

# CZECH UNIVERSITY OF LIFE SCIENCES PRAGUE

Faculty of Economics and Management

## Evaluation of the Diploma Thesis by supervisor

Thesis Title **Financial Analysis of the multinational company Škoda Auto**

Name of the student **Bc. Rimpal Rajeshkumar Soni**

Thesis supervisor **Ing. Pavel Srbek, Ph.D.**

Department **Department of Economic Theories**

Formulation of objectives	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Choice of appropriate methods and methodology used	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Logical process being used, work with data and information	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Theoretical background of an author	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The structure of paragraphs and chapters	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Work with scientific literature (quotations, norms)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comprehensibility of the text and level of language	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Clarity and professionalism of expression in the work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Formal presentation of the work, the overall impression	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fulfillment of objectives	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Formulation of conclusions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Professional contribution of the work and its practical usage	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Summary and key-words comply with the content the thesis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Author's stance and approach to the addressed problems	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Author's co-operation with supervisor and department	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation of the work by grade (1, 2, 3, 4)				<b>4</b>

Evaluation: 1 = the best

Date 02/05/2020

.....  
Supervisor signature

**Other comments or suggestions:**

At the beginning of Abstract, the author characterizes the firm as one that "focuses on vehicles for public transport and railways", although, in the first sentence Škoda Auto is mentioned. The author was advised of the fact she interchanges two distinct firms – Škoda Auto and Škoda Transportation – number of times. I can see it was ignored. It repeats again in chapter 4.1 Company profile, where the first paragraph is dedicated to Škoda Transportation.

Objective of the thesis is in line with the Assignment. The choice of a five-years series was questioned by myself multiple times. Such a series does not even allow to reach the intended goal. One cannot derive any useful information as we do not know how the firm is doing under varying economic conditions as the period chosen is quite exceptional.

Although the methodology section has been improved significantly since our last consultation, it is still really weak. It does not provide any guide through methods applied. The very first sentence really does not make any sense as it states the literature review "was conducted using the method of synthesis, extraction, deduction, and induction". The "Holy Trinity" of analysis-synthesis-deduction, which is mentioned in every other thesis, is a completely nonsense that says absolutely nothing about the path which was followed to reach intended goal.

I have no idea why this thesis starts with chapter 11. If compared to other problems, the fuzzy chapter numbering and missing page numbers are both a minor issue.

Literature review has been significantly improved since I saw it for the last time. The irrelevant sections have been deleted. Basically, no discussion is presented as it is just an unrelated list of view points/informations, sometimes its relevance to the topic is questionable. However, I appreciate the review rests majorly on articles from scientific journals, which is not so usual. Unfortunately, synthesis, declared in methodology section, is not applied. From time to time it is not clear what is the source of information, especially in the section where financial ratios are defined, references are missing in my opinion.

In the practical section, the author has added some explanations of significant changes and has extended comments. As the author presents only some recommended values/industry norms (although the source is not defined) for some indicators and the time series used is pretty short, no useful conclusions can be deduced and the comments do not cover all the indicators. Some of the indicators are only presented using a graph without any evaluation.

Chapter 14.14 covers a regression model. Unfortunately, I do not know which one, since it is not stated.

Chapter 15 Results and discussion starts with ".. Škoda, is a manufacturer and distributor of cars and other transport vehicles." What other transport vehicles? The title of this chapter is inappropriate as no discussion is presented. The finding that "around 50 percent of the increase in operating profit can be explained through the expenditure in the state infrastructure" is highly questionable if not obscure. Unfortunately, we do not know the model from which this statement is derived.

It seems to me the author underestimated the significance of master thesis. It was prepared in rush and without a larger picture in mind. We struggled a lot with communication. My recommendations and comments were largely ignored. I cannot accept the thesis in this state. I would accept as a very weak bachelor thesis but it is unacceptable as a master thesis that proves author's expert knowledge and deep insight into the problem.

**Plagiarism control:** The system Theses.cz has assessed the thesis as original.

Date 02/05/2020

.....  
Supervisor signature