

Sensation Seeking, Risk Taking Behaviour and Self Efficacy among Young Adults

J.Jerus Albert Britto^{1*}, Dr.B.Selvaraj², Ms. Janani³

ABSTRACT

The current study was undertaken for the purpose of studying the Sensation seeking, Risk taking behaviour and Self efficacy among young adults. The study also focused on the influence of demographic variables such as age, sex, education, and residential area of the Young adults. The population of this research was comprised of 100 young adults from various colleges, Coimbatore, Tamilnadu, India. Purposive sampling method was used for the selection of respondents. Sensation seeking was measured with a self report Sensation seeking scale- V developed by Zuckerman (1964), Risk taking behaviour was measured with a self report Domain specific risk taking scale developed by weber et al., (2006), Self efficacy was measured with a self report General self efficacy Scale developed by Schwarzer (1995) were the three questionnaires used in this study. Questionnaires were administered to collect primary data. Sensation Seeking, Self efficacy and Risk taking behaviour were taken as variables under study.

Analysis of data was carried out by applying SPSS 21.0. Chi-Square and correlation tests were carried out to establish the relation among variables. The results also revealed significant relationship between Sensation seeking, Risk taking behaviour and Self efficacy. Examination of results also shows that demographic variables influence Sensation seeking, Risk taking behaviour and Self efficacy of the young adults. This study has great value for the young adults to understand the risk taking and sensation seeking level of college students.

Keywords: Sensation Seeking, Risk Taking Behaviour, Self Efficacy, Young Adults

All situational factors being equal, individuals still differ in their risk-taking behaviour. Some are more inclined to engage in risks, others less so. Some engage in risks quite thoughtlessly no matter what the consequences might be, while others accept the risk but attempt to minimize it while indulging in rewarding but risky activities. Personality traits must be defined to describe, predict, and eventually explain such internal causes for inter-individual differences in propensity for taking risks and the style thereof.

¹ Guest Lecturer Of Psychology, Government Arts College, Coimbatore, India

² Associate Professor Of Psychology, Government Arts College, Coimbatore, India

³ II M.Sc Psychology, Government Arts College, Coimbatore, India

*Responding Author

Received: May 14, 2019; Revision Received: June 28, 2019; Accepted: June 30, 2019

Sensation Seeking, Risk Taking Behaviour and Self Efficacy among Young Adults

The concept of sensation seeking originated in work on explaining individual differences in sensory deprivation but rapidly expanded in validity to account for more diverse behaviours. The behavioural expressions of sensation seeking have not only been found in various kinds of risk-taking behaviours such as driving habits, gambling, health, financial activities, alcohol and drug use, sexual behaviour, and sports, but the trait was found to be also involved in vocational preferences and choices, job satisfaction, social premarital and marital relationships, eating habits and food preferences, creativity, humour, fantasy, media and art preferences, and social attitudes.

Sensation seeking is a personality trait defined by the search for experiences and feelings that are “varied, novel, complex and intense” and by the readiness to “take physical, social, legal, and financial risks for the sake of such experiences.” Risk is not an essential part of the trait, as many activities associated with it are not risky. However, risk may be ignored, tolerated, or minimized and may even be considered to add to the excitement of the activity. The concept was developed by Marvin Zuckerman of the University of Delaware. In order to assess this trait he created a personality test called the Sensation Seeking Scale. This test assesses individual differences in terms of sensory stimulation preferences. So there are people who prefer a strong stimulation and display a behaviour that manifests a greater desire for sensations and there are those who prefer a low sensory stimulation. The scale is a questionnaire designed to measure how much stimulation a person requires and the extent to which they enjoy the excitement. Zuckerman hypothesized that people who are high sensation seekers require a lot of stimulation to reach their Optimal Level of Arousal. When the stimulation or sensory input is not met, the person finds the experience unpleasant.

Definition Of Risk Taking Behaviour

- Risk taking is any consciously or non-consciously controlled behaviour with a perceived uncertainty about its outcome, and/or about its possible benefits or costs for the physical, economic or psycho-social well-being of oneself or others.
- Furby & Beyth-Maron (1990), risk defined as the chance of loss, risky behaviors have been characterized as those behaviors that entail the possibility of subjective loss.
- Irwin (1990) has defined adolescent risk taking behaviors as those behaviors, undertaken volitionally, whose outcomes remain uncertain with the possibility of an identifiable negative health outcome.

Self Efficacy

Self-efficacy is an individual's belief in their innate ability to achieve goals. Expectations of self-efficacy determine whether an individual will be able to exhibit coping behaviour and how long effort will be sustained in the face of obstacles.^[2] Individuals who have high self-efficacy will exert sufficient effort that, if well executed, leads to successful outcomes, whereas those with low self-efficacy are likely to cease effort early and fail.^[2] Psychologists have studied self-efficacy from several perspectives, noting various paths in the development of self-efficacy; the dynamics of self-efficacy, and lack thereof, in many different settings; interactions between self-efficacy and self-concept; and habits of attribution that contribute to, or detract from, self-efficacy.

REVIEWS OF LITERATURE

A 2012 study of 395 military veterans with PTSD found a link between risk-taking behaviour and the disorder. In addition to the above forms of riskiness, vets with PTSD have a propensity for firearms play, potentially endangering their lives. People with PTSD have

Sensation Seeking, Risk Taking Behaviour and Self Efficacy among Young Adults

already survived dangerous situations and risk-taking behaviour may give such individuals the feeling that they have more control over their present circumstances than those that led to them developing PTSD.

Adeyemo and Adeleye (2008) investigated religiosity, emotional intelligence and self-efficacy as determinant of secondary school adolescent's psychological well-being. A sample of the study consists of 292 adolescents age ranged 13 to 20 years. The results of the study indicated that emotional intelligence, religiosity and self-efficacy predict psychological well-being of adolescents.

Araújo, Malloy – Diniz and Rocha (2009) published a biographical review of archived online database from 1966-2006, and researchers discovered link between impulsiveness and risky driving behaviour, viz, “run for thrill”, and “traffic violations”, though review on impulsiveness and accident proneness was not conclusive.

Babak, Moeini, et al. (2008) investigated the relationships between general self-efficacy, perceived stress and mental health status among Iranian male adolescents taken from Tehran who studied in senior secondary school. The findings of the study revealed that greater level of stress was associated with lower mental health status and lower general self-efficacy. The results of the study also showed a significant inverse relationship between self-efficacy and general health status of the students.

Banet and Bellet (2008) studied the risk awareness analysis among car drivers and motor cyclists and observed that motorcycles, considered themselves vulnerable as compared to car drivers. The motor cyclists also feared being spotted by the car drivers as it may cause car crash. Since this study does not assess vengeance among these two group of drivers, though it just shows vulnerability among motorcyclists, who if threatened might retaliate with vengeance.

Berdoulat, Vavassori and Sastre (2013) in their study to investigate the three predictors i.e. driving anger, impulsiveness and aggressiveness, found that these three psychological variables significantly predicted aggressive behaviour and transgressive driving.

Boden (2009) in his study on boredom and impulsive behaviour found positive correlation between the two, with experience of boredom being linked to a wide range of impulsive and destructive behaviours like criminal activity, violence, compulsive gambling and sexual activity. It was also observed that individuals who engage in these maladaptive behaviours often share personality trait of boredom.

Broughton, Fuller, Stradling, Gormley, Kinnear, O'Dolan and Hannigan (2009) in their comparative study between car drivers and powered two-wheeled riders found a small sub group of older motorcyclists who were found to speed and were high on sensation-seeking. (Horswill & Helman, 2003). This study however did not study the difference on sensation-seeking among these two different types of vehicle drivers.

Catharine P. Cross (2013) Men score higher than women on measures of sensation-seeking, defined as a willingness to engage in novel or intense activities. This sex difference has been explained in terms of evolved psychological mechanisms or culturally transmitted social norms. We investigated whether sex differences in sensation-seeking have changed over

Sensation Seeking, Risk Taking Behaviour and Self Efficacy among Young Adults

recent years by conducting a meta-analysis of studies using Zuckerman's Sensation Seeking Scale, version V (SSS-V). We found that sex differences in total SSS-V scores have remained stable across years, as have sex differences in Disinhibition and Boredom Susceptibility. In contrast, the sex difference in Thrill and Adventure Seeking has declined, possibly due to changes in social norms or out-dated questions on this sub-scale. Our results support the view that men and women differ in their propensity to report sensation-seeking characteristics, while behavioural manifestations of sensation-seeking vary over time. Sex differences in sensation-seeking could reflect genetically influenced predispositions interacting with socially transmitted information.

Campbell and Muncer (2009) in their study found that where impulsive actions carry potential risks, men have been found to exceed women while not much significant difference with regard to other impulsive actions were found. On similar lines, they further add that there are well established sex differences with males being higher than females in terms of fear, risk aversion and harm-avoidance. As found in another study where impulsiveness with regard to alcohol problems were probed, higher levels of motor impulsiveness was the major reason for alcohol problems being higher in men than women, mediating the relationship between gender and risk for alcohol problems. Also in this study males numbered out females in terms of Significant difference on impulsiveness as measured by BIS-11 (Impulsiveness scale), also used in the present study (Stoltenberg, Batién, & Birgenheir, 2008).

Hromatko and Butkovic (2009) examined the Sensation Seeking and Spatial Ability in Athletes. The aim of this study was threefold: (a) to examine sex differences in sensation seeking and spatial abilities in a sample of athlete students, (b) to explore whether measures of sensation seeking and spatial ability can be used to distinguish between athletes engaging in sports of different levels of risk, and (c) to explore the relationship between sensation seeking and spatial abilities in a sample of athlete students. Two hundred one students athletes engaged in sports of different levels of risk completed the spatial relations test, mental rotation test and Zuckerman's Sensation Seeking Scale-V. Men scored higher than women did in both measures of spatial abilities and on DIS, while women scored higher than men on ES. High-risk group had higher SSS and TAS scores than low- and medium- risk groups, and low-risk group had lower DIS scores than medium- and high-risk group, but there were no differences in spatial ability among athletes engaged in sports of different levels of risk. Spatial ability correlated with sensation seeking measures in men only.

Harris, Houston (2014) In one of the recent studies, the prevalence of pro-social aggressive driving among undergraduate students was assessed. The results found that sensation-seeking was significantly associated with aggressive driving, however pro-social driving was associated with few reported traffic accidents and violations.

James b. hittner, emmalee c. owens, Rhonda j. swickert (2016) This study investigated the relevance of social settings as predictors of risky sexual behavior. In a young adult sample (n = 324, M age = 20.2 years), we examined the association between frequency of attendance at five different settings and frequency of engaging in four risky sexual behaviors (i.e., unprotected intercourse when not drunk or high, unprotected intercourse when drunk or high, casual sex when not drunk or high, casual sex when drunk or high). Predictive associations were examined using negative binomial regression, and all analyses controlled for frequency of recent alcohol use and age at first use of alcohol. Greater attendance at fraternity/sorority

Sensation Seeking, Risk Taking Behaviour and Self Efficacy among Young Adults

parties predicted more frequent intercourse for females in the not drunk or high and drunk or high contexts, and more frequent casual sex for males in the not drunk or high context. Greater attendance at large private parties predicted more frequent intercourse for females in the not drunk or high context. Greater attendance at bars without dance floors predicted more frequent intercourse for males in the drunk or high context. These findings highlight the importance of socializing habits in understanding risky sexual behavior.

Jeremy John Schweitzer (2011), This study evaluated the relationship between the personality trait sensation seeking and sexual risk taking behaviors. It aimed to determine whether high sensation seekers prefer poster presentations that differ in message sensation value (MSV). The goal was to inform the design and evaluation of sex education and teen pregnancy prevention campaigns. A random sample of 151 undergraduate students from a Midwestern university was surveyed to evaluate young people's sensation seeking tendencies and risky sexual behaviors. The respondents were exposed to two posters, one low in MSV and another high in MSV, to ascertain their preference. The findings suggest that sensation seeking does predict some risky sexual behaviors, but no relationship was found between sensation seeking and MSV. However, respondents expressed a preference for and demonstrated more elaborated message processing after exposure to the high MSV poster, indicating that future campaigns should consider using high MSV materials to target teenagers.

METHODOLOGY

The present chapter throws light on the research methodology adopted for the present study. Here research objectives and design of the study, i.e. sample for the study and selection of the research instrument are discussed in detail. Methods for the collection of the data and statistics for analysing the data have also been discussed.

The methodology of the present study involved the following:

- Objectives
- Hypotheses
- Area
- Sample
- Tools
- Scoring
- Procedure
- Analysis of Data

Objectives:

- To find out the level of sensation seeking among male and female respondents.
- To find out the level of sensation seeking among UG and PG students.
- To find out the level of sensation seeking among respondents with siblings.
- To find out the level of sensation seeking among rural and urban respondents.
- To find out the level of risk taking behaviour among male and female respondents.
- To find out the level of risk taking behaviour among UG and PG students.
- To find out the level of risk taking behaviour among respondents with siblings.
- To find out the level of risk taking behaviour among rural and urban respondents.
- To find out the level of self-efficacy among male and female respondents.
- To find out the level of self-efficacy among UG and PG students.
- To find out the level of self-efficacy among respondents with siblings
- To find out the level of self-efficacy among rural and urban respondents

Sensation Seeking, Risk Taking Behaviour and Self Efficacy among Young Adults

- To find out the relationship among sensation seeking, risk taking behaviour and self-efficacy.

Hypothesis:

1. There will be a significant difference in the sensation seeking between male and female respondents.
2. There will be a significant difference in the sensation seeking between UG and PG respondents.
3. There will be a significant difference in the sensation seeking between respondents who have siblings.
4. There will be a significant difference in the sensation seeking between respondents who live in rural and urban area.
5. There will be a significant difference in the risk taking behaviour between male and female respondents.
6. There will be a significant difference in the risk taking behaviour between UG and PG respondents.
7. There will be a significant difference in the risk taking behaviour between respondents who have siblings.
8. There will be a significant difference in the risk taking behaviour between respondents who live in rural and urban area.
9. There will be a significant difference in the self-efficacy between male and female respondents.
10. There will be a significant difference in the self-efficacy between UG and PG respondents.
11. There will be a significant difference in the self-efficacy between respondents who have siblings.
12. There will be a significant difference in self-efficacy between respondents who live in rural and urban area.
13. There is a positive relationship between sensation seeking, risk taking behaviour and self-efficacy.

Area:

The samples were selected randomly from Government Arts College, GRD College of Arts and Science and Sri Krishna College of Arts and Science of Coimbatore.

The reasons for selecting this area are given below.

- Co-operative rendered by the sample to the researcher.
- Convenience of administering the test to the sample.

Sample:

A sample size is 100 (50 males and 50 females) in the age group of 20 - 25 years was selected for the present study, from various colleges of Coimbatore District, Tamil Nadu. A sample of hundred were selected using a non-probability sampling method called convenience sampling.

Tools:

To collect the relevant information like gender, education, residence, family's monthly income, number of siblings, order of birth, personal data sheet was used.

1. SENSATION SEEKING SCALE:

To determine sensation seeking, the Sensation Seeking Scale -V is used. This tool was designed by Martin Zuckerman in the year 1964. This scale consists of 40 items with two alternatives each.

Reliability:

Cronbach alpha coefficients for the total score ranged from 0.83 to 0.86. those for the sub scales generally moderate (0.6 to 0.8). These coefficients were quite similar in the English and American samples, and in both sexes (Zuckerman, 1994). Despite the reduced number of items in the sub scales, the only scale showing lower alpha coefficients as compared with form IV was experience seeking.

Validity:

Zuckerman (1994) reported correlations between SSS – V and NEO – PI. Total SSS – V scales correlated positively 0.45 with openness to experience and 0.22 with extraversion. Aluja et al. (2003) correlated the SSS–V total score with the NEO – PI–R. extraversion and openness to experience were positively and significantly related to the SSS–V total, but the patterns for the SSS subscales were different. TAS and ES correlated most highly and significantly with NEO openness.

2. DOMAIN SPECIFIC RISK TAKING SCALE:

To determine risk taking behaviour, the tool DOSPERT scale is used. This tool was designed by Weber, Blais and Betz in the year 2002. The risk taking scale consists of 30 item version of the revised DOSPERT scale with five domains (ethical, financial, health/safety, social and recreational risks) using a 7 point rating scale.

Reliability:

The internal consistency estimates associated with the 30 item English risk taking scores ranged from 0.71 to 0.86, and the scale intercorrelations varied from 0.08 to 0.60.

Validity:

Internal consistency estimates for the DOSPERT domains social ($\alpha = 0.60$), health and safety ($\alpha = 0.64$), and ethical ($\alpha = 0.57$) are inadequate using the standards and the low alpha reliabilities of scores on these scales are expected to attenuate the correlations involving these variables.

3. SELF-EFFICACY SCALE:

To determine Self-efficacy, the general self-efficacy scale is used. This tool was designed by Schwarzer, R & Jerusalem, M in the year 1995. This scale consists of 10 items with four point rating scale.

Reliability:

The Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the entire scale was 0.80 and the test retest reliability coefficient estimated from data for 236 individuals that were contacted for follow up was 0.69.

Validity:

The general self-efficacy is correlated to emotion, optimism, and work satisfaction. Negative coefficients were found for depression, stress, health complaints, burnouts and anxiety.

Scoring:

1. SENSATION SEEKING SCALE V:

Ss1 = sensation seeking scale 1

Sensation Seeking, Risk Taking Behaviour and Self Efficacy among Young Adults

Normal items are scored such that A= high and B= low. Reversed items are scored such that A= low and B= high.

High = 1 and low = 0.

Items	Normal items	Reversed items
Boredom susceptibility	5, 8, 24, 34, 39	2, 7, 15, 27, 31
Disinhibition	1, 29, 32, 36	12, 13, 25, 30, 33, 35
Experience seeking	6, 9, 14, 18, 22	4, 10, 19, 26, 37
Thrill and adventure seeking	3, 16, 17, 23, 28	11, 20, 21, 38, 40

2. DOSPERT SCALE:

Extremely unlikely = 1

Moderately unlikely = 2

Somewhat unlikely = 3

Not sure = 4

Somewhat likely = 5

Moderately likely = 6

Extremely likely = 7

3. GENERAL SELF EFFICACY SCALE:

Not at all true = 1

Barely true = 2

Moderately true = 3

Extremely true = 4

INTERPRETATION:

1. Sensation seeking scale V:

0-13 => low

14-27 => moderate

28-40 => high

2. DOSPERT:

The minimum and the maximum score is 30 and 210.

30 – 90 => low

91 – 150 => moderate

151–210 => high

3. General Self efficacy scale:

10-20 => low

20-30 => average

30-40 => high

Procedure

The administrations of the respective institutes were informed and verbal consent to conduct the study was taken. Consent was also taken from the respondents after explaining to them the purpose of the research as well as the academic use of the data later on. After rapport formation the questionnaires were given individually to the subjects. Before administering the test the respondents were briefed about the test in detail. They were assured that their responses would be kept confidential and that the research is for educational purpose only.

Sensation Seeking, Risk Taking Behaviour and Self Efficacy among Young Adults

Instructions were read clearly by the investigator and simple classifications of word meanings were given on request without influencing responses.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The collected data were tabulated and analysed by using the following statistical tools:

- Percentage Analysis
- Correlation
- Chi square

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter deals with the results and the variables under study were discussed in detail. The data collected by using the questionnaire were tabulated using Mean, Chi Square and Correlation. To analyse the variables Sensation seeking, Risk taking behaviour and Self Efficacy among young adults, chi square was worked to find out the significant difference among the groups under study.

Table – 4.1

Distribution Of The Respondent According To Their Gender

S. No	Gender	Respondents	Percentage
1	Male	52	52%
2	Female	48	48%
	Total	100	100%

INTERPRETATION

The above table reveals the total population, it is clear that out of 100 respondents, 52 percent of the respondents are male and about 48 percent of the respondents are female.

Table – 4.2

Distribution Of The Respondent According To Their Educational Qualification

S. No	EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION	Respondents	Percentage
1	UG	56	56%
2	PG	44	44%
	Total	120	100%

INTERPRETATION

The above table reveals the educational qualification of the respondents, it is recorded that out of 100 respondents, 56 percent of the respondents have completed or pursuing Under-Graduate level of education and 44 percent of the respondents have completed or pursuing Post-Graduate level of education, by the evidence of the report. Researcher interpret that there is more or less equal level of under and post-graduation level of education pursuing or completed by the respondents.

Table – 4.3

Distribution Of The Respondent According To Their Siblings

S. No	SIBLINGS	Respondents	Percentage
1	Only child	11	11%
2	1 sibling	59	59%
3	2 and Above	30	30%
	Total	100	100%

INTERPRETATION

The above table reveals the sibling status of the respondents. It is recorded that out of 100 respondents, 11 percent of the respondents are only child, 59 percent have 1 sibling and only child and 30 percent of the respondents are having two and more than two siblings. By the evidence of the report, researcher interprets that among the overall respondents majority of the respondents have 1 sibling.

*Table – 4.4
Distribution Of The Respondent According To Their Residence*

S. No	RESIDENCE	Respondents	Percentage
1	RURAL	40	40%
2	URBAN	60	60%
	TOTAL	100	100%

INTERPRETATION

The above table reveals the residential type of the respondents. It is recorded that out of 100 respondents, 40 percent of the respondents live in rural area which is away from the city limit and 60 percent of the respondents live in urban area which is they are living inside the city, by the evidence of the report, researcher interpret that the greater part of the respondents are from urban area.

*Table – 4.5
Distribution Of The Respondent According To Their Level Of Sensation Seeking*

S. No	LEVEL OF SENSATION SEEKING	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
1	LOW	14	14%
2	AVERAGE	86	86%
	TOTAL	100	100%

INTERPRETATION

From the above table 14 percent of the respondents have low level of sensation seeking and 86 percent of the respondents have average level of sensation seeking showing majority of the population have average level of sensation seeking.

*Table – 4.6
Distribution Of The Respondent According To Their Level Of Risk Taking*

S. No	LEVEL OF RISK TAKING	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
1	LOW	14	14%
2	AVERAGE	76	76%
3	HIGH	10	10%
	TOTAL	100	100%

INTERPRETATION

From the above table 14 percent of the respondents have low level of risk taking behaviour, 76 percent of the respondents have average risk taking behaviour and 10 percent of the respondents have high level of risk taking behaviour showing majority of the population have average level of risk taking behaviour.

Distribution Of The Respondent According To Their Level Of Self Efficacy

S. No	LEVEL OF SELF EFFICACY	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
1	AVERAGE	45	45%
2	HIGH	55	55%
	TOTAL	100	100%

INTERPRETATION

From the above table 45 percent of the respondents have average level of self-efficacy and 55 percent of the respondents have high level of self-efficacy showing majority of the population have high level of self-efficacy.

Objectives 1:

To find out the level of sensation seeking among male and female respondents.

Hypothesis 1:

There will be a significant difference in the sensation seeking between male and female respondents.

TABLE – 4.8

The influence of Gender among the college students on their Sensation seeking

	SENSATION SEEKING		TOTAL
	LOW	AVERAGE	
MALE	2	50	52
FEMALE	12	36	48
TOTAL	14	86	100

CHI SQUARE TEST

	VALUE	DF	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON CHI SQUARE	9.277	1	0.003

INTERPRETATION

From the above table the chi square value is 9.277 and Significance level is 0.003 ($P < 0.05$) and this shows there is a significant difference between males and females on the level of sensation seeking. Hence the hypothesis, There is a significant difference in the sensation seeking between male and female respondents is retained.

Objectives 2:

To find out the level of sensation seeking among UG and PG students.

Hypothesis 2:

There will be a significant difference in the sensation seeking between UG and PG respondents.

TABLE – 4.9

The influence of Education Qualification among the college students on their Sensation seeking

	SENSATION SEEKING		TOTAL
	LOW	AVERAGE	
UG	10	46	56
PG	4	40	44
TOTAL	14	86	100

CHI SQUARE TEST

	VALUE	df	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON CHI SQUARE	1.573	1	0.256

INTERPRETATION

From the above table the chi square value is 1.573 and Significance level is 0.256 ($P > 0.05$) and this shows there is a no significant different between UG and PG students on the level of sensation seeking. Hence the hypothesis, There will be a significant difference in the sensation seeking between UG and PG respondents is rejected.

Objectives 3:

To find out the level of sensation seeking among respondents with siblings.

Hypothesis 3:

There will be a significant difference in the sensation seeking among respondents who have siblings.

TABLE – 4.10

The influence of Siblings among the college students on their Sensation seeking

	SENSATION SEEKING		TOTAL
	LOW	AVERAGE	
ONLY CHILD	0	11	11
1 SIBLING	12	47	59
2 AND ABOVE SIBLING	2	28	30
TOTAL	14	86	100

CHI SQUARE TEST

	VALUE	Df	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON CHI SQUARE	5.100	2	0.078

INTERPRETATION

From the above table the chi square value is 5.100 and Significance level is 0.078 ($P > 0.05$) and this shows there is a no significant difference between respondents as Only child, with 1 sibling and with two or more siblings on the level of sensation seeking. Hence the hypothesis, There will be a significant difference in the sensation seeking among respondents who have siblings is rejected.

Sensation Seeking, Risk Taking Behaviour and Self Efficacy among Young Adults

Objectives 4:

To find out the level of sensation seeking among rural and urban respondents.

Hypothesis 4:

There will be a significant difference in the sensation among respondents who are living in rural and urban area.

TABLE – 4.11

The influence of Residential Area among the college students on their Sensation seeking

	SENSATION SEEKING		TOTAL
	LOW	AVERAGE	
RURAL	4	36	56
URBAN	10	50	60
TOTAL	14	86	100

CHI SQUARE TEST

	VALUE	Df	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON CHI SQUARE	0.886	1	0.395

INTERPRETATION

From the above table the chi square value is 0.886 and Significance level is 0.395 ($P > 0.05$) and this shows there is a no significant difference between rural and urban on the level of sensation seeking. Hence the hypothesis, There will be a significant difference in the sensation among respondents who are living in rural and urban area is rejected.

Objectives 5:

To find out the level of risk taking behaviour among male and female respondents.

Hypothesis 5:

There will be a significant difference in the risk taking behaviour between male and female respondents.

TABLE – 4.12

The influence of Gender among the college students on their Risk taking behaviour

	RISK TAKING BEHAVIOUR			TOTAL
	LOW	AVERAGE	HIGH	
MALE	2	42	8	52
FEMALE	12	34	2	48
TOTAL	14	76	10	100

CHI SQUARE TEST

	VALUE	DF	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON CHI SQUARE	11.443	1	0.003

INTERPRETATION

From the above table the chi square value is 11.443 and Significance level is 0.003 ($P < 0.05$) and this shows there is a significant difference between males and females on the level of risk

Sensation Seeking, Risk Taking Behaviour and Self Efficacy among Young Adults

taking. Hence the hypothesis, There will be a significant difference in the risk taking behaviour between male and female respondents is retained.

Objectives 6:

To find out the level of risk taking behaviour among UG and PG students.

Hypothesis 6:

There will be a significant difference in the risk taking behaviour between UG and PG respondents.

TABLE – 4.13

The influence of Education Level among the college students on their Risk taking behaviour

	RISK TAKING BEHAVIOUR			TOTAL
	LOW	AVERAGE	HIGH	
UG	12	36	8	56
PG	2	40	2	44
TOTAL	14	76	10	100

CHI SQUARE TEST

	VALUE	DF	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON CHI SQUARE	9.652	2	0.008

INTERPRETATION

From the above table the chi square value is 9.652 and Significance level is 0.008 ($P < 0.05$) and this shows there is a significance different between UG and PG students on the level of risk taking. Hence the hypothesis, There will be a significant difference in the risk taking behaviour between UG and PG respondents is retained.

Objectives 7:

To find out the level of risk taking behaviour among respondents with siblings.

Hypothesis 7:

There will be a significant difference in the sensation seeking among respondents who have siblings.

TABLE – 4.14

The influence of Siblings among the college students on their Risk taking behaviour

	RISK TAKING BEHAVIOUR			TOTAL
	LOW	AVERAGE	HIGH	
ONLY CHILD	0	9	2	11
1 SIBLING	6	47	6	59
2 AND ABOVE SIBLI	8	20	2	30
TOTAL	14	76	10	100

CHI SQUARE TEST

	VALUE	DF	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON CHI SQUARE	7.165	4	0.127

INTERPRETATION

From the above table the chi square value is 7.165 and Significance level is 0.127 ($P > 0.05$) and this shows there is a no significant difference between respondents as Only child, with 1 sibling and with two or more siblings on the level of risk taking. Hence the hypothesis, There will be a significant difference in the sensation seeking among respondents who have siblings is rejected.

Objectives 8:

To find out the level of risk taking behaviour among rural and urban respondents.

Hypothesis 8:

There will be a significant difference in the risk taking behaviour between respondents who live in rural and urban area.

TABLE – 4.15

The influence of Residential Area among the college students on their Risk taking behaviour

	RISK TAKING BEHAVIOUR			TOTAL
	LOW	AVERAGE	HIGH	
RURAL	4	32	4	40
URBAN	10	44	6	60
TOTAL	14	76	10	100

CHI SQUARE TEST

	VALUE	DF	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON CHI SQUARE	0.902	2	0.637

INTERPRETATION

From the above table the chi square value is 0.902 and Significance level is 0.637 ($P > 0.05$) and this shows there is a no significant difference between rural and urban on the level of risk taking. Hence the hypothesis, There will be a significant difference in the risk taking behaviour between respondents who live in rural and urban area is rejected.

Objectives 9:

To find out the level of self-efficacy among male and female respondents.

Hypothesis 9:

There is a significant difference in the self-efficacy between male and female respondents.

TABLE – 4.16

The influence of Gender among the college students on their Self Efficacy

	SELF EFFICACY		TOTAL
	AVERAGE	HIGH	
MALE	22	30	52
FEMALE	23	25	48
TOTAL	45	55	100

CHI SQUARE TEST

	VALUE	DF	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON CHI SQUARE	0.317	1	0.688

INTERPRETATION

From the above table the chi square value is 0.317 and Significance level is 0.688 ($P > 0.05$) and this shows there is a no significant difference between males and females on the level of self-efficacy. Hence the hypothesis, There is a significant difference in the self-efficacy between male and female respondents is rejected.

Objectives 10:

To find out the level of self-efficacy among UG and PG students.

Hypothesis 10:

There will be a significant difference in self-efficacy of UG and PG respondents.

TABLE – 4.17

SELF EFFICACY – EDUCATION

The influence of Education Level among the college students on their Self Efficacy

	SELF EFFICACY		TOTAL
	AVERAGE	HIGH	
UG	34	22	56
PG	11	33	44
TOTAL	45	55	100

CHI SQUARE TEST

	VALUE	DF	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON CHI SQUARE	12.698	1	0.001

INTERPRETATION

From the above table the chi square value is 12.698 and Significance level is 0.000 ($P < 0.05$) and this shows there is a significant difference between UG and PG students on the level of self-efficacy. Hence the hypothesis, There will be a significant difference in self-efficacy of UG and PG respondents is retained.

Objectives 11:

To find out the level of self-efficacy among respondents with siblings

Hypothesis 11:

There will be a significant difference on the self-efficacy among respondents who have siblings.

TABLE – 4.18

The influence of Siblings among the college students on their Self Efficacy

	SELF EFFICACY		TOTAL
	AVERAGE	HIGH	
ONLY CHILD	8	3	11
1 SIBLING	27	32	59
2 AND ABOVE SIBLING	10	20	30
TOTAL	45	55	100

CHI SQUARE TEST

	VALUE	DF	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON CHI SQUARE	5.081	2	0.079

INTERPRETATION

From the above table the chi square value is 5.081 and Significance level is 0.079 ($P > 0.05$) and this shows there is a no significant difference between respondents as Only child, with 1 sibling and with two or more siblings on the level of self-efficacy. Hence the hypothesis, There will be a significant difference on the self-efficacy among respondents who have siblings is rejected.

Objectives 12:

To find out the level of self-efficacy among respondents who are living in rural and urban area.

Hypothesis 12:

There will be significant difference among respondents who are living in rural and urban area.

TABLE – 4.19

The influence of Residential Area among the college students on their Self Efficacy

	SELF EFFICACY		TOTAL
	AVERAGE	HIGH	
RURAL	20	20	40
URBAN	25	35	60
TOTAL	45	55	100

CHI SQUARE TEST

	VALUE	DF	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON CHI SQUARE	0.673	1	0.421

INTERPRETATION

From the above table the chi square value is 0.673 and Significance level is 0.421 ($P > 0.05$) and this shows there is a no significant difference between rural and urban on the level of self-efficacy. Hence the hypothesis, There will be significant difference among respondents who are living in rural and urban area is rejected.

Objectives 13:

To find out the relationship among sensation seeking, risk taking behaviour and self-efficacy.

Hypothesis 13:

There will be a positive relationship between sensation seeking, risk taking behaviour and self-efficacy.

Sensation Seeking, Risk Taking Behaviour and Self Efficacy among Young Adults

TABLE – 4.20

Relationship between sensation seeking, Risk taking behaviour and Self efficacy among college students.

	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
Sensation seeking	17.72	4.96
Risk taking behaviour	119.6	24.3
Self-efficacy	30.6	4.08

Relationship between sensation seeking, Risk taking behaviour and Self efficacy among college students.

		SENSATION SEEKING	RISK TAKING	SELF EFFICACY
SENSATION SEEKING	PEARSON CORRELATION	1	0.439	0.330
	SIG. (2 TAILED)		0.000	0.001
	N	100	100	100
RISK TAKING	PEARSON CORRELATION	0.439	1	0.173
	SIG. (2 TAILED)	0.000		0.085
	N	100	100	100
SELF EFFICACY	PEARSON CORRELATION	0.330	0.173	1
	SIG. (2 TAILED)	0.001	0.085	
	N	100	100	100

INTERPRETATION

On analysing the table, the mean and standard deviation of sensation seeking is 17.72 and 4.96, the mean and standard deviation of risk taking behaviour is 119.6 and 24.3, the mean and standard deviation of self-efficacy is 30.6 and 4.08.

The correlation value between sensation seeking and risk taking behaviour is 0.439. This is a positive correlation showing high in sensation seeking leads to high in risk taking behaviour.

The correlation value between sensation seeking and self-efficacy is 0.330. This is a positive correlation showing high in sensation seeking results in high self-efficacy.

The correlation value between risk taking behaviour and self-efficacy is 0.173. Although technically a positive correlation, the relation between risk taking and self-efficacy is weak (the nearer the value is to 0, the weaker the relation).

Hence the hypothesis, There will be a positive relationship between sensation seeking, risk taking behaviour and self-efficacy is retained.

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

In this previous chapter the results of the data analysis was presented in tabulations along with discussion of the obtained results. In the present chapter the summary of study, the findings and the conclusion drawn are presented. It is followed by the suggestions for further research.

Sensation Seeking, Risk Taking Behaviour and Self Efficacy among Young Adults

The purpose of this research was to study the sensation seeking, risk taking behaviour and self-efficacy of young adults. Specifically, this study sought to determine the following:-

- The relationship between sensation seeking, risk taking behaviour and self-efficacy of young adults.
- Impact of the demographic variables such as gender, education, siblings and residential area of the sample switched on each study variable.

A sample size is 100 (50 males and 50 females) in the age group of 20 - 25 years was selected for the present study, from various colleges of Coimbatore District, Tamil Nadu. A sample of hundred were selected using a non-probability sampling method called convenience sampling.

To determine sensation seeking, the Sensation Seeking Scale V is used. This tool was designed by Martin Zuckerman in the year 1964. This scale consists of 40 items with two alternatives each. This is a forced choice questionnaire.

To determine risk taking behaviour, the tool DOSPERT scale is used. This tool was designed by Weber, Blais and Betz in the year 2002. The risk taking scale consists of 30 item version of the revised DOSPERT scale with five domains (ethical, financial, health/safety, social and recreational risks) using a 7 point rating scale.

To determine Self-efficacy, the general self-efficacy scale is used. This tool was designed by Schwarzer, r & Jerusalem, M in the year 1995. This scale consists of 10 items with four point rating scale.

Hypotheses of the study

The following hypotheses were developed for the research study.

- H₁ There will be a significant difference in the sensation seeking between male and female respondents.
- H₂ There will be a significant difference in the sensation seeking between UG and PG respondents.
- H₃ There will be a significant difference in the sensation seeking between respondents who have siblings.
- H₄ There will be a significant difference in the sensation seeking between respondents who live in rural and urban area.
- H₅ There will be a significant difference in the risk taking behaviour between male and female respondents.
- H₆ There will be a significant difference in the risk taking behaviour between UG and PG respondents.
- H₇ There will be a significant difference in the risk taking behaviour between respondents who have siblings.
- H₈ There will be a significant difference in the risk taking behaviour between respondents who live in rural and urban area.
- H₉ There will be a significant difference in the self-efficacy between male and female respondents.
- H₁₀ There will be a significant difference in the self-efficacy between UG and PG respondents.
- H₁₁ There will be a significant difference in the self-efficacy between respondents who have siblings.

Sensation Seeking, Risk Taking Behaviour and Self Efficacy among Young Adults

- H₁₂ There will be a significant difference in self-efficacy between respondents who live in rural and urban area.
- H₁₃ There is a positive relationship between sensation seeking, risk taking behaviour and self-efficacy

OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS

- There is a significant difference between males and females on the level of sensation seeking.
- There is a no significant different between UG and PG students on the level of sensation seeking.
- There is a no significant difference between respondents as Only child, with 1 sibling and with two or more siblings on the level of sensation seeking.
- There is a no significant difference between rural and urban on the level of sensation seeking.
- There is a significant difference between males and females on the level of risk taking.
- There is a significance different between UG and PG students on the level of risk taking.
- There is a no significant difference between respondents as Only child, with 1 sibling and with two or more siblings on the level of risk taking.
- There is a no significant difference between rural and urban on the level of risk taking.
- There is a no significant difference between males and females on the level of self-efficacy.
- There is a significant difference between UG and PG students on the level of self-efficacy.
- There is a no significant difference between respondents as Only child, with 1 sibling and with two or more siblings on the level of self-efficacy.
- There is a no significant difference between rural and urban on the level of self-efficacy.
- There is a positive correlation showing high in sensation seeking leads to high in risk taking behaviour.
- There is a positive correlation showing high in sensation seeking results in high self-efficacy.
- Although technically a positive correlation, the relationship between risk taking and self-efficacy is weak.

CONCLUSION

In the present investigation, an attempt was made to find out the relationship between sensation seeking, risk taking behaviour and self-efficacy. The study was conducted with an extensive review of literature to establish the hypotheses to carry out the study. . It was found in this study that there is a positive relationship between these variables. Gender differences in sensation seeking and risk taking behaviour were found significant. The hypotheses of the educational difference in risk taking behaviour and self-efficacy were found significant. There is a positive relationship between sensation seeking and risk taking behaviour and sensation seeking and self-efficacy. There is no correlation between risk taking behaviour and self-efficacy. The study was carried out with an assumption that demographic variables will influence each of the variables of the study in question. It was found that,

except the demographic variables siblings and residence, gender and educational qualification alone influences the variations in sensation seeking, risk taking behaviour and self-efficacy.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

- Data was collected from Government arts college, GRD college of arts and science and Sri Krishna college of arts and science in Coimbatore, and the generalization of the present study result is limited.
- Data was collected only from college going students.
- Only descriptive study was carried out on the sample.
- Comparative study on engineering students, medical students and law students could have been carried out.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

- The study can be replicated taking the samples from young adults of different fields to have more reliable and valid conclusions.
- The future study can be done in various countries for broad comparative research and more Indian studies are expected.
- These scales can be studied further with multiple psychological aspects and factors.

REFERENCES

- Archer J. Does sexual selection explain human sex differences in aggression? *Behav. Brain Sci.* 32, 249–266 (2009).
- Buss D. M. How can evolutionary psychology successfully explain personality and individual differences? *Psych. Sci.* 4, 359–366 (2009).
- Cichalski R. L. & Shackelford T. K. Evolutionary personality psychology: reconciling human nature and individual differences. *Pers. Individ. Diff.* 48, 509–516 (2010).
- Cickett M. W., Dawkins M. P. & Braddock J. H. Race and gender equity in sports: have white and African American females benefited equally from Title IX? *Am. Behav. Sci.* 56, 1581–1603 (2012).
- Cippa R. A. Sex differences in sex drive, sociosexuality, and height across 53 nations: testing evolutionary and social structural theories. *Arch. Sex. Behav.* 38, 631–651 (2009).
- Cohmitt D. P., Realo A., Voracek M. & Allik J. Why can't a man be more like a woman? Sex differences in big five personality traits across 55 cultures. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 94, 168–182 (2008).
- Cross C. P. & Campbell A. Women's aggression. *Aggress. Viol. Behav.* 16, 390–398 (2011).
- Cross C. P., Copping L. T. & Campbell A. Sex differences in impulsivity: a meta-analysis. *Psych. Bull.* 137, 97–130 (2011).
- Datharine P. Cross, De-Laine M. Cyrenne and Gillian R. Brown (2013), Sex differences in sensation-seeking: a meta-analysis.
- Drown G. R., Dickins T. E., Sear R. & Laland K. N. Evolutionary accounts of human behavioural diversity. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc, B* 366, 313–24 (2011).
- Drown G. R., Laland K. N. & Mulder M. B. Bateman's principles and human sex roles. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 24, 297–304 (2009)
- Earmorstein NR. Associations between dispositions to rash action and internalizing and externalizing symptoms in children. *J Clin Child Adolesc Psychol.* 2013;42(1):131–8.

Sensation Seeking, Risk Taking Behaviour and Self Efficacy among Young Adults

- Eayle R. Byck, Greg Swann, Benjamin Schalet, John Bolland & Brian Mustanski (2015), sensation seeking predicting growth in adolescent problem behaviours, *child psychiatry hum dev* 2015 june; 46(3); 466-473
- Etautz K, Cooper A. Impulsivity-related personality traits and adolescent alcohol use: A meta-analytic review. *Clinical Psychology Review*. 2013;33(4):574–592.
- Faynak O, et al. Relationships among parental monitoring and sensation seeking on the development of substance use disorder among college students. *Addict Behav*. 2013;38(1):1457–63.
- Fuinn PD, Harden KP. Differential changes in impulsivity and sensation seeking and the escalation of substance use from adolescence to early adulthood. *Dev Psychopathol*.
- Galmberg M, et al. Do substance use risk personality dimensions predict the onset of substance use in early adolescence? A variable- and person-centered approach. *J Youth Adolesc*. 2012;41(11):1512–25.
- Gunnar Breivik, Trond Svela Sand, Anders McD Sookermany (2019) Risk-Taking and Sensation Seeking in Military Contexts
- Halmberg M, et al. Substance use risk profiles and associations with early substance use in adolescence. *J Behav Med*. 2010;33(6):474–85.
- Iastellanos-Ryan N, Conrod PJ. Personality correlates of the common and unique variance across conduct disorder and substance misuse symptoms in adolescence. *J Abnorm Child Psychol*. 2011;39(4):563–76.
- JacPherson L, et al. Changes in sensation seeking and risk-taking propensity predict increases in alcohol use among early adolescents. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res*. 2010;34(8):1400–8.
- Peremy John Schweitzer (2011), Sensation seeking, message sensation value and sexual risk taking: Implications for teen pregnancy prevention campaigns.
- Tames b. hittner, emmalee c. owens, Rhonda j. swickert (2016), influence of social settings on risky sexual behavior.
- Tina S. Mounts (Jun 09, 2015), Why Are Teen Brains Designed for Risk-taking?
- Tva Lerner, Bernhard Streicher, Rainer Sachs (2016), the effect of abstract and concrete thinking on risk taking behavior in women and men.
- Xrika Melonashi, Fleura Shkemi (2015), A Predictive Model for Physical Activity, Healthy Eating, Alcohol Drinking, and Risky Driving Among Albanian Youth, 3rd edition 443-456.
- Zuckerman, M. 1969. Theoretical formulations: 1. In *Sensory deprivation: Fifteen years of research*. Edited by J. P. Zubek, 407–432. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Acknowledgment

The author appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

Conflict of Interest

The authors carefully declare this paper to bear not a conflict of interests

How to cite this article: J.Jerus Albert Britto. J.A, , Selvaraj. B, Janani. (2019). Sensation Seeking, Risk Taking Behaviour and Self Efficacy among Young Adults. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 7(2), 983-1004. DIP:18.01.118/20190702, DOI:10.25215/0702.118