

## Assignment 2 : Paper review (Why craft beer business does not prosper in Thailand?)

### **Brief review about the paper**

Among the seminar papers from 2015 to 2017, there are many redundancies. To make it clearer, many of the papers were done with a similar method, like the regression analysis. Therefore, the majority of the paper names are started with the word factor and follow with the phrase “that influences something or impacts some organization”. The output of this research will come numerically or quantitatively. However, some distinguished papers try to analyze things qualitatively. This paper is one of them.

The main research question is “Why does the craft beer business not prosper in Thailand?”. According to the researcher, craft beer is a niche product that has started to become more attractive in the last few years. However, many limitations make the market of the product cannot grow further. A good example that everyone knows is Thai law that restricts suppliers from doing what they should do, but there are many more that researchers tried to elaborate like the fact that there is the monopoly power in the beer market, norm of people, not advanced production capability, government, or the law.

To answer this research question, this research includes both primary (market observation, survey through online questionnaire and in-depth interview) and secondary data (each different act and law that related to the case). The researcher brings all the information and data together and creates different analyses using many different tools, including five force analysis. Eventually, the result was appreciated. Using the reliable amount of interviews, questionnaires, and research, the researcher can determine factors that affect and do not affect the prosperity of the market.

### **The positive part about the research**

In my point of view, this is well-written research. There are many positive things about it. An excellent example is the way researchers explain the background of craft beer in a strongly informative way. Their explanations are always supported with appropriate quotes and examples of the real craft beer producer’s dilemma. This illustrates that they understand everything about the market. Nevertheless, the most positive thing is the ways researchers collect the data and information.

To have the most accurate piece of information, the source must be reliable. The researchers know this point well, so his interviewee is all the real players in this market, like Mr. Wichit Saiklao, who is said to be the father of craft beer, and many others in different fields. Having these interviews supported in each part makes the claim of the researcher more authentic. Moreover, this research contains the result from the in-depth interview with all the related players in the market, made up of consumers, lawyers, retailers, distributors, and producers and all of them provide clear and beneficial aspects. For the consumer, researchers make a separate online questionnaire to estimate the demand for the product. In the consumer section, they have almost 300 observations. Therefore, this makes me think that the raw information of this research is mostly decent and strong enough to create a good analysis.

### **The negative part about the research**

The first negative thing about this research is the research question itself that everyone can find the answer by just citing in the online platform. However, this problem is alleviated by the fact that the research provides more understanding that cannot be found easily, as the experiences from the in-depth interview or the analysis. Reading through all the parts of the research, the reader can know more than what they have expected.

Through the research, there are many claims or brief information about something. For instance, researchers claim in the Abstract section that “the number of producers and customers of the product has grown significantly in the past 3-4 years”. For an outsider that doesn’t know what craft beer is, this will be obscure for them. Therefore, there should be some text citation or a graph that can support the claim. This is the second negative thing about this research and this mistake can be found in every section of the research. In the previous section, one of the most positive things about this research is the way researchers put the interview and questionnaire answers in the research to support most of the claim. Nevertheless, when considered at the overall level of the research, this is the majority and could be the only way researchers make the claims.