

MASTER'S THESIS SUPERVISOR'S REPORT

Student's name: Meryem Czyž

Master's Thesis Supervisor (MT): Mohsin Javed, Ph.D.

MT topic: **The Role of Smart Tourism Technologies towards Destinations' Loyalty and Positive Word-of-Mouth: A Perspective through SOR Theory**

Acad. year: 2023/2024

Notes on completing the report:

1. For the evaluation of each criterion, use the following scale: A - fulfilled very well, significantly exceeds the requirements; B – fulfilled with quality; C – fulfilled without reservations; D – fulfilled with minor deficiencies; E - fulfilled but with significant deficiencies; F - not fulfilled.
2. If any criterion is graded F, the thesis must be evaluated as unsatisfactory overall, not meeting the criteria for the MT defence, and such a thesis cannot be recommended for the defence
3. MT Supervisor must comment verbally on each evaluation criterion!

Assessment criteria:

Assessment

Assessment criteria:	Assessment
<p>1. Thesis Objectives and Methods</p> <p><i>The commentary focuses on: clarity of the formulation of the thesis objectives and the methods used in the thesis elaboration; evaluation of the objectives of the thesis following the thesis theme; the methods and procedures chosen to fulfil the thesis objectives.</i></p> <p>The thesis objectives are in line with the main topic of the thesis. On page 12, the student presented the objectives, it would be better to present them in the bullet points, and by systematic connection with research questions. However, the topic of the thesis, the used theory to explore the problem in the thesis is appreciable. On page 12, the student gave title <i>objectives and methods of Master thesis</i>, but the student did not mention about the methods. On Page 47, under title <i>data and research methodology</i>, it was necessary to discuss the detail description of statistical methods. The detail description of the methods used in the thesis is missing. However, chosen method is appropriate to achieve the thesis objectives.</p>	C
<p>2. Theoretical Background</p> <p><i>The commentary focuses on: the content of the critical literature research; the appropriateness of the chosen domestic and foreign literature sources; the method of citing sources in an adequate manner.</i></p> <p>The theoretical part explains the tourism in Turkiye. However, the recent trend of tourism in Turkiye is missing, for example in the recent years (see page 16), either the country recovered fully in the post covid-era? On page 26, the student explained the importance of smart technologies, the ease and convenience tourist have due to such technologies. However, what smart tourism technologies exactly the student considered for the research, still not very clear. The explanation of SOR theory on page 29, is adequate and appreciable the way student link with the smart tourism technologies. All the constructs/constructs discussed adequately.</p>	B
<p>3. Practical Application – Analysis</p> <p><i>The commentary focuses on: the use of knowledge from theory, its appropriateness of application; sufficient description of the process of application of the methods of work; overall assessment of the current state; sufficient substantiation of the conclusions of the analyses; the difficulty of data collection and processing.</i></p> <p>In the analysis part, the student provided adequate information about the sampling procedure and data collection. The provided demographic profile of respondents also helps to understand the selected sample. The data was analysed through PLS-SEM, which has not been discussed adequately as a chosen method for this thesis. Whilst, the carried out analysis is sufficient and relevant.</p>	B

4. Practical Application – Project/ Research	C
<p><i>The commentary focuses on: the connection of the solving part of the thesis to the theory and to the analyses results; supporting the proposals with appropriate arguments; meeting the objectives set. For research-oriented MTs, the focus should be on discussion of the results and their evaluation.</i></p> <p>Student presented the discussion part of the results on page 61. However, the student did not discuss the results by comparing with other studies to highlight similarities and contradictions. This is missing in the discussion part despite available great potential. However, the given discussions, theoretical contributions, practical implications, limitations, and drawn conclusion is acceptable.</p>	
5. Formal Layout	C
<p><i>The commentary focuses on: logical coherence of the text of the thesis; use of correct terminology; use of the prescribed standard of citation of sources; appropriate linguistic and graphic level.</i></p> <p>The formal layout of the thesis has logical coherence and used correct terminologies. The list of abbreviations, list of tables, and figures are given on page 78 and 80. However, the outlook of questionnaire requires to mention clear instructions about the options of 5-point Likert scale. Some paragraphs in the theory part are not supported by citations. One more weakness in the formal layout is that used research methods has not been discussed in detail. References are appropriate.</p>	

Overall thesis assessment *	B
<p>The main theme of the thesis has high topicality. The presented model and used theory worthwhile and praiseworthy. Despite great potential, the presentation of the thesis and final write-up has some weaknesses. Overall, the thesis fulfils the requirements with quality.</p>	

** The final grade is not an arithmetic average of the individual criteria for assessing the thesis.*

Questions for the defence:

1. Since the student used only survey, were the respondents were fully able to grasp the idea of smart tourism technology, especially older people?
2. Student mentioned in limitations about lack of generalizability. So, are the results/findings just valid for Istanbul? Alternatively, can the findings be generalize to other similar cities of the world? Which factors are necessary to consider to get benefit from this study for other similar destinations/cities?

The thesis **fulfils** the criteria for the defence of the MT. The thesis **is recommended** for the defence.

The thesis has been checked for the originality of the work in IS STAG. Based on the results of this review, it was concluded that the work **is not** plagiarism. The apparent similarity from her previous master thesis, which she defended in the disciplinary committee on 28 May 2024. In light of the recommendations, this time she cited her previous year's master thesis and gave its reference in this year's master thesis.

Date 27.08.2024


 Signature of MT Supervisor