

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.

Student:	Yinyong Dong
Dissertation title:	Does corruption affect FDI inflow in Visegrad countries? A Panel Data Analysis

	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>		65				
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>			60			
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>				55		
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>				55		
Methodology <i>Understanding of techniques applicable to the chosen field of research, showing an ability to engage in sustained independent research.</i>			60			

ECTS Mark:	D/59	Charles Mark:	D/69	Marker:	Marek Vokoun
<i>Deducted for late submission:</i>			<i>No</i>	Signed:	
<i>Deducted for inadequate referencing:</i>			<i>No</i>	Date:	September 4, 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.

1. Introduction: Unclear Focus and Motivation: The introduction begins with the claim that the topic received attention 20 years ago, leaving the reader uncertain whether the author intended to focus on a contemporary issue or simply could not locate recent literature. The absence of references to literature from 2000-2024 raises questions about whether relevant research exists or was overlooked. The motivation behind the research is not clearly articulated, and the topic is not well-introduced, making it difficult for readers to grasp the significance of the study. **Weak Statement of Contribution:** The author states that "the contribution of this paper to the existing literature is to explore some of the mechanisms by which corruption affects FDI inflows in V4 countries." However, this phrasing lacks ambition and does not convey a strong, impactful contribution. A more assertive statement of the research's significance is needed. **Ambiguity in Terminology:** Terms like "path test" and the introduction of the corruption variable as something novel in the literature are not adequately explained. This leaves readers unclear about the specific innovations or new approaches the thesis offers. **Literature Review: Disjointed Structure:** The literature review does not start with a discussion of the core topic or relevant FDI frameworks. Instead, it begins with an introduction to the V4 region, which should be contextualized later. This disrupts the logical flow of the review and can confuse the reader. **Overemphasis on Outdated Theories:** There is an excessive focus on outdated and older FDI theories in the subchapter 1.2.2. of the introduction. This focus neglects the integration of contemporary frameworks such as Global Value Chains (GVCs), Resource-Based View (RBV), Uppsala model, Product Life Cycle, Eclectic Paradigm, and Internalization Theory, which are crucial for a comprehensive understanding of FDI inflows. **Lack of Framework Identification:** In sections 1.2.3 and 1.2.4, while FDI theories are discussed, the frameworks themselves are not named. The author only mentions broad categories like micro and macro factors, without delving into specific, widely-recognized models. This omission leaves readers with an incomplete understanding of the factors influencing FDI. **Data: Questionable Data Handling Practices:** The author justifies preserving original values instead of applying a logarithmic transformation to avoid losing observations. However, this approach is not adequately supported by literature or justified as a best practice. The decision should be backed by references to reputable studies or discussed in terms of its implications for the validity of the analysis. **Methodology: Formatting Issues:** There are inconsistencies in formatting, such as different fonts appearing on page 45, which detract from the professional presentation of the thesis. **Misunderstanding of Statistical Concepts:** The thesis displays a lack of precision in explaining statistical concepts. For example, the author incorrectly states, "The normal distribution of the error term is the third prerequisite for optimal linear unbiased estimation, i.e., the expected mean of the error term ϵ is equal to zero." It's important to clarify that having an expected mean of zero does not imply a normal distribution. **Inconsistent Citation Style:** There are inconsistencies in the citation style, such as "...heterogeneity.(Verbeek 2017)." versus "...variable (Verbeek 2017)." **Redundant Methodological Discussions:** The methodology section sometimes veers into textbook discussions of general methods and G-M conditions, rather than focusing on the specific methods used in this study. **Lack of Robustness Checks:** The author mentions the use of robust standard errors but does not explain why they were not employed, despite potential issues like heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation. The absence of a Wooldridge test for autocorrelation in the fixed effects (FE) model is concerning, as it raises doubts about the reliability of the results. **Methodological Choices:** The rationale for using FE over GMM that is used in research is not explained. **Results: Misplaced Content:** The results section inappropriately includes empirical specification, descriptive statistics, multicollinearity tests, and other elements that belong in the methodology or data sections. This misplacement disrupts the flow and clarity of the thesis. **Unprofessional Presentation:** Regression tables are not integrated into the text, which is unprofessional and makes the thesis difficult to read and interpret. **Lack of Discussion:** The thesis completely lacks a discussion section that compares the results to recent literature. This omission is critical, as it prevents the reader from understanding the study's contribution to the existing body of knowledge. **List of References: Poor Formatting:** The list of references is poorly formatted, making it hard to read. Issues such as missing symbols ("Is Africa Different") and incomplete bibliographic information ("Asiedu, Elizabeth. 2002. 'On the Determinants of Foreign Direct Investment to Developing Countries: Is Africa Different?' WORLD DEVELOPMENT.") detract from the professionalism and reliability of the thesis. **Appendix: Suspicious Hausman Test Results:** The Hausman test presented in Table 4 looks suspicious. Typically, the third column in a Hausman test table should display the difference between random effects (RE) and fixed effects (FE) coefficients. **Unclear R-squared Measures:** In Table 6, it is unclear whether the R-squared values presented are within or overall R-squared. This lack of clarity can confuse readers and obscure the interpretation of the results.

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

- 1) Describe the contemporary frameworks such as Global Value Chains (GVCs), Resource-Based View (RBV), Uppsala model, Product Life Cycle, Eclectic Paradigm, and Internalization Theory, which are crucial for a comprehensive understanding of current FDI inflows. How close was your model to these theories?
- 2) Is your corruption-FDI analysis disproving the results in current literature? Provide discussion of the topic and focus on comparison and representativeness of samples.
- 3) Are your results the same with the use of heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation (Arellano) robust standard errors?