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:	Jingxuan Weng
Dissertation title:	The Impact of FDI on Income Inequality - Evidence from Emerging Markets in CEE and China

	70+	69-65	60-61	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´s 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:	C/62	**Charles Mark:**	C/73	**Marker:**	František Čech
Deducted for late submission:				**Signed:**	
Deducted for inadequate referencing:				**Date:**	September 5 2024

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 presented thesis starts with a rather long abstract. In my opinion, the abstract could easily be shortened by half, which would contribute to its readability. The introduction of the thesis is presented in a non-standard format for economic literature. Splitting the introduction into subsections and further into sub-subsections disrupts the flow of ideas and confuses the reader. Moreover, there are several sentences that are very difficult to read and the reader has to guess what the author wanted to say. In the introduction, the author mentions that the literature on income inequality is scarce and that the literature on gender income inequality is "even more scarce", while in section 1.4.3 the reader learns that there are many studies that " have reached the conclusion that increased strength of education could optimize the impact of FDI inflows on the gender income gap regardless of time." - the thesis would benefit from a unification of thought and expression.

I have mixed feelings about the literature review. It seems from the text that the author is well aware of the current literature, but the form of presentation is not ideal. Most of the subsection is a mechanical description of the CEE countries followed by a description of the situation in China. What about other countries? I would say it would be much better to synthesize this into an overall comparison and possibly only highlight the specifics of individual regions/countries. Apart from the weaknesses mentioned above, the literature review is thorough, covering both historical and contemporary studies on FDI, income inequality, and gender disparities. This provides a solid theoretical foundation for the study and situates it within the literature.

The paper uses panel data econometric techniques, namely fixed effects models. The author's use of a two-way fixed effects model to control for both country-specific and time-specific effects is appreciated. The results of the analysis are commented in detail, although the description is sometimes a bit mechanical. The robustness check is also provided to support the results of the main analysis. As a possible extension of the presented thesis, I can see that the thesis would benefit from a more explicit theoretical framework linking FDI and gender income inequality. While the literature review touches on relevant theories, they are not fully integrated into the empirical analysis.

The manuscript form of the thesis is the weakest part. The structure of the thesis could benefit from a clearer delineation between sections. The transitions between literature review, methodology, and empirical analysis are somewhat abrupt, making it difficult for the reader to follow the logical progression of the argument. For example, I found the "summary of the literature review" section redundant - why do we need a summary of the literature review? It brings no new information.

Overall, the thesis makes some contributions to the understanding of the relationship between FDI and income inequality in emerging markets, although these contributions are diminished by the quality of the final version of the text. The text would greatly benefit from a revision that would improve clarity and better integrate the theoretical and empirical sections.

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

The variables PGDP and Law are at the edge of stationarity at common 5% significance level. Can you comment on problems that might arise when non-stationary variables are used in your analysis?

Can you please elaborate on correlation analysis as some results are bit unexpected. For example negative correlation of FDI and GDP per capita might not be fully intuitive - rise in FDI inflow will decrease GDP? Same for corruption and FDI.