IMESS DISSERTATION

**Note: Please email the completed mark sheet to Year 2 coordinator
(cc Julia Korosteleva j.korosteleva@ucl.ac.uk and Marta Kotwas m.kotwas@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:	Conrad Scheibe
Dissertation title:	Fiscal Consolidation and Their effects on Income Inequality

	Excellent		Satisfactory		Poor
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.*	V				
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.*	V				
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 arguments limitation or alternative views; Ability to use other evidence to support arguments and structure appropriately.*	V				
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.*	V				

ECTS Mark:		**UCL Mark:**	82	**Marker:**	
Deducted for late submission:				**Signed:**	
Deducted for inadequate referencing:				**Date:**	

MARKING GUIDELINES

A (UCL mark 70+; Charles University mark = 1): *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; Charles University mark =2): 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; Charles University mark = 3): 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; Charles University mark = neprospělúa): 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*):

This dissertation discusses the role of different forms of fiscal consolidation on inequality. It makes a distinction between expenditure-type and tax collection-type consolidation and test their impacts on both market Gini and net-Gini. It also makes a contribution by classifying consolidations differently from what has been done already in the literature and in so doing, provides a new set of results that contribute to nuance the current "accepted wisdom" on the topic.

Overall, this dissertation is of a very high standard. I have really enjoyed reading it and can only congratulate the student for this contribution.

The literature review presented sets a standard. It is very well structured, very thorough and with clear analytical elements. The student has done more than summarising the papers he read, he has constructed an analytical review that presents the state of the art and open new avenues for research. This section alone makes a contribution.

The analysis and interpretation is thorough, well grounded in the literature and clearly presented. The method used is sound and appropriately justified.

The conclusions are well written and the contribution is clearly articulated and valid.

This is one of the very best dissertation I have read.

I only have three comments/questions:

I have not found a section clearly explaining the sample selection. There is a good description of the sample with detailed tables and graphs, but why only 19 countries? Is it purely data driven: i.e. the data was not available for more countries? or did you decide to focus on a specific set of countries? or a specific time-period?

How could you improve on your empirical approach if you had more data and more time? Is there something you would have liked to do to present more robustness checks or validate your results but could not?

If you were to summarise your findings for policy makers, what recommendations would you give them based on your work? and how likely is it that they would implement your recommendations? Or how important do you think political economy factors are in explaining the type of consolidation method used?

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

See last part of review above. Three questions.