

# WOODWORK

---

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

## General comments

Candidates generally performed well in each part of the paper. All candidates attempted to answer the whole of **Section I** Part **A**, the correct number of questions in **Section I** Part **B** and all the requirements of **Section II** Drawing and Design. The standard this year was very good with some really high quality responses, particularly in **Section II** Drawing and Design.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section I**

#### **Part A**

##### **Question 1**

Most candidates answered at least two of the joints correctly with several gaining all four correct responses.

##### **Question 2**

- (a) The majority of candidates knew the correct angles for the plane blade. A few named correctly but in the wrong order.
- (b) Most named the correct planes. A few named the wrong plane.

##### **Question 3**

Almost all named the butt hinge, though fewer were able to name the rising butt hinge.

##### **Question 4**

Candidates showed good understanding of plywood and construction in this question.

##### **Question 5**

Many gave all four correct answers here. A few gave hardwood and softwood rather than heartwood and sapwood. A few gave bark, rather than cambium in (iii), while in (iv) most correctly stated ray or medullary ray.

##### **Question 6**

Most gained full marks here.

##### **Question 7**

Good level of knowledge in this question on defects. A few answered in the wrong order.

**Part B**

**Question 8**

This was the least popular question in this section. Those who did answer demonstrated good knowledge of preparing timber for turning between centres. Fewer were able to show a depth of knowledge of the safety checks around the wood/tool rest.

**Question 9**

- (i) Most were able to name the groove and rebate.
- (ii) Good level of knowledge of cutting the features. Many used tools such as saw and chisel, rather than using a plough or rebate plane. Few showed how the work would be held.

**Question 10**

- (a) All were able to name the joint at (a).
- (b) Most candidates gave a detailed knowledge of marking out and cutting the two parts of the joint.

**Question 11**

Few attempted this question. Those who did attempt it gave good information for each part (i) (ii) and (iii).

**Section II Drawing and Design**

**Part C and D**

This year there were some excellent responses to this part. The very best showed an excellent level of draughtsmanship. In Part **D (ii)** the sectional and elevation, a few candidates left out detail of the section of the drawer.

# WOODWORK

---

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

<b>Practical</b>
------------------

## **GENERAL COMMENTS**

Most of the candidates completed the test pieces, the working drawing being correctly understood and accurately followed. The wood generally had been well prepared and of suitable quality, however candidates from some Centres would have benefited from a milder working hardwood. Many pieces would have benefited from more care whilst cleaning up at the end of the completed work. The work presented ranged from excellent, through good and sound with very few poor or spoilt pieces.

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS**

### **(a) ASSEMBLY, FINISH AND DIMENSIONS**

A few candidates managed to construct and assemble their pieces the opposite way round to the instructions in the working drawing. The dimensions were generally correctly followed and accurate, but few candidates cleaned up end grain with a plane having been sawn to length. Final finishing with a smoothing plane was poor, not achieving the desired result.

### **(b) BRIDLE JOINT (PARTS A and B)**

This, a principle joint of the construction, was generally set out correctly and completed to a satisfactory standard. The joint set at an angle of 100 proved most difficult. Many candidates used either pencil or biro to mark out with, this created problems with accuracy, they would have been well advised to use marking knives, this provides greater accuracy and a location mark for edge tools such as chisels. There was little evidence of the use of a mortice gauge when marking each part of the joint. The faces of the joint were sawn straight and clean, keeping faces parallel; the housings were also mainly well executed.

### **(c) SQUARE HAUNCHED MORTICE AND TENON (PARTS A and C)**

An important joint within the construction and completed to a satisfactory standard by most candidates. However there was often little evidence of correct use of marking out tools, for example the use of a marking knife for shoulders and a mortice gauge for tenon and mortice. Generally both parts of the joint were well made to the correct dimensions.

### **(d) APPROPRIATE JOINT (PARTS D and A)**

A twin/double or single mortice and tenon, stopped or through, or a dovetail housing would have been appropriate in this situation. Most candidates provided a suitable solution, a form of mortice and tenon being the most popular. It was pleasing to see these correctly proportioned, for example one third of the width for the tenon when single and one fifth the width when twin or double. Some candidates made tenons and mortices far too large thus creating a very weak construction, others used through housing joints which did not have the structural strength needed in this situation.

### **(e) SHAPING PART A**

Attempted by most almost all candidates and they provided a suitable solution, simple curving on angling of the lower corner of part A. Tool work was often poor with evidence of chattering when using spokeshaves and planes on a small surface area.