



Záznam o průběhu obhajoby disertační práce

Akademický rok: 2020/2021

Jméno a příjmení studenta: Marin Drlje
Rok narození: 1990
Identifikační číslo studenta: 89236570

Typ studijního programu: doktorský
Studijní program: Ekonomie a ekonometrie
Studijní obor: Ekonomie a ekonometrie
Identifikační čísla studia: 450570

Název práce: Eseje z ekonometrie trhů párování: identifikace, estimace a praxe
Pracoviště práce: CERGE (23-CERGE)
Jazyk práce: čeština
Jazyk obhajoby: čeština
Školitel: prof. Ing. Štěpán Jurajda, Ph.D.
Oponent(i): Seth Zimmerman, Ph.D.
Thomas Le Barbanchon, Ph.D.

Datum obhajoby: 03.03.2021 **Místo obhajoby:** Praha
Hlasování komise: prospěl/a: 3 neprospěl/a: 0

Průběh obhajoby: The Defense Committee Chair initiated the defense by verbal statements confirming (i) that a satisfactory number of Defense Committee Members were present, (ii) that the student fulfilled all the requirements as listed in the Study and Examination Code of Charles University including showing the appropriate documents.

At the beginning, the curriculum vitae of Student was presented. Following this presentation, Student started the presentation of the dissertation "Dissertation", acquainting the Defense Committee with the main topics, methodologies, and findings of the dissertation. After reading the referees' (appointed by the Graduation Council) comments, an open discussion followed.

During the discussion, Student satisfactorily answered all the questions from the audience.

Libor Dušek: I have a clarifying question and a follow-up question. If I got it right from paper 2, you get the bias of the conventional local treatment effect estimator by simply taking into account the fact that never-takers come later into the labor market and therefore they have lower earnings than the comparable compliers or always-takers. Did I get this right?

Marin Drlje: Yes, exactly.

Libor Dušek: Isn't there a worry that there is a reason why they are

never-takers. In this context, they are the students who were admitted to some kind of program that turned out not to be a good match in part because they were not admitted to the most preferred program, but there's still a reason why they entered that program and then switched to another. These can be the people who do not know what they want and who make mistakes in one way or another. They choose the second-preferred college and then realize it's not good for them. Isn't there a worry these people would have lower earnings anyway, even if they had the same length of education and same entrance into the labor market? Is that a concern and if yes, how is that taken care of?

Marin Drlje answers

Mariola Pytliková: I would like to ask a question related to the third part of your dissertation. I noticed that in the part on the age differential between the siblings there were quite some differences between the covered countries. What do you think regarding what could explain these differentials? Also could you please give a small overview of the findings related to the gender of siblings? Are there any observed differentials?

Marin Drlje answers

Mariola Pytliková: That's OK. I was just wondering if there is any story related to the different setups in these countries: in the US with the schooling fee, I don't know how it is in Chile. I don't know if it explaining that or not

Výsledek obhajoby:	prospěl/a (P)
Předseda komise:	Stanislav Anatolev, Ph.D. (přítomen)
Členové komise:	doc. Mgr. Bc. Libor Dušek, Ph.D. (přítomen)
	doc. Ing. Mariola Pytliková, Ph.D. (přítomen)