

## **TELT March 2026 Examiners' Report**

### **1. Introduction**

Seventeen (17) candidates sat for the TELT March 2026 examination session. Seven (7) candidates were awarded a Pass grade, resulting in a 42% pass rate.

The grades for the written paper are listed below:

0 Distinction  
0 Pass with Merit  
7 Pass  
4 Narrow Fail  
6 Fail  
0 Unclassified

### **2. General Remarks**

Candidate performance in the March 2026 TELT session showed improvement compared to the previous sitting, with the pass rate increasing from 15% to 42%. While examiners noted several strengths, weaknesses were evident across multiple sections of the paper.

In Part 1, Sections A, C, and D were generally strong, with particular improvement in Section D compared to the previous sitting. Performance in Section B was quite weak, while Sections E and F remained similar to the previous session, ranging from average to strong.

In Part 2, Section A was weak, in contrast to the stronger performance in the previous session. Section B was also weak, while Section C was average. The lowest performance was recorded in Section D. Section E was below average, indicating that, as in previous examination sessions, candidates found this section challenging.

Many candidates did not demonstrate adequate control of language or sufficient familiarity with idiomatic expressions and natural phrasing. Carelessness was also evident in key areas such as essay format, genre, register, spelling, and paragraphing. However, adherence to the word limit showed improvement compared to the previous session.

### **3. Section Analysis**

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

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

Performance was lower than in the previous session, with an average score of 24.7 (62%), although only three candidates scored below 50%. Most candidates demonstrated a basic but acceptable knowledge of grammar and language terminology.

##### **Section B – Primary Stress Indication**

Performance in this section was satisfactory, with only one candidate scoring just below 50% and one candidate omitting the task, which may be considered an oversight. The average score was 75.2%.

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

This section was strong, with all candidates achieving full marks.

##### **Section D – Intonation**

Performance in this section was notably stronger than in the previous session, with an average score of 65.2. A better understanding of intonation patterns was demonstrated. Only two candidates scored below 50%.

### **Section E – Odd One Out**

This section continues to be one of the weaker areas, with results lower than in the previous session. As many as 12 candidates scored below 50%, and a number of candidates did not attempt some questions.

### **Section F – Functions**

Performance was weaker than in the previous sitting. While only two candidates scored below 50%, the average score was 58.8%. Some candidates appeared not to have been well prepared for this section, using incorrect terminology, while others appeared to have rushed through it.

## **Part 2 Language Proficiency**

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

The results indicate a poor performance in Section A, where the average score reached 10 out of 20 (50%), demonstrating a weak level of achievement. Moreover, it was observed that some candidates are still unfamiliar with collective nouns. For example, in Question 10 (“the group of fishermen has caught”), candidates often identified the incorrect use of “has” and changed it to “have”, rather than recognising the incorrect past participle “caught”, which should be “caught.” Other simple spelling errors were also noted, such as “eachother” instead of each other, and “water born” instead of waterborne.

### **Section B – Word Formation**

In Section B, candidates achieved a strong result, with the average mark reaching 9 out of 10 (90%). Nevertheless, some candidates still demonstrated a lack of knowledge in the correct spelling of certain words.

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

Performance in Section C was moderate, with an average achieving result of 50%. This suggests that candidates demonstrated a reasonable level of understanding, though there is still room for improvement, particularly in spelling accuracy and grammatical precision.

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

The lowest performance was recorded in Section D, with an average of 3 out of 10 (30%), indicating that this section posed significant difficulty for candidates. In particular, there appeared to be a lack of understanding of passive constructions, passive causatives, and collocations, with candidates performing poorly in these areas of sentence structure.

### **Section E – Writing Section**

Section E showed a below-average result indicating that candidates continue to find this component challenging, as in previous sessions, and would benefit from further preparation and practice.

A key issue was limited understanding of genre conventions, particularly the difference between essays and reports. As a result, texts were usually functionally relevant but not genre-appropriate. Structural control was also a major weakness. Common issues included lack of paragraphing, overly long sentences, run-on structures, all of which reduced clarity, especially in lower-performing scripts.

In terms of language, while many candidates attempted higher-level lexis, accuracy and naturalness were inconsistent. Frequent grammatical issues included awkward constructions (e.g. “what’s the

reason of...”, “talk to yourself at the phone”), unnatural phrasing (e.g. “I need to inform you about the fact...”), and spelling errors (e.g. *beleif*, *confortably*, *obsellite*).

Register awareness was generally adequate, with most candidates achieving appropriate tone in informal and semi-formal tasks. However, some responses showed inconsistent pragmatic control, including overly formal or unnatural expressions in informal contexts.

In Part 1, most candidates successfully met task requirements and achieved communicative purpose, even in weaker scripts, and logical sequencing was common. However, Part 2 responses often showed limited idea development, with generalised points, lack of examples, and insufficient depth.

Overall, while candidates generally met basic communicative aims, weaknesses in genre awareness, organisation, and linguistic accuracy indicate a need for more focused instruction in report writing and accurate, natural language use.

#### **4. Recommendations**

### **4. Recommendations**

Candidates would benefit from improved grammatical control, particularly in areas such as sentence transformation, passive constructions, and collocations. Greater attention should also be given to accuracy in spelling, word formation, and natural phrasing, as well as familiarity with idiomatic language.

In Part 1, further practice is needed in tasks such as “odd one out,” functional language, and intonation, where performance was weaker or inconsistent. Strengthening awareness of language terminology and phonological features remains important.

Writing continues to be a key area for development. Candidates need clearer understanding of genre conventions, particularly the distinction between essays and reports. Greater emphasis should be placed on appropriate structure, including paragraphing, organisation, and the use of titles and subheadings in report writing. Candidates should also develop their ability to expand ideas with relevant examples and sufficient depth.

Accuracy and naturalness of language in writing require further attention, especially for prospective EFL teachers. Focus should be placed on avoiding awkward constructions, improving register awareness, and maintaining consistent tone appropriate to the task.

Training programmes should place stronger emphasis on writing skills, including a process-writing approach supported by regular timed practice. Explicit focus should also be given to cohesion, internal organisation, and adherence to task requirements, including word limits.

Finally, increased exposure to authentic language through regular reading is recommended to support overall language development, lexical range, and more natural expression.