ANTHOR
Education and Learning Journal
https://anthor.org/index.php/anthor
Email. anthor.Jurnal@gmail.com
E-ISSN: 2963 –198X P-ISSN: 2963–2498 | Halaman: 1762 - 1770
Volume 5 Nomor 5 Tahun 2026

Growth Mindset-Based Classroom Guidance to Reduce Students' Fear of Failure

Manuscript Information

Shella Diani Gustina[1]
Putri Aprilia[2]
Yuliadini Az Zahra[3]
Ranni Rahmayanthi Z[4]
Wartini[5]

Guidance and Counseling Teacher Profesional Education (PPG) Student, University Lampung, Indonesia[1]
Guidance and Counseling Teacher Profesional Education (PPG) Student, University Lampung, Indonesia[2]
Guidance and Counseling Teacher Profesional Education (PPG) Student, University Lampung, Indonesia[3]
Lecturer in Guidance and Counseling, University of Lampung, Indonesia[4]
Guidance and Counseling Teacher, SMA Negeri 1 Bandar Lampung, Indonesia[5]

shelaagustiani8899@gmail.com[1]
180402aprilia@gmail.com[2]
azzahraa3008@gmail.com[3]

Abstrak

Ketakutan akan kegagalan dapat membuat siswa memandang kesalahan sebagai ancaman terhadap persepsi kompetensi, penerimaan sosial, dan prospek masa depan mereka. Penelitian Tindakan Bimbingan dan Konseling ini bertujuan menurunkan ketakutan akan kegagalan melalui layanan bimbingan klasikal berbasis growth mindset pada siswa kelas X.4 SMA Negeri 1 Bandar Lampung. Pemilihan masalah didasarkan pada hasil Daftar Cek Masalah yang menunjukkan bahwa 28 dari 31 siswa menyatakan pernyataan "Saya sering merasa takut gagal". Intervensi dilaksanakan dalam tiga siklus: sadar (Awareness), yang berfokus pada pengenalan pengalaman dan respons terhadap kegagalan; maknai ulang (Reframing), yang bertujuan mengubah persepsi siswa tentang kegagalan melalui growth mindset; dan tumbuh (Growth), yang berfokus pada pengembangan strategi untuk mencoba kembali. Ketakutan akan kegagalan diukur menggunakan Performance Failure Appraisal Inventory (PFAI) melalui pretest dan posttest. Analisis deskriptif terhadap 30 pasang pengamatan menunjukkan penurunan skor rata-rata dari 82,77 menjadi 71,90. Uji peringkat bertanda Wilcoxon menghasilkan $Z = -2{,}950$ dan $p = 0{,}003$, yang menunjukkan perbedaan skor yang signifikan secara statistik sebelum dan sesudah intervensi. Temuan ini mengindikasikan penurunan skor ketakutan akan kegagalan setelah layanan bimbingan dilaksanakan. Meskipun demikian, hasil perlu ditafsirkan dengan mempertimbangkan keterbatasan desain penelitian tindakan. Konsistensi data mentah, penskoran instrumen, dan dokumentasi perubahan pada setiap siklus juga perlu diverifikasi sebelum publikasi.

Kata Kunci:
Bimbingan Klasikal, Growth Mindset, Ketakutan Akan Kegagalan, Refleksi Pengalaman Kegagalan, Penelitian Tindakan Bimbingan dan Konseling.

Abstract

Fear of failure can lead students to perceive mistakes as threats to their perceived competence, social acceptance, and future prospects. This Guidance and Counseling Action Research aimed to reduce fear of failure through growth mindset-based classroom guidance services among students in class X.4 at SMA Negeri 1 Bandar Lampung. The selection of the problem was based on the results of the Problem Checklist, which indicated that 28 out of 31 students endorsed the statement, "I often feel afraid of failing." The intervention was implemented in three cycles: Sadar (Awareness), which focused on recognizing experiences and responses to failure; Maknai ulang (Reframing), which aimed to change students' perceptions of failure through a growth mindset; and Tumbuh (Growth), which focused on developing strategies for trying again. Fear of failure was measured using the Performance Failure Appraisal Inventory (PFAI) through pretest and posttest assessments. Descriptive analysis of 30 paired observations showed a decrease in the mean score from 82.77 to 71.90. The Wilcoxon signed-rank test yielded $Z = -2.950$ and $p = 0.003$, indicating a statistically significant difference in scores before and after the intervention. These findings suggest a reduction in fear-of-failure scores following the implementation of the guidance services. However, the results should be interpreted in light of the limitations of the action research design. The consistency of the raw data, instrument scoring, and documentation of changes across each cycle should also be verified before publication.

Keyword:
Classroom Guidance, Growth Mindset, Fear of Failure, Reflection on Failure Experiences, Guidance and Counseling Action Research.

Information Production:
© 2026 *by the authors of this article. This work is licensed under an Attribution-ShareAlike* 4.0 *International* (CC BY-SA 4.0)

INTRODUCTION

Failure is an inseparable part of students' learning and developmental processes. However, experiences of failure are not always perceived as opportunities for self-improvement. Some students perceive the possibility of failure as a threat to their perceived competence, self-esteem, social acceptance, or the expectations of people they consider important. Such concerns may affect their willingness to try new things, face challenges, express opinions, and persevere when encountering difficulties.

e-ISSN: 2963 – 198X
p-ISSN: 2963 – 2498

The need to address fear of failure was identified among students in class X.4 at SMA Negeri 1 Bandar Lampung through a Problem Checklist (Daftar Cek Masalah, DCM). In response to the item "I often feel afraid of failing," 28 out of 31 students indicated that the statement reflected a problem they experienced. This initial assessment finding provided the basis for selecting the issue addressed in the Guidance and Counseling Action Research (Penelitian Tindakan Bimbingan dan Konseling, PTBK). Because the problem was identified among a large proportion of students in one class, classroom guidance services were selected to facilitate structured opportunities for shared learning and reflection.

Fear of failure refers to more than the fear of obtaining unfavorable outcomes. Conroy et al. (2002) conceptualized this construct as the appraisal of aversive consequences anticipated when an individual fails. Through the Performance Failure Appraisal Inventory (PFAI), this construct is assessed across five dimensions: fear of experiencing shame and embarrassment, fear of devaluing one's self-estimate, fear of having an uncertain future, fear of important others losing interest, and fear of disappointing important others. This multidimensional framework helps explain why the sources of students' fears may differ.

A study by Fakhria and Setiowati (2017.) involving senior high school students found a significant relationship between fear of failure and achievement motivation. This finding highlights the relevance of fear of failure in secondary education. Therefore, interventions should help students not only recognize their fears but also examine the meanings they attach to failure and choose more constructive responses.

Growth mindset served as the theoretical foundation for the intervention in this study. Dweck and Leggett (1988) explained that beliefs about the nature of ability are associated with individuals' goals and response patterns when facing challenges. Within a growth mindset framework, ability is understood as something that can be developed through learning, appropriate strategies, practice, and support. Conversely, a fixed mindset orientation may lead individuals to interpret failure as evidence that their abilities are inherently limited. Blackwell et al. (2007) found that an intervention teaching the belief that intelligence can be developed was associated with positive changes in learning motivation among adolescent students. Nevertheless, more recent reviews have also indicated that the effects of growth mindset interventions may vary depending on the context and implementation (Macnamara & Burgoyne, 2023).

In this study, growth mindset was used as the foundation for the guidance intervention rather than as a separately measured outcome variable. Students were encouraged to connect the concepts presented with their real-life experiences through a reflective process: recognizing situations involving failure, identifying associated thoughts and feelings, reviewing their usual responses, reframing the meaning of failure, and developing concrete steps for trying again. The intervention was organized into three cycles: Sadar (Awareness), Maknai Ulang (Reframing), and Tumbuh (Growth).

Fear of failure should be distinguished from the normal disappointment experienced when outcomes do not meet expectations. Disappointment is generally associated with a particular outcome, whereas fear of failure involves anticipating the negative consequences that may follow failure. These anticipated consequences may affect self-evaluation, social relationships, and perceptions of the future. Consequently, students who receive equally low grades may not necessarily experience the same psychological responses. Some may view their grades as feedback for further learning, whereas others may interpret them as evidence of their inability or as a sign that they will disappoint others. The framework proposed by Conroy et al. (2002) helps school counselors identify differences in these interpretations without reducing all students' responses to a single cause. A recent study conducted in the senior high school context also identified fear of failure as a relevant issue for guidance and counseling services (Nurhaliza et al., 2026).

During adolescence, self-evaluation and acceptance by others may become particularly salient when students face tasks that expose them to the possibility of being evaluated. Concerns about peer comments, family expectations, and teachers' judgments may interact with students' perceptions of their academic abilities. Although this study did not separately measure the influences of peers, family members, or teachers, the dimensions of fear of failure highlight the importance of providing opportunities for students to reflect on the consequences they anticipate. Classroom guidance can serve as an efficient entry point for establishing a shared understanding of failure, while more individualized needs can be addressed through individual or group counseling, depending on the results of further assessment.

The growth mindset literature indicates that beliefs about ability do not operate in isolation but are associated with learning contexts, social experiences, and opportunities to employ effective strategies. Dweck and Yeager (2019) highlighted the evolution of mindset research from an initial focus on individual beliefs toward questions concerning when, for whom, and through what mechanisms interventions may be beneficial. Sisk et al. (2018) also reported that the overall association between mindset and academic achievement tends to be weak, although potential benefits may differ across student groups, including those at academic risk.

e-ISSN: 2963 – 198X
p-ISSN: 2963 – 2498

Accordingly, growth mindset in this study was not presented as a slogan suggesting that all problems can be solved through positive thinking. Instead, it served as a framework for reevaluating perceptions of ability, using feedback, selecting strategies, and seeking support. Local studies on counseling services and growth mindset have also identified educational counseling as a potential context for fostering a growth-oriented mindset (Akbar & Hidayati, 2025; Harapan, 2025).

A large-scale study by Yeager et al. (2019) demonstrated that brief growth mindset interventions can provide benefits under certain conditions, including for students with lower initial achievement. However, these findings cannot be assumed to apply uniformly across all students or schools. Recent systematic reviews have also emphasized that research design quality, implementation fidelity, and reporting practices influence conclusions regarding intervention effectiveness (Gazmuri, 2025; Macnamara & Burgoyne, 2023). Therefore, classroom-based action research should report not only differences in scores but also the activities implemented, students' responses, and the limitations of the evidence obtained.

The practical novelty of this study lies in integrating classroom guidance services, reflection on experiences of failure, and action-oriented follow-up steps for students. Based on this background, the study aimed to examine changes in fear-of-failure scores among students in class X.4 following participation in three cycles of growth mindset-based classroom guidance incorporating reflection on experiences of failure.

METHODS

Research Design and Setting

This study employed a Guidance and Counseling Action Research (GCAR) design to examine changes in students' fear-of-failure scores following the implementation of growth mindset-based classroom guidance incorporating reflection on failure experiences. The study was conducted in class X.4 at SMA Negeri 1 Bandar Lampung, Indonesia. The research problem was identified through a preliminary needs assessment using the Problem Checklist (Daftar Cek Masalah, DCM).

The intervention was organized into three sequential cycles: SADAR (Awareness), MAKNAI ULANG (Reframing), and TUMBUH (Growth). Each cycle was implemented in one classroom guidance session. The three cycles were designed to help students recognize their experiences of failure, reconsider the meaning of failure through a growth mindset perspective, and develop strategies for responding to difficulties more adaptively.

Participants and Research Instruments

The preliminary needs assessment involved 31 students in class X.4. Of these students, 28 endorsed the DCM statement, "I often feel afraid of failing." This finding indicated that fear of failure was a relevant concern in the class and provided the basis for selecting the focus of the intervention.

Students' fear of failure was measured using the Indonesian version of the Performance Failure Appraisal Inventory (PFAI), based on the instrument developed by Conroy et al. (2002). The instrument consisted of 25 items representing five dimensions: fear of experiencing shame and embarrassment, fear of devaluing one's self-estimate, fear of having an uncertain future, fear of important others losing interest, and fear of disappointing important others.

The PFAI was administered before and after the intervention. Responses were scored using the scoring guidelines for the Indonesian version of the instrument. The pretest and posttest scores were compared to examine changes in students' fear of failure. The quantitative analysis included 30 matched pretest and posttest records. Accordingly, the number of students involved in the preliminary needs assessment and the number of matched records included in the statistical analysis are reported separately.

Intervention Procedures

The intervention consisted of three classroom guidance cycles integrating growth mindset principles and reflection on failure experiences.

Cycle I: SADAR (Awareness). The first cycle focused on helping students recognize situations that triggered fear of failure and identify the thoughts, feelings, and responses associated with those experiences. Reflection activities and student worksheets were used to support students in examining their experiences of failure.

Cycle II: MAKNAI ULANG (Reframing). The second cycle focused on introducing the concepts of fixed mindset and growth mindset. Through the "Change the Statement" activity, students practiced reframing statements reflecting fixed beliefs about their abilities into statements emphasizing learning, effort, strategy adjustment, and opportunities for improvement.

e-ISSN: 2963 – 198X
p-ISSN: 2963 – 2498

Cycle III: TUMBUH (Growth). The third cycle focused on helping students identify practical strategies for responding to failure and trying again. Through the "Try Again Plan" activity, students were guided to formulate actionable steps for facing challenges, such as adjusting strategies, practicing incrementally, seeking feedback, and asking for assistance when needed.

Each cycle was conducted in one classroom guidance session. The supporting documentation consisted of the Guidance Service Implementation Plans (Rencana Pelaksanaan Layanan, RPL), student worksheets or reflection sheets, and photographs of the activities. These materials were used to document the planned activities and support the description of the intervention process.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data were collected through the DCM, PFAI pretest and posttest, and supporting documentation from the intervention. The DCM was used to identify the initial guidance need, while the PFAI provided quantitative data for examining changes in fear-of-failure scores. The RPL, student worksheets or reflection sheets, and photographs documented the intervention activities.

Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the pretest and posttest scores, including the mean and standard deviation. The normality of the difference scores was examined using the Shapiro–Wilk test. Because the difference scores did not meet the normality assumption ($p = 0.002$), the Wilcoxon signed-rank test was used to examine the difference between pretest and posttest scores. The significance level was set at 0.05.

The quantitative findings were interpreted alongside the documented intervention procedures. Since the study employed an action research design without a comparison group, the results were interpreted as changes observed following the intervention rather than definitive evidence that the intervention alone caused the changes.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Identification of Students' Needs

The DCM results showed that 28 out of 31 students in class X.4 endorsed the statement, "I often feel afraid of failing." Proportionally, this figure represented approximately 90.3% of the DCM respondents. This finding provided a practical basis for identifying fear of failure as a concern that needed to be addressed through guidance and counseling services. However, responses to a single DCM item serve as an initial needs assessment rather than a diagnosis or a comprehensive measure of fear of failure.

The use of the PFAI complemented this initial identification by providing a more detailed assessment of the consequences students feared when experiencing failure. Its five dimensions encompass both intrapersonal and interpersonal aspects, allowing reflection activities during the intervention to address experiences such as fear of embarrassment, feelings of inadequacy, concerns about the future, fear of losing the attention of important others, and fear of disappointing others (Conroy et al., 2002).

Implementation of the Intervention Across Three Cycles

Cycle I — SADAR (Awareness)

The first cycle aimed to develop students' awareness of their experiences of failure. Students were asked to identify situations that triggered fear and then recognize the thoughts, feelings, and responses that typically arose in those situations. This focus provided a foundation for helping students understand that fear is not merely a feeling that emerges without context but is associated with how they interpret the consequences of failure. Specific evidence regarding participation levels, excerpts from students' reflections, and the results of observations during Cycle I should be added based on the observation sheets or implementation records.

Cycle II — MAKNAI ULANG (Reframing)

The second cycle focused on reframing the meaning of failure through the concepts of fixed mindset and growth mindset. In the "Change the Statement" activity, the statement "I failed my presentation. I am just not good at speaking" was reframed as "My presentation was not as good as it could have been. I can practice expressing my ideas and prepare more effectively." This change in wording emphasized the distinction between viewing ability as fixed and recognizing that ability can be developed. To strengthen the findings, the final manuscript should include actual examples of students' responses or a summary of the Student Worksheets (Lembar Kerja Peserta Didik, LKPD) completed during Cycle II.

Cycle III — TUMBUH (Growth)

The third cycle focused on implementing adaptive responses through situational analysis and the development of a "Try Again Plan." Students were asked to select strategies they could apply when encountering obstacles, such as practicing again, modifying their learning strategies, breaking tasks into

e-ISSN: 2963 – 198X
p-ISSN: 2963 – 2498

smaller steps, or seeking appropriate assistance. This focus connected the understanding of growth mindset with actionable plans. Evidence regarding the quality of students' plans, changes in their responses, and their final reflections should be added based on the original documents rather than reconstructed from the planned activities.

Changes in Pretest and Posttest Scores

The statistical analysis presented in the document showed that the mean score before the intervention was 82.77 (SD = 16.25), whereas the mean score after the intervention was 71.90 (SD = 21.78). Thus, the mean score decreased by 10.87 points. The Wilcoxon signed-rank analysis indicated that 20 students had lower posttest scores than pretest scores, eight students had higher posttest scores, and two students had unchanged scores. The results are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Summary of PFAI Scores Before and After the Intervention

Indicator	Pretest	Posttest
Number of paired observations	30	30
Mean score	82.77	71.90
Standard deviation	16.25	21.78
Mean change	—	−10.87 points
Wilcoxon signed-rank test	Z = −2.950	p = 0.003

The Shapiro–Wilk test applied to the difference scores yielded p = 0.002, indicating a statistically significant departure from normality. Therefore, the Wilcoxon signed-rank test was an appropriate choice for comparing the two paired measurements when the normality assumption was not met. The result, Z = −2.950, p = 0.003, indicated a statistically significant difference between the pretest and posttest scores at the 5% significance level. Provided that the scoring procedure was correct and higher scores indeed represented higher levels of fear of failure, the decrease in the mean score was consistent with the intended outcome of the intervention.

Nevertheless, statistical significance should not be interpreted as evidence that the intervention was the sole cause of the observed change. An action research design without a comparison group cannot fully distinguish the effects of the intervention from other factors, such as additional learning experiences, changes in classroom circumstances, or repeated-testing effects. Therefore, the quantitative findings should be interpreted alongside process evidence from each cycle and students' reflections.

The observed changes should be examined at both the group and individual levels. At the group level, the lower mean score provides an overall summary of the direction of change. However, the mean does not indicate that all students experienced changes of the same magnitude. The Wilcoxon rank data showed that 20 students experienced a decrease in scores, eight experienced an increase, and two showed no change. This pattern highlights the need for guidance and counseling services that respond to diverse student experiences. Students whose scores increased should not automatically be considered as having failed to benefit from the intervention. This possibility requires further investigation through interviews or follow-up assessments, including an examination of whether students became more aware of and better able to report their fears after participating in the intervention.

Quantitative findings in action research should be reported with methodological caution. The Wilcoxon signed-rank test examines differences in the ranks of paired scores; it does not directly establish the psychological mechanisms responsible for the observed changes. A p-value below 0.05 indicates that the observed pattern of differences would be unlikely under the null hypothesis within the framework of the test used. However, it does not measure the magnitude of the benefit and does not, on its own, establish that the intervention caused the change. To provide a more comprehensive account, the final manuscript could report an appropriate effect size, confidence intervals where available, and the distribution of scores across PFAI dimensions after the raw scores and scoring procedures have been verified. Additional numerical results have not been included in this draft because they were not available in the verified output.

Discussion

Conceptually, the SADAR–MAKNAI ULANG–TUMBUH sequence provides a progression from awareness to reinterpretation and action. The SADAR cycle places students' experiences at the starting point, helping them identify situations that trigger fear of failure and recognize their associated thoughts, feelings, and responses. The MAKNAI ULANG cycle encourages students to reconsider interpretations that turn an unsuccessful experience into a general judgment of personal ability. The TUMBUH cycle then emphasizes the development of practical strategies for responding to difficulties and trying again. This sequence connects

e-ISSN: 2963 – 198X
p-ISSN: 2963 – 2498

students' experiences with opportunities to reflect, reframe their interpretations, and plan possible actions. Rather than treating growth mindset as an abstract concept, the intervention was designed to relate it to situations that students may encounter in their academic and social lives.

This approach is consistent with Dweck and Leggett's (1988) social-cognitive perspective, which explains how beliefs about ability are associated with individuals' goals and responses to challenges. Blackwell et al. (2007) also demonstrated that an intervention emphasizing the developability of intelligence could influence motivational and academic outcomes among adolescents in a particular educational context. More recently, Zhao et al. (2024) examined a growth mindset intervention designed to help primary school students respond to academic failure. Their findings highlight the potential relevance of growth mindset interventions to students' beliefs and strategies concerning failure, while also indicating that contextual factors can influence outcomes. Together, these studies provide a theoretical and empirical basis for exploring growth mindset-based guidance that helps students reconsider how they interpret failure. Nevertheless, differences in participant characteristics, intervention procedures, and measured outcomes mean that findings from these studies cannot be assumed to apply directly to the present sample.

The quantitative findings showed that the mean Performance Failure Appraisal Inventory (PFAI) score decreased from 82.77 (SD = 16.25) at pretest to 71.90 (SD = 21.78) at posttest, representing a decrease of 10.87 points. The Wilcoxon signed-rank test indicated a statistically significant difference between pretest and posttest scores ($Z = -2.950$, $p = 0.003$). Among the 30 students with matched data, 20 showed decreased scores, eight showed increased scores, and two showed no change. These results indicate that the overall pattern of fear-of-failure scores was lower after the intervention, although the direction of change varied among individual students. The findings should therefore be interpreted as preliminary evidence of a change following the guidance services rather than as proof that every student benefited equally or that the intervention alone caused the change.

The variation in individual scores is particularly relevant to guidance and counseling practice. The decrease in scores among most students does not eliminate the need to understand the experiences of students whose scores increased or remained unchanged. Such patterns may warrant further exploration to determine whether students continue to experience concerns related to embarrassment, self-evaluation, future uncertainty, or the expectations of important people. However, the present quantitative data do not establish the reasons for individual score changes. Further interpretation would require evidence from students' reflection sheets, follow-up conversations, or other systematically collected information. Individualized support may be considered where additional assessment indicates that students continue to experience difficulties.

The results should also be considered in light of the broader evidence on growth mindset interventions. Sisk et al. (2018) reported that the average association between growth mindset and academic achievement was relatively small, while Yeager et al. (2019) showed that the benefits of a growth mindset intervention could depend on contextual and student-related factors. Macnamara and Burgoyne (2023), through a systematic review and meta-analysis, further cautioned that the effects of growth mindset interventions on academic achievement are not consistently substantial across studies. These findings underscore the importance of evaluating interventions in their specific contexts rather than assuming that the introduction of growth mindset concepts will automatically produce positive outcomes. Since the primary outcome in the present study was fear-of-failure scores, the results should not be extended to claims that students' academic achievement improved or that a measurable change in growth mindset itself occurred.

The practical implication for guidance and counseling teachers is that services addressing fear of failure should move beyond simply telling students not to be afraid of failing. Such messages may not sufficiently address the meanings students attach to failure. Instead, teachers can help students identify what they fear, such as obtaining poor results, experiencing embarrassment, evaluating themselves negatively, facing an uncertain future, or disappointing people who matter to them. Once these concerns have been explored, students can be guided to distinguish between outcomes beyond their immediate control and actions they can take, including adjusting their strategies, seeking feedback, practicing specific skills, or asking for help. The aim is not to promise that every effort will result in immediate success, but to help students make informed decisions and continue learning when outcomes do not meet their expectations.

Reflective activities should be conducted in a safe and nonjudgmental environment. Students may differ in their willingness to discuss personal experiences in front of classmates, particularly when those experiences involve embarrassment or perceived inadequacy. Guidance and counseling teachers can begin with fictional situations, provide opportunities for private written reflection, and establish clear expectations that classmates' experiences must not become a source of ridicule. Participation should not be assessed solely by the frequency of verbal contributions. Written reflections and completed worksheets may also provide relevant information

e-ISSN: 2963 – 198X
p-ISSN: 2963 – 2498

about students' engagement, provided that these materials are reviewed systematically and interpreted within the limits of the evidence they contain. These precautions are important because an intervention intended to address fear of failure should not inadvertently create additional social pressure or expose students to unwanted disclosure.

The three-cycle structure also offers a practical way to connect service objectives with activities. During SADAR, prompting questions and written reflection can help students identify situations associated with fear without requiring them to disclose private experiences publicly. During MAKNAI ULANG, sample statements and hypothetical cases can help students distinguish rigid judgments about personal ability from more specific interpretations focused on learning and strategy. For example, the statement "I cannot do this" can be reconsidered as "I have not understood this part yet and may need another strategy." During TUMBUH, students can formulate a plan that identifies the situation they want to address, the first step they will take, the support they need, and how they will evaluate their progress. Concrete plans provide a more specific basis for follow-up than general commitments such as "I will become more confident." These descriptions reflect the intended structure of the intervention; conclusions about the effectiveness of individual activities should be made only when supported by the available documentation.

This approach also highlights the importance of distinguishing between outcomes, strategies, and self-identity. When a student interprets failure as proof of being incapable, the guidance process can encourage examination of the specific task, the strategies used, the difficulties encountered, and the resources still needed. The goal is not to replace negative thoughts with unrealistically positive statements, but to develop more balanced and actionable interpretations. A student may acknowledge disappointment while also recognizing that a particular skill has not yet been mastered or that a different approach may be required. Such reflection can help shift attention from a global negative judgment of the self toward aspects of the learning process that can be evaluated and adjusted.

Process-oriented feedback can complement this approach. Feedback that focuses exclusively on intelligence or final outcomes may encourage students to interpret success and failure as fixed indicators of ability. In contrast, feedback can address the strategies used, appropriate persistence, willingness to seek help, and readiness to revise an ineffective approach. Nevertheless, effort alone is not always sufficient. Students may also require effective strategies, suitable learning resources, and support from teachers, peers, and family members. A growth mindset should therefore not be interpreted as an instruction to continue using the same approach regardless of its effectiveness. Rather, it involves remaining open to learning, evaluating feedback, and adapting strategies when necessary. Benneker et al. (2023) further highlight the relevance of perceived parental autonomy support to adolescents' motivation, emphasizing that students' motivational experiences are also shaped by their social environment.

The findings also emphasize the distinction between needs assessment and outcome evaluation. The DCM was used to identify students' reported concerns and establish priorities for guidance services. The finding that 28 of 31 students endorsed the statement "I often feel afraid of failing" indicated that the issue was relevant to the class, but a response to a single DCM item should not be interpreted as a comprehensive assessment or individual diagnosis of fear of failure. The PFAI provided a more structured measure of the construct through its 25 items and five dimensions. These instruments served complementary purposes: the DCM informed problem identification, whereas the PFAI was used to compare fear-of-failure scores before and after the intervention. Claims about the most prominent PFAI dimension should only be made after the item-level data, item-to-dimension mapping, and scoring procedures have been verified against the Indonesian version's scoring guidelines.

The interpretation of the results also depends on the accuracy and consistency of the data. The preliminary DCM involved 31 students, whereas the quantitative pretest–posttest analysis included 30 matched records. These participant counts should remain clearly distinguished throughout the manuscript. In addition, item-level frequency tables should be checked against the raw data to ensure that their totals correspond to the number of valid responses. The scoring of all PFAI items, including any items requiring reverse scoring, must follow the official scoring guidelines for the Indonesian version used in this study. These checks are essential before reporting item-level findings or identifying a dominant dimension. Transparent reporting of participant numbers and scoring procedures strengthens the reliability and traceability of the research findings.

The documentation available for the intervention includes the Rencana Pelaksanaan Layanan (RPL), student worksheets or reflection sheets, and photographs of the activities. These materials can support the description of how the three cycles were planned and implemented. Student reflections and worksheets may also provide qualitative information about students' interpretations and proposed strategies, where their actual contents have been reviewed and systematically summarized. However, photographs alone cannot establish

e-ISSN: 2963 – 198X
p-ISSN: 2963 – 2498

changes in students' fear of failure, and the existence of reflection sheets does not automatically demonstrate that students' responses changed in a particular way. Process-related conclusions must therefore be grounded in the specific content of the documentation rather than inferred from the intervention design. Future reports could strengthen this evidence by systematically summarizing student engagement, recurring themes in anonymized reflections, strategies recorded in the Try Again Plans, and the researcher's reflections after each cycle.

Several limitations should be considered when interpreting the findings. First, the study was conducted in one class at one school, so the results cannot be generalized directly to all senior high school students. Second, the absence of a comparison group prevents the study from establishing that the guidance intervention alone caused the observed decrease in PFAI scores. Other experiences or contextual influences during the study period cannot be ruled out. Third, the pretest and posttest results indicate changes in reported fear of failure but do not independently demonstrate which activities contributed most to those changes. Finally, without follow-up measurements, it remains unclear whether the observed decrease was sustained after the intervention concluded. These limitations suggest that the findings should be understood as preliminary evidence from a context-specific action research study.

Future research could strengthen the evaluation by incorporating follow-up assessments, systematically documenting the process of each cycle, and examining the experiences of students whose scores decrease, increase, or remain unchanged. A comparison group, where feasible and appropriate, could help clarify whether similar changes occur in the absence of the intervention. Additional qualitative evidence, such as anonymized written reflections or structured follow-up questions, could also help explain how students interpret failure and which strategies they report using in subsequent learning situations. Such evidence would complement quantitative score comparisons without replacing the need for consistent instrument administration and scoring.

Overall, this study illustrates how guidance and counseling teachers can connect needs assessment findings with a structured sequence of classroom guidance activities and pretest–posttest evaluation. The practical contribution of the SADAR–MAKNAI ULANG–TUMBUH sequence lies in its organization of reflection on failure experiences, reframing of interpretations, and planning of possible responses to future challenges. The statistically significant decrease in mean PFAI scores provides preliminary evidence of change following the intervention, while the variation in individual scores highlights the importance of recognizing students' differing needs. The findings should not be treated as definitive evidence of causality or universal effectiveness. More systematic process documentation, careful data verification, and follow-up monitoring would strengthen future evaluations and support the development of evidence-informed guidance and counseling practices.

CONCLUSION

The Guidance and Counseling Action Research involving students in class X.4 at SMA Negeri 1 Bandar Lampung was conducted over three cycles: Sadar (Awareness), Maknai Ulang (Reframing), and Tumbuh (Growth), integrating reflection on failure experiences with a growth mindset approach. Based on the available statistical output for 30 students, the mean PFAI score decreased from 82.77 to 71.90, and the Wilcoxon signed-rank test indicated a statistically significant difference ($Z = -2.950$; $p = 0.003$). These findings provide preliminary evidence that the guidance services may help reduce fear of failure. However, a final conclusion should be established only after the consistency of the raw data, item-scoring procedures, and process evidence from each cycle have been verified and supplemented. Future research could incorporate follow-up assessments to determine whether the changes are sustained after the services have concluded.

REFERENCES

Akbar, S. R., & Hidayati, S. (2025). Konseling pendidikan sebagai sarana pengembangan growth mindset siswa: Telaah literatur teoretis dan praktis. As-Sulthan Journal of Education, 2(1). https://ojssulthan.com/asje/article/view/299

Benneker, I. M. B., Lee, N. C., & van Atteveldt, N. (2023). Mindset and perceived parental support of autonomy safeguard adolescents' autonomous motivation during COVID-19 home-based learning. npj Science of Learning, 8, Article 4. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41539-023-00153-2

Blackwell, L. S., Trzesniewski, K. H., & Dweck, C. S. (2007). Implicit theories of intelligence predict achievement across an adolescent transition: A longitudinal study and an intervention. Child Development, 78(1), 246–263. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2007.00995.x

Calo, M., Judd, B., & Peiris, C. (2024). Grit, resilience and growth-mindset interventions in health professional

e-ISSN: 2963 – 198X
p-ISSN: 2963 – 2498

students: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Medical Education, 58(8), 902–919. https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.15391

Conroy, D. E., Willow, J. P., & Metzler, J. N. (2002). Multidimensional fear of failure measurement: The Performance Failure Appraisal Inventory. Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 14(2), 76–90. https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200252907752

Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. Psychological Review, 95(2), 256–273. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.95.2.256

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

Fakhria, M., & Setiowati, E. A. (2017). Motivasi berprestasi siswa ditinjau dari fasilitasi sosial dan ketakutan akan kegagalan. Psikohumaniora: Jurnal Penelitian Psikologi, 2(1), 29–42. https://doi.org/10.21580/pjpp.v2i1.1279

Gazmuri, C. (2025). Can growth mindset interventions improve academic achievement? A structured review of the existing evidence. Review of Education, 13(2), Article e70066. https://doi.org/10.1002/rev3.70066

Harapan, A. (2025). Strategi dan dampak implementasi growth mindset dalam pembelajaran: Sebuah systematic literature review. Ilmu Pendidikan: Jurnal Kajian Teori dan Praktik Kependidikan, 10(2), 193–199. https://doi.org/10.17977/um027v10i22025p193-199

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

Martin, A. K., & Yunanto, K. T. (2022). Properti psikometri Performance Failure Appraisal Inventory versi Indonesia. Psikologi Kreatif Inovatif, 3(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.37817/psikologikreatifinovatif.v3i1.2136

Nurhaliza, S., Indreswari, H., Bariyyah, K., Atmoko, A., & Hambali, I. M. (2026). The fear within: Gender differences in fear of failure among senior high school students and implications for guidance and counseling. ProGCouns: Journal of Professionals in Guidance and Counseling, 7(1). https://doi.org/10.21831/progcouns.v7i1.97449

Sisk, V. F., Burgoyne, A. P., Sun, J., Butler, J. L., & Macnamara, B. N. (2018). To what extent and under which circumstances are growth mind-sets important to academic achievement? Two meta-analyses. Psychological Science, 29(4), 549–571. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797617739704

Yeager, D. S., Hanselman, P., Walton, G. M., Murray, J. S., Crosnoe, R., Muller, C., Tipton, E., Schneider, B., Hulleman, C. S., Hinojosa, C. P., Paunesku, D., Romero, C., Flint, K., Roberts, A., Trott, J., Iachan, R., Buontempo, J., Yang, S. M., Carvalho, C. M., ... Dweck, C. S. (2019). A national experiment reveals where a growth mindset improves achievement. Nature, 573, 364–369. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-1466-y

Zhao, S., Yu, C., Jin, L., & Lin, D. (2024). Helping students to face academic failures: Evaluation of a growth mindset intervention among primary school students in China. Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being, 16(2), 397–420. https://doi.org/10.1111/aphw.12496