

# Achievement Related Behavioural Orientations Amongst Urban, Semi Urban and Rural Youth of Assam

Utpal Das\*

Research Scholar, Department of Education, BRA, BU, Muzaffarpur

**Abstract – The empirical investigation intended to make a comparison amongst youths belonging to urban, semi-urban and rural areas in terms of achievement related behavioural orientations, goal setting, risk-taking behaviour, social mobility, perceived education employment link and perceived effort-outcome link. It was hypothesized that educated youths from urban, semi urban and rural areas would differ significantly from among themselves in terms of (i) goal setting, (ii) risk-taking behaviour, (iii) social mobility, (iv) PEEL and (v) PEOL respectively. For the purpose youths of urban (N = 120), semi-urban (N = 140) and rural (N = 220) areas were administered Achievement Behaviour Questionnaire (ABQ) along with PDS to measure the variables and to seek their personal information. The obtained data were analysed using t-test. The hypotheses were retained. It was found that educated urbanized youth excelled over semi-urban youth and semi urban youth excelled over rural youth in terms of achievement related behavioural orientations namely goal setting, risk-taking behaviour, social mobility, perceived education employment link and perceived effort outcome link respectively. Thus, it is concluded that achievement related behavioural orientations are the function of inhabitation.**

-----X-----

## INTRODUCTION

The achievement related behavioural orientations are the main variables of the present investigation. Certain behavioural patterns have been identified which are said to be achievement oriented. These included:- (a) High achievers are more focused on performance goal, (b) High achievers are more inclined to take challenging tasks with a moderate risk. Unchallenging tasks involving high risk do not interests them, (c) High achievers show high social mobility, (d) High achievers tend to be persistent on working on tasks they perceive as career related, (e) High achievers like to work in situations in which they have control over the outcome; they are not gamblers. As a psychological construct, ruralness might be defined on the basis of the attitudes and values typically held by people living in rural communities, particularly as they are differentiated from urban dwellers. Rural people are said to be (relative to urban people) conservative, religious, work-oriented, intolerant of diverse ideas, feministic, individualistic, fatalistic and so forth (Hey et. al., 1979). Such rural-urban differences have been identified in terms of differences in general environment and orientation to nature occupation, size of community, density of population, social mobility, social interaction, leadership pattern, standard of living etc. How these characteristics differences between rural and urban communities may account for differences in the achievement

orientation/ motivation among rural and urban youth, need to be examined in the Indian context in general and in the context of the state of Assam in particular, where the rural urban division is more accentuated.

The youth population of any nation constitutes the major force in the process of rapid national development. In the Indian context moreover, the large population of rural youth must play an active role in the development process. It is clear that unless the Indian youth in general and the Indian rural youth in particular is motivated to participate and contribute actively in the developmental process. The goal of national development will be difficult to achieve. It is obvious that the urban-rural differences, particularly in the state of Assam are not only limited to differences in infrastructural and economic opportunities but also in cultural, social and psychological orientations which may unduly cause differences in achievement related motivation and behaviour among educated youth from urban and rural Assam.

There are some studies linking the variables under references. Adsul and Kampe (2008) found that achievement motivation is a function of gender, SES and caste. Chaubey and Sinha (1974) found that risk-taking and economic development are significantly related. Dev and Krishnamurty (1973) reported that motivation level and risk-taking are

significantly related. Moddus et al. (1986) found that self-efficiency expectancy, outcome expectancy and outcome value are significantly related. Roebken (2007) found that multiple goal, satisfaction and achievement are significantly related. The foregoing references indicate that the variables under study have not been studied in context of Assam. This justifies undertaking of the problem.

## OBJECTIVE

The study intended to make a comparison among urban, semi-urban and rural youths in terms of achievement related behavioural orientations, goal setting, risk-taking behaviours, social mobility, perceived education employment link and perceived effort-outcome link respectively.

## HYPOTHESES

- (1) The educated youth subjects from urban areas, compared to youth from semi-urban areas, would be more realistic and clear about their future goal.
- (2) The educated youth subjects from urban areas would differ from semi-urban or rural youth subjects on risk-taking behaviour.
- (3) The social mobility would be stronger in educated youths from urban and semi-urban areas than those from extreme rural areas.
- (4) The perceived education employment link would be stronger in educated youths from urban and semi-urban than those from extreme rural areas.
- (5) The educated youth from more urbanised areas, compared to those from semi-urban and rural areas, would be higher on perceived effort outcome link.

## METHOD OF STUDY

### Sample

The sample comprised of 480 male and female undergraduate respondents selected from among urban (N = 120), semi-urban (N = 140) and rural (N = 200) areas of Kokrajhar, Goalpara, Bongaigam using incidental-cum-purposive sampling technique. Other than the conditions required the respondents were matched so far as practicable.

### Tools Used

- (1) A PDS was used to seek the necessary information about the respondents.
- (2) Achievement Behaviour Questionnaire (ABQ) was used to measure goal setting,

risk-taking behaviour, social mobility, Perceived Education Employment Link (PEEL) and Perceived Out-come Effort Link (POEL) respectively.

## RESULTS

**Table-01**

**Mean, SD, t-value showing a comparison of goal-setting behaviour amongst urban, semi-urban and rural youths.**

Youth	N	Mean	SD	t-value	df	p
Urban (a)	120	26.85	8.75	$t_{ab} = 2.25$	258	<.05
Semi-urban (b)	140	24.35	9.15	$t_{ac} = 7.89$	338	<.01
Rural (c)	220	28.25	11.05	$t_{bc} = 5.70$	358	<.01

The results displayed by table-01 clearly revealed the significant association of inhabitation on goal setting behaviour amongst urban, semi-urban and rural youths. The significance of difference between urban (a) and semi-urban (b) groups on goal setting behaviour was found significant [ $t_{ab} = 2.25$ ;  $df = 258$ ;  $p < .05$ ]. Thus, hypotheses no. (1) is retained. It was found that urban (Mean = 26.85) excelled over semi-urban (Mean = 24.35) in terms of goal setting behaviour. Further, rural respondents excelled over semi-urban and urban respondents in terms of goal setting. Higher score on goal setting indicates more clear and practical goal setting. Thus, rural youth excelled over urban and semi-urban in setting their goals more clearly.

**Table-02**

**Mean, SD, t-value showing a comparison of risk-taking behaviour amongst urban, semi-urban and rural youths.**

Youth	N	Mean	SD	t-value	df	p
Urban (a)	120	22.65	6.85	$t_{ab} = 3.83$	258	<.05
Semi-urban (b)	140	26.40	8.95	$t_{ac} = 5.19$	338	<.01
Rural (c)	220	18.60	7.10	$t_{bc} = 8.67$	358	<.01

The results displayed by table-02 clearly revealed the fact that urban, semi-rural and rural youth differed significantly in terms of their risk-taking behaviour. Urban and semi-urban youth differed significantly in terms of their risk taking behaviour ( $t_{ab} = 3.83$ ;  $df = 258$ ;  $p < .05$ ). Similarly, urban and rural youths ( $t_{ac} = 5.19$ ;  $df = 338$ ;  $p < .01$ ) and semi-urban and rural ( $t_{bc} = 8.67$ ;  $df = 358$ ;  $p < .01$ ) youths differed significantly in terms of their risk-taking behaviour. Thus, hypothesis no. (2) is retained. Thus, it is concluded that risk-taking behaviour is another important component influencing achievement oriented motivation amongst urban,

semi-urban and rural-youths especially in the context of Assam.

**TABLE-03**

**MEAN, SD, T-VALUE SHOWING A COMPARISON OF SOCIAL-MOBILITY BEHAVIOUR AMONGST URBAN, SEMI-URBAN AND RURAL YOUTHS.**

Youth	N	Mean	SD	t-value	df	p
Urban (a)	120	27.05	9.05	$t_{ab} = 2.03$	258	<.05
Semi-urban (b)	140	24.80	8.75	$t_{ac} = 8.03$	338	<.01
Rural (c)	220	19.10	8.05	$t_{bc} = 6.19$	358	<.01

The results displayed in table-03 clearly revealed the dominance of urban youth over semi-urban and rural youth in terms of social mobility dimensions of achievement related behavioural orientation. The urban youth excelled (Mean = 27.05) over semi-urban (Mean = 24.80) and rural (Mean = 19.10) youth significantly [ $t_{ab} = 2.03$ ;  $df = 258$ ;  $p < .05$ ;  $t_{ac} = 8.03$ ;  $df = 338$ ;  $p < .01$ ;  $t_{bc} = 6.19$ ;  $df = 358$ ;  $p < .01$ ]. Thus, hypothesis number-(3) is retained. It was concluded that inhabitation is a significant contributor to social mobility dimension of achievement related behavioural orientation amongst urban, semi-urban and rural youths of Assam.

**Table-04**

**Mean, SD, t-value showing a comparison of Perceived Education Employment Link (PEEL) amongst urban, semi-urban and rural youths.**

Youth	N	Mean	SD	t-value	df	p
Urban (a)	120	26.15	6.75	$t_{ab} = 1.97$	258	<.05
Semi-urban (b)	140	24.90	8.30	$t_{ac} = 2.55$	338	<.01
Rural (c)	220	23.80	10.15	$t_{bc} = 2.58$	358	<.01

The results displayed by table-04 clearly revealed the fact that youths belonging to urban, semi-urban and rural areas of Assam differed significantly in terms of Perceived Education Employment Link (PEEL). The urban (Mean = 26.15) excelled over semi-urban (Mean = 24.90) and rural (Mean = 23.80) youths significantly [ $t_{ab} = 1.97$ ;  $df = 258$ ;  $p < .05$ ;  $t_{ac} = 2.55$ ;  $df = 338$ ;  $p < .01$  and  $t_{bc} = 2.58$ ;  $df = 358$ ;  $p < .01$ ]. Thus, hypothesis no. (4) is retained. It was concluded that inhabitation is a significant contributor to PEEL dimensions of achievement related behaviour orientation amongst youths.

**Table-05**

**Mean, SD, t-value showing a comparison of Perceived Effort-Outcome Link (PEOL) amongst urban, semi-urban and rural youths of Assam.**

Youth	N	Mean	SD	t-value	df	p
Urban (a)	120	26.25	7.25	$t_{ab} = 2.05$	258	<.05
Semi-urban (b)	140	24.20	8.15	$t_{ac} = 5.21$	338	<.01
Rural (c)	220	21.20	10.20	$t_{bc} = 3.06$	358	<.01

It is clear from the result table-(05) that urban youth (Mean = 26.25) excelled over semi-urban (Mean = 24.20) and rural youths (Mean = 21.20) in terms of PEOL dimension of achievement related behavioural orientations significantly [ $t_{ab} = 2.05$ ;  $df = 258$ ;  $p < .05$ ;  $t_{ac} = 5.21$ ;  $df = 338$ ;  $p < .01$  and  $t_{bc} = 3.06$ ;  $df = 358$ ;  $p < .01$ ]. Thus, hypothesis no. (05) is retained. It was concluded that inhabitation significantly influence perceived effort-out come link (PEOL) dimension of achievement related behavioural orientation related urban, semi-urban and rural youth of Assam.

## CONCLUSIONS

- (1) Urban, semi-urban and rural youths of Assam differed significantly in terms of goal setting dimension of achievement related behavioural orientations.
- (2) Urban, semi-urban and rural youths of Assam differed significantly in terms of risk-taking behavioural dimension of achievement related behavioural orientations.
- (3) Urban, semi-urban and rural youths of Assam differed significantly in terms of social mobility dimension of achievement related behavioural orientations.
- (4) Urban, semi-urban and rural youths of Assam differed significantly in terms of perceived education employment link dimension of achievement related behavioural orientations.
- (5) Urban, semi-urban and rural youths of Assam differed significantly in terms of perceived effort out-come link dimension of achievement related behavioural orientations.

## REFERENCES

- Adsul, R.K. and Kampe, V. (2008). Achievement motivation as function of gender, economic background and caste differences in college students; journal of academy of applied psychology; Vol-34, No. - 02.

- Choubey, N.P. (1974). Motivational dimension of rural development; Chaitanya publication, Allahabad.
- Choubey N.C. Sinha D.N. (1974). Risk taking and economic development, applied psychology, vol-23, Issue 1.
- Choubey N.C. Sinha D.N. (1972). Achievement motivation and rural economic development, International journal of psychology, Vol-7.
- Dave, P.N. and Krishnamurthy, A.R. (1973). An investigation of motivation levels and risk-taking of small farmers of Mysore district; Research report in education.
- Moddux, J.E., Notonand Stolenberg, C.D. (1986). Self-efficiency expectancy, outcome expectancy and outcome value: Relative effect on behavioural intention; Journal of personality and social Psychology.
- Roebken, H. (2007). Multiple goals, satisfaction and achievement in University undergraduate education: A student experience in the research university: Research and occasional paper series CSHF, 207, University of California, Berkeley.

---

**Corresponding Author**

**Utpal Das\***

Research Scholar, Department of Education, BRA, BU, Muzaffarpur