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Ethics

• Moral principles that govern a person's behaviour or the conducting of an activity
• The moral correctness of specified conduct

Dilemmas in ethics:
• how to live a good life
• rights and responsibilities
• the language of right and wrong
• moral decisions - what is good and bad?
Individual Processes

**Virtue ethics**
- Virtue ethics
- Ethical care

**Ethical learning and growth**
- Ethical egoism
- Communitarianism
- Individual growth

**Principle**
*Doing right*

**Deontological ethics**
(Strict adherence to principles and duties)
- Kantian imperatives
- Rights
- Justice as fairness

**Teleological ethics**
(Consequentialism)
- Utilitarianism
- Discourse ethics

**Policy**
*Doing good*

**Institutional Structure**

*Fisher and Lovell, 2009*
Justice

- The quality of being just, impartial, or fair
- The maintenance or administration of what is just, especially by the impartial adjustment of conflicting claims or the assignment of merited rewards or punishments

Dilemmas in justice:
- Procedural, distributive or interactional?
- Actions or consequences?
- Equality or equity?
- Freedom or welfare?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theories of justice</th>
<th>Distribution of what?</th>
<th>Guiding principle of distribution</th>
<th>The fairest distribution pattern</th>
<th>Key authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarianism</td>
<td>Welfare, well-being, utility</td>
<td>The greatest good for the greatest number</td>
<td>Whatever distribution that maximises aggregate welfare</td>
<td>Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libertarianism</td>
<td>Basic rights and liberties</td>
<td>Self-ownership</td>
<td>Absolute equality</td>
<td>Robert Nozick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuitionism</td>
<td>Different “whats”, for example, resources (food, money, etc.), services (health, education, etc.)</td>
<td>Particular distributive problems demand different principles be applied to particular cases (rights, deserts, needs, expectations, procedural justice, etc.)</td>
<td>No clear distribution pattern</td>
<td>Brian Barry and David Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rawls’ Egalitarianism</td>
<td>Basic liberties</td>
<td>First principle (deontological justification)</td>
<td>Equal distribution</td>
<td>John Rawls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td>Fair equality of opportunity as pure procedural justice</td>
<td>Equal distribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary goods (rights and prerogatives of authority, income, and wealth)</td>
<td>Difference Principle</td>
<td>Maximin criterion: The distribution that maximises, subject to constraints, the prospects of the least advantaged groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capabilities approach</td>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td>Human dignity and equal respect</td>
<td>Equal distribution</td>
<td>Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central/basic capabilities</td>
<td>All should get above a minimum basic level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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