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#### Abstract

Introduction: Genetic disorder is a health problem that caused by a defect in theindividuals' DNA. In Palestine there is no specific statistics about mortality rate of children who suffer from genetic disorders.

Although, there is a big chance to catch a lot of genetic, because of consanguinity rate which exceed (44\%) (Hussein, 2014). It is notacable that the newcase from the sane family have been increased without any genetic counseling or prevention. The insufficiency of public health services directed to the prevention of genetic disorders, with the lack of health care increase the problem. Therefor, the study aim is to describe parents knowledge and attitudes toward genetic counseling and testing and to determine if knowledge affect attitudes.

Methodology: A quantitative descriptive cross sectional study via a questionnaire, quiz test (to evaluate knowledge), and likert scale (to evaluate attitudes was used in this study, to discover the relationship between variables. The sample size was 121 participants who attended the two hospitals (Palestine Medical Complex and Al-Najah National Hospital) from (Feb\} 2 0 1 6 to Sep\2016).


Results: The study showed that there is a significant relationship between parents educational level and their knowledge regards genetic disorders (P. 0.003 ). The most significant risk factors for genetic disorder were ignoring premarital genetic testing for (99.2\%) ; consanguineous marriage (71,1\%) and family history of genetic problem for (55.4\%).

The study found that most of parents of children with genetic problems had good knowledge regards genetic disorders (63\%), Whereas, the attitudes of these parents were positive for a majority of items that measure attitude level ( $81 \%$ for agreed answer). The relationship between knowledge and attitudes was positive and research hypothesis regards the effect of knowledge on attitude had been accepted. However, here was no association between number of children whose affected or lost by genetic problems and the parents knowledge and attitudes in this study.

This study recommended to increase awareness of parents about genetic importance of premarital testing which avoid consanguinity and these are the golden tool to decrease genetic problem in Palestine.

Key words: knowledge, attitudes, parents, genetic testing, genetic counseling, children, disorder.

## Chapter 1

## Introduction

### 1.1 Background:

In any pediatric hospital, there are children suffering from a variety of illnesses and diseases. This is particularly true for children with chronic diseases, which are mainly caused by genetic transmission. However, these genetic diseases can be prevented or limited using simple, low-cost methods and technologies. These methods are often cheaper and easier to implement than treatment, especially since the field of genetic sciences in Palestine has advanced greatly, and genetic labs have become more available. Additionally, individuals affected by genetic conditions are now more likely to seek information about inheritance and risk factors (Harvey et al., 2007).

Before the development of modern genetic technologies, genetic counseling was the only option, and health professinals attempted to characterize the genetic behavior of diseases based on family history (WHO, 2015).

### 1.1.1 Genetic disorders:

A genetic disorder is a health problem that is caused by an abnormal defect in the individual's DNA. Abnormalities can be as small as a single mutation in just one gene, or they may involve the addition or subtraction of entire chromosomes (University of UTAH Health Sciences, 2015).

### 1.1.2 Genetic counseling:

Genetic counseling is a service that provides information and advice about genetics conditions. These conditions are caused by changes (mutations) in known genes, which are usually passed down through a family. It is conducted by healthcare professionals who have been specially trained in the science of human genetics (a genetic counselor or a clinical geneticist) (WHO, 2015).

Genetic counseling provides the individual or family with information and support regarding health concerns that run in their family. Genetic counseling may involve the diagnosis of a genetic condition, as well as the provision of information and supportive counseling (advice and guidance) by a team of health professionals. This enables families and individuals to better adjust to the diagnosis. Follow-up counseling is available to ensure ongoing support, to review previous information, or to answer new questions as they arise (NHS Choices, 2014).

Individuals who come to see genetic counselors may be people who have a disorder themselves and are concerned about their family and vice versa, couples with an affected child who wish to plan another pregnancy, couples who are planning their first pregnancy and wish to understand the disease susceptibility of their future child, as well as couples who are planning a pregnancy late in life and want to assess any potential risks. Genetic counseling services may be useful at all stages of development. For instance, services can be available for infants undergoing screening,
teenagers being tested for Thalassemia genes, or adults assessing their predisposition for genetic disorders as they enter their mid-life stage, and attempt to make the appropriate lifestyle changes (WHO, 2013).

### 1.1.3 Genetic testing:

Genetic testing is a type of medical test which identifies changes in chromosomes, genes, or proteins. The results of a genetic test can confirm or rule out a suspected genetic condition, or help determine a person's chance of developing or passing on a genetic disorder (WHO, 2015).

Genetic testing is voluntary. Testing has benefits as well as limitations and risks; therefore, the decision to be tested is a personal and complex one. A geneticist or genetic counselor can help by providing information about the pros and cons of the test, and by discussing the social and emotional aspects of testing (WHO, 2015).

Genetic testing is often used for other reasons as well. For example, carrier testing can be used to help couples learn if they carry a gene mutation for a disorder they might pass on to a child, such as cystic fibrosis, sickle-cell anemia, or Tay-Sachs disease. Meanwhile, prenatal screening can be used to diagnose some conditions in babies before they are even born, such as Down syndrome (WHO, 2013).

Newborn screening is the most widespread form of genetic testing. Newborns are screened for a number of inherited conditions, such as phenylketonuria (PKU), cystic fibrosis, sickle cell disease, and others. The tests required vary from state to state (WHO, 2013).

### 1.1.4: Consanguinity:

Consanguinity, or intermarriage, is defined as the marriage of two relatives, second cousins or two who are more closely related (NCHPEG, 2013). Consanguineous marriages have been practiced since the early existence of modern humans (Tadmori et al., 2009). It is a rooted social trend among one-fifth of the world's population. This tradition is mostly practiced in the Middle East, West Asia and North Africa, as well as among emigrants from these communities now residing in North America, Europe and Australia (Hamamy, 2012).

Until recently, consanguinity was widely practiced in several global communities, with a variety in rates depending on religion, culture, and geography (Tadmori et al., 2009). Arab populations have a long-held tradition of consanguinity due to socio-cultural factors. Many Arab countries display some of the highest rates of consanguineous marriages in the world, especially first cousin marriages which may reach 25-30\% of all marriages. In some countries like Qatar, Yemen, and UAE, consanguinity rates are increasing in the current generation. Research among Arabs and worldwide has indicated that consanguinity could influence some reproductive health parameters such as postnatal mortality rates, and rates of congenital malformations (Tadmori et al., 2009)

### 1.2 Thalassemia as a successful example:

Thalassemia or Mediterranean anemia is endemic in almost all Arab countries. This is probably due to the historical presence of malaria in the region, and the high levels of consanguinity (WHO, 2014).

In the year 2012, there were 815 Palestinian patients suffering from anemia, and 16,000 carrying the genetic trait. The number of Thalassemia patients in Palestine before the year 2000 was 45 . This number decreased to five in 2000, and to zero after 2013 (PCBS, 2014).

This excellent achievement is related to the application of premarital genetic counseling to avoid new cases of Thalassemia. The experience of Thalassemia offers strong evidence in support of the effectiveness of genetic counseling to prevent or reduce future cases of genetic disorders.

### 1.3 Significance of the problem:

In the West Bank, pediatric wards in governmental and private hospitals have little to no statistics about the mortality rate of children suffering from genetic disorders. In some occasions, many members from the same family have been diagnosed with the same disorder. From the researcher's own experience as a nurse in the pediatrics suit in the Palestinian Medical Council, new children are often born with the same genetic diseases as previous siblings and family members, without the families being offered any genetic counseling or any prevention tools.

Unfortunately, only few epidemiological population studies were conducted to investigate the prevalence of genetic disorders among Palestinians (Abu Lebdeh and Teebe, 2010), especially for thalassemic and hemophiliac patients (PHIC, 2013).

On the level of the Arab world, a study was conducted by Ghazi Tadmori summarizing data from industrialized countries, which indicated that significant genetic diseases or birth defects may affect approximately 3\% of all pregnancies, account for up to $30 \%$ of pediatric hospital admissions, and cause about $50 \%$ of childhood deaths (Tadmori, 2010).

### 1.3.1 Genetic disorders in Palestine:

As an eastern society where consanguintity marriage is very common, the Palestinian society is particulalry prone to genetic disorders (Abu-Libdeh and Teebe, 2010). The Palestinian population is characterized by high consanguinity rates (about 44\%), large family size (5.5 children per family), and pregnancies in women over the age of 45 . These factors result in the high prevalence of genetic disorders among Palestinians (Hussein, 2014).

Additionally, insufficient public health services directed to the prevention of congenital and genetic disorders, as well as inadequate health care before, during, and after pregnancy, especially in low income countries, are all factors that increase the chances of genetic disorders among newborn children (Al-Gazali, 2006).

Services aiming to limit and control genetic disorders are constrained by certain cultural, legal, and religious limitations. Examples include the cultural fear of families with genetic diseases being stigmatized within their community, and the legal restrictions on selective termination of pregnancy of an affected fetus (Al-Gazali, 2006).

There is a need for easy public access to health resources, including the knowledge of the types of human diseases and methods to decrease and manage them. Misinformation or insufficient information can affect the public's impression about the fundamental concepts genomics, while an informed public can influence policy makers in the development of guidelines, and address the ethical, social and legal issues raised by expanding genomic technologies (WHO, 2015).

Sometimes, health professionals are unable to accurately diagnose a genetic condition. When this happens, physicians will say that a patient has an undiagnosed or rare genetic condition (NIH, 2011).

There is an advanced genetic lab in Al-maqased Hospital, where very rare genetic disorders are discovered. The genetic disease specialists summerized genetic disorders among Palestinians in the book "Genetic Disorders Among Arab Population" (2010). These diseases and disorders briefly are:
"Hemoglobinobathy, Familial Meditranian Fever, Cystic Fibrosis, Phenylketonuria, Bardet-Biedle Syndrom, Meckel Syndrom, Lysosomal Disorder, Familial Hydrocephalus, Genetic Disorders Causing Blindness,

Glansmann's Tthrompocytopenia, Nesidioblastosis (pancriatic disorder), Inborn Errors of Metabolism (46 defferent metabolic diseases), Cancer, Osteogenesis imperfecta" (Abu-Libdeh and Teebe, 2010).

### 1.3.2 New diseases reported among Palestinians:

Interestingly, there has been a number of new genetic diseases and disorders reported among Palestinians. These include:
"Limb/Pelvis Hypoplasia/aplasia Syndrom, Microcephaly with Normal Intelligence, Microfhthalmia, Disordered Pigmentation, Spastic Paraplagia, Hypogonadotropic Hypogonadism with Mental Retardation and Skeletal Abnormalities. Majeed Syndrom (congenetal deserthropiotic anemia type (1)) with chronic recurrent ostiomyelitis and sweet's syndrom" (AbuLibdeh and Teebe, 2010).

From the resaercher's point of view, these diseases deserve to be studied from several aspects. It is especillay important to become familiar with the knowledge and attitudes of parents and caretakers of the sick children with genetic problem.

In fact, genetic disorders are a big social, health, and economic problem. It is continuously increasing, and patients' families are often in the center of the problem, as well as the center of the solution. It is therefore important to become familiar with their knowledge and attitudes toward genetic disorders.

## Chapter 2

## Literature Review

### 2.1. Search strategy and key words:

Science Direct, PUBMED, Google Scholar, and HINARI are all databases that were used to research the body of literature on the topic, and to write the literature review.

The keywords used in the research were: knowledge, attitude toward genetic counseling, testing, awareness about genetic counseling and testing, perception toward genetic counseling, testing, family, parents, relatives, children, genetic diseases, genetic counseling, and genetic problems. Table (1) shows how these keywords were combined in the research.

Table (2.1): Key words:

| No | Term | Combined <br> with |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 1 | Knowledge OR attitude OR awareness OR <br> perception. |  |
| 2 | Genetic counseling OR genetic testing OR <br> genetic screening. | And |
| 3 | Family OR mothers OR parents OR relatives. |  |
| 4 | Genetic disorders OR genetic disease OR genetic <br> problems. |  |

### 2.2. Inclusion and exclusion criteria of articles:

A systematic review was conducted in order to capture the most relative articles to this research. Both qualitative and quantitative studies were included; some articles were excluded after reviewing the abstract, while
others were excluded after reviewing the entire article. The systematic review targeted articles published between 2005 and 2017. However, some articles were included in the literature review despite being published before 2005, as they were valuable and closely related to the topic.

### 2.3. Systematic review:

The following diagram (figure 1) showcases how this systematic review of the literature was conducted. After applying the inclusion and exclusion criteria, a total of 23 articles were selected for the review.


### 2.4. Literature Review Discussion:

### 2.4.1. Knowledge and attitudes about genetic testing and genetic counseling:

A knowledge, attitudes, and practice (KAP) study was conducted in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (KSA) in 2006 to assess knowledge of and attitudes toward premarital counseling. The study revealed that most subjects supported the application of premarital screening in KSA (Alam, 2006). Two years later, an interventional study (educational program) assessed the knowledge on the topic before and after the implementation of the educational campaign. The study found that knowledge about genetic counseling and testing was lower before the campaign, and significantly increased after the educational program (Ibrahim, et al. 2011).

Another cross-sectional study in the Netherlands used a questionnaire and a DNA test to conclude that older and lower-educated patients had less knowledge about genetic issues. Meanwhile, attitudes toward genetic testing and counseling were rather positive, and higher levels of genetic knowledge were associated with a more positive attitude toward genetic counseling (Morren and Rijken, 2006).

Another knowledge and attitude follow up study was conducted in the Netherlands over the span of two years, from 2002 to 2004. The study was done among patients of asthma, diabetes mellitus, and cardiovascular disease. Perceived knowledge on DNA-testing did not increase over the
span of the study, and attitudes toward genetic testing also were rather consistent. Little medical genetic knowledge as opposed to social genetic knowledge seems to be a predictor for a more reserved attitude toward genetic testing (Calsbeek et al., 2007).

Another knowledge and attitude study conducted in Ohio (US) in 2014 among parents of children with congenital heart defect showed that $73.8 \%$ of parents had accurate knowledge about the disease. There was a significant positive association between the accuracy of parents' knowledge, and their educational level and household income. Attitudes toward the health concerns of genetic testing were favorable, with about $57 \%$ of parents agreeing that genetic testing should be used for managing health care and finding cures for diseases (Fitzgerald-Butt et al., 2014).

Finally, a study was done in Australia in 2013 among Parkinson's disease patients to evaluate their knowledge and attitudes toward genetic testing. The level of knowledge was relatively low ( $37 \%$ accurate responses), but attitudes were positive. The vast majority of patients (97\%) supported diagnostic testing, while $90 \%$ would undertake a genetic test themselves. Support for predictive tests was lower (78\%), and prenatal genetic testing had the least support (58\%) (Scuffham et al., 2013).

### 2.4.2 Attitudes of families which have experienced genetic problems:

A study in Finland by Boardman (2014) revealed that the Finnish population in general, and family members of patients with genetic disorders in particular, have a favorable attitude toward genetic testing
(Hietala et al., 2000). In addition, a communication study done in America in 2007 showed that subjects who have a known history of genetic mutations communicated positively about genetic issues during counseling and testing (Ellington and Maxwel, 2006).

A study about cystic fibrosis (CF) found that the majority of affected families reject selective abortion for CF , and that many will curtail childbearing rather than use prenatal diagnosis (Wertz and Janes, 1992). The University of Central Lancashire in 1997 in UK studied the attitudes of deaf adults toward genetic testing for hereditary deafness. Participants had negative attitudes toward genetic testing, and said that they would rather have deaf children (Middleton and Hewison, 1998). This seems to contradict the findings of a study done in the USA in 2000, which showed that there was strong interest by families in genetic testing for deafness (Brunger et al., 2000). It also contradicts the results from the study in the Netherlands which examined the genetic knowledge and attitudes of patients with chronic diseases, and showed that attitudes toward genetic testing were rather positive, especially among younger and higher educated patients (Morren and Rijken, 2006).

### 2.4.3 Parents' attitudes toward prenatal testing and abortion:

All previous studies were conducted among families, however, in 2015, a comparative study was conducted among university students in Israel. Using Likert scale, the study compared students' attitudes towards genetic testing based on three aspects: their gender, their field of study, and their
religious affiliation. The most influential factor was found to be the religious affiliation of the student. Religious students, especially those who do not study life sciences (LS), place less trust in genetic tests than secular students and students studying LS. Students of LS show more critical thinking towards genetic testing than others. Gender was the least influential factor, showing a mixed trend of influence (Siani and Assaraf, 2015)

A study about prenatal testing used qualitative interviews and found that for families living with a case of spinal muscular atrophy, decisions against selective termination of pregnancy after prenatal testing were made by family members themselves (Boardman, 2014). However, there was high acceptability for prenatal diagnosis in b-Thalassemia afflicted families, and all couples with affected fetuses opted for abortion (Thawabteh et al., 2005).

### 2.4.4 In Vitro Fertilization (IVF) and genetic testing:

A study was conducted in the United Kingdom about pre-implantation diagnosis and other reproductive options in IVF to study attitudes of male and female carriers of recessive disorders. The majority of participants did not feel that pre-implementation genetic testing and diagnosis was the most useful option in their situation, especially for those who would not consider a termination (Snowdon and Green, 2000).

A German study analyzed the results of chromosome analysis and genetic counseling of infertile couples referred to genetic testing before undergoing
intracytoplasmic sperm injection. The study found a high rate of chromosomal abnormalities in female patients (Kaiser and Kiesel, 1997).

### 2.4.5 Genetic disorders: prevalence and statistics.

Ghazi Tadmori mentioned that there are around 752 genetic diseases in the Arab world. He further explained the data from industrialized countries, which showed that significant genetic diseases or birth defects may affect approximately $3 \%$ of all pregnancies, account for up to $30 \%$ of pediatric hospital admissions, and cause about $50 \%$ of childhood deaths (Tadmori, 2010).

Among the Palestinian population, Dr. Bassam Abu. Lebdeh and Dr. Ahmad Teebe highlighted about 98 types of genetic disorders, some of which are newly discovered mutations. They recommended increasing research and public education programs around issues of genetic diseases and genetic testing (Abu-Libdeh and Teebe, 2010).

### 2.4.6 Psychology and genetic counseling:

Elina Rantanen researched the literature to understand the expectations and concerns around genetic testing and counseling. The ideal genetic counseling seems to consist of information about the test, the condition, and the risks and their management. It also offers support in adjusting to this information, and in decision-making process concerning the test and its result (Rantanen, 2014).

To support these conclusions, another literature review study explored the psychological impact of genetic testing. The study found that highly
specific information provided by genetic testing can empower both clinicians and patients to develop behavioral strategies with the greatest impact on reducing disease morbidity and mortality (Tercyak et al., 2002). A meta-analytic review to discover the impact of genetic counseling found that genetic counseling significantly decreased anxiety (Meiser and Halliday, 2002).

### 2.4.7 The situation of genetic counseling and genetic testing:

Kocha and Svendsenb wrote about genetic counseling as imperative in disease prevention. They suggested that "solutions provide the framework within which certain problems can be stated (Kocha and Svendsenb, 2005). To evaluate genetic testing and counseling, a study conducted in the USA in 2004 found that traditional practice philosophies that have been longstanding in genetic counseling are being re-conceptualized to accommodate the shifts in genetics research brought about by the Human Genome Project. For future directions they recommended the implementation of more sophisticated research methods to overcome some of the existing limitations in the literature (Wanga et al., 2004).

### 2.5 Framework:

The framework was conceptualized according to the literature review, and helped the researcher develop the questionnaire. Figure 2 shows a flow chart of the development of the framework.


Figure (2.2): Framework

## Chapter 3

## Methodology

### 3.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the research and the aspects of the methodology, it identifies population, design, setting, data collection and analysis, validity and ethical considerations.

### 3.2 Study Design

A quantitative descriptive cross-sectional survey was used in this study in the form of a questionnaire. This design is the most appropriate to study knowledge and attitudes, and to investigate the relationships between different variables. The questionnaire covered all variables of the research, as shown in annex (1).

### 3.3 Hypothesis

1.Parents with high knowledge about genetic testing and counseling are expected to have positive attitudes toward it, and be more likely to use it.
2. Parents with sick children have more knowledge, and a more positive attitude toward genetic counseling.
3. Parents who have lost one or more children due to a genetic problem are more knowledgeable, and have more positive attitudes toward genetic counseling.

### 3.4 Aim and objectives:

### 3.4.1 Aim:

To determine parents' knowledge and attitudes toward genetic counseling and testing, and to determine if knowledge affects their attitudes.

### 3.4.2Specific objectives:

1.To assess parents' knowledge about genetic counseling and genetic testing.
2.To survey the associated risk factors for the emergence of genetic diseases.
3.To evaluate the effect of demographic data on parents' level of knowledge.
4.To explore parents' attitudes toward genetic counseling.
5.To investigate the relationship between the level of parents' level of knowledge about genetic testing and counseling, with their attitudes towards genetic counseling.
6.To compare the levels of knowledge of parents who have lost children due to genetic conditions or who have children diagnosed with genetic conditions, and parents who do not have these experiences.

### 3.5 Setting:

The study was conducted in two hospitals in the West Bank. The first hospital is Al-Najah National Hospital in Nablus (private hospital),
particularly in the pediatric ward and pediatric genetic clinic. The second is the Palestine Medical Complex (PMC) in Ramallah (governmental hospital), in the pediatric suite (Neonate ICU, Pediatric ICU and Pediatric ward) and pediatric clinic. Both hospitals are assumed to cover cases from all cities of the West Bank because they receive referrals from all of governmental and private hospitals.

### 3.6 Sampling and Population

### 3.6.1 Population

The population is all families of children who were admitted to pediatric suites in Al-Najah Hospital and PMC as cases of genetic disorders from the $15^{\text {th }}$ of February to the $15^{\text {th }}$ of September 2016.

### 3.6.2. Sampling and Sample size

## Sampling Method

This study used a convenience sampling method. All cases present in both hospitals during the research period (15\2\2016-15\9\2016) were included. The researcher visited both hospitals to collect data. If the same family happened to have more than one file, the researcher considered it as a single case.

## Sample Size

Subjects from the consecutive sample were a total of (121) from both hospitals. There was (140) subjects from the convenient sample, (19) of them were excluded, (10) subjects were excluded because they were
recurrent admission cases, and (9) subjects were brothers of the same family.

### 3.7 Data Collection

The data collection period was from $15 \backslash 2 \backslash 2016$ to $15 \backslash 9 \backslash 2016$ using a questionnaire with four sections:
1.Demographic data.
2.Potential risk factors: this section explains the risk factors for having genetic disease.
3.The knowledge section: this section is essentially a quiz that aims to evaluate the awareness of parents. There is no literature discussing a cut-off point to determine parents' knowledge levels. Therefore, results were summed into three groups (high, moderate and low). Details are given in page 36.
4. The attitudes section: this section is used to evaluate parents' attitudes toward genetic consulting and genetic testing. It also aims to understand what future plans parents have in order to avoid having more children with genetic conditions. A Likert scale questionnaire was used with five scales: (strongly agree, agree, I don't know, disagree, strongly disagree).

The researcher and supervisor built the questionnaire based on the literature review, with help from many experts in research and the field of genetics. To fill the questionnaire, the researcher met the families, asked the mother or father the different questions, and documented their answers.

### 3.8 Data analysis

The statistical analysis software, SPSS version 19, was used to analyze the data.

The questionnaire included the following sections:
1.Independent variables: education, address, age, number of lost children, number of sick children, income and knowledge.
2.Dependent variables: parents' attitudes toward genetic testing and counseling.

Parents' knowledge had been evaluated by a quiz, the quiz had ten multiple choice questions, and a total of ten marks, each correct answer equals one mark, with a scoring scale ranging from 0 to 10 . Scores were classified into three categories: good, moderate, and weak knowledge.

Parents attitudes were studied using a Likert scale questionnaire, which used five responses to answer questions. These were: strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, and strongly disagree. Positive attitudes were indicated by the answers: agree and strongly agree, while negative attitudes were indicated by disagree and strongly disagree.

Knowledge and attitudes relationship studied by (chi square) and the significant results studied by correlation to determine the type of relationship.

Associated factors had evaluated just by frequency.

### 3.8.1 Variable types and definitions:

Table (3.1) variable types and definitions:

| Variable | Type of variable | Conceptual <br> definition | Operational <br> definition |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Genetic <br> $\underline{\text { disorder }}$ | Categorical <br> Nominal | Is an illness caused by one or more abnormalities in the genome, especially a condition that is present from birth (congenital) (Oxford, 2015). | A disease or deformity caused by genetic issue (Ellington et al., 2006). |


| Knowledge | Categorical <br> Nominal | Facts, information <br> and skills <br> acquired through <br> experience, or <br> education, the <br> theoretical or <br> practical <br> understanding of <br> a subject <br> (Oxford, 2015). | A score of answers of parents on many questions about genetic counseling and testing (Ibrahim et al., 2011). |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Attitude | Categorical <br> Nominal | A settled thinking or feeling about <br> something (Oxford, 2015). | If you accept or refuse genetic testing and counseling and <br> your conviction toward it (Ibrahim et al., 2011). |
| Counseling | Categorical <br> Nominal | The provision or professional assistance or guidance in resolving personal or psychological problems <br> (Oxford, 2015). | Asking a consult or <br> advice from a <br> specialist (Ellington <br> et al., 2006). |


| Genetic testing | Categorical <br> Nominal | The condition of being of the same blood; relationship by descent from a common ancestor; blood-relationship (Oxford, 2015). | DNA exam to avoid genetic disorder (Ellington et al., 2006). |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Parents | Categorical <br> Nominal | A person's mother or father (Oxford, 2015). | Mothers and fathers of children with genetic disorders (Ellington et al., 2006). |
| Consanguinity | Categorical <br> Ordinal | Relationship by blood or by a common ancestor (Oxford, 2015). | Consanguinity, or intermarriage, is defined as the marriage of two relatives, second cousins or more closely related individuals (NCHPE,G2013). |

### 3.9 Validity

### 3.9.1 Piloting:

The questionnaire was given to seven experts in the genetic research field to critique it and provide their suggestions. All feedback and comments were incorporated into the final questionnaire design. A pilot study was then conducted with ten families who have one or more children with a genetic disorder. The goal of the pilot study was to evaluate the questionnaire and to seek the families' feedback. These ten families were chosen randomly, five from PMC and the other five from Al-Najah National Hospital. No changes were made to the questionnaire's design as a result of the pilot study. The pilot sample was included in the main sample, and both were analyzed together.

### 3.9.2 Translation

The questionnaire was translated from Arabic to English by a specialist in the English language. Another specialist then translated it to Arabic without any significant differences. Lastly, a doctor specialized in genetics reviewed the final questionnaire, and gave positive comments.

### 3.10 Reliability

Cronbach's alpha is a measure of internal consistency, that is, how closely related a set of items are as a group. It is not a statistical test, but a coefficient of reliability (or consistency). It can be written as a function of
the number of test items and the average inter-correlation among the items (IDRE, 2016)

Stability of the scale, or the internal consistency, was calculated using Cronbach's alpha coefficient (Cronbach Alpha). The stability coefficient was 0.72 , which means the tool of the study has good stability.

| Case Processing Summary |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | No. | \% |
| Cases | Valid | 119 | 98.3 |
|  | Excluded | 2 | 1.7 |
|  | Total | 121 | 100.0 |

## Table (3.2): Stability

### 3.11 Ethical considerations

The researcher obtained the permission of Al-Najah University's Institutional Review Board (IRB) before starting this study. Additionally, the thesis supervisor oversaw the development and implementation of all other steps throughout the research. Permission to conduct this study was also obtained from the directors of both the Palestine Medical Complex, and Al-Najah University Hospital.

The subjects were each given a consent form to sign prior to starting the questionnaire. All subjects had the option to withdraw from the study at
any point they wanted. In addition, no subject was obliged to provide their name or any piece of private information. Protecting the privacy of the subjects was taken into consideration in all steps of the data collection and analysis process.

The completed questionnaires and any information on the subjects are carefully kept in the researcher's office. The only people with access to this data are the researcher and the supervisor; however, they do not have the right to publish any of the subjects' private information.

### 3.12 strengths and limitation

### 3.12.1 Strengths of the study

1.Palestinian researchers rarely explore this topic, so it is still a relatively young research field.
2.This study is unique because it deals with parents of sick children.
3.This study will highlight the most important factors that help improve parents' knowledge about genetic counseling and testing.

### 3.12.1Limitations of the study

1.Patients of children with physical deformities due to genetic conditions could not be included, as they usually visit physiotherapy centers not hospitals.
2.Geographic limitations: the study was conducted in two hospitals only.
3.Small sample size.

### 3.13 Summary

The main method of this research was a quantitative, descriptive, crosssectional survey. This method was the most suitable to achieve the aim of this study, which was to determine parents' knowledge and attitudes toward genetic counseling and testing, and if knowledge affects attitudes.

The study was conducted in two hospitals: the first is governmental (PMC), and the other is private (AL- Najah National Hospital). A questionnaire was used to collect data from $15 \backslash 2 \backslash 2016$ to $15 \backslash 9 \backslash 2016$, the data was then analyzed using SPSS version 19. Ethical research standards were followed and taken into consideration.

Knowledge was measured by a quiz and attitudes by Likert scale. The relationship between knowledge and attitudes was measured using chi squire

## Chapter 4

## Results

### 4.1. Introduction:

Data from the descriptive cross-sectional study was analyzed using oneway ANOVA to assess the relationships and correlations between dependent and independent variables.

The first section of the questionnaire collected demographic data, which was then analyzed as descriptive data, and the variables treated as independent variables. Variables from the second section were also considered independent. These included causes and main risk factors of genetic problems. The third section was essentially a quiz to evaluate parents' knowledge, while the fourth section was a Likert scale used to discover parent' attitudes toward genetic testing and counseling. SPSS version 19 was used to analyze the data. The filter question "How many children with genetic disorders do you have?" helped in analyzing the data. ANOVA as a parametric test.

### 4.2 Sample distribution:

As figure 3 shows, the sample is normally distributed so it is suitable to use


Figure (3.1): Sample distribution

### 4.3 Descriptive statistics

### 4.3.1 Demographic data:

Table (4.1): Demographic data:

| Demographic Data |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Variables |  | No. | $\%$ |
| 1.Hospital | P MC | 42 | 35 |
|  | A l-Najah | 79 | 65 |
|  | City | 37 | 30.6 |


|  | Camp | 18 | 14.9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bedouin | 7 | 5.8 |
| 3.Gender | Male | 30 | 25 |
|  | female | 91 | 75 |
| 4.Age | $\leq 20$ years old | 2 | 1.7 |
|  | 21-30 years | 54 | 44.6 |
|  | 40-31years | 52 | 43.0 |
|  | $\geq 40$ years old | 13 | 10.7 |
| 5.Educational level | Primary school | 8 | 6.6 |
|  | Middle school | 30 | 24.8 |
|  | Tawjihi (Secondary) | 34 | 28.1 |
|  | Diploma | 17 | 14.0 |
|  | Higher academia | 32 |  |
| 6.Work | Employed | 54 | 44.6 |
|  | Unemployed | 67 | 55.4 |
| 7.Income | $\leq 1500$ | 19 | 15.7 |
|  | 1500-2500 | 22 | 18.2 |
|  | 2500-3500 | 38 | 31.4 |
|  | 3500-4000 | 33 | 27.3 |
|  | > 4000 | 9 | 7.4 |
| 8.Number of children with genetic problem | One child | 96 | 79.3 |
|  | Two children | 23 | 19.0 |


|  | Three children | 2 | 1.7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9.Genetic problem | Heart defect | 10 | 8.3 |
|  | Diabetic | 14 | 11.6 |
|  | Neurology | 18 | 14.9 |
|  | Metabolic disorder | 34 | 28.1 |
|  | Hemophilia | 8 | 6.6 |
|  | Digestive | 19 | 15.7 |
|  | Dermal | 7 | 5.8 |
|  | Immunity | 8 | 6.6 |
|  | Skeletal | 3 | 2.5 |
| 10.Lost a child or children or child | Yes | 35 | 28.9 |
|  | No | 86 | 71.1 |
| 11.Number of children lost | One | 27 | 77.1 |
|  | Two | 4 | 11.4 |
|  | Three | 2 | 5.7 |
|  | Four | 0 | 0 |
|  | Five | 0 | 0 |
|  | Six | 2 | 5.7 |

Demographic data was collected using ten questions in the survey. The purpose of collecting this data is to discover if different demographic factors enhances parents' knowledge and attitudes (table 4).

The first question was used to indicate the distribution of subjects between the two hospitals. $35 \%$ of subjects $(\mathrm{n}=42)$ were in PMC, and $65 \%(\mathrm{n}=79)$ were in Al-Najah National Hospital. Additionally, $75 \%$ ( $\mathrm{n}=91$ ) of subjects were females (mothers) and $25 \%(\mathrm{n}=30)$ were males (fathers). This is because individuals accompanying patients in pediatric wards tend to be women, particularly the mothers of the patients.

Near the half of subjects $(48.8 \%, \mathrm{n}=59)$ lived in villages, while $30 \%(\mathrm{n}=37)$ lived in cities, $14.9 \%(\mathrm{n}=18)$ in camps, and $5.8 \%(\mathrm{n}=7)$ were Bedouins nomads. The age of these parents ranged from 16 to 45 years old. Out of the total sample, $1.7 \%$ of parents $(\mathrm{n}=2)$ were 20 years old or younger, most of them ( $44.6 \%, \mathrm{n}=54$ ) were in the $21-30$ age group, around $43 \%(\mathrm{n}=52)$ were in the 31-40 age group, and only $10.7 \%$ ( $\mathrm{n}=13$ ) were older than 40 years old.

This study paid particular attention on the impact of the educational level of parents on their knowledge and attitudes toward genetic counseling and testing. About one third of subjects had low levels of educational, not exceeding the $12^{\text {th }}$ grade (secondary education or Tawjihi). Out of these parents, $6.6 \%(n=8)$ have only finished primary education, $24.8 \%(n=30)$ have only finished middle school, while $28.1 \% \quad(n=34)$ completed secondary school (Tawjihi). As for the subjects with education beyond the secondary school level, $14 \%(\mathrm{n}=17)$ completed a diploma program, while $26.4 \%(\mathrm{n}=32)$ had higher academic education.

It was also important to investigate the influence income has on knowledge and attitudes, therefore income data was collected. In this sample, $15.7 \%$ $(\mathrm{n}=19)$ of families lived on very low income (less than 1500 shekels a month). These families are considered to be living below the Palestinian poverty line. About $18.2 \%(\mathrm{n}=22)$ were in better conditions, and had an income between $1500-2500$ shekel a month. $31.4 \%$ of participants $(n=38)$ had an income of 2500-3500 shekel a month, and $27.3 \%(n=33)$ had an income of 3500-4000 shekels, which is considered a middle income level. However, only $7.4 \%$ of subjects $(\mathrm{n}=9)$ made what's considered a good income level, with more than 4000 shekel a month. Over half of the participants (55.4\%, $n=67$ ) had a job, while $44.6 \%(n=54)$ did not. This is because the majority of subjects were mothers $75 \%$ ( $n=91$ ), who are often unemployed.

Families were also asked about the number of children suffering from genetic disorder. This was done to study if a complex problem affects the knowledge and attitude of parents. Most parents (79.3\% $\mathrm{n}=96$ ) had one affected child, $19 \%(n=23)$ had two children, and only $1.7 \%(n=2)$ had the maximum number of three children. The genetic diseases the patients suffered from were classified according to body systems as: congenital cardiac problems $(8.3 \%, \mathrm{n}=10)$, diabetes $(11.6 \%, \mathrm{n}=14)$, neurology $(14.9 \%$, $\mathrm{n}=18)$, metabolic disorders $(28.1 \%, \mathrm{n}=34)$ which are considered the most common in Palestine, hemophilia ( $6.6 \%, \mathrm{n}=8$ ), gastrointestinal (15.7\%, ( $\mathrm{n}=19$ ), dermal problems (5.8\%, $\mathrm{n}=7$ ), immune system problems (6.6\%,
$\mathrm{n}=8)$, and skeletal problems ( $2.5 \%, \mathrm{n}=3$ ). Skeletal problems were the least common genetic problems.

Among these families, $28.9 \%(n=35)$ have lost children due to the same genetic problem while $71.1 \%(\mathrm{n}=86)$ did not. Most families who lost children lost one child $(77.1 \%, \mathrm{n}=27), 11.4 \%(\mathrm{n}=4)$ lost two, $5.7 \%(\mathrm{n}=2)$ lost three children, and $5.7 \%(n=2)$ lost six children.

### 4.3.2 Associated risk factors for genetic disorder:

Table (4.2): associated risk factors for genetic disorders

| Associated risk factors |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Variables | N | $\%$ |  |
|  | 20 years or less | 78 | 64.5 |
|  | $21-30$ years | 41 | 33.9 |
|  | $40-31$ years | 2 | 1.7 |
|  | 40 years or more | 0 | 0 |
| 2. Mother age when have | 20 years or less | 43 | 35.5 |
|  | $21-30$ years | 76 | 62.8 |
|  | $40-31$ years | 2 | 1.7 |
|  | 40 years or more | 0 | 0 |
| 3.Consanguineous | Yes | 86 | 71.1 |
| marriage | No | 35 | 28.9 |
| 4.Level of consanguinity | First degree | 34 | 39.5 |
|  | Second degree | 40 | 46.5 |
|  | Third | 12 | 14.0 |


| 5.Genetic test before marriage | Yes | 1 | 0.8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No | 120 | 99.2 |
| 6.a The result | Positive | 1 | 100 |
|  | Negative | 0 | 0 |
| 7.Genetic problem with Relatives | Yes | 67 | 55.4 |
|  | No | 54 | 44.6 |
|  | Heart defect | 6 | 9.0 |
|  | Diabetic | 7 | 10.4 |
|  | Neurology | 11 | 16.4 |
|  | Metabolic | 16 | 23.9 |
|  | Hemophilia | 7 | 10.4 |
|  | Digestive | 9 | 13.4 |
|  | Dermal | 7 | 10.4 |
|  | Immunity | 4 | 6.0 |
|  | Skeletal | 0 | 0 |
| 8. Do you live in an industrial Country? | Yes | 8 | 6.6 |
|  | No | 113 | 93.4 |
| 9.Did the mother do a detailed ultrasound? | Yes | 65 | 53.7 |
|  | No | 56 | 46.3 |
| 10.A Gestational age on detailed ultrasound | Less than 4 months | 5 | 7.7 |
|  | 4months or more | 60 | 92.3 |


| 11.Did you receive <br> information about genetic <br> counseling and genetic <br> problems? | No | 66 | 54.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  | Yes | 55 | 45.5 |
|  | A health center | 29 | 43.9 |
|  | Social media | 22 | 33.3 |
|  | school | 7 | 10.6 |
|  | The family | 1 | 1.5 |
|  | A clerk | 0 | 0 |
|  | Health lecture | 5 | 7.6 |
|  | The people | 2 | 3.0 |
|  | around |  |  |

This study wanted to investigate the main associated risk factors leading to genetic problems in Palestine, especially under the common culture of consanguineous marriage. A variety of associated factors were explored using ten questions in the survey (annex 1) and analyzed as shown in table (4.2).

Despite the well-known high levels of consanguineous marriages in Palestine, only one of the subjects $(0.8 \%)$ underwent a genetic test before marriage, while $99.2 \%(n=120)$ did not. This is the most important association for genetic problems. Additionally, 55.4\% ( $\mathrm{n}=67$ ) of the subjects had a family history of genetic disorders.

Genetic disorders of subjects relatives were classified into the same categories as those of the children. However, the percentages differ as follows: congenital cardiac problems ( $9 \%, \mathrm{n}=6$ ), diabetes $(10.4 \%, \mathrm{n}=7)$, neurology (16.4\%, $\mathrm{n}=11$ ), metabolic disorders (23.9\%, $\mathrm{n}=16$ ) which are considered the most common in Palestine, hemophilia ( $10.4 \%, \mathrm{n}=7$ ), gastrointestinal (13.4\%, $n=9$ ), dermal problems (10.4\%, $n=7$ ) and immune system problems $(6 \%, n=4)$. None of the relatives had skeletal problems. It is important to note that the distribution of genetic problems among relatives is similar proportionally to the distribution of problems among the sick children

Consanguinity was a common cause of genetic disorders, this was clear in this study, where more than two thirds of couples (71\%, $\mathrm{n}=86$ ) were relatives, and only $29 \%(\mathrm{n}=35)$ were not. In addition, $39.5 \%(\mathrm{n}=34)$ of couples had first degree marriages, $46 \% \quad(n=40)$ of consanguineous marriages were second degree, and $14 \% \quad(\mathrm{n}=12)$ were third degree consanguinity.

Another associated factor investigates is the mother's age at marriage. Most mothers $(64.5 \%, n=78)$ got married at 20 years younger, $33.9 \%(n=41)$ got married at ages between 21-30 years, and just $1.7 \%(n=2)$ got married between 31-40 years of age. The first child was born at the age of 20 or younger for $35.5 \%(n=43)$ of mothers, while most of them $(62.8 \%, n=76)$ gave birth to the first child between 21-30 years of age.

Industrial areas may affect human genes and lead to creating genetic mutation, therefore subjects were asked about whether they lived in industrial areas or not. The answer of $6.6 \%(n=8)$ of them was yes, and 93.4\% ( $\mathrm{n}=113$ ) answered no. However, it cannot be ignored that Palestine is not an industrialized country, and that the presence of heavily industrialized areas is scarce.

Another important associated factor in protecting children from advanced genetic problems is lack of antenatal care. Early diagnoses of genetic conditions can increase the opportunity of effective therapy. A detailed ultrasound is an advanced eco test done to examine the fetus's organs. Half of the mothers in this study ( $53.7 \% \mathrm{n}=65$ ) had this test done, while $46.3 \%$ ( $\mathrm{n}=56$ ) did not. Mothers did the test in different gestational ages, 7.7\% $(\mathrm{n}=5)$ did it before the gestational age of 4 months, and $92.3 \%(\mathrm{n}=60)$ did it after the gestational age of 4 months.

Health education is also very important for reproductive health, and when the subjects were asked whether they received any health education, 54.5\% ( $\mathrm{n}=66$ ) answered with yes, and $45.5 \%(\mathrm{n}=55)$ said that they did not receive any health education. Sources of education were various, and often not valid or professional. Only $43 \%(\mathrm{n}=29)$ of families received education from health centers, $33.3 \%(\mathrm{n}=22)$ from social media, and $10.6 \% \quad(\mathrm{n}=7)$ remembered information from school. Family was a source of information for $1.5 \%(n=1)$ of subjects, health lectures were a source for $7.5 \%(n=5)$, and $3 \%(n=2)$ of subjects used other people around them as sources.

### 4.3.3 Knowledge evaluation:

### 4.3.3.1 Parents' knowledge:

This section covers the process and results of the evaluation of parents' knowledge about genetic counseling. It is essentially a quiz from which the knowledge was assessed. The quiz had ten multiple choice questions, and a total of ten marks (table 4.3).

Table (4.3): knowledge Evaluation

| Knowledge evaluation |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Question | Answers | N | \% |
| 1. The meaning of genetic testing: | Analyze the genes of the Mother and Father | 31 | 25.6 |
|  | 2. Analyze DNA to determine a genetic problem | 21 | 17.4 |
|  | 3.Discover the chromosome of defected Genes | 13 | 10.7 |
|  | 4. All of the above | 56 | 46.3 |
| 2.the method of transmission of genetic disease is | 1.genes | 105 | 86.8 |
|  | 2.infection by touch | 1 | . 8 |
|  | 3.contaminated air and water | 1 | . 8 |
|  | 4.couldnt be transmitted | 14 | 11.6 |


| 3. The main purpose of genetic counseling is: | 1. decrease the cases of genetic problems in the Society | 68 | 56.2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2. terminate the pregnancy of defected fetus | 13 | 10.7 |
|  | 3. treat children of genetic <br> Problem | 40 | 33.1 |
| 4. Most suitable time for genetic counseling | 1. when planning for pregnancy | 69 | 57.0 |
|  | 2.the first trimester of pregnancy | 39 | 32.2 |
|  | 3. the last trimester of pregnancy | 0 | 0 |
|  | 4. directly after delivery | 13 | 10.7 |
| 5. Genetic problem could be Decreased | 1.Yes | 99 | 81.8 |
|  | 2. No | 22 | 18.2 |
| 6. Consanguineous marriage may increase genetic problem | 1. Yes | 120 | 99.2 |
|  | 2.No | 1 | 0.8 |
| 7. The responsibility of transmission | 1.Both mother's and father's genes | 103 | 85.1 |
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| of genetic problem is due to: | 2.Just mother's genes | 10 | 8.3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.Just father's genes | 8 | 6.6 |
| 8.Genetic counseling is important : | 1. In the first pregnancy | 51 | 42.1 |
|  | 2.In every pregnancy | 68 | 56.2 |
|  | 3. Not important at all | 2 | 1.7 |
| 9.The most prior <br> Relatives to analyze <br> DNA to determine the problem of the baby are | 1.Child, s mother and father | 109 | 90.1 |
|  | 2.His grand parents | 10 | 8.3 |
|  | 3.Cousins | 2 | 1.7 |
|  | 4.No body | 0 | 0 |
| 10.Genetic counseling before marriage is important for: | 1.treat the genetic problems | 59 | 48.8 |
|  | 2.control the expansion of genetic disorders in Palestinian society | 54 | 44.6 |
|  | 3. to determine the gender of the baby. | 4 | 3.3 |
|  | 4.to avoid infectious diseases. | 4 | 3.3 |

Question (1) was about the "meaning of genetic testing." The breakdown for the first question was as follows: analyzing the genes of the mother and father $(25.6 \%, \mathrm{n}=31)$, analyzing DNA to determine a genetic problem (17.4\%, $\mathrm{n}=21$ ), discovering the chromosome of defected genes $(10.7 \%$, $\mathrm{n}=13$ ), or all of the above, which is the correct answer ( $46.3 \%, \mathrm{n}=56$ ).

Question (2) got the highest number of correct answers. The question was about "the method of transmission of genetic disease." The answer breakdown was: genes, which was the correct answer, ( $86 \% \mathrm{n}=105$ ), infection by touch $(0.8 \%, n=1)$, by contaminated water and air $(0.8 \% \mathrm{n}=1)$, while ( $11.6 \% \mathrm{n}=14$ ) seemed to believe that genetic disorders could not be transmitted.

Question (3) asked about "the purpose of genetic counseling." Most subjects $(56.2 \%, \mathrm{n}=68)$ chose the right answer which was "to decrease the cases of genetic problems in society." Meanwhile, $10.7 \%(\mathrm{n}=13)$ thought the purpose is to terminate the pregnancy of fetuses with genetic problems, and $33.1 \%(n=40)$ assumed that the purpose is for treatment.

Question (4) was about the most suitable time for genetic counseling. The correct answer is "when planning for pregnancy," which was chosen by $57 \%(n=69)$ of participants. $32.2 \%(n=39)$ seemed to think the most suitable time to be in the first trimester of pregnancy, and just $10.7 \%$ $(\mathrm{n}=13)$ thought the correct answer was directly after delivery.

Question (5) was "is it possible to reduce the incidence of genetic problems?" $81.8 \%(\mathrm{n}=99)$ answered with yes, and $18.2 \%(\mathrm{n}=22)$ believed it was not possible.

Question (6) was if "consanguineous marriage increases the incidence of genetic problems" and $99.2 \%(\mathrm{n}=120)$ answered with yes, it does.

Question (7) was asking whether "the responsibility of transmission of genetic problem is due to" the genes of both parents, which is the correct
answer $(85.1 \%, \mathrm{n}=103)$, the father's genes alone $(8.3 \%, \mathrm{n}=10)$, or the mother's genes alone $(6.6 \%, n=8)$.

Question (8) was about the "importance of the genetic counseling", and $42.1 \%(n=51)$ of parents believed it was only important in the first pregnancy. The correct answer is that it is important in every pregnancy, as $56.2 \%(n=68)$ of parents answered. Lastly, $1.7 \%(n=2)$ seemed to believe that it is not important at all.

Question (9): was "the relatives with the top priority to undergo DNA analysis to determine the genetic problem of a child are" the parents as $90.1 \%(n=109)$ of subjects answered. Some ( $8.3 \%, \mathrm{n}=10$ ) thought grandparents should also do the analysis, while others ( $1.7 \% \mathrm{n}=2$ ) thought that cousins also have a priority. None of the subjects $(0 \% \mathrm{n}=0)$ seemed to thinks that there is no need for DNA analysis.

Genetic counseling before marriage is not customary in the Palestinian society, therefore when subjects were asked about the importance of that in question 10, nearly half of the answers (48.8\% $\mathrm{n}=59$ ) wrongly chose "treatment of genetic diseases" as the answer, and approximately 44.6\% $(n=54)$ chose the correct answer, which is "to control the expansion of genetic disorders in Palestinian society." Meanwhile, $3.3 \%(n=4)$ thought "to determine the gender of the baby" is the correct answer, and another $3.3 \%(\mathrm{n}=4)$ thought it was to avoid infectious diseases.

### 4.3.3.2 Evaluation and scoring:

The purpose of the previous ten questions was to evaluate parents' knowledge (table 4.4). Each correct answer equals one mark, with a scoring scale ranging from 0 to 10 . Scores were classified into three categories: good, moderate, and weak knowledge. There is no literature discussing how to determine a cutoff point for knowledge scores, so the researcher divided the scores into three intervals: good (7-10), moderate (4-6), and weak (0-3). This makes classifying and evaluating knowledge levels easier, and makes it possible to link it with attitudes. In this sample, $5 \%(n=6)$ of parents had weak levels of knowledge, $31.4 \%(n=38)$ had moderate levels, and $63.6 \%(\mathrm{n}=77)$ had good knowledge levels.

Table (4.4): Knowledge level

| Knowledge Level |  |  |  |  |  |  | Frequency | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Weak | 6 | $5.0 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Moderate | 38 | $31.4 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Good | 77 | $63.6 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 121 | $100.0 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |



Figure (4.2): knowledge level

### 4.3.4 Parents' attitude:

Table (4.5) in (annex 2) shows families' attitudes toward genetic counseling and testing. Attitudes were studied using a Likert scale questionnaire, which used five responses to answer questions. These were: strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, and strongly disagree. Positive attitudes were indicated by the answers: agree and strongly agree, while
negative attitudes were indicated by disagree and strongly disagree. For questions 6,10 , and 11 , positive attitudes were determined by answers (disagree and strongly disagree), which were used to avoid bias. A total of 22 questions were used for this evaluation:

Question (1): "Couples have to do genetic testing when they plan to get married": $88.4 \%(\mathrm{n}=107)$ of participants agreed, and $1.7 \%(\mathrm{n}=2)$ disagreed, so attitudes toward this question are considered significantly positive.

Question (2): "All pregnant women have to do genetic tests for the fetus": $93.3 \% ~(\mathrm{n}=113)$ of the answers were agreed, so attitudes toward this question are considered significantly positive.

Question (3): "Experience of genetic problem in the family will increase their care about genetic counseling": 97.5\% ( $\mathrm{n}=118$ ) of couples agreed with this, which indicates positive attitude.

Question (4): "Genetic testing has to be available for people as needed": $99.2 \%(\mathrm{n}=120)$ of parents agreed, indicating a positive attitude.

Question (5): "Genetic counseling must be available even for families with family history free of genetic problems": 72\% ( $\mathrm{n}=91$ ) of families agreed; again, this indicated a positive attitude.

Question (6): "Genetic counseling should never be used because of religious and social reasons." This question was written using negative wording, and $83.5 \%(\mathrm{n}=101)$ of answers disagreed, indicating a positive attitude.

Question (7): "IVF could be used to avoid defected genes when couples want to have a healthy child": answers to this question were: disagree ( $22.3 \%, \mathrm{n}=27$ ), I don't know ( $37.2 \%, \mathrm{n}=45$ ), and $40.5 \% ~(\mathrm{n}=49)$ said they agree. This is considered a negative attitude.

Question (8): "Genetic testing must be done for all newborns": 78.5\% $(\mathrm{n}=95)$ of answers agreed, and that's positive.

Question (9): "Each person has the right to know if he is at risk of having a genetic problem in the future": $95.5 \%(\mathrm{n}=116)$ of parents agreed , which is considered a positive attitude.

Question (10): "Each person has the right to know the probability of having a child with a genetic problem": 72\% ( $\mathrm{n}=87$ ) of answers were I don't know, which is considered negative attitude.

Question (11): "We have to bow to the genetic problems without interference": this question was written in negative wording, and $91 \%$ $(\mathrm{n}=110)$ of answers were 'disagree', which indicates a positive attitude.

Question (12): "Genetic counseling must be avoided because it increases the probability of abortion": this question was in negative wording, and $79 \%(n=96)$ of answers disagreed, which is a positive attitude.

Question (13): "I will take a genetic consultation when I plan for pregnancy in the future": $86.7 \%(\mathrm{n}=105)$ of answers agreed, and that's a positive attitude.

Question (14): "I advise my children to have genetic counseling before marriage": $95 \%(\mathrm{n}=115)$ of families agreed, and that's a positive attitude.

Question (15): "The presence of a genetic disorder in a family may lead them to stop consanguineous marriage": 86\% (n=104) of families agreed, and that's positive.

Question (16): "Genetic testing helps couples discover their genetic history and may destroy their relationship" $76.5 \%(\mathrm{n}=84)$ of answers agreed, and that's positive.

Question (17): "Genetic counseling can lead to avoiding consanguineous marriage": $92.6 \%(\mathrm{n}=112)$ of answers agreed, indicating a positive attitude.

Question (18): "Genetic counseling decreases the probability of having a genetic problem": 74\% ( $\mathrm{n}=90$ ) of answers agreed, which is considered a positive attitude.

Question (19): "It is important to consider the Islamic view in making the right decision to marry according to my family health history": $65.3 \%$ $(\mathrm{n}=79)$ of answers were agree, which is considered a positive attitude.

Question (20): "My information about genetic counseling is not insufficient": this question displays the desire of parents for education, $69.4 \%(n=84)$ of parents answered agree, which is considered positive.

Question (21): "Laboratories that offer genetic testing service are not available in my country": this question displays the desire of parents to
have benefits, $91 \%(\mathrm{n}=111)$ of them answered I agree, and that's a positive attitude.

Question (22): "High cost of genetic counseling may decrease the desire to take it": like the previous question, this question displays the parents' desire to have benefits, and $86 \%(n=104)$ of respondents agreed, and that's a positive attitude.

It is clear that most of the attitudes toward previous items were positive (20 out of 22), so it could be considered that parents' attitudes towards genetic counseling and testing are positive. The mean was calculated by taking the sum of positive answers (20) and dividing that by the number of items (22); the mean was $81 \%$.

The following section will examine whether certain factors affect parents' attitudes. Education and the number of sick children are two of the most important factors to discuss.

### 4.4 Inferential:

### 4.4.1 Introduction:

To evaluate the relationship between the three categories of knowledge (weak, moderate, and good) and the 22 items for attitudes, a chi-square test was used. Results of significant differences were organized in Table (6), then correlation tests were done for significant results in order to discover the type of the relationship (positive or negative). To study the $2^{\text {nd }}$ and $3^{\text {rd }}$ hypotheses, ANOVA test was used to compare between and within groups.

### 4.4.2 Chi-square test

Chi-square is a statistical test commonly used to compare observed data with data we would expect to obtain according to a specific hypothesis (Fisher and Yates, 2006). It is used when the researcher has two categorical variables_from a single population, and wants to determine whether there is a significant association between the two variables with two or more values (Stat Trek, 2016).

### 4.4.3 Correlation:

A statistical method that measures the degree to which two variables move in relation to each other. It is computed into what is known as the correlation coefficient, the values of which must fall between -1 and 1 (Invostopedia, 2016)

### 4.4.4 ANOVA Test:

One-way analysis (ANOVA) or (Analysis of Variance) is used to determine whether there are any statistically significant differences between the means of two or more independent groups (Lund Research, 2013). (ANOVA) is used with one categorical independent variable (attitudes) (total evaluation: positive or negative) and one continuous variable (knowledge evaluation). The independent variable can consist of any number of groups (Richard, 1998). When we compare more than two groups (weak, moderate, and good), based on one factor (independent variable), ANOVA is the most suitable statistical tool (Statistics Solutions, 2013).

### 4.4.5 Knowledge and attitudes (chi square analysis):

Table(4.5)Chi square significant table(effect of knowledge on attitudes)

| Item | Answer | Weak | Moderate | Good | Total | P -value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.Couples have | Disagree | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 1.8 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 1.8 \% \end{gathered}$ | 0.004 |
| testing | I don't <br> know | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 1.7 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ 6.6 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 1.7 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 12 \\ 9.9 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| to get married | Agree | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ 3.3 \% \end{gathered}$ | $30$ <br> $24.7 \%$ | $\begin{gathered} 73 \\ 60.3 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 107 \\ 88.4 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 2. Genetic counseling | Disagree | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 2.5 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 10 \\ 8.2 \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ 7.4 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22 \\ 18.2 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0.02 |
| must <br> available even | I don't <br> know | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 0.8 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 1.7 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ 4.1 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8 \\ 6.6 \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| for families which family history is free of genetic problems | Agree | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 1.7 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 26 \\ 21.4 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 63 \\ 52 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 91 \\ 75.2 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 3. Genetic counseling has | Disagree | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 1.7 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 29 \\ 23.9 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 70 \\ 57.8 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 101 \\ 83.4 \% \end{gathered}$ | 0.001 |
| to be avoided for religious | I don't <br> know | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ 3.3 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6 \\ 4.9 \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 7 <br> 5.8\% | $\begin{array}{r} 17 \\ 14 \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| and social <br> reasons | Agree | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |  |


|  |  | 0.0\% | 2.5\% | 0.0\% | 2.5\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4.Genetic <br> testing must be | Disagree | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 1.7 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 4.9 \% \end{gathered}$ | $4$ $3.3 \%$ | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ 9.9 \% \end{gathered}$ | 0.02 |
| done for all newborns | I don't <br> know | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 0.8 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 6 <br> 4.9\% | $\begin{array}{r} 7 \\ 5.8 \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ 11.7 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Agree | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 2.5 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 26 \\ 21.4 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 66 \\ 54.5 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 95 \\ 78.5 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 5.We have to bow to the | Disagree | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ 3.3 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 33 \\ 7.3 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 73 \\ 60 \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 110 \\ 91 \% \end{gathered}$ | 0.01 |
| genetic problems | I don't <br> know | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 1.7 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 1.7 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
| interference | Agree | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 1.7 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 2.5 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ 3.3 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ 7.4 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 6. Genetic counseling | Disagree | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 2.5 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ 20.6 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 70 \\ 57.8 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 96 \\ 79.3 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0.01 |
| must be <br> avoided | I don't <br> know | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 1.7 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7 \\ 5.8 \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 2.5 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 12 |  |
| because it increases the probability of abortion | Agree | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 0.8 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ 6.6 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ 3.3 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ 10.7 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |


| 7. Genetic counseling | disagree | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | 4 <br> $3.3 \%$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ 3.3 \% \end{gathered}$ | 0.04 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| leads to avoiding | I don't <br> know | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 2.5 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 1.7 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ 4.1 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
| s marriage | Agree | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 4.9 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 31 \\ 25.6 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 75 \\ 61.9 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 112 \\ 92.5 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 8. Genetic counseling | Disagree | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ 9.9 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 4.9 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 18 \\ 14.8 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
| decreases the probability of | I don't <br> know | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 1.7 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 2.5 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 4.9 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 11 \\ 9 \% \end{array}$ | 0.01 |
| genetic <br> problem | Agree | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ 3.3 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 23 \\ 19 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 63 \\ 52 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 90 \\ 74.4 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |

Table (4.6) shows the relationship between knowledge and attitudes. A total of eight items had a significant relationship with knowledge $(1,5,6,8$, $11,12,17$, and 18). In Table (4.6) the first item, "couples have to do genetic testing when they plan to get married," has a significant relationship with knowledge ( P -value $=0.016$ ). The fifth item, "genetic counseling must be available even for families whose family history is free of genetic problems", the difference between the three groups was
significant $(\mathrm{P}$-value $=0.04)$. The correlation test shows that this is a positive relationship.

Item 6, "genetic counseling has to be avoided for religious and social reasons", had a negative significant difference between the groups (Pvalue $=0.001$ ). This item was written in negative framing, so a negative relationship means positive attitudes.

For Item 8, "genetic tests must be done for all newborn children", the difference between three groups is considered significant $(\mathrm{P}$-value $=0.02)$. The correlation test revealed this relationship to be positive.

The P-value for Item 11 "we have to bow to the genetic problems without interference," was 0.02 , indicating a significant difference between groups. The correlation test indicates a negative relationship between knowledge and attitudes towards this item; however, this item was worded negatively, so a negative relationship means positive attitudes.

As for Item 12, "genetic counseling must be avoided because it increases the probability of abortion", the difference between the three groups was also significant $(\mathrm{P}$-value $=0.01)$. The correlation test indicates a negative relationship between knowledge and attitudes towards this item, but this item was worded negatively, so a negative relationship means positive attitudes.

Item 17, "genetic counseling leads to avoiding consanguineous marriage", showed a significant difference between the three groups $(\mathrm{P}$-value $=0.04)$.

The correlation coefficient shows there is a positive relationship between knowledge and attitudes towards this item.

Lastly, the P -value for Item 18, "genetic counseling decreases the probability of having a genetic problem", was 0.01 , indicating a significant difference between groups. The correlation test revealed a positive relationship between knowledge and attitudes towards this item.

There were 14 items with no significant relationship between knowledge and attitudes. These items were: $2,3,4,7,9,10,13,14,15,16,19,20,21$, and 22 (annex 3).

These items and their respective P-values were: "all pregnant womlen have to do genetic tests for the fetus", (P-value= 0.7); "Genetic tests must be available as needed", $(\mathrm{P}$-value $=0.1)$; "Experience of genetic problem in the family will increase their care about genetic counseling", ( P -value $=0.3$ ); "IVF could be used to avoid defective genes when couples want to have a healthy child", $(\mathrm{P}$-value $=0.1)$; "Each person has the right to know the risk of having a genetic problem in the future", (P-value $=0.3$ ); "Each person has the right to know the probability of having a child with a genetic problem", $(\mathrm{P}$-value $=0.6)$; "I will take a genetic consultation when I plan for pregnancy in the future", $(\mathrm{P}$-value $=0.7)$; "I advice my children to have genetic counseling before marriage", ( P -value $=0.2$ ); "The presence of genetic disorder in a family may lead them to stop consanguineous marriage", $(\mathrm{P}$-value $=0.1)$; "Genetic testing helps couples to discover their genetic history and may destroy their relationship", $(\mathrm{P}$-value $=0.9)$; "It is
important to clarify the Islamic view before making the right decision to marry according to my family's health history", (P-value $=0.3$ ); "My information about genetic counseling are not insufficient", $(\mathrm{P}$-value $=0.1)$; "Laboratories that offer genetic testing service are not available in my country", ( P -value $=0.3$ ); and "High cost of genetic counseling may decrease the desire to take it", $(\mathrm{P}$-value $=0.6)$. All these P -values indicate that there is no significant difference between groups for any of these items.

As discussed in the section about parents' attitudes, attitudes were clearly significantly positive (in 20 items from 22), however as can be seen from the results of the correlation test (table 4.7), only eight of these positive attitudes had a positive correlation with parents' knowledge levels.

## Table (4.6) Correlations: to discover the relationship between

 knowledge and attitudes:| Item | Sig. | Correlation | Person's <br> Coefficient | Correlation |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Couples have to do <br> genetic testing when <br> they plan to get marry | 0.016 | Positive | 0.220 | Positive |
| Genetic counseling must <br> be available even for <br> families <br> which family history | 0.04 | Positive | 0.272 | Positive |


| free of genetic problems |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Genetic counseling had <br> been never used for <br> religious and social <br> causes | 0.001 | Negative | -0.330 | Negative |
| Genetic testing must be <br> done for all newborns <br> We have to bow to the <br> genetic problems <br> without interference | 0.02 | Positive | 0.324 | Positive |
| Genetic counseling must <br> be avoided because it is <br> increase the probability <br> of abortion | 0.01 | Negative |  |  |
| Genetic counseling leads <br> to avoiding <br> consanguineous <br> marriage | 0.0296 | Negative |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

The first hypothesis of this research was that parents who have high knowledge about genetic testing and counseling are expected to have more
positive attitudes towards testing and are more likely to use it. The previously-mentioned results allow the researcher to accept this hypothesis.

### 4.4.6 Number of sick children and parents' knowledge and attitudes:

To study the relationship between the number of children suffering from genetic disorder and parents' knowledge and attitudes, an ANOVA test was performed at the significance level of ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) with total (positive or negative) attitude evaluation (Table 4.7).

Table (4.7) ANOVA Test: Number of sick children and attitudes and knowledge:

| Item |  | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Attitudes | Between Groups | 2 | 0.002 | 0.023 | 0.977 |
|  | Within Groups | 118 | 0.101 |  |  |
|  | Total | 120 |  | 1.058 | 0.350 |
| Knowledge | Between Groups | 2 | 0.364 |  |  |
|  | Within Groups | 118 | 0.344 |  |  |

This table shows that there are no differences between the means at a significance level of $(\alpha=0.05)$. The difference in attitudes between the different groups (parents with one child with a genetic disease, parents with
two children, and parents with three children) has a significance value of 0.977 , which is much higher than the significance level $(\alpha=0.05)$, and indicates an insignificant difference. Similarly for knowledge, the difference between groups had a significant value of 0.350 , which is again much higher than the significance level and indicates an insignificant difference.

These results suggest that there is no significant difference in parents' knowledge and attitudes towards genetic counseling and testing based on the number of children with genetic diseases that they have.

Based on these conclusions, the second hypothesis, which states that "Parents who have more children with genetic diseases have more knowledge and more positive attitudes towards genetic counseling" can be rejected and the null hypothesis can be accepted instead.

### 4.4.7 Number of lost children and parents' knowledge and attitudes:

To investigate the relation between the number of children who have died due to genetic disorders and their parents' knowledge and attitudes towards genetic testing and counseling, an ANOVA test was performed at the ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) significance level.

### 4.4.8 Parents' educational level and their knowledge evaluation and attitudes:

To study the relationship between parents' educational level and their knowledge and attitudes, another ANOVA test was done, again with a significance level of ( $\alpha=0.05$ ).

Table (4.8): ANOVA Test: Number of deceased children and attitudes and knowledge:

| Item |  | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Attitudes | Between Groups | 1 | 0.190 | 1.929 | 0.167 |
|  | Within Groups | 119 | 0.099 |  |  |
|  | Total | 120 |  |  |  |
| Knowledge | Between Groups | 1 | 0.009 | 0.025 | 0.875 |
|  | Within Groups | 119 | 0.347 |  |  |
|  | Total | 120 |  |  |  |

This table shows that there are no significant differences between groups at the 0.05 significance level. The significance value for differences in attitudes between the different groups (parents with one deceased child, parents with two deceased children, parents with three deceased children, and parents with six deceased children) is 0.167 , which is higher than the significance level, and indicates an insignificant difference. Additionally, the differences in knowledge between the different groups had a significance level of 0.875 , again indicating an insignificant difference.

These results suggest that there is no significant difference in parents' knowledge and attitudes towards genetic testing and counseling based on the number of children they've lost due to genetic disorders.

Therefore, the third hypothesis stating that "parents who lost more children due to a genetic problem have more knowledge and more positive attitudes towards genetic counseling" can be rejected, and the null hypothesis is accepted

Table (4.9): Parents' educational level and their knowledge and attitudes.

| Item | Sum of <br> Squares | Df | Mean <br> Square | F | Sig. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Between Groups | 0.374 | 4 | 0.093 | 0.938 | 0.445 |
|  | Knowledge | Between Groups | 6.753 | 4 | 1.688 | 5.663 | 0.0003

The table above shows that there are no significant differences between the attitudes of different groups (elementary education, middle school, secondary education, diploma education, or higher academic education)
toward genetic testing and counseling. The significance value for differences in attitudes was 0.445 , which is higher than the significance level of 0.05 , and indicates an insignificant difference. On the other hand, the table shows that there is a significant difference in knowledge levels between the different groups, with a significance value of 0.003 , indicating a significant difference.

### 4.4.9 Parents' income and knowledge:

To study the relationship between parents' income and their knowledge, an ANOVA test was done at the 0.05 significance level.

## Table (4.10): Parents' income level and their knowledge evaluation

| Item |  | Sum of <br> Squares | Df | Mean <br> Square | F | Sig. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Knowledge | Between Groups | 6.753 | 3 | 1.488 | 5.663 | 0.29 |
|  | Within Groups | 34.585 | 115 | 0.398 |  |  |
|  | Total | 41.339 | 122 |  |  |  |

This table shows that there is no significant difference in knowledge between the different income groups. The significance value for this difference is 0.29 , which is larger than 0.05 and indicates an insignificant difference. This suggests that family income does not affect parents' knowledge about genetic testing and counseling.

### 4.5 Summary:

Data collected in this study was analyzed using SPSS Version 19. The first section of the survey collected general and demographic data, which showed that $75 \%$ of subjects were mothers, and $25 \%$ were fathers. Additionally, $79.3 \%$ of subjects had one child with a genetic condition, $19 \%$ had two, and only $1.7 \%$ had three. The genetic diseases that children suffered from were classified according to body systems impacted: $28.1 \%$ of children had metabolic disorders, which are considered the most common in Palestine.

The most common associated factors for genetic problems were: ignoring premarital genetic tests, early motherhood, consanguineous marriages, and a family history of genetic problems.

Parents' knowledge was evaluated using a quiz of ten questions, with a possible score ranging from 1 to 10 . Scores were classified into three categories based on three score intervals: good (7-10), moderate (4-6), and weak (0-3). In this sample, $5 \%$ of parents had weak knowledge, $31.4 \%$ scored moderately, and $63.6 \%$ had scores indicating good knowledge.

Parents' attitudes towards genetic testing and counseling were overwhelmingly positive; respondents agreed with 20 out of 22 items on the attitudes part of the questionnaire, which reflects a positive attitude.

Different relationships and correlations were investigated in order to study the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis (1): Parents who have high knowledge about genetic testing and counseling are expected to have more positive attitudes toward and are
more likely to use it. To study this hypothesis, a chi-square test was used to compare attitudes between groups. The chi-square test results suggest knowledge affects attitudes positively, which allows for the first hypothesis to be accepted.

Hypothesis (2): Parents who have more sick children have more knowledge and more positive attitudes towards genetic counseling. To investigate this, an ANOVA test was used. The results showed that there is no relationship between the number of sick children and parents' knowledge and attitudes towards genetic counseling and testing. Based on these results, the second hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis (3): Parents who have lost more children to genetic problems have more knowledge and more positive attitudes towards genetic counseling. An ANOVA test was used again, and the results indicated that there is no relationship between the number of deceased children and parents' attitudes. However, there was a relationship between the number of deceased children and parents' knowledge. The third hypothesis was also rejected based on these results.

## Chapter (5)

## Discussion

### 5.1 Introduction

Results of this study were compared with other national and international studies, some of which were previously mentioned Chapter 2 . The results of this study were sometimes similar and sometimes different from the articles in the literature review. In the following section, the different aspects of this study will be discussed in detail while comparing this study to other published works. The purpose of this is to discover how different socio-demographic factors affect knowledge and attitude data.

### 5.2 Socio-Demographic characteristics

Out of a total of 121 subjects, $35 \%(n=42)$ were in PMC, while the rest were in Al-Najah University Hospital. Moreover, $75 \%$ ( $\mathrm{n}=91$ ) of them were females (mothers) and $25 \%(\mathrm{n}=30)$ were males (fathers). Most subjects ( $48.8 \%, \mathrm{n}=60$ ) lived in villages, whereas $30 \%(\mathrm{n}=37)$ lived in cities, $14.9 \%(n=18)$ lived in camps, and only $5.8 \%(n=6)$ were Bedouin nomads. It is worth mentioning that consanguineous marriages, which are considered a significant risk factor, are more common in villages.

Unfortunately, only a few epidemiological population studies were conducted to investigate the prevalence of genetic disorders among Palestinians (Abu Lebdeh and Teebe, 2010).

The educational level of participants was as follows: 26.4\% ( $\mathrm{n}=32$ ) had higher academic education, $52 \%(\mathrm{n}=64)$ went to middle and high school, and $6.6 \%(\mathrm{n}=8)$ only finished primary education. The results of this study suggest that parents' educational level positively affects their knowledge levels. The significance value ( P -value) was 0.003 , indicating a significant relationship.

As for the income of the subjects, $15.7 \%(n=19)$ of families had very low income (less than 1,500 shekels a month), $27.3 \%(\mathrm{n}=33)$ had an income between $3,500-4,000$ shekels, which is considered a middle-class income level. However, only $7.4 \%(n=9)$ had an income of 4,000 shekels or more, which is what's considered as 'good' or 'high' income. This study found no relationship between parents' income and their knowledge $(\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{value}=0.29)$. However, a study in Ohio (2014) found a significant association between parents' knowledge and household income (Fitzgerald-Butt et al., 2014). Other Arab countries had similar demographic distributions; however, studies done in Ohio, USA, showed very different distributions. This is possibly because the USA is a developed country, and often has higher income levels than Arab countries.

### 5.3 Associated risk factors:

Early marriages are common in Arab countries; therefore, the mother's age was studied as a risk factor for genetic diseases. In this study, $35.5 \%$ $(\mathrm{n}=43)$ of mothers had their first child when they were 20 years old or younger, $63 \%(n=76)$ when they were between 21-31 years of age, $1.7 \%$
$(\mathrm{n}=2)$ when they were between 31 and 40 years old, and no subjects had a child after the age of 40 . The high percentage of subjects with early motherhoods suggests that early marriage is, indeed, a risk factor in this study.

Another significant risk factor is consanguineous marriages, which are very common in Arab countries in general, and in Palestine in particular. Most parents in this study $(71 \%, \mathrm{n}=86)$ were married to their relatives, $40 \%$ ( $\mathrm{n}=48$ ) of which were first-degree relatives. A study by Tadmori et al. (2009) mentioned that consanguineous marriages, especially among first cousins constitute about 25-30\% of marriages in Arab countries.

Although more than half of the subjects (55.4\% $\mathrm{n}=67$ ) had a family history of genetic problems (relatives suffering genetic problems), less than $1 \%$ $(\mathrm{n}=1)$ of the subjects did genetic counseling before marriage. This is the most significant risk factor. Additionally, lack of laboratories, high costs, and lack of awareness are considered obstacles that prevent families from undergoing premarital genetic testing.

Pollution was not significant as a risk factor, as only $6.6 \%(n=8)$ of families lived in industrialized areas or near a factory. However, it is important to take into consideration that Palestine in general is not an industrialized country.

To summarize, early marriage and motherhood, consanguineous marriage, and neglecting premarital genetic test are the most significant risk factors
for genetic problems in Palestine, while pollution was not a significant factor in this study.

### 5.4 Parents' knowledge

Parents were asked about the meaning of genetic testing, genetic problems, its causes, methods of transmission, and prevention methods. Each of these questions were scored, and constituted the knowledge evaluation part of this study. Only 5\% ( $\mathrm{n}=6$ ) of parents had weak knowledge, $31.4 \%(\mathrm{n}=38)$ had moderate knowledge, and $63.6 \%(\mathrm{n}=77)$ had good knowledge.

These results are better than the results of an interventional study (educational program: pre and post exams) which was conducted in Saudi Arabia among university students, where knowledge levels about genetic counseling and testing were low (Ibrahim et al., 2011).

Another cross-sectional study in Netherland examined the knowledge and attitudes of patients with chronic diseases towards genetics and genetic testing using a questionnaire and a DNA test. The study found that genetic knowledge was low for older and lower educated patients (Morren and Rijken, 2006). This is consistent with the findings of this study which suggest that higher education is indicative of higher levels of knowledge $(\mathrm{P}$-value $=0.003)$.

Another knowledge and attitude study conducted in Ohio (US) in 2014 among parents of children with congenital heart defect revealed that parents' knowledge was good, with $73.8 \%$ of parents answering questions correctly (Fitzgerald-Butt et al., 2014). Meanwhile, a study conducted in

Australia in 2013 among Parkinson's disease patients to assess their knowledge and attitudes towards genetic testing found that the level of knowledge was relatively low ( $37 \%$ correct responses) (Scuffham et al., 2013).

It is clear that the subjects of this study had good knowledge levels about genetic testing and counseling. Different studies investigated various segments of society; including university students and chronic disease patients, both of which scored low on the knowledge evaluation. However, studies conducted among parents (like this study) seemed to have more knowledgeable subjects. It is possible that being a parent of a patient may push the individual to becoming more educated and aware about genetic issues, as well as genetic testing and counseling.

### 5.5 Parents' attitudes:

Attitudes toward genetic counseling and testing had been studied by a Likert scale questionnaire which used five aspects: (strongly agree, agree undecided, disagree, and strongly disagree), positive attitude was determined by the items (agree and strongly agree) and the negative counted by (disagree and strongly disagree).
(20) items from (22) had high percentage of (agree and strongly agree) and just (2) had high percentage (more than 50\%) of (disagree and strongly disagree), generally this result consider parents might have positive attitudes towards genetic counseling, which looks similar to many studies as shown below.

A cross sectional study in Netherland used questionnaire and DNA test, to examine knowledge of patients with chronic diseases and their attitudes towards genetics and genetic testing, found that attitudes toward genetics were positive and higher levels of genetic knowledge were associated with more positive attitude towards genetic counseling (Morren and Rijken, 2006).

Another knowledge attitude study conducted in Ohio (US) in (2014) among parents of congenital heart defect children showed attitudes towards the genetic testing were positive with (57\%) agreeing that genetic testing would be used for managing health care and finding cures for disease (Fitzgerald-Butt et al., 2014).

Parkinson disease patients were population for a study in Australia, their attitudes towards genetic testing and counseling were positive: the vast majority (97\%) supported diagnostic testing while (90\%) would undertake a genetic test themselves, support for predictive test was lower (78\%) and prenatal genetic testing had the least support (58\%) (Scuffham et al., 2013). All of above seems different from the study by University of Central Lancashire conducted in 1997 in the UK which studied the attitudes of deaf adults toward genetic testing for hereditary deafness. The study found negative attitudes and they said that they prefer to have deaf children (Middleton and Hewison, 1997). This is an old study; the tool was a questionnaire which was filled by delegation, which may have led to a lack of communication or misunderstanding, especially considering that the
population were deaf individuals. In general it is normal for any person to prefer to improve health and avoid having a genetic problem.

### 5.6 Knowledge and attitudes:

This section is to discuss the relationship between knowledge and attitudes; knowledge evaluation classified participants into three groups: good, moderate and weak.

Attitudes had been measured by the Likert scale and considered positive in general.

But when the three groups compared by Chi square, it is found that some significant results determined by which group had the positive results and if knowledge affecting attitudes (Table 4.6).

In the item (Couples have to do genetic testing when they plan to get married) there is a significant effect of good knowledge to have positive attitudes (p. value: 0.016).

A study conducted in Palestine by (Thawabteh, et al. 2005): families of Thalassemia mutation shows very good acceptability for prenatal diagnosis in b-Thalassemia afflicted families.

Both results are similar, both conducted in Palestine, so may culture affects their attitudes.

And regarding to the fourth item (Genetic counseling must be available even for families whose family history is free from genetic problems) it also has a significant positive attitude by the group of good evaluation (p.
value: 0.04 ). As mentioned before all of subjects had history of genetic problems and wants to stop that in the society.

The item (Genetic counseling has to be avoided for religious matters) is built in negative framing, so the answer 'disagree' expresses positive attitudes which significantly affected by the group of good knowledge (P.value:0.001).

Actually no studies in Arab or Moslem societies discussed attitudes according to religion, but in this study, although Palestinian society is conservative, religion was not considered as a barrier.

If (genetic test must be done for all newborns), it was a significant positive relationship between knowledge and attitudes (P. value: 0.02).

As mentioned before , this study and other literatures found that parents' attitudes towards testing were positive, especially those who had good knowledge.
(We have to accept to the genetic problems without interference) this item had a significant negative relationship between knowledge and attitudes towards this item, but this item had written in negative framing, so negative relationship mean positive attitudes.

Families want to stop suffering and live in a healthy society, so did not agree to bow to the genetic problems without interference.

Regards to Item 12 (Genetic counseling must be avoided because it increases the probability of abortion). The difference between the three
groups was negatively significant (P-value: 0.01). By correlation test it was a negative relationship between knowledge and attitudes towards this item, but this item was written in negative framing, so negative relationship mean positive attitudes, that similar to the finding of a study by (Thawabteh, et al. 2005) families of Thalassemia mutation show very good acceptability for prenatal diagnosis in b-Thalassemia afflicted families, and all couples with affected fetuses opted for abortion, this study was conducted in Palestine. While a study about prenatal testing by qualitative interviews found that parents' decisions around selective termination were not being made by unknown others, but by members of their own family (Boardman, 2014) that mean they may accept abortion for abnormal or sick fetus.

Otherwise abortion is not an easy decision, but may families refer that to religious and medical opinions.
(Genetic counseling leads to avoid consanguineous marriage): this Item had a significant positive association between knowledge and attitudes towards this item (P-value: 0.04). In the section of knowledge evaluation question (6) was if the consanguineous marriage increases the incidence of genetic problems $(99.2 \%(n=120)$ think yes it increases that (which was the correct answer).

So good knowledge about consanguineous marriage and genetics affects attitudes positively. On the other hand, consanguinity in this study considered as one of the associated risk factors.

The item (Genetic counseling decreases the probability of having genetic problems) most of subjects were agree and their evaluation was good.

A study in Germany to discuss the different aspects of genetic counseling in the infertile couples underwent chromosome analysis prior IVF couples referred to genetic testing and genetic counseling before intracytoplasmic sperm injection, the finding was high rate of chromosomal abnormalities in female patients (Kaiser and Kiesel, 1997). The aim of the study was to discuss the different aspects of genetic counseling in the infertile couples, but it could be useful to support this study because the genetic testing discovered serious genetic problems could be avoided.

Generally this study reflects that good knowledge significantly associated with positive attitudes towards genetic testing and counseling, and there are many literatures supported our result.

That is like a cross sectional study in Netherlands found patients of higher levels of genetic knowledge were associated with a more positive attitudes towards genetic counseling (Morren and Rijken, 2006).

To insure this idea other literatures found that the highly specific information provided about genetic testing can empower both clinicians and patients to target their efforts on behavioral strategies that will have the greatest impact on reducing disease morbidity and mortality (Tercyak, et al, 2002).

Another cross sectional study in Netherlands used questionnaire and DNA test found attitudes toward genetic testing were positive and higher levels
of genetic knowledge were associated with a more positive attitude towards genetic counseling (Morren and Rijken, 2006), also in Netherlands knowledge and attitude follow up study conducted over two years from (2002 to 2004) among patients of asthma, diabetes mellitus and cardiovascular disease, and found that the perceived knowledge on DNAtesting has not increased since 2002, and attitudes towards genetic testing also were rather consistent. Less perceived medical genetic knowledge and more perceived social genetic knowledge were found predictive for a more reserved attitude towards genetic testing (Calsbeek, et al,2007)

And finally there is a study conducted in Australia in (2013) among Parkinson's disease patients to assess their knowledge and attitudes towards genetic testing found that the level of genetic knowledge was relatively low (37\% correct responses), but their attitudes were positive (Scuffham, et al, 2013).

As discussed above most of studies found an association between knowledge and attitudes towards genetics, but it is essential to note that most of studies had good knowledge of subjects and found an association between that and positive attitudes, but the final one recorded low knowledge evaluation and also positive attitudes so it is obvious that people want to stop genetic problems.

### 5.7 Number of sick or lost children and attitudes (experience and attitudes):

All of sample subjects had experienced a genetic problem in the family, some of them had one sick child and some had more, while (29\%) of them lost a child or more, in table (4.9) it is found that no significant relationship between number of lost children because of genetic problem and parents knowledge about genetic counseling (P-value: 0.8) also no significant relationship between the number of lost children and parents' attitudes toward that (P-value: 0.16),

In table (4.8) there is no significant relationship between number of sick children because of genetic problem and parents' knowledge about genetic counseling (P-value: 0.3) also no significant relationship between number of sick children and parents' attitudes toward that (P-value: 0.9)

While a study in America in (2007), shows that subjects who are known as history of genetic mutation their communication about genetic was strongly positive among counseling and testing (Ellington and Maxwell, 2006), that seems different from the study by University of Central Lancashire in 1997 in UK, which studied the attitudes of deaf adults toward genetic testing for (hereditary deafness), that showed negative attitudes and they said that they preferred to have deaf children (Middleton and Hewison, 1997).

So when a family is suffering the problem from all dimensions, it is normal to refuse live that again, and to have positive attitudes towards genetic counseling, but deaf subjects who had negative attitudes towards genetic counseling, may lack of communication affect their answers.

### 5.8 Attitudes towards prenatal testing and abortion:

Subjects attitudes towards prenatal testing were positive (93\%) of them answered agree and strongly agree on (All of pregnant women have to do genetic analysis for the fetus), it is mentioned before that all of subjects had family history and experience of genetic disorders, and when asked if (Genetic counseling must be avoided because it increases the probability of abortion) $(96 \%)$ of them disagreed. That means that subjects had positive attitudes towards prenatal testing and abortion, which is similar to the finding of Thawabteh et al. (2005) that families of Thalassemia mutation show very good acceptability for prenatal diagnosis in Thalassemia-affected families, and all couples with affected fetuses opted for abortion; this study was conducted in Palestine. Another study about prenatal testing by qualitative interviews found that parents' decisions around selective termination were not being made by unknown people, but by members of their own family (Boardman, 2014). Abortion is not an easy decision, but may families base their decision on religious and medical beliefs and knowledge.

### 5.9 Attitudes towards using the IVF to avoid affected gene:

IVF could be used to avoid defected gene when couples want to have a healthy baby, ( $60 \%$ ) of parents inform negative attitudes, without significant differences between groups evaluations

A study conducted in the United Kingdom about pre-implantation diagnosis and other reproductive options in (IVF) to study attitudes of male
and female carriers of recessive disorders , the result shows that .the majority of the sample did not feel that it was the most useful option in their situation especially those who would not consider a termination (Snowdon and Green, 2000). Attitudes were negative among two different countries, which may be according to culture in Palestine, but according to fear of termination in the UK.

### 5.10 Conclusion:

The first hypothesis: Parents who have high knowledge about genetic testing and counseling expected to have positive attitudes toward s using it. This hypothesis had been accepted and the good knowledge evaluation parents had also positive attitudes towards genetic counseling and testing, chi square had been used to compare groups.

The second hypothesis: Parents who have more sick children have more knowledge and more positive attitudes towards genetic counseling.

This hypothesis had been rejected because it is found that no differences between the means and statistically no significant values, this is clear from the value of $\alpha$ which reach ( 0.167 ).

The third hypothesis: Parents who lost more children have good knowledge evaluation and more positive attitudes towards genetic counseling.

It is found that parents' attitudes were not affected by the number of lost children, (P-value: 0.875), so this hypothesis had been rejected.

### 5.11 Recommendations

1- The Ministry of health has to organize educational programs to increase people's awareness towards genetic problems and genetic counseling.

2- Adopt an initiative to start on inserting genetic tests in diagnostic process.

3- Expand the limitation of premarital tests to cover more genetic items.
4- Provide complementary laboratory services to cover genetic tests.

5- Recruit genetic counselors in primary health care centers.
6- Use media to publish awareness campaigns about consanguineous marriage and genetic problems, and about prenatal genetic exams.

7- Insert the genetic counseling in the process of antenatal care.

### 5.12 Summary :

In the West Bank governmental and private hospitals especially in pediatric wards there are no statistics about mortality rate of children who suffer from genetic disorders. In some occasions, many members from the same family have been diagnosed with the same disorder. From the researcher's own experience, there is a new child from the same family suffering from the same disease in the year after without any genetic counseling or any tool of prevention.

Unfortunately, only few population epidemiological studies were conducted to discover the incidence of genetic disorders among

Palestinians (Abu Lebdeh and Teebe, 2010), Except for thalassemic and hemophiliac patients (PHIC, 2013).

Sometimes, health professionals are unable to use a name to a genetic condition because it is newly appeared in some family. When this happens, physicians will say that a patient has an undiagnosed or rare genetic condition (NIH, 2011).

A quantitative descriptive cross sectional prospective survey had been used in this study using a questionnaire. The aim of the study was to describe the parents' knowledge about genetics and how it affects these attitudes toward genetic counseling and testing

The study was conducted in two hospitals in the West Bank: Al-Najah National Hospital in Nablus: pediatric ward and pediatric clinic (65\%) of subjects, and Palestine Medical Complex (PMC) in Ramallah: Pediatric suit (Neonate ICU, Pediatric ICU and Pediatric ward) (35\%) of subjects.

The questionnaire was built according to a literature review by the researcher and the supervisor with help from many experts in research and heredity. Data was collected from $(15 \backslash 2 \backslash 2016$ to $15 \backslash 9 \backslash 2016)$ the questionnaire contains four sections: Demographic data, associated risk factors, the section of knowledge; it is like a quiz to evaluate the awareness of parents, and the section of attitude to evaluate parent's attitudes toward genetic counseling and what their plan in the future to avoid it having other children with the same or other genetic problem is likert scale questionnaire
had been used in five aspects: (strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, strongly disagree).

Sample size (121) subjects, data analyzed by SPSS vergion 19.

Independent variables: education, address, age, number of children, income and Knowledge

Dependent variable: parents attitudes toward genetic testing and counseling There is a filter question (How many children with genetic disorders do you have?) this will help us to analyze the data.

In risk factors most risks were: Neglect the premarital genetic testing, consanguineous marriage and early marriage of mothers.

Ten questions had been used to evaluate parents' knowledge which was classified into three categories ( good, moderate, and weak), (5\%) of parents had weak evaluation, (31.4\%) of them their evaluation was moderate, and good knowledge evaluation was (63.6\%). People who had good knowledge had also positive attitudes towards genetic counseling and testing, chi square had been used to compare groups, then correlation was tested. Hypothesis 2 and 3: if number of lost or affected children affects parents knowledge and attitudes had been refused and there is no significant relationship.

According to the previous results it is recommended to increase people's awareness about genetic problems and genetic counseling especially
premarital and prenatal prevention, and to insert genetic testing in diagnostic process in national hospitals.
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## Annex (1) Questionnaire:



كلية الدراسات العليا
برنامـج ماجستير الصحة العامة
استنيان
المعرفة والموقف تجاه الاستشثارة الوراثية بين آباء الأطفال الذين يعانون من أمراض وراثية في الضفة الغربية/ فلسطين

اعداد الطالبة: فلسطين ياسين
المشرف: الدكتورة (يمان الثثاويش

معلومات أهالي الأطفال المصابين بأمراض وراثية عن الاستشارة الوراثية والفحص الجيني، وما
سيدي المشارك/ سيدي المشاركة:

أنا الباحثة فلسطين ياسين طالبة ماجستير صحة عامة في جامعة النجاح الوطنية يسرني أن
أدعوكم الى المشاركة في بحثي عن:
(معلومات أهالي الأطفال المصابين بأمراض وراثية عن الاستشارة الوراثية والفصص الجيني، وما رأيهم في اللجوء اليها)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { مع العلم أن لديك الحق في قبول أو رفض المشاركة في البحث و أخذ الوقت الكافي للالفكير في } \\
& \text { المشاركة أو عدمها كما لديك الحق في طلب تفسير السؤال الذي لا تفهمه. }
\end{aligned}
$$

نضمن لك الحفاظ على سرية المعلومات المتعلة بك ولن نطلب منك ادراج اسمك أو معلومات خاصة.

بامكانك الانسحاب من المشاركة في أي وقت دون الحاجة لأن تبدي أي عذر أو تبرير . الهـف من الدراسة:

نهذف من خال هذه الدراسة الى وصف مدى معلومانكم حول الاستشارة والفحص الجيني ومدى تأثير ذلك على آرائكم تجاه استخدامها فيا لمستقبل، للثك نرجوا من حضرتكم مسادتتا في تعبئة هذه الاستبانة حيث سيتم طرح السؤال عليكم وتعبئة الجواب من قبل الباحث حيث من المتوقع أن تأخذ من وقتكا خمسة عشر دققة حيث تتكون من أربعة أقسام: نتكون الاستبانة من ثلاثة أفسام:

القسم الأول : معلومات عامة عنكم القسم الثاني : أسباب وجود المرض الوراثي

القسم الثالث : أسئلة لاختبار معلومانكم حول الاستشارة الوراثية والفحص الجيني عليكم اختيار اجابة واحدة فقط لكل سؤال.

القسم الرابع : أسئلة تكثف رأيكم في اللجوء الى الاسنتارة الوراثية والفحوصات الجينية حيث ينم الجواب على هذه الأسئلة باختيار :(أرفض بشدة ، أرفض ، لا يهم ، أوافق، أوافق بشدة) كما أن مشاركنلك في هذا البحث ستساهم في دعم الوضع الصحي في الوطن ومحاولة انجاب جيل جديد خال من الأمراض الوراثية. اختيار المشاركين:

سيتم اختبار ذوي المرضى المصابين بأمراض مشخصة بأنها وراثية وقد تم إدخالهم إلى قسم الأطفال بسببها وذللك في مستشفى النجاح الوطني (قسم الأطفال)، و مجمع فلسطين الطبي (قسم العناية المكثفة بالأطفال الخدج وقسم العناية المكثفة بالأطفال، وقسم الأطفال). معلومات عن الباحثّة:

الاسم : فلسطين على حسين ياسين العنوان: عصيرة القبلية/ نابلس البريد الالكتروني: falasteen-yaseen@hotmail.com رقم الهاتف: شr

المشرف على البحث: الدكتورة إيمان الثاويش إن كنت موافقا على المشاركة في الدراسة نرجو من حضرتك النوقيع في الأسفل التوقيع:

القسم الأول : معلومات سكانية عامة (أرجو وضع رقم الإجابة في المكان المخصص للإجابة)

| الإجابة | خيارات الإجابة | السؤال | الرقم |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\square$ | ا. مدينة <br> r. برية <br> r. <br> غ. بادية | مكان السكن | .1 |
| $\square$ | ا. ذكر r. أ أنثى | الجنس | .r |
| $\square$ | ................. | العمر | .r |
| $\square$ | ا. لا شيء <br> r. <br> r. إعدادي <br> ٪. ثانوي <br> 0. دبلوم متوسط <br> 7. بكالوريوس فأعىى | الحالة التعليمية | . $¢$ |
|  | 1. <br> r. | العمل | . 0 |
|  | 1. . . 1 شيكل فأقل ro..-10.1. rer <br>  <br>  ه. أكثر من . . . ش شيكل | دخلك الثهري | . 7 |


|  | $\square \square$ إناث $\qquad$ ذكور $\square \square$ المجموع | عدد الأطفال | . $V$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\square$ إناث $\square$ ذكور $\square$ الدجموع | عد الأطفال المصابين بمرض وراثي | .^ |
| $\square$ | 1. تشوهات في القلب <br> r. سكري <br> r. أعصاب <br> \&. حموضة الام <br> 0. تكسر الام الوراثي <br> 7. هضمي <br> V <br> ^. <br> 9. مرض آخر، اذكره | نوع المرض الذي يعاني منه طفلك | . 9 |
| $\square$ | ע.r نع | هل فققت طفلا أو أطفالا بسبب مرض <br> وراثي؟ | . 1 |
|  | $\square$ إناث $\square$ ذكور $\square$ الججموع | إن كان جوابك نعم . كم عددهم | .11 |

القسم الثاني: العوامل المساعدة لظهو المرض الوراثي (أرجو وضع رقم الإجابة في المكان المخصص للإجابة)

| الإجابة | خيارات الإجابة | السؤل | الرقم |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\square$ |  | كم كان عمر الأم عند الزواج | . |
| $\square$ | ....................... | عمر الأم عند إنجاب الطفل الأول | .r |
| $\square$ | ע.1 نת- | هل يوجد قرابة بين الأم والأب؟ | .r |
| $\square$ | ا.أولى <br> ب. ثانية <br> r. ثالثة | إذا كان الجواب نعم ما درجة القرابة؟ | . |
| $\square$ | y.r نr | هل تم إجراء أي الفحوصات الوراثية قبل الزواج؟ (بالإضافة إلى فحص الثلاسيميا) | . 0 |
|  | ¢ ا.سلبية r. ايجابية | ماذا كانت النتيجة؟ | . 7 |
| $\square$ | y.r | هل لايكم أقارب مصابون بمرض وراثي ؟ | . V |
| $\square$ | 1. 1 .تشوهات في القلب <br> r. سكري r. أعصصاب <br> \&. حموضة الدم <br> 0. تكسر الدم الوراثي <br> 7. هضمي 「. جلاي <br> ^. عظمي 9. مرض آخر اذكره | إذا كان نعم ، ما هو نوع المرض ¢ |  |
| $\square$ | ע.t نr. | هل تقطنون في منطقة صناعية أو منطقة قريبة من إثعاعات (مفاعل ديمونا)؟ <br> ( الآن أو في السابق ) | . $\wedge$ |
| $\square$ | ע.r | هل قامت الأم خال الحمل بعمل صورة تلفزيونية للجنين (فحص الأعضاء) ؟ | . 9 |


| $\square$ | 1. أقل من أربعة أشهر r. r. أربعة أثهر أو أكثر | إذا كان الجواب نعم كم كان عمر الحمل (الجنين)؟ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\square$ | ע.r ن. | هل سبق أن قدمت لك معلومات عن الأمراض الوراثة وطرق انتقلها، والحد من انتشارها ؟ | 1. |
| $\square$ | 1. مركز صحي <br> r. r. وسائل الإعلام <br> r. r. مدرسة \&. الأسرة <br> ه. رجال الدين <br> 7. ندوة صحية <br> v. . من الناس المحيطين حولك | إن كان نعم ما هو مصدر المعلومة ¢ |  |

القسم الثالث: معلوماتك عن الاستشثارة الوراثية والاختبارات الجينة
(اختر الجواب الذي تعتقد أنه صحيح)

| الإجابة | خبارات الإجابة | السؤال | الرقم |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\square$ | ا ـ فحص الجينات الوراثية للأم والأب <br> r. فحص الحمض النووي للكثف عن صفة وراثية معينة <br> r. الكشف عن الكروموسومات التي تحمل الجينات <br> المصابة <br> ؛. كل ما ذكر صحيح | الفحص الوراثي هو ......... | .1 |
| $\square$ | 1. الجينات <br> r.r. العدوى بالملامسة <br> r. الماء والهواء اللموثان <br> ؛. لا ينتقل | المرض الوراثي ينتقل عن $\qquad$ | r |
| $\square$ | ا. النقليل من أطفال مصايين بأمراض وراثية <br> Y. إجهاض الجنين المصاب بالمرض الوراثي <br> r. علاج الطفل المصاب بالمرض الوراثي | الهدف الرئيسي من الاستثارة $\qquad$ | .r |
| $\square$ | 1. عند التخطيط للحمل <br> r. فـ الأششهر الأولى للحمل r. فـ الأشهر الأخيرة للحمل <br> ؛. ؛ بعد الولادة مباشرة | الوقت المناسب للاستثارة $\qquad$ | . |
| $\square$ | ע.r | يمكن الثقليل من الإصابة <br> بالأمراض الوراثة..........: | . 0 |
| $\square$ | ע.r نع | زواج الأقارب يزيد من احتمالية الإصابة بمرض وراثي........: | . 7 |


| $\square$ | ـ الأم <br> r. <br> r. | من السبب برأيك في انتقال <br> . المرض الوراثي | . V |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ا. في أول حمل فقط r. <br> 「. ليست ضرورية | الاستشارة الوراثثة ضرورية ... | .^ |
| $\square$ | 1. الأم والأب <br> r. الجد والجدة <br> r. أبناء العمومية <br> ६. لا داعي للفحص | الأفراد الذين يجب إخضاعهم <br> للاسنشارة الوراثية إلى جانب <br> الطفل المصاب هم | . 9 |
|  | 1. علاج الأمراض الوراثية <br> Y. التحكم في انتشار بعض الأمراض الوراثية في المجتمع <br> r. تحديد جنس المولود <br> \& .تجنب التترض للأمراض المعدية | برأبك ما أهمية الاستشارة <br> الوراثبة قبل الزواج .....: | .). |
|  | ا. ضعيف <br> r. r. متوسط r. جيد | النقيبيم |  |

القسم الرابع: رأيك في اللجوء إلى الاستثشارة الوراثية والفحوصات الجينية قبل الإنجاب
أرجو وضع إشارة (V) أسفل الكلمة التي تعبر عن رأيك:

| أوافق <br> بشدة | أواقق | لا رأي | أعارض | أعارض بشدة | السؤل | الرقم |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | ينبغي على الأفراد عمل فحوصـات وراثية عـد <br> اختيار الزوج/النزجة | . |
|  |  |  |  |  | ينبغي على كل النساء الحوامل عمل فحوصات وراثية للجبّين | .r |
|  |  |  |  |  | ينغـي أن يكـون الفـص الـوراثي متاــا لأي شخص يحتّاجه | r |
|  |  |  |  |  | يجب أن تتوفر الاستشــارة الوراثـة حتى للعائلـة <br> الني ليس لديها ناريخ في الأمراض الوراثية | . |
|  |  |  |  |  | الاستثـارة الوراثيـة لا يجب اللجوء إلبيها نهائيـا لأسباب ديبية واجتماعية | . |
|  |  |  |  |  | تستخدم تنتــات أطفـال الأنابيب لاختــار الجين <br> السليم عند الرغبة في الإنجاب. | . |
|  |  |  |  |  | يجب عمل فحص وراثي لكل المواليد الجدد | v |
|  |  |  |  |  | مـن حـق كـل فـرد أن يعـرف قابلبتـهـ للنـــرض للكمراض الوراثبة خال حياته. | . $\lambda$ |
|  |  |  |  |  | من حق كل فرد أن يعرف احتمالية إنجاب أطفال مصايين بأمراض وراثة. | . 9 |
|  |  |  |  |  | يجب النتليم بالهرض الوراثي دون تخل. | . 1 |


| أوافق <br> بشدة | أوافق | لا رأي | أعارض | أعارض بشدة | السؤال | الرقم |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | . 11 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  لإنجاب طفل في المستقبل. | . 1 r |
|  |  |  |  |  | أنصح أبنائي في الدستقبل باللجوء إلى الاستشارة <br> الوراثية قبل الزواج | . $1 \times$ |
|  |  |  |  |  | ظهور المـرض الوراثي يمنع من الاستمرار في زواج الأقارب في العائلة. | .) $\leqslant$ |
|  |  |  |  |  | تجربـة الإصابة بمرض وراثي داخل الأسرة تزيد من الاهتمام بالاستشارة الوراثية | . 10 |
|  |  |  |  |  | الفحوصـات الوراثيـة نسـاعد على كثـف الوضـع <br> الصحي للمقبلين على الزواج وإلحاق الضرر بهم | . 17 |
|  |  |  |  |  | الاستشـارة الوراثية نساعد على الابتعاد عن زواج <br> الأقارب. | . V |
|  |  |  |  |  | الاستثــارة الوراثيـة تقلل من احتماليـة إصـابة أحد <br> أفراد الأسرة بمرض وراثي | . 11 |
|  |  |  |  |  | مـن المهم توضيح رأي الثـرع في اتخـاذ القرار المناسـب فـي الـزواج حسـب التـاريخ الصــحي لعائلنتي المخطوبين | . 19 |
|  |  |  |  |  | المعلومـات المقـمـة لـي عن الاستنـــارة الوراثـــة <br> غير كافية. | .r. |
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| أوافق <br> بشدة | أوافق | لا رأي | أعارض | أعارض <br> بشدة | السؤال | الرقم |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | الهختبرات التي تقدم خمة الفحص الوراثي غير متوفرة في منطتّي. | .r |
|  |  |  |  |  | النكاليف المرنفعة للاستشارة الوراثية تشكل عائق <br> في اللجوء إليها. | . M |

## Annex (2): Tables <br> Table (4.5): Attitudes

| Attitudes |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Attitude |  | N | \% |
| 1. Couples have to do genetic testing when they plan to get marry | disagree | 2 | 1.7 |
|  | I don't know | 12 | 9.9 |
|  | Agree | 107 | 88.4 |
| 2. All of pregnant women have to do genetic test for the fetus | disagree | 5 | 4.1 |
|  | I don't know | 3 | 2.5 |
|  | Agree | 113 | 93.3 |
| 3.Experience of genetic problem in the family will increase their care about genetic counseling. | disagree | 1 | . 8 |
|  | I don't know | 2 | 1.7 |
|  | Agree | 108 | 97.5 |
| 4. Genetic testing have to be available for people as needed. | disagree | 0 | 0 |
|  | I don't know | 1 | . 8 |
|  | Agree | 120 | 99.2 |
| 5. Genetic counseling must be available even for families which family history free of genetic problems. | disagree | 22 | 18.2 |
|  | I don't know | 8 | 6.6 |
|  | Agree | 91 | 75.2 |
| 6. Genetic counseling had been never used for religious and social causes | disagree | 101 | 83.5 |
|  | I don't know | 17 | 14.0 |
|  | Agree | 3 | 2.5 |
| 7. IVF could be used to avoid defected gene when couples wont to | disagree | 27 | 22.4 |
|  | I don't know | 45 | 37.2 |


| have a healthy baby. | Agree | 49 | 40.5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8. Genetic testing must be done for all of new born. | Disagree | 12 | 9.9 |
|  | I don't know | 14 | 11.6 |
|  | Agree | 95 | 78.5 |
| 9. Each person have the right to know if he is risky to have a genetic problem in the future | Disagree | 4 | 3.7 |
|  | I don't know | 1 | . 8 |
|  | Agree | 116 | 95.9 |
| 10. Each person have the right to know the probability to have a child with genetic problem | Disagree | 5 | 4.1 |
|  | I don't know | 87 | 71.9 |
|  | Agree | 29 | 23.9 |
| 11.We have to bow to the genetic problems without interference | Disagree | 110 | 90.9 |
|  | I don't know | 2 | 1.7 |
|  | Agree | 9 | 7.4 |
| 12.Genetic counseling must be avoided because it is increase the probability to abortion | Disagree | 96 | 79.3 |
|  | I don't know | 12 | 9.9 |
|  | Agree | 13 | 10.8 |
| 13. I will take a genetic consultation when I plan for pregnancy in the future | Disagree | 10 | 8.2 |
|  | I don't know | 6 | 5.0 |
|  | Agree | 105 | 86.7 |
| 14.I advice my children to have genetic counseling before marriage | Disagree | 3 | 2.5 |
|  | I don't know | 3 | 2.5 |
|  | Agree | 115 | 95 |
| 15. The presence of genetic disorder in a family may lead them to stop consanguineous Marriage. | Disagree | 9 | 7.5 |
|  | I don't know | 7 | 5.8 |
|  | Agree | 105 | 86.8 |


| 106 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16. Genetic testing help couples to discover their genetic history and may destroy their relationship | Disagree | 21 | 17.3 |
|  | I don't know | 16 | 13.2 |
|  | Agree | 84 | 96.5 |
| 17. Genetic counseling lead to avoid consanguineous marriage | Disagree | 4 | 3.3 |
|  | I don't know | 5 | 4.1 |
|  | Agree | 112 | 92.6 |
| 18. Genetic counseling decrease the probability of having genetic problem | Disagree | 18 | 14.8 |
|  | I don't know | 13 | 10.7 |
|  | Agree | 90 | 74.3 |
| 19. It is important to clarify the Islamic view in making the right decision to marry according to my family health history | Disagree | 8 | 6.6 |
|  | I don't know | 34 | 28.1 |
|  | Agree | 79 | 65.3 |
| 20. My information about genetic counseling are not insufficient | Disagree | 32 | 26.5 |
|  | I don't know | 5 | 4.1 |
|  | Agree | 84 | 69.4 |
| 21. Laboratories that offer genetic testing service is not available in my country | Disagree | 8 | 6.6 |
|  | I don't know | 3 | 2.5 |
|  | Agree | 111 | 90.9 |
| 22. High cost of genetic counseling may decrease the desire to take it | Disagree | 11 | 9.1 |
|  | I don't know | 6 | 5 |
|  | Agree | 104 | 86 |

Annex(3) Chi-square analysis (relationship between knowledge and attitudes)

| Attitude |  | Knowledge evaluation |  |  | Total | P-value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | weak | moderate | good |  |  |
| 1. Couples have to do genetic testing when they plan to get marry | Strongly disagree | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0 \% \end{gathered}$ | 0.004 |
|  | Disagree | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ 0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ 0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 100 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ 100 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | I don't know | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 16.7 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ 66.7 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 16.7 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Agree | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ 4.8 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 26 \\ 31.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 54 \\ 64.3 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 84 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Strongly agree | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ \hline .0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ 17.4 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ 82.6 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 23 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 5.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 38 \\ 31.4 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 77 \\ 63.6 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 121 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 2. All of pregnant women have to do genetic analysis for the fetus | Strongly disagree | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0 \% \end{gathered}$ | 0.47 |
|  | Disagree | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 20 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ 80.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | I don't know | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 66.7 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 33.3 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Agree | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 6.3 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 32 \\ 33.3 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 58 \\ 60.4 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 96 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Strongly agree | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ 0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 17.6 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 14 \\ 82.4 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 5.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 38 \\ 31.4 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 77 \\ 63.6 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 121 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 3.Experience of genetic problem in the family will increase their care about genetic counseling | Strongly disagree | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ .0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ 0.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ .0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | 0.07 |
|  | Disagree | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ .0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ .0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | I don't know | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ .0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ .0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Agree | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ 5.6 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 28 \\ 31.1 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 57 \\ 63.3 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 90 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Strongly agree | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 3.6 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ 25.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ 71.4 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 28 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 5.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 38 \\ 31.4 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 77 \\ 63.6 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 121 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 4. Genetic testing have | Strongly disagree | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0 \% \end{gathered}$ | 0.06 |


|  |  |  | 108 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| to be available for people as needed | Disagree | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0.0 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | I don't know | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Agree | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 6.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ 35 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 59 \\ 59 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Strongly agree | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 15.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17 \\ 85.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 5.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 38 \\ 31.4 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 77 \\ 63.6 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 121 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
| ```5.Genetic counseling must be available even for families which family history free of genetic problems``` | Strongly disagree | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | 0.02 |
|  | Disagree | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 13.6 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ 45.5 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ 40.9 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | I don't know | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 12.5 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 25.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ 62.5 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Agree | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 2.6 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 23 \\ 29.9 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 52 \\ 67.5 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 77 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Strongly agree | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ .0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 21.4 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ 78.6 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 5.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 38 \\ 31.4 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 77 \\ 63.6 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 121 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 6. Genetic counseling had been never used for religious and social causes | Strongly disagree | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 2.3 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ 20.5 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 34 \\ 77.3 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 44 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | 0.001 |
|  | Disagree | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 1.8 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ 35.1 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 36 \\ 63.2 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 57 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | I don't know | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ 23.5 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 35.3 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ 41.2 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Agree | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ .0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ .0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Strongly agree | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 00.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 00.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 00.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 00.0 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 5.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 38 \\ 31.4 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 77 \\ 63.6 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 121 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 7. IVF could be used to avoid defected gene when couples wont to have a healthy baby | Strongly disagree | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ .0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 33.3 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ 66.7 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | 0.18 |
|  | Disagree | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 4.8 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ 42.9 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ 52.4 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | I don't know | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 6.7 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17 \\ 37.8 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ 55.6 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 45 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Agree | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 2.5 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ 22.5 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ 75.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 40 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Strongly agree | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 11.1 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 11.1 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ 77.8 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 5.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 38 \\ 31.4 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 77 \\ 63.6 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 121 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 8. Genetic testing must | Strongly disagree | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0.02 |


| 109 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| be done for all of new Born | Disagree | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 16.7 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 50.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ 33.3 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { I don't } \\ \hline \end{array}$ know | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 7.1 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 42.9 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ 50.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Agree | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 4.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ 32.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 48 \\ 64.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 75 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Strongly agree | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ .0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 10.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 18 \\ 90.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 20 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 5.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 38 \\ 31.4 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 77 \\ 63.6 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 121 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 9. Each person have the right to know his risk to have a genetic problem in the future | Strongly disagree | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ .0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ .0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0.16 |
|  | Disagree | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ .0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 50.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 50.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | I don't know | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ .0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ .0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Agree | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 6.6 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 33 \\ 36.3 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 52 \\ 57.1 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 91 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Strongly } \\ & \text { agree } \end{aligned}$ | Strongly agree | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ .0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 12.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 22 \\ 88.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Total | Total | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 5.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 38 \\ 31.4 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 77 \\ 63.6 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 10. Each person have the right to know the probability to have a child with genetic problem | Strongly disagree | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ .0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ .0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0.3 |
|  | Disagree | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | I don't know | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ .0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 25.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 75.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Agree | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 6.9 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 33 \\ 37.9 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 48 \\ 55.2 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 87 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Strongly agree | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ .0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ 14.3 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ 85.7 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 28 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 5.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 38 \\ 31.4 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 77 \\ 63.6 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 121 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 11. We have to bow to the genetic problems without interference | Strongly disagree | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 1.8 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ 28.1 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 40 \\ 70.2 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 57 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0.01 |
|  | Disagree | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 5.7 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17 \\ 32.1 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 33 \\ 62.3 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 53 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | I don't know | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ .0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ .0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Agree | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 25.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 25.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ 50.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Strongly agree | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ .0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ .0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 5.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 38 \\ 31.4 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 77 \\ 63.6 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 121 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |


|  |  |  | 110 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12. Genetic counseling must be avoided because it is increase the probability to abortion. | Strongly disagree | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ .0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ 29.8 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 33 \\ 70.2 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 47 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0.01 |
|  | Disagree | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 6.1 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ 18.4 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 37 \\ 75.5 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 49 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { I don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 16.7 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ 58.3 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 25.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Agree | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 9.1 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ 63.6 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 27.3 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Strongly agree | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ .0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 50.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 50.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 5.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 38 \\ 31.4 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 77 \\ 63.6 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 121 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 13. I will take a genetic consultation when I plan for pregnancy in the future | Strongly disagree | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ .0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ .0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0.5 |
|  | Disagree | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 11.1 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 33.3 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ 55.6 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | I don't know | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 16.7 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 16.7 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ 66.7 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Agree | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 2.6 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 28 \\ 36.4 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 47 \\ 61.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 77 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Strongly agree | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 7.1 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 21.4 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ 71.4 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 28 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 5.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 38 \\ 31.4 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 77 \\ 63.6 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 121 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 14. I advice my children to have genetic counseling before marriage | Strongly disagree | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ .0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ .0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | 0.7 |
|  | Disagree | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ .0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 50.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 50.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | I don't <br> know | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 66.7 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 33.3 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ .0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Agree | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 2.5 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ 37.5 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 48 \\ 60.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 80 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Strongly <br> agree | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 5.7 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 17.1 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 27 \\ 77.1 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ 100.0 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Total | 6 | 38 | 77 | 121 |  |
|  |  | 5.0\% | 31.4\% | 63.6\% | 100.0\% |  |
| 15. The | Strongly <br> disagree | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0.3 |
| presence of |  | . $0 \%$ | . $0 \%$ | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |  |
| genetic | Disagree | 0 | 5 | 2 | 7 |  |
| disorder in a |  | .0\% | 71.4\% | 28.6\% | 100.0\% |  |
| family may | I don't | 2 | 4 | 1 | 7 |  |
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| leadthem to stop | know | 28.6\% | 57.1\% | 14.3\% | 100.0\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Agree | 4 | 24 | 56 | 84 |  |
| consanguineo |  | 4.8\% | 28.6\% | 66.7\% | 100.0\% |  |
| us marriage | Strongly | 0 | 5 | 16 | 21 |  |
|  | agree | . $0 \%$ | 23.8\% | 76.2\% | 100.0\% |  |
|  | Total | 6 | 38 | 77 | 121 |  |
|  |  | 5.0\% | $31.4 \%$ | 63.6\% | 100.0\% |  |
| 16. Genetic | Strongly | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0.2 |
| testing help | disagree | . $0 \%$ | .0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |  |
| couples to | Disagree | 1 | 6 | 10 | 17 |  |
| discover their |  | 5.9\% | 35.3\% | 58.8\% | 100.0\% |  |
| genetic | I don't | 1 | 5 | 10 | 16 |  |
| history | know | 6.3\% | 31.3\% | 62.5\% | 100.0\% |  |
| And may destroy their relationship | Agree | 4 | 24 | 43 | 71 |  |
|  |  | 5.6\% | $33.8 \%$ | 60.6\% | 100.0\% |  |
|  | Strongly | 0 | 3 | 10 | 13 |  |
|  | agree | . $0 \%$ | 23.1\% | 76.9\% | 100.0\% |  |
|  | Total | 6 | 38 | 77 | 121 |  |
|  |  | 5.0\% | $31.4 \%$ | 63.6\% | 100.0\% |  |
| 17. Genetic | Strongly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.04 |
| counseling | disagree | . $0 \%$ | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 00.0\% |  |
| lead to avoid | Disagree | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 |  |
| consanguineo |  | . $0 \%$ | 100.0\% | . $0 \%$ | 100.0\% |  |


| us marriage | I don't | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | know | $.0 \%$ | $60.0 \%$ | $40.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
|  | Agree | 5 | 27 | 61 | 93 |


| Islamic view in making the |  | .0\% | 37.5\% | 62.5\% | 100.0\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| in making the right decision | $\begin{aligned} & \text { I don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 5.9 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ 41.2 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 18 \\ 52.9 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 34 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
| to marry according to | Agree | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 4.3 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ 27.5 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 47 \\ 68.1 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 69 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
| according to my family health history | Strongly <br> agree | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 10.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 20.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ 70.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 5.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 38 \\ 31.4 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 77 \\ 63.6 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 121 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 20. My information about genetic counseling are not insufficient | Strongly <br> disagree | 0 <br> .0\% | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 3 <br> $100.0 \%$ | 0.6 |
|  | Disagree | 0 <br> .0\% | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ 34.5 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ 65.5 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 29 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | I don't <br> know | 0 <br> .0\% | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 20.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ 80.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Agree | 4 <br> 6.3\% | $\begin{gathered} 18 \\ 28.1 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 42 <br> 65.6\% | 64 $100.0 \%$ |  |
|  | Strongly <br> agree | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 10.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ 45.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ 45.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 5.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 38 \\ 31.4 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 77 \\ 63.6 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 121 \\ 100.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 21.Laboratori es that offer | Strongly <br> disagree | 0 <br> .0\% | 0 $.0 \%$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 00.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 00.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0.8 |
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| genetic testing | Disagree | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| service is not |  | . $0 \%$ | . $0 \%$ | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |  |
| available inmy | I don't | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |  |
|  | know | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% | 100.0\% |  |
| Country | Agree | 1 | 20 | 35 | 56 |  |
|  |  | 1.8\% | 35.7\% | 62.5\% | 100.0\% |  |
|  | Strongly | 5 | 18 | 31 | 54 |  |
|  | agree | 9.3\% | 33.3\% | 57.4\% | 100.0\% |  |
|  | Total | 6 | 38 | 77 | 121 |  |
|  |  | 5.0\% | 31.4\% | 63.6\% | 100.0\% |  |
| 22. High cost | Strongly | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0.6 |
| of | disagree | 50.0\% | . $0 \%$ | 50.0\% | 100.0\% |  |
| genetic | Disagree | 0 | 1 | 8 | 9 |  |
| counseling |  | .0\% | 11.1\% | 88.9\% | 100.0\% |  |
| may decreasethe desire to |  | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 |  |
|  | know | . $0 \%$ | 50.0\% | 50.0\% | 100.0\% |  |
| take it | Agree | 1 | 16 | 28 | 45 |  |
|  |  | 2.2\% | 35.6\% | 62.2\% | 100.0\% |  |
|  | Strongly | 4 | 18 | 37 | 59 |  |
|  | agree | 6.8\% | 30.5\% | 62.7\% | 100.0\% |  |
|  | Total | 6 | 38 | 77 | 121 |  |
|  |  | 5.0\% | 31.4\% | 63.6\% | 100.0\% |  |

## Annex (4): Table of Literature Review

|  | Methodology |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Author, year and Title | Aim, Study design and tool | Population and Sample | Finding |
| (Felicity.Kate | Cross sectional | Population: | idea that such |
|  |  |  | screening and |
| Boardman, 2014) | Tool: | Families.and | selective termination |
| UK(The | Qualitative | individuals. | decisions are made in |
| expressivity | interview (over the | living with a genetic | the context of |
| objection.to | telephone (75\%), | .disease in | ignorance, or even |
| prenatal.testing: | via email (17\%) |  | prejudiced ideas, |
| The.experiences of | and face-to-face | sample: | about the reality of |
| Families.living | (8\%). | stratified sample | that particular |
| with.genetic | Aim: | 61 subject | condition. Indeed, |
|  |  |  | for families living |
| disease) | to explore the role |  | with inheritable |
|  | that experiential |  | diseases such as |
|  | knowledge of SMA |  | SMA, these |
|  | played in |  | decisions around |
|  | reproductive |  | selective termination |
|  | decision-making |  | were not being made |
|  | and attitudes |  | by unknown others, |
|  | towards having |  | but by members of |
|  | children with SMA |  | their own family. |


| ABALI,A. | Cross sectional | Families of | There were positive |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AYAYDIN, | State-Trait Anxiety | hemophilic patients | correlations between |
| H20014, turkey | Scale | Sample: | overprotective |
| (An examination of | Aim: | Forty-two | mothering and |
| the symptoms of | To assess | male patients | marital conflict. |
| anxiety and parental | symptoms of | between the | Also, another |
| attitude in | anxiety in children | ages of 7 and 16 | positive correlation |
| children with | with hemophilia | diagnosed and | was obtained |
| hemophilia) | and parental | followed as | between marital |
|  | attitude towards | hemophiliac. | conflict and strict |
|  | children with |  | discipline. |
|  | hemophilia. |  | Fifteen mothers |
|  |  |  | showed significant |
|  |  |  | anxiety disorder |
|  | Interventional | Unmarried female | This study highlights |
| Ibrahim, N. Al-Bar, | study. | students | that knowledge of |
| H. Al-Fakeeh,A | Tool: | In King Abdul-Aziz | female uni- versity |
| 2012, KSA | Questionnaire | University | students about the |
| (An educational | before education | Sample: | PMS program was |
| program about | And another after | Multi-stage stratified | low before the |
| premarital screening | education program | random sample | educational |
| for | Aim: | method was used | campaign. On the |
| unmarried | present study was | with recruitment | other hand, there was |
| female students in | conducted | of 1563 students | general positive |


| King Abdul- | to assess |  | attitude towards the |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aziz University, | knowledge and |  | importance of the |
| Jeddah | attitude of |  | PMS. Our |
|  | unmarried female |  | educational program |
|  | students in King |  | was successful in |
|  | Abdul-Aziz |  | improving students' |
|  | University (KAU) |  | knowledge about |
|  | towards premari- |  | PMS. |
|  | tal screening |  |  |
|  | (PMS) program, to |  | There is certainly a |
|  | determine |  | need for more |
|  | predictors of high |  | information and |
|  | students' |  | education about the |
|  | knowledge scores |  | program. |
|  | and to improve |  |  |
|  | their knowledge |  |  |
|  | about PMS through |  |  |
|  | conduction of an |  |  |
|  | educational |  |  |
| Awatif A. Alam | Cross sectional | Population: | The students in the |
| 2006 ksa | KAP survey | female students of | present study |
| (perception of | Tool: | King Saud University | demanded the |
| female students of | Questionnaire |  | extension of PMS to |


| king saud university | Aim: | sample: | investigate and |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| towards premarital | To in assess the | simple random | screen for other |
| screening | attitudes of | sampling method | diseases especially |
|  | university students |  | sexually transmitted |
|  | in Abha, KSA, in | 135 students | diseases likely to |
|  | 2002 towards |  | adversely affect the |
|  | premarital |  | health of individuals |
|  | counseling. |  | and the community. |
| (Hietala, M \& | A case control | The population: | survey indicated that |
| Hakonen, A \& Aro, | study using self | 1)Normal finland | the Finnish |
| A \& Peltonen,L \& | reported | population | population in |
| Aula, P.2000) | questionnaire | 2)Relatives of pt.s | general, and family |
| Finland |  | with genetic | members of |
| (Attitudes toward | Aim: | disorders | patients with AGU in |
| Genetic Testing | explore the | Sampling: | particular, have a |
| among the General | attitudes of the | 2 stratified samples | positive attitude |
| Population | Finnish | -control group: | toward genetic |
| and Relatives of | population toward | (1169 subjects) | testing in risk |
| Patients with a | genetic testing | -case group: (82 | determination for a |
| Severe Genetic |  | subjects | variety |
| Disease: |  |  | of genetically |
| A Survey from |  |  | determined disorders. |
| Finland) |  |  |  |


| (Snowdon, C. \& | A cross sectional | Population: | The majority of the |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Green, J. 2000) UK | questionnaire | Couples carrying a | sample did not feel |
| (Preimplantation | passed study. | recessive disorder | that it was the most |
| diagnosis and other | Aim: | whom recorded in | useful option in their |
| reproductive | describes in detail | four genetics centers | situation |
| options: attitudes of | the | in the UK. | Those who would |
| male and female | attitudes of | Sample: | not consider a |
| carriers of <br> recessive disorders) | carriers of | The couple were still | termination were also |
|  | recessive disorders | together; they were | those most likely to |
|  | to pre- | of an age where they | choose PID, and it is |
|  | implantation | may still be | for this group that |
|  | Diagnosis (PID). In | considering (more) | PID may really offer |
|  | IVF | children. | something new. |
| Ellington, L. | Pre and post test | Population: African | when providers were |
| Maxwel, A. 2006 | protocol | American kinder | informing clients that |
| USA | Tool : | have a genetic | they |
|  | Interview analyzed | mutation | were mutation |
| Genetic counseling | By RAIS scale | Sample: | carriers, they |
| communication | Aim: | 87 participants that | provided more |
| with an African | to open the "black | underwent genetic | Biomedical |
| American | box', of | testing, 85 | information and |
| BRCA1 kindred | genetic counseling | participated in the | Psychosocial |
|  | communication | post-test session and | communication |
|  |  | 46 participants' pre- | (which includes |


| 120 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | and post-test sessions | discussion of results with family members) and asked more psychosocial questions than when they talking with non-carriers. |
| (Awwad, R 2007) | A cross sectional | Population: | Several similarities |
| Palestine | comparative study | Tow group | and differences in |
| (Culture and | Tool: | population | native Palestinian |
| Acculturation | Demographic form | 1)Native Palestinian | and |
| Influences on | and interview | 2)American | Palestinian American |
| Palestinian | Aim: | Palestinian | responses were |
| Perceptions of | To investigate | Sample: | obtained. Similarities |
| Prenatal Genetic | influences of | 17 native Palestinians | appear to be due to |
| Counseling) | culture and | and 14 Palestinian | common cultural |
|  | acculturation on | Americans | roots, while |
|  | prenatal decision |  | differences |
|  | making processes |  | may be due to |
|  | of |  | acculturation. |
|  | native Palestinians |  |  |
|  | and Palestinian |  |  |
|  | Americans. |  |  |


| 121 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (Wertz,D. Janes,S, | A cross sectional | Population: | Attitudes toward prenatal diagnosis- |
| 1992) | study | All parents who | and <br> the decisions that it |
| Israel | Tool: | visited CF centers | may present-may be |
| (Attitudes toward | Anonymous survey | within 4 mo of | related to fundamental |
| the Prenatal | questionnaires | a center's entry into | perceptions of the |
| Diagnosis of Cystic | Aim: | the study were asked | affected child that go beyond the child's |
| Fibrosis: | to explore | to participate. | present |
| Factors in Decision | psychosocial |  | health status or the parents' |
| Making among <br> Affected Families) | factors underlying | Sample: | Many parents |
|  | decisions about use of prenatal | 318 families receiving | in this study said that, after seeing retarded or |
|  | Diagnosis for | questionnaires, 227 | severely disabled |
|  | cystic fibrosis | (71\%) responded. | children in their visits to pediatric |
|  | (CF), among |  | clinics, they |
|  | parents of affected |  | considered themselves fortunate |
|  | children. |  | to have a child with CF . |
| (Rantanen,A. 2014) | Tool: | Population: | On the basis of the |
| Finland | Literature review | international | analysis of all |
|  | Aim: | guidelines and | perspectives, the |
|  | to review the kinds | recommendations, | ideal genetic |
| (Expectations, | of expectations that | produced mostly by | ounseling |
| frames and practices | are concentrated | international | seems to consist of |
| of genetic ounseling | on genetic |  | information about the |


| in different contexts | ounseling, and the | the WHO and | test, the condition, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| of genetic testing) | different conceptions of | professional | the risks and their |
|  |  | associations. Which | management; and of |
|  | genetic information | naturally occurring | support in adjusting |
|  | that lie behind those expectations. | data that interestingly | to this information |
|  |  | reflect the ideals of | and in decision- |
|  |  | genetic ounseling. | making |
|  |  | Sample: | concerning the test |
|  |  | The 56 | and its result. |
|  |  | documents produced |  |
|  |  | by 29 different |  |
|  |  | organizations. |  |


| Meiser,B \& | A meta-analytic | Published studies | This review |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Halliday, | review | about heredity breast | highlighted that most |
| 2002(What is the | Aim: | cancer and genetic | research so |
| impact of genetic | to determine the | counseling | far focused on |
| ounseling in women | impact of genetic |  | generalized distress |
| at increased risk | ounseling on |  | and anxiety and |
| of developing | women with a |  | accuracy of |
| hereditary breast | family history of |  | perceived risk, to the |
| cancer? | Breast cancer. |  | exclusion of other, |
| A meta-analytic |  |  | perhaps equally |
| review) |  |  | Important |
|  |  |  | types of outcomes. |


| 124 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (Middleton, A. | Tool: | Population: | The sample group as |
| Hewison, J 1998) | questionnaire | There were 140 | a whole had a |
| UK(Attitudes of | Aim: | delegates in the | negative attitude |
| Deaf | to document the | auditorium; | toward genetics |
| Adults toward | attitudes of deaf | completed | and genetic testing |
| Genetic Testing for | adults toward | questionnaires were | for deafness. |
| Hereditary | genetic | collected from 124 |  |
| Deafness) | testing for deafness. | British individuals |  |
|  |  | (response rate 89\%), |  |
|  |  | 83 of whom |  |
|  |  | considered |  |
|  |  | themselves "deaf" |  |
|  |  | and 4 of whom |  |
|  |  | considered |  |
|  |  | themselves |  |
|  |  | "hearing impaired." |  |
|  |  | Sample : |  |
|  |  | 87 individuals in 46 |  |
|  |  | (53\%) considered |  |
|  |  | themselves culturally |  |
|  |  | Deaf, and 37 (43\%) |  |
|  |  | identified equally |  |
|  |  | with the Deaf and |  |
|  |  | hearing communities; |  |


| (Afifi, H. Al-robe, F | A prevalence study | Population: | A high prevalence of |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2010) Egypt | Tool: | -visitors of outpatient | genetic disorders |
| (The most | Medical files | clinic in Al-Giza | among Egyptians |
| encountered | Aim: | -NICU in Al-Giza | with frequencies |
| Group of genetic | To present the | Governmental | comparable with |
| disorders in Giza | prevalence of | Hospital | other Arab areas |
| Governorate, Egypt | genetic disorders in | Sample: 73260 pt |  |
|  | Al-Giza ,Egypt |  |  |
| (Dolev, Y. Weiner, | a cross-national | Population: | interviewees from |
| N | comparative study | Two groups of | these two groups |
| 2008) | tool: | Israeli and Germany | share similar |
| (New reproductive | interviews | counselors | knowledge |
| technologies, |  |  | concerning the fetus, |
| genetic ounseling | to compare | Sample: | and face similar |
| and the | between Israeli and | 18 Israeli and 14 | moral dilemmas in |
| standing of the | Germany morals | German genetic | their professional |
| fetus: views from | in the use of | counsellers | practice, they |
| Germany and Israel) | genetic technology |  | employ different |
|  | and genetic |  | ethical reasoning in |
|  | counseling |  | their considerations |
|  |  |  | of the fetus. |
| (MORREN, M. and | Cross sectional | Population: | It was found that |
| RIJKEN, R . 2006) | study | Respondents of the | while chronically ill |
| (Perceived genetic | Questionnaire and | 'Panel of Patients | patients indicate they |


| 126 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| knowledge, | DNA testing. | with Chronic | know little about |
| attitudes towards | Aim: | Diseases' (PPCD) in | genetic testing, their |
| genetic testing, and | to examine to what | Netherlands. | general view is |
| the relationship | extent patients with | Sample: | positive, although |
| between these <br> among patients with <br> a chronic disease) | chronic diseases | 1916 patients. | they also expressed |
|  | perceive to have genetic knowledge | Age at least 15 years, | some fears and |
|  |  | living independently, | worries. In addition, |
| a chronic disease) | and what their | being aware of the | older and less |
|  | attitudes towards | diagnosis, being | educated patients |
|  | genetics and | mentally and | perceived to have |
|  | genetic testing are. | physically fit to | relatively little |
|  |  | participate. | genetic knowledge |
|  |  |  | and found it more |
|  |  |  | difficult to form an |
|  |  |  | opinion about |
|  |  |  | genetics. We also |
|  |  |  | investigated the |
|  |  |  | relationship between |
|  |  |  | knowledge and |
|  |  |  | attitudes among |
|  |  |  | chronic patients. |




| (Siani and Assaraf, | Comparative study | Population: | the most influential |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2015) (University | Tool: Likert scale | Undergraduate | is the students' |
| Students' Attitudes | questionnaire | students from a | religious affiliation. |
| towards Genetic | Aim: To | variety of higher | Religious students, |
| Testing: A | examine the | education institutes | especially those who |
| Comparative Study) | attitudes of | throughout Israel. | do not study life |
|  | undergraduate | Sample: | sciences (LS), place |
|  | Israeli students | 490 students | less trust in genetic |
|  | toward genetic |  | tests than secular |
|  | issues and learn |  | Students of LS show |
|  | how these are |  | more critical thinking |
|  | affected by the |  | towards genetic |
|  | field they study, |  | testing than others. |
|  | their religious |  | Gender was least |
|  | affiliation and their |  | influential, showing |
|  | gender. |  | a mixed trend of. |
| (Fitzgerald-Butt, et | Cross sectional | Population: | Genetic knowledge |
| al, 2014) | study | parents of children | was assessed on an |
| (Genetic | Tool: | with CHD who | adapted measure on |
| Knowledge and | Likert scale | previously consented | which themean |
| Attitudes of Parents | questionnaire | to participate in a | percent correct was |
| of Children with | Aim: | separate research | 73.8\%. Educational |
| Congenital Heart | To measure the | study of the genetic | attainment and |
| Defects) | demographics, | etiology of left | household income |



| Two Year Follow- | genetic knowledge | diseases (CVD) were | be considered |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Up Study in | and | selected from the | an indicator for the |
| Patients with | attitude towards | Panel on the basis of | necessity |
| Asthma, Diabetes | genetic testing of | the patient's first | of social debates on |
| Mellitus and | patients with | diagnosis according | genetic |
| Cardiovascular | asthma, diabetes | to the followingcodes | testing. |
| Disease) | mellitus type II and | of the International |  |
|  | cardiovascular | Classification of |  |
|  |  | Primary Care. <br> Sample: 577 patients <br> responded: 299 <br> patients with asthma, <br> 144 with diabetes <br> mellitus type 2, and |  |
|  |  | 134 with <br> cardiovascular disease |  |
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[^0] من أمراض وراثية في الضفة الغربية/ فلسطين

فلسطين ياسين

إشراف
الاكتورة إيمان الشاويش

قدمت هذه الأطروحة استكمالاً لمتطلبات الحصول على درجة الماجستير في الصحة العامة بكلية الدراسات العليا، في جامعة النجاح الوطنية، نابلس - فلسطين.

المعرفة والموقف تجاه الاستشارة الوراثية بين آباء الأطفال الذين يعانون من أمراض وراثية في الضفة الغربية/ فلسطين

إعداد
فلسطين ياسين
إشراف

## د. ايمان شاويش

## الملخص

تزداد الحالات المصابة بالأمراض الوراثية في الضفة الغربية بشكل لافت دون تدوين هذه الحالات أو عمل أبحاث عليها، لاسيما وأن العائلة الواحدة تعاني من إصابة أكثر من طفل بنفس المرض دون اللجوء إلى طريقة للحد من ذلك، هذا دفع الباحثة لدراسة معلومات أهالي الأطفال المصابين بالأمراض الوراثية عن الاستثـارة الوراثية، وتأثنر ذلك على رأيهم في اللجوء إليها.

تم استخدام دراسة مقطعة وصفية للبحث بوساطة استبيان مكون من اختبار لقياس للمعلومات ومقياس ليكرت لقياس الرأي والموقف، وتمت تغطية كل المتغيرات في الاستبيان.

معلومات الأهالي كانت جيدة بشكل عام حيث حصل (\%7\%) منهك على نقيبم جبد لمعلومانه، أيضا الموقف كان ايجابي حيث حصل • • عنصر على نتيجة ايجابية من أصل r من عناصر دراسة الموقف، وعند دراسة العلاقة كان لمعلومات الأهالي أثز ايجابي على مواقفهم تجاه الاستشارة الوراثية.

لذلك نوصي وزارة الصحة الفلسطينية بزيادة وعي الأهالي تجاه الاستشثارة الوراثية، ثم شمول (الفحص الجيني في تشخيص الأمراض بشكل عام.
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