

# CONTENTS

---

<b>WOODWORK.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>GCE Ordinary Level .....</b>	<b>2</b>
Paper 6030/01 Theory, Drawing and Design .....	2
Paper 6030/02 Practical .....	3

## FOREWORD

---

This booklet contains reports written by Examiners on the work of candidates in certain papers. **Its contents are primarily for the information of the subject teachers concerned.**

# WOODWORK

---

## GCE Ordinary Level

**Paper 6030/01**  
**Theory, Drawing and Design**

### General comments

Candidates tended to answer **Section 1 Part A** well. There were several poor responses to the adhesives at **(e)**.

In **Section 1 Part B** there were few candidates who attempted **Question 5**, the design question. However, those who did choose this question gave good responses.

In **Section 2** most candidates gave very good responses to the drawing and design questions, with a few excellent attempts.

This year there were several excellent responses to the question paper, showing that candidates were familiar with the format of the question paper and understood the requirements of various styles of questions in the different sections of the paper.

As in previous years the best responses showed a clear understanding of the expectation of the syllabus. There was a small number of candidates who gained low marks.

### Comments on specific questions

#### **Section 1**

##### *Part A*

#### **Question 1**

- (a)** Very good responses to supplying two appropriate safety rules.
- (b)** Generally correctly answered. Some confusion with bridle at **(ii)** and dovetail halving at **(iv)**.
- (c)** Well answered. A small number repeated the answer given at **(i)** at **(ii)**.
- (d)** Generally well answered.
- (e)** Most gave at least one correct adhesive.
- (f)** Many correct for all three. Some lost marks naming tools rather than giving an appropriate use.

##### *Part B*

#### **Question 2**

Not the most popular question but those who did attempt it gave responses that showed clear understanding of wood turning processes. At **(c)** there were good safety rules given.

#### **Question 3**

This question was quite popular, with far better responses to **(a)** than **(b)**. A few gave answers that gained almost full marks.

#### Question 4

This question gained the best responses. There were several candidates who correctly labelled the cross section of the tree and then went on to give the function of each identified feature. These gained full marks.

#### Question 5

This was the least popular question. Those who did choose it named the stages of the design process and gave brief descriptions.

### Section 2

#### Part C

#### Drawing and design

- (i) Most candidates gave well proportioned, exploded sketches of an appropriate joint for the corner of the under frame at A.
- (ii) Some good sketches for a handle for the drawer.
- (iii) A minority of candidates drew a single line or did not attempt to answer this question.

#### Part D

- (a) Most candidates gave well drawn, accurate front end and plan views. At (ii) in the sectional end view several did not attempt to include sectional detail of the drawer.
- (b) Most gave several dimensions.
- (c) Most gave full details as laid out in (i) - (iv).

#### Further general comments

The question paper achieved the intended level of differentiation.

The responses showed that candidates used their time well and gave an appropriate allocation to each section.

There were no obvious misinterpretations of the question paper.

In **Section 1 Part B** all candidates followed the instructions and chose two from four questions, rather than attempting to answer all four.

<p><b>Paper 6030/02</b> <b>Practical</b></p>
--

#### General comments

This Report is based on the marking of very few candidates' work (eighteen candidates from three Centres).

Based on the few candidates' work seen, there was a marked improvement and Centres should be congratulated.

All but two candidates completed the test piece and the working drawings were correctly understood and followed. The wood had been well prepared and was of a quality more sympathetic to the test than had been used in the past, enabling the candidates to lightly plane their finished pieces and greatly improve the final product. All the Centres produced pieces of good quality that displayed a full range of woodworking skills well executed.

**Specific comments****(a)** *Dovetail joint between parts A and B*

The joint was completed by all the candidates and the workmanship ranged from satisfactory to excellent. The tails were set out accurately from the working drawing and it was pleasing to see marking knives being used for shoulder lines, resulting in greater accuracy. The pins were accurately marked and cut, resulting in an excellent fit in many cases. Toolwork was good, with good use of the tenon and/or dovetail saw for cutting both the tails and the pins, and the waste was removed cleanly and accurately.

**(b)** *Mortice and tenon joint between parts A and C*

The joint was completed by all candidates to a good standard and accurately positioned. Once more the quality was improved by the correct use of the marking knife rather than the pencil. Few mortices showed signs of breaking out on the underside because they were cut correctly from both sides, which avoids this error. Toolwork was generally good.

**(c)** *Appropriate joint between parts D and A*

The acceptable joints for this situation were a stopped housing joint, stub tenons and dovetail housing. A through housing joint, in view of the shelf's position and width, was an unsuitable solution. All candidates produced a solution, the majority of which were appropriate. The candidates all chose housing joints of one form or another. Some candidates stopped their housings and provided the shelf with a shoulder. This was the most complete solution. Other candidates let the whole width of the shelf into the side, whilst a few cut the housing the full width of the side, thus making an ugly gap on the front edge. A number of housings were cut much too deep, about two thirds of the thickness of the side, thus making it rather weak. Toolwork was generally satisfactory or better, with clean cut sides and level bottoms to the housings.

**(d)** *Shaping – part A*

Shaping was attempted by all but a few candidates. The solutions were appropriate in most cases, with the leading corner being rounded or removed at an angle to give a satisfactory appearance when viewed in position. The toolwork was generally good, where spokeshaves had been used the finish was smooth, showing little of the usual chattering associated with working against the grain.

**(e)** *Final cleaning up*

Cleaning up had been attempted in most cases and generally enhanced the final appearance of the finished piece. A good choice of suitable wood for the examination, for example a mild working, straight grained hardwood, greatly assisted this process.