

DISABILITY AND ETHICS OF CARE: REIMAGINING DEPENDENCE

Albert Uluroti Green
Special Education
St. Paul's Theological College Awka
green.albert@sptcawka.com.ng

Nganwuchu Geoffrey Chiazio
Department of Religion and Cultural Studies
University of Nigeria Nsukka
geoffrey.nganwuchu@unn.edu.ng

Abstract

The ethics of care questions conventional notions of independence and autonomy by emphasizing how interconnected and interdependent human existence is. This idea is particularly relevant to disability studies since traditional society attitudes usually see dependent negatively. This essay examines how, particularly in the context of disability, the ethics of care reframes reliance as a necessary and fulfilling part of human existence. It makes the case that redefining dependency as a reciprocal and dynamic relationship promotes respect and inclusivity for people with disabilities. The study emphasizes the shortcomings of autonomy-centered models, which frequently marginalize people in need of ongoing care, by drawing on theoretical understandings and real-world instances. It promotes a paradigm change that acknowledges both providing and receiving care as co-constitutive processes that uphold the autonomy and dignity of all parties. Particular focus is placed on the ways in which care ethics might influence healthcare, education, and social inclusion policies and practices for people with disabilities. The report emphasizes the need to eliminate the stigmas associated with reliance by addressing the ethical, cultural, and systemic obstacles to accepting care as a shared obligation. Employing a qualitative approach to gather data through in-person interviews, observations, journals, and books, it offers doable solutions for creating settings where care is viewed as an essential part of human flourishing rather than a burden. In the end, this book imagines a society, in which interdependence is embraced as a fundamental component of moral behavior, transforming ideas about care and disability into chances for empathy and group development.

Keywords: Ethics of care, disability, dependence, inclusion, caregiving.

Introduction

An innovative viewpoint on human interactions is provided by the ethics of care, which emphasizes compassion, connectedness, and the moral significance of care. Unlike traditional ethical perspectives focused on autonomy and justice, the ethics of care

emphasizes the unavoidable and dignity of dependent. This point of view challenges social norms that stigmatize reliance on others, particularly in relation to impairments. Care is more than just an auxiliary support.

Dependency, which is occasionally misinterpreted as a limitation, is a crucial element of disability discourse. Care-receivers and caregivers engage in dynamic exchanges of growth, trust, and value, symbolizing the reciprocity of human connections. Dependency has always been disregarded and presented as a barrier to self-reliance and autonomy. This stigmatization upholds a limited view of human dignity, exclusion, and inequity. An alternate perspective is provided by the ethics of care, which acknowledges reliance as a common and fulfilling part of life rather than a situation exclusive to people with disabilities.

The purpose of this essay is to reframe reliance in moral and social circumstances, recognizing its intrinsic value and eschewing its negative implications. The analysis aims to reframe societal perspectives, create inclusive policy frameworks, and foster interdependent environments by including the ethics of care into disability discourse. The scope extends to exploring practical implications in caregiving, healthcare, education, and community building, demonstrating how ethical engagement with dependence can foster equity, respect, and collective well-being.

Historical Context of the Ethics of Care

The late 20th century saw the emergence of the ethics of care as a unique moral framework that challenged prevailing theories of ethics based on impartiality, autonomy, and justice. As demonstrated by the writings of Immanuel Kant and John Stuart Mill (2005), Western moral philosophy has historically placed a high value on concepts like reason and universal laws. These frameworks often sidelined the emotional and relational aspects of human interactions, relegating care to the private domain and deeming it less significant in public moral discourse. Feminist philosophers recognized this oversight, arguing that such a narrow focus marginalized the lived experiences of women, caregivers, and those in dependent relationships.

The Nature of Dependence

The state of depending on others for social, emotional, or physical assistance is referred to as dependency in both philosophical and sociological contexts. From a philosophical standpoint, it questions the conventional view of autonomy as the pinnacle of human existence and proposes that reliance is a natural part of life. Dependency can take many different forms in society, ranging from financial reliance on caregivers to emotional bonds that uphold relationships. Dependency is often stigmatized as weakness or

failure, whereas independence is frequently praised as a sign of competence and success. The relational and interwoven aspect of human life, where everyone needs help at different times, is overlooked by this dualistic viewpoint.

The Universal Experience of Dependence Across the Life Span

Dependence is not confined to specific groups; it is a universal human experience that evolves throughout the life span. Infants are entirely dependent on caregivers for survival, while older adults may require assistance due to aging-related challenges. In between these stages, dependence takes various forms, such as relying on mentors, partners, or colleagues for guidance and collaboration. These changes demonstrate how dependence is dynamic and influenced by life's circumstances. The stigma associated with reliance is lessened when it is acknowledged as a normal aspect of human life. It goes without saying that the deaf rely on us, either directly or indirectly, to care for them and to encourage them to live normal lives like us. However, the marginalization they experience from us or believe we are giving them makes their lives difficult, so it is appropriate for all of us to start promoting a society that is more inclusive and compassionate. It also emphasizes how morally necessary it is to design systems that help those in need without compromising their autonomy or sense of dignity.

Distinguishing Between Voluntary and Involuntary Dependence

Dependence can be categorized as voluntary or involuntary, each with distinct ethical implications. Voluntary dependence occurs when individuals choose to rely on others, such as seeking mentorship or emotional support. . Involuntary dependence, on the other hand, arises from circumstances beyond an individual's control, such as illness, disability, or economic hardship. This form is more likely to be stigmatized, as it challenges societal ideals of self-reliance. Recognizing these nuances is critical to addressing the moral and social dimensions of dependence, as it shifts the focus from judgment to understanding and support for those who face involuntary reliance.

Dependency in the Context of Disability: A Special Case?

In the context of disability, dependency is frequently considered a "special case," although this viewpoint might reinforce negative perceptions. Even though people with disabilities might have special needs, their dependence on others shouldn't be viewed as unusual or troublesome. Rather, it emphasizes how interconnected all human relationships are. Dependency caused by disabilities frequently necessitates specific care, such as assistive technology or customized support services, which can raise awareness of dependence as a shared responsibility in society. It is easier to normalize disability-related dependence by seeing it as a component of the wider range of human reliance, which promotes inclusive settings where all types of need are respected. In order to meet the many needs of people with disabilities, it also demands ethical

frameworks that place a high priority on equity, respect, and dignity.

Challenging the Independence Paradigm

Western ethics have traditionally placed a strong emphasis on the idea of independence, which emphasizes personal accountability, autonomy, and self-sufficiency as characteristics of a happy life. This paradigm, which has its roots in Enlightenment philosophy, honors individualism and the ability to act independently. Although this viewpoint has significantly advanced human rights and personal liberties, it also marginalizes people who do not share its values, especially those with impairments. This ideology leaves out a significant portion of the human population whose lives are influenced by relationality and interdependence by portraying independence as a moral virtue and dependency as a weakness. Such a narrow view of human flourishing fails to capture the diversity and complexity of lived experiences.

The relational aspect of human existence and the inevitable nature of reliance are allegedly ignored by autonomy-centered ethical frameworks, according to its detractors. These criticisms have been led by feminist philosophers and disability advocates, who have pointed out how autonomy-focused paradigms undervalue community, caregiving, and mutual support. They draw attention to the fact that caregivers' hidden efforts, which are routinely disregarded, are frequently necessary to obtain autonomy. Furthermore, these models place unreasonably high demands on people to maintain their independence even in situations where it is both necessary and advantageous to rely on others. Prioritizing autonomy over care in ethical models runs the risk of alienating people who need assistance and thereby perpetuating structural injustices.

Disability exposes the boundaries of independence as a universal ideal, hence challenging the norm of self-sufficiency. Reliance on caretakers, assistive technology, or community networks is not an anomaly but rather a necessary aspect of life for people with disabilities. This fact emphasizes how crucial it is to redefine moral standards in order to take into account the interconnectedness of interpersonal interactions. Disability is a reminder that independence and need can coexist in dynamic ways rather than being mutually exclusive. The relational self presents interdependence as a new ethical standard and provides a convincing counterargument to the independence paradigm. This viewpoint acknowledges that people are inherently relational and that their relationships with others and the larger community shape who they are. It promotes a culture of respect and unity by redefining reliance as a shared experience rather than a personal constraint. Ethical frameworks can transcend the division between independence and dependency by embracing interconnectedness, making room for more compassionate and inclusive approaches to human flourishing.

The Ethics of Care and Its Relevance to Disability

With its foundation in interaction, context, and emotion, the ethics of care provides a sophisticated perspective on interpersonal relationships and moral obligation. Care ethics places a higher priority on people's lived reality and their interdependencies with one another than justice-oriented ethics, which emphasize abstract concepts like rights and responsibilities. It draws attention to the moral importance of empathy, compassion, and being sensitive to the needs of others while highlighting how context shapes moral judgments. According to , this approach is especially pertinent to disability since it challenges the stigma associated with dependency while acknowledging the intrinsic interconnectedness of human life.

The way care ethics views dependence is different from that of justice ethics. Autonomy, equality, and impartiality are the conventional focuses of justice ethics, which frequently ignores the relational and emotional aspects of moral behavior. Care ethics sees reliance as a necessary part of human life that requires moral consideration and social support rather than as a weakness. This distinction is important because, by promoting self-sufficiency as the goal, justice-based frameworks can unintentionally reinforce exclusion in disability discourse. Care ethics reframes dependence as a common human experience and a source of community strength by emphasizing relationships and the needs of individuals in particular contexts.

Ethical considerations for caregivers and care recipients are central to care ethics, particularly in the context of disability. Giving care requires striking a careful balance between assisting the person receiving care and honoring their agency and autonomy. To provide care that is empowering rather than paternalistic, ethical care must pay close attention to each person's unique needs and choices. In the care relationship, care receivers should be seen as active partners rather than passive beneficiaries, according to the ethics of care. Care becomes a dynamic, reciprocal process that benefits both people when dignity, respect, and common understanding are fostered by this mutual awareness.

Dependence, Vulnerability, and Human Dignity

Vulnerability is a universal aspect of the human condition, intrinsic to our nature as embodied and relational beings. From infancy to old age, every individual experiences phases of physical, emotional, or social vulnerability, reflecting our interdependence. Far from being a weakness, vulnerability underscores the necessity of care, compassion, and community. It reminds us that human flourishing is not achieved in isolation but through mutual support and relational bonds. Recognizing vulnerability as a shared reality challenges societal narratives that prioritize strength and self-reliance, fostering a more inclusive understanding of what it means to live with dignity.

Additionally, vulnerability serves as a lens through which the needs and rights of every individual are taken into consideration, making it a crucial component of ethical decision-making. Vulnerability-aware ethical frameworks transcend strict rules to accommodate the complexity of human experiences, leading to more sympathetic and contextually aware results. Recognizing vulnerability as a common human characteristic fosters solidarity and lessens the stigmatization of individuals who require care in the fields of healthcare, social policy, and caregiving. This viewpoint moves the moral emphasis from independence to interdependence, bringing moral judgments into line with the facts of human existence and our shared obligation to protect everyone's dignity.

Care, Disability, and Social Justice

By highlighting the moral responsibility to address human needs fairly and the interconnectedness of relationships, care ethics offers a convincing foundation for social justice. Care ethics emphasizes the actual realities of people, especially those in marginalized or vulnerable positions, in contrast to traditional justice theories that place more emphasis on abstract concepts of equality and rights. Care ethics in the context of disability challenges social structures that disregard the needs of those who rely on support networks. In order to ensure that people who need help are treated with respect and dignity, it advocates for a justice model that incorporates care as a key element.

Applying care ethics to social justice requires promoting equity in the allocation of care resources. This necessitates acknowledging that care is a limited resource that must be distributed according to need rather than convenience or privilege. People with disabilities and other marginalized groups are disproportionately affected by structural disparities, which frequently lead to unequal access to care. A care-based approach to resource allocation promotes systems that give priority to those who are most in need while highlighting solidarity and shared responsibility. Additionally, it demands that caretakers, whose work is sometimes disregarded and underappreciated, be acknowledged and supported.

Critiques of the Ethics of Care in Disability

One common critique of the ethics of care is its perceived overemphasis on emotional labor, particularly in care-giving relationships. Critics argue that this focus risks placing an undue burden on caregivers, who are often women, and perpetuating expectations that care must come at the expense of their own well-being. In the context of disability, this critique highlights the potential for caregivers to experience burnout or neglect their own needs due to the emotional and physical demands of care. While care ethics seeks to validate the emotional dimensions of care-giving, this emphasis may inadvertently undervalue the structural and institutional supports necessary to sustain care-giving relationships. Without addressing these broader systemic issues, the reliance on

emotional labor risks reinforcing inequities and limiting the transformative potential of care ethics.

The risk of paternalism is another concern in applying care ethics to disability. Critics warn that care, when improperly practiced, can become controlling or disempowering, treating individuals with disabilities as passive recipients rather than active participants in their care. This dynamic can undermine the autonomy and agency of care recipients, perpetuating harmful stereotypes about disability and dependence. Advocates of care ethics contend that it can develop into a progressive ethical framework that tackles these issues in response to these criticisms. Through the integration of justice, autonomy, and systemic reform principles, care ethics can transcend its perceived boundaries. For example, the over-reliance on emotional labor might be lessened by highlighting the shared responsibility for caregiving throughout society rather than individualizing it. The likelihood of paternalism can also be decreased by incorporating procedures for cooperation and respect into relationships between caregivers.

Rethinking Dependence in a Disability Context

Dependency, which is frequently seen as a weakness, can actually be seen as a strength, especially when it comes to disabilities. Social standards that idealize independence and self-sufficiency are challenged when dependence is acknowledged as a basic part of the human experience. Dependency on caregivers, assistive technology, or community support networks allows people with disabilities to have fulfilling lives and engage in meaningful social interactions. Instead of undermining their worth, these kinds of interactions emphasize how interconnected all human relationships are.

Rethinking the idea of "help" entails moving away from a one-way care model and toward one based on reciprocity and mutual care. Dependency does not mean passivity; those who accept support frequently make substantial contributions to their communities and relationships in ways that go beyond conventional ideas of help. Relationships between caregivers and care recipients, for example, can be reciprocal, with caregivers benefiting from the emotional support, company, and distinct viewpoints that care recipients provide.

The ethical obligation to support dependent individuals is central to fostering a society that values inclusivity and equity. Dependence is not a limitation but a call for collective responsibility, emphasizing the moral imperative to ensure that individuals with disabilities have access to the resources and care they need to thrive. This obligation extends beyond personal relationships to include systemic changes in healthcare, education, and social services. Policies that prioritize accessibility, inclusivity, and community-based support reflect a commitment to upholding the dignity and rights of dependent individuals. Recognizing care as a shared societal responsibility ensures that dependence is met with respect, empathy, and practical solutions.

Creating a society that values and embraces dependence requires a cultural shift in how we perceive human relationships and capabilities. By normalizing dependence as an integral aspect of life, societies can foster environments where individuals with disabilities are not marginalized but celebrated for their contributions. This involves dismantling stigmas surrounding dependence and advocating for inclusive systems that prioritize human connection over individualistic ideals. Valuing dependence as a shared experience paves the way for a more compassionate, equitable, and interconnected society, where the worth of every individual is acknowledged and upheld through acts of care and mutual respect.

Ethics of Care in Global Disability Rights

Because it highlights relationships, interdependence, and the importance of care in attaining social justice, care ethics plays a critical role in advancing worldwide disability rights. A crucial framework that emphasizes handicapped people's rights to care, education, and full participation in society is the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD). The CRPD promotes the inclusion of individuals with disabilities in all facets of life, acknowledging that their autonomy and dignity depend on receiving proper care and assistance. According to care ethics, disability is a socially constructed condition that results from society's failure to give adequate care and support, rather than a personal tragedy.

Society has a crucial role in promoting moral healthcare practices. In this situation, communities, governments, and institutions all have a role to play in providing care, in addition to caregivers. It is imperative that society establish systems that offer individuals with disabilities all-encompassing assistance, guaranteeing them access to essential resources, medical treatment, education, and social integration. The focus must be on creating settings where care practices value equality, empathy, and respect so that people with disabilities can live fulfilling lives while retaining their dignity and autonomy.

To create a more equitable and inclusive world, care as a fundamental value in the moral treatment of people with disabilities is crucial. Disability is a societal problem that necessitates structural reform, not just a personal one to overcome. In order to prevent people with disabilities from being marginalized or excluded from society, policies and practices must place a high priority on compassion, understanding, and respect for one another in all spheres of life, including healthcare, education, employment, and social interactions.

Recommendations

- i. **Societal**views should be shifted on dependence from a negative to a positive concept by emphasizing interdependence.

- ii. Governments and organizations should implement policies that ensure equal access to healthcare, education, and employment opportunities for people with disabilities.
- iii. The Society should ensure that assistive technologies are affordable, accessible, and tailored to the needs of individuals with disabilities. Support innovation in this area to create new tools that enhance independence without replacing human connection.
- iv. **Government should** launch nationwide or global campaigns that promote understanding and awareness of disabilities.
- v. **Government should** provide resources, training, and emotional support for caregivers, recognizing their vital role in the care process. Caregiver
- vi. **There should be** community-driven, inclusive care systems where local support networks work together to meet the needs of individuals with disabilities.
- vii. **The Government should provide** greater representation of people with disabilities in leadership, media, and decision-making roles.
- viii. **Policy makers should** establish ethical guidelines for the development and use of assistive technologies that prioritize user autonomy, privacy, and dignity.
- ix. **Government should** design public infrastructure, including transportation, buildings, and recreational areas, to be fully accessible to individuals with disabilities.
- x. **The Policy makers should** work toward establishing a global commitment to disability care as a human right.

Reference"

- Alberts, L. (2020). Paternalism to Trusteeship: Limitations of Autonomy Caring for Persons *With Intellectual Disabilities*. *International Journal for Human Caring*, 24(3).
- Asch, A. (2017). Critical race theory, feminism, and disability: Reflections on social justice and personal identity. In *Disability and Equality Law* (pp. 143-176). Routledge.
- Baffoe, M. (2013). Stigma, discrimination & marginalization: Gateways to oppression of persons with disabilities in Ghana, West Africa. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 3(1), 187-198.
- Barnes, M. (2012). *Care in everyday life: An ethic of care in practice*. Policy Press.
- Bennett, C. L., Brady, E., & Branham, S. M. (2018). Interdependence as a frame for assistive technology research and design. Proceedings of the 20th international acm sigaccess conference on computers and accessibility,
- Chatzidakis, A., Hakim, J., Litter, J., & Rottenberg, C. (2020). *The care manifesto: The politics of interdependence*. Verso Books.

- Davy, L. (2015). Philosophical inclusive design: Intellectual disability and the limits of individual autonomy in moral and political theory. *Hypatia*, 30(1), 132-148.
- Davy, L. (2019). Between an ethic of care and an ethic of autonomy: Negotiating relational autonomy, disability, and dependency. *Angelaki*, 24(3), 101-114.
- Dodds, S. (2007). Depending on care: Recognition of vulnerability and the social contribution of care provision. *Bioethics*, 21(9), 500-510.
- Easton-Calabria, E., & Omata, N. (2018). Panacea for the refugee crisis? Rethinking the promotion of 'self-reliance' for refugees. *Third World Quarterly*, 39(8), 1458-1474.
- Ethikrat, D. (2022). Benevolent coercion—tensions between welfare and autonomy in professional caring relationships. In.
- Ferrarese, E. (2016). Vulnerability: A concept with which to undo the world as it is? In (Vol. 17, pp. 149-159): Taylor & Francis.
- Frese, H. (2022). *Time to Care: Disabled and queer lived realities of care and time as forms of non-normative resistance*
- Giacomin, M., & Jordan, C. H. (2020). Interdependent and independent self-construal. In *Encyclopedia of personality and individual differences* (pp. 2319-2325). Springer.
- Hammel, J., Magasi, S., Heinemann, A., Whiteneck, G., Bogner, J., & Rodriguez, E. (2008). What does participation mean? An insider perspective from people with disabilities. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 30(19), 1445-1460.
- Hankivsky, O. (2014). Rethinking care ethics: On the promise and potential of an intersectional analysis. *American Political Science Review*, 108(2), 252-264.
- Held, V. (2005). *The ethics of care: Personal, political, and global*. Oxford university press.
- Ho, E. L.-E., Boyle, M., & Yeoh, B. S. (2015). Recasting diaspora strategies through feminist care ethics. *Geoforum*, 59, 206-214.
- Hosseini, S. H. (2023). The well-living paradigm: reimagining quality of life in our turbulent world. *Discover Global Society*, 1(1), 19.
- Jahn, B. (2005). Kant, Mill, and illiberal legacies in international affairs. *International Organization*, 59(1), 177-207.
- Janssen, S., Van Vuuren, M., & De Jong, M. D. (2016). Informal mentoring at work: A review and suggestions for future research. *International journal of management reviews*, 18(4), 498-517.
- Juujärvi, S. (2003). *The ethic of care and its development* [Citeseer].
- Kittay, E. F. (2011). The ethics of care, dependence, and disability. *Ratio juris*, 24(1), 49-58.
- Kittay, E. F. (2019). *Love's labor: Essays on women, equality and dependency*. Routledge.
- Longo, M., & Lorubbio, V. (2023). Vulnerability. from the paradigmatic subject to a new paradigm of the human condition? An introduction. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law-Revue internationale de Sémiotique juridique*, 36(4), 1359-1369.

- Marston, H. R., & Samuels, J. (2019). A review of age friendly virtual assistive technologies and their effect on daily living for carers and dependent adults. *Healthcare*,
- Matza, T. (2012). "Good individualism"? Psychology, ethics, and neoliberalism in postsocialist Russia. *American Ethnologist*, 39(4), 804-818.
- Miller, S. C. (2013). *The ethics of need: Agency, dignity, and obligation*. Routledge.
- Mishra, A. (2023). Elucidating the ontological potential of Care Ethics: Towards a revised narrative of morality. *Balkan Journal of Philosophy*, 15(2), 155-164.
- Mitra, S. (2017). *Disability, health and human development*. Springer Nature.
- Mladenov, T. (2016). Disability and social justice. *Disability & Society*, 31(9), 1226-1241.
- Noddings, N. (2015). *The challenge to care in schools, 2nd Edition*. teachers college press.
- Phillips, J. (2007). *Care*. Polity.
- Rao, S. (2024). Resuscitating Equality: Bringing the Heartbeat Back to Healthcare. *Advances in Social Work*, 24(2), 366-385.
- Sampaio, M. A., & Bellezi Guilhem, D. (2022). Care relationships and the autonomy of people with physical disabilities. *Bioethics*, 36(5), 525-534.
- Schilke, O., Reimann, M., & Cook, K. S. (2021). Trust in social relations. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 47(1), 239-259.
- Skorupski, J. M. (2010). *John Stuart Mill*. Routledge.
- Syed, M., & McLean, K. C. (2022). Who gets to live the good life? Master narratives, identity, and well-being within a marginalizing society. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 100, 104285.
- Thomson, G., Gill, S., & Goodson, I. (2020). *Happiness, flourishing and the good life: a transformative vision for human well-being*. Routledge.
- Tremain, S. (2017). *Foucault and feminist philosophy of disability*. University of Michigan Press.
- Tronto, J. (2020). *Moral boundaries: A political argument for an ethic of care*. Routledge.
- Ulutorti, G. A. (2024). ANGLICAN DIOCESE ON THE NIGER AND HER HUMANITARIAN ROLE FOR THE DEAF IN ONITSHA. *CROWTHER JOURNAL OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES*, 1(1).
- Vermeulen, M. (2024). *Alienation and the Narratives of Young Working-Class Individuals Seeking Assistance in an Era of Uncertainty* [Ghent University].