

IMESS DISSERTATION



Note: Please email the completed mark sheet to Year 2 coordinator (cc Allan Sikk a.sikk@ucl.ac.uk and Louise Wassell l.wassell@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:	Yu Yingying
Dissertation title:	Does Banking Concentration Lead to Banking stability in the CEE Countries?

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Poor
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 arguments 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

ECTS Mark:	D	UCL Mark:	57	Marker:	
<i>Deducted for late submission:</i>				Signed:	
<i>Deducted for inadequate referencing:</i>				Date:	

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):

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
**PLEASE PROVIDE SUBSTANTIVE AND
 DETAILED FEEDBACK!**

Constructive comments, explaining strengths and weaknesses (*at least 300 words*):

The paper looks at an interesting and policy-relevant question of the relationship between banking concentration and banking stability. The overview of the existing literature presents clear evidence of extensive reading. There is also an attempt to conduct a meaningful empirical investigation to shed light on the issue in the context of 10 CEE countries.

Unfortunately, the paper is largely unscholarly. Large part of the proposed arguments is either spurious or vague. The arguments also tend to be non-analytical and incomplete. As a result, the paper often leaves the reader with more questions than answers. A number of theories/ideas covered are misrepresented or misinterpreted (e.g. Jensen and Meckling, 1976).

The historical overview of the banking sector development in CEE is fragmented and over simplistic. There is little understanding of the reform process in CEE and a lot of claims made are (at least) disputable. The important episodes of the banking sector crisis/instability in CEE are overlooked and there is a leap in the text straight to the 2008-crisis.

Overall, some parts of the paper look like they have been done for formal reasons and as a result have little value added for the reader. There is no continuity in arguments presented, and the language tends to be rather sub-standard.

The empirical exercise is flawed in both the sample selection and the model estimated. The sample selection process is rather ad hoc and the claims of the representativeness of the final sample are dubious. The reasons for exclusion of Polish banks look very strange given that there is large number of studies for this country which use the same data source. The author claims to use the EU member countries but Croatia was not one during the period covered in the study.

The appropriateness of the statistical models (e.g., simple OLS) and tests used in the paper is questionable and required some critical discussion.

The overall presentation is highly unscholarly. The abbreviations are not properly (if at all) introduced. Some references (e.g., Jensen and Meckling, 1976) are missing from the bibliography. There is virtually no attempt to differentiate the importance of various results and they are simply moved to appendix. The tables are not self-contained and information provided is not always appropriate.

Specific questions you would like addressing at the oral defence (*at least 3 questions*):

- 1. Could you please explain the risk-shifting incentives of the bank clients and its relationship to the concept of moral hazard?**
- 2. In Conclusions you argue that "China, as a transition country has similar history and reform processes with the CEE countries". Could you elaborate on your statement?**
- 2. How is the panel nature of your data controlled for in your empirical model?**