Substance Use in Pregnancy: Risks & Attitudes

Authored by

mohammed looti

November 28, 2025

Introduction and Scope

Attitudes toward **substance use in pregnancy** constitute a critical area of study within public health, psychology, and bioethics, reflecting deep-seated societal values concerning motherhood, fetal vulnerability, and personal autonomy. These attitudes are complex, ranging from punitive moral condemnation to empathetic calls for comprehensive medical intervention and support. Understanding the prevailing attitudes--held by the general public, healthcare professionals, policymakers, and the pregnant individuals themselves--is paramount because these perceptions directly influence access to care, treatment efficacy, legal frameworks, and ultimately, maternal and fetal health outcomes. The discourse is often fraught with tension, balancing the perceived imperative to protect the fetus with the necessity of supporting the pregnant person through non-judgmental, evidence-based care. Furthermore, attitudes are not monolithic; they vary significantly depending on the type of substance involved--whether legal (e.g., alcohol, tobacco, prescription opioids) or illicit--and are frequently modulated by race, socioeconomic status, and cultural context, often leading to disproportionate scrutiny and punitive measures against marginalized populations.

The psychological research in this domain focuses on characterizing the nature of these attitudes, assessing their intensity, and analyzing their origins. Key constructs include **stigma**, **moralization**, and **attribution of blame**. When substance use occurs during pregnancy, the perceived violation of the maternal duty of protection often triggers intense moral outrage, positioning the pregnant individual not merely as a patient needing treatment but as a perpetrator of harm. This moral framing profoundly affects policy decisions, shifting the focus from public health solutions to criminal justice interventions. Therefore, any effective strategy aimed at reducing substance use during pregnancy must first address the underlying negative attitudes and systemic biases that create significant barriers to seeking help.

This encyclopedia entry explores the historical evolution of these attitudes, examines the specific challenges faced by clinical practitioners, analyzes the impact of policy decisions rooted in punitive attitudes, and finally, outlines strategies for fostering a more supportive and therapeutic environment. The goal is to move beyond simplistic judgments and toward a nuanced understanding of addiction as a chronic health condition, requiring compassion and sustained medical management rather than isolation and punishment. The intricate interplay between social perception and clinical reality defines the landscape of care for this vulnerable population.

Historical Context and Shifting Perceptions

Historically, attitudes toward maternal substance use have undergone significant shifts, moving from periods of relative medical indifference to eras of intense scrutiny and moral panic. Prior to the mid-20th century, while awareness of the dangers of heavy alcohol consumption existed, the specific risks associated with other substances like nicotine or illicit drugs during pregnancy were

not widely disseminated or medically prioritized. The focus remained heavily on infectious diseases and nutritional deficiencies. This changed dramatically in the 1960s and 1970s with the recognition of **Fetal Alcohol Syndrome (FAS)**, which provided undeniable evidence of substance-induced fetal harm. This discovery catalyzed a fundamental shift in public and medical attitudes, transforming the pregnant body into a site of intense public interest and regulatory concern regarding fetal health.

The 1980s and 1990s witnessed the height of the "War on Drugs," which profoundly shaped attitudes toward pregnancy and substance use, particularly concerning crack cocaine. Media narratives often sensationalized the concept of the "crack baby," fostering a perception of irreversible damage and creating a moral panic that prioritized criminalization over treatment. This period saw the rise of punitive legal actions, including mandatory reporting, involuntary commitment, and even criminal prosecution of pregnant individuals for drug use. These actions were largely driven by attitudes that viewed the pregnant person as uniquely responsible for fetal outcomes and deserving of punishment for perceived negligence. This punitive framework solidified a deeply stigmatizing environment, making individuals fearful of accessing necessary prenatal care or substance use disorder treatment, thereby exacerbating public health risks.

In the 21st century, while the rhetoric remains charged, professional attitudes have begun a slow transition toward a **public health approach**, particularly as the opioid crisis highlighted the widespread nature of addiction across diverse socioeconomic groups. There is growing recognition within medical communities that addiction is a treatable chronic disease, not a moral failing. However, this scientific understanding often conflicts with lingering societal and legal attitudes that retain punitive elements. The shift involves recognizing that treating the pregnant individual effectively is the best way to ensure fetal well-being. Nevertheless, the legacy of the moral panic persists, requiring ongoing efforts to educate both the public and professionals about evidence-based treatment modalities, such as Medication-Assisted Treatment (MAT), which are often met with skepticism rooted in historical biases against treating addiction during pregnancy.

The Role of Stigma and Moralization

The intersection of substance use disorder and pregnancy generates a powerful and unique form of **social stigma**. Stigma is amplified because substance use is perceived as a failure of the fundamental social role of motherhood--the unconditional protection and nurturing of the child. This perception transforms the health condition (addiction) into a moral transgression. The process of moralization dictates that the behavior is judged as inherently wrong, resulting in severe social ostracization, shame, and self-blame. The severity of the stigma is often greater for pregnant individuals than for non-pregnant individuals with similar substance use patterns, reflecting society's heightened expectation for self-sacrifice and control during gestation. This moralization is particularly acute when comparing attitudes toward substances deemed illicit versus those that are

legal, even though legal substances like alcohol or tobacco may pose significant fetal risks.

This intense moralization leads to significant consequences, including the internalization of shame by the pregnant individual, which severely compromises their psychological well-being and willingness to disclose substance use to healthcare providers. Furthermore, the externalization of stigma manifests through discriminatory practices, such as housing evictions, loss of employment, and involvement with child protective services (CPS). Research consistently shows that fear of CPS involvement is one of the primary deterrents to seeking prenatal care and substance use treatment. When attitudes are driven by the desire to punish rather than treat, the primary outcome is not cessation of substance use, but rather the concealment of the behavior and avoidance of the very medical systems designed to help.

Addressing this stigma requires a concerted effort to demoralize the issue, shifting the discourse from one of individual failure to one of public health necessity. This involves educating the public that **substance use disorder (SUD)** is a chronic medical condition characterized by biological, psychological, and social factors, necessitating compassionate, longitudinal care. Effective intervention strategies must actively counter the public narrative that frames pregnant individuals with SUD as inherently unfit mothers. This means promoting attitudes that emphasize recovery, support, and the establishment of a therapeutic alliance based on trust and confidentiality, rather than surveillance and judgment. The failure to mitigate stigma perpetuates a cycle of isolation and poor health outcomes for both mother and child.

Professional Attitudes and Clinical Response

Healthcare professionals (HCPs) hold attitudes that are crucial mediators of care quality. While many HCPs are dedicated to providing compassionate care, they are often influenced by the same societal stigmas and moral frameworks as the general public. Studies indicate that professional attitudes can range from highly empathetic and supportive to explicitly judgmental and punitive, depending on factors such as professional training, discipline (e.g., obstetrics vs. addiction medicine), and personal bias. Negative professional attitudes manifest in various ways, including rushed appointments, failure to provide adequate pain management due to fear of diversion, breaches of confidentiality, and the use of judgmental language, all of which erode the necessary therapeutic alliance.

A significant challenge in the clinical setting is the conflict between the HCP's role as a healer and potential mandated reporting duties. In many jurisdictions, positive drug screens at birth trigger automatic reporting to child protective services, regardless of the mother's engagement in treatment or overall prognosis. This legislative requirement forces HCPs into a surveillance role, fundamentally altering the patient-provider relationship. Even when HCPs personally hold non-judgmental attitudes, the legal requirement to report creates an atmosphere of distrust, making

pregnant individuals less likely to be honest about their substance use, thus hindering accurate diagnosis and appropriate treatment planning. This systemic conflict is a direct reflection of underlying societal attitudes that prioritize punitive measures over public health interventions.

To foster positive clinical attitudes, substantial investment in specialized training is required. This training must focus not only on the medical management of SUD during pregnancy (e.g., the safety and efficacy of MAT) but also on implicit bias recognition, motivational interviewing techniques, and trauma-informed care principles. Recognizing that many individuals with SUD have underlying histories of trauma is essential for developing empathetic and effective treatment plans. Furthermore, clinical guidelines must strongly advocate for non-punitive approaches, emphasizing that screening should be used for identification and support, not for legal or civil repercussions. The adoption of universal screening practices, rather than targeted screening based on race or appearance, can also help mitigate biases and ensure equitable care delivery.

Public Health Perspectives and Policy Implications

Public health attitudes generally favor preventative and harm reduction strategies, recognizing that punitive policies are counterproductive to achieving positive health outcomes. However, policy often lags behind evidence-based public health recommendations, reflecting lingering punitive societal attitudes. Policies concerning **substance use in pregnancy** often fall into two distinct philosophical camps: the punitive model and the public health model. The punitive model, driven by moral outrage, advocates for policies such as criminalizing fetal exposure, civil commitment, or mandatory reporting, aiming to deter behavior through fear of legal consequence.

Conversely, the public health model emphasizes policies that expand access to specialized prenatal care, offer comprehensive SUD treatment (including MAT), and provide robust social support services (e.g., housing, childcare). This model is rooted in the attitude that addiction is a treatable condition and that the greatest predictor of a healthy outcome is consistent engagement in care. Policy implications derived from this perspective include prioritizing funding for mother-baby units that allow infants to remain with their recovering mothers, ensuring that treatment facilities are equipped to handle the complexities of pregnancy, and enacting laws that protect individuals from discrimination based on their recovery status.

The differences in state-level policies across the United States vividly demonstrate the impact of prevailing attitudes. States that have adopted punitive policies, often classifying substance use during pregnancy as child abuse or neglect, often see reduced utilization of prenatal care and increased rates of adverse birth outcomes, confirming the chilling effect of these attitudes. In contrast, states that prioritize funding for non-punitive, comprehensive treatment programs tend to see improved engagement in care and better maternal and infant health statistics. Effective policy must be built upon the foundational attitude that the pregnant person is a patient first, and that

supportive intervention is always superior to criminal prosecution in the context of addiction.

Factors Influencing Attitudes

Attitudes toward **substance use in pregnancy** are not uniform; they are heavily influenced by a complex matrix of demographic, cultural, and socioeconomic factors. One of the most powerful modulating factors is the type of substance involved. For example, professional and public attitudes tend to be less judgmental toward pregnant individuals using substances prescribed for pain management, even if misused, compared to those using illicit substances like heroin or methamphetamine, despite similar clinical risks. This difference reflects a bias that privileges medical authorization over perceived criminal intent. Furthermore, cultural attitudes toward alcohol consumption vary widely, influencing the perceived severity of risk associated with fetal alcohol exposure.

Socioeconomic status and race are critical determinants of negative attitudes and resulting scrutiny. Pregnant individuals from marginalized or low-income communities, particularly women of color, face significantly higher rates of screening, reporting, and punitive intervention compared to their affluent, white counterparts, even when rates of substance use are comparable across groups. This disparity reflects deeply embedded systemic biases and attitudes that equate poverty or racial minority status with inherent moral failure or lack of capacity for motherhood. These biases are often unconsciously enacted by healthcare providers and social service agents, leading to disproportionate enforcement of punitive policies against vulnerable populations.

Furthermore, personal experience and proximity influence attitudes. Individuals who have personal experience with addiction, or who have close family members in recovery, often exhibit more empathetic and less judgmental attitudes. Conversely, those whose understanding is solely derived from sensationalized media reports or highly moralized public service campaigns tend to hold more punitive views. Education plays a crucial role; increased knowledge about the neurobiology of addiction and the efficacy of evidence-based treatments helps shift attitudes away from moral condemnation toward a health-oriented perspective, demonstrating that attitudes are malleable and responsive to accurate information and exposure.

Impact of Attitudes on Help-Seeking Behavior

The prevailing negative and judgmental attitudes surrounding **substance use in pregnancy** have a profound and detrimental impact on the willingness of individuals to seek and maintain necessary medical and behavioral health care. The fear of anticipated stigma and punitive consequences--such as losing custody of older children, mandated treatment, or criminal charges--creates a powerful barrier to disclosure and help-seeking. This phenomenon is often termed the "chilling effect," where the fear of the system outweighs the perceived benefit of treatment.

The consequences of this avoidance are severe. Pregnant individuals may delay or avoid prenatal care entirely, leading to missed opportunities for screening, intervention, and management of high-risk pregnancies. They may also withhold crucial information from their providers, leading to suboptimal medical management, especially regarding co-occurring mental health disorders or infectious diseases. This lack of transparency undermines the foundational principles of effective healthcare. For those who do seek treatment, the fear of judgment can lead to premature termination of therapy or recovery programs, resulting in relapse and poorer long-term outcomes for both mother and child.

To counteract this negative impact, healthcare systems must actively cultivate an environment of trust and safety. This requires more than just non-judgmental language; it necessitates systemic changes that guarantee confidentiality and prioritize treatment access over punitive reporting. When systems demonstrate a genuine commitment to supporting the family unit rather than separating it, individuals are far more likely to engage honestly and consistently in care. Successful programs are those that integrate maternal health, addiction treatment, and pediatric care into a seamless, supportive model, fundamentally altering the perception of the system from a threat to an ally.

Strategies for Promoting Non-Judgmental Care

Effective strategies to shift attitudes toward **substance use in pregnancy** must be multifaceted, targeting systemic, professional, and public levels. At the professional level, mandatory, recurring training in **trauma-informed care (TIC)** and implicit bias reduction is essential for all clinicians who interact with pregnant populations. TIC recognizes that substance use often stems from attempts to cope with past trauma and advocates for practices that avoid re-traumatization through judgmental or coercive interactions. Healthcare facilities must also review and revise policies to ensure that screening protocols are standardized, equitable, and explicitly linked to immediate, supportive resources rather than punitive outcomes.

Systemically, advocacy efforts must focus on reforming punitive laws and policies that criminalize addiction during pregnancy. Replacing mandatory reporting laws with policies that mandate referral to treatment and social support services is a critical step. Furthermore, funding must be allocated to create specialized, integrated treatment programs that are designed specifically for pregnant and parenting individuals, offering comprehensive services such as childcare, housing assistance, and mental health support alongside evidence-based SUD treatment. These integrated models send a clear message that the system is committed to supporting the family's health and recovery, rather than dismantling it.

Finally, public education campaigns are needed to demystify addiction and challenge the moralization of maternal substance use. These campaigns should utilize scientific data to frame

addiction as a treatable health condition, featuring recovery narratives that promote hope and reduce shame.

Professional Education: Implementing mandatory training in trauma-informed care and motivational interviewing for all clinical staff.
Policy Reform: Advocating for the repeal of punitive legislation that criminalizes prenatal substance exposure.
Integrated Care Models: Establishing comprehensive treatment centers that combine prenatal care, addiction treatment, and social support services.
Public Awareness: Launching campaigns that educate the public on the neurobiology of addiction and the efficacy of non-punitive treatment.

By implementing these strategies, society can move toward attitudes that foster trust, encourage disclosure, and ultimately improve the health and well-being of pregnant individuals and their children.