

IMESS DISSERTATION



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

Please note that IMESS students are not 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	60-61	59-55	54-50	<50
	A	B	C	D	E	F
Knowledge <i>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.</i>		X				
Analysis & Interpretation <i>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.</i>		X				
Structure & Argument <i>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's limitation or alternative views; Ability to use other evidence to support arguments and structure appropriately.</i>		X				
Presentation & Documentation <i>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.</i>			X			
Methodology <i>Understanding of techniques applicable to the chosen field of research, showing an ability to engage in sustained independent research.</i>		X				

ECTS Mark:	B/65	Charles Mark:	B	Marker:	Michal Paulus
<i>Deducted for late submission:</i>			No	Signed:	
<i>Deducted for inadequate referencing:</i>				Date:	September 10, 2023

MARKING GUIDELINES

A (UCL mark 70+) = A (Charles mark 91-100 - excellent): 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 69-65) = B (Charles mark 81-90 – very good)

C (UCL mark 64-60) = C (Charles mark 71-80 – good): 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. 65 or over equates to a B grade.

D (UCL mark 59-55) = D (Charles mark 61-70 – satisfactory)

E (UCL mark 54-50) = E (Charles mark 51-60 – sufficient):

Demonstration of a critical use of sources and ability to engage in systematic inquiry. An ability to engage in sustained research work, demonstrating methodological awareness. 55 or over equates to a D grade.

F (UCL mark less than 50) = F (Charles mark 0-50 - insufficient):

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.

Please provide substantive and detailed feedback!

Comments, explaining strengths and weaknesses (*at least 300 words*):

General comments:

The key weakness of the thesis lies in its methodological part. The author uses several methods (factor analysis, regression analysis, moderating effects analysis, and mediating effects analysis) to investigate the research questions. Unfortunately, I miss more detailed description of the used methodology together with the estimated specifications. The thesis suffers sometimes also from the lack of clarity and its “technical” part (presentations of results or specifications) need much more editing. As a result, the methodological part is quite confusing and needs further manuscript editing. On the other side I appreciate author’s effort to base the thesis on quite extensive literature review and to conclude the thesis with “management implications” based on the author’s results. Therefore, I assess the thesis with grade B.

More detailed comments:

1) Methodology

The chapter 4.2.1 introduces factor analysis. Unfortunately, the key paragraph relating the methodology to the questionnaire (the last one on page 49) is quite confusing and a reader does not clearly understand the purpose of the exercise. I would recommend to revise the subchapter to improve clarity of the text.

In the chapter 4.2.2 (page 50) the Moderating effect Model Specification is presented. Unfortunately, I miss more detailed explanation not only of the chosen specifications (e.g., their relation to existing empirical papers) but also the whole estimation strategy. The author also presents several related diagrams which are unexplained and make therefore the understanding of the whole subchapter even more difficult (Figures 4.1 – 4.4).

In the chapter 4.3.4 (page 56) the Structural Equation Modelling Analysis is presented. However, I miss the presentation of the structural model which shall be estimated together with related methodology of the estimation (only bootstrapping is mentioned). E.g., on page 78 we can find Figure 5.5 showing structural equation model diagram which is hardly understandable without proper description in the methodology section.

The paper refers to SERVQUAL model based on Parasuraman et al. (1988). I miss also a critical discussion of that work.

On page 38 the so called “conceptual model” (Figure 3.2) is presented but unfortunately left unexplained.

2) Manuscript – formal aspects

The whole thesis needs another round of revision to significantly improve clarity of the text, eliminate typos and also improve presentation of the equations, technical notations and tables (see e.g. page 62). Usage of the simple word equation editor would improve many subchapters considerably.

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

Explain clearly and in detail the estimation strategy and reasons behind the chosen specifications of the models presented in the chapter 4.2.2. Which existing research has inspired your specification and why? Please be concrete.

Explain clearly and in detail the estimation strategy and reasons behind the chosen specifications of the structural model mentioned in the chapter 4.3.4. Which existing research has inspired your specification and why? Please be concrete.

Explain the conceptual model presented on Figure 3.2 (page 38).

Can you describe how were the survey respondents selected? Is that selection representative to the whole sample of ČSOB's clients?