



# Master's Thesis Evaluation by the Opponent

#### Title of the Master's Thesis:

Analysis of current ŠKODA AUTO loyalty incentives and insights for a future loyalty strategy

### Author of the Master's Thesis:

Kevin Hargas

### Goals of the Master's Thesis:

to examine the current customer loyalty incentives and activities of ŠKODA AUTO in the Czech Republic and to exemplify that a well thought loyalty program cannot be standardized for a company like ŠKODA AUTO but has to be diversified, offering a variety of activities and offers to its customers.

# **Evaluation:**

	Criteria	Description	Max. points	Points
Content 70%	Output Quality	Results are well presented, discussed - substantiated, relevant and original (i.e. novelty produced by the author). They are of high practical/theoretical relevance.	20	16
	Goals	The goals of the thesis are evident and accomplished.	10	8
	Methodology:	Methods are adequate and used correctly in relation to pre-set goals.	20	20
	Theory/ Conceptualization:	Demonstration of an in-depth understanding of the topic area (state-of-the- art) including key concepts, terminology, theories, definitions, etc. based on a literature survey. Literature review.	20	16
Formal requirements 15%	Structure:	The thesis is a consistent, well-organised logical whole.	3	2
	Terminology:	Linguistic and terminological level.	4	4
	Formalities:	Formal layout and requirements, extent, abstract.	4	4
	Citing:	Quality of citations and reflection of Ephorus results.	4	4
Delivery 15 %	Presentation document:	Is the presentation itself structured in a clear way? Is it appealing and easy to follow? Does it convey the message efficiently?	5	
	Presentation skills:	Are you conveying the message efficiently and timely? Do you use appropriate words, speed, tone of voice, gestures, movement etc. to express your thoughts in a clear manner?	5	







Argumentation:	Are you able to readily and briskly react to questions or comments? Are you able to explain unclear parts and connect comments to relevant places in your presentation or parts of particular analyses? How well are you able to defend to your ideas and recommendations?	5	
		100	0

#### Other comments:

The thesis deals with an interesting topic of loyalty programs in automotive business which will, for sure, get more and more importance in the future. The goal is quite clear, however in my opinion the goal could have been more ambitious and the thesis could have provided concrete measures and steps that Škoda Auto should implement in order to gain more loyal customers. The research questions fit the goal of the thesis, but I think that they could have been formulated in a better way (the first research question still seems to be too obvious given the fact that the author and the readers know the car- making industry, the questions two and three are not even formulated as questions).

The structure is logical and leads to the accomplishment of the goals set. The methodology is clear and logical. I still lack a more detailed explanation why the concrete benchmark programs were selected for the analysis (was it the number of participants, economic results of the programs, satisfaction of the members, anything else?).

As a result, I expected a little more- namely concrete ideas what shall be done, for whom, when and how by Škoda Auto in order to increase the loyalty of its customers- basically a concrete and realistic idea of the loyalty program.

### Questions or comments to be discussed during the thesis defence:

For the final defence I suggest that the author explains what criteria were used for the selection of the benchmark programs. Further on I suggest that the author elaborates on concrete ideas of the loyalty program for Škoda (who will be the primary target group in terms of age, gender, other characteristics, what will be the price, what will be the concrete benefits for participants, their motivation to join the program and benefits for the company).

### The name of the Opponent:

Ing. Petr Král, Ph.D.

## The employer of the Opponent:

University of Economics, Prague, Department of International Business

Date 31. 8. 2019

Signature of the Opponent:

-----