WOODWORK

Paper 6030/01
Theory, Drawing and Design

General comments

The paper was well attempted by the majority of candidates. Candidates were able to access each of the sections of the exam paper and there were some excellent responses to each of the sections. Some candidates showed a good depth and breadth particularly in response to theory in ***Section 1*** **Part B**. There were also some examples of a high standard of draughtsmanship in ***Section II***.

Comments on specific questions

Section 1 Part A

Question 1

Most were able to identify and name the round head screw correctly. There was some confusion with the panel pin and French/Wire Nail.

Question 2

Most named the bridle and the through dovetail correctly at C and D. The lap joint (A) was often called a butt and the dovetail halving (B) was often just called dovetail.

Question 3

Candidates generally showed a good knowledge of the safe use of chisels. Some referred to wearing an apron, rather than relating to personal safety or safe use of tools.

Question 4

Candidates had a good knowledge of datum marks and tools for drawing both lines. Some crossed over tools or got face edge and face side in the wrong order.

Question 5

Most candidates knew and were able to draw grain direction and end grain.

Question 6

The majority correctly drew through and through. Some also knew quarter sawing but few indicated radial correctly.

Question 7

Many gave the correct reasons for converting by live/through and through and some for quarter sawing.

Question 8

Some correctly answered all three parts of the mortise gauge but a few only identified the pins/spurs. However, there were good descriptions of the use of the tool

Section 1 Part B

Question 9

(a) Most gained a mark for correctly naming the joint

(b) There were some very good answers which showed thorough knowledge of marking out and cutting the joint. Those who scored lower marks wrote in general terms about drawing lines and cutting with a saw, rather than identifying the correct tools. The best answers showed a sequence to both marking out and cutting the joint.

Question 10

There were many excellent answers to this question, showing clear understanding of timber conversion and seasoning. There were several who gained the full marks available.

Question 11

This was not a popular question and those who did attempt it answered **part (a)** far better than **part (b)**. Candidates seemed far more knowledgeable about the use of sash cramps than they were about cleaning up the top surface.

Question 12

Some excellent responses were seen to this question, closely following the requirements of both parts. The best answers showed a trunk cross section with clear accurate labels for **(a)**, then a detailed description of the purpose of each part in **(b)**. A few candidates gave answers in excess of what was required.

Section II Drawing and Design

Part C

Some examples of well proportioned freehand sketches of both joints were seen. The very best not only exploded their drawings, but angled the second joint to show detail, in order to access maximum marks. Some gave the same joint for both situations when they were told to show different joints. Candidates must take care to follow the instructions.

Part D

(a) It was pleasing to see many examples of an excellent standard of draughtsmanship with very precise Front View, End View and Plan. At the lower end a few candidates gave inaccurate drawings with a lack of attention to detail.

(b) & **(c)** Dimensioning and printing of details should present few problems for candidates, but once again there was a variation from a rather poor standard to excellent.

WOODWORK

Paper 6030/02

Practical

GENERAL COMMENTS

Most candidates completed the test piece; the working drawings correctly understood and accurately followed. The timber provided by some Centres was not entirely suitable, being too hard and containing short grain, liable to split easily and difficult to cut cleanly without very sharp tools and considerable craft skills. Some Centres had heeded advice from previous reports and used marking knives to mark out shoulder lines, thus working more accurately and with a better outcome. The range of work seen covered the whole spectrum from poor to very good, the best demonstrating excellent craft skills and good practice.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

(a) LAPPED DOVETAIL JOINT between PARTS **A** and **B**

This was the principle test joint and was completed to a satisfactory standard by many candidates. Most tails were accurately set out to the dimensions shown, where marking knives were used for the shoulder lines an accurate fit was achieved, however pencil shoulder lines led to poor fitting and irregular shoulders. The dovetail sockets were generally well cut, but some hard woods used had made cutting across the grain difficult and candidates were unable to avoid tearing the end grain.

(b) THROUGH DOVETAIL JOINT between PARTS **B** and **C**

This was completed to a good standard by most candidates, with cleanly cut tails and good fitting sockets. However, similar problems were encountered to **(a)** due to pencil shoulder lines and loss of accuracy and some unsuitable materials. Centres should endeavour to supply the candidates with mild working, straight grained hardwoods to give them the best chance.

(c) APPROPRIATE JOINT between PART **A** and **D**

The most appropriate joint in this situation was a housing joint, stopped at both ends or the top edge only. Other joints, such as a stopped double mortice and tenon, were also suitable. The stopped housing was most frequently used and completed to a good standard. However, a number of housings were rather too deep, over half the thickness of part **A**, where one third thickness would have been sufficient.

(d) APPROPRIATE JOINT between PART **C** and **D**

The problem was similar to **(c)** and therefore the most appropriate joint was a stopped housing, either at both ends or on the top edge only. Other joints used were double mortice and tenon, both stopped and through. Generally this joint was completed to a reasonable standard, the housings being cleanly cut, with vertical sides and clean parallel bottoms.

(e) SHAPING ON PART **A**

Many candidates found this difficult and few managed a cleanly cut and accurate shape: perhaps they were not familiar with scribing gouges since many curves were left roughly cut with a coping saw.

(f) FINAL CLEANING UP AND ASSEMBLY

When attempted, final cleaning up with a finely set smoothing plane was done to good effect. Once more, hard timbers with interlocking grain made this a difficult process for many candidates who therefore failed to enhance the final appearance.