

Level 3 Legal Word Processing – 03935 Summer 2010

General

The standard of scripts was variable, with several candidates gaining a Distinction but a large number failing. Penalties were incurred for incorrect expansion of abbreviations and omission of words, indicating a lack of proof-reading. Some candidates did not follow the rubric instructions for Document 2.

Document 1

This document was generally well done. Main errors were incorrect expansion of abbreviations – "instron" to "instructions", "contt" to "content" or "continuation", "decln" to "decline". Some candidates did not use spaced capitals for B E T W E E N. Other keying-in errors were "trails" for "trials", spellings of "hereby" and "receipt" not corrected and "ensure" for "ensue". Some candidates inserted full stops at the ends of the clauses, even though these did not appear in the draft.

Document 2

This document was mostly well done. Some candidates did not follow the instruction to use a smaller font for the footer and some did not change words to figures in spite of the instructions in the rubric. Of those who did follow this instruction, many keyed in "pound" instead of "pounds" for all the sums of money. Several candidates misspelled "Streetley" as "Streetly".

Document 3

The main error with this document was in leaving too large a margin at the bottom. This margin should be measured from the bottom of the page, not from the end of the text or from the footer. The footer itself was sometimes at the right margin instead of the left, as instructed and was also not in a smaller font. Another error was not aligning the top heading at the right margin. Some candidates added the e-mail address to the company details – this was not necessary but was not penalised.

Document 4

This document did not appear to present too many problems to candidates. Main errors included not correcting the spelling error "deseased" and inconsistency with the dashes – one being rendered as a hyphen and the other as dash. Penalties were incurred for non-alignment of the column headings with the figures (4P) and/or non-alignment of the decimal points (4Q) and for not leaving a clear line space after headings. There were some instances of faulty or omitted ruling. There was an unintentional arithmetical error in the VAT column which some candidates spotted and corrected, carrying the correction all the way through to the final total. Candidates who did not spot this were, of course, not penalised provided they had corrected the deliberate error in the final total as requested. There were some instances of candidates making alterations to the OCR supplied letterhead in spite of instructions on the front of the question paper that no changes should be made to this (penalty under 4H).