Considerable evidence indicates the significant role of spirituality and parenting styles in determination of personality disorders. The present research aims at investigating the relationships of “spiritual intelligence and parenting styles” with the schizoid, schizotypal, and paranoid personality disorders in Kerman Shahid Bahonar University students in Iran. A sample of 290 individuals were selected by random sampling to fill out the King’s spiritual intelligence questionnaire (SISRI-24), the Millon’s clinical multi-axis questionnaire (MCMI-III), and the Robinson’s parenting styles questionnaire. Results of Pearson correlation analysis indicate that spiritual intelligence has a significant negative correlation only with schizotypal personality disorder. Authoritarian and permissive styles of parenting have significant positive correlations with all the personality disorders of schizoid, schizotypal, and paranoid disorders, while the authoritative style has a negative correlation with them (P<.5). Results of stepwise regression analysis showed that the strongest predictive variables for schizoid personality disorder are authoritative and permissive styles, (P<.01). The predictors of schizotypal personality disorder are permissive and authoritarian styles and spiritual intelligence (P<.01), while the variable of the authoritarian style (P<.01) is the predictors of paranoia personality disorder. Adverse parenting styles and the lack of spiritual
intelligence, can cause disorders in young people’s behavioral processes, and thus turns them prone to personality disorders.
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Thoughts, feelings, and behaviors make up one's character. In Millon's opinion, personality is a very deep and complex pattern of psychological traits that cannot be rooted out easily, being automatically reflected in almost all aspects of one's performance. These traits are inherent and widespread, constituting a complicated matrix of biological preparedness and experimental learning (Millon, 1996).

Every human appreciates personality traits. When one's personality causes problems at workplace or at home, she is believed to be suffering from personality disorders. People's behaviors differ in various situations, but those with personality disorders have more inflexible behaviors. Personality disorder is relatively a new subject in the studies of psychological disorders, being first defined in the third edition of the “Guidelines of Determination and Statistics of Psychological Disorders of DSM” as the main reference for the scientists of mental health since 1980. Beginning in childhood, personality disorders continue up into one’s adolescence and adulthood (Wike, 2009).

Personality disorder is a widespread and chronic disorder that the rate of its spread is estimated to be between 10 to 15 percent (Svrakic, Draganic, Hill, Bayon, Przybeck, & Cloninger, 2002). Almost half of the psychological patients suffer from personality disorders, implying that this disorder is frequently accompanied by axis 1 (Sadock and Sadock, 2007). The American Psychological Association (2002) has classified all kinds of personality disorders into three main categories the first of which being investigated in the present research, identified with strange behaviors and is a combination of personality disorders of schizoid, schizotypal, and paranoid.
A schizoid patient is identified by symptoms of social seclusion, limited expression of emotions (apathy), disinterest in establishing friendly relations, and lack of intimate relations with others. The American Psychological Association (2002) has estimated the spread of this disorder as 1 percent of the general population. Sadock and Sadock (2000; as cited in Emami, Fatehizadeh & Najjarian, 2004) reported this rate as 7.5 percent and usually identified among the males. Emami et al. (2004) investigated 1400 students and reported the rate of the spread of this disorder as 0.23 percent. A Schizotypal person is identified by strange behaviors, cognitive and conceptual distortions, feelings of loneliness and pervasive sadness originated from inability to establish close relations and interactions, lack of enjoyment, and indifference to others' praise and/or criticism. Emami et al. (2004) estimated the rate of the spread of this disorder as 0.3 percent.

A paranoia patient is identified with such traits as pessimism, suspicion, doubtfulness, mistrust, and lack of relations with others. Torgersen, Kringlen, and Cramer (2001; as cited in Munoz Sastre, Vinsonneau, Chabrol, Mullet, 2005) in their study of its rate of spread, identified paranoid personality as the second most widespread disorder. Emami et al. (2004) identified the rate of the spread of this disorder as 4.4 percent.

Some scholars like Erikson believe that the stability of trust in childhood should provide the basic capacity of faith in adulthood. He recognizes religion as a valuable institution playing an important role in the fulfillment of psychological needs of human beings and especially their basic trust (Bkrmy, 1963 as cited in; Schultz, 1997). Allport, too, has regarded religion and spirituality as vital factors for having healthy personalities (Schultz, 1997). The overlapping of spirituality and intelligence has gained much attention in recent years, prompting the psychologists of religion and spirituality to regard spiritual intelligence more seriously (Emmons, 1999). Spiritual intelligence can be defined as a type of deep self-consciousness which helps one achieve more awareness of different aspects of his/her personality (Sisk and Torrance, 2000).
Following Pidmont’s thought, spiritual intelligence may also represent a stability among personality factors (interest and availability and expression of spiritual data), as well as a process related to intelligence, skills, and talents for doing so. This idea may extend to other personal and concrete capacities including a natural ability for parenting style, a cure, or an artistic representation. Thus, it can be stated that when such inherent tendencies are revealed, specific ways are provided for expression of spiritual intelligence to develop such skills and capabilities (Sinetar, 2000).

Factors related to family, genetics, biology, and environment have been cited as effective (Wike, 2009). In the 20th century some guidelines have been offered regarding the significance of internal environment of family and their beliefs in God as a part of their psychological theories. Family is the first founder of personality, values, and thinking criteria of children, with an important role in the fate and lifestyle of other members of the society. Its impact on children as the first and the most effective social section is clear-cut (Atkinson, 1983; as cited in Kimenjeni, 2007).

Parenting style is an intricate process which includes a set of interrelated behaviors showing the interaction between parents and children on a specific spectrum (Enten & Golan 2009). According to the studies carried out by Thomas and Chess (1975; as cited in Mussen, Kygan, Carrol Hustul, Kanjr, 2001), there is a bilateral principle in the relationship between parents and children, affecting parents' manners and parenting style as well as forming the children's personalities.

One of the main studies about the determination of symptoms of parenting style has been conducted by Diana Buamrind (Dwairy and Menshar, 2006). He has organized the three styles of authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting regarding the interaction between the two aspects of behavior as responsiveness and demandingness (Enten and Golan, 2009). People who use authoritarian styles are demanding but not responsive and their children suffer from certain problems like anxiety,
depression, and low self-esteem, thus developing the tendencies towards seclusion, dissatisfaction, and hostility in case of failure (Dwairy and Menshar, 2006; Berk 2007). Those who take up the permissive style are responsive rather than demanding and their children usually suffer from such problems as being over-dependent, irresponsible, selfish, rebellious, and inconsiderate, thus having lower self-esteem and weaker social skills. People who use authoritative styles are demanding and responsive together and this is considered as the optimal style (Dwairy and Menshar, 2006).

In fact, Joil Paris (1999; as cited in Wike, 2009) states that behavioral problems of children are accompanied by other different pathological traits, including inappropriate parenting or parents’ unreasonable communication skills. These problems lead to personality disorders and, in the long-term, become institutionalized in their natures. The relationship between personality disorders and spirituality has been investigated in several previous studies. Unterrainer, Huber, Sorgo, Collicutt, and Fink (2011) studied the relationship between spiritual welfare and the personality of schizotypal patients, concluding that there is a significant relation between the aspects of pathology of spiritual welfare and schizotypal personality.

Unterrainer at al., (2011) also recognized magical thinking as neurotic symptoms in schizotypal personalities. On the other hand, religious beliefs and/or tendencies are proved to have a negative relation with the personality traits of neuroticism, temper psychosis, obsessive compulsive disorder (OCD), and neurotic (Henningsgaard & Arnau, 2008; Beshlide, Hashemi, Charkhabi & Demiri, 2011; Nasihatkon, 2010, Bahrami & PurNaghash Tehrani, 2009; Shakeri, Parvizifard, Sadeghi & Moradi, 2005).

Day and Peters (1999) carried out a research to investigate the spread of schizotypal personality among new religious groups, concluding that anhedonia (being one of the negative symptoms of schizotypal) does not exist in them.
Ghaderi (2006) found out that there is a negative relationship between practicing religious beliefs and occurrences of paranoid personality disorder among male and female students. Ghorbani (2004) also mentioned the positive impact of spirituality in the treatment of all kinds of psychological disorders.

Moeeni (2002) in his comparative investigation of personality traits and religious identity and social support of ordinary and specific women found that specific women have more personality disorders and there is no significant relationship between ordinary and specific women regarding the scale of their religious identities.

Some research has highlighted the significance of negative aspects of the relationship between parents and children as a factor for creating behavioral problems that are considerably indicative of the relationship between parents' violent styles and the contradictory relation of parents and children and the personality problems of older children (Eron, Walder & Lefkowitz, 1971; Lober 1990; Muller, Hunter & Stollak 1990; as cited in Kimenjani, 2007 and Carter, Joyce, Mulder, Luty, & Sullivan, 1999).

Cheng, Huang, Liue, and Liue (2011) found that negative parenting styles like rejectiveness and over-protectiveness have significant relationship with the outbreak of personality disorders, discussing that people with personality disorders were found in opposite parenting styles.

Latzman, Elkovitch, and Clark (2009) found that teenagers' personalities are relatively related to their parents' personalities as well as to the three parenting styles of positive parenting, poor monitoring, and corporal punishment.

Rongrong, Fuyong, jang, Levestey, Paris, Mowei, Wei, and Rossier, (2007) in their research recognized that people who have personality disorders often tend to use parenting styles with less care for their children, applying stronger patterns of freedom control and denial of independence, in comparison with other parents.
Wolfradt, Hempdl, and Miles (2003) diagnosed a significant relationship between parenting styles (i.e., authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive) and depersonalization; people who use authoritarian and permissive parenting styles received high scores in depersonalization while those who use authoritative and permissive parenting styles score higher in problem-solving.

Rahmati, Etemadi, and Mehrabi (2008) in their research found that people who display more disorders had parents with permissive and authoritarian parenting styles.

The present study was conducted in order to investigate the relationship of spiritual intelligence and parenting styles with personality disorders of schizoid, schizotypal, and paranoid. Moreover, it aims to predict the personality disorders based on parenting styles and spiritual intelligence. To achieve this purpose, the hypotheses are as follows:

H1. There is a relationship between parenting styles and personality disorders.

H2. There is a relationship between spiritual intelligence and personality disorders.

Procedure

Research scope and Sampling Method. The research scope in this study included the students of technical engineering (electricity and architecture), humanities (theology and psychology), and basic sciences (biology and chemistry) at Shahid Bahonar University of Kerman, Iran, in the academic year of 2010-11. The sample included 1300 students who were reduced to 305 individuals by means of Cochran formula. Questionnaires were distributed among the students in a random sampling method. After excluding 15 questionnaires which were filled out incompletely, the remaining 290 questionnaires (including 206 girls and 84 boys) constituted our research sample. This research is correlational-
descriptive and the data were analyzed by Pearson correlation coefficient and stepwise regression analyses.

**Research Instruments**

Clinical multi-axis questionnaire of Millon and Robinson Parenting Methods and King’s Spiritual Intelligence were applied in this study.

*A) The Millon’s Clinical multi-axis questionnaire.* This questionnaire was devised by Theodore Millon in 1981 and its revised version was published in 1994. Being set up based on biological, psychological, and social theories of Millon, it includes 175 short self-descriptive sentences with yes-no answers. The present study has solely applied the criteria of personality disorders of schizoid, schizotypal, and paranoid, with the aim to evaluate the inefficient personality patterns. The coefficient of Cronbach’s alpha of this questionnaire was 0.87. The coefficient for reliability of this questionnaire is reported to be 0.91 and 0.69 after one month and one year, respectively (Millon, 1994). Abolghassemi and Kiamarsi (2006) obtained the coefficient of its Cronbach’s alpha for students to be 0.89.

*B) The Robinson’s questionnaire of parenting style.* This questionnaire has 32 items. All parents filled out the same questionnaires and only the names were different. This questionnaire is on a 5-point Likert scale including the choices of never (1), rarely (2), sometimes (3), often (4), and always (5); it measures the three main styles of parenting (i.e., authoritative, permissive, and authoritarian). The average points of all these styles are measured according to the diversity of fathers and mothers as well as the productive guidelines of the test (Robinson, 2001) to identify the parenting style at the first place. According to this approach, a parenting style of Subjects is the one with high scores for that style and low scores for the other styles. For example, if the testable score is high for authoritative style and low for authoritarian and permissive styles, the individual’s style is held to be authoritative. Alizadeh and Andris (2002 as...
The 32-item form of the 360-degree feedback instrument was used in their research. The internal validities of the authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive styles are 0.90, 0.91, and 0.76, respectively.

C) The king’s questionnaire of spiritual intelligence (2008). This questionnaire, devised by King, includes 24 items and is set up based on a 5-point Likert scale. High scores represent high spiritual intelligence or the existence of that capacity. An evaluation of the exploratory factor analysis in a sample including 619 students at Terrent University of Canada in 2007 revealed its Cronbach’s Alpha to be 0.95 and its split-half reliability coefficient was 0.84. In another research, Cronbach’s Alpha was also 0.92 and the standardized Alpha 0.92 via an evaluation of confirmatory factor analysis (King 2008). This result was later contradicted by Moallemi, Raghibi, SalariDaragy (2010) Who reported the coefficient of Cronbach’s Alpha to be 0.89 and the coefficient of the reliability of the spiritual intelligence questionnaire as 0.67 through a re-examination of a sample consisting of 70 individuals in an average time-period of two weeks (Moallemi et al., 2010).

Results

Descriptive elements of variables in this research, along with their correlations are included in Table 1.

The results of the correlation analyses showed that schizoid personality disorder had the highest correlation with 1) authoritarian, 2) authoritarian, and 3) permissive styles and, according to the data in Table 1; it had no significant relationship with spiritual intelligence. The results related to schizotypal personality disorder showed that it had the most significant relationship with 1) permissive, 2) authoritarian styles, and 3) spiritual intelligence but had no significant relationship with authoritative style. These results also showed that paranoia personality disorder had the highest significant relations with 1) authoritarian and 2) permissive styles
while it had no significant relationship with authoritative style and spiritual intelligence.

Table 1
Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations of Spiritual Intelligence and Parenting Styles with Clinical Personality Patterns Among University Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spiritual Intelligence</th>
<th>Authoritarian</th>
<th>Permissive</th>
<th>Authoritative</th>
<th>Schizoid</th>
<th>Schizotypal</th>
<th>Paranoid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>65.41</td>
<td>45.80</td>
<td>23.17</td>
<td>16.86</td>
<td>36.44</td>
<td>41.34</td>
<td>42.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sd</strong></td>
<td>13.45</td>
<td>11.68</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>23.18</td>
<td>20.43</td>
<td>18.13</td>
<td>19.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>r</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.21***</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.12*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.42***</td>
<td>-0.18**</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>0.22***</td>
<td>0.22***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
<td>0.24***</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.17**</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.39***</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.47***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P<.05  **P<.01  ***P<.001

Multiple stepwise regression analysis was utilized in order to identify the relationships as well as the share of each predictive variable of the spiritual intelligence, authoritarian, permissive, and authoritative parenting styles and to explain the criteria variables (schizoid, schizotypal, and paranoid personality disorders). At the first stage, the variables of spiritual intelligence, authoritarian, permissive, and authoritative parenting styles as predictive variables, and the schizoid personality disorder as the criterion variable and at the second stage the variables of spiritual intelligence, authoritarian, permissive, and authoritative parenting styles as predictive variables and the schizotypal personality disorder as the criterion variable and finally at the third stage, the variables of spiritual intelligence,
authoritarian, permissive, and authoritative parenting styles as predictive variables and the paranoia personality disorder as the criterion variable were inserted into the regression equation. Table 2 shows the results of the first stage.

**Table 2**
**Results of Stepwise Regression Analysis for Predicting Schizoid Personality Disorder Based on Spiritual Intelligence and Parenting Styles Among the University Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictive Variables</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative Style</td>
<td>Remaining</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.07</td>
<td>-.154</td>
<td>-3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>288</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive Style</td>
<td>Remaining</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.125</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>287</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P< .05  **P< .01  ***P< .001

Table 2 shows that only the predictive variables of authoritative and permissive parenting styles had the capacity to be inserted into regression equation and the variables of authoritarian parenting style and spiritual intelligence had no significant role in the increase of the prediction of the criterion variable. The ratio of F in Table 2 is indicative of a significant relationship between the predictive variable and the criterion one. The coefficients of determination resulting from regressions showed that at the first stage, inserting the variable of authoritative style predicted only 3% of changes of the criterion variable (i.e., schizoid personality disorder) while at the second stage, inserting the variable of permissive style increased this amount to 4% (p<.01).
Table 3
Results of Stepwise Regression Analysis for Predicting Schizotypal Personality Disorder Based on Spiritual Intelligence and Parenting Styles Among University Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictive Variables</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R'</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permissive Style</td>
<td>Remaining Regression</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>18.67***</td>
<td>.695</td>
<td>.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian Style</td>
<td>Remaining Regression</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>12.233***</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Intelligence</td>
<td>Remaining Regression</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>9.584***</td>
<td>-.153</td>
<td>-.114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P< .05  **P< .01  ***P< .001

Table 3 demonstrates the results of the second stage of analysis. The results of Table 3 show that, among the above-mentioned elements, only the predictive variables of authoritarian, permissive parenting styles, and spiritual intelligence had the required capacity to predict the clinical pattern of schizotypal personality while the variable of authoritative parenting style had no significant role in the increase of prediction of this clinical pattern. Significant ratios of F in Table 3 are indicative of a significant relationship between the predictive variable and the criterion. Coefficients of determination produced from regression results showed that at the first stage, inserting the variable of permissive style predicted 6% of the changes of the criterion variable (i.e., schizotypal personality disorder) while at the second stage, inserting the variable of authoritarian style increased this amount to 7% and finally at the third stage, inserting the variable of spiritual intelligence increased this amount to 9% (p< .01). Table 4 presents the results of the third stage of analysis.
Table 4
Results of the Analysis of Stepwise Regression for Predicting Paranoia Personality Disorder Based on Spiritual Intelligence and Parenting Styles among University Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictive Variables</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian Style</td>
<td>Remaining</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.419***</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>3.927***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P< .05  **P< .01  ***P< .001

Table 4 shows that, among the above-mentioned elements, only the predictive variable of authoritarian parenting style had the capacity to predict paranoid personality disorder; the variables of permissive and authoritative parenting styles and spiritual intelligence had a significant role in the increase of prediction of this clinical pattern. Significant ratio of F in the Table 4 indicates the presence of a significant relationship between the predictive variable and the criteron. The coefficient of determination produced from regression results showed that inserting the variable of authoritarian style predicts 5% of variance of the criterion variable (i.e., paranoia personality disorder) (p< .001).

Discussions and Conclusion

The relationship of spiritual intelligence and parenting styles with schizoid, schizotypal, and paranoid personality disorders in Shahid Bahonar University Kerman students was investigated in this research. The results showed that only schizotypal personality disorder has a negative correlation with spiritual intelligence. This correlation implies that people with high spiritual intelligence are less likely to suffer from schizotypal personality disorder. The relationship between schizotypal personality disorder and spirituality has been shown in previous research (Unterrainer et al., 2011, Day and Peters 1990; Henningsgaard and Arnau
We observed no significant relationship between schizoid and paranoia personality disorders and the spiritual intelligence. This finding is inconsistent with those of Ghaderi (2006) indicating a negative relationship between practicing religious beliefs and paranoid personality.

The results regarding the relationship between paranoid, schizoid, and schizotypal personality disorders and the parenting styles showed that schizoid personality disorder had a negative correlation with authoritative parenting styles and a positive correlation with authoritarian and permissive parenting styles. Authoritative and permissive parenting styles were the strongest predictive variables for this disorder among all the above-mentioned elements. Results relating to schizotypal personality disorder showed that this disorder had a positive correlation with permissive and authoritarian parenting styles. Moreover, we observed that paranoia personality disorder had a significant positive correlation only with the authoritarian parenting style and had the capacity to predict this disorder. The relationship between parenting styles and personality disorders is discussed in some previous research. Results of the present research are consistent with those of the previous ones (Aron et al., 1971; Luber 1990; Muller et al. 1990; as cited in Kimenjani, Maher, 2007; Cheng, Huang, Liu, Liu, 2011; Latzman, Elkovich, Clark, 2009; Rong & Rong, 2007; Wolfradt, Hempel, & Miles, 2003; Carter, Joyce, Mulder, Luty, & Sullivan, 1999; Rahmati et al., 2008). These results are indicative of the important role of the parents' parenting styles in formation of personality disorders and in causing behavioral problems in their children. In other words, if parents adopt authoritarian and permissive parenting styles, they are more likely to have children with personality disorders; but if they adopt the authoritative parenting style, this probability is more likely to diminish. These points can be clarified according to the related theories and the children's behavioral problems are accompanied by other
different traits of pathology such as parenting and parents' inappropriate communication skills. Other researchers can carry out this research at different levels and ages. The limitation was the respondent bias on the filling out of the self-report questionnaire.

In regard to the limitations of this research, we should refer to the low content of research literature in the scope of relationship between spiritual intelligence and parenting styles with the first group of personality disorders which posed a problem to the possibility of comparing the results of this research. Furthermore, considering the research sample limitation, that is, the students of a university who studied in different fields and in a specific period of time, should be careful about the generalization of the results. Researchers suggest, the repetition of research in different samples (regarding age, education, geographic distribution, etc.). Also, considering the high prevalence and ubiquity of personality disorders in psychological disorders, checking other effective factors in formation and growth of these disorders is of great importance.
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