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:	WANG, Mengyao
Dissertation title:	*Evaluation of the Impact of Banking Regulation on the Stability of Banking Sector in CEE EU Members*

	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:	A	Charles Mark:	A	Marker:	Karel Svoboda
Deducted for late submission:	No			Signed:	
Deducted for inadequate referencing:				Date:	

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 thesis concentrates on important from theoretical, but also policy-setting, question whether deeper banking regulation and stricter supervision increases stability of the banking systems in Central and Eastern Europe. Simply said, too much of regulation kills economy, too loose regulation may bring instability to the system. Finding the proper balance, when the banking is stable and fulfils its essential purpose to channel deposits into assets is a key task for regulatory bodies.

The aim of the text is well defined, clear, and understandable. Although I cannot comment on originality of the findings since I am not a specialist in the field, the whole paper explains a lot about banking regulation in the area under scrutiny. The hypotheses seem to be quite basic to me – increased capital adequacy unquestionably increases stability of a bank. However, when this stability poses acceptable limit on banking operations, is maybe more important question. The choice of the CEE countries may be questioned as well – comparing Slovenia to Poland may give some mixed results. Not that it is impossible, but I would welcome even deeper explanation of their comparability (claims such as …"the members share some commons in economy, politics, culture, and military," do not sound convincing. Nevertheless, I must say the conclusions look convincing.

The thesis is well-structured and contains all necessary attributes that diploma thesis should have. Referencing is correct, following the Harvard style, typical for the genre. The list of references would deserve some further editing for consistency, but in general, it is well done.

The thesis is well-written in clear and understandable language. It contains almost no typos. It does not mean that the paper is free of mistakes, but their number is not limiting the clarity of the message.

The student demonstrated a good command of methods and well-knowledge of the field of banking regulation. Although the thesis is not without mistakes (especially in knowledge of Central European context), it is still very good piece of work.

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

1. In the Czech Republic, bank fees typically represent an important source of revenues for banks. Has the regulation its touch even in the field of fees?

2. There is a clear contradiction you outline in the regulation. The more you regulate, the harder the supervision is and the less clear it is. Is there any regulation/rule, you would (in general terms) see as a "silver bullet" rule – something that may, despite its simplicity, address the main problem of regulation?