

Name of the Student: \_\_\_\_\_

Max. Marks : 18 Marks

Time : 18 Minutes

Mark Schemes

## Q1.

- (a) extension of wire  $Q = 2.7$  (mm) ✓  
 ignore any precision given eg  $\pm 0.1$  mm  
 if  $> 2$  sf condone if this rounds to 2.7 1

- (b) mass = 5.8 (kg) ✓  
 allow ce for incorrect 0.1.1 (only look at 01.1 if answer here is incorrect)  
 allow  $\pm 0.1$  kg 1

- (c) 0.51 (mm) ✓  
 ignore any precision given eg  $\pm 0.005$  mm 1

- (d) method 1:  
 use of  $E = \frac{\text{(tensile) stress}}{\text{(tensile) strain}}$  <sub>1</sub> ✓  
 for <sub>1</sub> ✓ expect to see some substitution of numerical data  
 cross-section area from  $\frac{\pi \times d^2}{4}$  <sub>2</sub> ✓  
 correct use of diameter for <sub>2</sub> ✓; ignore power of ten error; expect CSA =  $2.0(4) \times 10^{-7}$ ; allow ce from 01.3 (eg for  $d = 0.37$  mm  
 CSA =  $1.0(8) \times 10^{-7} \text{ m}^2$ )  
 (tensile) stress =  $\frac{mg}{\text{CSA}}$  <sub>3</sub> ✓  
 penalise use of  $g = 10 \text{ N kg}^{-1}$   
 (tensile) strain =  $\frac{\Delta l}{l}$  <sub>4</sub> ✓  
 value of  $\Delta l$  must correspond to Figure 2 value of  $m$ ; answers to 01.1  
 and 01.2 are acceptable  
 expect  $l = 1.82 \text{ m}$  but condone 182 etc; accept mixed units for  $l$  and  $\Delta l$

MAX 3

method 2:

- evidence of  $\frac{\Delta l}{\Delta m}$  from Figure 2 to calculate gradient <sub>1</sub> ✓  
 expect gradient between  $0.45$  to  $0.48 \text{ mm kg}^{-1}$

$$E = \frac{g \times \text{original length}}{\text{CSA} \times \text{gradient}} \quad 2 \checkmark \quad 3 \checkmark$$

missing  $g$  loses  $3 \checkmark$

substitution of  $l = 1.82 \text{ m}$   $4 \checkmark$

condone 182 etc  $4 \checkmark$

cross-sectional area from  $\frac{\pi \times d^2}{4}$   $5 \checkmark$

correct use of diameter for  $2 \checkmark$ ; ignore power of ten error; expect  $\text{CSA} = 2.0(4) \times 10^{-7}$ ; allow ce from 01.3 (eg for  $d = 0.37 \text{ mm}$   
 $\text{CSA} = 1.0(8) \times 10^{-7} \text{ m}^2$ )

MAX 3

result in range  $1.84 \times 10^{11}$  to  $1.91 \times 10^{11}$   $5 \checkmark$

condone  $1.9 \times 10^{11}$

$5 \checkmark$  mark requires correct working and no power of ten errors: allow ce for error(s) in 01.1, 01.2 and for false/incorrect CSA  
 (eg for  $d = 0.37 \text{ mm}$  allow result in range  $3.49 \times 10^{11}$  to  $3.63 \times 10^{11}$ ,  $3.5 \times 10^{11}$  or  $3.6 \times 10^{11}$ )

1

- (e) (smaller diameter) produces larger extensions  $1 \checkmark$   
 reduces (percentage) uncertainty (in extension and in result for Young Modulus)  $2 \checkmark$

(smaller diameter) increases (percentage) uncertainty in diameter **or** cross sectional area is smaller **or** increases (percentage) uncertainty in cross sectional area  $3 \checkmark$

increases (percentage) uncertainty (in result for Young Modulus)  $4 \checkmark$

(smaller diameter) increases likelihood of wire reaching limit of proportionality or of wire snapping or reduces range of readings  $5 \checkmark$   
 increases (percentage) uncertainty (in result for Young Modulus)  $6 \checkmark$

outcome and correct consequence for 2 marks, ie  $1 \checkmark$  followed by  $2 \checkmark, 3 \checkmark$

$\checkmark$  followed by  $4 \checkmark$  etc

dna 'error' for 'uncertainty'

no mark for consequence if outcome not sensible, eg 'it gets longer and reduces uncertainty' earns no mark for 'diameter smaller so uncertainty greater' award  $1 \checkmark$  (need to see further mention of uncertainty to earn  $2 \checkmark$ )

MAX 4

[11]

## Q2.

- (a) nuclear fallout / testing / weapons / nuclear accidents / Chernobyl / nuclear waste / nuclear medicine / X-rays / specific uses of radioactive sources eg medical tracers CT scan etc. / cosmic rays as a result of air travel  $\checkmark$   
 (Any source of radiation that an individual may encounter which would not have existed 100 years ago)

No mark for general answers such as 'medical' or Nuclear Power / nuclear plant.

If a list is given all must be correct but ignore generalisations such as medical or nuclear power.

1

(b) (i)  $I_{15\text{CCR}} = 2050 - 40 = 2010$  ✓

Use of inverse square law eg  $I_{\text{CCR}90} = I_{\text{CCR}15} \left(\frac{d_{15}}{d_{90}}\right)^2 = 2010 \times (0.15 / 0.90)^2 = 55.8$

$I_{90\text{CR}} = 55.8 + 40$

$I_{90\text{CR}} = 96 \text{ counts min}^{-1}$  ✓

*regardless of order:*

*1st mark subtraction of background in original data*

*2nd mark is for using inverse square function*

*3rd mark is for the answer*

3

- (ii) (reduce impact of) random error / decrease the (percentage) uncertainty / improve the statistics (because the percentage error is proportional to the inverse square-root of the count) ✓ (owtte)

*The answer must be an uncertainty related statement and not increases reliability / accuracy or increased chance of a reading (although these ideas can accompany a correct answer) Ignore comparisons with the background count.*

1

- (iii) use (sensible) absorber between source and detector ✓ (sensible absorber means it must have a noticeable effect e.g. 1mm of metal / aluminium sheet / 5mm perspex but do not allow metal foil / paper sheets. Also its effect must not be so great that it reduces the gamma rays noticeably)

(These two marks are independent)

$\beta$  shown by count rate falling when sheet of aluminium absorber is used ✓ Or (using the existing apparatus)

Compare the results (at various distances) in air with the expected inverse square law ✓ Below the range of beta law does not work but above range it does. ✓

*2nd mark no mark given if count rate falls to zero as  $\gamma$  is still present (magnetic deflection is not common but if seen.*

*Use of magnetic deflection ✓ correct deflection of beta from the beam ✓)*

*(If a cloud chamber is suggested. Observe the tracks in a cloud chamber ✓ beta tracks have varying lengths or they are curly / not straight ✓)*

*(The value of the range of beta is not a marking point so accept 15 – 80 cm if a number is given)*

2

[7]