REPORT ON THE MASTER THESIS

IEPS – International Economic and Political Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

Title of the thesis:	**Trade and Economic Relations between Russia and the EU**
Author of the thesis:	**Ksenia Mityukova**
Referee (*incl. titles*)**:**	**Prof. RNDr. Jiří Hlaváček, CSc.**

Remark: It is a standard at the FSV UK that the Referee's Report is at least 500 words long. In case you will assess the thesis as "non-defendable", please explain the concrete reasons for that in detail.

SUMMARY OF POINTS AWARDED (*for details, see below*):

CATEGORY	POINTS
Theoretical background (max. 20)	12
Contribution (max. 20)	13
Methods (max. 20)	12
Literature (max. 20)	20
Manuscript form (max. 20)	18
TOTAL POINTS (*max. 100*)	**75**
The proposed grade (1-2-3-4)	**1.8**

You can even use a decimal point (e.g. giving the grade of 2.5 for 60 points).

Comments of the referee on the thesis highlights and shortcomings (following the 5 numbered aspects of your assessment indicated below).

1) Theoretical background: Author shows understanding of basic international trade models, the Ricardian one and the Heckscher-Ohlin one. She does not apply these models explicitly but only implicitly in her choice of presented data. That is a pity that she did not present models in mathematical form, what ought to be standard on the master´s level.

2) Contribution:
This thesis is a nice survey of Russia – EU trade and economic relation. It would be more a contribution for someone out of the EU, because of a long chapter on the EU development. For the most of EU economists, this chapter just repeats "textbook stuff".

3) Methods:
Author tries to use some regression but she probably does not have good knowledge of time series econometrics. She used a lot of different resources and compiled a nice summary of the topic.

4) Literature:
Literature used is adequate with respect to the topic and master´s level.

5) Manuscript form:
There are no formal mistakes in the thesis. I think the first chapter on the EU is unnecessarily detailed and long, so there is a slight misbalance visible in the thesis as a whole.

DATE OF EVALUATION: May 30th, 2013

_____
Referee Signature

The referee should give comments to the following requirements:

1) THEORETICAL BACKGROUND: *Can you recognize that the thesis was guided by some **theoretical fundamentals** relevant for this thesis topic? Were some important theoretical concepts omitted? Was the theory used in the thesis consistently incorporated with the topic and hypotheses tested?*
Strong   Average   Weak
20   10   0   points

2) CONTRIBUTION: *Evaluate if the author presents **original ideas** on the topic and aims at demonstrating **critical thinking** and ability to draw conclusions based on the knowledge of relevant theory and relevant empirical material. Is there a distinct **value added** of the thesis (relative to knowledge of a university-educated person interested in given topic)? Did the author explain **why** the observed phenomena occurred? Were the policy implications well founded?*
Strong   Average   Weak
20   10   0   points

3) METHODS: *Are the **hypotheses** for this study clearly stated, allowing their further verification and testing? Are the theoretical explanations, empirical material and **analytical tools** used in the thesis relevant to the research question being investigated, and adequate to the aspiration level of the study? Is the thesis **topic comprehensively analyzed** and does the thesis not make trivial or irrelevant detours off the main body stated in the thesis proposal? More than 10 points signal an exceptional work, **which requires your explanation "why" it is so**).*
Strong   Average   Weak
20   10   0   points

4) LITERATURE REVIEW: *The thesis demonstrates author's full understanding and **command of recent literature**. The author quotes relevant literature in a proper way and disposes with a representative bibliography. (Remark: references to Wikipedia, websites and newspaper articles are a sign of **poor research**). If they dominate you cannot give more than 8 points. References to books published by prestigious publishers and articles in renowned journals give much better impression.*
Strong   Average   Weak
20   10   0   points

5) MANUSCRIPT FORM: *The thesis is **clear and well structured**. The author uses appropriate language and style, including academic **format** for quotations, graphs and tables. The text effectively refers to graphs and tables, is easily readable and **stimulates thinking**.*
Strong   Average   Weak
20   10   0   points

Overall grading scheme at FSV UK:

TOTAL POINTS	GRADE	Czech grading	US grading
81 – 100	1	= excellent	= A
61 – 80	2	= good	= B
51 – 60	3	= satisfactory	= C
41 – 50	3	= satisfactory	= D
0 – 40	4	= fail	= not recommended for defence