

Move-based Analysis of IELTS Writing Task 1 Model Responses

Yasunori Matsuzono

Meiji Gakuin University

Reference Data:

Matsuzono, Y. (2025). Move-based analysis of IELTS writing task 1 model responses. In B. Lacy, R. P. Lege, & M. Swanson (Eds.), *Moving JALT Into the Future: Opportunity, Diversity, and Excellence*. JALT. <https://doi.org/10.37546/JALTPCP2024-11>

This study examines key features of model responses for IELTS Academic Writing Task 1 using 22 advanced-level samples from *IELTS Academic Authentic Practice Tests*. The analysis focuses on structural, rhetorical, and linguistic features. Specifically, the study develops and applies an original move framework to identify rhetorical organization in responses. Structural analysis establishes benchmarks, with averages of 3.9 paragraphs, 8.4 sentences, and 180.5 words per response. Move analysis identifies seven optional but distinctive moves, with Making Comparative or Contrastive Statements (MCS) and Stating the Conclusion (SC) being most frequent. In addition, recommended move order patterns for data- and illustration-based visuals are proposed, serving as models for structuring responses by visual type. Discourse marker analysis highlights the frequent use of contrast and summing-up markers, with limited use of other categories. These findings offer guidance for educators to help students master crucial elements of effective responses and improve Task 1 performance.

本研究では、IELTS Academic Authentic Practice Tests に収録された上級レベルの模範解答22本を用いて、IELTSアカデミック・ライティング・タスク1における模範解答の主要な特徴を、構造的・レトリカル・言語的特徴に焦点化して分析した。模範解答のレトリカルな構成を明らかにするため、独自に開発したムーブ分析の枠組みを適用した。構造分析では、平均段落数3.9、平均文数8.4、平均語数180.5語という基準値が導かれた。ムーブ分析では、すべて任意ではあるが特徴的な7つのムーブが確認され、その中でも「比較・対照の記述」および「結論の提示」の出現頻度が高かった。さらに、データ型および図解型の視覚資料に応じた推奨ムーブ順も提示され、それぞれの視覚資料タイプに適した文章構成モデルとして機能することが示された。談話マーカ―の分析では、「対照」および「要約」に関するマーカ―の頻出が確認され、その他のカテゴリの使用は限定的であった。これらの結果は、タスク1の指導に有益な示唆を与える。

IELTS is a globally recognized English proficiency test. In Japan, the number of candidates has steadily increased since 2010 (EIKEN, n.d.). This growth highlights the importance of examining IELTS, particularly its Academic Writing module, in which Japanese test-takers often underperform (IELTS, 2025). Of the two tasks in this module, IELTS Academic Writing Task 1 emphasizes analytical writing based on visual data presented in six formats: bar chart, line chart, pie chart, table, diagram, and map (Matsuzono, 2019). This distinct feature makes it a valuable area for research.

Band scores for this task range from 1 to 9, each accompanied by a label and description. Based on the label “good” and its description—i.e., a test taker can generally use the language effectively but may occasionally make mistakes or choose inappropriate words (IELTS, n.d.-a)—test-takers who score above 7 are likely to have high-level writing skills. Responses are assessed on four criteria: task achievement (TA), coherence and cohesion (CC), lexical resource, and grammatical range and accuracy (IELTS, n.d.-b). For TA, five key requirements are outlined, including a minimum word count of 150 (IELTS, n.d.-c). However, one issue with the TA criterion is the ambiguity of “organizing the response in an appropriate format,” as the guidelines do not clearly define what constitutes appropriate organization. Moreover, while the 150-word minimum is specified, the optimal length for a high-scoring response remains unclear. Further investigation is therefore needed into the structure and length of responses that achieve a band score above 7, which are generally regarded as high-level.

Another key criterion is CC, which evaluates logical connections and the effective use of cohesive devices (IELTS, n.d.-c). In my experience teaching IELTS, high-level responses may rely on more nuanced discourse markers than those listed in the official assessment resource (IELTS, n.d.-c), such as “First of all” and “In conclusion.” Examining discourse markers’ use in high-level responses could offer practical insights for improving test-takers’ writing.

This study addresses the broad question: How do test-takers effectively compose their responses for IELTS Writing Task 1? To explore this, the following research questions are posed:

- RQ1. What structural features, such as word count and paragraph length, characterize high-level responses in Task 1?
- RQ2. What rhetorical structures are typically observed in these responses?
- RQ3. Which linguistic features, particularly discourse markers, are most prominent in these responses?

Literature Review

This section reviews the theoretical background of genre and move analysis, which underpins this study, and discusses previous research that has applied this approach in professional and academic contexts.

Genre and Move

Genre analysis is an effective approach for understanding how language achieves communicative goals in academic and professional contexts. It helps teachers identify expected rhetorical structures and helps learners grasp the organizational patterns of high-performing writing. Swales (1990) describes genre as a group of communicative events united by shared purposes acknowledged by experienced members of a discourse community. This highlights the role of shared purpose and community expectations in shaping text structure. Bhatia (1993) similarly stresses communicative purpose, while Henry and Roseberry (2001) view genre as a sociolinguistic action aimed at achieving specific goals.

A critical aspect of genre analysis is that a genre comprises a series of “moves” (Bhatia, 1993; Henry & Roseberry, 2001; Mirador, 2000; Swales, 1990). A move is a logical maneuver identified through the functional meaning of a sentence or group of sentences, contributing to the genre’s overall purpose (Mirador, 2000; Henry & Roseberry, 2001). This concept is particularly relevant to short, highly structured texts, such as IELTS Writing Task 1 responses, where rhetorical functions often operate at the sentence level. Moves are typically categorized as (1) obligatory moves, which appear consistently in a corpus, and (2) optional moves, which occur less frequently but remain noticeable (Mirador, 2000). The allowable move order includes both, representing the ideal rhetorical sequence within a genre (Henry & Roseberry, 1997, 2001). Hyon (2018)

further emphasizes the value of move analysis in revealing how discourse is organized in academic and professional contexts.

Previous Studies

For decades, move analysis has been widely used to study written texts in professional and academic contexts. In professional settings, it has been applied to genres, job application letters written by native English speakers (Henry & Roseberry, 2001), job application letters by ASEAN writers (Thumnong & Tongpoon-Patanasorn, 2017), and business request emails from Korean and American professionals (Park et al., 2021). While these studies address genres different from the one analyzed here, the work of Thumnong and Tongpoon-Patanasorn (2017), building on Henry and Roseberry (2001), offers valuable insights into developing a methodological framework for analyzing moves and move order, as well as presenting findings—an approach that is applicable to the present study.

In academic settings, move analysis has been applied to essays from various sources (Henry & Roseberry, 1997), tutors’ written feedback (Mirador, 2000), ELT research article abstracts (Kaya & Yagiz, 2020), and argumentative essays by undergraduate students in the Philippines (Escandallo, 2021). Among these, Henry and Roseberry (1997) are notable for systematically identifying move types and proposing an allowable move order. Their approach offers a methodological foundation for analyzing student writing structure and informs the framework developed in the present study. However, their research focused solely on introductions and conclusions, omitting body paragraphs, and their selection of texts—from feature articles to travel writing and academic essays by native speakers—may have yielded somewhat fragmented findings.

A more recent study by Escandallo (2021) also aligns with this study’s focus on academic contexts. However, it treats the introduction, body, and conclusion as distinct moves assigned at the paragraph level rather than the sentence level. This contrasts with earlier definitions proposed by Mirador (2000) and Henry and Roseberry (2001). Accordingly, Escandallo’s analytical framework is not directly adopted in this study.

These prior studies demonstrate the versatility of move analysis across various genres but also highlight a gap in its application to IELTS Writing Task 1 model responses. This study seeks to address that gap by analyzing the rhetorical features of high-level responses using an original move-based framework.

Methodology

Data

This study compiled a corpus of 22 model responses from *IELTS Academic Authentic Practice Tests* published by Cambridge ESOL (2005, 2006, 2007, 2009, 2011, 2013), Cambridge University Press & Assessment (2015, 2019, 2023), and the University of Cambridge Local Examination Syndicate (2000, 2002). These texts, presented as ideal samples for Task 1, were selected for their instructional value. Although exact band scores are not given, their alignment with band 8 (“very good”) is a reasonable assumption based on IELTS descriptors (IELTS, n.d.-b), supporting the corpus’s validity for move-based analysis. (See Appendix A for source details.)

Move Development

A key challenge in this study was the lack of prior research integrating move analysis with short, timed writing responses from English proficiency tests, as opposed to the well-established models for academic genres (e.g., Swales’ CARS model). To address this gap, an original move framework was developed, drawing on insights from established studies and academic writing textbooks—particularly Henry and Roseberry’s (1997) work on rhetorical organization, Chin et al.’s (2011) guidelines for expository essays, and relevant IELTS-related materials. Five initial moves were identified, and a pilot study using a subset of 22 model responses was conducted to establish the analytical framework.

The framework was then refined to better align with the specific features of Task 1 responses. Descriptions from the IELTS Writing Key Assessment Criteria (IELTS, n.d.-c) were incorporated, resulting in the development of seven revised moves. These were tested in a second pilot study using the same corpus to confirm their applicability. Ultimately, seven moves were finalized to reflect the distinctive characteristics of Task 1 responses.

This iterative development process followed Casal and Kessler’s (2024) perspective, which emphasizes flexibility and category refinement through repeated analysis. This approach supports the creation of a move framework that accurately reflects the rhetorical patterns of the target text type.

Data Analysis

The analysis began with a structural examination of the responses, dividing each into three components: introduction, body, and conclusion. This step aimed to identify

general textual patterns—such as paragraph and sentence length—prior to conducting move analysis. Paragraph, sentence, and word counts were systematically calculated to capture the structural and quantitative features of the responses.

Move analysis was then conducted on the model responses. Moves were identified using semantic and linguistic cues, following definitions by Mirador (2000) and Henry and Roseberry (2001), and coded using the method proposed by Thumnonong and Tongpoon-Patanasorn (2017). The frequency and order of moves were recorded, and responses were categorized by visual type to examine move patterns. Although IELTS official sources (e.g., Cullen et al., 2024) do not explicitly classify Task 1 visuals, a close review of their features allowed for a tentative classification into two types: (1) data-based visuals—bar charts, line charts, pie charts, and tables—containing numerical data; and (2) illustration-based visuals—diagrams and maps—lacking numerical data and requiring descriptive or spatial explanation. Responses were grouped accordingly, and each set was analyzed for type-specific move patterns. Visuals were also categorized by format (single vs. multiple), which was considered in the move order analysis.

Finally, the study examined linguistic features, focusing on discourse markers. Nine types, identified during the pilot study, were based on lists from Amanda (2022), Chuang (2020), and Swan (2014). These markers were reexamined, and their frequencies systematically analyzed. Although analyzed separately from the move analysis, this examination offers a complementary perspective on the linguistic strategies in high-scoring responses. (See Appendix B for examples.)

Findings and Discussions

Paragraph, Sentence, and Word Count

This study quantitatively analyzed paragraph, sentence, and word counts in the model responses. The average paragraph count was 3.9: two in three responses, three in seven, four in seven, and five in five. The average sentence count was 8.4 (range: 6–13), and the average word count was 180.5 (range: 154–230). Notably, all responses exceeded the Task 1 minimum of 150 words. The average sentence length was 22.2 words, ranging from 15.4 to 29.3 (see Appendix C for details).

These findings offer useful guidance for composing Task 1 responses. The consistent use of multiple paragraphs (average: 3.9) suggests that organizing information into two to five paragraphs is both common and effective. Sentence and word counts—averaging 8.4 sentences and 180.5 words, with 22.2 words per sentence—provide practical

benchmarks for test-takers. Overall, the results underscore the importance of providing sufficient detail while maintaining clarity and conciseness.

Moves and Their Occurrences

This study identified seven distinct moves for analyzing Task 1 responses, each assigned a unique code (see Table 1).

Table 1
Description of the moves and codes for this study

Move	Code	Example
Introducing the Topic	IT	<i>The two tables contain sales data for Fairtrade coffee and bananas . . .</i>
Stating the Overview	SO	<i>Clearly, the library has been updated to include dedicated spaces for events and now has an open space in the centre.</i>
Highlighting Key Trends	HKT	<i>The first table shows low-level coffee sales increasing in all five countries, albeit to widely varying degrees.</i>
Elaborating on the Key Trends	EKT	<i>In two places sales increased by the same small amount: 1.8-2 million euros in Denmark, and 0.8-1 million in Sweden.</i>
Including both Key Trends and their Elaboration	KTE	<i>Sweden and Denmark showed a different pattern, with falls in banana sales from 1.8-1 and 2-0.9 million euros.</i>
Making Comparative or Contrastive Statements	MCS	<i>The increment was slightly larger in Belgium, from 1-1.7 million euros. Meanwhile, in Switzerland sales doubled from 3-6 million euros.</i>
Stating the Conclusion	SC	<i>Despite the apparently significant changes, the park retains the basic elements of flowers, water, seating and music, with the addition of a café and a children's play area.</i>

(Cambridge University Press, 2015, 2019, 2023; Thumnonnong & Tongpoon-Patanasorn, 2017)

The moves serve distinct rhetorical purposes, from Introducing the Topic (IT) to Stating the Conclusion (SC). The IT move presents the subject of the visual data without interpretation, typically noting the data type, source, and relevant time frames or categories from the prompt. The Stating the Overview (SO) move summarizes key trends or patterns without specifics, providing readers with a general sense of notable changes such as increases, decreases, or stability. This emphasizes the importance of identifying and conveying overall trends when interpreting data.

In the body paragraphs, four moves were identified: Highlighting Key Trends (HKT), Elaborating on Key Trends (EKT), Including Both Key Trends and Their Elaboration (KTE), and Making Comparative or Contrastive Statements (MCS). The HKT move presents main trends, patterns, or themes, forming the body's foundation and preparing readers for details. The EKT move complements HKT by providing specific examples to support broader trends. These two moves reflect the structure of academic essays, functioning as the topic and supporting sentences, respectively (Chin et al., 2011).

A notable feature in some responses was the integration of general trend statements with specific details in a single sentence, categorized as KTE. This move helps readers grasp trends and supporting evidence simultaneously. Many responses also included sentences comparing or contrasting data, classified as MCS. This move is key to highlighting differences across categories, time periods, or groups, aiding understanding of relative changes—essential for accurately describing data in Task 1. Finally, the SC move summarizes the response by emphasizing the most significant data trends as a closing remark.

For this study, the occurrences of the moves were carefully recorded to determine which were obligatory or optional in Task 1 responses (see Appendix D for details). No move was found to be obligatory, as none appeared consistently across all responses. Consequently, all seven moves were classified as optional. However, their relative importance varied across two dimensions.

The first dimension involves three moves—IT, SO, and SC—primarily found in introductions or conclusions. The IT move occurred in 14 responses (63.6%), suggesting that introducing the visual data is an optional but effective strategy for beginning a response. The SO move appeared in only 7 responses (31.8%), while the SC move was more frequent, found in 16 responses (72.7%). This contrasts with academic norms, where a thesis statement—conceptually similar to SO—is typically considered essential for framing arguments (Chin et al., 2011). Further analysis revealed four patterns: SC only (14 responses, 63.6%), SO only (5, 22.7%), both (2, 9.1%), and neither (1, 4.6%).

These patterns suggest that test-takers may strategically prioritize a conclusion over an overview, or vice versa.

The second dimension pertains to four body moves: HKT, EKT, KTE, and MCS. MCS appeared most frequently, in 19 responses (86.3%), emphasizing the importance of identifying differences across categories, time periods, or groups. The other three showed similar frequencies: HKT in 14 responses (63.6%), KTE in 12 (54.5%), and EKT in 10 (45.4%). Notably, 12 responses (54.5%) featured combinations of two moves: KTE and MCS (6 responses), HKT and KTE (3 responses), HKT and EKT (2 responses), and HKT and MCS (1 response). These findings stress the value of understanding and combining these moves to improve clarity, coherence, and analytical depth in addressing task requirements.

Move Order

Analysis of the Task 1 model responses revealed a wide range of move order patterns. Table 2 summarizes these sequences for data-based visual information and distinguishes between responses with a single visual and those with multiple visuals.

Table 2

Move order in model responses for data-based visual information (n = 17)

Ill.	Move Order	Para.	n
BC	SO / KTE ^ MCS ^ KTE	2	1
	SO / HKT ^ ELB ^ KTE / HKT ^ MCS / SC	4	1
	IT / HKT ^ MCS / HKT / SC	4	1
	IT / MCS / HKT ^ MCS / SC	4	1
	IT / MCS ^ KTE / MCS / MCS / SC	5	1
	IT / MCS ^ KTE / MCS / HKT ^ ELB / SC	5	1
LC	IT ^ SO / MCS ^ KTE	2	1
	SO / MCS / HKT ^ ELB	3	1
	IT / KTE ^ MCS / KTE ^ MCS / KTE / SC	5	1
	IT / KTE ^ HKT ^ ELB / HKT ^ ELB ^ MCS / KTE ^ MCS / SC	5	1

Ill.	Move Order	Para.	n
T	SO ^ KTE / KTE ^ HKT	2	1
	IT / MCS / MCS ^ HKT / MCS / SC	5	1
PC & T	HKT ^ ELB / MCS / SC	3	1
T & T	IT / HKT ^ ELB ^ MCS ^ KTE / MCS ^ KTE / SC	4	1
LC & T	IT / KTE → MCS / IT → MCS → KTE	4	1
PC & PC	IT ^ SO / KTE / MCS / SC	2	1
PC & PC & PC	IT / MCS / MCS / SC	4	1

Note. Ill. = Illustration; Para. = Paragraphs; BC = Bar Chart; LC = Line Chart; T = Table; PC = Pie Chart. The symbol (/) indicates the boundary between one paragraph and the next. The symbol (^) indicates “precedes.”

17 distinct move orders were identified across 17 model responses, highlighting the complexity and variation in organizational structures. This diversity made a single definitive sequence impractical. However, examining move features by visual format allowed the study to propose one or two recommended patterns per category.

For bar charts, the MSC move appeared in all six responses of this type. This is unsurprising, as such visuals typically compare categories (e.g., age groups) over time. Additionally, four responses began with IT, and five ended with SC. Considering these patterns—along with the slightly higher frequency of HKT over KTE and EKT—two recommended move sequences are proposed: IT / HKT ^ MSC / HKT / SC and IT / MSC / HKT ^ MSC / SC, each with four paragraphs.

Turning to line charts, all four responses in this category included the MSC move, mirroring the pattern observed in bar chart responses. A distinctive feature of this format is the frequent use of the KTE move (in three responses), which combines general trends with specific data. This aligns with the nature of line charts, which display continuous data over time and emphasize changes such as increases, decreases, fluctuations, or stability. Accordingly, the recommended move sequence is IT / KTE ^ MSC / KTE ^ MSC / KTE / SC, comprising five paragraphs.

In the case of table-type visuals, only two responses were identified, each with a distinct move sequence and paragraph count—one with two paragraphs and the other with five. This variation likely reflects the nature of tables, which present numerical data

arranged in rows and columns, typically featuring horizontal categories and vertical indicators such as time or group. Accordingly, SO ^ KTE / KTE ^ HKT and IT / MSC / MSC ^ HKT / MSC / SC can be considered appropriate move orders.

Another area of exploration involved identifying patterns in responses to visuals combining multiple formats, such as tables and pie charts. Pie charts typically depict proportions or percentages on a given topic (e.g., sources of spending) over one or more time points. Five responses fell into this category. All included the MSC move; four began with IT and ended with SC. A simplified recommended sequence for this type is IT ^ SO / KTE / MSC / SC.

The study also examined possible move orders in model responses to another category—illustration-based visual information. Table 3 summarizes the move sequences observed in these responses.

Table 3
Move order in model responses for illustration-based visual information (n = 5)

Ill.	Move Order	Para.	n
D	IT ^ SO / MCS / MCS	3	1
	HKT ^ ELB / HKT ^ ELB / SC	3	1
D & D	HKT ^ ELB / HKT ^ ELB / SC	3	1
M	IT / HKT ^ ELB ^ KTE / HKT ^ MCS / SC	4	1
M & M	HKT ^ ELB / HKT ^ MCS / SC	3	1

Note. D = Diagram; M = Map

The analysis identified four move orders across five responses related to illustration-based visuals. Notably, two responses for diagram tasks followed the same sequence, despite differing input types (i.e., one vs. two diagrams), suggesting a shared rhetorical pattern for this category. Diagrams typically depict a process, cycle, or system (e.g., electricity generation) and require a linear or cyclical explanation. Accordingly, the recommended move order for diagram-based responses is HKT ^ ELB / HKT ^ ELB / SC, which effectively captures the chronological and explanatory nature of the task.

Another important focus was identifying move orders in map-based responses, which typically compare locations across time or space, highlighting changes such as additions,

removals, or spatial development. Only two responses fit this type, each with a distinct yet coherent move pattern. Given their alignment with spatial description demands, two recommended structures are: IT / HKT ^ ELB ^ KTE / HKT ^ MCS / SC (single map, four paragraphs) and HKT ^ ELB / HKT ^ MCS / SC (two maps, three paragraphs).

Discourse Markers

The final element of the findings concerns the frequency and distribution of discourse markers in the model responses, as detailed in Table 4.

Table 4
Frequencies of discourse markers in model responses

Discourse markers types	Examples	WC	NR
generalizing	overall	1	1
structuring	first, second, finally	8	5
balancing / emphasizing a contrast	while, but, however, although	55	19
similarity	similar, similarity	6	6
adding	also	7	7
giving examples	such as, including	2	2
making this clear, giving details	in fact	1	1
consequence & cause/effect	so, thus, as, due to	7	5
summing up	to sum up, overall	12	12

Note. WC = Word Count in all the responses (n = 3918), NR = Number of Responses (n = 22).

Discourse markers in the categories of balancing and emphasizing a contrast were the most frequent, appearing 55 times across 19 responses, indicating the importance of contrast in explaining trends and making comparisons in Task 1. This finding aligns with the move analysis results, where the MCS move was the most commonly observed move in the model responses. Summing-up markers appeared 12 times in 12 responses, consistent with the frequent use of the SC move in concluding paragraphs.

In contrast, markers from other categories were less frequent: addition (7 in 7 responses), examples (2 in 2), and details (1 in 1). This suggests a tendency to avoid heavy

reliance on these markers in Task 1 responses. Structuring markers (8 in 5), cause-and-effect markers (7 in 5), and similarity markers (6 in 6) were also infrequent, contrasting with examples listed in the official assessment resource (IELTS, n.d.-c), such as ‘first of all,’ ‘as a result,’ and ‘similarly.’”

The findings indicate that certain discourse markers serve specific purposes in Task 1 model responses, with contrast and summing-up markers being the most commonly used. The less frequent use of markers from other categories suggests they are deployed more selectively to meet specific rhetorical needs.

Conclusion

This study offers insights into IELTS Writing Task 1 model responses through move analysis, supported by structural and discourse marker analyses. The structural analysis provides benchmarks: 3.9 paragraphs, 8.4 sentences, and 180.5 words per response. Seven rhetorical moves were identified, all classified as optional. However, the frequent use of the MCS and SC moves underscores their importance in high-scoring responses. Although no single definitive move order was identified, the study proposed tentative patterns for data- and illustration-based visuals. These serve as practical models for structuring responses, though further research with a larger dataset is warranted. The discourse marker analysis revealed the strategic use of contrast and summing-up markers aligned with MCS and SC, while other types appeared infrequently.

Although the study focused on discourse markers, it did not examine other linguistic features such as grammatical range, paraphrasing strategies, or parallel structures—areas that merit further investigation. Ultimately, it is hoped that these findings will help educators guide learners in producing more coherent and rhetorically effective responses.

Bio Data

Yasunori Matsuzono is an associate professor in the Faculty of Economics at Meiji Gakuin University. He teaches English for Business Communication and leads a seminar on public speaking in English. With 20 years of experience teaching TOEFL and IELTS preparation courses, he has authored ten English learning books for students intending to study abroad in higher education. His research interests include genre analysis, second language writing, discourse analysis, and language assessment.

References

- Amanda, N. (2022, January 21). *What are discourse markers and how do you use them correctly in English?* Improve Your English. <https://improving-your-english.com/vocabulary/discourse-markers/>
- Bhatia, V.K. (1993). *Analysing genre: Language use in professional settings*. Longman.
- Cambridge ESOL. (2005). *Cambridge English IELTS 4 with answers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cambridge ESOL. (2006). *Cambridge English IELTS 5 with answers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cambridge ESOL. (2007). *Cambridge English IELTS 6 with answers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cambridge ESOL. (2009). *Cambridge English IELTS 7 with answers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cambridge ESOL. (2011). *Cambridge English IELTS 8 with answers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cambridge ESOL. (2013). *Cambridge English IELTS 9 with answers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cambridge University Press. (2015). *Cambridge English IELTS 10 with answers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cambridge University Press. (2019). *Cambridge English IELTS 14 with answers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cambridge University Press. (2023). *Cambridge English IELTS 18 with answers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Casal, J. E., & Kessler, M. (2024). Rhetorical move-step analysis. In M. Kessler & C. Polio (Eds.), *Conducting genre-based research in applied linguistics* (pp. 82–104). Routledge.
- Chin, P., Koizumi, Y., Reid, S., Wray, S., & Yamazaki, Y. (2011). *Academic writing skills 1 student's book*. Cambridge University Press.
- Chuang, F. (2020, July 15). *Discourse markers*. University of Warwick. <https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/al/globalpad-rip/openhouse/academicenglishskills/grammar/discourse/>
- Cullen, P., French, A., & Jakeman, V. (2024). *The official Cambridge guide to IELTS student's book with answers*. Cambridge University Press.
- EIKEN. (n.d.). 受験の状況 [The state of test-taking]. <http://www.eiken.or.jp/ielts/en/merit/situation/>
- Escandallo, J. C. (2021). Move analysis of the argumentative essays written by the undergraduate students: A genre-based approach. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 6(5), 1001–1068. https://ijisrt.com/assets/upload/files/IJISRT21MAY549.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com
- Henry, A., & Roseberry, R. L. (1997). An investigation of the functions, strategies, and linguistic features of the introductions and conclusions of essays. *System*, 25(4), 479–495.
- Henry, A. & R. L. Roseberry. (2001). A narrow-angled corpus analysis of moves and strategies of the genre: ‘Letter of Application.’ *English for Specific Purposes*, 20(2), 153–167. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906\(99\)00037-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(99)00037-X)
- Hyon, S. (2018). *Introducing genre and English for specific purposes*. Routledge.

- Kaya, F., & Yagiz, O. (2020). Move analysis of research article abstracts in the field of ELT: A comparative study. *Journal of Language and Linguistics Studies*, 16(1), 390–404.
- IELTS. (2025). *Test performance 2023-2024*. <https://www.ielts.org/for-researchers/test-statistics/test-taker-performance>
- IELTS. (n.d.-a). *Understanding IELTS scoring*. <https://ielts.org/organisations/ielts-for-organisations/understanding-ielts-scoring>
- IELTS. (n.d.-b). *IELTS writing band descriptors*. <https://s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/ielts-web-static/production/Guides/ielts-writing-band-descriptors.pdf>
- IELTS. (n.d.-c). *IELTS writing key assessment criteria*. <https://s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/ielts-web-static/production/Guides/ielts-writing-key-assessment-criteria.pdf>
- Matsuzono, Y. (2019, May 2–4). *Analysis of authentic IELTS writing task 1 questions* [Paper presentation]. LIF2019 – 6th International Language in Focus Conference: Language, Research, and Teaching in the 21st Century, Dubrovnik, Croatia.
- Mirador, J. F. (2000). A move analysis of written feedback in higher education. *RELJ Journal*, 31(1), 45–60. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003368820003100103>
- Park, S., Jeon, J., & Shim, E. (2021). Exploring request emails in English for business purposes: A move analysis. *English for Specific Purposes*, 63, 137–150. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2021.03.006>
- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge University Press.
- Swan, M. (2014). *Practical English usage* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Thumngong, P., & Tongpoon-Patanasorn, A. (2017). A genre analysis of job application letters written by ASEAN applicants. *Proceedings of the Asian Conference on Education & International Development 2017*. http://papers.iafor.org/wp-content/uploads/papers/aceid2017/ACEID2017_34975.pdf
- University of Cambridge Local Examination Syndicate. (2000). *Cambridge English IELTS 2 with answers*. Cambridge University Press.
- University of Cambridge Local Examination Syndicate. (2002). *Cambridge English IELTS 3 with answers*. Cambridge University Press.

Appendix A

Origins of 22 IELTS Writing Task 1 Model Responses

Year	Series	Test	Resp.	Ill.	Year	Series	Test	Resp	Ill.
2000	2	1	2-1	T	2009	7	2	7-2	LC
2000	2	2	2-2	BC	2009	7	4	7-4	PC & PC
2000	2	4	2-4	BC	2011	8	1	8-1	PC & T
2002	3	2	3-2	BC	2011	8	2	8-2	PC
2002	3	3	3-3	BC	2013	9	2	9-2	BC
2005	4	1	4-1	T	2013	9	4	9-4	LC
2005	4	3	4-3	BC	2015	10	2	10-2	T & T
2006	5	1	5-1	LC	2015	10	4	10-4	D
2006	5	3	5-3	M	2019	14	4	14-4	M & M
2007	6	1	6-1	LC & T	2023	18	3	18-3	D
2007	6	3	6-3	D	2023	18	4	18-4	LC

Note. Resp. = Response, Ill. = Illustration, T = Table, BC = Bar Chart, LC = Line Chart, M = Map, D = Diagram, PC = Pie Chart. Each response is labeled as “X–Y,” where X refers to the book series number and Y refers to the test number within that series. For example, Response 2–1 refers to the response text from *IELTS 2*, Test 4.

(Cambridge ESOL, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2009, 2011, 2013; Cambridge University Press, 2015, 2019, 2023; University of Cambridge Local Examination Syndicate, 2000, 2002)

Appendix B

Examples of Discourse Markers Used in This Study

Discourse markers types	Examples
generalizing	overall
structuring	first, second, finally
balancing / emphasizing a contrast	while, but, however, although
similarity	similar, similarity
adding	also
giving examples	such as, including
making this clear, giving details	in fact
consequence & cause/effect	so, thus, as, due to
summing up	to sum up, overall

(Amanda, 2022; Chung, 2020; Swan, 2014)

Appendix C

Paragraph, Sentence, and Word Counts in IELTS Writing Task 1 Model Responses

Resp.	2-1	2-2	2-4	3-2	3-3	4-1	4-3	5-1	5-3	6-1	6-3
Para.	2	4	2	4	5	5	4	3	4	3	3
Sent.	7	8	7	9	6	7	7	6	8	7	8
Word*	172	173	171	154	176	153	154	163	194	180	163
Word**	24.6	21.6	24.4	17.1	29.3	21.9	22.0	27.2	24.3	25.7	20.4
Resp.	7-2	7-4	8-1	8-2	9-2	9-4	10-2	10-4	14-4	18-3	18-4
Para.	5	4	3	4	5	5	4	3	3	3	2
Sent.	8	9	8	8	7	13	11	10	10	10	9
Word*	172	206	183	181	159	200	223	177	230	169	165
Word**	21.5	22.9	22.9	22.6	22.7	15.4	20.3	17.7	23.0	16.9	18.3

Note. Word* = Word count per essay; Word** = Word count per sentence.

Appendix D

Frequency of Moves in IELTS Writing Task 1 Model Responses (n = 22)

Code	IT	SO	HKT	EKT	KTE	MCS	SC
Freq.	14	7	14	10	12	19	16
%	63.6%	31.8%	63.6%	45.4%	54.5%	86.3%	72.7%