

CrossRef DOI of original article:

1 Scan to know paper details and author's profile

2

3 Received: 1 January 1970 Accepted: 1 January 1970 Published: 1 January 1970

4

5 **Abstract**

6

7 *Index terms—*

8 **1 I. INTRODUCTION**

9 Many college students may experience the persistence, exacerbation, or first onset of mental health and substance
10 use problems, while possibly receiving no or inadequate treatment. With the increasing recognition of child
11 mental health issues and the use of more psychotropic medications, the number of young adults with mental
12 health problems entering college has significantly increased. For example, in a survey of 274 institutions, 88 %
13 of counseling center directors reported an increase in "severe" psychological problems over the previous 5 years
14 including learning disabilities, self-injury incidents, eating disorders, substance use, and sexual assaults. Thus,
15 there is an increase in demand for counseling and specialized services. However, the increase in demands has not
16 always corresponded to an increase in staff. In particular, counseling centers are in need of psychiatrists with
17 expertise in treating traditional as well as non-traditional college students, two groups with specific age-related
18 characteristics and challenges. In this commentary, the prevalence of psychiatric and substance use problems
19 in college students, as well as their common onset, will be described. Next, the worrisome persistent nature
20 of mental health problems among college students and its implication will be discussed. Finally, important
21 treatment considerations for traditional and non-traditional college students will be outlined. ??Pedreli et al.,
22 2015:503).

23 **2 Purpose of the Study**

24 The current study aims to build an objective tool using the computer to diagnose psychotic disorders and mental
25 illness among university students, provided that the battery paragraphs are prepared from the exploratory study
26 of measures of psychotic disorders and mental illness according to the fifth Diagnostic and Statistical Manual
27 DSM-5.

28 **3 The inventory will contain the following subtests:**

- 29 ? Scale of neurodevelopmental disorders.
- 30 ? Scale of Bipolar and related disorders.
- 31 ? Anxiety Disorders scale.
- 32 ? Scale of Trauma and stressor-Related disorders.
- 33 ? Dissociative Disorders.
- 34 ? The scale of problem solving disabilities.
- 35 ? Scale of Feeding and eating disorders.
- 36 ? Scale sleep -Wake disorders.
- 37 ? Scale of Disruptive impulsive-Control and Conduct Disorders.
- 38 ? Neurocognitive Disorders Scale.
- 39 ? Personality Disorders Scale.

40 **4 Significance of the Study**

41 Theoretical importance: The theoretical importance of the current study lies in its handling of a new concept in
42 contemporary psychological literature, which is the assessment of psychotic disorders and mental illness using a
43 computer, according to the fifth Diagnostic and Statistical Manual as follows:

8 STUDY GROUP:

44 ? Scale of neurodevelopmental disorders.
45 ? Scale of Bipolar and related disorders.
46 ? Anxiety Disorders scale.
47 ? Scale of Trauma and stressor-Related disorders.
48 ? Dissociative Disorders.
49 ? The scale of problem solving disabilities.
50 ? Scale of Feeding and eating disorders.
51 ? Scale sleep -Wake disorders.
52 ? Scale of Disruptive impulsive-Control and Conduct Disorders.
53 ? Neurocognitive Disorders Scale.
54 ? Personality Disorders Scale.
55 Which the Arab studies did not adequately address -as within the limits of the researcher's knowledge and
56 because of the importance of this computerized scale in the diagnostic curve of psychotic disorders and mental
57 illnesses, and what it entails in reducing the impact of these disorders at the university level.

5 Practical Importance

58 The applied importance of the current study lies in the possibility of using the list of psychotic disorders and
59 computerized mental illnesses at the university stage, so that it can be developed and benefited from in the field
60 of early diagnosis of these disorders and identifying their causes as a first step in diagnosis, and then preparing
61 for the preparation of appropriate treatment programs and early intervention.

6 II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

62 Attending college can be a stressful time for many students. In addition to coping with academic pressure, some
63 students have to deal with the stressful tasks of separation and individuation from their family of origin while
64 some may have to attend to numerous work and family responsibilities ??Pedreli et al., 2015:503) Studies of the
65 prevalence of personality disorders have been fewer and smaller-scale, but one broad Norwegian survey found
66 a five-year prevalence of almost 1 in 7 (13.4%). Each year 73 million women are affected by major depression,
67 and suicide is ranked 7th as the cause of death for women between the ages of 20-59. Psychotropic medications
68 are available in Bangladesh but psychotherapy is hardly available Cadge et al. (2019) attempted to explore
69 lay understanding and perceptions of schizophrenia in university students using Qualitative study using semi-
70 structured interviews and thematic analysis at The University of Birmingham, West Midlands. The study was
71 applied on 20 UK home students of white British (n=5), Indian (n=5), Pakistani (n=5), African Caribbean
72 (n=4) and dual white British and African Caribbean ethnicity (n=1). Findings revealed a lack of knowledge
73 about schizophrenia, particularly the negative symptoms that were not mentioned.

74 Kabir and Ashraful (2017) conducted a study that is an attempt to explore an empirical investigation on
75 the search for psychological problems among the students in Bangladesh. The sample was composed of 300
76 respondents. A $2 \times 2 \times 2$ factorial design involving 2 levels of gender (male vs. female), 2 levels of residence
77 (urban vs. rural) and 2 levels of students' category (science vs. humanities) were used. It was to study the
78 psychological problems of 17 to 18 years old students. Four psychological problems such as anxiety, depression,
79 obsessive compulsive disorder and eating disorder were found. These four problems are related with mentioned
80 six categories at P at $P < 0.01$ level and ANOVA were significant at $P < 0.05$ level. It was found that students of
81 humanities group were more vulnerable with these problems as compared to the students of science group.

82 On the other side, Furnham et al. (2011) had a study to explore the mental health literacy of stu-
83 dents. This study is part of the growing interest in mental health literacy among young people. De-
84 sign/methodology/approach -Over 400 university students indicated their knowledge of over 90 psychiatric
85 illnesses labels derived from DSM:IV. They rated disorders on six questions concerning whether they had heard
86 of the disorder; knew anybody with it; could define or describe it; knew what causes it; whether those with it
87 can be cured; and whether it is common.

88 Findings -On average, participants had heard of just over one-third of the various illnesses. Those who rated
89 the conditions as more common deemed them to have more known causes and to be more curable.

90 Emotionally intelligent, open-to-experience females who had studied relevant academic subjects claimed to be
91 better informed. The participant's age and personality.

7 III. METHODOLOGY

92 The study will be carried out in university and will be applied on a sample of students with or without special
93 needs. the study will adopt the descriptive method.

8 Study group:

94 The population of the study will be from university students Study sample: The researcher will choose two
95 samples of university students: a group of university students with special needs, and a group of normal.

96 Tools: A battery of psychotic and mental illness using a computer that contains the following tests:
97 ? Scale of neurodevelopmental disorders.

102 ? Scale of Bipolar and related disorders.
103 ? Anxiety Disorders scale.
104 ? Scale of Trauma and stressor-Related disorders.
105 ? Dissociative Disorders.
106 ? The scale of problem solving disabilities.
107 ? Scale of Feeding and eating disorders.
108 ? Scale sleep -Wake disorders.
109 ? Scale of Disruptive impulsive-Control and Conduct Disorders.
110 ? Neurocognitive Disorders Scale.
111 ? Personality Disorders Scale

112 **9 Applied Study**

113 This section discusses the descriptive analysis for study sample and study variable as following:

114 Descriptive analysis for study sample: A sample of 20 university students who suffer from mental disorders and
115 developmental delays was selected as an experimental sample, and 20 university students from normal students
116 were identified as a control sample, and in Table (1) a description of the two groups is presented. The previous
117 table shows that the correlation coefficient of the lowest dimensions was 71.8%, means that the research tool is
118 able to measure what it was designed to measure and reliable. The highest correlation coefficient was 88.3%,
119 means that there is a strong relationship between all dimensions of the scale and purpose from measurement.

120 **10 Descriptive Analysis for Study Tool Dimensions**

121 Scale of neurodevelopmental disorders: The statistical analysis results of this dimension were as follow: Frequency
122 and Chi-square tests: The results of descriptive tests show in table (4). The previous table shows that most
123 elements have a lot of observation at mild disease level, but there are cases at middle and strong level, the chai
124 square was at the level less than 5%, this means that there are significant deficiencies between Study Groups.

125 **11 T-test for two Groups:**

126 The T-test results shown in table (5) The previous table shows that most elements have a significant level less
127 than 5%, this means that there are significant differences between Study Groups. It is clarify that the smallest
128 mean was 1.2 for the normal group, but the greatest mean was 2.35 for students with special needs group, this
129 means that the impact of drugs was strong on group two.

130 **12 Scale of Bipolar and related disorders:**

131 The statistical analysis results of this dimension was as follow:

132 Frequency and Chi-square tests: The results of descriptive tests show in table (??) From the previous table,
133 the results show that most elements have a lot of observation at mild disease level, but there are cases at middle
134 and strong level, the chai square was at the level less than 5%, this means that there are significant differences
135 between Study Groups.

136 **13 T-test for two Groups:**

137 The T-test results shown in table (7). The previous table shows that most elements have a significant level less
138 than 5%, this means that there are significant differences between Study Groups. We can show that the less
139 mean was 1.2 for the normal group, but the greater mean was 2.00 for students with special needs group, this
140 means that the impact of drugs was strong on group two.

141 **14 T-Test Results for D2**

142 **15 Anxiety Disorders scale:**

143 The statistical analysis results of this dimension was as follow: Frequency and Chi-square tests: The results of
144 descriptive tests show in table (8). The previous table shows that most elements have a significant level less than
145 5%, this means that there are significant differences between Study Groups. We can show that the less mean was
146 1.30 for the normal group, but the greater mean was 2.45 for students with special needs group, this means that
147 the impact of drugs was strong on group two.

148 **16 Scale of Trauma and stressor-Related disorders:**

149 The statistical analysis results of this dimension was as follow: Frequency and Chi-square tests. The results of
150 descriptive tests show in table (10). The previous table shows that most elements have a significant level less
151 than 5%, this means that there are significant differences between Study Groups. We can show that the less
152 mean was 1.30 for the normal group, but the greater mean was 2.45 for students with special needs group, this
153 means that the impact of drugs was strong on group two.

23 IV. CONCLUSION

154 Dissociative Disorders: The statistical analysis results of this dimension were as follow: Frequency and Chi-
155 square tests. The results of descriptive tests show in table (12). The previous table shows that most elements
156 have a significant level less than 5%, this means that there are significant differences between Study Groups.

157 The scale of problem-solving disabilities: The statistical analysis results of this dimension was as follow:
158 Frequency and Chi-square tests. The results of descriptive tests show in table (14). From the previous table
159 results show that most elements have a lot of observation at mild disease level, but there are cases at middle
160 and strong level, the chi square was at the level less than 5%, this means that there are significant differences
161 between Study Groups.

162 17 T-test for two Groups:

163 The T-test results shown in table (15)

164 18 Scale of Feeding and eating disorders:

165 The statistical analysis results of this dimension was as follow: Frequency and Chi-square tests. The results
166 of descriptive tests show in table (16). From the previous table results show that most elements have a lot of
167 observation at mild disease level, but there are cases at middle and strong level, the chi square was at the level
168 less than 5%, this means that there are significant differences between Study Groups.

169 19 T-test for two Groups:

170 The T-test results shown in table (17) The previous table shows that most elements have a significant level less
171 than 5%, this means that there are significant differences between Study Groups.

172 Scale Sleep -Wake Disorders: The statistical analysis results of this dimension was as follow:

173 Frequency and Chi-square tests. The results of descriptive tests show in table (??8) The previous table
174 shows that most elements have a significant level less than 5%, this means that there are significant differences
175 between Study Groups. We can show that the less mean was 1.2 for the normal group, but the greater mean
176 was 2.4 for students with special needs group, this means that the impact of drugs was strong on group two.
177 The previous table shows that most elements have a significant level less than 5%, this means that there are
178 significant differences between Study Groups. We can show that the less mean was 1.250 for the normal group,
179 but the greater mean was 2.30 for students with special needs group, this means that the impact of drugs was
180 strong on group two.

181 20 Scale of Disruptive

182 Neurocognitive Disorders Scale: The statistical analysis results of this dimension was as follow: Frequency and
183 Chi-square tests. The results of descriptive tests show in table (22). The previous table shows that most elements
184 have a significant level less than 5%, this means that there are significant shown between Study Groups. We can
185 show that the less mean was 1.250 for the normal group, but the greater mean was 2.30 for students with special
186 needs group, this means that the impact of drugs was strong on group two.

187 21 Personality Disorders Scale:

188 The statistical analysis results of this dimension were as follow: Frequency and Chi-square tests. The results
189 of descriptive tests show in table (24). From the previous table results show that most elements have a lot of
190 observation at mild disease level, but there are cases at middle and strong level, the chi square was at the level
191 less than 5%, this means that there are significant differences between Study Groups.

192 22 T-Test for Two Groups:

193 The T-test results shown in table ??25). The previous table shows that most elements have a significant level
194 less than 5%, this means that there are significant differences between Study Groups. We can show that the less
195 mean was 1.20 for the normal group, but the greater mean was 2.30 for students with special needs group, this
196 means that the impact of drugs was strong on group two.

197 23 IV. CONCLUSION

198 It is clear from the results of the statistical analysis that the scale that was formulated during the study enjoys
199 validity and stability, as the results of the Alpha Cronbach test indicate the reliability and validity of the scale,
200 and the results of the correlation test indicate the validity and reliability of the scale and therefore it can be
201 relied upon in completing the study and using it in diagnosis.

202 The results of the all dimensions of the scale indicate that the sample of students who suffer from disorders
203 were more affected and vulnerable to problems resulting from drug abuse of various kinds, but the ordinary
204 students were less affected and their problems did not worsen to the same degree, as the diagnosis was mostly at
205 the level of mild disease.

206 The results of the chi-squared test also indicate that there are significant differences in the diagnosis of the
207 control group from the test group, where the statistical significance of the test was less than 5%.

208 A T-test was conducted and the results for all dimensions of the scale indicated that there are fundamental
209 differences between the diagnosis of each of the study groups, in favor of the first group, where the levels of
210 problems and psychological and neurological disorders were higher in the experimental sample than the control
211 sample, at a level of significance of 5%.

212 **24 London Journal of Research in Computer Science and Tech-**
213 **nology**

Building

d an Norma Accor ing to 1 d the f h Fi t Statistica Diagnosis l

| | © 2023 Great] Britain Journals Press Volume 23 Issue 2 ?"? Compilation
1.0 Building A Computerized Psychotic Disorders and Mental Illness Inventory for
University Students with Special Needs

Figure 1:

214

1

London Journal of Research in Computer Science and Technology		Frequency	Percent	20	50.0	20	50.0	40	100.0	Reliability Tests of the Study Tool:	This part presents the
Cases										Valid 38	
										Excluded	
										Total 40	

From the previous table the Cronbach's alpha was 95% this means that the research tool is reliable, researcher can depend on it and complete the study procedures.

Consistency Tests of the Study tool: The consistency of research tool was test by correlation test to know how every dimension measure the objective which related it. The results of correlation test in table (3)

Building A Computerized Psychotic Disorders and Mental Illness Inventory for University Students with an Norma According to 1 d

Figure 2: Table 1 :

3

	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	D7	D8	D9	D10	D11	Y
D1 Pearson Correlation	1											
D2 Pearson Correlation	.729 **	1										
D3 Pearson Correlation	.827 **	.720 **	1									
D4 Pearson Correlation	.647 **	.614 **	.674	1								
			**									
D5 Pearson Correlation	.746 **	.591 **	.759	.727	1							
			**	**								
D6 Pearson Correlation	.409 **	.485 **	.573	.588	.552	1						
			**	**	**							
D7 Pearson Correlation	.668 **	.620 **	.725	.596	.663	.348	1					
			**	**	**	*						
D8 Pearson Correlation	.679 **	.727 **	.749	.747	.656	.492	.756	1				
			**	**	**	**	**					
D9 Pearson Correlation	.596 **	.676 **	.667	.691	.730	.698	.534	.709 **	1			
			**	**	**	**	**	**				
D10 Pearson Correlation	.629 **	.647 **	.704	.710	.709	.702	.540	.664 **	.799 **	1		
			**	**	**	**	**	**	**			
D11 Pearson Correlation	.647 **	.614 **	.674	1.000	.727	.588	.596	.747 **	.691 **	1		
			**	**	**	**	**	**	**			
Y Pearson Correlation	.803 **	.794 **	.866	.883	.857	.718	.759	.863 **	.860 **			
			**	**	**	**	**	**	**			

Figure 3: Table 3 :

4

Observed	Expected	Chi-Squa df re	Asymp. Sig.
N	N		

| Volume 23 Issue 2 ??"? Compilation 1.0 © 2023 Great] Britain Journals Press
London Journal of Research in Computer Science and Technology Building A
Computerized Psychotic Disorders and Mental Illness Inventory for University
Students with Special Needs

Figure 4: Table 4 :

	Study Groups	N	Mean	T-Test for Equality of Means		
				T	Df	Sig. (2-Tailed)
Intellectual disabilities,	students with special needs	20	1.8500			
Intellectual development disorder	Normal	20	1.2000	3.193	38	.003
	students with special needs	20	2.1000	3.193	28.0	.003
Delayed overall growth	Normal	20	1.3500	3.241	38	.002
	students with special needs	20	2.3500	3.241	29.1	.003
Unspecified intellectual disability	Normal	20	1.2500	6.681	38	.000
	students with special needs	20	2.1500	6.681	35.3	.000
Communication disorders	Normal	20	1.3000	3.474	38	.001
Language disorder, Speech sound disorder	students with special needs	20	1.4500	3.474	31.4	.002
Infantile onset of stuttering	Normal	20	1.3500		.531	.38
	students with special needs	20	1.5000		.531	.34.3
fluency disorder, Practical social communication disorder	Normal	20	1.3000	.890	38	.379
Unspecified Communication	students with special needs	20	1.7500	.890	37.8	.379
Disorder, Autism spectrum disorder	Normal	20	1.2500	2.330	38	.025
Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity	students with special needs	20	1.7000	2.330	28.6	.027
Disorder, Other Specific Attention						
Deficit /Hyperactivity Disorder, Unspecified Attention	Normal	20	1.2000	2.337	38	.025
Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder	students with special needs	20	1.9000	2.337	27.1	.027
Specific learning disorder	Normal	20	1.2500	3.025	38	.004

			Observed N	Expected N	Chi-Square df	Asy. Sig.
Exaggerated or grandiose self-esteem.	mild disease	24				
	middle disease	13	10.0			
	strong disease	2	10.0	35.0003		.000
			a			
Decreased need for sleep (for example, feeling rested after sleeping only 3 hours).	deep disease	1	10.0			
	Total	40				
	mild disease	26	10.0			
	middle disease	10	10.0	38.6003		.000
	strong disease	3	10.0	a		
More chatter than usual or pressure to keep talking.	deep disease	1	10.0			
	Total	40				
	mild disease	22	10.0			
	middle disease	13	10.0	26.6003		.000
	strong disease	3	10.0	a		
Flying ideas or a personal experience of racing ideas.	deep disease	2	10.0			
	Total	40				
	mild disease	22	10.0			
	middle disease	13	10.0	27.0003		.000
	strong disease	4	10.0	a		
Distraction (easily diverting attention to unimportant or irrelevant external stimuli). As reported or observed.	deep disease	1	10.0			
	Total	40				
	mild disease	25	10.0			
	middle disease	10	10.0	33.8003		.000
	strong disease	3	10.0	a		
	Total	40	10.0			

Figure 6: Table 6 :

7

More chatter than usual or pressure to keep talking.	Normal students with special needs	20	1.150	3.00	25.20	.006
			1.900	2.17	38	.036
Flying ideas or a personal experience ideas.	Normal students with special needs	20	1.350	2.17	27.29039	
			2.000	3.76	38	.001
Distraction diverting attention to unimportant or irrelevant external stimuli).	Normal students with special needs	20	1.200	3.76	27.25	.001
			1.900	2.84	38	.007
	Normal	20	1.200	2.84	24.98	.009

Figure 7: Table 7 :

8

Observed	Expected
	Chi-Square df Asymp. Sig.
N	N

| | © 2023 Great Britain Journals Press Volume 23 Issue 2 ?”? Compilation 1.0 Building A Computerized Psychotic Disorders and Mental Illness Inventory for University Students with Special

Figure 8: Table 8 :

	Study Groups	T-Test for Equality of Means			
		N	Mean	Sig.	Df
		T	(2-Tailed)		
Repeated excessive discomfort) of this view strongly.	students with special needs	20	1.7000	2.349	38 .024
A separation from someone who is very attached to his occurs	Normal	20	1.2500	2.349	.025
		31.307			
(Continuous middle, interval, foul) as disease, ratio, catastrophe, or the death.	students with special needs	20	2.1000	3.048	38 .004
	Normal	20	1.2500	3.048	.005
		24.409			
Continuous and excessive fear that an unfortunate event will occur) such as being lost.	and intense students with special needs	20	2.0000	2.774	38 .009
	Normal	20	1.3000	2.774	.009
		30.701			
Illness (will cause separation from a person with whom he is related)	students with special needs	20	2.1500	3.187	38 .003
	Normal	20	1.2500	3.187	.004
		24.262			
Continuous objection or refusal of an outsider to an outsider such as school, work or other places.	students with special needs	20	2.0500	2.806	38 .008
	Normal	20	1.3000	2.806	.009
		25.729			
Excessive persistent fear or reluctance, because we are alone or open At home or other places.	students with special needs	20	2.1500	3.204	38 .003
	Normal	20	1.3000	3.204	.004
		25.840			
	students with special needs	20	1.7000	1.125	38 .267
	Normal	20	1.4000	1.125	.269
		30.490			

Figure 9: Table 9 :

10

Feeling unusually restless.	mild disease	21	10.0	21.00 ³ .000 a
	middle disease	12	10.0	
	strong disease	4	10.0	
	deep disease	3	10.0	
	Total	40	10.0	

© 2023 Great Britain Journals Press

fh Fit Statistica Diagnosis
l
| Volume 23 Issue 2 ?" Compilation 1.0 | 15
31

T-test for two Groups: The T-test results shown in table(11)

Figure 10: Table 10 :

		T-Test for Equality of Means					
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	Df	Sig. (2-Tailed)
	Study Groups						
	students with spe- cial needs	20	2.1000	1.11921	2.746	38	.009
Feeling unusually rest- less.	Normal students with spe- cial needs	20	1.3500	.48936	2.746	26.009	.011
Difficulty concentrat- ing due to anxiety.	Normal students with spe- cial needs	20	1.9500	.94451	2.999	38	.005
Fear of something aw- ful that might happen.	Normal students with spe- cial needs	20	1.2500	.44426	2.999	27.015	.006
	Normal students with spe- cial needs	20	2.4000	.94032	4.430	38	.000
	Normal students with spe- cial needs	20	1.3500	.48936	4.430	28.588	.000
	Normal students with spe- cial needs	20	2.5500	.82558	5.592	38	.000
Feeling that the indi- vidual may lose control of himself	Normal	20	1.3500	.48936	5.592	30.884	.000

Figure 11: Table 11 :

12

Asymp.	
Observed N	Expected N
Sig.	Chi-Square df

From the previous table results show that most elements have a lot of observation at mild disease level, but there are cases at middle and strong level, the chi square was at the level less than 5%, this means that there are significant differences between Study Groups.T-test for two Groups: The T-test results shown in table(13)

Figure 13: Table 12 :

13

T-Test for Equality of Means		Sig.
T		Df
		(2-Tailed)

Figure 14: Table 13 :

14

Asymp.	
Observed N	Expected N
Sig.	Chi-Square Df

Figure 15: Table 14 :

15

		Study Groups	N	Mean	T-Test for Equality	
					T	Sig.
Difficulties in mathematical thinking.	students with special needs		20	1.8000	2.213	38
Poor ability to use feedback to infer rules and solve problems.	Normal students with special needs		20	1.3000	2.213	28.755
Controversy that may escalate into the threat of physical violence, avoiding problem solving.	Normal students with special needs		20	1.9000	2.924	38
an Normal Accor ing to l d	Normal		20	2.1500	3.827	31.005
			20	1.3000	2.924	3.827
			20	1.3000	2.924	29.125
					the h Fi t Statistica Diagnosis l	

The previous table shows that most elements have a significant level less than 5%, this means that there are significant differences between Study Groups. We can show that the less mean was 1.30 for the London Journal of Research in Computer Science and Technology 34 | | © 2023 Great] Britain Journals Press Volume 23 Issue 2 ?”? Compilation 1.0

Figure 16: Table 15 :

16

Observed	Expected	Chi-Square	df	Asymp.	Sig.
N	N				

Figure 17: Table 16 :

17

T-Test for Equality of Means		Sig.	Df	(2-Tailed)
T				

Figure 18: Table 17 :

18

Observed	Expected	Asymp.
Chi-Square df		
N	N	Sig.

From the previous table results show that most elements have a lot of observation at mild disease level, but there are cases at middle and strong level, the chi square was at the level less than 5%, this means that there are significant differences between Study Groups.

Figure 19: Table 18 :

19

T-Test for Equality of		Means		
Study	Groups	Sig.	N	Mean
t		df		(2-tailed)
				d)

Figure 20: Table 19 :

20

Chi-Sq	Asymp.
Observed N	df
Expected N	Sig.

Figure 21: Table 20 :

21

T-Test for Equality of		Means
Study Groups	N	Mean
T		Sig.
		Df
		(2-Tailed)

Figure 22: Table 21 :

22

Observed	Expected	
Chi-Square Df		Asymp. Sig.
N	N	

Figure 23: Table 22 :

23

This classification applies to cases in which symptoms neurocognitive clinically significant distress or impairment in social, occupational, or other areas of functioning predominate, but do not satisfy The full criteria for diagnosing any of the disorders neurocognitive disorders. The Unspecified Neurocognitive Disorder category is used in cases in which an exact etiology cannot be determined to make a firm diagnosis.

Study Groups	N	T-Test for Equality of Means	
		T	Df (2-Tailed)
students with special needs	20	2.1500	2.891
characteristic of a disorder that cause	Normal	20	1.3500 2.891
from the category of	students with special needs	20	2.0500 2.915
Normal	20	1.3000 2.915	
students with special needs	20	2.1000 3.414	
Normal	20	1.2500 3.414	

Figure 24: Table 23 :

24

Observed N Expected N Chi-Square df Asymp. Sig.

Figure 25: Table 24 :

25

	Study Groups	N	T-Test for Equality of Means		
			Me	Sig.	Df
	students with special needs	20	2.0500	3.116	36 .004
Ignite a purposeful fire on more than one occasion or opportunity.	Normal	20	1.2222	3.239	25.678.003
	students with special needs	20	2.3000	3.955	38 .000
B Emotional tension or excitement before the action	Normal	20	1.2000	3.955	23.573.001
	students with special needs	20	2.1500	3.971	38 .000
An increased sense of tension just before the theft was committed.	Normal	20	1.2000	3.971	25.366.001
	students with special needs	20	2.3000	5.858	38 .000
The feeling of pleasure, satisfaction, or relief (relaxation) at the time of the theft.	Normal	20	1.2000	5.858	29.853 .000

Figure 26: Table 25 :

d an Norma Accor ing to l d the f h Fi t Statistica Diagnosis l

|| © 2023 Great] Britain Journals Press Volume 23 Issue 2 ?”? Compilation 1.0

Figure 27:

d an Norma Accor ing to l d d l d the f h Fi t Statistica Diagnosis l f h l Fi t
an Norma Accor ing to the Statistica Diagnosis

|| © 2023 Great] Britain Journals Press Volume 23 Issue 2 ?”? Compilation 1.0

Figure 28:

215 .1 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

216 The author wish to acknowledge the approval and the support of this research study by grant no. 8-44301 Ffrom
217 the Deanship of Scientific Research in Taif University in Arar, KSA
218 Students with Special Needs d l d f h l the an Norma Accor ing to Fi t Statistica Diagnosis

219 .2 Conflict of Interest

220 The researchers have no conflict of interest.

221 .3 Consent the Scientific Research Ethics Committee

222 The Scientific Research Ethics Committee at Taif University recently reviewed the request submitted by you to
223 obtain the committee's approval of the research proposal shown below, knowing that the committee was approved
224 by the National Bioethics Committee No. (O H A-O 2 -T -1 0 5). The proposal meets the requirements of Altaf
225 University, and the ethical approval has been granted from the date (July 2022 -July 2023)

226 [London Journal of Research in Computer Science and Technology] , *London Journal of Research in Computer*
227 *Science and Technology*

228 [Kabir ()] *A study on common psychological problems in intermediate college students in the perspective of*
229 *Bangladesh. Submitted to Health Research*, Ashraful M Kabir . 2018. p. .

230 [American Psychiatric Association. The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders ()] *American*
231 *Psychiatric Association. The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*, 2013. Arlington:
232 American Psychiatric Publishing, Inc. (Fifth Edition)

233 [Ohan et al. ()] 'Brief report: The impact of changing from DSM-IV 'Asperger's' to DSM-5 'autistic spectrum
234 disorder' diagnostic labels on stigma and treatment attitudes'. J L Ohan , S E Ellefson , P W Corrigan .
235 *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders* 2015. 45 (10) p. .

236 [Pedreli et al. (2015)] 'College Students: Mental Health Problems and Treatment Considerations'. Paola ; Pedreli
237 , Maren ; Nyer , Albert ; Yeung , Zulauf , ; Courtney , Timothy Wilens . *Acad Psychiatry* 2015. 2015 October.
238 39 (5) p. .

239 [Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders ()] *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*, (Washington, DC) 2000. American Psychiatric Association. (Text Revision))

240 [Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders ()] *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders*,
241 2013. Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Association. (th ed.)

242 [Giles ()] 'DSM-V is taking away our identity': The reaction of the online community to the proposed changes
243 in the diagnosis of Asperger's disorder'. D C Giles . *Health* 2013. 18 (2) p. .

244 [Krueger et al. ()] 'Externalizing psychopathology in adulthood: A dimensional-spectrum conceptualization and
245 its implications for DSM-V'. R F Krueger , K E Markon , C J Patrick , W G Iacono . *Journal of Abnormal*
246 *Psychology* 2005. 114 p. .

247 [Dinh et al. ()] 'Influence of the DSM-IV Outline for Cultural Formulation on Multidisciplinary Case Conferences
248 in Mental Health'. N M Dinh , D Groleau , L J Kirmayer , C Rodriguez , G Bibeau . *Anthropology & Medicine*
249 2012. 19 (3) p. .

250 [Maneesriwongul and Dixon ()] 'Instrument Translation Process: A Methods Review'. M Maneesriwongul , J K
251 Dixon . *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 2004. 48 (2) p. .

252 [Kupfer et al. ()] D A Kupfer , M B First , D A Regier . *A research agenda for DSM-V*, (Washington, DC) 2002.
253 American Psychiatric Association.

254 [Mcmillan and Jarvis ()] Julie M& Mcmillan , Jane M Jarvis . <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259437995> *Mental Health and Students with Disabilities: A Review of Literature*, 2013.

255 [Furnham et al. ()] 'Mental health literacy among university students'. Adrian ; Furnham , Richard ; Cook , Neil
256 ; Martin , Mark Batey . *Journal of Public Mental Health* 2011. 10 (4) p. .

257 [Ritvo ()] 'Postponing the proposed changes in DSM 5 for autistic spectrum disorder until new scientific evidence
258 adequately supports them'. E R Ritvo . *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders* 2012. 42 (9) p. 2022.

259 [PTSD prevalence and symptom structure of DSM-5 criteria in adolescents and young adults surviving the 2011 shooting in Norway]
260 *PTSD prevalence and symptom structure of DSM-5 criteria in adolescents and young adults surviving the*
261 *2011 shooting in Norway Journal of Affective Disorders*, 2014. 169 p. .

262 [Dsm-5 ()] *PTSD's symptom dimensions and relations with major depression's symptom dimensions in a primary*
263 *care sample Psychiatry Research*, Dsm-5 . 2014. 215 p. .

264 [Bäärnhielm and Rosso ()] 'The Cultural Formulation: A Model to Combine Nosology and Patients' Life Context
265 in Psychiatric Diagnostic Practice'. S Bäärnhielm , Scarpinati Rosso , M . *Transcultural Psychiatry* 2009. 46
266 (3) p. .

269 [Liu et al. ()] 'The underlying dimensions of DSM-5 posttraumatic stress dis1388 BOVIN ET AL. order
270 symptoms in an epidemiological sample of Chinese earthquake survivors'. P Liu , L Wang , C Cao , R
271 Wang , J Zhang , B Zhang , J D Elhai . 10.1016/j.janxdis.2014.03.008. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2014.03.008> *Journal of Anxiety Disorders* 2014. 28 p. .

273 [Cadge et al. ()] 'University students' understanding and perceptions of schizophrenia in the UK: a qualitative
274 study'. Charlotte ; Cadge , Connor , Sheila Greenfield . *BMJ Open* 2019. 2019. 9 (4) p. 25813.

275 [Kirmayer et al. ()] 'Use of an Expanded Version of the DSM-IV Outline for Cultural Formulation on a Cultural
276 Consultation Service'. L J Kirmayer , B D Thombs , T Jurick , G E Jarvis , J Guzder . *Psychiatric Services*
277 2008. 59 (6) p. .

278 [Frazier et al. ()] 'Validation of proposed DSM-5 criteria for autism spectrum disorder'. T W Frazier , E A
279 Youngstrom , L Speer , R Embacher , P Law , J Constantino . *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 2012.
280 51 p. .