Professional misconduct in UK health and social care

Bad apples? Bad barrels? Or bad cellars?

Insights into sexual misconduct and dishonesty

New research funded by the Professional Standards Authority and led by Professor Rosalind Searle at Coventry University's Centre for Trust, Peace and Social relations identifies three types of perpetrator in cases of professional misconduct





An individual operating as a sole agent and motivated by self-gain – the 'bad apple'

Individuals whose moral compass is skewed by working in an organisation where misconduct is seen as the 'normal' or accepted way to behave – the corrupting barrel

Individuals who are worn down by stress/strain either at work/at home (or both), feel undervalued and overworked and misconduct can then occur through omission/error – the depleted barrel

Identifying the most frequent forms of professional wrongdoing

The study analysed information on the Authority's database* relating to final fitness to practise determinations from the 9 health and care regulators







6,714 individual fitness to practise (FtP) cases*

2014-2016 cases occurring during this period

3 regulators cases involving registrants from 3 regulators

The data analysed:

General Medical Council Souncil Mursing & Health & Care Professions Council Council Midwifery Council Council

Data from three distinct groups: doctors, nurses & midwives, and allied professionals

- 1. 633 GMC cases
- 2. 4852 NMC cases
- 3. 1229 HCPC cases





Find out more or read the full report at

www.professionalstandards.org.uk/misconduct

Bad apples? Bad barrels? Or bad cellars? Antecedents and processes of

professional misconduct in UK Health and Social Care: Insights into sexual misconduct and dishonesty

by Professor R Searle, Dr C Rice, Dr A A McConnell, Coventry University (additional analysis by Professor J Dawson, University of Sheffield. The research was funded by the Professional Standards Authority.

*Each regulator has a 'fitness to practise' process for handling complaints about health and care professionals. The most serious cases are referred to formal hearings in front of fitness to practise committees. The Professional Standards Authority reviews every final decision and can refer them to Court if we consider they are insufficient to protect the public. Records of every final fitness to practise determination are kept on a database and this was the source of the data used in the research.