

IMESS DISSERTATION

Note: Please email the completed mark sheet to Year 2 coordinator (cc Chiara Amini chiara.amini@ucl.ac.uk and fiona.rushworth@ucl.ac.uk)

Please note that IMESS students are not required to use a particular set of methods (e.g. qualitative, quantitative, or comparative) in their dissertation.

Student:	Chuanli Xun
Dissertation title:	The Transformation of Russian Industrial Structure

	70+	69-65	60-61	59-55	54-50	<50
	A	B	C	D	E	F
Knowledge <i>Knowledge of problems involved, e.g. historical and social context, specialist literature on the topic. Evidence of capacity to gather information through a wide and appropriate range of reading, and to digest and process knowledge.</i>					x	
Analysis & Interpretation <i>Demonstrates a clear grasp of concepts. Application of appropriate methodology and understanding; willingness to apply an independent approach or interpretation recognition of alternative interpretations; Use of precise terminology and avoidance of ambiguity; avoidance of excessive generalisations or gross oversimplifications.</i>					x	
Structure & Argument <i>Demonstrates ability to structure work with clarity, relevance and coherence. Ability to argue a case; clear evidence of analysis and logical thought; recognition of an argument's limitation or alternative views; Ability to use other evidence to support arguments and structure appropriately.</i>						x
Presentation & Documentation <i>Accurate and consistently presented footnotes and bibliographic references; accuracy of grammar and spelling; correct and clear presentation of charts/graphs/tables or other data. Appropriate and correct referencing throughout. Correct and contextually correct handling of quotations.</i>					x	
Methodology <i>Understanding of techniques applicable to the chosen field of research, showing an ability to engage in sustained independent research.</i>						

ECTS Mark:	50	Charles Mark:	E	Marker:	Karel Svoboda
<i>Deducted for late submission:</i>			No	Signed:	
<i>Deducted for inadequate referencing:</i>				Date:	

MARKING GUIDELINES

A (UCL mark 70+) = A (Charles mark 91-100 - excellent): Note: marks of over 80 are given rarely and only for truly exceptional pieces of work.

Distinctively sophisticated and focused analysis, critical use of sources and insightful interpretation. Comprehensive understanding of techniques applicable to the chosen field of research, showing an ability to engage in sustained independent research.

B (UCL mark 69-65) = B (Charles mark 81-90 – very good)

C (UCL mark 64-60) = C (Charles mark 71-80 – good): A high level of analysis, critical use of sources and insightful interpretation. Good understanding of techniques applicable to the chosen field of research, showing an ability to engage in sustained independent research. 65 or over equates to a B grade.

D (UCL mark 59-55) = D (Charles mark 61-70 – satisfactory)

E (UCL mark 54-50) = E (Charles mark 51-60 – sufficient):

Demonstration of a critical use of sources and ability to engage in systematic inquiry. An ability to engage in sustained research work, demonstrating methodological awareness. 55 or over equates to a D grade.

F (UCL mark less than 50) = F (Charles mark 0-50 - insufficient):

Demonstrates failure to use sources and an inadequate ability to engage in systematic inquiry. Inadequate evidence of ability to engage in sustained research work and poor understanding of appropriate research techniques.

Please provide substantive and detailed feedback!

Comments, explaining strengths and weaknesses (*at least 300 words*):

The paper deals with the problem of the evolution of Russia's industrial structure. As in previous versions, the author asks a simple question, 'How did it evolve?' as the core. Other questions aim at what the obstacles were and was the change effective. These are all relevant questions, but for a series of books, not for a thesis. The aim "this analysis can assist nations in attaining a harmonious development of their economy, society, and environment, concurrently with their pursuit of economic progress" is simply overambitious.

I received the final version one week before submission (only the "literature review" was consulted, by I don't see the reflection of my remarks), and due to some communication problems, my comments were not reflected. However, my comments are still the same because the topic is too broad, and the questions are too general. The research gaps are insufficiently identified. With addressing so many problems and issues, it is impossible to deal with all of them in-depth. Each of the sections deserves a deeper literature review, not few paragraphs based on several papers. It would be much more understandable if the paper united all parts into one whole, where the framework would emerge. Moreover, the research gap part would be more convincing if it addressed one topic, not several separate topics. In addition, the research gap in evaluation of industrial structure is not clear at all. The author speaks about controversies but then chooses Theil index as the indicator. As a comment to the

Furthermore, the theoretical framework is rather a collection of theories only briefly commented. Although I appreciate the effort for the methodological setting, this is only halfway toward a proper theoretical framework. It is not that the parts would be illogical, but the fact that they are presented separately deprives the paper of much of its strength.

The paper is also not very well structured. There is no clear path between the question, hypothesis, method and conclusion. The reader must find it "between the lines".

Some moments indicate that the paper was finished in haste. I did not get, for instance, what is the reason of placing the prediction "From an autocratic market economy, like China's, Russia will transition to an authoritarian command economy, like North Korea's (Hess, 2022)."

To sum up, the paper makes an impression that, despite its length, is undone and would need to be purified.

Specific questions you would like addressing at the oral defense (*at least 2 questions*):

1. Russian industrial structure change also has territorial aspects, when some territories become "depressive" due to losing the main industries. Could you, please, comment on this part?
2. Russia was unsuccessful in diversifying from oil and gas exports to other fields. What do you think is the main reason?