Educational Policy Analysis and Strategic Research, V17, N3, 2022

The Relationship Between Academic Risk-Taking Behaviours and Writing Concerns of Middle School Students

Elif ATALAY[1]
Atatürk University

Esra EKİNCİ ÇELİKPAZU[2]
Recep Tayyip Erdoğan University

Abstract

In this study, it was aimed to examine the relationship between middle school students' academic risk-taking behaviours and writing anxiety. This relational survey type research was carried out in the 2020-2021 academic year. The sample of the study consists of 493 middle school students in a city in Turkey. The data of the study were obtained from the "Academic Risk-Taking Scale" and the "Writing Anxiety Scale". Correlation Analysis tests were used in the analysis of the data. As a result of the research, it was found that there is a moderately significant negative correlation between the academic risk-taking behaviours of middle school students and their writing anxiety. While there was no significant difference in the academic risk-taking behaviours of the students in terms of school type, grade level, number of pages in reading books and academic achievement scores in the mother tongue course, a significant difference was found in terms of the variables determined in writing anxiety.

Keywords: Academic risk-taking, writing anxiety, middle school students.

DOI: 10.29329/epasr.2022.461.1

[1] PhD student, Atatürk University, Department of Turkish Education, Erzurum, Turkey. ORCID:0000-0001-5189-7362
Correspondence: elifatalay80@hotmail.com

[2] Assist. Prof. Dr., Department of Turkish Education, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan University, Rize, Turkey. ORCID: 0000-0002-1080-4593 Email:esra.ekinci@erdogan.edu.tr

Introduction

In the contemporary education approach, it is aimed to develop some knowledge, skills, and competencies in individuals. This accepted approach will both guide individuals to have the necessary competencies in the construction of the society they live in and help them learn the conditions of the age they live in, in other words, to understand and make sense of the life they live in. In the learning-teaching process, one of the concepts related to humans as well as the cognitive domain is the affective field characteristics. This concept is related to the value that the individual adds to the cognitive learning process (Varışoğlu & Ekinci Çelikpazu, 2019).

The affective domain is expressed as a combination of the individual's interest in the unit / unit to be learned, his/her attitude and academic self-confidence (Senemoğlu, 2020). Influencing the learning process of individuals, taking responsibility, and trying; one of the affective domain concepts that requires the development of a positive attitude and interest in the unit to be learned is academic risk-taking behaviour.

Academic risk-taking behaviour is discussed from different perspectives in the literature. Academic risk-taking is a situation in which students make decisions about more difficult or easier assignments to do in academic settings, known or unknown tasks, or sharing or not sharing ideas, and occurs when students choose one of several possible options. These decision-making processes in learning environments can be considered as specific examples of academic risk taking. The first of the two common views about academic risk-taking arises when students can choose from a range of possible options. In this direction, Skaar (2009) expressed academic risk taking as the student's preference for the academically unconventional. Second, these options are accompanied by undesirable consequences specific to the academic setting. For example, students who choose to share their ideas may run the risk of clashing with ideas in the class or of having their ideas rejected or ridiculed by others (Beghetto, 2009). Choosing a difficult and unusual academic task increases the likelihood of a person making mistakes or getting a lower score. Therefore, it can be said that this situation reflects taking more academic risks.

Academic risk taking has an important place in education when it is considered to have implications for various learning processes and outcomes. Strum (1971), in his study examining the relationship between creativity and risk-taking, explained academic risk-taking behaviour as the tendency to take chances, to guess while learning about any question or content, even if there is a possibility of negative results for the opinions or solution suggestions. This definition shows that students' risk taking is also a situation that can measure their mental process of realizing a new or different idea, that is, their ability to think creatively (Varisoglu & Ekinci Çelikpazu, 2019). In the definition made, the willingness and motivation to learn new things come to the fore in academic risk-

taking behaviour. Again, academic risk taking in the literature; the courage and perseverance of people to resist the difficulties they encounter in the learning process; In this process, they are defined as their tendency to prefer difficult and unconventional academic tasks or their willingness to ask questions and test new/different solutions by sharing opinions that are not sure of their accuracy (Neihart, 2010; Skaar, 2009; Beghetto, 2009; Korkmaz, 2002). Clifford (1991), on the other hand, defines academic risk-taking as the choice of academic tasks that vary according to difficulty levels, and states that academic risk-taking behaviours consist of choosing difficult actions, displaying negative behaviours after failure, and recovery after failure.

Although these explanations emphasize cognitive processes in academic risk-taking behaviour, academic risk-taking has an affective nature (Üztemur, Dinç & Acun, 2020). In the literature, there are studies from different disciplines that examine academic risk-taking behaviour from various aspects. Conducted studies examined mainly

-the relationship or tendency between students' risk-taking behaviour in a course and academic success is examined (Nacaroğlu & Yıldırım,2021; Varisoglu & Ekinci Çelikpazu, 2019; Bozpolat & Koç, 2016; Erricker, 2014; İlhan & Çetin, 2013)

-the effect of certain situations on students' cognitive development levels, education level, age, gender, peer relations, competitiveness, parental education, and income level, etc. on academic risk-taking behavior (Daşçı & Yaman, 2014; Majidifard, Shamoossi & Ghourchaei, 2014; Beghetto, 2009; Clifford, Lan, Chou, & Qi, 1989)

-the effect of teaching approaches on academic risk-taking behaviour was determined (Çiftçi, 2006; Korkmaz, 2002),

-tools were developed to measure students' academic risk-taking behaviours specific to a field (İlhan & Çetin, 2013),

-Comparing the students included in the curriculum of the Ministry of National Education with the students included in the International Baccalaureate Diploma Program in terms of academic risk taking, scientific creativity, problem-solving skill levels, and attitudes towards the course (Yaşatürk Midilli 2020),

-students' creative skills/abilities, self-efficacy and self-belief perceptions, perfectionism traits, metacognitive awareness levels, motivations and problem-solving skills, internet use, etc. and academic risk-taking behaviors (Erbaş & Baş, 2015; Odacı, 2013; Beghetto, 2009; Strum, 1971)

-the studies in which activities that encourage students to take academic risks are organized (Devonshire et al., 2014).

Studies examining the relationship between language learning and risk-taking behaviour are also noteworthy. Some of these studies generally examine the relationship between risk-taking and self-evaluation skills in writing skills for second language acquisition or examining the relationship between self-assessment and risk-taking behaviour in speaking ability (Tavakoli & Ghoorchaei 2009) or the relationship between risk taking behaviour and vocabulary learning strategies (Maftoon & Afroukhteh, 2013). However, among the studies in the literature, no study has been found that deals with the relationship between writing anxiety, which directly affects the mother tongue or writing skills (writing in the mother tongue), which constitutes an important part of language skills, and academic risk-taking behaviour.

Writing skills have a special place and importance in the language teaching process. The writing skill, which is one of the four basic language skills that contributes to the language, mental and social development of individuals, needs to be developed systematically. This skill, which can be explained as the expression of thought, can be gained through formal or natural education, and can be accepted as a skill and high-level thinking skill that the individual needs in almost every field of life today. However, in the traditional education approach, writing skill was considered as a secondary skill and students were not interested in expressing themselves in writing, naturally enough time was not allocated to writing skills in the teaching process (Güneş, 2017; Graham & Harris,1988). Today, with the common acceptance that all language skills develop holistically, writing skill has gained importance at least as much as other language skills. However, considering the difficulties involved in writing or acquiring skills in this direction, it is still a challenging process for both individuals in society and students in schools (Uysal & Sidekli, 2020; Arslan, 2018). Problems in the process may cause students to form prejudices against writing and bring along writing anxiety.

Anxiety that negatively affects students' writing performance in the language teaching process is called writing anxiety which negatively affects students' success and mental development in this direction (İşeri & Ünal, 2012). Süğümlü and Alver (2021) explained writing anxiety as one of the affective factors that directly affect students' writing success, motivation, and attitude towards writing. Deniz and Demir (2019) expressed writing anxiety as the tension experienced by the individual before starting the writing process.

In the literature, many studies point out that students with writing anxiety have difficulty in putting their thoughts on paper in a meaningful and structural way and the higher the anxiety of the student, the lower the writing skill (Yılmaz, 2019; Lee, 2016; Mills, Pajares, & Herron, 2006; Abu-Rabia, 2004; Bailey, Onwuegbuzie, & Daley, 2000).

It can be claimed that the lack of sufficient knowledge and self-confidence accompanied with the thought that the product or himself will be evaluated negatively, and behaviours such as feeling

inadequate may cause the emergence of writing anxiety. In the literature review, many studies were found in which writing anxiety was discussed in terms of various variables. It has been observed that some situations in this direction, especially self-efficacy stemming from individual differences, motivation, as well as educational level, gender, parental education level, method/type knowledge, etc., or many variables such as curriculum or teacher behaviour influence writing anxiety (Blasco, 2016; Çocuk, Yanpar Yelken & Özer, 2016; Tekşan, 2012; Zorbaz, 2010).

In the mother tongue curriculum, the importance of developing knowledge/skills for creativity, innovation and risk-taking is emphasized in the areas of competence that students will acquire (MEB, 2019). Writing, which is closely related to high-level cognitive skills and creativity, is an area that requires risk taking and its development contributes to the development of the student in all other areas. From this point of view, the question of whether writing anxiety is related to academic risk-taking behaviour draws attention.

Writing anxiety affects the development of the individual negatively. Academic risk-taking, on the other hand, affects the development of the individual positively, supports learning, and increases the courage and willingness of students to choose difficult operations. Both concepts have the characteristics of affective domain in learning. When evaluated in terms of this feature, the absence of any research examining the relationship between writing anxiety and academic risk-taking behaviour in the literature necessitated this research. In this direction, the aim of the research is whether there is a relationship between middle school students' academic risk-taking behaviours and writing anxiety. Within the framework of the general purpose, the research questions are:

1. Do middle school students' academic risk-taking scores differ significantly in terms of school type, grade level, frequency of reading books, and academic achievement scores in Turkish lessons?
2. Do middle school students' writing anxiety scores differ significantly in terms of school type, grade level, frequency of reading books, and academic achievement scores in Turkish lessons?
3. Is there a significant relationship between the academic risk-taking behaviours of middle school students and their writing anxiety?

Method

Research Pattern

In this study, by examining the relationship between the academic risk-taking behaviour and writing anxiety of middle school students, it is aimed to reveal whether there is a significant

difference between students' academic risk-taking behaviours and writing anxiety in terms of school type, grade level, frequency of reading, and academic success in Turkish lessons. Therefore, the research is in the relational research model. Relational research is based on measuring two or more variables and determining the degree of relationship between them, which is one of the non-experimental quantitative research methods (Christensen, Johnson & Turner, 2015).

Sampling

The sample of the research consists of 493 volunteer students studying in the 5th, 6th, 7th, and 8th grades of middle school. Participants attend middle school in a province (Erzurum) in Turkey in the 2020-2021 academic year. The total number of students studying in middle schools in the specified province is 20,593. In this direction, power analysis was performed on the universe of 20,593 people according to the formula of Barlett, Körtlikk and Higging (2001, p.46). The results obtained show that 377 people are sufficient for the representation of the universe.

Within the scope of the research, 493 people were reached, exceeding the base number of people. Easily accessible sampling method was chosen in the study. This sampling technique was preferred because it provides convenience to the researcher in terms of time, cost, and effort. Patton (2014) defines the convenient / easily accessible sampling method as the researcher tends to the easiest items to reach while forming sample from the universe, which is his or her target. Although this sampling method is not used as a strong sampling method to represent the universe compared to many of the other sampling methods, the reason for choosing this direction in the research is due to the COVID-19 epidemic experienced during the study period and the measures taken to prevent the epidemic in the 5th, 6th, 7th, and 8th grades of middle school. Detailed information on the demographic characteristics of the sample group is given in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of the students participating in the research

School Type	**Public Middle**	**Public imam Hatip**	**Private Middle**			
N	**305**	**131**	**57**			
%	**61.9**	**26.6**	**11.6**			
Grade Level	**5th grade**	**6th grade**	**7th grade**	**8th grade**		
N	**113**	**133**	**139**	**108**		
%	**22.9**	**27.0**	**28.2**	**21.9**		
Frequency of reading books	**Not reding**	**0-100**	**101-200**	**201-300**	**301-400**	**401+**
N	**5**	**173**	**164**	**79**	**38**	**34**
%	**1.0**	**35.1**	**33.3**	**16.0**	**7.7**	**6.9**
Turkish GPA	**0-25**	**26-50**	**51-75**	**76-100**		
N	**13**	**20**	**91**	**369**		
%	**2.6**	**4.1**	**18.5**	**74.8**		

** Imam Hatip Schools (prayer leader and preacher schools) are public educational institutions specialising about teaching classic Islamic courses as well as modern secular scientific curriculum.*

Data Collection Tools

The data of the research were collected with the "Academic Risk-Taking Scale" developed by Clifford (1991) translated into Turkish by Korkmaz (2002), and the "Writing Anxiety Scale" developed by Deniz and Demir (2019). The Academic Risk-Taking Scale is a 5-point Likert-type rating scale for middle school students and consists of 36 items. While there were 3 sub-dimensions in the original of the scale, another sub-dimension was added to the scale in Korkmaz's adaptation. These dimensions are the tendency to have negative feelings after failure, to prefer difficult operations, to recover after failure, to be active, and to not do homework. In Korkmaz's adaptation of the scale, the reliability coefficient was calculated as 0.90 in the application on middle school students. The Writing Anxiety Scale was also developed as a 5-point Likert type for middle school students and consists of 26 items. The scale consists of three sub-dimensions as writing process, avoidance and writing pleasure. Cronbach's Alpha, Spearman Brown and Guttman split-half reliability values of the overall scale and its sub-dimensions, structural reliability of the scale's sub-dimensions and the internal consistency coefficient obtained by the test-retest process are over 70%.

Data Collection Process

Due to the COVID-19 epidemic experienced during the period of the research, the research was conducted online. In this direction, demographic information was added to the Academic Risk-Taking Scale and Writing Anxiety Scale, and the scales were processed into "Google Forms", and then a shareable link was created. The link address was shared with the students studying in the 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th grades of middle school, and the participation of the students in the research was ensured on a voluntary basis. The form, designed through Google forms, was left open for data collection for a week. The students answered all the questions as they were prepared as “needs to be filled”.

Data Analysis

To determine whether the data obtained from the participants showed a normal distribution, the reference intervals determined by Pallant (2016) were considered. The skewness and kurtosis values of all the scales and the items in their sub-dimensions are between +/-2, the data showed normal distribution in the histogram graph, and the p value in the normality tests is greater than .05. These values allowed the correlation analysis to be performed in the study. In addition, Cohen's (1988) standards were taken as reference in the correlation tests. Accordingly, in the correlations obtained from the study; A weak relationship between .10-.29, medium between .30-.49, and higher than .50-1.0 indicate a strong relationship (As cited in Pallant, 2016).

Findings

The descriptive statistics of the average scores of the answers given by the students to the questions on the academic risk-taking and writing anxiety scales are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of the average scores of the answers given by the students to the questions of the academic risk-taking and writing anxiety scales.

	Arithmetic Mean	Median	Variants	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Range
Academic risk taking	2.65	2.63	0.147	0.383	1.00	4.25	3.25
writing anxiety	2.31	2.27	0.546	0.739	1.00	5.00	4.00

As seen in Table 1, according to the descriptive statistics of the scores of the answers given to the questions of the academic risk-taking and writing anxiety scales, the arithmetic mean of the answers to the questions of the Academic Risk-Taking Scale was 2.65, the median was 2.63, the variance was 0.147, and the standard deviation was 0.383. It was determined that the maximum value was 1.00, the maximum value was 4.25, and the variation width was 3.25. It was determined that the arithmetic mean of the answers to the questions on the Writing Anxiety Scale was 2.31, the median was 2.27, the variance was 0.546, the standard deviation was 0.739, the minimum value was 1.00, the maximum value was 5.00, and the width of variation was 4.00.

The descriptive statistics of the answers given by the students to the Academic Risk-Taking Scale sub-dimensions are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of responses to academic risk-taking sub-dimensions

Sub Dimensions	Arithmetic Mean	Median	Variant	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Range
Tendency to have negative feelings after failure	2.74	2.67	0.591	0.768	1.00	5.00	4.00
Tendency to prefer power operations	2.49	2.50	0.250	0.500	1.00	4.40	3.40
The tendency to recover and be effective after failure	2.49	2.45	0.176	0.419	1.00	3.91	2.91
Tendency to not do homework	3.37	3.33	0.550	0.741	1.00	5.00	4.00

According to the descriptive statistics given in Table 2, the arithmetic means of the answers given to the questions of "The tendency to have negative feelings after failure", one of the sub-dimensions of academic risk taking, was 2.74, the median was 2.67, the variance was 0.591, the standard deviation was 0.768, the minimum value was 1.00, the maximum value was 1.00. 5.00 and the change width was determined as 4.00. The arithmetic means of the answers given to the questions “Tension to prefer power operations”, which is another dimension, has a mean of 2.49, a median of 2.50, a variance of 0.250, a standard deviation of 0.500, a minimum value of 1.00, a maximum value of 4.40, and a variation of 3.40. appears to be. Considering the sub-dimension of "recovery and being active after failure", the arithmetic mean of the answers to the questions is 2.49, the median is 2.45,

the variance is 0.176, the standard deviation is 0.419, the minimum value is 1.00, the maximum value is 3.91, and the change and its width was found to be 2.91. Considering the sub-dimension of "not doing homework", it was determined that the arithmetic mean of the answers to the questions was 3.37, the median was 3.33, the variance was 0.550, the standard deviation was 0.741, the minimum value was 1.00, the maximum value was 5.00, and the width of variation was 4.00. determined.

The descriptive statistics of the answers given by the students to the sub-dimensions of the Writing Anxiety Scale are given in Table 3.

Table 3. Descriptive statistics of the answers given to the sub-dimensions of writing anxiety

Sub Dimensions	Arithmetic Mean	Median	Variant	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Range
Writing Process	2.62	2.50	0.804	0.896	1.00	5.00	4.00
Avoidance	1.84	1.60	0.695	0.833	1.00	5.00	4.00
Pleasure of writing	2.57	2.50	1.206	1.098	1.00	5.00	4.00

According to the descriptive statistics given in Table 3, the arithmetic means of the answers given to the “Writing process” questions, one of the sub-dimensions of writing anxiety, was 2.62, the median was 2.50, the variance was 0.804, the standard deviation was 0.896, the minimum value was 1.00, the maximum value was 5.00, and the width of change was determined to be 4.00. It is seen that the arithmetic means of the answers given to the "Avoidance" questions, which is another dimension, is 1.84, the median is 1.60, the variance is 0.695, the standard deviation is 0.833, the minimum value is 1.00, the maximum value is 5.00, and the variation width is 4.00. Considering the "pleasure in writing" sub-dimension, it was determined that the arithmetic mean of the answers to the questions was 2.57, the median was 2.50, the variance was 1.206, the standard deviation was 1.098, the minimum value was 1.00, the maximum value was 5.00, and the variation width was 4.00. has been done.

Table 4. Skewness and kurtosis coefficients of academic risk-taking and writing anxiety scales

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
Academic risk taking	1.00	4.25	2.64	.383	-.051	1.857
Writing anxiety	1.00	5.00	2.31	.739	.646	.198

When the descriptive tables of academic risk taking and writing anxiety are examined, it is seen that the parametric assumption about normality is met. In addition, since the skewness and kurtosis values are between +2 and -2, it is assumed that the data show a normal distribution. Pallant (2016) states that the normality coefficient value in social sciences is acceptable between +2 and -2.

In addition, the results of the histogram graph indicate that the data show a normal distribution. Since the normality assumptions were met, parametric tests were started.

Findings Related to the First Research Question

Table 5 presents the ANOVA results regarding whether students' Academic Risk-Taking Scale sub-dimensions and general average scores differ according to school type.

Table 5. ANOVA test results on whether students' Academic Risk-Taking Scale mean scores differ according to school types.

Sub Dimensions	School Type	N	Average± Std.Deviation	F	p	Post-Hoc
Tendency to have negative feelings after failure	Public Middle School	305	2.775±0.752	0.860	0.424	-
	Public imam hatip	131	2.670±0.791			
	Private middle School	57	2.747±0.804			
Tendency to prefer challenging processes	Public middle school	305	2.493±0.505	0.306	0.736	-
	Public imam hatip	131	2.468±0.531			
	Private Middle school	57	2.530±0.403			
The tendency to recover and be effective after failure	Public Middle school	305	2.474±0.404	0.803	0.449	-
	Public imam hatip	131	2.510±0.468			
	Private Middle School	57	2.542±0.387			
Tendency to not do homework	Public middle school	305	3.321±0.756	2.161	0.116	-
	Public imam hatip	131	3.476±0.755			
	Private Middle school	57	3.427±0.603			
Academic Risk-Taking Scale overall average	Public middle school	305	2.650±0.373	0.321	0.725	-
	Public imam hatip	131	2.632±0.423			
	Private middle school	57	2.681±0.349			

*****: $p<0.05$

As a result of the variance analysis performed to determine whether there is any difference between school types in terms of the mean scores of the Academic Risk-Taking Scale sub-dimensions and general average scores given in Table 5, no significant difference was found in any sub-dimension or general average ($p>0, 05$).

Table 6 shows the ANOVA results regarding whether the Academic Risk-Taking Scale sub-dimensions and overall mean scores of the students differ according to the classes.

Table 6. ANOVA results of students' Academic Risk-Taking Scale sub-dimension and general average score regarding the class variable

Sub Dimensions	Class	N	Average± Std.Deviation	F	p	Post-Hoc
Tendency to have negative feelings after failure	5	113	2.822±0.739[a]	2.91	0.034*	5. 6. 7. class>8. class
	6	133	2.800±0.762[a]			
	7	139	2.773±0.738[a]			
	8	108	2.555±0.823[b]			
Tendency to prefer challenging processes	5	113	2.424±0.484[b]	2.85	0.037*	8. class>5.class 8. class>7. class
	6	133	2.538±0.485[ab]			
	7	139	2.432±0.449[b]			
	8	108	2.579±0.580[a]			
The tendency to recover and be effective after failure	5	113	2.472±0.424	0.41	0.746	-
	6	133	2.518±0.376			
	7	139	2.471±0.362			
	8	108	2.506±0.526			
Tendency to not do homework	5	113	3.448±0.822[a]	4.001	0.008*	5. 6. class>8.class
	6	133	3.494±0.630[a]			
	7	139	3.348±0.802[ab]			
	8	108	3.185±0.662[b]			
Academic Risk-Taking Scale overall average	5	113	2.657±0.398	1.457	0.226	-
	6	133	2.699±0.333			
	7	139	2.634±0.330			
	8	108	2.599±0.476			

*: $p<0.05$

As a result of the one-way analysis of variance, in which the academic risk-taking tendencies of middle school students were analysed, a significant difference was found between the 8th grade and the other classes in terms of the mean scores of the sub-dimension "Tending to have negative feelings after failure" ($p<0.05$). A significant difference was determined between the 8th grade and the 5th and 7th grades in terms of mean scores in the sub-dimension of “tendency to prefer challenging processes” ($p<0.05$). There was no significant difference in the mean scores of the sub-dimension "recovery after failure and tendency to be active" ($p>0.05$). A significant difference was found between the 8th grade and the 5th and 6th grades in terms of the "tendency to not do homework" sub-dimension score averages ($p<0.05$). Additionally, based on the analysis performed on the general average of the scale, no significant result was reached at the .05 level ($p>0.05$). In this context, it has been determined that academic risk taking differs between certain classes on three dimensions. The results of the ANOVA test on whether the Academic Risk-Taking Scale sub-dimensions and the overall average score of the students differ according to the number of pages they read are presented in Table 7.

Table 7. ANOVA results of students' Academic Risk-Taking Scale sub-dimension and overall score averages on the number of reading pages

Sub Dimensions	How many pages have been read	N	Average± Std.Deviation	F	p	Post-Hoc
Tendency to have negative feelings after failure	Not reading	5	2.833±0.429[ab]	2.011	0.04*	201-300 > 0-100
	0-100	173	2.600±0.638[b]			
	101-200	164	2.806±0.775[ab]			
	201-300	79	2.921±0.827[a]			
	301-400	38	2.719±0.922[ab]			
	401 or above	34	2.779±0.958[ab]			
Tendency to prefer power operations	Not reading	5	2.820±0.669[a]	2.936	0.013*	Not reading>201-300. 301-400 and 401 above
	0-100	173	2.562±0.457[ab]			
	101-200	164	2.513±0.492[ab]			
	201-300	79	2.382±0.485[b]			
	301-400	38	2.329±0.475[b]			
	401or above	34	2.415±0.688[b]			
The tendency to recover and be effective after failure	Not reading	5	2.782±0.344[a]	3.010	0.011*	Not reading > 101-200. 201-300. 301-400 and 401 and above
	0-100	173	2.545±0.415[ab]			
	101-200	164	2.509±0.378[b]			
	201-300	79	2.420±0.402[b]			
	301-400	38	2.316±0.371[b]			
	401or above	34	2.455±0.624[b]			
Tendency to not do homework	Not reading	5	3.667±1.027[a]	2.468	0.032*	Not reading > 401 and above
	0-100	173	3.264±0.720[ab]			
	101-200	164	3.447±0.703[ab]			
	201-300	79	3.460±0.765[ab]			
	301-400	38	3.544±0.761[ab]			
	401or above	34	3.157±0.830[b]			
Academic Risk-Taking Scale overall average	Not reading	5	2.883±0.115	1.347	0.243	-
	0-100	173	2.628±0.341			
	101-200	164	2.687±0.369			
	201-300	79	2.663±0.375			
	301-400	38	2.556±0.443			
	401or above	34	2.610±0.571			

*: $p<0.05$

As noted in Table 7, there was a significant difference between those who read between 201-300 pages and those who read between 0-100 pages in terms of the mean scores of the sub-dimension "tendency to have negative feelings after failure" ($p<0.05$). However, a significant difference was determined between those who did not read books and those who read 201 pages or more in terms of the mean scores of the sub-dimension "Tension to prefer power operations" ($p<0.05$). Again, a significant difference was found between those who did not read a book and those who read 101 pages or more in terms of the mean scores of the sub-dimension "Recovery after failure and tendency to be active" ($p<0.05$). There was also a significant difference between those who did not read a book

and those who read 401 pages or more in terms of the mean scores of the sub-dimension "Tension not to do homework" ($p<0.05$).

In terms of overall score averages of the "academic risk taking" scale, there was no significant difference in terms of the number of pages in reading books ($p>0.05$).

Table 8 presents the results of the ANOVA test on whether the sub-dimensions of the Academic Risk-Taking Scale and the general average score of the students differ according to the academic achievement scores of the Turkish course.

Table 8. ANOVA test results on whether students' Academic Risk-Taking Scale sub-dimension and general score averages differ according to the academic achievement score of the Turkish course.

Sub Dimensions	Turkish score	N	Average± Std.Deviation	F	p	Post-Hoc
Tendency to have negative feelings after failure	0-25	13	2.853±0.986[a]	3.158	0.025*	0-25 > All Groups
	26-50	20	2.433±0.575[b]			
	51-75	91	2.582±0.716[b]			
	76-100	369	2.797±0.775[b]			
Tendency to prefer challenging processes	0-25	13	2.515±0.641	0.954	0.414	-
	26-50	20	2.495±0.315			
	51-75	91	2.569±0.507			
	76-100	369	2.471±0.502			
The tendency to recover and be effective after failure	0-25	13	2.587±0.635	1.433	0.232	-
	26-50	20	2.618±0.394			
	51-75	91	2.533±0.422			
	76-100	369	2.471±0.411			
Tendency to not do homework	0-25	13	3.308±1.134	2.367	0.070	-
	26-50	20	3.033±0.996			
	51-75	91	3.282±0.745			
	76-100	369	3.418±0.704			
Academic Risk-Taking Scale overall average	0-25	13	2.716±0.671	0.744	0.526	-
	26-50	20	2.557±0.251			
	51-75	91	2.622±0.384			
	76-100	369	2.659±0.376			

*: $p<0.05$

A significant difference was found between those with grades between 0-25 and the other score groups in terms of the average score of the sub-dimension "tendency to have negative feelings after failure" ($p<0.05$). In terms of the mean scores of the other sub-dimensions of the academic risk-taking Scale and the overall mean scores, there was no significant difference compared to the Turkish course grades ($p>0.05$).

Findings Related to the Second Research Question

ANOVA test results regarding whether students' Writing Anxiety Scale sub-dimensions and overall mean scores differ according to school types are as in Table 9.

Table 9. ANOVA results on whether students' Writing Anxiety Scale sub-dimensions and overall score averages differ according to school types.

Sub Dimensions	School Type	N	Average± Std.Deviation	F	p	Post-Hoc
Writing Process	Public middle school	305	2.604±0.902	1.063	0.346	-
	Public imam hatip	131	2.711±0.927			
	Private middle school	57	2.520±0.793			
Avoidance	Public middle school	305	1.854±0.876	0.478	0.621	-
	Public imam hatip	131	1.786±0.785			
	Private middle school	57	1.904±0.702			
Pleasure of writing	Public middle school	305	2.561±1.124[b]	3.902	0.021*	Private middle school> İmam hatip middle school and Public middle school
	Public imam hatip	131	2.439±1.041[b]			
	Private middle school	57	2.921±1.024[a]			
Writing Anxiety Scale overall average	Public middle school	305	2.309±0.763	0.056	0.945	-
	Public imam hatip	131	2.313±0.727			
	Private middle school	57	2.345±0.640			

*: p<0.05

There is no difference between school types (p>0.05) in terms of the mean scores of the "writing process" and "avoidance" sub-dimensions of the Writing Anxiety Scale, and when the mean scores of the "pleasure in writing" sub-dimension are taken into account, it is observed that private middle school students and public middle school and official It was found that there was a significant difference between the students of imam hatip middle schools.

The results of the ANOVA test regarding whether the sub-dimensions of the Writing Anxiety Scale and the general average score of the students differ according to the classes are as in Table 10.

Table 10. ANOVA results on whether students' Writing Anxiety Scale sub-dimension and overall mean scores differ according to grades.

Sub Dimensions	Class	N	Average± Std.Deviation	F	p	Post-Hoc
Writing process	5	113	2.543±0.887	1.951	0.121	-
	6	133	2.625±0.903			
	7	139	2.552±0.872			
	8	108	2.796±0.919			
Avoidance	5	113	1.903±0.923	1.751	0.156	-
	6	133	1.817±0.794			

	7	139	1.729±0.782			
	8	108	1.954±0.837			
	5	113	2.423±1.026[b]			
Pleasure of writing	6	133	2.607±1.092[ab]	4.029	0.008**	8th class>5th class
	7	139	2.432±1.126[b]			8th class>7th class
	8	108	2.859±1.095[a]			
	5	113	2.278±0.739[b]			
Writing Anxiety	6	133	2.311±0.741[ab]	2.780	0.041*	8th class> 5th class
Scale overall average	7	139	2.217±0.740[b]			8th class>7th class
	8	108	2.482±0.717[a]			

**: p<0.01

There was no significant difference between the classes in terms of the mean scores of the "Writing process" and "Avoiding" sub-dimensions (p>0.05). A significant difference was identified between the 8th grade and the 5th and 7th grades in terms of the mean scores of the “pleasure of writing” sub-dimension (p<0.01). Again, a significant difference was found between the 8th grade students and the 5th and 7th grade students in terms of the overall score averages of the "Writing Anxiety" scale (p<0.05).

The results of the ANOVA test on whether the students' Writing Anxiety Scale sub-dimensions and overall average score differ according to the number of pages in reading books are presented in Table 11.

Table 11. ANOVA results on whether students' Writing Anxiety Scale sub-dimension and overall score averages differ according to the number of pages they read.

Sub Dimensions	How many pages have been read	N	Average± Std.Deviation	F	p	Post-Hoc
	Not reading	5	3.283±1.157[a]			
	0-100	173	2.728±0.841[b]			
Writing Process	101-200	164	2.574±0.828[b]	1.438	0.013*	Not reading > Other Groups
	201-300	79	2.525±0.907[b]			
	301-400	38	2.564±1.010[b]			
	401 or above	34	2.517±1.223[b]			
	Not reading	5	2.100±0.889			
	0-100	173	2.002±0.896			
Avoidance	101-200	164	1.749±0.645	1.430	0.054	-
	201-300	79	1.701±0.791			
	301-400	38	1.729±0.875			
	401or above	34	1.885±1.199			
	Not reading	5	2.700±1.137			
	0-100	173	2.785±1.143			
Pleasure of writing	101-200	164	2.518±0.979	1.373	0.068	-
	201-300	79	2.386±1.103			
	301-400	38	2.368±1.081			
	401or above	34	2.368±1.288			
	Not reading	5	2.738±0.989[a]			
	0-100	173	2.458±0.741[ab]			
Writing Anxiety Scale	101-200	164	2.248±0.621[b]	2.601	0.025*	Not reading > 101 and above
overall average	201-300	79	2.187±0.745[b]			
	301-400	38	2.213±0.802[b]			
	401 or above	34	2.251±1.007[b]			

*: p<0.05

In terms of the mean scores of the "writing process" sub-dimension, there is a significant difference between those who did not read and those who read according to the number of pages in reading (p<0.05).

"Avoiding" and "Pleasure of writing" sub-dimensions were not found to be significant in terms of mean scores (p>0.05).

A significant difference was found between those who did not read a book and those who read 101 pages or more in terms of the overall score averages of the "writing anxiety" scale (p<0.05).

The results of the ANOVA test on whether the students' Writing Anxiety Scale sub-dimensions and general point averages differ according to their Turkish course academic achievement scores are presented in Table 12.

Table 12. ANOVA results on whether students' Writing Anxiety Scale sub-dimension and overall score averages differ according to the academic achievement score of the Turkish course.

Sub Dimensions	Turkish score	N	Average± Std.Deviation	F	p	Post-Hoc
Writing process	0-25	13	2.821±1.070[ab]	6.273	0.001**	26-50 > 76-100
	26-50	20	3.113±0.909[a]			
	51-75	91	2.878±0.954[ab]			
	76-100	369	2.526±0.856[b]			
Avoidance	0-25	13	2.446±1.206[a]	4.891	0.003**	0-25 > 51-75 ve 76-100
	26-50	20	2.155±0.910[ab]			
	51-75	91	1.968±0.840[b]			
	76-100	369	1.772±0.799[b]			
Pleasure of writing	0-25	13	2.942±1.525	0.852	0.466	-
	26-50	20	2.800±0.934			
	51-75	91	2.569±1.103			
	76-100	369	2.545±1.089			
Writing Anxiety Scale overall average	0-25	13	2.695±0.904[a]	5.908	0.001**	0-25 > 76-100 26-50 > 76-100
	26-50	20	2.696±0.824[a]			
	51-75	91	2.481±0.769[ab]			
	76-100	369	2.239±0.706[b]			

**: p<0.01

A significant difference was found between those with scores between 26-50 and 76-100 according to the academic achievement score of the Turkish course in terms of the "writing process" sub-dimension score averages (p<0.01). A significant difference was found between those with academic achievement scores between 0-25 and those with 51-75 and 76-100 scores in terms of "avoidance" sub-dimension mean scores (p<0.01). In terms of the mean scores of the other sub-dimensions of the Writing Anxiety Scale, there was no significant difference between the academic achievement scores of the Turkish course (p>0.05).

In terms of the overall score averages of the "writing anxiety" scale, a significant difference was found between those who scored between 76-100 and those whose scores were between 0-25 and 26-50, according to their Turkish course academic achievement scores ($p<0.01$).

Findings Regarding the Third Research Question

According to the second question of the research, the results of the correlation analysis between academic risk taking and writing anxiety scales are presented in Table 13.

Table 13. Correlation analysis results between academic risk taking and writing anxiety scales overall score averages

	Academic Risk taking	Writing Anxiety
Academic Risk Taking	1	-.32**
Writing Anxiety		1

**: p<0.01

According to the results of the correlation analysis between the Academic Risk-Taking Scale and the Writing Anxiety Scale, it was determined that there was a moderately significant negative relationship (r=-.32). Accordingly, as students' writing anxiety increases, their academic risk-taking levels decrease.

The results of the correlation analysis between the academic risk taking and writing anxiety sub-dimension mean scores of the students are presented in Table 14.

Table 14.Correlation analysis results between academic risk taking and writing anxiety subdimension mean scores

	Tendency to have negative feelings after failure	Tendency to prefer challenging processes	The tendency to recover and be effective after failure	Not doing homework	Writing process	Avoidance	Pleasure of writing
Tendency to have negative feelings after failure	1	.044	.176**	.310**	-.598**	-.331**	-.079
Tendency to prefer challenging process		1	.528**	-.079	.084	.037	.344**
The tendency to recover and be effective after failure			1	-.031	.003	.040	.292**
Not doing homework				1	-.334**	-.438**	-.160**
Writing process					1	.619**	.249**
Avoidance						1	.411**
Pleasure of writing							1

**: p<0.01

There was a high negative level correlation & relation (r=-.60) between the sub-dimension of the tendency to have negative feelings after failure and the writing process sub-dimension; Among the

avoidance sub-dimensions, there was a moderate negative (r=-.33); A significant relationship was found. Tendency to prefer challenging processes sub-dimension and pleasure of writing sub-dimension in the positive direction moderate (r=.34); There is a low level of positive (r=.29) significant correlation between the sub-dimension of the tendency to recover after failure and to be active and the Pleasure of Writing sub-dimension. Negatively moderate level (r=-.33) between not doing homework sub-dimension and Writing process sub-dimension; Negatively moderate (r=-.44) with avoidance sub-dimension; There was a low negative (r=-.16) significant relationship between the writing pleasure sub-dimension.

When Table 14 is examined, it is seen that there is a strong positive relationship between the academic risk-taking and the writing anxiety scales' own sub-dimensions. Since this situation is not within the scope of the research questions, the explanation is not included.

Results

Conclusion and Discussion

The aim of the study is to determine whether there is a relationship between the academic risk-taking levels of middle school students and their writing anxiety. Within this framework, firstly, students' academic risk-taking behaviours and writing anxiety were discussed in terms of the determined variables, and then the relationship between them was identified. The results of the research are as follows:

According to the first question of the research;

1. There is no significant difference in the academic risk-taking general average score of middle school students in terms of school type. It has been observed that the type of school the students attend does not have an impact on academic risk taking in the mother tongue course.

2. There is no significant difference in the academic risk taking general average score of the students according to their grade levels. Different results have been obtained in some studies in the literature. Daşçı and Yaman (2014) examined the effects of students' cognitive development periods and education levels on their mental risk-taking skills and concluded that students' mental risk-taking skills decrease as the education level increases. The mental risk-taking levels of the students in the first category are higher than the risk taking levels of the students in the second category. Similarly, Beghetto (2009) found that as the age of the students increased, their risk-taking behaviours decreased. Conversely, Clifford et al. (1990) examined the factors affecting students' motivations and risk-taking behaviours amongst 4th, 6th, and 8th grade students and concluded that risk-taking behaviour increased with development.

The research was carried out during the distance education period of the 2020-2021 academic year due to the COVID 19 epidemic. This result suggests that the negative effects of the epidemic on the academic risk-taking behaviours are also seen on students who are not in the real classroom environment.

There is a significant difference in the mean scores of the students according to the sub-dimensions in terms of grade levels. There is also a significant difference between the 8th grade and the other classes in terms of the mean scores of the sub-dimension "tendency to have negative feelings after failure". 5th, 6th, and 7th graders tend to have more negative feelings after failure than 8th graders. There is a significant difference between the 8th grades and the 5th and 7th grades in terms of mean scores in the sub-dimension of "tendency to prefer power operations". This shows that 8th graders tend to prefer more challenging process than 5th and 7th graders. There is a significant difference between the 8th grade and the 5th and 6th grades in terms of the mean scores of the "tendency to not do homework" sub-dimension.

5th and 6th graders tend to not do more homework than 8th graders. As the grade level increases, the tendency of students to prefer challenging processes increases, and the tendency to not do homework decreases. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of the sub-dimension "Recovery after failure and tendency to be effective". According to these results, it can be said that academic risk taking differs between certain classes on three dimensions.

Another study in which a significant difference was determined according to the sub-dimensions of the Academic Risk-Taking Scale was conducted by Korkmaz (2002). In this study, in which the effect of different learning approaches on academic risk-taking behaviour was examined, there was a significant difference in terms of the mean scores of the sub-dimensions of reflecting the tendency to have negative feelings after failure, to prefer challenging processes, to reflect the tendency to recover after failure and to be effective, to reflect the tendency to not do homework, in favour of the experimental group.

3. There is no difference in the academic risk-taking general score averages of the students according to the number of reading pages. However, the research reveals that there are significant differences in terms of sub-dimensions. In terms of the "tendency to have negative feelings after failure" sub-dimension, there is a significant difference between those who read between 201-300 pages and those who read between 0-100 pages. Students who read more books tend to have negative feelings after failure than those who read less. There is a significant difference between those who do not read books and those who read 201 pages or more in terms of the mean scores of the "tendency to prefer power operations" sub-dimension. There is a significant difference between those who do not read books and those who read 201 pages or more in terms of the mean scores of the "tendency to

prefer challenging processes" sub-dimension. Students who do not read books tend to prefer more challenging processes than those who do. This result suggests that students are more cautious in displaying academic risk-taking behaviour as their learning and/or awareness level increases as they read. In a study conducted by Bozpolat and Koç (2016), it was claimed that students with a high tendency to prefer difficult operations are willing to take academic risks.

The level of awareness of students' behaviour in mathematics was also effective in their preference for challenging operations in mathematics.

There is a significant difference between those who do not read a book and those who read 101 pages or more in terms of the mean scores of the sub-dimension of "recovery after failure and tendency to be active". Students who read less books tend to recover more and be more effective after failure than those who read more. There is a significant difference between those who do not read books and those who read 401 pages or more in terms of the mean scores of the sub-dimension of "tendency to not do homework". It is seen that students who do not read books tend not to do homework more than those who do.

4. There is no difference in the academic risk-taking general average score of the students according to the academic achievement scores of the mother tongue course. On the other hand, there is a significant difference in only one sub-dimension of the scale. Students with an academic success score between 0-25 tend to have negative feelings after failure compared to students with higher success scores. This result shows that as the academic success of the students increases, they tend to have fewer negative feelings even if the risk-taking behaviour results in failure. According to motivation theorists, measured risk-taking behaviour increases intrinsic motivation, enabling cognitive development to progress and giving constructive responses to failure (House, 2002, p. 13). İlhan, Çetin, Öner Sünkür, and Yılmaz (2013) emphasized that academic risk-taking behaviour is effective on students' academic success in their study, where they found a significant relationship between study skills and academic risk taking. In another study (Gündoğdu, Korkmaz, & Karakış, 2005) examining risk-taking behaviour and academic achievement in high school students, a significant relationship was found between risk-taking behaviour and academic success. According to the findings of the study, individuals who show risk-taking behaviour have higher academic success.

According to the second question of the research;

1. Students' writing anxiety average score does not change according to the type of school. However, when the sub-dimensions of the scale are examined, there is a significant difference between private middle school students, imam hatip middle school and public middle school students in terms of "writing pleasure". Private middle school students feel more pleasure in writing.

2. The general average score of students' writing anxiety varies according to their grade level. 8th graders have more writing anxiety than 5th and 7th graders. It is seen that as the grade level increases, the writing anxiety also increases. This result obtained in the research is in parallel with the studies of Zorbaz (2010), Aşılıoğlu and Özkan (2013), Akaydın and Ateş (2015) and Yılmaz (2019). Their research points that the anxiety levels of 8th grade students are higher than those of lower grade students. In terms of the sub-dimensions of the scale, there is no significant difference between the classes according to the "Writing process" and "Avoidance" sub-dimensions. There is a significant difference between the 8th grade and the 5th and 7th grades in terms of the "pleasure of writing" sub-dimension. According to these results, 8th graders have higher writing anxiety, but they feel more pleasure to write than 5th and 7th graders.

3. The general average score of students' writing anxiety varies according to the number of pages in the book. Students who do not read books have more writing anxiety than students who read 101 or more pages. According to the sub-dimensions of the scale, there is a significant difference between the non-readers and the other groups in terms of the "Writing process". Those who do not read books present more anxiety in the process.

4. Students' writing anxiety average score varies according to the academic achievement score of the mother tongue course. In this case, there is a significant difference between those with a score between 76-100 and those with a score of 0-25 and 26-50. Students with a success score between 0-25 and 26-50 have more writing anxiety than students with a score between 76-100. In terms of the "writing process" sub-dimension, there is a significant difference between those with scores between 26-50 and 76-100. In this case, students with a score between 26-50 feel more anxiety in the process. In terms of the "avoidance" sub-dimension, there is a significant difference between those with scores between 0-25 and those with 51-75 and 76-100 scores. Students with a success score between 0-25 avoid writing more.

According to the third question of the research;

1. There is a moderately significant negative correlation between students' academic risk-taking behaviours and writing anxiety. Accordingly, it can be said that as students' writing anxiety increases, their academic risk-taking levels decrease.

Academic risk-taking behaviour is generally explained as the responsibility that students take in situations where they do not know/predict the outcome, which may result in success or failure, and the desire to learn something new (Varışoğlu & Ekinci Çelikpazu, 2019). In this sense, an increase in the desire to take academic risks may be effective in reducing the anxiety felt when starting any assignment/task. At the same time, high level of anxiety may prevent academic risk-taking behaviour.

Different results were obtained in studies examining the relationship between academic risk-taking behaviour and other language skills. In a study examining the relationship between academic risk-taking and verbal expression skills (Majidifard et al., 2014), it was found that there was no significant relationship between Iranian students' risk-taking behaviours and verbal expression proficiency. In the study conducted by Farahani and Hivechi (2013), the relationship between risk taking and self-assessment skills in writing skills of students learning English as a foreign language was examined. The results of the study revealed that there is no relationship between risk-taking behaviour and self-evaluation skills. Students who took high risk did not take risks in terms of using compound sentences or new sentence structures in their written expressions. In Tavakoli and Ghoorchaei's (2009) study examining the relationship between self-assessment and risk-taking behaviour in speaking ability, no significant relationship emerged between students' risk-taking behaviours and their self-evaluation in speaking skills. It was observed that students who took high risk tended to evaluate their speaking abilities more than students who took medium and low risk and acted cautiously.

According to the results of the correlation analysis between the sub-dimensions of the Academic Risk Taking and Writing Anxiety scales, there is a highly significant negative correlation between the sub-dimension of "Tending to have negative feelings after failure" and the "Writing process" sub-dimension. This finding can be interpreted as the students' tendency to have negative feelings after failure increased, and their anxiety during the writing process decreased. The fact that students have less anxiety during the writing process suggests that they can be more effective in writing skills and if they fail at the end of the process, they will tend to have more negative feelings.

A moderately significant negative correlation was found between the sub-dimension of "The tendency to have negative feelings after failure" and the "Avoidance" sub-dimension. As students' avoidance of writing increases, their tendency to have negative feelings after failure decreases. This result may show that students do not want to write.

Between the sub-dimension "Tendency to prefer challenging processes" and "Pleasure of writing" sub-dimension, positive and moderate; There is a low level of positive correlation between the sub-dimension "Recovery after failure and the tendency to be effective" and the "Pleasure of writing" sub-dimension. This result suggests that as the tendency of students to prefer challenging processes and to recover and be effective after failure increases, they feel more pleasure from writing.

There is negatively moderate level relationship between "not doing homework" sub-dimension and "Writing process" sub-dimension; Negatively moderate to "avoidance" sub-dimension; There is negative and low-level significant relationship between the “pleasure of writing” sub-dimension. As students' tendency not to do homework increases, they worry less about the writing process, avoid writing less, and feel less pleasure in writing.

References

Abu-Rabia, S. (2004). Teachers' role, learners' gender difference and fl anxiety among seventh-grade students studying English as FL. *Educational Psychology, 24*, 711-729. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0144341042000263006

Arslan, A. (2018). Ortaokul öğrencilerinin yazma kaygıları ve akademik öz-yeterlik inançlarının çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *18*(3), 1286-1312.

Aşılıoğlu, B. & Özkan, E. (2013). Ortaokul öğrencilerinin yazma kaygılarının bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi: Diyarbakır örneği. *International Journal of Social Science*, *6*(6), 83-111.

Ateş, A. & Akaydın, Ş. (2015). Ortaokul öğrencilerinin yazma kaygılarının incelenmesi: Malatya ili örneği. *Dil ve Edebiyat Eğitimi Dergisi*, *16*, 24-38.

Bailey, P., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Daley, C. E. (2000). Correlates of anxiety at three stages of the foreign language learning process. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 19*(4), 474-490.

Bartlett.J, E., Körtlik, W., & Higgins C. C. (2001). Organizational research: determining appropriate sample size in survey research. *Information Technology, Learning, and Performance Journal, 19*(1), 43-50.

Baş, S. (2012). *The contrubution of personality, motivation, academic risk-taking and metacognition to the creative ability in mathematics*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Middle East Technical University. Ankara.

Beghetto, R. A. (2009). Correlates of intellectual risk taking in elementary school science. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46*(2), 210-223.

Blasco, J. A. (2016). The relationship between writing anxiety, writing self-efficacy, and Spanish EFL students' use of metacognitive writing strategies: A case study. *Journal of English Studies, 14*, 7-48. DOI: 10.18172/jes.3069

Bozpolat, E. & Koç, H. (2016). 8. sınıf öğrencilerinin matematik odaklı akademik risk alma davranışlarının bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*. DOI: 16986/HUJE.2016017559.

Christensen, L. B., Johnson, R. B., & Turner, L. A. (2015). *Araştırma yöntemleri: Desen ve analiz* (2. Baskı). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

Clifford, M. M. (1991). Risk taking: Theoretical, empirical, and educational considerations. *Educational Psychologist, 26*(3 & 4), 263-297.

Clifford, M. M., Lan, W. Y., Chou, F. C., & Qi, Y. (1989). Academic risk-taking: Developmental and cross-cultural observations. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 57*(4), 321-338.

Clifford, M., Chou, F. C., Mao, K., Lan, W. Y. & Kuo, S. (1990). Academic risk-taking, development and external constraint. *Journal of Experimental Education, 59*(1), 45-64.

Çiftçi, S. (2006). *Sosyal bilgiler öğretiminde proje tabanlı öğrenmenin öğrencilerin akademik risk alma düzeylerine, problem çözme becerilerine, erişilerine, kalıcılığa ve tutumlarına etkisi*. Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi. Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. Konya.

Çocuk, H. E., Yanpar Yelken, T. & Özer, O. (2016). The relationship between writing anxiety and writing disposition among secondary school students. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 63*, 335-352. DOI: 10.14689/ejer.2016.63.19

Daşçı, A. D. & Yaman, S. (2014). Fen ve teknoloji dersinde öğrencilerin zihinsel risk alma becerilerinin piaget'in bilişsel gelişim dönemlerine ve eğitim kademelerine göre incelenmesi. *Kuramsal Eğitimbilim Dergisi, 7*(3), 271-285.

Deniz, H. & Demir, S. (2019). Yazma kaygısı ölçeği'nin geliştirilmesi: güvenirlik ve geçerlik çalışması. *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim (TEKE) Dergisi*, *8*(2), 1034-1051.

Devonshire, I.M., Davis, J., Fairweather, S., Highfield, L., Thaker, C., Walsh, A., Wilson, R., & Hathway, G. J. (2014). Risk-based learning games improve long-term retention of information among school pupils. *PLOS ONE*, *9*(7), DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0103640.

Erbaş, A. K. & Baş S. (2015). The contribution of personality traits, motivation, academic risk-taking and metacognition to the creative ability in mathematics. *Creativity Research Journal, 27*(4), 299-307.

Erricker, K. (2014). Taking risk with literature: an exploration into the resilience of pupil responses to the study of a challenging text at GCSE. *Literacy, 48*(2), 86-94. DOI: 10.1111/LİT.12016.

Farahani, A.A. & Hivechi, Z. (2013). the relationship between risktaking and self-assessment of efl learners in writing ability. *Mediterranean Journal of Humanities*, *3*(1), 125-136.

Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (1988). Instructional recommendations for teaching writing to exceptional students. *Exceptional children, 54*(6), 506-512.

Gündoğdu, M., Korkmaz, S. & Karakış, K. (2005). Lise öğrencilerinde risk alma davranışı. *M. Ü. Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi 21*, 151-160.

Güneş, F. (2013). *Türkçe öğretimi*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

House, D. J. (2002). *An investigation of the effects of gender and academic self-efficacy on academic risk-taking for adolescent students*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Oklahama State University.

İlhan, M. & Çetin, B. (2013). Ortaokul öğrencilerinin matematik odaklı akademik risk alma davranışları: Bir ölçek geliştirme çalışması. *E-İnternational Journal Of Educational Research*, *4*(2), 1-28.

İlhan, M., Çetin, B., Öner-Sünkür, M. ve Yılmaz, F. (2013). Ders çalışma becerileri ile akademik risk alma arasındaki ilişkinin kanonik korelasyon ile incelenmesi. *Eğitim Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 3(2), 123-146.

İşeri, K. & Ünal, E. (2012). Türkçe öğretmen adaylarının yazma kaygı durumlarının çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *8*(2), 67-76.

Korkmaz, H. (2002). *Fen eğitiminde proje tabanlı öğrenmenin yaratıcı düşünme, problem çözme ve akademik risk alma düzeylerine etkisi*. Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. Ankara.

Lee, E. J. E. (2016). Reducing international graduate students' language anxiety through oral pronunciation corrections. *System*, *56*, 78-95.

Maftoon, P. & Affroukhteh, N. (2013). The relationship between risk-taking and vocabulary learning strategy use of Iranian efl learners. *Iranian EFL Journal*, *9*(6), 131-148.

Majidifard, E., Shamoossi, N. & Ghourchaei, B. (2014). risk taking, gender and oral narrative proficiency in persian learners of English. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *98*, 1085-1092.

MEB. (2019). *İlköğretim Türkçe dersi öğretim programı (1-8. sınıflar)*. Ankara: Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları.

Mills, N., Pajares, F., & Herron, C. (2006). A reevaluation of the role of anxiety: Self-efficacy, anxiety, and their relation to reading and listening proficiency. *Foreign language annals*, *39*(2), 276-295.

Nacaroğlu, O., & Yıldırım, T. (2021). Ortaokul öğrencilerinin fen bilimleri laboratuvar çalışmalarına yönelik akademik risk alma eğilimlerinin incelenmesi. *Erzincan Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *23*(1), 14-31.

Neihart, M. (2010). Systematic risk-taking. *Roeper Review*, *21*(4), 289-292.

Odacı, H. (2013). Risk-taking behavior and academic self-efficacy as variables accounting for problematic internet use in adolescent university students. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *35*(1), 183-187.

Özdemir, E., & Binyazar, A. (1979). *Yazmak sanatı, kompozisyon* (1. baskı.). Ankara: Varlık Yayınevi.

Pallant, J. (2016). *SPSS kullanma klavuzu spss ile adım adım veri analizi*. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

Patton, M. Q. (2014). *Nitel araştırma ve değerlendirme yöntemleri* (Çev Ed: Bütün, M. ve Demir, S. B). Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayınları.

Senemoğlu, N. (2020). *Gelişim öğrenme ve öğretim* (27. Baskı). Ankara: AnıYayıncılık.

Skaar, N.R. (2009). *Development of the adolescent exploratory and risk behavior rating scale*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Minnesota University, Minneapolis, Saint Paul, ABD.

Strum, I. S. (1971). *The Relationship of Creativity and Academic Risk-Taking Among Fifth Graders*. Retrieved from ERIC database (ED046212).

Süğümlü, Ü. & Alver, M. (2021). Öğrencilerin yazma özerkliği becerileri ve yazma kaygılarının nitel ve nicel yöntemlerle incelenmesi. *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi*, *9*(2), 470-491.

Tavakoli, M. & Ghoorchaei, B. (2009). On the relationship between risk-taking and self-assessment of speaking ability: A case of freshman EFL learners. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*. *6*(1), 1-27.

Tekşan, K. (2012). Analysis of writing anxiety of secondary school students according toseveral variables. *Educational Research and Reviews*, *7*(22), 487-493. DOI: 10.5897/ERR12.065

Uysal, H., & Sidekli, S. (2020). developing story writing skills with fourth grade students' mind mapping method. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, *45*(204), 1-22.

Üztemur, S., Dinç., E. & Acun, İ. (2020). Ortaokul öğrencilerinin sosyal bilgiler odaklı epistemolojik inançları, öğrenme yaklaşımları, akademik risk alma davranışları ve ders başarıları arasındaki

ilişkiler: Bir yapısal eşitlik modellemesi. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *35*(1), 179-199.

Varısoğlu, B., & Ekinci Çelikpazu, E. (2019). Secondary school students' academic risk-taking levels in Turkish lesson. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, *15*(4), 241-258.

Yaşatürk Midilli, Ü. (2020) *Uluslararası bakalorya diploma programı ve milli eğitim bakanlığı programı öğrencilerinin farklı değişkenler bakımından karşılaştırılması*. Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi. Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü. Ankara.

Yılmaz, N. (2019). *Ortaokul öğrencilerinin yazma kaygısı düzeyleri ve nedenlerinin belirlenmesi (Elazığ örneği)*. Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi. İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü. Malatya.

Zorbaz K. Z. (2010). *İlköğretim öğrencilerinin yazma kaygı ve tutukluğunun yazılı anlatım becerileriyle ilişkisi*. Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi. Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.