NEAR EAST UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
APPLIED (CLINICAL) PSYCHOLOGY MASTER PROGRAM

MASTER THESIS

THE MOBBING AND ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS, PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS AND PSYCHOLOGICAL DISORDERS AMONG EMPLOYEES WHO WORK AT HIGH SCHOOLS IN NORTHERN CYPRUS

İPEK ÖZSOY
20060088

SUPERVISOR
DR.DENİZ KARADEMİR ERGÜN

NICOSIA 2012

NEAR EAST UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

APPLIED (CLINICAL) PSYCHOLOGY MASTER PROGRAM

MASTER THESIS

<u>The Mobbing And Its Relationship With Demographic Characteristics, Personality Characteristics And Psychological Disorders Among Employees Who Work At High Schools In Northern Cyprus</u>

Prepared by: İpek ÖZSOY

Examining Committee in Charge

Assoc.Prof.Dr. Mehmet ÇAKICI   Chairman of the Committee,

Psychology Department,

Near East University

Assoc.Prof.Dr. Ebru ÇAKICI   Chairman of the Psychology

Department, Near East University

Dr. Deniz Karademir ERGÜN   Department of Psychology,

Near East University (Supervisor)

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof.Dr. Aykut POLATOĞLU

ÖZET

**Kuzey Kıbrıs'ta Liselerde Çalışanlarda Yıldırma(Mobbing) Ve Yıldırmanın
Demografik Özellikler, Kişilik Özellikleri Ve Psikolojik Bozukluklarla İlişkisi**
Hazırlayan: İpek ÖZSOY
Kasım 2012

İş yerindeki agresif davranış, diğer adıyla 'yıldırma' son zamanlarda ciddi bir problem olmaya başlamıştır. Bütün Dünya'da olduğu gibi Kuzey Kıbrıs'ta da yıldırma olgusu yeni ve az bilinen bir kavramdır. Bu çalışmanın amacı Kuzey Kıbrıs'ta Milli Eğitim, Gençlik Ve Spor Bakanlığı'na bağlı liselerde farklı pozisyonlarda çalışanlar arasında yıldırma düzeyini ve yıldırmanın demografik özellikler, kişilik özellikleri ve psikolojik sonuçlarıyla ilişkisini araştırmaktır.

Çalışmanın örneklemi Kuzey Kıbrıs'taki özel ve devlet liselerinde çalışan yöneticileri, öğretmenleri, sekreter ve memurları, temizlik görevlileri ile diğer çalışanları içeren 195 katılımcıdan oluşmaktadır. Katılımcılara sosyo-demografik form, Olumsuz Davranışlar Ölçeği (NAQ), Eysenck Kişilik Anketi-Gözden Geçirilmiş Kısaltılmış Formu (EKA-GGK), Belirti Tarama Listesi-90-R (SCL-90-R) uygulanmıştır.

Çalışmanın bulgularına göre; erkek katılımcılar Olumsuz Davranışlar Ölçeği'nden(NAQ) kadınlara göre daha yüksek puan almıştır (p=0.045). Şu anda çalışılan kurumdaki süre (r=-0.241,p=0.001) ve yıldırma arasında anlamlı ilişki bulunmuştur. EKA-GGK'nın alt ölçekleri olan nevrotizm ile yıldırma arasında pozitif korelasyon (r=0.340,p=0.000), dışadönüklük (r=-0.152,p=0.034) ve yalan (r=-0.389, p=0.000) ile yıldırma arasında negatif korelasyon olduğu, ayrıca yıldırma ile SCL-90-R'ın bütün alt ölçekleri ve Genel Belirti Ortalaması indeksi arasında pozitif korelasyon olduğu saptanmıştır.

Bu çalışmaya göre KKTC'de eğitim sektöründe yıldırma davranışları uygulanmaktadır ve yıldırmanın demografik özellikler, kişilik özellikleri ve psikolojik bozukluklarla ilişkisi vardır. Yıldırma ile mücadelede ilk adımın konuyla ilgili bilinçlendirme çalışmaları olması gerekmektedir. Ayrıca önleme programları oluşturulurken risk grupları göz önüne alınmalıdır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: yıldırma, demografik özellikler, kişilik özellikleri, psikolojik bozukluklar

ABSTRACT

The Mobbing And Its Relationship With Demographic Characteristics, Personality Characteristics And Psychological Disorders Among Employees Who Work At High Schools In Northern Cyprus
Prepared by **İpek ÖZSOY**
November 2012

Workplace aggressive behavior which is called 'mobbing' has become a serious problem recently. As all over the World, in Northern Cyprus the term mobbing is new and less known issue. The aim of the present study is to explore level of the mobbing and to examine the relationship between mobbing and demographic characteristics, personality characteristics and psychological consequences among employees who work at high schools of Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports in different positions.

Sample of this study was developed from 195 volunteer employees that include managers, teachers, secretaries/officers, servant staff and other workers from private and state high schools in Northern Cyprus. Socio-demographic form, Negative Acts Questionnaire (NAQ), The Revised-Abbreviated Version of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQR-A) and Symptom Check List-90-Revised (SCL-90-R) were applied to the participants.

In the present study it was indicated that male participants had higher scores from NAQ than female participants($p=0.045$), Duration of present work ($r=0.241, p=0.001$) had significant relationship with mobbing. It was found that there was significant relationship with some sub-scales of EPQR-A; positive correlation with neuroticism ($r=0.340, p=0.000$), negative correlation with extroversion ($r=-0.152, p=0.034$) and lie ($r=-0.389, p=0.000$). Also in this study it was indicated that there was positive correlation between mobbing and all sub-scales and Global Severity Index of SCL-90-R.

In TRNC, mobbing occurs in education sector and it has relationship with demographic characteristics, personality characteristics and psychological disorders. The first thing on handling with mobbing should be making interventions to inform employees about mobbing behaviours. Also risk factors should be considered when preparing a prevention program.

Keywords: mobbing, demographic characteristics, personality characteristics, psychological disorders

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATION

ADD   **:** Additional Items

ANX   **:** Anxiety

DEP   **:** Depression

EPQR-A **:** The Revised-Abbreviated Version Of The Eysenck Personality Questionnaire

GSI   **:** Global Severity Index

HOS   **:** Hostility

I-S   **:** Interpersonal Sensitivity

NAQ   **:** Negative Acts Questionnaire

O-C   **:** Obsessive-Compulsive

PAR   **:** Paranoid Ideation

PHOB   **:** Phobic Anxiety

PTSD   **:** Post Traumatic Stress Disorder

PSY   **:** Psychoticism

SCL-90-R: Symptom Check List-90-Revised

SOM   **:** Somatization

TR   **:** Republic of Turkey

TRNC   **:** Turkish Republic Of Northern Cyprus

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. MOBBING

Nowadays, the world of work is very different from what it was in the past.Many issues such as efficiency, performance, motivation, personal relations became more important than just earning money in the work. The importance of another issue, "competition" increased in employee marketting and cause potential harmful and unethical behavior among employees and employers. Due to these behaviours workers negatively effected who devote the majority of their waking weekday to work.

In the past specialists mostly focus on improvement of physical workplace environment instead of psychological workplace environment. Recently the importance of psychological issues especially "mobbing" have been increased in work marketting.

Mobbing can be defined as "ganging up on someone" or psychic terror. It occurs as schisms, where the victim is subjected to a systematic stigmatizing through, inter alia, injustices, which after a few years can mean that the person in question is unable to find employment in his/her specific trade. Those responsible for this can either be workmates or managers (Leymann, 1990).

Mobbing become important issue especiallly in Sweden, Germany, France, England, Japan, Australia and USA and researches and puplications about mobbing are made. Prevalance rates differs in countries.In an Irish study which includes 1009 participants, the prevalance rate was 17%. British studies have found that about 30% of employees report that they are faced with negative behaviour directed against them (Matthiesen, 2002).

According to the Fourth European Working Conditions Survey 2005, one in 20 (5%) European workers reported that they were being exposed to mobbing in the previous 12 months period (cited in Gök, 2011).

There are many researches about mobbing all around the World in different organizational sectors. When the researches about 'mobbing' are examined it is seen that most researches are

made among workers from education sector or health sector (Stadnyk,2008; Ertürk&Cemaloğlu,2005).

Mobbing can be related many psychological factors. For instance, some individuals because of their specific personality characteristics vulnerable being exposed to mobbing. Some recent studies showed that there is relationship between mobbing and personality (Matthiesen&Einarsen,2007; Balducci,2009). On the other hand, Leymann was against the idea, he believed that regardless of any personality characteristics, the conflict between parties is the key factor of mobbing.(Leymann,1996).

Being exposed to any type mobbing behavior cause both physical and psychological disorders. The victims of mobbing suffer from some physical problems such as, cardiovascular disease, skin diseases, digestive system diseases (Vartia,2001; Tınaz,2006). Mobbing cause various types of psychological problems such as, panic disorders, posttraumatic disorders, depression, somatization even suicidal ideation (Leymann,1990; Balducci,2009).

As all the World, 'mobbing' is a new term and less known issue in TRNC. The working population of TRNC mostly work for government as an officer and rigid hierarchical positions, competition and political opinions have negative effects on the job. This situation increases the possibility of being exposed or carrying out mobbing. The aim of the present study is to explore level of the mobbing and to examine the relationship between mobbing and personality characteristics and psychological consequences among employees who work in high schools for 'Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports' in different positions.

1.1.1. Meaning And Terminology

Origin of the term 'Mobbing' is came from the word "mobile vulgus" in the Latin language which means "undecided crowd, society that tend to violence" (Çobanoğlu,2005). Also 'mob' in English as a verb means "a large crowd of people, especially one that may become violent or cause trouble" and have no specific changes from language to language (cited in Gülen,2008).

The term "mob" originates from an anti-predator behaviour observed in birds. When a threat to the flock is detected, an alarm signal is emitted. Birds respond to the alarm signal and swarm around the predator, at times swooping down to peck at the enemy. In the workplace, a mob consists of ordinary worker who, after deeming an individual worker a threat, collectively attack the perceived enemy. Like birds, the individual workers harm the target by collective and relentless small jobs. The mob of workers can be understood as an entity in and of itself. Once it is formed, it takes on a life of its own, even when members may question the benefit of continuing to punish the target. As an aggressive force, a mob is very different from the "toxic worker" described in bullying literature. The toxic worker is understood as an aggressive individual who wilfully attacks innocent others. By contrast, the mob is a collection of ordinary workers who collectively demonize an individual and destroy him or her (mobbingportal,2012).

The term was applied to the psychology in 70's, by the Swedish scientist, Peter Paul Heinemann in his book "Mobbing: Group Violence among Children" which was about harassment and violence in schools among students (Heinemann,1972 cited in Gülen,2008).

The term 'Mobbing' was defined firstly and was popularized during the 80's by an industrial psychologist Heinz Leymann, who called mobbing a kind of long-term hostile behavior detected in employees at workplaces. After his studies Leymann determined 45 different psycological terror behaviors (Carnero,Martinez&Sanchez-Mangas,2006). According to

Leymann, psychological terror or mobbing in working life involves hostile and unethical communication which is directed in a systematic manner by one or more individuals, mainly toward one individual, who, due to mobbing, is pushed into a helpless and defenseless position and held there by means of continuing mobbing activities. These actions occur on a frequent basis (at least once a week) and over a long period of time (at least six months' duration). Because of the high frequency and long duration of hostile behavior, this maltreatment results in considerable mental, psychosomatic and social misery (Leymann,1990; Leymann,1996; leymann.se,2012).

Workplace aggressive behavior defined as behavior carried out by an individual or a group of individuals that harms a co-worker or others in a work-related context. This named as ''mobbing''. In mobbing verbally, non-verbally, psychologically or physically violence is exposed to a victim. Workplace aggressive behavior can be defined as ''mobbing'' when the violence occurs continuously and systematically. So terms of frequency and continuity are important for researchers. According to the recent studies, negative behaviours in workplace can be defined as mobbing, if they continue at least 6 months and occurs at least once in a week (Balducci,2009; Tınaz,2011).

Leymann's ideas and studies, form basis about all workplace mobbing behaviors researches, all around the world. Leymann, not only defines the mobbing behavior, also he emphasizes the private characteristics of the behavior, manner of appearance, people who are the most influenced from the carried out violence, and also psychological disorders that can be formed as a consequence. Also he provides to widen the attention and interest of mobbing in the working life mainly in Germany and in other European countries, after Skandinavian countries.

The concept of mobbing was used by Heinz Leyman who is known as the Pioneer of the mobbing studies. He called also 'psychological terrorization' to that phenomenon instead of 'mobbing'. The term 'mobbing' is a term that is mostly used in Skandinavian countries. In United Kingdom and United States the term 'bullying' is mostly preferred. In United States also the terms 'workplace harrassment' or 'emotional abuse' are used instead of 'mobbing' (Leymann,1996; Einarsen,1999; Davenport,2012).

In a recent study which was made in Italy, researchers named this phenomenon with 'workplace aggressive behavior' instead of 'mobbing'. According to this research, aggressive behavior is different from violent behavior in that the latter causes or is intended to cause physical harm (e.g. intentionally hitting or pushing someone at work), while the former may involve non-physical behavior such as humiliating or isolating someone at work. Thus aggressive behavior is a broader phenomenon than violent behavior, and may also include violent behavior (Balducci,2009).

According to Leymann, "There is a connotation between bullying and physical aggression and threat, along the lines of bullying at school being strongly characterized by such physically aggressive acts, whereas, in contrast, physical violence is very seldom found in mobbing behavior at work. Mobbing in the workplace is characterized by much more sophisticated behaviors such as, for example, the social isolation of the victim. Therefore, Leymann suggests retaining the word 'bullying' for activities between youths at school and reserving the word 'mobbing' for adult behavior in workplaces (Leymann,1996).

In Turkey the phenomenon contains different terminology; first of all Osman Cem Önertoy used the term "workplace emotional harrasment" (işyerinde duygusal taciz) in his translation of the Noa Davenport et al.'s book, then in 2004 Acar Baltaş used the term "workplace terrorization" (işyerinde yıldırma) instead of the term bullying, and in 2005 Saban Çobanoglu published a book named "workplace emotional attack" (isyerinde duygusal saldırı), and the same year Gülcan Arpacıoglu's article is named as "workplace bullying" (isyerinde zorbalık) and lastly Pınar Tınaz's book was " Workplace Psychological Harrassment" (İşyerinde Psikolojik Taciz). Additionally 11., 13., 14. and 15. Management and Organization Congress the term "yıldırma" is used for the phenomenon. In addition to these, it is seen that in thesis and studies as the second term *mobbing* find acceptance in Turkish literature. (Önertoy,2003; Baltaş,2004; Çobanoğlu,2005; Arpacıoğlu,2005; Tınaz,2011).

1.1.2. Prevalance

Prevalence estimates, usually based on self-reports of victims, suggest that aggressive behavior is a very widespread phenomenon in the modern world of work. The most recent European working conditions survey (European Foundation,2007) indicates that, at European level, 5% of workers report having been subjected to different forms of aggression (e.g., harassment and discrimination on different grounds) in the last 12 months, and an identical 5% reports having been exposed to physical violence or threats of violence. This means that, in absolute terms, each of the two forms of aggression regards almost 12 million workers. As far as Italy is specifically concerned, according to the Italian National Institute of Statistics (ISTAT, 2008) 4.6% of workers report being currently exposed to harassment and intimidation at work, and 1.6% to physical violence or threats of violence (Balducci,2009).

In 1996, according to the consequences of 15.800 interviews that were made in 15 countries which are members of European Union; in the previous year 4% of workers (6 million workers) were exposed to physical violence, 2% of workers (3 million workers) were exposed to sexual harrasment, 8% of workers (12 million workers) were exposed to mobbing. According to consequences of another research which was made in England, 53% of workers were exposed to mobbing and 78% of workers testified this situation.

According to the results of an another comprehensive research of European Union, at least 12 million workers were exposed to mobbing, and this number represented 8% of the working people population. According to the working people population, the ratio of those who were exposed to mobbing were, in England 16%, in Sweden 10%, in France and in Finland 9%, in Ireland and in Germany 8%, in Italy 4%. It is recorded that hundreds of victims of mobbing in Sweden and Germany retired earlier or hospitalized in psychiatry clinics (Tınaz,2011).

Large scale studies and surveys across countries indicate: 8.6% of the Norwegian working population experienced workplace bullying over a six-month period (Einarsen&Skogstad, 1996); 3.5% of the Swedish working population experienced workplace bullying over a six month period (Leymann,1996; Einarsen&Skogstad,1996).

8.8% of Finnish business professionals were bullied occasionally which was reduced to 1.6% when frequency was at least weekly (Salin,2001); 10.6% of workers from the UK reported being bullied over a six month period rising to 24.7% for within a five year period (Hoel et al.,2001); and 33.7% of employees from Portugal, Spain and the UK had experienced bullying behaviours on a regular basis (Jennifer et al.,2003 cited in Daniels,2005).

A study of over 1000 participants conducted in the United Kingdom found that 53% had experienced workplace bullying during their careers, and 77% had witnessed it happening to another employee during their careers (Rayner,1997).

Large variations in prevalence rates may be influenced by the differing definitions of workplace behaviours, differing measurements used for assessment and the differing time periods assessed(Balducci,2009).

As it was mentioned before, the term 'mobbing' is a new term and less known issue in Turkey and in North Cyprus. Below there are some researches and their consequences that were made in Turkey about mentioned phenomenon.

According to a research that was made by Gökçe in 2006 and was about mobbing in private and state primary schools, teachers and managers from both state and private schools were exposed to mobbing from time to time. Behaviors of looking down on achivements, being criticized in an unjustice way and cutting their words were the behaviors that most often seen. It was found that gender differencies played role in teachers, both teachers and managers were exposed mobbing by managers (Gökçe,2006).

According to the research which was made by Yavuz in 2007 and named as 'Factors that Effect Perception of Mobbing in Workplace', it was found that there was significant relation between mobbing perception of employees and their gender, marital status, educational backgrounds, occupations and weekly duration of working (Yavuz,2007).

1.1.3. Types Of Mobbing

Three types of mobbing can be considered depending on the power of victims and offenders. They are horizontal, up-down and down-up mobbing.

1. Horizontal Mobbing: When mobbing occurs between co-workers at the same hierarchical level it is called horizontal mobbing.

2. Up-down Mobbing: This type of mobbing occurs when a superior harasses one of her/his subordinates.

3. Down-up Mobbing: Down-up mobbing occurs when a worker or a group or workers harasses his/their superior (Branch, Sheehan, Barker & Ramsay,2004 cited in Yaman,2009).

1.1.4. Actors That Role In Mobbing Process

Victims: Risk of being a victim is equal for everybody in every organization, every culture. There's not determined personality type that it can be said this person will be a victim but some people have more risk to be a victim. For instance; a person who is the only woman in a workplace and the rest is men; different from others, successfull than others or a newcomer has more risk to be a victim. Minorities are always in a risk group (Tınaz,2006).

Offenders:In mobbing process rules are determined by offenders not by victims. Types of offenders:

1. Narcissistic offender :People who have narcissistic personality disorder can be an offender and they behave to their victims in an arrogant, cocky and cutthroat way.

2. Irate offender: They are typical offenders, they try to control by inspiring fear. They can't control emotions; they act on impulse right after they continue their work as if nothing

happened a little before. It is impossible not to be exposed to mobbing if there is someone like this in the workplace.

3. Disingenuous offender: This type of offenders continuously tries to injure the victim, makes plan to beat. They play 'good guy' role, when required easily impute the fault to somebody else. Appropriate the good ideas or works to own.

4 Megalomaniac offender: Main characteristics of offenders that have megalomaniac personality are being cocky and faker. All afford is to have the wind of others. They want to have all information and source control and new rules belong to them. Communication and information possibilities are impeded.

5. Critical offender: Continuously behave, think and talk negatively, look for a fault. Because of their behaviors, workers have to work away on, so the managers like this offenders.

6. Frustrate offender: This type of offender's private life contains negative remembrance, problems and conflicts but the offender turn them to the others who don't have such problems in their life, try to get even with them. Generally because they are more emotional, women more frequently are seen (Kök,2006; Tınaz,2011; Gülen,2008).

1.1.5. Experiences Of Victims In The Process Of Mobbing

The symptoms of illnesses are seen, the individual becomes sick, so he/she can't go to work, he/she is fired.Victim feels stress, due to this psychosomatic symptoms are formed. Sometimes he/she experiences a heavy depression, he/she can think to have suicide, also he/she can commit suicide. Victim defines his/her role as a back role and he/she says 'They exclude me'.He/she believes that he/she has not got any guilt. On the other hand, he/she believes that he/she makes everything wrong everytime.Victim has not self-confidence, also he/she is in a general indecision. Because of the situation that he/she experiences, he/she refuses all of the responsibilities, or he/she thinks that he/she is responsible for everything (Tınaz,2011).

According to Leymann, the victim is defined as the person in the schism who has lost his/her "coping resources". He mentioned that four critical incident phases which cause to start mobbing process can be found:

1. The Original Critical Incident: Conflict can be the cause of that situation, also it can be a triggering situation for mobbing. this phase is very short and the next phase will be entered into as soon as the focused person's workmates and management reveal stigmatizing actions.

2. Mobbing And Stigmatizing: In mobbing process, many of the communicative actions have an injurious effect as these actions are used consistently and systematically over a long period, with the intention of causing damage or putting someone out of action. All the observed actions have the common denominator of being based on the desire to "get at a person" or punish him/her. Thus manipulation is the main characteristic of the event. Aggressive acts play an important role in this phase.

3. Personnel Administration: During this phase, people can be confronted with serious violations of justice. Management tends to take over the prejudices of the victim's workmates. This is one of the outcomes of the mobbing situation, which turns the person into a marked individual. The isolation and expulsion process for victim is started..

4. Expulsion: At the end of mobbing process expulsion occurs. Victim is fired from the workplace. Expulsion can be a triggering situation for Post-Traumatic Stres Disorder, emotional distress, psychosomatic problems, depression and many of other psycholocigal problems. Victim can start to get psychological treatment so his/her name enters in sick list, then he/she has difficulties to find a new job (Leymann,1990).

1.1.6. The Mobbing Categories

1.1.6.1. Personal Mobbing Behaviours:

- Ignoring/excluding/silent treatment/isolating

- Malicious rumours or gossip

- Belittling remarks/undermining integrity/ lies told about you/ sense of judgement questioned/ opinions marginalized

- Public humiliation / eg making someone look stupid

- Ridiculing/insulting/teasing/jokes/ 'funny surprises'/sarcasm

- Shouted or yelled at / 'Bawling out'

- Threats of violence (or threats in general)

- Insulting comments made about your private life

- Physical attacks

- Attacking person's beliefs, attitudes, lifestyle/appearance / devaluing with ref to gender / accusations of being mentally disturbed

- Persistent criticism (often in front of others)

- Using obscene/offensive language/gestures/material

- Ganging up Colleagues/clients encouraged to criticise you or spy on you / Witch hunt/dirty tricks campaign / Singled out

- Intimidation / acting in a condescending or superior manner

- Intruding on privacy e.g., spying, stalking, harassed by calls etc when on leave/weekends

- Sexual approaches/offers (unwanted) or unwanted physical contact

- Verbal abuse

- Inaccurate accusation

- Insinuative glances/gestures/dirty looks

- Tampering with personal effects / Theft/destruction of property

- Encouraged to feel guilty (Beswick,2006).

1.1.6.2.Work-Related Behaviours:

- Giving unachievable tasks/impossible deadlines/overloading/demands/'setting up to fail' / unmanageable workloads

- Meaningless tasks / unpleasant jobs / Belittling person's ability / Undermined

- Withholding information deliberately / info goes missing / concealing information / failing to return calls / failing to pass on messages

- Undervaluing contribution / No credit where due / Taking credit for work that is not their own

- Constant criticism

- Under work / working below competence / removing responsibility / Demotion

- Unreasonable/inappropriate monitoring

- Offensive administrative penal sanctions e.g., denying leave

- Exclude/isolate/views ignored

- Changing goalposts/targets

- Not providing enough training/resources

- Reducing opportunities for expression / interrupting when speaking

- Negative attacks on person for no reason/sabotage

- Supplying incorrect / unclear information

- Making threats/hints about job security

- No support from manager

- Abuse/threats

- Denial of opportunity

- Judging wrongly

- Forced/unjustified disciplinary hearings

- Lack of clarity re. Role

- Not trusting

- Scapegoating (Beswick,2006).

1.1.7. Consequences Of Mobbing

1. Physical Consequences: About brain; distress, panic atack, depression, half head ache, vertigo, amnesia, concentration problems, insomnia. About skin; skin problems like itching, red spots, desquamation, skin eruption. About eyes; sudden feeling near fainting, turbidity on seeing. About neck and dorsal side; pain in neck muscles and dorsal side. About heart; rapid and unsysyematic palpitation, heart attack. About joints; tremors, sweating, feeling of weakness on legs, pain in joints.About digestive system; stomach problems like heartburn, pyrosis, indigestion, gastric ulcer. About respiratory sysyem; respiration problems like being breathless, unable to breath. About immune system; weakness in organism's defense units, becoming ill very often and earlier (Tınaz,2006).

2.Social Consequences: Social isolation, stigmatizing, voluntary unemployment, social maladjustment.

3.Social-psychological Consequences: Loss of coping resources; many coping resources are linked to social situations, and as these change in a negative direction, the coping system breaks down.

4.Psychological Consequences: A feeling of desperation and total helplessness, a feeling of great rage about lack of legal remedies, great anxiety and despair.

5. Psychosomatic and psychiatric Consequences: Depressions, hyperactivity, compulsion, suicides, psychosomatic illness. There are suspicions that the experiences deriving from this social situation have an effect on the immune system (one company physician observed a couple of "mysterious" cases of cancer) (Leymann,1990).

6.Economic Consequences: Treatment payments for recovering psychological and physiological health. Loss of systematic salary after loss of work (Tınaz,2006).

As consequence of mobbing, workplaces damage economically. Permissions because of illnesses increase, qualified expert employees leave from work, cost of education and taking new employees after increasing leavings from work increases, general low performances occur, low quality of work occurs, compensations that paid for workers, costs of

unemployment, costs of legal situations, payments for early retirement increase. Because of all those consequences, workplaces damage economically (Tınaz,2006).

1.1.8. Mobbing And Laws

Three Skandinavian countries recognize the employee's right to remain physically and mentally healthy at work (Sweeden, Finland, Norway). The Swedish National Board of Occupational Safety and Health has, on top of this legislation, submitted three ordinances in order to enforce this act, one of them especially regarding mobbing. One ordinance enforces the employer to internal control of the work environment on a regular basis in order to be able to take measures at an early stage. Another ordinance enforces direct interventions as mobbing occurs at the workplace. A third ordinance in this area enforces the employer's responsibility for vocational rehabilitation once an employee has been on sick leave for at least one month (Leymann,1996).

Almost all the establishments of the World mobbing actions are considered. But uncover the impacts of these actions which are employees faced with is so difficult. As employees do not want to lose their jobs want to avoid embarassing situation in the community, many times they hide mobbing which they were exposed. Foreign law systems has given way to code article for he/she needs of society, consequently wants to punish people who applies mobbing. (Özkul&Çarıkçı,2010).

Before 2011, it was a great lack of not being article concerned with mobbing in Turkish law system. In 2011 a commission was developed for prevention of mobbing. Under the ordinance of 417, law of protection of employees personality was established. According to article 417, employers have responsibility for protect employee's personalities, employers also have to take precautions for employees to protect them from psychological and sexual harrasments. Employers have to take all precautions for occupational health and confidence and for this situation they also have to keep all requirements available in full; employees have to obey all

the precautions that were taken for occupational health and confidence (Kadın Erkek Fırsat Eşitliği Komisyonu,2011).

In March 2011, Turkish prime minister released a circular letter about mobbing in The Official Gazette(mobbing.org,2012).

Unfortunately, in North Cyprus law system there is not any article concerned directly with mobbing. There are some indirect articles about employee's health and work security that if can not be obeyed it can cause judgement in the courts. According to article Y.25/2000's 54. item; employers have to take all precautions for occupational health and confidence and for this situation they also have to keep all requirements available in full; employees have to obey all the precautions that were taken for occupational health and confidence (Şahoğlu&Mamalı,2006).

1.2. DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS AND MOBBING

Nowadays mobbing is a fact that comes true in all workplaces and all cultures without discrimination of gender and hierarchy. So, risk of being exposed to mobbing, that is risk of being a victim is equal for everybody. About being a victim, Leymann said ' Victim is an individual who feels himself/herself as a victim' (Leymann,1990).

In recent studies researchers indicated that some demographic characteristics can be effective on being exposed to mobbing, also this characteristics can be changeable from one culture to another (Matthiesen,2002; Tınaz,2011).

According to the research that was made by Necati Cemaloğlu and Abbas Ertürk in 2004-2005 education year and was named as "Mobbing Acts That Teachers And Administrators Exposed In School Environment" which showed that male teachers and managers in sub-categories "capturing attention and communication, social relations, damage to reputation, life quality, and professional status" were exposed to mobbing more than female teachers and managers. According to the results of the survey, three-fourths of those subjecting those people to mobbing were male and the remaining one-fourths were females. The sample of this research were 347 teacher and manager from 16 primary shool in Ankara (Ertürk & Cemaloğlu,2005). On the other hand, in a Scandinavian research, it was found that there was not significant relationshipp between mobbing and gender differencies (Einarsen,Raknes&Matthiesen,1994).

Necati Cemaloğlu made another research in 2006-2007 education year which name was 'The Relationship Between School Administrators' Leadership Styles and Bullying'. At the end of this research, it was concluded that, school administrators showed low level leadership behaviours, teachers were victims of bullying at mid level, bullying behaviors directed to teachers increased if school administrators (principals) used laissez-faire leadership behaviors, motivation by inculcation and laissez-faire leadership had meaningful predictive ability for bullying (Cemaloğlu,2007).

In 2008, another research was made by Öznur Gülen and named as 'The Relationship Between Personality And Being Exposed To Workplace Bullying Or Mobbing'. According to the results of this research, the employee whose ages were below 30 was exposed bullying more than older ones, being at primary school level employee was significantly effective on being exposed to workplace bullying in the factors "physical violence" comparing to being both in high school and university level but not being at master or doctorate level (Gülen, 2008).Contrastly to this, there are researches that found, when age become older risk of exposure to mobbing increase (Einarsen&Skogstad,1996).

1.3. PERSONALITY AND MOBBING

According to Ewen, personality refers to important, relatively stable characteristics within the individual that account for consistent patterns of behavior. Aspects of personality may be observable or unobservable, and conscious or unconscious.

Personality is a dynamic and organized set of characteristics possessed by a person that uniquely influences his or her cognitions, motivations, and behaviors in various situations. It can also be thought of a psychological construct- a complex abstraction that encompasses the person's unique genetic background (except in the case of identical twins) and learning history and the ways in which these factors influence his or her responses to various environments or situations (Ryckman,2000 cited in Gülen,2008).

British psychologist Hans Eysenck developed a model of personality based upon three universal traits: Introversion/Extraversion; introversion involves directing attention on inner experiences, while extraversion relates to focusing attention outward on other people and the environment.So, a person high in introversion might be quiet and reserved, while an individual high in extraversion might be sociable and outgoing. Neuroticism/Emotional Stability; neuroticism refers to an individual's tendency to become upset or emotional, while stability refers to the tendency to remain emotionally constant. Psychoticism; individuals who are high on this trait tend to have difficulty dealing with reality and may be antisocial, hostile, non-empathetic and manipulative (Cherry,2012).

1.3.1. Characteristics Of Victim:

Leymann strongly against the idea that personality of a person can be reason for being victim because victims develop changes in personality due to workplace bullying; the symptoms of bullying are misunderstood and interpreted as being that which the individual brings into the organization in the first place (Leymann,1996). According to Leymann, personality characteristics are not important for mobbing. If 'conflict' occurs, the mobbing will start and behaviors of individuals will be shaped. So, 'conflict' is the key factor. Leymann thinks that the workplace should not be confused with other situations in life. A workplace is regulated by behavioral rules. One of this rules deals with effective co-operation, controlled by the supervisor. Conflicts can always arise, but must, according to these, behavioral rules, be settled. One of the supervisor's obligation is to manage this kind of situation. By neclecting this obligation, a supervisor promotes the escalation of the conflict in the direction of mobbing process. Mobbing in its early stages, is most often a sign that a conflict around the organization of work tasks has taken on a private touch. When a conflict is privatized or if the power behind its further development begins to become grounded in a deeper dislike between two individuals, then conflict concerning work tasks has become a situation that an employer has the obligation to stop. Once a conflict has reached this stage in its escalation, it is meaningless to blame someone's personality for it. He think that further researches should reveal personality as a source of conflicts of this kind.In another study Leymann mentiones that he is against the view to look an individual's personality as a cause of mobbing process. According to Leymann, when post-traumatic stress syndrome develops, the individual can develop major personality changes as a symptom of a major mental disorder due to the mobbing process (Leymann,1996). Also Brodsky says that if organizational climate doesn't permit, workplace bullying can't be occur (Shin, 2005). According to Zapf; the responses of the target can be thought at least in the early phases of conflict, but he stress on not to blaming victim (Zapf,1999).

Contrastly to these, there are opinions that personality is an effective factor on being exposed to mobbing or caring out mobbing. According to Einarsen, Rayner and others organizational factors naturally important but can't explain the whole of the picture without individual side.

The experiences of being bullied which is a cognitive process of evaluation affected by both situational and personality variables (Rayner,1997; Matthiesen&Einarsen,2007).

According to Einarsen, Raknes and Matthiesen, in a Norwegian survey it is found that victims coping and conflict management skills are lower than others as well as shyness contributed to being bullied (Einarsen,Raknes&Matthiesen,1994).

As another research Vartia in a survey in Finland reported that victims were higher in neuroticism than non-victims but when work environment and climate were controlled the relation was reduced. The targets also expressed feelings of low self-confidence more often than did those who had not been subjected to bullying. According to the research of Öznur Gülen there is a significant relationship between personality and being exposed to workplace bullying or mobbing. It is found that being exposed to workplace bullying by organizational measures and being a neurotic person is positively related to each other. It can be said as well, neurotic people are exposed to such behaviors more than others. Also it is found that being a psychotic person and being exposed to verbal violence are in relation with each other (Vartia,2001; Gülen,2008).

In 2007, Derya Deniz made a research which name was 'Personality Factors And Ego Defense Mechanisms Of Employees Who Were Exposed to Mobbing'. A questionnaire consists of the mobbing scale, the DSQ (Defense Style Questionnaire), the EPQ (Eysenck Personality Questionnaire) and the JSQ (Job Satisfaction Questionnaire) was applied to 113 participants. As a result of this research, positive relations are found between mobbing and neurotic personality and fantasy cross ego defence mechanisms (Deniz,2007).

Previous researches has provided initial evidence on the relationship between mobbing and personality as comprehensively described. According to many researches about the relationship between personality and mobbing, neuroticism personality type by both school bullying and workplace bullying (mobbing) studies found in relation with being exposed to mobbing significantly. Due to those findings, in this study personality and being exposed to mobbing investigated parallel to international studies the scale used in the study contains neuroticism personality type as well.

1.3.2. Characteristics Of Offenders:

There is not any empirical research about the personality and the psychological situations of offenders (Einarsen, 2002). But in researches that are about why individuals carry out mobbing, psychological situations and actions of offenders are based and generally it is seen that offenders carry out mobbing to get rid of deficiencies of themselves(Tınaz,2011).

According to Walter, offenders are individuals who; choose behavior which is more aggressive than other,do everything for continuity and being heated of conflict, when they catch a mobbing situation, know and accept the negative effects of mobbing on victims with an unconcern way,do not feel any guiltiness,not only believe that they are innocent but also think that they make a good thing, accuse others for their behavior and believe that they behave like that as reaction for others' provocations (Walter,1993 cited in Tınaz,2011).

1.4. PSYCHOLOGICAL DISORDERS AND MOBBING

A psychological disorder is a psychological pattern or anomaly, potentially reflected in behavior, that is generally associated with distress or disability and which is not considered part of normaldevelopment of a person's culture. Psychological disorders are generally defined by a combination of how a person feels, acts, thinks or perceives. (wikipedia,2012).

According to the recent studies about that fact it was seen that there was relationship between mobbing and psychological disorders. It was mentioned that psycholological disorders are mainly accepted as consequences of mobbing process. Post-traumatic stress disorder, depression, panic disorders, panic attacks, somatization, even suicides can occur as consequences of mobbing, due to recent findings (Leymann,1990; Leymann,1996).According to the statistical results of a research that was made in Sweden, the reason of %10-%15 of the suicides that occured in last one year, was mobbing(Tınaz,2011).

According to Leymann, the typical psychiatric diagnosis for bullying victims is Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), a disorder which usually ensues from an overwhelming traumatic event and is manifest in symptoms of re-experiencing (e.g., sudden flashbacks of the traumatic experience, painful memories, nightmares), avoidance (e.g., difficulties in remembering aspects of the trauma, progressive social withdrawal, emotional numbing), and arousal (e.g., irritable and angry behavior, concentration difficulties, being "superalert"), and which has a strong negative impact on the individual's level of functioning. In a study carried out on 62 bullying victims, Leymann found that PTSD was the correct diagnosis in 92% of cases. Leymann has gone further by suggesting that a long-term effect of bullying may also be, in the most extreme cases, the suicide of the victim (Leymann,1990; Leymann,1996).

Recent studies have found that work stress is a significant risk factor for the development of depression. According to researchers at the University of Rochester Medical School, stress and a lack of support from co-workers and supervisors is related to depression in both men and women. Workplace mobbing is an extreme form of stress where all social support at work

is turned against the target, making depression even more likely (mobbingportal,2012).

Findings or recent studies showed that, psychological consequences like psychosomatic complaints, obsession and compulsive behaviors, lower self-esteem and lower self-confidence, depression, anxiety disorders mainly post-traumatic stress disorder, sleeping and eating disorders were seen as consequence of mobbing (Ballducci,2009; Niedl,1996; Zapf,1999; Vartia,2001; Leymann,1996).

In another study that was made in Spain, it was found that there was significant and positive relation between workplace mobbing and psychosomatic symptoms (Pedro et al.,2008). According to a study which was made among psychiatry nurses it was indicated that in participants who reported probable post-traumatic stress disorder also reported significantly higher symptom levels in anxiety, depression, hostility, obsessive compulsive, somatization, interpersonal sensitivity, paranoid ideation and psychoticism (Stadnyk,2008).

By the light and the proved evidence of those previous information, in this research it was made an investigation about psychological disorders as a result of mobbing process.

2. METHOD OF THE STUDY

2.1. Aim Of The Study

Like all the World, 'mobbing' is a new term and less known issue in TRNC. Because of the competition, hierarchical positions and negative effect of political opinions in Northern Cyprus, possibility of being exposed to or carrying out mobbing is an expected situation. Education sector is one the most suitable sectors for the mobbing process; there can be both exposing or carrying out mobbing. The aim of the present study is to explore level of the mobbing and to examine the relationship between mobbing and personality characteristics and psychological consequences among employees who work in high schools of 'Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports' in different positions. There are four hypothesis in the present study:

Hypothesis 1: The mobbing occurs among employees that work in education sector in Northern Cyprus.

Hypothesis 2: Some demographic variables are effective on being exposed to mobbing.

Hypothesis 3: Some personality characteristics are related with mobbing.

Hypothesis 4: Psychological disorders are seen in the mobbing process.

2.2. Participants

This study was a cross-sectional study. Survey technique was used for gathering data. Data gathered in the spring semester of 2011-2012 education year and before gathering, written permission from Ministry of Education, Youth and Sportsfor applying questionnaires was taken. The sample was formed from 8 high schools in Nicosia, Famagusta, Kyrenia, Morphou and 195 (n=195) volunteer employees who workin high schools for Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports in North Cyprus participated to the study. In this study, voluntarines of the participants was the basis. The sample of this study included the managers (headmasters,deputy principals) (n=21), teachers (n=154), secretaries/officers (n=9), servant staff (n=7) and other workers (n=4) from private and state high schools that were working for Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports in North Cyprus.

2.3. Instruments

2.3.1. Socio-Demographic Form:

Socio-Demographic Form was developed by the researcher. It consisted of 15 questions about socio-demographic variables that include demographic characteristics; gender, age, marital status, nationality, mother's nationality, father's nationality, educational level, monthly income, number of children, habitat, characteristics about working; quality of workplace, position in the work, working condition, duration of work at present workplace, total duration of work.

2.3.2. Negative Acts Questionnaire:

Negative Acts Questionnaire (NAQ) was used for analysing the level of mobbing. Negative Acts Questionnaire was developed by Einarsen and Raknes in 1997, originally consists of 22 items which aims to examine negative and potentially harassing behaviors experienced at workplace. The scale measures the frequency of the negative behaviors within the last six months. And a five-point Likert Type scale 'never', 'sometimes', 'every month', 'every week', 'everyday'. All questions are about acts, the term bullying is pointed out nowhere. The advantage of this is to measure exposure degree of the person who answered the questions without imposing to name it as bullying (**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**; Cemaloğlu,2007).

Negative Acts Questionnaire (NAQ) was translated into Turkish by Necati Cemaloğlu in 2007. The translation was checked by three different language experts and after necessary changes, it was retranslated into English. Language was analyzed in terms explanation and meaning. It was implemented to 145 teachers chosen by random method. At the end of factor analyze results, it was concluded that 22 items were brought together under one factor (Cemaloğlu,2007). In 2009, Orhan Aydın and Hatem Öcel were also made a research for validity and reliability of Turkish version of NAQ. A total of 100 public and private sector employees participated in the study. Principle component analysis revealed that one factor solution accounted for 39 % of the total variance. The convergent and criterion related validities of the scale were explored by relating the scale scores with another workplace bullying scale and adverse outcomes such as low self esteem and high state anxiety respectively. The results indicated high convergent and criterion related validities. Reliability analyses showed that the scale had high internal consistency and high test-retest and split half reliabilities. Based on the findings, it was concluded that Turkish version of the NAQ had sufficiently high reliability and validity to justify its use as a tool to measure workplace bullying in Turkey (Aydın&Öcel,2009).

2.3.3. The Revised-Abbreviated Version Of The Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQR-A):

The Revised-Abbreviated version of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQR-A) was designed by Hans Eysenck and shortens by Francis et al, in 1992 to 24 questions. The questionnaire contains three main factors that were subscales (extroversion, neuroticism, psychoticism) and by the lie subscale aim was controlling the validity of answers. All factors contain 6 questions, at total participants answer 24 questions for the scale and the answers were yes (1) - no (0) so the points for every factor was between 0 and 6 (Francis,Brown&Philipchalk,1992). By the cultural scales the validity and reliability for adopting Turkish literature was examined. The translation and adapting was done by Nuray Karancı, Gülay Dirik and Orçun Yorulmaz. Factor analysis, similar to the original scale, yielded 4 factors; the neuroticism, extraversion, psychoticism, and lie scales. Kuder-Richardson alpha coefficients for the extraversion, neuroticism, psychoticism, and lie scales were 0.78, 0.65, 0.42, and 0.64, respectively, and the test-retest reliability of the scales was 0.84, 0.82, 0.69, and 0.69, respectively. The relationships between EPQR-A-48, FSI-III, EMBU-C, and RSES were examined in order to evaluate the construct validity of the scale. Our findings support the construct validity of the questionnaire. To investigate gender differences in scores on the subscales, MANOVA was conducted. The results indicated that there was a gender difference only in the lie scale scores. After the study the scale was found reliable and valid (Karancı,Dirik&Yorulmaz,2007).

2.3.4. Symptom Check List-90-Revised (SCL-90-R):

The Symptom Checklist-90-Revised (SCL-90-R) is a 90-item self-report symptom inventory developed by Leonard R. Derogatis in the mid-1970s to measure psychological symptoms and psychological distress. It is designed to be appropriate for use with individuals from the community, as well as individuals with either medical or psychiatric conditions. The SCL-90-

R assesses psychological distress in terms of nine primary symptom dimensions and three summary scores termed global scores. The principal symptom dimensions are labeled

Somatization (SOM), Obsessive-Compulsive (OBS), Interpersonal Sensitivity (INT), Depression (DEP), Anxiety (ANX), Hostility (HOS), Phobic Anxiety (PHOB), Paranoid Ideation (PAR), and Psychoticism (PSY). The global measures are referred to as the Global Severity Index (GSI), the Positive Symptom Distress Index (PSDI), and the Positive Symptom Total (PST).SCL-90-R was translated and adapted to Turkish by Dağ and Kılıç.In 1991, İhsan Dağ made a study among university students in Turkey for reliability and validity of Turkish version of SCL-90-R. At the same year, Mustafa Kılıç made another study for reliability and validity of Turkish version of SCL-90-R. According to both studies SCL-90-R was a reliable and valid instrument for Turkey as a psychiatric screening device (Dağ,1991; Kılıç,1991).

2.4. DATA ANALYSIS

All of the statistical analysis of questionnaires were performed by using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences Version 17 (SPSS 17). Frequency analysis, Student's t-test, ANOVA, Chi-square and correlations were done among factors of questionnaires.

3. RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The present study include 195 participants. The mean age of the sample was 38.52 (22-56).

Table 1a. Demographic Characteristics

		n(%)
Gender	Female	133(68.2)
	Male	62(31.8)
Marital Status	Married	156(80.0)
	Single	22(11.3)
	Engaged	8(4.1)
	Divorced	8(4.1)
	Widow	1(0.5)
Nationality	TRNC	180(92.3)
	TR	15(7.7)
Educational level	Primary school	4(2.1)
	Secondary school	2(1.0)
	Highschool	9(4.6)
	University and higher	180(92.3)
Mothers' nationality	TRNC	171(87.7)
	TR	22(11.3)
	Other	2(1.0)
Father's nationality	TRNC	164(84.1)
	TR	29(14.9)
	Other	2(1.0)

According to the demographic characteristics, 68.2% (n=133) of 195 participants were female, 31.8% (n=62) of them were male. While 80.0% (n=156) of them were married, 11.3%

(n=22) of them were single, 4.1% (n=8) of them were engaged, 4.1% (n=8) of them were divorced and 0.5% (n=1) of them were widow. Nationality of 92.3% (n=180) of the participants were TRNC and nationality of 7.7% (n=15) of the participants were TR. 2.1% (n=4) of them graduated from primary shcool, 1.0% (n=2) of them graduated from secondary school, 4.6% (n=9) of them graduated from highschool,92.3% (n=180) of them graduated from university and higher. 87.7% (n=171) of the participants' mother's nationality was TRNC, 11.3% (n=22) of the participants' mothers' nationality was TR and 1.0% (n=2) of the participants' mothers' nationality was other nationalities except TRNC and TR. 84.1% (n=164) of the participants' fathers's nationality was TRNC, 14.9% (n=29) of the participants' fathers' nationality was TR and 1.0% (n=2) of the participants' mothers' nationality was other nationalities except TRNC and TR.

Table 1 b.Demographic Characteristics

		n(%)
Monthly income	Less than 1300TL	8(4.1)
	1300TL-2500TL	36(18.5)
	2500TL-5000TL	96(49.2)
	More than 5000TL	55(28.2)
Number of children	0	48(24.6)
	1	54(27.7)
	2	82(42.1)
	3 and more	11(5.6)
Territory	City	155(79.5)
	Town	14(7.2)
	Village	26(13.3)

4.1% (n=8) of the participants had monthly income less than 1300TL, while 18.5% (n=36) of them had between 1300TL and 2500TL, 49.2% (n=96)of them had 2500TL and 5000TL,

28.2% (n=55) of them had more than 5000TL. 24.6% (n=48) of the participants had not got any children, 27.7% (n=54) of them had one child, 42.1% (n=8) of them had two children, 5.6% (n=11) of them had three and more children. While 79.5% (n=155) of them were living in a city, 7.2% (n=14) of them were living in a town and 13.3% (n=26) of them were living in a village.

Table 2. Characteristics of Work

		n(%)
The type of working place	Private school	27(13.8)
	State school	168(86.2)
Position	Manager	21(10.8)
	Teacher	154(79.0)
	Secretary/Officer	9(4.6)
	Servant staff	7(3.6)
	Other	4(2.1)
Working Condition	Permanent staff	161(82.6)
	Temporary staff	34(17.4)

13.8% (n=27) of the participants were working in a private school while 86.2% (n=168) of them were working in a state school. The position in the workplace of 10.8% (n=21) of the participants were manager, 79.0% (n=154) of them were teacher, 4.6% (n=9) of them were secretary or officer, 3.6% (n=7) of them were servant staff, 2.1% (n=4) of them had other posiritions. 82.6% (n=161) of them were permanent staff, while 17.4% (n=34) of them were temporary staff.

The mean 'duration of work at present workplace' of sample was 9.18 (0.50-35). The mean 'total duration of work' of sample was 14.39 (0.50-40).

Table 3. Perception of the participants as victim or non-victim according to question 22 of NAQ

	n(%)
Victim	13(6.7)
Non-victim	182(93.3)

According to perception of victim or non-victim, it was seen that 6.7% (n=13) of the participants percevied themselves as victim, 93.3% (n=182) of them perceived themselves as non-victim.

Table 4a. Percentage of personal mobbing items on the NAQ by participants

	Personal Mobbing				
	Never n(%)	Sometimes n(%)	Every month n(%)	Every week n(%)	Every day n(%)
NAQ5	92(47.2)	93(47.7)	4(2.1)	4(2.1)	2(1)
NAQ6	127(65.1)	54(27.7)	8(4.1)	3(1.5)	3(1.5)
NAQ7	151(77.4)	37(19)	4(2.1)	2(1)	1(0.5)
NAQ8	109(55.9)	79(40.5)	5(2.6)	1(0.5)	1(0.5)
NAQ9	162(83.1)	29(14.9)	2(1)	2(1)	-
NAQ12	116(59.5)	68(34.9)	10(5.1)	-	1(0.5)
NAQ14	94(48.2)	82(42.1)	12(6.2)	1(0.5)	6(3.1)
NAQ15	141(72.3)	48(24.6)	4(2.1)	-	2(1)
NAQ17	135(69.2)	54(27.7)	3(1.5)	1(0.5)	2(1)
NAQ20	174(89.2)	12(6.2)	4(2.1)	5(2.6)	-

According to the personal behaviors of mobbing; %47.7 (n=93) of the participants answered sometimes, %2.1 (n=4) every week, %1 (n=2) answered ever day to the question 5 'Spreading gossips and rumors about you'. %27.7 (n=54) of them answered as sometimes, %4.1 (n=8) as every month, %1.5 (n=3) as every week, %1.5 (n=3) as every day to the question 6 'Being ignored, excluded or being 'sent to Coventry'. For the question 7 'Having insulting or offensive remarks made about your person (i.e.habits and backgrounds), your attitudes or your private life', %19 (n=37) of them gave the answer sometimes, %2.1 (n=4) of them every month, %1 (n=2) of them every week, %0.5 (n=1) of them every day. %40.5 (n=79) of the

participants gave the answer of sometimes, %2.6 (n=5) of them every month, %0.5 (n=1) of them every week and %0.5 (n=1) of them every day to the question 8 'Being shouted at or being target of spontaneous anger (or rage)'. To the question 9 'Intimidating behavior such as finger-pointing, invasion of personal space, shoving, blocking/barring the way', %14.9 (n=29) of the participants gave the answer sometimes, %1 (n=2) of them every month and %1 (n=2) of them every week. %34.9 (n=68) of them answered as sometimes, %5.1 (n=10) O them every month, %0.5 (n=1) of them every day for the question 12 'Being ignored or facing a hostile reaction when you approach'. For the question 14 'Having your opinions and views ignored', %42.1 (n=82) of the participants gave the answer sometimes, %6.2 (n=12) of them every month, %0.5 (n=1) of them every week and %3.1(n=6) of them every day. To the question 15 'Practical jokes carried out by people you don't get on with', %24.6 (n=48) of them said sometimes, %2.1 (n=4) every month, %1 (n=2) every day. For the question 17 'Having allegations made against on you',%27.7 (n=54) of the participants answered as sometimes, %1.5 (n=3) of them every month, %0.5 (n=1) of rhem every week, %1 (n=2) of them every day. %6.2 (n=12) of the participants gave the answer of sometimes, %2.1 (n=4) of them every month, %2.6 (n=5) of them every week to the question 20 'Being the subjects of excessive teasing or sarcasm'.

Table 4b. Percentage of work-related mobbing items on the NAQ by participants

	Never n(%)	Sometimes n(%)	Every month n(%)	Every week n(%)	Every day n(%)
		Work-related Mobbing			
NAQ1	93(47.7)	96(49.2)	2(1)	2(1)	2(1)
NAQ2	139(71.3)	42(21.5)	8(4.1)	3(1.5)	3(1.5)
NAQ3	110(56.4)	70(35.9)	8(4.1)	3(1.5)	4(2.1)
NAQ4	126(64.6)	59(30.3)	6(3.1)	2(1)	2(1)
NAQ10	167(85.6)	21(10.8)	3(1.5)	3(1.5)	1(0.5)
NAQ11	133(68.2)	55(28.2)	4(2.1)	3(1.5)	-
NAQ13	127(65.1)	56(28.7)	9(4.6)	2(1)	1(0.5)
NAQ16	114(58.5)	66(33.8)	9(4.6)	5(2.6)	1(0.5)
NAQ18	118(60.5)	66(33.8)	6(3.1)	2(1)	3(1.5)
NAQ19	142(72.8)	47(24.1)	2(1)	2(1)	2(1)
NAQ21	123(63.1)	60(30.8)	4(2.1)	3(1.5)	5(2.6)

According to work-related behaviours of mobbing; %49.2 (n=96) of the participants answered as sometimes, %1 (n=2) of them every month, %1 (n=2) of them every week, %1 (n=2) of them every day to the question 1 'Someone witholding information which affects your performance'. To the question 2 'Being humiliated or ridiculed in connection with your work' %21.5 (n=42) of them gave the answer sometimes, %4.1 (n=8) every month, %1.5 (n=3) every week, %1.5 (n=3) every day. %35.9 (n=70) of them answered as sometimes, %4.1 (n=8) every month, %1.5 (n=3) every week, %2.1 (n=4) every day to the question 3 'Being ordered to do work below your level of competence'. %30.3 (n=59) of the participants gave

the answer of sometimes, %3.1 (n=6) of them every month, %1 (n=2) of them every week, %1 (n=2) of them every day to the question 4 'Having key areas of responsibility removed or replaced with more trivial or unpleasant tasks'. For the question 10 'Hint or signals from others that you should quit your job', %10.8 (n=21) of the participants gave the answer of sometimes, %1.5 (n=3) of them every month, %1.5 (n=3) of them every week, %0.5 (n=1) of them every day. For the question 11 'Repeated reminders of your errors or mistakes', %28.2 (n=55) of them answered as sometimes, %2.1 (n=4) of them every month, %1.5 (n=3) of them every week. %28.7 (n=56) of the participants gave the answer sometimes, %4.6 (n=9) of them every month, %1 (n=2) of them every week, %0.5 (n=1) of them every day for the question 13 'Persistent criticism of your work and effort'. %33.8 (n=66) of them gave the answer sometimes, %4.6 (n=9) every month, %2.6 (n=5) every week, %0.5 (n=1) every day to the question 16 'Being given tasks with unreasonable or imposible targets or deadlines'. For the question 18 'Excessive monitoring of your work', %33.8 (n=66) of them answered as sometimes, %3.1 (n=6) of them every month, %21 (n=2) of them every week, %1.5 (n=3) of them every day. %24.1 (n=47) gave the answer sometimes, %1 (n=2) every month, %1 (n=2) every week, %1 (n=2) every day for the question 19 'Pressure not to claim something which by right you are entitled to (e.g.sick leave,holiday entitlement, travel expenses)'. For the question 21 'Being exposed to an unmanageable workload', %30.8 (n=60) of them answered as sometimes, %2.1 (n=4) of them every month, %1.5 (n=3) of them every week, %2.6 (n=5) of them every day.

Table 5a. Comparison of Personal Mobbing Behaviours Of Victims and Non-victims

		Never n(%)	Sometimes n(%)	Every month n(%)	Every week n(%)	Every day n(%)	p
NAQ5	Victim	7(53.8)	5(38.5)	1(7.7)	-	-	0.563
	Non-victim	85(46.7)	88(48.4)	3(1.6)	4(2.2)	2(1.1)	
NAQ6	Victim	7(53.8)	5(38.5)	-	-	1(7.7)	0.280
	Non-victim	120(65.9)	49(26.9)	8(4.4)	3(1.6)	2(1.1)	
NAQ7	Victim	8(61.5)	4(30.8)	1(7.7)	-	-	0.427
	Non-victim	143(78.6)	33(18.1)	3(1.6)	2(1.1)	1(0.5)	
NAQ8	Victim	3(23.1)	10(76.9)	-	-	-	0.101
	Non-victim	106(58.2)	69(37.9)	5(2.7)	1(0.5)	1(0.5)	
NAQ9	Victim	6(46.2)	7(53.8)	-	-	-	0.001**
	Non-victim	156(85.7)	22(12.1)	2(1.1)	2(1.1)	-	
NAQ12	Victim	4(30.8)	9(69.2)	-	-	-	0.059
	Non-victim	112(61.5)	59(32.4)	10(5.5)	-	1(0.5)	
NAQ14	Victim	1(7.7)	10(76.9)	1(7.7)	1(7.7)	-	0.000**
	Non-victim	93(51.1)	72(39.6)	11(6)	-	6(3.3)	
NAQ15	Victim	5(38.5)	7(53.8)	-		1(7.7)	0.004*

	Non-victim	136(74.7)	41(22.5)	4(2.2)	-	1(0.5)	
NAQ17	Victim	5(38.5)	7(53.8)	1(7.7)	-	-	0.061
	Non-victim	130(71.4)	47(25.8)	2(1.1)	1(0.5)	2(1.1)	
NAQ20	Victim	6(46.2)	6(46.2)	1(7.7)	-	-	0.000**
	Non-victim	168(92.3)	6(3.3)	3(1.6)	5(2.7)	-	

*P≤0.05, **p<0.001

According to the personal behaviors of mobbing; %38.5 (n=5) of the victims answered sometimes, %7.7 (n=1) every month;%48.4 (n=88) of the non-victims answered sometimes, %1.6 (n=3) every month, %2.2 (n=4) every week, %1.1 (n=2) every day to the question 5 'Spreading gossips and rumors about you'. %38.5 (n=5) of the victims answered as sometimes, %7.7 (n=1) as every day; %26.9 (n=49) of them answered as sometimes, %4.4 (n=8) every month, %1.6 (n=3) every week, %1.1 (n=2) as every day to the question 6 'Being ignored , excluded or being 'sent to Coventry'. For the question 7 'Having insulting or offensive remarks made about your person (i.e.habits and backgrounds), your attitudes or your private life', %30.8 (n=4) of the victims gave the answer sometimes, %7.7 (n=1) of them every month;%18.1 (n=33) of the non-victims gave the answer sometimes, %1.6 (n=3) of them every month, %1.1 (n=2) every week, %0.5 (n=1) every day. %76.9 (n=10) of the victims gave the answer of sometimes; %37.9 (n=69) of the non-victims gave the answer of sometimes, %2.7 (n=5) every month, %0.5 (n=1) every week, %0.5 (n=1) every day to the question 8 'Being shouted at or being target of spontaneous anger (or rage)'. To the question 9 'Intimidating behavior such as finger-pointing, invasion of personal space, shoving, blocking/barring the way', %53.8 (n=7) of the victims gave the answer sometimes; %12.1 (n=22) of the non-victims gave the answer sometimes, %1.1 (n=2) every month, %1.1 (n=2) every week. %69.2 (n=9) of the victims answered as sometimes; %32.4 (n=59) of them answered as sometimes, %5.5 (n=10) every month, %0.5 (n=1) for the question 12 'Being ignored or facing a hostile reaction when you approach'. For the question 14 'Having your opinions and views ignored', %76.9 (n=10) of the victims gave the answer sometimes, %7.7 (n=1) of them every month, %7.7 (n=1) of them every week; %39.6 (n=72) of the non-victims

gave the answer sometimes, %6 (n=11) of them every month, %3.3 (n=6) of them every day. To the question 15 'Practical jokes carried out by people you don't get on with', %53.8 (n=7)of the victims said sometimes, %7.7 (n=1) every day;%22.5 (n=41) of them said sometimes, %2.2 (n=4) every month, %0.5 (n=1) every day. For the question 17 'Having allegations made against on you',%53.8 (n=7) of the victims answered as sometimes, %7.7 (n=1) of them every month; ,%25.8 (n=47) of the non-victims answered as sometimes, %1.1 (n=2) of them every month, %0.5 (n=1) every week, %1.1 (n=2) every day. %46.2 (n=6) of the victims gave the answer of sometimes, %7.7 (n=1) of them every month;%3.3 (n=6) of the non-victims gave the answer of sometimes, %1.6 (n=3) of them every month, %2.7 (n=5) every week to the question 20 'Being the subjects of excessive teasing or sarcasm'.

Table 5b. Comparison of Work-Related Mobbing Behaviours Of Victims and Non-victims

		Never n(%)	Sometimes n(%)	Every month n(%)	Every week n(%)	Every day n(%)	p
NAQ1	Victim	5(38.5)	8(61.5)	-	-	-	0.893
	Non-victim	88(48.4)	88(48.4)	2(1.1)	2(1.1)	2(1.1)	
NAQ2	Victim	8(61.5)	5(38.5)	-	-	-	0.552
	Non-victim	131(72)	37(20.3)	8(4.4)	3(1.6)	3(1.6)	
NAQ3	Victim	4(30.8)	8(61.5)	-	-	1(7.7)	0.212
	Non-victim	106(58.2)	62(34.1)	8(4.4)	3(1.6)	3(1.6)	
NAQ4	Victim	6(46.2)	7(53.8)	-	-	-	0.515
	Non-victim	120(65.9)	52(28.5)	6(3.3)	2(1.1)	2(1.1)	
NAQ10	Victim	8(61.5)	4(30.8)	1(7.7)	-	-	0.043*
	Non-victim	159(87.4)	17(9.3)	2(1.1)	3(1.6)	1(0.5)	
NAQ11	Victim	8(61.5)	5(38.5)	-	-	-	0.775
	Non-victim	125(68.7)	50(27.5)	4(2.2)	3(1.6)	-	
NAQ13	Victim	7(53.8)	5(38.5)	1(7.7)	-	-	0.873
	Non-victim	120(65.9)	51(28)	8(4.4)	2(1.1)	1(0.5)	
NAQ16	Victim	3(23.1)	9(69.2)	-	1(7.7)	-	0.036*
	Non-	111(61)	57(31.3)	9(4.9)	4(2.2)	1(0.5)	

	victim						
NAQ18	Victim	4(30.8)	7(53.8)	-	1(7.7)	1(7.7)	0.009*
	Non-victim	114(62.6)	59(32.4)	6(3.3)	1(0.5)	2(1.1)	
NAQ19	Victim	6(46.2)	6(46.2)	1(7.7)	-	-	0.033*
	Non-victim	136(74.7)	41(22.5)	1(0.5)	2(1.1)	2(1.1)	
NAQ21	Victim	4(30.8)	7(53.8)	1(7.7)	-	1(7.7)	0.074
	Non-victim	119(65.4)	53(29.1)	3(1.6)	3(1.6)	4(2.2)	

*p≤0.05, **p<0.001

According to work-related behaviours of mobbing; %61.5 (n=8) of the victims answered as sometimes; %48.4 (n=88) of the non-victims answered as sometimes, %1.1 (n=2) every month, %1.1 (n=2) every week, %1.1 (n=2) every day to the question 1 'Someone witholding information which affects your performance'. To the question 2 'Being humiliated or ridiculed in connection with your work' %38.5 (n=5) of the victims gave the answer sometimes;%20.3 (n=37) of the non-victims gave the answer sometimes, %4.4 (n=8) every month, %1.6 (n=3) every week, %1.6 (n=3) every day. %61.5 (n=8) of the victims answered as sometimes, %7.7 (n=1) every day; %34.1 (n=62) of the non-victims answered as sometimes, %4.4 (n=8) every month, %1.6 (n=3) every week, %1.6 (n=3) every day to the question 3 'Being ordered to do work below your level of competence'. %53.8 (n=7) of the victims gave the answer of sometimes; %28.5 (n=52) of the non-victims gave the answer of sometimes, %3.3 (n=6) every month, %1.1 (n=2) every week, %1.1 (n=2) every day to the question 4 'Having key areas of responsibility removed or replaced with more trivial or unpleasant tasks'. For the question 10 'Hint or signals from others that you should quit your job', %30.8 (n=4) of the victims gave the answer of sometimes, %7.7 (n=1) of them every month; %9.3 (n=17) of the non-victims gave the answer of sometimes, %1.1 (n=2) of them every month, %1.6 (n=3) every week, %0.5 (n=1) every day. For the question 11 'Repeated reminders of your errors or mistakes', %38.5 (n=5) of the victims answered sometimes;

%27.5 (n=50) of the non-victims answered sometimes, %2.2 (n=4) every month, %1.6 (n=3) every week. %38.5 (n=5) of the victims gave the answer sometimes, %7.7 (n=1) of them every month; %28 (n=51) of the non-victims gave the answer sometimes, %4.4 (n=8) of them every month, %1.1 (n=2) every week, %0.5 (n=1) every day for the question 13 'Persistent criticism of your work and effort'. %69.2 (n=9) of the victims gave the answer sometimes, %7.7 (n=1) every week; %31.3 (n=57) of them gave the answer sometimes, %4.9 (n=9) every month, %2.2 (n=4) every week, %0.5 (n=1) every day to the question 16 'Being given tasks with unreasonable or imposible targets or deadlines'. For the question 18 'Excessive monitoring of your work', %53.8 (n=7) of the victims answered as sometimes, %7.7 (n=1) of them every week, %7.7 (n=1) of them every day;%32.4 (n=59) of them answered as sometimes, %3.3 (n=6) every month, %0.5 (n=1) of them every week, %1.1 (n=2) of them every day. %46.2 (n=6) of the victims gave the answer sometimes, %7.7 (n=1) every month;%22.5 (n=41) of the non-vicitms gave the answer sometimes, %0.5 (n=1) every month, %1.1 (n=2) every week, %1.1 (n=2) every day for the question 19 'Pressure not to claim something which by right you are entitled to (e.g.sick leave,holiday entitlement, travel expenses)'. For the question 21 'Being exposed to an unmanageable workload', %53.8 (n=7) of the victims answered as sometimes, %7.7 (n=1) of them every month, %7.7 (n=1) of them every day;%29.1 (n=53) of them answered as sometimes, %1.6 (n=3) of them every month, %1.6 (n=3) every week, %2.2 (n=4) of them every day.

Table 6. The comparison of the mean NAQ scores according to gender

	m±sd	t(p)
Female	30.65±7.01	-2.042 (0.045*)
Male	34.42±13.74	

*p≤0.05

When we compare the mean NAQ scores of female and male employees with Student's t-test, we found that male participants had significantly higher scores (p=0.045). It was reported that male participants were exposed to mobbing more than female participants.

Table 7. The comparison of the mean NAQ scores according to work position

	m±sd	f(p)
Manager	32.62±8.43	0.255 (0.906)
Teacher	31.94±10.26	
Secretary/officer	31.33±7.16	
Servant staff	28.43±7.74	
Others	31.25±8.26	

p≤0.05

When we compare the mean NAQ scores of employees working at different work position with ANOVA, we found no statistically significant differences (p=0.906).

Table 8. The correlation between age, duration of present work, total duration of work and NAQ mean score

	1	2	3	4
1.NAQ	1	0.10	0.24**	0.10
2.Age	0.10	1	0.60**	0.85**
3.Duration of present work	0.24**	0.60**	1	0.62**
4.Total duration	0.10	0.85**	0.62**	1

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

When the correlation between age, duration of present work, total duration of work and NAQ mean score was investigated with Pearson correlation, positive weak correlation between duration of present work and total score NAQ (r=0.241, p=0.001).There were not any correlations between age and total score NAQ (r=0.103, p=0.152). There were not any correlations between total duration of work and total score NAQ (r=0.108, p=0.134).

Table 9. The comparison of NAQ mean scores of employees working at either private or state school

	m±sd	t(p)
Private school	31.41±8.16	-0.250(0.803)
State school	31.91±10.05	

p≤0.05

When we compare the mean scores of NAQ between employees working at either private or state school by Student's t-test, no statistical difference was found (p=0.803).

Table 10.The comparison of NAQ mean scores according to marital status

	m±sd	f(p)
Married	31.97±10.35	
Single	31.81±7.20	
Engaged	28.25±3.99	0.376(0.826)
Divorced	32.38±9.62	
Widow	38.00	

p≤0.05

When we compare the NAQ mean scores according to marital status with ANOVA analysis, no statistical difference was found (p=0.826).

Table 11. The comparison of NAQ mean score according to nationality

	m±sd	t(p)
TRNC	32.07±10.06	1.118(0.265)
TR	29.13±5.04	

p≤0.05

When we compare the NAQ mean scores according to nationality with Student's t-test, no statistical difference was found (p=0.265).

Table 12. The comparison of NAQ mean score according to nationality of mother

	m±sd	f(p)
TRNC	32.15±10.22	
TR	30.00±5.67	0.830(0.438)
Other	26.00±1.41	

p≤0.05

When we compare the NAQ mean scores according to nationality of mother with ANOVA analysis, no statistical difference was found (p=0.438).

Table 13. The comparison of NAQ mean score according to nationality of father

	m±sd	f(p)
TRNC	32.37±10.31	
TR	29.28±5.89	1.602(0.204)
Other	26.00±1.41	

p≤0.05

When we compare the NAQ mean scores according to nationality of father with ANOVA analysis, no statistical difference was found (p=0.204).

Table 14.The comparison of NAQ mean scores according to educational level

	m±sd	f(p)
Primary school	26.00±3.56	
Secondary school	35.00±14.14	0.733(0.533)
Highschool	29.56±5.65	
University and higher	32.05±9.99	

p≤0.05

When we compare the NAQ mean scores according to educational level with ANOVA analysis, no statistical difference was found (p=0.533).

Table 15. The comparison of NAQ mean scores according to monthly income

	m±sd	f(p)
Less than 1300TL	30.38±6.59	
1300TL-2500TL	29.97±6.35	2.762(0.043*)
2500TL-5000TL	33.86±11.96	
More than 5000TL	29.76±6.84	

$p \leq 0.05$

When we compare the NAQ mean scores according to monthly income with ANOVA, we found statistically significant differences (p=0.043), advanced analysing with Tukey, we did not find statistically significant differences. The participants who had 2500TL-5000TL monthly income had higher mean score of NAQ than others. It was reported that The participants who had 2500TL-5000TL monthly income were exposed to mobbing more than others.

Table 16. The comparison of NAQ mean scores according to working condition

	m±sd	t(p)
Permanent staff	31.96±10.06	0.361(0.718)
Temporary Staff	31.29±8.50	

$p \leq 0.05$

When we compare the mean scores of NAQ with working condition by Student's t-test, no statistical difference was found (p=0.718).

Table 17.The comparison of NAQ mean scores according to territory

	m±sd	f(p)
City	32.20±10.36	
Town	30.36±6.08	0.492(0.612)
Village	30.54±7.75	

p≤0.05

When we compare the NAQ mean scores according to territory with ANOVA analysis, no statistical difference was found (p=0.612).

Table 18. Correlation between GSI of SCL-90-R and NAQ mean score

	1	2
1.NAQ	1	0.576**
2.GSI	0.576**	1

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

There were positive moderate correlation between Global Severity Index (GSI) of SCL-90-R and NAQ mean score (r=0.576, p=0.000). It was reported that there were relationship between the distress that increased because of the psychiatric symptoms and mobbing.

Table 19. Correlation between subscales of SCL-90-R and NAQ mean score

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1.NAQ	1	0.475**	0.455**	0.517**	0.489**	0.511**	0.550**	0.524**	0.508**	0.580**	0.428**
2.SOM	0.475**	1	0.665**	0.607**	0.679**	0.771**	0.607**	0.661**	0.619**	0.656**	0.693**
3.O-C	0.455**	0.665**	1	0.809**	0.768**	0.777**	0.672**	0.639**	0.717**	0.710**	0.791**
4.I-S	0.517**	0.607**	0.809**	1	0.829**	0.806**	0.690**	0.716**	0.764**	0.755**	0.746**
5.DEP	0.489**	0.679**	0.768**	0.829**	1	0.854**	0.756**	0.641**	0.797**	0.733**	0.755**
6.ANX	0.511**	0.771**	0.777**	0.806**	0.854**	1	0.770**	0.767**	0.755**	0.837**	0.737**
7.HOS	0.550**	0.607**	0.672**	0.690**	0.756**	0.770**	1	0.594**	0.655**	0.700**	0.629**
8.PHOB	0.524**	0.661**	0.639**	0.716**	0.641**	0.767**	0.594**	1	0.615**	0.788**	0.602**
9.PAR	0.508**	0.619**	0.717**	0.764**	0.797**	0.755**	0.655**	0.615**	1	0.753**	0.673**
10.PSY	0.580**	0.656**	0.710**	0.755**	0.733**	0.837**	0.700**	0.788**	0.753**	1	0.692**
11.ADD	0.428**	0.693**	0.791**	0.746**	0.755**	0.737**	0.629**	0.602**	0.673**	0.692**	1

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level

In the present study there were positive correlation between NAQ and SCL 90 subscales; somatization subscale (r=0.475, p=0.000), obsessive-compulsive subscale (r=0.455, p=0.000), interpersonal sensitivity subscale (r=0.517, p=0.000), depression subscale and NAQ (r=0.489, p=0.000), anxiety subscale (r=0.511, p=0.000), hostility subscale (r=0.550, p=0.000), phobic-anxiety subscale (r=0.524, p=0.000), paranoid ideation subscale (r=0.508, p=0.000), psychoticism subscale (r=0.580, p=0.000), additional items subscale (r=0.428, p=0.000).

Table 20. Correlation between subscales of EPQR-A and NAQ mean score

	1	2	3	4	5
1.NAQ	1	0.340**	-0.152*	0.069	-0.389**
2.Neuroticism	0.340**	1	-0.220**	-0.033	-0.341**
3.Extroversion	-0.152*	-0.220**	1	0.058	0.091
4.Psychoticism	0.069	-0.033	0.058	1	-0.142*
5.Lie	-0.389**	-0.341**	0.091	-0.142*	1

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

In the correlational analysis of subscales of EPQR-A and NAQ, it was found that there were positive moderate correlation between neuroticism total score and NAQ total score ($r=0.340$, $p=0.000$). There were negative weak correlation between extroversion total score and NAQ total score ($r=-0.152$, $p=0.034$). There were not correlation between psychoticism total score and NAQ total score ($r=0.069$, $p=0.338$). There were negative moderate correlation between lie total score and NAQ total score ($r=-0.389$, $p=0.000$).

4. DISCUSSION

The present study indicated that negative acts of mobbing behaviors occured among employees who work at high schools of 'Ministry of National Education, Youth And Sports' in North Cyprus. 6.7% of the participants percieved themselves as victim. Also participants who were not percieved themselves as victim reported that they exposed many forms of mobbing behavior in work place.

In the present study, it was found that; there was relationship between gender differences and being exposed to mobbing. It was reported that male participants were exposed to mobbing more than female participants. Studies on the subject showed different results. In a study about mobbing that was made in Turkey it was found that male participants were exposed to mobbing more than female participants parallel to the present study (Ertürk& Cemaloğlu,2005). However, according to the findings of Scandinavian studies about mentioned phenomenon, no significant gender differences were found (Einarsen,Raknes&Matthiesen,1994; Einarsen&Skogstad,1996). In another study about mobbing that was made in USA among 9000 participants, it was found that 42% of women and %15 of men were exposed to mobbing in last two years (cited in Arpacıoğlu,2005). Those different findings according to some countries can be explained by different cultures of countries. The present study was made in North Cyprus and in this study it was found parallel findings with Turkey about gender differencies and mobbing. Both countries have the same cultural characteristics. There is a cultural respect for women, so it can be the reason for carring out negative acts of mobbing toward men more than women.

According to present study, there were not any relationship between work position and the mobbing. Recent studies indicated different findings about that fact. According to the findings of a study which was made among banking employees, there were not significant differencies between job title and mobbing parallel to the present study's findings (Gök,2011). Parallel to the present study's findings, according to Leymann's study in 1992, the differences with regard to hierarchical position were not statistically significant (cited in Gülen,2008). On the other hand, in another study it was found that according to the organizational status, managers had the highest rates of victimization (Çöl,2008).

In the present study, it was indicated that there was not any relationship between age and the mobbing. In literature there are different findings. In one study, it was shown that older workers were at a higher risk of victimization than younger ones (Einarsen&Skogstad,1996). Due to the findings of another study it was found that the employees whose ages were below 30 were exposed to mobbing more than older ones (Gülen,2008). In another study it was found that employees at the ages between 15 and 36 were exposed to mobbing more than older ones, that is rate of victimization decreases while age increases (Çöl,2008).

According to the findings of the present study, there was significant relationship between duration of present work and being exposed to mobbing. On the other hand there was not any significant relationship between total duration of work and mobbing. In another study which was also made analysis between duration of work and mobbing found that, there were significant differencies between tenure (duration of work) of the participants and their exposure to mobbing (Gök,2011). Parallel to recent findings, the fact that there was significant relationship between duration of present work and being exposed to mobbing, can be explained by decreasing job satisfaction. Recent studies showed that when mobbing was occured job satisfaction was decreased (Einarsen,Matthiesen&Skogstad,1998 cited in Vartia,2002). Also it was found that symptoms of lower job satisfaction causes to feel experiences of victimization (Matthiesen,2002).It can be said that with increasing duration at workplace, employees can lose their motivation for work and so their job satisfaction can decrease. This situation can be effective on their feeling of victimization and on exposure to mobbing.

The present study did not show any relationship between type of school and the mobbing. In a recent study, which analyzed relationship between school type and mobbing, findings were parallel to the present study. According to that study, there was not any difference about the most encountered mobbing behaviors by school type (Gökçe,2006).

According to the present study's findings, there was not any relationship between marital status and the mobbing. Contrastly to the present study's findings, in another study it was found that marital status had an impact on mobbing behaviors (Tunçel,2009). On the other

hand in another study there was similar findings with present study, that is; , there were not any significant differences between marital status and mobbing behaviors (Karcıoğlu&Çelik,2012).

Any relationship between nationality of the participants and mobbing was not found in this study. Also there was not any relationship between mothers' nationality and mobbing, and fathers' nationality and mobbing. In a study which was made in Australia among Australian and Korean teachers, found that victims in Australia are more likely to withdraw, while those in Korea are more likely to acknowledge shame (Shin, 2005). In another study about relationship between the nationality differencies and mobbing indicated that employees from Central America emphasized the physical component of workplace bullying more than the Southern European employees (Escartin, Zapf, Arrieta & Carballeira,2010).

In a study that was made in Turkey, indicated that being at primary school level employee was significantly effective on being exposed to workplace bullying in the factors physical violence comparing to being both in high school and university level but not being at master and doctorate level. There was significant difference between the high school and university level employee on being exposed to workplace bullying on "attacking on personal attributes" factor, high school level employees are being exposed to workplace bullying more than university levels (Gülen,2008). Contrastly to those findings, in this study it was not indicated any relationship between educational level and mobbing.

When the relationship between monthly income and mobbing was examined in the present study, it was found that there was significant relationship between monthly income and mobbing. According to the results, the participants who had 2500TL-5000TL monthly income were exposed to mobbing more than others. This can be the reason of different perceptions of mobbing. While the participants of lower and upper income groups were considering a behavior was not a negative act of mobbing, the participants of medium-level group were considering same behaviour as a negative act of mobbing. Parallel to those findings in a study indicated that teachers who had perception that they have lower socio-economic level were exposed to mobbing more than others (Koç&Bulut,2009).

In the present study, it was indicated that there was not any relationship between working condition and mobbing; that is, being permanent staff or temporary staff were not effective on being exposed to mobbing. Parallel to this, also a recent study did not find any relationship between cotracts of the participant and mobbing (Escartin, Zapf, Arrieta & Carballeira,2010).

According to the indications of the present study, there was not any relationship between the territory and mobbing. North Cyprus is a small country, villages and towns are too close to the cities. As a result of this there are not big differencies between the lives in cities, towns and villages. So this can be the reason of why there was not any relationship between territory and being exposed to mobbing.

In this study, it was found that there was relationship between some personality characteristics and negative acts of the mobbing. According to the findings of this study, there was relationship between some subscales of EPQR-A and mobbing; neuroticism, extroversion, lie subscales and being exposed to mobbing. However, there was not any relationship between psychoticism subscale and being exposed to mobbing. While neuroticisim had positive correlations with mobbing, extroversion and lie had negative correlations with mobbing. Many of the recent studies found similar results with the present study. According to the recent findings about the relationship between personality characteristics and being exposed to mobbing, parallel findings with the present study were indicated. In a study which was made among municipal employees, prison workers and hospital employees, it was reported that neuroticism was correlated with perceived bullying (Vartia,2002). In another study about the same subject that was made in Italy, it was found that bullying victims are individuals with a psychological functioning mainly of neurotic type (Balducci,2009).Another study which was made in Turkey about this subject it was found that neurotic people were exposed to mobbing more than others (Gülen,2008). As a result of another study which was among participants that were from different occupations and different organizational fields, it was found that there was positive relationship between mobbing and neurotic personality (Deniz,2007). Contrastly the present study's findings in a recent study it was reported that there was not any relationship between being an extrovert person and being exposed to mobbing (Gülen,2008). Parallel to the present study's findings of a recent study indicated that

victims of mobbing tended to be more introverted than non-victims (Glaso, Matthiesen, Nielsen& Einarsen cited in Matthiesen,2006).

Positive correlation of neuroticism and negative correlation of exroversion with mobbing in this study can be explained like that: Participants who had personality characteristics of neuroticism and who are less extrovert than others were being exposed to mobbing more than others. Lie subscale was developed mostly for testing the participants if they answer the questions of EPQR-A with honesty and sincerity. Expressions in this subscale mostly examines the bahaviours that assumed that they are wrong by society but can be exhibited by everybody at times. So this subscale reflects and triggers the sensibility about social desirability (Karancı,Dirik&Yorulmaz,2007). Negative relationship between lie and mobbing can be explained that victims of mobbing are tended to hide this situation, they can feel humiliated, so they can give socially desirable answers to the questions. Parallel to this; although it was not one of the hypothesis of this study, in the present study it was seen that some participants perceived and labelled themselves as mobbing victim, while some others perceived that they were not victim. But when it was examined it was interestingly seen that participants who perceived that they were not victim, were being exposed to personal and work-related mobbing behaviours same as other participants. That is; mobbing was occured, some participants accepted that they were victim, some others rejected that they were victims, may be they felt humiliated because of the situation and tended to hide it.

The present study indicated that there was relationship between Global Severity Index of SCL-90-R and the mobbing. As a result of this it can be said when mobbing occurs the distress because of the symptoms of the psychiatric dysfuntions increases, when mobbing was carried out participants had psychological distress. In a previous study, it was mentioned that; symptoms such as anxiety, sleep disorders, digestive disorders, irritation, depression and psychosomatic complaints are common among bullying victims (Lucas, INF 387C). Also it was reported that there were positive relationship between all subscales of SCL-90-R and the negative acts of the mobbing. So, it can be said that there were relationship between psychological disorders and being exposed to mobbing. In literature there were similar findings. According to the recent findings psycgological consequences can be occured as a result of mobbing (Leymann,1990; Leymann,1996; Balducci,2009). According to the

indications of this study somatization and mobbing had relationship with each other, similar to the recent studies' indications, that, there were psycosomatic consequences and some physical consequences like chronic fatique, weakness, pains, various aches, cardiovascular diseases occured as a result of mobbing (Leymann,1990; Brodsky,1976 cited in Matthiesen&Einarsen,2004; Vartia,2002).

The relationship between obsessive compulsive symptoms and the mobbing was found in the present study. In recent studies it was mentioned that many of the targets of the bullying suffered from obsession and compulsive behaviour (Niedl,1996; Zapf,1999).

 As another indication of the present study, it was found that there was relationship between interpersonal sensitivity and mobbing parallel to recent indications. In another words it can be said participants who were exposed to mobbing had lower self esteem, lower self confidence, felt themselves smaller than others, had damaged interpersonal relations, as similar as recent findings (Vartia,2001; Vartia,2002).

 In previous researches about mobbing and its consequences, it was seen that depression and mobbing had relationship. Many of the victims of the mobbing who experienced negative acts of mobbing behaviour suffered from depression, even suicidal ideation (Vartia,2002; Tınaz,2006; Balducci,2009). In the present study it was found that depression and the mobbing had positive relationship, parallel to recent findings.

Previous researches about the mobbing showed that great anxiety, high anxiety levels can be seen on individuals who were exposed to mobbing. As a anxiety disorder post-traumatic stress disorder can be seen generally (Leymann,1990; Leymann,1996; Matthiesen&Einarsen,2004). In the present study it was indicated that there was relationship between anxiety and being exposed to mobbing, parallel to those recent studies.

According to the indications of the present study there were positive relations between hostility and mobbing, there were positive relations between phobic anxiety and mobbing and there were positive relations between paranoid thoughts and mobbing. It can be said that participants who were exposed to mobbing had irritability, hostile behaviors, agressive behaviors and resentments toward others.

Also participant who were exposed to mobbing had some insistent phobic reactions toward a specific object or someone may be the offender. Participants were also suspicious and had fear of losing autonomy. In a study which was made among 17 victim of mobbing in Finland indicated that victims had socio-phobia (Björkqvist,1994). In another study it was indicated that victims of mobbing were over-sensitive, suspicious, angry and to be anxious in social settings (Einarsen,Raknes&Matthiesen,1994).

Another indication of the present study was finding positive relation between psychoticism and being exposed to mobbing. This situation can be explained by being introverted and preferring to stay alone by victims who were exposed to mobbing. According to recent findings being exposed to mobbing also impairs the relationships outside of work, also this situation has disastrous effects on family functioning, relationships and communication (Jennifer,Cowie&Anaiadou,2003; Rayner et al.,2002; Tracy et al.,2006 cited in Lutgen-Sandvik&Sypher,2009).

The present study indicated that there were positive relation between additional items of SCL-90-R, which represents sleeping problems, eating problems and feelings of guiltiness, and being exposed to mobbing. According to a Finnish research victims of mobbing suffered from insomnia (Björkqvist,1994). In another research it was indicated that 34% of victims of mobbing had sleeping problems (Vartia,2001). In a Norwegian study it was indicated that victims blamed themselves by their own shyness, low self esteem, lack of self-efficacy and lack of conflict management skills (Einarsen,Raknes&Matthiesen,1994).

5. CONCLUSION

The present study indicated that there were mobbing among employees who work at high schools of 'Ministry Of Education, Youth and Sports' and mobbing had relationship between demographic characteristics, personality characteristics and psychological disorders.

According to the results of the present study male gender, working for a longer time at one place and moderate income are high risk factors for mobbing. These factors should be considered when preparing a prevention program.

Findings of this study showed that some people who had some personality characteristics had higher risk for exposing mobbing because of their personality. Results about victims were expected because there are many researches about that subject. It can be said that personality characteristics of offenders are also effective on carring out mobbing behaviours, but there are not enough researches and evidences about that subject. Further researchers should also examine offenders personality characteristics instead of victims personality characteristics.

Another finding of this study is the relationship between psychological disorders and mobbing. Psychological disorders are generally consequences of mobbing rather than causes. So importance and necessity of psychologists in workplaces are seen. Unfortunately in Northern Cyprus, the idea of going to psychologists are not common yet. There should be psychologists in workplaces to educate employees and to help about their problems. Also going to a psychologist should be in insurance coverage for increasing continuity of therapies. If a person's psychological situation becomes better, his/her family life also becomes better, and at the end society becomes better.

Some negative acts of mobbing can be regarded normal in different cultures. Employees should be informed about continuity, frequency of mobbing and what are negative acts of mobbing and what are not. Participants who perceived themselves as non-victim, were being exposed to mobbing almost more than others. This situation shows us that people are feeling embarrassed or humiliated because of exposing mobbing and tend to hide it, or they don't know what behaviours are negative acts of mobbing. So there should be some interventions for informing employees about mobbing to let them know what behaviours are negative acts

of mobbing and what are not. Specialists or researchers should inform employees about causes and consequences of mobbing, if they learn they can protect themselves. The main issue on protection and struggling with mobbing should be educating and informing employees and society in general.

Further researches should examine other workplace sectors such as health, sports, government and private sectors besides education sector. People should regain knowledge about the mobbing phenomenon. Because as all the World in Northern Cyprus, some people are offenders, some others are victims of mobbing. Further researches should focus the mobbing phenomenon more, to increase attention and inform the society. If the society learns what behaviors are negative behaviors of mobbing, what are the causes and what are the consequences, they can also learn prevention and how to handle it. So this means; healthy people, healthy organizations and a healthy society.

REFERENCES

Arpacıoğlu, G. (2005). **İşyerinde Zorbalık**.Donanma Komutanlığı Kurum Gelişimi Bülteni.

Aydın, O., Öcel, H. (2009). İşyeri Zorbalığı Ölçeği: Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması. **Türk Psikoloji Yazıları** 12(24): 94-103.

Başbakanlık Mobbing Genelgesi 2011/2. (2011). İşyerinde Psikolojil Tacizin (Mobbing) Önlenmesi. **Resmi Gazete 27879**. Retrieved May 2012 from the World Wide Web: http://www.mobbing.org.tr/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=261:babakanlı k-mobbing-genelges&catid=48:mevzuat&Itemid=17.

Balducci, C. (2009). **Aggressive Behavior at Work: Investigating and Integrating the Target's and Actor's Perpectives**. Unpublished Doctorate Thesis, Italy.

Baltaş, A. (2004). **Adı Yeni Konmuş Bir Olgu: İşyerinde Yıldırma 'Mobbing'**.

Beswick, J. (2006). **Bullying At Work: A Review Of The Literature**. Health And Safety Laboratory Project, Harpur Hill, Buxton, Derbyshire, SK17 9JN.

Branch, S., Sheenan,M., Barker, M., Ramsay, S. (2004). **Perceptions Of Upwards Bullying: An Interview Study**. Fourth International Conference On Bullying And Harrassment In The Workplace. UK: London, 32-34 cited in Yaman, E. (2009).**Yönetim Psikolojisi Açısından İşyerinde Psikoşiddet-Mobbing**. Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Björkqvist, K., Österman, K., Hjelt-Back, M. (1994). Aggression Among University Employees. **Aggressive Behavior** 20:173-184.

Brodsky, C.M. (1976). The Harrassed Worker. Toronto: Leixton Books cited in Matthiesen, S.B., Einarsen, S. (2004). Psychiatric Distress and Symptoms of PTSD Among Victims of Bullying at Work. **British Journal Of Guidance and Counseling** 32(3): 335-356.

Carnero, M.A., Martinez, B., Sanchez-Mangas, R. (2006). **Mobbing and Its Determinants: The Case of Spain**. Spain.

Cemaloğlu, N. (2007). The Relationship Between School Administrators' Leadership Styles And Bullying. **Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (H.U. Journal Of Education)** 33: 77-87.

Cherry, K. **The Trait Approach To Personality**. Retrieved July 2012 from the World Wide Web: http://psychology.about.com/theoriesofpersonality/a/trait-theory.htm.

Çobanoğlu, Ş. (2005). **Mobbing: İşyerinde Duygusal Saldırı Ve Mücadele Yöntemleri**. Timaş Yayınları, İstanbul.

Çöl, S. (2008). İşyerinde Psikolojik Şiddet: Hastane Çalışanları Üzerine Bir Araştırma. **Çalışma Ve Toplum**.

Dağ, İ. (1991). Belirti Tarama Listesi (SCL-90-R)'nin Üniversite Öğrencileri İçin Güvenirliği ve Geçerliği. **Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi** 2(1): 5-12.

Daniels, D-L. (2005). **Workplace Bullying or Bad Behaviour in Australian Organisations: Prevalence and Employers' and Employees' Perceptions and Interpretations of the Phenomenon**. Unpublished Master Thesis, Australia, Swinburne University of Technology.

Davenport, N., Schwartz, R., Elliot, G. (2005). **Mobbing: Emotional Abuse In The American Workplace**. Retrieved May 2012 from the World Wide Web: http://www.mobbin-usa.com/B_Excerpts.html.

Deniz, D. (2007). **İşyerinde Örgütsel Yıldırmaya Maruz Kalan Çalışanların Kişilik Yapıları Ve Kullandıkları Ego Savunma Mekanizmaları**. Unpublished Master Thesis, İstanbul, İstanbul University, Institute of Social Sciences.

Doğan, M.A. (2009). **İlköğretim Okullarında Öğretmenlere Uygulanan Psikolojik Şiddetin (Mobbing) İş Doyumuna Etkisi: Ankara İli Sincan İlçesi Örneği**. Unpublished Master Thesis, Ankara, Atılım University, Institute of Social Sciences.

Depression. Retrieved from the World Wide Web: http://www.mobbingportal.com/glossaryofterms.html.

Ertürk, A., Cemaloğlu, N. (2005**). Öğretmen Ve Okul Yöneticilerinin Okul Ortamında Maruz Kaldıkları Yıldırma Eylemleri (Ankara İli İlköğretim Okulları Örneği)**. Unpublished Master Thesis, Ankara, Gazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences.

Einarsen, S. (1999). The Nature And Causes Of Bullying At Work. **International Journal Of Manpower** 20(1/2): 16-27.

Einarsen, S. (2002). Bullying At Work. **Working On Stress** 5: 25-27.

Einarsen, S., Skogstad, A. (1996). Bullying At Work: Epidemiological Findings In Public And Private Organizations. **European Journal Of Work And Organizational Psychology** 5(2): 185-201.

Einarsen, S., Raknes, B.I., Matthiesen, S.B. (1994). Bullying And Harrassment At Work And Their Relationship To Work Environment Quality: An Exploratory Study. **European Work And Organizational Psychologist** 4(4): 381-401.

Einarsen, S., Matthiesen, S.B., Skogstad, A. (1998). Bullying, Burnout And Well-Being Among Assistant Nurses. **Journal Of Occupational Health And Safety** 14(6): 563-568 cited in Vartia, M. (2002). **Workplace Bullying: A Study On The Work Environment, Well-being And Health**. Academic Dissertation, Finland.

European Foundation. (2007). **Fourth European Working Conditions Survey**. Luxembourg: Office For Official Publications Of The European Communities cited in Balducci, C. (2009). **Aggressive Behavior at Work: Investigating and Integrating the Target's and Actor's Perpectives**. Unpublished Doctorate Thesis, Italy.

Escartin, J., Zapf, D., Arrieta, C., Rodriguez-Carballeira, A. (2010). Workers' Perception Of Workplace Bullying: A Cross-Cultural Study. **European Journal Of Work And Organizational Psychology** 0(00): 1-28.

Francis, L., Brown, L., Philipchalk, R. (1992). The Development Of An Abbreviated Form Of The Revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQR-A): Its Use Among Students In England, Canada, The USA And Australia. **Personality And Individual Differencies** 13(4): 443-449.

Gülen, Ö. (2008). **The Relationship Between Personality and Being Exposed to Workplace Bullying or Mobbing**. Unpublished Master Thesis, İstanbul, Marmara University, Institute of Social Sciences.

Gökçe, A.T. (2006). **İş Yerinde Yıldırma: Özel Ve Resmi İlköğretim Okulu Öğretmen Ve Yöneticileri Üzerinde Yapılan Bir Araştırma**. Unpublished Doctorate Thesis, Ankara, Ankara University, Institute of Educational Sciences.

Gök, S. (2011). Prevalence And Types Of Mobbing Behavior: A Research On Banking Employees. **International Journal Of Human Sciences** 8(1): 318-334.

Glaso, L., Matthiesen, S.B., Nielsen, M.B., Einarsen, S. (submitted paper). Do Targets Of Workplace Bullying Portray A General Victim Personality Profile?. **Scandinavian Journal Of Psychology** cited in Matthiesen, S.B. (2006). **Bullying At Work: Antecedent And Outcomes**. Unpublished Doctorate Thesis, Norway, University of Bergen.

Heinemann, P. (1972). **Mobbing: Group Violence Among Children** cited in Gülen, Ö. (2008). **The Relationship Between Personality and Being Exposed to Workplace Bullying or Mobbing**. Unpublished Master Thesis, İstanbul, Marmara University, Institute of Social Sciences.

Hoel, H., Cooper, C., Faragher, B. (2001). The Experience Of Bullying In Great Britain: The Impact Of Organizational Status. **European Journal Of Work And Organizational Psychology** 10: 443-465 cited in Daniels, D-L. (2005). **Workplace Bullying or Bad Behaviour in Australian Organisations: Prevalence and Employers' and Employees' Perceptions and Interpretations of the Phenomenon**. Unpublished Master Thesis, Australia, Swinburne University of Technology.

ISTAT, Italian National Institute Of Statistics. (2008). Salute e sicurezza sul lavoro. **Health And Safety At Work** cited in Balducci, C. (2009). **Aggressive Behavior at Work: Investigating and Integrating the Target's and Actor's Perpectives**. Unpublished Doctorate Thesis, Italy.

Jennifer, D., Cowie, H., Ananiadou, K. (2003). Perceptions And Experience Of Workplace Bullying In Five Different Working Populations. **Aggressive Behavior** 29: 489-496 cited in Daniels, D-L. (2005). **Workplace Bullying or Bad Behaviour in Australian Organisations: Prevalence and Employers' and Employees' Perceptions and Interpretations of the Phenomenon**. Unpublished Master Thesis, Australia, Swinburne University of Technology.

Jennifer, D., Cowie, H., Ananiadou, K. (2003). Perceptions And Experience Of Workplace Bullying In Five Different Working Populations. **Aggressive Behavior** 29: 489-496 cited in Lutgen-Sandvik, P., Sypher, B.D. (2009). Workplace Bullying: Causes, Consequences And Corrections. **Destructive Organizational Communication**. New York: Routledge Press.

Kök, S.B. (2006). **İş Yaşamında Psiko-Şiddet Sarmalı Olarak Yıldırma Olgusu Ve Nedenleri**. 14. Ulusal Yönetim Ve Organizasyon Kongresi.

Kadın Erkek Fırsat Eşitliği Komisyonu. (2011). İş Yerinde Psikolojik Taciz (Mobbing) Ve Çözüm Önerileri Komisyon Raporu. **Kadın Erkek Fırsat Eşitliği Komisyonu Yayınları** 6, Ankara.

Karancı, A.N., Dirik, G., Yorulmaz, O. (2007). Eysenck Kişilik Anketi-Gözden Geçirilmiş Kısaltılmış Formu'nun (EKA-GGK) Türkiye'de Geçerlik Ve Güvenilirlik Çalışması. **Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi** 18(3): 254-261.

Kılıç, M. (1991). Belirti Tarama Listesi (SCL-90-R)'nin Geçerliliği ve Güvenirliği. **Psikolojik Danışma Ve Rehberlik Dergisi** 1(2): 45-52.

Karcıoğlu, F., Çelik, Ü.H. (2012). Mobbing (Yıldırma) Ve Örgütsel Bağlılığa Etkisi. **Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi Ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi** 26(1): 59-75.

Koç, M., Bulut, H.U. (2009). Mobbing In The Secondary EducationTeachers: Investigation From The Gender, Age And High School. **International Online Journal Of Educational Sciences** 1(1): 64-80.

Leymann, H. (1990). Mobbing and Psychological Terror at Workplaces. **Violence and Victims** 5(2):119-126.

Leymann, H. (1996). The Content And Development Of Mobbing at Work. **European Journal Of Work And Organizational Psychology** 5(2): 165-184.

Lucas, S. **Workplace Bullying**. INF 387C- Managing Information Service Organizations.

Lutgen-Sandvik, P., Sypher, B.D. (2009). Workplace Bullying: Causes, Consequences And Corrections. **Destructive Organizational Communication**. New York: Routledge Press.

Matthiesen, S.B., Einarsen, S. (2004). Psychiatric Distress and Symptoms of PTSD Among Victims of Bullying at Work. **British Journal Of Guidance and Counseling** 32(3): 335-356.

Matthiesen, S.B. (2006). **Bullying At Work: Antecedent And Outcomes**. Doctorate Thesis, Norway, University of Bergen.

Matthiesen, S.B., Einarsen, S. (2007). Perpetrators And Targets Of Bullying At Work: Role Stress And Individual Differencies. **Violence And Victims** 22(6): 735-753.

Meaning Of The Term Mob. Retrieved from the World Wide Web: http://www.mobbingportal.com/glossaryofterms.html.

Negative Acts Questionnaire.Bergen Bullying Research Group. Retrieved April 2012 from the World Wide Web: http://www.uib.no/rg/bbrg/projects/naq.

Niedl, K. (1996). Mobbing And Well-Being: Economic And Personnel Development Implications. **European Journal Of Work AndOrganizational Psychology** 5(2): 239-249.

Önertoy, O.C. (2003). **Mobbing: İşyerinde Duygusal Taciz**, Sistem Yayıncılık.

Özkul, B., Çarıkçı, İ.H. (2010). Mobbing Ve Türk Hukuku Açısından Değerlendirilmesi. **Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi Ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi** 15(1): 481-499.

Pedro, M-M., et al. (2008). Workplace Mobbing And Effect On Worker's Health. **The Spanish Journal Of Psychology** 11(1): 219-227.

Psychological Disorders. Retrieved from the World Wide Web: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Psychological_disorders.

PTSD. Retrieved from the World Wide Web: http://www.mobbingportal.com/glossaryofterms.html.

Rayner, C. (1997). The Incidence Of Workplace Bullying. **Journal Of Community And Applied Social Psychology** 7(3): 199-208.

Rayner, C., Hoel, H., Cooper, C.L. (2002). **Workplace Bullying : What We Know, Who Is To Blame, And What Can We Do?**. London: Taylor And Francis cited in Lutgen-Sandvik, P., Sypher, B.D. (2009). Workplace Bullying: Causes, Consequences And Corrections. **Destructive Organizational Communication**. New York: Routledge Press.

Ryckman, R.M. (2000). **Theories Of Personality**. 7th Ed., USA: Wadsworth p.5 cited in Gülen, Ö. (2008). **The Relationship Between Personality and Being Exposed to Workplace Bullying or Mobbing**. Unpublished Master Thesis, İstanbul, Marmara University, Institute of Social Sciences.

Stadnyk, B.L. (2008). **Workplace Violence Isn't Always Physical: A One Year Experience Of A Group Of Registered Psychiatric Nurses**. Project Of Registered Psychiatric Nurses Association Of Saskatchewan (RPNAS).

Salin, D. (2005). Prevalence And Forms Of Bullying Among Business Professionals: A Comparison Of Two Different Strategies Of Measuring Bullying. **European Journal Of Work And Organizational Psychology** 10: 425-411 cited in Daniels, D-L. (2005). **Workplace Bullying or Bad Behaviour in Australian Organisations: Prevalence and Employers' and Employees' Perceptions and Interpretations of the Phenomenon**. Unpublished Master Thesis, Australia, Swinburne University of Technology.

Shin, H.H. (2005). **Institutional Safe Space And Shame Management In Workplace Bullying**. Unpublished Doctorate Thesis. Australia, Australian NationalUniversity.

Şahoğlu, M., Mamalı, B. (2006). **Kıbrıs Yasaları**. Derleme Cilt 1-2. Mavi Basın Yayın, 1st. Ed., Lefkoşa.

The Definition Of Mobbing At Workplaces. **The Mobbing Encylopaedia**. Retrieved from the World Wide Web: http://www.leymann.se/English/frame.html.

Tınaz, P. (2006). İşyerinde Psikolojik Taciz (Mobbing). **Çalışma Ve Toplum** 4: 13-28.

Tınaz, P. (2011). **İşyerinde Psikolojik Taciz (Mobbing)**. Beta Yayıncılık, 3rd Ed., İstanbul.

Tunçel, Ö. (2009). **Kişilik Ve Örgüt Kültürü Bağlamında Yıldırma Davranışının Örgütsel Bağlılık Üzerine Etkisi: Ampirik Bir Çalışma**. Unpublished Master Thesis. Muğla, Muğla University, Institute Of Social Sciences.

Tracy, S.J., Lutgen-Sandvik, P., Alberts, J.K. (2006). Nightmares, Demons And Slaves: Exploring The Painful Methaphors Of Workplace Bullying. **Management Communication Quarterly** 20(2): 148-185 cited inLutgen-Sandvik, P., Sypher, B.D. (2009). Workplace Bullying: Causes, Consequences And Corrections. **Destructive Organizational Communication**. New York: Routledge Press.

Vartia, M. (2001). Consequences Of Workplace Bullying With Respect To The Well-Being Of Its Targets And The Observers Of Bullying. **Scandinavian Journal Of Work, Environment And Health** 27(1): 63-69.

Vartia, M. (2002). **Workplace Bullying – A Study On The Work Environment, Well-Being And Health**.Academic Dissertation, Finland.

Walter, H. (1993). **Mobbing: Kleinkrieg Am Arbeitplatz, Frankfurt And New York: Campus** cited in Tınaz, P. (2011). **İşyerinde Psikolojik Taciz (Mobbing)**. Beta Yayıncılık, 3rd Ed., İstanbul.

Yavuz, H. (2009). **Çalışanlarda Mobbing (Psikolojik Şiddet) Algısını Etkileyen Faktörler: SDÜ Tıp Fakültesi Üzerine Bir Araştırma**. Unpublished Master Thesis. Isparta, Süleyman Demirel University, Institute Of Social Sciences.

Yaman, E. (2009).**Yönetim Psikolojisi Açısından İşyerinde Psikoşiddet-Mobbing**. 1st Ed., Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Zapf, D. (1999). Organizational, Work Group Related And Personal Causes Of Mobbing/Bullying At Work. **International Journal Of Manpower** 20(2/2): 70-85.

APPENDIX

Değerli katılımcılar,

Elinizde bulunan form KKTC genelindeki liselerde görevli kişiler arasında yapılmaktadır. Bu çalışma ile işyerinde yaşanan sorunların, yaşama etkilerinin araştırılması amaçlanmıştır. Bu form tamamen bilimsel amaçlar ile düzenlenmiştir. Çalışma katılımcıların gönüllülüğü temeline dayanmaktadır. Yanıtlarınızı içten ve doğru olarak vermeniz anket sonuçlarının toplum için yararlı bilgi olarak kullanılmasını sağlayacaktır. Size ait bilgiler kesinlikle gizli kalacaktır. Kişisel bilgileriniz okul yönetimi veya bir başka mercinin eline geçmeyecektir.

Çalışmaya katıldığınız için teşekkürler.

Psikolog

İPEK ÖZSOY

Sosyo-Demografik Form

1. Cinsiyetiniz:
   A)Kadın   B)Erkek

2. Yaşınız: …………

3. Yaşadığınız yer: ………………………..

4. Medeni Durumunuz:
   A)Evli   B)Bekar   C)Nişanlı   D)Boşanmış   E)Dul

5. Çocuk sayısı: ……………..

6.Uyruğunuz:
   A)KKTC   B)TC   C)Diğer…………………(belirtiniz)

7. Anne doğum yeri:
   A)KKTC   B)TC   C)Diğer………………… (belirtiniz)

8. Baba doğum yeri:
   A)KKTC   B)TC   C)Diğer…………………(belirtiniz)

9.Eğitim Durumunuz:
   A)Okuma-yazma bilmiyor   B)Okur-yazar   C)İlkokul   D)Ortaokul
   E)Lise   F)Üniversite ve üzeri

10.Çalıştığınız Kurumun Niteliği:
   A)Özel   B)Devlet

11.Evinize giren aylık Geliriniz:
   A)1300TL'den az   B)1300TL-2500TL   C) 2500TL-5000TL   D)5000TL'den fazla

12.Çalıştığınız Kurumdaki Göreviniz/Pozisyonunuz:

A) Yönetici   B) Öğretmen C) Sekreter/Memur   D) Temizlik Görevlisi   E) Diğer...............

13.Çalışma Durumunuz:
   A)Kadrolu   B)Sözleşmeli/Geçici

14.Şu An Çalıştığınız Kurumdaki Çalışma Süreniz:………………………
15.Toplam Çalışma Süreniz:……………………………………………

ANKET I

Bu bölümde yıldırma ile ilgili ifadeler yer almaktadır. Aşağıda verilen durumları yaşama sıklıklarınızı belirtiniz.

	Yıldırma ile İlgili İfadele	Hiç	Ara sıra	Ayda bir	Haftada bir	Hergün
1	Birinin başarınızı etkileyecek bilgiyi saklaması	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
2	Yeterlilik düzeyinizin altındaki işlerde çalışarak küçük düşürülmek	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
3	Ustalık/Yeterlilik seviyenizin altındaki işleri yapmanızın istenmesi	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
4	Önemli alanlardaki sorumluluklarınızın kaldırılması veya daha önemsiz ve istenmeyen görevlerle değiştirilmesi	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
5	Hakkınızda dedikodu ve söylentilerin yayılması	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
6	Görmezden gelinme, dışlanma, önemsenmeme	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
7	Kişiliğiniz (ör; alışkanlıklar ve görgü), tutumlarınız veya özel hayatınız hakkında hakaret ve aşağılayıcı sözler söylenmesi	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
8	Bağırılmak veya anlık öfkenin (veya hırsın) hedefi olmak	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
9	Parmakla gösterme, kişisel alana saldırı, itme, yolunu kesme gibi gözdağı veren davranışlar	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
10	Diğerlerinin işi bırakmanız konusunda imalı davranışları	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
11	Yanlış ve hatalarınızın sürekli hatırlatılması/söylenmesi	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
12	Yaklaşımlarınızın dikkate alınmaması/yok sayılması veya düşmanca tepkilerle karşılaşma	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
13	İşinizle çabalamanızla ilgili bitmek bilmeyen eleştiriler	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
14	Fikir ve görüşlerinizin dikkate alınmaması	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
15	İyi geçinmediğiniz kişiler tarafından hoşlanmadığınız şakalar (eşek şakası) yapılması	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
16	Mantıksız yada yetiştirilmesi mümkün olmayan işler verilmesi	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
17	Size karşı suçlama ve ithamlarda bulunulması	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
18	İşinizin aşırı denetlenmesi	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
19	Hakkınız olan bazı şeyleri (örneğin; hastalık izni, tatil hakkı, yol harcırahı) talep etmemeniz için baskı yapılması	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
20	Aşırı alay ve sataşmalara konu olmak.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
21	Üstesinden gelinemeyecek kadar iş yüküne maruz bırakılmak	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

22. İşyerinde zorbalığa maruz kaldınız mı? (Tanıma göre değerlendirin: Zorbalık; bir ya da birden çok kişinin belli bir süreden beri devamlı olarak yaptığı ve kişinin kendini olumsuz davranışa maruz kalmış olarak algıladığı, ve kendini bu eylemlere karşı korumada zorlandığı bir durumdur. Sadece bir defa olan ve tekrarlanmayan durumlar zorbalık değildir:

1. ( ) Evet   2. ( ) Hayır

ANKET II

Lütfen aşağıdaki herbir soruyu, 'Evet' ya da 'Hayır'ı yuvarlak içine alarak cevaplayınız. Doğru veya yanlış cevap ve çeldirici soru yoktur. Hızlı cevaplayınız ve soruların tam anlamları ile ilgili çok uzun düşünmeyiniz.

1. Duygu durumunuz sıklıkla mutlulukla mutsuzluk arasında değişir mi?	EVET	HAYIR
2. Konuşkan bir kişi misiniz?	EVET	HAYIR
3. Borçlu olmak sizi endişelendirir mi?	EVET	HAYIR
4. Oldukça canlı bir kişi misiniz?	EVET	HAYIR
5. Hiç sizin payınıza düşenden fazlasını alarak açgözlülük yaptığınız oldu mu?	EVET	HAYIR
6. Garip ya da tehlikeli etkileri olabilecek ilaçları kullanır mısınız?	EVET	HAYIR
7. Aslında kendi hatanız olduğunu bildiğiniz bir şeyi yapmakla hiç başka birini suçlanınız mı?	EVET	HAYIR
8. Kurallara uymak yerine kendi bildiğiniz yolda gitmeyi mi tercih edersiniz?	EVET	HAYIR
9. Sıklıkla kendinizi her şeyden bıkmış hisseder misiniz?	EVET	HAYIR
10. Hiç başkasına ait olan bir şeyi (toplu iğne veya düğme bile olsa) aldınız mı?	EVET	HAYIR
11. Kendinizi sinirli bir kişi olarak tanımlar mısınız?	EVET	HAYIR
12. Evliliğin modası geçmiş ve kaldırılması gereken bir şey olduğunu düşünüyor musunuz?	EVET	HAYIR
13. Oldukça sıkıcı bir partiye kolaylıkla canlılık getirebilir misiniz?	EVET	HAYIR
14. Kaygılı bir kişi misiniz?	EVET	HAYIR
15. Sosyal ortamlarda geri planda kalma eğiliminiz var mıdır?	EVET	HAYIR
16. Yaptığınız bir işte hatalar olduğunu bilmeniz sizi endişelendirir mi?	EVET	HAYIR
17. Herhangi bir oyunda hiç hile yaptınız mı?	EVET	HAYIR
18. Sinirlerinizden şikayetçi misiniz?	EVET	HAYIR
19. Hiç başka birini kendi yararınıza kullandınız mı?	EVET	HAYIR
20. Başkalarıyla birlikte iken çoğunlukla sessiz misiniz?	EVET	HAYIR
21. Sık sık kendinizi yalnız hisseder misiniz?	EVET	HAYIR
22. Toplum kurallarına uymak, kendi bildiğinizi yapmaktan daha mı iyidir?	EVET	HAYIR
23. Diğer insanlar sizi çok canlı biri olarak düşünürler mi?	EVET	HAYIR
24. Başkasına önerdiğiniz şeyleri kendiniz her zaman uygular mısınız?	EVET	HAYIR

ANKET III

Aşağıda zaman zaman herkeste olabilecek yakınma ve sorunların bir listesi vardır. Lütfen her birini dikkatlice okuyunuz. Sonra her bir durumun**,** bugün de dahilolmak üzere son on beş gün içinde sizi ne ölçüde huzursuz ve tedirgin ettiğini göz önünde alarak, cevap kağıdında belirtilen tanımlamalardan (Hiç / Çok az / Orta derecede / Oldukça fazla / İleri derecede)uygun olanın (yalnızca bir seçeneğin) altındaki parantez arasına bir (**X**) işareti koyunuz. Düşüncelerinizi değiştirirseniz ilk yaptığınız işaretlemeyi silmeyi unutmayınız. Lütfen anlamadığınız bir cümle ile karşılaştığınızda uygulamacıya danışınız.

	Hiç	Çok Az	Orta Derece	Oldukça Fazla	İleri Derece
1. Baş ağrısı	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
2. Sinirlilik ya da içinin titremesi	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
3. Zihinden atamadığınız, yineleyici, hoşa gitmeyen düşünceler	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
4. Baygınlık veya baş dönmesi	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
5. Cinsel arzu veya ilginin kaybı	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
6. Başkaları tarafından eleştirilme duygusu	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
7. Herhangi bir kimsenin düşüncelerimizi kontrol edebileceği fikri	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
8. Sorunlarımızdan pek çoğu için başkalarının suçlanması gerektiği duygusu	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
9. Olayları anımsamada güçlük	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
10. Dikkatsizlik ve sakarlıkla ilgili endişeler	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
11. Kolayca gücenme, rahatsız olma hissi	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
12. Göğüs veya kalp bölgesinde ağrılar	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
13. Caddelerde veya açık alanlarda korku hissi	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
14. Enerjinizde azalma veya yavaşlama hali	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
15. Yaşamınızın sonlanması düşünceleri	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
16. Başka kişilerin duymadıkları sesleri duyma	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
17. Titreme	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
18. Çoğu kişiye güvenilmemesi gerektiği hissi	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
19. İştah azalması	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
20. Kolayca ağlama	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
21. Karşı cinsten kişilerle utangaçlık ve rahatsızlık hissi	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
22. Tuzağa düşürülmüş veya yakalanmış olma hissi	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
23. Bir neden olmaksızın aniden korkuya kapılma	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
24. Kontrol edilemeyen öfke patlamaları	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
25. Evden dışarı yalnız çıkma korkusu	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
26. Olanlar için kendini suçlama	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

27. Belin alt kısmında ağrılar	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
28. İşlerin yapılmasında erteleme duygusu	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
29. Yalnızlık hissi	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
30. Karamsarlık hissi	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
31. Her şey için çok fazla endişe duyma	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
32. Her şeye karşı ilgisizlik hali	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
33. Korku hissi	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
34. Duygularınızın kolayca incitilebilmesi hali	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
35. Diğer insanların sizin özel düşüncelerinizi bilmesi	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
36. Başkalarının sizi anlamadığı veya hissedemeyeceği duygusu	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
37. Başkalarının sizi sevmediği yada dostça olmayan davranışlar gösterdiği hissi	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
38. İşlerin doğru yapıldığından emin olabilmek için çok yavaş yapma	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
39. Kabin çok hızlı çarpması	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
40. Bulantı veya midede rahatsızlık hissi	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
41. Kendini başkalarından aşağı görme	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
42. Adale (kas) ağrıları	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
43. Başkalarının sizi gözlediği veya hakkınızda konuştuğu hissi	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
44. Uykuya dalmada güçlük	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
45. Yaptığınız işleri bir ya da birkaç kez kontrol etme	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
46. Karar vermede güçlük	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
47. Otobüs, tren, metro gibi araçlarla yolculuk etme korkusu	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
48. Nefes almada güçlük	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
49. Soğuk veya sıcak basması	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
50. Sizi korkutan belirli uğraş, yer ve nesnelerden kaçınma durumu	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
51. Hiçbir şey düşünememe hali	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
52. Bedeninizin bazı kısımlarında uyuşma, karıncalanma olması	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
53. Boğazınıza bir yumru tıkanmış olma hissi	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
54. Gelecek konusunda ümitsizlik	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
55. Düşüncelerinizi bir konuya yoğunlaştırmada güçlük	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
56. Bedeninizin çeşitli kısımlarında zayıflık hissi	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
57. Gerginlik veya coşku hissi	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
58. Kol veya bacaklarda ağırlık hissi	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
59. Ölüm ya da ölme düşünceleri	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
60. Aşırı yemek yeme	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
61. İnsanların size baktığı veya hakkınızda konuştuğu zaman rahatsızlık duyma	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

62. Size ait olmayan düşüncelere sahip olma	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
63. Bir başkasına vurmak, zarar vermek, yaralamak dürtülerinin olması	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
64. Sabahın erken saatlerinde uyanma	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
65. Yıkanma, sayma, dokunma gibi bazı hareketleri yineleme hali	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
66. Uykuda huzursuzluk, rahat uyuyamama	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
67. Bazı şeyleri kırıp dökme hissi	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
68. Başkalarının paylaşıp kabul etmediği inanç ve düşüncelerin olması	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
69. Başkalarının yanında kendini çok sıkılgan hissetme	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
70. Çarşı sinema gibi kalabalık yerlerde rahatsızlık hissi	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
71. Her şeyin bir yük gibi görünmesi	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
72. Dehşet ve panik nöbetleri	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
73. Toplum içinde yiyip-içerken huzursuzluk hissi	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
74. Sık sık tartışmaya girme	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
75. Yalnız bırakıldığında sinirlilik hali	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
76. Başkalarının sizi başarılarınız için yeterince taktir etmediği duygusu	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
77. Başkalarıyla birlikte olunan durumlarda bile yalnızlık hissetme	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
78. Yerinizde duramayacak ölçüde huzursuzluk duyma	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
79. Değersizlik duygusu	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
80. Size kötü bir şey olacakmış duygusu	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
81. Bağırma ya da eşyaları fırlatma	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
82. Topluluk içinde bayılacağınız korkusu	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
83. Eğer izin verirseniz insanların sizi sömüreceği duygusu	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
84. Cinsiyet konusunda sizi çok rahatsız eden düşüncelerin olması	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
85. Günahlarınızdan dolayı cezalandırılmanız gerektiği düşüncesi	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
86. Korkutucu türden düşünce ve hayaller	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
87. Bedeninizde ciddi bir rahatsızlık olduğu düşüncesi	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
88. Başka bir kişiye asla yakınlık duyamama	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
89. Suçluluk duygusu	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
90. Aklınızdan bir bozukluğu olduğu düşüncesi	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

<u>ÖZGEÇMİŞ</u>

KİŞİSEL BİLGİLER:

Adı- Soyadı: İPEK ÖZSOY
Doğum Tarihi:11/06/1985
Doğum Yeri: Güzelyurt
Uyruğu: KKTC
Medeni Durum: Evli
Meslek: Klinik Psikolog
Adres: Yasemin Sokak No:26, Küçük Kaymaklı, Lefkoşa
Telefon No: Cep: 0533 862 58 22
              Ev:(0392) 227 70 27
e-mail: ipekozsoy@hotmail.com

EĞİTİM DURUMU:

- 2010-2012: Yakın Doğu Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü,
  Klinik Psikoloji Ana Bilim Dalı (Yüksek Lisans)

- 2006-2010: Yakın Doğu Üniversitesi, Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi,
  Psikoloji Bölümü

- 1996-2002: Güzelyurt Türk Maarif Koleji

MESLEKİ DENEYİMLER:

- Eylül 2012 – Halen   : Özel Klinik (Klinik Psikolog)
- Eylül 2010 – Mayıs 2012   : Özel Başkent Hastanesi (Psikolog)
- Temmuz 2011 – Şubat 2012 : Barış Ruh ve Sinir Hastalıkları Hastanesi
  Klinik Psikoloji Stajı
- 01/07/2009 – 30/07/2009   : Bakırköy Ruh ve Sinir Hastalıkları Hastanesi
  Klinik Psikoloji Stajı
- 02/02/2009 – 27/02/2009   : Artı Eğitim Merkezi
  Gelişim Psikolojisi Stajı

ARAŞTIRMA PROJELERİ:

- Kuzey Kıbrıs'ta Liselerde Çalışanlarda Yıldırma(Mobbing) ve Yıldırmanın Demografik Özellikler, Kişilik Özellikleri ve Psikolojik Bozukluklarla İlişkisi (Yüksek Lisans Tezi)(2012)

- KKTC'deki Sel Felaketinin Psikolojik Etkileri (Lisans Bitirme Ödevi)(2010)

EĞİTİMLER – KONFERANSLAR:

- Pozitif Psikoterapi Master Eğitimi (75 saat + süpervizyon)
- Pozitif Psikoterapi Temel Eğitimi (120 saat)
- NAADAC-Madde Bağımlılığı Danışmanlığı Eğitimi (90 saat)
- Adli Psikoloji Eğitimi (50 saat)
- Psikodrama Göç Araştırma Grubu (80 saat)
- Temel Psikanaliz Konferansları (Psikanalitik Çerçeve,Histeri,Metapsikoloji,Aktarım-Karşı Aktarım)
- I. Ruh Sağlığı Sempozyumu (2009)
- 12. Ulusal Psikoloji Öğrencileri Kongresi
- I. Kıbrıs Pozitif Psikoterapi Sempozyumu
- II.Ruh Sağlığı Sempozyumu (Poster Sunumu: KKTC'deki Sel Felaketinin Psikolojik Etkileri) (2010)

YABANCI DİL: İngilizce

İLGİ ALANLARI: keman çalmak, araştırmak, kitap okumak, sevdikleriyle birlikte sosyal faaliyetlerde ve ortamlarda bulunmak…