e-ISSN 2987-6680
Transforma Jurnal Manajemen
Universitas Pasundan
DOI:https://doi.org/10.56457/tjm.v4i2.430

EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTOR TRAINING THROUGH PARTICIPANT RESPONSES AND FINAL ACHIEVEMENTS IN A GROWTH MINDSET PERSPECTIVE AT THE CURUG AVIATION EDUCATION AND TRAINING CENTER (BP3)

Yanuar Jinu Satiti[1*], Sri Terta Dewi[2], Adhani Ekowati[3], Siswantoyo[4]
Program Studi Penelitian dan Evaluasi Pendidikan, Sekolah Pascasarjana,
Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta
Korespondensi: yanuarjinu.2026@student.uny.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study evaluates participant reactions and final outcomes of the first Instructor Training program at the Curug Aviation Education and Training Center (BP3 Curug), and formulates implications for improvement from a growth mindset perspective. The study employed a quantitative approach with a non-experimental program evaluation design based on retrospective secondary data, employing Kirkpatrick's model at the reaction and learning levels. Data sources included three training reports, final grades from 72 participants, six questionnaire response files, and three comment files. The training was conducted in three batches with 23, 24, and 25 participants, each attending 40 hours of instruction. Of the 93 rows of the administration questionnaire, 21 identical duplicates were merged and six records without numerical answers were excluded, resulting in 66 complete responses. The same eighteen items were used as a descriptive administration reaction index. The 221 participant evaluations of instructors were averaged at the participant level to avoid counting interdependent observations as independent cases. Analysis included descriptive statistics, batch-stratified bootstrap intervals, and exploratory rank correlations along with sensitivity analysis. The mean response to the organizer was 3.81 out of 4 (SD = 0.33; 95% bootstrap interval 3.72–3.88), while the instructor response was 3.87 (SD = 0.31). The mean final grade was 92.74 out of 100 (SD = 3.55), and all participants passed. In the 64 data pairs with conservative matching, there was no clear relationship between the organizer's reaction and final grade (rho = 0.055; 95% bootstrap interval −0.155–0.268). The internet and learning tools received the lowest ratings. Findings support positive participant experiences and high final outcomes, but do not demonstrate increased competency due to the training or mindset changes. A growth mindset perspective underpins suggestions for feedback, strategy revisions, and reteaching practices. Future evaluations will require performance standards, comparable pre-post assessments, and monitoring of teaching practices in the workplace.

Keywords: training evaluation; Kirkpatrick model; instructor training; participant reactions; learning outcomes; growth mindset

INTRODUCTION

Instructor training aims to equip participants with the skills to plan, implement, and evaluate learning. Organizers require information about participants' experiences during the training as well as their demonstrable skills at the end of the training. These two types of information serve different purposes. Participant reactions help identify service and learning process issues, while performance assessments provide information about achievement under specific assessment conditions. Satisfaction

Copyright© Authors
(cc) BY

with the service itself does not indicate mastery of teaching competencies or successful implementation in the workplace.

The Curug Aviation Education and Training Center (BP3 Curug) held its first Instructor Training program in 2026, with three classes. Seventy-two participants participated in a 40-hour curriculum, consisting of 12 hours of theory and 28 hours of practice. The first class was held online from August 10–14, while the second and third classes were held face-to-face from September 28–October 2 and October 5–9, respectively. The objective stated in the report was to equip participants to plan, implement, and evaluate learning (BP3 Curug, 2026a, 2026b, 2026c). This initial evaluation is necessary as a basis for future program improvements, taking into account the limitations of available information.

Kirkpatrick's model distinguishes between reactions, learning, behavior, and outcomes (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2016). This study used the first two levels because the available data consisted of participant experiences and post-training assessments. This framework helps organize evaluation evidence, but it does not make each level interchangeable or prove causal relationships. Paul et al. (2024) pointed out the need for clear indicators to operationalize training effectiveness. The composite framework they developed in other populations requires testing before being applied to flight instructors. Therefore, reactions and outcomes were analyzed separately without being combined into a single success score.

A growth mindset provides a perspective for utilizing evaluation results as a basis for development. This concept relates to the belief that abilities can develop through appropriate learning, strategies, and support (Dweck & Yeager, 2019). Yeager and Dweck (2020) emphasize the importance of enabling conditions for these beliefs to be linked to outcomes. In this article, an advanced growth mindset is used as an applied perspective linking openness to feedback, strategy adjustments, and institutional support for continued practice. The term is not treated as a newly validated construct or a variable measured in an administrative questionnaire. High satisfaction scores are also not interpreted as evidence of a change in mindset.

This caution is necessary because the benefits of mindset interventions cannot be assumed to apply across contexts. Macnamara and Burgoyne (2023) identified design and reporting weaknesses that could inflate the impression of intervention benefits, while Burnette et al. (2023) discussed variation based on target group and implementation fidelity. Unlike this study, those studies examined interventions specifically designed to change mindsets. The relevance lies in the need to explain mechanisms and measure outcomes, rather than inferring them from positive impressions. Mendoza and Yan (2025) distinguished between proactive and reflective practices that can guide preparatory measurement and revision of work in subsequent research.

Evaluation issues in this study lie in the adequacy and interpretation of evidence. Repeated entries may erroneously inflate the number of respondents, different versions of the questionnaire may confound comparisons, and multiple instructor ratings by the same participant should not be considered independent cases. Final scores can also be misinterpreted as improvements when baseline scores are unavailable. This study addressed these issues through item equating, using participants as the unit of analysis, and openly reporting limitations. The objectives

Copyright© Authors
(cc) BY

were to describe reactions to the implementation and instructor, examine outcomes, explore the relationship between reactions and final scores, and formulate improvements from a growth mindset perspective. The contribution is a traceable evaluation of the initial implementation and an agenda for program strengthening based on the findings.

METHOD

This study is a program evaluation study with a quantitative approach and a non-experimental design. The evaluation used the Kirkpatrick model, which focused on the level of participant reactions and learning, with learning outcomes operationalized as documented final training scores. The study was retrospective because it examined secondary data collected during the training before the research analysis was conducted. Descriptive analysis was used to describe participant reactions and final outcomes, while exploratory correlational analysis was used to examine the relationship between the two. This design did not involve manipulation of treatment, baseline measurements, or comparison groups, so the results cannot be used to infer the causal effect of the training.

The study population included all 72 participants of the Curug BP3 Instructor Training, divided into three batches. Final grade data covered the entire population, while reaction analysis used complete responses available after completeness checks and duplicate unification. Data collection was conducted through a documentation study of three implementation reports, three implementation questionnaire files, three instructor questionnaire files, and three instructor comment files. Cross-checking was conducted on information on implementation time, curriculum, number of participants, graduation status, and grade list. Open-ended comments were used as supporting data to clarify the interpretation of the quantitative findings.

The online administration questionnaire contained 19 numerical items, while the in-person version contained 29. Eighteen items with identical wording were used to calculate a mean for each participant, using the stored numerical coding (maximum 4; response option labels were not available in the export). The descriptive index included administrative information, digital access, learning, staff services, and facilities. Dormitory-specific items and discipline in cohort I were excluded from the common index. This index is not a validated mindset scale. The instructor questionnaire contained the same 20 items. Means were calculated for each instructor rated by a participant and then averaged across participants. Each participant rated three instructors in cohort I, four in cohort II, and three in cohort III. Thus, 221 evaluations yielded 66 independent participant summaries.

Final grades were used as indicators of achievement at the end of the training. Batch I provided theoretical, practical, and final grades; the final grade was equal to the average of the two components. Batches II–III provided only one final grade. The equivalence of tasks, assessor calibration, detailed rubrics, and numerical passing thresholds were not adequately documented to ensure equivalence of measurement across cohorts. Passing status was maintained as an administrative outcome. Name variation was examined within each cohort, including both full and abbreviated forms. Two significant name differences in Batch III were excluded from the main pairwise analysis, resulting in 64 cases. Tentative matching of the two was used only

Copyright© Authors
(cc) BY

in sensitivity analyses. Descriptive analyses retained the 66 reaction responses and 72 final grades.

Data are described using the mean, sample standard deviation, median, range, and proportion of maximum scores. Bootstrap percentile intervals used 10,000 resamples of participants within each cohort with a fixed cohort size (seed 20261104). Intervals reflect stability in the observed respondent composition and do not correct for nonresponse bias. Cronbach's alpha was calculated descriptively for the 18 shared items and the 20 instructor items aggregated at the participant level. Alpha was not used as evidence of construct validity due to the lack of independent content review and structure validation (McNeish, 2018). Two Spearman correlations explored the association of organizer and instructor reactions with final grades; Holm's adjustment was applied to the two combined tests. Sensitivity analyses used pooled rank correlations after cohort mean subtraction and 10,000 permutations within cohorts. Identical comments were aggregated at the participant and source domain levels and then grouped descriptively without estimating theme prevalence or intercoder agreement. Analyses were conducted using Python, NumPy, and SciPy; coded analysis scripts and tables are provided in the author's materials.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 shows the data coverage after duplicate pooling. Complete responses represented 91.7% of the population, representing 95.7% of cohort I, 95.8% of cohort II, and 84.0% of cohort III. Six records were excluded because they were blank on all numeric items, rather than missing only a few responses. The larger proportion of blanks in cohort III limits the interpretation of the means. Instructor ratings were available from the same 66 participants. The instructor comment files contained overlapping material and therefore were not added to the questionnaire response count.

Table 1. Data coverage by class

Force	Participant	Starting line	Duplicate	Empty	Complete
I	23	36	13	1	22
II	24	30	6	1	23
III	25	27	2	4	21
Amount	72	93	21	6	66

Duplicates are additional identical rows. Blank entries retain their identity but lack a numerical answer.

The mean reaction index to the organizer was 3.807 (SD = 0.334), with a 95% stratified bootstrap interval of 3.725–3.884. Reactions to the instructor had a mean of 3.865 (SD = 0.306; interval 3.789–3.935). The median of both indices was 4.00 (Table 2). Thirty-four participants (51.5%) gave all items a score of 4, while 50 participants (75.8%) had a mean instructor rating of 4.00. Centering at the upper limit of the scale reduced the instrument's ability to differentiate experiences between participants. Therefore, small mean differences between cohorts should be interpreted in conjunction with the distribution and results per item.

Copyright© Authors
(cc) BY

Table 2. Reactions at the participant level

Force	n	M Implementation	Elementary School	Instructor M	Elementary School
I	22	3,763	0.334	3,849	0.293
II	23	3,826	0.326	3,887	0.285
III	21	3,833	0.352	3,859	0.352
Total	66	3,807	0.334	3,865	0.306

Maximum response code 4; all instructor indices are averaged at the participant level.

All 66 respondents chose to recommend or strongly recommend BP3 Curug; 46 chose to strongly recommend. Recommendation intentions support the interpretation of a positive experience, but do not measure teaching competence. Cronbach's alphas of 0.973 for the collaborative delivery item and 0.998 for the instructor item were aggregated at the participant level. Very high values may relate to content overlap or a tendency to provide similar overall ratings. These values do not prove that each index measures a single construct and do not eliminate the issue of centering of maximum scores.

Table 3 presents all items together so that improvement priorities are not determined by selecting favorable indicators. Curriculum and materials received the highest average (3.894), followed by clarity of information for training officers (3.879). Internet connection (3.652) and learning resources (3.712) received the lowest averages, although they remained near the upper end of the scale. The findings indicate relative priorities. The study did not set satisfaction thresholds retrospectively and did not equate the index with the Community Satisfaction Index in the report.

Item	M	Elementary School
1. Clarity of training administration	3,82	0,270138889
2. Clarity of information on training officers	3,88	0,228472222
3. Clarity of site/social media information	3,8	0,278472222
4. Update website/social media information	3,77	0,293055556
5. Information on rules and regulations	3,8	0,278472222
6. Ease of SSO login	3,79	0,311111111
7. SSO access speed	3,77	0,293055556
8. Ease of SSO features	3,82	0,270138889
9. Clarity of SSO interface	3,8	0,278472222
10. Access services via SSO	3,82	0,270138889
11. Suitability of training time	3,8	0,278472222
12. Curriculum and materials	3,89	0,215277778
13. Learning structure and methods	3,86	0,240277778
14. Competence of training officer services	3,86	0,240277778
15. Politeness and neatness of training officers	3,85	0,250694444
16. Handling complaints	3,82	0,270138889

Copyright© Authors
(cc) BY

17. Learning support facilities	3,71	0,339583333
18. Internet connection	3,65	0,375

n = 66 for each item. Labels are shortened; source information is available in the analysis materials.

The organizers' reports separately recorded Community Satisfaction Indexes of 95.00, 97.07, and 95.94, categorized as excellent. The report tables contain 20, 16, and 20 responses per element, respectively. The summary uses eight service elements, while the individual analyses of this study use 18 shared items. Therefore, the report summary serves as supporting context, not as an addition to individual observations. Without respondents' identities and overlapping information, these numbers are not combined with the 66 responses or linked to the final score.

All 72 participants had final grades and were recorded as having passed. The overall mean was 92.743 (SD = 3.548), the median was 92.75, and the range was 77.5–100 (Table 4). The higher mean for cohort III is a descriptive finding. Training mode, work background, time of year, and potential differences in assessments coincided with cohort membership. This comparison cannot isolate the influence of each factor or prove that face-to-face learning is more effective than online learning.

Table 4. Final training scores

Force	n	M	Elementary School	Median	Range
I	23	91,283	3,343	92.50	77.5–94.0
II	24	91,833	3,535	91.00	82.0–100.0
III	25	94,960	2,653	95.00	90.0–100.0
Total	72	92,743	3,548	92.75	77.5–100.0

All participants were recorded as having passed. Equivalency between classes has not been verified.

The separation of theory and practice scores in the first cohort explains the formation of the final grade for that cohort. The absence of a common component in other cohorts prevents a uniform analysis of teaching practices for all 72 participants. Pass status also reflects the organizer's decision, but it does not yet constitute independent verification of competency mastery based on externally accountable standards. Presenting a continuous grade alongside pass status maintains achievement information without making 100% pass the sole evidence of effectiveness.

The primary pairwise analysis included 64 participants after two differences in names for the third cohort were removed. The Spearman correlation between the organizer's reaction and the final score was 0.055, while the correlation between the instructor's reaction and the final score was 0.104 (Table 5). Both bootstrap intervals crossed zero, allowing for small to moderate positive and negative relationships. The p-value after Holm's adjustment was 0.829 for both tests. Thus, the data do not provide clear evidence of an overall monotonic relationship. These findings do not prove the equivalence or absence of a relationship in other contexts.

Copyright© Authors
(cc) BY

Table 5. Exploratory relationships with final grades

Reaction index	n	rho	95% interval	p	p Holm
Implementation	64	0.055	-0.155; 0.268	0.663	0.829
Instructor	64	0.104	-0.099; 0.295	0.414	0.829

Batch-stratified bootstrap interval of 10,000 retakes. Two tentative matches were excluded.

After removing the cohort means from the composite rankings, the correlations were 0.026 for administrator reactions and 0.097 for instructor reactions, with p-values within cohorts of 0.840 and 0.448. When two tentative matches were included, the composite correlations across 66 participants were 0.057 and 0.106, thus maintaining the main interpretation. The correlations with instructor reactions differed descriptively across cohorts, with values of −0.521, 0.131, and 0.433 in the conservative analysis. Small cohort sizes, numerous identical scores, and limited ranges make the pattern unstable. This pattern provides a reason not to assume the composite correlations are uniform across cohorts.

Comments included requests for more teaching practice time, the use of case studies, the provision of pre-class modules, more timely access to materials, and clarity of certification information. Other comments appreciated the relevance of the materials and instructor support. Positive experiences can coexist with specific needs for improvement. Because participation and frequency of comments vary across files, this grouping reflects emerging issues, not the frequency of problems in the population. Table 6 links selected findings, proposed actions, and evidence that could be examined in subsequent evaluations.

Table 6. Proposed improvements in the growth mindset perspective

Basis of findings	Proposed action	Evidence of subsequent evaluation
Internet and relatively low facilities	Check device connection and compatibility before class	Notes on disruptions and successful access to material
Request for additional practice and cases	Provide initial demonstrations, feedback, revisions, and re-practice	Start–restart and strategy change rubric
Modules and materials are not always on time	Set upload time before learning	Upload time and participant access success
Achievements are only measured at the end	Arrange comparable start–end tasks and follow-up observations	Changes in performance and evidence of teaching implementation

All actions are proposals; their implementation and impact have not been tested in this study.

This proposal translates the advanced growth mindset into assessable learning opportunities. Participants can prepare a learning segment, practice it, receive rubric-based feedback, refine their strategies, and then practice again. The initial design and

Copyright© Authors
(cc) BY

revised results can provide evidence of responsiveness to the feedback. This cycle has not been documented as a measurable intervention in current research data. Therefore, it is a developmental recommendation, not a proven mechanism for producing high final grades.

Data-driven assessments of effectiveness are limited to positive respondent experiences and high final outcomes. The directional congruence between implementation assessments, instructor ratings, recommendation intentions, and service recaps strengthens this descriptive interpretation. However, these sources are not independent replicates of learning effectiveness measurements. The similarity of results cannot replace the initial assessment or prove the validity of the final exam.

The overall weak relationship between reactions and final grades suggests the need to maintain distinct evaluation criteria. Reactions primarily relate to experiences during the administration, while final grades also depend on prior ability, task difficulty, and assessment decisions. This study cannot determine which explanation is most influential. The large number of maximum scores also reduces information available for correlational analysis. Paul et al. (2024) operationalized multiple dimensions within the framework being tested; the administrative data in this study support a more limited descriptive evaluation.

A growth mindset perspective focuses on the use of feedback in participants' actions, rather than equating high grades with beliefs about developing abilities. The proactive and reflective practices discussed by Mendoza and Yan (2025) can guide the recording of preparation and revision of work. Their instrument was developed with undergraduate students and requires adaptation and validation before use with flight instructors. Laine and Tirri (2023) also link a developmental orientation to teaching practice. For BP3 Curug, the implication is to provide time and materials that enable strategic change, then observe those changes separately from satisfaction.

Feedback should clarify areas of performance that could be improved. For example, the assessor might identify explanations lacking relevant examples, ask the participant to correct them, and then use the same criteria during repeated practice. Wisniewski et al. (2020) demonstrated that the usefulness of feedback varies depending on its information content. Numerical scores or general encouragement alone do not adequately document the information received and the responses made. Therefore, subsequent evaluations should retain evidence of both to examine the relationship between feedback use and performance improvement.

Institutional development requires traceable changes. When issues with material delays or equipment inconsistencies are addressed, providers should document these actions and review access and teaching performance in subsequent implementations. Kirwan (2025) emphasizes formative evaluation and the factors influencing transfer. Its implementation encourages ongoing evaluation beyond satisfaction scores. On-the-job teaching observations, coupled with lesson plans and student feedback, assess outcomes distinct from test scores. Blume et al. (2019) discuss transfer as a process that develops over time and requires repeated monitoring.

The study encompasses the first administration at a single institution and a limited population. Six participants did not have reaction responses that could be analyzed; their experiences may have varied. Completion times were not available, although identical duplicates could be pooled without changing responses. Name differences

Copyright© Authors
(cc) BY

necessitated conservative matching and sensitivity analysis. The questionnaire was not independently validated for this study, and centering of maximum scores limits discriminatory power. Equivalence of assessments across cohorts, rater agreement, and numerical thresholds for completeness could not be verified. One of the authors also served as a program instructor, potentially introducing evaluation bias. Without baseline scores, a comparison group, direct mindset measures, and follow-up observations, the study cannot causally estimate competency gains, mindset changes, workplace transfer, or organizational impact.

CONCLUSION

The first implementation of the BP3 Curug Instructor Training demonstrated positive participant experiences and high final scores across all three cohorts. Complete responses were available from 66 participants, with an average reaction to the organizer being 3.81 and an average instructor reaction being 3.87 out of 4. All 72 participants passed, with an average final score of 92.74 out of 100. Exploratory analysis of 64 conservatively matched data pairs did not reveal a clear overall relationship between reactions and final scores. Internet connectivity, facilities, access to materials, and opportunities for advanced practice are concrete priorities for the next implementation.

The findings support program development by limiting effectiveness claims to actual observed outcomes. A contribution of the growth mindset perspective is the suggestion of using feedback to refine strategies and re-practice under supportive conditions. The implementation and impact of this cycle remain to be tested. Subsequent evaluations should establish performance standards, provide comparable pre- and post-training assignments, calibrate assessors, record completion times, and observe teaching practices after training. Measuring growth mindset beliefs and practices is necessary if the mindset is used as a research outcome. This step allows subsequent assessments to directly examine improvements in skills.

Ethical approval.[MUST BE COMPLETED BY AUTHOR BEFORE SUBMISSION: include the ethics committee decision or valid exemption determination, the name of the institution, number/date, basis for use of secondary data, and the status of participant consent or exemption. These documents are not yet available in the research materials; the use of administrative data does not automatically exempt the research from ethical review.]

Author's contribution. All authors contributed equally as major contributors to this article.

Funding. This research did not receive any specific funding from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Conflict of interest. Yanuar Jinu Satiti is listed as an instructor in the second cohort. This involvement constitutes a non-financial interest relevant to the interpretation of the evaluation. The authors declare that no financial interests influenced the research.

Data availability. The author's materials include coded analysis tables and reproduction scripts. The original data contain personal identifiers and are therefore not included in the public materials. Secondary data access mechanisms follow data owner permission and applicable ethical decisions.

Copyright© Authors
(cc) BY

Declaration of use of AI. ChatGPT was used to assist with data checking, analytical coding, literature searches, and manuscript preparation, translation, and editing. Authors are responsible for reviewing and verifying the data, analysis, references, interpretation, and final version before submission.

REFERENCES

Blume, B. D., Ford, J. K., Surface, E. A., & Olenick, J. (2019). A dynamic model of training transfer. *Human Resource Management Review, 29*(2), 270–283. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2017.11.004

BP3 Curug. (2026a). *Laporan Pelatihan Instruktur Angkatan I* [Internal report]. Balai Pendidikan dan Pelatihan Penerbangan Curug.

BP3 Curug. (2026b). *Laporan Pelatihan Instruktur Angkatan II* [Internal report]. Balai Pendidikan dan Pelatihan Penerbangan Curug.

BP3 Curug. (2026c). *Laporan Pelatihan Instruktur Angkatan III* [Internal report]. Balai Pendidikan dan Pelatihan Penerbangan Curug.

Burnette, J. L., Billingsley, J., Banks, G. C., Knouse, L. E., Hoyt, C. L., Pollack, J. M., & Simon, S. (2023). A systematic review and meta-analysis of growth mindset interventions: For whom, how, and why might such interventions work? *Psychological Bulletin, 149*(3–4), 174–205. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000368

Dweck, C. S., & Yeager, D. S. (2019). Mindsets: A view from two eras. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 14*(3), 481–496. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691618804166

Haryadi, R. N., Purwanto, P., Makruf, I., Khuriyah, K., & Usman, U. (2026). Pengantar Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif. *Mafy Media Literasi Indonesia*.

Kirkpatrick, J. D., & Kirkpatrick, W. K. (2016). *Kirkpatrick's four levels of training evaluation*. ATD Press.

Kirwan, C. (2025). Measuring the effectiveness of L&D: Time to move on from Kirkpatrick and Phillips? *International Journal of Training and Development, 29*(1), 38–55. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijtd.12342

Laine, S., & Tirri, K. (2023). Literature review on teachers' mindsets, growth-oriented practices and why they matter. *Frontiers in Education, 8*, Article 1275126. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2023.1275126

Macnamara, B. N., & Burgoyne, A. P. (2023). Do growth mindset interventions impact students' academic achievement? A systematic review and meta-analysis with recommendations for best practices. *Psychological Bulletin, 149*(3–4), 133–173. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000352

McNeish, D. (2018). Thanks coefficient alpha, we'll take it from here. *Psychological Methods, 23*(3), 412–433. https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000144

Mendoza, N. B., & Yan, Z. (2025). From beliefs to behaviors: Conceptualizing and assessing students' practices that reflect a growth mindset. *Social Psychology of Education, 28*, Article 73. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-025-10032-w

Paul, S., Roy Burman, R., & Singh, R. (2024). Training effectiveness evaluation: Advancing a Kirkpatrick model based composite framework. *Evaluation and Program Planning, 107*, Article 102494. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2024.102494

Priadana, M. S., & Sunarsi, D. (2021). Metode penelitian kuantitatif.

Copyright© Authors
(cc) BY

Wisniewski, B., Zierer, K., & Hattie, J. (2020). The power of feedback revisited: A meta-analysis of educational feedback research. *Frontiers in Psychology, 10*, Article 3087. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.03087

Yeager, D. S., & Dweck, C. S. (2020). What can be learned from growth mindset controversies? *American Psychologist, 75*(9), 1269–1284. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000794

Copyright© Authors
(cc) BY