

TECHNICAL GRAPHICS

SUBJECT 7049

PAPER 3

GENERAL COMMENTS

The general performance was satisfactory. Around 50% of the total candidature who sat for this paper performed fairly well. Presentation of work was generally good for some candidates. Line work was also good but there is need to improve in some cases and also the lettering aspect. The generality of the candidates reflected that they acquired some basic draughting skills though at different levels. Questions on calculations were attempted by a few candidates.

QUESTION 1

A popular question though not satisfactorily answered. Presentation of diagrams lacked connectivity, i.e. they were disjointed. Components were not drawn in their correct order. Most diagrams were drawn freehand. Conventions for walls, earth and concrete were not correctly represented. There were, however, a few exceptional candidates who drew correct diagrams and conventions.

QUESTION 2

A popular question common to most centres. Some candidates drew their views away from the given ground line. However quite a number of candidates were able to draw the correct solution. Occasionally some candidates attempted to point perspective. In some cases some candidates produced isometric and oblique views. Some candidates did not use the given measurements. Generally a well attempted question.

QUESTION 3

This was avoided by most candidates and those who opted for it performed badly. Errors were common on calculations, i.e. addition and multiplication. There were also errors on converting to the final answer which was in cubic meters.

QUESTION 4

This was a poorly attempted question. The majority of the candidates who attempted it labelled parts wrongly. Spelling errors were common especially on the words "skirting" and "concrete". Candidates were not very certain of the appropriate terms to use.

QUESTION 5

The majority of the candidates who attempted this question failed to align parts correctly. Several candidates produced pictorial diagrams which made it difficult to show all the required parts. A few candidates simply reproduced the given diagram and tried to label the parts. The brick on edge sill was commonly substituted with other forms of sills. Freehand diagrams were common.

QUESTION 6

Not a popular question. For the few who attempted it, part (i) of the question was quite challenging. Candidates could not realise that they were required to calculate the perimeter. Part (ii) was satisfactorily done by most candidates who chose it. They were able to calculate the surface area correctly. However, several candidates missed the final answer by failing to convert to square meters as specified by the question.

QUESTION 7

This question was very popular and generally well done. Most candidates were able to produce the correct solution. However, a few candidates could not correctly project details from the roof to the elevation. Still, some could not use the given dimensions, i.e. a wrong scale was used. Some candidates produced freehand drawings.

QUESTION 8

This was the most popular question. Most candidates failed to correctly show conventions for the given features. They were, however, able to show the brick and concrete conventions correctly. Part (ii) of the question was excellently done by the majority of the candidates. Only a few could not correctly identify the backfill and the natural foundation. Generally a well answered question.

QUESTION 9

- (a) Scale was correctly represented by most candidates and within tolerance. Some candidates modified the plan by adding additional rooms/space especially in the bedroom and thereby creating an extra entrance and window opening.

Most candidates labelled all the other rooms correctly except the entrance hall. Candidates were able to identify and position the windows correctly. Doors were correctly identified and positioned although several candidates failed to show the step on the foyer and kitchen doors. The roof plan was ignored by most candidates and those who attempted it did not represent the hipped roof plan correctly.

Draughtsmanship: Line work was generally good but there was need to improve on the lettering aspect. Guidelines were not used by most candidates. Work was generally neat.

- (b) This part of the question received mixed reactions from the candidates. The few candidates who got this question correct did exceptionally well. However, some candidates failed to correctly project details from the floor plan to the elevation. The roof was also not properly represented on the elevation. Some candidates failed to include window sills. The fan light door was not easily identified. The ground line and the finished floor line were also omitted.
- (c) **Orientation:** Quite a number of candidates were able to produce the required view. However, some candidates failed to consider the given direction of viewing. Candidates also tended to use instruments instead of freehand as required by the question. Window schedule was not utilised by many candidates who ended up showing wrong window details. The pictorial roof details presented a challenge to many candidates.