

operation and the transcription operation were verified simultaneously. This verification made unnecessary the computation of check digits and the posting of check sums. However, the order of transcribing the corrections to the sheet became all important. This ordering requirement, when introduced into the instructions for the transcribers, resulted in a reduction of the omission type of error by about one-third to one-half.

Quality summary reports of the transcription operation were maintained on an every-other-week basis from a 20-percent sample of the verified work. The error rates shown in table 7 below are the medians (M) from the biweekly summary reports. The error rates associated with the first (Q1) and third (Q3) quartiles are also given.

Table 7. A1 DIARY CORRECTION SHEET PREPARATION ERROR RATES

A. Error Proportions for Various Units

Unit	Error proportions		
	1st quartile	Median	3d quartile
Counties with error.....	.778	.826	.878
Correction sheets in error.	.037	.041	.050
Corrections in error.....	.013	.015	.020
Punched data fields in error ¹005	.006	.009
Check digits in error ¹001	.002	.005
Breaker sheets in error ²025	.032	.042

Table 7. A1 DIARY CORRECTION SHEET PREPARATION ERROR RATES--Continued

B. Errors per 100 Units

Unit	Number		
	1st quartile	Median	3d quartile
Per 100 corrected A1's.....	6.37	9.37	11.02
Punch data only.....	6.33	8.64	10.97
Correction fields only...	4.84	5.78	9.07
Per 100 corrections.....	2.73	3.70	4.06
Punch data only.....	2.73	3.42	3.85
Correction fields only...	2.09	2.55	3.36

C. Proportion of Error by Type

Type	Proportion		
	1st quartile	Median	3d quartile
Omission errors.....	.510	.565	.649
Transcription errors.....	.262	.313	.429
Commission errors.....	.042	.072	.086
Omission of correction lines.....	.243	.321	.411
Transcription of correction field.....	.098	.162	.183
Omission of correction field.....	.098	.133	.139

¹From manual match only.
²From machine match only.