

## **Family composition and risk taking behaviour**

**SAPNA\*<sup>1</sup> AND ISRAIL MIYA<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>S.R.F. and <sup>2</sup>H.O.D.

Department of Psychology, Meerut College, Meerut (U.P.) India

### **ABSTRACT**

“Risk taking as an experience of human behaviour can be defined as an action with an unclear outcome; It is an action with a chance of loss or negative outcome”. Risk taking behavior as a dependent variable is determined by a number of socio-psychological variables. In this connection the role of family composition in risk taking behavior cannot be underrated. The objective of the present research work was to find out whether there is significant difference between youths of joint and nuclear families in terms of their score on risk taking behavior?. The sample size consisted of 200 male students out of which 100 students belonged to joint families and 100 students belonged to nuclear families. Data was collected through “Risk Taking Questionnaire” developed by P.N. Arora and V. Sinha. Results show that there is no significant difference between the youths belonging to the joint and nuclear families in terms of their score on risk taking behavior. It indicates that the youth of joint as well as nuclear families are more or less equally risk taker.

**Key Words :** Risk taking behaviour, Family composition

### **INTRODUCTION**

Risk is an unavoidable part of our everyday lives. Life is full of risk. In fact, every decision contained in every moment necessitates an element of risk (Yates, 1992). Everything we do involved risk. Risk taking is a fairly normal part of youth, and most adolescent won't take to it extreme. Risk taking, stress seeking, thrill seeking, sensation seeking, action seeking, impulsiveness, and looking for kicks all generally refer to behaviors that take people closer to the edge, heighten emotions, raise arousal levels, or require one to use one's skills in an attempt to control the potentially uncontrollable (Johnson *et al.*, 2004; Lopes, 1987; Heimer, 1988; Neihart, 1999; Leith and Baumeister, 1996; Baumrind, 1987; Rolison, 2002; Daly and Wilson, 2001; Bell and Bell, 1993). Risk is defined as a situation or an event in which something of human value has been put at stake and where the outcome is uncertain (Jaeger *et al.*, 2001). Risk taking behavior is referred to the tendency to engage in behaviors that have the potential to be harmful or dangerous, yet at the same time provide the opportunity for some kind of outcome that can be perceived as positive (Gray and Jennings, 1999). Various factors affect the risk taking behaviour in youth including individual factor, family factor, peer factor, school factor, and community factor. Among them a family plays the most important role in the risk taking behaviour of a person at every stage of life. A family is the most primary and immediate environment in which a child is exposed. It is the basic unit of a society (Adhiambo *et al.*,

2011; Raju and Rahmalullah, 2012). A child learns the strategy of dealing various situations in his life from his family. In present days many types of family have come in existence such as joint family, nuclear family, divorced and single parent. The environment of a family affects a child's life at a large extent. Family structure is an important aspect of the family context that has been linked with many child development outcomes. Family structured is conceptualized as the configuration of role, power, status and relationships in the family. In India, the structure/pattern of family can be seen broadly as two types, nuclear family and joint family. Azmawati *et al.* (2015) found no statistically significant association between family structure, parent occupations, parental income and also mother's education level in both rural and urban areas and the involvement in adolescent risk taking behavior. Raj (2011) found that there is no significant difference between nuclear and joint family Ho tribe students in their risk taking behavior. Haslinda *et al.* (2009) found that 85% of adolescent who have risk live in nuclear family and it show no association.

To find out the risk taking behavior between students belonging to joint family and students belonging to nuclear family, this study is conducting.

### **Objective:**

To study the risk taking behavior between students belonging to joint family and students belonging to nuclear family.

### **Hypothesis:**

There will be no significant difference between student belonging to joint family and student belonging to nuclear family in respect to their level of risk taking behaviour.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Sample:**

The sample of the present study consist of 200 students out of which 100 students were belonging to joint family and 100 students were belonging to nuclear family. Sample were selected from different colleges in Meerut City proper, the age range of the sample 18 to 25.

### **Variable :**

IV – Family Structure

DV – Risk Taking Behaviour

### **Tool used :**

Risk taking questionnaire developed and standardized by Dr. P.N. Arora and Dr. V. Sinha was used for measuring the risk taking behavior/ tendency in student of joint and nuclear family. It is a five point rating questionnaire. This questionnaire consists of 40 items related to the eight areas of the risk taking behavior *i.e.* Hill, Space, Sea, Commercial trades, Police and Intelligence service, Fire, Professional trades and Military services. Five items from each area. It takes about 30 minutes on an average. In Risk taking questionnaire, the five learning categories *i.e.*, very much, much, moderate, less and very less carry the 5,4,3,2, and 1 scores, respectively. The sum of the scores in all the eight areas gives the total extent of risk- tendency in the subject/ testee. High score is indicative of high risk taking behavior in the subject and *vice- versa*.

**Procedure of data collection:**

Risk taking questionnaire was used to measure the risk taking behaviour. Prior to the administration of the risk taking questionnaire to the students in different colleges, the researcher sought the permission and cooperation to the heads of the institutions and teachers. First of all, the purpose of research was clarified to the students and rapport was established with them and necessary direction were given comprehensively to them. After explaining the instructions, the questionnaire were distributed to the subjects. Questionnaire was taken back from all the subjects, it was completed by them. Whole data were collected from all students following the same procedure.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The purpose of the present study was to investigate the difference between student belonging to joint family and student belonging to nuclear family in terms of their score on risk taking behavior. To examine the framed hypothesis 't' test was applied and the obtained result are presented in the Table 1.

| <b>Table 1 : Comparison between the joint and nuclear family's students in terms of their score on risk taking behaviour</b> |     |        |       |     |      |                 |
|--|-----|--------|-------|-----|------|-----------------|
| Groups   | N   | Mean   | SD    | df  | 't'  | Sig.            |
| Joint family student   | 100 | 148.07 | 20.76 | 198 | 0.79 | Not significant |
| Nuclear family student   | 100 | 144.77 | 20.93 |     |      |                 |

Table 1 show that students belonging to joint family have high risk taker as compared to the students belonging to nuclear family. Mean value of student belonging to joint and nuclear family is 148.07 and 144.77, respectively and 't' value is 0.79 which is not significant even at .05 level of significance. Mean value show that students belonging to joint family have more risk taker as compared to nuclear family. However 't' value show that there is no significant difference between two groups. Statistical analysis indicate that family structure does not contribute significantly to the level of risk taking among college students. The youths of joint as well as nuclear families are more or less equally risk taker. Therefore, the hypothesis formulated in the present context "There will be no significant difference between students belonging to joint family and students belonging to nuclear family in respect to their level of risk taking behaviour" gains supported from the present findings.

**REFERENCES**

- Adhiambo, W.M., Odwar, A.J. and Mildred, A.A. (2011). The relationship among school adjustment, gender and academic achievement amongst secondary school students in Kisumu district Kenya. *JETERAPS* 2011; vol. 2(6):ISSN:2141-6990
- Azmawati, Mohd Nawi, Hazariah, Abdul Hamid Siti, Azhar Shah Shamsul, Ahmad Norfazilah, Noor Aizudalin Azimatun and Hod Rozita (2015). Risk taking behaviour among urban and rural adolescents in two selected districts in Malaysia. *J. South African family Practice*, **57** (3) :160-165.
- Baumrind, D. (1987). "A developmental perspective on adolescent risk taking in conyemporary America". In C. Irwin, (ed.), *Adolescent Social Behavior and Health*. San Francisco: Jossey- Bass.
- Bell, N. and Bell, R. (eds.) (1993). *Adolescent risk taking*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage
- Daly, M. and Wilson, M. (2001). "Risk-taking, intra sexual competition and homicide". *Nebraska Symposium*

*on Motivation*, **47** : 1-36.

- Gray, Catherine and Jennings, Debra (1999). Adolescent risk behavior and influence on parental and Education. *Journal of American Board of Family Medicine*.
- Haslinda, N. and Jamsiah, M. (2009). Faktor pendorong salah laku social dalam Kalangan remaja dalam daerah Malaka Tengah. Thesis Sarjana Kesehatan Masyarakat, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia. In press 2009.
- Heimer, C. (1988). "Social structure, psychology, and the estimation of risk". *American Review of Sociology*, **14** : 491-519.
- Jaeger, C., Renn, O., Rose, E. and Webler, T. (2001). *Risk, Uncertainty and Rational Action*. London: Earthscan.
- Johnson, J., Wilki, A. and Weber, E. (2004). "Beyond a trait view of risk taking: A domain-specific scale measuring risk perceptions, expected and perceived- risk attitudes in German-speaking populations". *Polish Psychological Bulletin*, **35** : 153-163.
- Leith, K. and Baumeister, R. (1996). "Why do bad moods increase self-defeating behavior? Emotion, risk-taking and self-regulation". *J. Personality & Soc. Psychol.*, **71** : 1250-1267.
- Lopes, L. (1987). "Between hope and fear: The psychology of risk". *Adv. Experimental Soc. Psychol.*, **20** : 255-295.
- Neihart, M. (1999). "Systematic risk-taking". *Roeper Review*, **21** : 289-292.
- Raj, P. Anthony (2011). Influence of emotional intelligence, risk taking behavior and modernity on academic achievement of ho tribe students studying in high school in Kolhan, Jharkhand.
- Raju and Rahmatullah. Adolescence- Psychology Today. Available from [www.psychologytoday.com/.../adolescence](http://www.psychologytoday.com/.../adolescence). (Last accessed on 2012 Feb 19)
- Rolison, M. (2002). "Factors influencing adolescents' decision to engage in risk-taking behavior". *Adolescence*, **37** : 585-596.
- Yates, F. J. (Ed). (1992). *Risk taking behavior*. Chichester. John Wiley & Sons.

\*\*\*\*\*