

TELT November 2025 Examiners' Report

1. Introduction

33 candidates sat for the TELT November 2025 examination session. Five candidates were awarded a Pass grade, resulting in a 15% pass rate.

The grades for the written paper are listed below:

0 Distinction
0 Pass with Merit
5 Pass
7 Narrow Fail
21 Fail
0 Unclassified

2. General Remarks

Candidate performance in the November 2025 TELT session was once again unsatisfactory and fell below the standard of the previous sitting. While examiners noted several strengths, weaknesses were evident across multiple sections of the paper. In Part 1, Sections A and C were generally strong. Performance in Sections B and F ranged from average to strong, while Sections D and E were noticeably weaker, with Section E being the weakest overall. In Part 2, Section A was strong and Section B was average, whereas Sections C and D were weak. The Writing section (Part 2, Section E) was particularly problematic, with the average score reaching only 38%.

Many candidates did not demonstrate adequate control of language, nor sufficient familiarity with idiomatic expressions or natural phrasing. Carelessness was also apparent in key areas such as essay format, genre, register, spelling, and paragraphing, and several candidates did not adhere to the required word limit.

The examiners noted that some candidates appeared to have attempted the exam without sufficient formal preparation. This was reflected in responses that did not follow the required format, particularly in Part 1, Section E, which resulted in significant loss of marks. In addition, the examiners also observed limited awareness of certain key concepts, such as intonation patterns and functional language terminology, across a number of scripts. As in previous TELT examinations, the presentation of many essays was below the expected standard, 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 82.5%. Most candidates demonstrated a basic but acceptable knowledge of grammar and language terms. 5 candidates scored below 50% in this section.

Section B – Primary Stress Indication

Section C – Transcription of Phonemic Script into Normal Spelling

These sections were the strongest overall, with average scores of 83% in Section B and 90% in Section C. Some candidates had difficulty identifying primary stress, often underlining two syllables instead of one. Recognition of phonemic script was generally very good, with most candidates answering all items correctly and only 4 candidates scoring below 4 out of 5.

Section D – Intonation

Performance in this section was notably weak, with an average score of 55%. Many candidates showed limited understanding of intonation patterns, frequently identifying or marking them incorrectly. A recurring issue involved placing rising intonation on statements requiring a falling pattern, or marking stress on the wrong part of the utterance.

Section E – Odd One Out

Results in this section were similar to the previous session, remaining low at an average of 47.5%. At least 3 candidates did not use the required answer format. Some indicated which item was the odd one out but provided no rationale. Performance was strong on items involving modal verbs, 's (possessive vs auxiliary), and present simple vs present continuous forms. Responses on literal vs metaphorical meaning, separable vs inseparable phrasal verbs, and subject vs object noun phrases were average. Candidates struggled most with types of adverbs, adjectives, positive vs negative conjunctions, and present vs past passive forms. These results suggest insufficient preparation.

Section F: Functions

Performance was relatively strong, with an average score of 70%. Some inaccuracies in functional terminology were noted, such as confusion between labels like “giving advice” and “making a statement.” This indicates a need for a clearer understanding of functional language use.

Part 2 Language Proficiency

Section A – Identifying and Correcting Errors

Section B – Word Formation

Performance in both sections improved compared with the previous exam session, with average scores of 77.5% and 80% respectively.

Section C – Cloze Text – Selective Deletion

Performance remained weak, with an average score of 40%, showing no improvement from the previous session. Only three questions were consistently answered correctly. A stronger command of collocations and common phrases would greatly benefit candidates.

Section D – Sentence Transformation

Candidates struggled with this section, achieving an average score of 30%. Six candidates scored 0, failing to answer any items correctly. Errors reflected ongoing difficulty with word order, phrase construction, and collocations.

Section E – Writing Section

This was the weakest part of the paper, with only 4 candidates (12%) scoring above 50%. The overall average was 38%. Essays showed a limited range in grammar and vocabulary, and presentation was often unclear due to poor handwriting and layout. Text organisation was also problematic, particularly in paragraphing, cohesion, and overall structure; some essays lacked an appropriate introduction or conclusion. Spelling and punctuation continued to be weak, and many candidates did not respect the word count. Additional issues included insufficient development of ideas, overly formal language in the informal email task, and long, unfocused sentences with inadequate linking. Examiners also noted signs of first-language interference, including Maltese, such as overuse of the past perfect and incorrect collocations.

Candidates are advised to plan and review their work carefully, making necessary edits before submission. Despite time pressure, attention to presentation remains essential, as it continues to affect marks negatively.

4. Recommendations

Areas requiring particular improvement include greater grammatical proficiency to handle the “odd one out” task, as well as stronger knowledge of intonation patterns and functional language terminology. Candidates also need a broader awareness of collocations and common phrases.

In writing, candidates must learn to follow appropriate layouts and conventions and develop their ability to expand ideas. Cohesion and correct register remain essential, and candidates should be familiar with different essay types, such as reports, narratives, and argumentative essays. Trainers should place a stronger emphasis on writing skills during preparation courses. Explicit attention should be given to punctuation, paragraphing, and correct use of genre as well as developing the essay to sufficiently meet the requirements in the rubric. A process writing approach is recommended, complemented by regular practice in timed, product-style tasks.

Further focus should also be placed on word order, phrase construction, and collocations. Candidates must be reminded of the importance of respecting the word count. Finally, consistent reading practice should be encouraged, as it exposes learners to authentic language and supports broader development as well as creativity, which was limited in this session.