

Peer Review

Review of: "Does Teacher Feedback Potentiate a Positive Feedback Loop That Underlies the "Achievement Gap"? The Role of Race and Gender in the Interrelations Between Self-Perceptions, Teacher Feedback, and Academic Performance at West Point"

Thomas Hinz¹

1. Department of Sociology, Universität Konstanz, Germany

This paper contributes to the discussion about the achievement gap as it is described in educational research literature. This phenomenon describes the differential development of social groups within educational institutions. These groups are often disadvantaged or vulnerable compared to more privileged groups, even when potential group differences are adjusted for at the entry points to the educational system. The research at hand focuses on psychological mechanisms, such as self-efficacy, and how these mechanisms drive the development of the achievement gap in response to teachers' feedback. The group differences of interest highlight prevalent categorization by gender and race, incorporating an intersectional perspective. In my reading of the paper, the data source has great potential for investigating how achievement gaps develop in an educational organization that is rarely studied: the West Point Military Academy.

Given my academic background in survey research and sociology and my limited expertise in structural equation modeling, as well as my preference for other types of statistical models in longitudinal data analyses (fixed effects approaches), my further comments might not fully acknowledge the paper's strengths. In general, the paper would benefit from a clearer presentation of the research questions and hypotheses. This would make the reasoning easier for the reader to follow. Along with this, I would also

like to see a more structured argument. While it can be interesting to see the cross-lagged panel model with all coefficients estimated, I would prefer a more detailed view of specific hypotheses and testing them in a more fine-grained way.

Additionally, I recommend clarifying the (possibly) descriptive nature of the findings, as the author points out in the discussion section regarding the limited capacity to identify mechanisms. Taken together, I think the paper has great potential given the unique data. Hopefully, my very generic comments will stimulate the author to restructure the paper.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.