https://research.adra.ac.id/index.php/midwifery
P - ISSN: 3110-7877
E - ISSN: 3110-7133

Who Owns Childbirth? A Philosophical Inquiry into Autonomy, Medicalization, and Midwifery-Led Care

Noorhani Dyani Laksmi [1], Jaden Tan [2], Isabelle Ng [3]

[1] Universitas Muhammadiyah Palangka Raya, Indonesia
[2] Singapore Institute of Technology (SIT), Singapore
[3] Temasek Polytechnic, Singapore

ABSTRACT

Background. Childbirth increasingly takes place within highly medicalized healthcare systems in which clinical expertise, institutional protocols, and technological surveillance may conflict with bodily autonomy and meaningful maternal choice. This tension raises important ethical questions concerning who should hold decision-making authority during childbirth and how professional responsibility can be balanced with the autonomy of birthing women.

Purpose. This study aimed to examine how authority over childbirth should be ethically distributed among birthing women, healthcare professionals, and maternity institutions, with particular attention to the role of midwifery-led care in reconciling maternal autonomy with clinical safety.

Method. A qualitative philosophical inquiry was conducted using conceptual clarification, normative argument analysis, critical comparison, and representative ethical case examination. The analysis drew on literature from bioethics, feminist philosophy, philosophy of medicine, and maternity care to evaluate competing claims concerning bodily autonomy, professional expertise, institutional authority, risk, and informed decision-making.

Results. The analysis indicates that birthing women retain primary moral authority over their bodies, values, and healthcare choices, while healthcare professionals possess legitimate but bounded epistemic and fiduciary authority derived from professional expertise and duties of care. Medicalization becomes ethically problematic when clinical recommendations, institutional routines, or risk-based discourse override competent maternal choices without proportionate ethical or clinical justification.

Conclusion. Childbirth is best governed through a model of shared but asymmetrical authority in which clinical expertise contributes substantially to protecting maternal and neonatal health without displacing the bodily sovereignty, dignity, informed refusal, and moral agency of the person giving birth. Midwifery-led care offers an ethically valuable framework for achieving this balance by integrating professional responsibility with relational and autonomy-respecting maternity care.

KEYWORDS

Autonomy, Childbirth, Medicalization.

Citation: Laksmi, N. D., Tan, J., & Ng, I. (2026). Who Owns Childbirth? A Philosophical Inquiry into Autonomy, Medicalization, and Midwifery-Led Care. *Journal of Midwifery History and Philosophy, 2*(2), 107–123. https://doi.org/10.70177/midwifery.v2i2.4365

Correspondence:

Noorhani Dyani Laksmi,
noryanilaksmi@gmail.com

Received: January 12, 2026

Accepted: March 10, 2026

Published: June 26, 2026

INTRODUCTION

Childbirth occupies a distinctive position at the intersection of biology, medicine, ethics, embodiment, family life, and social authority. It is simultaneously a physiological event, a deeply personal experience, and an

institutional concern shaped by clinical standards and professional responsibility. Modern maternity care has substantially improved the capacity to recognize complications, manage emergencies, and reduce preventable maternal and neonatal harm (Kuipers dkk., 2024; May & Elton, 1998; Norris & Murphy, 2020). These advances have also placed childbirth increasingly within hospitals, clinical protocols, technological monitoring, and professional systems of decision-making. The philosophical question of who possesses legitimate authority over childbirth therefore cannot be answered solely by referring to medical expertise. It also requires consideration of bodily autonomy, informed choice, relational vulnerability, professional duty, and the meaning women assign to their own birth experiences.

Medicalization has profoundly influenced contemporary understandings of pregnancy and birth by bringing normal physiological processes within the conceptual and organizational framework of medicine (Brady dkk., 2023; Hood dkk., 2010; Palimbo dkk., 2021). Clinical surveillance, risk classification, induction, continuous fetal monitoring, pharmacological pain management, operative delivery, and standardized intervention pathways have become familiar features of many maternity systems. These practices can be lifesaving when clinically indicated, yet their routine or excessive use raises questions about whether childbirth is increasingly treated as a condition requiring professional management rather than as an embodied process requiring support and selective intervention. Philosophical scrutiny is necessary because the issue is not simply whether medical technologies are effective, but how their use affects agency, consent, responsibility, and the distribution of authority between birthing women and healthcare professionals.

Midwifery-led care provides an important alternative lens through which the organization of childbirth can be reconsidered. Midwifery traditions commonly emphasize continuity of care, relational trust, physiological birth, informed decision-making, emotional support, and respect for the woman's embodied knowledge (Catling dkk., 2017; Mallick, 2016; Sahrul dkk., 2024). Contemporary midwives also operate within evidence-based clinical systems and are trained to recognize complications requiring referral or interdisciplinary management. The model therefore does not require a rejection of medicine but offers a different arrangement of professional authority in which intervention is proportionate to need and the birthing person remains central to decision-making. The contrast between obstetricized and midwifery-led models creates a productive philosophical space for examining whether safety and autonomy should be understood as competing values or as mutually reinforcing dimensions of good maternity care.

The central problem addressed by this study concerns the distribution of authority in childbirth decision-making (Brady dkk., 2024; Egenberg dkk., 2025; Sakala, 1988). Clinical professionals possess specialized knowledge about risk, pathology, emergency treatment, and potential outcomes, while women possess first-person knowledge of their bodies, preferences, values, pain, fears, and life circumstances. Conflict can emerge when these forms of knowledge point toward different decisions. A clinician may view intervention as the safest option, while a woman may consider the intervention inconsistent with her values or acceptable level of risk. The philosophical difficulty lies in determining how professional expertise should influence decisions without becoming a justification for overriding competent autonomous choice.

The language of safety introduces a second problem because safety is often treated as an objective concept even though maternity decisions involve competing forms of risk and well-being (O'Malley-Keighran & Lohan, 2016; Permezel dkk., 2023; Timmenga & van der Zande, 2026). Clinical safety commonly prioritizes morbidity, mortality, measurable complications, and

emergency prevention, while women may also value dignity, bodily integrity, emotional security, freedom from unnecessary intervention, continuity of care, and a sense of control. A technically successful birth may still be experienced as coercive or traumatic when consent is weak, communication is poor, or interventions are imposed without meaningful participation. The ethical evaluation of maternity care therefore requires a broader conception of harm that includes psychological, relational, and autonomy-related dimensions alongside biomedical outcomes.

Institutional structures create a further challenge because childbirth decisions rarely occur in conditions of complete freedom (George dkk., 2024; Maier, 2014; Maude & Foureur, 2007). Women make choices within environments shaped by hospital protocols, professional hierarchies, legal liability, resource limitations, staffing arrangements, cultural expectations, and unequal access to maternity options. Formal consent may exist while practical alternatives remain unavailable. Women from marginalized social groups may face additional barriers involving discrimination, language, socioeconomic inequality, disability, or limited access to continuity models. The problem of autonomy in childbirth must therefore extend beyond whether consent forms are signed and examine whether individuals possess meaningful power to understand, negotiate, accept, or refuse available forms of care.

The primary objective of this study is to examine the philosophical foundations of autonomy in childbirth and clarify how decision-making authority should be distributed between birthing women and healthcare professionals (Davis, 2010; Leavy & Leggett, 2022; OBoyle, 2013). The analysis seeks to move beyond simplistic interpretations of autonomy as unrestricted personal preference by considering informed consent, relational dependence, vulnerability, responsibility, and the ethical significance of professional expertise. Particular attention is given to circumstances in which maternal choice conflicts with clinical recommendations. The study aims to establish a more nuanced framework in which autonomy remains morally substantive without denying the legitimate role of professional guidance and emergency intervention.

The study also aims to critically evaluate medicalization as both a protective and potentially autonomy-limiting feature of contemporary childbirth. Medical intervention is not treated as inherently oppressive, because technological and clinical developments have prevented significant maternal and neonatal harm (Crowther & Lau, 2019; Tarlazzi dkk., 2025; Varslev-Pedersen, 2022). The analysis instead investigates how appropriate clinical intervention can be distinguished from unnecessary normalization of surveillance and control. Questions concerning risk classification, standardization, defensive medicine, institutional efficiency, and professional authority are examined to determine how medicalization changes the moral status of childbirth from an experience primarily belonging to the woman toward an event increasingly governed by institutional expertise.

A further objective is to evaluate midwifery-led care as a possible ethical model for reconciling safety, autonomy, and relational support. The study seeks to examine whether continuity, shared decision-making, physiological birth support, and selective use of medical intervention offer a different philosophical configuration of authority. Midwifery-led care is considered not as an ideological rejection of obstetrics but as a model that may redistribute epistemic and decision-making power more evenly. The expected outcome is a conceptual framework capable of explaining when clinical authority is justified, when autonomy should prevail, and how collaborative maternity care can preserve both safety and meaningful self-determination.

Existing research on childbirth has extensively examined clinical safety, maternal outcomes, intervention rates, satisfaction, continuity of care, informed consent, and respectful maternity services. Bioethical scholarship has also developed sophisticated accounts of autonomy, paternalism, beneficence, nonmaleficence, and shared decision-making. These literatures frequently remain separated, with clinical studies concentrating on measurable outcomes and philosophical discussions addressing autonomy at a more abstract level. Limited integration exists between normative theories of autonomy and the concrete institutional realities of childbirth. This gap makes it difficult to explain how ethical principles should operate when medical risk, emotional vulnerability, institutional routines, and embodied experience converge during labor.

Scholarship on medicalization has provided influential critiques of the expansion of professional control over pregnancy and childbirth. Feminist and sociological accounts have highlighted how women's bodies can become objects of surveillance, risk management, and technological intervention. Some critiques risk constructing an overly sharp opposition between natural birth and medical care, while some clinical narratives risk interpreting increased intervention as synonymous with improved safety. A conceptual gap remains between these positions. A more philosophically balanced analysis is needed to recognize the life-saving value of obstetric medicine while still asking whether the organization and use of medical authority can undermine autonomy, dignity, or meaningful consent.

Research on midwifery-led care has increasingly documented outcomes related to continuity, satisfaction, intervention, and maternal experience, yet its philosophical implications remain comparatively underdeveloped. Midwifery is often evaluated as a service model rather than as an alternative distribution of epistemic and moral authority. Limited attention has been given to how midwifery-led care changes the meaning of expertise, risk, consent, and relational autonomy. This gap is important because the distinctive contribution of midwifery may not lie only in different clinical outcomes but also in a different ethical structure of care. The present study addresses this neglected dimension by positioning midwifery-led practice within broader debates about who has the right to define and govern childbirth.

The principal novelty of this study lies in framing childbirth as a philosophical problem of ownership without reducing ownership to legal possession. The concept is used to ask who has the strongest moral claim to define the meaning, acceptable risks, and direction of the childbirth experience. This perspective integrates bodily autonomy, epistemic authority, professional responsibility, and institutional power within one analytical framework. Childbirth is therefore interpreted as a domain in which ownership is relational and contested: women retain primary authority over their bodies, while clinicians possess legitimate but limited authority derived from expertise and duties of care. This formulation provides a more precise alternative to both absolute patient sovereignty and unrestricted medical paternalism.

A second element of novelty involves conceptualizing midwifery-led care as an ethical architecture of shared authority rather than merely a clinical service arrangement. Continuity of care, relational knowledge, informed dialogue, and proportionate intervention are examined as mechanisms that may reduce the conflict between autonomy and safety. The model recognizes embodied knowledge as ethically relevant without placing it above clinical evidence, and it recognizes professional knowledge as indispensable without treating it as automatically decisive. Such a framework can help explain why respectful maternity care depends not simply on offering choices but on organizing relationships and institutions so that those choices can be genuinely understood and exercised.

The justification for this research rests on the continuing ethical tensions surrounding intervention, consent, birth trauma, respectful maternity care, and professional authority across maternity systems. Improvements in clinical safety do not eliminate questions about how women experience decision-making or whether institutional routines adequately protect bodily integrity and dignity. A philosophical inquiry can clarify the normative principles required to judge practices that may be clinically defensible yet ethically contested. The study is positioned to contribute to bioethics, philosophy of medicine, midwifery studies, feminist philosophy, reproductive ethics, and health-policy scholarship by proposing that the central question is not whether childbirth belongs exclusively to patients or professionals, but how authority should be structured so that clinical competence protects life without displacing the moral agency of the person giving birth.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employed a qualitative philosophical inquiry using normative analysis, conceptual clarification, and critical interpretation to examine the distribution of authority in childbirth (Prince, 2025; Rigg dkk., 2015; Zhang dkk., 2015). The research focused on three interrelated concepts: autonomy, medicalization, and midwifery-led care. Philosophical inquiry was selected because the central problem concerns not only what happens in maternity care, but also what ought to count as legitimate decision-making authority when clinical expertise, bodily autonomy, maternal preferences, institutional responsibility, and fetal or neonatal interests intersect. The study therefore moved beyond descriptive analysis to assess the ethical justification of different forms of authority exercised during childbirth.

The analytical design integrated principles from bioethics, feminist philosophy, philosophy of medicine, and relational autonomy. Autonomy was examined through informed consent, bodily integrity, voluntariness, decision-making capacity, and the ability to accept or refuse recommended interventions. Medicalization was analyzed as a process through which physiological childbirth becomes increasingly defined through clinical risk, technological surveillance, professional protocols, and institutional control. Midwifery-led care was evaluated as a possible model of shared authority in which clinical safety, relational knowledge, continuity of care, and maternal agency are negotiated rather than treated as mutually exclusive values.

The study adopted a critical-comparative philosophical approach to avoid constructing an artificial opposition between medical intervention and maternal autonomy. Clinical intervention was not assumed to be inherently coercive, while maternal choice was not treated as ethically unlimited under every circumstance. The analysis instead examined the conditions under which professional recommendations become ethically justified, the point at which professional authority risks becoming paternalistic, and the mechanisms through which shared decision-making can preserve both safety and self-determination. This design enabled the study to distinguish legitimate clinical guidance from unjustified substitution of professional judgment for competent maternal choice.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The analyzed literature revealed four recurring configurations of authority in contemporary childbirth: professionally dominated authority, procedural patient autonomy, relationally shared authority, and institutionally constrained choice. Professionally dominated models positioned clinical expertise and risk prevention as the principal basis for decision-making, particularly when adverse maternal or neonatal outcomes were considered foreseeable. Procedural autonomy models

formally recognized informed consent and refusal but often reduced autonomy to the completion of disclosure and consent procedures. Relational models treated decision-making as an interaction among bodily experience, professional knowledge, trust, communication, and social context. Institutionally constrained models demonstrated that apparent choice could remain limited by hospital protocols, staffing arrangements, available birth settings, legal concerns, and unequal access to continuity of care.

Table 1. Major Configurations of Authority Identified in the Philosophical Analysis

Configuration of Authority	Primary Basis of Legitimacy	Position of the Birthing Woman	Role of Clinical Professionals	Main Ethical Risk
Professionally dominated authority	Clinical expertise and risk prevention	Recipient of professionally guided decisions	Primary decision authority	Paternalism and loss of bodily agency
Procedural autonomy	Formal informed consent	Individual chooser	Information provider and treatment proposer	Consent without meaningful alternatives
Relationally shared authority	Dialogue, trust, expertise, and embodied knowledge	Primary moral agent within collaborative care	Clinical adviser and fiduciary partner	Unequal communication or hidden power
Institutionally constrained choice	Protocols, resources, liability, organizational norms	Formally autonomous but practically restricted	Institutional representative and clinician	Structural coercion
Midwifery-led shared authority	Continuity, physiological support, informed choice	Central participant and embodied knowledge holder	Relational clinical partner with referral responsibility	Under-recognition of emerging clinical risk

The secondary evidence also showed that debates about childbirth authority were rarely disagreements about autonomy or safety in isolation. Most conflicts arose from different interpretations of what constituted an acceptable risk, who was epistemically qualified to interpret that risk, and whether professional responsibility permitted clinicians to override or strongly pressure competent patients. Literature supporting stronger clinical authority emphasized preventable harm and professional accountability, while autonomy-centered sources emphasized bodily integrity, informed refusal, and the ethical distinction between recommending treatment and controlling another person's body. Midwifery-led care occupied an intermediate position by recognizing clinical risk while organizing decision-making around continuity, dialogue, and proportionate intervention.

The recurring tension between safety and autonomy was found to depend heavily on how childbirth itself was conceptualized. Sources approaching birth primarily as a potentially

pathological event tended to assign greater authority to professional surveillance, intervention, and anticipatory risk management. Sources approaching childbirth primarily as a physiological process with the possibility of complications assigned greater significance to non-intervention, embodied knowledge, and maternal participation. These different ontological starting points shaped subsequent judgments regarding monitoring, induction, operative delivery, place of birth, and acceptable thresholds for intervention.

The analysis also indicated that autonomy became weaker when it was defined exclusively as formal consent. A signed consent form or verbal agreement did not necessarily demonstrate meaningful self-determination when the woman lacked sufficient time, understandable information, realistic alternatives, or freedom from coercive pressure. Meaningful autonomy required more than permission for clinicians to proceed; it required the practical ability to participate in defining the course of care. Relational autonomy provided a stronger explanatory framework because it recognized that choices are made through relationships of trust and dependence without assuming that dependence eliminates personal agency.

Medicalization appeared across the analyzed sources as both a protective and potentially restrictive process. Clinical monitoring, surgical capacity, pharmacological treatment, and standardized emergency response were consistently associated with legitimate professional responsibilities when maternal or fetal complications were present. Ethical difficulties emerged when risk-oriented practices expanded into low-risk circumstances without sufficiently individualized justification. Standard protocols could improve consistency while also normalizing interventions that patients experienced as non-negotiable. The philosophical significance of medicalization therefore depended less on the existence of medical technology than on how and why professional power was exercised through that technology.

Table 2. Ethical Assessment of Major Dimensions of Childbirth Care

Dimension	Potential Ethical Benefit	Potential Ethical Problem	Normative Requirement
Clinical risk assessment	Early identification of serious complications	Risk can be framed as unquestionable professional authority	Transparent and individualized risk communication
Informed consent	Protects bodily autonomy	May become procedural or symbolic	Voluntariness, comprehension, and genuine alternatives
Obstetric intervention	Prevents or treats serious harm	Unnecessary intervention may undermine agency	Proportionality and clinical justification
Midwifery continuity	Builds trust and individualized knowledge	May face limitations in high-risk situations	Clear referral and escalation pathways
Institutional protocols	Promotes consistency and safety	Can restrict individualized choice	Flexible application according to clinical context
Informed	Protects bodily	Can generate conflict over	Respectful counseling and

refusal	integrity	foreseeable harm	documentation without coercion

Midwifery-led care demonstrated a distinct ethical pattern because it redistributed rather than eliminated professional authority. Midwives retained expertise concerning physiological birth, risk recognition, clinical assessment, and referral while giving greater weight to continuity, dialogue, and the woman's experiential knowledge. The model did not eliminate asymmetry because professionals still possessed specialized knowledge unavailable to most patients. Its distinctive feature lay in making that asymmetry less likely to become unilateral control by embedding expertise within an ongoing relationship rather than relying predominantly on episodic intervention.

Normative inference from the combined conceptual evidence indicates that bodily authority and clinical authority should not be treated as equivalent forms of power. The birthing woman possesses primary moral authority because interventions occur directly upon her body and because competent adults ordinarily retain the right to accept or refuse medical treatment. Clinicians possess epistemic and fiduciary authority derived from specialized knowledge and professional obligations to explain risk, recommend appropriate care, and respond to emergencies. Clinical expertise can justify strong recommendations, but expertise alone does not ordinarily convert professional judgment into ownership of the patient's bodily decisions.

A second normative inference concerns the limits of paternalism. Professional intervention against expressed maternal preferences becomes increasingly difficult to justify as decision-making capacity, information quality, voluntariness, and absence of immediate emergency increase. Ethical justification for overriding ordinary consent norms becomes stronger only when capacity is seriously impaired or when an emergency prevents meaningful decision-making under conditions requiring immediate action. Disagreement with a competent patient's risk tolerance does not itself establish incapacity. The analysis therefore supports a presumption in favor of autonomy while recognizing exceptional circumstances in which professional emergency authority may temporarily become more extensive.

The relationship between medicalization and autonomy was conditional rather than inherently antagonistic. Medical intervention supported autonomy when it expanded meaningful options, protected life, relieved suffering, and was selected through informed participation (Albert, 1992; Chrisley, 2008; Maqbool & Herold, 2024). The same intervention became autonomy-limiting when presented as compulsory without adequate justification or when institutional routine substituted for individualized judgment. Medicalization should therefore be evaluated according to proportionality, consent quality, availability of alternatives, and the relationship between actual clinical risk and the intensity of intervention.

The relationship between professional expertise and embodied knowledge also proved complementary rather than mutually exclusive. Clinicians possess knowledge derived from scientific evidence, training, diagnostic systems, and accumulated professional experience, while birthing women possess first-person knowledge of pain, values, bodily sensations, previous experiences, fears, and acceptable trade-offs (Flesch, 2007; Madeley dkk., 2026; Reiger, 1999). Ethical maternity care became stronger when these forms of knowledge informed one another. Epistemic injustice occurred when embodied knowledge was dismissed merely because it lacked professional status, while clinical irresponsibility could occur when experiential preference was treated as sufficient to negate serious and well-supported medical risk.

The first representative case involved a competent woman declining a recommended intervention after receiving information regarding possible maternal and fetal risks. Clinical professionals interpreted the refusal as inconsistent with the safest biomedical course and intensified efforts to secure agreement (Ingvarsson dkk., 2020; Newsome dkk., 2024; Thomas dkk., 1998). Philosophical analysis showed that the ethical status of these efforts depended on whether communication remained persuasive or became coercive. Repeated explanation, clarification of consequences, and exploration of alternatives remained compatible with respect for autonomy, while threats, manipulation, humiliation, or treatment without valid authorization crossed into ethically problematic paternalism in the absence of exceptional legal or emergency conditions.

The second representative case involved a low-risk pregnancy managed through midwifery-led continuity care with access to obstetric consultation and emergency referral. Decision-making developed through repeated encounters in which preferences, fears, clinical findings, and potential intervention thresholds were discussed before labor. The continuity relationship reduced the need for rapid negotiation with unfamiliar professionals during the birth process. Clinical escalation remained available when risk changed, but the default model treated physiological birth and maternal participation as legitimate starting points. This case illustrated how professional expertise could remain substantial without becoming institutionally dominant.

The refusal case demonstrates that conflict in childbirth frequently concerns authority over acceptable risk rather than factual information alone. Clinicians may accurately identify an increased probability of harm while patients may assign different moral weight to the intervention required to reduce that probability. Ethical tension emerges because biomedical evidence can estimate risk but cannot independently determine how a competent individual should value every trade-off involving bodily integrity, pain, surgery, psychological experience, or future consequences. Professional expertise remains essential to informing the decision, yet the final evaluative judgment includes personal values that clinical evidence cannot replace.

The midwifery-led case demonstrates why continuity can alter the ethical structure of decision-making. Relationships established before moments of urgency allow information to accumulate over time and enable professionals to understand individual values rather than interpreting preferences only when conflict occurs. Trust also makes clinical recommendations more intelligible because they arise within a known relationship rather than through sudden institutional authority. Midwifery-led care therefore offers ethical value not because it removes professional power, but because it creates conditions in which that power can be exercised through dialogue, proportionality, and prior understanding.

The overall analysis indicates that the question “Who owns childbirth?” cannot be answered responsibly by assigning exclusive authority either to the birthing woman or to clinical professionals. The woman holds primary moral authority over her body and values, while healthcare professionals hold legitimate but bounded epistemic and fiduciary authority concerning clinical assessment and recommendations. Institutional systems possess administrative authority but should not transform organizational convenience or standardized protocol into automatic moral superiority over individualized decisions. Ethical childbirth care requires these forms of authority to remain differentiated rather than collapsed into a single professional power.

The findings position midwifery-led care as a particularly useful model of shared but asymmetrical authority. Its philosophical significance lies in combining respect for bodily autonomy with professional responsibility, relational knowledge, continuity, physiological support, and access to escalation when clinical circumstances change. The strongest normative conclusion is

that safety and autonomy should not be framed as opposing goals unless particular circumstances genuinely make them conflict. Good maternity care seeks to protect life and health while preserving the woman's status as the central moral agent of childbirth, making clinical expertise a source of protection and informed guidance rather than a claim of ownership over the birth itself.

The findings demonstrate that authority in childbirth cannot be reduced to a single professional, legal, or personal source. The philosophical analysis identified several recurring configurations of authority, ranging from professionally dominated decision-making to relationally shared care. The most defensible arrangement was one in which the birthing woman retained primary moral authority over her body while clinicians exercised legitimate epistemic and fiduciary authority through diagnosis, risk communication, recommendations, and emergency care. This distinction is crucial because clinical expertise provides reasons for action but does not automatically create a moral entitlement to control the bodily decisions of a competent patient.

The analysis also showed that medicalization has an ethically ambivalent character. Clinical monitoring, diagnostic technologies, pharmacological treatment, surgical intervention, and standardized emergency pathways can protect maternal and neonatal well-being when applied proportionately to identified risks. Ethical tension arises when these measures become routine, institutionally normalized, or detached from individualized consent. Medicalization therefore becomes problematic not simply because medicine is involved in childbirth, but because professional and institutional authority may expand beyond what clinical necessity can justify. The moral evaluation of intervention depends on necessity, proportionality, consent quality, and the availability of meaningful alternatives.

The results further revealed that informed consent is insufficient when understood only as a procedural requirement. A woman may formally agree to an intervention while experiencing limited time, incomplete information, fear, institutional pressure, or a perceived absence of alternatives. Meaningful autonomy requires comprehension, voluntariness, opportunity for deliberation, and genuine capacity to accept or refuse recommended care. Relational autonomy provides a more adequate framework because childbirth decisions are made within networks of dependence, trust, vulnerability, professional expertise, and social expectation. Autonomy is therefore strengthened rather than weakened when supportive relationships improve the conditions under which choices are made.

Midwifery-led care emerged as an ethically significant model because it reorganizes rather than abolishes professional authority. Continuity, relational knowledge, support for physiological birth, and collaborative decision-making can create conditions in which clinical expertise remains available without becoming automatically dominant. Midwifery-led care was not found to be ethically superior in every clinical situation, particularly where risk requires rapid multidisciplinary intervention. Its philosophical value lies in demonstrating that safety and autonomy can often be structured as complementary goals rather than competing principles.

The findings are consistent with bioethical scholarship that treats respect for autonomy as a central principle of healthcare decision-making while rejecting the idea that autonomy means unlimited individual preference. Contemporary accounts of informed consent generally recognize that competent adults retain the right to refuse recommended treatment even when professionals consider the refusal medically unwise. The present analysis extends this principle to childbirth by emphasizing the bodily immediacy and emotional intensity of maternity care. The birthing woman remains the primary moral subject of the intervention even when professional concern extends simultaneously to fetal or neonatal welfare.

The results also align with feminist critiques of medicalization that have drawn attention to the historical expansion of professional control over reproductive bodies. Such scholarship has shown how pregnancy and childbirth can become framed through risk, surveillance, and institutional management. The present study supports this critique while resisting a simplistic opposition between medicine and autonomy. Obstetric intervention can be ethically justified and clinically indispensable, especially in emergencies. The philosophical problem therefore concerns the organization and proportional use of medical authority rather than the mere presence of medical technology.

The relational understanding of autonomy corresponds with feminist and care-ethical approaches that challenge excessively individualistic models of decision-making. People do not make important healthcare decisions independently of social relationships, histories of trust, vulnerability, cultural expectations, or access to support. Childbirth makes this point particularly visible because labor often places women in conditions of pain, dependency, urgency, and emotional exposure. The present analysis strengthens relational perspectives by showing that support and professional guidance can enhance autonomy when they expand understanding and agency rather than replace personal judgment.

The findings concerning midwifery-led care complement clinical and sociological research emphasizing continuity, shared decision-making, and individualized maternity care. Previous research frequently evaluates such models in terms of intervention rates, satisfaction, continuity, or maternal outcomes. The present study adds a philosophical dimension by interpreting midwifery-led care as a distinctive distribution of epistemic and moral authority. Its significance lies not only in what interventions occur, but in how decisions are generated, whose knowledge is heard, and whether professional power remains responsive to the woman's values and embodied experience.

The findings signify that the central ethical problem in childbirth is not simply whether women are offered choices, but whether those choices are genuinely governable by them. Formal options can exist within systems that still constrain practical agency through rigid protocols, professional hierarchies, staffing limitations, or unequal access to preferred care models. Autonomy therefore has an institutional dimension. A maternity system can affirm autonomy rhetorically while organizing care in ways that make refusal difficult, alternatives inaccessible, or individualized decision-making impractical.

The results also signify that professional expertise and moral authority should not be conflated. Clinicians may know more about epidemiological risk, diagnostic indicators, and treatment consequences, yet expertise does not settle every normative question. Medical knowledge can estimate probabilities and recommend interventions, but it cannot determine how a competent person should value every trade-off involving bodily integrity, pain, surgery, psychological experience, cultural meaning, or future consequences. Good maternity care therefore requires both epistemic humility and clinical competence.

The analysis further signifies that childbirth safety must be understood more broadly than the absence of mortality or measurable physical morbidity. Psychological trauma, loss of control, humiliation, coercion, and violation of bodily integrity can constitute significant harms even when clinical outcomes appear technically successful. A philosophically adequate concept of safety should therefore include physical, psychological, relational, and autonomy-related dimensions. Such an expanded understanding does not diminish the importance of emergency obstetric care; it strengthens the ethical standard by recognizing that good outcomes involve more than biological survival.

The findings also signify that ownership is best understood metaphorically as moral standing rather than legal possession. Childbirth cannot literally be owned by a woman, a clinician, a hospital, or an institution. The question of ownership reveals a deeper issue concerning who has the strongest claim to define acceptable risk, bodily intervention, and the meaning of the birth experience. The analysis suggests that the birthing woman holds primary moral standing, while professionals possess bounded authority justified by expertise, care obligations, and emergency responsibility.

The principal ethical implication is that maternity care should distinguish clearly between recommendation and authorization. Clinicians have a responsibility to recommend interventions they judge clinically appropriate, explain foreseeable risks, correct misunderstandings, and document informed refusal. These responsibilities do not ordinarily authorize professionals to substitute their judgment for that of a competent patient. Strong recommendations can remain ethically legitimate while coercive implementation remains unacceptable. This distinction is especially important in childbirth because urgency and institutional culture can blur the boundary between persuasion and pressure.

The clinical implication is that shared decision-making should begin before moments of crisis whenever possible. Discussions about induction, operative delivery, pain management, monitoring, place of birth, and escalation preferences are more ethically robust when introduced during antenatal care rather than first presented during acute labor. Advance discussion allows women to understand possible scenarios without the same level of pain or time pressure. Continuity models are especially valuable because they enable preferences, values, and risk tolerances to become known before emergency decisions arise.

The institutional implication is that hospitals and maternity services should examine whether their protocols preserve individualized judgment or function as hidden mechanisms of coercion. Standardization is valuable when it reduces preventable error, but protocols should not automatically become moral substitutes for informed consent. Institutional policies should include mechanisms for respectful refusal, second opinions, escalation review, and documentation of individualized choices. Organizational efficiency and defensive medicine should not be treated as sufficient ethical reasons to override competent bodily autonomy.

The professional implication is that midwifery and obstetric education should include stronger preparation in communication, ethics, relational autonomy, and epistemic humility. Technical competence remains indispensable, but clinicians also need the capacity to discuss uncertainty without exaggeration, distinguish probability from certainty, and recognize when professional language unintentionally becomes coercive. Ethical maternity care requires professionals who can tolerate disagreement while continuing to provide respectful and clinically responsible support.

The persistence of conflict between autonomy and medical authority can be explained by the uncertainty inherent in childbirth. Clinical decisions often involve probabilities rather than certainties, and professionals are trained to prevent adverse outcomes that may be rare but severe. This responsibility can encourage precautionary intervention, particularly when clinicians fear preventable harm or legal accountability. Women may evaluate the same risk differently because they also consider bodily, emotional, social, and experiential consequences. Divergent risk thresholds therefore create moral disagreement even when both parties understand the relevant facts.

The strength of medicalization can also be explained by institutional incentives. Hospitals require standardized procedures to coordinate care, manage staffing, document accountability, and

respond efficiently to emergencies. These systems necessarily simplify individual variation to some degree. Problems arise when organizational routines become interpreted as inherently medically necessary. Institutional authority can then acquire moral force that exceeds the evidence supporting a particular intervention. Medicalization is therefore sustained not only by clinical beliefs but also by administrative structures.

The ethical importance of relational autonomy can be explained by the vulnerability of labor. Pain, fatigue, fear, unfamiliar environments, and time-sensitive decisions can reduce the practical ability to process complex information. Trusted caregivers can support autonomy by translating information, recalling previously expressed preferences, and protecting the woman from unnecessary pressure. Relationships become ethically valuable because they can preserve agency under conditions that would otherwise make autonomous participation more difficult. Dependence in this context does not necessarily undermine autonomy; appropriately structured dependence can protect it.

The distinctive ethical value of midwifery-led care can be explained by continuity and proximity to the woman's experience. Repeated interaction allows midwives to understand preferences, communication styles, prior experiences, and thresholds for concern. This accumulated relational knowledge can improve interpretation of both verbal and nonverbal cues during labor. Midwifery-led care therefore offers a model in which professional judgment remains clinically informed while being embedded in a relationship that gives greater weight to the person experiencing childbirth.

Future maternity policy should strengthen systems that make informed choice practically meaningful rather than merely formally available. Access to different models of care, understandable risk communication, continuity, second opinions, culturally appropriate information, and respectful refusal procedures should become part of institutional quality assessment. Autonomy cannot be protected by consent documentation alone when structural conditions make alternatives inaccessible. Policy reform should therefore address both interpersonal practice and organizational design.

Future clinical practice should develop clearer standards for distinguishing persuasion from coercion. Professionals require ethical guidance concerning repeated recommendations, emotionally charged language, threats of adverse outcomes, involvement of senior staff, and escalation when women continue to refuse proposed treatment. Transparent standards can protect both patients and clinicians by clarifying when intensive counseling remains legitimate and when it begins to undermine voluntariness. Such guidance is especially necessary in labor, where time pressure can make ethical boundaries difficult to recognize.

Future research should examine the lived experience of authority in childbirth through qualitative and mixed-methods studies involving women, midwives, obstetricians, nurses, birth partners, and marginalized populations. Philosophical analysis identifies normative principles, but empirical research is needed to understand how authority is actually perceived and negotiated in clinical settings. Comparative studies across healthcare systems could also determine how institutional structure, continuity models, cultural expectations, and resource limitations influence the practical realization of autonomy.

Future philosophical work should continue refining the concept of shared but asymmetrical authority. The model proposed here requires further examination in cases involving impaired decision-making capacity, emergency intervention, fetal interests, home birth, maternal request for potentially harmful intervention, and profound disagreement among professionals. Such cases can

test the limits of the framework more rigorously. The most defensible direction for maternity ethics is not to decide whether childbirth belongs exclusively to women or professionals, but to develop systems in which clinical expertise protects life without erasing bodily sovereignty, relational dignity, or the moral agency of the person giving birth.

CONCLUSION

The most important finding of this study is that authority in childbirth should not be understood as belonging exclusively either to the birthing woman or to healthcare professionals. The analysis shows that the birthing woman retains primary moral authority over her body, values, and preferences, while clinicians possess legitimate but bounded epistemic and fiduciary authority grounded in professional knowledge, risk assessment, and duties of care. Medicalization becomes ethically problematic not because clinical intervention is inherently incompatible with autonomy, but because institutional routines, professional hierarchy, or risk discourse can transform recommendation into coercive control. Midwifery-led care emerges as a particularly valuable model because it demonstrates that safety and autonomy can often be pursued simultaneously through continuity, relational trust, informed dialogue, proportionate intervention, and timely escalation when clinical circumstances change.

The principal contribution of this research is conceptual, supported by a philosophical-normative method that integrates autonomy, medicalization, relational ethics, epistemic authority, and midwifery-led care within a single analytical framework. The study introduces the idea of shared but asymmetrical authority, in which bodily sovereignty remains primarily with the person giving birth while clinical professionals retain a legitimate advisory and protective role that does not automatically justify overriding competent choice. This framework moves beyond the simplistic opposition between patient sovereignty and medical paternalism and offers a more precise basis for evaluating informed consent, informed refusal, professional recommendation, institutional protocols, and emergency intervention. Methodologically, the combination of conceptual clarification, normative argument analysis, critical comparison, and representative ethical case examination provides a structured approach for connecting abstract philosophical principles with the practical realities of maternity care.

The study is limited by its philosophical and literature-based design, which cannot independently determine how authority, coercion, autonomy, and relational care are experienced across different clinical environments. Institutional structures, cultural expectations, socioeconomic inequality, professional regulation, and access to midwifery-led care may also produce different ethical realities across healthcare systems. Future research should combine normative inquiry with qualitative interviews, ethnographic observation, comparative health-system analysis, and mixed-methods investigation involving women, midwives, obstetricians, nurses, birth partners, and marginalized populations. Further philosophical work should examine difficult cases involving impaired decision-making capacity, emergency intervention, fetal interests, home birth, refusal of potentially life-saving treatment, and conflict among professionals. Such research can refine the boundaries of shared authority and support maternity systems in which clinical expertise protects health without displacing bodily autonomy, dignity, and the moral agency of the person giving birth.

DECLARATION OF AI AND AI ASSISTED TECHNOLOGIES IN THE WRITING PROCESS

During the preparation of this work, the author(s) used **ChatGPT (OpenAI)** to assist with language refinement, grammatical corrections, and improving the clarity and coherence of the manuscript. After using this tool, the author(s) reviewed, verified, and edited the content as needed and take(s) full responsibility for the content of the publication.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This is a short text to acknowledge the contributions of specific colleagues, institutions, or agencies that aided the efforts of the authors.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTION

Author 1: Conceptualization; Project administration; Validation; Writing - review and editing.

Author 2: Conceptualization; Data curation; In-vestigation.

Author 3: Data curation; Investigation.

DECLARATION OF COMPETING INTEREST

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

REFERENCES

Albert, S. M. (1992). Psychometric investigation of a belief system: Caregiving to the chronically ill parent. *Social Science & Medicine*, *35*(5), 699–709. https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-9536(92)90008-E

Brady, S., Bogossian, F., & Gibbons, K. S. (2023). Achieving international consensus on the concept of woman-centred care: A Delphi study. *Special Issue: Early Labour*, *36*(6), e631–e640. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wombi.2023.06.001

Brady, S., Gibbons, K. S., & Bogossian, F. (2024). Defining woman-centred care: A concept analysis. *Midwifery*, *131*, 103954. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.midw.2024.103954

Catling, C. J., Reid, F., & Hunter, B. (2017). Australian midwives' experiences of their workplace culture. *Women and Birth*, *30*(2), 137–145. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wombi.2016.10.001

Chrisley, R. (2008). Philosophical foundations of artificial consciousness. *Artificial Consciousness*, *44*(2), 119–137. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.artmed.2008.07.011

Crowther, S., & Lau, A. (2019). Migrant Polish women overcoming communication challenges in Scottish maternity services: A qualitative descriptive study. *Midwifery*, *72*, 30–38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.midw.2019.02.004

Davis, J. A. P. (2010). Midwives and Normalcy in Childbirth: A Phenomenologic Concept Development Study. *Special Continuing Education Issue*, *55*(3), 206–215. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmwh.2009.12.007

Egenberg, S., Skogheim, G., Tangerud, M., Sluijs, A.-M., Slootweg, Y. M., Elvemo, H., Barabara, M., & Lundgren, I. (2025). Clinical decision-making during childbirth in health facilities from the perspectives of labouring women, relatives, and health care providers: A scoping review. *Midwifery*, *140*, 104192. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.midw.2024.104192

Flesch, H. (2007). Silent voices: Women, complementary medicine, and the co-optation of change. *Complementary Therapies in Clinical Practice*, *13*(3), 166–173. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ctcp.2007.03.005

George, E. K., Dominique, S., Irie, W., & Edmonds, J. K. (2024). "It's my Home away from Home:" A hermeneutic phenomenological study exploring decision-making experiences of

choosing a freestanding birth centre for perinatal care. *Midwifery*, *139*, 104164. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.midw.2024.104164

Hood, L., Fenwick, J., & Butt, J. (2010). A story of scrutiny and fear: Australian midwives' experiences of an external review of obstetric services, being involved with litigation and the impact on clinical practice. *Midwifery*, *26*(3), 268–285. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.midw.2008.07.008

Ingvarsson, S., Schildmeijer, K., & Oscarsson, M. (2020). Swedish midwives' experiences and views of amniotomy: An interview study. *Midwifery*, *91*, 102840. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.midw.2020.102840

Kuipers, Y. J., Bleijenbergh, R., Thaels, E., & Mestdagh, E. (2024). A multi-actor perspective of humanised midwifery care excellence: An exploratory survey. *Women's Studies International Forum*, *106*, 102956. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2024.102956

Leavy, F., & Leggett, H. (2022). Midwives' experiences of working in team continuity of carer models: A qualitative evidence synthesis. *Midwifery*, *112*, 103412. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.midw.2022.103412

Madeley, A.-M., Earle, S., & O'Dell, L. (2026). Reproductive identity expression, reinforcement and defence: A constructivist grounded theory of non-normative pregnancy and childbirth decisions in the UK. *Midwifery*, *160*, 104873. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.midw.2026.104873

Maier, B. (2014). Is the narrow concept of individual autonomy compatible with or in conflict with Evidence-based Medicine in obstetric practice?: A philosophical critique on the misapplication of the value concept "autonomy." *Woman - Psychosomatic Gynaecology and Obstetrics*, *1*, 40–49. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.woman.2014.10.003

Mallick, S. (2016). Challenges of mainstreaming: Ayurvedic practice in Delhi Government health institutions. *Journal of Ayurveda and Integrative Medicine*, *7*(1), 57–61. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaim.2015.10.001

Maqbool, B., & Herold, S. (2024). Potential effectiveness and efficiency issues in usability evaluation within digital health: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Systems and Software*, *208*, 111881. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2023.111881

Maude, R. M., & Foureur, M. J. (2007). It's beyond water: Stories of women's experience of using water for labour and birth. *Women and Birth*, *20*(1), 17–24. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wombi.2006.10.005

May, A. E., & Elton, C. D. (1998). 6 The effects of pain and its management on mother and fetus. *Baillière's Clinical Obstetrics and Gynaecology*, *12*(3), 423–441. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0950-3552(98)80076-X

Newsome, L., Sheridan, A., Lawson, A., Charry, S., & Field, S. (2024). The "dreaded" daughter-in-law in Australian farm business succession. *Journal of Rural Studies*, *109*, 103324. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2024.103324

Norris, S., & Murphy, F. (2020). A community of practice in a midwifery led unit. How the culture and environment shape the learning experience of student midwives. *Midwifery*, *86*, 102685. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.midw.2020.102685

OBoyle, C. (2013). 'Just waiting to be hauled over the coals': Home birth midwifery in Ireland. *Midwifery*, *29*(8), 988–995. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.midw.2012.12.010

O'Malley-Keighran, M. P., & Lohan, G. (2016). Encourages and guides, or diagnoses and monitors: Woman centred-ness in the discourse of professional midwifery bodies. *Midwifery*, *43*, 48–58. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.midw.2016.10.007

Palimbo, A., Salmah, A. U., Amiruddin, R., & Syam, A. (2021). An overview of the implementation of the continuity of care model in maternal health services: A literature review. *The 3rd International Nursing and Health Sciences Students and Health Care Professionals Conference (INHSP)*, *35*, S388–S392. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaceta.2021.10.058

Permezel, J., Arnold, A. S. C., Thomas, J., Maepioh, A. L., Brown, R., Hafford-Letchfield, T., Skouteris, H., Hatzikiriakidis, K., & McNair, R. P. (2023). Experiences in the delivery of

preconception and pregnancy care for LGBTIQA+ people: A systematic review and thematic synthesis of patient and healthcare provider perspectives. *Midwifery*, *123*, 103712. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.midw.2023.103712

Prince, I. (2025). On "minor" adverse effects: Some misconceptions affecting the handling of epistemic risks in medical research. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science*, *114*, 102080. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.shpsa.2025.102080

Reiger, K. (1999). 'Sort of part of the women's movement. But different': Mothers' organisations and australian feminism. *Women's Studies International Forum*, *22*(6), 585–595. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-5395(99)00069-2

Rigg, E., Schmied, V., Peters, K., & Dahlen, H. (2015). Not addressing the root cause: An analysis of submissions made to the South Australian Government on a Proposal to Protect Midwifery Practice. *Women and Birth*, *28*(2), 121–128. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wombi.2014.12.005

Sahrul, Widhi Nirwansyah, A., Demirdag, S., & Daulai, A. F. (2024). Batu Qulhu—The stone of death: Harmonizing traditional funerals in the Mandailing community of North Sumatra. *Heliyon*, *10*(13), e33363. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e33363

Sakala, C. (1988). Content of care by independent midwives: Assistance with pain in labor and birth. *Social Science & Medicine*, *26*(11), 1141–1158. https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-9536(88)90190-6

Tarlazzi, E., Sacco, N., Branchini, L., Simonazzi, G., & Parma, D. (2025). Midwives' perspectives on exploring emotional well-being during prenatal and postnatal care in the Italian contest: A qualitative study (the BEN_EM_OS study). *Midwifery*, *149*, 104572. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.midw.2025.104572

Thomas, B. G., Quant, V. M., & Cooke, P. (1998). The development of a problem-based curriculum in midwifery. *Midwifery*, *14*(4), 261–265. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0266-6138(98)90099-7

Timmenga, F., & van der Zande, I. (2026). Evaluating and diversifying philosophy education. *Learning and Instruction*, *104*, 102369. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2026.102369

Varslev-Pedersen, C. (2022). Mothers and Melancholia: Sacrifice in Søren Kierkegaard's Fear and Trembling. *Interdisciplinary Journal for Religion and Transformation in Contemporary Society*, *8*(2), 377–392. https://doi.org/10.30965/23642807-bja10051

Zhang, J., Haycock-Stuart, E., Mander, R., & Hamilton, L. (2015). Navigating the self in maternity care: How Chinese midwives work on their professional identity in hospital setting. *Midwifery*, *31*(3), 388–394. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.midw.2014.11.013

Copyright Holder :
© Noorhani Dyani Laksmi et al. (2026).

First Publication Right :
© Journal of Midwifery History and Philosophy

This article is under:

