

IMESS dissertation										
Name/code:										
Dissertation title:	The Role of State Ownership in Commercial Banks – Experience of CEE									
Scale: 5 - excellent, 4 - good, 3 - satisfactory, 2 - poor, 1 - very poor										
		5	4	3	2	1				
ARGUMENT:										
Clearly defined research question		٧					No clearly defined research question			
Answers research question		٧					Does not answer research question			
Well structured			٧				Badly structured			
Shows theoretical awareness		٧					Shows no theoretical awareness			
Conceptual clarity		V					Conceptual confusion			
Empirically appropriate & robust		V					Full of empirical errors			
Logical and coherent		V					Illogical and incoherent			
Analytical		٧					Descriptive			
Critical			V				Uncritical			
Shows independent thought			V				Does not show independent thought			
SOURCES & USAGE:										
Evidence of reading/research		V					No evidence of reading/research			
Effective use of sources/data		V					Ineffective use of sources/data			
WRITING STYLE:										
Clear			V				Obscure			
Good punctuation			V				Poor punctuation			
Grammatically correct			٧				Grammatically incorrect			
PRESENTATION:										
Appropriate length			V				Too long/short			
Good referencing						V	Poor/inconsistent referencing			
Good spelling			V				Poor spelling			
Good bibliography		V					Poor bibliography			

Comments: The candidate does very impressive job in the empirical part of the dissertation, defining the empirical questions and than implementing them using careful, advanced and adequate econometric design. This is commendable for an MA dissertation. Also, awareness of theory and range of reading is impressive. Graphs are well designed, independently done and illustrate important points well. The slightly weaker points relate to hypotheses (p.36); these were not designed with care and are poorly presented (even if it the intentions of empirical design are clear from the main text). In addition, the overall style of the dissertation is uneven—most sections are very good but some are surprisingly week, and last but not least, referencing is faulty, see Turnitin report for detail. I felt I had no option but to deduct points for it.

Specific questions for oral defence: This is a candidate that will do well if stays in research. However still have to learn few things. One is that it is not a bad idea to focus on hypotheses in any empirical work. These should provide a crystal clear bridge between theory – should be directly motivated by it, should be formulated with clarity and there should also be a link forward – the subsequent empirical sections. Second is one needs to show respect to others by using quotation marks where appropriate.

Deducted for late submission: no	Deducted for faulty referencing: yes	Mark*: B
UCL marker: Tom Mickiewicz	Signed: T. Mickiewicz	Date: 16 06 10

<sup>\*</sup> Mark: A = 70+; B = 65-69; C = 60-64; D = 55-59; E = 50-54; F = fail, less than 50