

APPENDIX

Author(s): Katre Luhamaa; Amy McEwan-Strand; Barbara Ruiken; Marit Skivenes; Florian Wingsen

Title of publication: Services and support to mothers and newborn babies in vulnerable situations. A study of eight countries.

Year: 2021

Journal / Publisher: Children and Youth Service Review

Innhold

Maternal risk factors	2
Table A. Cases with none, one or several of risk factors, N=216	2
Table B. Presence and combinations of risk factors present in the cases, N=216Header 3	2
Table C. Presence of risk factors in combinations	2
Table D. Cases with nil, one, two three or four of the risk factors SA/MH/LD/PH, total and per country, N=216, (percentages are calculated per column)	3
Table E. Service provision (code category 1) by 0 or 1 of the risk factors	3
Comments to table E:	4
Parental Requests and assessment of services	4
Table F. Parental requests and assessment of services.	4

Maternal risk factors

Table A. Cases with none, one or several of risk factors, N=216

Cases with X risk factors	N
Cases with no risk factors	32
Cases with one risk factor	124
Cases with two risk factors	50
Cases with three risk factors	10
Cases with four risk factors	0
Total	216

Table B. Presence and combinations of risk factors present in the cases, N=216 Header 3

Factors	N
Cases with no mentioning of parental risk factors	32
Cases with only one of the factors	124
SA: Substance abuse – misuse of legal or illegal drugs, or alcohol.	45
MH: Mental health – serious mental health issues/psychiatric disorders, such as (but not limited to) depression, personality disorder, anxiety, PTSD. Includes also self-harm and suicidality. Some diagnoses are more temporary and other more permanent.	49
LD: Cognitive issues / learning difficulties - cases where mother has clear cognitive limitations. This can range from severe learning difficulties to reduced cognitive function.	28
PH: Physical health – mother has a physical disability or somatic illness that influences parenting capacity.	2
Cases with two of the factors	50
- SA + MH	28
- SA + LD	2
- SA + PH	0
- MH + LD	14
- MH + PH	2
- LD + PH	4
Cases with three of the factors	10
- SA + MH + LD	6
- SA + MH + PH	1
- SA + LD + PH	0
- MH + LD + PH	3
Cases with four factors	0
Total	216

Table C. Presence of risk factors in combinations

Cases with no risk factors	32		
Cases with one risk factor	124	This factor in combination with other risk factors	Total cases mentioning a risk factor (solely or in combination)
- SA	45	37	82
- MH	49	54	103
- LD	28	29	57
- PH	2	10	12

Table D. Cases with nil, one, two three or four of the risk factors SA/MH/LD/PH, total and per country, N=216, (percentages are calculated per column)

	Total	Austria	England	Estonia	Finland	Germany	Ireland	Norway	Spain
Total	216	24	14	17	25	27	17	76	16
Cases with none of the 4	32 15 %	5 21 %	4 29 %	0 -	5 20 %	4 15 %	2 12 %	8 11 %	4 25 %
Cases with only one factor	124 57 %	13 54 %	9 64 %	13 76 %	14 56 %	18 67 %	9 53 %	41 54 %	7 44 %
Cases with 2 of the factors	50 23 %	4 17 %	1 7 %	2 12 %	4 16 %	5 19 %	5 29 %	24 32 %	5 31 %
Cases with 3 of the factors	10 5 %	2 8 %	0 -	2 12 %	2 8 %	0 -	1 6 %	3 4 %	0 -
Cases with all 4 factors	0								

Table E. Service provision (code category 1) by 0 or 1 of the risk factors

	Part 1: risk factor prevalence by country								
No or singular risk factor % by N=judgements per country	Total	Austria	England	Estonia	Finland	Germany	Ireland	Norway	Spain
	216	24	14	17	25	27	17	76	16
0 factors	32 15 %	5 21 %	4 29 %	0 -	5 20 %	4 15 %	2 12 %	8 11 %	4 25 %
1 factor: SA	45 21 %	4 17 %	3 21 %	9 53 %	7 28 %	7 26 %	8 47 %	3 4 %	4 25 %
1 factor: MH	49 23 %	5 21 %	4 29 %	1 6 %	5 20 %	9 33 %	0 -	24 32 %	1 6 %
1 factor: LD	28 13 %	4 17 %	2 14 %	3 18 %	1 4 %	2 7 %	1 6 %	14 18 %	1 6 %
1 factor: PH	2 1 %	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 4 %	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 6 %
	Part 2: Service provision by risk factor prevalence and country								
Category I Services % by N=judgements per country	191 88 %	19 79 %	14 100 %	13 76 %	25 100 %	17 63 %	17 100 %	75 99 %	11 69 %
0 factors % by N=judgements with 0 risk factors	26 81 %	4 80 %	4 100 %	0 -	5 100 %	1 25 %	2 100 %	7 88 %	3 75 %
1 factor: SA % by N=judgements with only SA risk factor	39 87 %	3 75 %	3 100 %	7 78 %	7 100 %	5 71 %	8 100 %	3 100 %	3 75 %
1 factor: MH % by N=judgements with only MH risk factor	45 92 %	4 80 %	4 100 %	0 0 %	5 100 %	7 -	0 -	24 100 %	1 25 %
1 factor: LD % by N=judgements with only LD risk factor	24 86 %	3 75 %	2 100 %	2 67 %	1 100 %	0 -	1 100 %	14 100 %	1 100 %
1 factor: PH % by N=judgements with only PH risk factor	1 50 %	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 100 %	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -

Comments to table E:

Part 1 shows the prevalence of 4 risk factors in our sample, substance misuse, mental health issues, learning disabilities and physical health issues. We have here only included the cases where the mother has none of these four, or only one of them. There are other cases in the sample where the mother has several of these four risk factors, but as it is not possible to isolate the effect of one risk factor on the service provision in those cases, we have focused on the cases with none or single risk factors (these make up almost ¾ of cases, see **Error! Reference source not found.**). The cases in table E **Error! Reference source not found.** can contain other risk factors than the four chosen ones, but we focus on these four.

Percentages are calculated as indicated in the table. For example: there are four Austrian cases in the sample that only have SA of the four risk factors (see part 1 of **Error! Reference source not found.**). Of these, it is mentioned in three (75%) that the family has received services (see part 2 of **Error! Reference source not found.**).

Error! Reference source not found. informs hypothesis 2:

H2) There will be differences in service provision due to the type of problems the families / parent face (for example if parent has substance misuse – learning disability – mental health problems).

We see that the countries with high amount of welfare services provided (code 1-4 in category I), England, Estonia, Finland, Ireland and Norway, provide these across the board regardless of the problem type the mother faces. These countries seem to succeed in providing services regardless of the challenges the mother has. However, the services seem to be unable to fix the situation sufficiently, as most of these cases end in care orders.

Hypothesis 2 is with this not confirmed. When services are provided universally, this does not change by problem type. When they are not provided universally, there is an indication that mothers with learning difficulties may receive less services. However, the N is so small that this should only be taken as an indication. Otherwise no detectable pattern.

Parental Requests and assessment of services

Table F. Parental requests and assessment of services.

	Total	Austria	England	Estonia	Finland	Germany	Ireland	Norway	Spain
Parent's request % of 216	65 30 %	1	7	1	7	1	3	44	1
- no services available % of 66	40 62 %	1	3	0	2	0	1	33	0
- services are futile % of 66	52 80 %	1	4	1	6	1	1	38	0

Table F shows that of the 65 cases where parents requested services (30% of the whole sample), someone else than the court (most of the time the CPS/local authority) argued that there were no services available that could help the family in 40 cases (62%). In the same 65 cases where parents requested services, the court assessed in 52 of them (80%) that past and future services are futile.