

---

## **| RESEARCH ARTICLE**

### **Critical Review of "Gender Peer Effects in Doctoral Education: Evidence from Sweden" by Simon Lundin**

**Hicham Tetouani<sup>1</sup> ✉ and Sana Sakale<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>*Teacher of English, Applied Linguistics, Language and Society Research Laboratory, Faculty of Languages, Letters and Arts, Ibn Tofail University, Morocco*

<sup>2</sup>*Associate Professor, English Department, Language and Society Research Laboratory, Faculty of Languages, Letters and Arts, Ibn Tofail University, Morocco*

**Corresponding Author:** Hicham Tetouani, **E-mail:** [hicham.tetouani@uit.ac.ma](mailto:hicham.tetouani@uit.ac.ma)

---

## **| ABSTRACT**

This basic audit assesses Simon Lundin's proposal, "Gender Peer Impacts in Doctoral Instruction: Evidence from Sweden," which examines the impact of gender orientation composition inside doctoral cohorts on scholarly execution. The survey commends Lundin's comprehensive writing audit, straightforward technique, and persevering observational methodology, all of which contribute to the study's legitimacy and unwavering quality. Outstanding qualities incorporate the utilization of a broad national dataset and clearly enunciated investigative questions. Be that as it may, the audit recognizes ranges for enhancement, such as the requirement for a more basic engagement with existing writing, a more profound dialogue of methodological restrictions, and a broader investigation of arrangement suggestions. In general, Lundin's work makes a critical commitment to the field of gender peer impacts in higher instruction, advertising important bits of knowledge and laying the basis for future inquiry about the complex elements of gender orientation in doctoral education.

## **| KEYWORDS**

Gender peer effect, doctoral education, academic performancen, educational policy, cohort composition.

## **| ARTICLE INFORMATION**

**ACCEPTED:** 01 June 2025

**PUBLISHED:** 09 July 2025

**DOI:** 10.32996/jweep.2025.7.2.4

---

### **1. Introduction**

Simon Lundin's Master's thesis examines the impact of gender peer{ <http://hdl.handle.net/2077/57869>} in doctoral cohorts on academic performance. This study addresses a significant gap in educational research, focusing on how gender dynamics affect academic and professional trajectories in doctoral education. This review critically assesses the thesis, evaluating its adherence to scientific research methodology and the robustness of its findings.

### **2. Literature Review**

Lundin begins with a comprehensive literature review, situating his investigation within the broader context of gender peer effects in education. He references seminal works (e.g., Hoxby, 2000; Lavy & Schlosser, 2011) and identifies various mechanisms through which gender composition might influence academic outcomes. The literature review is thorough and well-organized, providing a solid foundation for the study. However, it could benefit from a more critical engagement with the cited studies, highlighting potential methodological limitations and gaps that his research aims to address.

### **3. Research Questions and Hypotheses**

The thesis is guided by two primary research questions : (1) Does the gender composition of a doctoral student's cohort affect said student's academic performance? (2) if gender composition has an effect, does this effect differ between men and women?

These questions align with recent research on gender peer effects in education (e.g., Feld & Zölitz, 2017; Hill, 2017). The questions are clearly articulated and operationalized into specific hypotheses regarding the probability of graduating within seven years, net time to graduation, and net time to graduation. The clarity and specificity of these hypotheses are commendable, providing a clear framework for the analysis.

#### **4. Methodology**

Lundin utilizes a robust methodological approach, using a unique dataset from Statistics Sweden that includes individual registry data for all individuals enrolled in Swedish doctoral programs from 1971 to 2010. This approach is similar to that used by Black et al. (2013) in their study of peer effects. By exploiting within-program, across-cohort variation in gender composition, Lundin aims to ensure exogeneity. This approach effectively addresses the common issue of self-selection bias in peer effect studies. The methods section is detailed and transparent, enhancing the reproducibility of the study. However, a more explicit discussion of potential limitations and biases inherent in the dataset and the measures taken to mitigate these would strengthen the methodology.

#### **5. Empirical Strategy**

The Empirical Strategy is well-articulated, with Lundin controlling for common time fixed-effects and program-specific time trends. This thorough approach enhances the validity of the findings, following best practices in peer effects research (Sacerdote, 2011). However, the thesis could benefit from a more extensive discussion of alternative models and sensitivity analyses. While Lundin does perform robustness checks, exploring different model specifications and their implications would provide additional confidence in the results.

#### **6. Results**

The results show a negative effect on male academic performance from a higher proportion of females in the cohort, with no overall effect on female performance. However, a positive effect on female performance is observed within Engineering Sciences. These findings align with some results in the literature (e.g., Oosterbeek & Van Ewijk, 2014), but contrast with others (e.g., Hill, 2017). The results are presented clearly, with appropriate use of tables and figures to illustrate key points. The discussion of results is insightful, linking back to the hypotheses and existing literature. However, the interpretation of results could be expanded to consider broader implications and potential policy implications.

#### **7. Discussion and Conclusion**

In the discussion, Lundin effectively synthesizes his findings with the existing literature, contributing to our understanding of gender peer effects in higher education. These findings contribute to the ongoing debate about gender peer effects in higher education (e.g., Brenoe, 2017; Feld & Zölitz, 2017), particularly in the context of doctoral education. He acknowledges the need for further research, particularly to explore the mechanisms behind observed effects. The conclusion concisely summarizes the study's contributions and limitations. However, it could be strengthened by a more detailed exploration of practical implications for educators and policymakers.

#### **8. Overall Assessment**

Simon Lundin's thesis is a well-executed study that adheres closely to the steps of scientific research. It demonstrates a clear research question, a thorough literature review, a robust methodological framework, and an insightful discussion of results. While there are areas for improvement, particularly in the depth of robustness checks as suggested by Sacerdote (2011), the thesis makes a valuable contribution to the field of gender peer effects in doctoral education.

#### **9. Specific Strengths and Weaknesses**

##### **9.1 Strengths**

1. Special Dataset: The utilize of comprehensive person registry information from Measurements Sweden includes critical strength and validity to the think about.
2. Clear Theories: The inquire about questions and theories are well-defined and straightforwardly address crevices within the existing writing.
3. Methodological Meticulousness: The experimental procedure is well-designed, with fitting controls for time fixed-effects and program-specific time patterns.

##### **9.2 Weaknesses**

1. Writing Study: Whereas comprehensive, the writing survey can be more basic, talking about the confinements of past thinks about in more prominent detail.
2. Discourse of Confinements: The technique segment seem advantage from a more express dialog of potential inclinations and confinements, and how these were tended to.

3. Broader Suggestions: The talk and conclusion segments may dig more profound into the broader suggestions of the discoveries, giving suggestions that are more concrete for policymakers and teachers.

## 10. Conclusion

Simon Lundin's thesis gives a critical commitment to the understanding of gender peer impacts in doctoral instruction. The consider is methodologically sound and offers profitable experiences into how gender composition inside scholarly cohorts can affect execution results. By utilizing a special and comprehensive dataset, Lundin guarantees a tall degree of unwavering quality and legitimacy in his discoveries. The clear verbalization of inquire about questions and theories, combined with a thorough observational technique, underscores the strength of the work.

Nevertheless, the proposal might be encourage fortified by tending to certain regions. A more basic engagement with the writing, a point by point discourse of potential inclinations and impediments, and a more profound investigation of the broader suggestions of the discoveries would improve the in general affect of the consider. These advancements might give more nuanced arrangement suggestions and viable applications for teachers and policymakers.

In conclusion, Lundin's inquire about could be a commendable exertion that propels the field of genderual orientation thinks about in instruction. It opens up modern roads for future investigate and offers a strong establishment for understanding the complex flow of gender composition in doctoral programs. As such, it speaks to a profitable expansion to the scholastic talk on gender peer impacts and sets the arrange for encourage examinations into this critical zone.

**Funding:** This research received no external funding

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

**ORCID iD:** 0009-0000-4398-6859

**Publisher's Note:** All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers

## References

- [1] Black, S. E., Devereux, P. J., & Salvanes, K. G. (2013). Under pressure? The effect of peers on outcomes of young adults. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 31(1), 119-153.
- [2] Brenoe, A. A. (2017). High school gender composition and STEM choice in tertiary education. Unpublished manuscript.
- [3] Feld, J., & Zölitz, U. (2017). Understanding peer effects: On the nature, estimation, and channels of peer effects. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 35(2), 387-428.
- [4] Hill, A. J. (2017). The positive influence of female college students on their male peers. *Labour Economics*, 44, 151-160.
- [5] Hoxby, C. (2000). Peer effects in the classroom: Learning from gender and race variation. NBER Working Paper No. 7867.
- [6] Lavy, V., & Schlosser, A. (2011). Mechanisms and impacts of gender peer effects at school. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 3(2), 1-33.
- [7] Oosterbeek, H., & Van Ewijk, R. (2014). Gender peer effects in university: Evidence from a randomized experiment. *Economics of Education Review*, 38, 51-63.
- [8] Sacerdote, B. (2011). Peer effects in education: How might they work, how big are they and how much do we know thus far? In E. A. Hanushek, S. Machin, & L. Woessmann (Eds.), *Handbook of the Economics of Education* (Vol. 3, pp. 249-277). Elsevier