# IMESS DISSERTATION

**Note: Please email the completed mark sheet to Year 2 coordinator (jiri.vykoukal@post.cz)**

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: | Yixuan Zhang |
| --- | --- |
| Dissertation title: | Determinants of Commercial Banks' Financial Performance in Central and East European Countries |

| | 70+ | 69-65 | 64-60 | 59-55 | 54-50 | <50 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | A | B | C | D | E | F |
| **Knowledge**<br><br>*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**<br><br>*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**<br><br>*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.* | | X | | | | |
| **Presentation & Documentation**<br><br>*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**<br><br>*Understanding of techniques applicable to the chosen field of research, showing an ability to engage in sustained independent research.* | | X | | | | |

| ECTS Mark: | B | UCL Mark: | 66 | | Marker: | Ilias Chondrogiannis |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Deducted for late submission:* | | | | | Signed: | Ilias Chondrogiannis |
| *Deducted for inadequate referencing:* | | | | | Date: | 4/9/2024 |

**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_):**

The justification of the research question is generic and relies on literature that is 15 years old. There is no relevance to modern challenges that would call for a reassessment of older results. The introduction does not properly account for the modern situation in the sample countries, why old results should be revisited or what the scope is. This is simply a narration, not a foundation of a research question. The literature review is of the same quality, with many studies being outdated or out of scope. The choice of the CAMEL method (framework?) is not justified – why is it an improvement over other approaches and what do we hope to learn by applying it? In addition, the CAMEL indicators are common in many different areas of banking research without that moniker.

There is not a correlation matrix, or other testing, for the control variables, and the summary statistics come too late in the text.

The methodology is severely lacking in presentation and consistency. The 5 FE models are not numbered, the models of Table 8 are not contained in the text in a comprehensive manner, there is no explanation why the controls change in that way in every model (it would actually make some sense to change the IVs but keep the controls the same) and the time coeffs are not necessary. The same critique holds for the rest of the results.

Overall, there is no big ambition or new intuition. Without a solid economic or banking story, this is an econometric exercise that has been done many times in the past with similar ways, and is basically a FE regression with standard banking indicators. There is not a solid conclusion, policy suggestions or findings that can be directly connected to the countries in question and their banks. The discussion lacks originality or a novel insight.

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

**How does the CAMEL model improve on other methods and why was it selected?**

**What are the tailored policy suggestions for each country in the sample?**