IMESS DISSERTATION

Note: Please email the completed mark sheet to Year 2 coordinator
(cc Chiara Amini chiara.amini@ucl.ac.uk **and** fiona.rushworth@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:	Bin Yu
Dissertation title:	Corruption Distance and Foreign Direct Investment: Evidence from European Transition Economies

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

ECTS Mark:		**UCL Mark:**	68	**Marker:**	Randolph Luca Bruno
Deducted for late submission:				**Signed:**	Randolph Luca Bruno (e-mail)
Deducted for inadequate referencing:				**Date:**	10th June 2019

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*):

This dissertation tackles an important research question and attempts to address it in a very comprehensive way. The literature on the relationship between institutional context and Foreign Direct Investment (FDII) is wide reaching. Dissecting the main results on the impact of institutional weaknesses(such as corruption) on FDI is far from straightforward , and it requires a good knowledge of the main theory, of the fast evolving pace of the literature and of the fat evolving methodological empirical tool to analyse complex economic questions.

This dissertation goes in that direction with the following set of strengths and weaknesses:

1. Strengths:

    a. Up to page 27, end of section 3, the dissertation covers quite a lot of grounds of the wide-ranging literature by spanning theoretical underpinnings, empirical results and mythological advances. In other words the reader is guided through a complex set of concepts (relatively) smoothly

    b. It is an ambitious dissertation. The idea to test outwards and inward, intensive (with caveats see weaknesses) and extensive, industrial countries and developing countries, traditional measure of corruption and adjusted measure of corruption (with caveats see weaknesses) is laudable.

    c. It is critically informed, i.e. the conclusions are evidence-based and not forces into some precise "school of thoughts"

2. Weaknesses:

    a. Starting from page 28 (Chapter 4) the consistency and clarity progressively fades away. There are quite a few simplifications and blurred concepts that cannot be reconciled with the tables (not to mention some dubious presentational choice on the tables)

    b. Dyadic dummies and multilateral resistance terms are missing in all specifications (on host and home separate fixed effects are included): these dummies would have highly enriched the model and address the problem of pseudo time-invariance of some institutional pair-wise variables.

    c. The concept of extensive margin in the micro literature is much better defined (breadth –e.g. location wise" versus depth –intensity in the same location-) than in the macro (as in this dissertation): the selection equation "measures" the zeros' or the likelihood of "seeing" FDI between two countries. In terms of locational choices it much more difficult to argue that the section really capture the extensive margin.

    d. The dissertation is supporting the "grabbing hand" hypothesis, really, without fully recognising it. See table 14 (table 15 is not readable….unfortunately)

    e. The Adjusted measures of corruption have strong persistence characteristics (corruption does not change much year by year) and the loosely correcting for the "experience factor", unfortunately.

    f. Following "step by step" one main paper Cezar 2015 might and up being a straight –jacket, not seeing some of the limitations of this very same paper.

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

Major

1. Policy implications for the governments of transition countries:

   a. Which "type" of FDI should they attract (e.g. form which countries') and how (tax breaks?)

   b. Which type of FDI they should promote and how

2. What is the joint impact of the interaction of FDI and corruption on the overall Growth or productivity of a country? (this is a different research question but it would be address via some of the results of the dissertation)

Minor

1. Table 15 is incomplete, it would be nice to see it compiled on the top part too

2. Table 13 right panel is incomplete