

Document Production Level 2 – 06978 Summer 2009

General

The general standard of papers seen was good, and candidates continue to improve upon previous series.

Document 1:

Most candidates inserted an attractive full page fancy border, but some inserted a border round the text only, or a plain border. A picture was usually inserted at the correct point and suitably resized. The WordArt was usually moved to the correct vertical position, but candidates were penalised for placing it within the left margin (4A). A few candidates added 'Retain' to the end of the WordArt. The shading in the text box did not always fill the box and in some cases the border was omitted. Candidates were penalised if the font chosen was not different to the rest of the document, but merely larger or italicised. Some candidates did not leave a clear linespace above and below the picture, text box or WordArt (4B). The word 'a' before 'chorizo sausage risotto' was frequently omitted and 'DESSERTS' sometimes changed to 'DESERTS'. The final paragraph was occasionally retyped completely, with the original sentence from the source document left in at the end of the document.

Document 2:

A few candidates typed 'pet food' instead of 'pet foods' and 'food and wine' instead of 'food and wines', but most of the errors in this document related to the tear-off slip. The dashes indicating the tear-off portion stopped at the margins instead of extending to both edges of the page; a few candidates inserted a scissors symbol although none was drafted and some typed other characters instead of the dashes required (2.3). The smiley face symbol was usually correctly inserted with a space following it as shown, and was accepted either at the left margin or inset as the draft was ambiguous. Some candidates failed to leave a clear linespace between items (4B). A space was not always left between each heading and its associated line of dots; the dotted lines were not always accurately aligned at the right margin and hyphens were sometimes used instead of dots. The second full line of dots for the address was sometimes omitted. The bottom margin of this document was also frequently greater than 4 cm.

Document 3:

This document was usually well typed. The justification, linespacing and amendments were all well done. A small number of candidates failed to set the margins correctly (4T). The copyright symbol in the footer was occasionally omitted. The 'O' in '(TiO₂)' was sometimes presented as a zero. In some cases the organisation chart extended to within 13 mm of the margins (4A) and 'Adviser/Advisor' was not always presented consistently (4K). The page number was sometimes omitted from the second page and 'ultra-fine' typed as 'ultra - fine'.

Document 4:

Part 1 of this document was usually well-presented and accurately typed although some candidates did not spell 'PREFERRED' or 'QUALIFICATIONS' correctly and some left spaces in 'SUBJECT/LEVEL'. The most common error was not to take account of the

relative widths of the columns in the 2-column section. In Part 2 some candidates incurred a penalty under Section 4B for not leaving a clear linespace between the address and telephone number. A few candidates did not remove the ruling as requested. The Roman numeral 'II' in the job role was accepted in either a sans-serif or serif font ('II'), but insertion of special marks such as II , π or Π was penalised. Some candidates typed only one of the entries under Education, or typed only the names of the school or college, without the full address. Any effective display of the qualifications was accepted, but the insertion of an apostrophe in 'GCSEs:' (GCSE's :) was penalised.