



GENRE ANALYSIS OF ONLINE CONSUMER REVIEWS ON AMAZON AND DARAZ IN PAKISTAN: A COMPARATIVE STUDY

Wajeeha Noor

Department of English Language and Linguistics, Faculty of Arts and
Humanities, University of Sargodha, Sargodha, Pakistan.

Naveed Nawaz Ahmad
naveed.nawaz@uos.edu.pk

Department of English Language and Linguistics, Faculty of Arts and
Humanities, University of Sargodha, Sargodha, Pakistan.

Abstract

Online consumer reviews now shape purchasing decisions, yet little is known about how their rhetorical and linguistic construction differs between a global platform and a Pakistani one. Existing work has examined reviews mainly through marketing and computational approaches, and genre-based studies have concentrated on Amazon and other Western sites, leaving Pakistani e-commerce largely unexamined. This study presents a comparative genre analysis of 50 consumer reviews, 25 from Amazon and 25 from Daraz. Using a qualitative, descriptive, and comparative design, it applies Bhatia's (1993) move-step model to identify rhetorical organization and examines code-switching and culturally embedded expression through close reading. Two research questions guide the analysis: which moves and steps make up the genre on both platforms, and how the platforms differ in rhetorical structure, language, and cultural expression. Both sets of reviews contain the same four moves: identifying the product, evaluating the product, justifying the evaluation, and recommending the product or giving seller feedback. Evaluation is the only obligatory move, found in all 25 reviews on each platform. The platforms differ in the steps that realize the moves. Amazon reviews centre on the product: its features, its performance, and the reviewer's experience of use. Daraz reviews centre on the transaction: conformity with the listing, delivery, and appreciation of the seller, often expressed through English and Roman Urdu code-switching and, in a minority of reviews, through religious formulas of thanks and blessing. Because the corpus is small, the patterns are descriptive and cannot be generalized to either platform as a whole. The study shows that one genre can take different shapes in different marketplaces, and it adds a Pakistani case to a literature built largely on Western data.

Keywords: *Amazon, Bhatia (1993) Move-Step Model, Daraz, Digital Discourse, Genre Analysis, Online Consumer Reviews, Pakistani E-Commerce*

Corresponding Author: Naveed Nawaz Ahmad (Department of English Language and Linguistics, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, University of Sargodha, Sargodha, Pakistan.)

Email: naveed.nawaz@uos.edu.pk

1. Introduction

Digital technologies have changed how consumers speak to businesses and to one another. Before buying, people now look less at the product itself or at traditional promotion and far more at what other buyers report online, and the consumer review has become the main vehicle for that peer talk: reviewers describe what happened, judge what they bought, and advise whoever buys next. It is a small text with a large audience.

Reviews serve several functions in digital markets. They report on product performance, reduce uncertainty for prospective buyers, and build trust between buyers and sellers. Ventre and Kolbe (2020) found that the perceived usefulness of online reviews, together with trust and perceived risk, shapes online purchase intention in an emerging market, which makes reviews a main resource for judging a product's credibility.

Reviews are publicly available and address several audiences at once, among them prospective buyers, existing customers, and sellers. They work as post-purchase evaluations, but they are also social acts of meaning-making in which reviewers build credibility, state attitudes, and take part in marketplace practices.

A genre perspective treats the review as a structured communicative event and not as a scatter of personal opinions. Swales (1990) defines genres as communicative events that share a purpose recognized by a discourse community, and Bhatia (1993, 2004) adds that genres are conventionalized yet flexible, adapted by their users to the situation at hand. Reviews fit this description. They recur and serve identifiable purposes, yet they vary with the setting in which they are written.

The linguistic side of reviews matters most in multilingual settings. Online communication in Pakistan mixes English and Urdu freely, and Urdu is often typed in Roman script, with spellings that vary from writer to writer. These practices carry identity and cultural meaning. A review written there may therefore do more than report on a product.

Pakistan is a useful site for asking how a global digital genre is adapted locally. Amazon is a global marketplace whose reviews, on first inspection, centre on product features, functionality, and use. Daraz serves Pakistani buyers and may add other concerns. Dealings with sellers, delivery, and culturally embedded expression are the obvious candidates, and the comparison that follows tests whether reviewers on each platform actually bring them into the text.

1.1. Statement of the Problem

E-commerce in Pakistan has grown quickly, and reviews have become part of how buyers and sellers deal with each other. The language of those reviews has received little attention. Marketing research has asked what makes a review helpful or persuasive, and computational work has classified reviews by sentiment, but neither explains how reviewers organize a text, which rhetorical steps they choose, or which languages and

cultural resources they draw on. Genre-based studies that do address these questions have worked mostly with Amazon and similar international sites.

The result is a gap with practical consequences. It is not known whether reviews on a global platform and on a Pakistani platform realize the same genre, or whether the marketplace changes what reviewers do. Without that knowledge, claims about the review as a stable genre rest on Western data, and accounts of Pakistani digital writing lack a systematic description of one of its most common forms. This study addresses the problem by comparing the rhetorical organization, linguistic choices, and culturally embedded practices of Amazon and Daraz reviews.

1.2. Purpose and Contributions of the Study

This study compares consumer reviews of products on Amazon and Daraz as instances of one genre. It examines their rhetorical strategies, linguistic characteristics, and culturally embedded discursive practices to explain how reviewers construct meaning in marketplace communication.

The study makes two contributions. First, it applies Bhatia's (1993) move-step model to a genre that has mostly been studied through marketing and computational approaches. Second, it compares a global platform with a Pakistani one, which shows how a single genre adapts to different marketplace structures and whether the adaptation reaches beyond the choice of steps to the choice of language. Two research questions guide the analysis. They address the rhetorical organization the platforms share and the variation in steps, language, and cultural expression that separates them.

1.3. Research Questions

1. Which rhetorical moves and steps make up online consumer reviews on Amazon and Daraz, and how frequent is each?
2. How do the two platforms differ in the realization of these moves and steps, in language choice, and in culturally embedded expression?

2. Literature Review

This section situates the study within genre analysis and research on digital consumer discourse. It reviews the theoretical background and earlier empirical work on online reviews, rhetorical organization, language practices, and e-commerce discourse, and it ends by stating the gap that a comparison of Amazon and Daraz reviews is meant to address.

2.1. Concept of Genre and Genre Analysis

Genre analysis studies texts as they are organized for communicative purposes and social contexts. Swales (1990) views genre as a class of communicative events that share a common purpose and are recognized by members of a discourse community, which means that a text belongs to a genre because of what it is for and not only because of how it looks. The point matters. Genres are not just types of text defined by similar forms; they

are socially meaningful practices through which people achieve specific communicative objectives.

Bhatia (1993, 1996, 2004) refines the notion of genre by focusing on the interaction between communicative purpose, rhetorical organization, and linguistic realization. Genres, for Bhatia, are conventional yet flexible means of communication that evolve in particular social contexts. They have recognizable patterns. Users still adapt those patterns to the communicative situation as they see fit, which is why two texts that belong to the same genre can look quite different on the page.

Genres also change with technology. Online consumer reviews are a recent digital genre, yet they keep stable communicative functions, among them reporting an experience, judging a product, recommending it, and influencing the choices of other buyers. Reviews differ in length and style from one writer to the next. Each can still be recognized as a review by these rhetorical functions.

2.2. Online Consumer Reviews as Electronic Word-of-Mouth

Online consumer reviews are a major form of electronic word-of-mouth. Hennig-Thurau et al. (2004) define it as the information consumers share with one another about products and services through the Internet. Unlike traditional word of mouth, which stays within a circle of acquaintances, reviews are open to everyone and can reach a very large number of prospective buyers who have never met the writer.

Reviews perform several communicative functions. They give information, record evaluations, relay experience, and build relationships between reviewers and readers. These functions support trust and decision-making in online marketplaces.

Mudambi and Schuff (2010) analyzed customer reviews on Amazon and found that the quality, depth, and relevance of the information determine how useful readers judge a review to be. Readers, then, do not treat reviews only as signals of a positive or negative opinion; they also weigh how much information a review carries and of what kind.

Vasquez (2014) analyzed the discourse of online consumer reviews and showed how reviewers build identity and credibility through personal stories, evaluative language, and stance. Reviews are therefore more than informational texts: they are communicative practices in which consumers present themselves as knowledgeable users and as advisers to others.

2.3. Genre-Based Studies of Online Consumer Reviews

Genre-based studies have found identifiable rhetorical patterns in online consumer reviews. Pollach (2006) analyzed product reviews posted on consumer opinion web sites and found that writers regularly combine product evaluations with personal experience, which already suggests an organized text and not a stream of opinion. Reviews, on this evidence, are systematic.

Racine (2002) analyzed how the genre of the retail catalogue changed from Sears, Roebuck to Amazon.com. Its object is the catalogue and not the review, but the study places consumer-facing digital text within a longer history of commercial genres and shows the consumer's move from recipient of commercial information to participant in an online marketplace.

Skalicky (2013) applied genre analysis to Amazon's "most helpful" product reviews and examined their rhetorical patterns. Successful reviews often combined product information with personal experience, which allowed reviewers to build credibility and help other consumers.

Wang (2023) analyzed texts from four Daraz country websites in South Asia and found that cross-border e-commerce English varies in its linguistic features, variation the author links to cultural background, regional market size, and internet infrastructure. The study concerns platform texts and not consumer reviews, but it shows that regional and cultural factors may shape e-commerce genres.

These studies confirm that online reviews have recognizable rhetorical and linguistic properties. They have, however, tended to examine single platforms or Western contexts, and they say little about how a similar genre functions across different cultural and commercial settings.

2.4. Language, Code-Switching, and Culture in Online Reviews

Language use is closely linked to cultural identity in multilingual digital settings. In Pakistan, English and Urdu interact online, and reviewers use Roman Urdu and code-switching as communicative resources to convey specific meanings, not merely out of habit. Awan et al. (2025) report that code-switching and code-mixing in Pakistani English work as tools of identity construction, with English tending to mark formality and professional register and Urdu carrying culture and emotion. Cultural background also shapes how reviews are written and read. Hofstede's (1980) cultural dimensions are the usual reference point for such comparisons. Koh et al. (2010) found that online movie reviews track perceived quality more closely in Chinese and Singaporean networks than in the United States, where under-reporting is more common, and Park and Lee (2009), comparing U.S. and Korean consumers, found that national culture moderates how reviews are used and how strongly they influence purchases.

Language choice in Pakistan has long carried ideological weight, since the learning and use of Urdu and English are tied to questions of power and identity (Rahman, 2002). English keeps its institutional role in education and professional life (Rahman, 2006). Online, mixed constructions and non-standard spellings are common features of networked multilingual writing (Androutsopoulos, 2015), and Roman Urdu belongs to that pattern. Mixing is not confined to private talk. Khan (2014) treats code-switching in

Pakistani television advertisements as a social practice, which points to social meaning in commercial communication as well.

Cultural factors also shape how consumers express evaluation. A review's credibility and trustworthiness are reinforced by appreciation, interpersonal reference, and culturally situated expression. A review is commercial text, but it is also embedded in a culture.

2.5. Research Gap

Existing literature gives a solid base for studying online reviews as a rhetorical genre, as a site of linguistic choice, and as a product of cultural context, and it has clarified review helpfulness, consumer behavior, and rhetorical organization. Two areas remain thin. First, reviews are often studied computationally, through sentiment analysis or review classification, which leaves the rhetorical and linguistic work consumers do to build meaning comparatively neglected. Second, genre-based research has mostly used Amazon and other established international review sites, and few studies ask how one review genre is realized on a global platform and on a local one.

The gap is sharper in Pakistan. E-commerce there has grown considerably, yet research on consumer-generated discourse says little about rhetorical organization, linguistic use, and cultural discourse strategy in online reviews. The present study addresses this gap by examining the rhetorical organization, linguistic resources, and culturally embedded practices of reviews written on Amazon and Daraz.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Design

This study is qualitative, descriptive, and comparative. It is qualitative because the aim is to understand how consumers frame their experiences, build evaluations, and express meaning through rhetorical and linguistic means, not only to identify a single linguistic feature. It is descriptive because it records the communicative patterns, language practices, and cultural expressions that occur naturally in consumer discourse. It is comparative because it sets Amazon reviews against Daraz reviews to identify similarities and differences. Frequency counts are reported, but only to show how widespread each move and step is in this corpus; they are not used for statistical inference.

The corpus was treated as naturally occurring digital discourse produced by consumers in marketplace settings. Reviews are written for an audience, and they show how people use language to express satisfaction, dissatisfaction, judgment, and personal experience in a space that strangers can read. The unit of analysis was the single review. Each was analyzed as a communicative, rhetorical, and social event and not just as an opinion about a product, an event in which the reviewer plays several roles at once: buyer, critic, adviser, and sometimes a witness for or against the seller.

3.2. Corpus and Sampling

The data are 50 online consumer reviews collected from two e-commerce platforms: Amazon, a global marketplace, and Daraz, a Pakistani one. The corpus holds 25 reviews from each. The platforms were chosen because they offer two distinct commercial environments in which customers evaluate products and interact digitally, and comparing them shows whether the communicative purposes of the genre hold across different commercial and cultural settings. The reviews concern everyday consumer goods such as clothing, bags, household items, and accessories.

Reviews were selected by purposive sampling. This allowed the study to concentrate on reviews with enough text to show rhetorical organization, evaluation, and linguistic practice, and the selected reviews cover different kinds of consumer experience, including product evaluation, personal experience, recommendation, and comment on the purchasing process. Reviews without meaningful text were excluded, because the study concerns written discourse and not star ratings or other non-linguistic responses.

3.3. Move-Step Analytical Model

This study applies Bhatia's (1993) genre analysis model, specifically the move-step model, to the rhetorical structure of online consumer reviews. Bhatia treats genres as conventional but flexible ways of communicating that develop in particular social and professional settings. That treatment suits online consumer reviews. They show recognizable patterns, yet they adapt to the platform on which they appear and to the habits of the people who write them, and the model has to be able to register both.

The model identifies the communicative functions that reviews perform. A move is a major rhetorical function; steps are the concrete ways in which the function is carried out. Here the model is used to examine how products are introduced, how experience is described, how products are evaluated, how opinions are justified, and how recommendations or feedback are given. The aim is to find the rhetorical patterns in Amazon and Daraz reviews and to see whether the organization of consumer discourse differs by platform.

Alongside the rhetorical analysis, the study examines linguistic choices and their cultural meaning. Language choices matter because reviewers do more than supply product information: they signal attitudes, build credibility, and position themselves in relation to other consumers and to sellers.

The study also attends to culturally embedded discourse practices in Pakistani online consumer communication. Particular attention goes to English-Urdu code-switching and to Roman Urdu phrases, which are visible traces of the multilingualism that marks digital communication in Pakistan and which a purely rhetorical reading would pass over. Such choices carry more than the message. They can signal emotion, familiarity,

social relations, and culture, and a coder who ignored them would miss part of what a review does.

The rhetorical, linguistic, and cultural strands are used together, so that reviews can be treated as complex digital texts and the findings on organization and language can be read against each other.

3.4. Data Analysis Procedure

Each review was read closely and coded for moves and steps. A move was counted as present in a review when at least one of its steps occurred, and each move and step was then labelled obligatory, conventional, or optional according to its frequency within each platform's 25 reviews (see Section 4.1). Language choice, religious expression, address to the seller or reader, and family reference were identified by close reading of the same reviews and recorded as present or absent. The coding therefore records the presence of an expression and not the reviewer's intention. A single coder carried out the coding, a limitation taken up in the Conclusion.

4. Results: Move-Step Analysis

4.1. The Shared Move Structure

Applying Bhatia's (1993) move-step model to the 50-review corpus (25 reviews from each platform) yielded four rhetorical moves on both platforms: Identifying Product, Evaluating Product, Justifying Evaluation, and Recommendation/Seller Feedback. Table 1 presents the communicative purpose of each move and the steps through which it was realized.

Table 1. Moves and realization steps in Amazon and Daraz reviews

Move	Communicative purpose	Amazon realization steps	Daraz realization steps
1. Identifying Product	Establishing the object under review and the circumstances of purchase	Product identification; purchase/order context; received-item information	Product identification; purchase/order context; received-item information
2. Evaluating Product	Expressing a judgment of the product	Overall evaluation; feature/performance evaluation; quality/material evaluation	Overall evaluation; feature/performance evaluation; quality/material evaluation

Move	Communicative purpose	Amazon realization steps	Daraz realization steps
3. Justifying Evaluation	Giving reasons and evidence for the judgment	Personal/usage experience; reasons/evidence; conformity evidence	Personal/usage experience; reasons/evidence; conformity evidence; delivery experience
4. Recommendation / Seller Feedback	Guiding future consumers and closing the review	Direct recommendation; future purchase intention; closing evaluation	Direct recommendation; future purchase intention; seller/platform appreciation; closing evaluation

Following Kanoksilapatham's (2015) classification, each move and step was labelled obligatory (found in 100% of the reviews), conventional (60–99%), or optional (below 60%) according to its frequency within each platform's 25 reviews. A move was counted as present in a review when at least one of its steps occurred. Table 2 reports the counts, percentages, and resulting labels.

Table 2. Frequency and status of moves and steps (Amazon n = 25; Daraz n = 25)

Move / step	Amazon (n = 25)	Nature	Daraz (n = 25)	Nature
1. Identifying Product	23 (92%)	Conventional	15 (60%)	Conventional
product identification	20 (80%)	Conventional	10 (40%)	Optional
purchase/order context	10 (40%)	Optional	6 (24%)	Optional
received-item/delivery information	1 (4%)	Optional	3 (12%)	Optional

Move / step	Amazon (n = 25)	Nature	Daraz (n = 25)	Nature
2. Evaluating Product	25 (100%)	Obligatory	25 (100%)	Obligatory
overall evaluation	20 (80%)	Conventional	15 (60%)	Conventional
feature/performance	23 (92%)	Conventional	13 (52%)	Optional
quality/material	14 (56%)	Optional	14 (56%)	Optional
3. Justifying Evaluation	22 (88%)	Conventional	18 (72%)	Conventional
personal/usage experience	14 (56%)	Optional	6 (24%)	Optional
reasons/evidence (explanation, comparison, proof)	19 (76%)	Conventional	9 (36%)	Optional
conformity evidence (matches or differs from listing)	3 (12%)	Optional	10 (40%)	Optional
delivery experience	0 (0%)	–	5 (20%)	Optional
4. Recommendation/Seller Feedback	18 (72%)	Conventional	22 (88%)	Conventional
direct recommendation	6 (24%)	Optional	8 (32%)	Optional
future purchase intention	4 (16%)	Optional	4 (16%)	Optional
seller/platform appreciation	0 (0%)	–	13 (52%)	Optional

Move / step	Amazon (n = 25)	Nature	Daraz (n = 25)	Nature
closing evaluation	13 (52%)	Optional	8 (32%)	Optional

Note. Move rows count reviews in which at least one step of the move occurs. Obligatory = 100%; conventional = 60–99%; optional = below 60%.

Three observations follow from Table 2. First, evaluation is the structural backbone of the genre. It is the only move that appears in every review on both platforms (25 of 25), and so the only obligatory one; a text with no evaluation would hardly count as a review. Second, the other three moves are conventional on both platforms: Identifying Product (92% on Amazon, 60% on Daraz), Justifying Evaluation (88% and 72%), and Recommendation/Seller Feedback (72% and 88%). They are common but not required, so reviewers can choose whether to name the product, support their judgment, or close the review. Third, the platforms differ more in steps than in moves. On Amazon, four steps reach conventional status: product identification, overall evaluation, feature/performance evaluation, and reasons/evidence. On Daraz only overall evaluation does, and it sits exactly at the 60% threshold. The four-move skeleton is shared, which points to one genre; the Daraz reviews, however, draw on a different and more varied set of optional steps, among them conformity evidence, delivery experience, and seller/platform appreciation, which points to a distinct realization of that genre.

4.2. Move Realization in Amazon Reviews

Identifying Product. This move appears in 23 of the 25 Amazon reviews (92%), and the product is named in 20 of them (80%), typically in the first sentence, as in “These jeans are AMAZING!” (Review 1) and “I didn’t think I’d like a cutting board this much” (Review 6). Ten reviews (40%) also place the product in a purchase context by stating the need or occasion behind the purchase: “I needed a bag that would fit my laptop” (Review 17), “I hate ironing so thought I’d give this iron/steamer a try” (Review 20), and “The night before my trip my suit case broke so I ordered this” (Review 19). These openings do more than label the product. They give the reader a reference point for the evaluation, since the verdict can be judged against the stated need. Only one review (Review 19) mentions receiving the item, and it does so briefly.

Evaluating Product. Evaluation occurs in all 25 reviews. An overall verdict appears in 20 reviews (80%), as in “I absolutely love them” (Review 4) and “This is perfect!”. Reviewers who give a verdict seldom stop there: 19 of those 20 reviews also comment on features or performance. Feature/performance evaluation is the most common evaluative step (23 reviews, 92%). Reviewers remark on the fit of a band, described as

“stretchy and comfortable” (Review 1), on whether a steamer “steams well” (Review 20), and on charging time and motion detection in lights (Review 4). Quality or material is addressed in 14 reviews (56%), for example “buttery smooth” (Review 2) and “The material is not cheap at all and is high quality” (Review 17). Evaluation on Amazon is therefore layered: an overall verdict is backed by facts about the product and its construction.

Justifying Evaluation. Justification appears in 22 reviews (88%). The most frequent step is reasons/evidence (19 reviews, 76%), which includes comparisons with other items, such as “it’s more hygienic than traditional boards” (Review 6), and with the reviewer’s earlier purchases, such as “I have two other samsonite suitcases that are similar to this” (Review 19) and “feels much better than my last watch band did” (Review 24). Two reviewers explain their star ratings: “Only reason for the 4 stars” (Review 8) and “the reason I took off a star” (Review 21). Personal or usage experience, which lends credibility to the judgment, is reported in 14 reviews (56%). Durability is confirmed by “all the lights have survived a few rainstorms” (Review 5), and a suitcase by “Mine has already been through 4 or 5 airports now” (Review 19). Conformity evidence is uncommon (3 reviews, 12%) and concerns matches or mismatches with the listing photos: “Looks just like the listing photos” (Review 13); “The color was pretty accurate in the photos” (Review 24); “Even though the dimensions were listed, this purse does appear smaller in real life” (Review 18). No Amazon review comments on delivery.

Recommendation/Seller Feedback. This move occurs in 18 reviews (72%). Six reviews (24%) give a direct recommendation: “You will not be disappointed in this purchase” (Review 4), “I highly recommend” (Review 5), “I would purchase and recommend” (Review 8), and “Definitely a must in your closet!” (Review 15). Four reviewers state an intention to buy again, as in “I’ll be buying every color” (Review 1) and “I will be getting more” (Review 11). Closing evaluation appears in 13 reviews (52%) and gives a final judgment, such as “My favorite cup, hands down” (Review 14) and “Definitely worth it for the price!” (Review 24). The move is addressed to the product and to other buyers. No Amazon review thanks or rates the seller or the platform; the nearest case is “I will check this company out again to purchase additional items” (Review 7), which concerns future purchases and not the seller relationship. Closings on Amazon therefore persuade and sum up; they do not address a relationship with the seller.

4.3. Move Realization in Daraz Reviews

Identifying Product. This move appears in 15 Daraz reviews (60%), against 92% on Amazon, and the product is named in only 10 reviews (40%). Reviewers who do identify something often refer to the transaction and not the product, using words such as parcel, order, and store: “i just received the parcel” (Review 12), “I reviewed my parcel” (Review 1), “this was my first time ordering from this store” (Review 6), and “this is my

second order from same store” (Review 9). Purchase or order context appears in six reviews (24%) and receipt of the item in three (12%). Identification on Daraz thus points to the transaction, and many reviewers never name the product.

Evaluating Product. Evaluation is again universal (25 of 25). An overall verdict appears in 15 reviews (60%), for example “the winter beanie cap is awesome” (Review 2) and “Overall, a very nice product and I am satisfied” (Review 18), against 80% on Amazon. Feature/performance evaluation is markedly lower (13 reviews, 52%, against 92%) and is typically short. Review 4 notes that the product turns itself off when the heat is high (automatic h high heat hoti h), and Review 12 gives only “Application :smooth”. Quality or material is the one evaluative step that occurs equally often on both platforms (14 reviews, 56%): “quality was good” (Review 20), “The quality of case is 10/10” (Review 23), and “The quality of these silicone socks is very poor” (Review 14). Six reviews (7, 8, 11, 12, 15, and 17) contain attribute fields with labels such as “Longevity:good”, which resemble a structured review form. Because such fields are not freely composed evaluations, they were counted toward the feature and quality steps.

Justifying Evaluation. Justification appears in 18 reviews (72%), but it rests on different evidence than on Amazon. The most common step is conformity evidence (10 reviews, 40%, against 12% on Amazon): reviewers report whether what arrived matches what they saw or ordered. Positive cases include “same as shown” (Review 10), “They delivered exact color what I ordered” (Review 23), and Jo deehkaya wo hi paya (“I received exactly what was shown”, Review 25). Negative cases include colour bhi change bhaja ha (“the colour sent is also changed”, Review 8), Fit:medium order keya tha large bhaja ha (“I ordered medium but large was sent”, Review 16), and “the slime bottles were not the same they have shown” (Review 16). Delivery experience appears in five reviews (20%) and never on Amazon. Reviewers praise it (“My package arrived EVEN BEFORE the estimated time”, Review 19; “packaging was Very good and safe”, Review 13) or criticize it (“but delivery was not on time”, Review 22). Reasons/evidence (36%) and personal or usage experience (24%) are used less than on Amazon (76% and 56%). When experience is reported, it usually takes the form of a test or inspection: “I have checked every jaar” (Review 10), “I wore them for two hours after getting the package” followed by “Here is the picture” (Review 14), and mein ny is ko different cheezo par tested Kiya (“I tested it on various things such as floor, furniture and cabinets”, Review 15). Taken together, 13 Daraz reviews (52%) cite transactional evidence (conformity or delivery) and 12 (48%) cite reasons or experience with the product. On Amazon the figures are 3 reviews (12%) and 22 reviews (88%). A Daraz reviewer is therefore about as likely to base an evaluation on the purchase process as on the use of the product, which is not true of Amazon reviewers.

Recommendation/Seller Feedback. This is where Daraz reviews depart most clearly from Amazon reviews. The move appears in 22 reviews (88%), and its most common step is seller/platform appreciation (13 reviews, 52%), which never occurs on Amazon. Reviewers thank the seller (“Thanks to the seller given the opportunity”, Review 2; “thanx dear seller”, Review 9), thank the platform (“thanx daraz and seller”, Review 10), praise the seller’s conduct (“really appreciate seller’s honesty”, Review 6; “Seller is so cooperative”, Review 23), or bless the seller (“May God bless the seller”, Review 19). Direct recommendation occurs in 8 reviews (32%), for example “Recommended with 5 stars” (Review 3), “highly recommend product” (Review 6), and jaldi say order kray or mazay kray (“order quickly and enjoy”, Review 22). Four reviewers say they will order again, as in “will definitely order from here again” (Review 23). Six reviews (6, 10, 11, 13, 17, and 21) both recommend the product and thank or praise the seller, so the closing serves two purposes: advising other buyers and rewarding the seller. Closing evaluation appears in eight reviews (32%, against 52% on Amazon) and often takes the form of a rating: “all 10/10” (Review 16), “all over the bag is 10 on 10” (Review 20), and “Overall, a very nice product and I am satisfied” (Review 18).

4.4. Comparison of the Two Platforms

Both sets of reviews contain the same four moves in the same functional roles, and evaluation is obligatory on both, which indicates a shared underlying genre rather than two unrelated ones. The difference lies in what the moves are made of. Table 3 lists the steps on which the platforms differ most.

Table 3. Steps with the largest differences between platforms (n = 25 per platform)

Step	Amazon	Daraz	Difference (Amazon minus Daraz, percentage points)
seller/platform appreciation	0%	52%	−52
feature/performance evaluation	92%	52%	+40
product identification	80%	40%	+40
reasons/evidence	76%	36%	+40
personal/usage experience	56%	24%	+32
conformity evidence	12%	40%	−28

Step	Amazon	Daraz	Difference (Amazon minus Daraz, percentage points)
overall evaluation	80%	60%	+20
closing evaluation	52%	32%	+20
delivery experience	0%	20%	-20

Amazon reviews are organized around the product. They are more likely to name it (80% against 40%), to evaluate its features and performance (92% against 52%), and to support the evaluation with reasons, comparisons, and experience of use (88% of reviews against 48%). Daraz reviews are organized around the transaction. They are far more likely to address the seller or platform (52% against 0%), to check the product against the listing (40% against 12%), and to comment on delivery (20% against 0%). Taken together, 52% of Daraz reviews mention conformity or delivery, compared with 12% of Amazon reviews.

The largest difference lies in the closing move. Amazon reviews end with a product endorsement or a final verdict addressed to prospective buyers. Daraz reviews regularly add thanks and praise for the seller, which addresses a second audience and builds a relationship between reviewer and seller as well as between reviewer and reader; six reviews do both. This fits a transaction-centred reading of Daraz reviews, in which reviewers judge the seller's conduct, the accuracy of the listing, and the product as parts of one transaction. The data cannot show, however, whether the pattern results from the structure of the marketplace.

Not all steps differ. Direct recommendation (24% and 32%) and quality or material evaluation (56% on both platforms) are about equally common. With 25 reviews per platform, each review accounts for four percentage points, so the figures are descriptive only, and differences below 20 points (five reviews) should not be treated as meaningful. Amazon and Daraz reviews are best understood as two situated realizations of the same genre.

4.5. Language Choice and Culturally Embedded Expression

Language choice. The two sets differ sharply in language. Every Amazon review is in English. Twelve of the 25 Daraz reviews (48%; Reviews 1, 4, 7, 8, 9, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 22, and 25) contain Roman Urdu or Urdu expressions. Most mix both languages within a review or sentence, and a few, including Review 25, are almost entirely in Roman Urdu. Three Daraz reviews (15, 17, and 22) also contain emoji; no Amazon review does.

The mixing is patterned, though it does not follow a strict division of labour. English provides product and platform terms (“quality”, “order”, “delivery”, “Daraz”), the labels of the attribute fields (“Material Quality:”, “Fit:”, “Design:”), and many ready-made evaluative words (“best”, “good”, “awesome”). Roman Urdu commonly carries judgments on price, conformity, intentions, and the seller. On price: Thik hein ab is price mein aisi hi multi hein (“splendid; products at this price usually are as like this”, Review 7) and 1700 mne aj kal milta hi Kiya ha (“what can you get now in 1700?”, Review 9). Conformity: colour bhi Jo bola wo he aya (Review 1). On intentions: ab Mai or bhi order Kru gi (“now I will order more”, Review 1). On the seller: seller humble or kind person hen (“the seller is a very humble and kind person”, Review 17). Eight label-predicate pairs combine an English field label with a Roman Urdu predicate, for example “Fit: medium order keya tha large bhaja ha” (Review 16). Roman Urdu is not confined to transactional and interpersonal talk, however. In reviews 7 and 15 it is used to refer to the product itself (scent bohat achi hy is mein; zabadest), so code-switching is better seen as a way of reaching both transactional and evaluative content than as a split between technical English and emotional Urdu.

Religious expression. No Amazon review contains a religious expression. Five Daraz reviews do (20% of the 25). They serve several purposes. Most bless the seller or give thanks for the sale: allah ap ke karoobar me Barket de (Review 25), May God bless the seller (Review 19) and JazakAllah And Shukriya Saller Sahab (Review 21). In Review 22, Mashallah expresses approval twice: Mashallah Cheze to achi hai; Mashallah chalanay mai Bohat Maza aaraha hai, in which he also makes a promise of purchase in the future in Sha Allah dubra order krongi (“God willing, I will order again”). Religious language enters these reviews at three points (evaluation, future purchase, and feedback to the seller), and each use expresses goodwill or approval.

Personal address and the seller’s character. Daraz reviewers also evaluate the seller as a person. Three reviews comment on the seller’s character, for example “seller bhut humble or kind person hen” (Review 17), “seller is honest” (Review 13), and “really appreciate seller’s honesty” (Review 6). Three reviews use terms of familiarity or respect: “please brother” (Review 5), “Amazing yaar amazing” (Review 19), and “Saller Sahab” (Review 21). Two reviewers vouch for their own sincerity: “i am here to share my honest Review” (Review 13) and “Its Not A Paid Or Fake Review” (Review 21). Honesty therefore appears in two forms: as an attribute of the seller and as a claim made by the reviewer. Both can be read as a bid for trust in a market where buyers deal one-to-one with individual sellers.

Community framing and family reference. Community framing is rare. Review 4 argues that such products should be available to ordinary consumers (aesi cheezain honi chahiye, “things like this should exist”) and it is the only review to take this view. Direct

address to readers occurs on both platforms: "You will not be disappointed in this purchase", Amazon Review 4; "Close your eyes and Smash That Buy Button", Daraz Review 21; it is not a cultural marker by itself. Family reference runs the other way: Amazon Reviews 12, 13, and 25 mention a granddaughter, a son, and grandsons as recipients or users of the product, while no Daraz review mentions family.

These findings suggest that the cultural and linguistic resources of Daraz reviews cluster in the relational part of the review, especially in thanks, blessings, and statements about the seller's honesty, and that they appear alongside product evaluation and do not replace it. Two cautions apply. The corpus is small, and every pattern except code-switching rests on between one and five reviews. The coding also records the presence of an expression, not the reviewer's intention, so the readings above are interpretations.

5. Discussion

5.1. Shared Rhetorical Organization (Research Question 1)

The first research question asked which rhetorical strategies and communicative functions the reviews on the two platforms perform. Reviewers on both share a set of four moves. Evaluation is the stable core; identification, justification, and recommendation sit at the periphery and vary in realization from one platform to the other. Because all four moves occur on both platforms, the data support a shared base genre with platform-specific realizations. This agrees with Bhatia's (1993, 2004) view that genres are conventional yet flexible, and with earlier genre studies that found recurring evaluative and experiential content in reviews (Pollach, 2006; Skalicky, 2013). It also locates the stability of the review genre in its evaluative core and not in the whole move sequence.

5.2. Platform-Specific Realization and Cultural Expression (Research Question 2)

The second research question asked how the two platforms differ in rhetorical structure, language, and culturally embedded expression. Both use the same four moves. The steps that realize those moves differ. At the rhetorical level, Amazon reviews are product-oriented: evaluation proceeds through features, justification through reasons, comparison, and reported use, and recommendation takes the form of product endorsement. Evaluation remains the core of Daraz reviews, but it extends to conformity, delivery, and dealings with the seller, and recommendation is often joined to appreciation of the seller. Language separates the two sets just as clearly. Every Amazon review is in English, whereas nearly half of the Daraz reviews (48%) mix in Roman Urdu or Urdu; English supplies most product and platform terms on Daraz, and Roman Urdu carries judgments on price, conformity, intention, and the seller, although it also appears in evaluation of the product itself. Culturally, Daraz reviews contain religious formulas of thanks and blessing (five reviews), moral comment on the seller's character, and terms of address such as "brother" and "Sahab". Family reference appears only in Amazon reviews. Community framing appears in a single Daraz review.

These patterns are compatible with research showing that culture shapes how reviews are written and used (Koh et al., 2010; Park & Lee, 2009), and with genre studies showing that rhetorical structure holds across review communities while linguistic realization varies with context. The corpus cannot show, however, that culture explains the Daraz patterns. Only one Daraz review shows explicitly community-oriented framing, and the relational features that do appear, thanks to the seller and blessings, are equally compatible with the transactional structure of a marketplace in which buyers deal with individual sellers. The main contribution of the analysis is to show that Amazon and Daraz reviews are instances of one genre and not two: one realization is product-centred and the other is centred on the transaction and the buyer-seller relationship. Amazon reviews construct the reviewer as an experienced evaluator who addresses future buyers in an informational discourse. Daraz reviews construct the reviewer as an evaluator of the product and as a party to a buyer-seller relationship, addressing future buyers and the seller at once, in a discourse that joins product evaluation with religious and moral expressions of trust and goodwill.

5.3. Implications

These findings bear on genre theory, on how reviews are read, and on language teaching. For genre theory, they support Bhatia's view that genres are conventional but flexible. The evaluative core is stable. The supporting steps change with the marketplace. For readers and platform designers, the Daraz pattern suggests that buyers use reviews to assess sellers as well as products, so a review form that asks only about the product may miss part of what reviewers want to say. For language and writing instruction, the findings show English and Roman Urdu serving different communicative purposes in everyday digital writing in Pakistan, a pattern that writing classes can treat as a resource and not as an error.

6. Conclusion

This study applied Bhatia's (1993) move-step model, together with linguistic and cultural analysis, to online consumer reviews on Amazon and Daraz.pk. The reviews prove to be a coherent genre and not a loose collection of opinions: both platforms show the same four rhetorical moves, and evaluation is the only obligatory one. The platforms differ in how the moves are realized. Amazon reviews stay product-oriented, combining description, feature evaluation, and reported use. Daraz reviews extend the evaluative core to conformity with the listing, delivery, and the buyer-seller relationship, and they express this through English-Roman Urdu code-switching and, in a minority of reviews, through religious formulas of thanks and blessing and moral comment on the seller. The online consumer review emerges as a transnational format whose realization follows the commercial and communicative setting in which it is written, a point still underrepresented in the genre-analytic literature.

The study has limits. The corpus is small and covers a limited range of product categories, so the results describe patterns in these reviews and not in all reviews on either platform, and any comparison with other marketplaces would need new data. The cultural readings come from qualitative interpretation by a single coder and would be strengthened by a second coder. Only written text was analyzed; star ratings, images, and video were not. Since most cultural patterns rest on a handful of reviews, they should be treated as leads to test and not as established findings.

Future work could use a larger corpus with controlled product categories, add a second coder with a reliability check, and include multimodal features. It could also extend the comparison to other South Asian marketplaces, especially those that hold sellers accountable in different ways, to test whether the transaction- and relationship-oriented language found on Daraz reflects a regional pattern or the design of Daraz itself.

References

- Androutsopoulos, J. (2015). Networked multilingualism: Some language practices on Facebook and their implications. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 19(2), 185–205. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006913489198>
- Awan, Z. N., Begum, U., & Khan, M. (2025). Code-switching and code-mixing in Pakistani English: A sociolinguistic analysis. *Social Science Review Archives*, 3(1), 1448–1456. <https://doi.org/10.70670/sra.v3i1.446>
- Bhatia, V. K. (1993). *Analysing genre: Language use in professional settings*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315844992>
- Bhatia, V. K. (1996). Methodological issues in genre analysis. *HERMES – Journal of Language and Communication in Business*, 9(16), 39–59. <https://doi.org/10.7146/hjlc.v9i16.25383>
- Bhatia, V. K. (2004). *Worlds of written discourse: A genre-based view*. Continuum.
- 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.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Sage. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08961530.2020.1712293>
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0279716>
- Kanoksilapatham, B. (2015). Distinguishing textual features characterizing structural variation in research articles across three engineering sub-discipline corpora. *English for Specific Purposes*, 37, 74–86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2014.06.008>

- Khan, A. M. (2014). Social aspects of code-switching: An analysis of Pakistani television advertisements. *Information Management and Business Review*, 6(6), 269–279. <https://doi.org/10.22610/imbr.v6i6.1125>
- Koh, N. S., Hu, N., & Clemons, E. K. (2010). Do online reviews reflect a product's true perceived quality? An investigation of online movie reviews across cultures. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*, 9(5), 374–385. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.elerap.2010.04.001>
- Mudambi, S. M., & Schuff, D. (2010). What makes a helpful online review? A study of customer reviews on Amazon.com. *MIS Quarterly*, 34(1), 185–200.
- Park, C., & Lee, T. M. (2009). Antecedents of online reviews' usage and purchase influence: An empirical comparison of U.S. and Korean consumers. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 23(4), 332–340. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intmar.2009.07.001>
- Pollach, I. (2006, January). Electronic word of mouth: A genre analysis of product reviews on consumer opinion web sites. In *Proceedings of the 39th Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences (HICSS'06)* (Vol. 3, pp. 51c-51c). IEEE.
- Racine, S. S. J. (2002). *Changing (inter)faces: A genre analysis of catalogues from Sears, Roebuck to Amazon.com* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.
- Rahman, T. (2002). *Language, ideology and power: Language-learning among the Muslims of Pakistan and North India*. Oxford University Press.
- Rahman, T. (2006). Language policy, multilingualism and language vitality in Pakistan. In A. Saxena & L. Borin (Eds.), *Lesser-known languages of South Asia: Status and policies, case studies and applications of information technology* (pp. 73–104). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Skalicky, S. (2013). Was this analysis helpful? A genre analysis of the Amazon.com discourse community and its “most helpful” product reviews. *Discourse, Context & Media*, 2(2), 84-93.
- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge University Press.
- Vasquez, C. (2014). *The discourse of online consumer reviews*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Ventre, I., & Kolbe, D. (2020). The impact of perceived usefulness of online reviews, trust and perceived risk on online purchase intention in emerging markets: A Mexican perspective. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 32(4), 287–299.
- Wang, S. (2023). A multi-dimensional analysis of CBEC English genre variation in South Asia: Based on Daraz. *PLOS ONE*, 18(4), Article e0279716.