

## **TELT May 2025 Examiners' Report**

### **1. Introduction**

20 candidates sat for the TELT May 2024 examination session. one candidate was awarded Pass grade resulting in a 5% pass rate.

The grades for the written paper are listed below:

0 Distinction  
0 Pass with Merit  
1 Pass  
2 Narrow Fail  
16 Fail  
1 Unclassified

### **2. General Remarks**

Candidate performance in the May 2025 TELT session was very unsatisfactory falling below the standard of previous exam sessions.

Examiners noted significant weaknesses across all sections of the paper. The Writing Section, (Part 2 Section E), was particularly weak with an average score reaching just 28%.

Many candidates failed to demonstrate sufficient control of language or familiarity with idiomatic expressions and natural phrasing. Carelessness with key features such as essay format, genre, register, spelling and paragraphing was also evident. Some candidates failed to respect the word limit.

As with past TELT examinations, the presentation of many essays was substandard, with at least two scripts being almost illegible.

### **3. Section Analysis**

#### **Part 1 Language Description, Sensitivity and Awareness**

##### **Section A – Language Terminology**

Performance was adequate, with an average score of 60%. Many candidates demonstrated a basic but acceptable knowledge of grammar and language terms.

##### **Section B – Primary Stress Identification**

##### **Section C – Transcription of Phonemic Script into Normal Spelling**

##### **Section D – Transcription into Phonemic Script**

Performance ranged from satisfactory in Section B (70% average) to very good in Section C (95% average). Candidates showed reasonable skill in recognising phonemic script and converting it to standard spelling. However, performance in Section D was very poor, with a low average score of only 10%. Many candidates either skipped this section or demonstrated minimal understanding. Much greater preparation and familiarity with the IPA and phonemic transcription are required to tackle this section of the exam.

##### **Section E – Odd One Out**

Performance in this section was also weak, with an average of 40%. The examiners noticed that many candidates guessed rather than identified clear patterns. Moreover, a large number failed to follow the task rubric, addressing only one out of the three stages required.

## **Part 2 Language Proficiency**

### **Section A – Identifying and Correcting Errors**

This section proved challenging, with a low average score of 42%. Candidates struggled to identify or correct errors, particularly in collocations, word formation, and word choice. In some cases, correct sentences were wrongly marked as incorrect, and some errors were missed altogether.

### **Section B – Word Formation**

This was another weak area, with an average score of just 35%. Many marks were lost due to poor spelling and a lack of awareness of word families and correct formation.

### **Section C – Cloze Text – Selective Deletion**

Performance in this task was also weak, with an average score of 49%. Candidates who provided plausible lexical items gained some marks. A stronger knowledge of collocations and common phrases would benefit candidates significantly. Trainers are encouraged to raise awareness of the importance and benefits of this concept during preparation courses.

### **Section D – Sentence Transformation**

The average score here was slightly higher, at 60%. However, errors showed a continued lack of familiarity with word order, phrase construction, and collocations.

### **Section E – Writing Section**

This was a very weak section, with only one candidate meeting the pass mark. The average score was 48%. Essays lacked range in both grammar and vocabulary. Presentation was often unclear due to poor handwriting, layout, and spelling.

One candidate submitted only one essay, another submitted only part of the second essay, and one wrote around 400 words for each essay (exceeding the limit). Several essays failed to follow a suitable 'Report' format. Register was frequently inappropriate, especially in the letter of application, which also lacked proper layout and relevant content. Other common weaknesses included poor paragraph structure, awkward sentence construction, poor cohesion, and inadequate control of form. Spelling and punctuation were also problematic.

Candidates are advised to plan and review their writing carefully, making necessary edits before submission. Despite the time constraints, presentation should not be neglected, as this continues to impact marks negatively.

## **4. Recommendations**

As in previous reports, examiners strongly recommend increased focus on phonology, especially phonemic transcription, where performance remains consistently poor. Candidates often neglect this area, perhaps due to a lack of awareness of its relevance to teaching and learner autonomy. Trainers and examination centres should place greater emphasis on this skill during preparation courses. Additionally, candidates need more practice in producing various written text types with appropriate conventions and register. Explicit focus should be placed on punctuation, paragraphing, and correct use of genre. Trainers are encouraged to adopt a process writing approach, while also giving candidates the opportunity to practise timed product writing.

Finally, candidates should be reminded of the value of regular, high-quality reading practice, which can expose them to authentic English usage and broaden their lexical and structural range. This also supports creativity, which was lacking in this session. Activities such as journaling may help candidates to practise and refine their writing and trainers may encourage and support this during preparation courses.