

# **TELT May 2017**

## **Examiners' Report**

### **1. Introduction**

34 candidates sat for the TELT May 2017 examination session. 29 candidates were awarded Pass grades or higher. This is the equivalent of an 85.3% pass mark compared to the 62.9% pass mark of the candidates who sat the examination in March 2017, equating to a healthy 13% increase in the Pass rate.

The grades for the written paper are listed below:

**0 Distinction**  
**4 Pass with merit**  
**25 Pass**  
**4 Narrow Fail**  
**1 Fail**  
**0 Unclassified**

### **2. General Remarks**

The May 2017 TELT session has seen a significant improvement in candidate performance when compared to the previous session held in March 2017. Candidates performed well overall, with Section D in Part One, Transcription into Phonemic Script, still being the section that candidates struggle with most. The Writing Section still poses a challenge for many candidates who struggled with the format conventions of the text they selected; both structural and lexical weaknesses were especially noticeable in this section.

### **3. Section Analysis**

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

##### **Part 1 Section A – Language Terminology**

In Section A Part 1, the average pass mark was 75%, (comparable to the 70% recorded in the last examination session), but it was noted that, as for previous sittings, some candidates could not tell the difference between basic language awareness terms. It is advisable for all candidates to adequately prepare themselves for the exam in terms of learning the grammar, as well as the labels and terminology that go with it. Candidates struggled mostly with question numbers 12, 15, 16 and 20.

Candidates who did well were likely to have given particular attention to grammar terms either as part of a self-study programme or after having followed a TELT preparation course.

**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**

The May session registers an average 69% pass mark in these sections. This is, in fact, comparable to the 65% registered in the March 2017 session.

Candidate performance was very satisfactory in Section B (79%). Candidates performed exceedingly well in Section C where all scored maximum marks (100%), indicating that candidates who sat for this exam were able to recognise/decipher all words transcribed phonemically.

Section D remains the most challenging examination task for TELT candidates with the lowest result (29%). Most candidates scored only 4 marks out of 10. As has been noted in most of previous examination sessions, some candidates did not even attempt this task.

Once again the examiners would like to impress upon centres and trainers preparing candidates for this exam the importance of teaching pronunciation and using the phonemic script as a teaching aid in the classroom, especially as a ‘tool’ leading to and reinforcing learner autonomy.

**Part 1 Section E – Odd One Out**

Performance in this section clearly improved when compared to the previous sitting with an average pass mark of 93% in comparison with the 67% pass mark of March 2016. Some candidates, however, continued to struggle with terminology.

There was an evident improvement in candidates following the rubric; however, candidate performance was not consistent in this section. Many candidates failed to follow the rubric and consequently gave partial answers which led to an inevitable loss of marks. Candidates who partly responded to the questions had a chance to gain marks if their parts were correct. Errors were spread across this task.

Candidates who did not select the correct odd one out but delivered a justifiable description of what they identified as being in common and odd had a chance to gain marks.

## **Part 2 Language Proficiency**

### **Part 2 Section A – Identifying and Correcting Errors**

The average pass mark for this section was 67%, which is again an improvement on the 60% registered in March 2016. Candidates did well to follow the rubric and, in most cases, wrote down only the correct word, phrase or punctuation in the space provided. Errors include candidates attempting to correct sentences which were already correct. Candidates who identified and corrected two errors lost a mark even if one was the target error.

## **Part 2 Section B – Word Formation**

With an average pass mark of 78%, candidates performed well in this section, again better than in the previous session which had registered an average 70% pass mark. Once again, apart from some words which were not reformulated correctly, valuable marks were lost with the majority of the candidates due to poor spelling, particularly with numbers 2 and 10.

## **Part 2 Section C – Cloze Test – Selective Deletion**

The majority of candidates performed well in this section with a good average mark of 71% compared to the very low 42% pass rate mark in the previous session. It is to be reiterated that only candidates who read regularly and broaden their range of collocation and commonly used phrases would fare well in this section.

## **Part 2 Section D – Sentence Transformation**

The candidates' performance in this section registered a 71% average pass mark: a marked improvement from the 63% pass mark in the March 2016 session. There were, however, unanticipated problems with numbers 3 and 4. Errors with spelling and collocation led to a considerable loss of marks.

## **Part 2 Section E – Writing Section**

Overall, the majority of essays ranged from Pass to Merit with once case of excellence, with the task being addressed and all points being covered. In many instances, essays were coherent with good control of language and cohesive devices. Task completion in the form of answering what was specifically requested of them in the rubric was good.

Many candidates had problems with format, displaying a disregard to paragraphing and the elements of a paragraph. Specific formatting and the use of specific conventions in the cases of the report were, once again, usually absent. For example, there was no attempt at using headings in many of the reports, nor was there control of appropriate sections. Letter writing conventions were sometimes ignored.

Moreover, a number of essays were not always logically organised.

Examiners are surprised yet again at the high incidence of spelling errors and a disregard for punctuation. Moreover, in many cases, presentation was far from what is expected with writing that was hardly legible, with words and paragraphs that were crossed out.

A few candidates disregarded the word count for which they were penalised.

Examiners suggest that candidates dedicate more time to reading, with reading being a model for writing as well as a means by which candidates broaden their range of lexis and structures. Reading would also serve to help students develop their creativity and come up with ideas for their writing. Examiners encourage trainers to provide candidates with opportunities to read and develop their writing using a variety of texts.

#### **4. Recommendations**

As with previous reports, more focus and attention to phonology is encouraged, in particular the phonemic script, an area which repeatedly appears to be the Achilles' heel of most TEL examination candidates. Correct spelling needs to be impressed upon candidates as well as correct combinations of collocated words. Trainers are encouraged to provide candidates with opportunities to improve their writing skills in the various text types and their respective writing conventions. Candidates should also be trained to proofread their written work before submitting for marking in an examination like the TELT.