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:	Zhuoran Wang
Dissertation title:	A study on the relationships among FDI, innovation and economic growth in European countries from 1998 to 2021

	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:	B	UCL Mark:	66	Marker:	Elodie DOUARIN
Deducted for late submission:				Signed:	
Deducted for inadequate referencing:				Date:	

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 writing is overall ok. The structure of your dissertation is clear and relatively logical, but you would have gained in clarity by focusing less on the generic and more on what is directly relevant to your empirical work.

For example: I do appreciate that you summarised your literature review into "gaps" and suggested a conceptual model for your analysis (Figure 2-1). But both could have been used more effectively. Regarding the former, it would have been easier to really clarify your contribution if you had been more specific about what you do that is different or similar from a handful of benchmark papers – this way you could have been more specific about what you were doing and also clearer on how your results compared to the rest of the literature. Similarly, on the latter, I am not sure I am fully convinced by your figure 2.1 and I would have liked to know how it differed from frameworks used in the literature or how it derived from either theory or extent empirical papers.

That said your analysis is ambitious and you do try to explore the relationship between innovation, FDI and economic growth in some nuance and with some originality. I would always encourage students to build their analysis on a conceptual framework and I appreciate that you did.

You implemented a sophisticated method and provided honest interpretations. You are critical of your results, but you could have demonstrated even more critical thinking by also discussing the drawbacks and advantages of your data and methodological choices. Recognising limitations is important, it helps demonstrate your analytical skills. For example, you find some results that contradicts earlier findings from the literature: why is that so? Being specific about what you do differently (different years? Different specifications? Etc.) would lead to more interesting interpretations and discussion.

The presentation is clear. Most tables are self-explanatory.

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

Could you explain figure 2.1 again? Why is R&D expenditure interacting with FDI but not patent or article? And what is the best way of modelling the direct and indirect role of R&D expenditure on growth? Could it make sense to use a system of equations?

Is model (2) typical of what is found in the literature?

Page 67, you state: "However, unlike the findings in other countries, in CEE, the relationship is not significant or even shows a negative correlation. This is contrary to the findings of previous studies (Jimborean, Kelber, 2017; Sokhanvar, 2022)." Why do you think your results differ? What have you done differently from them?