

IMESS DISSERTATION



Note: Please email the completed mark sheet to Year 2 coordinator (cc Chiara Amini chiara.amini@ucl.ac.uk and ssees-imess@ucl.ac.uk)

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:	Chuanli Xun
Dissertation title:	The Transformation of Russian Industrial Structure

	70+	69-65	64-60	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>						X
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>					X	
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 limitation or alternative views; Ability to use other evidence to support arguments and structure appropriately.</i>					X	
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>						X
Methodology <i>Understanding of techniques applicable to the chosen field of research, showing an ability to engage in sustained independent research.</i>						X

ECTS Mark:		UCL Mark:	51	Marker:	Slavo Radosevic
<i>Deducted for late submission:</i>				Signed:	
<i>Deducted for inadequate referencing:</i>				Date:	02/09/2022

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):

This is a potentially interesting and relevant dissertation regarding the topic. It has an appropriate formal structure. It demonstrates significant effort, as seen in the number of consulted references and an extensive literature review. However, work also has serious shortcomings, primarily of three kinds: a limited analytical value-added, which is limited to descriptive analysis with new marginal insights. Second, there are significant inconsistencies between the content of the literature review (chapter 2) and the content of the empirical chapter (4). Third, the analytical framework outlined in chapter 3 is quite inarticulate and is not followed or implemented in the empirical part (chapter 4). The Conclusion chapter (6)(actually 5) does not bring the issue to a more general interpretative level but repeats elements from the descriptive chapter (4). Overall, this is readable though very poorly written work which barely meets the minimum level for an IMEES dissertation.

The analysis is confined to macroeconomic and basic structural indicators of shares of economic activities at three sector levels. Given the enormous role of resource-based sectors in the Russian economy, it is quite puzzling that the extractive industries are included in agriculture. So, a crucial specificity of Russia has been, in that way, ignored.

The proposed conceptual (analytical) framework of determinants of the economic structure consists of the demand side (consumption demand, investment demand, and export demand) and the supply side (technology supply, labour supply, and institutional supply). However, indicators to show this are not spelt out, and the framework itself is not applied. So, its function in the overall line of argument is quite puzzling. Moreover, it is stated that 'the study explains how demand-side and supply-side came into play during the four Russian economic phases between 1991 and 2020 to drive industrial structure transformation'. I am not sure that this is the case. I do not see where these issues are discussed

A second argument is that industrial structure is generated by activities of broadly defined industrial policy. Moreover, it is stated that 'the study aims to evaluate the impact of industrial policy by the Russian government from 1991 to 2020 on changing industrial structure'. A literature review does review the general literature which pertains to industrial policy, but we do not learn much about Russian industrial policy.

The dissertation has spelt out four relevant research questions, but in the analysis, they do not seem to be addressed or at least addressed in conclusions. How are the four economic phases experienced in Russia between 1991 and 2020 related to industrial structure change? In many respects, structural change or some of its dimensions occurred unrelated to these stages. What were micro-level measures in different stages? I do not see where the issue of the trade-offs between supply-side and demand-side fiscal (micro-level) measures in the four economic phases are discussed.

Write-up is too often inarticulate. It would be too much to cite all examples. For example, what is the meaning of the following sentence: *Rent seeking has caused financial crisis (like 1998) affected reforms negatively but as it increases in competition there are more limitation to it.*

Too many sections are confusing and inarticulate. For example, the discussion on the convergence of industrial policies and innovation policies and their vertical and horizontal dimensions is impossible to follow. For example, what does the following mean: *The crisis pushed the state to change from being tactical to strategic in its objectives to extend of implementing manual control and the state reconsidered its development opportunities and priorities for the large-scale reconstruction of economy.*

Section 2 esp. 2.3. is very poorly if at all, referenced. A structuring of 2.3 is not explained or justified

There is no systematic picture of industrial policy instruments by stages for Russia. This section is extensive but lacks the specificity of Russia and overall lacks clarity

The methodology section argues that analysis follows a mixed (qualitative/quantitative) method. However, it is quite puzzling what qualitative means in the work which relies entirely on secondary literature and statistical data. In this section, there is an extensive elaboration of Divisia index and the Shift-Share Decomposition methodology. However, I do not see where these methodologies are applied in the analysis.

Analysis in chapter 4 is consistent though quite elementary. The chapter describes Russia's industrial structure transformation through a three-sector model. It is a very basic descriptive analysis which does not go beyond describing figures

Re Figure 23: Correlation analysis between value-added from agriculture, manufacturing, and service sectors as a percentage of GDP. Why are outliers not discussed?

Correlation analysis is used among variables which are shares, and thus almost by definition, they should be highly correlated. So the use of correlations is redundant.

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

1. You define industrial policies as 'government-driven efforts to change the economic structure of the economy'. This broad definition ignores differences between industrial policy 'proper' and 'broad'. It also ignores the distinction between 'explicit' and 'implicit' industrial policies ie policies which change the structure of the economy but are driven by other considerations like privatisation. What can you tell us about these dimensions of industrial policy in Russia?
2. Figure 18 shows a change in value-added as a percentage of GDP for the manufacturing sector, and also you show data on the stagnation of the services sector. Has this anything to do with sanctions and import substitution strategies? How have these two issues affected industry structure?
3. Why did you ignore extractive sectors (oil and gas and metals) as significant specificity of the Russian economy in analysing changes in industry structure?
4. When analysing changes in shares of agriculture, manufacturing, and service sectors (for example, Figure 22) is not that obvious that there will be correlations between changes (when one sector increases, the other decline by the same share). What is then the analytical value of doing correlations in these cases?

