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## Section A, Part 1

| Question 1 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | (i) | method: | at least three (raw) readings of diameter to 0.01 mm , valid average (diameter or radius) calculated | 1 |
|  |  | accuracy: | all raw reading(s) of diameter in the range 11.92 mm to 12.08 $\mathrm{mm} \checkmark$ (don't penalise for failure to convert diameter to radius since this is penalised in (iii)) | 1 |
| 1 | (ii) | method: | $T_{1}$, result sensible, eg about 0.65 s , from $n T_{1}$, where $n$ or $\Sigma n$ $\geq 30 ; n T_{1}$ to 0.1 s or $0.01 \mathrm{~s} \checkmark$ <br> (reject $T$ from oscillations in a fixed time; if no unit is found in the working and/or answer for $T_{1}$ and for $T_{2}$ for then withhold the mark in 2(i)) | 1 |
| 1 | (iii) | method and result: | $R_{1}$ to mm or to 0.1 mm , in range $62(.0) \mathrm{mm}$ to $92(.0) \mathrm{mm}$ or $0 / 2 \checkmark \checkmark$ (reject 1 sf answers) <br> correct substitution of $T_{1}$ and $r$, no mixed units or deduct 1 mark; if no unit is found in the working and/or answer for $R_{1}$ and for $R_{2}$ for then withhold the mark in 2(ii) | 2 |
| 1 | (iv) | method and explanation: | extrapolate [extend] line and read [find] the horizontal [ $r$ ] intercept ${ }_{1} \checkmark$ (bland 'find intercept' is not enough) <br> (from $T_{1}=2 \pi \sqrt{\frac{7\left(R_{1}-r\right)}{5 g}}$ ) deduces that when $T_{1}^{2}\left[T_{1}\right]=0$, $\left(R_{1}-r\right)=0{ }_{23} \checkmark \checkmark$ <br> [for poor/missing analysis, statement that $R_{1}=$ horizontal $[r$ ] intercept earns ${ }_{3} \checkmark$ only] <br> or <br> extrapolate [extend] line and read [find] the vertical [ $T_{1}{ }^{2}$ ] intercept ${ }_{1} \checkmark$ <br> (from $T_{1}^{2}=\frac{-28 \pi^{2} r}{5 g}+\frac{28 \pi^{2} R_{1}}{5 g}$ ) deduces that when $r=0$, vertical $\left[T_{1}{ }^{2}\right]$ intercept $=\frac{28 \pi^{2} R_{1}}{5 g} 2^{\checkmark}$ <br> explains rearrangement ie $R_{1}=\frac{5 g}{28 \pi^{2}} \times$ verticalintercept(ie reject bland 'rearrange to find $R_{1}$ ') [(measure gradient of graph, then) $\left.R_{1}=\frac{\text { verticalintercept }}{(-) \text { gradient }}\right]_{3} \checkmark$ <br> (condone $\frac{5 g}{28 \pi^{2}} \approx \frac{7}{4 \pi^{2}} \approx \frac{5}{28}$ ) <br> [the idea that reading $T_{1}$ and the corresponding value of $r$ from a point on the line, then using the equation, rearranged to find $R_{1}$ is worth 1 MAX ] | 3 |
|  |  |  | Total | 8 |


| Question 2 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | (i) | method: | $T_{2}$, result sensible, eg about 2.0 s, from $n T_{2}$, where $n$ or $\Sigma n \geq$ $10 ; n T_{2}$ to 0.1 s or $0.01 \mathrm{~s} \checkmark$ | 1 |
| 2 | (ii) | result: | $R_{2}$ in range 62(.0) mm to 92(.0) mm $\checkmark$ (reject 1 sf answers) | 1 |
| 2 | (iii) | sketch: <br>  <br> explanation: | fiducial mark shown at centre of oscillation or $\mathbf{0 / 2}$, some part (or all) of the mark must be beyond free end of ruler $\checkmark$ (tolerate mark shown aligned with top or bottom surface of the ruler providing the ruler is horizontal) eg | 2 |
| 2 | (iv) | method and result: | uncertainty in $20 T_{2}=0.5 \times(41.4-38.7)=1.35(\mathrm{~s})$ (reject 1.4 (s)) mean $20 T_{2}=40.26$ (s) [40.3 (s)] $1_{1}$ $\text { percentage uncertainty }=100 \times \frac{1.35}{40.26}=3.35(\%)_{2} \downarrow$ <br> (expect same answer if 40.3 used; accept $3.353(\%)$, $3.47(\%)$ if 1.4 and 40.3 are used, $3.23(\%)$ if all 3sf data used; reject any 2 sf) <br> [if $T_{2}$ values are calculated from $20 T_{2}$ : <br> uncertainty in $T_{2}=0.5 \times(2.07-1.935)=0.0675(\mathrm{~s})$ (reject 0.068 (s)); accept 0.065 (s) if 1.94 used; mean $T_{2}=$ 2.01(3)(s) ${ }^{\checkmark}$ $\text { percentage uncertainty }=100 \times \frac{0.0675}{2.013}=3.35(\%) \text { etc } 2^{\checkmark} \checkmark \text { ] }$ | 2 |


| 2 | (v) | explanation: | plausible reasons why results are different, any 2 from valid reason why $R_{1}$ and $R_{2}$ are different ie due to the thickness of mirror, so $R_{2}=R_{1}+t_{1} \checkmark$ (reject ' $R_{1}$ is concave and $R_{2}$ is convex') <br> equation giving $R_{2}$ is only an approximation ${ }_{2} \checkmark$ uncertainty in $T_{1}$ is large because the motion dies away quickly [cannot time many oscillations] or motion tends to become elliptical [ball does not travel in a straight line] ${ }_{3} \checkmark$ uncertainty in $T_{2}$ is large because the ruler passes the fiducial mark slowly or the ruler tends to rotate on upturned mirror, changing the plane of oscillation $4^{\checkmark}$ ball bearing may slide rather than roll ${ }_{5} \checkmark$ period of ball bearing is not constant since (as it rolls) it subtends a large angle (hence not true shm) ${ }_{6} \downarrow$ <br> period of ruler is not constant since point of contact with mirror changes (hence not true shm) $7^{\checkmark}$ <br> (for ${ }_{6} \checkmark$ or ${ }_{7} \checkmark$ reject ideas about damping affecting the period and reject idea that mirror may not be perfectly spherical or that it distorts under the weight of ball or ruler; give no credit for short/long periods as difficulties and reject unqualified statement that 'random errors are different') | 2 MAX |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Total | 8 |

## Section A, Part 2

| Question 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | (a) | accuracy: | final answer for $T_{0}$ in range 15.0(0) s to 30.0(0) s $\checkmark$ (reject $\geq 5 \mathrm{sf}$ ) <br> raw reading(s) must be to 0.1 s or to 0.01 s and to the same precision as for readings of $T$ or deduct sf mark in (b); if $T_{0}$ is not found from repeated readings, deduct 1 result mark in (b) |  |  | 1 |
| 1 | (b) | tabulation: | $\begin{array}{llll}R & / \square & T\end{array}$ |  |  | 1 |
|  |  | results: | 6 sets of $R$ and $T \checkmark \checkmark$ deduct 1 mark for each set missing; dedu or $T_{0}$ not found from repeated readings | mark | any $T$ | 2 |
|  |  | significant figures: | all (raw) $T$ and $T_{0}$ to nearest 0.1 s or to nearest $0.01 \mathrm{~s} \checkmark$ |  |  | 1 |
| 1 | (c) | tabulation: | $\frac{R}{R+R_{0}}\left(\text { reject } R / R+R_{0}\right) /(\text { no unit) }$ | /(s) |  | 1 |
|  |  | significant figures: | all 6 sets of $\frac{R}{R+R_{0}}$ correctly calculated (see right), all sets to 2 sf or all to 3 sf (tolerate all to 4 sf ) $\checkmark$ <br> if $\left(\frac{R}{R+R_{0}}=1, T_{0}\right)$ is tabulated this must be plotted too | $\begin{aligned} & 0.828 \\ & 0.682 \\ & 0.548 \\ & 0.411 \\ & 0.282 \\ & 0.128 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.83 \\ & 0.68 \\ & 0.55 \\ & 0.41 \\ & 0.28 \\ & 0.13 \end{aligned}$ | 1 |


| 1 | (d) | axes: | marked $\frac{R}{R+R_{0}}$ (vertical) and $T / \mathrm{s}$ (horizontal) deduct $1 / 2$ for each error involving label, separator or unit, rounding down; no mark if axes reversed either or both marks may be lost if the interval between the numerical values is marked with a frequency of $>5 \mathrm{~cm}$ | 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | scales: | points should cover at least half the grid horizontally $\checkmark$ <br> and half the grid vertically <br> (if necessary a false origin, correctly marked, should be used to meet these criteria; either or both marks may be lost for use of a difficult or non-linear scale) | 2 |
|  |  | points: | 6 points plotted correctly (check at least three including any anomalous points) <br> 1 mark is deducted for every point missing or false and for every point > 1 mm from correct position deduct 1 mark if any point is poorly marked; no credit for false data | 3 |
|  |  | line: | ruled best fit straight line of positive gradient maximum acceptable deviation from best fit line is 2 mm , adjust criteria if graph is poorly scaled; withhold mark if line is poorly marked, no credit for false data | 1 |
|  |  | quality: | (all) 6 points to $\pm 2 \mathrm{~mm}$ of a straight line of positive gradient (judge from graph, providing this is suitably-scaled) | 1 |
|  |  |  | Total | 16 |

## Section B

| Question 1 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | (a)(i) | valid attempt at gradient calculation or 0/2 <br> correct transfer of $y$ - and $x$-step data between graph and calculation or 0/2 $\checkmark$ (mark is withheld if points used to determine either step $>1 \mathrm{~mm}$ from correct position on grid; if tabulated points are used these must lie on the line) <br> $y$-step and $x$-step both at least 8 semi-major grid squares $\checkmark$ <br> [ 5 by 13 or 13 by 5] (if a poorly-scaled graph is drawn the hypotenuse of the gradient triangle should be extended to meet the $8 \times 8$ criteria) | 2 |
| 1 | (a)(ii) | $G T_{0}$, no unit, in range 1.24 to $1.30 \checkmark \checkmark$ [ 1.19 to 1.35 or 1.3 V ] | 2 |
|  | (b)(i) | (when the time for the voltmeter reading to fall by $50 \%=T_{0}$ there is nothing connected between P and Q , hence) $R=\infty \checkmark$ | 1 |
| 1 | (b)(ii) | (when $\left.T=T_{0}, R=\infty\right) \frac{R}{R+R_{0}}=1 \checkmark$ (don't insist on correct supporting argument since this result can be inferred from the graph; don't insist on detail such as 'extrapolate' and/or 'read off') | 1 |
| Total |  |  | 6 |


| Question 2 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | (a)(i) | there are 4 voltmeter readings [values/samples/steps] recorded during each 2 second interval [two voltmeter readings recorded per second etc] | 1 |
| 2 | (a)(ii) | (idea that) the required voltmeter reading(s) may not be shown, ie the pd across the capacitor reaches the required reading between samples ${ }_{1} \checkmark$ if required value of $V$ is not displayed the correct $T$ could occur at any point during a 0.5 s interval [ $V$ is unlikely to be exactly $50 \%$ at the instant the sample is taken] ${ }_{2} \checkmark$ <br> values shown on the voltmeter are not bound to be in the ratio of 2 to $1{ }_{3}$ r true value of $V$ is changing while voltmeter reading is not changing ${ }_{4} \checkmark$ (reject bland 'sample rate is too low' or 'can't get accurate $V$; reject ideas such as the 'voltmeter readings are discrete values', 'readings change quickly' or 'reading voltmeter and stopwatch at the same time is difficult'; reject idea that at the time a sample is taken there are different possible values of $V$ ) | MAX 1 |
|  |  | Figure 6 shows that the voltmeter never reads $\underline{2.5}(\mathrm{~V}) \checkmark$ (this also earns ${ }_{1} \checkmark$ ) [ $T$ could be anywhere between 5.5 (s) and 6.0 (s) $\vee$ (this also earns ${ }_{2} \checkmark$ )] | 1 |
| 2 | (a)(iii) | (idea that) student is measuring $2 T$ [student should divide measured time by 2 to find $\Pi \checkmark$ | 1 |
|  |  | timing interval is longer [doubled] so percentage [fractional] uncertainty (due to human or random error) is smaller [halved]; accept 'uncertainty in calculated value of $T$ is halved' $\checkmark$ <br> rate of change of $V$ is less after $2 T$ [(vertical steps) are smaller] so more likely to see the required value of [closer to] the required voltmeter reading $\checkmark$ (reject 'human error is reduced' or 'uncertainty is halved'; reject the idea that uncertainty is reduced because 'the number of samples have been doubled' or the idea that the precision of the voltmeter readings improves / $V$ is more accurate' when the reading is changing more slowly) | MAX 1 |
| 2 | (a)(iv) | (idea that) the sample rate [readings taken per second] (of the data logger) is (much) higher (than that of the voltmeter [ 2 Hz ]); allow 'takes readings more rapidly' $\checkmark$ <br> (any suggestion that the data logger takes 'continuous readings' or 'takes more readings' loses the mark; reject idea that the sensor has a sample rate) | 1 |
| 2 | (b)(i) | systematic (error); accept 'zero error' $\checkmark$ | 1 |
| 2 | (b)(ii) | either no because own graph was straight line or yes because own graph showed increasing gradient $\checkmark$ <br> (the answer is for the explanation and must refer to the shape of the candidate's own graph) | 1 |
|  |  | Total | 8 |


| Question 3 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 3 | (i) | precision $=0.005 \mathrm{~mm}[5 \square \mathrm{~m}] \checkmark$ (suitable unit essential) | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| 3 | (ii) | $R=84.4 \times\left(\frac{100-4.5}{100}\right)=[84.4 \times 0.955]=\underline{80.6}(\mathrm{~mm}) \checkmark($ reject $80.8(\mathrm{~mm}))$ | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| 3 | (iii) | percentage uncertainty in $R=2 \times$ percentage uncertainty in $T$ <br> $\therefore$ percentage uncertainty in $T=2.25(\%)[2.3(\%)] \checkmark$ | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| 3 | (iv) | uncertainty in $T=\frac{2.25 \times 2.04}{100}=0.0459(\mathrm{~s})$ <br> uncertainty in $10 T=0.459(\mathrm{~s})[0.46(\mathrm{~s})]$ <br> $(2.3 \%$ |  |


| Question 4 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | (a) | 2 smooth curves to show envelope of exponential decay waveform; lines to be continuous from first to fifth points, maximum deviation from best-fit lines thorough each set of 5 points must not be greater than 1 mm | 1 |
|  |  | equilibrium position marked on grid with horizontal line at $A=15.7 \pm 0.1 \mathrm{~cm} \checkmark$ | 1 |
| 4 | (b) | evidence of valid working (using the line(s) and/or the equilibrium position) established in (a)(iii) to test for the exponential nature of the decay (working may be shown on the graph): do not penalise confusion between $n$ and time either <br> evidence of relevant $A$ values [ $2 A$ ie $A-(-A)$ ] measured from graph (correct to nearest mm ) or deduced from difference between tabulated values and equilibrium position of pointer) or $0 / 3 \downarrow^{\checkmark}$ <br> at least two half life measurements (expect evidence of working) ${ }_{2} \checkmark$ values obtained giving $n_{1 / 2}=6.3 \pm 0.3$ from either or both curves confirming exponential decay ${ }_{3} \checkmark$ <br> or <br> $i^{\checkmark}$ as above; evaluates at least two ratios of successive amplitudes [or the fractional change in successive amplitudes], eg <br> $\frac{A_{0}}{A_{1}}$ and $\frac{A_{1}}{A_{2}}\left[\frac{A_{0}-A_{1}}{A_{0}}\right.$ and $\left.\frac{A_{1}-A_{2}}{A_{1}}\right] 2^{\checkmark}$; ratios obtained giving consistent results <br> to $\pm 5 \%$ confirming exponential decay ${ }_{3} \checkmark$ <br> or <br> ${ }_{1} \checkmark$ as above; evaluates difference between natural logs of at least two successive amplitudes, eg $\ln \left(A_{0}\right)-\ln \left(A_{1}\right)$ and $\ln \left(A_{1}\right)-\ln \left(A_{2}\right) \checkmark$ <br> differences obtained giving results consistent to $\pm 10 \%$ confirming exponential decay ${ }_{3} \checkmark$ | 3 |
|  |  | Total | 5 |

