



Growth Mindset in Educational Psychology

Between Conceptual Promise and Pedagogical Misuse

¹Hamidah Mohamad, ¹Marini Abd Razak*

Corresponding Author: * marini@unirazak.edu.my

¹ Universiti Tun Abdul Razak, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

Article submitted:

17 May 2026

Revised:

8 July 2026

Accepted:

11 July 2026

Abstract

Growth mindset has been widely embraced in educational psychology as a construct that promotes motivation, resilience, and academic persistence. However, its rapid diffusion into educational practice has been accompanied by conceptual dilution and pedagogical misuse. This opinion article critically examines the contemporary deployment of growth mindset in educational settings, arguing that it has increasingly been reduced to a motivational slogan detached from instructional quality, assessment systems, and institutional responsibility. Drawing on educational psychology and learning sciences literature, the article problematizes individualistic and decontextualized interpretations of growth mindset and highlights the risks of moralizing effort while obscuring structural inequities. Rather than rejecting the construct, this paper calls for a critical re-engagement with growth mindset as a theoretically grounded, context-sensitive, and pedagogically accountable framework. The article contributes to ongoing debates in educational psychology by questioning prevailing assumptions and urging a more rigorous conceptualization of growth mindset in research and practice.

Keywords: critical perspective, educational psychology, growth mindset, learning theory, motivation, resilience.

Introduction

Since its introduction into educational psychology, growth mindset has attained an almost axiomatic status in discussions of learning motivation, persistence, and student resilience. Rooted in Dweck's theory of implicit beliefs about intelligence, growth mindset advances the premise that cognitive abilities are malleable and can be developed through sustained effort, effective strategies, and adaptive responses to failure [1], [2]. This theoretical proposition has been widely supported by empirical studies demonstrating positive associations between growth-oriented beliefs and academic engagement, mastery-oriented goals, and perseverance in the face of difficulty [3]. As a result, growth mindset has become a dominant explanatory construct in educational psychology, frequently invoked to account for individual differences in learning trajectories.

However, the rapid diffusion of growth mindset beyond psychological theory into educational policy and classroom practice has generated a series of unintended consequences. As the construct gained popularity, it increasingly underwent simplification, instrumentalization, and decontextualization [4]. In many educational settings, growth mindset is promoted as a universal solution to low achievement, motivational decline, and academic failure, often without corresponding attention to instructional quality, assessment practices, or systemic learning conditions. Such practices

suggest a shift away from theory-informed application toward what may be described as ideological adoption.

This article adopts a critical opinion stance to argue that contemporary uses of growth mindset in education reflect a problematic transformation from a theoretically grounded psychological construct into a pedagogical ideology. Rather than functioning as a nuanced explanatory framework that accounts for the interaction between beliefs, context, and learning processes, growth mindset is frequently operationalized as a moral injunction directed at learners. Students are encouraged—explicitly or implicitly—to “adopt” a growth mindset as a personal responsibility, regardless of the structural and pedagogical constraints shaping their learning experiences.

From a psychological standpoint, this moralization of mindset raises serious concerns. When growth mindset is framed as an individual obligation, learning difficulties risk being interpreted as evidence of insufficient effort or improper attitudes, rather than as indicators of misaligned instruction or inequitable learning conditions. Such framing not only misrepresents the original theoretical intent of growth mindset but also weakens its explanatory validity. Educational psychology has long emphasized that learning outcomes are co-produced through the interaction of learner characteristics, instructional design, and socio-institutional contexts. Detaching growth mindset from these interacting variables undermines its scientific coherence.

Moreover, the ideological deployment of growth mindset risks shifting responsibility for educational failure away from institutions and toward individual learners. In systems characterized by high-stakes assessment, rigid curricula, and limited pedagogical support, growth mindset discourse may function as a legitimizing narrative that obscures structural shortcomings. Rather than challenging inequitable practices, growth mindset rhetoric may inadvertently normalize them by suggesting that perseverance alone is sufficient to overcome systemic barriers.

Critically, this argument does not reject growth mindset as a construct. Instead, it calls for a re-examination of how growth mindset is conceptualized and applied within educational psychology. To retain its theoretical integrity, growth mindset must be understood as a context-sensitive belief system shaped by instructional practices, feedback structures, and institutional norms. Without such alignment, growth mindset risks becoming not a tool for understanding learning, but a convenient ideology that simplifies complex educational problems into matters of individual disposition.

Results and Discussion

A. From Psychological Construct to Educational Slogan

A central concern in contemporary growth mindset discourse is its gradual transformation from a theoretically grounded psychological construct into a simplified educational slogan. In many educational settings, growth mindset is communicated through brief declarative statements encouraging students to “try harder,” “embrace challenges,” or “learn from mistakes,” often without corresponding changes in pedagogy, curriculum design, or assessment practices [5]. These messages are frequently displayed on classroom posters, embedded in motivational speeches, or delivered as generic advice, suggesting that mindset itself is a sufficient driver of learning improvement.

From a psychological perspective, this reductionist framing is deeply problematic. Growth mindset was never conceptualized as a standalone motivational message, but rather as one component of a broader explanatory model linking implicit beliefs about intelligence to achievement goals, attributional patterns, emotional responses to failure, and subsequent learning behaviors [6]. When this construct is detached from its theoretical architecture, it loses explanatory precision and becomes difficult to distinguish from general motivational encouragement. In effect, growth mindset becomes conceptually diluted, functioning less as a psychological variable and more as an ideological label.

The sloganization of growth mindset also weakens its status as a scientific construct. Psychological constructs derive their value from their capacity to explain variance, generate testable hypotheses, and be empirically falsified. When growth mindset is reduced to an unquestioned educational virtue, it becomes resistant to critical scrutiny. Any learning difficulty can be retrospectively attributed to the absence of a growth mindset, rendering the construct tautological and undermining its analytical utility within educational psychology.

Moreover, the transformation of growth mindset into a slogan creates a profound disconnect between belief and lived educational experience. Students are encouraged to internalize the belief that intelligence is malleable while simultaneously operating within learning environments that privilege fixed performance outcomes, norm-referenced grading, and competitive ranking [7]. Such environments implicitly communicate that ability is stable, scarce, and hierarchically distributed. This contradiction generates cognitive and motivational dissonance: learners are told to believe in growth, yet are evaluated through systems that reward static achievement.

Rather than motivating learners, this inconsistency may foster cynicism, particularly among students who repeatedly encounter failure despite sustained effort. From a psychological standpoint, the credibility of motivational messages depends on their alignment with environmental contingencies. When institutional practices contradict growth-oriented rhetoric, students may disengage not because they reject effort, but because they perceive the message as inauthentic or misleading.

Table 1. Transformation of Growth Mindset from Psychological Construct to Educational Slogan

Aspect	Observed Practice	Critical Implication
Conceptual framing	Slogan-based mindset messaging	Theoretical dilution
Pedagogical alignment	Belief promotion without instructional change	Reduced explanatory power
Assessment context	Performance-oriented evaluation systems	Fixed-ability reinforcement
Learner response	Optimistic discourse amid rigid structures	Motivational dissonance
Scientific status	Popular uptake exceeding empirical nuance	Construct trivialization

B. The Moralization of Effort and Its Pedagogical Risks

One of the most pervasive manifestations of growth mindset misuse is the moral elevation of effort. Within popular discourse, effort is frequently framed as an inherent virtue, independent of task design, instructional clarity, or cognitive scaffolding. Learners are praised for persistence and encouraged to “keep trying,” often without systematic attention to whether the learning task is developmentally appropriate, conceptually coherent, or instructionally supported.

While effort is undeniably a necessary condition for learning, educational psychology has long demonstrated that effort alone is insufficient for conceptual change, skill acquisition, or transfer [8].

Cognitive load theory, self-regulated learning research, and instructional design literature consistently emphasize that effective learning requires structured guidance, feedback, and opportunities for strategy refinement. Effort that is misdirected or unsupported may result not in growth, but in frustration and disengagement.

This article argues that the uncritical celebration of effort risks producing what may be termed *pedagogical moralism*. Within this framing, persistence becomes a moral obligation, and failure is implicitly attributed to insufficient commitment or flawed attitudes rather than to ineffective instruction or misaligned curricula. Such moralization shifts the evaluative focus from pedagogical quality to learner character, subtly redefining academic struggle as a personal shortcoming.

From a psychological equity perspective, this dynamic is particularly concerning. Learners who face cognitive, linguistic, socio-economic, or cultural barriers are disproportionately affected by effort-centered moralism [9]. When these learners fail to achieve expected outcomes despite sustained effort, growth mindset rhetoric may intensify feelings of inadequacy rather than foster resilience. In this sense, the misuse of growth mindset may exacerbate, rather than mitigate, existing educational inequalities.

Critically, growth mindset discourse that emphasizes effort while neglecting instructional conditions functions as a mechanism of responsabilization. Responsibility for learning outcomes is transferred to learners, while the roles of teachers, curricula, and institutions are rendered secondary. Such framing is inconsistent with core principles of educational psychology, which conceptualize learning as a joint product of individual cognition and environmental affordances.

Table 2. Moralization of Effort in Growth Mindset Discourse

Aspect	Dominant Discourse	Educational Risk
Effort positioning	Effort as inherent virtue	Cognitive oversimplification
Failure attribution	Persistence deficits emphasized	Instructional neglect
Feedback practice	Effort-focused praise	Strategy invisibility
Equity implications	Uniform effort expectations	Structural disadvantage
Pedagogical logic	Persistence as moral duty	Pedagogical moralism

C. Growth Mindset and the Individualization of Educational Failure

Educational psychology has long cautioned against overly individualistic explanations of learning outcomes. Research on attribution theory, motivation, and classroom climate has consistently shown that learners' performance is shaped by systemic, relational, and contextual factors. However, contemporary applications of growth mindset often reintroduce individual deficit narratives under the guise of empowerment [10].

When growth mindset is framed primarily as a personal attitude that students must adopt, structural inequities and pedagogical limitations are rendered invisible. Underachievement is interpreted as a failure to internalize the "right" mindset, rather than as a signal of inadequate instructional alignment, resource disparities, or exclusionary assessment practices. In this way, growth mindset discourse risks psychologizing what are fundamentally educational and institutional problems.

This individualization of failure aligns uncomfortably with broader neoliberal trends in education, where adaptability, self-regulation, and resilience are emphasized while structural investment and institutional accountability are minimized [11]. Within such policy contexts, growth mindset can

function as an ideological buffer, absorbing critique of educational systems by reframing inequality as a matter of individual psychology.

From a critical psychological standpoint, this shift represents a narrowing of analytical focus. Rather than interrogating how learning environments constrain or enable development, attention is redirected toward learners' internal dispositions. The danger is not merely conceptual, but ethical: students may internalize responsibility for failures that lie beyond their control.

Importantly, this critique does not suggest that growth mindset lacks value. Rather, it emphasizes that the value of growth mindset is contingent upon its integration with equitable and responsive pedagogical practices. When growth mindset is embedded within supportive instructional systems, it can empower learners. When isolated from such systems, it risks legitimizing unequal learning conditions by framing success and failure as primarily psychological phenomena.

Table 3. Individualization of Educational Failure through Growth Mindset

Aspect	Mindset Application	Critical Reading
Responsibility locus	Learner-centered accountability	Systemic obscuring
Failure explanation	Psychological framing	Depoliticization of inequality
Policy resonance	Emphasis on adaptability	Neoliberal alignment
Institutional role	Reduced structural scrutiny	Accountability displacement
Learner positioning	Empowered subject	Hidden burdening

D. Reclaiming Growth Mindset as a Contextualized Psychological Framework

Rather than abandoning growth mindset, this article calls for its conceptual reclamation within educational psychology. Growth mindset should be re-situated as a contextualized and relational construct, shaped by classroom discourse, feedback practices, assessment regimes, and institutional norms [12]. From this perspective, mindset is not merely an individual belief, but an emergent property of learning environments.

Empirical research increasingly suggests that the effects of growth mindset are significantly moderated by context, instructional alignment, and teacher beliefs [13]. Studies demonstrating positive mindset effects often occur in environments where pedagogical practices consistently reinforce messages about learning, improvement, and error as a natural part of cognition. Conversely, in contexts where evaluation systems emphasize fixed outcomes, mindset interventions yield weaker or inconsistent effects.

Consequently, growth mindset research and application must move beyond short-term, decontextualized interventions. Educational psychology should prioritize investigations into how learning environments systematically communicate messages about ability, improvement, and failure over time. This includes examining how assessment practices, feedback language, and classroom norms interact with students' belief systems.

A psychologically responsible application of growth mindset requires coherence between belief-oriented interventions and pedagogical structures. Without such coherence, growth mindset remains rhetorically appealing but scientifically fragile. Reclaiming its value requires restoring its theoretical depth and situating it firmly within the complex ecology of teaching and learning.

Table 4. Recontextualizing Growth Mindset within Educational Psychology

Aspect	Reclaimed Orientation	Psychological Significance
Conceptual status	Relational construct	Restored coherence
Context sensitivity	Pedagogy-dependent effects	Increased validity
Teacher mediation	Belief enacted through practice	Discourse–action alignment
Research focus	Learning environment analysis	Beyond interventionism
Scientific integrity	Theory–context integration	Ideological restraint

Conclusion

This opinion article has argued that the contemporary use of growth mindset in education reflects a tension between conceptual promise and pedagogical misuse. While grounded in robust psychological theory, growth mindset has frequently been reduced to a motivational slogan that individualizes responsibility and obscures structural determinants of learning. For educational psychology, the challenge is not to promote growth mindset uncritically, but to interrogate how, where, and under what conditions it meaningfully contributes to learning. Growth mindset should function as an explanatory framework embedded within pedagogical systems, not as a moral directive imposed on learners. Future research should prioritize context-sensitive models that examine the interaction between mindset beliefs, instructional quality, and institutional practices. Only through such critical engagement can growth mindset retain its theoretical integrity and educational relevance.

Practical Implications

This article suggests that educators, school leaders, and policymakers should move beyond treating growth mindset as a motivational slogan and instead integrate it into coherent pedagogical systems. For teachers, growth mindset should be reflected in instructional practices through adaptive feedback, explicit strategy instruction, formative assessment, and learning tasks that progressively develop competence rather than merely encouraging students to "try harder." Such alignment reduces the risk of attributing learning difficulties solely to students' attitudes while overlooking instructional quality.

For school leaders, the findings emphasize the importance of creating institutional conditions that reinforce growth-oriented learning. Professional development should focus not only on promoting growth mindset language but also on equipping teachers with evidence-based pedagogical approaches that support meaningful learning. Likewise, assessment policies should reward improvement, reflection, and mastery rather than relying exclusively on high-stakes performance indicators.

At the policy level, growth mindset initiatives should be embedded within broader educational reforms addressing curriculum flexibility, equitable learning opportunities, and supportive classroom environments. Viewing growth mindset as one component of a comprehensive learning ecosystem rather than a standalone intervention can enhance its educational value while preventing its misuse as a mechanism for shifting responsibility from educational systems to individual learners. Such an approach preserves the theoretical integrity of growth mindset and promotes more equitable, psychologically informed educational practice.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] C. S. Dweck, *Mindset: The New Psychology of Success*. New York, NY, USA: Random House, 2006.
- [2] C. S. Dweck, "Self-theories: Their role in motivation, personality, and development," *Psychol. Inquiry*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 227–268, 2000.
- [3] D. S. Yeager and C. S. Dweck, "Mindsets that promote resilience: When students believe that personal characteristics can be developed," *Educ. Psychol.*, vol. 47, no. 4, pp. 302–314, 2012.
- [4] S. J. Burgoyne, E. A. Hamlin, and D. S. Yeager, "What does growth mindset research really show? A critical review," *Psychol. Sci. Public Interest*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 1–33, 2020.
- [5] J. Hattie and K. Zierer, *Ten mindframes for visible learning: Teaching for success*, Routledge, 2020.
- [6] A. Bandura, *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. New York, NY, USA: Freeman, 1997.
- [7] R. M. Ryan and E. L. Deci, "Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective: Definitions, theory, practices, and future directions," *Contemp. Educ. Psychol.*, vol. 61, Art. no. 101860, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101860.
- [8] National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, *How People Learn II: Learners, Contexts, and Cultures*. Washington, DC, USA: National Academies Press, 2018.
- [9] T. Perry, R. Davies, and J. Brady, "Using culturally responsive teaching to support resilience," *Educ. Psychol. Rev.*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 1181–1207, 2021.
- [10] B. Weiner, "Attribution theory: Retrospect and prospect," *Motivation Sci.*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 1–12, 2020.
- [11] S. J. Ball, "The education debate revisited," *Policy Futures Educ.*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 421–438, 2021.
- [12] L. Bardach, K. C. Bostwick, T. Fütterer, M. Kopatz, D. M. Hobbi, R. M. Klassen, and J. Pietschnig, "A meta-analysis on teachers' growth mindset," *Educ. Psychol. Rev.*, vol. 36, no. 3, Art. no. 84, 2024, doi: 10.1007/s10648-024-09959-3.
- [13] D. S. Yeager et al., "A national experiment reveals where a growth mindset improves achievement," *Nature*, vol. 573, pp. 364–369, 2019.
- [14] J. Lave and E. Wenger, *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1991.
- [15] L. S. Vygotsky, *Mind in Society*. Cambridge, MA, USA: Harvard Univ. Press, 1978. (*Grand theory*)
- [16] E. L. Deci and R. M. Ryan, "Self-determination theory: A macrotheory of human motivation, development, and health," *Can. Psychol.*, vol. 49, no. 3, pp. 182–185, 2008, doi: 10.1037/a0012801.
- [17] B. J. Zimmerman and D. H. Schunk, *Self-regulated learning and performance*, Routledge, 2021.
- [18] J. Biggs and C. Tang, *Teaching for Quality Learning at University*, 5th ed. Maidenhead, UK: Open Univ. Press, 2022.
- [19] M. Taguma, E. Feron, and M. H. Lim, *Future of Education and Skills 2030: Conceptual Learning Framework*. Paris, France: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://www.oecd.org/education/2030-project/>
- [20] R. J. Sternberg, "Adaptive intelligence and educational reform," *Educ. Psychol.*, vol. 56, no. 4, pp. 243–255, 2021.
- [21] M. Alvesson and S. Sveningsson, *Changing Organizational Culture: Cultural Change Work in Progress*, 3rd ed. London, UK: Routledge, 2024.
- [22] D. Wiliam, "Assessment for learning: Meeting the challenge," *Educ. Assess. Eval. Account.*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 571–593, 2021.
- [23] T. S. Kuh et al., "Reframing student success in postsecondary education," *Change*, vol. 53, no. 6, pp. 8–15, 2021.
- [24] D. H. Schunk, P. R. Pintrich, and J. L. Meece, *Motivation in Education: Theory, Research, and Applications*, 3rd ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA: Pearson Education, 2010.
- [25] P. Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York, NY, USA: Continuum, 1970.

Authors



Asst. Prof. Dr. Hamidah Mohamad  is an Assistant Professor and Program Leader at the Tun Razak Graduate School, Universiti Tun Abdul Razak (UNIRAZAK), Malaysia. She holds a Ph.D. in Education from the International Islamic University Malaysia. Her research interests include curriculum and instruction, English language studies, communication, and educational policy. She has served as chief editor of international conference proceedings and has published extensively on language education, vocational education, inclusive education, and educational reform. (email: hamidah_mohamad@unirazak.edu.my).



Asst. Prof. Dr. Marini Abd Razak    is an Assistant Professor at the Tun Razak Graduate School, Universiti Tun Abdul Razak (UNIRAZAK), Malaysia. Her academic work focuses on graduate education, research methodology, and interdisciplinary studies in education and social sciences. She is actively involved in postgraduate teaching, academic supervision, and research collaboration. Her scholarly interests include educational development, higher education, and evidence-based research practices that contribute to academic excellence and institutional capacity building. (email: marini@unirazak.edu.my).