
ACADEMIC FEEDBACK LITERACY AND PSYCHOLOGICAL RESILIENCE IN MASTER'S STUDENTS: A DEVELOPMENTAL AND EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY FRAMEWORK

Saidova Rushana Ravshanovna

Head of the Master's Department, University of
Journalism and Mass Communications of Uzbekistan

Email: rushana.saidova.93@mail.ru

Abstract

This conceptual paper explores the relationships among academic feedback literacy, achievement emotions, and psychological resilience in master's students. Feedback in graduate education involves more than receiving corrective information: it also requires interpreting critique, regulating emotions, exercising judgement, and translating comments into revisions. Drawing on feedback literacy research, control-value theory, self-determination theory, and self-regulated learning scholarship, the article proposes a developmental-educational framework comprising four linked processes: feedback interpretation, emotional regulation, strategic response, and reflective transfer. It also outlines practical supervisory strategies and observable indicators for future evaluation. The approach is particularly relevant to students undertaking research-intensive tasks, including thesis planning, scholarly writing, and oral defence preparation. The conclusions are conceptual rather than causal: no original interviews, interventions, or quantitative data were collected. The proposed framework requires empirical testing across graduate programmes and learning contexts.

Keywords: educational psychology; developmental psychology; master's students; academic feedback literacy; psychological resilience; achievement emotions; self-regulated learning; research supervision.

1. Introduction

Graduate study demands an important developmental transition: students move from completing structured academic tasks to planning projects, defending evidence-based positions, and managing complex decisions under uncertainty. Within this transition, critique from lecturers, research

supervisors, and peers can function both as a learning resource and as an emotionally challenging experience. The same comment may be interpreted as helpful guidance by one student and as a threat to competence by another. Academic feedback is therefore not merely a matter of transmitting information. Its educational value depends on the learner's capacity to understand standards, make evaluative judgements, manage affective responses, and take informed action. Carless and Boud (2018) conceptualise these capacities through student feedback literacy, shifting attention from the quantity of comments provided to what students can do with them.

For master's students, this perspective intersects with developmental tasks including identity formation as a novice researcher, increasing autonomy, and building confidence in professional communication. It also raises a central question for specialty 19.00.06: which educational-psychological conditions help learners use difficult feedback without disengagement or avoidant coping? This paper aims to synthesise a conceptually grounded answer and translate it into a practical instructional framework.

2. Theoretical Background and Literature Review

Feedback literacy. Carless and Boud (2018) identify appreciating feedback, making judgements, managing affect, and taking action as interrelated aspects of feedback literacy. Students must recognise why feedback matters, distinguish stronger from weaker work, cope productively with criticism, and revise their output. These capacities are developmental: they require repeated opportunities to practise judgement rather than passive exposure to comments.

Achievement emotions. Pekrun's (2006) control-value theory explains how perceived control over an academic task and the value attached to it shape emotions such as anxiety, pride, enjoyment, and shame. In thesis supervision, ambiguous or highly negative feedback may reduce perceived control, especially where expectations and revision options are unclear. Conversely, actionable guidance and attainable goals can plausibly strengthen students' sense of agency.

Motivation and agency. Self-determination theory distinguishes the psychological needs for competence, autonomy, and relatedness (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Feedback practices may support these needs when students

retain meaningful choice, understand criteria, and experience a respectful supervisory relationship. It is reasonable to hypothesise that controlling or humiliating feedback can undermine engagement; this implication requires direct empirical examination in the specific institutional context.

Self-regulated learning. Zimmerman (2002) describes regulation through cyclical processes of forethought, performance, and self-reflection. Feedback can provide evidence for monitoring progress and revising strategies, but learners need practical routines for setting goals, tracking revisions, and evaluating outcomes. Hattie and Timperley (2007) similarly distinguish feedback concerning current progress and what to do next, emphasising that feedback effectiveness depends on its level and interpretation.

Psychological resilience. In this article, academic resilience means adaptive persistence and recovery when encountering demanding learning experiences, rather than an unchanging personality trait. Feedback literacy and resilience are analytically distinct: a student may know how to revise but experience strong anxiety, or may tolerate criticism without understanding the next revision step. Their interaction is therefore more informative than treating either characteristic alone.

3. Materials and Methods

The study adopts a theory-informed narrative review and conceptual modelling approach. It synthesises established publications in higher-education feedback, achievement emotions, motivation, and self-regulated learning. Works were selected for theoretical relevance to graduate learning processes; the selection was purposive, not a systematic or exhaustive literature search. Concepts were compared in three stages: (1) specifying learner capacities required to use critique, (2) identifying emotional and motivational mechanisms that may enable or obstruct those capacities, and (3) translating these relationships into instructional practices and provisional indicators.

No master's students were recruited, and no experimental comparison, survey, clinical assessment, or statistical test was conducted. The proposed relationships and instructional sequence should consequently be treated as hypotheses and design principles, not demonstrated intervention effects.

4. Conceptual Findings: An Integrated Developmental Framework

The synthesis yields a four-stage feedback-to-growth cycle. Stage 1 - interpretation: the student identifies the precise gap between current work and an agreed criterion. Stage 2 -affective regulation: the student recognises the emotional response to criticism and distinguishes task-related guidance from global self-evaluation. Stage 3 -strategic response: the student prioritises changes, seeks clarification when necessary, and develops a concrete revision plan. Stage 4 -reflective transfer: the student evaluates whether revisions improved the work and transfers the learning to future assignments. These stages are proposed as a flexible cycle rather than a rigid psychological sequence.

At the transition from coursework to independent research, students may be especially sensitive to how competence is communicated. Clear criteria and opportunities to ask questions can increase perceived control, while iterative drafts create low-stakes opportunities to practise handling criticism. Supervisors also need to make space for students to disagree respectfully, justify alternative decisions, and become active evaluators of their own work.

Table 1. Proposed feedback-literacy framework for graduate education

Process	Illustrative supervisory practice	Observable indicator
Interpretation	Compare annotated work with an explicit rubric	Student explains the criterion and the revision need
Affective regulation	Invite a brief, nonjudgmental response to critique	Student identifies emotion and an adaptive coping step
Strategic response	Agree on two or three prioritised revision actions	Student produces a feasible revision plan
Reflective transfer	Ask for a short note documenting what changed and why	Student justifies changes and identifies transferable lessons

Source: Author's conceptual synthesis based on Carless and Boud (2018), Pekrun (2006), and Zimmerman (2002). The indicators are suggested observational criteria and have not been psychometrically validated.



5. Discussion

The framework suggests that emotionally supportive supervision and academically demanding feedback need not be opposites. Psychological safety should not imply abandoning critical standards; rather, critical standards can be communicated with specificity, consistency, and opportunities for response. When students understand the rationale for revision, they may be better positioned to separate criticism of a draft from judgement of personal worth.

A practical application is a structured feedback conference following submission of a thesis proposal. Before the meeting, the student identifies two strengths, two uncertainties, and one question about assessment criteria. During the conference, supervisor and student compare interpretations of the task, prioritise changes, and agree on a manageable revision period. Afterward, the student submits a brief change log explaining which comments were adopted, adapted, or not followed and the academic reasons for each decision. This example is a suggested practice, not a tested programme.

Implementation should be sensitive to programme design, students' prior educational experiences, language demands, and supervisory workload. Cultural expectations concerning authority can also influence whether students feel able to seek clarification or discuss alternatives. Future studies should avoid assuming that a single pattern of feedback behaviour has the same meaning across all graduate cohorts.

6. Practical Implications and Future Research

Higher-education institutions may pilot short workshops on interpreting assessment rubrics, giving peer feedback, managing academic frustration, and planning revision cycles. Research supervisors could adopt shared feedback templates distinguishing essential corrections, optional enhancements, and issues requiring discussion. Master's departments could also provide guidance on the timing and sequencing of supervisory feedback, particularly near high-pressure submission deadlines.

For an empirical evaluation, researchers could use a longitudinal design with baseline and follow-up measures of feedback literacy, perceived academic control, learning-related emotions, and revision quality. Independent

assessment of successive written drafts would help avoid relying solely on self-reports. Interviews could clarify how students experience feedback across research stages. Appropriate ethics review, informed consent, confidentiality protections, and explicit reporting of analytic limitations would be necessary.

7. Conclusion

Academic feedback literacy provides a productive bridge between developmental and educational psychology in graduate education. A theoretically informed account of feedback use must consider evaluative judgement, emotional interpretation, strategic action, and reflective learning together. The proposed four-stage framework translates these ideas into a set of supervisory practices and indicators that may guide future programme development. Its educational value remains a proposition for empirical investigation rather than a verified outcome. By making feedback comprehensible, actionable, and psychologically constructive, master's programmes may better support students' transition toward independent scholarly work.

References

1. Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist*, 55(5), 469–480. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.5.469>
2. 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>
3. Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81–112. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>
4. Pekrun, R. (2006). The control-value theory of achievement emotions: Assumptions, corollaries, and implications for educational research and practice. *Educational Psychology Review*, 18, 315–341. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-006-9029-9>

E- Global Congress

Hosted online from Dubai, U. A. E., E - Conference.

Date: 30th September, 2026

Website: <https://eglobalcongress.com/index.php/egc>

ISSN (E): 2836-3612

-
5. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68–78. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68>
 6. Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. *Theory Into Practice*, 41(2), 64–70. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4102_2