

WOODWORK

<p>Paper 6030/01 Theory, Drawing and Design</p>

General comments

The paper was well attempted by all candidates. The majority gained more than half of the marks available. Candidates understood the requirements of each section of the examination paper. As in previous recent years **Section 1 Part A** was answered well showing a breadth of knowledge. Responses in **Section 1 Part B** varied from rather brief responses to some excellent answers. At the higher level candidates are following the sub-sections of questions and matching responses to the marks available. In **Section II**, Drawing and Design, there was a variation in the standard of draughtsmanship from a few rather poor examples to many good quality and a few excellent responses.

Comments on specific questions

Section I Part A

Question 1

- (i) Cutouts were usually answered correctly, but sometimes in the wrong order. Cutout A was sometimes answered as housing, rather than groove.
- (ii) Tools for marking out the cutouts were often correct with mortice gauge and marking gauge the most common. A few candidates named tools for cutting the cutouts.

Question 2

All candidates attempted the question, though only a few knew all four joints. Few identified dovetail housing at (i). Most knew the square haunched mortice and tenon at (ii) and the lapped dovetail at (iii). Some knew cross halving joint at (iv).

Question 3

Good knowledge of safety was shown, with common sense rules identified.

Question 4

Most candidates named both try square and Warrington Pattern hammer with appropriate uses given at (b).

Question 5

Many gave the correct names for the datum marks at (i) and (ii). Some gave correct names in the wrong order.

Question 6

A few candidates did not have knowledge of these defects.

Question 7

Good knowledge was shown of both methods of conversion with many giving live or through and through at (i), and quarter sawing at (ii).

Question 8

Plywood was usually given correctly for board **(i)**, though fewer candidates named blockboard at **(ii)**.

Question 9

Some candidates gained all the marks available, but others named tong instead of washer at **(a)** or ferrule at **(b)**.

Section 1 Part B

Only a few candidates attempted to answer all four questions this year. Where this occurs all four are marked and the two top scores taken. However, candidates who attempt all four questions invariably do badly and often have insufficient time to complete Parts C and D.

Question 10

This was the second most popular question. Those candidates who followed the three parts of the question and matched their responses to the marks available gained the best marks. Generally better answers to **(i)** and **(ii)**, than at **(iii)**.

Question 11

This was the most popular question. Some excellent responses were given to this question, with candidates knowing the parts of the tree and naming the function of each part.

Question 12

Only a few candidates attempted the question. A few named the joint correctly at **(a)**, but a few just gave housing, rather than stopped housing to gain both marks. A few gave detailed answers showing the stages of marking and cutting joint at **(b)**.

Question 13

Some excellent responses were seen to this question on marking out and cutting the space for the hinge. Few gave detail of fitting the hinge though.

Section II

Candidates all followed the format of **Part C** and **D** and followed the instructions about the layout of the paper.

Part C

- (i)** Generally good responses to the joint. All shown exploded and in good proportion.
- (ii)** Many good designs for the handle were developed.

Part D

Some excellent examples of draughtsmanship, with accurate views and clean pencil work. The best responses showed good detail of the drawer in the end view.

Best responses also gave good dimensioning in **(b)** and printing of candidate details in the title box. Poorer responses had the three views in the top left hand part of the paper, rather than carefully planned on the paper and printing/dimensioning was poor.

WOODWORK

<p>Paper 6030/02</p>

<p>Practical</p>

General Comments

Few candidates failed to complete the test in the time available. Some of the wood had been poorly prepared prior to the examination and was not of a suitable quality, being too hard and with difficult grain. Few candidates attempted to finish their pieces with a finely set smoothing plane, and the overall quality of work was down on previous years. However, the work presented showed a good range of working skills, from excellent to very weak. The overall accuracy of setting out and cutting to size was disappointing, all too often lengths were left to the prepared sizes and not sawn and planed to lengths as shown in the working drawings, this can lead to inaccurate setting out of joints and their positions.

Specific Comments

SQUARE HAUNCHED MORTICE AND TENON PARTS A AND B

This, the principle joint of the test piece, was attempted by all candidates with satisfactory outcomes. All but a few candidates set out the joint accurately in the centre of the leg and the tenon was correctly proportioned. Mortice gauges had not been used on several occasions making marking out more difficult and a longer process. Once more there was little evidence of the use of a marking knife for shoulder lines, thus reduced accuracy, biro is not suitable for this purpose. The mortices were generally cleanly cut, but tenons showed little evidence of correct sawing techniques down the sides, and shoulders were poorly sawn and uneven. The use of a marking knife for marking out would have made it possible to saw and clean up much easier by giving a clean and clear location mark

CROSS—HALVING JOINTS—PARTS B AND C AND D AND E

The halving joints were correctly set out by most candidates and completed to a satisfactory standard. Their sides were cleanly sawn and square in most cases, however, the bottoms of the joints were generally rough showing poor tool work and splitting out. Once more, quality was sacrificed by not using the correct tools for the marking out.

APPROPRIATE JOINT –PARTS A AND D

The most suitable joints for this situation were a stopped mortice and tenon, shouldered all round, a stopped mortice and tenon with two long shoulders or a shouldered through mortice and tenon. All but a very few candidates attempted this part with considerable success, most using a form of stopped mortice and tenon, with either two or four shoulders, Quality once again was reduced by incorrect use of tools for setting out, for example marking gauges and marking knives.

SHAPING PART A

The bottom of the leg had a gentle slope that should have been planed---a simple task. Several candidates tried to remove the waste wood with a saw but with little success. It was disappointing that this proved difficult in a number of instances.