IMESS DISSERTATION

Note: Please email the completed mark sheet to Year 2 coordinator (jiri.vykoukal@post.cz)

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

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

	70+	69-65	64-60	59-55	54-50	<50
	A	B	C	D	E	F
Knowledge *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.*				X		
Analysis & Interpretation *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.*					X	
Structure & Argument *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 limitation or alternative views; Ability to use other evidence to support arguments and structure appropriately.*					X	
Presentation & Documentation *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.*					X	
Methodology *Understanding of techniques applicable to the chosen field of research, showing an ability to engage in sustained independent research.*					X	

ECTS Mark:	E/50	UCL Mark:	50		Marker:	Chiara Amini
Deducted for late submission:					Signed:	Chiara Amini
Deducted for inadequate referencing:					Date:	30.08.2023

MARKING GUIDELINES

A (UCL mark 70+): *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 65-69):
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.

C (UCL mark 60-61):
Some evidence of critical analysis, knowledgeable interpretation. Wide range of sources used to develop a logic and coherent argument. Good understanding of techniques applicable to the chosen

field of research, the extent of independent research could have improved.

D (UCL mark 59-55):
Employ relevant sources and show ability to engage in systematic inquiry. Little critical analysis of the material. It demonstrate methodological awareness but the standard and rigor of the analysis can improve.

E (UCL mark 54-50):
Mostly descriptive argument. Employ relevant but limited sources. The structure, logic and overall quality of the argument needs improvement.

F (UCL mark less than 50):
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.

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

The dissertation investigates the extent of structural change in the Russia' economy. Given reliance of the country on heavy industry first and then on energy, this is a topic much debated and explored in the literature. The importance of the topic explored is well motivated and four research questions are clearly spelled out. The dissertation empirically attempts at estimating the determinant of structural change in Russia.

The student has conducted extensive independent research and the discussion contain a wide variety of sources. So overall the work shows good knowledge of the topic discussed.

Section 2.2 does cover relevant content. This is a good effort that cover many points which may drive structural change. There are some interesting insights regarding factors specific to structural change in Russia. However the content of the sub-section is not always clearly organised and is very descriptive.

Overall the quality of the argument can improve. Some comments and statements are questionable, and the reasoning behind them is not clear. For instance, at p. 6, it is claimed that Putin "has implemented a command-oriented strategy for economic governance to assist the shift from a centrally planned to a market-based economy". Subsequently, it is mentioned that GDP increased, but it is not clear why the regime change led to growth. Some information is slightly outdated, for instance , at p. 7 "Projections indicate that by the year 2020…".

Section 3 covers relevant theories of structural change, but including the Theil index here is not appropriate as this is not a "theory " rather an index to possibly measure how the data fits a theory.

Conceptually, there are many issues, for example using the word rationality in section 2, but when really discussing efficiency. I feel that the terminology employed should have been better explained.

The analysis of political economy elements, aspect is very questionable. For instance, the claim that Russia will move to an "authoritarian command economy".

There are also minor area that needs improvement, for instance referencing can improve. At p.21, it is mentioned "Although prior studies", but which studies? In addition, the writing can improve, and the discussion feels at time too informal.

The empirical section is a weak attempt at addressing the research questions and also present many issues. Tables presented are hard to interpret.

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

Explain the main theoretical framework that underlies your research.

What are the main results that emerge from your empirical analysis?