

## **Text Processing (Business Production)**

### **Text Production (Level 3) - 03932, and Text Production - Screen Reader (Level 3) - 00007 Autumn 2008**

It is noticeable that the majority of candidates who failed this paper did so because of poor proofreading. The three documents, including the fax, which is a new type of document at this level, were usually displayed to a very high standard, but candidates need to check their work very carefully against the draft before submitting it. The majority of errors found cannot be picked up by a spellchecker as they involve the omission, addition or substitution of common words such as “in”, “on”, “a” and “the”.

#### ***Document 1:***

The majority of candidates used the correct letterhead supplied by OCR. Not all candidates inserted the special mark FOR THE ATTENTION OF MR J PALMER correctly, either abbreviating the first four words to FAO, failing to use blocked capitals as shown, failing to leave a clear linespace before the address, or addressing the letter to “Mr J Palmer”. Some candidates did not expand “PI” to “Place”. Most candidates correctly inserted the heading. Most candidates corrected “companys” to “company's” and “makes” to “make”. “Option One” and “Option Two” were often typed with initial lower case for the numbers, incurring a fault for each occasion. The word “end” after “River Thames” was not always corrected to “ends”, but “we currently has vacancies” was usually corrected to “we currently have vacancies”. Nearly all candidates correctly inserted the ballooned text “Saturday will be spent sightseeing.” But a surprising number failed to insert the words “on either of these packages” indicated by the caret insertion. “Bookings Manager”, was sometimes changed to “Booking Manager” but nearly all candidates correctly inferred that there was no enclosure to this letter.

#### ***Document 2:***

Most candidates correctly used the OCR-supplied fax template, although some appeared to amend this by changing the font or the linespacing or adding boxes around the details. “Thomson Electronics” was sometimes changed to “Thompson Electronics” and “Developmental” to “Development”, whereas “Workshops” was usually correctly inserted from the resource sheet. A number of candidates failed to range the columns in the table fully to the left, especially in the DURATION column, where “5 hours” and “6 hours” were started under the “0” of “10 hours”. The numbered paragraphs were generally rearranged well, but “flipcharts” was often typed with an initial capital letter. The final two paragraphs were generally transposed as required, only a few candidates omitting the final paragraph altogether as a result. The underscore beneath “additional” was occasionally too short or too long.

**Document 3:**

This document was generally well-typed, although omission of words such as “all”, “to”, “at”, “the” and “a”, substitutions including at/in, having/had, or/and, or/in, your/you, the/our, possible/possibly, that/than, weeding/wedding were seen in some of the less well-typed documents. Candidates seemed to find it particularly difficult to spell “OCCASIONS” and a number removed or changed the position of the apostrophe in “your staff’s need” although it was correct. The abbreviation “tel” was sometimes expanded to “tell” instead of “telephone”. The footnotes were generally well done, although a few candidates changed the initial letters to capitals and/or inserted full stops where none were shown, or typed the footnote immediately following the paragraph above it in the draft, instead of at the foot of the page of typescript where the footnote symbol appeared in the text.

The transpositions, inset paragraph and the portion in single linespacing were generally done well.