BACHELOR'S THESIS EXAMINER REPORT
PPE – Bachelor's in Politics, Philosophy and Economics
Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

Thesis title:	**Considering Japanese political apologies to China**
Student's name:	**Yimin Bu**
Referee's name:	**Mgr. Aleš Michal**

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
Major Criteria			
	Contribution and argument (quality of research and analysis, originality)	**50**	40
	Research question (definition of objectives, plausibility of hypotheses)	**15**	7
	Theoretical framework (methods relevant to the research question)	**15**	10
Total		*80*	57
Minor Criteria			
	Sources, literature	**10**	8
	Presentation (language, style, cohesion)	**5**	4
	Manuscript form (structure, logical coherence, layout, tables, figures)	**5**	2
Total		*20*	13
TOTAL		*100*	71

Plagiarism-check (URKUND) match score:
[NB:] If the plagiarism-check (URKUND) match score is above 15%, the reviewer has to include his/her assessment of the originality of the reviewed thesis in his/her review.

Reviewer's commentary according to the above criteria (min. 1800 characters including spaces when recommending a passing grade, min. 2500 characters including spaces when recommending a failing grade):

Yimin Bu selected a super interesting topic for the BA thesis, focusing on Japanese apologies to China. This research subject is highly relevant in contemporary international relations in Asia, making it a significant contribution to current research in the overlapping fields of political memory & international relations.

However, there are some formal issues that would be mentioned, as they make the text somewhat confusing. Foremost, aligning the text to block format would enhance readability. Additionally, I am unsure if the subchapter titles adhere to standard formatting: better graphic differentiation is needed there. These all are more likely kind of minor points and suggestions for future improvement of the student's work.

In terms of research value and potential to contribute, there are several ways the thesis could be enhanced. While I understand your decision on p. 10 to eschew a comparative analysis (and I am completely OK with this approach), I believe integrating more contextual literature on political apologies in international relations, post-war intentions, and potential political aftermaths would strengthen the theoretical background. Unfortunately, therefore, the thesis lacks a solid theoretical foundation, even though the argument that within-location relations are specific is valid and I admit limitations from this perspective. On the contrary, the text offers a wide historical basis, clearly outlining the key developments in bilateral relations. The effort and quality of work in this part are beyond doubts.

Some methodological aspects need better explanation, especially the sincerity scoring, which would be difficult to replicate as presented. The thesis actually includes two single empirical analyses: the use of regression analysis in the second one is interesting, but not all parameters are clearly marked and described, as particularly projected in the regression tables. Nonetheless, I appreciate the effort to incorporate this type of analysis to this topic.

Besides, there is a more serious issue with the second part of the empirical analysis: the hypotheses are formulated within the core of the analysis without clearly following the theory. This is not necessarily a failure, but it should be discussed more thoroughly. Tables and figures are underdeveloped: for example, on p. 6, you labelled a line chart as a 'table' and used an inappropriate type of chart to capture points.

Overall, despite all these issues, I appreciate the systematic work, which utilizes interesting sources and aims to fill a research gap in a field lacking comprehensive contextual studies. The empirical analysis meets the demands of a BA thesis by a solid way. Proposed grade: C.

Proposed grade (A-B-C-D-E-F): C

Suggested questions for the defence are:
1) What are the main differences between Asian and European approach to post-war political apologies?
2) Can you please describe briefly your advance in collecting data for the second part of empirical analysis?

I 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.