Dissertation reader`s assessment

I. Author: Nunthanut Kewsuwan

Title: Digital Marketing for promoting Thailand Tourism, Case Study: The Tourism Authority of Thailand

II. Objective of the thesis and its fulfilment

The objective of the thesis was fulfilled.

III. Content processing and approach to diploma work conception

Generally, the thesis is well structured: It starts with description of a background of the chosen topic, then it introduces the researched problem and its relevancy, followed by literature review, research aims and plan, results and implications.

I appreciate that the author did utilize the up-to-date resources and constructed original review on a given topic, which also substantiate the three hypotheses. I partially miss a deeper focus on effectiveness, which is at the heart of the research; in literature review this is discussed just briefly.

The scope of the thesis is very broad, which results in a fact that some (e.g. methodological) details are neglected, which is pity. I do appreciate the author`s effort, but partial, more focused approach to the problem would bring more valuable results in the end.

The text is extremely long (exceeding the expected length of a theses twice) and some pieces of information can be omitted (e.g. in chapter 4 contains a lot of general information about the methodology; some tables could be moved to appendix; some results are presented twice in the chapter 5 – table 5-3 vs. 5-5 or table 5-4 vs. 5-7). At the same, a couple of things are missing there – information of the questionnaire design (How were the question constructed; Were they adopted from any other studies?), or better explanation of hypothesis testing procedure (the author didn`t refer to particular questions contained in the questionnaire by any number or other label, thus it is sometime hard to find the exact question/variable that the author speaks about – see the VI. of the Assessment).

In the chapter 5, results are described thoroughly; however some less important findings need not to be commented as the text is too long for a reader to concentrate on in properly (for some results, it is enough to be in appendix only). The author systematically doesn`t present the answer choice of “I don`t know”, which is a problem.

Whereas the introduction of results of univariate statistics (frequencies) is fine (however less than perfect), the testing of hypothesis raises questions. Here is an example, which relates to testing of H2:

The author tests the H2 by means of regression analysis between variables 3.1.1 and 3.1.2:
3.1.1 Do you know the official site of Tourism Authority of Thailand? (1-Yes; 2. No; 3. I do not have an answer)

3.1.2 Do you think "awareness" of the official site of Tourism Authority of Thailand influences your decision to travel to Thailand? (1 Yes; 2. No; 3. I do not have an answer).

In the text, I haven’t found any information how this regression was calculated and why. First, the choice answer 3 (I do not have an answer) must be removed from the analysis, to make the variable a dichotomous one - the variable can't be interpreted as ordinal variable with the levels 1, 2, and 3. Were the variables reprocessed like that?

Second, after this modification, you test the relationship between two dichotomous variables (0/1 and 0/1) – the regression analysis is not ideal in this case (may be association measures like Phi or Cramer's V would be more effective).

Third, for the purpose of testing H2 a different the question/variable (3.1.3) could have been employed to get more precise results.

Based on the above explained suspicion, I do afraid that the results concerning H1 to H3 are wrong. In this respect I don’t comment on the discussion and implications suggested by the author.

IV. Formal particulars of the diploma thesis and layout

Formal requirements of the thesis are fulfilled on good quality, except for some particulars mentioned in other parts of the assessment.

V. Comments about the thesis

- The description of research questions should follow after the setting of research aims – the order in the thesis is opposite (chapter 1.3 vs. 1.2).

- The non-random sampling procedure should be mentioned as a limitation of the research.

- The formulation of questions in the questionnaire is little bit complicated – "3.3.1.2 Do you think "awareness" of this mentioned online service under the partnership agreement between TAT and Trip Advisor influences your decision to travel to Thailand?“ – The word of awareness might be clear to every respondent; the information about partnership isn’t necessary in the question. Wouldn’t be better to ask simply: “How much does Trip Advisor influence your decision to travel to Thailand?“

- More appropriate name for chapter 5 would be Results.

- The readers would appreciate short summary of main finding after each presented topic in the chapter 5.

- page 84 – the table there is not a contingency table as the author claims.

VI. Questions recommended to detailed explanation during defence

1. Can you explain your substantiation of H1 – how does the TAM relates to the H1? Does it mean that awareness is similar to constructs like Usefulness, Ease of Use or Attitude?
2. Please explain the process of hypotheses testing more thoroughly and comment on the
critique concerning the H2 in this assessment. In case my suspicions were relevant, please re-
calculate the H2, show the differences and alter the implications.

VII. Conclusion

The master thesis by Nunthanut Kewsuwan is a little bit contradictory: some parts are of high
quality, whereas others raise questions. Also the length of the text is far behind the limit.
Because of my doubt that some results are calculated wrong I suggest the grade D. I am not
aware of any plagiarism in this thesis.
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