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Aims Informally transferring children to a new home and looking after them on a temporary or permanent basis has always existed in the United Kingdom (UK). However adoption, the permanent removal of a child into another family, has only been legislated in the UK since the 20th Century. Most literature and academic writing on adoption in the UK is mainly written from a contemporary social work and sociological perspective, rather than the history of adoption, which this presentation aims to address.

Methods A literature review was conducted to learn more about the history of adoption in the UK.

Results Prior to adoption legislation the closest concept was ‘wardship’. A guardian was given custody of a child by the Chancery Court, but parental rights were not transferred. Following World War One an increase in organised adoption occurred and pressure grew for adoption to be legislated. In 1926 the first legislation was passed for England and Wales, with similar legislation rapidly following for Northern Ireland and Scotland. In almost every subsequent decade new laws have been introduced to further regulate the process. Prior to the 1960’s most adopted children were given up by unmarried mothers, or through step-parents adopting their new partner’s children. Since then, social, cultural, economic, and legal changes mean children adopted now are mainly from local authority care because their birth family situation placed them at risk.

Conclusions Debates around how adoption should work, who should adopt and what is in the child’s best interests have always been influenced by social constructs, significant world events, and the perception of what family life ‘could’ and ‘should’ look like. The process of adoption has therefore changed significantly over the last Century from informal arrangements prior to legislation, through to the current framework in place today. The types of children deemed ‘adoptable’ and parents deemed ‘appropriate’ have also changed significantly over time. The subsequent family units created as a result of the adoptive process are now much more varied in keeping with the wider construct of current UK society.
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Aim To understand the rationale behind mothers keeping knives and matchsticks with their newborn.

Method Mothers who had delivered newborns within the last three days (72 hours) in these hospitals where Facility based newborn care (FBNC) is available, were interviewed regarding their Knowledge, attitude and practices (KAP) for protecting their newborn. A total of 134 such mothers were interviewed over a span of two weeks after receiving their consent. They were questioned regarding common practices to protect their newborns. Those who did not give their consents were the ones who had their babies admitted in the Neonatal ICUs.

Results All the mothers i.e 100% were found to be keeping either a knife, needle, safety pin or matchstick near their newborn. 78% mothers attributed the use of this practice to protect their newborns from ghost, evil eye and paranormal adverse events. 89% followed this as an order from the elderly ladies in their house which they felt was not worth opposing 62% mothers felt that this is important to protect their child from attack by cats or snakes. They informed that in villages even today wild panthers and foxes can carry away their child at night and use of matches for lighting up a fire will keep such animals away.

Conclusion Despite the government providing facility based newborn care (FBNC) in each district hospital for the last ten years, the general public still relies on its old beliefs and practices to protect the newborn. Presence of such practices inside the hospital demonstrates a clear lack of trust in the modern system of medicine for protecting the newborns against life threatening events. The health infrastructure needs to be strengthened further before the general public will feel confident in entrusting the staff and facilities provided in the hospital to save their vulnerable babies’ lives.

The role of exclusive breast feeding, immunization and mosquito nets in protecting their newborns was stressed.