

IMESS DISSERTATION



Note: Please email the completed mark sheet to Year 2 coordinator
(cc Ilias Chondrogiannis i.chondrogiannis@ucl.ac.uk and ssees-intma@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:	ZIXI NING
Dissertation title:	The Determinants of Non-Performing Loans in Banking Sectors in Central and East European Countries

	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 arguments 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>	X					

ECTS Mark:	A	UCL Mark:	76	Marker:	Ilias Chondrogiannis
<i>Deducted for late submission:</i>				Signed:	Ilias Chondrogiannis
<i>Deducted for inadequate referencing:</i>				Date:	13 June 2024

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/C (UCL mark 60-69):

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. 65 or over equates to a B grade.

D/E (UCL mark 50-59):

D/E (UCL mark 50-59):

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):

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.

CONTINUES OVERLEAF

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

The numbering of all pages is 1, which makes references to specific parts of the text difficult.

Other than that, there is very little to comment. A very strong, well-researched and well-arranged piece of work with a suitable quantitative methodology that takes into account endogeneity issues, a very good analysis of NPLs in CEE countries and meaningful results according to standard economic theory and intuition. A certain lack of originality is to be expected, as this is a well-trodden path for research in that area and most angles have already been explored. The only seriously weak part is the policy suggestions, which are contradictory and lack nuance. They seem to assume some kind of collective action from a central planning agent and ignore the different incentives of agents. For example, private banks do not have a mandate to tackle unemployment or increase GDP – the government and/or the regulatory authority does. Banks have a high degree of transparency and regulatory/ reporting requirements compared to other sectors, especially if listed. Also, what about the conservative argument that increased regulatory oversight may reduce bank profits? Does that hold any truth in that environment or not? “Optimisation” of workforce is a bit generic – is there any evidence to suggest that there is a deficit in that sector? Technically it is solid work but the interpretation of the results leaves quite a lot to be desired, especially since the findings can support a more nuanced discussion. It is a bit of a lost opportunity.

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