Name of the student:	Jo-Hsuan Chuang
Title of the thesis:	Europe's Incoherent Attitudes toward Taiwan: Does the Dragon's Shadow Still Linger?
Reviewer:	Martin Mejstřík (Charles University)

1. KNOWLEDGE AND CONNECTION TO THE FIELD
(relevance of the research question, research objective, literature review):

MA Dissertation of Jo-Hsuan Chuang offers an interesting look on EU-Taiwan relations focusing on analysis of factors behind the inconsistency in EU member states´ engagement with Taiwan. The author put together a relevant and convincing research question concerning the role of economic interdependence with China on this engagement. To do that, the author chose a quantitative approach with a comprehensive data set, thus achieving his main research objectives.

The literature review is comprehensive and is presented in a systematic way using a range of studies from different disciplines. The thesis convincingly argues that there is a broad literature on general economic interdependency but also use primary sources to showing particularities in the EU-China-Taiwan triangle case study.

The research objectives and research questions are laid out in a comprehensive and systematic manner. The author has been able to clearly identify the research gap and expand his research on it.

2. ANALYSIS
(methodology, argument, theoretical backing, appropriate work with sources):

The author chose a quantitative approach with regression models which functions well together with the theoretical framework anchored in the Interdependence Theory. The research design is clear and coherent, and the author showed a good ability to operationalise defined variables. The main week point of his analysis is potential bias and rather small sample size. Nevertheless, the author acknowledges these limitations and offered a convincing explanation why his research still offers valuable results.

Concerning the work with sources, the author showed a good ability to connect his sources with the research framework and used them in the operationalisation of defined variables.

3. CONCLUSIONS
(persuasiveness, link between data and conclusions, achievement of research objectives):

The conclusions are developed in terms of the contributions of the research paper and the findings are presented in a persuasive and systematic manner. The thesis identifies potential limitations, and these are explained in a convincing manner. The authors also provide solid politically relevant outcomes from his research and clearly shows how his finding could contribute to the general debate. His findings about how investments made by state-controlled entities can be leveraged for political purposes are presented in a very convincing way. However, the author could expand more on this critical finding.

4. FORMAL ASPECTS AND LANGUAGE
(appropriate language, adherence to academic standards, citation style, layout):

The formal aspects of the thesis are without major issues. Thesis language is clear and coherent, and the structure of the text is solid. References are extensive and presented in the right manner, the same is valid for the citation style.

5. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT
(strong and weak point of the dissertation, other issues)

MA Dissertation of Jo-Hsuan Chuang offers a valid contribution to the research on economic interdependency. The author constructed a strong research design and was able to connect it with his complex case study. He also clearly identified a research gap and showed how his research might fill it. The research and his validity has certain limitations, the author, however, was able to tackle them. In general, the text is an excellent dissertation and fully deserves an A.

Grade (A-F)	A (9.0)
Date	Signature
30/06/2024	

Classification scheme

Percentile	Prague		Krakow		Leiden		Barcelona	
A (91-100)	91-100 %	8,5%	5	6,7%	8,5-10	5,3%	9-10	5,5 %
B (81-90)	81-90 %	16,3%	4,5	11,7%	7.5-8.4	16.4%	8-8.9	11,0 %
C (71-80)	71-80 %	16,3%	4	20%	6.5-7.4	36,2%	7-7.9	18,4 %
D (61-70)	61-70 %	24%	3,5	28,3%			6-6.9	35,2 %
E (51-60)	51-60 %	34,9%	3	33,4 %	6-6.4	42,1 %	5-5.9	30,1 %

Assessment criteria:

Excellent (A): "Outstanding performance with only minor errors";
Very good (B): 'Above the average standard but with some errors';
Good (C): "Generally sound work but with a number of notable errors";
Satisfactory (D): 'Fair but with significant shortcomings';
Sufficient (E): 'Performance meets the minimum criteria';
Fail: 'Some/considerable more work required before the credit can be awarded'.