

Question	Marking details	Marks Available
(d)	<p>N.B. There is no mark for Yes / No only.            Comment regarding straight line, e.g. it's a straight line! (1)            Mention of negative gradient. (1)            Mention of positive intercept [accept clear implication, e.g. 'intercept as expected']. (1)</p>	3
(e) (i)	<p>Large triangles used (should be close to the extremities of the lines) or 2 equivalent suitable points clearly indicated on each line or clearly implied by calculation [see below]. (1)            Both gradients calculated correctly (ignore unit and significant figures). (2)            Allow <b>ecf</b> for incorrect max/min lines.            Example of clear implication [from graph on page 7].</p> <p>Max gradient = <math>\frac{5.97 - 10.14}{1.00 - 0.00} = [-]4.17[\text{s}^2 \text{m}^{-1}] \checkmark</math></p> <p>Min gradient = <math>\frac{6.12 - 9.96}{1.00 - 0.00} = [-]3.84[\text{s}^2 \text{m}^{-1}] \checkmark</math></p> <p>N.B. No penalty for positive gradient here.</p> <p>Marking tips:</p> <p>First check: The value of <math>m_{\text{max}}</math> should be <math>\sim [-]4.2 [\text{s}^2 \text{m}^{-1}]</math> and the value of <math>m_{\text{min}}</math> should be about <math>[-]3.85 [\text{s}^2 \text{m}^{-1}]</math>. Candidates who have drawn lines which are too extreme may obtain <math>&gt;4.25</math> and <math>&lt;3.80</math>. This is penalised in (c), so apply <b>ecf</b>. Candidates who have drawn 'tram lines' will have two nearly identical values of <math>\sim [-]4.02</math>. Again <b>ecf</b> should be applied.</p>	3
	<p>(ii) Mean gradient correct (1) [expected value <math>\sim [-]4.01[5] \text{s}^2 \text{m}^{-1}</math> but apply <b>ecf</b> from (c) and (e)(i)] (no sig fig penalty).            % uncertainty correct (1) [expected value <math>\sim \pm 5\%</math>. – Allow 2 sig figs. Apply <b>ecf</b> from (c) and (e)(i)].</p>	2
	<p>(iii) <math>g</math> calculated correctly (1) (by whatever means including using points from the line of <b>best fit</b>) and quoted to 1 or 2 d.p. (if answer in <math>\text{m s}^{-2}</math>).</p> <p>% difference calculated on the comparison with <math>9.81 \text{ m s}^{-2}</math>. (1) [Typical difference = <math>0.03 \text{ m s}^{-2} \rightarrow 0.3\%</math>, apply <b>ecf</b>].            Comment on accuracy. (1) [Expected answer for <math>\sim 0.3\%</math> difference is that the result is accurate].</p> <p><b>Alternative approach:</b>            1st mark as above (<math>\checkmark</math>).            Calculation of % uncertainty from (e)(ii), typical value <math>5\%</math> (<math>\checkmark</math>).            Comment that the accepted value of <math>g</math> is within the <math>5\%</math> uncertainty of the calculated value (<math>\checkmark</math>).</p>	3