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Chapter 1

RISKTAking AND ITS IMPLICATIONS
FOR THE EDUCATIONAL SCENE

Research on risktaking has followed many divergent paths of which the majority can be found in the area of banking, business investment and gambling behavior. This emphasis is certainly a valid concern for the economist and the businessman, but more recently it has become the concern of the vocational counselor and all personnel who are involved in career education. The high school counselor working with a wide variety of young people is interested in research concerning the personal-social attitudes of those who take physical risks.

NEED

Whether by design or by desire the schools have become involved in the dynamic process of socializing the student populace. This socializing process includes stimulating academic achievement, vocational preparation, and assisting in personal-social adjustment. The worthwhile counselor plays no small part in working with students in the above mentioned areas. As a means of gaining further understanding of the risktaker and his relationship to the social structure, a tool is needed which will quickly
indicate the student's possible tendency toward behavior which is not consistent with society's expectations, even though such behavior may have much personal meaning. The important aspect of a tool which indicates a unique profile of personal-social characteristics is the fact that these attitudes tell the counselor something about the student's level of socialization. The personal attitude which a student possesses toward the social structure as well as its implications in terms of behavior displayed is important to the counselor.

There is also a need to relate the physical risktaker to more appropriate curriculum choice in school and vocational selection beyond school. In terms of academic achievement the tool which measures socialization and responsibility can be a most useful one in determining a tendency for underachievement.

As for the vocational implications of this study for the counselor, there is a need to expose some of the psychological aspects of individuals who choose occupations involving a high degree of physical risk. This applies to any occupation in which the uncertainty of success is a major factor. The results of this study should help the counselor develop an expertise in the area of personality, a research area which many counselors feel is more the concern of the psychologist. It is imperative that counselors take into account the social responsibility aspects of the individual, not only understanding him better from a vocational
standpoint but also from a recreational one. Tyler expressed the need to study attitudes toward the vocational world when she stated, "It is well worth the continuing effort a counselor must make to increase his skill in dealing with the facts and attitudes, the physical and psychological aspects of the world of occupations." ¹

In addition to the emphasis on the world of work there is a great need to gain understanding of students who face a most confusing situation with regard to societal expectations and individual choices. That situation involves the individual and society in all its aspects. Wrenn¿ discussed the conflicts between "socialization" and "individualization" as one of the more prominent features of the changing education scene.

Both areas mentioned above offer a means whereby the counselor can gain some much needed accountability. Through the easily administered tool presented in this study the counselor can have available such profiles that will supply an added observation of personal and social behavior which has some relevance in many areas of school concern. A tool which will allow early indentification of personality characteristics and social attitudes which may present blocks

---


toward development in the aforementioned areas is a needed asset for school counselors.

THEORY AND RATIONALE

From the standpoint of theory the study is based on social learning theory as opposed to the need achievement theory which surrounds most risk-taking research. The risk-takers in this study are participating in such activity which is in line with their interests, and are individuals who manifest unusual degrees of indifference toward some of society's accepted norms. Partly as a consequence of earlier social learning they have managed to express their athletic ability in areas which are not associated with teamwork. In other words, they are individuals with fairly high levels of motor ability (eye-hand coordination) but have not learned to express themselves in athletic team sports as much as they have in individual endeavors. Since more social reinforcement is attached to risk-taking which serves a useful purpose to society it will be assumed that persons engaged in the more useful risk will tend to have a more positive relationship to society in terms of their socialization level attained and personal responsibility. In other words, the more importance the risk has in terms of group meaning, the higher the socialization and responsibility level will tend to be. The nonfunctional risk is interpreted as that having individual meaning as opposed to group or societal meaning.
In terms of rationale the nonfunctional risk is defined as that activity which serves little or no purpose for society. Such activity is occasionally curtailed by various societal means. For example, the government legislature actually has proposed that all motorcycles be equiped with three wheels and seat belts. Various state legislatures did pass helmet laws for the protection of cycle riders. It is conceivable that in a highly technological society all physical risk could be eliminated thus protecting the members of that society. The more functional risks are those which do serve a group need in some form. For example, pilots serve a useful function in terms of risktaking and therefore tend to be more socialized and responsible than other groups of risktakers. This may be due to the fact that they receive more positive reinforcement from the social structure. Stated briefly, the nonfunctional risk has individual meaning while the functional risk has group meaning.

In further consideration of social learning theory the variables of age, size of hometown, marital status and years of experience were deemed relevant.

PROBLEM

To show the relationship of functional and nonfunctional risktaking to selected personality characteristics a continuum of functional and nonfunctional risktaking was established. Airplane pilots were chosen to represent the more functional risktakers and professional motorcycle racers
were selected to represent a lesser level of functional risk-taking. These professions were assumed to be risktakers but also to have a higher responsibility level than the nonfunctional risktakers. The nonfunctional classification included amateur motorcycle racers and to represent the least functional classification a group of skydivers was chosen.

To develop balanced groups which would be more workable for statistical analysis the following definitions were used.

1. Age:
   22 years and less = young group (n=32), and
   23 years and more = older group (n=30).

2. Size of hometown:
   5200 and less = small group (n=19),
   5201 to 100,000 = medium group (n=21), and
   100,001 and more = large group (n=22).

3. Years of experience:
   1 year = inexperienced group (n=28), and
   2 years or more = experienced group (n=34).

These variables present the individual with different influences of society in terms of larger and smaller groups and the amount of experience involved. Individuals from larger hometowns should have more opportunity to interact with larger groups which represent a wider variety of interest. This should allow individuals to receive positive reinforcement from a larger group with more specific interests. To receive positive group reinforcement in a small town one
will have to conform to the larger society represented in that town.

With respect to age, the longer one lives the more opportunity he should have to learn more of the group dynamics or inner workings by which the larger society functions and to forego certain individual desires and interests in order to perpetuate society as a whole.

In dealing with years of experience in risk-taking activity it is reasonable to believe that the longer one is engaged in this activity the more he has received in terms of personal meaning. His capacity for status related to that activity, assuming people do seek status, should be higher the longer he remains in such activity.

In obtaining some measure of individual vs. group meanings, a personality inventory was utilized which has been widely researched in areas of socialization and responsibility, the California Psychological Inventory (CPI).\textsuperscript{3} Four scales of this inventory were reproduced by special permission from The California Psychological Inventory. The specific scales most relevant to the study are explained as follows:

Socialization (So) - Indicates the degree of social maturity, integrity, and rectitude which the individual has attained.

Responsibility (Re) - Identifies persons of conscientious, responsible and dependable disposition and temperament.

\textsuperscript{3}Harrison G. Gough, California Psychological Inventory, (Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologist Press, 1959.)
Capacity for Status (Cs) - Indicates an individual's capacity for status; it attempts to measure the personal qualities and attributes which underlie and lead to status.

Achievement via Conformance (Ac) - Identifies those factors of interest and motivation which facilitate achievement in a setting where conformity is a positive behavior.

HYPOTHESES

$H_1$: There is a difference in level of functional risktaking and degree of responsibility which a person has toward society.

$H_2$: There is a difference in level of functional risktaking and the degree of socialization a person has attained.

$H_3$: There is a difference in level of functional risktaking and the degree of a person's capacity for status.

$H_4$: There is a difference in level of functional risktaking and the degree of a person's desire to achieve by way of conformance.

$H_5$: There is a difference in the degree of capacity for status between people who are experienced in an activity and those who are inexperienced.

$H_6$: There is a difference in socialization and responsibility levels between risktaking individuals who are older and those who are younger.
$H_7$: There is a difference in socialization and responsibility levels between risktaking individuals who are married from those who are single.

$H_8$: There is a difference in socialization and responsibility levels between risktakers from larger hometowns and those from smaller hometowns.

**PLAN OF THE STUDY**

This study is concerned with the socialization and responsibility levels of individuals who engage in high physical risk activities that serve varying degrees of function to the larger society. Since the nonfunctional risk-taker is a man of action and not readily available for the laboratory experiment, it was necessary to use a field type approach in the design of this study. The selected CPI scales were used to measure the personal socialization and responsibility levels of the four groups of risktakers. The four groups were analyzed in terms of the four personality scales. Size of hometown, age, married vs. single, and years of experience were considered as other relevant variables. The scheffe test were then applied to the results. An analysis of these results is presented in Chapter Four.

**OVERVIEW**

In Chapter Two a review of pertinent literature was presented. The research studies showed, by various means, the motivational question of risktaking behavior and its
relationship to personality characteristics and interests. There was very little research dealing with the individual engaged in risktaking activity of physical nature or studies which related physical risktaking to material forms of risk.

Research relating the CPI to interest surveys and educational studies, crosscultural studies and juvenile delinquency were also reviewed.

A description of the samples, instrumentation and statistical hypotheses were presented in Chapter Three.

In Chapter Four the data were presented in the same sequence as the hypotheses were presented. A fuller explanation of the meaning of the personality characteristics was given when discussing the results of testing each hypotheses. These definitions were taken from the CPI manual. Statements of acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses were given with the corresponding probability level.

The concluding Chapter included some further rationale for utilizing the CPI scales and procedures followed in carrying out the experimental design. The conclusions which were derived from the study and a discussion of the results were also presented. Implications for further research were based on the results of this study and its relationship to previous research. The present study approached the domain of human behavior from a viewpoint which may have a tenuous grasp on theory. However, its relationship to related research and its feasibility as a counseling tool can be viewed from the following review of literature.
Chapter 2

LITERATURE RELATED TO
RISK-TAKING BEHAVIOR

In reviewing the related literature one theory appeared to dominate and that was the risktaking theory of John W. Atkinson.4 His approach using need-achievement and manifest-anxiety to determine those who are the risktakers in laboratory experiments has been used by many researchers. Goding,5 Raynor and Smith,6 Cronback and Quick7 are a few who have followed Atkinson's format. This format describes risktaking in terms of levels of achievement motivation or aspiration as it relates to wagering, risking prizes, poker, dice and ring toss games. Findings by Cronback and Quick8 supported the idea that high achievement motivation implies


8 Ibid., p. 171.

11
readiness to seek an opportunity to succeed, while anxiety implies desire to avoid failure.

Since the present study deals with physical skill in combination with uncertainty the results obtained by Raynor and Smith\(^9\) are useful in understanding the physical risk-taker. Their study revealed that games in which success depends upon both skill and chance have a moderate relationship between achievement-related motives and preference for intermediate risk.

**LITERATURE ON EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH**

In relating the study more specifically to the educational scene Flaherty and Reutzel\(^10\) and Griffin and Flaherty\(^11\) showed that Ac, Re and Cs scales of the CPI could discriminate well between the High academic achiever and the Low academic achiever.

The academic area is only a part of the counselors concern. In years past this was the all important area but counselors are becoming more involved with the vocational and career development aspects of students' concern. The CPI has been very helpful in many counseling centers that have shown

---

\(^9\) Raynor and Smith, op. cit., p. 176.


a desire for an efficient and effective tool to help them in evaluating students in personal adjustment and vocational education areas. Goodstein, Crites, Heilbrun, Jr., and Rempel\(^\text{12}\) discovered that both the overall profile evaluation of the CPI as well as patterns of scores on pairs of scales, which indicate dominant adjustment mechanisms, differentiate reliably and extensively between groups of clients and non-clients. This finding in association with additional research by Heilbrun, Jr.\(^\text{13}\) which indicated counseling readiness in clients and implications for counselor behavior will help establish the utility value of the CPI scales for school counselors. Further research relating to the vocational area was supplied by Spalto\(^\text{14}\) who found that individual interest may predict risk-taking behavior and group interaction processes. Such findings indicate that individuals' interests coupled with personality correlates can assist the counselor in helping students reach realistic decisions. Springog\(^\text{15}\) related interests to personality characteristics by studying


the correlations between the Kuder Personal Preference Record and the CPI scales.

There is not a clear relationship between risktaking and curriculum or vocational choice but Slakter and Cramer\textsuperscript{16} suggested for the future, empirically-keyed measures of risk-taking which are validated on existing occupational groups much as the Strong Vocational Interest Blank.

In addition to research that relates interest scales to personality characteristics, Wallach\textsuperscript{17} presented the following question to the American Psychological Association Convention in September, 1967; 'Are risktakers more persuasive than conservatives in group discussions?' The results of his investigation showed that female risktakers are slightly more persuasive than controls but that males are not at all, thus indicating that persuasiveness and risktaking were essentially independent of each other. What this could mean for the counselor is that the risktaker need not unduly influence a group session in terms of decision making. However, some research describes the risktaker as aggressive and with a tendency toward dominance, Cameron and Meyers\textsuperscript{18}


\textsuperscript{17}Michael A. Wallach, "Are Risk Takers More Persuasive than Conservatives in Group Discussion," presented to American Psychological Association Convention, September, 1967, \textsc{ERIC} (ED 015 502).

have found this to be the case. Such characteristics have also been attributed to those individuals who find themselves at cross purposes with larger society, the juvenile delinquent.

JUVENILE DELINQUENT RESEARCH USING CPI SCALES

A great deal of research on juvenile delinquency has relied on the CPI scales. Reckless, Knapp, Richardson and Roebuck, Okado and Sakaki, Mizushima and DeVos, and Stein, Gough and Sarbin are a few among many. Only a limited number of these will be discussed.


In an attempt to study cross cultural injustices which are occasionally launched against various tests, Mizushima and DeVos\textsuperscript{25} studied Japanese delinquents and nondelinquents using the CPI scales. The means reported were strikingly similar to those reported for U.S. delinquents by Gough and others.\textsuperscript{26} A comparison of their studies are listed in Table 10. Knapp\textsuperscript{27} found the So scale of the CPI to be significantly related to delinquency rate criterion; offenders So = 25.62, nonoffenders So = 30.49. In an earlier study of delinquency Knapp\textsuperscript{28} realized that identification of personality characteristics associated with delinquency rate is an important first step in understanding the potentially habitual or frequent offenders.

Of course, what must not be overlooked is the individual and his self perception. In comparing risk perception between delinquents and nondelinquents, Claster\textsuperscript{29} found that the mechanism of perceptual distortion leads delinquents to perceive themselves as more likely to commit crimes, less likely to be arrested, but not significantly less likely to

\textsuperscript{25}Mizushima and DeVos, op. cit., p. 45.

\textsuperscript{26}Stein, Gough and Sarbin, op. cit., p. 197.

\textsuperscript{27}Knapp, op. cit., p. 59.


be convicted. Concluding the research on juvenile delinquency Richardson and Roebuck\textsuperscript{30} indicated that social delinquents are less maladjusted than solitary delinquents. This finding has had special relevance to the functional–nonfunctional continuum which is postulated in the present study.

RESEARCH ON RELATED VARIABLES

Research on the variables size of hometown, years of experience and age related to risktaking and its associated personality characteristics was lacking. A study by Kass\textsuperscript{31} found no significant difference associated with chronological age and a tendency to prefer risk. He did find a sex difference however, boys preferring the risk situation more so than girls.

DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS RESEARCH

The related research appears to approach the risk-taker from the standpoint of a gambler. It tries to discover why he bets or prefers the low or intermediate probability of payoff. Is this due to a high level of motivation to win or achieve? In considering the individual who will not gamble or risk what is materially his; does he avoid the situation involving chance because he can not tolerate the

\textsuperscript{30} Richardson and Roebuck, op. cit., p. 547.

anxiety of failure? The research to this point supports the notion that risktakers usually are persons who possess high levels of need achievement. To obtain measures of need achievement and manifest anxiety using such tools as the Thematic Appreception Test and other sophisticated scales is beyond the expertise of this particular researcher and that of most counselors. What is valuable from the standpoint of using tests in the counseling situation is to find a tool which is helpful but does not require such sophisticated methods of interpretation. Such a tool is the CPI scales which gives a profile of personal-social development which is helpful in understanding the socialization and responsibility levels of relatively normal populations. Since the scales most directly associated with the individuals relationship to others are the Socialization (So), Responsibility (Re), Capacity for Status (Cs) and the Achievement via Conformance (Ac) they can be used for the less ambitious purpose of simply a screening device for students. Research supports the idea that such a tool has wide utility and is not especially aimed at putting any particular individual in a "pigeon-hole". There are implications for starting group sessions using the potentially high and low academic achievers. In terms of the young men and women who display profiles much like the delinquent, it will give the counselor some indications as to integrating these people into the social atmosphere of the school environment.
In view of the related findings it would appear that studying individuals according to group interest and using relevant CPI scales would be a valid way to approach further understanding of risktakers and the socialization and responsibility levels of students in general. An experimental design utilizing these concepts is discussed in the following chapter.
Chapter 3

DESIGN OF THE RISKTAKing STUDY

SAMPLE

The sample of risktakers for the study were males with the exception of one female in Group 1. The groups labeled in increasing order of functional use to society were Group 1 (skydivers), Group 2 (amateur motorcycle racers), Group 3 (professional motorcycle racers), and Group 4 (Air Force ROTC pilots).

The first group consisted of nineteen skydivers associated with a skydiving club at Kansas State University and Herington, Kansas. Experience ranged from one to eight years. The majority of this group was single. Their hometown size ranged from 500 to 500,000. The president of the club was contacted and became enthused with the study and had the members participate by filling out the questionnaire at the following club meeting.

The amateur racers were sampled at two races in addition to the Blue Valley Motorcycle Club in Manhattan, Kansas. The amateur races sampled were in Topeka and Junction City, Kansas, where participation usually involves Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma and Nebraska. The riders were contacted in the pit area and presented with the questionnaire
in a stamped, self-addressed envelope. They were briefly informed on the nature of the study and asked to fill it out soon and mail it. The results from eighteen amateur racers were based on ages ranging from seventeen to thirty-three years with one to six years of experience. There was a relatively even split with regard to married vs. single. Size of hometown ranged from 100 to 1,000,000.

Group 3 consisted of thirteen professional motorcycle racers, ages ranging from eighteen to twenty-nine years, the majority of which were single. Their range of experience was from one to eleven years, size of hometown from 3,000 to 600,000. The racers were contacted at a professional race during the 1971 Kansas State Fair at Hutchinson, Kansas. Since Evel Kinevel was jumping that afternoon the crowds were large and drew racers literally from coast to coast. The riders were contacted in the same manner as Group 2 immediately following Kinevel's jump.

The pilots of Group 4 chosen for the study were twelve Air Force ROTC pilot trainees at Kansas State University under the direction of Colonel Hebert of the Military Science Department. They were members of a class that was in the flight part of their training. Their ages ranged from twenty-one to twenty-four years and their experience was limited to under one year. The size of their hometowns ranged from 100 to 1,500,000. The split between the married and single pilots was approximately even.
Data on Groups 2 and 3 was collected during the summer months of 1971 and for Groups 1 and 4 during the winter months of 1971 and 1972. As mentioned earlier this type of risktaker is action oriented and hard to contact for a laboratory type study so a field type study was designed to collect data which would indicate the socialization and responsibility level of these groups. Groups 1 and 4 were contacted in a class type setting but were presented with the same questionnaire. Needless to say, the percentage of participation was much higher with the classroom type, captive audience. The returns were approximately thirty percent for the two cycle racing groups and about ninety percent for the pilots and skydivers.

INSTRUMENTATION

The CPI scales consist of 480 true-false questions which comprise eleven different scales to measure various aspects of personality. The four scales used for the study (So, Re, Cs and Ac) have been widely used in researching the area of socialization and responsibility but to this writer's knowledge, never in that particular combination. A copy of the questionnaire was sent to the test publishers in partial fulfillment of their requirements to reproduce the four scales mentioned. Reliability estimates for the CPI range from .62 to .65 for "normal" samples and .79 to .85 for "abnormal" samples. The higher reliabilities were reported for prison inmates which indicates why the CPI scales have been so widely used in the delinquent area.
STATISTICAL HYPOTHESES

$H_1$: There is a difference between level of functional risktaking and responsibility as measured by the Re scale of the CPI. The functional risktaker will score higher on the Re scale than the nonfunctional.

$H_2$: There is a difference between level of functional risktaking and socialization as measured by the So scale of the CPI. The functional risktaker will score higher on the So scale than the nonfunctional.

$H_3$: There is a difference between level of functional risktaking and capacity for status as measured by the Cs scale of the CPI. The functional risktaker will score higher on the Cs scale than the nonfunctional.

$H_4$: There is a difference between level of functional risktaking and achievement via conformance as measured by the Ac scale of the CPI. The functional risktaker will score higher on the Ac scale than the nonfunctional.

$H_5$: There is a difference between experienced and inexperienced risktakers in their degree of capacity for status as measured by the Cs scale of the CPI. The experienced risktaker will score higher on the Cs scale than the inexperienced.

$H_6$: There is a difference between older and younger risktakers in their responsibility level and socialization level as measured by the CPI scales. The older risktaker will score higher on the Re and So scales than the younger risktaker.
$H_7$: There is a difference between married and single risktakers in their responsibility level and socialization level as measured by the CPI scales. The married risktaker will score higher on the Re and So scales than the single risktaker.

$H_8$: There is a difference between risktakers from large towns and those from small towns in their responsibility level and socialization level as measured by the CPI scales. Risktakers from larger towns will score higher on the Re and So scales than risktakers from small towns.

**ANALYSIS**

The groups used in this study were termed risktakers due to their avowed interest and participation in activity which by common consent is labeled high physical risk. No insurance company statistics or accident reports are cited to support the contention that the participants in these various activities were risktakers. The activities under consideration are usually exempt from life and hospitalization insurance policies or else the premiums are prohibitive. $^{32}$

The homogeneity of these groups was justified from the standpoint of having sampled, in all cases, a very transient population. A high percentage were young college males not unlike others in their specific interests. They

were deemed representative of individuals with like interests across the nation.

**SUMMARY**

The four groups in this study were for the most part young men in their early twenties of which approximately half were married. The size of hometown ranged from 100 to 1.5 million and their years of experience from one to eleven years. The pilots and skydivers were almost totally college men a difference which may show up on the capacity for status scores since college education is strongly associated with attaining higher status.

The CPI scales used to measure the selected personality characteristics have fairly good reliabilities especially when administered to a specific population such as the delinquent. It is hoped that high reliability on the scales is the case when dealing with any specific interest group such as those in this study.

The hypotheses were stated in a positive form and indicate the expected differences between the functional and nonfunctional risktaker. The homogeneity of the groups involved is assumed on the basis of their likeness in age and their apparent interest in risktaking activity.

The analysis of the results obtained using the four CPI scales mentioned is presented in Chapter Four.
Chapter 4

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

Hypothesis number one is supported by the results of the analysis. An F-ratio was computed which yielded a probability of .01. The Scheffe tests for multiple comparisons indicated that the most significant difference was between the professional motorcycle racers and the pilots. Means, standard deviations and Scheffe contrasts are listed in Table 1 of Appendix A.

Hypothesis number two is supported by the results. A significance level of .025 was reported with the greatest mean differences between the pilots and the skydivers. The means, standard deviations and Scheffe contrasts are found in Table 2.

The third hypothesis was supported at a probability level of .05 with the largest mean difference between the skydivers and the professional motorcycle racers. Means, standard deviations and Scheffe contrasts are found in Table 3.

Table 4 shows the means, standard deviations and Scheffe contrasts for hypothesis number four. The greatest mean difference was between the pilots and the skydivers which was significant at the .05 level.
The last significant finding of the study supports hypothesis number five with a probability level of .043. The means and standard deviations are located in Table 5.

Hypotheses six through eight were not supported with any degree of significance. The probabilities and F-ratios computed for these hypotheses are found in Table 6.

**ORGANIZATION OF ANALYSIS**

\( H_1 \): Functional risk-takers will score higher on the Re scale of the CPI than nonfunctional risk-takers. \( H_1 \) is accepted at the .01 level of probability.

\( H_2 \): Functional risk-takers will score higher on the So scale of the CPI than nonfunctional risk-takers. \( H_2 \) is accepted at the .025 level of probability.

\( H_3 \): Functional risk-takers will score higher on the Cs scale of the CPI than nonfunctional risk-takers. \( H_3 \) is accepted at the .05 level of probability.

\( H_4 \): Functional risk-takers will score higher on the Ac scale of the CPI than nonfunctional risk-takers. \( H_4 \) is accepted at the .05 level of probability.

\( H_5 \): Experienced risk-takers will score higher on the Cs scale of the CPI than inexperienced risk-takers. \( H_5 \) is accepted at the .05 level of probability.

\( H_6 \): Older risk-takers will score higher on the Re and So scales of the CPI than younger risk-takers. \( H_6 \) is rejected; probability level insignificant.
H₇: Married risktakers will score higher on the Re and So scales of the CPI than single risktakers. H₇ is rejected; probability level insignificant.

H₈: Risktakers from larger hometowns will score higher on the Re and So scales of the CPI than risktakers from smaller hometowns. H₈ is rejected; probability level insignificant.

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

The mean differences found between the professional racers and the pilots is certainly in the expected direction. A greater difference was expected between the skydivers and the pilots since these two groups are at opposite ends of the postulated functional-nonfunctional continuum, the pilots serve the most functional risk and the skydivers serve the least functional. The means on the responsibility scale show the three more nonfunctional groups to have much in common. The incremental relationship existed in the order of professional racer, skydiver, amateur racer and pilots. It is interesting to note that the means of all groups on this scale are quite low compared with most individuals in their general age group as shown in Table 9. It would seem that the professionals who are out for the money, which is a socially valued motive, are less responsible than the amateurs. Possibly the amateurs and the skydivers see themselves as serving only in a recreational capacity while the professionals realize a feeling of being more independent, aggressive and responsible for himself.
The results obtained on the capacity for status measurement are somewhat harder to interpret. The incremental relationship does not exist but the results seem to show a true difference between the risktakers on the ground and those in air since their respective means are almost identical. The motorcycle racers must aspire for status in a fairly consistent pattern. Status among their immediate fellow racers may be the goal for such individuals since cycle racing is not as national an attraction as is car racing.

Another important consideration is the fact that the skydivers and the pilots are largely college men since both groups are associated with the university. The pilots are 100 percent college men. The indications of capacity for status would almost certainly be operating in these particular groups since college education is presently associated with higher status in our society. Years of education probably should have been one of the experimental variables but a few of the cycle racers resented the college associated approach enough with out them being asked about their own educational levels.

The test for differences in socialization level indicated that the pilots differed most significantly from the skydivers. In fact, the pilots indicated a social maturity (So = 38.17) slightly higher than the CPI norms of 36. A high So score indicates a conscientious, modest, serious, self-denying and conforming individual. It would be
erroneous to attach this label to pilots in general but to those pilots involved in an ROTC program who face military service this conforming tendency is a positive value. Of course, pilots in general must curtail some expressions of individuality to conform to rules which govern the crowded sky.

The low So scores of the cycle racer groups and skydivers indicate tendencies to be defensive, deceitful in dealing with others, rebellious, given to excess, exhibition and ostentation in their behavior. These characteristics may be positive virtues for success in the more individual pursuits of cycle racing and skydiving. It can be noticed that with low Re and So scores the description of attitudes approaches what many would call the juvenile delinquent.

The forth hypothesis was supported with the greatest mean difference between the pilots and skydivers, with fairly strong differences between the pilots and both racer groups. This finding again indicates the more individual risktakers, those who are on their own with little need of cooperation, show their achievement via possibly individual means. The pilots on the other hand require the cooperation of others in order to achieve. It can be noted that even the pilots are below the established norm which may indicate that the attitudes of the risktaker are only partially oriented toward cooperating with others in society.

A low Ac score indicates an individual who is coarse, stubborn, awkward, insecure and pessimistic about his
occupational futures and easily disorganized under stress or pressure to conform. This finding was also in support of the So score for the pilots.

The last significant finding related to the Cs score was of the risktakers as a whole divided into experienced and inexperienced groups. The inexperienced risktakers were defined as those with one year of experience and the experienced were defined as having two to eleven years of experience. It seems the longer a man is engaged in this activity the higher is his capacity for status. This could be due to the fact that persons will desire the status of whatever activity the longer they are associated with it. When an individual commits himself to a vocation this will be the means or within this group, whereby he will acquire the status that he feels he must have.

The low Cs scores, which were obtained by both cycle racing groups indicated an individual who is apathetic, shy, being stertotyped in thinking, restricted in outlook, uneasy and awkward in new and/or unfamiliar social situations. The higher Cs score may indicate that the participants of more experience were simply no longer uneasy or awkward in the situations associated with their particular risktaking activity. They know the ropes, so to speak.

The sixth hypothesis regarding age differences was rejected. This may be due to the fact that the differences in age were not that great. Only three teenagers were represented and the vast majority of individuals were men in their
early twenties. This would indicate something to the fact that high physical risk activity is usually associated with a fairly high degree of physical fitness. Once a man is past high physiological prime of approximately twenty-six years there seems to be a proportionate decline in participation with physical risk activity. This is not to discount the proportionate increase in social responsibility that comes with marriage and family. However, as hypothesis number seven was also rejected the married-single dichotomy did not have a discriminating influence between the individual risk-takers from the standpoint of scores on the Re scale.

The size of hometown hypothesis was rejected also which may lend some support to the homogeneity claim of the groups involved. The young men seemed to get around and probably are aware of many societal influences which operate differently from one town to the next or that operate the same but only on a different scale. The fact that transportation is such an integral part of our society there does not appear to be any barrier which would prevent these groups from being transient and able to find sizeable groups who share their interests.

SUMMARY

The first five hypotheses were accepted at probability levels ranging from .01 to .05. Hypotheses six through eight were rejected with insignificant findings. However, there was a trend which would indicate that married risk-takers tend to be more responsible than single risk-takers.
Chapter 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS OF THE RISKTAKING STUDY AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR THE EDUCATIONAL SCENE

SUMMARY

The present study of risktaking with implications for counselors was attempted in order to modify and evaluate an existing counseling tool, the CPI scales. Four scales frequently used to study and evaluate personal-social development were lifted from the CPI and transferred to a questionnaire format. This questionnaire was delivered to four groups of risktakers. The four scales used in questionnaire form can be found in Appendix B.

The definition of risktaker was established on the basis of participation in certain high physical risk activities; skydiving, amateur and professional motorcycle racing, and Air Force ROTC pilot trainees. A continuum of functional-nonfunctional risktaking was hypothesized. This hypothesis stated that since society attaches more value to certain useful risktaking activities than others there will be more social reinforcement associated with the more functional or socially valued risktaking. This was measured by the socialization and responsibility scales of the CPI. In other words, flying is risky as defined by insurance policies, etc. but
serves a useful function, while professional motorcycle racing serves less of a function to society. Amateur racing was hypothesized to serve society even less and skydiving even less. The basic experimental question was "what relationship do these apparent levels of functional risktaking have to the personal-social attitudes of the individuals engaged in those activities?" Specifically it was questioned if these different groups differ from one another as to scores obtained on the four CPI scales selected for study. These scales were responsibility (Re), socialization (So), capacity for status (Cs), and achievement via conformance (Ac). Reliabilities for these scales range from .62 to .85.

These scales as well as the CPI as a whole have been used in various educational settings. The review of literature highlighted some of the studies which included predictions of high and low academic achievers, implications of counseling readiness and counselor behavior, correlations between interests and personality characteristics and student persuasiveness as related to risktaking.

In an area where counselors could use much help, that of working with the delinquent, the previous research supports the validity of using these scales for the purpose of discriminating the delinquent from the nondelinquent. The most obvious discriminators being the Re and So scales.

The four scales were presented as an easily administered device which need not be discriminatory toward any particular individual or group in the school. In other words,
with proper care it could serve the counselor as a screening devise which would show indications for setting up group sessions for those who need development in social interaction.

To obtain data on the more physically active type risktaker a field type experiment was designed. The questionnaire mentioned above was presented to the motorcycle racing groups at various races during the summer months of 1971. Results were obtained on individuals from a wide geographical area. Samples of the pilots and skydivers were taken during the winter months of 1971 and 1972. They were given the same questionnaire but in a classroom type setting. Percentage of participation was much higher from the latter two groups. Additional data which was deemed relevant to the study included age, years of experience, marital status and size of hometown. The data were transferred from questionnaires to Fortran proof forms and then to computer punch cards. With some help from the Department of Administration and Foundations of Education an established program of analysis of variance was used to analyze the data. The means, standard deviations, Scheffe test for multiple comparisons, F-ratios and probabilities are listed in Appendix A, Tables 1-6.

The eight statistical hypotheses were stated in positive form. The first five were accepted with probabilities ranging from .01 to .05. The remaining hypotheses were rejected.
On the whole, ages ranged from seventeen to thirty-three years, experience from one to eleven years and size of hometown from 100 to 1,500,000. The split between married and single was approximately equal.

A comparison of means reported by researchers on juvenile delinquency are also available for comparison.

CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions have been drawn from the study:

1. The significant difference between the pilots and professional racers on scores received on the Re scale indicates that pilots tend to be more responsible and alert to moral issues than do cycle racers. The racers possess an inclination to be more uncontrolled, impulsive, changeable and disbelieving in behavior than the pilot trainees.

2. Skydivers are somewhat more defensive, demanding, deceitful in dealing with others, rebellious, given to exhibition and ostentation in their behavior than ROTC pilot trainees. The pilots, on the other hand, are more conscientious, modest, serious, being self-denying and conforming than skydivers.

3. The two racing groups were very different from the skydivers and pilots with the greatest difference between the professional racers and the skydivers. The skydivers are more effective in communicating while the racers tend to be shy, apathetic, restricted in outlook and interests and uneasy and awkward in new social situations.
4. The Air Force ROTC pilots are more capable, cooperative, stable, valuing intellectual activity and achievement than skydivers. The latter tend to be coarse, stubborn, insecure and easily disorganized under stress to conform.

5. Risktakers who have had over a year of experience tend to be more active in communication than risktakers who have only a year or less of experience. The inexperienced risktakers are more apathetic, shy, uneasy and awkward in new or unfamiliar social situations.

6. There are no real differences in socialization and responsibility levels between married and single risktakers, however, there is a tendency for the married risktakers to be more responsible and alert to moral issues than single risktakers.

7. Size of hometown and age differences have no significant relation to the personality variables under consideration in this study.

DISCUSSION

From the findings of the study there is some support for the social learning theory mentioned in Chapter One. The risktakers who serve the more useful function for society and hence conform more to the values of that society have scored higher on most measurements of personal and social development which were selected for research purposes. The Cs scale was the only exception and this mean difference measured by the Scheffe contrasts was only .01, actual means
were pilots 19.50 and skydivers 19.74. On the Ac, So and Re scales the more functional risk-takers appeared more conforming, socialized and responsible. Possibly they do derive more positive reinforcement from the larger society because a larger sector of society is reinforcing such risk-taking behavior as opposed to the much more specific group which reinforces the skydiver. A larger group of social reinforcers can be found for those groups who engage in the more functional risk activity.

This study can serve as an indication of how the measurers of socialization and responsibility are related not only to physical risk-takers but to the academic and vocational setting. The academic achiever displays much the same personality characteristics as the more functional risk-taker.

The research does give some support to Spalto's findings that individual interests may predict risk-taking behavior. Since there were no significant findings which discriminated between the amateur and the professional motorcycle racer, possibly they represent only one basic interest and set of personality characteristics and should have been included or grouped together. If this were done there would have been even more rationale for the functional-nonfunctional continuum on all but the Re and Cs scales.

In view of the related research it would seem advisable to attempt to use these four scales on high school

\[33\text{Spalto, op. cit., p. 7.}\]
classes and see if it does have some predictive value as far as high and low academic achievers, delinquents and possibly what type of people tend to enter what kind of risk occupation, avocation and prefer what type of recreational activity.

IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The study has shown some interesting personality differences between the various groups of risktakers but many more questions have appeared which call for further investigation. One major question is "to what extent is the physical risktaker also a gambler in the material or social scene?" The present classification of "risktaker" which is often measured by determining various levels of need-achievement and manifest-anxiety needs to be correlated with various groups of physical risktakers. This would present some validity for studying the physical risktaker by way of laboratory experiments and thus subject the results to a little stricter interpretation.

Further research is also needed to detect what influence social attitudes have on juvenile delinquency and to what extent the risktaking behavior is an outlet for anti or asocial behavior. The present study could have incorporated delinquency rate criteria to determine the extent of delinquency in the risktaking groups. Possibly the more nonfunctional risk activity is the path or interest area that the delinquent will take due to his ambivalent feelings toward some of societies values.
In a more educational vain, follow up research can be done on the young men and women who display these atypical personality characteristics to see how their academic or vocational interests develop. Such findings can be very valuable in helping the counselor and administrator set up programs which will assist students in utilizing their time and energies more effectively and efficiently.
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Table 1. Means of the Four Groups of Risktakers on the Responsibility (Re) Scale of the CPI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>453.20</td>
<td>151.07</td>
<td>4.08*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>58.</td>
<td>2145.51</td>
<td>36.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61.</td>
<td>2598.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>22.63</td>
<td>23.22</td>
<td>20.77</td>
<td>28.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STDV</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scheffe Contrasts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>3.66*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .01 level
Table 2. Means of the Four Groups of Risktakers on the Socialization (So) Scale of the CPI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>427.81</td>
<td>142.60</td>
<td>3.46*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2269.75</td>
<td>41.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2697.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>30.50</td>
<td>33.35</td>
<td>32.83</td>
<td>38.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STDV</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scheffe Contrasts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>3.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level
Table 3. Means of the Four Groups of Risktakers on the Capacity for Status (Cs) Scale of the CPI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>152.54</td>
<td>50.85</td>
<td>3.25*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>906.88</td>
<td>15.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1059.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>19.74</td>
<td>16.83</td>
<td>16.15</td>
<td>19.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STDV</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scheffe Contrasts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>2.11*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level
Table 4. Means of the Four Groups of Risktakers on the Achievement via Conformance (Ac) Scale of the CPI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>235.46</td>
<td>78.39</td>
<td>3.45*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1320.47</td>
<td>22.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1555.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>20.16</td>
<td>21.67</td>
<td>21.85</td>
<td>25.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STDV</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheffe Constrast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level
Table 5. Means of Experienced and Inexperienced Risktakers on the Capacity for Status (Cs) Scale of the CPI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>68.82</td>
<td>68.82</td>
<td>4.17*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>60.</td>
<td>990.61</td>
<td>16.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61.</td>
<td>1059.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>3 years and more experience</th>
<th>2 years and less experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>17.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STDV</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level
Table 6.1. Means of Older and Younger Risktakers on the Responsibility (Re) Scale of the CPI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1*</th>
<th>2**</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>22.84</td>
<td>24.43</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STDV</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Group 1 = Younger Group - 17 to 22 years
** Group 2 = Older Group - 23 to 33 years

---

Table 6.2. Means of Older and Younger Risktakers on the Socialization (So) Scale of the CPI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1*</th>
<th>2**</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>33.81</td>
<td>32.86</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STDV</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Group 1 = Younger Group - 17 to 22 years
** Group 2 = Older Group - 23 to 33 years
Table 7.1. Means of the Married-Single Dichotomy on the Responsibility (Re) Scale of the CPI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1*</th>
<th>2**</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>24.96</td>
<td>22.76</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STDV</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Group 1 - Married  
** Group 2 - Single

Table 7.2. Means of the Married-Single Dichotomy on the Socialization (So) Scale of the CPI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1*</th>
<th>2**</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>24.86</td>
<td>32.46</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STDV</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Group 1 - Married  
** Group 2 - Single
Table 8.1. Means of Risktakers From Small, Medium and Large Hometowns on the Responsibility (Re) Scale of the CPI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1*</th>
<th>2**</th>
<th>3***</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>25.89</td>
<td>23.52</td>
<td>21.73</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STDV</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Group 1 - Small Hometown
** Group 2 - Medium Hometown
*** Group 3 - Large Hometown

Table 8.2. Means of Risktakers From Small, Medium and Large Hometowns on the Socialization (So) Scale of the CPI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1*</th>
<th>2**</th>
<th>3***</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>32.19</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STDV</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Group 1 - Small Hometown
** Group 2 - Medium Hometown
*** Group 3 - Large Hometown
Table 9. Matrix of the Four Risktaking Groups and Their Means on the Four Selected Scales of the CPI Compared to Established Norms on These Scales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>CPI Norm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>So</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.50</td>
<td>33.35</td>
<td>32.83</td>
<td>38.17</td>
<td>36.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td>23.22</td>
<td>20.77</td>
<td>28.83</td>
<td>31.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cs</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.74</td>
<td>16.83</td>
<td>16.15</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>19.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.16</td>
<td>21.67</td>
<td>21.85</td>
<td>25.75</td>
<td>27.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Means and Probability Levels Reported by Mizushima\textsuperscript{34}.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Nondelinquent (n=64)</th>
<th>Delinquent (n=36)</th>
<th>Diff</th>
<th>t-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cs</td>
<td>15.06</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re</td>
<td>25.51</td>
<td>19.75</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So</td>
<td>35.74</td>
<td>24.25</td>
<td>11.49</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac</td>
<td>22.43</td>
<td>17.78</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{34}Mizushima and DeVos, op. cit., p.45.
A STUDY OF SUCCESSFUL RISKTAKERS

1. NAME __________________________________________

2. ADDRESS
   (Street) ______________________ (City) __________ (State)
   (Zip Code) __________

3. NUMBER OF YEARS OF EXPERIENCE ______

4. AGE ______

5. SIZE OF HOMETOWN ______

6. CHECK ANY OF THE FOLLOWING IN WHICH YOU PARTICIPATE
   (a) Scrambles __________
   (b) Short Track __________
   (c) Moto Cross __________
   (d) Hare and Hound Race ______

7. Married ____  Single ____

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ANSWERING THE FOLLOWING 153 QUESTIONS:

(1) Answer each question as you feel about it at that time.

(2) Mark each blank space with either a 'T' if true or a 'F' if False.

(3) Take as much time as you please and when finished please mail promptly in the self-addressed, stamped envelope.

IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO KNOW THE RESULTS OF THIS RESEARCH

PLEASE MARK BELOW.

Yes ________  No ________
1. I have a very strong desire to be a success in the world.

2. I liked "Alice in Wonderland" by Lewis Carroll.

3. I usually go to the movies more than once a week.

4. I often feel that I made a wrong choice in my occupation.

5. There's no use in doing things for people; you only find that you get it in the neck in the long run.

6. I would like to be a journalist.

7. A person who doesn't vote is not a good citizen.

8. I have had very peculiar and strange experiences.

9. When a person "pads" his income tax report so as to get out of some of his taxes, it is just as bad as stealing money from the government.

10. In most ways the poor man is better off than the rich man.

11. Clever, sarcastic people make me feel very uncomfortable.

12. It's a good thing to know people in the right places so you can get traffic tags, and such things, taken care of.

13. I am often said to be hotheaded.

14. I tend to be on my guard with people who are somewhat more friendly than I had expected.

15. When I was going to school I played hooky quite often.

16. I get very nervous if I think that someone is watching me.

17. It's no use worrying my head about public affairs; I can't do anything about them anyhow.

18. I think I would like the work of a school teacher.

19. Women should not be allowed to drink in cocktail bars.
20. When someone does me a wrong I feel I should pay him back if I can, just for the principle of the thing.

21. Every family owes it to the city to keep their sidewalks cleared in the winter and their lawn mowed in the summer.

22. I liked school.

23. Some of my family have quick tempers.

24. I think Lincoln was greater than Washington.

25. I am embarrassed by dirty stories.

26. I used to keep a diary.

27. Maybe some minority groups do get rough treatment, but it's none of my business.

28. We ought to worry about our own country and let the rest of the world take care of itself.

29. When I get bored I like to stir up some excitement.

30. I am afraid of deep water.

31. As long as a person votes every four years, he has done his duty as a citizen.

32. I would do almost anything on a dare.

33. With things going as they are, it's pretty hard to keep up hope of amounting to something.

34. I like to listen to symphony orchestra concerts on the radio.

35. I am fascinated by fire.

36. School teachers complain a lot about their pay, but it seems to me that they get as much as they deserve.

37. Planning one's activities in advance is very likely to take most of the fun out of life.

38. I was a slow learner in school.

39. I think I am stricter about right and wrong than most people.
40. There is something wrong with a person who can't take orders without getting angry or resentful.

41. I do not dread seeing a doctor about a sickness or injury.

42. It takes a lot of argument to convince most people of the truth.

43. I think I would like to drive a racing car.

44. I wake up fresh and rested most mornings.

45. I wish I were not bothered by thoughts about sex.

46. I seldom or never have dizzy spells.

47. It is all right to get around the law if you don't actually break it.

48. I am somewhat afraid of the dark.

49. I have a tendency to give up easily when I meet difficult problems.

50. I certainly feel useless at times.

51. I like tall women.

52. I hardly ever get excited or thrilled.

53. I have the wanderlust and am never happy unless I am roaming or traveling about.

54. I would like to hear a great singer in an opera.

55. I am sometimes cross and grouchy without any good reason.

56. Every citizen should take the time to find out about national affairs, even if it means giving up some personal pleasures.

57. My parents have often disapproved of my friends.

58. I should like to belong to several clubs or lodges.

59. My home life was always happy.

60. I often act on the spur of the moment without stopping to think.
61. My way of doing things is apt to be misunderstood by others.

62. I have had blank spells in which my activities were interrupted and I did not know what was going on around me.

63. When I work on a committee I like to take charge of things.

64. My parents have generally let me make my own decisions.

65. I would rather go without something than ask for a favor.

66. I have had more than my share of things to worry about.

67. I usually don't like to talk much unless I am with people I know very well.

68. In school my marks in deportment were quite regularly bad.

69. Only a fool would ever vote to increase his own taxes.

70. When I meet a stranger I often think that he is better than I am.

71. I would be ashamed not to use my privilege of voting.

72. I like to keep people guessing what I'm going to do next.

73. Before I do something I try to consider how my friends will react to it.

74. In a group of people I would not be embarrassed to be called upon to start a discussion or give an opinion about something I know well.

75. I have no patients with people who believe there is only one true religion.

76. If given the chance I would make a good leader of people.

77. I enjoy a race or game better when I bet on it.

78. I have often found people jealous of my good ideas, just because they had not thought of them first.
79. I very much like hunting.
80. I have never been in trouble with the law.
81. It makes me angry when I hear of someone who has been wrongly prevented from voting.
82. In school I was sometimes sent to the principle for cutting up.
83. I feel uneasy indoors.
84. People have a real duty to take care of their aged parents, even if it means making some pretty big sacrifices.
85. I keep out of trouble at all costs.
86. It is hard for me to find anything to talk about when I meet a new person.
87. I like to read about history.
88. I would rather be a steady and dependable worker than a brilliant but unstable one.
89. A person does not need to worry about other people if only he looks after himself.
90. We ought to pay our elected officials better than we do.
91. I can honestly say that I do not really mind paying my taxes because I feel that's one of the things I can do for what I get from the community.
92. I am so touchy on some subjects that I can't talk about them.
93. The future is too uncertain for a person to make serious plans.
94. I like to talk before groups of people.
95. Most of the time I feel happy.
96. I like to plan out my activities in advance.
97. I must admit I find it very hard to work under strict rules and regulations.
98. I like large, noisy parties.
99. When prices are high you can't blame a person for getting all he can while the getting is good.

100. I often feel as though I have done something wrong or wicked.

101. In school I found it very hard to talk before the class.

102. I always try to do at least a little better than what is expected of me.

103. We ought to let Europe get out of its own mess; it made its bed, let it lie in it.

104. I would be very unhappy if I was not successful at something I had seriously started to do.

105. I often lose my temper.

106. My parents were always very strict and stern with me.

107. I am bothered by people outside, on streetcars, in stores, etc., watching me.

108. If I get too much change in a store, I always give it back.

109. I often get disgusted with myself.

110. Society owes a lot more to the businessman and the manufacturer than it does to the artist and the professional.

111. I like to read about science.

112. It is hard for me to act natural when I am with new people.

113. I have never done anything dangerous for the thrill of it.

114. I think I would like to belong to a singing club.

115. As a youngster I was suspended from school one or more times for cutting up.

116. I think I would like to belong to a motorcycle club.

117. I used to like it very much when my papers were read in front of the class.
118. I feel that I have often been punished without cause.

119. I don't seem to care what happens to me.

120. I am afraid to be alone in the dark.

121. Police cars should be especially marked so that you can always see them coming.

122. I have often gone against my parents' wishes.

123. I often think about how I look and what impression I am making on others.

124. I have never done any heavy drinking.

125. I find it easy to "drop" or "break with" a friend.

126. I get nervous when I have to ask someone for a job.

127. Sometimes I used to feel that I would like to leave home.

128. I never worry about my looks.

129. I have been in trouble one or more times because of my sex behavior.

130. I go out of my way to meet trouble rather than try to escape it.

131. My home life was always very pleasant.

132. I seem to do things that I regret more than other people do.

133. My table manners are not quite as good at home as when I am out in company.

134. It is pretty easy for people to win arguments with me.

135. I know who is responsible for most of my troubles.

136. I get pretty discouraged with the law when some smart lawyer gets a criminal free.

137. I have used alcohol excessively.

138. Even when I have gotten into trouble I was usually trying to do the right thing.
139. It is very important to me to have enough friends and social life.
140. I sometimes wanted to run away from home.
141. Life usually hands me a pretty raw deal.
142. People often talk about me behind my back.
143. I would never play cards (poker) with a stranger.
144. I don't think I'm quite as happy as others seem to be.
145. I used to steal sometimes when I was a younger.
146. My home as a child was less peaceful and quiet than those of most other people.
147. Even the idea of giving a talk in public makes me afraid.
148. As a youngster in school I used to give the teachers lots of trouble.
149. If the pay was right I would like to travel with a circus or carnival.
150. I never cared much for school.
151. The members of my family were always very close to each other.
152. My parents never really understood me.
153. A person is better off if he doesn't trust anyone.
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ABSTRACT

This risktaking study was undertaken to show that there is a relationship between risktaking activity which serves various degrees of function or use to society and measures of socialization and responsibility associated with society. The purpose of this type of study was to investigate the possibility of utilizing personality measures to help counselors better understand risktaking behavior from a social learning point of view.

The study tested hypotheses concerning the following personality characteristics: (1) Responsibility, (2) Socialization, (3) Achievement via Conformance and (4) Capacity for Status. The instrumentation used to measure these areas was selected scales of the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) with the special permission of the test publisher. The hypotheses were tested to see if there were any differences on these variables between groups of functional and nonfunctional risktakers. Functional risktaking was defined as that activity which involves physical risk but serves a useful purpose to society while nonfunctional risktaking serves a very limited purpose to society.

To establish different levels of risktaking the following groups were designated as forming a continuum of nonfunctional to functional: Group 1 (skydivers), Group 2
(amateur motorcycle racers), Group 3 (professional motorcycle racers) and Group 4 (Air Force ROTC pilot trainees).

A field type experimental approach was used to study this type of risktaker. The two cycle groups were contacted at various races in Kansas during the summer of 1971 and presented with the questionnaire contained in self-addressed envelopes. The two other groups were given the same questionnaire in a classroom type setting during the winter months of 1971. Group 1 consisted of 19 persons; Group 2, 18; Group 3, 13 and Group 4, 12 individuals. Ages ranged from 17-33 years; years of risktaking experience, 1-11 years; size of hometown, 100 to 1.5 million and the married-single split was about equal.

The analysis, using the Scheffe tests for multiple comparisons, showed five significant results. There was a significant difference between groups of risktakers on the Responsibility, Socialization, Achievement via Conformance and Capacity for Status scales. Levels of probability ranged from .01 to .05.

Implications for further research included correlation between material and physical forms of risktaking, follow up of students who display low responsibility and socialization profiles to see if they can in fact be dichotomized into high and low achievers and delinquent and non-delinquent. One further possibility would be to study the vocational, avocational and recreational development of students whose scores are similar to physical risktakers.