

25 JULY 2026 SESSION

LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY EXAMINATION REPORT

Report date: 15 August 2026

Scripts reviewed: 7

Executive summary

Five of the seven candidates (71.4%) were recorded as successful: one Pass with Merit and four Passes. Two candidates received a Narrow Fail. Percentages ranged from 55.25% to 83.25%, with a cohort mean of 67.1% and a median of 66.0%.

Part 1 was the stronger of the two components, with a cohort mean of 69.9/100 compared with 64.4/100 in Part 2. The strongest areas were Communicative Function in Part 1 and Word Formation in Part 2. The principal areas of difficulty were Odd One Out analysis, Identifying and Correcting Errors, and the long writing task. As the cohort is small, all percentages are descriptive of this session only.

PART 1 - Language Description, Sensitivity and Awareness

Five candidates met the 65/100 benchmark in Part 1. Scores ranged from 51 to 85, with a cohort mean of 69.9 and a median of 73. The cohort showed strongest control of communicative functions and generally secure recognition of intonation patterns. Primary stress was less secure, while Odd One Out was the main weakness.

Section-level analysis

Section A - Language terminology

Performance was generally secure: all candidates obtained between 26 and 36 marks out of 40. Candidates usually identified broad grammatical categories and common tense, voice and lexical classifications. Errors were more frequent where distractors required fine distinctions between semantic relationships, morphology and word class in context.

Section B - Primary stress identification

This section produced substantial variation, from 5 to 15 marks. One candidate achieved full marks, while several had difficulty with longer or derivationally complex items and less familiar stress patterns. The spread indicates that primary-stress knowledge was not stable across the cohort.

Section C - Phonemic transcription

The mean was 3.6 out of 5. Three candidates achieved full marks and two scored 4, while two scored 1. Some losses arose from inaccurate normal spelling after the phonemic form had been partly recognised; this was marked in accordance with the syllabus rule that misspelled responses receive no credit.

Section D - Rising and falling intonation

Intonation was one of the stronger areas, with scores from 6 to 9 and a mean of 8. Candidates generally recognised the expected contours for statements, commands, yes/no questions and wh-questions. Greater difficulty arose where an utterance required more than one movement or allowed a context-sensitive interpretation. Where more than one contour was required, the complete pattern was needed for the available mark; no half marks were awarded.

Section E - Odd One Out

This was the weakest and most discriminating section. The mean was 9.1 out of 20, scores ranged from 4 to 20, and only one candidate achieved full marks. Many responses identified a possible odd item but did not state the common feature shared by the other three, or used terminology too imprecisely to establish a valid three-to-one contrast.

The section also generated the greatest moderation burden because several sets supported more than one defensible analysis, particularly items 2, 8 and 10; items 4 and 6 also prompted alternatives. Credit depended on whether an explanation consistently addressed the printed linguistic focus and accounted for all four utterances.

Section F - Name the communicative function

This was the strongest section. Four candidates achieved 10 out of 10 and the remaining scores were 8 or 9. Equivalent terminology was accepted where it accurately captured communicative intent. The few errors mainly involved labels that described sentence form or propositional content rather than pragmatic function.

PART 2 - Language Proficiency

Part 2 scores ranged from 56 to 89.5, with a corrected cohort mean of 64.4/100 and a median of 59.5. The objective component averaged 34.3/50. Writing averaged 30.1/50. The quantitative analysis below is based on section totals; no item-level comments were supplied for Sections A-D, so the report does not infer unrecorded error patterns.

Section A - Identifying and Correcting Errors

This was the weakest objective section in Part 2, with a mean of 11.4 out of 20 (57.1%) and scores ranging from 6 to 16. The task assessed grammatical, lexical, spelling and punctuation accuracy. Inclusive rulings were applied where the live paper allowed more than one defensible correction.

Section B - Word Formation

Word Formation was the strongest component of Part 2. The mean was 8.9 out of 10 (88.6%), and all candidates scored between 7 and 10. The result indicates generally secure control of derivational morphology and contextually appropriate word-class selection.

Section C - Selective Deletion

The cohort mean was 7.0 out of 10 (70.0%), although the range of 4 to 10 indicates uneven performance. Marking followed the syllabus requirement to accept any single, correctly spelled word that was grammatical, coherent and meaningful in context, rather than restricting credit to the examples printed in the key.

Section D - Sentence Transformations

The mean was also 7.0 out of 10 (70.0%), with scores ranging from 4 to 10. Performance was therefore satisfactory overall but variable.

Section E - Writing Tasks

Writing performance was mixed. The compulsory short task was comparatively stronger, averaging 13.6 out of 20 (67.9%), while the long task averaged 16.6 out of 30 (55.2%). The final writing totals ranged from 25.5 to 44.5 out of 50, with a cohort mean of 30.1 (60.3%).

All seven scripts were double marked. Differences between the two short-task marks ranged from 1 to 2 marks; differences on the long task ranged from 2 to 3 marks. All were therefore within the agreed tolerance, and the worksheet calculated the final writing mark as the arithmetic mean of the two marker scores.

Stronger responses addressed the task, maintained an appropriate register, used relevant and sometimes ambitious vocabulary, and organised ideas into coherent paragraphs. Across the cohort, recurring weaknesses included limited or inconsistent paragraphing, underdeveloped or imbalanced content, repetition, missing or compressed conclusions, weak use of cohesive devices, spelling and punctuation errors, overlong or poorly controlled sentences, and occasional inappropriate register or sign-off conventions. These features were more pronounced in the long task, where sustained development and overall structure carried greater demands.

Conclusion

The July 2026 cohort produced a broadly satisfactory overall outcome, with five of seven candidates recorded as successful. Part 1 showed strong pragmatic awareness and generally good intonation recognition, but Odd One Out analysis remained a pronounced weakness. In Part 2, Word Formation was a clear strength, while Identifying and Correcting Errors and extended writing were less secure.