

Text Production Level 2 – 06975, and Text Production – Screen Reader Level 2 – 00005 Autumn 2009

General:

The standard of work was high with the majority of candidates completing all three documents. Failure to key commas as shown on the draft, omitted words, typographical errors and failure to expand abbreviations correctly continue to be the main errors. Proofreading skills are a requirement of this scheme and candidates should check their work very carefully against the original draft to eliminate these errors. Penalties for modifying the OCR-supplied stationery have reduced significantly.

Document 1:

The majority of candidates are presenting this on letterhead paper with most using the correct OCR-supplied letterhead; a few candidates continue to change the font style and/or size of this letterhead (Marking Criterion 4H). In some cases the majority in a batch are presented using the correct stationery but a few use an alternative letterhead, which may suggest some tutors are unaware of the requirement to use the OCR-supplied stationery. A few candidates incurred a fault for failing to follow the capitalisation of Our ref and/or the reference details (MC 2.1). The majority correctly entered the special mark and displayed this in capitals at the left margin. Candidates must underline words as shown in the draft but some failed to underline the text 'very carefully' with several emboldening this instead, or the underline extended under the space following the text (MC 2.3). A few candidates keyed 'up-to-date' instead of 'accurate' in the stet instruction (MC 2.1). There were two enclosures implied in the draft and whilst many candidates indicated an enclosure the majority failed to differentiate between single and multiple enclosures (MC 2.3). The abbreviation 'Dr' was often retained, 'opp' was expanded to 'option' instead of 'opportunity' and although 'Cres' was expanded, this was frequently presented as 'Cresent'. A few candidates incurred a fault in the post-dating, either for failing to display this in the same style as the letter date (MC 4L) and/or for including the year as 2009 when it should have been 2010 (MC 2.1). The year is not required in post-dating, but if included it must be accurate. Other common errors included 'Notice to Policyholders' keyed as 'Notice of Policyholders', 'quotation' keyed as 'question', 'Manager' keyed as 'Manger', the words 'or may' omitted, addition of the word 'card' after 'credit' and the spelling of 'discus' not corrected. Initial capitals must be presented as shown in the draft ('Notice to Policyholders' and 'Certificate of Insurance') and a few candidates failed to present some of these words with initial capitals incurring a fault per word (MC 1.7).

Document 2:

This document was completed well with many candidates producing error-free work. Most candidates used the correct OCR-supplied memo paper, but a few changed the font style and/or size of the headings (MC 4H). A few candidates failed to follow the capitalisation of the reference details (MC 2.1). The most common faults were the omission of commas as shown in the draft, 'attach' keyed as 'attached', 'pleased' keyed as 'please' and the apostrophe in 'newspapers' moved instead of deleted. Many candidates failed to indicate an

enclosure (MC 2.3) – on this occasion a single or multiple enclosure was accepted as this document could refer to document 1 where there was more than one enclosure.

Document 3:

Punctuation must be keyed as shown on the draft, but commas and/or hyphens were frequently omitted. The vertical transposition of headings caused some problems with candidates incorrectly moving the paragraphs with the headings when only the headings were circled (MC 3.1). A few candidates also misplaced the interim paragraph and heading. Many did not expand the abbreviation 'asap' and 'immed' was expanded to 'immediately' which did not make sense (MC 2.1). A few candidates who had correctly executed the stet instruction in document 1 then keyed 'section' instead of 'unit' in this document (MC 2.1). The additional paragraphs were presented in the correct place, but many candidates omitted the commas after 'current needs' and 'conference rooms'. Emphasis was usually correctly applied to the sentence with most candidates opting to embolden this. WiFi was not always presented as shown on the draft, with some candidates hyphenating this, or presenting it all in capitals. The close-up correction sign continues to cause difficulty with the words being transposed to 'work team' or 'workteam' instead of removing the space to 'teamwork'. A few candidates incurred a fault for inconsistent display of figures mixing the use of words and figures for the display of '250 people' and '60 people' (MC 4L). The word 'seventeenth' was accepted as '17th'. Other common errors included 'century' as 'centaury', 'bear' as 'bare', 'suit' as 'suite', 'barn' as 'bam' and 'Croftside' as 'Craftside'. Spelling errors were evident in the capitalised headings which may not be identified by spellchecking alone and reinforces the need for careful proofreading. Some candidates failed to number the continuation sheet (MC 2.3).