IMESS DISSERTATION

Note: Please email the completed mark sheet to Year 2 coordinator (jiri.vykoukal@post.cz)

Please note that IMESS students are <u>not</u> required to use a particular set of methods (e.g. qualitative, quantitative, or comparative) in their dissertation.

Student:	Yu Zhong
Dissertation title:	Customer Satisfaction's Mediation Role in the Relationship Between Service Quality and Customer Loyalty: Evidence From ČSOB

	70+	69-65	64-60	59-55	54-50	<50
	A	B	C	D	E	F
Knowledge *Knowledge of problems involved, e.g. historical and social context, specialist literature on the topic. Evidence of capacity to gather information through a wide and appropriate range of reading, and to digest and process knowledge.*		X				
Analysis & Interpretation *Demonstrates a clear grasp of concepts. Application of appropriate methodology and understanding; willingness to apply an independent approach or interpretation recognition of alternative interpretations; Use of precise terminology and avoidance of ambiguity; avoidance of excessive generalisations or gross oversimplifications.*			X			
Structure & Argument *Demonstrates ability to structure work with clarity, relevance and coherence. Ability to argue a case; clear evidence of analysis and logical thought; recognition of an argument limitation or alternative views; Ability to use other evidence to support arguments and structure appropriately.*		X				
Presentation & Documentation *Accurate and consistently presented footnotes and bibliographic references; accuracy of grammar and spelling; correct and clear presentation of charts/graphs/tables or other data. Appropriate and correct referencing throughout. Correct and contextually correct handling of quotations.*			X			
Methodology *Understanding of techniques applicable to the chosen field of research, showing an ability to engage in sustained independent research.*		X				

ECTS Mark:	C/63	**UCL Mark:**	63	**Marker:**	Ilias Chondrogiannis
Deducted for late submission:				**Signed:**	Ilias Chondrogiannis
Deducted for inadequate referencing:				**Date:**	07/09/2023

MARKING GUIDELINES

A (UCL mark 70+): *Note: marks of over 80 are given rarely and only for truly exceptional pieces of work.*
Distinctively sophisticated and focused analysis, critical use of sources and insightful interpretation. Comprehensive understanding of techniques applicable to the chosen field of research, showing an ability to engage in sustained independent research.

B (UCL mark 65-69):
A high level of analysis, critical use of sources and insightful interpretation. Good understanding of techniques applicable to the chosen field of research, showing an ability to engage in sustained independent research.

C (UCL mark 60-61):
Some evidence of critical analysis, knowledgeable interpretation. Wide range of sources used to develop a logic and coherent argument. Good understanding of techniques applicable to the chosen

field of research, the extent of independent research could have improved.

D (UCL mark 59-55):
Employ relevant sources and show ability to engage in systematic inquiry. Little critical analysis of the material. It demonstrate methodological awareness but the standard and rigor of the analysis can improve.

E (UCL mark 54-50):
Mostly descriptive argument. Employ relevant but limited sources. The structure, logic and overall quality of the argument needs improvement.

F (UCL mark less than 50):
Demonstrates failure to use sources and an inadequate ability to engage in systematic inquiry. Inadequate evidence of ability to engage in sustained research work and poor understanding of appropriate research techniques.

Comments, explaining strengths and weaknesses (_at least 300 words_):

The dissertation covers an interesting topic using a very wide array of methodologies and provides some background in regional banking and customer satisfaction. The literature review could provide some more insight of stylised facts about the operating environment of CSOB, its competitors, customer needs etc so the findings can be contextualised better. The research method is mixed and very ambitious, as there is a clear attempt to cover in detail both the qualitative and the quantitative part. However, there is no methodological justification for this approach, although plausible. There is no explanation why or how factor analysis, structural equations etc are suitable for the research question. The most important drawback is that the methodological choices for each method, parametrisation, models, description etc are very inadequately presented, leaving the reader to guess how the results were extracted. As an example, Table 3.1, which is key in understanding the method, is generic and there is no connection to the specifics of the bank and the case at hand. Another example is section 5.5.3, where virtually nothing is discussed about the regressions. There is a large gap between the effort put in expanding and the effort put in putting everything under perspective, explaining the method to the reader and convincing that those choices are correct. The research requirement of replicability (every piece of work is self-standing and should produce the same results with the same data while providing enough information on how those results are derived) is not upheld. A positive aspect is the great effort put in combining qualitative and quantitative methodologies. In most cases the results do not leave much space for discussion, as there are few controversies or actually interesting points. In that respect, the conclusion does what it can with the findings and any policy suggestions are limited, but at least it is well-written.

Specific questions you would like addressing at the oral defence (_at least 2 questions_):

1) What is the motivation behind the research question, in more detail?
2) Given the multitude of approaches (qualitative and quantitative) to answer that research question, why was that particular set adopted?