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:	YUEHAN WANG
Dissertation title:	A STUDY OF THE TRADE EFFECTS OF CHINA'S DIRECT INVESTMENT IN CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

	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:	C	**Charles Mark:**	C	**Marker:**	
Deducted for late submission:				**Signed:**	
Deducted for inadequate referencing:				**Date:**	

MARKING GUIDELINES

A (UCL mark 70+) = A (Charles mark- 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 – very good)
C (UCL mark 64-60) = C (Charles mark – 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.

Please provide substantive and detailed feedback!

Comments, explaining strengths and weaknesses (_at least 300 words_):

The discussion of the literature is confusing. While the general question – does FDI replace or support trade is understandable, the authoress makes contradicting claims – majority of empirical studies see the substitution effect as more important than complementarity (p. 8) x "Conclusions are supporting both the substitution effect and the complementary effect, while the complementary effect is the majority." (p. 11). In other case – pages 27 and 41, the authoress repeats the same information.

The whole thesis is written in the language that is sometimes too complicated, hard to read ("On the other hand, from the perspective of the importing country (the investment recipient country), the products produced by receiving foreign investment are the industries with a comparative disadvantage of the country, which will also lead to the reduction of the country's import from the exporting country". (p. 14 for instance). They found that the different efficiency of enterprises makes foreign trade and FDI have a different relationship under different conditions (p. 6).

The authoress clearly knows the theories of FDI and trade. This is a plus. However, the theoretical part itself seems to be more enumeration of these theories without clear connection to the empirical part of the thesis. This is not to say that the theories applied and presented are off topic, but the link could have been strengthened.

There are some formal omissions. First and foremost, the authoress uses exact numbers, however, does not provide any source where are the numbers taken from (27, 34). Although it may be guessed that it is from the statistical bulletin the authoress uses for other numbers, this must be clearer. My reservations go also to the paragraph 27-28, which mostly repeats what is in the table anyway. Furthermore, Figure 3 is unclear – the year it describes, should be pointed out.

There is some country called "Abaya" (30) which is, regretfully, unknown to me. Is it Albania?

In general, I am still somewhere in between B and C.

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

1. You speak about "Budapest principles" (I guess the "Bucharest principles" on the page 34 are the same), however, it is not clear what you mean by this. Could you, please, elaborate it?

2. According to declarations, Chinese investment is enormous. However, the reality is more than modest. What do you regard as the biggest obstacle for increasing Chinese FDI in CEEC?