

TELT Award November 2024 Examiners' Report

1. Introduction

21 candidates sat for the TELT Award November 2024 examination session. 12 candidates were awarded Pass grades or higher. This is the equivalent of a 57% pass rate.

The grades for the written paper are listed below:

0 Distinction
2 Pass with Merit
10 Pass
6 Narrow Fail
3 Fail
0 Unclassified

2. General Remarks

Overall candidate performance in the November 2024 TELT session could be considered to be rather disappointing. Examiners once again noted a widespread lack of attention to examination task rubric which often led to loss of marks especially in Part 1 Section E, Part 2 Section A and E. The Writing Section was nothing more than adequate in this examination session with an average mark just reaching 61%. Many candidates demonstrated an acceptable control of language and familiarity with idiomatic expressions and turn of phrase. In this section, a certain inattention to spelling and paragraphing was, however, also evident. Moreover, word count limits were often ignored. All this resulted in loss of marks. As in past TELT examinations, the presentation of many essays, moreover, left much to be desired, with several submissions being close to being illegible.

3. Section Analysis

Part 1 Language Description, Sensitivity and Awareness

Part 1 Section A – Language Terminology

Candidates fared adequately in Section A Part 1 where the average pass mark reached a satisfactory 68%. A number of candidates seem to have been adequately prepared for this section, while some only demonstrated a very basic knowledge of grammar and language terms.

Part 1 Section B – Primary Stress Identification

Part 1 Section C – Transcription of Phonemic Script into Normal Spelling

Part 1 Section D – Transcription into Phonemic Script

Candidate performance ranged from just satisfactory in the Word Stress Section B with an average mark of 61%, to solid in Section C, with a rather strong performance leading to an average mark of 85%. As in previous examination sessions, a number of candidates lost marks for spelling errors in Section C. Candidates overall showed a good amount of dexterity in recognizing items in phonemic script and were able to change them to normal spelling. The fact that

candidates can generally recognise primary word stress and easily decipher words transcribed phonemically was counterbalanced by the usual dismal performance in Section D with a very low average mark of just 32%.

Once again, examiners have to report a worrying phenomenon here. As many as 14 candidates either ignored this section completely or performed very poorly. Much better preparation for and familiarization with the IPA and transcription is required for this section.

Part 1 Section E –Candidate performance in this section could be considered as very poor with a low average mark registering 52%. Again, the examiners noticed that one of the main problems here lies in the fact that many of the candidates did not follow the rubric carefully, or simply ignored it, and did not identify all the three distinct strands: identifying the odd one out; specifying what all the items in bold had in common; and why the odd one out was different to the others. Marks were therefore lost by many candidates who presented only part of the answer. Moreover, several candidates seem to have simply guessed the right odd one out (for which a mark was rewarded) but then gave totally unrelated and irrelevant explanations and reasons for their choice. There were also many instances where many questions were simply left unanswered. This certainly shows a clear lack of preparation for this section: many candidates did not even hazard a guess where they were not sure of the answer.

Part 2 Language Proficiency

Part 2 Section A – Identifying and Correcting Errors

Once again, and following the trend noticed in previous TEL examination sessions, this section turned out to be unexpectedly challenging for candidates, resulting in a disappointing average mark of just 54%. Errors had to do with failing to identify and correct errors, with a lack of familiarity with certain collocations, word formation, and word choice. Some candidates wrongly identified errors in sentences where there were none, and marked as ‘correct’ ones that included one.

Once again, examiners encourage examination preparation trainers to remind candidates to follow the rubric closely, particularly in this section: identify the error by underlining the target error and writing only the corrected word(s). Some candidates failed to follow this instruction, and rewrote either whole sentences or chunks of sentences including the corrected word(s). This poor examination technique, which has become common in TELT examination sessions, undoubtedly led to a loss of precious examination time.

Part 2 Section B – Word Formation

In this section, candidates’ performance was unexpectedly low just reaching an average mark of 68%. Once again, valuable marks were lost due to poor spelling.

Part 2 Section C – Cloze Test – Selective Deletion

Performance in this task was very poor leading to an average mark of just 46%. As is

always the case, candidates who came up with plausible lexical options gained marks. Examiners believe that candidates who read regularly and broaden their range of collocation and commonly used phrases would generally stand a better chance of performing well in this challenging section. Examination preparation trainers would do well to emphasise and remind candidates of the importance of this concept.

Part 2 Section D – Sentence Transformation

In this section, candidates registered a merely satisfactory 68% average mark. Marks were lost mostly due to errors in phrase construction, word order, collocation and, again, misspelt words.

Part 2 Section E – Writing Section

Performance in this section was just adequate with an average mark which reached 61%. Many essays were well-written; a few others clearly less so in terms of language range and control as well as, as noted above, presentation. One candidate only submitted one essay. A number of candidates went over the word limit. There were a few instances of weakness with and/or complete lack of paragraph structure. One candidate went out of subject in one of the two essays. As usual, marks were deducted for poor spelling, awkward sentence construction, weak control of structure, poor text cohesion and for ignoring the word limit.

Candidates are advised to plan what to write and revise their written text, making any necessary edits before handing the paper in. Moreover, even though candidates are writing under examination conditions, they should still pay some attention to presentation of their work – an area which, as noted above, once again left much to be desired.

4. Recommendations

As with previous reports, the examiners recommend a sharper focus and attention to phonology, in particular, the transcription of the phonemic script. The lack of familiarity with the phonemic script remains a matter of serious concern. Examiners have repeatedly reported that a number of candidates in every examination session simply ignore this important area. Examiners feel that this continues to arise from the fact that candidates fail to recognise its usefulness in and out of class for their learners, especially with a view of reinforcing learner autonomy. This is an area that trainers and examination centres should strive to address much more forcibly in their TELT Preparation courses.

Moreover, trainers are encouraged to provide candidates with opportunities to improve their writing skills in the various text genres and their respective writing conventions and register. Correct punctuation, conventions for paragraphing and presentation (in terms of legibility), in particular, should also be explicitly focused on.

Lastly, candidates should be reminded of the importance of regular quality reading practice as this will increase their exposure to modern English and serve as a valuable model for their own writing as well as a means by which candidates broaden their range of lexis and structures, as well as their creativity.