

Audio Transcription (Level 1) – 06967 Spring 2009

The work produced by candidates was of a good standard and the majority of the candidates completed all documents, but poor proofreading led to many uncorrected typographical errors. All documents were well presented.

Some candidates failed to follow the capitalisation as shown on the Candidate Information Sheet. The change from double linespacing to single linespacing and the emphasis of the sentence were generally well done. The homophone to/too was not recognised by a high number of candidates.

Document 1:

This document was generally well done. The word "Sydney" did not appear on the Candidate Information Sheet, so no penalty was incurred if candidates spelt it as "Sidney". Some candidates omitted the date (Marking Criterion 2.1). A significant number of candidates failed to leave a clear linespace after the letterhead template (4B). "John" was occasionally omitted in the address (MC 2.1). The heading was sometimes entered using initial capitals instead of closed capitals (MC 4J). The words "programme" and "advise" were sometimes keyed in as "program" and "advice" (MC 2.1).

Document 2:

Again, another document generally well done. A few candidates keyed-in "half way" as one word instead of two words (MC 1.2). A surprising number of candidates failed to follow the capitalisation shown on the Candidate Information Sheet for "Progress Hotel" (MC 1.7).

Document 3:

This document was very well presented with candidates only incurring a few keying-in errors. The main problem was the use of the homophone "too" with many candidates keying-in the word "to" (MC 2.1). The majority of candidates coped with the change of linespacing and the emphasis.