This is a high-quality master thesis. The candidate stimulated readers' interests from the start using a stand-alone and self-contained title. She then presented her readers with preambles that are accessible, concise, and informative. Readers gained a clear understanding of the author's motivation, theoretical framework, data source, relations between key variables, as well as the main results, before arriving at the main text of the thesis. By guiding the readers with a sharp first impression and clear expectations, the candidate has successfully demonstrated her mastery of academic communication skills.

The main body of this thesis presents corroborating evidence of the author's capability in organising literature and her domain knowledge. The candidate contextualised her motivation for conducting this study upon a rich body of prior studies and citations. She then clearly identified the knowledge gap in existing literature and presented her research questions and study designs as a natural derivation from this literature review. Subsequently, the thesis guided the readers with detailed definitions and further references for all key words and variables, with cares being given to commonly confused concepts such as "innovation" versus "innovativeness" (p. 3). Relations between variables were exhaustively interrogated, with corresponding hypotheses being backed up by prior literature. The candidate's ability to synthesise large amount of, at times conflicting, information into insightful excursions is one strength of this thesis.

The quantitative analysis sections served to highlight the candidate's scientific reasoning and analytical thinking skills. The author presented convincing argument for establishing her multilevel structural equation models by mapping theoretical concepts into their corresponding input, mediating and outcome variables. In addition, the author clearly explained and justified the necessity and interpretation of contextual effect, adding one more contribution to existing literature. The candidate subsequently presented sufficient information about her statistical approach by reporting sampling weights treatment, intra-class correlations, computer packages and estimator employed for her analyses. With exceptions such as the interpretation of FIML (pp. 27--28), the candidate presented herself as a well-trained and highly disciplined methodologist in her chosen field.

In addition, there is ample evidence supporting the author's competence in representation, interpretation, relating model results to existing literature through sophisticated scientific writing. For example, statistical output has been purposefully selected for interpretation into accessible English, hence greatly aiding policy considerations. Parameters failing to reach significance criteria were consistently anchored into reasonable conjectures based on prior studies. Limitations such as non-causal interpretation of study outcome were correctly highlighted with alternative designs proposed (p. 46). The conclusions provided on pages 47 and 48 were appropriate in scope although additional justification such as causality is desired before elevating these observed correlations into advocacy for policy changes.

Finally, the candidate demonstrated her consideration to research ethics using extensive GDPR documentation in Appendix A. For an improved reference list, the candidate may review these sections of the *APA7 Manual*: 9.19, 9.25, 9.33, 9.38 (Example 41 of Chapter 10), and 10.6.