



FAKULTA
SOCIÁLNÍCH VĚD
Univerzita Karlova

Záznam o průběhu obhajoby disertační práce

Akademický rok: 2021/2022

Jméno a příjmení studenta: Gega Todua, M.A.
Identifikační číslo studenta: 93199242

Typ studijního programu: doktorský
Studijní program: Ekonomie a ekonometrie
Studijní obor: Ekonomie a ekonometrie
ID studia: 392721

Název práce: Essays on the Economics of Education
Pracoviště práce: CERGE (23-CERGE)
Jazyk práce: angličtina
Jazyk obhajoby: čeština
Školitel: Byeongju Jeong, Ph.D.
Oponent(i): Harry Anthony Patrinos, Ph.D.

Gregory Veramendi, Ph.D.

Datum obhajoby: 18.03.2022 **Místo obhajoby:** Praha
Termín: řádný

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 Gega Todua 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 "Essays on the Economics of Education", 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.

A. Menzel: Interesting that you say depreciates. So, you say you have lower wages for the same skill, the skill does not depreciate.
G. Todua answered.

A. Menzel: What about undergraduate studies of high ability students? What do they have to do before going to graduate school? Is it that you rather mean graduate studies mean high quality universities and undergraduate studies mean mediocre universities? Because it is an interesting conjunction. Low ability students are more likely to go abroad during undergraduate when the high ability students stay in the country during the undergraduate times hoping

that they may then get a government funding opportunity to go abroad during their graduate studies? If you take your model literally that could be something that one could explore in the data. If high ability people tend to go abroad during undergraduate studies.
G. Todua answered.

M. Bauer: Can you use the term “stylized facts” when you include these six observations out of 27? If you take away 25 percent of the sample and find some relationship, can you still call it a stylized fact? So, my point is that if you take all countries together you would not probably find this relationship, right?
G. Todua answered.

P. Bertoli: Sorry, just a clarification question. Are there any fees that you should pay? Do you control for any supporting program as well? You collect the fees data on the hypothesis of the Georgian applicant. I don’t know if this can change the evaluation of Italian data.
G. Todua answered.

A. Menzel: What do you mean exactly by that? What are you basing that on?

If a country sets higher fee for foreign students then for local students would this be an unfavorable view? Can you define what an unfavorable view towards migrants is?

G. Todua answered.

M. Bauer: I have the same question. Is there any empirical evidence for this explanation, is there any empirical evidence to support that?
G. Todua answered.

A. Menzel: What is a “constraint”? Is that it can be both the negative attitude of the population or the political constraint on the fees? So, why are some countries constrained and some – not? I see on the one hand the argument of negative attitude of the population, but do you think that this is a core reason why some countries are considered constrained? Where does it come from? Why some rich countries cannot set high fees?

G. Todua answered.

A. Menzel: The unconstrained countries may not be happy about unskilled students. So, can it be that unconstrained countries specifically reduce the fees on the high ability students? Implicitly assume that the UK cannot differentiate over high and low ability students, is it a good assumption to make? But the constrained countries can do that, they admit only the high ability students. Is it reasonable that unconstrained countries set different fees for the high and low ability students? Assuming that if the high ability students stay they can boost the economy.

G. Todua answered.

M. Bauer: One point that appears in different ways in both reports regarding the third chapter is about the relevance of the information that you provide regarding the students, namely how selective the sample is. Since you are providing population numbers, the question is whether they are relevant for the sample of students from Tbilisi, or maybe from the second biggest city. So, could you comment on that? Because it would have implications whether you can interpret the finding that you have as biased expectations and how relevant the provided information for this particular subject is?

G. Todua answered.

A. Menzel: So, I noticed that you randomized across 22 schools in your experiment. How do you treat your standard errors that you showed us (the confidence intervals and standard errors)? Do you see

any reason to worry there?

Did you cluster your standard errors? How many clusters do you have?

I think you are in a bit of a tricky situation. First, you put schools into treatment and control, and then inside of the treatment schools you put treated classes and control classes. So, for example, control is only assigned at the school level, on the 22 schools.

There is a recent paper by Imbens who discusses how to think about clustering in these complex cases, and bootstrap standard errors or randomization of standard errors instead.

G. Todua answered.

P. Bertoli: I have a minor comment on the schools. Andreas brought up the topic of schools. Are they really equal between treating and control? I was thinking, is there any information on the excessive rate of the admission of students to the university, different sources of quality of the schools? And another thing I was interested in, between the second and the third round you actually provide more information to students, right, at least to the treated one. Because, you provide information about the major, like top university procedure to enter and so on. Did I get it correctly?

G. Todua answered.

M. Bauer: One of your conclusions in the third paper is that relying on the intentions responded may not be reliable if you get the actual choices. If I recall correctly, in this experiment when you tried to motivate the students to truthfully reveal their intention, you promised them the tailored information about the major that they choose. Is it really the case that everybody got the same information, or did the students who chose the particular major then received tailored information about the particular major which would then complicate indeed the interpretation that there was a revision with no additional information afterwards?

What exactly are the measures of actual college major choices? Is it where they ended up or is it what you know just before they applied, what was their preferred major. Is this measure affected how successful they were in their applications? And maybe the reason why you see a little relationship between the initial intentions and the actual choices are the fact that they did not get where they wanted to get.

G. Todua answered.

J. Byeongju: Let me briefly mention. When I was listening to Andreas's question about the first paper, the choice of undergraduate and graduate school, I tried to recover the content, but probably the choice between the graduate and undergraduate is not an important element of your analysis. It was more about given that there are different types of students, let's say there is a pool of students for graduate school and a pool of students for undergraduate school, and they are different qualities and also the nature of studies is different in terms of failure rate, government would implement different policies. I think it was the main point. Am I correct Gega?

G. Todua answered.

Výsledek obhajoby:	prospěl/a (P)	
Předseda komise:	doc. PhDr. Michal Bauer, Ph.D. (přítomen)
Členové komise:	doc. Paola Bertoli, M.A., M.Sc., D.Phil. (přítomen)
	Andreas Menzel, Ph.D. (přítomen)