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:	Zhuoran Wang
Dissertation title:	A study on the relationships among foreign direct investment, innovation and economic growth in European countries from 1998 to 2021

	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.*	65					
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.*	70					
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.*	67					
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.*	68					
Methodology *Understanding of techniques applicable to the chosen field of research, showing an ability to engage in sustained independent research.*	70					

ECTS Mark:	B/68	Charles Mark:	B/89	Marker:	Marek Vokoun
Deducted for late submission:	No			Signed:	
Deducted for inadequate referencing:	No			Date:	Sep 4, 2024

MARKING GUIDELINES

A (UCL mark 70+) = A (Charles mark 91-100 - 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 81-90– very good)
C (UCL mark 64-60) = C (Charles mark 71-80 – 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.

D (UCL mark 59-55) = D (Charles mark 61-70 – satisfactory)
E (UCL mark 54-50) = E (Charles mark 51-60 – sufficient): 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) = F (Charles mark 0-50 - insufficient): 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.

Please provide substantive and detailed feedback!

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

The student displayed admirable cooperation and made notable contributions to the literature and methodological approaches, with a pronounced emphasis on the econometric aspects of the research. Her work extensively explored the development of theories, yet it remains somewhat ambiguous as to which contemporary theories are most applicable to the current global context and which ones she intended to confirm or challenge. Furthermore, it allows for the investigation of a multitude of topics within the confines of a limited master's thesis.

The results presented offer valuable insights, and the discussion section is well written and adequately addresses the subject matter. Some of the recommendations provided are rather general and lack specificity. It would have been beneficial for the author to examine existing real-life policies in order to suggest ways to enhance their effectiveness and applicability. Those responsible for formulating and implementing economic policies are frequently required to make critical decisions. The challenge for policymakers is to determine whether to adopt general policies, such as broad R&D tax deductions and first-year benefits, or more targeted approaches, such as strategic support and additional R&D incentives for specific industries or sectors. Among these considerations is the evaluation of the efficacy of strategic foreign direct investment (FDI) incentives as an economic policy tool. The question thus arises as to whether the focus should be on attracting well-established multinational companies or on companies that can leverage the host country's endowments for sustainable long-term growth. Another crucial question is whether it is feasible to structure incentives in a way that is beneficial without distorting market dynamics or harming competition. Furthermore, decision-makers must determine whether a universal approach to FDI incentives is preferable, or if a more tailored strategy for specific investors would yield superior results. This paper could have initiated a more valuable debate on these issues, providing insights into how such policies might be crafted to balance these competing priorities.

The incorporation of the interaction term between FDI and R&D in the results constitutes a particularly noteworthy contribution to the analysis. Nevertheless, the analysis would have been enhanced by further investigation into the interactions between specific categories of R&D and types of FDI. Such an approach could have provided a more profound understanding of the current scientific discourse. In light of the fact that the thesis is a macroeconomic analysis utilising aggregated data, there is always scope for additional detail. The incorporation of controls for variables such as the share of origin or specific types of investment would serve to enhance the analysis and add depth to the findings. Moreover, integrating the theoretical framework with models that posit FDI as a catalyst for innovation, particularly in developing regions, would offer a more comprehensive and compelling perspective.

This study encourages further analysis and the investigation of new approaches to examining the relationship between foreign direct investment (FDI), research and development (R&D) and gross domestic product (GDP). In summary, the study offers insights into the context of European countries between 1998 and 2021, with a particular focus on the CEE region.

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

1) **Scientific articles are a positive determinant of growth in your FDI – GDP models. Discuss in detail this result and possibly relation to the concept of quadruple helix.**

2) **Explain in detail the threshold you have find in the FDI – R&D – GDP growth framework.**