



General Certificate of Education

Science for Public Understanding 5401

SPU2 Issues in the Physical Sciences

Mark Scheme

2007 examination - June series

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2007 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

SPU2 Issues in the Physical Sciences

Question 1			
(a) (i)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • can be replaced as it is used • energy from Sun to grow new trees <p>no marks for everlasting/cannot run out/can be used again and again</p>	any 1 for 1 mark	3
(ii)	<p>cycle showing 3 items linked by arrows</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CO₂ in atmosphere • trees growing taking in CO₂ • burning wood returning CO₂ to atmosphere <p>penalise 1 mark if C instead of CO₂ in air tree to wood → not essential must be clear that absorbs CO₂ from air for 2 marks</p>	<p>any 2 for 1 mark</p> <p>all 3 for 2 marks</p>	
(b) (i)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • any calculation showing about 25 times (23.9 exact answer) for 2 marks • correct use of efficiency data for 1 mark/correct use of energy content data • two correct statements comparing the two without calculation for 1 mark max 	any 2 for 1 or 2 marks	3
(ii)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • heats air/stove/environment • transferred to the environment/dispersed in surroundings <p>note heat must go somewhere no marks for heat alone/back to atmosphere/another form of energy</p>	for 1 mark	
(c) (i)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CO – lack of oxygen/heart strain/can kill/ respiration problems/respiratory problems • PM 10 – lung damage/increased infection risk/ asthma • benzene – cancer <p>no marks for CO is toxic/breathing problems/ respiratory disease</p>	any 1 for 1 mark	3
(ii)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • concentrations very high/higher • compared with, those considered safe in developed countries/standards set for health • must have reference to health/safety for 2 marks no marks if no reference to the data in Figure 1 	any 1 for 1 or 2 marks	

(d)	(i)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • mother reporting • time not measured accurately • judgement of severity of disease • discussion of reasons for possible poor correlation between time and smoke inhaled • researchers infrequent visits • other named variable 	any 1 for 1 mark	3
	(ii)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • correlation between time spent near fire and number of episodes of infection • criticism of sample size/lack of repeat for 1 max • discussion of data <p>must refer to data in figure 2 for 2 marks</p>	any 2 for 1 mark each	
				Total 12

Question 2				
(a)	(i)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • rising population • rising standard of living/more electrical equipment • development (of poorer countries) 	any 2 for 1 mark each	4
	(ii)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3200 – 1500 (1400-1500)/1700 (1700-1800) • $1700 \times 100/1500$ • 113% (113-129) 	any 2 for 1 mark each	
(b)	(i)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • number of protons/atomic number <p>no marks for electrons</p>	for 1 mark	3
	(ii)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • radioactive/emit ionising radiation/radiation causes mutation • long half life/long time to decay • $\alpha/\beta/\gamma$ radiation 	for 1 mark each	
(c)	(i)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • fall in total • nuclear always about half total • decline in nuclear • decline in fossil fuels • rise in conservation 	any 2 for 1 mark each	2

(ii)	<p>The marking scheme for this section includes an overall assessment for the quality of written communication. There are no discrete marks for the assessment of written communication but quality of written communication will be one of the criteria used to assign the answer to one of the three levels.</p> <p>level 3 – good claims supported by an appropriate range of evidence good use of information or ideas about science going beyond those given in the question argument well structured with minimal repetition or irrelevant points accurate and clear expression of ideas with only minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling</p> <p>level 2 – modest claims partially supported by evidence good use of information or ideas about science given in the question but limited beyond this the argument shows some attempt at structure the ideas are expressed with reasonable clarity but with a few errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling</p> <p>level 1 – limited valid points but not clearly linked to an argument structure limited use of new information or ideas about science unstructured errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling or lack of fluency</p> <p>incorrect or no response examples of the sort of information or ideas that might be used to support an argument issues that need to be considered include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • likelihood of successful product • low CO₂ • safety • example of other environmental impact • sustainability <p>details on 2 options</p> <p>nuclear</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • low CO₂ • waste • plenty of uranium • accident/terrorism <p>renewable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no CO₂ • unreliable • will not run out • expensive <p>conservation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • efficiency gains possible <p>fossil fuels</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • cleaner technologies possible • more efficient technologies • this research can be done by private sector <p>storage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • importance of storage if renewables used 	<p style="text-align: right;">5-6</p> <p style="text-align: right;">3-4</p> <p style="text-align: right;">1-2</p> <p style="text-align: right;">0</p> <p style="text-align: right;">max 6</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Total 12</p>
------	--	--

Question 3			
(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> flooding low land large population centres/an example (e.g. Bangladesh) 	any 1 for 1 mark	1
(b)	<p>(i)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> thermal expansion <p>(ii)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Antarctic ice/land ice 	<p>for 1 mark</p> <p>for 1 mark</p>	2
(c)	<p>(i)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 45 mm (allow 40-50 mm) ± 20 (allow 20-25) mm <p>(ii)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> fewer measurements in 1910 local variations affected by weather/annual fluctuations hard to measure accurately equipment more accurate now than in 1910 <p>note uncertainty is in sea level, not in measuring equipment</p>	<p>1 mark for answer 1 mark for error</p> <p>any 1 for 1 mark</p>	3
(d)	<p>(i)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> monitor ice very carefully monitor sea levels research to understand how ice sheets respond modify models to fit new data look at historical data on ice/sea levels <p>no mark for 'monitor temperature' no mark for 'ways of preventing ice melting'/or any other impact of global warming</p> <p>(ii)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to predict future (in complex system) level of uncertainty only useful when mechanisms understood depend on input information depends on quality of model can deal with complex models/large amounts of data/rapid processing of data 	<p>any 2 for 1 mark each</p> <p>any 2 for 1 mark each</p>	4
			Total 10

Question 4			
(a)	(i)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> remove electron from atom/forms positive ions forms charged particles high energy radiation <p>not 'forms ions'/forms + ions and – ions</p>	any 1 for 1 mark
	(ii)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> cause mutation in genes/DNA/chromosomes cells proliferate uncontrollably <p>no marks for 'cause tumours'</p>	any 2 for 1 mark each
	(iii)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 in 2000 10 in 20000 0.05% 	any 1 for 1 mark
(b)	(i)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> sponsors might try to influence reports inclusion deters bias indicates what sort of bias might be introduced protects Cancer Research UK from criticism over conclusions bias may be introduced at any stage/example of stage 	any 2 for 1 mark each
	(ii)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> very small effect cannot distinguish from other factors/an example hard to find suitable control group exposure to other ionising radiation very variable/many sources delayed effect animal experiments might not be applicable large individual/genetic, differences in susceptibility very large groups needed for small effect not ethical to test on humans 	any 2 for 1 mark each
	(iii)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> precaution/provides guidelines best evidence available at present 	any 1 for 1 mark

(c)	<p>The marking scheme for this section includes an overall assessment for the quality of written communication. There are no discrete marks for the assessment of written communication but quality of written communication will be one of the criteria used to assign the answer to one of the three levels.</p> <p>level 3 – good claims supported by an appropriate range of evidence good use of information or ideas about science going beyond those given in the question argument well structured with minimal repetition or irrelevant points accurate and clear expression of ideas with only minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling</p> <p>level 2 – modest claims partially supported by evidence good use of information or ideas about science given in the question but limited beyond this the argument shows some attempt at structure the ideas are expressed with reasonable clarity but with a few errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling</p> <p>level 1 – limited valid points but not clearly linked to an argument structure limited use of new information or ideas about science unstructured errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling or lack of fluency</p> <p>incorrect or no response examples of the sort of information or ideas that might be used to support an argument need to seek information on the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • cancer risk from dose to be given • what are my specific risk factors for cancer? • what other evidence suggests CT needed? • will CT diagnosis/early diagnosis make a difference to outcome? • what alternative diagnostic methods are available? • consider past radiation doses 	<p style="text-align: center;">5-6</p> <p style="text-align: center;">3-4</p> <p style="text-align: center;">1-2</p> <p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p style="text-align: center;">max 6</p>
		Total 15

Question 5			
(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> group of stars 	for 1 mark	1
(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> force of attraction between two masses/objects field round mass 	any 1 for 1 mark	1
(c)	<p>(i)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> observation did not fit predictions galaxies predicted to fly apart <p>(ii)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> well established explains many phenomena single anomaly does not overthrow theory no better theory to replace it <p>(iii)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> B (only give this mark if some explanation attempted) new explanation does not emerge data requires conjecture and creative imagination some other explanation of the data may be possible <p>insist on good answer for second mark no marks if A chosen</p> <p>(iv)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> fits observations of bending of light <p>(v)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> need to confirm predictions from explanation to increase confidence in the theory to provide evidence for the theory to increase understanding of the Universe <p>no marks for prove theory</p>	<p>any 1 for 1 mark</p> <p>any 1 for 1 mark</p> <p>any 2 for 1 mark each</p> <p>for 1 mark</p> <p>any 1 for 1 mark</p>	6
			Total 8