

## **Level 3 Legal Word Processing – 03935 Summer 2011**

### **General**

The standard of scripts was mixed, with a few candidates producing very good work. The main problems were typographical errors, showing lack of proof reading, and lack of knowledge of legal terminology. Expansion of abbreviations was also an area of weakness, along with not carrying out instructions.

### **Document 1**

Errors were incurred by inconsistent use of initial capitals for "Provider" and by incorrect expansion of abbreviations: "change" for "charge" and "continued" or "contracted" for "contained". The transposition of the text of paragraphs cont20 and cont21 was correctly carried out. Some candidates misspelled "sub-licences" as "sub-licenses". The allocation of 4 cm horizontal space was usually correct but some candidates measured the space from the edge of the paper instead of to the margin. It should be noted that 2011 when expressed in words should be two thousand and eleven, not twenty eleven, particularly in a legal document.

### **Document 2**

This document was mostly well done. The instructions in the rubric to use capitals for the names of organisations were usually followed correctly, but some candidates additionally used capitals for Bank of England in Clause 3(ii). The postcode SO22 was often miskeyed as S022 or 5O22. Other errors included per cent as one word or the use of the per cent sign when expressing 3% in words (three %) and misplacing of clause 3(ii). There were a few problems with the alignment of the braces; some candidates again measured the space from the edge of the page rather than from the margin. Some candidates failed to use a smaller font for the footer in this document.

### **Document 3**

This document was mostly well done. The main error was incorrect measurement of the margins, particularly the bottom. This margin should be measured from the last line of text, not from the footer. The first line was often not correctly aligned at the right margin.

#### **Document 4**

This document was the least well done of the four. Main errors were non-alignment of the decimal points in the columns, figures not aligned with the column headings. In some cases the figures were not aligned correctly with the last line of the paragraph to which they referred. There were also some errors with the ruling, mainly the omission of some of the lines. Line spacing caused a problem with many candidates not leaving a clear line space between the different sections, although this was quite clear on the draft. In some cases this appeared to have been done in order to fit the document on to one page, However, no penalty was applied if it went on to a second page provided this page is numbered. Other errors were "parties" for "party's" and misspelling of "negotiations".