# RISK TAKING BEHAVIOUR AND CREATIVITY AMONG THE HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

DR.C.SUBBULAKSHMI Assistant Professor Women's Studies Centre Madurai Kamaraj University Madurai-625 021

#### **Abstract**

The nineteenth century was the age where stress was simply laid on the concept of '3 Rs' Subsequently, the twentieth century reflected towards the promotion of intelligence and competence along with development of skill. The recent 21st century has made a man very busy achieving his ultimate objectives of securing a job in the era of competitions and exerting more and more for acquiring knowledge from various sources. In doing such type of activities involving competitions and to reaching to the targetsachieved or unachieved, various types of intervening factors come into play. Such factors often hinder the progress in the children and the human beings.

**Keywords**: Risk taking behaviour, Creativity and High school teachers

#### Introduction

Creativity is viewed in terms of problem solving behavior. Researches in the area have shown that most create subjects pick up the unformulated problems and they themselves formulate them into integrative harmonious whole that leads to productive solutions, etc. These people themselves make the task challenging and lead a creative life characterized by 'originality', 'uniqueness' and 'imaginativeness'. Thus, creative thinking as a problem solving behavior depend much on tremendous amount of previously acquired knowledge (Gagne, 1970). It is a form of thought process which are directed towards discovering something new, novel, unusual and characterized by originality.

The term risk-taking behavior has been used to link, conceptually, a number of potentially healthdamaging behaviors including, among others, substance use, precocious or risky behavior, delinquency etc. The behaviors are considered risk- taking because of their initiation include premature sexual behavior or alcohol/other substance use. The linkages of these behaviors under a single domain are theoretically useful as it allows for the investigation of particular behavior in the context of other behaviors. Inherent in the term risky taking behaviors is the notion that the behaviors are volitional, that there is some conscious weighing of alternative courses of action. Psychological theories of risk-taking behavior examines the role of cognitive ability, personality traits, and dispositional characteristics such as self-esteem, self-efficacy etc. in risk-taking behavior. Cognitive factors such as risk perception, decisionmaking and Psychological factors contribute to risk-taking behavior. Social cognitive theory provides a useful framework for understanding how determinants of behavior operate together to explain actions (Bandura, 1986, 1997). According to the theory, self-efficacy, one's beliefs in capabilities to meet specific performance attainments, is part of the self-regulatory aspect of behavior. Behavior is dependent on one's efficacy beliefs, which determine which behaviors one chooses to perform, the degree of perseverance, and the quality of the performance.

#### **Need for the Study**

Creativity is that characteristic of human behaviour that seems to be the most mysterious and yet most critical to human advancement. It is the capacity to solve problems in a new ways and to produce works that are novel, appropriate and socially valued. (Simonton, 2000) Creativity uses cognitive process

like recognition, reasoning and understanding and it is a state of mind which can be learned. A wide review of research indicates that creativity is associated with student success in the areas of academic study. So creativity has to be considered as the key factor for the development of personal, academic and social competencies (European Commission, 2008). In this global era schools have a greater responsibility than even before to help the students to develop their emotional competencies and creativity to succeed in all walks of life.

Social or environmental models of risk-taking behavior look at the roles of peers, parents, family structure and function, and institutions (school/college or church) in risk-taking behaviors. These theories examine how social/environmental contexts provide models, opportunities and reinforcements for young people to engage in risk-taking behaviors. Risk factors for drug use, alcohol use include social pressures from peers, family, media as well as internal pressures, perceived use by peers, peer approval of drug use, low family pride and the youth's general willingness to engage in non-normative behavior. So the present study intends to measure torisk taking behaviour and creativity among the high school students which is entitled the present study, "RISK TAKING BEHAVIOUR AND CREATIVITY AMONG THE HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

# Variables of the Study

# **Dependent Variable:**

- 1. Risk taking behaviour
- 2. Creativity

# **Independent Variables:**

: Male / Female 1. Gender 2. Nativity : Rural / Urban 3. Family type : Joint / Nuclear 4. School kind : Government / Private

#### **Objectives of the Study**

- 1. To measure the level of risk taking behaviour among the high school students.
- 2. To find out the significant influence of select independent variables on dependent variable risk taking behaviour among the high school students.
- 3. To measure the level of creativity among the high school students.
- 4. To find out the significant influence of select independent variables on dependent variable creativity among the high school students.
- 5. Risk taking behaviour and creativity are significantly correlated.

# **Hypotheses of the Study**

- 1. Each of the population variables involved in the study exerts a significant influence on risk taking behaviour among the high school students.
- 2. Each of the population variables involved in the study exerts a significant influence on creativity among the high school students.
- 3. There is a positive relationship between Risk taking behaviour and creativity.

#### **Methodology-In-Brief**

: Descriptive; Method : Normative; Technique Design : Survey

**Sample of the Study:** 

A stratified representative sample of 180 students constituted from six schools recognized by the Department of School Education, Tamil Nadu situated in Madurai District with due representation given to the population variables.

#### **Tools used:**

The following tools were used by the investigator for the data collection:

- 1. General Information Sheet developed by the Investigator.
- 2. Risk taking behaviour Inventory developed by Subbulakshmi, C. (2015).
- 3. Creativity Scale developed by Subbulakshmi, C. (2016).

#### **Statistical Treatments:**

't'- test for significance of difference between the means of large independent samples.

# **Analysis and Discussion**

# Risk taking behaviour among the high school students

The average score of the Risk taking behaviour among the high school students is found to be 15.40, while the theoretical average is 13. This shows that the Risk taking behaviour among the high school students is above the average level.

Table 1: The results of tests of significance of difference between the mean scores of Risk taking behaviour among the high school students are presented in Table -1:

| Variable | Sub-category | N   | M     | S.D. | ' t'- value | Significance at 0.05 level |
|----------|--------------|-----|-------|------|-------------|----------------------------|
| Gender   | Male         | 99  | 13.69 | 5.73 | -4.315      | Significant                |
|          | Female       | 81  | 17.48 | 6.04 |             |                            |
| Nativity | Rural        | 46  | 17.41 | 5.99 | 3.041       | Significant                |
| -        | Urban        | 134 | 14.32 | 5.81 |             |                            |
| Family   | Joint        | 116 | 13.97 | 5.24 | -3.032      | Significant                |
| type     | Nuclear      | 64  | 16.95 | 6.74 |             |                            |
| School   | Government   | 141 | 17.99 | 6.08 | 5.234       | Significant                |
| kind     | Private      | 39  | 13.18 | 4.77 |             | _                          |

# Gender and Risk taking behaviour

It is evident from table that the obtained 't' value -4.315 is greater than the table value 1.96 at 0.05 level of significance. This shows that there is a significant difference between the male and female students in terms of creativity. Further, it is observed that female students have high risk taking behaviour than male students.

#### Nativity and Risk taking behaviour

It is evident from table that the obtained 't' value 3.041 is greater than the table value 1.96 at 0.05 level of significance. This shows that there is a significant difference between the rural and urban students in terms of creativity. Further, it is observed that rural students have high risk taking behaviour than urban students.

#### Family type and Risk taking behaviour

It is evident from table that the obtained 't' value -3.032 is greater than the table value 1.96 at 0.05 level of significance. This shows that there is a significant difference between the joint and nuclear students in terms of creativity. Further, it is observed that nuclear family students have high risk taking behaviour than joint family students.

#### School kind and Risk taking behaviour

It is evident from table that the obtained 't' value 5.234 is greater than the table value 1.96 at 0.05 level of significance. This shows that there is a significant difference between the Government and private school students in terms of creativity. Further, it is observed that Government school students have high risk taking behaviour than private school students

# Creativity among the high school students

The average score of the creativity among the high school students is found to be 25, while the theoretical average is 22. This shows that the creativity among the high school students is above the average level.

Table 2: The results of tests of significance of difference between the mean scores of creativity among the high school students are presented in Table -2:

| Variable | Sub-category | N   | M     | S.D. | ' t'- value | Significance at 0.05 level |
|----------|--------------|-----|-------|------|-------------|----------------------------|
| Gender   | Male         | 99  | 23.66 | 2.63 | -3.052      | Significant                |
|          | Female       | 81  | 26.59 | 2.61 |             |                            |
| Nativity | Rural        | 46  | 25.57 | 3.02 | 3.867       | Significant                |
|          | Urban        | 134 | 23.65 | 2.47 |             |                            |
| Family   | Joint        | 116 | 23.63 | 2.46 | -0.010      | Not Significant            |
| type     | Nuclear      | 64  | 23.64 | 2.88 |             |                            |
| School   | Government   | 141 | 2.48  | 2.62 | -1.516      | Not Significant            |
| kind     | Private      | 39  | 24.18 | 2.55 |             |                            |

#### **Gender and Creativity**

It is evident from table that the obtained 't' value -3.052 is greater than the table value 1.96 at 0.05 level of significance. This shows that there is a significant difference between the male and female students in terms of creativity. Further, it is observed that female students have high creativity than male school students.

#### **Nativity and Creativity**

It is evident from table that the obtained 't' value 3.867 is greater than the table value 1.96 at 0.05 level of significance. This shows that there is a significant difference between the rural and urban students in terms of creativity. Further, it is observed that rural students have high creativity than urban school students.

#### Family type and Creativity

It is evident from table that the obtained 't' value -0.010 is lower than the table value 1.96 at 0.05 level of significance. This shows that there is no significant difference between the joint and nuclear family students in terms of creativity.

#### School kind and Creativity

It is evident from table that the obtained 't' value -1.516 is lower than the table value 1.96 at 0.05 level of significance. This shows that there is no significant difference between the Government and private school students in terms of creativity.

#### **Conclusions**

The major conclusions arrived at from the study are listed below:

- 1. Risk taking behaviour and creativity among high school students are found high.
- 2. Risk taking behaviour among high school students is found dependent upon-
  - Gender
  - Nativity
  - > Family type
  - School kind
- 3. Creativity among high school students is found dependent upon-
  - ➢ Gender
  - Nativity

# **Educational Implications**

From the overview of these researches, it is evident that risk taking behaviour has been focus of psychological and educational researches since 1960s to explain human behaviour in different social and economic conditions of social life. It is a well known fact that the high school students in today's world are facing a number of threatening uncertainties and are over exposed to mass media depicting a lot of antisocial behavioural patterns including violence, drug/sexual abuse and cheating/forgery and unfair means to earn quick money etc. So, in such a situation, it was thought worthwhile to look into risk taking behaviour in high school students in relation to certain cognitive and non-cognitive variables. So that, Schools should organize various developmental programmes from time to time to develop creativity among high school students.

#### References

- 1. Agarwal, S. (1982) A study of Creativity as a Function of Self- Esteem, Risk-Taking and Home Background. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation in Education, Agra University. In Third Survey of Research in Education, by Buch, M.B. 1978-83.
- 2. Agarwal and Kumari, S. (1982) A Correlational Study of Risk Taking and Creativity with Special Reference to Sex Differences. Indian Educational Review, 17(3), 104-110.
- 3. Agarwal, S. (2005) Analysing Adolescent Risk Taking Behaviour in India: Findings from a Large Scale Survey. Paper for the Oral Presentation in the IUSSP XXV International Population Conference Tours, France. July 18-23.
- 4. Aklin, W.M., Lejuez, C.W., Zvolensky, M.J., Kahler, C.W. and Gwadz, M. (2005) Evaluation of Behavioral Measures of Risk Taking Propensity with Inner City Adolescents. Behaviour Research and Therapy, 43, 215-228.
- 5. Ale, B. J.M. (2009) Risk: An Introduction. The Concepts of Risk, Danger and Chance, Abington, Oxon: Routledge.
- 6. Alexander, Et.: A Measure of Risk Taking For Young Adolescents." Review of Psychological Studies, 560-561(2].
- 7. Anastasi, A (1992) What Counselors Should Know About the Use and Interpretation of Psychological Tests. Journal of Counseling and Development, 70(5), 610-615.
- 8. Anderson, H.W and Sommerfelt, K. (1999) Infant Tempramental Factors as Predictors of Problem Behaviour and IQ at Age 5 Years: Interactional Effects of Biological and Social Risk Factors." EJ605421. Link to CIJE Availability Information.

- 9. Kaur, B. (2004) A Study of Risk Taking Behaviour in Relation to Locus of Control. Unpublished M.Ed Dissertation, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- 10. Kaur, D. (2008) Study of Risk Taking Behaviour of College Students in relation to Emotional Maturity. Unpublished M.Ed Dissertation, Panjab University Chandigarh.

