

## **MA Economics of Globalisation and European Integration**

### **Supervisor's Evaluation Form**

**Dissertation title:**           **Assessment of the Effects of Sanctions on Trade between the EU and Russia**

**Candidate:**                   Barbara Hašková

Reminder of the general instructions:

- 1) The dissertation should:
  - a. have an original empirical part, albeit of limited scope, OR
  - b. (in the best of cases) contribute to theory, OR
  - c. be a 'meta-empirical' study, i.e. a comparative study of empirical results, with particular care to synthesis, OR
  - d. be a thorough critical survey of the literature (empirical and/or theoretical).
- 2) The length of the dissertation should be kept within well-defined limits (8,000 to 12,000 words). Quality before quantity.
- 3) There should be proper attention to the citation of sources in footnotes or endnotes. The list of references should be carefully made.
- 4) The supervisor and the readers of the dissertation may perform checks on plagiarism. Citations should be made very explicit with quotation marks, indented text and quotation of the source in the main text. Quotations should be limited. Attempts of plagiarism will be severely dealt with, according to the examination regulations.

According to these general guidelines, please report the final overall grade, using the following grading system:

- 5 = 'excellent' (outstanding performance with no or only minor errors);
- 4 = 'very good' (above the average standard but with some errors);
- 3 = 'good' (generally sound work with a number of notable errors);
- 2 = 'satisfactory/sufficient' (pass; performance meets the minimum requirements);
- 1 = 'not sufficient' (marginal fail);
- 0 = 'poor' (fail).

In order to determine the overall grade, it may be helpful to mark the dissertation on each one of the specific aspects mentioned below. However, the final grade does not necessarily have to be the simple average of these partial grades. Please do not use decimals for the final overall grade.

A short motivation of your grade will be much appreciated.

NAME OF SUPERVISOR: Vilém Semerák

**FINAL OVERALL GRADE:**

4

(please, read the comments below).

Presentation of the dissertation objectives (motivation, main objective, bottom line, etc.)

5

Organization of the dissertation (division in sections, introduction and conclusions, etc.)

4

Use of presentation devices (tables, graphs, referenced material, quotes, etc.)

3

Development of the argument and provision of evidence for the dissertation objective (including references to the literature)

2.5

Originality of the work

3

Length of the dissertation (whether appropriate, penalize if you think the 12,000 words limit has not been reasonably respected)

5

**Motivation:**

The dissertation is not so easy to evaluate by one grade as it includes two empirical sections with different levels of difficulty (and quality of results). Moreover, the clarity of presentation of both results and of methodology is obscured by rather lacking language quality of the text (grammar errors, occasional typos, the use of number formats more typical for Czech than English text).

Out of the two empirical parts it is clearly the gravity model section which is more problematic. While the author provides fairly standard overview of gravity literature including at least a cursory reference to most pressing problems of the model (including e.g. the option to use Poisson estimator as a solution to the zero trade issue), some facts and results, such as e.g. the claim on the importance of GDP similarity for trade intensity on page 29 or the specific results of the trade potential estimates may even lead to some doubts on the authors depth of understanding of the model and the soundness of application of the model. Nevertheless, a similar style of treatment has been accepted as standard in economic literature until not so long ago.

The IO section is less problematic technically, but then it also uses much simpler methodology based on a number of simplifying assumptions (not all of which have been stated openly). The results appear plausible and in line with both expectations and results published by other authors. There were only two major omissions: the conclusion (unlike the preceding section) includes an extremely high total value of effect of the shock (18%) and the effects on GDP are most likely effects on total output (i.e. with the inclusion of intermediates) rather than GDP.

As far as literature reviews are concerned, the most interesting is the review of literature focused on the logic and history of economic sanctions, presentation of the literature on IO and gravity is quite brief. Finally, it would have been useful to ask a native speaker for final proof-reading of the text, I believe that this would have removed some of the inconsistencies and substantially improve both the quality of the text and the grade.

**Grade:** I would grade the text by a grade 3.5, i.e. between 3 and 4. If a round number is to be given, I choose 4.

