



DEFENSIVE BEHAVIOUR AMONG SCHOOL TEACHERS IN COIMBATORE DISTRICT

Dr. A. Sivakumar¹ and A. Arun²

¹Assistant Professor, KSR College of Education, KSR Kalvinagar, Tiruchengode, Tamil Nadu.

²Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Education, Bharathiar University, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu.

ABSTRACT :

The present study aimed to find out the defensive behaviour among school teachers. The objectives of the study were 1) to explore the level of defensive behaviour among school teachers in coimbatore district and 2) to study the defensive behaviour and its dimensions among school teachers. Survey method was conducted on a sample of 294 school teachers were selected in coimbatore district. Defensive Behaviour Scale Prof. S. Sathiyagirirajan was used for the study. Data was analyzed by t-test. Result found that the level of defensive behaviour among school teachers is average.



KEYWORDS : Defensive Behaviour, School And Teachers.

INTRODUCTION

When an individual is confronted with a problem, his choice is between coping behaviour and defensive behaviour. Some of us identify problems, analyse them, and try our best to solve them. If the solution is beyond our reach, in spite of our best efforts, we seek the advice of our (resourceful) well wishers and solve them. If the solution is beyond our reach even then, we learn how to pull on with such unsolved problems. This type of behaviour is called coping behaviour. However, most of us do not admit our inability to solve problems. We feel it is rather infradig. Such of us employ defensive behaviour which is manifest in what are called 'ego' defences or defence mechanisms. These defence mechanisms are self deceptive and are unconscious manifestations of our defensive behaviour. Famous international communication consultant and an award winning speaker Sharon Ellison defined, defensive behaviour is to react with 'a war mentality to a non war issue.' It is a reactive mode of responding to a situation. Rather than listening with an open heart, we respond with our metaphorical shields up with our weapons drawn. People behave defensively when they are weak to face problems. In case of teachers, they feel insecure or they themselves consider as failure because of the over expectations that leads to the defensive behaviour. Beside these, frustration and attention seeking also leads to this. Some teachers seek attention, but when they failed to get attention they seek attention through negative way and the result may be defensive. Defensive behaviour in teachers affects them in their effective teaching process because they do not get proper consideration. By promoting positive interaction like a friendly conversation, appreciation, etc, we can develop a remedy to eradicate the behavioural problems. When teacher displays any problematic behaviour, we should remain calm and identify the emotional trauma they are going through. That may be the most effective thing to solve the problem.

One way of improving mental health is to identify our defences and deal with them. In this attempt we need the services of our well wishers— close friends and relatives who can easily identify our defences and draw our attention to them. Defences are barriers to coping behaviour. (Through defences we are only saving our face, not solving our problems) Only through coping behaviour one can improve one's mental health. Hence the researcher made an attempt to the study of defensive behaviour among school teachers in Coimbatore district.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To find out the level of defensive behaviour among school teachers.
- To find out whether there is any significant difference of the school teachers towards defensive behaviour and its dimensions between
 - A. Male & Female (Gender)
 - B. Rural & Urban (Locality of the School)
 - C. UG & PG (Educational Qualification)
 - D. Below 5yr & Above 5yr (Year of Experience)

HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

1. There is no significant difference of the school teachers towards defensive behaviour and its dimensions between
 - A. Male & Female (Gender)
 - B. Rural & Urban (Locality of the School)
 - C. UG & PG (Educational Qualification)
 - D. Below 5yr & Above 5yr (Year of Experience)

METHOD & SAMPLE

The selected problem had been dealt significantly by using survey method. The data on the samples' defensive behaviour were obtained, analyzed statistically and interpreted. A simple random sampling technique was adopted for the selection of 294 Teachers from the Coimbatore district.

TOOL

- Defensive Behaviour Scale by Prof. S. Sathiyagirirajan.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Table 1: Level of Defensive Behaviour of School Teachers

Defensive Behaviour			
N		294	
Mean		96.05	
Std. Deviation		26.870	
Percentiles	Q1	25	80.00
	Q2	50	81.00
	Q3	75	113.00

Table-1 shows that the low, high and moderate groups are categorized in defensive behaviour of school teachers. The value of Q1 and below was considered as low group, the value Q3 and above was considered as high group and the value in between Q1 and Q3 was considered as average group. The mean scores of defensive behaviour on teacher is 96.05. The mean score fall between Q1 and Q3. Hence, the school teachers have an average level of defensive behaviour.

Table 2: t-test and Results for Male and Female Teachers in their Defensive Behaviour and its Dimensions

Variables	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value
Daydreaming	Male	196	12.75	3.29	0.46	0.64
	Female	98	12.57	2.70		
Compensation	Male	196	10.00	2.09	2.76	0.00*
	Female	98	10.79	2.66		
Projection	Male	196	7.29	3.31	2.23	0.02*
	Female	98	8.29	4.16		
Rationalization	Male	196	7.43	4.22	2.81	0.00*
	Female	98	8.86	3.87		
Identification	Male	196	13.21	4.16	0.85	0.39
	Female	98	12.79	3.82		
Belittling	Male	196	11.89	2.01	0.34	0.73
	Female	98	12.00	3.33		
Displacement	Male	196	9.89	2.95	2.36	0.01*
	Female	98	10.86	3.89		
Conversion	Male	196	8.54	3.46	1.57	0.11
	Female	98	9.29	4.53		
Reaction	Male	196	6.86	4.80	2.26	0.02*
	Female	98	8.21	4.91		
Repression	Male	196	5.43	5.74	3.42	0.00*
	Female	98	7.93	6.17		
Overall Defensive Behaviour	Male	196	93.29	24.24	2.51	0.01*
	Female	98	101.57	30.86		

*Significant at 0.05 level.

From Table-2, the calculated 't' value of Compensation, Projection, Rationalization, Displacement, Reaction, Repression and Overall Defensive Behaviour are 2.76, 2.23, 2.81, 2.36, 2.26, 3.42 and 2.51 are higher than the table value 1.96 at 0.05 level. Hence, there is significant difference between male and female school teachers with respect to Compensation, Projection, Rationalization, Displacement, Reaction, Repression and Overall Defensive Behaviour. Table-2 also revealed that the calculated 't' value of Daydreaming, Identification, Belittling and Conversion are 0.463, 0.85, 0.34 and 1.57 are less than the table value 1.96 at 0.05 level. Thus, there is no significant difference between male and female school teachers with respect to the Daydreaming, Identification, Belittling and Conversion.

Table 3: t-test and Results for Rural and Urban School Teachers in their Defensive Behaviour and its Dimensions

Variables	Locality of the School	N	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value
Daydreaming	Rural	189	12.74	3.046	0.37	0.71
	Urban	105	12.60	3.236		
Compensation	Rural	189	9.52	1.291	8.13	0.00*
	Urban	105	11.60	3.065		
Projection	Rural	189	6.70	2.407	6.12	0.00*
	Urban	105	9.27	4.762		
Rationalization	Rural	189	6.56	3.434	8.12	0.00*
	Urban	105	10.33	4.258		
Identification	Rural	189	13.26	4.016	1.06	0.28

	Urban	105	12.73	4.110		
Belittling	Rural	189	11.48	1.878	4.18	0.00*
	Urban	105	12.73	3.250		
Displacement	Rural	189	9.59	2.383	4.44	0.00*
	Urban	105	11.33	4.336		
Conversion	Rural	189	7.70	2.873	6.94	0.00*
	Urban	105	10.73	4.604		
Reaction	Rural	189	6.19	4.263	5.57	0.00*
	Urban	105	9.33	5.262		
Repression	Rural	189	4.33	5.017	8.18	0.00*
	Urban	105	9.73	6.090		
Overall Defensive Behaviour	Rural	189	88.07	15.952	7.43	0.00*
	Urban	105	110.40	35.363		

*Significant at 0.05 level.

Table-3 shows that the calculated 't' value of Compensation, Projection, Rationalization, Belittling, Displacement, Conversion, Reaction, Repression and Overall Defensive Behaviour are 8.13, 6.12, 8.12, 4.18, 4.44, 6.94, 5.57, 8.18 and 7.43 are higher than the table value 1.96 at 0.05 level. Hence, there is significant difference between rural and urban school teachers with respect to Compensation, Projection, Rationalization, Belittling, Displacement, Conversion, Reaction, Repression and Overall Defensive Behaviour. Table-3 also depicts that the calculated 't' value of Daydreaming and Identification are 0.37 and 1.06 are less than the table value 1.96 at 0.05 level. Thus there is no significant difference between rural and urban school teachers with respect to Daydreaming and Identification.

Table 4: t-test and Results for Below 5 Years and Above 5 Years Experience of Teachers in their Defensive Behaviour and its Dimensions

Variables	Year of Experience	N	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value
Daydreaming	Below 5yr	217	13.16	2.904	4.49	0.00*
	Above 5yr	77	11.36	3.304		
Compensation	Below 5yr	217	9.71	1.252	7.44	0.00*
	Above 5yr	77	11.82	3.612		
Projection	Below 5yr	217	6.45	2.173	10.92	0.00*
	Above 5yr	77	10.91	4.788		
Rationalization	Below 5yr	217	6.26	3.086	15.25	0.00*
	Above 5yr	77	12.55	3.165		
Identification	Below 5yr	217	12.81	4.354	1.89	0.06
	Above 5yr	77	13.82	2.937		
Belittling	Below 5yr	217	11.45	1.294	5.72	0.00*
	Above 5yr	77	13.27	4.163		
Displacement	Below 5yr	217	9.26	2.004	9.46	0.00*
	Above 5yr	77	12.91	4.592		
Conversion	Below 5yr	217	7.58	2.399	10.52	0.00*
	Above 5yr	77	12.18	5.039		
Reaction	Below 5yr	217	5.61	3.730	12.33	0.00*
	Above 5yr	77	12.09	4.551		
Repression	Below 5yr	217	3.87	4.644	15.41	0.00*
	Above 5yr	77	13.00	3.910		

Overall Defensive Behaviour	Below 5yr	217	86.16	11.993	13.45	0.00*
	Above 5yr	77	123.91	36.181		

*Significant at 0.05 level.

Table-4 reveals that the calculated 't' value of Daydreaming, Compensation, Projection, Rationalization, Belittling, Displacement, Conversion, Reaction, Repression and Overall Defensive Behaviour are 4.49, 7.44, 10.92, 15.25, 5.72, 9.46, 10.52, 12.33, 15.41 and 13.45 are higher than the table value 1.96 at 0.05 level. Hence, there is significant difference between below 5 years and above 5 years experience of school teachers with respect to the Daydreaming, Compensation, Projection, Rationalization, Belittling, Displacement, Conversion, Reaction, Repression and Overall Defensive Behaviour. Table-4 also shows that the calculated 't' value of the Identification (1.89) is less than the table value 1.96 at 0.05 level. Thus there is no significant difference between below 5 years and above 5 years experience of school teachers with respect to Identification.

Table 5: t-test and Results for UG and PG Qualifications of Teachers in their Defensive Behaviour and its Dimensions

Variables	Year of Experience	N	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value
Daydreaming	Below 5yr	175	13.04	2.954	2.35	0.00*
	Above 5yr	119	12.18	3.272		
Compensation	Below 5yr	175	9.60	1.300	6.30	0.00*
	Above 5yr	119	11.24	3.052		
Projection	Below 5yr	175	6.52	2.392	6.72	0.00*
	Above 5yr	119	9.24	4.485		
Rationalization	Below 5yr	175	6.32	3.459	8.92	0.00*
	Above 5yr	119	10.24	4.010		
Identification	Below 5yr	175	13.44	4.111	1.92	0.058
	Above 5yr	119	12.53	3.914		
Belittling	Below 5yr	175	11.64	1.723	2.39	0.00*
	Above 5yr	119	12.35	3.338		
Displacement	Below 5yr	175	9.44	2.408	5.05	0.00*
	Above 5yr	119	11.35	4.075		
Conversion	Below 5yr	175	7.64	2.806	6.59	0.00*
	Above 5yr	119	10.47	4.545		
Reaction	Below 5yr	175	5.80	4.188	6.93	0.00*
	Above 5yr	119	9.53	4.981		
Repression	Below 5yr	175	3.92	4.937	9.19	0.00*
	Above 5yr	119	9.71	5.782		
Overall Defensive Behaviour	Below 5yr	175	87.36	16.213	7.29	0.00*
	Above 5yr	119	108.82	33.594		

*Significant at 0.05 level.

Table-5 depicts that the calculated 't' value of Daydreaming, Compensation, Projection, Rationalization, Belittling, Displacement, Conversion, Reaction, Repression and Overall Defensive Behaviour are 2.35, 6.30, 6.72, 8.92, 2.39, 5.05, 6.59, 6.93, 9.19 and 7.29 are higher than the table value 1.96 at 0.05 level. Hence, there is significant difference between UG and PG qualifications of school teachers with respect to Daydreaming, Compensation, Projection, Rationalization, Belittling, Displacement, Conversion, Reaction, Repression and Overall Defensive Behaviour. Table-5 also reveals that the calculated 't' value of the

Identification (1.92) is less than the table value 1.96 at 0.05 levels. Thus there is no significant difference between UG and PG qualifications of school teachers with respect to Identification.

FINDINGS

1. It is found that the level of defensive behaviour among school teachers is average.
2. There is significant difference between male and female school teachers with respect to Compensation, Projection, Rationalization, Displacement, Reaction, Repression and Overall Defensive Behaviour.
3. There is no significant difference between male and female school teachers with respect to Daydreaming, Identification, Belittling and Conversion.
4. There is significant difference between rural and urban school teachers with respect to Compensation, Projection, Rationalization, Belittling, Displacement, Conversion, Reaction, Repression and Overall Defensive Behaviour.
5. There is no significant difference between rural and urban school teachers with respect to Daydreaming and Identification.
6. There is significant difference between below 5 years and above 5 years experience of school teachers with respect to Daydreaming, Compensation, Projection, Rationalization, Belittling, Displacement, Conversion, Reaction, Repression and Overall Defensive Behaviour.
7. There is no significant difference between below 5 years and above 5 years experience of school teachers with respect to Identification.
8. There is significant difference between UG and PG qualifications of school teachers with respect to Daydreaming, Compensation, Projection, Rationalization, Belittling, Displacement, Conversion, Reaction, Repression and Overall Defensive Behaviour.
9. There is no significant difference between UG and PG qualifications of school teachers with respect to Identification.

CONCLUSION

Teachers' defensive behaviour level plays an important role in their entire life. Defensive behavior alone gives hundred percent success in teacher's life as well as for their career. The present study revealed that the level of defensive behaviour among school teachers is average. It is referred that there is significant difference between school teachers' communication behaviour on the basis of gender, year of experience, locality of the school and educational qualification. The positive or effective defensive behavior helps the teachers to be a successful person in the field of education.

SUGGESTION FOR THE FURTHER RESEARCH

- The same study can be conducted among higher secondary school teachers.
- It is suggested that a nation or statewide study can be carried out.
- The ongoing Research programmes in the State and Central Universities may be studied.
- A Replica of the present study may be conducted among private school teachers.
- The similar study can be conducted of faculty members of the University and Colleges.
- In the present study questionnaire survey was used. Consequently, for future studies another instrument such as interview, experimental and observation schedule can be used, in order to understand more clearly about the teacher competency.
- Research Bodies (e.g., NCERT, UGC, ICSSR, CSIR, DST, NUEPA and University) have a significant influence on individual to engage in research activity. Hence, the influence of research bodies could be isolated and tested in future research.

REFERENCES

1. Basu, Sarah. (2009). Job Satisfaction of secondary school teachers. *Indian Journal of sychometry and Education*. 40 (1&2)
2. Billings, Andrew G.; Moos, Rudolf H. (1981). The role of coping responses and social resources in attenuating the stress of life events. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine* 4 (2): 139-57. doi:10.1007/BF00844267. PMID 7321033.
3. George, T. Top 7 Psychological Defense Mechanisms. Listverse. Retrieved 2013-05-05.
4. Cramer, P. (1998). Coping and defense mechanism: what is the difference? *Journals of Personality*, 66, 6, 919-935.
5. Cramer, P. (2000). Defense mechanism in psychology today. *American Psychologist*, 6, 637-646.
6. Cramer, P. (2008). Seven Pillars of defense mechanism theory. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 2008, 2, 1963-1981.
7. Fields, B. (2004). Breaking the cycle of office referrals and suspensions: Defensive management. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 20, 103-115.
8. Floyd P. Garret (2014). *Addiction and its Mechanisms of Defense Behavioural Medicine Associates, Comprehensive modern Mental Health services* © 2012 by Behavioural Medicine Associates.
9. Fredrickson. (2001). The Role of Positive Emotions, In *Positive Psychology: The broadening and build theory of positive emotions*, *American Psychologists*, 56, 218-226.
10. George Domino, Jeffrey Short, Anna Evans & Patricia Romano. (2002). Creativity and Ego Defense Mechanisms: Some Exploratory Empirical Evidence. *Creativity Research Journal*, Vol. 14, Issue 1.
11. Hattie, J.A. Myers, J.E. Sweeney, T.J. (2004). A factor structure of wellness: Theory, assessment, analysis and practice. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 82(3), 354-364.
12. Hovanesian, S., Isakov, I., & Cervellione, K.L. (2009). Defense mechanisms and suicide risk in major depression. *Arch Suicide Research Gate* 13(1), 74-86.
13. Karayurt, Ö., & Dicle, A. (2008). The Relationship between Locus of Control and Mental Health Status among Baccalaureate Nursing Students in Turkey. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal*, 36, 919-930.
14. Plutchik, R., Kellerman, H., & Conte, H. R. (1979). A structural theory of ego defences and emotions. In C. E. Izard (Ed.), *Emotions in personality and psychopathology* (pp.229--257). New York: Plenum Press.
15. Prathima, H. P. & Umme Kulsum. (2015). Relationship Between Social Intelligence and Mental Health of Secondary School Teachers. *Indian Journal or Research*, Vol. 2, Issue 11.
16. Psychological Defenses from DSM-IV (see Repression), Virginia Commonwealth University. Retrieved on 2014.
17. Qudsia Tariq & Naima Aslam Khan. (2014). Relationship of Sense of Humor and Mental Health: A Correlational Study. *The world health report 2001 - Mental Health: New Understanding, New Hope* . WHO. Retrieved 4 May 2014.
18. Reddy, B.P. (1989). Job Satisfaction of Primary School Teachers. M.Phil. (Education) Thesis, Sri Venkateswara University, Tirupati, Andhra Pradesh.
19. Richards, K.C., Campana, C. Muse-Burke J.L (2010). Self-care and Wellbeing in Mental Health Professionals: The Mediating Effects of Selfawareness and Mindfulness. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, 32(3), 247.
20. Rotter, J. B. (1954). *Social Learning and Clinical Psychology*. New York: Prentice Hall.
21. Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized Expectancies for Internal versus External Control of Reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs*, 80, 609.