

## การวิเคราะห์ประเภทผลงานบทวิจารณ์หนังสือ เชิงเปรียบเทียบระหว่างบทวิจารณ์โดยผู้เชี่ยวชาญและ บทวิจารณ์ออนไลน์ที่เขียนโดยผู้บริโภค

อุมาภา เตโชวิบูลย์

MEng, MSc, นักศึกษาปริญญาโท

ภาษาและการสื่อสาร สถาบันพัฒนบริหารศาสตร์

umapa.may@gmail.com

### บทคัดย่อ

บทวิจารณ์ออนไลน์ที่เขียนโดยผู้บริโภคถือเป็นการให้ข้อมูลที่ช่วยลดปัจจัยเสี่ยงในการตัดสินใจซื้อ ด้วยเหตุนี้บทวิจารณ์ออนไลน์จึงมีผลกระทบต่อยอดขายของสินค้า บทวิจารณ์ประเภทนี้ต่างจากบทวิจารณ์ที่เขียนโดยผู้เชี่ยวชาญ ผู้บริโภคที่ซื้อสินค้าสามารถเขียนและเผยแพร่คำวิจารณ์เกี่ยวกับสินค้าได้เอง ดังนั้น บทวิจารณ์ออนไลน์จึงเป็นหัวข้อวิจัยที่ดึงดูดในแวดวงการศึกษา อย่างไรก็ตาม งานวิจัยเชิงเปรียบเทียบว่าด้วยบทวิจารณ์ที่เขียนโดยผู้บริโภคและผู้เชี่ยวชาญยังมีน้อย งานวิจัยนี้จึงมุ่งประเด็นศึกษาความแตกต่างระหว่างบทวิจารณ์ทั้งสองประเภทด้วยหลักการวิเคราะห์ประเภทผลงาน โดยเน้นที่โครงสร้างของรูปแบบบทวิจารณ์ทั้งสองประเภท ใช้ตัวอย่างการทดลองทั้งหมด 50 ตัวอย่าง เป็นบทวิจารณ์โดยผู้เชี่ยวชาญ 25 ตัวอย่างและบทวิจารณ์ที่เขียนโดยผู้บริโภคอีก 25 ตัวอย่าง ผลการวิเคราะห์พบว่า โครงสร้างบทวิจารณ์ที่เขียนโดยผู้เชี่ยวชาญเป็นระเบียบแบบแผนมากกว่าโครงสร้างบทวิจารณ์ที่เขียนโดยผู้บริโภค นอกจากนี้ ผู้เชี่ยวชาญมักใช้

ภาษาที่เชิญชวนน้อยกว่า ไม่อ้างอิงเรื่องส่วนตัว ในขณะที่  
ผู้บริโภคมักชอบบรรยายประสบการณ์ส่วนตัวในบทวิจารณ์

**คำสำคัญ:** การวิเคราะห์ประเภทผลงาน; บทวิจารณ์หนังสือ;  
บทวิจารณ์ออนไลน์

## A Genre Analysis of Book Review Written by Professional Critics Versus Online Consumer Critics

**Umapa Dachoviboon**

MEng, MSc, MA Student

Language and Communication

National Institute of Development Administration

umapa.may@gmail.com

### **Abstract**

Online consumer reviews, as a type of Word-of-Mouth (WOM), are regarded by potential buyers as a source of information to reduce uncertainty in making buying decisions, and therefore could impact a product's sales. This type of review is different from the conventional reviews written by professional critics, as consumers are given the independence to write and publish their own reviews of a purchased product. As a result, online consumer reviews have become an attractive research topic for the academic circle. However, comparative studies as to how professional critics and consumer critics write are still scarce. This research therefore aims to explore such discrepancies, utilizing genre analysis as a framework, and focusing on the written structures of the two types of reviews. The total sample for this study was 50;

25 for professional reviews and 25 for consumer reviews. It was found that the written structure of the professional reviews were more structured and uniform, whereas the structure of the consumer reviews were inconsistent. It was also found that professional critics keep their writing less personal and less persuasive, whilst consumer critics have the tendency to articulate their own personal reading experience.

**Keywords:** Genre analysis; Book reviews; Online reviews

## Introduction

Word-of-mouth (WOM) is an exchange of information about goods and services among consumers and has long been recognized as a powerful marketing tool, which can cause a significant impact on consumers' buying decision, (Schindler & Bickart, 2012). Because buying a product is an investment in uncertainty, information that could reduce that uncertainty is valuable. One type of WOM that has become more influential over these past decades is online consumer reviews. Such phenomenon is owing to the rise of the Internet technology. To assist possible customers with their buying decisions, online retailer stores, such as Amazon.com, provide a section of consumer reviews on each page of a product. As opposed to the more conventional reviews written by professional critics, consumers themselves can become the critics, as such systems enable them to comment and/or provide information about the purchased products. A lot of previous research can be found on the generic structure of book reviews (i.e. Motta-Roth, 1995, Khunkitti, 2005). However, comparative studies as to how professional critics and consumer critics write are still scarce. This research therefore aims to explore such discrepancies in the light of genre analysis, focusing on the written structures of these two types of reviews.

As one of the biggest online retailer stores is Amazon. com. It is a rich source for WOM. For each page of a product, there is a section dedicated solely to product reviews. Because Amazon.com originated as an online bookstore, one of the most common reviews on the website is book review. This current paper, therefore, has chosen book reviews on Amazon.com as its research sample for online consumer reviews. On the other hand, The New York Times', The

New York Review of Books, established in 1963, is a well-known magazine that publishes book reviews by professional writers. Because The New York Times is an American newspaper, with worldwide influence and readership, this research selected book reviews from The New York review of Books as research samples for professional reviews.

## Literature Review

### 1. Genre Analysis

Based on the definition by the pioneering work of Swales (1990), genre is a term used to characterize a category of discourse of any type, spoken or written, with or without literary aspirations. Bhatia (1993) added, that there are several aspects to be considered when defining a genre: 1) a communicative event characterized by a set of communicative purposes; 2) the structure of genres; 3) constraints on allowable contributions of a particular genre; and 4) these purposes are understood and often employed by members of the discourse community of the genre. In summary, genres are communicative events with identifiable and recognizable communicative purposes in a specific community, and genre analysis is an analysis on the regularities of structure that differentiate one type of text from another. The main objective of genre analysis is to understand and to account for the realities of the world of texts (Bhatia, 2002). In performing the genre analysis, Bhatia (1993) proposed a seven-step model, which has been adopted and applied efficiently by many researchers in the field. The seven-step model of new genre analysis consists of the following steps:

(a) Placing the given genre-text in a situational context

- (b) Surveying existing literature
- (c) Refining the situational/contextual analysis
- (d) Selecting corpus
- (e) Studying the institutional context
- (f) Linguistic analysis
- (g) Specialist information in genre analysis

Dudley-Evans and St. John (1998) have provided the definitions of move and step as follows:

Move refers to “a unit that relates both to the author’s purpose and to the content that s/he wishes to communicate”

Step refers to “a lower level text unit than move that provides a detailed perspective on the options open to the author in setting out the moves.”

An analysis of moves and steps is an important element of genre analysis. Bhatia (2004, 2012) further explicated, that all frameworks of discourse and genre analysis could offer useful insights into specific aspects of language use in typical contexts.

## 2. Online Reviews

The rise of online consumer reviews has given the academic circle various dimensions to be discussed. A number of literature focus on the effectiveness and/or perceived helpfulness of these product reviews. Some studies indicate that professional critics may have a bigger influence on the buying decision of consumers than consumer reviews, (Reinstein & Synder, 2005; Boatwright et al., 2007), whereas another branch of studies suggests that professional critics may be subject to more commercial biases and connections (Dobrescu et al., 2013), thus consumers expect them to be less

trustworthy (Zhang et al., 2010).

Among these studies, various factors could be identified as influencing factors for the perceived helpfulness. One of them is the expertise of the critics (Vermeulen and Seegers, 2009; Willemsen et al., 2010, Willemsen et al., 2011), and another is the language used (Schellekens et al., 2010, Schindler & Bickart, 2012, Skalicky, 2013) in the written reviews.

The work of Skalicky (2013) applied the framework of genre analysis to analyze the rhetorical patterns that exist in Amazon.com's rated "most helpful" reviews in an attempt to understand the shared values of the Amazon.com discourse community on the perceived helpfulness, as reflected in this specific genre. The findings reported that reviews which are similar to the "soft selling" form of advertisements (Cook, 1992) are considered less helpful than those focusing on the author or product. Jong and Burgers (2013) addresses the difference between the writing of online film reviews by consumer critics and professional critics utilizing genre analysis on a corpus of 72 online film reviews. They classified the moves found into descriptive and evaluative moves, and also reported that online film reviews written by consumer critics tend to use more evaluative moves than professional critics. In addition, they also often take on the first-person perspective, whereas professional critics tend to give their opinions in a more objective way by using the third person-perspective.

## Methodology

This study seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What are the generic structures of online professional and

online consumer book reviews? Are they similar or different?

2. What are the linguistic implications of the discrepancies found in the written structures of these two types of reviews?

### 1. Data Collection & Analysis

In order to answer the research questions, the data was collected from two different sources to represent each type of review. For professional reviews, 25 samples from the reviews of fiction books dated between February 2014 and April 2016 are selected first from The New York Times website with the simple random sampling method. With this method, each sample is drawn simply by chance and has an equal chance to be drawn. The reason for picking the sample from The New York Times first is due to the limited selection of book review articles provided by the website. The overall average length of these reviews is 1,176 words. For online consumer reviews, 25 samples of the same books selected from The New York Times are collected from Amazon.com for the purpose of comparison. All the samples used are reviews with the highest number of people finding the review helpful from Amazon.com's "most helpful" review section. The overall average length of these reviews is 524 words.

In the case that the book reviewed on New York Times cannot be found on Amazon.com, a new sample was then selected to replace the problematic one. With these reviews, a corpus of 50 samples was formed for the data analysis. The data analysis draws on the theoretical framework of genre analysis, according to the work of Swales (1990) and Bhatia (1993). In order to analyze the move structure of the research sample, coding protocol will be developed based on

previous literature (Motta-Roth, 1995; Nicolaisen, 2002; Khunkitti, 2005; Valensky, 2010; Jong and Burgers, 2013; Skalicky, 2013) and guidelines on writing a book review from various online library sources.

## 2. Research Procedures

All book reviews (BR) both from The New York Times and Amazon.com are printed out and assigned specific labels: CR for Consumer Review and PR for Professional Review, followed by the given numbers, for example, CR01 for Consumer Review No.1 and PR01 for Professional Review No.1. As this research aims to differentiate between the writing of the professional book reviews and the consumer book reviews, the analysis will therefore focus solely on the content of the reviews. Graphics and materials that appeared uniformly as a template, or a given across the page, such as, the title of the review, the timestamp, the format purchased, as well as the preliminary information, (author, number of pages, price, publisher etc.) as already given by Amazon.com, and as appeared at the end of every review from The New York Times, will be excluded. The reviews will be examined and analyzed for the move structure and the underlying communicative purposes of identified moves, sub-moves, and steps, using the theoretical framework of genre analysis.

- The coding protocol is developed using earlier research and guidelines on writing a book review from various online library sources.
- The coding protocol is pilot-tested on a small sample of the corpus to verify its actual usability.

- If discrepancies are found from the pilot-test, the protocol will be revised. Otherwise, the research will proceed to the actual study using the obtained coding protocol.

As the move structure, as well as the moves, sub-move, and steps are identified, the frequencies of each move, sub-move, and step will be calculated and presented as a percentage. The results of the analysis for both types of reviews are compared and contrasted. The researcher also provides discussion and replies to the research questions.

### 3. The Coding Protocol

The final coding protocol and the sources from which the moves are derived are presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1 Coding protocol and sources for data analysis

Move	Communicative Purpose	Strategies	Source(s)
Introduction	Capturing reader's attention and defining the general topic of the book	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Informing potential readership</li> <li>- Situating the book within the identity of the author</li> <li>- Situating the book within the genre of fiction</li> <li>- Highlighting some parts of the book</li> <li>- Raising a point from the related topic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Motta-Roth (1995), Nicolaisen (2002)</li> <li>- Valensky (2010)</li> <li>- Khunkitti (2005)</li> <li>- Pilot study</li> </ul>

Move	Communicative Purpose	Strategies	Source(s)
Describing the book	Informing the reader about the book	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Describing the story</li> <li>- Describing the character</li> <li>- Describing the physical characteristics of the book</li> <li>- Describing the reading experience</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Jong &amp; Burgers (2013)</li> <li>- Jong &amp; Burgers (2013)</li> <li>- Pilot study</li> <li>- Pilot study</li> </ul>
Evaluating the book	Forming an attitude and giving a view about the book	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Providing evaluation of the author</li> <li>- Providing evaluation of the book itself</li> <li>- Providing evaluation of the content of the book</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Jong &amp; Burgers (2013), Valensky (2010)</li> </ul>
Overall statement	Providing the comprehensive statement about the book	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recommending or disqualifying the book</li> <li>- Summarizing the review or the content of the book</li> <li>- Leaving a cliffhanger</li> <li>- Giving comments related to personal experience</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Motta-Roth (1995), Nicolaisen (2002)</li> <li>- Skalicky (2013),</li> <li>- Pilot study</li> <li>- Pilot study</li> </ul>

Move	Communicative Purpose	Strategies	Source(s)
Reviewer information	Providing information about the reviewer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Providing background information about the reviewer</li> <li>- Providing a brief biography of the reviewer</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pilot study</li> <li>- Pilot study</li> </ul>
Review information	Providing information about the review itself	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Providing information/reasoning for writing/ updating the review</li> <li>- Providing information/reasoning for updating the review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Skalicky (2013)</li> <li>- Pilot study</li> </ul>

From Table 1, the coding protocol can be further categorized and revised as follows:

Table 2 The revised coding protocol

Rhetorical Structures	Communicative Purposes
Move 1	Introduction
Sub-move 1	Capturing reader's attention
Step I	Raising a point from the related topic (and/or)
Step II	Highlighting some aspects/parts of the book
Sub-move 2	Situating the book
Step I	Situating the book within the identity of the author (and/or)

Rhetorical Structures	Communicative Purposes
Step III	Situating the book according to readership
Move 2	Describing the book
Step I	Describing the physical characteristics of the book (and/or)
Step II	Describing the story (and/or)
Step III	Describing the character (and/or)
Step IV	Describing the reading experience
Move 3	Evaluating the book
Step I	Providing evaluation of the author (and/or)
Step II	Providing evaluation of the book itself (and/or)
Step III	Providing evaluation of the content of the book
Move 4	Overall assessment
Step I	Recommending or disqualifying the book (and/or)
Step II	Summarizing the review or the content of the book (and/or)
Step III	Leaving an ending with suspense (and/or)
Step IV	Giving comments related to personal experience
Move 5	Reviewer information
Step I	Providing background information about the reviewer (and/or)
Step II	Providing a brief biography of the reviewer
Move 6	Review information
Step I	Providing information/reasoning for writing the review (and/or)
Step 6	Providing information/reasoning for updating the review

### Findings & Discussions

The revised coding protocol is applied to the entire corpus, and the frequencies of occurrence of moves, sub-moves, and steps found in professional book reviews (PRs) and online consumer book reviews (CRs) can be summarized as written in Table 3.

Table 3 Frequencies of occurrence of moves, sub-moves, and steps in BRs

Rhetorical Structure	Total Number of Occurrence in CRs (Percentage)	Total Number of Occurrence in PRs (Percentage)
M1	84	100
SM1	52	76
SI	24	52
SII	28	56
SM2	56	76
SI	24	60
SII	28	40
SIII	20	8
M2	92	100
SI	12	0
SII	80	100
SIII	48	68
SIV	36	8
M3	100	96
SI	64	76
SII	28	4
SIII	64	84
M4	92	84
SI	36	12
SII	28	80
SIII	12	4
SIV	60	8
M5	8	64

Rhetorical Structure	Total Number of Occurrence in CRs (Percentage)	Total Number of Occurrence in PRs (Percentage)
SI	4	20
SII	4	40
M6	4	16
SI	4	0
SII	0	16

### 1. What are the generic structures of online professional and online consumer book reviews? Are they similar or different?

The results of the genre analysis and the summary provided in the above table show that both CRs and PRs share an almost similar generic structure albeit with difference in the occurrence of certain moves and steps used. According to the data, Move 1: Introduction and Move 2: Describing the book appear to be mandatory for PRs. For Move 2: Describing the book, the step that always appears (100% occurrence) in PRs is Step II: Describing the story. Move 2: Describing the character, Step IV: Describing the reading experience appears mostly in CRs (36%) while in PRs, the occurrence is very minor (8%). The total occurrence for Move 3: Evaluating the book is 96% for PRs and 100% for CRs and CRs tend to use Step II: Evaluating the book itself (28%) more than PRs (4%). For Move 4: Overall assessment, PRs tend to use Step II: Summarizing the review or the content of the book (80%), whereas CRs tend to use Step IV: Giving comments related to personal experience (60%). Step I: Recommending or disqualifying the book also appears more in CRs (36%) than PRs (12%). Move 5: Reviewer information and Move 6: Review information

appear more in PRs (64% and 16% respectively) while in CRs, they are almost non-existent (8% and 4% respectively).

From the genre analysis, the sequence of Moves for each CR can be listed as follows:

CR01: M1-M3-M1-M2-M5-M4

CR02: M1-M2-M3-M4

CR03: M1-M2-M3-M4-M5

CR04: M1-M3-M4-M6

CR05: M1-M2-M3-M4

CR06: M2-M4-M3-M4

CR07: M1-M2-M3-M4-M2-M3-M4-M3-M4

CR08: M2-M3-M4

CR09: M1-M2-M3-M2-M4

CR10: M1-M2-M3-M4

CR11: M1-M2-M3-M4

CR12: M1-M3-M2-M4-M2-M3-M4

CR13: M4-M1-M3-M2

CR14: M1-M2-M3-M4

CR15: M1-M3-M2-M3-M2-M3

CR16: M1-M4-M2-M3-M4-M3

CR17: M1-M3-M2-M4

CR18: M1-M3-M2-M3-M2-M3-M4

CR19: M2-M3-M4

CR20: M1-M2-M3-M2-M4

CR21: M1-M2-M3-M2-M3-M4

CR22: M1-M4-M2-M3-M4

CR23: M1-M3-M2-M3-M4

CR24: M1-M4- M2-M3-M4

CR25: M4-M2-M3-M4

From the genre analysis, the sequence of Moves for each PR can be listed as follows:

PR01: M1-M2-M3-M4-M5

PR02: M1-M2-M3-M4-M5

PR03: M1-M2-M3-M4-M5

PR04: M1-M2-M3-M4-M5

PR05: M1-M2-M3-M4-M6

PR06: M1-M2-M3-M4

PR07: M1-M2-M3-M4-M5

PR08: M1-M2-M3-M4

PR09: M1-M2-M3-M2-M4-M5

PR10: M1-M2-M3-M4-M5-M6

PR11: M1-M2-M3-M2

PR12: M1-M2-M3-M4-M5

PR13: M1-M2-M3-M4-M3-M5

PR14: M1-M2-M3-M2

PR15: M1-M4-M3-M2-M3-M4

PR16: M1-M3-M2-M3-M4

PR17: M1-M2-M3-M5

PR18: M1-M2-M4-M3-M5

PR19: M1-M2-M4-M5-M6

PR20: M1-M2-M3-M4-M5

PR21: M1-M3-M2-M4-M5

PR22: M1-M3-M2-M3-M4-M5

PR23: M1-M2-M3-M4-M5

PR24: M1-M2-M3-M4-M6

PR25: M1-M2-M3-M4-M5

It can be noted that the moves and steps found in PRs are more structured. Most PRs follow the uniform of Move 1->Move 2->Move 3->Move 4-> Move 5 (Move 6 rarely appears, thus it is optional). All PRs always start with Move 1: Introduction and usually follow by Move 2: Describing the book or Move 3: Evaluating the book and conclude with Move 4: Overall assessment. Move 5: Reviewer information is often left at the end of the review. An interesting point here is that Move 2: Describing the book and Move 3: Evaluating the book are often used together and the sequence of their appearance are interchangeable. For example, the sequence of moves appeared in PR09 is Move 1->Move 2->Move 3->Move 2->Move 4->Move 5 and the sequence of moves appeared in PR16 is Move 1->Move 3->Move 2->Move 3->Move 4.

In contrast, CRs are much less structured. While some CRs follow the same pattern as PRs, the sequence of the rest is less consistent. Even though most CRs start with Move 1: Introduction, Move 2: Describing the story can replace Move 1: Introduction at the top of the review, resulting in that review having no Move 1. Such reviews that start with Move 2 are CR06, CR08, and CR19. Move 3: Evaluating the story and Move 4: Overall assessment too can also appear anywhere in the review although Move 3 can be found often together with Move 2 just like in PRs.

## **2. What are the linguistic implications of the discrepancies found in the written structures of these two types of reviews?**

Previous literature reported that the effectiveness / perceived helpfulness of the review relies on the critics' expertise and the language used in the written reviews (e.g. Vermeulen and Seegers,

2009; Willemsen et al., 2010, Willemsen et al., 2011). The findings of this paper, therefore, have illustrated that professional critics structure their writings differently from their consumer counterpart. The most obvious factor is the uniformity. PRs are apparently more uniformed than CRs, which is a good indicator of the writer's expertise. This point might be one of the factors that make professional critics "professional".

It could also be seen from the statistics of moves and steps that appeared in both types of reviews that, compared to their consumer counterpart, professional critics tend to avoid mentioning their personal experience, and opt instead to set the more neutral tone by describing and summarizing the content of the book or the review itself. This is in agreement with previous literature (Jong & Burgers, 2012) that professional critics tend to keep their writing less personal and more objective. As a result, PRs tend not to recommend or disqualify a book directly. In contrast, consumer critics recommend or disqualify a book more openly and tend to express their personal reading experience.

An interesting point here is that while previous research (Jong & Burgers, 2013) states that the expertise of the writer could be a significant factor for the effectiveness of the review, the inconsistently structured, "less professional" reviews, are perceived as "most helpful" on Amazon.com. This might be due to the fact that online consumer reviews are perceived as "more truthful", due to the story of personal experience relayed by fellow users, thus making these "more truthful" reviews effective.

## Conclusion

This paper provides a comparative study on the genre analysis of reviews written by professional and consumer critics, utilizing the framework of genre analysis. The objective of this research is to answer 2 main questions: 1) What are the generic structures of these two types of reviews? Are they different or similar? 2) What are the linguistic implications of the discrepancies found in the written structures of these two types of reviews?

The researcher has selected Amazon.com as a source for research samples for online consumer critics because, Amazon.com is one of the largest online retailers. As for the research sample for professional critics, The New York Times is a good candidate, due to it being an influential magazine so well-known across the world. 25 reviews were first taken off The New York Times website at random, then 25 reviews of the same books were selected from Amazon.com website's "most helpful" section. Because Amazon.com can also be regarded as a discourse community, samples of reviews taken from the section users voted as "most helpful" may reflect the preference of the users on Amazon.com. This, therefore, could be worthy taking note of, as it may play a distinguishing role between these two types of reviews.

The coding protocol was adapted from the book review guidelines, previous research, and the pilot study. The findings from the application of move analysis have illustrated that professional reviews follow quite strictly the pattern of Move 1->Move 2->Move 3->Move 4->Move 5 with Move 6 being optional. Move 1 always appears at the top of professional reviews. Move 2 and Move 3 are also used together and can appear before or after each other in a review's sequence. The most used strategies for move 2 are describing

the story and describing the character, which usually appear together. The review usually concludes with Move 4, with the most used strategy of summarizing the review or the content of the book. In contrast, online consumer reviews are much less structured. While most online consumer reviews start with Move 1, some reviews exclude Move 1 completely and start instead with Move 2. Except Move 1, all other moves can appear anywhere in the review. Move 5 and Move 6 are rare for online consumer reviews.

Furthermore, steps that involve personal experience tend to be avoided by professional critics. This could be because some potential buyers might expect professional critics to be subject to bias and personal connection. Therefore, professional critics tend to write their reviews to sound less personal and less persuasive. This point is highlighted by the fact that professional reviews rarely recommend or disqualify a book directly. They opt instead to summarize the review or the content of the book.

On the other hand, the inconsistent structure of reviews written by online consumers speaks for itself, regarding the writer's expertise. Jong and Burgers (2013) mentioned that, the expertise of the writer could be a significant factor in the effectiveness of the review. However, the feedback on the Amazon.com discourse community might be different as these "less professional" reviews are the ones voted as most helpful. It could be possible that these online consumer reviews are perceived as "more truthful" due to the story of personal experience relayed by fellow users, making these "more truthful" reviews effective.

## References

- Bhatia, V. K. (1993). *Analyzing genre-language use in professional settings*. London: Longman.
- Bhatia, V. K. (2002). *Applied genre analysis: A multi-perspective model*. Retrieved July 6 2016 from <http://www.aelfe.org/documents/text4-Bhtia.pdf>.
- Bhatia, V. K. (2004). *Worlds of written discourse: A genre-based view*. London: Continuum.
- Bhatia, V. K. (2012). *Critical reflections on genre analysis. Model*. Retrieved from [www.aelfe.org/documents/03\\_24\\_Bhatia.pdf](http://www.aelfe.org/documents/03_24_Bhatia.pdf)
- Boatwright, P., Basuroy, S., & Kamakura, W. (2007). Reviewing the reviewer: The impact of individual film critics on box office performance. *Qualitative Market Economics*, 5(4), 401-425.
- Dobrescu, L. I., Luca, M., & Motta, A. (2013). What makes a critic tick?: Connected authors and the determinants of book reviews. *Journal of economic behavior & organization*, 96, 85-103.
- Dudley-Evans, T., & St. John, M.J. (1998). *Developments in English for specific purposes: A multi-disciplinary approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jong, I. K. E., & Burgers, C. (2013). Do consumer critics write differently from professional critics?: A genre analysis of online film reviews. *Discourse, Context and Media*, 2(6), 75-83.
- Khunkitti, W. (2005). *Genre analysis of book reviews in journals in the English language field* (Unpublished master's thesis). Kasetsart University, Bangkok.
- Motta-Roth, D. (1995). Same genre, different discipline: A Genre based study of book reviews in academia. *The ESPECIALIST*, 17(2), 99-131.

- Nicolaisen, J. (2002). Structure-based interpretation of scholarly book reviews: A new research technique. Retrieved July 6 2016 from [https://web.archive.org/web/20050818220548/20050818220548/http://www.db.dk/jni/Articles/Abstract\\_Colis4.htm](https://web.archive.org/web/20050818220548/20050818220548/http://www.db.dk/jni/Articles/Abstract_Colis4.htm)
- Reinstein, D., & Snyder, C. (2005). The influence of expert reviews on consumer demand for experience goods: A case study of movie critics. *Journal of Industrial Economics*, 53, 27-52.
- Schindler, R.M., & Bickart, B. (2012). Perceived helpfulness of online consumer reviews: The role of message content and style. *Journal of Consumer Behavior*, 11(3), 234-243.
- Skalicky, S. (2013). Was this analysis helpful?: A genre analysis of the Amazon.com discourse community and its “most helpful” product reviews. *Discourse, Context and Media*, 2(1), 84-93.
- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vermeulen, I. E., & Seegers, D. (2009). Tried and tested: The impact of online hotel reviews on consumer consideration. *Tourism Management*, 30(1), 123-127.
- Willemsen, L., Neijens, P. C., & Bronner, F. (2010). Perceived expertise vs. perceived trustworthiness: The suppressed effect of source type on review attitude. In Okazaki, S. (Eds.), *Advances in Advertising Research Vol.2*. Wiesbaden: Gabler Verlag.
- Willemsen, L., Neijens, P. C., Bronner, F., & Ridder, J. A. (2011). Highly recommended! The content characteristics and perceived usefulness of online consumer reviews. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 17(1), 19-38.

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