

**A genre analysis of restaurant reviews:
Differences between reviews written by professional critics, experienced consumers and
inexperienced consumers.**

Suzanne Breur

SNR: 2031177

Master's thesis

Communication and Information Sciences

Specialization Business Communication and Digital Media

Tilburg School of Humanities and Digital Sciences

Tilburg University, Tilburg

Supervisor: Dr. J.A.A. Engelen

Second reader: Dr. N. Kamoen

June 2019

Abstract

There are three different types of restaurant reviews: professional critics, experienced consumers and inexperienced consumer reviews. The research expands on the Swalesian genre model by applying it to the restaurant reviews. Thereby, this study increases the understanding of the groups of restaurant reviews, especially the experienced consumer group because that group is barely researched. Restaurant reviews are a form of word-of-mouth. Thus, they have an impact on the sales and the popularity of restaurants, which makes it a relevant research field. The genre analysis focuses on the differences in the use of move types, move structure and strategies between the three groups of restaurant reviews. In total, 126 reviews were analyzed (26 professional reviews, 50 experienced consumer reviews, and 50 inexperienced consumer reviews). A codebook was developed based to investigate the reviews, which is proven to be reliable. The analysis used both quantitative and qualitative methods to gain a detailed understanding of the genre differences. The results show that professional restaurant reviews are more descriptive, while both groups of consumer reviews are more evaluative. None of the three groups have a distinguishable move structure. However, professional reviews provide more arguments and details to realize the moves. The results indicate a clear difference between professional and consumer restaurant reviews. At the same time, the analysis shows no genre differences between experienced and inexperienced consumer reviews.

Keywords: Genre theory, restaurant reviews, professional critics, consumer reviews

Content

1. Introduction and theory	4
1.1 Genre theory and research questions.....	7
1.2 Online restaurant reviews and electronic Word-of-Mouth.....	9
1.3 Professional restaurant reviews	10
1.3.1 Content and style of professional restaurant reviews	11
1.4 Online consumer restaurant reviews	12
1.4.1 Content and style of online consumer reviews.....	13
1.5 Online experienced consumer reviews.....	14
2. Methodology	16
2.1 Data collection and corpus	16
2.2 The development of the codebook	17
2.2.1 Validity and reliability of the codebook.....	18
2.3 Data analysis	19
3. Results	21
3.1 Quantitative analysis of the move usage	21
3.1.1 Giving practical information.	21
3.1.2 Describing the restaurant.....	22
3.1.3 Placing the restaurant in context.	22
3.1.4 Assessing the restaurant.	23
3.1.5 Recommending the restaurant.	23
3.2 Qualitative content analysis of strategies	24
3.3 Qualitative analysis of the move sequence in restaurant reviews	26
4. Discussion	28
Reference list.....	32
Appendix A: Codebook overview	37
Appendix B: Means and standard deviations of strategies	39

1. Introduction and theory

“Today we dined at Fizzy which was previously known as ‘t Soerel. Surprising cuisine, young skilled waiters and, of course, delicious dishes served with excellent wines. We sincerely felt welcome.” This is an example of an online consumer review written about a restaurant. It was posted on TripAdvisor, a popular review platform where anyone can post about a restaurant, hotel, or tourist attraction. From this review, it becomes clear that the writer really liked the dining experience. There are various types of restaurant reviews. For example, Pieter Nijdam (2018), a culinary expert for the Dutch newspaper *De Telegraaf*, wrote a review about the same restaurant. This review is longer, more detailed and covers more parts of the dining experience. He starts his review with a description of the location, the history of the restaurant and the experience of the chef. Then, he describes the interior, the wine menu and his conversation with the waitress. Next, he tells about the food he ordered. He ends with a summary about the ambiance, service, menu and the wine.

This illustrates that there are different types of restaurant reviews. First, every customer can post a restaurant review on websites, such as Yelp, OpenTable.ie, or TripAdvisor. With a few clicks, people rate and write their opinion about a restaurant they like or dislike. These online reviews impact the decision making process of potential customers (Lu, Ba, Huang, & Feng, 2013), both positively and negatively. Within this group of customer reviews are consumers who regularly write restaurant reviews. These consumers are often passionate about food or about the activity of reviewing itself. They post their reviews on review platforms or on their personal blog. The last group of reviews consists of the professional food critics, who get paid to write reviews (Parikh, Behnke, Almanza, Nelson, & Vorvoreanu, 2017).

This research will compare these groups of restaurant reviews in terms of genre, which makes this research theoretically relevant in three ways. The first reason is the fact that genre analysis of online reviews is a new use of the genre theory. Taboada (2011) is the first to

apply genre theory to analyze online reviews. Where her research is more focused on discovering the different stages of an online review, De Jong and Burgers (2013) focus on finding the differences between types of reviews. They are the first to develop and test a codebook based on the moves and strategies that appear in online reviews. They tested their codebook on movie reviews and they argue that it would also form a basis for other types of reviews. Yet, this codebook has not been applied to restaurant reviews, while those are a big part of the review industry (Z. Zhang, Ye, Law, & Li, 2010).

Furthermore, this research will expand on the differences between professional and consumer reviews. De Jong and Burgers (2013) argue that professional reviews and consumer reviews fall into different genres. While they conclude this based on film reviews, it would be interesting to see if the study can be replicated for restaurant reviews, because different products have different reviewers and audiences. This means there might also be a different genre distinction.

Thirdly, this research aims to fill a particular gap in the current literature about the differences within the consumer review group. Beaudouin and Pasquier (2017) suggest looking at the different evaluation processes within the diverse group of user-generated reviews because they find that consumer reviews come in all shapes and sizes. This means that we cannot consider consumer reviews as one coherent group. Besides this research, there is barely any evidence that experienced consumer reviews are inherently different from inexperienced consumer reviews. Moreover, there is hardly any information about this group of experienced reviewers. Therefore, it is worthwhile to look at possible sub-categories.

Next to the academic relevance described above, this research is also relevant in a practical sense. Professional and consumer reviews have different impacts on the popularity of a restaurant. Zhang and colleagues (2010) conclude that a large number of consumer reviews increases the popularity of a restaurant, while professional reviews posted on

newspaper websites have a negative effect regardless of the rating. This requires different response strategies from the restaurant managers (Chen & Xie, 2008). In their eyes, professional culinary critics have more legitimacy than consumer reviewers (Beuscart, Mellet, & Trespeuch, 2016). Yet, they do recognize the importance of online consumer reviews, by checking their online ratings, responding to comments, and showcasing their certificate of excellence in their restaurants. So, professional restaurant reviews are viewed differently than consumer reviews, which might be explained by genre differences.

King, Racherla, and Bush (2014) mention that there is uncertainty about how companies can foster higher quality reviews in an anonymous online platform. It is still unclear how higher quality reviews can be distinguished. Companies are now experimenting with helpfulness ratings. Lim and van der Heijden (2015) argue that the experience of the reviewer influences credibility. In this case, one's experience might be an antecedent of higher quality reviews. Investigating the quality of a review is beyond the scope of this research, but a distinction between experienced and inexperienced reviews based on genre can be a first step in answering the question of King et al. (2014).

Simultaneously, professional critics have to adjust to the fact that everyone is a critic now (Kobez, 2018). Professional reviewers are changing their practices and ethics to stay relevant in the field with a large number of consumer reviews. This indicates that the boundaries between the types of reviews are blurring. These imprecise boundaries make it hard for people to frame their expectations of these reviews. Finn and Kushmerick (2006) note that online text genres allow people to distinguish between documents about the same topic, in this case, restaurant reviews. This distinction can guide customers to the right place to find information and it can help restaurant owners to find the right response strategies to these types of reviews. Thereby, framing restaurant reviews according to the genre theory may help professional critics to distinguish themselves within the restaurant review industry.

1.1 Genre theory and research questions

This paper aims to use genre theory to compare the reviews written by professional critics, experienced consumers and inexperienced consumers. This leads to the following research question: *To what extent do restaurant reviews written by professional critics, experienced consumers, and inexperienced consumers constitute different text genres?* Genre is a concept that has been used in multiple different ways without a clear conceptualization (Steen, 2011). For this research genre is understood “as a class of communicative events, the members of which share some set of communicative purposes. (...) This rationale shapes the schematic structure of the discourse and influences and constrains choice of content and style.” (Swales, 1990, p. 58). This definition highlights that the communicative purposes guide the structure, content, and style of the texts within that genre. Furthermore, Swales (1990) proposes a genre model that looks at the communicative purpose, the move structure, and rhetorical strategies, which will guide this research.

The communicative purpose is a difficult concept to define, as Swales (1990) does not provide this definition. Even though, he stresses the importance of communicative purpose for classifying texts. Askehave (2017) addresses this issue but does not formulate a clear definition. She describes communicative purposes as the intention the maker of the text has. Therefore, it is important to look at the context of a text and the discourse community (Askehave & Ellerup Nielsen, 2005). At the same time, she acknowledges that the communicative purpose cannot determine a genre by itself. Purposes are not always clearly stated, or they are broadly defined, and texts can have multiple purposes (Askehave, 2017). For example, reviewers rarely state the reason why they review a particular restaurant, it might not even be clear to themselves. Because communicative purposes are difficult to identify, the genre analysis of this research focuses on moves and strategies.

A move is understood as a part of the text that fulfills a certain function (de Jong & Burgers, 2013). In turn, a move structure is a fixed set of communicative stages that organize a text (Askehave & Ellerup Nielsen, 2005). The same authors recognize that moves are not as fixed as this definition suggests. They understand the structure as a specific number of moves in a specific order. This relates closely to the definition of stages, which are the elements of a particular genre in a specific, predetermined order (Taboada, 2011). Taboada (2011) identifies two different stages in online reviews: descriptive and evaluative stages. However, identifying moves is more difficult because there is no consensus on the criteria (Askehave & Ellerup Nielsen, 2005).

For the purpose of this research, the move types of De Jong and Burgers (2013) are used. They distinguish between descriptive and evaluative moves based on the research of Taboada (2011). A difference in the use of move types and a difference in the move structure point towards a difference in text genre, because moves are an important part of the genre model. So, the first sub-question is formulated to address the differences in move usage: *How do restaurant reviews written by professional critics, experienced consumers, and inexperienced consumers differ in move types and move structure?*

The final concept related to the genre model is rhetorical strategies. Strategies relate to the content and style of the texts (Swales, 1990). Strategies are the way moves are realized (de Jong & Burgers, 2013). This does not mean that each particular move has a specific strategy (Askehave & Ellerup Nielsen, 2005). Each move can be realized in multiple different ways. Yet, as Askehave and Ellerup Nielsen (2005) mention, within a genre, similar strategies are often used. So, it is interesting to look at common ways of realizing certain moves within or between genres. Thus, the second sub-question is: *How do restaurant reviews written by professional critics, experienced consumers, and inexperienced consumers differ in the use of strategies?*

1.2 Online restaurant reviews and electronic Word-of-Mouth (eWOM)

Genre theory will be applied to online reviews, which is a part of the research field of Word-of-Mouth (WOM). An understanding of WOM and of online reviews will provide the general background information about restaurant reviews. WOM refers to a form of communication where a person tells another person about a brand, product or service (Arndt, 1967). The communication must be independent from an organization, otherwise, it is considered a form of advertisement (Buttle, 1998). Yet, WOM is often encouraged by organizations because they see it as free marketing (Chen & Xie, 2008). It is important to note that only positive WOM is considered as a free form of advertisement for the company.

The older definitions of WOM often focus on oral and person-to-person communication. Nowadays, anyone can share their opinions about an organization or product on the Internet, which is often referred to as electronic Word-of-Mouth (eWOM). Henning-Thurau, Gwinner, Walsh and Gremler (2004) define eWOM as “any positive or negative statement made by potential, actual, or former customers about a product or company, which is made available to a multitude of people and institutions via the Internet” (p. 39). Most researchers look at eWOM through online consumer reviews on opinion-platforms or shopping websites, such as Amazon (Cheung & Thadani, 2012). Based on the definition of eWOM made by Henning-Thurau et al. (2004), in this article, a review is defined as any positive or negative evaluative statement made by (former) customers about a product or service, which is shared with a multitude of people.

Reviews can be published online and offline, for example in newspapers. Because reviews and WOM are closely related, differences between online and offline reviews can be drawn from the differences between traditional WOM and eWOM. King et al. (2014) identify six characteristics that differentiate eWOM from traditional WOM. To begin with, the volume

and reach of online reviews are exceptionally large. Second, online conversations about products and services are taking place across different websites and communities. In addition, the messages will stay accessible for a long period of time. Moreover, the Internet is an anonymous place, which makes it harder to identify credible reviewers. Fifth, positive and negative reviews are more salient because of the scores and ratings. Lastly, there is community engagement instead of person-to-person communication. To comprehend the differences between professional restaurant reviews and (in)experienced consumer restaurant reviews, the next sections will explain the three types of restaurant reviews.

1.3 Professional restaurant reviews

The first group of restaurant reviews is professional culinary experts. These are people who get paid to write reviews, for example, restaurant reviews published in newspapers (Parikh et al., 2017). Professional reviewers are trained in journalism and experienced the restaurant industry through working in a restaurant or going to culinary school (Titz, Lanza-Abbott, & Cruz, 2004). That is to say, the dining experience must be exceptional to receive a very positive evaluation because the reviewer has seen it all. Next to the newspapers, professional food critics evaluate restaurants for gastronomic guides, such as the Michelin guide (Mellet, Beauvisage, Beuscart, & Trespeuch, 2014). Professional critics are perceived as more legitimate by restaurant owners because of their expertise and status in the field (Beuscart et al., 2016).

Professional critics are a small group of reviewers compared to the consumer group (Parikh et al., 2017). Strictly speaking, this means that professional restaurant reviews are the minority. This implies that critics must be selective about which restaurant they evaluate. For newspapers, they mostly visit non-chain restaurants that just opened or that became popular or restaurants that introduced new menu items (Titz et al., 2004). Mellet and colleagues (2014)

highlight this by looking at the number of restaurants listed and rated in gastronomy guides. For example, the Michelin guide 2012 listed four thousand restaurants in France, while consumers reviewed more than eighteen thousand French restaurants (Mellet et al., 2014). This illustrates the selectivity of this particular guide and of the group of professional culinary experts.

As a profession, food critics operate through an ethical and procedural framework (Kobez, 2018). Titz et al. (2004) describe that a critic visits the restaurant two or three times before writing the review and they try different dishes to avoid very negative reviews. These conventions changed as a result of the increased popularity of online consumer reviews (Kobez, 2018). Newspapers try to stay relevant in an online environment, which means that they try to conform to the conventions of online reviews. Through the interviews conducted by Kobez (2018), some changes became clear. For example, critics feel like they have to operate faster to keep up with the demand for restaurant reviews. Thus, they review the restaurant after just one visit. In addition, the reviews have to be shorter and less nuanced because the publishers (e.g. newspapers) want more accessible reviews formatted more like consumer reviews. This way the consumer reviews influence how professional critics review restaurants.

1.3.1 Content and style of professional restaurant reviews. The lack of nuance and fear of being too negative can be seen in how professional critics write reviews. Based on research about movie reviews, it becomes clear that professional critics are more descriptive and give more practical information than consumer reviews (de Jong & Burgers, 2013). Jiang and Diesner (2016) discover that professional reviews are longer, use longer and more diverse words, have a clearer structure and contain fewer emotional words.

The professional restaurant critics have developed personalized criteria to evaluate restaurants (Hsu, Roberts, & Swaminathan, 2012). In essence, their opinion as a critic

influences what is perceived as good and bad instead of standardized rules of quality. This means that professional reviews are unpredictable because the evaluation depends on the critic's tastes and priorities (Hsu et al., 2012). On the other hand, professional reviews are more uniform than consumer reviews (Jiang & Diesner, 2016). Titz et al. (2004) identify eight categories that the food critic evaluates. These categories include the quality and quantity of food, quality of service, and ambiance/atmosphere.

Titz et al. (2004) also note that most categories (with the exception of the quality of food and service) are only mentioned when they exceed or do not satisfy the expectations. When comparing the content of professional restaurant reviews with online consumer reviews, Parikh et al. (2017) discovered that professional critics write more about the quality of food. This is in line with Chossat and Gergaud (2003) who found that professional critics focus on food quality. They also found that wines and setting do not matter when the food does not reach their standard. In other words, food quality is the most important part of the review process of professional restaurant critics.

1.4 Online consumer restaurant reviews

The biggest group of restaurant reviewers are the consumers who post their reviews on social media or user-generated platforms, like Yelp. These consumers do not have to have a journalistic background nor experience in the restaurant industry. Anyone can be a critic online. Mellet et al. (2014) describe the emergence of consumer reviews as part of the democratization of the restaurant industry, which is a shift from a few elite restaurant reviewers to a cultural activity that anyone can participate in (Vásquez & Chik, 2015). Brown (2012) points out that reviewing is an unpaid activity which requires time and effort, which makes it, as he puts it, surprising that user-generated websites collect so many reviews.

Because money is not the reason why consumers write restaurant reviews, it is necessary to look at why this group participates in the restaurant industry. Hennig-Thurau and colleagues (2004) identify four motives that influence the number of reviews a consumer posts, namely concern for other consumers, positive self-enhancement, social benefits, and economic incentives. These four motivations can be linked to intrinsic and extrinsic motives. Economic incentives and positive self-enhancement are a form of a reward (Hennig-Thurau et al., 2004), thus they belong to, what Brown (2012) calls, extrinsic motives. Concern for other consumers and social benefits stem from the idea of adding value to the community (Hennig-Thurau et al., 2004), which relates to intrinsic motives defined as the enjoyment of when others are reading your review (Brown, 2012).

In more recent research, Cheung and Lee (2012) propose two factors that increase consumers' intentions to write restaurant reviews. Namely, a sense of belonging and the enjoyment of helping others. Again, the latter is an intrinsic motive and the first extrinsic. Parikh and colleagues (2014) identify two motivations to contribute on Yelp: to share experiences and to help other consumers. The same authors classify four themes based on qualitative research: to help businesses and fellow diners, writing a review as an enjoyable activity, to be part of a community, and lastly, to report a dining experience (Parikh, Behnke, Nelson, Vorvoreanu, & Almanza, 2015). These themes and motivations are altruistic reasons for writing restaurant reviews (Parikh et al., 2015, 2014). In short, most consumers write reviews for each other (Taboada, 2011).

1.4.1 Content and style of online consumer reviews. Consumer reviews are often posted without a grammar check or a second read-through (Taboada, 2011). This makes the structure of these reviews less predictable (Jiang & Diesner, 2016). However, regarding the content of online consumer reviews, there are common themes. For instance, they talk mostly about the food followed by service (Pantelidis, 2010; Parikh et al., 2017). Other factors

include atmosphere or ambiance, price, menu, and design or decor (Pantelidis, 2010). In addition, Parikh et al. (2017) compare Yelp reviews to professional reviews and reviews of the website Zagat (where bloggers post peer-reviewed restaurant reviews). They find that consumer reviews focus more on the waiter and less on the chef and decor.

Just like content, there are similar stylistic elements within the large group of consumer reviews. De Jong and Burgers (2013) see that consumer reviews contain many evaluative moves compared to descriptive moves. Likewise, Jiang and Diesner (2016) find that consumer reviews are more opinionated than professional reviews. This means that consumers use more evaluative words in their reviews (Taboada, 2011).

1.5 Online experienced consumer reviews

While most consumer reviews are posted by people who barely write reviews, there is a group of people who post more than ten reviews per year (Beaudouin & Pasquier, 2017). In this paper, this group is referred to as experienced consumer reviews. In the context of restaurant reviews, these people can be called 'foodies'. Vásquez and Chik (2015) describe a foodie as someone who is passionate about food and shares this with their peers or online. In this case, online can mean on user-generated platforms, social media or a personal blog. Being an experienced reviewer leads to some advantages. For example, Yelp offers an Elite status for regular reviewers and encourages these Elites to interact with each other (Brown, 2012). This status mostly relates to reputation, but there is also a sense of community.

Similar to inexperienced consumer reviews, they do not write restaurant reviews for money, but for altruistic reasons. Brown (2012) state that experienced consumer reviewers are motivated by showcasing their taste and knowledge of food. In the same way, Vásquez and Chik (2015) notice that by writing a review about a Michelin star restaurant, consumers see themselves as part of the culinary elites.

This group of reviews is under-researched, even though they are part of the restaurant review field. Beaudouin and Pasquier (2017) look at the differences between novice (inexperienced) reviews and regulars (experienced) reviews. They discover that experience leads to longer reviews. At the same time, the reviews written by experienced reviewers conform more to the professional standard as experience grows. This means that the reviews contain richer and more technical vocabulary, in addition to a more impersonal style of writing. Besides the study by Beaudouin and Pasquier (2017), there is not enough information about this experienced consumer reviews, especially in the restaurant context.

In sum, there are three types of restaurant reviews that will be researched in this paper: professional critics, experienced consumer reviews, and inexperienced consumer reviews. Both groups of consumers reviewers do not write for money, whereas professional critics make their living with writing reviews. The main difference between consumer and professional reviews is that professional reviews are longer and more descriptive than consumer restaurant reviews. To investigate the genre differences between the three groups, this research is guided by two sub-questions. The first sub-question investigates the differences in move use and move structure. The second sub-question focuses on the content of the reviews by analyzing the strategies. The next section explains the methodology used to answer these questions.

2. Methodology

To answer the research question, I conducted a genre analysis based on the move and structure model (Swales, 1990). This genre analysis applied both quantitative and qualitative methods to give insight into the differences between the three groups of restaurant reviews (Creswell, 1999). Within the mixed method paradigm, I used a fully mixed sequential dominant status design, which means that the research combines quantitative and qualitative methods in a sequential order where one method is more dominant than the other (Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2009). In this research, the quantitative analysis was more dominant than the qualitative method because the quantitative analysis pointed towards genre differences between the groups. Then, a qualitative analysis extended these findings by providing more detail about the moves and strategies used in the reviews (Creswell, 1999). Because qualitative analysis uncovers patterns, it was used to find differences in move structure (Y. Zhang & Wildemuth, 2016).

2.1 Data collection and corpus

For this research, 126 online restaurant reviews were selected. The group of professional reviews contained 26 reviews from different American newspapers. For the other two consumer categories, 50 reviews were selected for each group. All reviews were posted in 2018 to ensure that the corpus reflected the current restaurant review landscape. The reviews are written in English and they are about American restaurants. The focus on the United States reduced the amount of available data, while it still provided enough professional critics to analyze. In total fifteen different professional restaurant critics were found and from each critic, I selected at most two reviews.

The other reviews were selected from the review website Yelp.com. To identify experienced consumer reviews, I only selected those reviewers who were part of the Yelp

Elites in 2018. This means that Yelp considered their reviews and their review frequency as excellent. On average, the reviewers in this group had written 97.68 reviews. The minimum amount of reviews was 43 and the maximum was 365. The last group consisted of inexperienced consumer reviewers who had written on average 4.28 reviews. The minimum amount of reviews was 1 and the maximum was 10. For the consumer reviews from Yelp.com, I only selected positive reviews (four- or five-star rating) to exclude differences based on sentiment. Professional restaurant reviews are in general more neutral (Titz et al., 2004). By limiting the corpus to neutral and positive reviews, the reviews were easier to compare to each other.

2.2 The development of the codebook

To make the move and strategy analysis as reliable as possible, a detailed codebook was developed. The first step of the development of the codebook was defining the unit of analysis. For this research, the units of analysis are main clauses with their corresponding sub-clause because this unit definition was explicit enough for a quantitative content analysis (Y. Zhang & Wildemuth, 2016), but still allowed some flexibility for dividing a sentence into multiple moves. The codebook used in this research was inspired by the codebook from De Jong and Burgers (2013), who conducted a genre analysis of film reviews. While most of their moves and strategies were specialized for movies, the moves are easy to adapt to restaurant reviews. For the moves, there is a distinction between descriptive and evaluative moves based on Taboada's (2011) review stages. A main clause was considered descriptive only when it is completely neutral. Any form of assessment or opinion made a sentence evaluative, for example when the clause contained an evaluative adjective, such as 'delicious' (de Jong & Burgers, 2013).

In total, there are five different moves adopted from De Jong and Burgers (2013). Three moves are descriptive and the other two are evaluative. The move, ‘giving practical information about the restaurant’, can be achieved through mentioning contact information, giving information about the restaurant or about the critic. The other descriptive move, ‘describing the restaurant’, consists of describing the food, drinks, service, atmosphere, menu, price, other customers, and professionalism. The last descriptive move, ‘placing the restaurant in context’, can be accomplished by making comparisons and by specifying the context of the visit. ‘Assessing the restaurant’ is one of the two evaluative moves, which has the same strategies as the second move except for giving an overall assessment of the restaurant. The other evaluative move, ‘recommending the restaurant’, is divided into two strategies: making a recommendation for the reader and mentioning the future plans of the reviewer.

The strategies that de Jong and Burgers (2013) defined, were too specific for movie reviews. While some strategies could be altered to apply to restaurant reviews, other strategies were identified by existing literature on the content of restaurant reviews (Pantelidis, 2010; Parikh et al., 2017; Titz et al., 2004). A few strategies were added after a small pilot test, where eight restaurant reviews were analyzed. After this pilot test, the codebook was completed. A complete overview of the moves and strategies and their sources is provided in Appendix A.

2.2.1 Validity and reliability of the codebook. To test the reliability of the codebook, an intercoder reliability analysis was conducted. For this analysis, I selected 10% of the data from each subgroup (Wimmer & Dominick, 2003, p. 157). The fourteen reviews were independently analyzed by two coders. Then, the two analyses were compared after checking whether the units of analysis were the same. The two coders differed slightly in dividing the unit of analyses (304 units compared to 293 units). Most differences occurred because the rules about splitting a sentence into its main clauses were too ambiguous. As a result, one

coder divided some sentences into two main clauses, while the other left it as one unit.

Another cause for the disagreement is the fact that one coder combined consecutive sentences when were coded as the same move and strategy. After establishing more concrete rules regarding the unit of analysis, the units were aligned correctly. In this process, none of the original codes were changed.

The Cohen's Kappa analysis showed that the codebook had substantial reliability according to the guidelines of Landis and Koch (1977). The choice between descriptive or evaluative moves was reliable ($K=.721$). There was substantial agreement regarding the moves ($K=.735$). Lastly, for the strategies, the codebook is also reliable ($K=.686$). I also looked at where the two coders disagreed with each other, after which some moves and strategies were adjusted or better explained in the codebook. Regarding the validity of the research, I adopted some techniques from Whittemore, Chase, and Mandle (2001). These techniques include the use of a computer program and transparency in research design, data collection decisions and the data analysis process,

2.3 Data analysis

For the coding process, the computer program Atlas.ti was used. The analysis started with assigning one of the five moves to each unit of analysis, namely main clauses. Then, for each unit, the strategy was determined. The next step was to calculate, per review, how many times a move and strategy was used. To control for the differences in length between the reviews, I calculated the number of times a move was used relative to the total number of moves in the review. With these percentages, a one-way between-groups analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to identify differences between the three groups of reviews. SPSS 25 was used to perform the statistical analysis.

For the strategies, I calculated the distribution of the strategies per move because then I can compare the differences between the groups regarding how they realize each move.

However, the results of the latter analysis are to be interpreted cautiously because no statistical tests were conducted due to the scope of the research. These quantitative data are presented first in the result section organized by move type. Then, the results of the qualitative analysis are presented. This analysis started with comparing the three groups in terms of strategies. The second part of the qualitative analysis focused on the move structure.

3. Results

3.1 Quantitative analysis of the move usage

The first step of the analysis focused on the comparison of the use of the two types of moves, namely descriptive and evaluative. Because the reviews have different lengths, the percentage of the evaluative moves (relative to the total number of moves) was calculated. This percentage was used as the dependent variable in the one-way between-groups analysis of variance (ANOVA). The independent variable was the type of reviews: professional, experienced consumer and the inexperienced consumer. The assumption of the homogeneity of variance was violated, and thus, the Brown-Forsythe test was used. The Brown-Forsythe test showed that the differences between the three groups are significant ($F(2,122) = 71.28$, $p < .001$). The results indicated that restaurant reviews written by professional reviewers use relatively fewer evaluative moves ($M=30.99$, $SD=11.68$) than experienced consumers ($M=66.49$, $SD=17.35$), while inexperienced consumers use the most evaluative moves ($M=76.11$, $SD=18.79$). The post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey test showed that the mean scores of the three groups differ significantly from each other.

Then the five different moves were compared across the types of reviews. Again, the number of times a move was used, is expressed as the percentages relative to the total number of moves. For each of the five moves, a one-way between-group ANOVA was conducted to compare the move usage across the three different groups. Table 1 shows descriptive data about the usage of the five moves.

3.1.1 Giving practical information. The data about this move violated the assumption of homogeneity of variances, thus the results of the Brown-Forsythe test were interpreted. These results showed a significant effect of review group on the use of this move ($F(2,35) = 49.91$, $p < .001$). The post-hoc test revealed that there is a significant difference between professional reviews ($M=21.43$, $SD=13.02$) and the other two groups. However, the differences between the inexperienced consumer reviews ($M=2.11$, $SD=4.88$) and the

experienced consumer reviews ($M=1.43$, $SD=4.29$) were not significant. This means that the professional reviewers gave more practical information than experienced and inexperienced consumer reviewers. Regarding the strategies used to realize this move, there was one clear difference. The professionals were the only group that gave practical information about the restaurant. Experienced and inexperienced consumers did not provide this information in their reviews.

3.1.2 Describing the restaurant. Regarding the second descriptive move, the one-way between-group ANOVA showed that the differences between the three groups were significant ($F(2,123) = 30.99$, $p < .001$). The post-hoc test showed that the mean scores of the professional review group ($M=36.24$, $SD=11.71$) were significantly higher than the other two groups. A significant difference was also found between the experienced consumer group ($M=20.19$, $SD=13.13$) and the inexperienced consumer group ($M=11.34$, $SD=11.34$). In other words, all three groups differed in their use of the second move. Professional reviewers described the restaurant the most, followed by the experienced consumer reviewer, and lastly, the inexperienced consumer reviewers used the second move the least. Regarding the strategies, there were small differences between the three groups, mostly between reviews written by professional critics and the reviews of experienced and inexperienced consumers (see Appendix B).

3.1.3 Placing the restaurant in context. The one-way between-group ANOVA of this move showed no significant difference between the three groups of reviews. ($F(2,123) = .009$, $p = .991$). Which means that professionals, experienced consumers, and inexperienced consumers used this move a similar amount of times in their restaurant reviews. However, the groups differed in the way they use the strategies to realize this move. Both the second and the third group provided more context for the visit than the professional critics. At the same time, professional critics made more comparisons of the restaurant to a specific other

restaurant or the general food culture. This rarely happened in the two groups of consumer reviews.

3.1.4 Assessing the restaurant. For this move, the assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated. So, the Brown-Forsythe test was used to test the differences between the groups. These results showed a significant effect of review group on the use of this move ($F(2,117) = 42.82, p < .001$). The post-hoc test revealed that there was a significant difference between professional reviews ($M=28.41, SD=11.04$) and the other two groups. However, the differences between the inexperienced consumer reviews ($M=58.36, SD=16.56$) and de experienced consumer reviews ($M=63.86, SD=21.28$) were not significant. This means that professional restaurant critics used the move ‘assessing the restaurant’ less often than consumer reviewers, who used the move a similar amount of times. Regarding the strategies, there were no clear differences between the three groups. However, there were small variations between the professional reviews and the two consumer review groups (see Appendix B).

3.1.5 Recommending the restaurant. The last move, making a recommendation, violated the assumption of homogeneity of variances, thus, the results of the Brown-Forsythe test were interpreted. These results showed a significant effect of review group on the use of this move ($F(2,92) = 11.41, p < .001$). Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for professional reviews ($M=2.57, SD=2.52$) was significantly lower than experienced consumer reviews ($M=8.12, SD=8.47$) ($p=.047$) and inexperienced consumer reviews ($M=12.25, SD=12.47$). On the other hand, there was no significant difference between the experienced and inexperienced consumer reviews. In other words, there was a difference between the professional review group and the two consumer review groups. The use of the strategies also differed between the professional group of reviews and

the two consumer groups. Experienced and inexperienced consumers mentioned whether they are planning on coming to the restaurant again. Professional critics did not mention this at all.

Table 1:

Descriptive statistical data about moves

	Professional reviews	Experienced consumer reviews	Inexperienced consumer reviews
Total number of moves	1212	662	353
Descriptive	69.01% (SD=11.68) _a	33.51% (SD=17.35) _b	23.89% (SD=18.79) _c
Evaluative	30.99% (SD=11.68) _a	66.49% (SD=17.35) _b	76.11% (SD=18.79) _c
Giving practical information	21.43% (SD=13.02) _a	2.11% (SD=4.88) _b	1.43% (SD=4.29) _b
Describing the restaurant	36.24% (SD=11.71) _a	20.19% (SD=13.13) _b	11.34% (SD=13.57) _c
Placing the restaurant in context	11.34% (SD=7.36) _a	11.21% (SD=10.09) _a	11.03% (SD=10.74) _a
Assessing the restaurant	28.41% (SD=11.04) _a	58.36% (SD=16.56) _b	63.86% (SD=21.18) _b
Recommending the restaurant	2.57% (SD=2.52) _a	8.12% (SD=8.47) _b	12.25% (SD=12.47) _b

Note: Move percentages for each review are calculated by dividing the number of move uses

by the total number of moves of the review. The table presents the average percentages per group. Values in a given row that share a subscript do not differ significantly from each other at $\alpha = .05$.

3.2 Qualitative content analysis of strategies

Regarding the strategies corresponding with the move ‘giving practical information’, the biggest difference was the mention of contact information in professional restaurant reviews. These reviews included the address, phone number and opening hours. This information is also provided on Yelp.com by the website itself. This means that Yelp

reviewers do not have to mention this information. The quantitative analysis also showed that professional critics disclosed less information about themselves. When they did disclose some information, it is not always related to the dining experience. For example, one professional reviewer started his review by describing his difficulty of finding a hobby. The information about the critic provided in the two consumer groups was more related to food preferences, which is more relevant to a restaurant review.

There were also differences in the execution of the strategies related to the move 'describing the restaurant'. While all three groups used the strategy 'describing the food' the most to realize this move, they did so in different ways. Professional critics described the food, the ingredients and preparation in detail, while inexperienced consumer reviewers usually just gave the name of the dish. The experienced consumers fall somewhere in between because they did provide more descriptions of the food, but not as detailed as the professionals. Overall, professionals were more detailed than the other two groups, especially regarding the atmosphere and menu. However, describing the service was more prominent in experienced consumer reviews, but the content of these descriptions did not differ much between the three groups. The strategy 'describing professionalism' mostly related to the waiting time of the restaurant, which is more often discussed in consumer reviews.

The strategies of move 'placing the restaurant in context' were used differently as well. Both consumer groups described the context of the visit, for example, "Came here with a large group for a friend's birthday last night." or "Every time I'm in Dallas my Mom & I make a stop for lunch here". This kind of context is not disclosed in professional restaurant reviews. While all three groups spend a similar amount of space comparing the restaurant to similar restaurants, they did so in different ways. Professional reviewers often stated what the restaurant did differently than other restaurants, while both inexperienced and experienced consumer reviewers made statements like this: "My favorite falafel sandwich in LA". These

statements were often without a clear explanation of why this is better than other similar dishes/restaurants.

Regarding the strategies of the move ‘assessing the restaurant’, the qualitative results were similar to the findings of the move ‘describing the restaurant’. More specifically, the professional group was more detailed and elaborately argued than the other two consumer groups. For example, both consumer review groups often expressed their assessment of the food quality in one word, such as delicious, good, or perfect. Professional reviewers discussed what made the food good or what could be better. This is not to say that consumer reviewers never explained their assessments, but most of their opinions were not argued in the review. This is the case for all strategies for this move.

Regarding the strategies of the last move, the quantitative results already showed that professional reviewers did not say anything about their future plans. Experienced and inexperienced consumer reviewers expressed their future plans in similar ways, often with a statement like this one: “Will definitely go again”. There were some differences in the execution of the other strategy, ‘recommendations for other’. Professionals often recommended which dishes the reader should order to make the whole meal worthwhile. For example, they described the ideal meal. Experienced and inexperienced consumer reviewers generally recommended one dish or drink. They also recommended the restaurant in general, stating that the reader must visit the place.

3.3 Qualitative analysis of the move sequence in restaurant reviews

The analysis of the move structure was conducted per review group. First, professional reviews had some elements that were similar for all reviews in the first group, but there is not a clear move structure. The move ‘giving practical information’ was often used at the end, where the reviewer provided the contact information and some information about the

restaurant, such as wheelchair access and reservation system. At the end of the review, they also stated their recommendations. The other three moves appeared throughout the review without a clear pattern. However, upon closer inspection, it became clear that the reviews were more organized by topic instead of move. To put it differently, professional critics often spend multiple sentences describing or assessing topics like the food, atmosphere and other elements of the dining experience.

In the experienced consumer review group also showed some patterns. The move 'placing the restaurant in context' was often at the beginning of the review. The move 'making a recommendation' was often put at the end of the review. The description of the dining experience and the assessment of the experience were not clearly structured in terms of moves. Yet, something that happened a lot in this group of reviews was the combination of a short food description and their evaluation of that dish, in that order. This happened less often for the other categories of the dining experience.

Similar patterns were found in the inexperienced consumer review group. Again, the review often began with the move 'placing the restaurant in context' and ended with the move 'making a recommendation'. It was more difficult to discover patterns in the use of the move 'describing the restaurant' and the move 'assessing the restaurant' because the reviews were a lot shorter and thus there was less room to realize different moves. Some reviews in this group only assessed the restaurant and barely described anything.

4. Discussion

To answer the main research question, two different sub-questions were formulated to guide this research. The first sub-question, *to what extent do restaurant reviews written by professional critics, experienced consumers, and inexperienced consumers differ in move types and move structure*, was answered through a quantitative content analysis and a qualitative content analysis for the move structure. The analysis of the move usage indicates that professional reviews differ from the two groups of consumer reviews. There are no big differences between experienced and inexperienced consumer reviews. In general, professional restaurant reviews are more descriptive and consumer reviews are more evaluative. These differences are also reflected by the use of each move type. Consumers are more opinionated in their restaurant reviews (Jiang & Diesner, 2016). These results corroborate the findings of de Jong & Burgers (2013).

The analysis of the move structure demonstrates that none of the three groups have a consistent move structure. Professional reviewers organize their review more by topic than by move type, for example, they first talk about the food, and then the atmosphere and so on. Experienced consumer reviews have less structure, and inexperienced consumer reviews have the least structure of the three groups. Thus, restaurant reviews do not have a distinguishable move structure, but professional reviews are more organized by topic than the other two groups. This supports the notion that reviews written by professionals are more predictable (Jiang & Diesner, 2016). The lack of structure in consumer restaurant reviews can be attributed to the fact that the reviews are too short to make structured arguments.

The second sub-question, *how do restaurant reviews written by professional critics, experienced consumers, and inexperienced consumers differ in content*, looked at the use of the strategies. The biggest difference between the groups is that professional critics provide more detail in their descriptions and assessments of the restaurant. Overall, they support their statements with arguments more often than experienced and inexperienced consumer

reviewers do. Professional reviewers are able to provide more detail and arguments because they have more knowledge about the restaurant industry and they have more writing experience (Titz et al., 2004). Professional reviews also provide practical information about the restaurant, while this information is not provided by the other two groups. A probable explanation for this difference is the medium of the review because the website Yelp.com already provide this information. So, it is unnecessary for Yelp users to mention this in their reviews. Both experienced and inexperienced consumer reviewers disclose more personal information, for example, why they visited the restaurant, with whom, and whether they would go again.

Based on the results, this research answers the main question: *To what extent do restaurant reviews written by professional critics, experienced consumers, and inexperienced consumers constitute different text genres?* The results indicate that there are clear differences between professional restaurant reviews and consumer reviews. These differences in the use of moves and strategies imply that these two groups are different text genres (Swales, 1990). So, professional restaurant reviews are a different text genre than consumer restaurant reviews, which is in line with the findings of De Jong and Burgers (2013). At the same time, it contradicts the notion that the lines between professional restaurant critics and consumer reviewers are blurring in terms of content and format (Kobez, 2018). The different in text genre is an explanation for why professional restaurant reviews are viewed differently than consumer reviews (Beuscart et al., 2016; Z. Zhang et al., 2010).

However, I did not find enough differences between experienced and inexperienced consumer reviews to conclude that those are two different genres. The results somewhat contradict the findings of Beaudouin and Pasquier (2017), who argue that experienced consumers write different types of reviews than inexperienced consumers. An explanation for this difference in conclusions is the fact that Beaudouin and Pasquier (2017) looked at

different variables and they focused on differences in general, while I concentrated on genre differences. Yet, this research found a similar difference between the two groups, namely, inexperienced consumer reviews are more evaluative than experienced consumer reviews. So, while some findings of this research point to the heterogeneity within the consumer review group, this heterogeneity is not enough to conclude genre differences.

While this research provides little evidence for genre differences within the consumer review group, the results are contributing to a clearer understanding of consumer restaurant reviews. More specifically, this research points to how consumers write about restaurants and how they structure their reviews. The lack of differences between experienced and inexperienced consumer reviews give new insight into the role of experience in writing reviews. While previous research looked at the effect of experience on credibility (Lim & Van Der Heide, 2015), the analysis shows that experience does not lead to more professional reviews. This means that the increase in credibility is not due to similarities with professional critics, who are considered more legitimate (Beuscart et al., 2016).

This research also adds to the current literature on genre theory. This research is an expansion of the genre analysis because it applied genre analysis to a review genre. While previous literature on genre theory and consumer reviews focused on movie reviews, this study demonstrates that genre theory can also be applied to restaurant reviews (de Jong & Burgers, 2013; Taboada, 2011), which is one of the biggest review industries (Z. Zhang et al., 2010). A new codebook was created based on the codebook by De Jong and Burgers (2013) and literature on the contents of restaurant reviews (Pantelidis, 2010; Parikh et al., 2017; Titz et al., 2004). The reliability test showed that this codebook is reliable, and thus, this research broadens the methodology of the genre theory.

This research has some limitations. The generalizability is limited by the size of the corpus. While the number of analyzed reviews gives an indication of the genre differences

between the three groups, a larger corpus would make the results more representative of the restaurant review field. Especially, there was a shortage of available data for the group of professional reviews. The number of professional restaurant reviewers is small compared with the group of consumer reviewers, which makes it difficult to gather enough data to have three equally sized groups. Future studies should take this into account when they compare professional reviews with consumer reviews. A possible solution is to increase the period in which the professional reviews are published.

It was beyond the scope of this research to analyze the difference in style and language use in depth. Previous research did suggest that there are linguistic differences between groups of reviews (Jiang & Diesner, 2016), but there is no clear link between linguistic analysis and genre theory. This study limited itself to move and strategies because there is not a developed framework integrating style with genre theory. Even though style is part of the genre theory (Finn & Kushmerick, 2006). In order to grasp the differences in style between professional restaurant reviews and (in)experienced consumer reviews, an in-depth analysis is necessary, which was beyond the time constraints of this research. Taboada (2011) shows that genre and (linguistic) style are linked by discovering that evaluative and descriptive stages have different linguistic elements, such as connectives. However, this is not fully developed within the field of genre analysis. So, it would be interesting to extend the genre analysis model to include a linguistic/style analysis (Finn & Kushmerick, 2006).

In sum, this research extended the methodology of genre analysis to online restaurant reviews. The findings show that professional restaurant reviews are a different genre than consumer restaurant reviews. The research also shows that there is no clear evidence that experienced consumer reviews are another genre than inexperienced consumer reviews.

Reference list

- Arndt, J. (1967). Role of product-related conversations in the diffusion of a new product. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 4(3), 291–295.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/002224376700400308>
- Askehave, I. (2017). Communicative purpose as genre determinant. *HERMES - Journal of Language and Communication in Business*, 12(23), 13–23.
<https://doi.org/10.7146/hjlc.v12i23.25545>
- Askehave, I., & Ellerup Nielsen, A. (2005). Digital genres: a challenge to traditional genre theory. *Information Technology & People*, 18(2), 120–141.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/09593840510601504>
- Beaudouin, V., & Pasquier, D. (2017). Forms of contribution and contributors' profiles: An automated textual analysis of amateur on line film critics. *New Media & Society*, 19(11), 1810–1828. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444816643504>
- Beuscart, J.-S., Mellet, K., & Trespeuch, M. (2016). Reactivity without legitimacy? Online consumer reviews in the restaurant industry. *Journal of Cultural Economy*, 9(5), 458–475. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17530350.2016.1210534>
- Brown, B. (2012). Beyond recommendations. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction*, 19(4), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2395131.2395134>
- Buttle, F. A. (1998). Word of mouth: understanding and managing referral marketing. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 6(3), 241–254. <https://doi.org/10.1080/096525498346658>
- Chen, Y., & Xie, J. (2008). Online consumer review: Word-of-mouth as a new element of marketing communication mix. *Management Science*, 54(3), 477–491.
<https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.1070.0810>
- Cheung, C. M. K., & Lee, M. K. O. (2012). What drives consumers to spread electronic word of mouth in online consumer-opinion platforms. *Decision Support Systems*, 53(1), 218–

225. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.DSS.2012.01.015>

Cheung, C. M. K., & Thadani, D. R. (2012). The impact of electronic word-of-mouth communication: A literature analysis and integrative model. *Decision Support Systems*, 54(1), 461–470. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.DSS.2012.06.008>

Chossat, V., & Gergaud, O. (2003). Expert opinion and gastronomy: The recipe for success. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 27(2), 127–141.

<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1023432502059>

Creswell, J. W. (1999). Mixed-method research: Introduction and application. In *Handbook of Educational Policy* (pp. 455–472). American Press. Retrieved from

http://cachescan.bcub.ro/e-book/V/580599_6.pdf

de Jong, I. K. E., & Burgers, C. (2013). Do consumer critics write differently from professional critics? A genre analysis of online film reviews. *Discourse, Context & Media*, 2(2), 75–83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.DCM.2013.03.001>

Finn, A., & Kushmerick, N. (2006). Learning to classify documents according to genre.

Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, 57(11), 1506–1518. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.20427>

Hennig-Thurau, T., Gwinner, K. P., Walsh, G., & Gremler, D. D. (2004). Electronic word-of-mouth via consumer-opinion platforms: What motivates consumers to articulate themselves on the Internet? *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 18(1), 38–52.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/DIR.10073>

Hsu, G., Roberts, P. W., & Swaminathan, A. (2012). Evaluative schemas and the mediating role of critics. *Organization Science*, 23(1), 83–97.

<https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1100.0630>

Jiang, M., & Diesner, J. (2016). Says who...? Identification of expert versus layman critics' reviews of documentary films. In *Proceedings of COLING 2016, the 26th International*

- Conference on Computational Linguistics* (pp. 2122–2132). Retrieved from <http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/C16-1200>
- King, R. A., Racherla, P., & Bush, V. D. (2014). What we know and don't know about online word-of-mouth: A review and synthesis of the literature. *Journal of Interactive Marketing, 28*(3), 167–183. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.INTMAR.2014.02.001>
- Kobez, M. (2018). 'Restaurant reviews aren't what they used to be': digital disruption and the transformation of the role of the food critic. *Communication Research and Practice, 4*(3), 261–276. <https://doi.org/10.1080/22041451.2018.1476797>
- Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The Measurement of Observer Agreement for Categorical Data. *International Biometric Society, 33*(1), 159–174. Retrieved from <https://about.jstor.org/terms>
- Leech, N. L., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2009). A typology of mixed methods research designs. *Qual Quant, 43*, 265–275. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-007-9105-3>
- Lim, Y., & Van Der Heide, B. (2015). Evaluating the wisdom of strangers: The perceived credibility of online consumer reviews on Yelp. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 20*(1), 67–82. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12093>
- Lu, X., Ba, S., Huang, L., & Feng, Y. (2013). Promotional marketing or word-of-mouth? Evidence from online restaurant reviews. *Information Systems Research, 24*(3), 596–612. <https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.1120.0454>
- Mellet, K., Beauvisage, T., Beuscart, J.-S., & Trespeuch, M. (2014). A “democratization” of markets? Online consumer reviews in the restaurant industry. *Valuation Studies, 2*(1), 5–41. <https://doi.org/10.3384/vs.2001-5992.14215>
- Nijdam, P. (2018). Tussen tien sterren. *De Telegraaf*. Retrieved from <https://www.telegraaf.nl/vrij/2141215/tussen-tien-sterren>
- Pantelidis, I. S. (2010). Electronic meal experience: A content analysis of online restaurant

comments. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 51(4), 483–491.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1938965510378574>

Parikh, A. A., Behnke, C., Almanza, B., Nelson, D., & Vorvoreanu, M. (2017). Comparative content analysis of professional, semi-professional, and user-generated restaurant reviews. *Journal of Foodservice Business Research*, 20(5), 497–511.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/15378020.2016.1219170>

Parikh, A. A., Behnke, C., Nelson, D., Vorvoreanu, M., & Almanza, B. (2015). A qualitative assessment of Yelp.com users' motivations to submit and read restaurant reviews. *Journal of Culinary Science & Technology*, 13(1), 1–18.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/15428052.2014.952474>

Parikh, A. A., Behnke, C., Vorvoreanu, M., Almanza, B., & Nelson, D. (2014). Motives for reading and articulating user-generated restaurant reviews on Yelp.com. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Technology*, 5(2), 160–176. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JHTT-04-2013-0011>

Steen, G. (2011). Genre between the humanities and the sciences. In M. Callies, W. R. Keller, & A. Lohöfer (Eds.), *Bi-directionality in the Cognitive Sciences: Avenues, Challenges, and Limitations* (pp. 21–42). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Swales, J. (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Taboada, M. (2011). Stages in an online review genre. *Text & Talk - An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language, Discourse & Communication Studies*, 31(2), 247–269.

<https://doi.org/10.1515/text.2011.011>

Titz, K., Lanza-Abbott, J., & Cruz, G. C. y. (2004). The anatomy of restaurant reviews. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 5(1), 49–65.

https://doi.org/10.1300/J149v05n01_03

Vásquez, C., & Chik, A. (2015). "I am not a foodie...": Culinary capital in online reviews of Michelin restaurants. *Food and Foodways*, 23(4), 231–250.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/07409710.2015.1102483>

Whittemore, R., Chase, S. K., & Mandle, C. L. (2001). Validity in qualitative research.

Qualitative Health Research, 11(4), 522–537.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/104973201129119299>

Wimmer, R. D., & Dominick, J. R. (2003). *Mass Media Research: An introduction* (7th ed.).

Zhang, Y., & Wildemuth, B. M. (2016). Qualitative analysis of content. In B. M. Wildemuth (Ed.), *Applications of social research methods to questions in information and library science* (2nd ed., pp. 318–329). Oxford: Pearson Education.

Zhang, Z., Ye, Q., Law, R., & Li, Y. (2010). The impact of e-word-of-mouth on the online popularity of restaurants: A comparison of consumer reviews and editor reviews.

International Journal of Hospitality Management, 29(4), 694–700.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IJHM.2010.02.002>

Appendix A: Codebook overview

Move	Strategy	Explanation	Source
1: Giving practical information about the restaurant	Contact information	Location, phone number, opening times and where to make a reservation.	De Jong & Burgers (2013)
	Information about the restaurant	Who is the chef/owner, background and history of the restaurant, some practical information about happy hour or live music or other extra's. This also includes accessibility, dietary restrictions and whether you should make a reservation.	De Jong & Burgers (2013)
	Information about the critic	Any form of self-disclosure of the critics. For example, why they visited the restaurant and with whom.	De Jong & Burgers (2013)
2: Describing the restaurant	Food	Description of flavor, how it is presented, ingredients and preparation of the food. This also includes the name of a dish.	Pantelidis (2010)
	Drinks	Description of flavor, ingredients, preparation and presentation.	Parikh et al. (2017)
	Service	A neutral description of the service, for example the name of the waiter.	Pantelidis (2010); Titz et al. (2004)
	Atmosphere	The layout and design of the restaurants.	Pantelidis (2010); Titz et al. (2004)
	Menu	What is on the menu, including the drink menu. Also, the availability of vegan/gluten free dishes on the menu	Pantelidis (2010); Titz et al. (2004)
	Price and value	How much certain dishes cost and the price class of the restaurant.	Pantelidis (2010); Titz et al. (2004)
	Customers	The type of customer that comes to the restaurant and whether it is a busy place.	Titz et al. (2004)
	Professionalism	The perceived professionalism of the restaurant and the staff, including waiting times and dishes that are sold-out.	Titz et al. (2004)
3: Placing the restaurant in context	Describing the context of the visit	A description of why they visited the restaurant or whether it was a special day (e.g. birthday). Also, whether the reviewer had any expectations before going to the restaurant.	Pilot
	Comparing to other dishes of the restaurant	A description of a dish in relation to other dishes they ordered at the restaurant. For example, "The best dish on the menu is".	Pilot
	Comparing to similar restaurants	When the restaurant is placed in relation to other restaurants. For example, "for a Thai restaurant,	De Jong & Burgers (2013)

		their dishes are very spicy” and “One of my favorites [type of dish] ever tasted”.	
	Comparing to a specific restaurant	A comparison to a competitor or other restaurants in the neighborhood. For example, “I still believe [name of another restaurant] is better”.	De Jong & Burgers (2013)
	Comparing to the food culture	National or industry context of the restaurant.	De Jong & Burgers (2013)
4: Assessing the restaurant	General	Statements about the whole dining experience, the overall feeling about eating in the restaurant. For example, “I love this place”.	Pilot
	Food quality	Evaluation of the taste, flavor and presentation.	Titz et al. (2004)
	Food quantity	The evaluation of the servings. Is there too much or not enough?	Titz et al. (2004)
	Drinks	Evaluation of the taste, flavor and presentation.	Parikh et al. (2017)
	Service	Evaluation of the service, politeness, personal attention etc.	Pantelidis (2010); Titz et al. (2004)
	Atmosphere	The layout and design of the restaurants. Also, noise level and temperature. For example, “It was very loud”.	Pantelidis (2010); Titz et al. (2004)
	Menu	The look of the menu and whether there are enough options/variety of dishes/drinks.	Pantelidis (2010); Titz et al. (2004)
	Price and value	Whether the price is worth it and if the reviewer thinks it is expensive or cheap.	Pantelidis (2010); Titz et al. (2004)
	Customers	How other customers influenced the dining experience. For example, “The couple next to use kept arguing, which was very annoying”.	Titz et al. (2004)
	Professionalism	The perceived professionalism of the restaurant and the staff, including waiting times and dishes that are sold-out.	Titz et al. (2004)
5: Recommending the restaurant	Recommending others	Mentioning that other should or should not go to this restaurant and which dishes they should try or avoid.	Pilot
	Future plans of the reviewer	Whether the reviewer is planning to go again to the restaurant.	Pilot

Appendix B: Means and standard deviations of strategies

	Professional reviews	Experienced consumer reviews	Inexperienced consumer reviews
Total number of move 1 uses	246	13	7
Contact information	17.60% (SD=12.43)	0	0
Information about the restaurant	70.25% (SD=18.30)	59.26% (SD=49.38)	66.67% (SD=51.64)
Information about the critic	12.15% (SD=22.54)	40.74% (SD=49.38)	33.33% (SD=51.64)
Total number of move 2 uses	448	152	50
The food	47.54% (SD=22.14)	53.66% (SD=33.89)	63.21% (SD=42.23)
Drinks	3.54% (SD=6.00)	2.18% (SD=8.04)	0
Service	3.97% (SD=5.91)	14.25% (SD=21.20)	13.08% (SD=29.77)
Atmosphere	13.38% (SD=11.33)	7.37% (SD=18.15)	5.45% (SD=16.49)
Menu	17.21% (SD=14.28)	6.83% (SD=20.12)	1.28% (SD=6.54)
Price and value	7.79% (SD=5.32)	3.18% (SD=10.06)	0
Customers	3.16% (SD=4.92)	10.16% (SD=24.01)	0.96% (SD=4.90)
Professionalism	2.86% (SD=9.98)	2.37% (SD=10.87)	16.03% (SD=31.79)
Total number of move 3 uses	139	71	40
The context of the visit	8.8% (SD=16.83)	58.52% (SD=45.07)	51.08% (SD=47.52)
Comparing to other dishes of the restaurant	13.84% (SD=23.19)	3.47% (SD=12.18)	6.45% (SD=10.04)
Comparing to similar restaurants	32.81% (SD=25.87)	31.67% (SD=37.56)	36.02% (SD=44.53)
Comparing to a specific restaurant	18.05% (SD=27.28)	1.85% (SD=7.74)	5.38% (SD=19.43)
Comparing to the food culture	26.50% (SD=29.38)	4.49% (SD=11.98)	1.08% (SD=5.99)
Total number of move 4 uses	349	374	216
General	9.18% (SD=8.83)	15.44% (SD=14.73)	20.31% (SD=24.80)
Food quality	55.46% (SD=22.81)	40.70% (SD=23.11)	40.63% (SD=28.88)
Food quantity	0.38% (SD=1.96)	2.82% (SD=7.08)	2.58% (SD=9.26)
Drinks	2.74% (SD=4.77)	2.72% (SD=8.12)	5.13% (SD=12.52)
Service	7.20% (SD=8.28)	16.67% (SD=13.48)	18.65% (SD=21.81)

Atmosphere	16.58% (SD=21.42)	8.90% (SD=11.44)	6.85% (SD=13.10)
Menu	4.26% (SD=5.86)	3.65% (SD=7.27)	2.47% (SD=7.64)
Price and value	2.69% (SD=4.93)	4.83% (SD=9.13)	3.05% (SD=8.34)
Customers	0.35% (SD=1.24)	1.51% (SD=4.71)	0.33% (SD=2.36)
Professionalism	1.80% (SD=4.51)	2.77% (SD=7.41)	0
Total number of move 5 uses	30	52	40
Recommending others	100% (SD=0)	42.42% (SD=43.12)	51.67% (SD=44.50)
Future plans of the reviewer	0	57.58% (SD=43.12)	48.33% (SD=44.50)

Note: Strategy percentages calculated per move: number of a strategy divided by how many times that particular move is used.