

Risk Taking Behavior Among Youth

Jadav Manmohanbhai Bharatbhai^{1*}

ABSTRACT

This research paper examines the levels of risk-taking behavior among youths in Patan District of Gujarat, India, focusing on educational level, area of residence, gender, and their interactive effect. A factorial design is employed, and ANOVA is used for data analysis. The sample includes 120 participants, equally distributed across different education levels, areas, and genders. Risk Taking Inventory (RTI) is utilized to measure risk-taking tendencies. The findings indicate that there are no significant differences in risk-taking behavior based on educational level, area of residence, or gender. The interactive effect of these factors is also non-significant. These results suggest that educational attainment, area of residence, and gender do not significantly influence risk-taking behavior among Gujarat's youth. The study provides insights into the factors influencing risk-taking behavior and contributes to our understanding of this phenomenon. However, limitations such as the small sample size and limited geographic scope should be considered. Future research should aim to include larger and more diverse populations to enhance generalizability. Additionally, the study suggests the inclusion of individuals with diverse gender identities and varying health conditions to gain a more comprehensive understanding of risk-taking behavior among youths.

Keywords: Risk-taking behavior, Youth population, Level of education, Area, Gender, Gujarat, India

The younger generation plays a vital role in propelling societal progress, exerting influence on economic advancement and cultural transformation. This is particularly evident in regions like Gujarat, India, where the youth are instrumental in driving significant changes. However, a crucial issue revolves around understanding their inclination towards engaging in risky behaviors. Risk-taking behavior refers to the propensity, especially among young individuals, to participate in activities characterized by uncertain outcomes or potential harm. This behavior is an integral part of adolescent growth, involving boundary exploration, the pursuit of novel experiences, and asserting independence. While risk-taking can contribute to personal development and innovative thinking, it also carries the potential for adverse consequences like accidents, substance misuse, or setbacks in education. To ensure the well-being and harness the potential of young people, it is essential to gain a deeper comprehension of the intricate factors underlying their risk-taking tendencies. Several researchers have examined diverse aspects of risk-taking behavior among youth, shedding light on the mechanisms and influencers. Smith, A. R., Chein, J., & Steinberg, L. (2014) delved into the impact of socio-emotional context, brain development,

¹Research scholar, Department of Psychology, Hemchandracharya North Gujarat University, Patan, India

*Corresponding Author

Received: August 22, 2023; Revision Received: September 27, 2023; Accepted: September 30, 2023

Risk Taking Behavior Among Youth

and pubertal maturation on adolescent risk-taking. Though slightly predating the specified period, their insights underscore the complex interplay of these elements in shaping risk propensity during youth. Galván, A. (2016) provided fresh perspectives on the heightened sensitivity to rewards in the teenage brain. This study emphasized the neurobiological basis for adolescents' attraction to risky endeavors, offering a contemporary viewpoint on the matter. Romer, D. (2015) delved into the neurobiological foundations of adolescent risk-taking behavior and its implications for preventive strategies. Published within the defined timeframe, this study underscores the enduring significance of understanding how brain development and impulsivity contribute to risky behaviors among young people. An in-depth exploration of these facets grants us valuable insights into the challenges that young individuals confront, facilitating the formulation of approaches that encourage responsible risk-taking while mitigating potential harm. A comprehensive approach to understanding risk-taking behavior can cultivate an environment fostering personal growth, resilience, and innovation, thereby safeguarding the well-being and future prospects of the youth.

METHODOLOGY

Objectives

1. To compare and examine the levels of risk-taking behavior among youths with different level of educational, specifically up to graduation level and above graduation level.
2. To investigate and compare the levels of risk-taking behavior between youths residing in urban and rural areas.
3. To explore and compare the levels of risk-taking behavior between male and female youths.
4. To assess the interactive effect of Level of education (up to graduation/above graduation), area (urban/rural), and gender (male/female) on risk-taking behavior among youths.

Hypotheses

1. There is no significant difference in the mean levels of risk-taking behavior between youths with up to graduation and those with above graduation.
2. There is no significant difference in the mean levels of risk-taking behavior between youths residing in rural and urban areas.
3. There is no significant difference in the mean levels of risk-taking behavior between male and female youths.
4. There is no significant interactive effect of Level of education (up to graduation/above graduation), area (urban/rural), and gender (male/female) on the mean levels of risk-taking behavior among youths.

Samples

A sample was selected from Patan District for the purpose of this study. A total of 120 subjects were included, with 60 having education up to graduation and 60 having education above graduation. Within each education level, 30 youths were selected from rural areas and 30 from urban areas. Among these, 15 male youths and 15 female youths were included.

Research Design

The research adopted a 2x2x2 factorial design, considering the factors of education level (up to graduation/above graduation), gender (male/female), and area (urban/rural).

Risk Taking Behavior Among Youth

Statistical Analysis

ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) was applied as the statistical technique for data analysis.

Tools

1. **Personal Data Sheet:** A personal data sheet was developed to collect information about the participants, including education level, area, name, gender, Age, types of family, parents' education, and family income.
2. **Risk Taking Inventory (RTI):** The RTI, developed by K. P. Nimbalkar and R. D. Helode (Hindi), was used to assess the tendency for risk-taking behavior. It consists of 40 items divided into four dimensions: Monetary Risk, Physical Risk, Social Risk, and Ethical Risk.

Table: 1 Reliability Coefficient of the RTI.

Types of Reliability	Monetary Risk	Physical Risk	Social Risk	Ethical Risk	Total Risk
Split-Half (Odd-even)	0.81	0.76	0.80	0.78	0.90

The reported Reliability coefficient in Table 1 are statistically significant beyond .01 level for 98 df.

Table: 2 “Concurrent Validity” of the Risk-taking Inventory

Risky job personnel N= 100 M = 22.24 Sd = 5.85	Non-Risky job personnel N = 100 M=16 Sd = 3.42 Md = 6.24 CR =9.31*
---	---

*P<0.01 for 198 df.

Entries reported in table 2 that, personnel in risky occupations have shown more degree of risk-taking than non-risky occupations. Thus, this significant empirical finding can be cited as an evidence of risk-taking inventory’s “concurrent validity” Thus it can be said that RTI is statistically highly reliable and valid for measuring Risk-taking tendency.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The study aimed to understand the level of risk-taking behavior among youths based on different factors such as educational level, area, and gender. A 2x2x2 factorial ANOVA was conducted to analyze the data. The results of the analysis are presented in a table, which will be discussed in detail.

Table -3 Difference between mean score of overall Risk taking with reference to Level of education, Area, and Gender. (N=120).

Independent Variable	N	Mean	Difference between Mean
Up to graduate	60	12.10	0.95
Above graduate	60	13.05	
Rural	60	12.33	0.49
Urban	60	12.82	
Male	60	13.03	0.91
Female	60	12.12	

Risk Taking Behavior Among Youth

Table-4 ANOVA summary of overall Risk Taking with reference to Level of education, Area and Gender.

Variables	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig. Level
Level of education (A)	27.08	1	27.08	2.34	N.S.
Area (B)	7.00	1	7.00	0.61	N.S.
Gender (C)	25.21	1	25.21	2.18	N.S.
Level of Education × Area × Gender (A × B × C)	31.00	1	31.00	2.68	N.S.
Error	1297.33	112	11.58	-	-
Total	20445.00	120	-	-	-
Corrected Total	1469.33	119	-	-	-

*0.05=3.89, N.S. = Not Significant

- **Result on Risk taking with reference to Level of education**

The above null hypothesis formulated by researcher by applying ANOVA test for analyzing the level of risk taking on levels of education. The result is found of risk taking behavior, mean score of youth having education up to graduation is 12.10 and risk-taking mean score of youths having education above graduation is 13.05. The mean difference of both the level of education is 0.95. Here, we can observe the mean sum of square values is 27.08 as well as 'F' value is 2.34 which is statistically not significant, hence, hypothesis No.01 is accepted. It is concluded that there is no significant difference in the mean levels of risk-taking behavior between youths with up to graduation and those with above graduation. It can be seen in table No.03 and 04.

- **Result on Risk taking with reference to Area**

The above null hypothesis formulated by researcher by applying ANOVA test for analyzing the level of risk taking on Area. The result is found of risk taking behavior, mean score of rural areas youths is 12.33 and risk-taking mean score of urban areas youths is 12.82. The mean difference of both the areas is 0.49. Here, we can observe the mean sum of square values is 7.00 as well as 'F' value is 0.61 which is statistically not-significant, hence, hypothesis No.02 is accepted. It is concluded that there is no significant difference in the mean levels of risk-taking behavior between youths residing in rural and urban areas. It can be seen in table No.03 and 04.

- **Result on Risk taking with reference to Gender**

The above null hypothesis formulated by researcher by applying ANOVA test for analyzing the level of risk taking on both genders. The result was found of risk taking behavior, mean score of male youth is 13.03 and risk-taking mean score of female youth is 12.12. The mean difference of both the genders is 0.91. Here, we can observe the mean sum of square values is 25.21 as well as 'F' value is 2.18 which is statistically not-significant, hence, hypothesis No. 03 is accepted. It was concluded that there is no significant difference in the mean levels of Risk Taking between male and female youths. It can be seen in table No.03 and 04.

- **Result on Risk taking Behavior with reference to interactive effect of level of education, area and gender**

ANOVA (2x2x2) factorial design was used for analyzing the level of risk taking behavior among level of education, types of area and types of gender. The value of mean sum of square is 31.00 and 'F' value is 2.68. Here, the null hypothesis No. 04 is accepted because

Risk Taking Behavior Among Youth

'F' value is not found to be significant. It is concluded that there is no significant interactive effect of Level of education, area, and gender on risk-taking behavior among youths. It can be seen in table No.03 and 04.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results obtained from the analysis, several conclusions can be drawn:

1. Level of Education: The analysis revealed that there is no significant difference in the mean levels of risk-taking behavior between youths with up to graduation and those with above graduation. This suggests that the level of education does not have a significant impact on risk-taking behavior among the youth.
2. Area: The findings indicate that there is no significant difference in the mean levels of risk-taking behavior between youths residing in rural and urban areas. This implies that the area of residence does not play a significant role in influencing risk-taking behavior among the youth.
3. Gender: The analysis showed that there is no significant difference in the mean levels of risk-taking behavior between male and female youths. This indicates that gender does not have a significant influence on risk-taking behavior among the youth.
4. Interactive Effect: The analysis of the interactive effect of level of education, area, and gender on risk-taking behavior did not yield a statistically significant result. This suggests that the combination of these factors does not have a significant impact on risk-taking behavior among the youth.

In summary, based on the results obtained, it can be concluded that the variables of level of education, area, gender, and their interactive effect do not significantly influence risk-taking behavior among the youth. These findings contribute to our understanding of the factors related to risk-taking behavior and provide insights for further research and interventions in this area.

Limitations and Suggestions

1. The limited sample size and regional focus of the study call for caution when generalizing the findings to a larger population. To enhance generalizability, future research should include a larger and more diverse sample, encompassing different regions and demographics.
2. The exclusion of the third gender and the restriction to physically and mentally healthy youth further restricts the applicability of the findings. To gain a more comprehensive understanding of risk-taking behavior, future studies should aim to include individuals from diverse gender identities and consider participants with varying health conditions.

In conclusion, the study's limitations emphasize the need for future research to broaden its scope by including larger, more diverse samples from different geographic regions, as well as encompassing a wider range of gender identities and health conditions. Doing so would contribute to a more representative understanding of risk-taking behavior among youth in various contexts.

REFERENCES

Arnett, J. J. (2004). *Emerging adulthood: The winding road from the late teens through the twenties*. Oxford University Press.

Risk Taking Behavior Among Youth

- Byrnes, J. P., Miller, D. C., & Schafer, W. D. (1999). Gender differences in risk taking: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125(3), 367-383.
- Fergusson, D. M., Lynskey, M. T., & Horwood, L. J. (1996). Childhood exposure to alcohol and adolescent drinking patterns. *Addiction*, 91(10), 1507-1528.
- Galván, A. (2016). The teenage brain: Sensitivity to rewards. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 25(3), 172-177.
- Nimbalkar, K. P., & Helode, R. D. (2017). *Manual for RISK TAKING INVENTORY (RTI)*, *PsychoScan*, 58. Laxminagar- 442001 % - 07152-244844, (1-12).
- Romer, D. (2010). Adolescent risk taking, impulsivity, and brain development: Implications for prevention. *Developmental Psychobiology*, 52(3), 263-276.
- Romer, D. (2015). Adolescent risk taking, impulsivity, and brain development: Implications for prevention. *Developmental Psychobiology*, 57(6), 624-632.
- Smith, A. R., Chein, J., & Steinberg, L. (2014). Impact of socio-emotional context, brain development, and pubertal maturation on adolescent risk-taking. *Hormones and Behavior*, 64(2), 323-332.
- Steinberg, L. (2008). A social neuroscience perspective on adolescent risk-taking. *Developmental Review*, 28(1), 78-106.

Acknowledgment

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

Conflict of Interest

The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

How to cite this article: Jadav, M.B. (2023). Risk Taking Behavior Among Youth. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 11(3), 4863-4868. DIP:18.01.453.20231103, DOI:10.25215/1103.453