

# IMESS DISSERTATION



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

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

<b>Student:</b>	Jingxuan Weng
<b>Dissertation title:</b>	The impact of FDI on Income Inequality – Evidence from Emerging markets in CEE and China

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

<b>ECTS Mark:</b>	C	<b>UCL Mark:</b>	62	<b>Marker:</b>	Elodie DOUARIN
<i>Deducted for late submission:</i>				<b>Signed:</b>	E.D.
<i>Deducted for inadequate referencing:</i>				<b>Date:</b>	03/09/2024

## 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 (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):**

Your literature review tries to cover too much and as a result seems superficial and/or confusing. For example, you very briefly mention the Kuznets' hypothesis on the links between growth and inequality – but why? How is it relevant to your work? Can this be used to moderate the findings you review on the links between FDI and inequality?

Similarly, your review of gender inequality is a bit patchy and overall difficult to follow. What are the key take aways?

[pages 11 and 12 – a full line is repeated twice. Same again page 59.]

While it was a good idea to explain why CEE and China could be studied together, discussing their similarities in terms of common background was probably not sufficient. What about differences? For example, the cultural specificities of China that you describe pages 17 and 18: do they also exist in the CEE? If the 2 regions are different, does it matter?

More generally: What sort of econometric models are you estimating? How focusing on only 6+1 countries affects your results if you compared to a situation where you would use a larger sample? Can there be issues from merging data from different sources?

[Table 2 – what is the point of having N=118.000 rather than N=118?]

[Figure 3 is not very meaningful – the difference in scale is the only thing that I see. Could it be better to focus on FDI as share of GDP or something?]

I am not entirely convinced by how you justify your modelling approach and specification. Part of your literature review focuses on the fact that FDI impact on inequality indirectly via growth, and then directly – but this is not reflected in your models. There is thus a disconnect between the literature review and the empirical part. You could have explained that looking into the direct and indirect effects was beyond the scope of this paper, and your focus was narrower. Stating this clearly would have demonstrated your critical thinking by acknowledging a limitation, while giving a chance to argue on the value of what you were doing.

You could also have provided more detailed discussions of empirical papers focusing on the same relationship as you, to explain more clearly what you are doing that is the same and what is different – again that would have made your own work more transparent and would have helped demonstrating your analytical skills.

The discussion of the moderating effect of education is interesting and does add value, but it comes a bit out of nowhere, as it is not even mentioned in intro and not the focus of the literature review.

Overall, this was an ambitious project, and your choice of questions is relatively original. The implementation is however a little bit unequal. Your paper would have benefited from a clear conceptual framework directly building on your literature review. Your review of the literature would also be much stronger if you were also engaging with the methods implemented, not only the theory or the findings.

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

What would happen to your results for CEE and China if you were using more countries in your estimations?  
{see also robustness 3.5}

If growth increases inequality and FDI increases growth, could it be that FDI does not increase inequality at all directly and the effect estimated is only through growth?

You mentioned that results can change if you use other indicators of inequality rather than GINI. Why did you limit yourself to GINI and what are the key advantages of using GINI?

