

## **WOODWORK**

### **SUBJECT 6035**

#### **PAPER 3**

#### **GENERAL COMMENTS**

Most centres used the correct current marking schemes with only a couple of centres using outdated ones. This resulted in most deviations falling within acceptable limits. Centres submitted the required numbers of project per class as well as all folios. Only one centre did not use a marking scheme at all for marking projects. It was apparent, in a few centres, that candidates had not received any assistance from their teachers at all. Standard of projects submitted were generally of a good standard although one centre misinterpreted the requirements of an option with a 'swivel' unit. Some candidates hurriedly compiled their folios and constructed projects which were not up to standard. Entry for the subject improved greatly and teachers are commended for ensuring that these candidates submitted projects of a good standard. Very few transcription errors were noted on centres' marksheets.

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS**

##### **1. SITUATION AND DESIGN BRIEF**

Most candidates did very well in this section of the folio. They personalised their design briefs and refined them. Factors were identified and well analysed in detail supported by meaningful comments. Only a few candidates listed their factors without analysing them. A few others 'designed' without 'making'.

##### **2. INVESTIGATION AND GENERATION OF IDEAS**

More than half the candidates had relevant pictures or good drawings for their market research. The others neither did not have the market research at all nor had some irrelevant pictures. Sources of the market research were mostly acknowledged by the candidates. Most centres away from urban areas failed to present cuttings.

Adequate sketches of possible solutions were presented with the majority of candidates going for Option 1 (bathroom unit). Most of the comprehensive sketches in the folios has also been analysed satisfactorily. Most candidates also indicated their choice and justified their choice.

### **3. DEVELOPMENT OF CHOSEN SOLUTION**

Only a few candidates produced satisfactory tests of ideas. Most had difficulties in this area. More attention is required from both the candidates and the supervising teachers in future so as to improve this area.

#### **Refinements**

The majority of candidates did very well in refining their solutions. Only a few candidates picked up their chosen solution and went straight into construction without any refinements.

#### **Model (Mock-Up)**

Most of the candidates produced good quality mock-ups which were satisfactorily evaluated. These candidates used materials like plywood and hardboard on their mock-ups. Those centres which provided waste materials like old cardboard paper and manila produced sub-standard mock-ups some of which disintegrated in transit to moderation venues.

### **4. SKETCHES AND WORKING DRAWINGS**

Some average to above average sketches and working drawings were produced. Most were labelled and well dimensioned but a few candidates produced work that left a lot to be desired. Layout of elevations in some cases was poor meaning these candidates had a poor grasp of first or third angle projections. Most candidates could not produce good exploded diagrams of their chosen solutions.

#### **Planning and Organising**

Some very good planning was observed in many folios with the correct and detailed sequence of the construction of the projects. Some candidates, however, lost some marks since they had left out some important stages in the construction sequence.

#### **Realisation of Design Solution**

Generally, good projects were produced, cleaned and finished with appropriate finishes. Some candidates had problems working to the dimensions on their drawings and others apparently worked backwards. Many candidates encountered problems in squaring their work whilst gluing.

## **Finish**

The majority of candidates applied finishes on their projects. Some painted work was in some cases more impressive than polished work. Inadequate coats of finish were applied in many instances and candidates lost marks. Other candidates did not remove glue, pencil marks and tears and hence lost important marks for finish.

## **Evaluation of Project**

The majority of candidates evaluated their projects. Some candidates could, however, not separate the relevance to the brief and how they tested the article for functionality. Other candidates failed on recommendations for further improvements. Some candidates could identify problems encountered during construction but could not state how they solved these problems. Rather, they suggested solutions that could be employed in the future.

On the whole, there was a great improvement in this section of the folio when compared to previous projects.