

2009 ANNUAL AAPAE CONFERENCE ABSTRACTS AND BIOS

Professional Aerosol Art, Media, Politics and the Ethical issues Joseph Angert-Quilter

My paper will explain some of the influences on the aerosol art movement, politically and aesthetically. I will address the problem of vandalism by clarifying some definitions, sorting the differences between aerosol and aerosol art, calligraphy, street art, graffiti and vandalism. I will also explain some of the challenges that confront professional aerosol artists and street artists. I will explain my theory of responsibility related to aerosol artists and critique the perspective of some street art. I will describe the sociological issues that face the responsible aerosol artist, and the political and economic issues. With a great deal of theory in hand, and an expanse of knowledge on this issue, I try and fit as much information into this talk as possible. However with limited time I will only be able to extract the key issues, the primary ethical concerns, and some suggestions for an applied ethics of professional aerosol art, which traverses the boundaries of fine art and community-social work. My aim is to summarize the social movement aspects of this particular phenomenon, to layout the problems and suggest some solutions.

Joe Angert-Quilter is a professional aerosol artist, an academic with an honours degree working on his masters and tutoring at Notre Dame University. He has exhibited art works, run workshops and received commissions to paint aerosol murals. His academic work is primarily in philosophy and theology, his honours paper was an ethical construction of the work of Soren Kierkegaard and Emmanuel Levinas, and his masters is on theology, recognition and the universal theology of religions. He also plays representative level basketball.

Co-Production in the Policing Complex - The Ethical Issues of the Pluralised Policing Environment of the 21st Century David Aspland

Private Policing is making a resurgence in the realm of “policing” as the world moves into the 21st Century. Market forces, the emergence of the Market State, increased public insecurity and Neo-Liberal political agendas have all contributed to a return of interest in the provision of policing services by the Private Sector and other Non Government Organisations, together with Non-Police Public Agencies in an increasingly “Pluralistic” policing environment.

Public and Private Policing have had a chequered relationship through history with the Public policing models coming to the fore after the Industrial Revolution at the end to the 18th Century, with the breakdown in older policing systems as society became increasingly urbanised and traditional social crime controls ceased to be effective. The creation of the New Police in England in 1829 is regarded as the commencement of the ascendancy of Public Policing in the English speaking world. Yet now, as the Industrial Age comes to a close and the Information Age begins, are the older models of policing suitable in a globalised crime environment? As the term “policing” evolves to take on a meaning of more than just “The Police” the policing environment has become increasingly pluralistic in its outlook and this has created a range of issues and ethical dilemmas for the actors in it, both public and private. The developing interface has also brought about new “models” of policing that have attempted to adapt to the pluralistic policing environment. In some areas cooperation has proved to be problematic with mutual suspicion and conflicting organisational

objectives leading to a difficult working relationship, whereas in others cooperation has been fundamental to successful outcomes.

The aim of this paper is to explore these issues and to examine the factors that hinder or support the interface between the public and private sectors in the realm of policing. The ethical areas that are going to be examined include the level of cooperation, the extent of information sharing, issues of accountability, opposing or conflicting organisational objectives, areas of possible collusion and benefit, issues of trust and conflict resolution and matters of jurisdiction and legislation.

Mr David Aspland is a lecturer with Charles Sturt University based at the School of Policing Studies at the New South Wales Police College in Goulburn, New South Wales, Australia. He is former Inspector of the New South Wales Police who retired in early 2005 after 25 years of service. During that time he worked in General Duties, SWOS and Investigations in both city and country locations in the roles of Constable, Shift Supervisor, Crime Manager and Duty Officer in a number of locations. He was attached to the NSW Police Academy from 1988 to 1997 working in the Police Recruit Education Program, the School of Organisation and Management Studies and the Intelligence Training Unit. He holds a Masters Degree in Public Policy and Administration from the Australian Graduate School of Police Management, Charles Sturt University. He is currently undertaking a PhD in Criminology at Griffith University looking at the ethical issues that underpin public/private partnerships in policing. He worked for Charles Sturt University as a casual member of Faculty from 1997 to 2005 with both the Australian Graduate School of Policing and the School of Policing Studies, after which he commenced a full time academic career in Policing Studies where he currently specialises in Police Professional Ethics and researching Future Trends in Policing. He served in the Australian Army, both Regular and Reserve, for over 8 years and was a Commissioned Officer in the Army Reserve serving as both an Infantry Platoon Commander and as a Regimental Intelligence Officer. He has been a Member of the Australian Institute of Professional Intelligence Officers (AIPIO) since 1996 and Police Futurists International since 2007. He is also on the Board of Directors of the US Public Safety Leadership Development Consortium.

Equality, Responsibility, and the Welfare State

Nicholas Barry

Luck egalitarianism is a theory of egalitarian justice that is sensitive to notions of individual choice and responsibility, and it has attracted attention from a number of prominent supporters and critics in recent years. Despite the level of interest in the theory, there have been relatively few attempts to explore its implications for public policy. In this paper, I will address this under-explored issue, investigating which model of the welfare state luck egalitarians should support. I will argue that the social democratic model, which emphasises universal forms of social provision and labour market decommodification, is most just from a luck egalitarian point of view. This conclusion has significance in light of the “intrusive state” objection to luck egalitarianism, and the widely held belief that the liberal, residual approach to social protection is most consistent with the notion of individual responsibility.

Nicholas Barry is a Research Fellow at the Centre for Applied Philosophy and Public Ethics and a Lecturer in Politics at Charles Sturt University. His research interests are in contemporary political philosophy and political institutions. He is currently working on the Australian bill of rights debate, and on a range of topics in contemporary egalitarian theory.

Teaching Ethics: Embedding Ethics or Stand-Alone Subjects in MBA Programs

Mr Chris Booth and Dr Michael John Segon

The United Nations Global Compact issued a series of six principles that address the issue of CSR and Sustainability in business. They state, “any meaningful and lasting change in the conduct of corporations toward societal responsibility and sustainability must involve the institutions that most directly act as drivers of business behavior, especially academia”. Arguably the most recognized of Business School’s offerings for senior management is the MBA program. Surveys of such programs suggest that there is little visible evidence of ethics/CSR content. An often posed question is how business ethics and or corporate social responsibility should be addressed in business courses - as themes “embedded” in more traditional courses such as finance, marketing and strategy etc, or whether it should be a separate and equal stand alone course? This paper will review the current literature around business ethics and business courses at MBA level and seek to establish which approach is considered the more effective.

***Chris Booth** is a lecturer in the Graduate School of Business at RMIT University where he currently coordinates the Business and Economic Analysis course in the RMIT Masters of Business Administration (Executive). Chris has previously coordinated the Global Business and Research Project courses in the RMIT MBA. His teaching interests and consulting practice includes global business, strategy development and implementation, leadership capability development particularly in the areas of Emotional Intelligence.*

Following a successful career in policy development and implementation in the Australian Federal Government and then sales and marketing in both the book and music industries, Chris returned to tertiary study completing an MBA and a postgraduate teaching qualification. His mix of industry management and policy development experience and academic capabilities led to roles in industry and executive development teaching at RMIT and involvement in course development and delivery in multiple MBA programs. His PhD research involves studying the effect of leadership development programs using Emotional Intelligence constructs on the leader practice of program participants.

***Dr Michael John Segon** is Senior Lecturer: Governance and Corporate Social Responsibility within the Graduate School of Business at the RMIT University. Michael coordinates and teaches in MBA management core and elective courses including: managing people and relationships, understanding organisations and the ethics and governance offerings. He has also has extensive overseas teaching background facilitating programs in Malaysia, Singapore, Hong Kong, New Zealand and France.*

He served as a committee member of the AAPAE, a member of the European Business Ethics Network and was Committee member for the International Society for Business, Economics and Ethics 2004 World Congress, and in 2007 convened the 14th Annual Australian Association of Professional and Applied Ethics Conference in Melbourne.

Dr Segon is also active as a business ethics consultant being the principal of Corporate Ethos. From 2004-2006 he was retained by KPMG, as their Australian business ethics and integrity consultant. He is currently retained by the national firm McGrath Nicoll undertaking the same function. He has worked with numerous clients in both private and public sectors including major retailers, insurance firms and Government Departments providing professional advice and assistance in relation to the creation of codes of ethics and codes of conduct, has devised and conducted corporate ethics training and reviewed corporate ethics systems and processes.

In Defense of Utilitarianism

Peter Bowden

This is a refereed paper – please click here to read

This paper argues that people from all walks of life are required to make ethical decisions. Assessing the consequences of what we decide provides us with a workable method of reaching an answer – by deciding whether the consequences are good or bad. The decisions we make in the institutions that organise our lives – be it the workplace, our professional lives, in our industry associations or our social or public structures – are often complex, difficult to choose between conflicting alternatives, between good or bad consequences. Most people have little or no training in moral decision making. This paper argues that utility is more likely to provide a defensible response. But utilitarianism has been attacked on many fronts, and by renowned philosophers. The paper refutes these attacks, further arguing that the version of utilitarianism set out by John Stuart Mill provides a simpler, preferable way to make an ethical choice than competing theories, particularly deontology and virtue. The principles that he sets out, readily identifiable in his text - Encourage happiness, do good; Avoid pain, do no harm; Ensure justice; Respect individuals & their freedoms - will not answer all issues. But they will, with some weighing of utilities, bring greater rationality into our ethical decisions.

Dr Bowden is National Secretary of the AAPAE (Australian Association for Professional and Applied Ethics). Formerly Professor of Public Administration at the University of Manchester, he has undertaken consulting and advisory work for a number of international agencies, including the World Bank and the United Nations. Currently Research Associate in the Department of Philosophy, he now teaches ethics at Sydney University, and is active in writing, consulting and speaking on ethical issues.

Property in Activities: the case for intellectual property

Hugh Breakey

All modern theories of property take as their archetype the relation between an owner and a thing, and thus focus on property-incidents such as open-ended usage, exclusivity and alienability. Theorists then do their best to fit problem cases – like intellectual property – into this mould. I argue that a better alternative is to consider the possibility of *property in activities*. Generally speaking, to have property in an activity is to have that activity and its consequences protected from others' interference. More specifically, to have property in an activity is to have the right to perform that activity within a certain domain and to have its natural consequences protected from competitors or others who could worsen the way the resources within that domain facilitate that activity. The focus of property discourse shifts from excluding others from a thing, to non-interference and non-worsening with an activity and its consequences. I argue that this way of understanding intellectual property more elegantly explains both the protection afforded to authors and inventors and the limitations of that protection. I suggest that recent changes to intellectual property law in the UK may be better explained *not* as increased exclusive control over an ideational object, but rather as an interesting re-construal of the *type of activity* that society is asked to protect.

*Hugh is a researcher in political philosophy at the University of Queensland, working in the Ethics of Intellectual Property. He has lectured in philosophy, ethics and distributive justice at UQ and Queensland University of Technology and done research in jurisprudence for the Key Centre for Justice, Law and Governance (at Griffith University). He recently published in Cambridge's *Utilitas* and has forthcoming publications in *The Philosophical Quarterly* and *Philosophy, Politics and Economics*.*

Neurotechnology: the need for neuro-ethicists

Laura Cabrera

This is a refereed paper – please click here to read

During the latter part of the 20th century, the study of the brain moved from a minor position within the psychological and the biological sciences to become an interdisciplinary field. This field has matured and made rapid progress thanks to advances in technology that have enabled further investigation and clarification of functions and mechanisms of the brain. Consequently, we are acquiring the science and technology, processes and devices that enable us to understand, analyse, measure, monitor, treat and heal the nervous system and brain – neurotechnology.

In this paper I will argue that ethical discussion of neurotechnology is crucial as it deals with the organ that has been considered the core of ourselves, namely the brain. In the past a great deal of ethical reflection was dedicated to neurocognitive enhancers such as pharmaceuticals, or more recently to brain imaging techniques. However, pharmaceuticals and imaging techniques are only two of the different fields covered by neurotechnology, and not much ethical reflection has been focused on other fields, such as neuro-implants or brain machine interfaces. In this paper my aim is to expand the common understating of neurotechnology and present the different ethical issues, analysing why it is crucial that ethicists focus on the issues presented by neurotechnology.

Laura Cabrera is a research PhD student in ethics and emergent technologies in the Centre for Applied Philosophy and Public Ethics at Charles Sturt University. Laura received a BSc in Electrical and Communication Engineering from ITESM University in Mexico City, and a MA in Applied Ethics from Linköping University in Sweden. Her current research is focused on nanotechnology and neurotechnology, human enhancement, posthumanity, and the ethical dimensions of emerging technology especially those connected to medical issues and individual/social perspectives.

Teaching professional decision-making through use of the virtual world

Matthew Campbell

This paper explores an upcoming project which will use virtual world technologies, namely Second Life®, to provide simulated environments for the development of decision-making capacities of pre-graduate teachers. At present, students, as part of a subject on professional ethics, engage in role-plays within the classroom environment as a tool for learning decision-making and ethical responses. The use of role plays has been demonstrated to allow students to test ideas and ethical decisions; however, the effectiveness of these are limited by the already existing identities and social relationships of the students and the scenarios often lack the complexities, due to the limitations of the classroom, evident in the professional world. Through using virtual world technologies it is expected that there should be improved learning outcomes for students within this unit as they will be able to engage in more complex scenarios with the avenue available for outside influences, such as current teachers and principals, to also engage in the role plays. Further to these outcomes for this cohort of students such an approach may prove useful for ongoing workplace professional development around ethical decision-making and for other professional educational settings.

Matthew Campbell is a Lecturer in Professional and Educational Studies in the School of Education (NSW) at the Australian Catholic University. In this role Matthew coordinates several units on professional ethics across areas of disability, Aboriginal and secondary education. His research areas include professional practice, especially in policing and education settings, workplace learning and

using technology to support learning. He has had previous experience as a lecturer in policing professional ethics, and as an educational designer and secondary teacher.

Autonomy vs Best Interests - Direct-to-Consumer-Advertising (DTCA) and the Australian Healthcare Consumer

Betty Chaar

Direct-to-Consumer-Advertising (DTCA), defined as 'any statement or pictorial design directed at the general public to promote the use or supply of medical goods', has always been a highly controversial issue. The controversy centres on whether there is an ethical obligation on the healthcare provider to respect the autonomy of the patient when that patient's best interests may be in doubt. Whilst DTCA of prescription medications is commonly broadcast in the United States and New Zealand, DTCA is currently restricted by law to Over-The-Counter (OTC) and Pharmacist-Only (S3) medications in countries such as Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom and the European Union. Where such restrictions exist, the current situation may change if governments succumb to the pressure of the global pharmaceutical industry to loosen restrictions on DTCA of prescription medicines.

Pharmaceutical industries claim DTCA can enhance patient autonomy by educating consumers about disease states and treatment options, and therefore empower patients to seek resolution of the disease state. However, considering pharmaceutical companies' conflict of interest, DTCA has been shown to persuade consumers to seek inappropriate medications, leading to adverse health outcomes. There is evidence demonstrating DTCA can be misleading. Also, some advertisements display representations that frighten patients into initiating treatment, a tactic for which the term "scare-mongering" was coined. Where DTCA for prescription medications has been allowed, both patient requests as well as prescribing patterns for physicians were shown to be altered by DTCA. In cases where the patient requests inappropriate medication, healthcare professionals must spend more time and effort correcting patient misconceptions. This often adversely affects the healthcare provider-patient relationship. Studies have also demonstrated that patients are likely to engage in prescription shopping, pharmacy shopping or to terminate their relationship with the provider if the medicine was not provided.

There is much evidence to support the notion that DTCA does not serve the best interests of the patient. However, the principles of bioethics rank the principle of patient autonomy as "first among equals"*. How then should a healthcare provider address this ethical dilemma of such vast proportions?

* Gillon, R. (2003). Ethics needs principles-four can encompass the rest-and respect for autonomy should be "first among equals". *Journal of Medical Ethics* 29, 307-312.

Dr Betty Chaar is a lecturer in Pharmacy Practice and Professional Ethics at the University of Sydney, Faculty of Pharmacy. Her publications and ongoing research are in the areas of moral reasoning, ethical decision making, professional ethics in practice, misconduct, and ethics in the context of the practice of pharmacy as well as the pharmaceutical industry.

"Appropriate" police discretion and Indigenous over-representation in the Criminal Justice System

Anna Corbo Crehan

The appropriate use of discretion is frequently identified as critical in the policing of Indigenous people – in particular, for reducing the over-representation of Indigenous people in the criminal justice system. The NSW Police *Aboriginal Strategic Direction 2007 – 2010*, for instance, has as its seventh objective: *Reduce offending and over-representation of Aboriginal people in the criminal justice system*. And one of the strategies listed for achieving this objective is ‘Encourage the appropriate use of discretionary Police power’ (2007, p. 47). This claim about the efficacy of appropriate use of police discretion is then taken to imply the normative assertion that police *ought* to use their discretion appropriately to reduce Indigenous representation in the criminal justice system – which seems reasonable, given the various issues that arise from contact with that system, together with the gate-keeping role that police play in relation to it. Just as reasonable, however, is the claim that in obliging police to use their discretion appropriately we must be assured that they *can* use it appropriately – that they know what appropriate use of discretion actually entails. My argument in this paper is that the ability of police to use discretion appropriately is compromised by the fact that the concept ‘appropriate use of discretion’ has not been rendered conceptually precise. To ground the claim that police *ought* to use their discretion appropriately to reduce Indigenous representation in the criminal justice system, we first need to clarify exactly what appropriate use of discretion entails and, specifically, what it entails in the context of policing Aboriginal people.

Dr Anna Corbo Crehan is a philosopher, lecturing on various police ethics subjects in the School of Policing Studies, Charles Sturt University. Her PhD, which is currently being re-written as an e-book under contract with Melbourne University Press, was on Compensatory Justice and Aboriginal Land Claims. Her areas of research interest include Indigenous issues, police ethics (particularly the making of discretionary decisions and interactions with vulnerable people), and the concept of professional distance (from the broader perspective of professional ethics).

Disinterestedness and the ‘New Breed’ of Humanitarian Intervention

Ned Dobos

One particularly common objection to the practice of humanitarian intervention is that it is seldom if ever motivated purely by humanitarian concern. National self-interest is invariably in play, and this is said to adversely affect the consequences of intervention. I argue that this oversimplifies the relationship between motives and consequences, and overlooks the various ways in which national self-interest can actually facilitate the achievement of positive humanitarian outcomes. Furthermore the *absence* of national self-interest can in fact render an intervention morally illegitimate under some circumstances. This is especially true of what Sean Murphy has dubbed ‘new breed’ humanitarian missions, where the human rights under attack are ‘largely political in nature’. The national interest in these cases serves to reconcile humanitarian action abroad with the domestic obligations that the intervening state owes to its own taxpayers and armed forces personnel. Hence far from undermining the legitimacy of an intervention, national self-interest can enhance its moral credentials.

Ned Dobos has published widely on just war theory and the ethics of humanitarian intervention, including papers in The Philosophical Forum, Journal of Military Ethics, Ethical Theory and Moral Practice, and the Journal of Moral Philosophy. He recently completed his PhD in applied philosophy at the University of Melbourne, and now has a position at the Centre for Applied Philosophy and Public Ethics, Charles Sturt University and the Australian National University.

Researching with Young Children: Seeking Assent

Sue Dockett and Bob Perry

This is a refereed paper – please click here to read

Changing views of children and childhood have resulted in increased focus on the nature of children's participation in research. Rather than conducting research *on* children, many researchers now seek to engage *with* children in research. Such a change recognises children's agency as well as their rights to have a say in matters that affect them. Research that reflects a participatory rights perspective and respects children's agency must be based on children making informed decisions about their participation. However, prevailing views of children's competence to make such decisions often preclude young children's involvement in such decisions. While recognising the importance of informed consent from parents/guardians, we argue the importance of assent as a means of recognising the wishes of young children (aged zero to 8 years) in relation to research participation. In this context, we draw on Cocks' (2007) definition of assent as a relational process whereby children's actions and adult responses taken together, reflect children's participation decisions.

Sue Dockett is Professor in Early Childhood Education, Charles Sturt University. Prior to entering tertiary education, Sue worked as an educator in prior-to-school settings as well as the early years of school. Since 1988, Sue has been involved in early childhood teacher education and research. Much of her research agenda is focused on educational transitions, particularly transitions to school and the expectations, experiences and perceptions of all involved. With Bob Perry, Sue has published widely, both nationally and internationally in the area of transition to school. Integral to the investigations of educational transitions is a commitment to incorporating children's perspectives. Much of Sue's current collaborative work is focused on refining and critiquing these approaches as well as conceptual and theoretical analysis of what is meant by engaging children and young people's voices within research agendas.

Bob Perry is Professor of Education, within the Murray School of Education at Charles Sturt University. As well as teaching mathematics education and research subjects, he is leader of the Curriculum, Policy and Change research team. Bob has worked in tertiary institutions in Australia since 1972. His research agenda includes transition to school, early childhood mathematics education, researching with children, education of Indigenous children and community capacity building. Bob has published widely in all of these areas and has been invited to speak at gatherings ranging from individual prior-to-school settings and schools through to keynote addresses at international research meetings.

Student assessment in police ethics education

Brad Edlington

Measurement of student progress and achievement in ethics education is undertaken by many institutions using time-tested and well regarded methods of assessment. These methods usually require students to demonstrate not only a sufficient knowledge of the relevant theory and principles but also for students to show their ability to think critically, to reason their way through ethical dilemmas and to propose courses of action based on these principles.

Common and specific methods of assessment include essay questions, short-answer questions, and various types of report writing. While these approaches seem to cater well for most contexts, there are some disciplines in which this is problematic. Ethics education in policing, for

example, provides educators with specific challenges that appear in other contexts to a much lesser degree. These challenges create some difficulty in formulating valid and effective approaches to assessment and sometimes render more traditional approaches as less than ideal.

This paper discusses what is often considered a controversial approach to assessment within ethics education, namely using multiple-choice questions as the basis for an exam. It will endeavour to show the effectiveness of this approach through its implementation within a policing education context and will offer some justification for the continuance and ongoing development of this approach.

Brad Edlington is a lecturer with the School of Policing Studies, Faculty of Arts at the Goulburn campus of Charles Sturt University. He teaches Professional Ethics to policing students, which largely requires them to develop and refine their decision-making abilities. Brad's research interests include teaching, learning and assessment in ethics education, critical thinking and reasoning generally but specifically how e-learning can enhance learning.

Scientific Freedom and the Dual Use Dilemma

Nicholas Evans

The ongoing debate surrounding the regulation of the life sciences has a number of important factors to consider. One of these, defending against regulation, is an appeal to what I will call scientific freedom. Such an appeal is in two parts: 1) That open communication is necessary for the progress of science; 2) That the autonomous progress of science is valuable not only for its own sake, but as it benefits humanity as a whole. I wish to address these two arguments. To the first, I wish to show that the alleged openness of science is not as necessary to scientific progress as such an appeal would lead us to believe. To the second, I wish to show that there is in fact a case to be made that would advocate for regulation. To conclude, I will address three objections to my analysis.

Nicholas Evans is a PhD Candidate at the Centre for Applied Philosophy and Public Ethics, ANU. His dissertation is focused on the dual-use dilemma, the right to free speech, and the moral responsibilities of scientists. In addition to this, his research interests in ethics are the ethics of emerging technologies, just war theory, and moral pluralism. As a former Physics graduate, he also has research interests in the history and philosophy of the natural sciences.

Implications for Australian Research of the Taxonomic Chaos in the Confused Canadian Bioethics Industry: *Après Moi la Deluge*

John J. Furedy

This is a refereed paper – please click here to read

This paper, based on my experience as an experimental psychologist and psychophysiological at Indiana University (1965-7) and the University of Toronto (1967-2005), presents a conceptual analysis of a two-decades-old movement in Canada to purportedly raise ethical standards in research with human subjects. I contend that the actual result of these reforms has been to transform what used to be a relatively disinterested enterprise based on ethics (i.e., the treatment of human and animal subjects) into an ideological one for which the label "Canadian bioethics industry", though offensive, is justifiable. Like all ideological enterprises, it has produced taxonomic chaos by, for example, confusing ethics (i.e., the treatment of subjects) with epistemology (e.g., the

validity of a research design), and feelings of discomfort concerning an area of investigation with intellectual expertise about that area. In practical terms most senior researchers may have been able deal with the burgeoning Canadian bioethics industry and ignore the anti-epistemological and implicit principles according to which the industry's REBs (Research Ethics Boards) operate. Younger researchers, who have no memory of how research used to be conducted, have succumbed and, in an epistemological sense, have been "corrupted". In the final section of my paper, I discuss the implications for Australian research. I pay particular attention to what I think are legitimate and illegitimate meanings of the term "bioethics", and I issue a plea to Australian senior researchers not to adopt the apparent Canadian Louis XV *après-moi-la-deluge* attitude toward the epistemological threat represented by the bioethics industry.

John Furedy is currently an Emeritus Professor of Psychology at the University of Toronto, residing, since his retirement in 2005, in Sydney. His interests are indicated in various sections of his web site, of which the most relevant section to the paper at this conference is <http://www.psych.utoronto.ca/users/furedy/bioethic.htm>. All his academic degrees are from the University of Sydney (1958-65), with double honours in undergraduate psychology and philosophy (1962) and a Masters and Ph.D. in experimental psychology and psychophysiology (1964, and 1965, respectively). He continued his empirical research as a faculty member at Indiana University (1965-7) and University of Toronto (1967-2005) with over 300 publications, but has also written more conceptual pieces in both psychology and in other more general areas such as higher education, academic freedom, and "bioethics". His general orientation is a brand of realism espoused by the late John Anderson of Sydney University, and he is particularly concerned with moving a relatively "soft" science like psychology toward the chemistry/astronomy end of the soft-hard science continuum, away from the other alchemy/astrology end of that continuum.

Consultation, Deliberation and the Review of the National Statement

Eliza Goddard and Susan Dodds

In 2007 the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC), Australian Research Council (ARC) and Australian Vice Chancellor's Committee (AVCC) jointly issued the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research. The Statement sets national standards of ethical conduct for research involving humans and was the result of two rounds of community consultation as part of the review of the 1999 National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans. 362 submissions were received by the National Statement working party, a committee of AHEC (Australian Health Ethics Committee). AHEC has the sole legislative authority in Australia to develop guidelines on ethical research conduct, through provisions of the NHMRC Act. That Act requires AHEC to conduct a community consultation process (NHMRC Act, 11-14).

We are currently working on a larger project (Big Picture Bioethics: Public Policy and Liberal Democracy) that explores the challenges of making defensible public policy in ethically contentious domains. This paper arises from one of our case studies: developments of research ethics guidelines in Canada and Australia since the 1990s.

This paper examines the impact of the public submissions received by the National Statement working party in order to ask whether the consultation process was effective as a mechanism for encouraging deliberation by the working party and better policy outcomes in the final guidelines. The paper specifically assesses the impact of a subset of submissions—those that raised and defended critical ethical responses to the original (1999) National Statement or either of the two Consultation drafts—against the working party's own requirements for consultation and compares this with the principles of deliberative and justificatory democracy.

Eliza Goddard is a Research Associate in the Faculty of Arts at the University of Tasmania. Eliza is working as part of a team on an ARC project - 'Big Picture Bioethics: policy-making and liberal democracy'. Her focus is on issues concerning consultation and deliberation and the review of the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research. Eliza Goddard is also the Executive Officer of the Australasian Association of Philosophy (AAP).

Susan Dodds is Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Professor of Philosophy at the University of Tasmania. She has published in the areas of bioethics, research ethics and political philosophy. She is currently a Chief Investigator on two ARC funded grants 'Big Picture Bioethics: policy-making and liberal democracy' (with Rachel Ankeny, Françoise Baylis and Jocelyn Downie) and the ARC Centre of Excellence for Electromaterials Science (ACES) as the Ethics program leader. For five years she was the Chair of the University of Wollongong / Illawarra Health Human Research Ethics committee and she has worked on three Commonwealth funded projects relating to research ethics: the National Palliative Care Program's 'Ethical Research in Palliative Care: a guide through the Human Research Ethics Committee Progress' (Masso, Dodds, Fildes, Yeatman and Eagar, 2004) the NHMRC Human Research Ethics Handbook (Komesaroff, Dodds, McNeill, Skene and Thomson (eds), 2002), and the Department of Human Services and Health Report: Ethical Research and Ethics Committee Review of Social and Behavioural Research Proposals (Dodds, Albury and Thomson, 1994).

Virtue: the missing piece in spiritual leadership

Patricia Grant and Peter McGhee

This is a refereed paper – please [click here to read](#)

Fry's (2003, 2008) models of spiritual leadership have successfully shown that spiritual leaders can create greater organisational commitment, productivity and improved employee well-being. In particular, they have proved beneficial to organisations such as the army and the police. This paper explains the origins of spiritual leadership and Fry's model in particular and builds on this model using Aristotle's theory of virtue. Fry's model has been criticised for a number of reasons including instrumentalising spirituality and for not explaining *how* leaders and followers become spiritual. The main thrust of this paper is to modify Fry's Spiritual Leadership model by replacing values with the Aristotelian notion of virtue. This revised framework offers an improved understanding of spiritual leadership and provides potential outcomes that are of significant benefit to law-enforcing entities.

Patricia Grant is a senior lecturer in the Centre for Business Interdisciplinary Studies (CBIS) in the Faculty of Business & Law at AUT University. She is interested in the philosophical foundations of business and management. Her areas of research include virtue ethics and corporate governance.

Peter McGhee is a senior lecturer in the Centre for Integrated Business Studies in the Faculty of Business at AUT where he has taught for 10 years. His main disciplinary and research interests are in the areas of philosophy and business (specifically ethics but also ontology/epistemology), and organisational behaviour. He is currently enrolled in a PhD at the University of Auckland in the Department of Management and Employment Relations, Faculty of Commerce exploring the relationship between individual spirituality and ethical behaviour in work-related contexts.

Spirituality and Professions: Shifts in the Australian Perception Howard Harris

This is a refereed paper – please [click here to read](#)

Before the dotcom bubble burst and the global financial crisis hit there was concern that material well-being had disguised a spiritual hole in the heart of the law and many other professions. With that material well-being now further dented, and the mercantile attitude underlying many professional practices under question, how well are Australians prepared to search for the soul within their profession? Over the past decade the links between spirituality and work have changed in Australia, with less rather than more discussion and an increasing focus on traditional religious beliefs. These changes may, respectively, hinder or help professional development.

Howard Harris teaches international management ethics and values in the school of management at the University of South Australia. After a career in the industry as a chemical engineer and manager he returned to university to complete his PhD in applied ethics, examining the role of courage in management decision-making. He is a former president of the Australian Association for Professional and Applied Ethics. His current research interests focus on the role of traditional virtues in contemporary management.

The nature of Transparency and its impact on Corporate Reputation

Howard Harris and Saadia Mahmud

Transparency is widely demanded but has no clear definition in literature and practice. This paper puts forward a broader view of transparency than one that focuses on disclosure alone. Transparency can be duty, virtue, outcome, tool, spin or something to be avoided, and managers make moral choices regarding the degree of transparency to adopt. Our contention is that transparency undertaken with virtuous intent will be positively linked to corporate reputation. This paper examines corporate transparency and its impact on corporate reputation in two incident studies. Lack of virtuous transparency is shown to have a negative impact on corporate reputation for Visy in an Australian cardboard box cartel, and for AWB in the Oil-for-Food scandal.

Saadia Mahmud was awarded a PhD in 2006 at the University of South Australia for her thesis “Role of self-organisation in the handling of adaptive challenges by enterprises”. This work explores self-organisation in SMEs, and has developed a framework for the role of self-organisation in the handling of adaptive challenge by enterprises. Earlier Saadia worked in international banking based at Citibank in Karachi and Islamabad in Pakistan, working in London, Bombay, Singapore, Kuala Lumpur and Riyadh. She now works in the School of Management and in the Learning and Teaching unit of the Division of Business at UniSA.

Professional ethics and expert opinions in the biomedical sciences

Judith R Kennedy and Michael C Kennedy

The Pocket Macquarie Dictionary defines the noun ‘expert’ as “some-one who has special skill or knowledge in a particular field; a specialist” and the adjective as “possessing special skill or knowledge” and ‘Opinion’ is defined as “a judgment or belief not held firmly enough to produce certainty; a personal view; a formal judgment as in *counsel’s opinion*”. An Expert Opinion then, is a formal assessment and interpretation of the material to hand, carried out by a person with particular expertise. Given that providing an Expert Opinion for the establishment of facts in law or in the course of a formal inquiry is an ethical thing to do, we examine the disquiet about Expert Opinions that is expressed from time to time in forensic and professional circles. We conclude that the ethical burden on the expert is best conceived as (1) to produce good science and (2) to explain,

without prejudice, his or her reasoning to those who are entitled to ask and we present a model of professional engagement to assist experts avoid ethical pitfalls on a case by case basis.

Judith Kennedy is a psychologist with an MA in healthcare ethics and PhD in professional ethics and is a Research Fellow attached to the Professional Ethics Program at UNSW.

Michael Kennedy is a consultant physician with an MD in clinical pharmacology and is a Conjoint Senior lecturer at UNSW.

Policing in the 21st Century: Professionalisation and the Ethics of Ambiguity

Michael Kennedy

Although the police can be a repressive institution that so often contains the poor and the powerless, they are also themselves exploited. Not only by uncertain working conditions and social isolation but also as instruments of a highly politicised criminal justice system, which they neither control nor really benefit from.

The police protect property they do not own; as guardians of the peace, they so often defend highly questionable government policies that reinforce the alienation associated with class oppression and racism. But they seldom derive any significant profit from this action. In their repression of popular movements, the police legitimise a political order, which they do not create.

Control and management of the police, therefore, must take into account their dual role as both victimisers and victims. For contemporary policing practice to progress forward the professional community associated with the policing vocation should examine possibilities for organising police resentment into political action ... Professionalization.

Dr Michael Kennedy is a senior lecturer and Course Advisor in the Bachelor of Policing Degree at the University of Western Sydney. Between 1978 and 1996 Michael was a detective in the New South Wales Police. During his policing career Michael worked as a detective at the Bureau of Crime Intelligence, Organised Crime Squad, Major Crime Squad and the NSW State Crime Commission. Michael has also worked with the Brigade de répression du Proxénétisme and the Brigade de protection des Mineurs in Paris. As a detective Michael worked extensively with the Arabic speaking community and later specialised in Child Protection and Sexual Assault investigations. At the time of his resignation in 1996 Michael was the Senior Investigator at the Lakemba Local Area Command.

On Truth Telling and Deceitful Non-Disclosure

Madeline Kilty

This is a refereed paper – please [click here](#) to read

Ought children to be informed who their genetic parents are, because concealing this information may be a form of deception that has the potential to lead to long established beliefs being suddenly shattered? Concealing genetic parentage information may result in serious physical, psychological and emotional damage causing a severe loss of trust and confidence when the truth is exposed later in life. It may be especially wrong to conceal this information, if one accepts that children have a legal right to know their genetic parents under the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, which was ratified in Australia in 1990. Someone deceived about their genetic parentage would be, consequently, not only wrong about their genetic identity but wrong about their narrative identity. In cases of misattributed paternity, children and their genetic fathers may be denied certain

knowledge about their genetic identities, while 'social' fathers may be unfairly led to believe they have children for whom they are responsible. I focus on deceitful non-disclosure in relation to misattributed paternity.

Madeline Kilty is a PhD research student at CAPPE. She has a B.A. (Hons) in philosophy from Charles Sturt University. She has previously written on issues of gender identity.

Ethics, Money, Rugby League and Swimming

Julian Lamont

There would be few adult sports' participants and/or sports' fans, who would not have witnessed, over the last few decades, the transforming effect of money on their favourite sport(s). In their recent book *Ethics, Money and Sport*, Walsh and Giulianotti give the most comprehensive analysis to date of sporting values and how they are affected by the pervasive intrusion of the market into sport. In this paper I extend and develop their analysis with respect to two sports not covered in their book – rugby league and swimming. While I use these two sports for illustration, the ethical issues covered arise in many sports. The first is the tension between the degree of freedom players have to move between teams/countries and the value of community representation/competition. The second set of ethical issues arises from the desire of a sport's promoters to have a continuous flow of records in order to keep the money flowing into their sport and the potentially pernicious effect this can have on some of the values of that sport.

Julian Lamont lectures in philosophy at the University of Queensland. His research interests include political philosophy and economics, metaphysics, applied ethics, and business and professional ethics.

Practising Regional Accountants' Perceptions of APES110: A Genuine Attempt to Promote Ethical Behaviour or a Tool for Legitimacy?

Donata Muntean

Accounting rules in regard to the treatment of assets and liabilities have been suggested as a possible factor in the current global financial crisis. In 2009, the Financial Crisis Advisory Group recommended that improvements in financial reporting were necessary in the wake of the crisis. Following a series of corporate collapses in the 1990s and 2000s, the role that accountants and auditors played in these collapses was criticised. Despite significant regulatory reforms, questions still arise regarding the ethics of the accounting profession.

Leung and Cooper (1995) surveyed Australian Certified Practicing Accountants to examine their perceptions about ethical standards within the accounting profession. Their research found that, although accountants were generally positive about ethical standards, a significant number believed that standards were declining and that at least parts of the code of conduct were not well known. Over a third of survey respondents believed that the code had little impact on accountants' behaviour, and 64% had not consulted the code in the 12 months prior to completing the survey despite respondents having encountered, on average, four ethical issues during the same period. Leung and Cooper (1995, p.17) suggested that, 'professional accountants will only be responsive to a code about which they are knowledgeable, and which elicits from them a sense of respect because it is viewed as relevant, reasonable and unbiased'.

The current research investigates whether the current code has garnered such respect. It has been undertaken to examine accountants' beliefs about the level and effectiveness of guidance within the current code; APES110's perceived value to users; its effectiveness in discouraging unethical behaviour; and the level to which APES110 has been accepted, and is consulted, by its intended users. By examining these issues, the researcher aims to determine whether the code is perceived to be of practical use in resolving ethical dilemmas faced by accountants today.

Donata Muntean is currently in the final stages of her Master of Commerce (Accounting) at Charles Sturt University (CSU) Bathurst. She joined CSU as a full-time associate lecturer in 2006, after completing her undergraduate degree, and commencing postgraduate study. Her teaching duties include Accounting subjects; Business and Professional Ethics; and Security, Privacy and Ethics in Computing.

Donata's primary research interest is in the field of ethics, but she has also written and presented papers on the changing role of accountants, and on the business opportunities that Romania's accession to the European Union presented to small business. Donata has written two case studies, reviewed a chapter, and prepared the lecture slides for Shaw, Barry and Sansbury's 'Moral Issues in Business, First Asia Pacific Edition (Cengage Learning, Australia).

Donata is now focusing on her chosen area of research interest: ethics. Her presentation is based upon work that she has undertaken for her Masters dissertation.

Abstract

Chris Provis

This is a refereed paper – please [click here to read](#)

The paper surveys some normative considerations that may be relevant to justifying wage relativities. The possibility that market mechanisms may offer a justification of relativities is considered, but while those are relevant they do not seem to provide a full justification. Fair negotiation processes may also be relevant, but seem to assume reference to prior normative considerations. Such considerations include factors like effort, skill and responsibility. These and other factors are examined. The different factors considered are not independent, but most have some case to be made for them as relevant to determining correct relativities.

Chris Provis is an Associate Professor in the School of Management at the University of South Australia. He originally studied and taught philosophy, then worked for some years in industrial relations, and has published papers in both areas. His present research interests lie especially in areas of business ethics, and his book *Ethics and Organisational Politics* was published by Edward Elgar in 2004. He is a past president of the Australian Association of Professional and Applied Ethics, and an active member of the Ethics Centre of South Australia.

Abstract

Michael Schwartz

This is a refereed paper – please [click here to read](#)

This paper contemplates the reasons for the demand for nation-states and some of the costs of the creation of nation-states. It discusses the ethics of nationality, and explores whether consociations provide a better possible alternative than the nation-state.

Dr Michael Schwartz is an associate professor at the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology. He is the president of the Australian Association for Professional and Applied Ethics. His research in the field of business ethics has been published in the *Australian Journal of Professional and Applied Ethics*, the *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, *Business Ethics: A European Review*, *Business Ethics Quarterly*, the *Journal of Business Ethics* and *Research in Ethical Issues in Organizations*. He is also a member of the editorial board of *Research in Ethical Issues in Organizations*.

Is Ethics and Integrity as Corporate Strategy Moral?

Dr Michael John Segon and Mr Chris Booth

With increased attention being given to the importance of ethics within business, in particular the role of unethical practices in the global financial crisis, an issue to consider is whether the development of an ethical culture can be approached as a form of business strategy. If this is the case then do the systems and techniques for encouraging ethics simply become another form of business data, rather than have its own moral dimension. If so then an argument can be mounted that organisations that approach organisational ethics from this perspective are not acting morally but rather opportunistically and that if the strategy was to prove less than cost effective or did not appear to contribute to the organisational goal attainment, it would be dropped in preference for other business strategies that would enhance organisational objectives. This paper will consider the relationships between strategy and ethics and explore the arguments for treating such strategies as empirical data versus moral action.

Abstract

Dr Paul Sendziuk

This is a refereed paper – please click here to read

Nearly all Australian universities specify as their graduate attributes the ability to communicate, problem solve, work in teams and develop life-long learning skills, and staff develop curriculum and learning activities accordingly. Another oft-stated graduate attribute is for students to acquire and demonstrate an awareness of ethical and cultural issues in professional practice. It is less clear, however, how educators go about facilitating the development of such. This paper suggests that in one discipline, Historical Studies, the development of students' understanding of ethical and cultural issues in professional practice is generally achieved through an 'osmotic' process, if at all, and makes a case for a more rigorous approach in this regard. It concludes by suggesting two teaching and learning activities that have been used successfully by the author and which can be employed in the classrooms of many academic disciplines.

Dr Paul Sendziuk is a Senior Lecturer in the School of History and Politics at the University of Adelaide. He specialises in twentieth-century Australian History, with particular interests in post-war immigration, public health and the history of disease. Paul's most recent book, *Learning to Trust: Australian Responses to AIDS*, was short-listed for the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission's 2004 Human Rights Award (non-fiction section). He also publishes in the area of teaching and learning and was the recipient of the Executive Dean's Excellence in Teaching Award in 2007.

Autonomy and trust in professional ethics

Alan Tapper and Stephan Millett

This is a refereed paper – please click here to read

This paper examines recent discussions of the key ideas of autonomy and trust in the professional ethics literature. We argue that while there is a consensus on the nature of professions and professional ethics, there is no agreement on the philosophical basis of this consensus. Some authors, most notably in the bioethics field, derive professional ethics from general philosophical ethics. We argue that these derivations have so far been flawed, since any general ethics must apply equally to both professional and client, and thus it is difficult to see how the special obligations of professionals are grounded. We don't offer any solution to this problem, just a diagnosis of it.

Dr Alan Tapper is a research fellow at the Centre for Applied Ethics and Philosophy at Curtin University. He was formerly a philosopher at Edith Cowan University. His other research interests include eighteenth-century intellectual history and Australian family issues. He is author, with Stephan Millett, of three secondary school textbooks on Philosophy and Ethics.

Associate Professor Stephan Millett is Director of the Centre for Applied Ethics and Philosophy at Curtin University and ethics specialist with the Curtin Health Innovation Research Institute. His other research interests include philosophy in schools and environmental ethics.

Disaster Ethics

Leila Toivainen

Disaster situations with their extreme conditions present ethical challenges for which nurses need to prepare before they are confronted with them in practice. Examples of such real-life events in the recent past are the bushfires in the state of Victoria in Australia in February 2009, hurricane Katrina in New Orleans in 2006, the SARS epidemic in Taiwan in 2003 and the Gujarat earthquake of 2001. Their aftermaths reveal the lack of preparation by health professionals and health care institutions that still impact on the communities. This paper is an exploration of how nurses as members of communities could prepare for disasters affecting them in ways that can alleviate the losses experienced by victims of disasters. This they can do by understanding their ethical obligations as health professionals under normal circumstances and how these need to be adapted in emergency conditions while still practising ethically. Nurses need to understand the codes of ethics not only in their countries but also in the countries that they choose to work in; they also need to be aware of the cross-cultural issues related to religion, gender and particular cultural practices that can either diminish or enhance their contribution to individuals and communities in need during and after disasters. Nurses, then, need to develop not only good clinical but also good ethical skills in their daily practices in order to be equipped with them when they are most needed in times of disasters.

Leila Toivainen teaches applied ethics, including bioethics, environmental and police ethics at the University of Tasmania. She works as a registered nurse at a Hobart nursing home at weekends and is an editorial member of the international Nursing Ethics journal.

Leila is a visiting lecturer at the University of Helsinki in Finland, mostly teaching courses on Nietzsche at the Department of Social and Moral Philosophy.

Abstract

David Treanor

This is a refereed paper – please [click here](#) to read

The focus of this paper is our generation as we chronologically age and our future should we require residential care. In my view, residential aged care is a utilitarian approach to the contemporary phenomenon of people living longer and not being able to live with extended kinships. I believe that Utilitarianism is employed as its emphasis shifts the well-being of the individual to that of society as a whole. In addition professionals and organisations that offer supported residential care easily intrude upon the personal autonomy of individuals through the provision of this service. This paper explores the utilitarian approach and the cost to personal autonomy.

David Treanor graduated from the University of Ulster in social work in the early 1990s and has worked in the United Kingdom and Australia in a number of diverse roles in human services. These roles have included employment in Government and Non-Government services. David has also completed a Master of Public Administration at the University of Tasmania.

David is a PhD Candidate in the School of Philosophy at the University of Tasmania, with interests in personal identity theory, applied ethics, human rights, nonviolence and reconciliation. His research examines the phenomena of friendship. Through an analysis of friendship as a phenomenon, he suggests a tentative explanation to the philosophical problem of personal identity that is embedded in Aristotelian ethics: it is plausible and realistic to define a person by one's capacity for relationships. The theme of metaphysical investigation will reveal that humanity is not inscribed only by rationality and intellectual prowess rather by one's capacity to experience relationships between individuals. David rejects the notion that individuals are locked into a rigid network of divergence and individualism, rather that our personal identity rests primarily on an accurate understanding of our relational nature and capacity to change. The contemporary application of this theoretical construct will unlock and expose processes that will be particularly useful to individuals who are marginalized and excluded in our societies. Further, my hypothesis will argue for inclusion, for a shared humanity and a particularly practical approach to resolving conflict, enabling mediation processes and transforming relationships.

Can Morality Be Codified?

Peter Shiu-Hwa Tsu

In this paper, I will examine the debate between the principlists and the particularists with special focus on the question of whether there is any true and coherent set of moral principles that codifies the moral landscape metaphysically speaking. My stance on this issue is an extreme sort of particularism which gives a “no” answer to the above question. Yet it is significantly different from the positions of other extremists like John McDowell, Jonathan Dancy and Margaret Little. In section II, I will explain how my position is distinguished from theirs and why it is worth exploring. In section III, I elucidate the meaning of “codify”. In section IV, I examine four types of principlism that claim to codify morality and argue that none of them succeeds. In section V, I distinguish between four models of virtue and explore what implications the failure of principlism has for normative ethics and applied ethics.

Peter Shiu-Hwa Tsu is currently a Ph.D. Candidate in Philosophy in Australian National University. His Ph.D. thesis defends moral particularism. He has a broad range of research interests, including applied ethics, normative ethics, meta-ethics, political philosophy, philosophy of science and philosophy of language. He was the winner of the best essay prize in an essay competition held by the Taiwanese Philosophical Association in 2008 on the theme of politics and morality.

Setting the Nanotechnology Research Agenda: Medical Research vs Energy Research

John Weckert

While there has been a strongly held view that the best way for science to advance and provide maximum benefits to society is for scientists to be free to follow their research wherever it leads, national agendas for research influence the distribution of public funding. This is certainly true of nanotechnology research. Given the competing and sometimes incompatible research goals, there is a need to examine, from an ethical and social perspective, what these goals should be. If research is aimed at improving life, whether it be better health, more knowledge of the world or greater profits, serious questions must be asked concerning the kind of research that should be done and who should make the decisions. An obvious criterion is needs. Clearly needs of people are important but which needs and which people? Two current needs concern health and energy, and the potential of nanotechnology to contribute to both seems great. Rather than arguing in the abstract about criteria this paper will develop a case that there should be less of a focus in nanotechnology on medical research aimed at the developed world and more of a focus on clean energy and other technologies for energy efficiency.

John Weckert is a Professorial Fellow at the Centre for Applied Philosophy and Public Ethics and Professor of Computer Ethics at Charles Sturt University. His research interests are in the ethics of new technologies, particularly information and communication technology, nanotechnology and synthetic biology. He is editor-in-chief of Nanoethics: Ethics for Technologies that Converge at the Nanoscale (Springer).

The Colour of Ethical Policing: A question about preferential treatment

Kim Willer

Ethical policing depends, to a large extent, on the ability of police to act impartially. In practice, however, individual police officers are clearly partial towards certain groups and types of individuals – e.g. those they identify with socially and/or culturally, those who have particular lifestyles or avoid other lifestyles, etc. This is not usually a conscious disposition on the officers' part, but it impacts on those involved in interactions with police, in some cases in significant ways. In professional ethics subjects, future police officers have demonstrated that while they accept they have their own preferences, in some cases very strongly-held preferences, they are unable to appreciate the fact that these preferences may be viewed as discrimination by those who are not favoured by them. This paper examines the need for teaching strategies that enable students to appreciate the ways in which their preferences can impact on others, particularly in circumstances where those impacts do not match with the students' intentions. Moreover, it considers the importance of doing this in ways that allow students to understand that the fact their actions have bad consequences does not necessarily make them bad people, although it does make them people who can benefit from a professional ethics subject.

Kim Willer was a serving member of the NSW Police from 1985 to 2003. During that time she worked in both country and metropolitan stations in the areas of general duties and education, also lecturing at the Police Academy. She was a lecturer/tutor at the University of Western Sydney in Policing subjects and is currently a lecturer in Professional Ethics, Policing Studies with Charles Sturt University. She has a Bachelor of Adult Education, a Graduate Certificate in Human Resource Management and a Graduate Certificate in Professional Leadership. She is currently doing a Masters in Ethics and Legal Studies.

