REFEREE'S REVIEW

Program:	
Student:	Ivan Yuzhakov
Title of thesis:	Russian and Chinese OFDI. Drivers and determinants for FDI exchange

Justification of the topic choice. Accuracy in defining the aim and objectives of the thesis. Justification of the topic choice; accuracy in defining the aim and tasks of the thesis; originality of the topic and the extent to which it was covered; alignment of the thesis' topic, aim and objectives.	5	**4**	3	2
Structure and logic of the text flow. Logic of research; full scope of the thesis; alignment of thesis' structural parts, i.e. theoretical and empirical parts.	5	**4**	3	2
Quality of analytical approach and quality of offered solution to the research objectives. Adequacy of objectives coverage; ability to formulate and convey the research problem; ability to offer options for its solution; application of the latest trends in relevant research are for the set objectives.	5	**4**	3	2
Quality of data gathering and description. Quality of selecting research tools and methods; data validity adequacy; adequacy of used data for chosen research tools and methods; completeness and relevance of the list of references.	5	**4**	3	2
Scientific aspect of the thesis. Independent scientific thinking in solving the set problem/objectives; the extent to which the student contributed to selecting and justifying the research model (conceptual and/or quantitative), developing methodology/approach to set objectives.	5	4	**3**	2
Practical/applied nature of research. Extent to which the theoretical background is related to the international or Russian managerial practice; development of applied recommendations; justification and interpretation of the empirical/applied results.	5	4	**3**	2
Quality of thesis layout. Layout fulfils the requirements of the Regulations for master thesis preparation and defense, correct layout of tables, figures, references.	5	**4**	3	2

Each item above is evaluated on the following scale, as applicable: 5 = excellent, 4 = good, 3 = satisfactory, 2 = poor.

Additional comments:

Accuracy in defining the aim and objectives of the thesis

The main pre-requisite of the selection of the Master thesis topic, as presented by the author, looks too general and appears as FDI flows have become "a distinguishing feature of the current era" (p. 5). The purpose of the thesis is "to uncover the place of Russian FDI in China and Chinese FDI in Russia, drivers and determinants of two counties FDI exchange compared to their investment in the rest of the world; to investigate on motives for Russian and Chinese FDI exchange" (p. 6). Practically, this is not the only goal but rather a number of objectives. On the page 17, the authors comes back to the formulation of the paper's goals which appear as "(1) To provide a comprehensive full-scale introduction to China's and Russia's most recent FDI background; (2) to provide a systematic analysis of the size, composition, sectoral and geographical distribution of Outward Investment by two countries on Macro and Meso levels; (3) to uncover the determinants of the direction, amount and objectives of investment outflows from Russia and China; and (4) to explore the basis for further researches and investigations of determinants of China's and Russia's outward FDI exchange".

The author does not specify what could be a difference between "drivers and determinants" and "motives" for FDI exchange between Russia and China. The focus of the study on the two countries looks purely 'academic' and is based just on a fact that the two countries are large and show a growth in outward FDI. However, China is not even in top-ten foreign direct investors in Russia.

Structure and logic of the text flow

The structure of the thesis is enough logical. However, the attempt of the author to uncover too many aspects of the problem (such as FDI theories, explanations for FDI from developed and emerging countries, allocation of FDI from and into Russia and from and into China by sectors and countries) makes the description and analysis superficial.

Quality of analytical approach and quality of offered solution to the research objectives

The analytical approach is rather traditional. The author applies the methodology correctly. The conclusions based on an empirical model look reasonable. However, formulae (pp. 59, 63) are not numbered; there some incorrectness in variables' foot indices. The results of the analysis are presented in descriptive form only which makes it difficult to compare roles of separate determinants and to generalize the conclusions.

Quality of data gathering and description

The author describes rather the *sources of data* used for the analysis (p. 18), but not the *data as such*. It is unclear what does the author mean by *observations* which contribute to the "two datasets of Russian and Chinese investments" (p. 59).

Scientific aspect of the thesis

The analysis of the data on FDI from and into Russia and from and into China made it possible to make some particular conclusions which contribute to the purpose of the thesis. However, the research model looks rather standard and no new approaches have been developed. While selecting FDI determinants for the model, the author follows straightforward the conservative branch of IB-field, namely OLI-paradigm (p. 54) and adds few institutional determinants (p. 56). A set of discussion points is presented in part 8.1 devoted to Russian and Chinese FDI determinants, however hypotheses are not presented in the text formally. Two propositions are formulated for influence of institutions and corruption separately from the other determinants (pp. 56, 57).

Practical/applied nature of research

The results of the study have very low practical implications which could be somehow connected with the decision-making process by country authorities.

Quality of thesis layout

The main results of the study and appropriate conclusions are presented in a descriptive form rather than through more formalised way. Visual tools are used weakly in part 8 to present the analytical tools, frameworks, and appropriate results. There is some incorrectness in bibliography description. For example, Bell (p. 11) Globerman and Shapiro 2002 (p. 16) are not mentioned in the Reference list while Amighini, Batjargal, Blomstrom, Globerman and Shapiro 2006 are not cited in the text.

The Master thesis of Ivan Yuzhakov meets the requirements of MIB Programme, and deserves a good grade, thus the author of the thesis can be awarded the required degree.

Date June 15, 2012

Referee: Professor Andrey Medvedev