OVERALL ASSESSMENT (provided in English, Czech, or Slovak):

Contribution

The submitted bachelor thesis contributes to current knowledge by introducing analysis of customer loyalty on the market of mobile phone services in the Czech Republic. I consider this contribution to be quite sufficient for Bachelor thesis. According to the methods used for studying the relationships between loyalty, satisfaction and other studied variables, I would welcome more discussion about possible bias corresponding to the mentioned fact that the respondents were mainly university students. I would expect that loyalty is very different for university students than for elderly people (the median age is just 24 years which is far below the overall population median).

Methods

Regarding the methodology the usage of principal components analysis seems to give quite plausible results as well as the measures of inner consistency (Cronbach’s alpha). The methods of factor analysis and regression analysis seem to be applied correctly with checking all the major assumptions. The used methods shows that the author has adopted the statistical knowledge and is able to use it independently and find relevant literature as well as understand the consequences and interpret the results. I would welcome to more elaborate on the bootstrap technique being used for testing the hypothesis H2. Methodology weaknesses are discussed and I agree with them. I have not found any flaws regarding the methodology used and I confirm that it is based on recent development in the field.

Literature

The referenced literature is recent and relevant. The number of reviewed literature is more than sufficient.

Manuscript form

The thesis is clearly and logically structured, of expected length and the language used is appropriate and in line with the academic standards. I have detected few misprints, such as in the last paragraph on page 3: „as well at” instead of „as well as”, too many commas on page 4: „four major variables – service quality, customer, satisfaction, customer loyalty, and switching costs”, me instead of be on page 9: „customers with the same level of satisfaction might me more loyal simply for the fact that switching is difficult”, etc. For the figure 2 I am missing the information about authorship. For the correct assessment I would welcome to see the questionnaire in the appendix as well as to see the data table or at least some statistical characteristics of the distinct variables. I think that the data screening description provided is not sufficient to get an impression about the „indicators of latent factors”. I would welcome to see the real results, not just statements about kurtosis and skewness.

Regarding the overall evaluation of the thesis, in case of successful defense I suggest the grade „excellent".
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LITERATURE REVIEW: The thesis demonstrates author’s full understanding and command of recent literature. The author quotes relevant literature in a proper way.
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\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Strong} & \text{Average} & \text{Weak} \\
20 & 10 & 0 \\
\end{array}
\]
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CONTRIBUTION: The author presents original ideas on the topic demonstrating critical thinking and ability to draw conclusions based on the knowledge of relevant theory and empirics. There is a distinct value added of the thesis.
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