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 <u>not</u> required to use a particular set of methods (e.g. qualitative, quantitative, or comparative) in their dissertation.

Student:	Yuhan Zhang
Dissertation title:	The Impact of Institutional Quality on FDI: A Study based on EU Countries

	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.*	70					
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.*			60			
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 arguments limitation or alternative views; Ability to use other evidence to support arguments and structure appropriately.*			61			
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.*		65				
Methodology *Understanding of techniques applicable to the chosen field of research, showing an ability to engage in sustained independent research.*		65				

ECTS Mark:	C	UCL Mark:	64		Marker:	Dr Sangaralingam Ramesh
Deducted for late submission:					Signed:	Sangaralingam Ramesh
Deducted for inadequate referencing:					Date:	25th August 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 thesis evaluates the impact of institutional quality on the inward flows of FDI into European and CEE countries. However, in contrast to other studies of a similar nature it looks at moderating effects such as the extent of trade openness and the availability of natural resources in a country context. The findings indicate that the greater the level of trade openness then the greater the benefit to FDI inflows. Although, the abundance of natural resources in a country context does not have any significant impact on impacting on institutional quality and FDI inflows.

The thesis may be novel in its research approach to investigate the impact of institutional quality on FDI inflows. However, while the literature review is good it could be more specific in places in order to avoid ambiguity. Moreover, the structure can be improved by breaking down the narrative into more concise paragraphs. The narrative is, however, relatively coherent. Although, no rationale is given as to why regression, panel data and the GMM model were chosen in contrast to other types of methodologies such as case studies.

But the methodology section is constructed relatively well although the treatment of data could have been more thorough. For example, there does not seem to be anything on outliers. Furthermore, the methodological section could have been more effectively linked to the literature review especially in the context of the choice of the control variables and the regression model. The literature review could also have been more critical as could have other sections. For example, different indices and definitions of institutions has been discussed. However, this discussion tends to be descriptive and could have been more critical.

Finally, the analysis excludes an evaluation of the moderating effects of government economic development policy in attracting inward bound FDI and the role of entrepreneurship in effectively utilising FDI in order to promote economic growth. Both of these factors are important either in the absence of institutions or at times when institutions are developing as was the situation in the CEE countries following the collapse of the Soviet Union.

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

a) How would you define institutional quality and how has this been integrated into your analysis?

b) Why is it the case that the moderating effects on FDI inflows of the role of government economic development policy and entrepreneurship not evaluated given their importance in countries in which institutions are still developing?