



## Diploma Thesis Evaluation Form

Author: Milan Horák

Title: The Rise of China and Its Impact on East Asia

Programme/year: Mezinárodní vztahy (2016)

Author of Evaluation (supervisor): Tomáš Karásek

| Criteria              | Definition                                  | Max.       | Points |
|-----------------------|---|------------|--------|
| <b>Major Criteria</b> |   |            |        |
|                       | Research question, definition of objectives | <b>10</b>  | 10     |
|                       | Theoretical/conceptual framework            | <b>30</b>  | 25     |
|                       | Methodology, analysis, argument             | <b>40</b>  | 20     |
| <i>Total</i>          |   | <b>80</b>  | 55     |
| <b>Minor Criteria</b> |   |            |        |
|                       | Sources                                     | <b>10</b>  | 10     |
|                       | Style                                       | <b>5</b>   | 4      |
|                       | Formal requirements                         | <b>5</b>   | 5      |
| <i>Total</i>          |   | <b>20</b>  | 19     |
| <b>TOTAL</b>          |   | <b>100</b> | 74     |



## Evaluation

### Major criteria:

The author of the thesis seems to have committed a 'classical' mistake: being so steeped in the topic as to forget to explain his research intentions. The text has an undeniable informative and analytical value, and rests on a respectable heap of sources. It is also well structured and clearly highly knowledgeable about the issues it is dealing with. The theoretical framework that was selected makes sense in the given empirical context.

However, there is no outline of the thesis's methodology and operationalization. We do not know what data, how (e.g. by what method(s)) and why are going to be analysed. There is a selection of country-specific chapters (coherent and well crafted in themselves), yet no explanation of why these specific countries were chosen, and why indeed the thesis features an analysis based on single actors' policies when it operates within a structuralist (i.e. primarily relational) theoretical framework.

The author is apparently not 'wrong' about the situation he describes, but the component that would identify the process of how he can be 'right' is simply missing.

### Minor criteria:

The scope, complexity and depth of sources needs to be appreciated. So does the long list of annexes which together add a fine informative value to the thesis. The language could have been more sophisticated, but generally serves the purpose well.

### Overall evaluation:

Highly informative, undeniably analytical and clearly theoretically based thesis that, however, misses any meaningful methodological component (which it dearly needs).

Suggested grade: **2**

Signature: 