MASTER´S EXAMINER REPORT

GPS – Geopolitical Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

Thesis title:	Buck-passing: A Theoretical Framework and Case Studies on the Munich Crisis and the Korean War
Name of Student:	Tai-Yun Wen
Referee *(incl. titles)***:**	Michael Romancov, Ph.D.
Report Due Date:	January, 16th 2022

Comments of the referee on the thesis highlights and shortcomings (following the four numbered aspects of your assessment indicated below).

1) Contribution and argument:
What is the contribution of the work? Is the argumentation and research quality strong? Interpretation of own results, justified analyses, conclusions. Originality and independent scientific thinking.

The author states that the issue of a buck-passing is an increasingly prominent concept to explain states' foreign policy which suffers from inconsistency in both theory and application. Therefore his thesis proposes a revised theoretical framework of buck-passing, which is established on the distinguishment of three images of buck-passing—intent, action, and outcome.
I sincerely admit that I was not familiar with the concept, but I consider the way in which the topic was processed to be very successful. The selected case studies are interesting and very well done, including a broad historical context.
I believe that the author has met all the conditions that are imposed on master's theses.

2) Theoretical and methodological framework:
Is the theoretical background relevant? Is there a sufficient theoretical framework applied? Are the applied methods relevant for answering the selected research questions and/or testing hypotheses? Are they used correctly?

In my opinion, the author showed beyond any doubt that he was very well acquainted with the presented approaches to the issue of buck-passing. The works of the five authors he has chosen (Posen, Christensen and Snyder, Schweller, and Mearsheimer) are presented and subsequently discussed in a comprehensible and factual manner.

2) Sources and literature:
Is literature research relevant? Is the thesis situated in a broader context (field of research)? Quotation of sources.

The list of literature and other sources used is more than respectable. Working with resources is exemplary. All sources used are properly and carefully cited.

4) Manuscript form and structure:
Are there any formal issues (logical coherence, layout, structure, tables, figures)?

The work is clearly structured, the chapters follow each other logically and organically. The diagrams and tables created by the author are clear (the shortcomings are minor, as for example slightly disorganized table on page 107).

5) Quality of presentation
What is the quality of presentation (language, style, cohesion)

The work is written in readable and completely understandable language without any spelling or stylistic problems.

CATEGORY		POINTS
Contribution (research quality, analysis, and conclusions)	*(max. 40 points)*	38
Theoretical and methodological framework	*(max. 25 points)*	23
Sources and literature	*(max. 10 points)*	10
Manuscript form and structure	*(max. 15 points)*	15
Quality of presentation (grammar, style, coherence)	*(max. 10 points)*	10
TOTAL POINTS	*(max. 100 points)*	**96**
The proposed grade (A-B-C-D-E-F)		**A**

Suggested questions for the defence are:

I have no further questions.

I (do not) recommend the thesis for final defence.

_____
Referee Signature

Overall grading scheme at FSV UK:

TOTAL POINTS	**GRADE**	Quality standard
91 – 100	**A**	= outstanding (high honor)
81 – 90	**B**	= superior (honor)
71 – 80	**C**	= good
61 – 70	**D**	= satisfactory
51 – 60	**E**	= low pass at a margin of failure
0 – 50	**F**	= failing. The thesis is not recommended for defence.