

Socio-Genic Needs as Predictors of Risk- Taking Behaviour among Adolescents of Kumaun Region

Dr. Kanchan Jamir^{1*}

ABSTRACT

The main objective of the Present study is to find out the comparative results of socio-genic needs as predictors of risk taking tendency among the adolescents of Kumaun region. A total sample of 300 students (150 boys and 150 girls) of Almora district from Kumaun region was taken. Tools use was SOCIO –GENIC NEED SATISFACTION SCALE (S.N.S) this tool is designed by Chauhan and Dhar (1986) and Risk -Taking Questionnaire (RTQ) prepared by Sinha and Arora (1983).

Keywords: *Socio-Genic Needs, Risk-Taking Behavior, Adolescents.*

The word “Adolescence” has been taken from Latin word “Adolescere” means to grow or to grow to maturity. Some who have studied adolescence view it as a period of “Storm and stress”. This was the view of G. Stanley Hall, an American psychologist (1904) whose book, “Adolescence”, helped make this age period a focus of scientific study.

Eysenck, (1972) defined adolescence “As the post-puberal period in which individual self-responsibility is established”. According to Morgan, King, Weisz and Schopler (2002) “Adolescent means the period of life from puberty to the completion of physical growth.” Jersild et.al. (1975) defined adolescence “As the period through which a growing person makes transition from childhood to maturity”.

Adolescence is also an age of identity crisis, when they like to assert independence and fluctuate between dependence on parents and attempt to assert independence. This motivational desire to be an independent leads them to take “Risk”. Risk can be observed or identified in many forms.

Hobrin (1974) defines the term ‘risk’ as “a condition where there is a possibility of the occurrence of loss as a result of deviation from the intended or expected situation”. Chaubey

¹ Asst. Prof. Dept. Of Psychology, Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru College, Faridabad, Haryana

*Responding Author

Socio-Genic Needs as Predictors of Risk- Taking Behaviour among Adolescents of Kumaun Region

(1974) is of the opinion that risk is a condition where both the aspects of a thing are clear to the individual and the outcome clearly defines the success and failure.

Risk as Layman understands may be an act which a man undertakes to earn his livelihood or does some act under compulsion, or in other words we can say that “In a dangerous or critical situation a person takes the very quick decision and follows it carefully. The results may be positive or negative, no question remains in mind in this regard”.

Every living being is in want of some substance always. The need is physical body raises because of deficiency or excess in quantity. Needs exist as basic striving, common to people that help us to by products of ‘roles’ and ‘role’ expectancies of individual and his social environments. According to Elliott (1993) “Need is a condition marked by the feeling of lack or want of something or of requiring the performance of some action”. According to Davidoff (1976), “Need refers to a bodily or felt social psychological deficiency”. Chauhan, Dhar and Singh (1986) “Socio-Genic needs are the rock bottom of the process of socialization and socio-genic need satisfaction relates to the need satisfaction provided to the individual by a society in general”. But needs are not only physical or organic there are psychological and socio-genic needs pertaining to bodily organs, like money, honour, reward, appraise etc. Motivational behaviour takes birth through physical and social needs, but this destiny ends up in fulfillment of the goal. There are also intermediate stages between the need and the goal thus forming a cycle called as motive cycle.

MAJOR OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The present study is planned to study the following objectives-

- To assess the level of socio-genic needs among adolescents.
- To compute the contribution of socio-genic needs in determining the risk taking behaviour of adolescents.

Hypotheses

On the basis of review of related literature indirectly concerned with the investigation under taken, the following hypotheses have been formulated:

- There would be a significant correlation between Positive Need Satisfaction and Risk-Taking Tendency among students.
- In multivariate analysis Positive Need Satisfaction would significantly contribute to criterion variable.
- Negative Need Experience would be significantly correlated with Risk-Taking behavior among students.
- Negative Need Experience would significantly contribute to Risk-Taking Tendency among students.

METHOD

For testing the proposed hypothesis and objectives of this investigation normative survey method was adopted to collect the data. The choice of normative survey method is made principally because the study aims at ascertaining the present information and knowledge of socio-genic needs as predictor of risk – taking behavior among adolescents.

Sample

The present study was conducted on 300 students 150 boys and 150 girls from different schools in Almora district of Kumaun region. The students were selected randomly. The age range was 13 to 15 years.

Tool Used-

SOCIO –GENIC NEED SATISFACTION SCALE (S.N.S)

This tool is designed by Chauhan and Dhar (1986). The scale relates to measurement of specific kind of need-satisfaction provided to the individual by a society in general. Socio-genic need are crucially important. The scale provides measures of socio-genic need satisfaction related to four dichotomous need dimensions. It provides scores for all the eight ‘end-areas’ of these dimensions.

Differentiation, Rejection, Isolation and Submission are negative dimensions described as Negative Need Experience. On the other hand identification, acceptance, cooperation and dominance are positive dimensions also known as Positive Need Satisfaction. In this scale all these dichotomous need dimensions are presenting as eight different areas that have their area values also as presenting below. The number of items in each area is 5 thus there are 40 items in this scale. The items are put into the following six point response category.

RISK- TAKING QUESTIONNAIRE (R.T.Q)

This tool is designed by Sinha and Arora (1983).It is designed to measure the extent of risk – taking of a particular individual in his personal as well as in his social life. It is useable on male and female literates. The authors covered eight areas of risk which are considered to be the most important and affiliated areas of risk for Indian life by a number of sociologists and psychologists. These areas are Hills, Space, Sea, Commercial Trades, Police & Intelligence Services, Fire, Professional Trade and Military Services. Risk Taking Questionnaire is a five point scale. The reliability of RTQ was computed by the method of rational equivalence using the Kuder – Richardson formula for different areas of questionnaire range rom 0.66 to 0.83.The concurrent validity of the tool established by the authors is 0.82.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION*Table 1 Descriptive Statistics For Boys Group(N = 150)*

S.NO.	NAME OF THE VARIABLES	MEAN	S.D.	SKEWNESS	KURTOSIS	REMARK
1.	Risk -Taking	152.99	24.126	-.726	.172	Lepto Kur.
2.	Acceptance	54.90	10.340	-.629	.401	Platy Kur.
3.	Cooperation	78.91	19.778	-.646	.304	Platy Kur.
4.	Identification	40.26	7.503	-.759	.463	Platy Kur.
5.	Dominance	11.54	5.164	.003	.334	Platy Kur.
6.	Rejection	15.04	16.553	1.427	.202	Lepto Kur.
7.	Isolation	16.38	9.022	.488	.439	Platy Kur.
8.	Differentiation	23.06	7.012	-.181	.637	Platy Kur.
9.	Submission	23.60	8.880	.394	.279	Platy Kur.
10.	Positive Need Satisfaction	185.61	29.791	-.390	.191	Lepto Kur.
11.	Negative Need Experience	78.10	28.890	.941	.157	Lepto Kur.

Table 1 show that the values of Skewness of Risk - Taking, Acceptance, Cooperation, Identification, Differentiation, Positive Need Satisfaction, were negatively skewed. The values of Skewness of Dominance, Rejection, Isolation, Submission and Negative Need Experience were found positively skewed.

Further it was also found from the Table 1 that the value of Kurtosis shows the distribution was slightly Lepto Kurtic for Risk- Taking, Rejection, Positive Need Satisfaction, and for Negative Need Experience. Whereas the value of Kurtosis for Acceptance, Cooperation, Identification, Dominance, Isolation, Differentiation, and Submission, was found Slightly Platy Kurtic.

Table 2, Descriptive Statistics For Girls Group, (N=150)

S.NO.	NAME OF THE VARIABLES	MEAN	S.D.	SKEWNESS	KURTOSIS	REMARK
1.	Risk –Taking	144.83	24.395	-.376	.102	Lepto Kur.
2.	Acceptance	56.83	10.239	-1.206	.290	Platy Kur.
3.	Cooperation	82.84	20.496	-.600	.318	Platy Kur.
4.	Identification	40.42	7.272	-.775	.412	Platy Kur.
5.	Dominance	10.11	5.633	.412	.339	Platy Kur.
6.	Rejection	9.36	12.861	2.318	.736	Platy Kur.
7.	Isolation	12.85	8.177	1.066	.943	Platy Kur.
8.	Differentiation	23.26	6.332	-.060	.017	Lepto Kur.
9.	Submission	23.98	8.750	-.021	.556	Platy Kur.
10.	Positive Need Satisfaction	190.39	30.149	-.338	.159	Lepto Kur.
11.	Negative Need Experience	69.28	23.617	1.187	.253	Lapto Kur.

It is evident from the Table 2 that the values of Skewnes for Risk- Taking, Acceptance, Cooperation, Identification, Differentiation, Submission and Positive Need Satisfaction are negatively skewed. The values of skewness for Dominance, Rejection, Isolation, and Negative Need Experience were positively skewed.

The value of Kurtosis, shown in the Table 2 reveals slightly Lepto Kurtic tendency of distribution for Risk – taking, Differentiation, Positive Need Satisfaction, and Negative Need Experience. Table 2 unveils slightly Platy Kurtic distribution for Acceptance, Cooperation, Identification, Dominance, Rejection, Isolation and for Submission.

Table 3, Descriptive Statistics For Total Students, (N=300)

S.NO.	NAME OF THE VARIABLES	MEAN	S.D.	SKEWNESS	KURTOSIS	REMARK
1.	Risk – Taking	148.91	24.563	-.528	.607	Platy Kur.
2.	Acceptance	55.87	10.318	-.899	.145	Lepto Kur.
3.	Cooperation	80.87	20.202	-.600	.281	Platy Kur.
4.	Identification	40.34	7.376	-.764	.416	Platy Kur.
5.	Dominance	10.82	5.442	.194	.440	Platy Kur.
6.	Rejection	12.20	15.069	1.785	.366	Platy Kur.
7.	Isolation	14.62	8.775	.746	.020	Lepto Kur.
8.	Differentiation	23.16	6.669	-.134	.357	Platy Kur.
9.	Submission	23.79	8.803	.189	.444	Platy Kur.
10.	Positive Need Satisfaction	188.01	30.016	-.356	.025	Lepto Kur.
11.	Negative Need Experience	73.69	26.709	1.092	.202	Lepto Kur.

Table 3 concludes that the value of Skewness for Risk Taking, Acceptance, Cooperation, Identification, Differentiation, Positive Need Satisfaction, was negatively skewed. It is also evident that the value of Skewness for Dominance, Rejection, Isolation, Submission, and Negative Need Experience were positively skewed.

Table 3 also indicates slightly Lepto-Kurtic tendency of distribution for Acceptance, Isolation, Positive Need Satisfaction and Negative Need Experience. Whereas the value of kurtosis reveals slightly Platy-Kurtic tendency of distribution for Risk – Taking, Cooperation, Identification, Dominance, Rejection, Differentiation and for Submission.

Thus it was concluded that positive and negative dimensions of Socio-Genic Need Satisfaction play an important role all together in Risk- Taking Behaviour. In support of our finding it could be said that Socio-Genic Needs are the rock bottom of the process of socialization and the need satisfaction provided to the individual by a society in general determine the course of his action in future. A person is motivated by his primary and secondary needs and in order to satisfy these needs he takes risk.

These findings are indirectly supported by the study conducted by David (1966) who also observed significant differences on need achievement in high and low achieving boys and girls. Bhatnagar (1967) while predicting academic achievement of high school students from personality variables, found that need for achievement, dominance, nurturance, endurance and aggression are correlated positively and need for differentiation, and affiliation and abasement are correlated negatively with their academic achievement. By contrast, it was found in Verma

Socio-Genic Needs as Predictors of Risk- Taking Behaviour among Adolescents of Kumaun Region

and Dashora's (1989) investigation that academic achievement of high school's boys and girls is not affected by their Socio-Genic Need Satisfaction.

REFERENCES

- Bhatnagar, R.P. (1967). A Study of Some of The Personality Variables as Predictors of Academic Achievement Ph.D. Thesis, Delhi University In M.B. Buch (Ed.) A Survey of Research in Education CASE, M.S. University, Baroda, 1974, 327.
- Chaubey , N.P. (1974 a). Effect of Age Expectancy of Success and Failure on Risk- Taking Behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 29, (6), 774-778.
- Chauhan, N.S. et. al. (1986). Manual for The Socio-Genic Need Satisfaction Scale (S.N.S.). Mapa Publications, Meerut.
- Davids, A. (1966). Psychological Characteristics of High School's Male and Female. *Psychology in The Schools*, 3 (i), 79.-87.
- Elliott, H. (1993). *Dictionary of Psychology*. 10th ed. Cosmos publication, New Delhi, 156-182
- Eysenck, et. al. (1972). Cited by Bhai Yogandrajeet in *Child Psychology : Child Development* . Vinod Pustak Mandir Agra, 444.
- Jersild,A.T. et.al. (1975). *Child Psychology*. Englewood Clifts, N.J. Prentice Hall.
- Morgan, T. King, A. & Schopler, J. (2002). *Introduction To Psychology* (7th edition), Tata McGraw-Hill edition. Published by Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Company Limited.
- Sinha, V. Gupta, G.S. and Arora, P.N. (1983). Alcoholism and Risk- Taking Tendency, Paper Presented At U.P.P.A. 5th Annual Conference Held at Almora.
- Verma, B.P. & Dashora. (1989). Relationship of Socio-Genic Needs Satisfaction with Academic Achievement of High School Boys and Girls. *The Progress of Education*. IX III No. 10-11 May-June page 239-241.

How to cite this article: K Jamir (2016), Socio-Genic Needs as Predictors of Risk- Taking Behaviour among Adolescents of Kumaun Region, *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, Volume 3, Issue 3, No. 6, DIP: 18.01.112/20160303