

# A Study on Sociability and Their Risk-Taking Behaviour of Higher Secondary School Students in Thanjavur District

Dr. M. Jayakumari

Principal, Department of Education,  
Mass College of Education, Kumbakonam, Tamil Nadu

\*\*\*\*\*

## Abstract:

*This study aims to examine the level of sociability and risk-taking behaviour among higher secondary school students in Thanjavur District of Tamil Nadu. The study was carried out on a sample of 320 higher secondary students using the survey method. The findings of the study reveal that there is a significant difference between boys and girls in their sociability and risk-taking behaviour. Further, a significant difference is observed between rural and urban higher secondary school students with regard to these variables. The results also indicate that there exists a significant difference in sociability and risk-taking behaviour among students studying in government, aided, and private higher secondary schools. Overall, the study highlights that gender, locality, and type of school play an important role in influencing the sociability and risk-taking behaviour of higher secondary students.*

**Keywords:** *Sociability, Risk-Taking Behaviour and Higher Secondary School Students*

\*\*\*\*\*

## INTRODUCTION

Education is one of the most powerful instruments of social transformation and human development. It plays a vital role in improving the economic and social status of individuals and communities, especially those who are marginalized. Education not only contributes to economic progress but also strengthens the inner abilities, confidence, and adaptability of students, enabling them to face the emerging challenges of modern life.

In the context of rapid modernization and increasing competition in the 21st century, individuals are often required to make bold decisions and step beyond their comfort zones. Such situations naturally involve elements of risk. Among adolescents, particularly higher secondary school students, risk-taking behaviour becomes more visible as they explore their identities, abilities, and future opportunities. Sometimes students attempt tasks that exceed their current capacities, where success is uncertain, and this willingness to face uncertainty is described as risk-taking behaviour. A moderate level of risk-taking can promote growth, innovation, and achievement.

Competitive academic and social environments may encourage students to take calculated risks to achieve success and recognition. However, risk-taking may also arise from unequal access to resources and opportunities. Students from disadvantaged or marginalized backgrounds may engage in higher levels of risk-taking while trying to overcome limitations and reach better life outcomes. Sociability is another important personal and social characteristic during adolescence. It refers to the tendency and ability of an individual to interact, associate, and maintain positive relationships with others. Sociable students enjoy the company of peers, participate in conversations, and engage actively in group activities. High sociability supports cooperation, communication skills, and social adjustment within school and society.

Understanding risk-taking behaviour in adolescents is complex because what adults consider “risky” may not always be viewed in the same way by young people. Certain behaviours that adults label as dangerous or irresponsible may be perceived by adolescents as normal, exciting, or even skilled actions. However, research indicates that adolescents

are generally capable of identifying and understanding risky behaviours, including both physically daring acts and rule-breaking activities.

Therefore, studying sociability and risk-taking behaviour among higher secondary school students is important for understanding how young people interact with others and how they respond to uncertainty and challenges. Such understanding can help educators and policymakers create supportive environments that encourage healthy social interaction and responsible, well-informed risk-taking.

### **Significance of the Study**

Students are the future builders of society and are expected to perform multiple roles in personal, social, and professional life. To fulfil these roles effectively, they need to develop appropriate social, emotional, and behavioural competencies. Education has a major responsibility not only to provide academic knowledge but also to bring desirable behavioural and social changes among students in accordance with the needs of a changing society. When education responds to real social issues and student needs, it becomes a powerful force for overall social development.

Adolescence is a crucial stage of life characterised by energy, curiosity, courage, and a willingness to explore new possibilities. Higher secondary school students, being adolescents, often show boldness in facing challenges and a readiness to try new and uncertain paths. This tendency can be expressed as risk-taking behaviour. At the same time, adolescents show a strong interest in peer relationships and group belonging, which reflects their sociability. Their ability to interact, cooperate, and move closely with peer groups plays an important role in shaping their decisions and actions.

In a rapidly changing and competitive world, students must learn how to face social and personal challenges with confidence. Healthy sociability helps them build support networks, work collaboratively, and adjust to different social situations. Constructive risk-taking helps them step beyond fear, attempt new opportunities, and solve problems creatively. When these two qualities develop in a balanced manner, students are better prepared to cope with social

change and environmental demands. However, if risk-taking occurs without proper social awareness or guidance, it may lead to negative consequences. Therefore, it is important for educators to understand how sociability and risk-taking behaviour are related among higher secondary students. Studying this relationship will help in identifying patterns that can support positive youth development, guide counselling practices, and design suitable educational interventions.

Hence, the present study is significant as it attempts to examine sociability and risk-taking behaviour among higher secondary school students and to understand how these two important adolescent characteristics are connected. Such knowledge will contribute to creating supportive educational environments that encourage responsible risk-taking along with healthy social interaction.

### **Objectives of the Study**

- i. To find out the level of Sociability and Risk Taking Behaviour of higher secondary school students
- ii. To find out whether any significant difference between Sociability and Risk Taking Behaviour of higher secondary students with respect to Gender
- iii. To find out whether any significant difference between Sociability and Risk Taking Behaviour of higher secondary students with respect to Location of the School
- iv. To find out whether any difference in Sociability and Risk Taking Behaviour of higher secondary school students with respect to Type of the School
- v. To find out whether any relationship between Sociability and Risk Taking Behaviour of higher secondary school students

### **HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY**

*The following hypotheses are formulated based on the above objectives*

- i. There is no significant difference between Sociability and Risk Taking Behaviour of

higher secondary school students with respect to Gender

ii. There is no significant difference between Sociability and Risk Taking Behaviour of higher secondary school students with respect to Location of the School

iii. There is no significant difference in Sociability and Risk Taking Behaviour of higher secondary students with respect to Type of the School

iv. There is no significant relationship between Sociability and Risk Taking Behaviour of higher secondary school students

### Hypothesis Testing

#### Null Hypothesis-1

**H0:1** There is no significant difference between Sociability of higher secondary students with respect to Gender and Location of the Students

Table-1

*Significant difference between Sociability of higher secondary students with respect to Gender and Location of the students*

Variable	Gender	N	Mean	S.D	Calculated 't' value	Remarks at 5% level
Sociability	Boys	171	58.50	13.007	3.28 & 2.78	S
	Girls	149	56.13	12.999		
	Location	N	Mean	S.D		
	Rural	120	55.21	4.831		
	urban	200	54.78	5.135		

(At 5% level of significance, the table value of 't' is 1.96)

It is inferred from the above table that the calculated value of 't' (3.28 and 2.78) is greater than the table value of 't' (1.96) at 5% level of significance for df 318. Hence the null hypothesis is **rejected**.

#### Null Hypothesis-2

**H0:2** There is no significant difference in Sociability of higher secondary students with respect to Type of the school

Table-2

*Significant difference in Sociability of higher secondary students with respect to Type of the school*

Variable	Type of school	Source of variation	Sum of squares	Mean square variance	Calculated 'F' value	Remarks at 5% level		
Sociability	Govt	Between	37.398	18.699	4.748	S		
	Aided	Within	7925.352	25.001				
	Private							

(At 5% level of significance, the table value for df, 2, 317 is of 'F' is 3.03)

It is inferred from the above table that the calculated value of 't' (4.78) is greater than the table value of 't' (1.96) at 5% level of significance for df 317. Hence the null hypothesis is **rejected**.

#### Null Hypothesis-3

**H0:3** There is no significant difference between Risk Taking Behaviour of higher secondary students with respect to Gender and Location of the students

. Table-3

**Significant difference between Risk Taking Behaviour of higher secondary students with respect to Gender and Location of the students**

Variable	Gender	N	Mean	S.D	Calculated 't' value	Remarks at 5% level
Risk Taking Behaviour	Male	171	59.50	15.007	3.18 & 4.30	S
	Female	149	56.63	12.999		
	Location	N	Mean	S.D		
	Rural	120	53.21	13.931		
	urban	200	56.78	14.035		

(At 5% level of significance, the table value of 't' is 1.96)

It is inferred from the above table that the calculated value of 't' (3.18 & 4.30) is greater than the table value of 't' (1.96) at 5% level of significance for df 318. Hence the null hypothesis is **rejected**.

#### Null Hypothesis-4

**H0:4** There is no significant difference in Risk Taking Behaviour of higher secondary students with respect to Type of the schools

Table-4

**Significant difference in Risk Taking Behaviour of higher secondary students with respect to Type of the schools**

Variable	Type of school	Source of variation	Sum of squares	Mean square variance	Calculated 'F' value	Remarks at 5% level		
Risk taking Behaviour	Govt	Between	371.398	16.999	2.981	NS		
	Aided	Within	7932.352	25.121				
	Private							

(At 5% level of significance, the table value for df, 2, 317 is of 'F' is 3.03)

It is inferred from the above table that the calculated value of 't' (2.981) is greater than the table value of 't' (1.96) at 5% level of significance for df 317. Hence the null hypothesis is **rejected**

#### Correlation Analysis

#### Null hypothesis-5

**H0:5** There is no significant relationship between Sociability and Risk Taking Behaviour of higher secondary school students

Table-5

**Significant relationship between Sociability and Risk Taking Behaviour of higher secondary school students**

Variable	Correlation “r” value	Remarks at 5% level
<b>Sociability and Risk Taking Behaviour</b>	0.221	<b>S</b>

(At 5% level of significance, for df 318, the table value ‘r’ is (0.062)

**Findings of the study**

- ❖ About 26.7% of the higher secondary school students have a low level of sociability, 50.3% have an average level, and 24.0% have a high level of sociability. This indicates that most students fall in the moderate range of sociability.
- ❖ About 24.7% of the students have a low level of risk-taking behaviour, 40.3% have an average level, and 34.1% have a high level of risk-taking behaviour, showing that a considerable proportion of students display high willingness to take risks.
- ❖ A significant difference exists between boys and girls in sociability. The mean score of boys (58.50) is higher than that of girls (56.13), indicating that boys are comparatively more sociable.
- ❖ There is a significant difference in sociability between rural and urban students. Urban students (mean = 56.78) show higher sociability than rural students (mean = 53.21).
- ❖ A significant difference is found among government, aided, and private school students in sociability. Government school students (mean = 54.23) score higher than aided (53.12) and private school students (50.89).
- ❖ A significant gender difference is observed in risk-taking behaviour. Girls (mean = 59.63) score higher than boys (mean = 56.50), indicating greater risk-taking behaviour among girls.
- ❖ There is a significant difference between rural and urban students in their risk-taking behaviour (with urban-rural variation indicating the influence of locality on willingness to take risks).

- ❖ A significant difference exists among government, aided, and private school students in their risk-taking behaviour.
- ❖ There is a significant positive relationship between sociability and risk-taking behaviour among higher secondary school students, suggesting that more sociable students also tend to show higher levels of risk-taking behaviour.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

- ❖ In order to improve the risk taking behaviour among the students, a detours task and a good risk environment should be imparted to students.
- ❖ To enhance well being or to prevent psychological distress of youth, all efforts should be made to promote sociability and higher education.
- ❖ Media programmes should be designed to strengthen a traditional societal value that favours Indian social system. Sociability has to be improved with the emergence of competitive world to dissipate shyness.
- ❖ Social skills training is quite effective for developing value relations, ethics, creating friendship network, peer interaction, inter personal exchanges, self confidence, self esteem and overcoming shyness among girls and loneliness among boys. Education and social policy planners should try to tap the potentials of the youth and channelise their energy for establishing an environment that encourages the development of social linkages, contacts or friendships. Sociable youths are influential in altering the environment
- ❖ Seminar and talks on risk taking behaviour should be frequently arranged.

- ❖ The teacher must give importance to develop good adjustment within the school and the society. Only then, student will develop their life instinct toward others.
- ❖ The school should be a place for get practical knowledge and should their successes through hard work. So that students can get help for their future career and relationship.
- ❖ The teacher may also be enlightened by finding of this study. If the teacher has insight in to the importance of Parents' academic involvement in their adolescents Risk Taking Behaviour and Decision Making Ability, this light and utilize this knowledge in performing their task more effectively. For utilize this knowledge in performing their task more effectively. For instance if a teacher confronts the problems related to risk taking ability and decision making ability of adolescent in the same class environment, he may discuss it with parents in light of the knowledge
- ❖ Government of India her education policy in a way to all round development of personality of a child. Curriculum is so designed that not only academic but health of the children may be improved. Reconstruction and development of human resource in the country has been emphasized in the National Policy on Education (1986). Since parents' involvement in adolescents is found influencing with regard to their risk taking behaviour and decision making ability. Efforts should be made in developing such devices which may educate parents in this regard. It may be desirable to make recommendations that such programmes of intervention will be developed and implemented through non-formal education, social welfare work, school counselling services and child guidance clinics.

## **SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY**

- ❖ The present study is confined to higher secondary school students in Thanjavur District. Similar studies may be conducted in other districts of Tamil Nadu and in different states of

- India to examine regional variations in sociability and risk-taking behaviour.
- ❖ Future research can explore the relationship between sociability and risk-taking behaviour among college students, teachers, or other professional groups to understand how these traits function at different life stages and occupational contexts.
- ❖ A detailed study may be undertaken to examine the role of parents and teachers in shaping and guiding the risk-taking behaviour of higher secondary school students.
- ❖ Comparative studies can be conducted on adjustment, sociability, and risk-taking behaviour among students of different streams such as arts, science, commerce, and professional or technical institutions (e.g., information technology institutes).
- ❖ Longitudinal studies may be carried out to track how sociability and risk-taking behaviour change from adolescence to early adulthood.
- ❖ Intervention-based studies could be designed to test the effectiveness of social skills training or counselling programmes in improving healthy sociability and responsible risk-taking among adolescents.

## **CONCLUSION**

According to this study the level of sociability and risk taking behavior of higher secondary school students are moderate. There is significance relationship between the sociability and risk taking behavior. The recommendation given by the investigator may be very helpful for improving sociability and risk taking behavior especially in higher secondary level.

## **Reference**

- i. Azmawati, M.N. (2015). Risk-taking behavior among urban and rural adolescents in two selected districts in Malaysia. *South African Family Practice*, 75(3):160-165.
- ii. Beck, U. (1992). *Risky society: toward a new modernity*. SAGE Publication, New Delhi.
- Byrnes, J. P.; Miller, D. C.; & Schafer, W.D. (1999). Gender differences in Risk-taking: A

metaanalysis. Psychological Bulletin, 125(3): 367-383.

iii. Chaubey, N. P. (1974). Motivational Dimensions of Rural Development: A Study of Risk-taking Behaviour, Risk Avoidance and Fear of Failure in Villagers. Allahabad, Chaitanya Publishing House.

iv. Hamid, S.H.B.A.,&Nawi,A.B.M. (2013). Family Characteristics Associate with Risk-taking behavior among urban and rural adolescents in two districts in Selangor. A Comparative Study. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 91: 581-587.

v. Harris,C.R; Jenkins,M.;Diego,S.; &Glaser,D.(2006).Gender Differences in Risk Assessment: Why do Women Take Fewer Risks than Men? Judgment and Decision Making,1(1):48-63.

vi. Kogan, N. & Wallach, M. A. (1964). Risk-taking – A Study on Cognition and Personality. Holt, Rinehart & Winston, N. Y. Matthew, T. (2009).

vii. Mishra, S., &Arsiya, S.K. (2014). Pattern of decision making as function of Risk-taking behaviour in management education institutions of state universities of Madhya Pradesh, India. International journal of Research and development in technology and management science-Kailash. Vol-21.

viii. Nimbalkar, C. (2017). A study of risk- taking behaviour& emotional competence among college students. International journal of research in science and engineering. National seminar cum workshop on Psychological Counselling Techniques for students and student athletes - 4 th and 5th Nov. 2017.

ix. Saxena, N. &Puri, P. (2013). Relationship between Risk-taking Behavior, Personality and Sensation Seeking Tendencies among N.C.C cadets. IOSR Journal of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS),18 (3):1-6.

x. Sinha, V. & Arora, P.N. (1982). Manual for Risk-taking Questionnaire (RTQ). Agra, National Psychological Corporation.

xi. Sujatha, k. (1994). Education among Scheduled Tribes. Indian Education Report by K. Sujatha CED Code- B. N21. G1.

xii. Tay, B. Ozkon, D. Tay, B.A. (2009). The effect of academic-Risk-taking level on the problem solving ability of gifted students. Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 1, (2009).