

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

**COMPARISON OF SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC  
CHARACTERISTICS AND PROBLEM INTERNET USE  
PROBLEM BETWEEN GAMBLERS AND NON-  
GAMBLERS AMONG UNIVERSITY STUDENTS**

**YA MUR FIRAT**

**20133832**

**SUPERVISOR  
PROF. DR. MEHMET ÇAKICI**

**NEAR EAST UNIVERSITY**

**NICOSIA**

**2015**

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

**MASTER THESIS**

**Comparison of Sociodemographic Characteristics and Problem Internet Use of Problem  
Gamblers and Non-gamblers Among University Students**

Prepared by: Ya mur Fırat

**Examining Committee in Charge**

**Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ebru Tansel ÇAKICI**

**Chairman of the committee**

**Department of Psychology**

**Near East University**

**Assist. Prof. Dr. Zihniye OKRAY**

**Department of Psychology**

**European University of Lefke**

**Prof. Dr. Mehmet ÇAKICI Department of Psychology**

**Near East University (Supervisor)**

**Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences**

**Prof. Dr. Çelik Aruoba- Dr. Muhittin Özsa lam**

## ÖZET

### Üniversite Ö rencileri Arasında Problemlı Kumar Oynayanlar ile Oynamayanların Sosyo-demografik Özelliklerinin ve Problemlı İnternet Kullanımının Kar ıla tırılması

Hazırlayan: Ya mur Fırat

Eylül, 2015

Kumarın yasalla masıyla birlikte önceden eri kin erkeklere özgü oldu u dü ünülen kumar sorunları, kadınlarda ve gençlerde de daha sık görülmeye ba lanmı tır. Özellikle internet kullanımının gençler arasında yaygınla masıyla beraber problemlı kumar oynama davranı ı ile problemlı internet kullanımı arasında ili ki daha da belirginle mi tir. Bu çalı mada üniversite ö rencileri arasında problemlı kumar oynayanlar ile oynamayanların sosyo-demografik özellikleri kar ıla tırmak ve problemlı internet kullanımı arasındaki ili ki düzeyini belirlemek amaçlanmı tır.

Nisan-Mayıs 2015 tarihinde Yakın Do u Üniversite ö rencileri arasında yüz yüze görü me yöntemiyle anket uygulanmı tır. Uygulanan anket formu sosyo-demografik bilgileri, Problemlı internet kullanım ölçe ini (P KÖ) ve South OaksKumar Tarama ölçe ini (SOKTÖ) içermekteydi. Çalı mada betimleyici istatistik yöntemleri, problemlı kumar oynayanlar ve oynamayanların sosyo demografik özelliklerinin kar ıla tırılmasında ki-kare istatistik yöntemi ve P KÖ ile SOKTÖpuanlarının ili kisinin belirlenmesinde pearson korelasyon analizi kullanılmı tır.

Ara tırma sonuçları Problemlı ve patolojik kumar oynatanların yarısından fazlasının internet ile olan kumarı hiç oynamadı ını belirtmektedirler. Erkeklerin kadınlardan daha fazla kumar oynadı ı görülmü tür. Gelir seviyesi yüksek olanlar daha fazla problemlı ve patolojik kumar oynadı ı gösterilmi tir. Üniversitede 5 yıldan fazla olan ö rencilerin daha fazla Problemlı Ve Patolojik Kumarı (PPK) oynadı ı görülmü tür. Problem ve patolojik kumar oynayanların derslerindeki ba arı durumunun dü ük oldu u görülmü tür. PPK oynayanların at yarısı-köpek-futbol kumarı PPK oynamayanlara göre daha yüksek bulunmu tur. İnternet ba ımlılı ı ve problemlı ve patolojik kumar ba ımlılı ı arasındaki ili kinin oldu u görülmü tür.

Bu çalı ma göstermektedir ki problemlı internet kullanımı olan üniversite ö rencileri PPK problemine daha yatkındır ve önemli bir risk grubudur. Birbirini etkileyen sorunlar olan problemlı ve patolojik kumar sorununu ve problemlı internet kullanımını önlemek için devletin etkin bir halk sa lı ı politikasına ihtiyaç bulunmaktadır. Özellikle üniversitelerde farkındalık ve bilinçlendirme programlarına ihtiyaç vardır.

**Anahtarkelime: Problemlı kumar oynama, Patolojik kumar oynama, problemlı internet kullanımı, Üniversiteö rencileri,**

**ABSTRACT****Comparison of Socio Demographic Characteristics and Problem Internet Use  
between Problem Gamblers and Non-gamblers Among University Students**

Prepared by: **Ya murFirat**

**September, 2015**

Gambling problems were previously seen to be only unique to males, however, now due to legalization of gambling, women and adolescents are also prone to such problems. With the widespread use of internet among young people, a relationship is evident between problem with gambling and internet use. The purpose of this study is to investigate the differences about their socio-demographic characteristics and problem internet use, between problematic gamblers and non-gamblers.

The research's survey questionnaire was administered by face to face interviews with Near East University students in April-May 2015. The questionnaire has three parts. The first part includes socio-demographic information questions, second part include South Oaks Gambling Screening (SOGS) scale questions and third part include Problematic Internet Usage Scale (PIUS) questions. Descriptive and chi-square statistical methods were used in comparison of socio-demographic characteristics and analysis of the Pearson correlation was used to determine the relationship between PIUScale and SOGS Scale.

The survey results showed that more than half of the gamblers played gambling over the internet. It also showed that men tended to gamble more than women. Those with high income level were found to have more pathological gambling problem. Students attending to the university for more than 5 years were shown to have more frequent PPG problem. Problem and students with PPG had lower academic success. It is also observed that gambling on games such as horse-racing and dog-football-gambling were higher than those with PPG. Problem internet use has been seen as one of the leading causes of problem and pathological gambling.

These studies showed that university students who had problem internet use were more prone to have PPG problem and are one of the riskgroups. In order to prevent the inter related problems of PPG and problem internet use, there needs to be effective public health policy. In particular there is a need for awareness and consciousness programs at universities.

**Key words: Problem gambling, Problematic gambling, University students**

## ACNOWLEDGEMENT

Firstly, I would like to thank my supervisor Prof. Mehmet akıcı for his advice and useful directions that made me work on this dissertation more effectively and helped me stay motivated. I would like to thank my dear teachers; Assoc. Prof. EbruTanselakıcı, Dr. DenizKarademir, Assist. Prof.Dr. ZihniyeOkray, for all the support, understanding and concern that they provided me with during my master program at Near East University. I would also like to thank my family for helping me and supporting my achievement. Not forgetting my friends who helped in the course of editing and reading through the thesis.

## INDEX

<b>ÖZET</b> .....	iii
<b>ABSTRACT</b> .....	v
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</b> .....	vii
<b>INDEX</b> .....	viii
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b> .....	x
<b>ABBREVIATIONS</b> .....	xiii
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	1
1.1. Definition of Addiction .....	1
1.2. Problem and Pathological Gambling.....	2
1.3. What is Gambling Use.....	2
1.4. What is the prevalence of gambling Use.....	4
1.5. Treatment of Gambling Use .....	5
1.6. Problematic Internet Use.....	7
1.6.1. Young’s Internet Addiction Diagnostic Criteria for the Advice.....	9
1.6.2. Diagnostic Criteria for Internet Addiction Goldberg.....	9
1.6.3. Causes of Internet Use .....	11
1.6.4. Prevalence of Internet Use .....	12
1.7. Causes of Problem Internet Use.....	12
1.8. Relationship between Problem and Pathologic gambling and Problematic Internet use.....	14



<b>2. METHOD OF THE STUDY.....</b>	<b>15</b>
2.1. Sample of the Study.....	15
2.2. Instruments and Measures.....	15
2.2.1. Demographic Information Form.....	15
2.2.2. South Oaks Gambling Screen Scale (SOGS Scale).....	15
2.2.3. Problematic Internet Use Scale (PISS).....	16
2.3. Statistically Analysis.....	17
<b>3. RESULT.....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>4. DISCUSSION.....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>5. REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>APPENDIXES.....</b>	<b>57</b>
Socio-Demographic Form	
Problematic Internet Usage Scale	
South Oaks Gambling Screening Test (SOKTT) Turkish League Schedule Form	
Informed Consent	
Debrief form	

**LIST OF TABLE**

**Table 1.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers in terms of men and women – comparison

**Table 2.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers in terms of nationality

**Table 3.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers by birth place

**Table 4.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers by marital status

**Table 5.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers living together

**Table 6.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers who get the scholarship and who don't

**Table 7.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers by their monthly income

**Table 8.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers enrolled at university

**Table 9.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers in terms of those who study and who work

**Table 10.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers by how successful they are at studies

**Table 11.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers in terms of their academic performance

**Table 12.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers in terms the schooling level of their mothers

**Table 13.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers in terms the schooling level of their fathers

**Table 14.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers in terms their religious attitude

**Table 15.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers who bet with horse-dogs-football

**Table 16.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers who bet with money and those with cards

**Table 17.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers who play Okey game with Money

**Table 18.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers who play gambling with dice games

**Table 19.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers who bet on cockfighting

**Table 20.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers who bet on sport lotteries

**Table 21.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers who bet on lotteries.

**Table 22.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers who play scratch-off games

**Table 23.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers who play national lottery game.

**Table 24.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers who bet on stock market.

**Table 25:** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers who bet in casinos.

**Table 26.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers who have skills of gambling.

**Table 27.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers who play gambling games on internet

**Table 28.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers who play other gambling games

**Table 29:** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers who play frequently on internet.

**Table 30.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers who play on internet with Money.

**Table 31.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers who play on internet without Money

**Table 32.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers who play in casino.

**Table 33.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers who bet in betting Office.

**Table 34.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers who bet on gambling games on internet.

**Table 35.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers who bet on gambling in coffeehouse.

**Table 36.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers who bet on gambling in sportsclubs.

**Table 37.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers who bet on gambling in other places.

**Table 38.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers in terms of age.

**Table 39.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers in terms of Money spent in a day.

**Table 40.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers in terms of people betting from different places due to internet connections.

**Table 41.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers in terms of playing different types of games on internet.

**Table 42.** Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers in terms of P KO total and subscales.

**Table 43.** All of the individuals' SOKTT points total and subscale scores with PIKO comparison by using Pearson Correlation Analysis.

## **ABBREVIATION**

PPG : Problem and pathological gambling

PPK: Problem and pathological gambling

P KÖ : Problematic Internet Use Scale

SOGS : South Oaks Gambling screening

SOKTÖ: South Oaks Gambling screening

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1. Definition of Addiction**

Dependency is defined as a substance or stop using me or inability to control behavior (Egger, Rauterberg, 1996:8). The concept of “addiction” and “dependence” is found in the international literature in abundance and is corresponding to the notion of inability to control behavior (Günüç, Kayri, 2010: 220-232).

Individuals smoking and/or drinking alcohol may be addicted to many substances such as drugs; but synonymous with addiction to smoking, alcohol, drugs and so on. It also includes material other than a physical addiction, eating behavior based addiction, game addiction, sex addiction, computer addiction, T.V addiction, shopping addiction, internet addiction etc. (Kim, Kim, 2002:3-4). It is stated that despite their inability to control behavior or actions, causes them to not care about the consequences (Henderson, 2001: 4-153).

The behavior-based addiction; eating, gambling, sex and so on technological dependence and the establishment of human-machine interaction is stated that in addition to the dependence covers (Griffiths, 1999: 246-250). In the context of examining the individual behavior-based technology addiction addictive, passive (e.g. television) or active (e.g. computer games) are said to be the case, it provides the ability to interact with the technology tools with voice, image and so on. Dependence on technology covers by media addiction, TV addiction, cell phone addiction, computer addiction, internet addiction. Internet is very important in today's modern life and therefore it cannot be removed and hence we need to come up with solutions to reduce dependency on internet and associated addiction (Günüç, Kayri, 2010: 220-232).

## **1.2. Problem and Pathological Gambling**

Williams et al (2012), the term '*pathological gambling*' is similar to severe problem gambling. The origin of problem gambling started in medical history in early 1800s (Harvard Mental Health Letter, 2010: 1-3). It was recognized as an official impulse control disorder in DSM-III (American Psychiatric Association 1980). However, according to Çakıcı et al (2015), in order to be classified under the category of pathological gambling, nine conditions were set as criteria in DSM V. They were such as an increasing need to gamble, requiring more money to gamble, irritable behavior if not allowed to gamble.

According to the University of Maryland Medical Center it defines pathological gambling as "being unable to resist impulses to gamble, which can lead to severe personal or social consequences".

## **1.3. What is Gambling Behaviors?**

Many societies throughout the ages show gambling behavior are a phenomenon in culture (Allcock, 1986:259-265). By undergoing several changes in its historical development process it has evolved into a quality representing the economic and social situation. (Kaya, 2001: 119-125), states that gambling is both legal and becomes important in a major tourism and entertainment industry in the world. State regulation of gambling as a source of revenue for the first time in the 16th century was the time of Queen Elizabeth and etc. After 1990, legal gambling, including government policies and practices it has been observed much more frequently pathological gambling (Ögel, 2010, 5). The reason is to diversify at the same time as the vehicle while carrying a valid social aspect of gaming. Gambling problems previously thought to be unique to the adult male along with increasingly more legalized gambling, women and young people have also become more frequent.

Pathological gambling, DSM-IV-TR discussed in the category of impulse control disorders; continuous and repetitive behavior manifested by way of social gambling is defined as a mental disorder that can cause significant losses in professional and

family life (APA, 2007). DSM-V in the "Substance Abuse and Addiction Disorders related" took place under the title (APA, 2013). In addition to these now, gambling for fun "normal gaming", coping with stress and the difficulties in solving the crisis "psychologically predisposed gaming" and impulsive behavior that exhibits the characteristics of "impulsive gambling" including three pathological gambling type. It reveals that there are three subtypes, including obsessive-compulsive and dependent. (Dannon, et al, 2006, 49-54).

It is reported that concomitant treatment of pathological gambling behavior affects the results of psychological disorders (Güriz, Türkçapar, Ekinçi , 2012, 1105-112). When held up to now examine research in pathological gambling it was found to be the most frequently encountered comorbid depression (Kalyoncu , Pektas , Mirsal , 2003, 76-80). In a study of 30 patients, it was seen that the various somatoform disorders accompanied the diagnosis (Black, Moyer, 1998). In addition, there has not been provided any information relating to the conversion of a pathological gambling cases and the treatment process accompanied by disorder (Sevi et al, 2014, 105-109).

The following features are problematic / pathological gambling is characterized by (Güriz, Ekinçi, Türkçapar, 2012, 1105-112).

Unchangeable prejudgment of individual about luck of game.

Increasing the money spent on gambling to achieve the desired level of excitement

Gambling repeated failures in efforts to limit or leave

Gambling as a result of trying to limit the restlessness and irritability to play

Luck Game as seen as an escape from the problems of negative emotions, with the idea of winning by playing again

Hiding the gambling problem in their behavior towards people close to them.

Resorting to illegal methods to find financial resources to gambling



Gambling playing results in the loss of close relationship and endangered by opportunities to entering a job.

Using other people's money to gamble.

A person with "pathological gambling" displays at least five of the ten criteria; "Problematic gambling behavior" must contain at least three of them to the criteria listed above.

#### **1.4. What is the prevalence of gambling Use?**

Looking at the studies of the prevalence of pathological gambling seems to be between 1-3% of the adult population (Kaplan, 1995, 31-60; Leiseur, 1992:32-62). America, Canada, Australia and New Zealand made the prevalence study the prevalence of pathological gambling are found to be 0.42 to 4% (Volberg, Steadman, 1988: 502-505; Volberg, 1994: 237–241; Volberg, 1996: 237-241; Cox et al, 2005: 213–217; Shaffer et al, 1999: 1369 –1376). According to Derevensky, et al, (2003), the prevalence of pathological gambling in young people, the general adult populations, such as 4-8% are stated at a higher rate. Pathological gambling men play in early adolescence and that woman start in the elderly, and both these developments in both the amount of money invested in gambling the result has been argued that followed a marked increase in the number of people with gambling problems (Cayuela, Guirao 1991: 679-688; Walker, 1992; Lesieur, 1992; Lester 1994; 1611-1616; Hollander, Wong., 1995; 7-12).

Blume (1996) stated that gambling is legalized in the last thirty years by governments who are experiencing financial difficulties. In women, the proliferation of increasingly legalized gambling and casino gambling problem and the youth are set to be more in respect (Ögel, 2010, 7). Young experienced problems due to gambling of 2-3%, and it appears to form 10-15% of their risk for pathological gambling.

11% of those who have problems with gambling appear to be under 18 years of age. Despite all the restrictions adolescents have gambled for a year, 75%, and 15% have played every week (Cayule, Guirao 1991; 679-688: Walker 1992; Hollander; Wong; 1995; 7-12). McGill's study found that more than four times higher than the general population of adolescents with gambling problems. (Bostancı, Doksat, 2000:154-156) states that many people gambling pathological gambling started 19 years ago. In Turkey country there are no statistical data on the number of gambling, when some gambling-related statistics are examined, the number of people gambling in our country there is an increase, for example, compared to the previous year, in 1988 the number of dealers who Ganymede in Izmir city center about states that reached 155 increased by 50% (Duvarcı, Varanda, 2001: 24-45).

Çakıcı (2014) by the study held northern Cyprus to investigate the prevalence and risk factors of gambling behavior in the Turkish Republic, the participants of 17 varieties over 55% of life involving one or more of the gambling activity and the TRNC 2% in the possible gambling addiction 2007 2 and 3.5% in 2012, the gambling addicts (SOKTT points 8 and higher) rate has risen to 3.8% level. Gambling problem (SOKTT score between 3 and 7) the rate at 9.2% in 2007, and has been identified as 9.5% in 2014 to 9.7% in 2012. Most played national lottery games, scratch, casino games, horse and dog racing and was found to be betting on football games (Çakıcı et al, 2014, 7).

### **1.5. Treatment of Gambling**

It is indicated for the treatment of pathological gambling, that cognitive behavioral approach to the current approach. The purpose of this treatment, people's perceptions and irrational thinking and develop awareness against faulty cognitions such as these seems to be changing with the adaptive scheme that provides a better fit (Wan, Chiou, 2006, 762-6). Although breaking the denial of a person's treatment program tailored to the person, confronted with the problem of coping with the problems and the ability to say no development, teaching can be said that the concept of addiction

are the main concern. This as well as the relationships within the family of information work done for family therapy program for improving implementation is seen to increase its effectiveness.

Also associated with pathological gambling depression, treatment is required to identify the diseases, such as alcohol or drug abuse. Changing the shape of a person's previous behavior and lifestyle in the development of a successful treatment program is important for the prevention of relapse. In studies examining the pharmacological treatment of pathological gambling, a variety of SSRI 's mood and editor of opiates antagonists have been found to be effective in the short term (Chou, Ting, 2003, 663-75).

The recommendations made in order to cope with gambling thoughts are listed as follows (Charlton, Danforth, 2007, 1531-1548).

Gambling is required to stay away from places to play. Internet gambling sites should be avoided.

Gamblers should move away from the things that make up the idea of playing (horse racing programs, "Casino" ads, lottery tickets, etc.)

Gambling interested persons who should be avoided.

Gamblers should avoid entering into discussions about gambling

Will your money should be enough to meet your daily needs, with the use of Credit cards and ATM cards.

In addition, members of Gamblers Anonymous, anger, impatience, laziness and emotions like self-pity, people have said it to gamble again. Changing the lifestyle to stay away, it is necessary to put in the positive instead of the negative habits of behavior. In addition, help is available by referring to BATE for the treatment of gambling addiction.

## 1.6. Problematic Internet Use

The internet is an important communication and information sharing tool in home and business environments contain many activity indicate that changing our everyday lives (Yellowlees, Marks, 2007:23). In addition to the benefits of the Internet, everyone is likely to be the use of the problems that arise from being open. Information on the internet, information overload and knowledge etc. do not allow unsafe. It indicates that. Also still in the cyber-crimes committed via the Internet and Internet addiction it can be said that the serious problems caused by the Internet (Kim, Kim, 2002: 1-19).

Turkish 'as mostly "internet addiction" as used in this concept, the international literature for the first time, Dr. For the joke which was sent in 1996 by Ivan Goldberg, a specific Mail is reported (Goldberg et al, 1996). International literature the first "Internet addiction" of this concept, then it is seen that the concept of entering different concept called by different researchers and clinicians. These concepts are "Internet dependency (Internet addiction)" (Tvedt, 2007), "pathological internet use (pathological Internet use)" (Young et al, 2004, 402-415), "problematic Internet use (problematic Internet use)" (Caplan et al., 2002: 625-648). (Internet abuse (internet abuse) "(Young KS, Case SJ, 2004, 105-111)," Internet addiction Disorder (irregular internet use) "(Kiralla, 2005) and so on. It is stated in the figures.

Young (2004) and Goldberg (1996), first used the concept of Internet addiction, but the absence of a clinical concept in later work, "Internet addiction" is a clinical concept rather than the concept of "pathological internet use" have used the concept. Similarly, also by other researchers "addiction" rather than the concept of "problematic" and "pathological" concept to be said that orientation. Basically, all of these concepts are used similarly, as a starting point the scope excessive and problematic internet use has been advocated can be addressed (Ceyhan, Ceyhan, Gurcan, 2007:411-416). In addition to these (Thurlow, Lengel, Tomic, 2004, 150-159), DSM researchers to define Internet addiction (American Psychiatric Association's Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders) using the

criteria, the scope of DSM sex addiction, pathological gambling, etc. It is that they also benefit from other behavioral addictions.

Internet addiction is defined as the inability to control for a long time reviewing and using the Internet (Leung et al, 2004, 333-348). The use of the Internet to express a dependency with another statement and identified the biggest symptoms and effects, the individual can be said to occur when the beginning of the internet excessive spending.

In addition, the American Psychiatric Association (APA) by 1994, published and "DSM-IV", known by the acronym "Descriptive and numeric Manual of Mental Disorders" in there has not been identified as still a disease of internet addiction. In contrast with the use of the internet in recent years, an increasing publications that reach the size of some people may be talking about an addictive habit and use of the Internet is rapidly increasing case reports can be called. Therefore investigators DSM V of internet addiction 'is said to have begun to enter the candidate becomes a disorder that can qualify.

Who is the first Internet addiction diagnostic criteria for definition and constitutes the first Young, the internet is just as addictive as gambling and said they showed symptoms of impulse control disorders in a variety of Internet addicts. However, DSM-IV dependence criteria were identified only as defined chemicals and to include behavioral dependencies. DSM-IV dependence on non-chemical behavior from "impulse control disorders" is considered; DSM's closest internet addiction disorder does not contain any substance abuse IV also included under the heading of impulse control disorders "pathological gambling" that there has been no conviction. Therefore, the diagnostic criteria for pathological gambling have adapted pathological use of the Internet and the "Internet addiction" has been created and published the first serious diagnostic criteria for.

### **1.6.1. Young's Internet Addiction Diagnostic Criteria for the Advice**

Young Pathological Gambling and 5 by criteria was prepared by modifying the criteria for diagnoses are diagnosed to be positive (Young et al, 2004, 402-415).

1. Internet related to extreme mental occupation (constantly thinking of the Internet, setting up the dream of the activities carried out on the Internet, think about the next event scheduled on the internet, etc.)

2. Increasingly more likely to get the desired pleasure of needing to use the internet

3. Check the use of the Internet, reducing or completely be the unsuccessful attempt to quit

4. In the case of Internet use to reduce or completely cut restlessness, depression or anger to be felt

5. Initially planned to stay longer on the internet

6. Due to excessive Internet use from family, school, work and friends have problems with the environment, education or an opportunity to dispose of hazards related to career or losing

7 others (family, friends, therapists, etc.) lie about the time spent in the Internet

8. Internet to escape problems or negative emotions (eg, helplessness, guilt, depression, anxiety) use to walk away

### **1.6.2. Diagnostic Criteria for Internet Addiction Goldberg**

On three of the following at any time occurring within two months or more manifested clinically significant deterioration or causing distress inappropriate internet usage (Öztürk, Odabaşoğlu, Eraslan, Genç, Kalyoncu, 2007, 36-41).

Development of tolerance defined by those

a. Internet usage significantly increased time to obtain the desired pleasure

b. Received with joy has always been a decrease in the use of internet at the same time.

The lack of development defined in 2.Install.

At the end of long-term heavy use of the Internet and the emergence of at least two days in one of the following (may occur within 1 month), and people who work for them, social and living shortages in key functional areas.

a. Psychomotor agitation

b. Anxiety

c. Obsessive thoughts about what is happening on the Internet

d. Fantasies and daydreams about Internet

e. Do not press the action key willingly or unwillingly

f. The internet or connect to other services to get rid of this troublesome situation

g. Internet use planning that often takes a long time

h. There is a constant desire or wasted the efforts to contain or control the use of the Internet to leave.

i. separated too long to related actions by the Internet (take a book, to try new web browsers and programs, edit files, etc.).

j. Internet use due to significant social or occupational activities leisure activities dropped or reduced.

k. Internet use, the problems caused by (insomnia, marital problems, work, and do not be late for appointments, etc.) will continue despite the extreme.

### **1.6.3. Causes of Internet Use**

A team that Internet-addicted individuals appear to be the direct and indirect causes the purpose of such factors as use of the Internet and the amount of internet, it is stated that an important role in internet addiction (Gunuc, Kayri, 2010, 220-232). An analysis of research done until now; internet gambling, chat, gaming, pornography and so on, in for the purpose of the Internet addiction or development of dependence it is seen to be a direct factor may be (Chang, Man Law, 2008, 59-64, Chen et al, 2001; Everhard et al, 2000; Henderson, 2001, 4-153; Huang et al, 2004; Irvansyah, 2005; Jang et al, 2008; Thatcher, Goolam, 2005, 793-809; Yang et al, 2005, 407; Young et al, 1996).

In addition, the individual is said to be associated with social networking needs internet addiction (Bayraktutan, 2005). This need cannot be achieved in real life or socialization that cannot be won, it can be regarded as desirable to be corrected in the virtual environment. Individual e-mails, chat rooms, seem to try to socialize through discussion forums and in-game cycle (Grohol et al, 1999). In addition, an individual wishing to establish social interaction via the Internet is reluctant to defend you face to face interaction (Caplan et al, 2002, 553-575). Individuals of the internet to socialize or to find social support for turning the internet addiction and individuals are said to trigger the risk away from society (Thatcher, Goolam, 2005: 793-809).

It, as well as in the development of pathological internet use is advocated that depression is an important factor (Bayraktar et al, 2001; Young, Rodgers, 1998, 25-28). In organized research, internet addict observed that the state of depression in individuals, it is stated that there is a strong relationship between internet addiction and depression (Jang et al, 2008; Kim et al, 2006, 185-192; Lee et al., 2008, 165-169; McGlinchey, 2003; Song, 2003; Spa et al, 2008; Thatcher, Goolam, 2005; Yang et al, 2005; Yen et al, 2007).

Depression concept of internet addiction is seen as a cause and a result will be. Another form of depression due to sociological or psychological factors such as individual observed might therefore aim at Internet addict, addicted to the internet



after the state because of its dependence could be called depression can be observed. An internet web dependent adolescents who defend what they see as an environment where alleviate depression. At the same time dependent individuals is also possible to observe the state of depression when unable to use the internet could be called. (Tsai, Lin, 2003).

#### **1.6.4. Prevalence of Internet Use**

Some work done, with 1.98% of total internet users can be described as the proportion of people dependent was found to vary between 3.5% (Cömert, Ögel, 2009, 9-16). In addition, the proportion of users who might be at risk for Internet addiction has been observed between 8.68% and 18.4% (Whang, Lee, Chang, 2003, 143-150). The proportion of Internet addiction diagnosis in the 16 age group was found to be 5.4% in Italy (Pallanti, Bernardi, Quercioli, 2006, 966-74).

The 43.4% rate of internet usage in Europe in 2007 and the first half of 2007 indicate that in Turkey the opportunity to access the Internet 22.5% of the population (Cömert, Ögel, 2009, 9-16), For all of 2007, our country as one of internet access in the quarter of the population, 34.3% use the computer in the last three months that has emerged is of 32.2% in the study conducted by the Statistical Institute of Turkey enters the internet (Cömert, Ögel, 2009, 9-16). There is a high rate of increase in Internet use between 2000 - 2007 while 231% across Europe seems to be about 700% in Turkey. This finding is said to provide information on the prevalence of the Internet and computer use. Also, there is health problems brought by the use of the internet and the computer appears to be addictive.

#### **1.7. Causes of Problem Internet Use**

Internet gambling and betting sites, fervent played over the individuals, and it seems to become once around chasing the money they lose dependent. Betting in the brains of individuals who accessed any time and award the gambling website content and punishment system is broken, and the same people as in the treatment of drug

addiction addicted person is made hospitalized. Playing games for money for gambling or betting and include the chance to invest based on the event. In terms of short-term development of the formation of betting and gambling problems without labor it is expressed is of great importance. This is just the condition of the person claimed to be a result of the focus on waiting and waiting for an exciting feeling to live (Tarhan, 2011).

Internet gambling has greatly affected the ways things are done, as many people have direct access with the internet on a daily basis (Griffith, 2003, 557-568). On the other hand, Tresniowski et al, 2003 explains that an estimated of about \$6 billion has been accrued since its inception, and with over 2000 websites since inception in 1995. A major challenges of these gambling results from lack of regulations (Tresniowski. A, Morrison, M, Ron, A, 2003, 119-122).

The habit of Internet gambling, as with other addicting habits, results from a few variables: a man's genetic or hereditary inclination, mental attitude, social environment, and/or peer influence. There are different components, on the other hand, about Internet betting that can make it addictive. The virtual environment of the Internet itself can give excitement, unlimited access, and diversion to those utilizing it. (Griffiths, 2003) Similarly, other reasons found were the antipathy for casinos, easier and easier access to gambling via internet and also the potential for bigger wins and lower expenses to play. (Wood T. Robert, Williams J. Robert, Lawton, K. P., 2007, 235-252)

Internet becomes more widespread in our country, just as in developed countries are starting to increase the virtual gambling. Ankara Chamber of Commerce's of its publication "Virtual Trap: Internet Casinos" says the report, the number of people gambling and betting on the internet in Turkey, it was announced that found 1.5 million. In Turkey, 21 of the preferred games in virtual casino, and is said to be poker. Besides, around the world on the internet a side football, basketball, horse racing, boxing, tennis matches, games of chance for entering the allegations are

found to be played (<http://www.canlibilimi.com/bagimlilik-nedir-ve-turleri.asp>, 02.03.2015).

Determined to be the most widely used form of payment is a credit card to play virtual gambling. According to the report due to fear of giving the users' credit card information, depending on the credit card "virtual card" can be taken easily. The card limit is determined by the user. Only it used for purchases made on the Internet. After I finished shopping, this card cannot be used by others. Thus, the internet gambling behavior can be easily achieved ([http://www.bagimlilik.info.tr/seks\\_bagimliliği.html](http://www.bagimlilik.info.tr/seks_bagimliliği.html) 2:03. 2015).

### **1.8. Relationship between Problem and Pathologic gambling and Problematic Internet use**

Internet use is correlated to pathological gambling (Öztürk, Odabaşoğlu, Eraslan, Genç, Kalyoncu, 2007: 36-41). It is also found that the relationship between internet and pathological gambling is positive. Those who have never gambled before tended to only gamble less on the internet as found in the Devensky (2003) study illustrating the percentage at 28.8%. However, it is also found that PPG tended to use the internet more for gambling games and could provide a relation between pathological gambling and internet addiction.

## **2. METHODS**

### **2.1. Sample and procedure of the Study**

This study has been done at Near East University in April-May 2015. The sample among the university students are selected in non-randomized way. The students are selected in the university campus at the places they spend their leisure time. The study included 299 students and the questionnaire applied to the students by the author in approximately 20 minutes time.

### **2.2. Instruments and Measures**

#### **2.2.1. Demographic Information Form**

Demographic questionnaire prepared by the author consists of two parts. In the first part, participant's age, gender, place of birth, education, social support, questions containing socio-demographic information such as place of stay is located. In the second part of the study of properties related to the use of internet and playing time on the internet, using social networking sites features, there are questions where the internet is used.

#### **2.2.2. South Oaks Gambling Screen (SOKTT)**

South Oaks Gambling Screen (SOKTT) (Lesieur, Blume, 1987, 1184-1188) has been developed by the South Oaks Psychiatric Hospital. South Oaks Gambling Screen is a pen and paper in 20-point scale, is based on DSM-III pathological gambling criteria. Self-applied or applied by professional or non-professional interviewers. A total of 1,616 subjects were used for the development of the scale; 867 diagnosed with pathological gambling and substance abuse patients, 213 members of Gamblers Anonymous, 384 university students and 152 hospital employees was used. Obtained for independent verification and consultants calibration model is determined by family members and internal consistency and test-retest reliability. Test, DSM-III-R criteria was associated with good clinical and population alcoholics, drug addicts

were also found to be a suitable tool to the general population of pathological gambling (Lesieur, Blume, 1987, 1184-1188).

Original SOGS includes 44 questions, 20 of these questions are used to create the index. It is divided into 20 questions and "Yes" response is scored as 1, and "No" answers are scored as 0. Question scores are added together to create an overall index. Possible pathological gambling SOGS is indicated by five or more points and "gambling problem" SOGS 3 or 4 points with showing of validity and reliability of the mason IR made by the South Oaks Gambling Screen (Revised South Oaks Gambling Screen) (SOGS) were used (Duvarcı, Varan, 2011: 34-45).

### **2.2.3. Problematic Internet Use Scale (PIUS)**

PIUS of university students has been developed to measure the levels of problematic Internet use. Scale "completely appropriate" not appropriate "up with the answer consists of 33 items ranging from five ratings (Ceyhan, Ceyhan, Gürcan, 2007, 387-416). It can vary between points 33 and 165 can be taken from the scale, if healthy score of the height of individual Internet use can be obtained from the scale, that their lives a negative way affect and are likely to predispose a pathology such as internet addiction (Ceyhan, Ceyhan, Gürcan, 2007:387-416).

Scale factor analysis results related to university students revealed that the scale consists of three subscales. These three factors, is called "the negative consequences of the internet", "social benefit / social comfort" and "overuse". This was announced 48.96's% of the total variance with three factors. In addition, the scope of validity of PIKÖ's distinctiveness was found to have a more problematic Internet use of more time spent on the internet. At the same time, those who perceive themselves problematic Internet use the Internet as dependent increased levels significantly higher than stating that there is no dependency on itself (Ceyhan, Ceyhan, Gürcan, 2007:387-416).

The Cronbach's alpha coefficient of internal consistency reliability of the scale covered by PIUS ( $\alpha$ ) was found to be 0.94. The total score of Article reliability

coefficients between 0.31 and 0.70 ( $p < 0.001$ ) were found to change. Again, the result of comparison of scores end groups has been found that all the substances  $p < 0.0001$  level is important. The scale of the four-week search for a re-test scores obtained by the correlation of 0.81 ( $p < 0.001$ ). The scale was found to be 0.83 the correlation between the two parts (Ceyhan, Ceyhan, Gürcan, 2007:387-416).

### **2.3. Statistical Analysis**

The study participants diagnosed with PPG (SOKTT score  $\geq 3$ ) and those without (SOKTT score  $\leq 2$ ) were separated and analyzed using two different socio-demographic characteristics between groups' chi-square statistics. PPG, PIUS subscale score of gambling diagnosed and receiving groups were compared by t-test. The relationship between scores and also PIUS and SOKTT subscale scores of the participants were examined by the Pearson correlation analysis

### 3. RESULT

In this study 107 female and 192 male are accepted to join to do the questionnaire. From the total 299 participants, 259 born in Turkey, 29 born in Cyprus, 11 born other countries. The mean age of the students is 22.96.

#### 3.1. Comparison of Socio-demographic Characteristics of Pathological Gamblers and non-gamblers

**Table 1. Comparison of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers according to gender**

	PP Gamblers		PP Non-Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
Female	8	11,1	99	43,6
Male	64	88,9	128	56,4
Total	72	100	227	100

$$X^2=25,127, df=1, p=0,000, CV=0$$

When comparing men and women playing PPK, it was found that there was a significant gender difference and it was concluded that men play more than women.

**Table 2. Comparison of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers in terms of nationality**

	PP Gamblers		PP Non-Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
Cyprus	4	5,6	25	11,0
Turkey	66	91,7	193	85,0
Others	2	2,8	9	4,0
Total	72	100	227	100

$$X^2=2,167, df=2, p=0,338$$

Regarding comparisons based on nationality, it was found that in both groups Turkey had the most majority. There was no statistically significant difference

**Table 3. Comparison of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers according to birth floor**

	PP Gamblers		PP Non-Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
Cyprus	1	1.4	24	10.6
Turkey	67	93.1	194	85.5
England	1	1.4	0	0.0
Others	3	4.2	9	4.0
Total	72	100	227	100

$$X^2=9.033, df=3, p=0.029$$

In this comparison it was found that both groups had the majority from Turkey. There is a statistically significant difference

**Table 4. Comparison of problems of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers by marital status**

	PP Gamblers		PP Non-Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
Single	65	90.3	212	93.8
Engaged	1	1.4	10	4.4
Married	2	2.8	3	1.3
Divorced	1	1.4	0	0.0
Widow	2	2.8	0	0.0
Separated	1	1.4	1	0.4
Total	72	100	226	100

$$X^2=12.266, df=5, p=0.031$$

When compared in terms of marital status, it is seen that most gamblers from both groups were single. There is a statistically significant difference



**Table 5. Comparison of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers according to who they live together**

	PP Gamblers		PP Non-Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
Alone	18	25.0	56	24.7
Partners	1	1.4	4	1.8
Siblings	3	4.2	16	7.0
Parents	13	18.1	48	21.1
Relatives	1	1.4	2	0.9
Friends	26	36.1	61	26.9
Dormitory	10	13.9	40	17.6
Total	72	100	227	100

$$X^2=3.217, df=6, p=0.781$$

There was no difference found in terms of those who lived or did not live with pathological gamblers. In both groups, students either lived alone or with friends.

**Table 6. Comparison of problems of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers according to having scholarship**

	PP Gamblers		PP Non-Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
Yes	16	22.2	72	31.7
No	56	77.8	155	68.3
Total	72	100	227	100

$$X^2=2.373, df=1, p=0.123$$

The difference between those who gamble and those who don't in terms of getting a scholarship has not been determined.

**Table 7. Comparison of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers by their monthly income**

	PP Gamblers		PP Non-Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
0	37	51.4	141	62.1
1560 YTL ve 3000 YTL	27	37.5	76	33.5
3000 YTL ve 5000 YTL	8	11.1	10	4.4
Total	72	100	227	100

$$X^2=25,127, df=1, p=0.000, CV=0$$

Significant difference was found in comparison of monthly incomes. Those with more monthly income tended to gamble more.

**Table 8. Comparison of problems and pathological gamblers and non-gamblers enrolled at university**

	PP Gamblers		PP Non-Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
1 year	14	19.4	58	25.6
2 years	7	9.7	50	22.0
3 years	14	19.4	38	16.7
4 years	11	15.3	36	15.9
5 years or more	26	36.1	45	19.8
Total	72	100	227	100

$$X^2=11.536, df=4, p=0.021, CV=0$$

Comparison showed that those who spent 5 years or more at university were more involved in gambling.

**Table 9. Comparison of problems of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers in terms of those who study and who work**

	PP Gamblers		PP Non-Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
Yes full-time.	2	2.8	13	5.7
Yes part-time.	13	18.1	38	16.7
No	57	79.2	176	77.5
Total	72	100	227	100

$$X^2=1.022, df=2, p=0.600, CV=0$$

No significant difference found in those who played PPK and those who didn't in terms of students working part-time, full-time or not working at all. All groups tended to gamble.

**Table 10. Comparison of problems of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers by how successful they are at studies**

	PP Gamblers		PP Non-Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
Newly started	4	5.6	26	11.5
Passed from all courses	28	38.9	121	53.3
Failed in some courses	18	25.0	38	16.7
Postponed one semester	7	9.7	21	9.3
Postponed more than one semester	15	20.8	21	9.3
Total	72	100	227	100

$$X^2=12.269, df=4, p=0.015, CV=0$$

Difference was found in the performance of gamblers and non-gamblers. Those who gambled tended to perform badly in lessons and vice versa.

**Table 11. Comparison of problems of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers in terms of their academic performance**

	PP Gamblers		PP Non-Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
Very good	8	11.1	51	22.5
Good	17	23.6	91	40.1
Normal	41	56.9	72	31.7
Bad	5	6.9	12	5.3
Very bad	1	1.4	1	0.4
Total	72	100	227	100

$$\chi^2=17.884, df=4, p=0.001, CV=0$$

Those who tended to play PP had a normal academic performance in comparison with those who don't and no particular difference was recorded.

**Table 12. Comparison of problems of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers in terms the schooling level of their mothers**

	PP Gamblers		PP Non-Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
No school	13	18.1	29	12.8
Nursery	24	33.3	61	26.9
Middle School	13	18.1	31	13.7
High School	10	13.9	65	28.6
University and more	12	16.7	41	18.1
Total	72	100	227	100

$$\chi^2=7.405, df=4, p=0.116, CV=0$$

No significant difference was recorded due to the educational level of mothers in comparison of gamblers and non-gamblers.

**Table 13. Comparison of problems of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers in terms the schooling level of their fathers**

	PP Gamblers		PP Non-Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
No school	2	2,8	5	2.2
Nursery	14	19.4	45	19.8
Middle School	14	19.4	23	10.1
High School	17	23.6	78	34.4
University and more	25	34.7	76	33.5
Total	72	100	227	100

$$X^2=5.925, df=4, p=0.205, CV=0$$

No significant difference was recorded due to the educational level of fathers in comparison of gamblers and non-gamblers.

**Table 14. Comparison of problems of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers in terms their religious attitude**

	PP Gamblers		PP Non-Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
Very important	28	38.9	83	36.6
Important	35	48.6	115	50.7
Not important	9	12.5	29	12.8
Total	72	100	227	100

$$X^2=0.129, df=2, p=0.938, CV=0$$

No significant difference was recorded due to religious attitude in comparison of gamblers and non-gamblers.

### 3.2. Comparison of Pathological Gamblers and non-gamblers According to Types of Gambling

**Table 15. Comparison of problems of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers who bet with horse-dogs-football**

	PP Gamblers		PP Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
No gambling	21	29.2	168	74.0
Once in a week	24	33.3	46	20.3
Once a week or more	27	37.5	13	5.7
Total	72	100	227	100

$$X^2=62.626, df=2, p=0.000, CV=0$$

Difference was recorded between gamblers and non-gamblers where PP gamblers tended to gamble more on football-horseracing-dog games.

**Table 16. Comparison of problems of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers who bet with money and those with cards**

	PP Gamblers		PP Non-Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
No gambling	32	44.4	199	87.7
Once in a week	15	20.8	17	7.5
Once a week or more	25	34.7	11	4.8
Total	72	100	227	100

$$X^2=62.836, df=2, p=0.000, CV=0$$

Difference was recorded that pathological gamblers tended to gamble more using Money rather than cards when compared to non-gamblers.

**Table 17. Comparison of problems of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers who play Okay game with Money**

	PP Gamblers		PP Non-Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
No gambling	35	48.6	196	86.3
Once in a week	20	27.8	23	10.1
Once a week or more	17	23.6	8	3.5
Total	72	100	227	100

$$X^2=48.2866, df=2, p=0.000, CV=0$$

Pathological gamblers tended to play okay game with Money more in comparison to non-gamblers.

**Table 18. Comparison of problems of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers who play gambling with dice games**

	PP Gamblers		PP Non-Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
No gambling	53	73.6	218	96.0
Once in a week	6	8.3	5	2.2
Once a week or more	13	18.1	4	1.8
Total	72	100	227	100

$$X^2=34.140, df=2, p=0.000, CV=0$$

Significant difference was recorded between PP gamblers and non-gamblers in relation with playing dice games. 26.4% PP gamblers played dice games with Money. 4% Non-gamblers don't play dice games. PP gamblers play dice games more than non-gamblers.

**Table 19. Comparison of problems of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers who bet on cockfighting**

	PP Gamblers		PP Non-Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
No gambling	61	84.7	214	94.3
Once in a week	4	5.6	9	4.0
Once a week or more	7	9.7	4	1.8
Total	72	100	227	100

$$\chi^2=10.275, df=2, p=0.006, CV=0$$

Significant difference was recorded between PP gamblers and non-gamblers in relation with betting on cockfighting. 15.3% PP gamblers played betting on cockfighting. 5.8% Non-gamblers played betting on cockfighting. It was established that PP gamblers played betting on cockfighting more than non-gamblers.

**Table 20. Comparison of problems of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers who bet on sport lotteries**

	PP Gamblers		PP Non-Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
No gambling	24	33.3	173	76.2
Once in a week	32	44.4	44	19.4
Once a week or more	16	22.2	10	4.4
Total	72	100	227	100

$$\chi^2=48.715, df=2, p=0.000, CV=0$$

PP gamblers played more Sport Toto game in comparison to non-gamblers and the difference is illustrated in the table.



**Table 21. Comparison of problems of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers who bet on lotteries**

	PP Gamblers		PP Non-Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
No gambling	35	48.6	171	75.3
Once in a week	27	37.5	49	21.6
Once a week or more	10	13.9	7	3.1
Total	72	100	227	100

$$X^2=22.335, df=2, p=0.000, CV=0$$

PP gamblers bet more on lotteries in comparison to non-gamblers and the difference is illustrated in the table.

**Table 22. Comparison of problems of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers who play scratch-off games**

	PP Gamblers		PP Non-Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
No gambling	32	44.4	156	68.7
Once in a week	29	40.3	58	25.6
Once a week or more	11	15.3	13	5.7
Total	72	100	227	100

$$X^2=62.626, df=2, p=0.000, CV=0$$

55.6% PP Gamblers played scratch-off games in comparison to 31.3% non-gamblers playing the same. Scratch-off games have a reputation that only PP gamblers play it more.

**Table 23. Comparison of problems of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers who play national lottery game**

	PP Gamblers		PP Non Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
No gambling	29	40.3	155	68.3
Once in a week	33	45.8	62	27.3
Once a week or more	10	13.9	10	4.4
Total	72	100	227	100

$$X^2=20.217, df=2, p=0.000, CV=0$$

59.7% PP gamblers played the national lottery game in comparison with 31.7% non-gamblers playing the same. It is shown that PP gamblers played the national lottery game more.

**Table 24. Comparison of problems of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers who bet on stock market**

	PP Gamblers		PP Non-Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
No gambling	49	68.1	202	89.0
Once in a week	12	16.7	19	8.4
Once a week or more	11	15.3	6	2.6
Total	72	100	227	100

$$X^2=21.829, df=2, p=0.000, CV=0$$

32% PP gamblers bet on stock market in comparison with 11% of non-gamblers doing the same. It is found that PP gamblers bet more on stock.

**Table 25. Comparison of problems of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers who bet in casinos**

	PP Gamblers		PP Non-Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
No gambling	20	27.8	178	78.4
Once in a week	27	37.5	41	18.1
Once a week or more	25	34.7	8	3.5
Total	72	100	227	100

$$X^2=78.452, df=2, p=0.000, CV=0$$

72.2% PP gamblers bet in casinos in comparison to 21.6% non-gamblers doing the same. It is established that the PP gamblers play more games in the casino.

**Table 26. Comparison of problems of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers who have skills of gambling**

	PP Gamblers		PP Non-Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
No gambling	41	56.9	200	88.1
Once in a week	15	20.8	18	7.9
Once a week or more	16	22.2	9	4.0
Total	72	100	227	100

$$X^2=36.624, df=2, p=0.000, CV=0$$

43% PP gamblers were found to have skills of gambling compared to 11.9% non-gamblers with equivalent talent. It is established that PP gamblers have more skills of gambling than the latter.

**Table 27. Comparison of problems of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers who play gambling games on internet**

	PP Gamblers		PP Non-Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
No gambling	40	55.6	199	87.7
Once in a week	13	18.1	19	8.4
Once a week or more	19	26.4	9	4.0
Total	72	100	227	100

$$X^2=41.194, df=2, p=0.000, CV=0$$

44.5% PP gamblers play gambling games on internet in comparison with 12.4% non-gamblers playing the same. It is established that gamblers have a positive relationship with internet in terms of playing betting games online.

**Table 28. Comparison of problems of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers who play other gambling games**

	PP Gamblers		PP Non-Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
No gambling	50	70.4	219	96.9
Once in a week	8	11.3	5	2.2
Once a week or more	13	18.3	2	0.9
Total	72	100	227	100

$$X^2=46.784, df=2, p=0.000, CV=0$$

29.6% PP gamblers played other gambling games in comparison with non-gamblers playing the same. PP gamblers played more other gambling games than non-gamblers.

### 3.3. Comparison of Pathological Gamblers and non-gamblers According to Types of Internet Gamblings

**Table 29. Comparison of problems of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers who play frequently on internet**

	PP Gamblers		PP Non Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
No gambling	32	44.4	191	84.1
Once in a week	22	30.6	22	9.7
Once a week or more	18	25.0	14	6.2
Total	72	100	227	100

$$X^2=45.834, df=2, p=0.000, CV=0$$

55.6% PP gamblers played frequently on the internet in comparison with 15.9% non-gamblers playing the same. PP gamblers players more frequently on the internet than non-gamblers

**Table 30. Comparison of problems of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers who play on internet with Money**

	PPK Gamblers		PPK Non-Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
No gambling	38	52.8	200	88.1
Once in a week	19	26.4	20	8.8
Once a week or more	15	20.8	7	3.1
Total	72	100	227	100

$$X^2=44.925, df=2, p=0.000, CV=0$$

47.2% PP gamblers played frequently on the internet with money in comparison with 11.9% non-gamblers playing the same. PP gamblers played more frequently on the internet with Money than non-gamblers.

**Table 31. Comparison of problems of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers who play on internet without Money**

	PP Gamblers		PP Non-Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
No gambling	35	48.6	179	78.9
Once in a week	22	30.6	35	15.4
Once a week or more	15	20.8	13	5.7
Total	72	100	227	100

$$X^2=26.876, df=2, p=0.000, CV=0$$

51.4% PP gamblers played frequently on the internet without money in comparison with 21.1% non-gamblers playing the same. PP gamblers played more frequently on the internet without Money than non-gamblers.

**Table 32. Comparison of problems of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers who play in casino**

	PPK Gamblers		PPK Non-Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
No gambling	16	22.2	186	81.9
Once in a week	32	44.4	32	14.1
Once a week or more	24	33.3	9	4.0
Total	72	100	227	100

$$X^2=95.090, df=2, p=0.000, CV=0$$

77.7% PP gamblers played in casino in comparison with 18.1% non-gamblers playing the same. PP gamblers played more in casino than non-gamblers.

**Table 33. Comparison of problems of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers who bet in betting Office**

	PP Gamblers		PP Non-Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
No gambling	21	29.2	164	72.2
Once in a week	18	25.0	49	21.6
Once a week or more	33	45.8	14	6.2
Total	72	100	227	100

$$X^2=71.394, df=2, p=0.000, CV=0$$

70.8% PP gamblers played in betting offices in comparison with 27.8% non-gamblers playing the same. PP gamblers played more in betting offices than non-gamblers.

**Table 34. Comparison of problems of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers who bet on gambling games on internet**

	PP Gamblers		PP Non-Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
No gambling	39	54.2	201	88.5
Once in a week	16	22.2	16	7.0
Once a week or more	17	23.6	10	4.4
Total	72	100	227	100

$$X^2=42.137, df=2, p=0.000, CV=0$$

45.8% PP gamblers played betting on internet games in comparison with 11.4% non-gamblers playing the same. PP gamblers played betting on internet games than non-gamblers.

**Table 35. Comparison of problems of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers who bet on gambling in coffeehouse**

	PP Gamblers		PP Non-Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
No gambling	40	55.6	211	93.0
Once in a week	21	29.2	10	4.4
Once a week or more	11	15.3	6	2.6
Total	72	100	227	100

$$X^2=56.779, df=2, p=0.000, CV=0$$

44.5% PP gamblers played betting in coffeehouse in comparison with 7% non-gamblers playing the same. PP gamblers played betting in coffeehouse more than non-gamblers.

**Table 36. Comparison of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers who bet on gambling in sports clubs**

	PP Gamblers		PP Non-Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
No gambling	47	65.3	213	93.8
Once in a week	18	25.0	6	2.6
Once a week or more	7	9.7	8	3.5
Total	72	100	227	100

$$X^2=43.350, df=2, p=0.000, CV=0$$

34.7% PP gamblers played gambling in sports clubs in comparison with 6.1% non-gamblers playing the same. PP gamblers played gambling in sports clubs more than non-gamblers.



**Table 37. Comparison of PPG and non-gamblers who bet on gambling in other places**

	PP Gamblers		PP Non-Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
No gambling	51	70.8	216	95.2
Once in a week	12	16.7	5	2.2
Once a week or more	9	12.5	6	2.6
Total	72	100	227	100

$$X^2=34.321, df=2, p=0.000, CV=0$$

29.2% PP gamblers played gambling in other places in comparison with 4.8% non-gamblers playing the same. PP gamblers played gambling in other places more than non-gamblers.

**Table 38. Comparison of problems of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers in terms of age**

	PP Gamblers		PP Non-Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
Younger than 22 years	22	30.6	119	52.4
Older than 22 years	50	69.4	108	47.6
Total	72	100	227	100

$$X^2=10.489, df=1, p=0.001, CV=0$$

Significant difference was found in the ages of gamblers. PP in both groups, the gamblers were found to be over 22 years of age.

**Table 39. Comparison of problems of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers in terms of Money spent in a day**

	PP Gamblers		PP Non-Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
0	6	8.3	125	55.3
1-500 TL	37	51.4	89	39.4
501-1000 TL	25	34.7	10	4.4
1001-5000 TL	4	5.6	2	0.9
Total	72	100	227	100

$$X^2=77.866, df=3, p=0.000, CV=1$$

PP gamblers tended to invest more Money in gambling in a day in comparison with non-gamblers. However, the amounts invested by PP gamblers were significantly higher than those invested by non-gamblers.

**Table 40. Comparison of problems of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers in terms of people betting from different places due to internet connections**

	PPK Gamblers		PPK Non-Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
Home	25	34.7	67	29.6
Dormitory	10	13.9	30	13.3
Telephone	27	37.5	91	40.3
The visited places	2	2.8	6	2.7
Internet café	0	0.0	4	1.8
From multiple places	8	11.1	28	12.4
Total	72	100	227	100

$$X^2=88.988 df=5, p=0.000, CV=8, (% 2,7)$$

PP gamblers were found to bet from different places in comparison with non-gamblers. The most popular place to bet from has been discovered as home in both groups.

**Table 41. Comparison of problems of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers in terms of playing different types of games on internet**

	PP Gamblers		PP Non-Gamblers	
	N	%	N	%
No gambling	13	18.8	173	77.9
Poker	14	20.3	12	5.4
Backgammon	3	4.3	3	1.4
Football, basketball, horseracing, books, tennis matches	21	30.4	26	11.7
Roulette	3	4.3	4	1.8
Multiple games	15	21.7	4	1.8
Total	72	100	227	100

$$X^2=10.489, df=1, p=0,001, CV=0$$

PP gamblers were found to play more different types of games on internet in comparison with non-gamblers.

### 3.4. COMPARISON OF PROBLEMS OF PATHOLOGICAL GAMBLERS AND NON-PATHOLOGICAL GAMBLERS IN TERMS OF RELATIONSHIPS ON INTERNET GAMES

**Table 42. Comparison of problems of pathological gamblers and non-gamblers in terms of PİKÖ total and subscales**

	<b>PPK Gamblers</b> Ort ± sd	<b>PPK Non-Gamblers</b> Ort ± sd	T	p
PİKÖ total points (n=299)	84.3±29.6	66.1±25,9	-4.666	0.000
PİKÖ total points excessive use (n=299)	19.4±4.5	17.9±6,4	-1.821	0.070
PİKÖ Social benefits, social comfort scores. (n=299)	24.6±10.0	17.8±8,2	-5.187	0.000
PİKÖ Internet negative consequences scores.	14.5 ±6.4	11.0±5,3	-4.141	0.000

PP gamblers were found to have more PİKÖ totals and subscales in comparison with non-gamblers.

**Table 43. All of the individuals' SOKTT points total and subscale scores with PIKO comparison by using Pearson Correlation Analysis**

	Total SOKTT Points of All Individuals	
	r	p
PİKÖ total points (n=299)	0.300	0.000
PİKÖ Aşırı kullanım puanları (n=299)	0.105	0.070
PİKÖ Social benefits, social comfort scores. (n=299)	0.336	0.000
PİKÖ Internet negative consequences scores. (n=299)	0.273	0.000

A significant relationship was found using the Pearson Correlation analysis between social comfort scores and PIKO scores. PP gamblers showed internet as a negative consequen

#### 4. DISCUSSIONS

In our research among the university students, the ratio of problem gambling is 18.4% and pathologic gambling ratio is %5.7. In our study, we found that the problem of pathological gambling is more prevalent among the adolescents rather than the general population. This claim of our study can be supported by a corresponding study done by (Çakıcı et al ,2015) who found out that in TRNC at the age of 18 to 65 year group the problem gambling ratio is %9.5 and pathological gambling for life ratio is %3.5. In similar study done by Çakıcı (2015) it was established that there is a high level of pathological gambling in Asian countries. He illustrated this point by showing the trend of pathological gambling at 2% in Asian countries like Hong Kong, Singapore and Macau (Wong, So, 2003; Fong, Orozio, 2005). High risk gambling problems are present among adolescents, indigenous minority groups, and communities (Derevensky, Gupta, 2004:231-252, Westermeyer et al, 2005). When we examine the studies about problem gambling we found that being younger than 29 years old, male, unmarried, unemployed, an immigrant and having low education level are the risk factors of problem gambling (Volberg, Steadman 1988; Volberg, 1994; Volberg et al. 2001; Potenza et al, 2001).

Both in TRNC or in the world, gambling is considered to be entertainment and type of recreation and is increasing in popularity day by day. Gambling is basically risk that a person willingly enters and there is redistribution of wealth without producing work on both sides (Aksoy, 2004). Researches in TRNC done in recent years are showing that the problem of pathological gambling is increasing in TRNC (Çakıcı et al, 2014, 7). Ratios in TRNC (Çakıcı et al, 2015). Correspond to those found in Puerto Ricans in Puerto Rico (Volberg, Vales, 1998), the Maoris in New Zealand (Abbott, Volberg, 1996) and Native Americans in North Dakota (Volberg, Silver, 1993). The reasons found of such similar ratios of pathological gambling are explained by (Volberg, Vales, 1998) as similar colonization, limited economy and sociological problems (Çakıcı et al, 2015). In this study it is found out that the level of problematic and pathological gambling is high among the university students.

Although it is ban to enter casinos and betting offices for the university student this prohibition is not applied effectively because of this the university students can enter casinos very easy.

According to our research, we found that men play more PPG in comparison to women. Derevensky's (2004) study also revealed that men gamble 61.5 percent more than women. In Mason's study 51.5% of men gamble more (Duvarcı, Varanda, 2000). In a similar study conducted in Sweden the trend of men gambling more than women were illustrated (Svensson, Romild, Shepherdson, 2013). When an assessment is done in terms of marital status, it has been observed that single people gamble more. Another study done by the Duvarcı and Varanda (2000) showed that only 37.1 percent of divorced and widowed people play gambling. The study by Devensky (2003) shows that 47.5 percent gamblers are single. With more students living alone or with friends, our study focuses more on unmarried students. Universities are the period of pre-marital life. Students who have high academic performance have less time to do gambling. However, this study shows that students who do have money tend to spend it more on gambling and it affects their academic performance. In a corresponding study it is that for a college student the major problems due to gambling are loss of money intended for living expenses and spending a lot of time on gambling resulted in low grades (Stinfield et al, 2006). One of the criteria of academic success in school is, undoubtedly, to pass the course. Those who gamble tend to finish their studies later than those who don't. Students are turning to gambling and they do not have the time to focus on their studies to do well.

It is observed that most of those who play gambling games preferred the games of dog and football (Çakıcı, et al, 2015) also found in his study that horse-dog-football game are the most preferred game in TRNC. Out of 70.8% of those who play PPG, 26% prefer the horse-dog games. PPG also tend to spend more money on gambling games. Similarly, Derevensky (2003) concluded in his work that 48.2% of those who prefer to gamble paid with money. Also the majority of PPG playing coin games is higher than non-gamblers. The data that has garnered the more attention is that of

PPG playing the dice games. Those who have never played dice games tended to play it comparatively more. Duvarcı (2014) concluded in his study that 17.5% people preferred the dice games. Alternatively, cockfighting is another popular gambling game. Similarly, PPG tended to play more sports toto lottery, national lottery games as well as scratch-off games. Scratch-off games have a reputation of being mostly played by the PPG. (Çakıcı, M et al, 2015) concluded the number of people preferring national lottery game is at 44.8%. The relationship between gambling and stock market is very frisky and it is observed that those who are more PPG tended to trust the stock market and played more betting on it in comparison with the non-gamblers. Using Derevensky (2003) study of PPG involved in casino playing standing at 30.8% illustrates that pathological gamblers are more involved in casino games and Mason concludes the number as 27.6% (Duvarcı, Varan, 2011). Those who gambled more in terms of PPG were found to have higher gambling skills and also preferred to be involved in other forms of gambling games in comparison with non-gamblers.

In our study it is illustrated that the highest number of gambling occurs at casinos (77.7%) followed closely by betting offices (70.8%). Although there is a ban on underage university students, however, it has been found that many students in TRNC, particularly, Turkish students, can enter the casino and play betting even when prohibited. (Çakıcı M., et al, 2015). It is also observed that environment matters a lot in conducting gambling studies and if the environment is positive and alluring, people tended to gamble more. Derevensky (2003) found that 32% people gamble at the casinos (Derevensky, 2003). In relation to betting offices, it is found that PPG used the betting offices more. Similarly, out of other places, coffeehouses were another popular place for holding gambling games, particularly, those hosted by the PPG.

Our works is showing us that there is a relationship between problem internet user and problem gambling. Some studies suggest that PG and PIU exhibit frequent co-occurrence among adults (Shapira et al., 2000, Young, 1998 and youths (Dowling, Brown, 2010).



It has been shown that internet is largely being used in recent years for gambling and can be seen as a start of internet addiction. It also leads us to the finding that one addiction can be replaced with another addiction and Tarhan (2011) observed that gambling addiction is leading way for internet addiction There is no bar on gambling on internet with or without money. Both categories are showing significant increase in usage of internet for gambling. It is also observed by Egger and Rauterverg (1996) that addiction is the use of any substance or material and the inability of leaving that particular action and letting it control your behavior (Egger, Rauterberg, 1996). So the control of one addiction can lead to the addiction of another thing. This has been observed by Aasved (2002) who believes that increasing in eating behavior exists after a person stops smoking addiction (Aasved, 2002). This problem is important to illustrate as the human brain is capable of being addicted and if gambling is stopped, it will link to either internet in a harmful way.

This study showed that the state's problem and to avoid the problematic Internet usage problematical and pathological gambling problems also need to be an effective public health policies. It is the most threatened group of university students in relation to these issues. In particular there is a need for awareness and consciousness programs at the universities. In the university the psychological counseling and guidance center can educate and scientifically train the youth and also can help to reduce these problems. In addition students who applied in these centers because their use of the internet gambling problem or issue that may be of both should not be ignored.

## REFERENCES

Alcock, Canal, 1986. Pathological gambling. **Aust NZ J Psychiatry**; 20: 259-265.

Aasved, Mikail, John, 2002. **The Psychodynamics and Psychology of Gambling; The Gambler's Mind**. Vol 1. Charles Thomas Publishers Ltd. Illinios USA

Abbott, W Max, Rachel A, Volberg. 1996. The New Zealand national survey of problem and pathological gambling. **Journal of Gambling Studies**, 12(2): 143–160.

Aksoy, Alper. Sex Adiction. Accessed on [2-02-2015].  
[http://www.bagimlilik.info.tr/seks\\_bagimliliği.html](http://www.bagimlilik.info.tr/seks_bagimliliği.html)

Aksoy, Alper, (2004). 'Kumar Bağımlılığı'. Accessed on [22-02-2015] from;  
[http://www.bagimlilik.info.tr/kumar\\_bagimliliği.html](http://www.bagimlilik.info.tr/kumar_bagimliliği.html)

Alaçam, Hüseyin, Figen Ç, Ateşçi, Cem A.,Sengul, Selim, Tumkaya. 2015. The relationship between smoking and alcohol use and internet addiction among the university students: **Anadolu Psikiyatri Derg** : 16:383-388

American Psychiatric Association. 1980. Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: **American Psychiatric Association**

American Psychiatric Association. 2007. **Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders ,(4th ed.) ( DSM-IV)**,. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association

American Psychiatric Association. 2013. **Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (5th ed.) ( DSM-V)**, Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association

- Arısoy, Özden. 2009. Internet addiction and its treatment. **Current Approaches in Psychiatry-Current Approaches in Psychiatry**: 1 (1), 55-67.
- Bayraktar, Fatih, 2001. İnternet kullanımının ergen gelişimindeki rolü. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Ege Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İzmir
- Bayraktutan, Fidan. 2005. Internet usage in terms of family relationships. Unpublished master's thesis, Istanbul University, Institute of Social Sciences, Social Structure - Social Change Department, Istanbul
- Black W David, Moyer Talks. 1998. Clinical features and psychiatric comorbidity of subjects with pathological gambling behavior. **Psychiatric Services**: 49 (11): 1434-1439.
- Blume, B, Seheila. 1996. **Pathological gambling. The Principles and Practice of Addictions in Psychiatry**. Norman S. Miller (Ed). W.B. Saunders Co. s. 422-432.
- Bostancı, Aslı, Kerem, Doksat. 2000. Patolojik Kumar oynama. **Yeni Symposium**; 38(4):157-161.
- Bourdeau, Paul. 2011. 'Post-Secondary Student Problem Gambling and Academic Motivation'. Electronic Theses and Dissertations. University of Windsor
- Caplan, E, Scott. 2003. Preference for online social interaction: a theory of problematic Internet use and psychosocial wellbeing. **Communication Research**: 30 (6), 625-648.
- Caplan, E Scott. 2002. Problematic internet use and psychosocial well-being: Development of a theory-based cognitive-behavioural measurement instrument. **Computers in Human Behavior**: 18, 553-575.

- Cayuela, Ruben, Juan Luis Garcia, Guirao. 1991. **Characteristics and situation of gambling addiction in Spain**. Gambling and Public Policy: International Perspectives, WR Eadington ve JA Cornelius (Ed).
- Ceyhan, Esra, Aykut, Ceyhan, Aysen, Gürcan. 2007. Problematic Internet Usage Scale validity and reliability studies, {The Validity and Reliability of the Problematic Internet Usage Scale}. Educational Sciences: **Journal of Theory and Practice of Educational Sciences-Focused to Small Scale**, 7 (1), 387-416.
- Chang, Ming-Kuan, Sally Pui Man, Law, 2008. Factor Structure for Young's Internet Addiction Test, A confirmatory study. Computers in human behavior, Volume 24 Issue 6, 2597-2619
- Charlton P John, Lan, Danforth. 2007. Distinguishing addiction and high engagement in the context of online game playing. **Computers in Human Behavior**, 23(3), 1531-1548.
- Chen, Kai, Chen, I, Henry, Paul. 2001. Explaining online behavioral differences: An Internet dependency perspective. **The Journal of Computer Information Systems**, 41(3), 59-64
- Chou Ting-Jui, Ting Chih-Chen. 2003. The role of experience in cyber-game addiction. **Cyberpsychology Behavior**: 6(6):663-75
- Cox, J Barry, Yu Nancy, Afifi Tracie, O, Ladouceur Robert. 2005. A national survey of gambling problems in Canada. **Canadian journal of psychiatry**, 50(4): 213-217.
- Cömert, Tarı, Kültekin, Ögel. 2009. Samples in Istanbul prevalence of Internet and computer addiction and relationship with different factors. **Turkey Clinical Journal of Forensic Medicine**, 6 (1), 9-16.

- Çakıcı, Mehmet. 2012. The prevalence and risk factors of gambling behavior in Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. **Anatolian Journal of Psychiatry**, 243–249.
- Çakıcı, Mehmet, Ebru, Çakıcı, Meryem, Karaaziz. 2014. KKTC’ de Kumar Davranışının Yaygınlığı, Risk Faktörleri ve Kültürlenme Tutumları ile İlişkisi. **Turkish Journal of Psychiatry**, c.25, s.7
- Çakıcı, Mehmet, Ebru, Çakıcı, Meryem, Karaaziz. 2015. Lifetime of Prevalence and Risk Factors of Problem and Pathologic Gambling in North Cyprus. **Journal of Gambling Studies** DOI: 10.1007/s10899-015-9530-5.
- Dannon Pinhas, Katherine, Lowengrub, Shalgi Boaz. 2006. Dual psychiatric diagnoses and substance abuse in pathological gamblers: a preliminary gender comparison study. **J Addict Dis** : 49–54.
- Derevensky, Jeffrey. 2003. ‘International Centre for Youth Gambling Problems and High-Risk Behaviors’. McGill University,
- Derevensky, Jeffrey, Gupta, Rina. 2004. **Gambling problems in youth: Theoretical and applied perspectives**. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, 231-252.
- Dowling A Nicki, Brown, Martin. 2010. Commonalities in the psychological factors associated with problem gambling and Internet dependence. **Cyberpsychology, Behavior and Social Networking**; 13(4):437–441.
- Duvarcı, İbrahim, Varan, Azmi, 2000. Descriptive features of Turkish pathological gamblers. **Scandinavian Journal of Psychology**: 41, 253–260.
- Duvarcı, İbrahim, Varan, Azmi. 2011. Reliability and validity study of the Turkish Form of the South Oaks Gambling Screen. **Turkish Journal of Psychiatry**: 12(1), 34–45.

- Dyall, Lorna. 2002. Kanohiki Te Kanohi. Face to face. A Maori face to gambling. **New Ethical Journal: New Zealand's Journal of Patient Management:** 5(1), 11–16.
- Egger, Oliver, Matthias, Rauterberg. 1996. Internet behavior and addiction. Semester thesis; Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Zurich.
- Everhard, R. Aaron. 2000. Characteristics of pathological Internet users: An examination of on-line gamers. Unpublished doctorate's thesis, The Department of Psychology, Spalding University.
- Fong, Ka-chio Davis, Bernadete, Orozio. 2005. Gambling participation and prevalence estimates for pathological gambling in a Far East gambling city: Macau. **UNLV Gaming Research & Review Journal:** 9(2), 15–28. Griffiths, M. D. (1999).
- Goldberg, Ivan. (1996). Goldberg's message. Accessed on [14.09.2008] <http://www-usr.rider.edu/~suler/psycyber/supportgp.html>
- Griffiths, Mark. 1999. Internet Addiction: Fact or Fiction ?. **The Psychologist**, 12 (5): 246-250.
- Griffiths, Mark. 2001. Sex on the Internet; Observation and Implication for Internet Sec Addiction. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 38 (4), 333 – 342
- Griffiths, Mark. (2003). Internet gambling: Issues, concerns, and recommendations. **CyberPsychology & Behavior**, 6(6), 557-568.
- Griz, Olga Seher, Aslı, Ekinçi, Mehmet, Hakan, Türkçapar. 2012. Cognitive behavioral therapy of patients with pathological gambling. **Journal of Cognitive Behavioral Psychotherapy and Research**,1: 1105-112.
- Grohol M John. 1999. Internet Addiction Guide. Erişim tarihi 24.07.2008, <http://psychcentral.com/netaddiction>

- Gupta, Rina, Jeffrey, Derevensky, George, Ellenbogen. 2006. 'Personality Characteristics and Risk-Taking Tendencies Among Adolescent Gamblers, International Center for Youth Gambling Problems and High-Risk Behaviors'. McGill University
- Günüç, Selim, Murat, Kayri. 2008. Sayısal uçurum ve internet bağımlılığı paradigmasının lojistik regresyon ile açıklanması. Ege Üniversitesi, Uluslararası II. BÖTE Sempozyumu, Kuşadası,
- Gunuc, Selim, Murat, Kayri. 2010. The profile of Internet dependency in Turkey and development of the internet addiction scale: study of validity and reliability. **Hacettepe University Journal of Education**, 39: 220-232.
- Harvard Mental Health Letter. 2010. Pathological gambling. **Harvard Mental Health Letter**, 27(2), 1-3.
- Henderson, Elizabeth, Connel. 2001. **Understanding addiction**. University Press of Mississippi, 4-153.
- Hollander, Eric, Christina Misa, Wong. 1995. Body dysmorphic disorder, pathological gambling, and sexual compulsions. **J Clinical Psychiatry**: 7-12.
- Huang, S Alice. 2004. The bright and dark side of cyberspace: the paradoxical media effects of internet use on gratifications, addiction, social and psychological well-being among taiwan's net-generation. Unpublished doctorate's thesis, Southern Illinois, University at Carbondale,
- Irwansyah, Muhammad Azhar. 2005. Internet uses, gratifications, addiction, and loneliness among international students. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Hawaii, Department of Communication.
- Kaya, Burhanettin. 2001. Kumar hastalık mı? Endüstri mi? **8. Ulusal Psikiyatri Kongresi Bilimsel Çalışmaları**, 23-31 Mayıs Lefkoşa, 119-125.

- Kalyoncu Ö. Ayhan, Özkan, Pektas, Hasan, Mirsal. 2003. Pathological gambling: a biopsychosocial approach. **Journal of Addiction**; 4 (2): 76-80.
- Kim, Sun-Woo, Ran-Do, Kim. 2002. A Study of Internet Addiction: Status, Causes, and Remedies- Focusing on the alienation factor - **International Journal of Human Ecology** , 3(1), 1-19.
- Kim, Kyunghee, Eunjung, Ryu, Mi-young, Chon. 2006. Internet addiction in Korean adolescents and its relation to depression and suicidal ideation: A questionnaire survey. **International Journal of Nursing Studies**: 43, 185–192.
- Kiralla, Laura Venturini. 2005. Internet addiction disorder: A descriptive study of college counselors in four-year institutions. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of La Verne Department of Organizational Leadership, LA Verne.
- Kumar, Shiva Kota Balaji. 1995. Strange quark matter. **Nuclear Physics A**, 590 (1): 29-45.
- Ladouceur, Robert, Chantal, Mireault. 1988. Gambling behaviours among high school students in the Quebec area, **Journal of Gambling Behaviour**: 4: 3-12.
- Lesieur, Henry.1992. Pathological gambling, work, and employee assistance. **J Employee Assistance Research**: 32-62.
- Lee, Sang-Ki, Doug Hyun,,Ha, Kevin C, Yang. 2008. Depression Like Characteristics of 5HTTLPR Polymorphism and Temperament in Excessive Internet Users. **Journal of Affective Disorders**: Vol 109:1 -2: 165–169.
- Lester, David. 1994. Access to gambling opportunities and compulsive gambling. **Int Addict** , : 1611-1616.
- Leung, Louis. 2004. Net-generation attributes and seductive properties of the internet as predictors of online activities and internet addiction. **Cyberpsychology & Behavior**: 7(3), 333-348.



- McGlinchey, B James. 2003. Internet usage of college students and relationship to psychopathology and addiction symptomatology. Unpublished doctorate's thesis, University of Washington, Department of Psychology
- Odabaşıoğlu, Gürkan, Özgür, Öztürk, Yasin Genç, Özkan, Pektas. 2007. Cases In A Series on the internet addiction: Clinical Views. **Journal of Addiction**; c, 8: 46-51.
- Ögel, Kültegin, 2010. **Sigara, Alkol ve Madde Kullanım bozuklukları: Tanı, Tedavi ve Önleme**. Yeniden Yayınları. İstanbul,:3-12.
- Pallanti, Stefano, Silvia, Bernardi, Leonardo, Querciolana. 2006. The Shorter PROMIS Questionnaire and the Internet Addiction Scale in the assessment of multiple addictions in a high-school population: prevalence of and related disability. **Spectator CNS**; 11 (12): 966-74.
- Potenza, N Marc. Marvin A, Steinberg. Susan D, McLaughlin, Ran, Wu, Bruce J, Rounsaville, Stephanie S. O'Malley. 2001. Gender-related differences in the characteristics of problem gamblers using a gambling helpline. **American Journal of Psychiatry**, 15, 1500–1505.
- Sevi, Oya, Marton, 2014. The Comorbidity of Pathological Gambling and Conversion Disorder: Case Report and The Psychotherapy Progress. **Bağımlılık Dergisi - Journal of Dependence**:15 (2), 105-109.
- Shaffer, Howard , Matthew , Hall, Bilt J, Vander, 1999. Estimating the prevalence of disordered gambling behavior in the United States and Canada: A research synthesis. **American Journal of Public Health**, vol. 89, 1369 –1376.
- Shapira, A Nathan, Toby, Goldsmith Toby, Paul E. Keck, Uday M. Khosla, Susan L. McElroy. 2000. Psychiatric features of individuals with problematic internet use. **Journal of Affective Disorders**;57(1-3):267–272.

- Spada, Marcantonio, Benjamin, Langston, Ana V, Nikčević, 2008. The role of metacognitions in problematic Internet use. **Computers in Human Behavior**, : 24(5), 2325–2335.
- Song, Indeok, 2003. Internet gratifications, depression, self-efficacy, and internet addiction. Unpublished master's thesis, Michigan State University, Department of Telecommunication,
- Stinchfield, Randy, William E, Hanson, Douglas H, Olson. 2006. Problem and pathological gambling among college students. **New Directions for Student Services**: 113, 63-72.
- Svensson, Jessika, Ulla, Romild, Emma, Shepherdson. 2013. The concerned significant others of people with gambling problems in a national representative sample – a 1 year follow up study. *BMC Public Health*: 13-1087.
- Tarhan, Nevzat, Serdar, Nurmedov. 2011. ‘**Bağmlılık**’ Timas Yayinlari, Borsa Istanbul. Taschenbuch.
- Thatcher, Andrew, Shamira, Goolam. 2005. Development and psychometric properties of the problematic internet use questionnaire. **South African Journal of Psychology**: 35(4), 793-809.
- Theory Practice, 2000. *Journal of Theory and Practice of Educational Sciences-Focused to Small Scale*, 7 (1), 387-416.
- Thurlow, Cirispin, Laura, Lengel, Ante, Tomic, 2003. Computer-mediated communication: Social interaction and the Internet. London: Sage Publications, (2004): 150-159. Tresniowski,
- Tresniowski, Alex, Ron., Melissa, Morrison. (2003). Gamling Online. **People**, (60)15:119-122.

- Tsai, Chin-chung, Lin, Sunny. 2003. Internet Addiction of Adolescents in Taiwan: An Interview Study. **Cyberpsychology & Behavior**, 6(6),
- Tvedt, H Eric. 2000. Internet Use and Related Factors Among Fifth-Graders. Unpublished master's thesis, Umeå University, Department of Psychology.
- University of Maryland Medical Center."Pathological Gambling" Retrieved August 27, 2015. <http://umm.edu/health/medical/ency/articles/pathological-gambling>
- Volberg, A. Rachel. 1994. The prevalence and demographics of pathological gamblers: Implications for public health. **American Journal of Public Health**, 237–241.
- Volberg, A. Rachel, Henry J. Steadman. 1988. Refining prevalence estimates of pathological gambling. **American Journal of Psychiatry**, 502–505.
- Volberg, A Rachel, Eric, Silver. 1993. **Gambling and problem gambling in North Dakota. Report to the North Dakota Department of Human Services, Division of Mental Health.** Albany, NY: Gemini Research.
- Volberg, A. Rachel, Pedro A. Vales. 1998. Gambling and problem gambling in Puerto Rico [Juegos de azar y el problema de juego en Puerto Rico]. **Report to the Puerto Rico Treasury Department.**
- Volberg, A. Rachel, Max W, Abbott, Sten, Ronnberg, Ingrid, Munck. 2001. Prevalence and risks of pathological gambling in Sweden. **Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica**, 104, 250–256.
- Walker, B. Michael. 1992. **The psychology of gambling. International series in social psychology.** Oxford, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann Ltd. Wal
- Wan Chin-Shendg, Wen-Bin Chiou, 2006. Why are adolescents addicted to online gaming? An interview study in Taiwan. **Cyber Psychol Behav**, 9(6):762-6.

- Wang Sang-Min Leo, Sujin Lee, Geunyoung Chang. 2003. Internet over-users' psychological profiles: a behaviour sampling analysis on internet addiction. **Cyberpsychol Behav**, 6(2):143-150.
- Williams, Johnson Robert, Rachel A, Volberg. 2009. Impact of survey description, administration format, and exclusionary criteria on population prevalence rates of problem gambling. **International Gambling Studies**, 9(2), 101–117.
- Wong, L. K. Irene, Ernest M. T So. 2009. Prevalence estimates of problem and pathological gambling in Hong Kong. **American Journal of Psychiatry**, (2003): 60, 1353–1354.
- Wood T. Robert., Robert J. Williams., Paul K. Lawton., Why do Internet gamblers prefer online versus land-based venues? University of Lethbridge, Alberta, *Journal of Gambling Issues*, 20: 235-252.
- Yang, Chang-Kook, Byeong-Moo Choe, Matthew R, Baity, Jeong-Hyeong Lee, Jin-Seok, Cho. 2000. SCL-90-R and 16PF Profiles of Senior High School Students With Excessive Internet Use. **Canadian Journal of Psychiatry**, 50(7), 407.
- Yellowlees, M. Peter, Shayna, Marks. 2007. Internet addiction or problematic Internet use?. **Computers in Human Behavior: 23**.
- Yen, Ju-Yu, Cheng-Fang, Yen, Chih-Hung Ko, Cheng-Chung, Chen, Sue-Huei, Chen. 2007. Family Factors of Internet Addiction and Substance Use Experience in Taiwanese Adolescents. **Cyberpsychology & Behavior: 10(3)**.
- Young S. Kimberly S, 1998. Internet addiction: The emergence of a new clinical disorder. **CyberPsychology & Behavior: 1(3):237–244**.
- Young, S. Kimberly, Richard C. Rodgers, 1998. The Relationship Between Depression and Internet Addiction. **Cyberpsychology & Behavior: 1(1), 25-28**.

Young, S. Kimberly, Carl J. Case, 2004. Internet abuse in the workplace: New trends in risk management. **Cyberpsychology & Behavior**: 7(1), 105-111.

**Appendix 1****AYDINLATILMIŐ ONAM**

Bu alıŐma, Yakın Doęu niversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Klinik Psikoloji Yksek Lisans Programı erevesinde dzenlenen bir alıŐmadır.

Bu alıŐmanın amacı yakın doęu niversitesi ęrencileri arasında problemliler kumar oynayanlar ile oynamayanların sosyo-demografik zellikleri karŐılaŐtırmak ve problemliler internet kullanımını arasındaki iliŐki dzeyini belirlemektir.

Anket tamamen bilimsel amalarla dzenlenmiŐtir. Anket formunda kimlik bilgileriniz yer almayacaktır. Size ait bilgiler kesinlikle gizli tutulacaktır. Yanıtlarınızı iten ve doęru olarak vermeniz bu anket sonularının toplum iin yararlı bir bilgi olarak kullanılmasını saęlayacaktır.

Telefon numaranız anketrn denetlemesi ve anketin uygulandıęının netleŐmesi amacıyla istenmektedir.

Yardımanız iin teŐekkr ederim.

Psikolog.  
Yaęmur Fırat.

İsim:

İmza:

Telefon:

**BİLGİLENDİRME FORMU****ÜNİVERSİTE ÖĞRENCİLERİ ARASINDA PROBLEMLİ KUMAR OYNAYANLAR İLE OYNAMAYANLARIN SOSYO-DEMOGRAFİK ÖZELLİKLERİNİN VE PROBLEMLİ İNTERNET KULLANIMININ KARŞILAŞTIRILMASI, 2015**

Bu çalışmanın amacı yakın doğu üniversitesi öğrencileri arasında problemlü kumar oynayanlar ile oynamayanların sosyo-demografik özellikleri karşılaştırmak ve problemlü internet kullanımı arasındaki ilişki düzeyini belirlemektir. Çalışmanın sonucunda elde edilen veriler doğrultusunda problemlü ve patolojik kumar oynayanlar ile oynamayanların problemlü internet kullanımı arasındaki ilişkinin düzeyi belirlenmiş olacaktır.

Bu çalışmada size bir demografik bilgi formu ve bir dizi ölçek sunduk. Demografik bilgi formu sizin yaş, cinsiyet gibi demografik özellikleriniz hakkındaki sorunları içermektedir. Ölçekler ise Problem ve Patolojik kumar düzeyini ve problemlü internet kullanım düzeyini ölçmektedir.

Daha önce de belirtildiği gibi, ölçeklerde ve görüşmelerde verdiğiniz cevaplar kesinlikle gizli kalacaktır. Eğer çalışmayla ilgili herhangi bir şikâyet, görüş veya sorunuz varsa bu çalışmanın araştırmacısı olan Psikolog Yağmur Fırat ile iletişime geçmekten lütfen çekinmeyiniz ([psikologyagmurfirat1986@gmail.com](mailto:psikologyagmurfirat1986@gmail.com). Telefon: 0533 848 38 85 ).

Eğer bu çalışmaya katılmak sizde belirli düzeyde stres yaratmışsa ve bir danışmanla konuşmak istiyorsanız, ülkemizde ücretsiz hizmet veren şu kuruluşlar bulunmaktadır:

Eğer üniversite öğrencisiyseniz, devam ettiğiniz üniversitede Psikolojik Danışmanlık, Rehberlik ve Araştırma Merkezine ( PDRAM ) başvurabilirsiniz.

Eğer öğrenci değilseniz, Barış Ruh ve Sinir Hastalıkları Hastanesine başvurabilirsiniz.

Eğer araştırmanın sonuçlarıyla ilgileniyorsanız, Haziran 2015 tarihinden itibaren araştırmacıyla iletişime geçebilirsiniz.

Katıldığınız için tekrar teşekkür ederim.

Psikolog  
Yağmur fırat  
Psikoloji Bölümü,  
Yakın Doğu Üniversitesi, Lefkosa.

## Appendix 3

**Bölüm 1. SOSYODEMOGRAFİK BİLGİ FORMU**

1. Cinsiyetiniz Kadın  Erkek
2. Yaşınız? (.....)
3. Uyruğunuz nedir?  
Kıbrıs  Türkiye  İngiltere  Diğer
4. Doğum yeriniz neresidir?  
Kıbrıs  Türkiye  İngiltere  Diğer
5. Medeni haliniz?  
Bekâr  Nişanlı  Evli  Boşanmış  Dul  Ayrı
6. Eğer evliyseniz, ne kadar zamandır evlisiniz? (.....)
7. Varsa yaşayan çocuk sayınız? (.....)
8. Kiminle ve/veya kimlerle birlikte yaşıyorsunuz? (Birden fazla seçenek işaretleyebilirsiniz)  
Yalnız  Annem – babamla   
Eşimle  Akrabalarla   
Çocuklarımla  Arkadaşlarımla   
Kardeşimle  Yurtta



9. Burs alıyor musunuz?
- Evet
  - Hayır
10. Aylık geliriniz yaklaşık ne kadardır?
- 1 YTL ve 500 YTL
  - 1560 YTL ve 3000 YTL
  - 3000 YTL ve 5000 YTL
11. Kaç yıldır üniversitedesiniz?
- 1 yıl
  - 2 yıl
  - 3 yıl
  - 4 yıl
  - 5 yıl yada daha fazla
12. Öğrencilik dışında başka bir işte çalışıyor musunuz?
- Evet tam zamanlı
  - Evet yarı zamanlı
  - Hayır
13. Derslerinizdeki başarı durumu nedir?
- Okula bu dönem başlamadım
  - Bütün derslerimi geçtim
  - Birkaç dersten kaldım fakat dönem uzatmadım
  - Eğitimim bir dönem uzadı
  - Eğitimim bir dönemden fazla uzadı
14. Kendi akademik performansınızı nasıl değerlendirirsiniz?
- Çok iyi
  - iyi
  - orta
  - kötü
  - çok kötü
15. Annenizin eğitim durumu?
- okumamış
  - İlkokul
  - Ortaokul
  - Lise
  - Üniversite ve daha üstü

16. Babanızın eğitim durumu?

- a. Okumamış
- b. İlkokul
- c. Ortaokul
- d. Lise
- e. Üniversite ve daha üstü

17. Din hayatınızda ne kadar önemli?

- a. Çok önemli
- b. Önemli
- c. Önemsiz

## Appendix 4

## Böüm 2. Kumara olan ilgi ve oynama

1. Bugüne kadar aşağıdaki kumar çeşitlerinden hangisini veya hangilerini oynadığınızı ve sıklığını belirtiniz.	Hiç oynamadım	Haftada bir kereden az	Haftada bir veya daha fazla
a) At yarışı-Köpek-Futbol	A	B	C
b) Parasına kağıt oyunları (yanık, poker v.s)	A	B	C
c) Parasına okey	A	B	C
d) Parasına zar oyunları (barbut v.s)	A	B	C
e) Horoz dövüşü	A	B	C
f) Spor Toto veya Spor Loto	A	B	C
g) Sayısal Loto	A	B	C
h) Kazı-Kazan	A	B	C
i) Milli Piyango	A	B	C
j) Borsada oynama	A	B	C
k) Casino oyunları (rulet, makine v.s)	A	B	C
l) Parasına beceri isteyen oyunlar oynama (bilardo v.s.)	A	B	C
m) İnternette kumar oyunları oynama	A	B	C
n) Yukarıda belirtilmeyen diğer kumar oyunları .....	A	B	C

2. Bugüne kadar bir günde kumara yatırdığınız en fazla para ne kadardır?  
(.....)

3. İnternette oynadığınız kumar süresi ne kadar?

- A. haftada bir veya daha fazla
- B. haftada bir kereden az
- C. hiç oynamadım

4. İnternette paralı kumarı ne sıklıkla oynuyorsunuz?

- A. haftada bir veya daha fazla
- B. Haftada bir kereden az
- C. Hiç oynamadım

5. internette parasız kumarı ne sıklıkla oynuyorsunuz?

- A. Haftada bir veya daha fazla
- B. Haftada bir kereden az
- C. Hiç oynamadım

6. internete nerden bağlanıyorsunuz?

- A. evden
- B. Yurttan
- C. telefondan
- D. Ziyaret edilen mekanlardan
- E. internet kafeden

7. internette ne tip kumar oyunu oynuyorsunuz?

A. Poker

B. 21

C. futbol, basketbol, at yarışı, boks, tenis maçları

D. Rulet

E. Diğer belirtiniz(.....)

8. Hayatınızdaki insanlardan hangilerinin geçmişte veya halen kumar sorunu olduğunu işaretleyiniz?

Baba	<input type="checkbox"/>	Anne	<input type="checkbox"/>
Kardeşler	<input type="checkbox"/>	Eş veya partner	<input type="checkbox"/>
Büyükanne-Büyük baba	<input type="checkbox"/>	Çocuklar	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yakın Arkadaş	<input type="checkbox"/>	Diğer akrabalar	<input type="checkbox"/>
Diğer	<input type="checkbox"/>		

9. Kumar oynadığınızda, kaybettiğiniz parayı yeniden kazanmak için bir başka gün yine kumar oynamaya gider misiniz?

- Hiç gitmem
- Bazen giderim (kaybettiğim zamanların yarısında)
- Kaybettiğim çoğu zaman tekrar giderim
- Her kaybettiğimde tekrar giderim

10. Gerçekten kazanmıyorken, hatta kaybettiğinizde, hiç kumardan para kazandığınızı iddia ettiğiniz oldu mu?  
Asla  Evet, kaybettiğim zamanların yarısında  Evet, çoğu zaman

11. Bahis ve kumarla ilgili hiç sorunuz olduğunu düşünüyor musunuz?  
Hayır  Evet, geçmişte vardı fakat şimdi değil  Evet

12. Hiç niyet ettiğinizden daha fazla kumar oynadığınız oldu mu?  
Evet, oldu  Hayır, olmadı

13. Hiç insanların, sizin kabul edip etmediğinize bakmaksızın, bahis oynamanızı eleştirdikleri veya size kumar sorunuz olduğunu söyledikleri oldu mu?  
Evet, oldu  Hayır, olmadı

14. Kumar oynamanızdan veya kumar oynadığınız zaman olanlardan dolayı hiç suçluluk duyduğunuz oldu mu?  
Evet, oldu  Hayır, olmadı

15. Bahse girmeyi veya kumar oynamayı bırakmak istediğiniz ama bunu yapamayacağınızı düşündüğünüz oldu mu?  
Evet, oldu  Hayır, olmadı

16. Bahis kağıtlarını, piyango biletlerini, kumar paralarını, kumar borçlarını veya diğer bahis veya kumar delillerini eşinizden çocuklarınızdan veya hayatınızdaki diğer önemli insanlardan hiç sakladığınız oldu mu?  
Evet, oldu  Hayır, olmadı

17. Birlikte yaşadığınız insanlarla parayı nasıl harcadığınız konusunda hiç tartıştığınız oldu mu?  
Evet, oldu  Hayır, olmadı

18. (Eğer yukarıdaki soruyu “evet” diye cevaplandırdıysanız) Para konusundaki tartışmaların hiç sizin kumar oynamanız üzerinde yoğunlaştığı oldu mu?  
Evet, oldu  Hayır, olmadı

19. Hiç birinden borç alıp kumar yüzünden borcunuzu ödeyemediğiniz oldu mu?  
Evet, oldu  Hayır, olmadı

20. Bahis oynama veya kumar yüzünden hiç işinize veya okulunuza geç gittiğiniz ya da gitmediğiniz oldu mu?  
Evet, oldu  Hayır, olmadı

21. Eğer kumar oynamak veya kumar borçlarını ödemek için borç aldıysanız, kimden veya nereden borç aldınız? (Birden fazla seçenek işaretleyebilirsiniz)

a-Evin parasından

b-Akrabalarınızdan

c-Banka/kredi kuruluşlarından

d-Kredi kartlarından

e-Tefecilerden

f-Şahsi veya ailevi eşya ve malları satarak

g-Arkadaş veya tanıdıklardan

h-Altın,mücevherleri satarak

j-Bahisçiye borçlanarak

k-Kumarhaneye borçlanarak

22. Aşağıdaki mekanlardan hangisine ne sıklıkta kumar oynama maksadıyla gidesiniz?	Hiç	Haftada bir kereden az	Haftada bir veya daha fazla
a) Casino	A	B	C
b) Betting Ofis	A	B	C
c) İnternet	A	B	C
d) Kahvehane	A	B	C
e) Spor klübü / kulüp	A	B	C
f) Diğer	A	B	C





9. Tekrar internete girene kadar kendimi huysuz,  
karamsar, rahatsız ve huzursuz hissediyorum..... ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
( )
10. Problemlerimden bunaldığımda sığındığım en iyi yer internettir ( ) ( ) ( )  
( ) ( )
11. Birisi internette ne yaptığımı sorduğunda  
savunmacı ve gizleyici oluyorum..... ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
( )
12. Planladığımın dışında fazladan bir dakika bile  
interneti kullanmıyorum ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
13. İnternette bağlantı kurduğum insanlara kendimi  
daha iyi anlatıyorum..... ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
( )
14. İnternete giremediğim zaman, internette olmayı  
düşünmekten kendimi alıkoyamıyorum.....( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
( )

**Hiç** uygun

**Tamamen Oldukça Biraz Nadiren**

uygun uygun uygun  
uygun değil ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓

15. İnternette, kontrol benden çıkıyor..... ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
( )
16. İnternet yüzünden yemek yemeyi unuttuğum  
zamanlar oluyor..... ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
( )
17. İnternette daha fazla vakit geçirmek için  
günlük işlerimi ihmal ediyorum..... ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
( )

18. Sosyal aktiviteler için para harcamaktansa  
internete erişmek için harcamayı tercih ediyorum ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
( )
19. Sürekli ziyaret ettiğim internet sitelerini  
bir gün dahi girememeye tahammül edemiyorum.. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
( )
20. İnternet kullandığım süre boyunca  
her şeyi unutuyorum..... ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
( )
21. Yapmam gereken işler çoğaldıkça,  
internet kullanma isteğim de o ölçüde artıyor..... ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
( )
22. İnternet, yapmam gerekenleri ertelemek için  
vazgeçilmez bir araçtır..... ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
( )
23. İnternet kullanımım, benim için önemli kişilerle  
olan ilişkilerimde problem yaşamama neden oluyor( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
( )
24. İnternet kullanırken başkalarının  
beni meşgul etmesine öfkeleniyorum..... ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
( )
25. İnterneti kullanmasam bile sürekli aklımda ..... ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
( )
26. İnternette kendimi çok özgür hissediyorum..... ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
( )
27. İnternette çok fazla zaman geçirdiğim için  
başarım düşüyor..... ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
( )
28. İnternet kullanmayı bırakamadığım için  
randevularıma veya derslerime geç kalıyorum..... ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
( )
29. Sabahları uyandığında bir an önce  
internete bağlanmak istiyorum..... ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
( )

30. İnternet kullanırken zamanın nasıl geçtiğini  
hiç anlayamıyorum..... ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
( )
31. İnternet beni kendisine esir ediyor..... ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
( )
32. İnternet ortamında genellikle kendimi huzurlu  
hissediyorum..... ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
( )
33. İnternet yoluyla iletişim kurmayı,  
yüz yüze iletişim kurmaya tercih ediyorum.....( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
( )