

Observations on teaching first-year physics

SANJOY MAHAJAN
 Cavendish Laboratory
 Astrophysics
 University of Cambridge
 Cambridge CB3 0HE
 England
 sanjoy@mrao.cam.ac.uk

Abstract. Highly successful students, as measured by grades and by scores on the Force Concept Inventory, still struggle with fundamental concepts in mathematics and physics. These difficulties, which turn physics into parrot learning and include confusing velocity and acceleration or being unable to reason with graphs, are revealed by problems requiring estimation and conceptual reasoning. I discuss these problems, the difficulties that they reveal, and suggest possible remedies.

I gave tutorials to ten students taking the first-year (IA) physics course at Cambridge University. The students – diligent, curious, and a joy to teach – had studied physics in high school for years and, as measured by grades and by scores on the Force Concept Inventory, with great success. However, using problems requiring estimation and conceptual reasoning (collected in the Appendix), I found that they struggle with fundamental concepts in mathematics and physics. These difficulties – such as confusing velocity and acceleration or being unable to reason with graphs – prevent them from understanding or appreciating the beauty of physics, and force them into rote or parrot learning. Physics becomes a game of memory and formula juggling. We can avoid this disastrous result by teaching students how physicists think: how we approximate and reason in unfamiliar situations. Section 4 contains suggestions in this direction.

1 Physics difficulties

Students live in the pre-Newtonian world and do not understand acceleration; they confuse Newton’s second law and third laws; they find circular motion confusing; and they cannot make or reason with freebody diagrams (diagrams of one object – the free body – in which every other object is replaced by a force on the free body).

Such difficulties go unnoticed because students can solve many standard problems in spite of the difficulties; they are talented and have memorized rules that are often true. For example, students know that in circular motion some force will be $F = mv^2/r$, if only because that formula is highlighted in the textbook section on circular motion. They are not sure of the force’s direction or cause, but problems often specify F , m , and r , and ask for v . Simple algebra yields v , whether or not the student understands the cause or direction of the force.

Copyright © 1998–2005 by Sanjoy Mahajan. Licensed under the Open Software License version 3.0. See the file COPYING in the source code.

1.1 Aristotelian thinking: The Force Concept Inventory

Perhaps the most fundamental physics misconception is confusion acceleration with velocity: Students believe that zero velocity implies zero acceleration and therefore zero net force. This belief is an example of Aristotelian, or more precisely, of pre-Newtonian thinking.

Such beliefs are tested for by the Hestenes–Halloun Force Concept Inventory (FCI) [3], which contains 30 multiple-choice questions requiring no calculation but rather a solid understanding of Newtonian principles. For example, one question asks about a truck (lorry) colliding with a small car: How does the force on the truck from the car compare with the force on the car from the truck? The typical answer, which reveals that students do not understand the third law, is that the truck exerts more force than the car exerts. Many American physics departments use the FCI before and after a semester of first-year mechanics (which is roughly at the level of British A-level physics). Typical pre-instruction scores for American students range around 50% but that number varies greatly among universities. Hestenes and Halloun state that scores of 60% indicate entry into Newtonian thinking, and that scores above 85% indicate ‘confirmed Newtonian think[ing]’ [2]. I gave the FCI to my ten students as their first assignment before lectures began. The lowest score was 25/30 (83%) and the average was 27.5/30 (92%); one student had a perfect score of 30/30. The students did extremely well on this measure.

1.2 Beyond the Force Concept Inventory

Yet I doubted this conclusion for a number of reasons. First, on the difficult questions (such as the truck question), students who answered it correctly often circled and then scribbled out one or two wrong answers before choosing the correct answer. Second, I realized how late in my study of physics I had sorted out the difference between Newton’s second and third laws: only when I helped to teach first-year physics as a graduate student.

The FCI is too easy for Cambridge students; they study physics and mathematics for many years in high-school, far more than American students: In high school the Cambridge students take A-level Mathematics, Physics, and Further Mathematics (and often Chemistry). Each A-level course, which takes up one-third or one-fourth of a student’s time for the last two years of high school, is equivalent to perhaps 1.5 Advanced Placement exams.

So, as part of the weekly tutorial work, I assigned free-response problems that required Newtonian thinking. Problem 15, for example, asks about skiing downhill holding a pendulum (the problems are collected in the Appendix). A few students correctly guessed that, without friction, the bob in case 1 points perpendicular to the hill. I say ‘guessed’, because none produced a free-body diagram or other convincing argument. All except one student said that the pendulum points directly downwards in case 3, when the skier is motionless at the top of her path. One student realized that in each case the pendulum points perpendicular to the hill; he was the only student to realize that velocity was independent of acceleration. He also had the only perfect score on the FCI.

Problem 12, about a bouncing steel ball, brought out the same difficulty. The freebody diagrams were correct for cases 1 and 2, but were wildly incorrect for case 3 (when the ball is motionless as it rebounds). A typical diagram had a downwards gravitational force of mg balanced by an upwards ‘reaction’ force of $R = mg$. The most common justification for $R = mg$ was that the velocity is zero, so the body must be in equilibrium; another justification was that most reaction forces met in A-level problems were equal to mg (see Section 3). This ‘zero velocity implies zero force’ reasoning illustrates the pre-Newtonian belief $F \propto v$, rather than the Newtonian law $F = ma$.

One student realized that the upwards force had to be larger than mg , otherwise the ball would never leave the ground, but even he said that R was only $2mg$. In the tutorial we estimated the upwards force by modelling the steel ball as a springy cube; all the students were surprised to find that $R \sim 10000mg$. To get a feel for these magnitudes, students could study such systems in their laboratory courses.

1.3 Newton's second and third laws

Students also have difficulty distinguishing Newton's second from Newton's third law. Most of the difficulty results because students do not understand the third law. Problem 4 asks students to prove that a composite object has weight equal to the sum of the individual objects' weights (for a two-object system). None of the students provided a proof, and their explanations confused the second and third laws. I therefore assigned the problem again, giving more instructions, as Problem 8. (The difficulty with proof is a mathematical trouble, and the topic of Section 2.1.)

Students stated that the force of their hand on the book equals the weight of the book, 'because of action–reaction'. They did not realize that they had implicitly invoked equilibrium and must therefore use Newton's second law to conclude that the two forces *on the same object* are equal and opposite. Students were surprised to find that the gravitational force of the book on the earth is the third-law counterpart to the weight of the book. They do not understand the third law as a statement about interactions, so they see any pair of equal and opposite forces as a third-law pair. I often asked students to discuss a law for a candidate force:

$$F = k \frac{s_1 s_2^3}{r^4},$$

where s_1 and s_2 are charges, analogous to mass or electric charge, and k is the constant that makes the dimensions correct. Could such a force exist? Students are pleasantly surprised that the third law forbids such forces because its force pairs are not equal and opposite.

1.4 Heavier objects fall faster

The classic Aristotelian belief is that heavier objects fall faster than lighter objects. Surely three hundred years after Galileo showed otherwise, students no longer share this belief? Unfortunately, many do, but the belief shows up only in novel situations. Students know that if a stone and a cannonball fall, they should *say* that both objects hit the ground 'at the same time'; if they have been carefully taught, they might even say 'roughly at the same time'. They also know what to say about two objects sliding down an incline, that mass is irrelevant. However, when the problem includes the novel effect of rolling (yet more trouble with circular motion!), many students have no practiced Newtonian answer to quote, and reveal their gut-level Aristotelian belief. For example, in Problem 23, about objects rolling down a plane, some students reasoned that an object with a large moment of inertia, such as a disc, rolls faster than an object with a small moment of inertia, such as a solid sphere. Two students argued that 'moment of inertia is analogous to mass, and heavier objects fall faster than lighter objects'! I could not agree with the analogy, but I admired its boldness.

The way that rehearsal hides this misconception reminds me of the theory of the English accent: that if you step on an Englishman's toes in the middle of the night, he'll shout at you in an American accent. On this view, the one true accent is American. An English accent is just an act, a mask dropped upon surprise. Similarly, the students' response that 'all objects fall at the same speed' is carefully rehearsed. It falls away when we step on their toes by asking about it in a novel context, whereupon they reveal their true belief, that heavier objects fall faster.

1.5 Centrifugal force

Students think that circular motion implies a centrifugal force. I asked students to draw a freebody diagram for an amusement park ride. In this ride, you stand against the edge of a cylindrical cage that spins rapidly; eventually the floor drops away. But, voilà, you remain against the wall. This ride is the subject of a typical high-school physics problem: Find the angular velocity such that a person does not slide down the wall. Students solve it correctly, because they need only know that some radial force is $F = mv^2/r$ (never mind in what direction it points) and that the friction force is μF . However, when they draw a freebody diagram, their confusion is evident. A typical diagram is Figure 1. Students insert the centrifugal force, because some force is ‘throwing the person outwards (which is why you feel pressed against the wall).’




Figure 1. Freebody diagram for amusement park ride.

1.6 Freebody diagrams

The trouble with acceleration and confusion about third-law pairs means that students cannot make freebody diagrams. In answers to Problem 4 (standing on a scale with a book in hand), most students drew book, person, and scale with no separations, and drew ambiguous contact forces on the border between objects. These difficulties are typical when students first learn freebody diagrams [1]. I had to explain that freebody diagrams are diagrams of one object (or of one composite object) – the free body – with other objects replaced by a force on the free body.

If students understood this replacement principle – and the idea of *system* – they would not double count by inserting centrifugal forces. Only when I asked them what object causes the centrifugal force did they realize that this force merely labels an actual force and has no separate existence. Unlike experienced physicists, students do not naturally make freebody diagrams to analyze confusing situations. None of the students made a freebody diagram for Problem 15 (skier holding a pendulum), even the students who drew the correct pendulum positions. In university physics we need to teach this valuable skill, which is not part of most British school physics curricula (although it is in most American physics textbooks).

2 Mathematical troubles

Students have many mathematical difficulties. They have not been taught how to construct proofs or how to make educated guesses. They cannot make numerical estimates or reason using graphs.

2.1 Proof and guessing

In Section 1.3, I alluded to students' difficulty with proof (Problems 4 and 8 on weighing a composite object). The solutions had numerous holes, besides the errors in using Newton's laws. When confusion between Newton's second and third laws barred legitimate progress, students assumed the conclusion. Perhaps school mathematics should reintroduce Euclidean geometry, not to indoctrinate students with 10,000 theorems about triangles, circles, and diagonals of rhombuses, but to teach proof. We want students to learn how to distinguish sound from unsound arguments, whether or not they become mathematicians.

A complementary difficulty is fear of guessing. Students have not been taught techniques for making educated guesses [7]; they are therefore reluctant to guess a solution before solving a problem exactly. Having no feel for how a result should turn out, they instead push symbols around until a reasonable formula appears and declare it to be the answer.

2.2 Heuristic arguments

Students do not know how to tell whether an answer is reasonable. For example, they do not naturally use heuristics such as checking limiting cases, or use more rigorous methods such as dimensional analysis. This difficulty is related to their reluctance to guess: If students had a clear idea of what answers might be reasonable, they would find it easier to guess an answer.

As practice with heuristic methods, I assigned Problem 2, analyzing the formula for the projectile range. A few students realized that, for example, v^2 results from one v in the flight time and one v in the horizontal speed. Many, however, refused to make a heuristic analysis, and instead derived the range formula in the standard way.

Almost everyone is reluctant to make guesses, especially in a supposedly exact subject such as physics. To overcome this natural reluctance, we must teach students heuristic methods; with practice, students will develop the courage to use them.

When I explicitly forbade messy calculations and forced students to use intuitive arguments, many were stumped. Problem 14 asked them to determine, without evaluating any integrals, whether a spherical shell or a flat disc (same radius and mass) has the larger moment of inertia. Only one student found a correct argument: squashing the sphere perpendicular to the axis of rotation, and comparing the squashed mass distribution to the mass distribution of the flat disc. Some evaluated the integrals, in spite of the instructions. But many evaluated the wrong integral, $\int \rho r^2 dV$, rather than $\int \rho(x^2 + y^2) dV$ (for rotation about the z -axis). More practice with heuristic arguments, leading to conceptual understanding, would help them set up the correct integral.

2.3 Graphical reasoning

Students cannot reason using graphs. The troubles are mathematical and physical. A mathematical trouble is shown in the answers to Problem 27a (deriving Stirling's formula). Students correctly drew a diagram like Figure 2. They then had to decide, 'Does the integral over- or underestimate the sum?' Even with the clear graph *that they had drawn*, they did not see that the area under the smooth curve is less than the area under the total rectangles. Instead, this realization came only by using a calculator to evaluate

$$\sum_{k=1}^7 \ln k = 8.52 \dots$$

and finding it larger than

$$\int_1^7 \ln k \, dk = 7 \times (\ln 7 - 1) + 1 = 7.62 \dots$$

I cannot quarrel with the answer but the method reveals serious difficulty reasoning with graphs. In a famous example, Wertheimer [9] would ask school students questions like

$$\frac{273 + 273 + 273 + 273 + 273}{5} = ?$$

Some students got the joke and laughed. Some protested that the calculations were too hard. Most worryingly, some added the 273's and then used long division to find...273. With the answer one has no quarrel, but like with the logarithm graph, the method reveals a fundamental difficulty.




Figure 2. Deriving Stirling's formula.

Students also do not realize the physical implications of a graph. For example, in Problem 26 – about a snooker ball slipping and rolling – they realized that the ball slips for a while, then eventually rolls, although not all correctly solved for the time t_0 until pure rolling. However, their graphs of center-of-mass velocity v and of scaled angular velocity $r\omega$ looked like Figure 3. Students did not realize that the rolling condition, $v = r\omega$, requires that the two curves coincide after t_0 . This difficulty is also related to confusion about rolling motion. Students have memorized $v = r\omega$, but are not sure of its character. They wonder if it is the definition of ω . It took much discussion to convince them that $v = r\omega$ follows from the definition of rolling: Motion where the point of contact is motionless. This difficulty with the character of $v = r\omega$ is related to the difficulties with proof. Students rarely know what assumptions a formula requires, or what consequences follow from a formula.




Figure 3. Snooker ball rolling and sliding.

2.4 Number sense and approximations

Perhaps the most serious mathematical difficulty is an atrophied number sense and an inability to approximate. For example, I asked students to estimate $\sqrt{1.2}$, and most had no idea. After I prodded them to guess anyway, one said 1.05; one said $1.\sqrt{2}$ meaning $1 + \sqrt{2}/10$ (at least a creative answer). Only one student said 1.1, and he was unsure of himself. All the students except the one who answered correctly had been using calculators since age 11. This other student, who went to school in Singapore, had not been permitted to use a calculator until the last two years of high school. Ironically, some students who could not evaluate $\sqrt{1.2}$ could instantly tell me that $\sqrt{1+x}$ is roughly $1 + x/2$ by the binomial theorem.

I am not surprised by this lack of number sense. I co-taught a short, intensive physics course to twenty A-level students; the course is run by Villiers Park, a charity in Foxton. The students, from all over the United Kingdom, were in their final year of high school, taking A-levels in Physics, Mathematics, and Further Mathematics. Each participating school nominated its best physics student, and these students were all talented and curious about physics. Over one-half had interviews at Cambridge for admission to the Natural Sciences degree (which includes the physics major), and a significant fraction of them will attend Cambridge to study physics. Yet none could estimate $\sqrt{1.2}$; one student had trouble working out $120/10$.

Following up on approximations, I asked my Cambridge students to estimate $\ln 1.25$. Some said that there was a series for \ln , which they could not remember. Some remembered that $\ln(1+x) \approx x$, but could not say why the approximation was plausible. A graphical approximation using the definition

$$\ln(1+x) \equiv \int_1^{1+x} \frac{dx}{x},$$

was a new and pleasant surprise for them.

2.5 Mathematics obscuring physics

Mathematics in a derivation often prevents students from understanding physics in the derivation. For example, in the kinetic-theory derivation of the diffusion coefficient, a series of flux integrals simplify to

$$D = \frac{1}{3}\ell c,$$

where ℓ is the mean free path and c is the root-mean-square particle velocity. Students do not realize that all the fiddling with integrals of sines and cosines gives only the factor of $1/3$, and that the factor of ℓc is independent of the angular integrals. Partly, they have not been taught dimensional analysis, which requires that

$$D = (\text{dimensionless constant}) \times \ell c.$$

Partly, they do not understand diffusion even in one dimension, where angular factors no longer torment them. We should spend most of the time on the qualitative reasoning in one dimension, and assert the result for three dimensions by fiat, giving the derivation in Eric Rogers' classic text, *Physics for the Inquiring Mind* (Princeton University Press, 1960). That derivation, also used in the old Nuffield O-level physics course (for ages 11-15!), uses six swarms of molecules, each marching along one coordinate direction.

3 Parrot learning

One theme has shown up in many of these examples: A-level learning is parrot learning. Students memorize rules without understanding their origin or range of validity. As Mark Twain said, ‘It’s not what I do not know that worries me, it’s what I know that ain’t so.’ Here are a few ‘not-so’ stories, culled from what students believe:

- *Every normal or reaction force is mg (or, on an incline, $mg \cos \theta$).* This rule is often true, but students do not know when, and invoke it as a law of physics. Problem 9 asks what a scale reads when the scale–person system accelerates down a plane. A few students correctly reasoned that it reads $3mg/4$, but most concluded that the scale reads mg .
- *In circular motion, there is a centrifugal force mv^2/r .* Such a force exists in the reference frame of the moving object, but students use it even in the laboratory frame, and do not realize that its validity depends on the frame.
- *Tension is a force.* This rule is always wrong; students induce it after seeing many freebody diagrams in which arrows representing forces are labelled **T**. I once believed the rule for the same reason. Now I always label forces produced by tension as **F_T**. The rule causes trouble when, for example, students analyze a tug-of-war. Two people hold one end each of a rope and pull with force 100 N; what is the tension in the rope? Some students say zero: They add the two end forces (to get an alleged force, the tension). Some say 200 N: They add the force vectors as if they were unsigned scalars. A few say 100 N, without conviction. We need not explain tension in its full glory as a component of the stress tensor, but we need to eradicate this rule.
- *In oscillating motion, acceleration = 0 at the equilibrium position.* This rule is correct for simple harmonic motion, but students apply it too widely. For example, in Problem 5, asking about pendulum motion, most students stated that the bob was not accelerating at point C, probably because they had memorized pendulum motion as an example of simple harmonic motion, and did not pause long enough to think that the bob must have an inwards acceleration to move in a circle. This difficulty is not confined to first-year physics students. At the University of Washington, 0 out of 120 first-year physics students answered it correctly, a result that no longer surprises me; however, only 15% of students taking their PhD qualifying exams answered it correctly [8]!




Figure 4. Perpetual motion.

- *Buoyancy can be replaced by an upthrust, a vertical force with magnitude equal to the weight of fluid displaced.* This rule is often true, but not in this perpetual-motion machine of Figure 4. The figure shows a cross-section of the machine: The circle is a long cylinder, and the dot at its center is a spindle that allows it only to rotate, not translate. The thick vertical line is a barrier that prevents the mercury and water from mixing. I explain to the students why the fluid exerts a torque: The upthrust from the mercury side (longer

arrow) is 13 times larger than the upthrust from the water side (shorter arrow), because mercury is 13 times denser than water. So the spindle rotates: perpetual motion! None of the students exorcised the perpetual-motion demon without extensive help, because they do not understand how upthrust or buoyancy is a consequence of pressure forces (which in this case all act through the spindle and hence provide no torque); instead, upthrust or buoyancy is a memorized word.

Even when the upthrust rule is true, students do not realize its origin. For example, in Problem 31, analyzing the isothermal atmosphere, students counted the buoyant force twice in their freebody diagram for a slab of air (Figure 5). In the figure, A is the bottom or top surface area of the slab, and P_1A and P_2A are the pressure forces. Students realized that $P_1 > P_2$, and solved correctly for the pressure versus height, but did not realize that the pressure forces already included the upthrust.




Figure 5. Incorrect freebody diagram for a slab of air. The upthrust duplicates the result of the two pressure forces.

Many school physics courses do not include Archimedes' principle; those that do often simplify the treatment to 'upthrust', with no discussion of its origin in pressure forces. The preceding examples show the danger of such a simplification, which provides little scope for thoughtful physical reasoning.

Parrot learning makes physics into a memory game, and students see physics the way many see history: as a collection of facts to memorize. Professional historians are repelled by this view of history, as we are by the same view of physics. Doing and enjoying physics requires understanding fundamental principles and seeing how they connect with one another.

4 Suggestions

After years of school physics, students should not have the mathematical and physical misconceptions that I have discussed. When they come to university, we should be able to discuss problems and ideas with them as budding physicists, even if they later specialize in other subjects. We obviously do not live in such a world; high-school physics does not give students a high level of mathematical and physical understanding.

We cannot expect any improvement soon. On the contrary, most changes in the school curriculum increase students' reliance on calculators and reduce the physics and mathematics that they must know. Furthermore, many teachers, products of the school and university physics-teaching system (we share a lot of responsibility for the problem), have some of the above misconceptions;

every time I teach, I find misconceptions in my own thinking. How can students learn what their teachers do not understand and what their textbooks do not mention?

Instead of compounding the misconceptions, as we traditionally do in university physics teaching, we could remedy the defects. One solution is to teach qualitative physics. By qualitative I do not mean physics for poets [4]; it is an excellent idea for a course, but it might poorly serve future scientists. Rather, I mean that we teach dimensional analysis, heuristic methods, graphical reasoning, and the arts of approximation and guessing: We should teach students how physicists think.

We can illustrate these methods with applications to everyday physics; for example, to stirring tea (Problem 36). Students are fascinated by such problems. When I assigned the tea problem, they gathered in each others' rooms and spent hours stirring tea and timing the spindown. Such problems give students a graspable example of a physical concept (in this case, diffusion of momentum). Using everyday examples, students get feedback from the world on the correctness of their physical picture. When students study waves and oscillations, they can apply their knowledge to the physics of music, a subject that interests most physics students. Such an approach will inspire students and encourage them to think like physicists.

I present here a few methods to teach qualitative physics, in order of increasing headache to implement. A few methods apply more to the British university system, but I have tried to make most methods of wide applicability.

4.1 Peer instruction

Eric Mazur at Harvard developed a simple method for getting students to think qualitatively: *peer instruction* [5, 6]. After explaining a concept, such as buoyancy, he stops and puts on the overhead projector a multiple-choice question – called a Concept Question – for students to answer individually. The question is easy for the student who understands the principle; otherwise it takes a while, longer than Mazur gives them. One buoyancy question is:

Two cups are filled to the same level with water. One of the two cups has ice cubes floating in it. Which cup weighs more?

1. The cup without ice cubes.
2. The cup with ice cubes.
3. The two weigh the same.

To allow no time for useless calculation, Mazur gives students only two minutes. Then he asks students which choice they picked. After this public commitment, each student spends one or two minutes convincing her neighbor of her answer – the key to Mazur's method. In explaining their choice, students realize what concepts confuse them and begin to sort out their confusions. And they get interested in the material as they defend their views. The discussion improves their attention and their intuition.

Mazur breaks lecture into 15-minute blocks; each block has a short explanation and then time for a Concept Question. But even one question per one-hour lecture (the format used in Caltech first-year physics course) improves students' attention and understanding. Peer instruction has several merits. First, it requires no fancy hardware in the lecture theatre (although Mazur's classroom has networked palmtop computers for the students to enter answers); I get students to close their eyes (to prevent the herd effect) and vote by raising hands. Second, anyone can try it, using either their own questions or the database of *ConceptTests* in Mazur's book.

4.2 Two-week intensive preparation in the summer

Another possibility is to offer a two-week intensive ‘order-of-magnitude physics’ course for students before they start their year of physics. Two weeks of intensive teaching is enough time to teach the main ideas, especially if the rest of the year occasionally uses the ideas taught in the intensive course. At Villiers Park, I taught qualitative physics for half a week to students in their last year of high school. The students enjoyed it, and by the end of the session, after they had seen the principles illustrated with many examples, they grasped the main ideas.

4.3 Vacation study

Or, the regular teaching could remain mostly as it is and instead students could learn qualitative physics during the breaks between terms. This approach applies especially to British universities with their short terms and long breaks (especially to Oxford and Cambridge, where terms are only eight weeks!). With this approach, the examination at the end of the first year should contain questions that require such reasoning, otherwise students might spend the entire vacation recovering from sleep deprivation rather than also learning physics. Students would need to written material to learn from, ideally a textbook on approximation and based on the first-year physics topics. The vacation-study approach has pros and cons. On the bad side, it reduces their sleep. Perhaps more fair is to winnow the standard topics, and use the time saved to teach approximation during the year. On the good side, it encourages students to learn from textbooks, a skill valuable especially after they finish their degree.

4.4 Alter tutorials

In the Oxford and Cambridge system, with tutorial as well as lecture teaching, the lectures could remain traditional while tutors could teach qualitative physics. In the American system, the sections could teach qualitative physics, leaving lectures alone. As with the vacation-study approach, the exam would need to be changed to emphasize the value of qualitative reasoning. Many graduate students, who are a large fraction of the tutors or section leaders, do not feel confident teaching material that they did not learn at university. They would need training.

With proper training, this approach can work well, even if it is used only for one term. I used it with my students, assigning them the problems in the Appendix and using tutorials to discuss the difficulties. The students and I enjoyed these problems. They prepare students to think like physicists, although alone they do not prepare students for the first-year exam. So I asked students to use the Christmas vacation to practice old exam problems on the first term’s material. The students were sufficiently happy with the method to do as I asked, but it requires extra time from them and their tutors.

4.5 Modify lectures and tutorials

The first term, or the first year, could teach qualitative physics – in lectures and tutorials. On the down side, this approach combines the problems of the alter-tutorials approach (training tutors) with the pain of redoing the lectures. A specially written textbook would be useful here. This approach, although painful, has the best chance of teaching the physics and mathematics that we want students to know.

Even with a radical approach of devoting the entire first year to qualitative physics, students would not be harmed by the deemphasis on exact calculations. Those continuing as physics majors will practice exact analyses in their second and third years; by then their mathematical maturity

will be greater and the analyses will not hinder their understanding of physics (what it does in the first year). Students majoring in chemistry, geology, or material science, who will study only the qualitative physics, will also benefit. A geologist, for example, needs to estimate the relative contributions of convection and conduction in transporting heat in the mantle more than she needs to solve exactly a model that includes only conduction. In general, non-majors need intuitive understanding of physics more than they need exact calculations.

The difficulties that students have with physics and mathematics are soluble. Using the methods above, I hope that we can introduce students to many years of understanding and enjoying physics.

References

- [1] Arnold B. Arons. *Teaching Introductory Physics*. John Wiley, New York, 1997.
- [2] David Hestenes and Ibrahim Halloun. Interpreting the Force Concept Inventory. *Physics Teacher*, 33(8):502–506, 1995.
- [3] David Hestenes, Malcolm Wells, and Gregg Swackhamer. The Force Concept Inventory. *Physics Teacher*, 30:141–151, 1992.
- [4] Robert H. March. *Physics for Poets*. McGraw–Hill, New York, 1995.
- [5] Eric Mazur. *Peer Instruction: A User’s Manual*. Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ, 1997.
- [6] Eric Mazur. Understanding or memorizing: Are we teaching the right thing. In Jack Wilson, editor, *Conference on the Introductory Physics Course*, pages 113–123, New York, 1997. John Wiley & Sons.
- [7] George Polyà. *Induction and Analogy in Mathematics*, volume 1 of *Mathematics and Plausible Reasoning*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1954.
- [8] Frederick Reif. Millikan lecture 1994: Understanding and teaching important scientific thought processes. *American Journal of Physics*, 63(1):17–32, 1995.
- [9] Max Wertheimer. *Productive thinking*. Harper, New York, enlarged edition, 1959.

Appendix

I assigned these problems to my students in the first term of their first year.

1 *Estimations*

- a) How many English words can you recognise?
- b) How many pieces of mail does the UK postal system carry each day? Estimate the annual budget of the Royal Mail; check your estimate by looking up a recent Royal Mail budget.

2 *Interpreting equations*

Here you will study the well-known formula for the horizontal range of a rock. You throw a rock with velocity v at an angle θ with respect to the ground. Its range is

$$R = \frac{2v^2}{g} \sin \theta \cos \theta. \quad (1)$$

You can increase your confidence in this result in a number of ways (parts a–e). (It may help for many of the parts to draw a diagram.)

- a) Dimensional analysis: Check whether the dimensions are correct.
- b) Consider limiting cases (for example, $\theta = 0$). Does the range formula work in these cases?
- c) Give a physical argument for why the range contains a factor of v^2 (instead of, say, simply v or $1/v$ or no v at all). (Dimensional analysis, which you did in part a, is a mathematical argument; in this part, you are asked to reinforce the mathematics with a physical argument.)
- d) Give a physical argument for the factor of 2.
- e) Give a physical argument for the $1/g$ factor.
- f) To derive (1), you have to neglect many effects (for example air resistance). List as many of these effects as you can. Let your imagination run; no effect is too small to mention here.

3 *Number sense*

Without a calculator, estimate

- a) $\sqrt{1.3}$
- b) $\sqrt[3]{1.6}$
- c) $\sin 7$
- d) 1.01^{100} (Hint: What is $\ln 1.01$?)


4 *Scales*

You stand on a scale holding a book. You then place the book next to you on the scale. The two scale readings are of course identical. Of course!? Prove it by using Newton's laws and drawing free-body diagrams. Clearly label the third-law pairs (pairs that must be equal and opposite as a consequence of Newton's third law),¹ and describe each force in words.

¹ I avoid using the perhaps more familiar term 'action–reaction pairs' because it needlessly confuses; it implies, wrongly, that one force causes the other.

5 *Pendulum*

The figure shows a pendulum at five points in its swing; positions A and E are the extremes of the motion. On each bob, draw (approximately) the acceleration vector at that point in the swing. If the acceleration is zero (in which case there is no arrow to draw), simply circle the bob.



6 *Tetrahedron*

In methane, the four hydrogen atoms lie at the corners of a regular tetrahedron, and the carbon atom lies at the centre. Where is the centre of a tetrahedron with unit edge length? What is the bond angle (the angle between two C–H bonds)? (Hint: Make an analogy.)

7 *Estimation*

- Estimate how thick a layer of rubber is deposited on the road by a car tyre. Comment on your result.
- Estimate the world-record speed for cycling and for swimming. (Hint: First estimate how much mechanical power an athlete can put out.)


8 *Scales (again)*

You stand on a scale holding a book (for simplicity of diagramming, you balance it on your head). You then place the book next to you on the scale. The two scale readings are of course identical. Of course! Prove the equality by using Newton's laws and drawing free-body diagrams. The givens here are your weight and the book's weight. You are in effect asked to prove that the weight of the combined you–book object is the sum of the individual weights.

Draw *well-separated* free-body diagrams. Clearly label the third-law pairs (pairs that must be equal and opposite as a consequence of Newton's third law); carefully distinguish uses of Newton's second law from Newton's third law; and describe each force in words. Ensure that your argument convinces a skeptical reader (perhaps try it on your supervision partner), one who says at every opportunity 'Why are those forces equal in magnitude?', 'Are you sure it isn't Newton's third law that justifies this step?', 'Or maybe it should be Newton's second law here?', and so on.

9 *Skiing*

You (tall rectangle, with mass m) stand on a wedge sliding down a frictionless plane, as shown in the figure. What weight does the scale (shaded rectangle) read? Use clearly labeled, well-separated free-body diagrams.




10 *Analogy*

Into how many regions can n planes divide space? Find the maximum number (what conditions on the planes ensure that the number is a maximum?). For example, one plane divides space into two regions; two planes divide space into at most four regions (but only three if you are unlucky, and only two if you are really unlucky). Hint: Play with the one- and two-dimensional versions of this problem, and then try to generalize the patterns that you find.

11 *Virtual work*

The mass m_1 slides down the plane with constant velocity, and m_2 rises with constant velocity (see the figure). Use the principle of virtual work to find the mass ratio m_1/m_2 . We live as usual in the make-believe world of physics: The plane is frictionless, the string is massless, and the pulley is massless and frictionless.



12 *Bouncing ball*

You drop a steel ball from a height of one or two metres. It lands on a scale and bounces up to nearly the original height. (Neglect air resistance.) Draw free-body diagrams for the ball at four times: (1) whilst you are holding it, (2) whilst it is falling, (3) when it is motionless on the scale (namely, just as it starts its upwards journey), and (4) whilst it is rising. Indicate qualitatively the relative magnitudes of the forces. Sketch qualitatively the scale reading as a function of time, whilst the ball is on the scale.

13 Improved petrol

Drivers want a petrol that yields more joules per kilogram than current petrol does. Discuss the following proposal.


When you accelerate your car from 0 to, say, 15 m s^{-1} , the increased kinetic energy, ΔE_1 , is supplied by burning a quantity of petrol. Jack is driving in the opposite direction, at 5 m s^{-1} . From his point of view, your car was going 5 m s^{-1} and, after accelerating, is going 20 m s^{-1} . He measures a change in kinetic energy, ΔE_2 ; and $\Delta E_2 > \Delta E_1$ (check this assertion). The mass of petrol burned is the same in every reference frame, so Jack measures your petrol to have more energy per unit mass than you measure it to have. So, the proposal is: To increase the energy content of petrol, use a moving reference frame.

14 Moments of inertia

Without evaluating any integrals, rank the following objects in order of decreasing moment of inertia: (1) a solid sphere, (2) a thin ring, (3) a spherical shell, and (4) a thin disc. All objects have the same mass and radius and are uniform. For each object, the axis of rotation passes through the centre of mass. For the disc and the ring, the axis is perpendicular to the plane that contains the disc or ring. Explain your rankings.

15 More skiing

You ski down hill A and up hill B, then ski backwards down hill B and backwards up hill A (see figure). There is no friction or air resistance, so the cycle repeats forever and ever. Being a skilled skier, you don't need to clutter your hands with poles; instead, from your hand, you dangle a string with a mass at its end. Draw the direction of the string: (1) as you ski down hill A (square with 1 in it), (2) as you ski up hill B (square with 2 in it), (3) when you are momentarily stopped on hill B (square with 3 in it), and (4) as you ski backwards down hill B (square with 4 in it). There is plenty of friction in the oscillations. How does each string's direction change if there is slight friction on the slopes?




16 Falling moon

The moon is a rock; perhaps large, but it is still a rock. Why doesn't it fall to the earth, as other rocks do? Explain quantitatively, perhaps with one or two diagrams.

17 Messy collision

i) A ball comes in from the left and causes a series of collisions; the initial motion is




The number in the circle is the object's mass (in arbitrary units) and the arrow shows the object's velocity (in arbitrary units). All motion is one dimensional, and all collisions are elastic.

Which choice describes the motion after the all the collisions?

- a) $\frac{1}{2} \leftarrow (1) \quad \frac{1}{2} \leftarrow (1) \quad (1) \quad (1) \quad (2) \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}$
- b) $\frac{1}{3} \leftarrow (1) \quad (1) \quad (1) \quad (1) \quad (2) \rightarrow \frac{2}{3}$
- c) $\frac{1}{2} \leftarrow (1) \quad (1) \quad (1) \quad (1) \quad (2) \rightarrow \frac{3}{4}$
- d) $\frac{1}{2} \leftarrow (1) \quad (1) \quad (1) \quad (1) \quad (2) \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}$

ii) By transforming to the zero-momentum frame, work out the result of this collision (also one-dimensional and elastic):



Comment on similarities or differences with part i.

18 Mathematical conservation


You write a 0 on each vertex of a cube, except for a 1 on one of the vertices. Now you play a game. At each move, you may add 1 to each of two adjacent numbers (adjacent means connected by an edge). Your goal is, using a suitable series of moves, to make all vertex labels be multiples of 3. Is this goal possible? If it is, give the sequence of moves. If it is not, prove the impossibility.

19 Pendulum

As a pendulum slowly loses energy, the amplitude of its swing decreases. How does the period change as the amplitude decreases? Is it constant, decreasing, or increasing? Justify your answer.

20 Centre of mass

A uniform sphere, of radius r , has a sphere of radius $r/2$ cut out of it. The figure shows a cross section through the sphere. Where is its centre of mass?



21 *Estimation: Oblateness of the earth*

Compared to a sphere, the earth is squashed.

- a) Why? Should the polar radius or the equatorial radius be the larger?
- b) Which physical quantities determine d , the difference in radii? How can you combine these quantities into a length (in other words, into an estimate for d)?
- c) Use your formula to make a rough numerical estimate of d , and compare it with actual data.

22 *Moments of inertia*

- a) What are the dimensions of moment of inertia?
- b) An object has mass M and characteristic length l . The characteristic length is a typical length in the object, such as a radius or diameter. What is its moment of inertia, up to a dimensionless constant? Consider a geometrically similar object that is twice as big as this object, in all its dimensions, and made out of the same material. What is the ratio of moments of inertia: $I_{\text{bigger}}/I_{\text{smaller}}$?
- c) The moment of inertia of a uniform thin disc is $MR^2/2$, about an axis perpendicular to the plane of the disc and through its centre. Perhaps using your results from last week, guess a moment of inertia for a uniform spherical shell with mass M and radius R (axis of rotation through the centre). Now calculate it and compare with your guess.

23 *Rolling*

Four objects, made of identical steel, roll down an inclined plane. The objects are (1) a large spherical shell, (2) a large disc, (3) a small solid sphere, and (4) a small ring. The large objects have triple the radius of the small objects. Rank the objects in order of decreasing acceleration down the plane.

24 *Buoyancy*

A solid iron sphere is floating in a bath of mercury. You pour water over the sphere and cover it with water. Does the sphere rise, sink, or stay at the same height?

25 *Quadratics by approximation*

- a) Use the quadratic formula and your calculator to find the solutions of $1 + 200000x + x^2 = 0$. What goes wrong? Why?
- b) Instead, let's approximate. If x is near zero, which term can you neglect? Solve the simplified equation to get a first approximation to the smaller root. Call this first approximation x_1 .
- c) How can you improve your approximation?
- d) If you know one root, how can you easily find the other root?

26 *Slipping and sliding*

You give a snooker ball (mass m and radius r) a horizontal impulse through its centre of mass and it starts to move with velocity v_0 . Let μ be the coefficient of sliding friction.

- a) At first, the ball skids; eventually, at some time t_0 , it starts to roll. Why? On the same graph, sketch qualitatively the centre-of-mass velocity $v(t)$ and the scaled angular velocity $r\omega(t)$ (rather than ω , because ω and v do not have the same dimensions), label any interesting features, and explain your reasoning. Be sure to specify your sign convention for ω .
- b) Qualitatively, how does t_0 depend on m , r , μ , v_0 , and g ? How should the mass distribution within the ball affect t_0 ? (For example, how should t_0 for a spherical-shell ball compare with t_0 for

a solid-sphere ball?) Based on your qualitative reasoning, *guess* an expression for t_0 . Make sure that your guess has dimensions of time!

c) Now analyse the motion quantitatively. Solve for $v(t)$ and $r\omega(t)$, and sketch them on the same graph. What is t_0 ? Compare with your guess in part b, and discuss any differences.

d) What is the final velocity of the ball, $v(t_0)$? What is the ball's kinetic energy? What fraction of its initial kinetic energy has it lost?

e) How much work is done by the force of sliding friction? Is your result consistent with the energy loss from part d?

f) Try it out: Strike a snooker ball as described, and collect whatever data you need to make a rough estimate of μ .

27 Stirling's formula

Stirling's formula says that, for large n ,

$$n! \approx \sqrt{2\pi n} \left(\frac{n}{e}\right)^n. \quad (2)$$

Here are two ways to derive a rough version of this formula.

a) The first version derives an expression for $\log n!$, which is also $\sum_{k=1}^n \log k$. Sketch a graph of $\log k$ and mark the area represented by the sum $\sum_{k=1}^n \log k$. As an approximation, replace the sum by an integral of $\log k$ and evaluate it to get an approximation to $\log n!$. Does the integral over- or underestimate the sum?

b) i) For the second method, begin with a useful trick: differentiating under the integral sign. You know that $\int_0^\infty e^{-t} dt = 1$ and, by changing variables, that

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-at} dt = \frac{1}{a}. \quad (3)$$

Now differentiate both sides of this expression n times with respect to a , and show that

$$\int_0^\infty t^n e^{-t} dt = n!. \quad (4)$$

ii) By approximating the integral (4), you can approximate $n!$. The integrand is also $e^{f(t)}$ where $f(t) = n \log t - t$. Sketch $f(t)$ as a function of t . Where is its maximum (call it t_0)? For large n , the exponential of $f(t)$ is even more sharply peaked than $f(t)$ itself; most of the contribution to the integral comes from around t_0 . Therefore, $n! \sim e^{f(t_0)}$. What is the resulting approximation? How does it compare with Stirling's formula (2)?

iii) This last approximation, $n! \sim e^{f(t_0)}$, is dodgy: It neglects the width of the sharply peaked function $e^{f(t)}$. A more accurate approximation is:

$$n! \sim e^{f(t_0)} \times \text{width of peak}.$$

Why? Draw a picture to explain the argument. Estimate the width (there are many reasonable ways to make this estimate) and refine your estimate from ii. How does it compare with Stirling's formula? How could you improve the approximation yet further? If you feel adventurous, derive the $\sqrt{2\pi}$ factor.

28 Random walks

A confusing feature of a random walk is the presence of square roots: Why in a random walk does it take on the order of N^2 steps to move a distance N ? Here is one way to understand this bizarre behaviour. Imagine a particle making a one-dimensional random walk: with equal probabilities, it moves one step either to the left or to the right. Let d_n be its position after n steps, with $d_0 = 0$. We shall study $\langle d_n^2 \rangle$, the expected value of d_n^2 .

a) After 0 steps, the distribution of possible d_0 is simple: There is only one possibility, that the particle is at the origin. So $\langle d_0^2 \rangle = 0$. After 1 step, the particle is at either -1 or $+1$, with equal probabilities. So

$$\langle d_1^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \{ (+1)^2 + (-1)^2 \} = 1.$$

Work out the probability distribution for the particle position after 2 steps, and from the distribution, work out $\langle d_2^2 \rangle$. Repeat for $\langle d_3^2 \rangle$ and $\langle d_4^2 \rangle$. Generalise the pattern: After N steps, what is the expected squared distance $\langle d_N^2 \rangle$? Harder: Prove your result.

b) What is $\sqrt{\langle d_N^2 \rangle}$? Therefore explain the behaviour mentioned in the introduction.

29 Air molecules

a) Estimate the mean free path, l , of air molecules at room temperature. This length is the step size in a random walk.

b) Roughly how fast does an air molecule move? Call the speed c .

c) What dimensions does a diffusion coefficient have? How can you combine c and l into a diffusion coefficient? Estimate the diffusion coefficient, D , for air molecules in air (this coefficient is called the *self-diffusion* coefficient of air). Estimate how long it would take an air molecule to diffuse across a room.

d) Fast pieces of fluid donate momentum to neighbouring slow pieces of fluid; so the fast pieces slow down, and the slow pieces speed up. The viscosity measures the ease with which the momentum diffuses. In air, momentum is diffused by particle motion directly: The particles carry their momentum with them, so viscosity arises from the same physics as does molecular diffusion. The viscosity of air should therefore be related to the diffusion coefficient D , which you estimated in part c. What are the dimensions of viscosity? How can you turn D into a viscosity? Therefore estimate the viscosity of air, and compare with reality. Why can't you use the same method to estimate the viscosity of water?

30 Atmosphere thickness

Here is a crude method to estimate the height, H , of the earth's atmosphere. The atmosphere does not end abruptly at H ; rather, the density falls gradually to zero. You can think of H as the height at which the density has fallen by a significant fraction. To determine H , mentally launch an air molecule vertically upwards; how high does it reach (if there is no atmosphere in its way)? The height of course depends on the launch velocity. How can you choose a reasonable launch velocity? Get a numerical estimate for the height.

31 *Atmosphere, take 2*

You can also use a more honest method to work out the density versus height in the atmosphere. Assume that the atmosphere has a uniform temperature. Now work out how the density varies with height. (Hint: Consider also how the pressure must vary, and use the ideal gas law to relate pressure and density.) Your density should have the form of the Boltzmann distribution. Coincidence? Discuss.

32 *Return probability in random walks*

From last week: In a one-dimensional random walk, the particle's rms distance from the origin after n steps is \sqrt{n} . You can use this result to determine the probability that the particle returns to the origin (the other possibility is that the particle escapes to infinity and never returns). The particle's position is distributed with approximately a Gaussian distribution; the standard deviation is the rms distance \sqrt{n} .

Approximate the distribution instead as a rectangle of width \sqrt{n} . In other words, replace the Gaussian distribution by a uniform distribution. So p_n , the probability that the particle is at the origin after n steps, is $1/\sqrt{n}$ (give or take a constant). What is the expected number of visits to the origin over all time? What therefore is the probability that the particle returns to the origin?

Extend the argument to two- and three-dimensional random walks. What if anything changes as you go from one to two to three dimensions?

33 *Tricky die (from vac problems)*

You roll a 1000-sided die once per second.

a) How long, on average, between rolls of a 1? *Answer:* 1000 s

b) Your friend Jane walks up and sees you rolling the die. How long does she have to wait, on average, before a 1 turns up? *Answer:* 1000 s (careful of the gambler's fallacy)

c) How long, on average, between the time that she walked up to you and the time that you *last* rolled a 1? *Answer:* 1000 s

Combining the answers to parts b and c, we conclude that a 1 turns up every 2000 s, in contradiction to part a. How can you resolve the paradox?

In the kinetic theory, you find the same paradox. A molecule travels on average a distance l (the mean free path) before colliding with another molecule. Observe one of the molecules and be puzzled. How far away, on average, is its next collision? *Answer:* l , because molecules have no memory. How far away, on average, was its last collision? *Answer:* l , because molecules have no memory. So the mean free path should be $2l$.

34 *Singing logarithms*

Read p. 25 approximating logarithms, and use the method to compute 3^8 and $\log_{10} 5$. How accurate are the values? Make up four more computations in which logarithms would aid the computation; use the method to do the computations.

35 *Adiabatic or isothermal sound waves?*

Newton was the first to work out the speed of sound. He found that $c_s = \sqrt{P/\rho}$. Today we would deduce the speed by deriving and solving the wave equation, which is a partial differential equation for the pressure $p(x, t)$. When Newton derived the speed, regular derivatives were barely understood and partial derivative were unimagined.

Newton's formula implicitly assumes the compressions and rarefactions that constitute a sound wave are isothermal. (An adiabatic compression happens too quickly for heat to flow and thereby to

equalise the temperature with the neighbouring rarefaction.) Are the compressions or rarefactions isothermal or adiabatic?

a) To decide, consider a sound wave with angular frequency ω , which is $f/2\pi$. (Angular frequency usually makes for more accurate estimates than regular frequency does.) Roughly how long does a compression last? Call this time t_c . The size of the compression region is roughly c_s/ω , which is usually called λ . Roughly how long does it take the heat in this region to diffuse outside this region? Call this time t_d . Hint: In a gas, the molecular-diffusion constant D is roughly equal to the heat-diffusion constant κ . Sketch t_c and t_d as functions of ω (on the same graph). What is special about the intersection frequency (call it ω_0)? What is ω_0 as a function of κ and c_s ?

b) From Set 6, Question 4d, you know that $\kappa \sim lc_s$, where l is the mean free path. Actually, you found that $D \sim lc$, where c is a typical molecular speed, but $c \sim c_s$, and $D \sim \kappa$. If τ is the mean free time, then $l \sim c_s\tau$. Use this relation to simplify your expression for ω_0 .

c) Is a sound wave of frequency $f = 256$ Hz adiabatic (this tone is roughly middle C)? Therefore decide whether Newton's implicit assumption is correct.

d) Now decide experimentally. Compute c_s for air at sea level using Newton's formula. The adiabatic speed is given by

$$c_s^{\text{adiabatic}} = \sqrt{\gamma} c_s^{\text{isothermal}},$$

where γ is the ratio of specific heats c_p/c_v , which is roughly 1.4 for dry air. How closely do the two speeds match the actual speed of sound?

36 *Teacup spindown*

You stir your afternoon tea to mix the milk (and sugar if you have a sweet tooth). Once you remove the stirring spoon, the rotation starts to slow. What is the spindown time τ ? In other words, how long before the angular velocity of the tea has fallen by a significant fraction?

To estimate τ , consider a physicist's idea of a teacup: a cylinder with height L and diameter L , filled with liquid. Why does the rotation slow? Tea near the edge of the teacup – and near the base, but for simplicity neglect the effect of the base – is slowed by the presence of the edge (the noslip boundary condition); the edge produces a velocity gradient. Because of the tea's viscosity, the velocity gradient produces a force on any piece of the edge; this force tries to spin the piece in the direction of the tea's motion. The piece exerts a force on the tea, which is equal in magnitude and opposite in sense: The edge slows the rotation.

a) In terms of the total viscous force F and of the initial angular velocity ω , estimate the spindown time. Hint: Consider torque and angular momentum. (Feel free to drop any constants, such as π and 2, by invoking the Estimation Theorem: $1 = 2$.)

b) You can estimate F with the idea that

$$\text{viscous force} \sim \rho\nu \times \text{velocity gradient} \times \text{surface area.} \quad (5)$$

Here $\rho\nu$ is η . The more familiar viscosity is η , known as the dynamic viscosity. The more convenient viscosity is ν , the kinematic viscosity. (To see why ν might be more convenient than η , work out the dimensions of ν .) The velocity gradient is determined by the size of the region in which the the edge has a significant effect on the flow; this region is called the boundary layer. Let δ be its thickness. Estimate the velocity gradient near the edge, and use (5) to estimate F .

- c) Put your expression for F into your earlier estimate for τ , which should now contain only one quantity that you have not yet estimated (the boundary-layer thickness).
- d) You can estimate δ using your knowledge of random walks. The boundary layer is a result of momentum diffusion; just as D is the molecular-diffusion coefficient, ν is the momentum-diffusion coefficient. In a time t , how far can momentum diffuse? This distance is δ . What is a natural estimate for t ? (Hint: After rotating 1 radian, the fluid is moving in a significantly different direction than before, so the momentum fluxes no longer add.) Therefore estimate δ .
- e) Now put it all together: What is τ ?
- f) Stir some tea and estimate τ_{exp} . Compare this value with the value predicted by your theory. In water (and tea is roughly water), $\nu \sim 10^{-6} \text{ m}^2 \text{ sec}^{-1}$.

37 Stokes' law

You can use ideas from the previous problem to derive Stokes' formula for drag at low speeds (more precisely, at low Reynolds' number). Many weeks ago, we derived the result from dimensional analysis; here you will find a physical argument.

Consider a sphere of radius R moving with velocity v . Equivalently, in the reference frame of the sphere, the sphere is fixed and the fluid moves past it with velocity v . Next to the sphere, the fluid is stationary. Over a region of thickness δ (the boundary layer), the fluid velocity rises from zero to the full flow speed v . Assume that $\delta \sim R$ (the most natural assumption) and estimate the viscous drag force. Compare the force with Stokes' formula (remember that $\rho\nu = \eta$).

Approximate Logarithms Using Half-Decibels*

<i>Semitones</i>	<i>Interval</i>	<i>Ratio</i>	<i>Exact Value</i>
2	M2	9/8	1.122
3	m3	6/5	1.1885
4	M3	5/4	1.259
5	P4	4/3	1.3335
6	d5	$\sqrt{2}$	1.4125
7	P5	3/2	1.496
8	m6 = P8 – M3	8/5	1.585
9	M6 = P8 – m3	5/3	1.679
10	P5 + m3	9/5	1.7783
	2 · P4	16/9	1.7783
11		17/9	1.8836
12	P8	2	1.9953
17.4		e	2.718
19	P8 + P5	3	2.9854
24	2 · P8	4	3.981
28	2 · P8 + M3	5	5.012
31	2 · P8 + P5	6	5.9566
34	3 · P8 – M2	$\frac{64}{9} \approx 7$	7.080
36	3 · P8	8	7.943
38	2 · (P8 + P5)	9	8.913
40	3 · P8 + M3	10.	10.

KEY		
<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Interval</i>	<i>Notes</i>
M2	Major 2nd	C–D
m3	Minor 3rd	C–E \flat
M3	Major 3rd	C–E
P4	Perfect 4th	C–F
d5	Diminished 5th	C–G \flat
P5	Perfect 5th	C–G
m6	Minor 6th	C–A \flat
M6	Major 6th	C–A
P8	Octave	C–C

The starting point is $2^{10} \approx 10^3$, or $2^{1/12} \approx 10^{1/40}$. By chance $2^{1/12}$ is the semitone frequency ratio on the equal-tempered scale. Since we know what Pythagorean ratios the equal-tempered intervals are supposed to approximate, we can approximate logarithms to the base $2^{1/12}$, and thereby approximate logarithms to the base $10^{1/40}$. The ratio column indicates the ratios for perfect Pythagorean intervals, and the exact value column shows $10^{\text{semitones}/40}$, to show the accuracy of the method. Note that 10 semitones has two possible breakdowns into intervals, as P5 + m3 or 2 · P4. The second is much more accurate, because in the equal-tempered scale, the perfect intervals come out almost exactly right, at the cost of some error in the major and minor intervals.

To use the table to compute $\log_{10} x$, find x as a product of ratios, add the number of semitones for the ratios, and divide by 40 (divide by 2 to get dB). To calculate 10^x , multiply x by 40, find that value in the semitones column, and read off the corresponding ratio. From a few basic Pythagorean ratios and number of semitones, most of the table is easy to figure out. The most important to remember one is the fifth: 7 semitones corresponds to 3/2. For example, from the fifth we can compute the frequency ratio for a fourth (5 semitones). The two intervals together make an octave, so the product of their frequency ratios is 2. This means 5 semitones corresponds to 4/3. Many other entries can be worked out similarly.

Some examples (arrows point from the real to the log world):

$$2 \rightarrow 1 \text{ octave} = 12 \text{ semitones} = 6 \text{ dB} = 0.3 \text{ decades.}$$

$$\left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^{10} \rightarrow 10 \cdot \text{P4} = 50 \text{ semitones} = 40 + 2 \cdot \text{P4} \leftarrow 10 \cdot \frac{16}{9} = 17.78 \text{ (exact 17.76).}$$

$$5 = \frac{5}{4} \cdot 2 \cdot 2 \rightarrow \text{M3} + 2 \cdot \text{P8} = 28 \text{ semitones} = \frac{28}{40} \text{ or } 0.7 \text{ decades (14 dB).}$$

* Method due to the statistician I. J. Good, who credits his father.