Difference between beneficence and nonmaleficence with examples

Science, Social Science



Nursing Ethics Difference between Beneficence and Nonmaleficence with Examples Both beneficence and nonmaleficence are regarded as appropriate medical terms that are used during the conduct of clinical treatments or applications. In this regard, it must be mentioned that the term beneficence represents the actions that have been used for promoting the well being of the people especially the patients. On the other hand, the meaning of nonmaleficence implies providing no harm to anyone during the treatment procedure. In the context of medical treatment, the process of beneficence denotes taking effective actions towards serving the best interests of the patients (Kimberly, 2012).

In contrast, the aspect of nonmaleficence signifies refraining physicians to provide ineffective treatments to the patients. The concept of beneficence is recognized as a core value of healthcare ethics. Nevertheless, it is regarded as a principle of delivering proper healthcare services to the patients.

Beneficence has the potentiality to provide enough support to the healthcare experts in the context of preventing the patients from any sort of harm. On the other hand, the principle of nonmaleficence is used as guidance for the physicians while treating the patients. At certain times, the beneficial therapy or beneficence can also provide harm to the patients and make them to face serious risks (Hsu, 2011).

For instance, a nurse may encourage a patient to quit smoking and start an exercise program, which can be related to beneficence practice. On the other hand, a nurse may also make patients to stop consuming medicines that can be harmful for them in long run. This practice is related to nonmaleficence action (Hsu, 2011).

References

Hsu, L-L. (2012). Blended learning in ethics education: A survey of nursing students. Nursing Ethics, 18(3), 418–430.

Kimberly I. D. (2012). Cultural competence: An evolutionary concept analysis. Nursing Education Perspectives, 33(5), 317-321.