Joint Dissertation Review

Name of the student:	Karolina Kucerova
Title of the thesis:	Third Culture Kids on Navigating Cultural Identities
Reviewer:	Joan Miró (UPF)

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

The literature review is solid and well-linked to the research objectives of the thesis. Minor point: in the literature review, it is not clear why the author devotes so much space to explain the process of cultural adjustment of expatriates, since although connected, it does not seem relevant to the research objectives of the thesis.

On the basis of the literature review, a gap in the literature and thereby a research question are identified. The justification of the relevance of this gap is solid.

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

The theoretical framework is not original but drawn from existing research. No innovations to this framework are added. However, the framework fits well the research purposes of the thesis.

The author shows an understanding of research design, i.e. of the relationship of theory to methodology. The rationale for and merits of adopting the methods used are well-explained.

Minor point: an appendix with information about the interviewees (age, period of expatriation, country of expatriation, date of the interview, and so on) would have been welcomed. Little information about the population is provided.

Controlling for the country of expatriation as a variable would have been beneficial in terms of research design.

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

The empirical analysis shows a solid application of the theoretical concepts to the empirical data.

In my opinion, at times, the findings appear to be a bit too intuitive, that is, they do not seem particularly original.

The main limitation of the analysis is that it is purely descriptive; this is most clearly seen in discussion section, which is limited to a description of the individual trajectory of each participant. No attempt at explaining these differences, or at drawing broader implications is attempted. This is seen in the section "Contribution to the academic & theoretical debate", in which it is not explained how the

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

The thesis is well-written and follows the academic conventions.

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

The thesis shows that the author has carried out a significant volume of research, both in terms of revising the literature as well as in terms of data collection and interpretation.

The empirical analysis is methodologically solid, but its academic, social and/or policy relevance is not clear.

Grade (A-F)	B – UPF scale: 8
Date	Signature
27/06/2024	

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'.