Feedback for EEE6011 Session: 2009-2010

<u>Feedback:</u> Please write simple statements about how well students addressed the exam paper in general and each individual question in particular including common problems/mistakes and areas of concern in the boxes provided below. Increase row height if necessary.

General Comments:

The paper average is was what I would have expected. The first question was well answered, with the remaining having reasonable averages. The fourth question was least popular.

Question 1:

A well answered question.

(a) This part was bookwork, and since the answer was already given marks were awarded for clearly showing the relevant stages of the derivation. There was a slight tendency to skip the explicit

factorization term
$$e^{j\frac{\Psi}{2}}$$

- (b) In the third calculation, no one realized that a beam shift of 30° from broadside could go either way, and most assumed $\theta = 60^{\circ}$ only.
- (c) Most calculated the beam shift correctly.

Question 2:

A reasonably answered question.

- (a) Some people did not clearly indicate the incident and refracted angles between the ionospheric layers when using Snell's law.
- (b) Most correctly calculated the values, but some did not specifically make clear that with an ionosonde $i_Q = 0^Q$ when explaining their working.
- (c) Some used the sine rule here, which wasn't necessary since we have a right angled triangle because the elevation angle is zero.
- (d) Most people figured propagation would cease below the critical frequency, but not all described the shortened skip distance below 24MHz.

Question 3:

Another reasonably answered question.

- (a) Most people calculated the correct value for the radiation resistance.
- (b) No one figured that the insulated dipole would have a longer electrical length, thereby making its input impedance inductive.
- (c) Some gave confused reasoning for their answers here.
- (d) Most got this right.

Question 4:

Only a few people attempted this question. I guess it appeared the most challenging, since it involved a moment method triangular basis function. However, parts (b) and (c) were really quite simple, the latter requiring Ohm's law.