TELT July 2025 Examiners' Report

1. Introduction

22 candidates sat for the TELT July 2025 examination session. **4** candidates were awarded **Pass** grades. This is the equivalent to an **18.18%** pass rate, and **81.82%** fail.

The grades for the written paper are listed below:

0 Distinction

0 Pass with Merit

4 Pass

10 Narrow Fail

8 Fail

O Unclassified

2. General Remarks

Although the results show a slight improvement compared to the previous exam session, the overall performance in the July 2025 TELT exam remains unsatisfactory. Despite the introduction of a new exam format designed to support and favour candidates' performance, the outcomes still fell below expectations and did not meet the average standard of an A-level examination. Examiners once again noted that many candidates failed to pay adequate attention to the instructions and rubrics of individual tasks, which contributed to avoidable loss of marks across several sections.

Performance in the writing component, particularly in Section E, continued to reveal significant weaknesses. Although there was a marginal improvement over previous sessions, many candidates demonstrated limited ability in key writing conventions such as proper use of capital letters, punctuation, and appropriate register for formal and informal writing. A general lack of familiarity with genre-specific writing styles was also evident, along with poor adherence to word limits and formatting requirements. As seen in past TELT exams, the overall presentation of written work was often poor, with some submissions approaching illegibility, further impacting clarity and assessment.

3. Section Analysis

Part 1 Language Description, Sensitivity and Awareness

Section A – Language Terminology

Performance in this section was varied. While 10 candidates scored between 28 and 36, only 45.45% achieved a passing mark. The results indicate that many candidates lacked sufficient knowledge of grammar and language terminology, suggesting that they were not adequately prepared for this part of the exam.

Section B – Primary Stress Indication

Section C – Transcription of Phonemic Script into Normal Spelling

Candidate performance in this part of the exam ranged significantly between Sections B and C. In Section B (Primary Stress), results were relatively weak, with an average score of 45.45%. Many candidates lost marks by underlining two syllables instead of one, rendering their answers incorrect. In contrast, Section C (Phonemic Transcription) showed strong results, with a high pass rate of 81.81%, and most candidates achieving full marks.

Section D – Intonation

Examiners observed that candidate performance in this section was notably weak, with a pass rate of only 41%. The majority of candidates demonstrated limited understanding of intonation patterns, often failing to correctly identify or indicate them. A common error involved marking rising intonation on statements that required a falling intonation, reflecting a fundamental gap in phonological awareness.

Section E – Odd One Out

Although performance in this section showed some improvement compared to the previous two exam sessions, results remained relatively low, with a pass rate of 45.45%. Notably, two candidates left the entire section blank. Candidates struggled particularly with items involving extreme adjectives, passive versus active voice, first versus second conditionals, and distinguishing between past simple and past participle forms. These outcomes clearly indicate insufficient preparation for this part of the exam.

Section F: Functions

Candidate performance in this section was relatively strong, with a pass rate of 63.63%. However, some inaccuracies were observed in the use of functional terminology—for example, confusion between terms such as "making a statement" and "asking a question." Examiners also noted that candidates often struggled to distinguish between functions like asking for help and requesting information, indicating a need for clearer understanding of functional language use.

Part 2 – Language Proficiency

Section A – Identifying and Correcting Errors

In this section, candidates achieved an impressive pass rate of 90.91%. Unlike previous exam sessions, the majority demonstrated a strong command of error identification and correction, reflecting a solid understanding and improved accuracy in language use.

Section B – Word Formation

As in the previous exam session, candidates in this section performed very well, achieving an impressive average score of 95.94%. However, none of the candidates attained a full score, and only five managed to achieve 9 out of 10 marks. Examiners noted that several candidates struggled with specific vocabulary items, particularly with words such as *"proof"* and *"tragedy."*

Section C – Selective Deletion

Out of the 22 candidates assessed on a 10-point scale, only 5 achieved the minimum passing score of 5 or higher. This represents a passing rate of just 22.73%. Many candidates scored below the required level, indicating a significant need for academic support and targeted intervention to improve performance and overall success in this section.

Section D – Sentence Transformation

In Section D, Sentence Transformation, 18 out of 22 candidates achieved a passing score, resulting in a success rate of 81.82%. While most performed well, a few struggled with the task, particularly with more complex sentence structures. Overall, the results indicate a strong grasp of sentence transformation, though continued reinforcement of grammatical flexibility is recommended for weaker candidates.

Section E – Writing Section

Part 1 – Short Writing Task

In Section E, the short writing task, only 4 out of 22 candidates achieved a passing mark, resulting in a low success rate of just 18.18%. Most students scored below the required threshold, indicating notable difficulties with written expression, structure, or content development. Additional writing practice and targeted feedback will be essential to help students improve in this skill area.

Part 2 – Long Writing Task

In the long writing task, 14 out of 22 candidates achieved a passing score, resulting in a success rate of 63.64%. Most candidates demonstrated adequate control of content and structure, though a number fell short of the required standard. Continued emphasis on coherence, paragraph development, and lexical variety will support further improvement in extended written expression.

Overview of Both Writing Tasks

Although there was a marginal improvement over previous sessions, the writing performance varied across the two tasks. Only 18.18% of candidates passed the short writing task, while 63.64% succeeded in the long writing task. Performance in the writing component, continued to reveal significant weaknesses. Many candidates showed limited control of language and a lack of familiarity with idiomatic expressions, common phrases, and limited ability in key writing conventions such as proper use of capital letters, punctuation, and appropriate register for formal and informal writing. A general lack of familiarity with genre-specific writing styles was also evident, along with poor adherence to word limits and formatting requirements. Weaknesses in essay format, spelling, and paragraphing were also evident, reflecting a lack of awareness of genre conventions. Marks were also lost due to submissions falling below or over the word limit.

As seen in past TELT exams, the overall presentation of written work was often poor, with some submissions approaching illegibility, further impacting clarity and assessment.

Recommendations

Despite the introduction of a more candidate-friendly exam format, based on the overall performance in the July 2025 TELT exam session, with only 18.81% of candidates achieving a passing score, results remained unsatisfactory. Therefore, targeted action is clearly required.

Weaknesses were particularly evident in the Primary Stress and Intonation section where candidates frequently lost marks due to fundamental misunderstandings, such as underlining two syllables instead of one, and misidentifying rising and falling patterns.

Examiners also observed a recurring disregard for task rubrics, especially in sections like the Odd One Out, where a lack of understanding of grammatical contrasts and lexical categories led to avoidable errors, which remains a persistent weakness, demonstrating a lack of focus in both training and understanding of its relevance to learner autonomy.

It is recommended that training providers reinforce phonemic awareness, grammatical terminology, and task interpretation strategies throughout the course, supported by focused practice and formative assessment. Additionally, in writing section, candidates

need structured opportunities to develop genre awareness, tone, punctuation, and paragraphing. Trainers are strongly advised to adopt a process writing approach, prioritising structured drafting, peer review, and feedback. Timed writing practice should be integrated regularly, alongside extensive reading of authentic texts to strengthen vocabulary, coherence, and stylistic accuracy. Consistent exposure to high-quality English through extensive reading not only encourage vocabulary building, but also foster syntactic flexibility, and creativity, areas that remain notably underdeveloped.

_____