

Defence Mechanism and Behavior Orientation in Male and Female

Nilesh M. Vadoliya

Department of Psychology
Saurashtra University, Rajkot-GUJARAT

Received Dec. 10, 2017

Accepted Jan. 08, 2018

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this study was to find out a defence mechanism and behavior orientation in male and female. The total sample consisted 100 (50 Male and 50 Female) were taken as a sample. The research tool for defence mechanism was measured by Mrinal N.R. and Singhal U and behavior orientation made by Jha P.K. To check the significant difference between group t-test was applied and to check correlation between variables Karl Pearson correlation method was used. Result revealed that there is significant difference in defence mechanism and there is significant difference behavior orientation in male and female. The correlation between defence mechanism and behavior orientation is which positive correlations.

Key words: Defence mechanism and Behavior orientation

Defence mechanisms can be defined as “regulatory processes that allow individuals to reduce cognitive dissonance and to minimize sudden changes in internal and external environments by altering how these events are perceived” (Vaillant, 1993, p. 44). Originally associated with psychoanalytic psychotherapy, the concept of defense mechanisms has long made its way into mainstream psychology and psychiatry, as suggested by the inclusion of the Defensive Functioning Scale (DFS) in the DSM-IV (APA, 1994). Studies generally tend to support the overall validity of the DFS and of others similar to it (for a review, see Bond, 2004, or Despland, Drapeau & de Roten, 2001). The DFS model, which includes a total of 31 defense mechanisms divided into 7 levels organized hierarchically based on defensive maturity, is also presumed to be indicative of defensive functioning and adequate regardless of gender. Indeed, existing models and conceptualizations of defensive functioning, including the assignment of individual defenses to levels of defenses, were generally devised and validated using mixed samples of men and women, and as such reflect an “average” or an “asexual” conceptualization of defenses. This is somewhat surprising given that research strongly suggests that there are significant differences in the use of defense mechanisms by men and women (e.g. Cramer, 1991, 2006; Hibbard & Porcerelli, 1998; Mahalik et al., 1998; Petraglia et al., 2009; Watson, 2002; Watson & Sinha, 1998). Because models of defensive functioning are used to establish the distinction between psychologically healthy individuals and individuals presenting with a mental disorder, to match defensive functioning to other variables of interest in clinical research, to track changes in patients, and to evaluate therapeutic outcomes, the creation and use of a common template or model of defensive functioning for men and women is potentially inadequate. It is thus imperative to determine if models of defensive functioning are indeed equally applicable to both men and women. Whereas previous research has established differences between men and women in regards to the use of individual defenses, this study does not seek to document such differences. Rather, it aims to examine the extent to which a proxy of the DFS model of defense mechanisms, and another related model underlying a widely used scale, the Defense Style Questionnaire (Trijsburg, et al., 2003a), can be adequately applied to men and women. In the modern age the behavior of people is very technical. So it is very interesting to illustrate technical behavior of people. That provides us huge information about how people think and deal about themselves and others? Whether the behavior of people is constructive or destructive? Due to analysis of behavior we can identify why people behave destructively and where and why conflict occurs? So the study of how people use defense mechanisms in daily life help us to understand certain types of behavior expressed by people about ourselves and others.

The idea of defense mechanism was first defined by Sigmund Freud in 1874. Freud identified several forces that impact on personality development and strategies that protect us from anxiety and tension (Phaneuf, RN, 2000) Word “defense” is commonly used in linguistic, fun and in literature with different meanings. Researchers and clinicians used defense theory to illustrate different kinds of behavior, thoughts, emotions and psychological ailments (Blackman, 2011). Shaver et al., 1987 define defense mechanisms address a vital part of human ability to sustain emotional balance. Without emotional homeostasis our consciousness would be more defenseless and people will experience negative emotions like anxiety, fear and sadness (as cited in Bowins, 2004). Defense mechanisms can be defined as “regulatory processes that allow individuals

to reduce cognitive dissonance and to minimize sudden changes in internal and external environments by altering how these events are perceived” (Vaillant, 1993, p. 44). Concept of defense mechanisms was introduced by Sigmund Freud. According to DSM-IV Defense mechanism is defined as an unconscious psychological procedure that is used to cope with stressful and anxious situation. When the individual defense mechanisms are theoretically and empirically divided into various groups are known as defense level. Freud, 1946 defined “id” is a personality force that operates on pleasure principle and wants gratification of all wishes and impulses. When individual face anxious situation that is uncomfortable and stressful then individual take immediate action to change it. Ego creates involuntary actions to eradicate stress and anxiety is known as defense mechanism. Freud described four categories of defense mechanisms. There are a lot of evidences that indicate an impact of involuntary forces on personality development. So it is very crucial and interesting to study such type of reactions. And also very crucial to investigate how people deal with stressful and anxious situations. To study defense mechanisms are very important to understand and treat patients both medical and psychiatric (Cramer, 1995). According to Million, 1994 “A systematic assessment of defense mechanism is central to a comprehensive personality assessment” (as cited in Cramer, 1995). Vaillant, 1992, p.3, defined “Today, no mental status or clinical formulation should be considered complete without an effort to identify the patient’s dominant defense mechanism” (as cited in Cramer, 1995). This study is socially significant as it measure gender differences in the use of defense mechanism in university students. As we know young generation is very important for society and our family structure and for whole nation. Gender is an important consideration. Therefore, it is socially and clinically worth to explore gender variation in the use of defense mechanisms. Because clinicians can take better insight by identifying defensive style used by their male and female client. That is very crucial for treatment. On the other hand, to improve and promote healthy life style it is very important to study which type of defensive pattern are useful.

Review of literature:

There are diverse types of researches on gender difference and defense mechanism. A research was conducted on gender difference of self-report defense mechanisms by Petraglia , Thygesen, Lecours & Drapeau (2009). In this study it was identified how the men and women’s are differ in the use of defense mechanisms. It was concluded that there is no significant gender difference in the use of defense mechanisms. Cramer (1987) identified gender differences in self-report defense mechanisms among university students. It was concluded that women scored considerably higher on narcissistic defenses than male participants (as cited in Petraglia , Thygesen, Lecours & Drapeau, 2009) .

Watson & Sinha (1998) found that university male students are more likely to score high on neurotic defense mechanism than female university students (as cited in Petraglia , Thygesen, Lecours & Drapeau, 2009). Whereas, Munteanu (2002), investigated that overall scores of females are high on defense mechanisms scale than male (as cited in Petraglia , Thygesen, Lecours & Drapeau, 2009).

This study is publicly substantial as it measure gender differences in self-report defense mechanism in university students. Young generation is very important for society and nation.

In a study the defense mechanisms were identified in adults, adolescents, and children. This study has confirmed a linear design for the development of different defenses, as theorized by Anna Freud. The study testified here also delivers pragmatic provision for the basic psychoanalytic notion of the defense mechanism. The investigation also goes outside of psychoanalytic theory in order to explore who the males and females respondents are different in the use of different type of defense mechanisms. The results of study suggested that there were no significant gender differences in defense mechanisms (Robert & Joseph, 2002).

A research was conducted on gender difference of defense mechanisms among a sample of 162 males and females respondents. Defense Style Questionnaire was used in order to explore gender differences in the use of defense mechanisms. Substantial alterations were identified between males and females respondents on the measures of projection, isolation, and denial. The results of this tests specified there was an important outcome of gender (male, female) on the expression of defense mechanisms (McNichols, 2014).

Problem of study:

The problem of present study is to find out the defence mechanism (projection) and behavior orientation (view) in male and female.

Objectives:

The main objectives of present study were as under.

1. To measure the defence mechanism in male and female.

2. To measure the behavior orientation in male and female.
3. To check the co-relation between defence mechanism and behavior orientation.

Hypothesis:

To related objective of this null-hypothesis were under.

1. There is no significant difference defence mechanism in male and female.
2. There is no significant difference behavior orientation in male and female.
3. There is no co-relation between defence mechanism and behavior orientation.

Method

Samples:

According the purpose of present study total 100 samples has been selected. There were 50 male and 50 female were taken as a sample in Rajkot city (Gujarat).

Research Design:

The aim of present research was to a study of defence mechanism (projection) and behavior orientation (view) in male and female. For these total 100 male and female were taken as a sample. Here to measure research tools defence mechanism measured by Mrinal N.R. and Singhal U and behavior orientation made by Jha P.K. To check the difference between groups t-test and to check the relation Karl-person co-relation 'r' method was used.

Instruments:

Defence Mechanism Inventory: Defence mechanism Inventory was developed by Mrinal N.R. and Singhal U. It is measure five defence mechanisms: Turning against object (TAO), Projection (PRO), Principialization (PRN), turning against self (TAS) and reversal (REV). There are two versions of this inventory. One of in male and the female. Each version contains 10 stories. After reading each story the S is asked to respond to four questions corresponding to four types of behavior evoked by the situation described in the story: (A) Proposed actual behavior (B) impulsive behavior (C) Thoughts and (D) Fallings. Five responses are provided for each question, each response representing one of the five defence mechanisms listed above. The S Marks a plus (+) for the response most representative of his reaction and a minus (-) for that least representative. The responses marked with plus sign by subject are given the numerical value of two, those marked with a minus sign are scored zero and the unmarked responses are given the value of one. There were total 200 questions thus the score for any one defence can range from 0 to 80. Validity and reliability of the inventory was high.

Behavior Orientation Scale: Behavior Orientation scale was developed by Jha P.K. it is also known as Machiavellianism Scale. Scale having three different sub scales namely Tactics, Views and Morality. In the Total 41 items in this scale.15 items for tactics, 21 items for views and 5 items for morality. Among 41 items 33 were in pro-Machiavellian direction and 8 items were in anti-Machiavellian. It is a Likert - type 5 point scale having response categories: 1 strongly Agree, 2 agree, 3 Undecided, 4 Disagree and 5 strongly Disagree. Each positively question has been given the scores 5 to 1 and for negatively worded question the scores 1 to 5 have been provide. The validity and reliability of the scale is high.

Procedure

The testing was done on a group of male and female. The whole procedure of fill the inventory was explained to them fully and clearly. The Instruction given on the scale was explained to them. It was also male mode clear to them that their scores would be kept secret. It was checked that none of the subjects left any questions unanswered or that no subjects encircled both the answer given against question.

Result and discussion:

The main objective of present study was to study of defence mechanism (projection) and behavior orientation (view) in male and female. In it statistical t method was used and to check correlation method was used. Result discussion of present study is a under.

Result Table

Table-1 Showing Mean, S.D. and t value of Defence mechanism (projection) in male and females.

Sr. No.	Group	n	Mean	S.D.	t	Sig.
1	Male	50	44.63	6.79	10.11	0.01
2	Female	50	39.11	5.22		

0.05 = 2.01

0.01 = 2.68

According to table-1 the result obtained on the basic are of defence mechanism (projection) reveals no significant difference of male and females.

Defence mechanism (projection) received male high mean score 44.63 as compare female mean score 39.11 (table-1). There has mean difference. The standard deviation score of male received 6.79 and female received 5.22. The t-value was 10.11. There was 0.01 levels significant difference of defence mechanism (projection) in male and female. So we can say that first hypothesis reject.

Table-2 Showing Mean, S.D. and t value of behavior orientation (view) in male and females.

Sr. No.	Group	n	Mean	S.D.	t	Sig.
1	Male	50	105.20	16.18	2.84	0.01
2	Female	50	120.18	18.20		

0.05 = 2.01

0.01 = 2.68

According to table-2 the result obtained on the basic are of behavior orientation (view) reveals no significant difference of male and females.

Behavior orientation (view) received male mean score 105.20 as compare female high mean score 120.18 (table-2). There has mean difference. The standard deviation score of male received 16.18 and female received 18.20. The t-value was 2.84. There was 0.01 levels significant difference of behavior orientation (view) in male and female. So we can say that second hypothesis reject.

Table-3 Showing the co-relation of Defence mechanism (projection) and Behavior orientation (view) in male and female

Sr. No.	Group	N	Mean	r
1	Defence mechanism (projection)	100	41.90	0.41
2	Behavior orientation (view)	100	112.70	

According to table-3 the result obtained that a defence mechanism (projection) is a 71.57 and behavior orientation (view) mean is a 24.63 it as a positive correlation between defence mechanism (projection) and behavior orientation (view). The positive correlations between defence mechanism (projection) and behavior orientation (view) received 0.41.

Conclusion:

We can conclude by data analysis as follows:

There was significant difference in defence mechanism (projection) and behavior orientation (view) in male and female. The positive correlations seen defence mechanism (projection) and behavior orientation (view) received 0.41.

References:

1. Abdel-Khalek, A. M. (1991). Death anxiety among Lebanese samples. *Psychological Reports*, 68, 924–926.
2. American Psychiatric Association (1994). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders DSM-IV-TR* (4th Ed.). Washington, Author.
3. American Psychiatric Association (2000). *Handbook of Psychiatric Measures*. Washington.
4. American Psychiatric Association. (1994). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders DSM-IV-TR* (4th ed.). Washington, Author.
5. Andrews G, Pollock C, & Stewart G (1989). The determination of defense style by questionnaire. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 46, 455-460.
6. Angela, M. (2014). Low self-esteem, gender, and defense mechanisms among depressive disorders. Chicago, il.`
7. Blackman, J.S. (2011). Defense mechanisms in the 21st century. *Synergy Psychiatric Writing worth Reading*, 16 (2) 1-16. Cheah, Y. K., & Tang, C. F. (2011). The role of socio-demographic factors on self-rated happiness: The case of Malaysia. *Munich Personal RePEC Archive*.
8. Bond M (2004). Empirical studies of defense style: relationships with psychopathology and change. *Harvard Review of Psychiatry*, 12, 263-278.
9. Bond M, Gardner ST, Christian J, & Sigal JJ (1983). Empirical study of self-rated defense styles. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 40, 333-338.
10. Bowins, B. (2004). Psychological defense mechanisms: a new perspective. *The American Journal of Psychoanalysis*. 64 (No). 1-26.
11. Cramer P (1991). Anger and the use of defense mechanisms in college students. *Journal of Personality*, 59, 39-55.
12. Cramer P (2006). *Protecting the self: Defense mechanisms in action*. New York, NY: The <http://www.ijpsy.com> © International Journal of Psychology & Psychological Therapy, 2011, 11, 1 Gender and Defense 155 Guilford Press.

13. Cramer, P. (1995). Identity, narcissism and defense mechanisms in late adolescence. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 29, 341-361.
14. Despland JN, Drapeau M, & de Roten Y (2001). Les mécanismes de défenses: une pluralité de point de vue. *Psychothérapies*, 3, 113-122.
15. DeWilde J, Broekaert E, & Rosseel Y (2006). Problem severity profiles of clients in European therapeutic communities: Gender differences in various areas of functioning. *European Addiction Research*, 2, 128-137.
16. Hibbard S, & Porcerelli J (1998). Further validation for the Cramer defense mechanism manual. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 70, 460-483.
17. Hu L & Bentler PM (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6, 1-55.
18. Mahalik JR, Cournoyer RJ, DeFranc W, Cherry M, & Napolitano JM (1998). Men's gender role conflict and use of psychological defenses. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 45, 247-255.
19. Ogrodniczuk JS (2006). Men, women, and their outcome in psychotherapy. *Psychotherapy Research*, 16, 452-462.
20. Ogrodniczuk JS, Piper WE, Joyce AS, & McCallum M (2001). Effect of patient gender on outcome in two forms of short-term individual psychotherapy. *Journal of Psychotherapy Practice and Research*, 10, 69-78.
21. Petraglia J, Thygesen KL, Lecours S, & Drapeau M (2009). Gender differences in self-reported defense mechanisms: A study using the new Defense Style Questionnaire-60. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 63(1), 87-99.
22. Petraglia J, Thygesen KL, Lecours S, & Drapeau M (2009). Gender differences in self-reported defense mechanisms: A study using the new Defense Style Questionnaire-60. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 63(1), 87-99.
23. Phaneuf, M., RN. (2000). *Defense Mechanisms among Our Students*.
24. Robert, Joseph (2002). *American Policies and Societies Today*. Malden: Blackwell Publishers. Vaillant, G.E. (1993). *The wisdom of the ego*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
25. Roth A & Fonagy P (2005). *What works for whom?* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford Press.
26. Thygesen KL, Drapeau M, Trijsburg RW, Lecours S, de Roten Y (2008). Assessing defense styles: Factor structure and psychometric properties of the new Defense Style Questionnaire 60 (DSQ-60). *International Journal of Psychology and Psychological Therapy*, 8, 171-181.
27. Trijsburg RW, Bond M, & Drapeau M (2003a) Defense Style Questionnaire-60. Unpublished instrument. Institute of Community and Family Psychiatry, McGill University.
28. Trijsburg RW, Bond M, Drapeau M, Thygesen KL, de Roten Y, & Duivenvoorden HJ (2003b). Defense Style Questionnaire 60: Development and psychometric evaluation. Paper presented at the University of Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland.
29. Trijsburg Van T' Spijker A, Van HL, Hesselink AJ, & Duivenvoorden HJ (2000). Measuring overall defensive functioning with the defense style questionnaire: A comparison of different scoring methods. *Journal of Nervous & Mental Disease*, 188, 432-439.
30. Vaillant GE (1993). *The wisdom of the ego*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
31. Watson DC & Sinha BK (1998). Gender, age, and cultural differences in the Defense Style Questionnaire-40. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 54, 67-75.
32. Watson DC (2002). Predicting psychiatric symptomatology with the Defense Style Questionnaire-40. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 9, 275-287.