

Navigating Constructive Feedback in Indonesia's PPG Practicum: Challenges, Emotions, and Emerging Feedback Literacy

Nadrun*, Mashuri, Nur Sehang Thamrin, and Abdul Kamaruddin

Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Tadulako, Palu, Indonesia

*nadrun@untad.ac.id

Article Info	Abstract
Article history: Received: September 26, 2025 Accepted: April 1, 2026 Published: April 17, 2026 Keywords: Constructive feedback Feedback literacy Mentoring Pre-service teachers Teaching practicum This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License. © 2026 Vidya Karya	Constructive feedback is a core component of professional learning in school-based teaching practicums, yet pre-service teachers often experience difficulty turning feedback into concrete instructional improvement. This study aims to explore how pre-service teachers in the Indonesian <i>Pendidikan Profesi Guru</i> (PPG) program receive, interpret, and enact constructive feedback during the school-based teaching practicum (<i>Praktik Pengalaman Lapangan/PPL</i>), including the challenges they face and the strategies they use to respond. The study employed a qualitative phenomenological design. Participants included eight student teachers and five mentor teachers from seven partner schools in Palu, Indonesia. Data were collected through individual semi-structured interviews conducted in Indonesian, audio-recorded, transcribed verbatim, and analyzed using inductive thematic analysis. The findings show that student teachers generally accepted feedback as supportive and developmental, but enactment remained limited. Key barriers included pedagogical-technical difficulties (translating curriculum learning outcomes into ABCD-structured learning objectives, selecting appropriate instructional models, and aligning assessment practices), classroom enactment constraints (pacing, engagement, classroom management), affective pressures (low confidence, pressure from repeated revisions, confusion due to multiple inputs), and mentoring continuity issues (limited access to mentors/supervisors and delayed clarification). Despite these barriers, student teachers developed adaptive strategies, such as note-taking, iterative revision, peer collaboration, intensive consultation, and the use of digital and AI-supported resources, while mentor teachers supported progress through gradual coaching and combined verbal and written feedback. In conclusion, feedback effectiveness in PPL depends not only on student teachers' positive acceptance but also on the acceptance-to-enactment pathway enabled by actionable feedforward, psychologically safe interactions, and sustained dialogic mentoring. The study implies that PPG programs should strengthen mentoring coordination, provide clear exemplars and criteria, and embed structured feedback literacy support to help pre-service teachers translate feedback into observable teaching improvement.
To cite this article: Nadrun, N., Mashuri, M., Thamrin, N. S., & Kamaruddin, A. (2026). Navigating constructive feedback in indonesia's ppg practicum: challenges, emotions, and emerging feedback literacy. <i>Vidya Karya</i>, 41(1), 36-48.	

INTRODUCTION

High-quality teacher education depends on learning experiences that connect pedagogical theory with authentic teaching practice because pre-service teachers need repeated opportunities to translate conceptual knowledge into situated professional action (Kostiainen et al., 2018; Mystakidis, 2021). In Indonesia, this integration is most evident in the Teacher Professional Education program, where the school-based teaching practicum serves as the primary context for professional learning through engagement with real classrooms, diverse learners, and institutional routines. Within the teaching practicum, student teachers are guided by mentor teachers and university supervisors, and this mentoring relationship plays a crucial role in shaping how they plan instruction, enact teaching practices, and reflect on their professional growth.

Within the PPL context, constructive feedback becomes a key mechanism for accelerating pre-service teachers' professional learning (Nurjanah et al., 2023; Soh, 2024; Sumarmi et al., 2025). Feedback helps novices refine instructional decisions, clarify performance expectations, and develop reflective teaching habits. Classic feedback theory conceptualizes feedback as information that reduces the gap between current performance and intended goals (Lipnevich & Panadero, 2021; Ramani et al., 2019), while more recent syntheses show that feedback produces strong effects only when recipients can interpret it, evaluate its relevance, and translate it into actionable change (Carless & Boud, 2018; Lechermeier & Fassnacht, 2018; Wisniewski et al., 2020). This point is crucial in teacher education because feedback functions not only as evaluation but also as developmental guidance that supports instructional confidence and shapes emerging professional identity during the practicum.

However, evidence consistently shows that feedback availability does not automatically translate into improvement. The key challenge lies in feedback uptake: how recipients interpret, internalize, and transform feedback into concrete instructional change (Carless & Boud, 2018; Henderson et al., 2019). This line of work has crystallized into the construct of feedback literacy, which frames uptake as a set of capabilities that include appreciating feedback, making judgments, managing affect, and taking action. Subsequent research has expanded this agenda by empirically detailing feedback literacy-related competencies and showing that feedback engagement involves both cognitive and relational work, not just technical compliance with suggestions (Lerdpornkulrat et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2024). In teacher education, studies also indicate that different feedback configurations can shape perceived usefulness and reflective depth, yet outcomes vary depending on how novices experience feedback and whether they find it actionable within their teaching constraints.

Emotional and cultural dynamics further complicate feedback use during practicum. Novice teachers can experience anxiety, embarrassment, or self-doubt when receiving criticism, and these emotions can inhibit clarification-seeking and action planning (Kashima et al., 2020; Riquelme et al., 2025). In contexts where hierarchical relations and high power distance influence communication norms, student teachers may avoid dialogic engagement with mentors, which reduces opportunities to negotiate meaning and co-construct improvement plans (Wisniewski et al., 2020; Xu, 2025). At the same time, practicum teaching demands remain multi-layered. Student teachers must coordinate lesson goals, classroom management, differentiation, and assessment under time pressure, so they often struggle to implement feedback even when they agree with it.

Despite the structured supervision embedded in PPG, empirical research still provides limited insight into how student teachers in Indonesia actually *experience* constructive feedback during PPL, especially as a lived relational process shaped by institutional routines, mentor variability, and cultural expectations (Sari & School, 2024; Simbolon et al., 2024; Xu, 2025). Existing local discussions frequently address implementation and program improvement at a general level, but they seldom unpack the internal meaning-making process through which student teachers interpret feedback, manage affect, and

decide what to do next within real school constraints. Moreover, mentoring quality can fragment across schools because mentor teachers and DPL (*Dosen Pembimbing Lapangan*) may differ in expectations, communication styles, and feedback specificity (Abetang et al., 2020; Mullen, 2025). This inconsistency can generate contradictory messages or overly general guidance, leading to confusion and cognitive overload. These gaps justify a qualitative approach that foregrounds lived experience and accounts for both student and mentor perspectives within the same practicum setting.

Situated within the Indonesian Teacher Professional Education program, particularly in the context of the school-based teaching practicum, this study addresses existing gaps through a qualitative phenomenological inquiry into constructive feedback experiences. The novelty of this study lies in its focus on feedback as a lived, meaning-making pathway that integrates cognitive interpretation, affect regulation, and action decisions within hierarchical mentoring structures. In addition, the study triangulates student teacher accounts with mentor teacher perspectives to capture relational dynamics in situ. This design enables the study to move beyond viewing feedback as a pedagogical technique and instead explain how feedback becomes usable, resisted, or reinterpreted within authentic school environments.

Accordingly, this study investigates three research questions: (1) What challenges do pre-service teachers face in receiving and applying constructive feedback during PPL? (2) What factors shape feedback effectiveness within school practicum settings, including relational, emotional, and structural conditions? and (3) What adaptive strategies do student teachers use to manage and respond to feedback demands during practicum? By answering these questions, the study aims to strengthen theoretical understanding of feedback literacy in teacher education and provide practical implications for mentoring design and supervision practices in PPG and comparable Southeast Asian contexts.

Despite the growing body of research on feedback literacy and practicum mentoring, limited studies have examined how constructive feedback is actually interpreted, emotionally managed, and enacted by pre-service teachers within real practicum settings, particularly in hierarchical mentoring contexts such as the Indonesian PPG program. Most previous studies focus on feedback effectiveness or feedback perceptions, but fewer studies explain the process through which feedback moves from acceptance to instructional enactment in classroom practice. Therefore, this study addresses this gap by proposing an acceptance-to-enactment pathway as a conceptual model that explains how feedback is translated into teaching improvement through the interaction of pedagogical competence, classroom enactment conditions, affective regulation, and mentoring continuity. The theoretical contribution of this study lies in extending feedback literacy theory by conceptualizing feedback enactment as a situated and relational process rather than solely an individual capability. Practically, this study provides implications for mentoring design in PPG, particularly the need for actionable feedforward, dialogic mentoring cycles, and structured support for feedback literacy development during practicum.

METHODS

This study used a qualitative phenomenological design to explore the lived experiences of pre-service teachers in receiving, interpreting, and responding to constructive feedback during the school-based teaching practicum in the Indonesian PPG program. Phenomenology aims to describe the essence of a shared human experience by examining how participants make meaning of a phenomenon in authentic contexts (Neubauer et al., 2019; van Manen, 2017). This design was selected because constructive feedback is not merely instructional information but a subjective experience that involves cognitive appraisal, emotional reactions, and relational dynamics within mentoring and supervision settings, which cannot be adequately captured through quantitative measures alone. By adopting this approach, the study sought to illuminate how feedback becomes meaningful,

how it is negotiated in practice, and how it shapes novice teachers' reflective and adaptive actions in real classrooms.

This study is situated within an interpretive (hermeneutic) phenomenological tradition, which aims to understand and interpret the meaning of participants' lived experiences rather than merely describing them. Following van Manen (2017), the study focused on how pre-service teachers made sense of constructive feedback experiences within the social, emotional, and institutional context of the practicum. This interpretive approach is appropriate because feedback experiences are shaped by relationships, emotions, and situational constraints, requiring interpretive understanding rather than purely descriptive analysis.

The study involved two participant groups: pre-service teachers undertaking the teaching practicum (hereafter referred to as student teachers) and mentor teachers who supervised them. Eight student teachers and five mentor teachers participated, drawn from seven partner schools in Palu, Indonesia. The partner schools varied in institutional resources, student characteristics, and school size, providing diverse contexts in which feedback was enacted and interpreted. Participants were selected through purposive sampling to ensure information-rich cases. Student teachers were included if they had completed at least half of the practicum period and had experienced multiple feedback cycles from mentor teachers and university supervisors. Mentor teachers were selected based on their direct responsibilities in observing teaching practice, delivering feedback, and guiding the completion of practicum tasks throughout the mentoring process. Participant recruitment and data collection were conducted until thematic saturation was achieved, meaning that no new themes or significant new insights emerged from subsequent interviews. Saturation was indicated when similar patterns of experiences, challenges, and strategies were repeatedly reported by participants across interviews. At this point, data collection was considered sufficient to capture the essence of the phenomenon under investigation.

Data were generated using semi-structured interviews as the primary research instrument. The interview guides were developed in alignment with the study's research questions and informed by prior research on feedback literacy, emotional responses, and mentoring practices. Two guides were prepared to reflect participants' roles. The student teacher guide explored experiences of receiving feedback, including interpretation, cognitive and emotional responses, and challenges in applying feedback in practice. The mentor teacher guide examined perspectives on student teachers' readiness, areas for improvement, and approaches to providing constructive feedback, thereby capturing the relational dimensions of feedback processes. All interviews were conducted in Indonesian, audio-recorded with consent, and transcribed verbatim. Transcripts were returned to participants for member checking to ensure accuracy and credibility.

The study analyzed data using thematic analysis following Braun & Clarke (2013). Analysis began with repeated reading of transcripts to build familiarity and document early analytic impressions. Inductive coding was then conducted by assigning labels to meaningful units related to participants' experiences of receiving and responding to feedback. For example, statements about difficulty translating lesson plans were coded as "pedagogical challenge," expressions of anxiety or hesitation were coded as "emotional response," and descriptions of unclear guidance from mentors were coded as "mentoring constraint." Codes were subsequently compared and grouped into broader categories, which were refined into sub-themes and synthesized into overarching themes representing pedagogical, emotional, relational, and structural dimensions of feedback experiences. To strengthen rigor, triangulation was applied by comparing themes from student teachers' and mentor teachers' accounts to identify convergences and contrasts. Peer debriefing was conducted to review coding decisions and resolve discrepancies through consensus. Reflexive journaling and bracketing (*epoche*) were also applied to minimize researchers'

assumptions and ensure that interpretations remained grounded in participants' lived experiences (Kenny, 2012; Dangal & Joshi, 2020).

Data analysis followed an inductive thematic analysis process. The researchers first familiarized themselves with the data by repeatedly reading the interview transcripts, followed by open coding to identify meaningful units related to participants' experiences in receiving and enacting feedback. Similar codes were then grouped into broader categories, which were further interpreted and synthesized into overarching themes that captured the essence of the lived experiences. The analysis was conducted iteratively by moving back and forth between the data, codes, and themes to ensure interpretive accuracy. Theme validation was carried out by reviewing the themes against the original transcripts, triangulating perspectives between student teachers and mentor teachers, and conducting peer debriefing among the research team to refine and confirm the final themes.

The study proceeded through a systematic sequence of activities. The researchers first defined the phenomenon under investigation, namely how constructive feedback is experienced and acted upon by student teachers during the PPG practicum, and then developed semi-structured interview guides tailored to student teachers and mentor teachers based on the relevant literature. After identifying the partner-school settings in Palu, the researchers recruited participants using purposive criteria to ensure they had sufficient exposure to feedback cycles during the practicum. Individual interviews were then scheduled and conducted in Indonesian, audio-recorded with consent, and transcribed verbatim. The researchers subsequently returned transcripts to participants to confirm accuracy through member checking. Following transcript verification, the research team conducted inductive coding and thematic analysis to generate categories, sub-themes, and final themes. To enhance trustworthiness, the team compared perspectives across participant groups for triangulation and held peer debriefing discussions to refine interpretations. Finally, the researchers consolidated the themes and prepared the report by presenting the thematic findings supported by representative excerpts, while maintaining participant confidentiality throughout the process.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As shown in Table 1, both participant groups consistently described constructive feedback as supportive and generally well received. However, the main challenges emerged at the enactment stage, where student teachers experienced difficulty translating feedback into revised lesson plans and effective classroom practice, often under emotional pressure and constrained mentoring continuity.

Despite this generally positive acceptance, student teachers encountered substantial challenges in applying feedback in practice. The most prominent difficulties were pedagogical and technical. Student teachers reported challenges in revising lesson plans, selecting appropriate instructional models, designing assessments, differentiating instruction, and generating feasible teaching ideas. Similarly, mentor teachers identified parallel difficulties, particularly in translating learning outcomes into ABCD-structured objectives, aligning instructional models with content, maintaining lesson syntax, and ensuring instructional coherence. These challenges were further intensified during classroom enactment. Student teachers struggled with pacing and time management, sustaining student engagement, maintaining classroom control, and consistently applying instructional strategies. Mentor teachers confirmed similar issues, including lessons ending too early and difficulties in managing student behavior. In addition, affective and psychological factors played a significant role in shaping feedback uptake. Student teachers reported pressure from repeated revisions, reduced confidence, and confusion due to multiple feedback sources, while mentor teachers observed hesitancy and low self-confidence, particularly in the early stages of the practicum.

Table 1 Thematic matrix of feedback experiences during the school-based teaching practicum

Aspect	Student Teachers (ST)	Mentor Teachers (GP)	Synthesis
Feedback acceptance	Welcomed feedback and felt supported; some reported embarrassment when criticism was public (ST1, ST2, ST4).	Observed openness and low defensiveness when students received feedback (GP1, GP4).	Acceptance was generally positive; the key challenge was implementation.
Pedagogical–technical demands	Difficulty revising lesson plans; selecting learning models; designing assessments; differentiating instruction; generating teaching ideas (ST3, ST4, ST7, ST8).	Difficulty translating CP–TP into ABCD objectives; aligning models with content; maintaining lesson syntax; ensuring instructional coherence (GP2, GP5).	Core barriers were pedagogical and technical, indicating a persistent theory–practice gap.
Classroom enactment constraints	Problems with pacing/time management; avoiding monotonous instruction; classroom control; consistent strategy use (ST5, ST6, ST7).	Pacing problems (lessons ending too early); student behavior management challenges (GP4).	Enactment barriers centered on pacing and classroom management.
Affective and psychological responses	Pressure from repeated revisions; low confidence; confusion due to multiple inputs (ST1, ST2, ST4).	Low self-confidence and hesitancy, especially at early practicum stages (GP1, GP4).	Performance anxiety and low self-efficacy constrained feedback uptake.
Mentoring continuity and access	Limited availability of mentors/DPL reduced opportunities for timely clarification and follow-up (ST3, ST7).	Misaligned schedules; delayed student follow-up observed (GP1, GP2).	Mentoring continuity and communication strongly shaped feedback effectiveness.
Feedback engagement strategies	Note-taking; iterative revision; peer collaboration; intensive consultation; AI/digital media support (ST2–ST8).	Gradual coaching; verbal plus written feedback; progress monitoring; group discussion (GP3, GP4).	Collaboration, reflection, technology support, and iterative coaching enabled progress.
Development trajectory	Increased confidence and independence across revision cycles; observable improvement in teaching practice.	Growth was most visible among students who actively consulted and welcomed coaching.	Consistent mentoring and iterative cycles supported gradual professional transformation.

Note: ST = student teachers; GP = mentor teachers; DPL= university supervisor; CP = Course Learning Outcomes; TP = Instructional Objectives; ABCD = Audience-Behavior-Condition-Degree

Beyond these challenges, the findings indicate that feedback effectiveness was shaped by interconnected relational, emotional, and structural conditions. From a relational perspective, both groups emphasized generally positive feedback acceptance, characterized by openness and low defensiveness. However, some student teachers experienced discomfort when feedback was delivered publicly, highlighting the importance of feedback delivery practices. The emotional climate also influenced how feedback was interpreted and enacted, as feelings of anxiety, pressure, and low self-efficacy sometimes limited its effectiveness despite its supportive intent. Structurally, mentoring continuity and access emerged as critical factors. Student teachers reported limited opportunities for consultation due to the availability of mentors and university supervisors, while mentor teachers noted

misaligned schedules and delayed follow-up. These constraints reduced opportunities for clarification and iterative improvement, thereby affecting feedback usability.

In response to these conditions, student teachers demonstrated a range of adaptive strategies to manage feedback demands. These included note-taking, iterative revision, peer collaboration, intensive consultation, and the use of digital resources and AI tools to support lesson development. Mentor teachers facilitated this process through gradual coaching, combined verbal and written feedback, progress monitoring, and group discussions, creating opportunities for ongoing engagement with feedback. Across repeated feedback cycles, both groups described a clear development trajectory in which student teachers became more confident and independent. The most substantial progress was observed among those who actively engaged in consultation and were receptive to feedback, highlighting the importance of active participation in feedback processes.

Table 1 indicates that constructive feedback during the PPG practicum was generally accepted as supportive, yet the main bottleneck occurred when student teachers attempted to implement feedback in lesson planning and classroom enactment. This pattern is consistent with prior research showing that feedback effectiveness depends less on feedback provision and more on how learners engage with, interpret, and act on feedback input (Dawson et al., 2019; Henderson et al., 2021; Malecka et al., 2022). In the present study, student teachers' openness did not automatically translate into instructional change, suggesting that the critical transition point in practicum feedback lies in converting understanding into action under real classroom constraints.

Table 1 highlights that pedagogical and technical demands were the primary barriers to effective feedback enactment, particularly in translating learning outcomes into ABCD-structured objectives, aligning instructional models with content, maintaining instructional coherence, and designing assessments. This finding aligns with well-established feedback theory that distinguishes between information about current performance and guidance that specifies actionable next steps (Alavi, 2024; Dawson et al., 2019; Govaert et al., 2019). Student teachers in this study appeared to receive correction and direction, yet they often lacked sufficient operational "feedforward" to implement improvements efficiently. This interpretation supports earlier arguments that novices require explicit criteria, exemplars, and scaffolded guidance to build instructional judgment and reduce ambiguity in applying feedback (Ramani et al., 2019; Williams, 2024; Zhu et al., 2020). Therefore, the results reinforce the view that effective practicum feedback should not only identify what is wrong but also model what "better" looks like and how to get there.

Table 1 further highlights classroom enactment constraints, including pacing, engagement maintenance, and classroom management. This pattern is compatible with dialogic feedback scholarship that emphasizes the need for iterative cycles of clarification, trial, and follow-up, rather than one-way feedback transmission (Al-Hayani & Ilhan, 2020; Carless, 2022; McGinness et al., 2020). In practicum settings, instructional improvements are enacted in real time and require situational judgment, so feedback becomes more effective when mentors provide coaching-oriented support that includes rehearsal, observation-based discussion, and progressive refinement (Henderson et al., 2021; Sims et al., 2025; Zhang et al., 2024). The present findings extend this literature by showing how enactment barriers persist even when student teachers revise lesson plans repeatedly, indicating that feedback must travel beyond documentation into coached classroom enactment.

A key contribution of the study is the affective dimension shown in Table 1, including pressure from repeated revisions, reduced confidence, and confusion due to multiple inputs, alongside mentor observations of hesitancy and low self-confidence. These experiences align with research that conceptualizes feedback as an affective event, where achievement emotions can shape whether learners seek clarification, persist with revision, or avoid engagement (Fleming et al., 2021; Fong & Schallert, 2023; Hill et al., 2023). The results

also resonate with work suggesting that hierarchical communication contexts can discourage dialogue and increase emotional vulnerability, thereby limiting opportunities for collaborative meaning-making (Aldemir et al., 2022; Fong & Schallert, 2023; McGinness et al., 2020). This indicates that emotionally safe feedback practices and mentor sensitivity are not peripheral but central conditions for effective feedback uptake, consistent with calls for feedback approaches that attend to emotion regulation and psychological safety (Keiler et al., 2023; Moloney et al., 2023; Sarabipour et al., 2022).

Table 1 also identifies structural barriers that weakened feedback continuity, especially limited mentor or supervisor availability and schedule misalignment, which delayed clarification and follow-up. This finding aligns with critiques of transmission-based feedback that lacks dialogue and iterative support, leaving learners to infer expectations independently and increasing the likelihood of misinterpretation or superficial compliance (Moloney et al., 2023; Winstone & Carless, 2021). It also supports dialogic feedback arguments that emphasize feedback as an interactive process and a maintained loop, rather than a single event (Henderson et al., 2021; Lipnevich & Panadero, 2021; Ramani et al., 2019; Winstone & Carless, 2021). In the PPG context, these structural constraints suggest a program-level need for coordinated schedules, shared criteria between GP and supervisors, and structured post-lesson conferencing so that feedback can be clarified, enacted, and monitored consistently.

At the same time, Table 1 shows that student teachers developed adaptive strategies, including note-taking, iterative revision, peer collaboration, intensive consultation, and the use of digital resources and AI tools, while mentor teachers supported learning through gradual coaching, mixed-mode feedback, and group discussions. These behaviors directly reflect the learner agency emphasized in feedback literacy frameworks, where learners build capability by actively making sense of feedback, managing affect, and taking action through available resources (Carless & Winstone, 2023; Molloy et al., 2020; Yu & Liu, 2021). The development trajectory reported across revision cycles suggests that feedback becomes developmentally powerful when mentoring continuity improves and when students can enact changes incrementally with guided support. This pattern reinforces research arguing that feedback literacy does not emerge automatically but develops through scaffolded practice, dialogue, and repeated opportunities to apply and refine performance (Hoo et al., 2022; Nieminen & Carless, 2023; Winstone et al., 2022).

Overall, the study contributes to the established knowledge base by clarifying how the acceptance–enactment gap in feedback is produced through the intersection of pedagogical-technical demands, classroom enactment constraints, affective experiences, and mentoring continuity within a practicum setting. The findings support a clear implication for PPG practicum design: strengthening feedback effectiveness requires explicit development of feedback literacy, increased feedforward specificity with exemplars and modeling, dialogic coaching cycles, and mentoring structures that protect time for clarification and follow-up (Carless & Winstone, 2023; Nieminen & Carless, 2023; Wongvorachan et al., 2022).

Building on the patterns summarized in Table 1, this study contributes to feedback scholarship by clarifying that the critical “failure point” in practicum feedback is the transition from acceptance to enactment. Prior work in feedback literacy emphasizes capabilities such as appreciating feedback, making judgments, managing affect, and taking action (Boud & Dawson, 2023; Chong, 2021; Nieminen & Carless, 2023). The present findings refine this framework for practicum contexts by showing that enactment depends on an interaction between (1) pedagogical-technical competence (e.g., objective formulation, model fidelity, assessment alignment), (2) classroom enactment constraints (pacing, control, engagement), (3) affective regulation under evaluative pressure, and (4) mentoring continuity that enables dialogic clarification. This synthesis suggests that “taking action” in practicum is not a single learner skill but a conditional capability that

emerges when coaching infrastructure and psychological safety allow novices to translate feedback into concrete instructional moves. This conceptual refinement extends dialogic feedback arguments that treat feedback as an iterative loop rather than a one-off message (Myers & Buchanan, 2025; Pitt & Winstone, 2020), and it provides a context-sensitive explanation for why feedback can be welcomed yet remain difficult to implement.

CONCLUSION

This study examined how pre-service teachers in the Indonesian PPG practicum (PPL) experienced constructive feedback. The results show that student teachers generally accepted feedback as supportive, yet many struggled to enact it in lesson planning and classroom practice. The discussion indicates that this gap was shaped by four interconnected conditions: pedagogical-technical demands (e.g., CP-TP to ABCD objectives, model selection, and assessment alignment), classroom enactment pressures (pacing, engagement, and classroom management), affective responses (pressure, low confidence, and confusion from multiple inputs), and mentoring continuity (limited access and follow-up). From these findings, a key new idea emerges: in practicum settings, feedback effectiveness depends on an acceptance-to-enactment pathway. Acceptance alone is not enough. Feedback becomes usable when mentors provide actionable feedback and when student teachers can regulate affect and access timely dialogic clarification. This study has limitations. The sample was small and context-specific (Palu partner schools), and the evidence relied mainly on interview accounts, which may be influenced by recall or social desirability. The study also captured experiences within a bounded practicum period rather than tracking change longitudinally. Implications are straightforward. PPG should strengthen feedforward clarity with explicit criteria and exemplars, protect time for dialogic feedback and follow-up through coordinated mentoring schedules and shared rubrics, and promote psychologically safe feedback interactions. Programs can also formalize peer support and guided use of digital tools to accelerate feedback literacy and help student teachers translate feedback into observable teaching improvement.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS STATEMENT

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article.

AI DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The authors used ChatGPT (OpenAI) solely as a limited writing support tool during manuscript preparation for language editing, sentence refinement, and improving the organization of the manuscript. The tool was not used to generate research data, conduct data analysis, interpret findings, or produce the core intellectual contributions of the study. All AI-assisted outputs were critically reviewed, substantially revised, and verified by the authors. The authors assume full responsibility for the accuracy, integrity, and final content of this manuscript.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to express our appreciation to the following parties: Rector of Universitas Tadulako, Head of LPPM Universitas Tadulako, Dean of FKIP, and Coordinator of PPG Universitas Tadulako for supporting and providing PPG-based research grants; and the principals of PPG partner schools for facilitating the research process.

REFERENCES

- Abetang, M. A., Oguma, R. N., & Abetang, A. P. (2020). Mentoring and the difference it makes in teachers' work: A literature review. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 7(6), 301–323. <https://doi.org/10.46827/ejes.v7i6.3146>

- Al-Hayani, B., & Ilhan, H. (2020). Efficient cooperative image transmission in one-way multi-hop sensor network. *International Journal of Electrical Engineering & Education*, 57(4), 321–339. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020720918816009>
- Alavi, S. B. (2024). A theoretical analysis of the implications of self-determination theory in explaining the effectiveness of feedback-seeking behaviors and the seeker's reaction to feedback: A research agenda. *New Ideas in Psychology*, 74, 101091. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.newideapsych.2024.101091>
- Aldemir, T., Borge, M., & Soto, J. (2022). Shared meaning-making in online intergroup discussions around sensitive topics. *International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning*, 17(3), 361–396. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11412-022-09375-9>
- Boud, D., & Dawson, P. (2023). What feedback literate teachers do: an empirically-derived competency framework. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 48(2), 158–171. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1910928>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2013). *Successful qualitative research: A practical guide for beginners*.
- Carless, D. (2022). From teacher transmission of information to student feedback literacy: Activating the learner role in feedback processes. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 23(2), 143–153. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787420945845>
- Carless, D., & Boud, D. (2018). The development of student feedback literacy: enabling uptake of feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(8), 1315–1325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1463354>
- Carless, D., & Winstone, N. (2023). Teacher feedback literacy and its interplay with student feedback literacy. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 28(1), 150–163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1782372>
- Chong, S. W. (2021). Reconsidering student feedback literacy from an ecological perspective. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 46(1), 92–104. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1730765>
- Dawson, P., Henderson, M., Mahoney, P., Phillips, M., Ryan, T., Boud, D., & Molloy, E. (2019). What makes for effective feedback: staff and student perspectives. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 44(1), 25–36. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1467877>
- Fleming, J., Rowe, A. D., & Jackson, D. (2021). Employers as educators: the role of work placement supervisors in facilitating the transfer of skills and knowledge. *Journal of Education and Work*, 34(5–6), 705–721. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13639080.2021.1969343>
- Fong, C. J., & Schallert, D. L. (2023). “Feedback to the future”: Advancing motivational and emotional perspectives in feedback research. *Educational Psychologist*, 58(3), 146–161. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2022.2134135>
- Govaert, L., Fronhofer, E. A., Lion, S., Eizaguirre, C., Bonte, D., Egas, M., Hendry, A. P., De Brito Martins, A., Melián, C. J., Raeymaekers, J. A. M., Ratikainen, I. I., Saether, B., Schweitzer, J. A., & Matthews, B. (2019). Eco-evolutionary feedbacks—Theoretical models and perspectives. *Functional Ecology*, 33(1), 13–30. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.13241>
- Henderson, M., Ajjawi, R., Boud, D., & Molloy, E. (2019). *The impact of feedback in higher education: Improving assessment outcomes for learners*. Springer Nature.
- Henderson, M., Ryan, T., Boud, D., Dawson, P., Phillips, M., Molloy, E., & Mahoney, P. (2021). The usefulness of feedback. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 22(3), 229–243. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787419872393>
- Hill, J., Berlin, K., Choate, J., Cravens-Brown, L., McKendrick-Calder, L., & Smith, S. (2023). Emotions experienced by instructors delivering written feedback and dialogic feed-forward. *Teaching and Learning Inquiry*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.20343/teachlearninqu.11.6>

- Hoo, H.-T., Deneen, C., & Boud, D. (2022). Developing student feedback literacy through self and peer assessment interventions. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 47(3), 444–457. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1925871>
- Kashima, Y., Coman, A., Pauketat, J. V. T., & Yzerbyt, V. (2020). Emotion in cultural dynamics. *Emotion Review*, 12(2), 48–64. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073919875215>
- Keiler, L. S., Diotti, R., & Hudon, K. (2023). Supporting teachers as they support each other: Lessons concerning mentor teacher feedback to teacher mentees. *Professional Development in Education*, 49(2), 225–242. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2020.1839781>
- Kenny, G. (2012). An introduction to Moustakas's heuristic method. *Nurse Researcher*, 19(3), 6–11. <https://doi.org/10.7748/nr2012.04.19.3.6.c9052>
- Kostiainen, E., Ukskoski, T., Ruohotie-Lyhty, M., Kauppinen, M., Kainulainen, J., & Mäkinen, T. (2018). Meaningful learning in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 71, 66–77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.12.009>
- Lechermeier, J., & Fassnacht, M. (2018). How do performance feedback characteristics influence recipients' reactions? A state-of-the-art review on feedback source, timing, and valence effects. *Management Review Quarterly*, 68(2), 145–193. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-018-0136-8>
- Lerdpornkulrat, T., Poondej, C., Koul, R., Khiawrod, G., & Prasertsirikul, P. (2019). The positive effect of intrinsic feedback on motivational engagement and self-efficacy in information literacy. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 37(4), 421–434. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734282917747423>
- Lipnevich, A. A., & Panadero, E. (2021). A review of feedback models and theories: Descriptions, Definitions, and Conclusions. *Frontiers in Education*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.720195>
- Malecka, B., Boud, D., & Carless, D. (2022). Eliciting, processing and enacting feedback: mechanisms for embedding student feedback literacy within the curriculum. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 27(7), 908–922. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1754784>
- McGinness, H. T., Caldwell, P. H. Y., Gunasekera, H., & Scott, K. M. (2020). An educational intervention to increase student engagement in feedback. *Medical Teacher*, 42(11), 1289–1297. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2020.1804055>
- Molloy, E., Boud, D., & Henderson, M. (2020). Developing a learning-centred framework for feedback literacy. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 45(4), 527–540. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1667955>
- Moloney, M., Pope, J., & Donnellan, A. (2023). *Critical Role of Feedback in the Mentoring Process* (pp. 119–140). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-37186-8_7
- Mullen, C. A. (2025). *Cases of New Teaching Mentoring in Schools*. 61–100. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-78744-7_4
- Myers, T., & Buchanan, J. (2025). Dialogism in feedback literacies: a critical review. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 50(6), 846–860. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2025.2478159>
- Mystakidis, S. (2021). Deep Meaningful Learning. *Encyclopedia*, 1(3), 988–997. <https://doi.org/10.3390/encyclopedia1030075>
- Neubauer, B. E., Witkop, C. T., & Varpio, L. (2019). How phenomenology can help us learn from the experiences of others. *Perspectives on Medical Education*, 8(2), 90–97. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S40037-019-0509-2>
- Nieminen, J. H., & Carless, D. (2023). Feedback literacy: a critical review of an emerging concept. *Higher Education*, 85(6), 1381–1400. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-022-00895-9>
- Nurjanah, L., Wicaksono, B. H., Andini, T. M., & Effendi, M. I. (2023). Evaluation of teacher professional development program: A review of pre-service English teacher professionalism. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning (JETLE)*, 5(1),

- 20–27. <https://doi.org/10.18860/jetle.v5i2.23820>
- Pitt, E., & Winstone, N. (2020). *Towards Technology Enhanced Dialogic Feedback* (pp. 79–94). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-41956-1_7
- R. Dungal, M., & Joshi, R. (2020). Hermeneutic Phenomenology: Essence in Educational Research. *Open Journal for Studies in Philosophy*, 4(1), 25–42. <https://doi.org/10.32591/coas.ojsp.0401.03025d>
- Ramani, S., Könings, K. D., Ginsburg, S., & van der Vleuten, C. P. (2019). Feedback redefined: Principles and practice. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 34(5), 744–749. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-019-04874-2>
- Riquelme, E. H., da Costa Dutra, S. C., & Paez, D. (2025). Editorial: Culture and emotion in educational dynamics, volume II. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 16. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1558664>
- Sarabipour, S., Hainer, S. J., Arslan, F. N., de Winde, C. M., Furlong, E., Bielczyk, N., Jadavji, N. M., Shah, A. P., & Davla, S. (2022). Building and sustaining mentor interactions as a mentee. *The FEBS Journal*, 289(6), 1374–1384. <https://doi.org/10.1111/febs.15823>
- Sari, I. D. R., & School. (2024). *A study of professional connectedness and isolation in the learning lives of remote and peri-urban primary school teachers in Indonesia* Imelda Dwi Rosita Sari School of Education and Social Work University of Sussex Supervisors : 1 Professor Jo Westbroo. https://sussex.figshare.com/articles/thesis/A_study_of_professional_connectedness_and_isolation_in_the_learning_lives_of_remote_and_peri-urban_primary_school_teachers_in_Indonesia/27361929
- Simbolon, M. E., Iskandar, A. N., & Hardiyanti, D. (2024). Implementation of the teacher professional education program (ppg) for elementary school teacher education at universitas kuningan. *Indonesian Journal of Learning and Instruction*, 7(2). <https://doi.org/10.25134/ijli.v7i2.10839>
- Sims, S., Fletcher-Wood, H., O'Mara-Eves, A., Cottingham, S., Stansfield, C., Goodrich, J., Van Herwegen, J., & Anders, J. (2025). Effective teacher professional development: New theory and a meta-analytic test. *Review of Educational Research*, 95(2), 213–254. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543231217480>
- Soh, S. B. (2024). Collective learning in pre-service teacher education: exploring challenges, negotiations, and co-constructed solutions towards continuing professional learning and development. *Professional Development in Education*, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2024.2399047>
- Sumarmi, S., Putra, A. K. K., Sholeha, A. W., Rahmasyah, P. I., Aliman, M., Wahyuningtyas, N., & Ahmad, W. I. W. (2025). The Pedagogical and professional abilities of pre-service teachers through a project-based research learning model. *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 17(1), 1618–1631. <https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v17i1.5867>
- van Manen, M. (2017). But is it phenomenology? *Qualitative Health Research*, 27(6), 775–779. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732317699570>
- Williams, A. (2024). Delivering effective student feedback in higher education: an evaluation of the challenges and best practice. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science*, 10(2), 473–501. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijres.3404>
- Winstone, N. E., Balloo, K., & Carless, D. (2022). Discipline-specific feedback literacies: A framework for curriculum design. *Higher Education*, 83(1), 57–77. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-020-00632-0>
- Winstone, N. E., & Carless, D. (2021). Who is feedback for? The influence of accountability and quality assurance agendas on the enactment of feedback processes. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 28(3), 261–278. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2021.1926221>

- Wisniewski, B., Zierer, K., & Hattie, J. (2020). The power of feedback revisited: A meta-analysis of educational feedback research. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.03087>
- Wongvorachan, T., Bulut, O., Tsai, Y.-S., & Lindner, M. A. (2022). Improving student feedback literacy in e-assessments: a framework for the higher education context. *Trends in Higher Education*, 1(1), 16–29. <https://doi.org/10.3390/higheredu1010002>
- Xu, L. (2025). *Feedback Dialogues in Intercultural Doctoral Supervision: The Becoming of Students' Voices Through Feedback Engagement*. Springer Nature.
- Yu, S., & Liu, C. (2021). Improving student feedback literacy in academic writing: An evidence-based framework. *Assessing Writing*, 48, 100525. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2021.100525>
- Zhang, Y., Schunn, C. D., & Wu, Y. (2024). Interconnecting peer feedback literacy: Exploring the relationship between providing and acting on peer feedback. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 83, 101411. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2024.101411>
- Zhu, M., Basdogan, M., & Bonk, C. J. (2020). A case study of the design practices and judgments of novice instructional designers. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, 12(2). <https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/7829>

AUTHOR PROFILES



Name: Nadrun, S.Pd., M.Pd., M.Ed.
 Email: nadrun@untad.ac.id
 Affiliation: Universitas Tadulako
 Expertise: Curriculum Development in ELT
 Google Scholar ID: vZ-JeiEAAAAJ&hl=en
 Sinta ID: 6191687
 Orcid ID: 0009-0004-3509-741X



Mashuri, S.Pd., MA
 Email: mashuri.djalil@gmail.com
 Affiliation: Universitas Tadulako
 Expertise in the field of English Language Education
 Google Scholar ID: Okv7nPAAAAAJ
 Sinta ID: 6795334
 ORCID ID: 0009-0005-8254-3467



Dr. Nur Sehang Thamrin, S.Pd., M.Ed
 Email: nursehangthamrin@untad.ac.id
 Affiliation: Universitas Tadulako
 Expertise: ELT Assessment and Research
 GS: dfjRcd0AAAAAJ&hl=id
 Sinta ID: 6041518
 Orcid ID: 0000-0001-5508-0886
<https://www.scopus.com/authid/detail.uri?authorId=58365992900>



Abdul Kamaruddin, S.Pd., M.Ed., Ph.D
 Email: abdul_kamaruddin@untad.ac.id
 Affiliation: Universitas Tadulako
 Expertise in ELT Methodology
 Google Scholar ID: qMzOralAAAAAJ
 Sinta ID: 6661135
 Orcid ID: 0009-0006-2420-5555