading	185
<i>References</i>	186
<i>Index</i>	210

Introduction

Current context of social work

The occupation of social work is currently in a period of change – both in the UK and in many other countries – as the role of the state as a direct provider of services declines, resources for welfare are being reduced and new styles of management and accountability are introduced. This makes it not only difficult to look at the ethics and values of social work (because old values may be becoming irrelevant and new ones are beginning to emerge) but also particularly important. Social work has always been a difficult occupation to define. It is located within and profoundly affected by diverse cultural, economic and policy contexts in different countries of the world. Social work embraces work in a number of sectors (public, private, independent, voluntary); it takes place in a multiplicity of settings (residential homes, area offices, community development projects); practitioners perform a range of tasks (caring, controlling, empowering, campaigning, assessing, managing); and the work has a variety of purposes (redistribution of resources to those in need, social control and rehabilitation of the deviant, prevention or reduction of social problems). This diversity, or ‘fragmentation’ as some have called it, is increasing, which raises the question of whether the occupation can retain the rather tenuous identity it was seeking to develop in the 1970s and 1980s.

In such a climate of fragmentation, there are some who argue that it is the values of social work that should hold it together. Yet the values traditionally stated – self-determination of the service user, acceptance, non-judgementalism and confidentiality, for example – are neither unique to social work nor do they seem to be complete for social work. Similar statements of values or ethical principles are made for medicine, nursing and counselling, for example. It is precisely because these values are so broad ranging that they can encompass the variety of tasks and settings that come under the umbrella of ‘social work’. They are relevant to the ‘caring profes-

sional' who is in a relationship of trust with a service user in need of help. Yet this description has never adequately characterised social work, which may also be about controlling people in the interests of social order. So, not only do the traditional social work values fail to characterise social work uniquely, they also fail to encompass social work itself completely. Other values also seem relevant, such as fairness in the distribution of resources and the promotion of the public good. As state-sponsored social work changes, with the emphasis less on the individual helping relationship and more on the distribution of resources and on social control, this is becoming more apparent. State social workers who are involved in the criminal justice system, community care, child protection and mental health are finding themselves working to an increasing number of legal, governmental and agency procedures and guidelines. This brings ethical issues around justice and fairness to prominence. At the same time, workers in specialist services that are often located in the voluntary (not-for-profit) sector, such as child advocacy or AIDS/HIV counselling, can operate more easily within the traditional casework value system that emphasises the self-determination of service users (or its modern development, 'empowerment') and the rights and welfare of individuals.

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

There are many definitions of social work. These vary in emphasis according to the purpose for which they are written, the ideological viewpoint of the authors, the country and/or organisation of origin and the level of generality or detail. As Healy (2001, p. 80) comments, there are both striking similarities and differences in social work practice around the world. Some of the similarities are due to the influence of American and western European education programmes and literature in countries where social work developed later or was influenced by former colonial links. The establishment of international professional organisations and the growing ease of global communications have also contributed to an increasing awareness of common and inter-connected issues and problems. Yet, at the same time, as social work has become established in a range of countries, so its methods and approaches have adapted to the local conditions and culture. So while it is possible for the International Federation of Social Workers (IFSW) to produce a definition of social work that is designed to be applicable worldwide, it is a very general statement of purpose and principle. It is acknowledged that

the priorities of social work will vary between countries and time periods, depending on cultural, historical and socio-economic conditions. The IFSW (2000) definition will, however, be used as a starting point for this book:

The social work profession promotes social change, problem solving in human relationships and the empowerment and liberation of people to enhance well-being. Utilising theories of human behaviour and social systems, social work intervenes at points where people interact with their environments. Principles of human rights and social justice are fundamental to social work.

The purpose of this statement is to unify social workers around the world and to provide a common starting point for presenting social work to governments and other international and national agencies and bodies. The term ‘profession’ is used to describe social work, which instantly gives the occupation a status and implied unity. Reference is made to the use of theories relevant to social work interventions, which again serve to legitimise social work as a profession, based on a body of knowledge. Implicit in this is the fact that the theories need to be learnt through an educational process and applied through expertise. The definition also focuses on the purposes of social work, which include the terms ‘social change’, ‘empowerment’ and ‘liberation’. These terms indicate that social work is about more than just helping people to adapt to their environments. It is about enabling them to take action for themselves. The fact that the definition explicitly refers to principles as fundamental highlights the importance of social workers having a commitment to a set of core values. The mention of ‘human rights’ and ‘social justice’ covers both issues of individual freedom of choice and action and the distribution of power and resources in society.

The term ‘social worker’ is used in this book to refer to people who are paid in a professional capacity to undertake the work just described. The IFSW definition is followed by a commentary, which includes a fuller description of social work practice, suggesting that ‘interventions range from primarily person-focused psychosocial processes to involvement in social policy, planning and development’. It is important to note that some of the activities that form part of these interventions (such as counselling or helping people obtain services and resources in the community) may be carried out by people who are not social workers (volunteers, family members, other welfare professionals). But the loca-

tion of the interventions undertaken by social workers within a rubric of theory and specialised terminology indicates that the practices will only be recognised as social work if they can be constructed in this way.

I have tended to adopt the term ‘service user’ or simply ‘user’ to refer to the people who use social work services. I prefer this to ‘customer’ or ‘consumer’ as these terms have connotations of choice and market-based relationships that are not necessarily appropriate in social work. Occasionally the term ‘client’ is used, as this was until recently in common usage and some of the social work literature uses this term. I have tended to use ‘she’ when I am referring to a social worker instead of the more cumbersome ‘he/she’.

Terminology: ‘ethics’ and ‘values’

It is also important to clarify the terms in the title of the book – ‘ethics’ and ‘values’. People use the term ‘ethics’ in a number of different ways, but perhaps the most important distinction to make is between ethics as synonymous with moral philosophy and ethics as moral norms or standards. Within each of these two broad types of usage there are also many variations, depending on what aspects of moral philosophy are stressed and whether ‘moral norms’ are seen as habits, preferences, rules, standards, principles or character traits, for example.

If we take the first usage of ethics, as moral philosophy, it is a singular term, used to describe a branch of philosophy concerned with the study of ‘morality, moral problems and moral judgements’ (Frankena, 1963, p. 3). This is the way most moral philosophers writing on ethics use the term. For example, Warnock (1998, p. 7) talks of ‘ethics (or moral philosophy, as I prefer to call it)’. The nature and remit of moral philosophy is, of course, disputed. But often philosophers distinguish three types of ethics as follows:

1. *Metaethics* – comprises critical and analytical thinking about the meaning and use of moral terms such as ‘right’, ‘good’ or ‘duty’, about whether moral judgements can be justified or what the nature of morality is, for example.
2. *Normative ethics* – attempts to give answers to moral questions and problems regarding, for example, what the morally right course of action in a particular case is, whether someone is a morally good person or whether lying is always wrong.
3. *Descriptive ethics* – studies what people’s moral opinions and

beliefs are and how they act in relation to these – for example, whether people in Britain believe abortion is always morally wrong.

Some philosophers confine moral philosophy to metaethics only (for example, Urmson, 1975, p. 99), but generally it is regarded as comprising both metaethics and normative ethics, although some philosophers may inevitably spend more of their time on the former than the latter. Descriptive ethics, however, is usually regarded as outside the realm of moral philosophy, although not irrelevant, in that it comprises the kinds of empirical and historical inquiries that might be conducted by anthropologists, sociologists or historians. Clearly in the context of professional ethics, we are interested in all three aspects of ethics, including descriptive ethics (what moral views social workers actually hold and how they behave in practice), although the purpose of this book is not to conduct an empirical inquiry.

The second usage of the term ‘ethics’ is as a plural term referring to the norms or standards of behaviour people follow concerning what is regarded as good or bad, right or wrong. Commentators vary according to whether they regard ethics as norms, standards, rules, principles or character traits and whether they regard them as internally developed by the moral agent or externally imposed by an outside authority. A common use of this second sense of ethics is in the expression ‘code of ethics’ – which is usually regarded as a set of principles, standards or rules of conduct for ethical practice. A variant on this usage of ethics is to use the term synonymously with ‘morality’ to mean a system of moral norms or standards.

In English we often use the terms ‘ethics’ and ‘morals’ interchangeably in this second sense. Indeed, as Edwards (1998, p. 41) points out, ‘morals’ is derived from the Latin (*mores*) and ‘ethics’ from the Greek (*ethos*), both meaning habits or customs. It is in this interchangeable sense that I will use the terms ‘ethics’ and ‘morals’ in this book, along with the adjectives ‘ethical’ and ‘moral’. However, it is important to point out that some commentators do distinguish between the two. Osborne (1998, pp. 221–2) makes the following distinction:

Moral systems are systems of interdiction; they are ideologies, codes to which individuals must relate themselves. Ethics, on the other hand, might be considered in a more positive sense, not as codes of interdiction, not as external norms to which individuals must relate themselves, but as constructed norms of ‘internal

consistency' (cf. Deleuze, 1988: 23; Foucault, 1984). Morality, one could say, is about doing one's duty to others or doing one's duty by some moral norm; ethics is about doing one's duty to oneself.

This has resonances with the distinction made in some of the French literature between 'la morale' and 'l'éthique'. Bouquet (1999, p. 27) defines 'la morale' as 'a set of universalisable values, absolute and imperative; it comprises duties'. She suggests that the term has become discredited through being confused with moralising and through the recent rejection of a prescriptive morality, of dogmatism and universalism. Common usage is now substituting the term 'éthique' for 'morale'. She regards 'l'éthique' as equally normative, but not categorical. It is principally associated with the subject and interior to the subject (that is, the moral agent) who is autonomous, free and responsible to herself for her acts. Bouquet defines 'l'éthique' as 'the set of principles which are at the foundation of each person's conduct'.

However, such distinctions in the English-speaking literature are less common and great care must be taken to ascertain how commentators are distinguishing 'ethics' and 'morals', if at all, since they do not all follow the same broad distinctions made by Osborne and Bouquet. For example, Bauman frequently talks of 'ethics' as the externally imposed codes prescribing correct behaviour universally (1995, p. 11) and the 'moral impulse' or 'morality' as internal and 'autonomous' (1993, p. 46). No such distinctions will be made in this book.

The term 'values' is equally problematic. 'Social work values', 'the value-base of social work', 'social work as a value-laden activity' are all common phrases in the social work literature. Yet what is meant by 'the values of social work'? 'Values' is one of those words that tends to be used rather vaguely and has a variety of different meanings. Timms (1983, p. 107) cites a literature review that discovered 180 different definitions. In everyday usage, 'values' is often used to refer to one or all of religious, moral, cultural, political or ideological beliefs, principles, attitudes, opinions or preferences. For our purpose, 'values' can be regarded as particular types of belief that people hold about what is regarded as worthy or valuable. In the context of professional practice, the use of the term 'belief' reflects the status that values have as stonger than mere opinions or preferences.

Clearly there are many different types of thing that can be regarded as valuable. Seedhouse (1998, p. 78) lists: physical objects

(for example furniture); aesthetic qualities (for example beauty); intangibles (for example creativity); principles (for example truth telling); or ideologies (for example communism). In the literature on professional values, it is frequently principles, and particularly ethical principles, relating to how people should be treated, what ideas or actions are worthy or unworthy, good or bad, right or wrong that are regarded as values. For example, the IFSW (2000) definition of social work includes 'respect for the equality, worth, and dignity of all people', 'human rights' and 'social justice' under the heading of 'values'. However, some of the literature also includes what Seedhouse calls 'intangibles' as professional values, such as creativity or integrity, which we might regard as 'virtues' or character traits of workers. Furthermore, there is an increasing tendency to distinguish 'values' from 'principles' in some statements on professional ethics (for example, Australian Association of Social Workers, 1999; British Association for Counselling and Psychotherapy, 2001; British Association of Social Workers, 2002), with 'values' being used to encompass broad beliefs about the nature of the good society and the role of social work within this (belief in human dignity and worth, integrity in social work practice) and principles being general statements about actions that promote these values (treating people with respect, placing service users' needs first). I will use the term 'social work values' in a very broad sense to encompass this whole range of beliefs about what is regarded as worthy or valuable in a social work context (general beliefs about the nature of the good society, general principles about how to achieve this through actions and the desirable qualities or character traits of professional practitioners).

Professional values can be distinguished from personal values, in that personal values may not be shared by all members of an occupational group. For example, a person who works as a social worker may have a personal belief that abortion is wrong, but this is not one of the underlying principles of social work. Insofar as professional values are located within and influenced by broader societal values, then they may reflect particular ideological or political positions (for example liberalism). But lists of professional values do not usually include direct or overt statements of ideological or political beliefs. Employing agencies' values are usually similar to those of the profession as a whole, although some specialist organisations may include explicit religious or ideological beliefs. A worker's personal values, however, will encompass all of Seedhouse's range

of categories and may include religious as well as aesthetic and ideological beliefs.

Rationale and aims of the book

The discussion thus far suggests that it is both timely and difficult to explore the nature of the ethical and value issues inherent in social work practice. It is timely not just because the old values are under threat, but also because social workers themselves are increasingly under moral attack from the press and public for the outcomes of their actions. Controversies over the handling of child abuse cases, for example, raise ethical questions about the duties and rights of social workers and the extent to which they should be blamed if a child dies or if children are removed from their families unnecessarily. Many social workers feel a sense of guilt and anxiety when having to make a difficult ethical decision. While such feelings are inevitable for anyone who makes difficult decisions and has a sense of moral responsibility, should social workers take all the blame for bad outcomes? One of the purposes of this book is to encourage social workers to be clear about their own value positions and hence to reduce some of the unnecessary feelings of guilt, blame and anxiety in making difficult ethical decisions.

In the course of collecting material for this book, I have found that when social workers are asked to describe ethical dilemmas in their practice, there is never any shortage of examples and there is no need even to define what is meant by an 'ethical dilemma'. If we do define what is meant by the term 'ethical dilemma' – a choice between two equally unwelcome alternatives relating to human welfare – then it is immediately apparent that the occurrence of ethical dilemmas in social work is serious and common. There is never any shortage of cases where the rights of parents have to be balanced against the rights of children or the social worker's duty to the agency conflicts with a duty to the service user, for example.

There are no easy answers to the ethical problems and dilemmas in social work practice. It is not possible (or desirable) to produce a rulebook that would enable social workers easily and quickly to resolve these dilemmas. Even if it were, the resolution of the dilemma will still entail making a choice between two unwelcome alternatives, perhaps by careful consideration and deciding that one alternative is less unwelcome than the other. Having made the choice, the impact of the dilemma does not go away, for even the

least unwelcome alternative is still unwelcome. The resolution of a dilemma often leaves a residue of guilt, blame or regret. This is where some of the main stresses for social workers lie; not just in having to make difficult choices and decisions, but having to take responsibility for the unwelcome nature or outcomes of the decisions. For example:

Peter is a 10-year-old boy whose parents are still barely able to control him after a lot of support from a social worker and a range of professionals from other agencies. Should the social worker recommend that Peter be removed from the parental home, a decision that would go against the wishes of Peter and his parents and might cause further disruptive behaviour as a result of the move? Or should she recommend that he stay at home, a course of action that is contrary to the demands coming from neighbours and the school and risks further violent and disruptive behaviour towards other children and neighbours?

Both solutions have unwelcome consequences. The process of investigation, taking into account the legal and moral rights of different parties, the risks involved in both courses of action and the legal, procedural and moral responsibilities of the social worker is a complex one. Whatever course of action is taken, somebody's rights may be compromised and some of the consequences may be unwelcome.

The aim of this book is not to tell social workers how to make such choices – I believe that would be both impossible and undesirable. It is impossible because of the complexity of social work decision-making; no rulebook could cover the variety of situations. It would be undesirable because it would suggest that social workers would simply have to follow the prescribed rules applying in each case and could in effect abrogate their individual responsibility for decision-making. Rather, the book aims to encourage critical thinking, reflection and reflexivity through exploring the nature of the ethical problems and dilemmas in social work, how and why they arise and what might be some alternative ways of tackling them according to different ethical theories and approaches. Through gaining a clearer understanding of what the problems and dilemmas are about, social workers should be able more readily to decide where they stand on some of the important ethical issues in the work and will have more confidence in justifying the decisions they have

made and may feel less obliged to take the blame for the inevitable unwelcome outcomes of social work intervention.

At the end of each chapter, exercises have been included that can be used by readers to focus their thoughts around particular issues or by tutors/facilitators teaching or working with groups of social workers. Case studies drawn from accounts given by social work students and practitioners have also been used, mainly in Chapter 7, to illustrate how ethical problems and dilemmas arise and can be tackled in practice. Details of the cases and all names of people involved have been changed to preserve anonymity.

Index

A

abortion 5, 7, 12, 136
acceptance 32, 33, 34, 43
accountability 125
action
 ethical judgements and 155
 reflection in/on 159
activism 160
act utilitarianism 36, 37
advertising 91, 91–2
advocates 119, 139–40
agencies 124, 125
 agency role v. service users’
 interests 170–2
 codes of practice 99, 100, 101
 responsibilities to 129
agency workers 145
Alaszewski, A. 145
Aldridge, M. 21
Amnesty International 108
anti-foundationalism 64
anti-oppressive approaches to ethics
 37–9, 44, 45, 50–1, 100
anti-professionalism 147
anxiety 8
appeal, right of 113
approaches to ethics 28, 37, 39
 anti-oppressive 37–9, 44, 45, 50–1
 character-based 54–8
 common morality 39–51
 discourse ethics 31
 Kantian 29–31, 39–41, 42–4
 principle-based 27–53, 54
 radical 37–9, 42–4, 50–1
 relationship-based 54–8
 rights-based 103
 utilitarian 35–7, 39–41, 42–4
 virtue-based 54–8, 69–71
Aristotle 55, 59, 67, 73, 160

Asquith, S. 105, 106
asylum seekers 111–12
attentiveness 61
Australia, code of ethics 82, 84, 85,
 86, 87–8
Austria, code of ethics 82
authenticity 47
authoritarianism 144
 growth of 143–8
autonomy 34, 41, 42, 48–9
 principled 30, 34
 professional, in codes of ethics
 92–6
 relational 34
 see also self-determination

B

Baier, A. 63
Bamford, T. 116
Bauman, Z. 6, 64, 126, 131, 132
Beauchamp, T. 27, 39, 41, 42, 52,
 54, 56, 58, 68
behaviour
 control of 45
 moral 157
 standards of 5
beneficence 41, 42
benevolence 56
Bentham, J. 36, 37
Berry, L. 114–5
Biestek, Felix, casework principles
 31, 32, 33, 35, 46, 107, 109
bioethics 39, 41
 principles of 41
blame
 case studies 168–77
 in social work 9, 20–5
 see also victim-blaming
Blum, L. 62

- Boss, J. 108
 Bouquet, B. 6
 Bowie, N. 30
 Brandon, D. 119
 Braye, S. 11
 Brazil, code of ethics 82
 Briskman, L. 87, 89, 134
 British Association of Social Workers (BASW), code of ethics 78, 79, 82, 84, 85, 91, 92
 Brock, D. 119
 Brookfield, S. 159
 Buber, M. 126, 127
 Buchanan, A. 119
 Buddhism 108
 Bulgaria, code of ethics 82, 84, 98
 bureaucracies
 defensive practice in 144, 147, 148, 149, 150
 definition 148
 ethics in 92–6, 148–51
 bureau professionals 76
 Burkitt, I. 127
- C**
- Calman, K. 96, 97
 Canada, code of ethics 82, 86, 88, 90, 91, 99
 care, dispositional 62
 care ethics 54, 58–63, 132
 caring
 detached 56
 work v. commitment 70
 caring professionals 77
 caring professions 76
 caring about/caring for 76
 casework 2, 31, 32, 35
 principles 32, 35, 109
 casuistry 157
 CCETSW (Central Council for Education and Training in Social Work) 35, 44, 45–6
 character, moral 158
 character-based approaches to ethics 54–8
 child abuse 8, 21–3, 24–5, 144–6
 child care, bureaucratisation of 144
 child protection 21, 22, 24–5, 144–6
- children
 children's needs, and black community, case study 175–7
 UN Declaration of the Rights of the Child 104, 106, 131
 Childress, James 39, 41, 42, 52, 54, 56, 58, 68
 choice 113–15
 citizenship 47, 111–12, 113
 claim rights 105
 claims, v. rights 104–5
 Clark, C. 47, 57, 105, 106
 clients, *see* service users
 Cocking, D. 56
 codes of ethics 5, 18, 47, 49, 57, 77–9, 130–1
 advertising 91, 91–2
 in bureaucracies 92–6
 confidentiality 91, 99
 content of 78–9, 81–92
 differences between 86
 disciplinary procedures 92
 duties 90
 factors determining need for 79–80
 fees 91–2
 forging a common identity 81
 form of 81–92
 further reading 102
 generating shared values 81
 guiding practice 98–9
 from individual countries 81–93, 98–9
 introduction of 80–1
 lengths of 83, 85
 limitations 96–7
 partnership agreements 91
 principle-based 85
 principles in 86, 98–9
 professional autonomy 92–6
 professional integrity 85, 89–90
 professional practice issues 91–2
 protecting service users 99
 reasons for 79–80, 97–8
 research participation 91
 service user self-determination 86–7
 similarities 86
 social justice 87–9
 usefulness of 96–101
 see also individual countries

codes of practice 46, 91–2, 99
 agencies' 99, 100, 101
 regulatory bodies, UK 92
 collaborative working 57
 collectivism 38
 commitment 67, 70
 case study 177–83
 committed/radical practitioner
 practice model 133–4, 137, 138
 common morality approach to ethics
 39–51
 principles 41
 communitarianism 108–9, 113
 community care management 146–7
 community development workers
 140–1
 confidentiality 141–2
 distributive justice 143
 self-determination of service users
 142
 compassion 56, 70
 competence 47, 61
 complaints 117
 confidence, of trainee social workers
 161–2
 confidentiality 32, 33, 34, 42, 43
 in codes of ethics 91, 99
 in different work settings 141–2
 duty of 125
 promises about 165–6
 right to 106, 107
 v. service users' interests 172–3
 conscientiousness 56
 considered judgements 41–2
 consistency, ethical judgements and
 156
 constructionism 65, 66
 consumerism 116–17, 144
 consumers, service users as 113–16
 contract culture 148
 control
 of behaviour 45
 of social work 95, 110
 social workers' function 2, 18, 21
 Cooper, D. 144
 counselling 41
see also HIV/AIDS counsellors
 courage 55, 56
 case study 177–83
 critical practice 151

critical reflection 150, 159
 critical reflexivity 151, 159
 Croatia, code of ethics 82, 98
 Czech Republic, code of ethics 82,
 87, 98

D

Davis, M. xiii
 decision-making 66–8, 117, 118–19
 defensive practice in bureaucracies
 144, 147, 148, 149, 150
 deindividualisation 47
 Denmark, code of ethics 82, 84
 Dent, M. 139
 deontology 125
 de-professionalisation 138–9, 144
 descriptive ethics 4–5
 Deverell, K. 140
 difference, issues of 13
 dignity 48–9
 dilemma
 definition 24
see also ethical dilemmas
 Diploma in Social Work 45–6
 disability 12, 59
 disabling professions 77
 discernment 56
 disciplinary procedures, in codes of
 ethics 92
 discipline 47
 discourse ethics 31
 dispositional care 62
 distributive justice 50, 51, 143
 diversity in social work 1–2, 65
 doctors 18, 21, 77, 93, 94
 Downie, R. 29, 30, 34, 35, 37, 40,
 41, 96, 97, 127, 128, 132
 duties 125–6
 in codes of ethics 90
 relational 126–7
 of social workers 128
 duty, sense of 30
 duty ethics 125

E

Eastham, M. 130
 Edwards, P. 5
 Edwards, S. 70
 elderly people 140
 confidentiality and 141

distributive justice 143
 self-determination 142
 emancipatory values/forms of social
 work 38–9, 47
 emotion 70
 emotional involvement, controlled 32
 emotional responsiveness 58
 empathy 70
 v. feeling with 61
 empowerment 3, 43, 47
 of service users 2, 120–1
 see also self-determination
 engrossment 62
 equality 13, 38–9, 47, 50–1, 63
 of opportunity 50
 of result 50
 of treatment 50
 ethical dilemmas 8–9, 13
 in practice 154–9
 v. problems 160–1
 of trainee social workers, case
 studies 161–8
 ethical issues 12, 13–17
 v. legal issues 11–13
 types of 13–17
 ethical judgements, in practice 154–9
 ethical problems 12–13
 v. dilemmas 160–1
 ethics
 approaches to, *see* approaches to
 ethics
 in bureaucracies 92–6, 148–51
 of care 54, 58–63, 132
 the end of 64
 humanistic 130–2
 of justice 59–60, 61, 132
 v. morals 5–6
 postmodern 54, 63–6
 principles and rules 27–8, 42
 professional 63, 68, 78
 of proximity 71, 131, 132
 situated 158
 teaching 69–70
 terminology 4–6
 types of 4–5
 virtue ethics 54–8, 69–71
 Etzioni, A. 108
 evidence-based practice 138–9

F

faithfulness 56
 Farley, M. 60
 feelings
 feeling with v. empathy 61
 purposeful expression of 32, 34
 fees, in codes of ethics 91–2
 Feinberg, J. 104, 105
 feminist approaches 20, 34, 38, 59,
 126, 134
 fiduciary relationships 18, 79–80, 80
 Finland, code of ethics 82, 84
 Fook, J. 150
 Foucault, M. 115
 fragmentation
 of social work 95–6, 98, 139
 of value 66–71
 France, code of ethics 82, 84, 93
 Franklin, B. 21
 freedom 37
 Freidson, E. 77
 Freire, P. 160

G

gender 20, 44, 163, 164, 176
 General Social Care Council, code
 of ethics 82
 Germany, code of ethics 82
 Gilligan, C. 59, 60, 63
 Glennerster, H. 146
 Graham, M. 60, 107, 108, 127
 Greece, code of ethics 82
 Greenwood, E. 74–5
 guilt
 case studies 168–77
 in social work 9, 22, 23–5

H

Habermas, Jürgen 31
 Halmos, P. 131, 133
 happiness 36–7, 40–1, 49, 155
 Harris, N. 144, 150
 Hayes, D. 111
 hedonistic utilitarianism 36
 Hekman, S. 63
 HIV/AIDS counsellors 140, 141
 confidentiality 141
 distributive justice 143

self-determination of service users
142
Hollis, M. 22, 23
honesty 55, 56
Hong Kong, code of ethics 82, 85, 86
hopefulness 56
Howe, D. 22, 23, 138, 144, 145
Hugman, R. 70, 114
humanistic ethics 130–2
human rights 28, 104, 106, 107–8
see also rights of service users
human services 17–18
human welfare, ethical judgements
about 155
humility 56
Hursthouse, R. 55
Husband, C. 132, 133

I

Iceland, code of ethics 82
ideal utilitarianism 36
ideology 38, 137
Ife, J. 66
Illich, I. 77
Immigration Act 1988 111
independent practice 92
individual, as fundamental unit in
society 28
individualisation 32, 33
individualism 37
inequalities, challenging 43, 48
'informed consent' 118
instrumental thinking 62
integrity 47, 55, 56, 57–8, 70
of care 61
professional, in codes of ethics
85, 89–90
interests, conflict between 35
internal markets 114
International Code of Ethics 131
International Federation of Social
Workers (IFSW) 81, 82–3, 106
code of ethics 84, 86, 88, 90, 96,
98
definitions 2–3, 7
Ireland, Republic of, code of ethics
82, 84, 98
Italy, code of ethics 82, 92–3

J

Japan, code of ethics 82, 86
Johnson, T. 76, 77
Jordan, B. 11, 44–5
Judeo-Christian tradition 28
judgement 67–8, 69
moral 30, 34, 157, 158
justice 35, 41, 43, 47, 56, 63
conflicting with utility 37
distributive 50, 51
ethics of 59–60, 61, 132
Kantian–utilitarian principles 40
social 38–9, 44, 47, 48, 50–1,
87–9
justification, of ethical arguments
156

K

Kant, Immanuel 29, 30
Kantian ethics 29–31, 39–41, 43
criticisms of 30–1
kindness 55
King, M. 145
Koehn, D. 75, 77, 135–6
Kuhse, H. 62

L

Lansdown, G. 118
laws, interpretation of 11–12
learning disabilities 110, 119, 174
legal issues, v. ethical issues 11–13
legal rights/duties 128
legal rights of service users 105,
112
Leighton, N. 134–6
Levinas, E. 64, 126, 127, 131, 132
Lewis, J. 146
liberation 3
liberties (negative rights) 105
liberty 35, 40, 43
literature 38, 46–7
Lithuania, code of ethics 84
Logstrup, K. 131
Loudfoot, E. 127, 128, 132
love 131
loyalty 55
Lund, B. 113
Luxembourg, code of ethics 82, 84,
93

lying 30, 35
 Lymbery, M. 146, 147
 Lyotard, J.-F. 64

M

McBeath, G. 144
 McDermott, F. 33
 Macdonald, G. 22
 Machin, S. 133–4
 MacIntyre, A. 55, 59
 Malin, N. 139
 managerialism 124, 144
 growth of 143–8
 new 152
 Maori people 88–9
 Marshall, T. H. 19, 111, 112, 113
 Marx, K. 38
 Marxist theory 38
 Maude, A. 130
 medicine 37, 40, 42, 44, 76, 95,
 138–9
 Mendus, S. 63
 Mental Health Act 11
 mentalism 160
 metaethics 4, 5
 Mill, John Stuart 36, 37, 40
 Millerson, G. 78, 79–80, 96
 Milner, J. 65
 Mintzberg, H. 94
 Moon, D. 19
 moral behaviour 157
 moral character 158
 moral codes, relationship between
 136
 moral duties 128
 moral impulse 6, 132
 morality 5, 6
 personal v. professional 148–9
 moral judgements 30, 34, 157, 158
 moral motivation 158
 moral perception 157
 moral philosophy 4–5
 moral pluralism 66–71
 moral reasoning 157, 158
 moral rights of service users 105,
 112
 morals, v. ethics 5–6
 moral sensitivity 157, 158
 motivation, moral 158
 Mullender, A. 120

N

Nagel, T. 22, 66–8
 National Association of Social
 Workers (NASW), USA, code of
 ethics 78–9, 83, 84, 85, 86–7,
 90–1
 National Health Service and
 Community Care Act 1990 146
 needs 104, 106, 108–9, 111, 114,
 117–9
 Netherlands, code of ethics 82, 86,
 87, 91, 92
 new professionalism 77, 139
 New Zealand, code of ethics 82, 84,
 88, 88–9
 Noble, C. 87, 89
 Noddings, N. 59, 61, 62, 63
 non-judgementalism 32, 33, 34, 43
 non-maleficence 41
 non-malevolence 56
 non-preferential treatment 43
 Norman, R. 68
 normative ethics 4, 5
 Norway, code of ethics 83, 84, 88
 nursing 28, 52, 61, 62, 63, 70, 76
 nursing ethics 61–2

O

Oakley, J. 56
 O'Byrne, P. 65
 O'Connor, J. 19
 obligations, personal 67
 offenders 49, 133
 Okin, S. 58–9
 O'Neill, O. 30
 oppression 120
 structural 13, 15, 17, 45, 120, 121
 Osborne, T. 5, 6
 O'Sullivan, T. 181

P

Parsons, T. 94
 partnership 47
 partnership agreements 91
 Parton, N. 65, 145, 180
 patients 42, 76
 psychiatric 11–12, 119, 161–2,
 170–1, 179
 Payne, M. xvii

- 'people work' professionals 76
 - perception, moral 157
 - perfectionist ends 67
 - person, definition 29, 48
 - personal values 7–8, 130–3, 134–6
 - political aspect 134
 - personhood 109–10
 - Phelan, P. 110
 - Picht, W. 130
 - Pinker, R. 11
 - Plant, R. 34
 - pluralism, moral 66–71
 - Poland, code of ethics 84
 - Portugal, code of ethics 83, 84
 - postmodern ethics 54, 63–6
 - power and the professions 76–7
 - practice
 - defensive 144, 147, 148, 149, 150
 - evidence-based 138–9
 - standardisation of 139
 - practice models 136–41
 - choice affected by individual work/setting requirements 140–1
 - committed/radical practitioner 133–4, 137, 138
 - professional 137, 138, 147
 - technical–bureaucratic 137, 138, 147–8
 - praxis 38, 121, 160
 - Preston-Shoot, M. 11
 - principle-based approaches to ethics 27–53, 54
 - principle-based codes of ethics 85
 - principled autonomy 30, 34
 - principles
 - definition 27
 - prima facie 42
 - v. rules 27–8, 42, 69–70
 - v. values 7
 - principlism 54, 58, 68
 - private sector 18
 - procedural rights/duties 128
 - professional autonomy, in codes of ethics 92–6
 - professional
 - boundaries/relationships 13–14, 16
 - professional conduct 78
 - professional ethics 63, 68, 78
 - see also* codes of ethics
 - professional integrity, in codes of ethics 85, 89–90
 - professionalism
 - advancing claims to 139
 - democratic 116–17
 - new 77, 139
 - trait theory 74, 75–6
 - professionally competent service, right to 106, 107
 - professional practice 78
 - professional practice issues, in codes of ethics 91–2
 - professional practice model 137, 138, 147
 - professional rights/duties 128
 - professional role 13–14
 - professionals
 - bureau professionals 76
 - caring professionals 77
 - people work professionals 76
 - types of 130–1
 - professional values 7–8, 130–3, 134–6
 - political aspect 134
 - professions
 - attributes of 74–5
 - caring professionals 77
 - disabling professions 77
 - responsibilities to 129
 - promise-keeping 30, 36
 - proximity, ethics of 71, 131, 132
 - public interest 43, 49
 - public pledges 75, 77
 - public services, v. social services 18–19
 - public welfare 13, 14–15, 17
- R**
- racism 16, 44, 143
 - radical approaches to ethics 37–9, 43, 44, 50–1
 - see also* committed/radical practitioner practice model
 - Raphael, D. 37
 - rationalisation 139
 - Rawls, J. 41, 42, 51
 - Rea, D. 114

- reasonableness 157
 reasoning, moral 157, 158
 records, to records 110, 115, 117
 redistribution of good(s) 35, 37, 43, 48
 reflection, in/on action 159
 reflective equilibrium 42
 reflective practice in bureaucracies 148
 reflective practitioners 149–50, 150, 159–61
 reflexive practice in bureaucracies 148
 reflexive practitioners 149–50, 150–1, 159–61
 regulatory bodies, UK 92
 relational responsibility 124, 126–7
 relational rights of service users 104, 107–8, 127
 relationship-based approaches to ethics 54–8
 reliability 57
 religion 28 130
 research, participation in 91
 resource distribution 2, 63, 95, 149
 respect for persons 34–5, 43, 47–8, 107, 109
 definition 29
 Kantian principle 29–31, 33, 41, 47, 104
 respectfulness 56
 responsibilities 107–9, 113, 126
 conflicting 128–9
 relational 124, 126–7
 responsibility 61
 responsiveness 61
 emotional 58
 Rhodes, M. 35, 56, 148
 Rice, D. 79
 rights-based approaches to ethics 103
 rights of individuals 13, 14, 67
 conflict between 35
 rights of service users 103–4
 absolute 105, 106, 107
 of appeal 113
 v. claims 104–5
 classification 105–7
 definition 104
 examples of 106
 of groups of people 107–9
 individualist v. collectivist cultures 107–9
 legal 105, 112
 moral 105, 112
 negative 105
 positive 105
 qualified 105–6, 106, 107
 relational 104, 107–8, 127
 social rights 109, 112
 theories about 103
 UN Declaration of the Rights of the Child 104
 as valid claims 104–5
 see also human rights
 risk assessment 23
 Romania, code of ethics 83, 84, 86, 98
 Ronnby, A. 130, 131, 133
 Rosenau, P. xii
 Ross, W. 42
 Rossel, T. 95–6
 rules, v. principles 27–8, 42, 69–70
 rule utilitarianism 36, 37
 Russia, code of ethics 83, 84, 85, 98
- S**
 Sartre, J.-P. 160
 Schön, D. 150, 159, 160
 Seedhouse, D. 6–7
 self-determination 33–4, 34, 43, 48, 48–9
 Biestek's principle 32
 in different settings 142
 of service users 33, 86–7, 98, 117, 118
 v. service users' interests 172–3, 174
 see also autonomy; empowerment
 sensitivity, moral 157, 158
 service users 4
 access to records 110, 115, 117
 as consumers 113–16
 decision-making 117, 118–19
 duty towards 80
 empowerment 2, 120–1
 as fellow citizens 110–13
 as friends 132–3, 136

- individual qualities 32
 - participation xviii, 48, 83, 86, 91, 115, 117, 118–9, 122
 - as persons 109–10
 - protection, need for 118
 - responsibilities of social workers to 129
 - self-determination, *see* self-determination
 - social worker–service user relationship 33, 35
 - welfare/well-being of 43, 48, 49
 - service users' interests
 - v. agency role 170–2
 - v. confidentiality 172–3
 - v. self-determination 172–3, 174
 - Singapore, code of ethics 83, 86
 - situated ethics 158
 - situation, context of, and ethical arguments 156
 - Slovakia, code of ethics 83, 85, 98
 - social change 3, 43
 - social control function 2, 18, 21
 - social duties 128
 - social justice 38–9, 44, 47, 48, 50–1, 87–9
 - in codes of ethics 87–9
 - social rights 109, 112
 - social services, v. public services 18–19
 - social work
 - aspiration to be full profession 81
 - blame/guilt in 9, 20–5, 22
 - control of 95, 110
 - current content 1–2
 - definition 2–3
 - diversity in 1–2, 65
 - duties 127–8
 - fragmentation 95–6, 98, 139
 - in period of change 1
 - principles of 47–51
 - as profession 3
 - purposes of 3
 - responsibilities 126–7, 128–9
 - as 'role-job' 127–8, 131
 - as a semi-profession 18, 75
 - solution-focused approaches 65–6
 - as state-mediated profession 20
 - transformational 121
 - as vocation 130
 - social workers
 - commitments 44
 - control function 2, 18, 21
 - definition 3–4
 - duties to service users 124
 - employment constraints 35
 - qualities of practice 57
 - relational responsibilities 124, 126–7
 - role requirements 44
 - rules for 57
 - service user–social worker relationship 33, 35
 - standards of conduct 46
 - title protected by law 75
 - trainees, *see* trainee social workers
 - virtues of 55–6
 - social work practice models, *see* practice models
 - social work values 1–2, 6–7, 44–6
 - see also* values
 - society, responsibilities to 129
 - Solomon, R. 56
 - South Africa, code of ethics 83, 85, 87
 - Spain, code of ethics 83, 84
 - Spicker, P. 50
 - Stalley, R. 34
 - standardisation of practice 139
 - standards
 - behavioural 5
 - of social workers' conduct 46
 - state
 - declining provision of services 1, 2
 - welfare systems 18–20
 - Statman, D. 55, 69
 - structural oppression 13, 15, 17, 45, 120, 121
 - supervision 94
 - Sweden, code of ethics 83, 84, 85–6, 86, 98, 131
 - Switzerland, code of ethics 83, 88, 92
- T**
- Taylor, C. 150
 - Taylor, D. 111

teaching professional ethics 69–70
 technical–bureaucratic practice
 model 137, 138, 147–8
 Telfer, E. 34, 35, 37, 40, 41
 terminology 2–8
 theories in use 160
 thinking, instrumental 62
 Thompson, I. 160
 Thompson, N. 46, 120, 121
 Timms, N. 6, 110
 Toren, N. 93, 95
 Torstendahl, R. 148
 trade unions 20, 38, 167
 trainee social workers
 lack of clarity about role 164–5
 lack of power 162–4
 limited knowledge in new
 situation 165–6
 low confidence levels 161–2
 narrow focus on service user/issue
 166–7
 overwhelming complexity of
 situation 167–8
 promise about confidentiality
 165–6
 trait theory of professionalism 74
 criticisms of 75–6
 travellers 15, 17
 Treaty of Waitangi 89
 Tronto, J. 60–1
 Trowell, J. 145
 trust 18, 79–80, 80
 trustworthiness 56, 58, 70
 truthfulness 55, 56
 Turkey, code of ethics 83, 84

U

UK, codes of ethics, *see* British
 Association of Social Workers;
 General Social Care Council
 United Nations 28
 Declaration of Human Rights 28,
 106, 131
 Declaration of the Rights of the
 Child 28, 104, 106, 131
 USA, code of ethics, *see* National
 Association of Social Workers
 users, *see* service users
 utilitarian approaches to ethics
 35–7, 39–41, 42–4

utilitarianism 35–7, 39–41, 42–4
 act 36, 37
 hedonistic 36
 ideal 36
 rule 36, 37
 utility 35, 36–7, 43, 67

V

value, fragmentation of 66–71
 values
 definition 6
 personal/professional 7–8, 130–3,
 134–6
 v. principles 7
 social work values 1–2, 6–7,
 44–6
 terminology 6–8
 v. virtues 7
 victim-blaming 38
 virtue ethics 54–8, 69–71
 virtues
 Aristotelian 57–8, 59
 in codes of conduct 85
 definition 55
 examples 55
 v. values 7
 of women 59
 vocation, social work as a 130
 voluntary sector 172, 175

W

Ward, D. 120
 warmth 56
 Warnock, M. 4
 Watson, D. 79
 Webb, S. 144
 welfare
 of individuals 13, 14
 right to 106, 107
 welfare state 18–20, 131
 welfare/well-being, of service users
 43, 48, 49
 whistleblowing 133–4, 135, 162
 White, S. 150
 Wicclair, M. 118
 Wilding, P. 81
 Wilkes, R. 130, 131, 133
 will 30
 wisdom 55

women

- ethics of care 59–60
- social rights 109
- as traditional carers 76
- virtues of 59
- worth 48–9

Y

- youth development workers 140–1, 142
- confidentiality 141–2
- distributive justice 143
- self-determination of service users 142