The decision behind Diplomatic Recognition

A quantitative study of Taiwan and Kosovo

Joakim Carbonnier

Abstract

This study is about diplomatic recognition, and why some states have not received full diplomatic recognition from the international community. The central research-problem focuses on the factors that affect a state's foreign policy decision not to recognize other states. Taiwan and Kosovo are chosen as research-cases through a strategic case-selection. The theoretical framework used in this study is a traditional Liberalism theory on international relations. Hypotheses are based on the Liberalism theory and previous research done in this field. These hypotheses are then tested through a quantitatively analysis. Furthermore a logistic regression analysis is being conducted on the two cases, in order to find a general factor behind the decision of non-recognition. The result shows that states with low democracy status are less willing to recognize other states in general. It also shows that states without a colonial heritage have a lower tendency to recognize Kosovo. Therefore it shows support for the liberalism ideas about democratic values and how a state's domestic interests and inner structure affects its foreign policy.

Key words: Recognition, Taiwan, Kosovo, Quantitative Method, Liberalism
Words: 9970

Table of contents

1   Introduction

Recognition is a process whereby certain facts are accepted and endowed with a certain legal status, such as statehood, sovereignty over newly acquired territory, or the international effects of the grant of nationality. – (Encyclopædia Britannica –"International Law: Recognition" 2010)

This process is political, and each state decides itself whether to recognize another state (ibid 2010). Today a majority of the world's states are fully recognized by the international community. There are however states who do not yet benefit from full diplomatic recognition. For instance Taiwan has been an independent state for more than 60 years (Encyclopaedia Britannica – "Taiwan" 2010), with diplomatic ties to many of the world's states, but very few of these grant Taiwan recognition. In comparison there is Kosovo, a relatively new state, but with a controversial self-proclaimed independency. Although it is supported by many european states who have decided to recognize it. How come that Kosovo has support from European states, but Western Sahara in Africa on the other hand is rarely recognized by any European state. Instead they have gained recognition from many African states. But on the same continent there is the state of Somaliland, a de facto independent and democratic state, but still not a single state in the world has decided to recognize it. These are just a few examples of how recognition of statehood works in different and sometimes peculiar ways.

The lack of recognition from the rest of the world often cripples the state's ambitions to become fully accepted on the international arena. Without recognition states become excluded from cooperation and decision-making in international politics. By not being accepted as legitimized states they can not become a member of international organisations like the UN. Moreover this could be seen as a democratic issue, as the demos in these states lack representation on a global level. It is evident that there are several factors behind the decision to neglect another state and by that deliberately excluding them from the international community. How could the foreign policy decision not to recognize another state be explained? And what affects this decision? These are just some of the questions surrounding the subject of non-recognition.

2   Research-problem

Diplomatic recognition is an interesting topic in many ways; it is a subject of international politics and diplomatic relations between states. At the same time it is a case of diplomatic tactics and reflects conflicts and disputes between states. Diplomatic recognition is an important decision in foreign policy and it has a strong effect on a country's relationship with other states. This chapter will formulate and most importantly, delimit the research-problem.

The research is concentrated on those few states that still lack recognition from the international community, states with limited recognition. These are the states intended to be examined, and for what reason they have not received recognition.

Diplomatic recognition is often mentioned in the context of international law, where it is discussed whether a state's status as sovereign is correct by judicial definition, and if so, does it then fulfill the criterion to receive diplomatic recognition. There are especially two theoretical models connected to the recognition of states. The first one is the constitutive theory which says that a state only exists if another state recognizes it, a model which was developed during the 19th century (Hillier 1998:201f). The second one is the declarative theory where a state must fulfil four criteria before it can be accepted as a state in the international community (Hillier 1998:202f). These criteria are 1) a defined territory, 2) a permanent population, 3) a government and 4) the capacity to have foreign relations with other states. This model is based on the 1933 Montevideo convention. In contrast to the constitutive model a state's sovereignty is not dependent on the recognition from other states here (Montevideo Convention 1933 Article 1 & 3). These two models will define and delimit the selection of cases to research. In practice this means that the study is delimited to only include those states that have received recognition from at least one state according to the constitutive model and meets up to the four criteria stipulated by the declarative model.

Diplomatic recognition of a state is usually divided into two different types, *de facto* and *de jure* recognition. The first one, de facto, is revocable and less formal than the de jure recognition which implies a stronger type of recognition (Columbia Encyclopedia – "Recognition" 2010). It is sometimes asserted that de jure recognition is irrevocable and that a de facto recognition would be a more temporarily case of recognition (O'Brien 2001:178f). However the statement that de jure recognition would be irrevocable could be questioned, history has shown that recognition of a state could be revoked regardless whether it is a de jure or de facto recognition. This thesis intends to concentrate the research on de jure recognition, since this is more of a formal type of recognition in contrast to the de facto recognition.

This thesis is theory-consuming and intends to cumulatively continue on earlier research done in this area, but at the same time be able to contribute with its own perspectives and theories on the case of diplomatic recognition. It starts out from a hypothetical-deductive method, where a hypothesis is first formulated and then derived empirically, to be able to examine empirically whether there is support for the hypothesis or not (Teorell & Svensson 2007:50f). Consequently, it is worth mentioning that the definition of the problem is of an explanatory nature, where the study aims to find causalities as to why some states have not been recognized (Teorell & Svensson 2007:27f). Furthermore a secondary research-ambition is to examine if there are factors behind diplomatic recognition that are more tied to certain cases, and not applicable to use in a general explanation of non-recognition. Focus is here on both the cases of Taiwan and Kosovo, which are studied both as individual cases and a general case of recognition as well. Why these cases are selected is further elaborated in the next section of this chapter.

The main research-problem is formulated as:
What affects the foreign policy decision to not recognize another state?

Secondary research-problem:
Which factors are behind the decision to not recognize Taiwan and Kosovo?

2.1   Delimitations

In this study three different actors are identified which are involved in the case of diplomatic recognition between states. These actors are elaborated and defined more closely here.

- **The Disputer(s)** – This is the state or the states that have some kind of territorial claim on the state that seeks recognition. This actor will protest against any attempt to recognize this state, since they see themselves as the rightful owner of that territory and will most likely not approve that the state becomes sovereign.
- **The Recognizer** - The recognizing state, this is the state that has the option to give another state diplomatic recognition.
- **The Claimer** – The last actor is the state that claims recognition from the international community. This state is often in conflict with the disputer(s) concerning the matter of independency or autonomy.

The recognizer and the disputer(s) are defined as those states who are members of the United Nations, currently 192 States (UN Press Release ORG/1469). This delimitation is made to avoid including other states with limited diplomatic recognition, which both have an uncertain status as legitimate states, and a strong

tendency to support other states in the same situation. A member of the United Nations can, to some extent, be seen as a globally accepted member of the international community, and therefore a legitimate actor in international politics.

Furthermore the study will only deal with cases where the recognizer has made an officially declared diplomatic recognition of the claiming state. Hence, it will not include cases where the State is partially recognized, or where only the government is recognized. Important to mention here is that the recognizing state and the disputing state could never be the same actor, it would be somewhat contradictory for a disputing state to recognize the state of which it has claim on.

2.1.1 Selection of study-cases

It is important for the research to define and select what cases to analyze. The thesis has previously been delimited to only consider those states that have limited recognition, which in the definition of the actors consist of the "claimer".

A strategic selection of cases is made (Teorell & Svensson 2007:84), where an approach that is largely similar to what is often called the "*method of agreement*" is being used. This involves using two cases that are different from each other in all aspects, except when it comes to the independent variable (x) and the dependent variable (y). The independent variable that unites these two cases would according to this method be the factor that may explain the outcome on the dependent variable (y) (Teorell & Svensson 2007:227). The dependent variable is whether a state recognized the claiming state. The study intends to examine whether there are one or more common independent variables shared between these two cases of recognition. Is it possible, based on these two cases, to find an overall unifying factor to explain why states choose not to recognize other states? These two cases are intended to constitute a representative sample of states with limited diplomatic recognition. From this sample it should be possible to achieve a generalization to the whole population of states with limited recognition (cf. Teorell & Svensson 2007:68-70).

There is a rather small amount of states with limited recognition to include in the study if the criterion is the ability to generalize to the whole population. States as South Ossetia, Abkhazia and Northern Cyprus have only received recognition from less than five states; therefore they might not be suitable for a generalization. The opposite direction, to choose states that are recognized by a majority of the world's states would not be a plausible approach either. This would be represented by states as Israel, recognized by a great majority of the world's states. It is fair to assume that the case of non-recognition of Israel is caused by a diplomatic or political dispute with Israel and not comparable to other cases of non-recognition. A state as Western Sahara[1] would be excluded from the study as well, but for other reasons. Their territory is partly occupied by Morocco and most

---

[1] SADR - Sahrawi Arab Democratic Republic (CIA World Factbook – Western Sahara).

of the population live in refugee camps in Algeria (CIA World Factbook – Western Sahara 2010). Therefore SADR barely fulfils the first and second criteria of the declarative model, a defined territory and a permanent population (Hillier 1998:202f).

The two cases selected for the study are hence Taiwan and Kosovo. Both states are recognized by a fair amount of states, at the moment 22 for Taiwan and 72 for Kosovo (see appendix A). This offers an opportunity to both analyze the motives behind recognition and non-recognition. To fit into the method of agreement-model Taiwan and Kosovo are also selected based on their differences in aspects as geographical location, culture, historical background and economic strength.

3　Method

Previous studies of diplomatic recognition have mostly been made as case studies in the form of a qualitative study. This method might not be suitable for this study, as the purpose is to find a general or universal explanation behind a state's decision to not recognize other states. A quantitative approach is chosen instead, in which statistical methods will be used to analyze quantitative data. The advantage with quantitative analysis compared to qualitative studies is that it offers the possibility to generalize. All the states in the world can be included in one analysis where numerical measureable data could be compared in order to find general patterns and causal factors which can explain why some states do not receive full recognition. It is also an interesting choice of method as it is not commonly used in studies of this kind.

The study will focus on the two chosen states, Taiwan and Kosovo. This will be done by analyzing the recognizing state's[2] decision when it comes to diplomatic recognition of these two cases. This will be done in two parts, one for each case. The dependent variables are based on whether the recognizing state recognized Taiwan or Kosovo. The dependent variable is dichotomous[3], and is encoded with two different values, 1 - if there is recognition, and 0 - If recognition is lacking.

　　Two tests will be executed, one for each case, thus one for each dependent variable. The variables that will be included in each analysis are based on the formulated hypotheses. Some hypotheses are believed to apply to both the case of Taiwan and Kosovo; therefore both analyses will consist of some shared independent variables. In addition to this, there are some hypotheses presumed to be unique for each case, which means that some independent variables will only be used in one analysis.

When critically reasoning about the choice of method it is particularly the issue of proximity in time that is seen as a possible issue. The analysis will take the form of a cross-sectional study, in which the variables are measured at one specific time (cf. Teorell & Svensson 2007:80f). It could be argued that this could cause a problem when the foreign policy decision to recognize a state may have been made at a different time. It would therefore be difficult to satisfy the causal

---

[2] See previous actor definition in section "2.1 Delimitations".

[3] A variable that only consist of two values are defined as "dichotomous", but also as "discrete" since it consist of a limited amount of values. When used in a regression-model the term "dummy-variable" is commonly used, or "categorical" to show that the values are divided in categories (Körner & Wahlgren 2006:400 & Teorell & Svensson 2007:108-109 & 146).

criterion of chronological order, that is to say that the cause preceded the effect of time (Teorell & Svensson 2007:64). However, I have made the assumption that this decision can be taken at all times. The research-problem does not intend to explain diplomatic recognition through a historical perspective. A state always has the option to change its decision in this matter; it is more relevant to examine them from a current date which allows a comparison between the states current situation and attributes.

3.1 Mode of analysis

The mode of analysis in this study is partly based on the hypothetical-deductive method (cf. Teorell & Svensson 2007:50f) and it is executed in five steps:

(i)   A theoretical framework is created and previous research on Taiwan and Kosovo are reviewed.
(ii)   Hypotheses are formulated based on the result from the previous step.
(iii)   These hypotheses are operationalized into quantitatively measureable variables.
(iv)   A quantitative analysis is conducted on the material.
(v)   The result from the analysis is reviewed and either support is found for the formulated hypotheses or they are falsified.

3.2 Logistic Regression

Multiple regression is the most commonly used analysis. However the dependent variable needs to be continuous in this analysis (Pallant 2004:160). Therefore it cannot be used in this study where the dependent variable is categorical. The chosen analysis for this study is the Logistic Regression analysis which is often used when the dependent variable is categorical or dichotomous. Logistic regression is however a complex method; this section is therefore merely a short introduction for the reader.

Logistic regression is used to predict a dependent variable on the basis of independent variables, and to determine the effect size of the independent variables. It is often explained in terms of odds ratio, by estimating the odds that a certain event occurs. The "event" is a particular value on the dependent variable (y), in this case diplomatic recognition (Garson 05-20-2010).

The equation for multiple logistic regression is:
$$z = b_0 + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + ... + b_kX_k$$

z is the log odds of the dependent variable = ln(odds(event))
b_0 is the constant and there are k amount of independent (X) variables

There are many similarities to the multiple regression, especially with the b-coefficients effect on the dependent variable (Garson 05-20-2010).

The analysis will be conducted by using the statistical programme SPSS's function called 'binary logistic' (Pallant 2004:160).

3.3 Multicollinearity

There are reasons for testing against multicollinearity in the regression analysis, which occurs when two or more independent variables correlate. This may cause a problem for the results of regression analysis since it might make it difficult to measure the effect of the independent variables and its significance in the analysis (Teorell & Svensson 2007:211 & Garson 11-19-2010).

There are especially two indicators used to diagnose multicollinearity, these are Tolerance and VIF. Tolerance measures how much of the variance that cannot be explained by the individual variable. When the value of Tolerance approach zero, the higher the correlation is between the independent variables in the analysis. This means that if Tolerance has a value close to zero, there is a high multicollinearity in the regression analysis. On the other hand a high value on VIF reflects a higher multicollinearity (Garson 11-19-2010). Logistic regression analysis are sensitive to high correlations among the predictor variables (Pallant 2004:163 & 161), therefore the limit is set relatively tight for these indicators, to avoid multicollinearity in the analysis. For this analysis, accepted multicollinearity is Tolerance higher than 0.2 and a VIF-value less than or equal to 2, on the independent variables.

4 Material

In this quantitative analysis focus is on one database in particular, the Quality of Government database. This database is created by the University of Gothenburg and they have compiled several different variables into one database (QoG Database 24-05-2010). It is difficult, and above all very time-consuming to build your own database to cover the world's states, that is why this database is chosen. Using a proven and widely accepted material the QoG-database does also reduces the risk of non-systematic measurement errors in my analysis, and hopefully affect the reliability of the analysis in a positive way (Teorell & Svensson 2007:56f). Empirical data on Taiwan and Kosovo will be derived from the CIA World Factbook, The Encyclopaedia Britannica and Freedom House.

For the literature-review on the cases of Taiwan and Kosovo a wide range of articles are chosen mostly based on a time-criterion. Articles written the last ten years are selected to be able to base the study on the latest research available. In the case of Kosovo on the other hand the time aspect is even more relevant. Since they were not a proclaimed independent state until 2008, there is a focus on articles written after this year. Furthermore the articles are chosen on the basis of the chosen theoretical framework, liberalism. The article-authors are not always generally expressed as liberalists. Although the selected articles keep themselves inside the boundaries of the liberalism framework in order to obtain coherence between the literature-review and the theory.

5   Theory

There is an absence of general theories on diplomatic recognition. Therefore this study has turned to well-known theories about international relations. Liberalism is chosen as the general theoretical framework for this study because of its focus on states. This is highly relevant in diplomatic recognition where there is a strong focus on states as the main actor. The focus is set on a traditional perspective of liberalism, thus excluding institutionalism and cosmopolitanism as these does not emphasize the state's role in the same way. Economical interdependency is there too also a relevant reason for the choice of this theory, as diplomatic recognition is believed to be tied to economical factors between different states.

5.1   Liberalism

The liberal perspective of international relations is based on the assumption that states act rational in a world characterized by interdependency. Even though focus is on the state as the main actor, other actors play an important role as well. Cooperation between states could create peace, economic growth and freedom in the world. Liberalism does also accentuate that a state's internal structure affects how they act in international politics. Both in the way that different domestic interest groups influence how the state acts, but also how the state's political system affects its behaviour. The *democratic peace* is a liberalist theory based on these assumptions, it is said that democratic states do not wage war against each other because of their democratic structure (Ericson 2006:51).

The state is an important actor according to the liberalist perspective. It exists to protect people and guarantee that agreements are kept; this makes it possible for the individual to act more rational. However the state does not exist for its own sake, it is merely a guarantor for helping individuals to live in freedom (Ericson 2006:51f).

Liberalism has a normative view of the world to some extent. It is said that all individuals have inborn rights and liberties which must be respected. Democratic states have a political system that safeguard these rights, and that is thus the ideal system. War is not legitimized in a democracy either, and it needs the consent by the voters (Ericson 2006:53). Liberalism does also emphasize the importance of human rights, free trade, economic growth and market economy as objectives for international relations. The most prominent liberalist theory would be the one about *the democratic peace (*Ericson 2006:55). The theory is derived from the fact that since 1815 there has been no war between democratic states. The liberalist

explanation to this absence of war is that the state's political system hinders them to go to war against each other. Wars are costly both economically and in the loss of life; therefore war is never appreciated by the voters in a democratic state. It is also seen as illegitimate to go to war against other democratic states (Ericson 2006:62). This theory is based on the ideas of Immanuel Kant, which he formulated in his book, *Perpetual Peace* 1796. What Kant meant was that peace between states is promoted by their inner republican order. Constitutional states governed by laws where the citizens have influence should always be favoured above states with a more authoritarian rule (Ericson 2006:54). Although it is important to not stretch Kant's conception of democracy too much, the republican order he referred to is far from today's ideas of a democracy (cf. Kant 1796:13-17). Critics against the democratic peace theory would say that even if there is no war between democratic states, they still wage war against other states. A democratic system does not necessarily stand for a more peaceful world, just peace between their equals (Ericson 2006:63).

One of the central assertions in Liberalism is how it exists a mutual interdependency between the states in the world. All states are mutually dependent on each other for survival, welfare and development. For instance economic interdependency is always present in a global economy where states are dependent on profits from export. States use their comparative advantages and specialize by producing the products they are best in, and by importing things that are more favourable for other states to produce (Ericson 2006:58). Power politics is too costly for states, liberalism point out the importance of negotiations and compromises as more relevant instruments for states. The world is seen as a potential plus-sum game, in contrast to the zero-sum. There are good opportunities for reciprocal benefits and advantages for the international actors (Ericson 2006:58-60). However the mutual interdependency in the world is rarely symmetrical, some states are more dependent on others. This is usually shown in different areas of interest, where different interests have varying importance for states (Ericson 2006:58). Interdependency does also mean that some of the problems in the world are mutually shared and move across states with no respect for borders.

According to the Liberalist theory the difference between domestic politics and foreign politics should not be exaggerated. How states act internationally reflect their domestic conditions (Ericson 2006:60). It is the interest-conflict between different domestic groups that affects how a state acts in international politics. Individuals are hence important actors as well, and the states politics depend on which interest group that, for the present, controls the politics. This idea helps explaining why states have different goals in international politics and how it changes over time (Ericson 2006:61).

6 Literature-review

This section consists of a review of literature written about these subjects. This is made in order to give a short outline of previous research in this area. The literature review is also done to identify possible factors and independent variables that might explain why Taiwan and Kosovo have not received full diplomatic recognition. It will then be possible to cumulatively continue the analysis partly based on previous research in this field. The literature-review is divided in two sections, starting off with Taiwan followed then by Kosovo. Each section begins with a short introduction of each case.

6.1 Taiwan

Following the Chinese communists' victory on the mainland 1949-50, nationalists fled to the island of Taiwan where they set up a new government. The US supported Taiwan for almost three decades which greatly benefitted their economical development and their security by the signing of a mutual defence treaty. Taiwan was recognized as the official representative of China in the UN until 1971 when it was replaced by the People's Republic of China (Encyclopaedia Britannica – "Taiwan" 2010). Today Taiwan has a strong economy, with a GDP per capita of $32,000, which ranks them as 41 in the world. Their economy is strongly dependent on export (CIA World Factbook – Taiwan 2010). Freedom house rate Taiwan as "Free" with high rankings in democracy (Freedom House – Taiwan 2010), and there are currently 22 states recognizing Taiwan (see Appendix A).

There is a vast selection of articles researching the case of Taiwan[4], and its struggle for recognition. China and Taiwan have a strong diplomatic rivalry when it comes to regions as the Pacific islands and Central America, where Taiwan has the main part of their recognizing allies (Rich 2009:168). China is strongly advocating its position called "*one China*", which basically is formulated as, there is only one China, and Taiwan is a part of it (Fossen 2007:126). Independency for Taiwan would therefore never be tolerated by China. Another important reason is that China fears that if Taiwan becomes an independent state it would legitimize secession of other Chinese regions as Tibet and Xinjiang. Because of the considerable influence and strength of China, many states avoid upsetting or

---

[4] ROC – Republic of China (Encyclopaedia Britannica – "Taiwan" 2010).

antagonise China by recognizing Taiwan, and by that deviate from the principles of "one China" (Fossen 2007:126f).

It has been suggested here that this struggle for recognition could be seen as a case of '*chequebook diplomacy*', where diplomatic recognition is given in return for aid (Atkinson 2010:408 & Rich 2009:171). Another term used for this is "*dollar diplomacy*". Often the state that offers the greatest aid, wins this struggle, where China and Taiwan continuously try to outbid each other. For instance the island-state Nauru has often changed their allegiance according to which state that could offer them the most money in aid (Fossen 2007:135 & 128). It is therefore often said that in diplomacy you can never buy friends, you can only rent them (Rich 2009:183 & Fossen 2007:138). However only five of the 14 pacific island states have during the last 30 years switched side and recognition from one of the rivals to the other (Atkinson 2010:413). Joel Atkinson who studies this rivalry between China and Taiwan in the Pacific regions estimates that China spent $100–150 million on its Pacific Islands allies in 2007, and that Taiwan at the same time annually spent $60–90 million on their allies. Although it is difficult to completely trust these figures because both states refuse to fully disclose exactly how much they spend (Atkinson 2010:411).

The economical factor plays a great role when it comes to the question if a state should recognize Taiwan and break the ties with China, or comply with China's demands. An interesting case is Costa Rica who revoked its recognition of Taiwan 2007. This was made for economical reasons as they thought a better relationship with China would benefit them in trade and investments (see Cheng & Córdobab 2009). However, it is not to say that trade with Taiwan has been a decisive factor for the few states that recognized Taiwan. Timothy S. Rich points out the fact that Taiwan's allies, in contrary to what one might think; in many cases are not their main trading partners. He argues instead that it is those states with relatively low trade that have recognized Taiwan, as they are not strongly dependent on trade, they have little economical incentives to establish close ties with China (Rich 2009:175). To trade with Taiwan you do not necessarily have to recognize them or as Anthony Van Fossen puts it, "*trade missions do not imply recognition*" (Fossen 2007:128). If you examine trade statistics for Taiwan and their 50 most important trading partners, none of these states recognize Taiwan. In addition to this it shows that China is actually Taiwan's most important trading partner when it comes to the value of total trade (Taiwan's Bureau of Foreign Trade 2010). This might falsify the hypothesis that a state's decision to recognize Taiwan goes hand in hand with a large trade exchange between them. Instead it would be suggested here, as Rich previously pointed out, that it is the recognizing state's trade with China that matters when they decide whether they should recognize, and not its trade with Taiwan.

In Timothy S. Rich quantitative study of Taiwan he tests several other variables apart from total exports. For instance he suggest that states located far away from China would be less likely to become influenced by China, and because of the lack of dependency of Beijing they are able to recognize Taiwan (Rich 2009:176f). In his analysis this proves to be correct to some extent, the larger the distance is between the state and Beijing the more likely they are to

recognize Taiwan (Rich 2009:177). He also suggests that democratic states might be more likely to recognize Taiwan as well. Taiwan could be seen as an exporter of democracy, and states might recognize them by democratic solidarity (Rich 2009:175).

.

6.2 Kosovo

Kosovo was an autonomous province within Serbia until 1989 when Serbia took control over their administration; which caused protests from the province's Albanian population. In 1998-99 Albanian secessionist rebellion escalated into a conflict with Serbia, this was followed by NATO air strikes and a withdrawal of Serbian forces from Kosovo. From 1999 onwards Kosovo was administered by the UN until their self-declared independency in 2008, an action which Serbia, backed by Russia, declared to be illegal. However in 2010 the International Court of Justice (ICJ) ruled that Kosovo's declaration of independence was not a violation of international law (Encyclopaedia Britannica – "Kosovo" 2010). Kosovo is a relatively poor country with a GDP per capita of only $2,500, which ranks them as 173 in the world. They have showed some progress in the transition to a marked-based economy, but their economy is still strongly dependent on its diaspora and the international community (CIA World Factbook – Kosovo 2010). The latest democracy ranking by Freedom House shows improvement as they have moved from a status of "Not Free" to "Partly Free" (Freedom House – Kosovo 2010). Today 72 states currently recognize Kosovo (see Appendix A).

In the case of recognition of Kosovo there is a more narrow variety of articles, with a special focus on international laws surrounding Kosovo's sovereignty (cf. Berg 2009), or how recognition of Kosovo as a sovereign state is needed as a prerequisite for democracy (Tansey 2007:131). The case of Kosovo as an independent state is rather new which could explain that there is not the same amount of research done on this subject compared to the case of Taiwan.

One of the main reasons for the limited recognition of Kosovo is said to be the lack of international consensus regarding the legal status of Kosovo as an independent state, and the fear of a domino effects in other conflict areas (Berg 2009:224). The recognition of Kosovo might have an impact of other secessionist conflict regions in the world (Berg 2009:220). This might have affected Spain's decision not to recognize Kosovo, who has experienced its own separatist unrest in regions as Catalonia and the Basque region. A Spanish recognition of Kosovo might legitimize these regions's claim for independency (BBC News 18-02-2008 & Sveriges Radio 05-02-2008). In the same manner both the republic of Cyprus and Moldova refuse to recognize Kosovo, as they both have experienced conflicts with Northern Cyprus and Transnistria (Berg 2009:228f). Edwin Bakker supports this idea as well, and points out that the recognition of Kosovo is a recipe for

worldwide trouble. The international community has always shown restraint from recognizing separatist or breakaway regions, a policy they have now abandoned (Bakker 2008:185). The case of Kosovo is said to raise questions if this would set a precedent for other breakaway regions and their claims for independency, this is what Eiki Berg denominate as the "*Kosovo Syndrome*" (Berg 2009:228). Russia used a similar argument when they opposed the western state's recognition of Kosovo (Nielsen 2009:174 & 178). In addition to this, Russia frequently referred to the case of the western countries policy on Kosovo when they tried to legitimize their own recognition and intervention of South Ossetia and Abkhazia the same year (Nielsen 2009:178). The recognition of Kosovo has therefore to some extent become a precedent for future recognition of states that seek secession. This is probably not the outcome that the EU and the US hoped for when they continually defined the case of Kosovo as "so unique", or *sui generis,* in order to legitimize their decision to recognize despite the legal controversies surrounding Kosovo's status as a sovereign state (Müllersson 2009:4 & Nielsen 2009:173).

Caspersen mentions the importance of powerful external players to help and promote recognition of a state as Kosovo. Where states with limited recognition often play '*the recognition game'* and try to imitate democratic ideals in order to be accepted by recognizing states. It is their belief that a state with a democratic constitution has more chances to be recognized by the international community (Capersen 2009:55f). This is made as a way to argue that they posses all necessary attributes of statehood, often with emphasis on democratic attributes (Caspersen 2009:49 & 52). This might attract other democratic states to recognize, but it is not said how these arguments are received by non-democratic regimes.

7   Hypotheses

Based on the chosen theoretical framework and research done in this area, five different hypotheses are formulated to be tested in the analysis. The hypothetical-deductive method of analysis requires a formulation of hypotheses which then are tested against empirical data (see Teorell & Svensson 2007:50f). The main hypotheses are based on economical factors, colonial solidarity and democratic solidarity as unifying factors for the two cases. This chapter starts out from the assumption that these are the common factors that affect states decision to not recognize Kosovo and Taiwan. There are two other alternative hypotheses formulated in this chapter. These alternative hypotheses will, however, differ between the different cases, as it is presumed that there may be explanations that are more tied to each particular case of non-recognition.

7.1   General unifying hypotheses

Hypothesis 1 – Economical Factors – Trade
Trade is an important factor when it comes to maintaining good relations with other states. This refers to the liberalism ideas about how market economy and trade are means for a more peaceful world. This hypothesis is also based on economical interdependency in the world, where states are mutually dependent on each other when it comes to trade. In Timothy S. Rich's article he pointed out that trade between Taiwan and its recognizing allies was actually low. Instead it is those states with a low amount of total trade who are more likely to recognize Taiwan. These states have low economical incentives to maintain good relations with China as they are not dependent on trade (Rich 2009:175). In the case of Taiwan, trade as an economical factor seems to be more dependent on the relationship with the disputer (China) than the recognizer's relationship with the claimer (Taiwan).

In the literature reviewed there is no support found for this hypothesis on the case of Kosovo. Economical factors are rarely mentioned or dealt with in the research done here. However based on the liberalism theory it is presumed that trade could be a causal factor behind non-recognition of Kosovo as well.

H1: A recognizing state with a relatively low amount of trade are less economically dependent on good relationship with the disputing state, thereby they are more likely to recognize Taiwan and Kosovo.

Hypothesis 2 – Democratic Solidarity

It has been suggested in the literature that democratic states might feel some kind of solidarity towards other democratic states (Rich 2009:175). Further support to these ideas is found in what Nina Caspersen calls the "*the recognition game*", in which the claiming state tries to imitate democratic attributes in order to show other states that they are in fact a legitimate democratic state (Capersen 2009:55f). Whether this tactic is successful is not said, however Timothy S. Rich tests for this in his analysis on Taiwan and finds significant support for this hypothesis (Rich 2009:175).

This hypothesis would be based on the liberalist-idea of the democratic peace, where states see democracy as the ideal and the instrument for world peace. Since democratic states have a lower tendency to wage war against each other promotion and support for a new state's democratic development would benefit the security of the recognizing state. It does also emphasize the liberalist idea about how a state's inner structure affects its foreign policy.

It is believed that this hypothesis is applicable on both Taiwan and Kosovo.

H2: Democratic states are more likely to recognize Kosovo and Taiwan, because they act out of democratic solidarity and wish to support the claiming state's democratic development.

Hypothesis 3 – Post-Colonial Solidarity

A majority of the world's states have a colonial origin, which means they have once been colonized by a colonial power and eventually received independency. It might exist a certain amount of colonial solidarity among these states. This is based on the same logic as in the previously stipulated hypothesis regarding democratic solidarity. Former colonized are plausible supporters of other states claim for secession and independency. Those states that have never been colonized might not feel the same solidarity, and might even fear these states's secession and how this would affect their own position. In this study this is represented by Taiwan's secession from China and Kosovo's independency from Serbia.

H3: States with a colonial origin are more likely to recognize Taiwan and Kosovo because of post-colonial solidarity and their wish to support other states claim for independency.

7.2 Hypothesis on the case: Taiwan

Hypothesis 4 – Economical factor – Foreign Aid

By examine the case of Taiwan it becomes clear that aid-packages in the form of money play an important role when it comes to the struggle for recognition. In the rivalry and diplomatic struggle between Taiwan and China they both use aid as an

instrument to persuade other states to support them. This is as mentioned before usually called *chequebook* or *dollar diplomacy*. Many of these recognizing states are poor and dependent on foreign aid; therefore recognition in return for money is an important economical incentive (cf. Atkinson 2010, Rich 2009, Fossen 2007). The interdependency in the world shows how states are mutually dependent on each other; Taiwan is dependent on state's diplomatic support for its existence while these states rely on Taiwan's economical support. Howsoever this interdependency is symmetrical is not said, the recognizing states could be more dependent on aid than Taiwan is dependent on their recognition. However the recognizing states have the option to seek foreign aid from someone else.

It is presumed here that this does not apply to the case of Kosovo, as they are in contrast to Taiwan a poor country and in need of foreign aid themselves (CIA World Factbook – Kosovo 2010).

H4: If the recognizing state is dependent on foreign aid they are more likely to recognize Taiwan in order to receive aid from them.

7.3   Hypothesis on the case: Kosovo

Hypothesis 5 - Fear of the domino-effect
The presence of separatist regions, autonomous regions or conflict areas in a recognizing state may affect their decision not to recognize Kosovo. The reason for this is that it would legitimize secession of regions in their own country. Recognition of Kosovo could be interpreted as a precedent for other regions or de facto states that claim secession and independency. The recognizing state is therefore cautious when it comes to recognizing Kosovo, as this could cause domestic implications and start a domino-effect in their own state. This is a hypothesis that is supported throughout the literature regarding Kosovo (cf. Müllersson 2009, Nielsen 2009, Berg 2009 & Bakker 2008). Further support for this hypothesis is found in the liberalism theory which emphasize that how a state acts internationally is based on domestic conditions. National interest-conflicts affect their decisions in foreign politics. In this case the presence of domestic interests for secession or independency is reflected in foreign politics by the decision not to recognize.

In the examination of previous research on Taiwan there is no particular support for this hypothesis. It is mentioned that China disapproves of Taiwan's independency partly based on their fear that this would legitimize secession of regions as Xinjiang and Tibet (Fossen 2007:126f). However this causal-factor belongs to the disputer (China) and not the recognizer as far as previous research has shown. This might be explained by the fact that Taiwan has been independent for a relatively long time. It is also not completely clear if Taiwan could be defined as a separatist or breakaway region of China. Thus with Kosovo it is more

evident that this state could be regarded as more of a separatist regions descended from a history of conflicts.

H5: If the recognizing state has its own regions or territories that claim secession and independency they are less likely to recognize Kosovo.

8 Operationalization

8.1 Dependent Variables

Two different dependent variables are used in the analysis, one for Taiwan and one for Kosovo. Both of them are coded as dummy variables. The value 1 – means that the state recognizes the claimer, and the value 0 – means that there is no recognition of the claiming state. According to the delimitations all UN member states are here represented. Source for the dependent variable for Taiwan is derived from Timothy S. Rich article (cf. Rich 2009:168), and the year of measurement is 2009. For Kosovo the variable comes from Kosovo's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and it is measured 2010 (see Kosovo MFA 2010). For further information about what states that recognized Taiwan and Kosovo see Appendix A.

8.2 Independent Variables

This section consists of a short presentation of the independent variables used in the research. They are based on the stipulated hypotheses, and represent an operationalization of those. The independent variables are derived from the QoG-Database.

The selection of the variables are based on four different criteria, (1) They should represent the foremost correct operationalization of the hypotheses, (2) The year of measurement should be close to today's date, (3) The variable shall include a majority of the world's states (i.e. a high value on N), and (4) the variable should be derived from a well-known source. To obtain intersubjectivity in this analysis all variables are presented with a short description as well as year of measurement, variable name and amount of included states.

Total Trade (% of GDP) – ea_tr (Easterly)
Year of measurement: 1995-1999, States included (N): 162
Easterly has derived this variable from IMF Government Finance Statistics (QoG Codebook 27-05-2010:155). It measures a state's total amount of export and import as a percentage of their Gross Domestic Product (QoG Codebook 27-05-2010:156f).

The variable is used to measure how dependent a state's economy is on trade, and it is based on hypothesis 1 on trade as an economical factor. However a minor reliability-flaw is the year of measurement which is relatively old in comparison with the other independent variables and especially the dependent variables. To adjust this, another variable by Gleditsch is used as a complement (see below).

Total Trade – gle_trade (Gleditsch)
Year of measurement: 2000, States included (N): 190

This variable comes from Gleditsch, who has complemented the trade data from IMF with alternative sources. It measures the sum of a countries export and import, in millions of current year (2000) US dollars (QoG Codebook 27-05-2010:96f).

Based on hypothesis 1 on trade as an economical factor this variable shows the total amount of trade, and presents how dependent a state's economy is of trade. This variable has a year of measurement which is more up-to date than Easterly's, and a greater amount of states included. However it is important to keep in mind that this variable only measures the total trade and not its percentage of GDP. It is in those terms an inferior operationalization of a state's dependency on trade.

Democracy status – fh_ipolity2 (Freedom House)
Year of measurement: 2002-2006, States included (N): 194

This variable is derived from the organization Freedom House who analyzes and ranks states' democracy status. The variable is in the scale 0 to 10, where 0 is the least democratic and 10 the most democratic. It is transformed from the average value of two other variables from Freedom House, Political Rights and Civil Liberties (QoG Codebook 27-05-2010:45). The variable is chosen because it consists of 10 values, and could thereby approximate an interval scale and be used in the regression analysis.

The variable is an operationalization of hypothesis 2 – Democratic solidarity, and it is supposed to measure if democratic states have a stronger tendency to recognize Taiwan and Kosovo.

Colonial Origin – ht_colonial (Hadenius & Teorell)
Year of measurement: 2005, States included (N): 192

Hadenius & Teorell's variable for colonial origin is here transformed into a dummy variable where 1 – means colonial origin and 0 – no colonial origin. Included are all states that have been colonized by a "western" state since 1700. Excluded are states colonized by none-western states and British settler colonies as the US, Canada, Australia, Israel and New Zeeland (QoG Codebook 27-05-2010:107).

Following hypothesis 3 on post-colonial solidarity this is an explicit operationalization of that hypothesis.

Net Development Assistance and Aid – wdi_aid (World Development Indicators)
Year of measurement: 2002-2006, States included (N): 163

The source for this variable is the OECD, and it measures the official development assistance, official aid flows and net of repayments in current US dollars (QoG Codebook 27-05-2010:151).

The QoG-database does not include a specific variable for the amount of received aid. This variable does instead indirectly measure a state's dependency of foreign aid, as a higher value on this variable would indicate that the state is a net-giver of aid, and a lower value would indicate that the state receives aid instead. This is based on hypothesis 4 – foreign aid as an economical factor.

Real GDP per Capita – gle_rgdp (Gleditsch)
Year of measurement: 2002, States included (N): 192

Another variable from Gleditsch, this variable measures the Real Gross Domestic Product per Capita in US Dollars with 2000 as the base year (QoG Codebook 27-05-2010:97).

This variable is used as a complement to hypothesis 4. The hypothesis constitutes that a state which is dependent on foreign aid is more likely to recognize Taiwan. The operationalization is based on the presumption that a state with a low GDP per Capita is poor and therefore dependent on foreign aid for survival.

Autonomous Regions – dpi_auton (Database of Political Institutions)
Year of measurement: 2001-2007, States included (N): 174

The variable is coded as a dummy variable, 1 – means there is an autonomous region in the state and 0 – no autonomous region. In the codebook it is stated that an autonomous region is defined as a region, area or district in the state that is autonomous or self-governing. Excluded from this definition are capital or federal districts, disputed autonomy and Indian reservations (QoG Codebook 27-05-2010:87).

This is an operationalization of hypothesis 5 – fear of the domino-effect.

9   Analysis

SPSS's "collinearity diagnostic" was used to measure the multicollinearity between the independent variables in all analyses. The result shows that all variables have an accepted value on multicollinearity, with Tolerance and VIF well inside the accepted limits. Highest VIF measured was about 1.7 and lowest Tolerance was around 0.6.

The result presented here is derived from the analyses made in SPSS. Independent variables are presented with the B-coefficients and the significance (p-value) put in parenthesis. In each regression-model the total amount of included states (N) and the proportion of explained variance (Nagelkerke R Sqaure) are presented.

Further comments for the reader are that the two different variables for trade are never used in the same model as they are operationalizations of the same hypothesis, for the same reason the variables for Foreign Aid and GDP per Capita are never used in the same model.

9.1   Taiwan

Disputer: China (Excluded from the analysis)
Claimer: Taiwan (Excluded from the analysis)
Recognizers: 192 member states of the UN, except for the disputing and claiming state

Dependent Variable: Diplomatic Recognition of Taiwan

Model:	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Total Trade (% of GDP)		.002 (.747)	.009 (.155)		
Total Trade (Gleditsch)	.000 (.162)			.000 (.136)	.000 (.175)
Democracy Status	. 233** (.026)	.178 (.125)	. 268** (.032)	. 324*** (.005)	. 179 (.145)
Colonial	-19.064 (.997)	-19.630 (.998)	-19.304 (.997)	-18.725 (.996)	-18.809 (.996)
Net Aid & Assistance	.000 (.300)	.000 (.223)			
Real GDP per Capita			.000 (.268)	.000 (.534)	.000 (.482)
Autonomous Region					1.799 (.103)
N	158	137	160	187	169
Pseudo R Square (Nagelkerke R Square)	.328	.239	.274	.386	.303

***$p \leq 0.01$; **$p \leq 0.05$; *$p \leq 0.10$. Two tailed tests.

The first four models are based on the stipulated hypotheses. Therefore the variable for autonomous region is excluded, since it is assumed that hypothesis 5 – fear of the domino-effect, does not apply to the case of Taiwan. However that variable is included in the fifth model to see if it has any significant effect and if the decision to exclude it from the other models were correct to begin with.

The result shows no significant support for trade, foreign aid, GDP per capita or colonial origin as an explanatory for diplomatic recognition on Taiwan. However democracy seems to have a significant effect on diplomatic recognition. Democracy status is significant on at least a 5 %-significance level, holding all

other variables constant. Democracy has a positive effect on diplomatic recognition, which means that a higher level of democracy for a recognizing state increases the tendency for diplomatic recognition of Taiwan, which also confirms hypothesis 2 – democratic solidarity. Furthermore the strongest model when it comes to explaining diplomatic recognition of Taiwan is model number 4, where 38.6 % of the variances in the dependent variable could be explained by this model. It is also the model with the highest amount of included states (N = 187 out of 192), and the democracy status is significant on a 1 %-significance level, when holding all other variables constant.

9.2 Kosovo

Disputer: Serbia (Excluded from the analysis)
Claimer: Kosovo (Excluded from the analysis)
Recognizers: 192 member states of the UN, except for the disputing and claiming state

Dependent Variable: Diplomatic Recognition of Kosovo

Model:	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Total Trade (% of GDP)		.006 (.136)		.002 (.624)	
Total Trade (Gleditsch)	.000* (.096)		. 000 (.382)		.000 (.412)
Democracy Status	.171*** (.007)	.280*** (.000)	.130** (.043)	.179** (.025)	.093 (.162)
Colonial	1.627*** (.000)	1.508*** (.000)	1.404*** (.001)	.942** (.046)	1.363*** (.002)
Net Aid & Assistance					.000 (.293)
Real GDP per Capita			.000** (.016)	.000*** (.004)	
Autonomous Regions	1.492** (.016)	.878 (.116)	1.459** (.023)	1.175* (.068)	2.078* (.058)
N	170	155	170	155	147
Pseudo R Square (Nagelkerke R Square)	.331	.341	.366	.401	.179

***$p \leq 0.01$; **$p \leq 0.05$; *$p \leq 0.10$. Two tailed tests.

The first two models are based on the stipulated hypotheses. Therefore the variables for foreign aid, GDP per Capita and Total trade are excluded since it is assumed that hypothesis 4 – foreign aid does not apply to the case of Kosovo. However those variables are included in the three other models in order to see if they have any significant effect and if the decision to exclude them from the other models were correct to begin with.

This analysis seems to show stronger support for the hypotheses in comparison with the analysis of Taiwan, both in the amount of significant variables but also in a generally higher value of explained variance. Total trade is only significant on a

10 %-significance level in the first model, and no significant support for hypothesis 1 is found in the other models. In addition to this it seems to have a positive effect on diplomatic recognition, higher amount of total trade increases the tendency to recognize Kosovo. This opposes the stipulated hypothesis which says that states with a low amount of trade are said to have a stronger tendency to recognize Kosovo. Hypothesis 1 could therefore be rejected.

Both democracy and colonial origin seem to have a strong significant effect on diplomatic recognition. These variables are significant on a 1 %-significant level in the first two models when holding all other variables constant, and still a steady significance in the three other models. Both show a positive effect on diplomatic recognition, which means that higher level of democracy in the recognizing state and a colonial origin would increase the tendency to recognize Kosovo. This follows the stipulated hypotheses, and both hypothesis 2 – democratic solidarity and hypothesis 3 – post-colonial solidarity could be confirmed to apply to the case of Kosovo.

The variable for autonomous regions is significant on a 5 %-significant level when holding all other variables constant in the first model. However it has a positive effect on diplomatic recognition, meaning that the presence of an autonomous region in the recognizing state increases the tendency to recognize Kosovo. This is in direct contravention to hypothesis 5, where it is instead said that the presence of an autonomous region would decrease the tendency to recognize Kosovo. Hypothesis 5 could therefore be rejected.

Foreign aid and GDP per Capita are not generally supported in this analysis as hypothesis 4 of foreign aid is assumed not to apply to the case of Kosovo. However these two variables are included in the last three models to see if it was a correct decision to exclude them from the analysis of Kosovo. GDP per Capita is here significant on a 5 %-significance level when holding all other variables constant. However it shows a positive effect on diplomatic recognition. In contrast to the stipulated hypothesis a higher value in GDP per Capita also increases the tendency towards recognition of Kosovo. It seems like this hypothesis does not apply to the case of Kosovo then.

9.3   Reflection on the results

In the analysis it seems like hypothesis 2 - democratic solidarity proves to be the unifying factor to explain diplomatic recognition. For Taiwan it was hereto the only variable with significant explanation value. A conclusion drawn from this is that the decision not to recognize another state is based on the recognizing states inner political structure. Liberalists would explain this by pointing out how a state's foreign policy is dependent on its internal structure. Democracy is seen as the ideal for other democratic states, and they would thereby support states democratic development. Liberalists do also talk about individuals inborn right

and civil liberties, a conventional thesis would be that the citizens in a democratic state feel solidarity with the citizens in Kosovo and Taiwan and their demands for independency and liberty. States with a low level of democracy do not share the same democratic values of rights and liberty; therefore they are less likely to recognize Taiwan and Kosovo, and other states in general, if a generalization is drawn from these two cases.

For the individual case of Kosovo, support for hypothesis 3 – post-colonial solidarity was found. The post-colonial solidarity is based on the same logic as the democratic solidarity and is supported by the liberalist theory. States with citizens that have once been colonized and eventually received independency are more likely to support Kosovo's secession and search for liberty and recognition. On the other hand, a state which has never been under colonial rule does not feel the same solidarity. They might even fear this trend of states seeking independency and secession.

Hypothesis 5 is rejected because it has a positive effect on diplomatic recognition. The presence of autonomous regions in the recognizing state seems to increase the likelihood that they would recognize Kosovo. However closer analyze of this hypothesis shows that there is actually no significant difference between states with and without autonomous regions when it comes to recognition of Kosovo (see appendix A).

It is important to be cautious while looking at the result from this study. There are still many aspects of diplomatic recognition which need to be taken into account. In the same way as a quantitative method has its advantageous there are still complex factors behind diplomatic recognition that are difficult to analyze with this method. The presence of alliances, historical relations between states, cultural similarities, international laws and external players influence (cf. Capersen 2009:55f) are other possible factors behind diplomatic recognition. These factors are complicated to operationalize into numerical values and analyze quantitatively. Cases-studies could be more efficient when it comes to these alternative factors behind the decision not to recognize other states. The analysis is also dependent on the variables offered by the QoG-database; this limits the operationalization to some extent. Alternative variables derived from other databases might further improve the result.

10 Conclusion

The purpose of this study has been to explain why some states have not received recognition from the international community and how this foreign policy decision could be explained. There has also been a focus on Taiwan and Kosovo as individual cases, and whether there exist certain factors behind non-recognition only applicable on these cases. The analyses are based on the liberalism theory, which is used to explain diplomatic recognition.

The results from the quantitative analyses show that the hypothesis of democratic solidarity is the unifying factor behind diplomatic recognition. Democratic states are more likely to recognize other states. Thus recognizing states with other political systems do not feel the same democratic solidarity and this explains why they do not recognize other states. This corroborates the liberalist theory as well.

When it comes to the individual cases, the non-recognition of Taiwan seems to be difficult to explain with other hypotheses than democratic solidarity. The factors behind the non-recognition of Kosovo seem to have more support among the stipulated hypotheses. Apart from democratic solidarity, the hypothesis of colonial solidarity is strongly supported. States without a colonial origin are believed not to feel solidarity for Kosovo's independency and by that they are less likely to recognize them.

As said before it is important to be humble and cautious while drawing conclusions from this study. Quantitative analyses have their advantageous but are not able to cover all the factors behind diplomatic recognition. Additional studies need to be conducted and further material needs to be analyzed on this subject. However this study is a start and it shows how liberalism could explain how democratic values play an important role when it comes to diplomatic recognition. At the same time it offers a model for studying this research-problem quantitatively.

11 References

Atkinson, Joel, 2010. "China-Taiwan diplomatic competition and the Pacific Islands." The Pacific Review 23, no. 4 (August 2010): 407-427.

Bakker, Edwin, 2008. "The recognition of Kosovo: Violating territorial integrity is a recipe for trouble." Security and Human Rights 19.3 (2008): 183-186.

Berg, Eiki, 2009. "Re-Examining Sovereignty Claims in Changing Territorialities: Reflections from 'Kosovo Syndrome'." Geopolitics 14, no. 2 (April 2009): 219-234.

BBC News, 18-02-2008. "Recognition for new Kosovo grows". http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/7251359.stm (Retrieved: 26-11-2010).

Caspersen, Nina, 2009. "Playing the Recognition Game: External Actors and De Facto States". International Spectator 44, no. 4 (December 2009): 47-60.

Cheng, Joseph Y. S - Córdobab, Thaís M. 2009. "The Establishment of Diplomatic Relations with China: A Study of Costa Rica's Rationale". The Journal of Comparative Asian Development vol. 8, no. 2 (February 2009): 333—364.

CIA World Factbook, Kosovo, 30-11-2010. "Kosovo: Economy – Overview". https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/kv.html (Retrieved: 09-12-2010)

CIA World Factbook, Taiwan, 08-12-2010. "Taiwan: Economy - Overview". https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/tw.html (Retrieved: 13-12-2010)

CIA World Factbook, Western Sahara, 24-11-2010. "Western Sahara: Transnational Issues". https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/wi.html (Retrieved: 13-12-2010)

Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia, 2010. "Recognition". Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia, 6th Edition (Juli 2010): 1. Academic Search Complete, EBSCOhost (Retrieved: 9-11-2010).

Encyclopædia Britannica. "International law: Recognition", 2010. Retrieved December 26, 2010, from Encyclopædia Britannica Online: http://www.britannica.com.ludwig.lub.lu.se/EBchecked/topic/291011/international-law

Encyclopædia Britannica. "Kosovo", 2010. Retrieved December 13, 2010, from Encyclopædia Britannica Online: http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/322726/Kosovo

Encyclopædia Britannica. "Taiwan", 2010. Retrieved December 13, 2010, from Encyclopædia Britannica Online:
http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/580902/Taiwan

Ericson, Magnus 2006 'Liberalism', in Jakob Gustavsson and Jonas Tallberg (red), "Internationella Relationer". Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Fossen V., Anthony. "The Struggle for Recognition: Diplomatic Competition Between China and Taiwan in Oceania." Journal of Chinese Political Science 12, no. 2 (August 2007): 125-146.

Freedom house, Kosovo. 2010 "Country Report: Kosovo (2010)". http://www.freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=22&year=2010&country=7972 (Retrieved: 13-12-2010)

Freedom house, Taiwan. 2010. "Country Report: Taiwan (2010)". http://www.freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=22&year=2010&country=7929 (Retrieved: 13-12-2010)

Garson, David, 11-19-2010. "Multiple Regression: multicollinearity" http://faculty.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/PA765/regress.htm#multicollinearity (Retrieved: 21-12-2010)

Garson, David, 05-20-2010. "Logistic regression", http://faculty.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/PA765/logistic.htm (Retrieved: 21-12-2010)

Hillier, Tim, 1998. "Sourcebook on public international law". London: Cavendish Publishing Limited.

Kant, Immanuel, 1796. "Project for a Perpetual Peace", printed by: Stephen Couchman. London: Vernor and Hood.

Kosovo MFA, 2010. "Countries that have recognized the Republic of Kosova". http://www.mfa-ks.net/?page=2,33 (Retrieved: 09-12-2010)

Körner, Svante – Wahlgren, Lars, 2006. Statistisk Dataanalys. Lund: Studentlitteratur. 4th ed.

Montevideo Convention, 1933. http://www.jus.uio.no/english/services/library/treaties/01/1-02/rights-duties-states.xml

http://www.cfr.org/publication/15897/montevideo_convention_on_the_rights_and_duties_of_states.html (Retrieved: 17-11-2010)

Müllerson, Rein, 2009. "Precedents in the Mountains: On the Parallels and Uniqueness of the Cases of Kosovo, South Ossetia and Abkhazia." Chinese Journal of International Law 8, no. 1 (March 2009): 2-25.

Nielsen, Christian Axboe, 2009. "The Kosovo precedent and the rhetorical deployment of former Yugoslav analogies in the cases of Abkhazia and South Ossetia." *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies* 9.1-2 (2009): 171-189.

O'Brien, John, 2001. "International Law". London: Cavendish Publishing Limited.

Pallant, Julie, 2004. "SPSS survival manual a step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for Windows (version 12)". St Leonards: Allen & Unwin.

QoG-Database, 24-05-2010. "The QOG Data". http://www.qog.pol.gu.se/data/data_1.htm (Retrieved: 17-11-2010)

QoG Codebook, 27-05-2010. "The Quality of Government Dataset Codebook". http://www.qog.pol.gu.se/data/QoG_Codebook_v27May10.pdf (Retrieved: 17-11-2010)

Rich, Timothy S., 2009. "Status for Sale: Taiwan and the Competition for Diplomatic Recognition", Issues & Studies vol. 45, nr. 4 (December 2009), 159-188.

Sveriges Radio Ekot, 05-02-2008. "Spanien erkänner in Kosovo". http://sverigesradio.se/sida/artikel.aspx?programid=83&artikel=1905043 (Retrieved: 17-11-2010)

Taiwan's Bureau of Foreign Trade 2010. "Value of exports and imports by country: Time Period: 2010/01 - 2010/09". http://cus93.trade.gov.tw/ENGLISH/FSCE/ (Retrieved: 24-11-2010)

Tansey, Oisín, 2007. "Democratization without a State: Democratic Regime-building in Kosovo." *Democratization* 14, no. 1 (February 2007): 129-150.

Teorell, Jan – Svensson, Torsten, 2007. Att fråga och att svara. Samhällsvetenskaplig metod. Malmö: Liber.

UN Press Release ORG/1469. 3 July 2006. "United Nations Member States". http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2006/org1469.doc.htm (Retrieved: 22-11-2010)

12 Appendix A

12.1 Recognition of States

	States	Kosovo	Taiwan	Recognition of Both
1	Afghanistan	1		
2	Albania	1		
3	Algeria			
4	Andorra			
5	Angola			
6	Antigua and Barbuda			
7	Argentina			
8	Armenia			
9	Australia	1		
10	Austria	1		
11	Azerbaijan			
12	Bahamas			
13	Bahrain	1		
14	Bangladesh			
15	Barbados			
16	Belarus			
17	Belgium	1		
18	Belize	1	1	x
19	Benin			
20	Bhutan			
21	Bolivia			
22	Bosnia and Herzegovina			
23	Botswana			
24	Brazil			
25	Brunei Darussalam			
26	Bulgaria	1		
27	Burkina Faso	1	1	x
28	Burundi			
29	Cambodia			
30	Cameroon			
31	Canada	1		
32	Cape Verde			

33	Central African Republic				
34	Chad				
35	Chile				
36	China				
37	Colombia	1			
38	Comoros	1			
39	Congo (Republic of the)				
40	Costa Rica	1			
41	Côte d'Ivoire				
42	Croatia	1			
43	Cuba				
44	Cyprus				
45	Czech Republic	1			
46	Democratic People's Republic of Korea	1			
47	Democratic Republic of the Congo				
48	Denmark	1			
49	Djibouti	1			
50	Dominica				
51	Dominican Republic	1	1	x	
52	Ecuador				
53	Egypt				
54	El Salvador		1		
55	Equatorial Guinea				
56	Eritrea				
57	Estonia	1			
58	Ethiopia				
59	Fiji				
60	Finland	1			
61	France	1			
62	Gabon				
63	Gambia	1	1	x	
64	Georgia				
65	Germany	1			
66	Ghana				
67	Greece				
68	Grenada				
69	Guatemala		1		
70	Guinea				
71	Guinea-Bissau				
72	Guyana				
73	Haiti		1		
74	Honduras	1	1	x	
75	Hungary	1			
76	Iceland	1			

77 India				
78 Indonesia				
79 Iran				
80 Iraq				
81 Ireland	1			
82 Israel				
83 Italy	1			
84 Jamaica				
85 Japan	1			
86 Jordan	1			
87 Kazakhstan				
88 Kenya				
89 Kiribati	1	1	x	
90 Kuwait				
91 Kyrgyzstan				
92 Lao People's Democratic Republic				
93 Latvia	1			
94 Lebanon				
95 Lesotho				
96 Liberia	1			
97 Libya				
98 Liechtenstein	1			
99 Lithuania	1			
100 Luxembourg	1			
101 Madagascar				
102 Malawi	1			
103 Malaysia	1			
104 Maldives	1			
105 Mali				
106 Malta	1			
107 Marshall Islands	1	1	x	
108 Mauritania	1			
109 Mauritius				
110 Mexico				
111 Micronesia (Federated States of)	1			
112 Monaco	1			
113 Mongolia				
114 Montenegro	1			
115 Morocco				
116 Mozambique				
117 Myanmar				
118 Namibia				
119 Nauru	1	1	x	
120 Nepal				

121	Netherlands	1			
122	New Zealand	1			
123	Nicaragua		1		
124	Niger				
125	Nigeria				
126	Norway	1			
127	Oman				
128	Pakistan				
129	Palau	1	1	x	
130	Panama	1	1	x	
131	Papua New Guinea				
132	Paraguay		1		
133	Peru	1			
134	Philippines				
135	Poland	1			
136	Portugal	1			
137	Qatar				
138	Republic of Korea				
139	Republic of Moldova				
140	Romania				
141	Russian Federation				
142	Rwanda				
143	Saint Kitts and Nevis		1		
144	Saint Lucia		1		
145	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		1		
146	Samoa	1			
147	San Marino	1			
148	Sao Tome and Principe		1		
149	Saudi Arabia	1			
150	Senegal	1			
151	Serbia				
152	Seychelles				
153	Sierra Leone	1			
154	Singapore				
155	Slovakia				
156	Slovenia	1			
157	Solomon Islands		1		
158	Somalia	1			
159	South Africa				
160	Spain				
161	Sri Lanka				
162	Sudan				
163	Suriname				
164	Swaziland	1	1	x	

165	Switzerland	1		
166	Sweden	1		
167	Syria			
168	Tajikistan			
169	Thailand			
170	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	1		
171	Timor Leste			
172	Togo			
173	Tonga			
174	Trinidad and Tobago			
175	Tunisia			
176	Turkey	1		
177	Turkmenistan			
178	Tuvalu	1	1	x
179	Uganda			
180	Ukraine			
181	United Arab Emirates	1		
182	United Kingdom	1		
183	United of Republic of Tanzania			
184	United States	1		
185	Uruguay			
186	Uzbekistan			
187	Vanuatu	1		
188	Venezuela			
189	Viet Nam			
190	Yemen			
191	Zambia			
192	Zimbabwe			
	Total:	**72**	**22**	**12**

Sources:

UN Member States: UN Press Release ORG/1469. 3 July 2006. "United Nations Member States".
http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2006/org1469.doc.htm (Accessed: 22-11-2010)

Recognition of Taiwan: Rich, Timothy S., 2009. "Status for Sale: Taiwan and the Competition for Diplomatic Recognition", Issues & Studies vol. 45, nr. 4 (December 2009), 159-188. On page 168.

Recognition of Kosovo: Kosovo MFA, 2010. "Countries that have recognized the Republic of Kosova". http://www.mfa-ks.net/?page=2,33 (Accessed: 09-12-2010)

12.2 Autonomous Regions and Kosovo

Further analysis made in SPSS on the case of Kosovo and Autonomous regions effect on diplomatic recognition. The analysis shows no significant difference between states with or without autonomous regions when it comes to recognition of Kosovo.

Autonomous regions * Recognition of Kosovo Crosstabulation

			Recognition of Kosovo		
			,00	1,00	Total
Autonomous regions	0. No autonomous regions	Count	93	53	146
		Expected Count	93,9	52,1	146,0
		% within Recognition of Kosovo	84,5%	86,9%	85,4%
	1. Autonomous regions	Count	17	8	25
		Expected Count	16,1	8,9	25,0
		% within Recognition of Kosovo	15,5%	13,1%	14,6%
Total		Count	110	61	171
		Expected Count	110,0	61,0	171,0
		% within Recognition of Kosovo	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	,172[a]	1	,678		
Continuity Correction[b]	,036	1	,850		
Likelihood Ratio	,174	1	,676		
Fisher's Exact Test				,822	,431
Linear-by-Linear Association	,171	1	,679		
N of Valid Cases	171				

a. 0 cells (,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8,92.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table