



A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF RISK TAKING ABILITY OF CHILDREN OF WORKING AND NON-WORKING MOTHERS

Dr. Shabnam Khan

Assistant Professor, St. Thomas College, Ruabandha, Bhilai, C.G.

ABSTRACT

The present study aimed to compare the Risk taking ability of children of working and non-working mothers. Objective of the study was to compare the risk taking ability of working and non-working mothers. Sample for the study constitute 200 students, 100 belonging to the working mothers and 100 belonging to non working mothers. Risk taking questionnaire (RTQ) constructed by Dr. Virendra Sinha and Dr. Prem Nath Arora was used for collection of data. Results of the study revealed that there exist no significant difference in risk taking ability of the students belonging to the working mothers and risk taking ability of the students belonging to non-working mothers.

KEY WORDS: Risk Taking Ability.

INTRODUCTION:

Risk is an uncertain event or condition that, if it occurs, has an effect on at least one [project] objective.

A growing area of research has been to examine various psychological aspects of risk taking. Researchers typically run randomized experiments with a treatment and control group to ascertain the effect of different psychological factors that may be associated with risk taking. Thus, positive and negative feedback about past risk taking can affect future risk taking. In an experiment, people who were led to believe they are very competent at decision making saw more opportunities in a risky choice and took more risks, while those led to believe they were not very competent saw more threats and took fewer risks. [Another study showed that decision makers who feel highly capable are more likely to invest effort in an issue that is negatively, rather than positively, framed. Conversely, with low capability, they are more likely to invest effort in an issue that is positively, rather than negatively, framed. Interestingly, the study showed this occurred because of the differential focus on upside potential and risk taking among decision makers. There are also studies that show that people's emotional states can affect their level of risk taking. More recently, research has shown differences in risk taking between males and females. Specifically, for decisions that are mainly driven by achievement of gains (e.g., investment decisions), men's risk-taking propensity is more influenced by their levels of issue capability than women's because the nature of the decision task is consistent with men's agented orientation focused on the self; conversely, for decisions that are mainly driven by avoidance of losses (e.g., insurance decisions), women's risk taking is more sensitive to issue capability than men's because the nature of such decisions is consistent with women's communion orientation.

Present century is the age of competition, in which human being is busy to keep him in a leading position. This competitive spirit bounds him to opt the risk. It is evident now that a risk-taker is more successful and leading position holder in the society.

Risk, as layman understands, may be an act where an individual undertakes to earn his livelihood. Generally the term 'risk' means a dangerous element or factor, where an individual is put in willingly/unwillingly in that situation. Hobrin (1974) is of the opinion that 'risk' is a condition that there is a possibility of occurrence of loss as result of deviation from the intended or expected situation. Kogan and vallach (1967) described the risk taking behavior on the basis of kind situation in which it is likely to be elicited. They stated that behavior reflective of risk taking disposition occurs in situation where there is a desirable goal and lack of certainty that can be attained. Wallach and Kogn (1964), in their book 'Risk-Taking: A study on cognition and personality' concluded that the risk element is based on subject's assessment of his own tolerance and is clearly explicit whether the decisions occurs in a hypothetical success-failure context or in a situation involving gain-loss consequences. Bem and others (1962) also meant the term 'risk' to the extent at which the decision maker is willing to expose himself to possible failure in the pursuit of desirable goal.

Chaubey (1974) believe that risk is a condition where both the aspects of a thing are clearer to individual and the outcome clearly defines the success and failure. Knight and Shackle (1971) in the 'Insurance Theory' explode a distinction between 'measurable' and 'non measurable' risk. According to them the measurable risk is the situation which can be fairly and accurately estimated, as it can be predicted on the basis of past experiences. The non measurable risk, on the other

hand cannot be predicted with any degree of accuracy.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY:

To compare the risk taking ability of children of working and non-working mothers.

HYPOTHESIS:

There will be no significant difference in risk taking ability of children of working and non-working mothers.

TOOLS:

To find out the level of risk taking ability of the students, Risk taking questionnaire (RTQ) constructed by Dr. Virendra Sinha and Dr. Prem Nath Arora was used. RTQ was to be made workable for six types of testees i.e. Urban Literate Adolescents, Urban Literate Adults, Urban Literate olds, Rural Literate Adolescents, Rural Literate Adults and Rural Literate olds, the reliability and validity of RTQ was computed for each of six stratum. Test- Retest Reliability of RTQ for three age groups is given in the following table:

Nature of Ss	N	R	P	Range
Adolescents	37	.79	.01	
Adults	55	.83	.01	.66 to .83
Olds	17	.66	.01	
Total N	109	.785	.01	

POPULATION AND SAMPLE:

The population of the present study includes all the higher secondary school male students studying in different higher secondary schools, in Durg District, during the session 2014-2015. Out of these schools 200 students, 100 belonging to the working mothers and 100 belonging to non working mothers formed the sample for the present study.

STATISTICAL ANALYSES:

The statistical techniques used for analysis of data are:

- i. Mean
- ii. Standard Deviation
- iii. t-test

ANALYSIS OF DATA AND INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS:

To compare the Risk Taking ability of Rural and Urban area students 't' test was calculated. Summary of this analysis has been presented in the table below:

Risk Taking Ability	Mean	t-value
Working Mothers	153.9	0.74
Non-working Mothers	151.31	

FINDING:

Results revealed that there exist no significant difference in risk taking ability of the students belonging to the working mothers and risk taking ability of the students belonging to non-working mothers.

DISCUSSION:

Results of the present study revealed that there exist no significant difference in risk taking ability of the students belonging to the working mothers and risk taking ability of the students belonging to non-working mothers. Risk taking ability is determined by behavior of individual as well as environmental and individual factors. Home environment, impulsiveness, self control and sensation seeking characteristics are also important factors which determine the risk taking ability.

Working status of the mother do not affects the risk taking ability of the children as other variables like personality, innate temperament and cultural norms develops the risk taking ability of children.

REFERENCES:

1. A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge (4th Edition) ANSI/PMI 99-001-2008.
2. Arkes, Hal R., Lisa Tandy Herren, and Alice M. Isen. "The role of potential loss in the influence of affect on risk-taking behavior." *Organizational behavior and human decision processes* 42, no. 2 (1988): 181-193.
3. Arora, P.N. (1982) A psychological study of personality pattern of risk and non-risk takers of Kumaun Region. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Kumaun University, Nainital.
4. Bem, J. Daryl; Wallach, M.A., & Kogan, N. (1965) Group decision making under risk of adverse consequences. *J.Pers. Soc Psychol.*, 1 (5), 453-460.
5. Chaubey, N.P. (1974) Motivational Dimensions of Rural development: A study of Risk-Taking Behaviour, risk avoidance and fear of failure in villagers. Allahabad, Chaitaya Publishing House.
6. He, Xin and Inman, Jeffrey and Mittal, Vikas, Gender Jeopardy in Financial Risk Taking (August 1, 2008). *Journal of Marketing Research*, 45(4), August 2008, 414-424. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2341789>
7. Horbin (Ed) (1974) *Advanced Learners Dictionary*.
8. Knight, F.H. & Shackle, G.L.S. (1971) *Risk Uncertainty and Profit*. Boston Houghton, Mifflin, N.Y. 197-232.
9. Kogan, N. & Wallach, M.A., (1967) Risk-Taking as a function of situation, the person and the group, *New Directions in Psychology*: N.Y. 211-273.
10. Krueger, Norris, and Peter R. Dickson. "How believing in ourselves increases risk taking: perceived self-efficacy and opportunity recognition." *Decision Sciences* 25, no. 3 (1994): 385-400.
11. Mano, Haim. "Risk-taking, framing effects, and affect." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 57, no. 1 (1994): 38-58.
12. Mittal, Vikas and Ross, William T., The Impact of Positive and Negative Affect and Issue Framing on Issue Interpretation and Risk Taking (December 1, 1998). *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 76, No. 3, December 1998, pp. 298-324. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2338720>
13. Mittal, Vikas, William T. Ross, & Michael Tsiros. (2002) "The role of issue valence and issue capability in determining effort investment." *Journal of Marketing Research*, 39(4): 455-468.. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2344821>
14. *Oxford English Dictionary*
15. Wallach, M.A., & Kogan, N. (1964) *Risk –Taking –A study on cognition and personality*. Holt, Rinehart & Winston, N.Y.
16. Yousuf, S.M.A. (1974) A measure of Risk –Taking. *Psychological studies* ; 19 (1); 64-68.