



ASSESSMENT and
QUALIFICATIONS
ALLIANCE

Mark scheme January 2003

GCE

Law

Unit LAW4

Copyright © 2003 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334
Registered address: Addleshaw Booth & Co., Sovereign House, PO Box 8, Sovereign Street, Leeds LS1 1HQ
Kathleen Tattersall: *Director General*

Unit 4: Criminal Law or Contract Law

Assessment Objectives One and Two

General marking guidance

You should remember that your marking standards should reflect the levels of performance of candidates, mainly 17 years old, who have completed some part of the advanced subsidiary course, writing under examination conditions. The Potential Content given in each case is the most likely correct response to the question set. However, this material is neither exhaustive nor prescriptive and alternative, valid responses should be given credit within the framework of the mark bands.

Positive marking

You should be positive in your marking, giving credit for what is there rather than being too conscious of what is not. Do not deduct marks for irrelevant or incorrect answers, as candidates penalise themselves in terms of the time they have spent.

Mark range

You should use the whole mark range available in the mark scheme. Where the candidate's response to a question is such that the mark scheme permits full marks to be awarded, full marks must be given. A perfect answer is not required. Conversely, if the candidate's answer does not deserve credit, then no marks should be given.

Levels of Response for essay marking

When reading an essay it is useful to annotate your recognition of the achievement of a response level. This will help the Team Leader follow your thought processes. Levels of Response marking relies on recognition of the highest level achieved by the candidate. When you have finished reading the essay, therefore, think top-down, rather than bottom-up. In other words, has the candidate's overall answer met the requirements for the top level? If not, the next level?

Citation of authority

Candidates will have been urged to use cases and statutes whenever appropriate. Even where no specific reference is made to these in the mark scheme, please remember that their use considerably enhances the quality of an answer.

Assessment Objective Three**Quality of Written Communication**

The Code of Practice for GCSE, GCSE in vocational subjects, GCE, VCE and GNVQ requires the assessment of candidates' quality of written communication wherever they are required to write in continuous prose. In this unit, this assessment will take place by marking the candidate's script as a whole, by means of the following criteria:

- Level 3** Moderately complex ideas are expressed clearly and reasonably fluently, through well linked sentences and paragraphs. Arguments are generally relevant and well structured. There may be occasional errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. **4-5 marks**
- Level 2** Straightforward ideas are expressed clearly, if not always fluently. Sentences and paragraphs may not always be well connected. Arguments may sometimes stray from the point or be weakly presented. There may be some errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling, but not such as to detract from communication of meaning. **2-3 marks**
- Level 1** Simple ideas are expressed clearly, but arguments may be of doubtful relevance or be obscurely presented. Errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling may be noticeable and intrusive, sufficient to detract from communication of meaning. **1 mark**
- Level 0** Ideas are expressed poorly and sentences and paragraphs are not connected. There are errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling, such as to severely impair communication of meaning. **0 marks**

Criminal Law (Offences against the Person)**1****Total for this question: 75 marks**

(a) Discuss Anne's criminal liability for the injuries to Ben and Dan. (25 marks)

Potential content

- (A) In relation to Ben, explanation of unlawful and malicious infliction of gbh (s20) and assault occasioning abh (s47). Causation issues
- (B) In relation to Dan, unlawful and malicious wounding (s20) and assault occasioning abh (s47). Causation, omission/duty issues
- (C) Explanation of the plea of intoxication and/or automatism

Mark bands

- 21 - 25 The candidate demonstrates the ability to recognise and explain the rules of law in (A)-(C), and to select and analyse the key facts so as to achieve perceptive application on which a sustainable solution can be based.
- 16 - 20 The candidate shows clear understanding of the rules of law in (A)-(C), developing explanations and using illustration but is a little hesitant in developing the application required
or
 explains and applies any **two** of (A)-(C). (Treatment of all three may compensate for some deficiencies in the treatment of all or any.)
- 11 - 15 The candidate shows understanding of the appropriate rules of law in **two** of (A)-(C), developing explanations and using illustration but is unable to extend the analysis to achieve substantial application of the rules to the facts
or
 the answer explains and applies any **one** of (A)-(C)
or
 there is a more balanced approach in which explanation, analysis and application are present across the range but the answer is a little superficial or suffers from some confusion.
- 6 - 10 The candidate begins to indicate some capacity for explanation and analysis by introducing consideration of some appropriate rule(s) drawn from (A)-(C) but the explanations are limited and superficial
or
 the candidate adopts an approach in which there is concentration on explanation in terms of the facts presented rather than through development of explanation and application of legal rules.
- 1 - 5 The candidate merely introduces fragments of information or unexplained examples from which no coherent analysis and explanation can emerge
or
 though the candidate attempts to introduce explanation, analysis and application, this is so fundamentally undermined by error and confusion that it remains substantially incoherent.
- 0 The candidate presents no information relevant to the question.

(b) Discuss Ellen's criminal liability for the death of Fred.	(25 marks)
---	------------

Potential content

- (A) Explanation of the offence of murder, concentrating in particular on malice aforethought - foresight rather than aim or purpose, of gbh rather than of death
- (B) Explanation of the defence of provocation
- (C) Explanation of the defence of diminished responsibility
- (D) Explanation of unlawful act manslaughter as the alternative in the absence of malice aforethought

Mark bands

- 21 - 25 The candidate demonstrates the ability to recognise and explain the rules of law in (A) and (B), and to select and analyse the key facts so as to achieve perceptive application on which a sustainable solution can be based. Reference to (C) and/or (D) may compensate for deficiencies in the treatment of (A) and/or (B).
- 16 - 20 The candidate shows clear understanding of the rules of law in (A) and (B), developing explanations and using illustration, but is a little hesitant in developing the application required
or
explains and applies (A) and presents some explanation and application of any **two** of (B)-(D)
or
presents very strong explanation and application of (B) with some explanation and application of (A) (**max 17**) and **one** other from (C)-(D)
or
explains and applies (A) and (D).
- 11 - 15 The candidate shows understanding of the appropriate rules of law in (A) and (B), developing explanations and using illustration but is unable to extend the analysis to achieve substantial application of the rules to the facts
or
the answer explains and applies (A) (**max 13**) or (B) (**max 13**) and presents some discussion of **one** other
or
the answer concentrates on explanation and application of (D), though addressing the *mens rea* issues raised in (A)
or
there is a more balanced approach in which explanation, analysis and application are present across the range but the answer is a little superficial or suffers from some confusion.
- 6 - 10 The candidate begins to indicate some capacity for explanation and analysis by introducing consideration of some appropriate rule(s) drawn from (A)-(D) but the explanations are limited and superficial
or
the candidate adopts an approach in which there is concentration on explanation in terms of the facts presented rather than through development of explanation and application of legal rules.
- 1 - 5 The candidate merely introduces fragments of information or unexplained examples from which no coherent analysis and explanation can emerge
or
though the candidate attempts to introduce explanation, analysis and application, this is so fundamentally undermined by error and confusion that it remains substantially incoherent.
- 0 The candidate presents no information relevant to the question.

(c) What criticisms would you make of the current law of homicide?	(25 marks)
--	------------

Potential content

- (A) General structural issues - for example, division between murder and manslaughter, mandatory penalties etc
- (B) Murder issues - for example, the difficulties with malice aforethought
- (C) Defence issues - for example deficiencies in the definition and application of provocation and diminished responsibility
- (D) Manslaughter issues - for example, the scope of involuntary manslaughter, confusion in the elements of the various forms of involuntary manslaughter

Note: The question invites discussion of criticisms. It does not demand proposals for reform, though they may be relevant if used to establish criticisms.

Mark bands

- 21 - 25 The candidate demonstrates the ability to identify and explain the criticisms in any two of (A)-(D). Discussion of criticisms in three or four may compensate for some deficiencies in the explanation of any or all.
- 16 - 20 The candidate demonstrates the ability to give a sound explanation of the criticisms in one of (A)-(D) and to deal more hesitantly with criticisms in one other
or
explains the criticisms in at least two of (A)-(D) without being comprehensive or being able to advance fully coherent arguments.
- 11 - 15 The candidate demonstrates the ability to explain criticisms in at least one of (A)-(D) **or** presents some explanation of criticisms in at least two of (A)-(D) which suffer from some confusion and superficiality.
- 6 - 10 The candidate begins to indicate some capacity for explanation by introducing discussion of any of the material in (A)-(D) but the explanations are limited and superficial. At the lower end of this band, the answer will contain little more than recognition of possible criticisms.
- 1 - 5 The candidate merely introduces fragments of information from which no coherent explanation can emerge
or
though the candidate attempts to introduce explanation, this is so fundamentally undermined by error and confusion that it remains substantially incoherent.
- 0 The candidate presents no information relevant to the question.

2

Total for this question: 75 marks

- (a) Discuss Gurdeep's criminal liability in connection with the incidents involving Helen.
(25 marks)

Potential content

- (A) In relation to Helen's fear, explanation of the offence of assault
- (B) In relation to the splinter injury, explanation of the offences of battery, assault occasioning abh and of unlawful and/or malicious wounding (possible gbh for infection)
- (C) In relation to the nervous breakdown, explanation of abh and/or unlawful and malicious infliction of gbh
- (D) Explanation of consent as a defence in personal injury offences

Mark bands

- 21 - 25 The candidate demonstrates the ability to recognise and explain the rules of law in (A)-(D) and to select and analyse the key facts so as to achieve perceptive application on which a sustainable solution can be based.
- 16 - 20 The candidate shows clear understanding of the rules of law in (A)-(D), developing explanations and using illustration, but is a little hesitant in developing the application required
or
explains and applies any three of (A)-(D) (**max 16** if no (D)).
- 11 - 15 The candidate shows understanding of the appropriate rules of law in any three of (A)-(D) (**max 13** if no (D)), developing explanations and using illustration but is unable to extend the analysis to achieve substantial application of the rules to the facts
or
the answer explains and applies two of (A)-(D) (**max 13**) with some reference to one other
or
there is a more balanced approach in which explanation, analysis and application are present across the range but the answer is a little superficial or suffers from some confusion.
- 6 - 10 The candidate begins to indicate some capacity for explanation and analysis by introducing consideration of some appropriate rule(s) drawn from (A)-(D) but the explanations are limited and superficial
or
the candidate adopts an approach in which there is concentration on explanation in terms of the facts presented rather than through development of explanation and application of legal rules.
- 1 - 5 The candidate merely introduces fragments of information or unexplained examples from which no coherent analysis and explanation can emerge
or
though the candidate attempts to introduce explanation, analysis and application, this is so fundamentally undermined by error and confusion that it remains substantially incoherent.
- 0 The candidate presents no information relevant to the question.

(b) Discuss Gurdeep's criminal liability for the death of Irene.	(25 marks)
--	------------

Potential content

- (A) Explanation of battery and abh, including causation issues, to suggest possibility of unlawful act manslaughter. (Possible alternative in murder/malice aforethought.) Explanation of self-defence, including mistake and excessive force
- (B) Explanation of gross negligence manslaughter (possible alternative in murder) and of liability for omissions as a possible alternative ground of liability
- (C) Explanation of the defence of insanity as a possible defence to both forms of involuntary manslaughter (and/or diminished responsibility if murder addressed in (A) or (B))

Mark bands

- 21 - 25 The candidate demonstrates the ability to recognise and explain the rules of law in (A)-(C), and to select and analyse the key facts so as to achieve perceptive application on which a sustainable solution can be based (the answer may tend to concentrate more on (A) than on (B) or vice versa, but some discussion of the other will appear).
- 16 - 20 The candidate shows clear understanding of the rules of law in (A)-(C), developing explanations and using illustration but is a little hesitant in developing the application required
or
explains and applies either (A) or (B), and (C)
or
explains and applies (A) and (B) (**max 17**).
- 11 - 15 The candidate shows understanding of the appropriate rules of law in (A) or (B), and (C), developing explanations and using illustration but is unable to extend the analysis to achieve substantial application of the rules to the facts
or
the answer explains and applies either (A) or (B)
or
explains and applies any two of (A)-(C) but where there is some superficiality and confusion in the explanation and/or application.
- 6 - 10 The candidate begins to indicate some capacity for explanation and analysis by introducing consideration of some appropriate rule(s) drawn from (A)-(C) but the explanations are limited and superficial
or
the candidate adopts an approach in which there is concentration on explanation in terms of the facts presented rather than through development of explanation and application of legal rules.
- 1 - 5 The candidate merely introduces fragments of information or unexplained examples from which no coherent analysis and explanation can emerge **or** though the candidate attempts to introduce explanation, analysis and application, this is so fundamentally undermined by error and confusion that it remains substantially incoherent.
- 0 The candidate presents no information relevant to the question.

- (c) Discuss the suggestion that, with some minor changes, the existing non-fatal offences against the person would be perfectly satisfactory, so that major reform is not required. (25 marks)

Potential content

- (A) Review of the major criticisms of the non-fatal offences - antiquated language, structural issues, particular offences
- (B) Examination of possible reforms as suggested by Law Commission, or the Government's 1998 proposals
- (C) Evaluation of the scale of the problem in the light of 'minor' changes that could be made either by Parliament or the courts

Mark bands

- 21 - 25 The candidate demonstrates the ability to debate the scope of the problem as suggested in (A)-(C) and to reach a sustainable conclusion as to the need for reform.
- 16 - 20 The candidate demonstrates the ability to explain the criticisms as in (A) (which may include discussion of (B) as a way of reinforcing the criticisms), and to make some tentative attempt at evaluation as in (C) (which may be by comparison with reforms suggested as in (B)), so that a conclusion emerges rather hesitantly.
- 11 - 15 The candidate concentrates on explaining the criticisms as in (A) without really being able to introduce an evaluative element, so that no conclusions emerge
or
the candidate attempts evaluation against an inadequate framework of explanation of criticisms (this may be developed by reference to proposals for reform)
or
the candidate attempts to deal with a range across (A)-(C) in which explanations of criticisms, evaluation and conclusions are not fully developed or suffer from a little confusion.
- 6 - 10 The candidate begins to indicate some capacity for explanation by introducing discussion of any of the material in (A)-(C) but the explanations of criticisms, evaluation and conclusions are limited and superficial. At the lower end of this band, the answer will contain little more than recognition of possible criticisms or brief indications of areas of possible reform.
- 1 - 5 The candidate merely introduces fragments of information from which no coherent explanation, evaluation and conclusions can emerge
or
though the candidate attempts to introduce explanation, evaluation and conclusions, they are so fundamentally undermined by error and confusion that the answer remains substantially incoherent.
- 0 The candidate presents no information relevant to the question.

Contract Law**3****Total for this question: 75 marks**

- (a) Consider whether Leo has any legal right to the £20 000 which Ken originally promised to pay him.
(25 marks)

Potential content

- (A) Explanation of intention to create legal relations
- (B) Explanation of offer and acceptance and consideration in unilateral contracts, including the issue of whether the offer can be withdrawn once performance has begun
- (C) Explanation of certainty of terms and the meaning of ‘succeed’
- (D) Explanation of breach and remedy

Mark bands

- 21 - 25 The candidate demonstrates the ability to recognise and explain the rules of law in (A)-(D), and to select and analyse the key facts so as to achieve perceptive application on which a sustainable solution can be based. There may be some imbalance in treatment as between the elements (A)-(D) but this will not prevent a clear analysis from emerging.
- 16 - 20 The candidate shows clear understanding of the rules of law in (A)-(D), developing explanations and using illustration but is a little hesitant in developing the application required
or
explains and applies three of (A)-(D).
- 11 - 15 The candidate shows understanding of the appropriate rules of law in three of (A)-(D), developing explanations and using illustration, but is unable to extend the analysis to achieve substantial application of the rules to the facts
or
the answer explains and applies two of (A)-(D) (**Max 12** for one only)
or
there is a balanced approach in which explanation, analysis and application are present across a range from (A)-(D) but the answer is a little superficial or suffers from some confusion.
- 6 - 10 The candidate begins to indicate some capacity for explanation and analysis by introducing consideration of some appropriate rule(s) drawn from (A)-(D) but the explanations are limited and superficial
or
the candidate adopts an approach in which there is concentration on explanation in terms of the facts presented rather than through development of explanation and application of legal rules.
- 1 - 5 The candidate merely introduces fragments of information or unexplained examples from which no coherent analysis and explanation can emerge
or
though the candidate attempts to introduce explanation, analysis and application, this is so fundamentally undermined by error and confusion that it remains substantially incoherent.
- 0 The candidate presents no information relevant to the question.

- (b) Taking account of the rules on termination of contracts by frustration and by breach, consider the rights, duties and remedies of Ken and Ned in connection with their agreement. (25 marks)

Potential content

- (A) Explanation of the rules on frustration of contracts, especially on frustration of the common venture
- (B) Explanation of the rules if the contract is frustrated - application of the Law Reform (Frustrated Contracts) Act 1943
- (C) Explanation of remedies for breach of contract if the contract is not frustrated. Selection of damages as the appropriate remedy and explanation of measure

Mark bands

- 21 - 25 The candidate demonstrates the ability to recognise and explain the rules of law in (A)-(C), and to select and analyse the key facts so as to achieve perceptive application on which a sustainable solution can be based.
- 16 - 20 The candidate shows clear understanding of the rules of law in (A)-(C), developing explanations and using illustration but is a little hesitant in developing the application required **or** explains and applies (A) and (B) or (A) and (C) but does not really address the alternative (**max 17**).
- 11 - 15 The candidate shows understanding of the appropriate rules of law in (A)-(C), developing explanations and using illustration but is unable to extend the analysis to achieve substantial application of the rules to the facts **or** the answer explains and applies (A)
or
 concentrates on explanation and application of (B) or (C) (**max 12**)
or
 there is a more balanced approach in which explanation, analysis and application are present across the range of (A)-(C) but the answer is a little superficial or suffers from some confusion.
- 6 - 10 The candidate begins to indicate some capacity for explanation and analysis by introducing consideration of some appropriate rule(s) drawn from (A)-(C) but the explanations are limited and superficial
or
 the candidate adopts an approach in which there is concentration on explanation in terms of the facts presented rather than through development of explanation and application of legal rules.
- 1 - 5 The candidate merely introduces fragments of information or unexplained examples from which no coherent analysis and explanation can emerge
or
 though the candidate attempts to introduce explanation, analysis and application, this is so fundamentally undermined by error and confusion that it remains substantially incoherent.
- 0 The candidate presents no information relevant to the question.

- (c) Proof of an agreement between the parties is one of the essential requirements of a valid contract. How satisfactory are the rules on agreement in contract? (25 marks)

Potential content

- (A) Explanation and consideration of the general approach to construing agreement - use of the objective rather than the subjective approach. Implications in connection with ‘agreement’ mistakes
- (B) Explanation and consideration of the use of the formal rules of offer - for example, offers and invitations to treat, counter offers and requests for further information, termination and revocation (especially in unilateral contracts)
- (C) Explanation and consideration of the use of the formal rules of acceptance for example, communication, silence, method of acceptance (especially, via the post and by the use of more modern technology), knowledge of offer (as in reward cases)
- (D) Explanation and consideration of an alternative mechanism (as revealed in the analysis of the “battle of the forms”)

Mark bands

- 21 - 25 The candidate demonstrates the ability to explain and evaluate criticisms in any two of (A)-(D). Where three or more are dealt with, there may be minor deficiencies and explanation and/or evaluation of one or more.
- 16 - 20 The candidate demonstrates the ability to explain and evaluate the criticisms in at least one of (A)-(D) and to present less comprehensive and coherent explanation and evaluation of one other
or
 is sound in explanation of at least two of (A)-(D) but hesitant in evaluation
or
 adopts a strong evaluative approach to two of (A)-(D) within a more hesitant framework of explanation
or
 attempts explanation and evaluation across a range from (A)-(D) which is relatively coherent but a little superficial.
- 11 - 15 The candidate demonstrates the ability to explain and evaluate criticisms in any one of (A)-(D)
or
 explains criticisms in any two of (A)-(D)
or
 develops evaluation of any two of (A)-(D) with little basis in explanation of criticisms
or
 attempts a balanced approach across the range but in which the answer is superficial or suffers from some confusion.
- 6 - 10 The candidate begins to indicate some capacity for explanation and/or evaluation by introducing discussion of any of the material in (A)-(D) but the explanations and evaluation are limited and very superficial.
- 1 - 5 The candidate merely introduces fragments of information from which no coherent explanation and evaluation can emerge
or
 though the candidate attempts to introduce explanation and evaluation, this is so fundamentally undermined by error and confusion that it remains substantially incoherent.
- 0 The candidate presents no information relevant to the question.

4

Total for this question: 75 marks

- (a) Discuss the rights, duties and remedies of Saiqa, Roger and Pete in connection with the arrangements for the gardening work. (25 marks)

Potential content

- (A) As between Saiqa and Roger, explanation of the rules on offer and acceptance, in particular, request for further information, counter offer, acceptance
- (B) As between Saiqa and Pete, interpretation of the terms of the contract, including the notion of an implied term. Warranties contrasted with Conditions
- (C) Explanation of possible remedies available – even if contract between Saiqa and Roger, no specific performance. Damages for Pete

Mark bands

- 21 - 25 The candidate demonstrates the ability to recognise and explain the rules of law in (A)-(C), and to select and analyse the key facts so as to achieve perceptive application on which a sustainable solution can be based.
- 16 - 20 The candidate shows clear understanding of the rules of law in (A)-(C), developing explanations and using illustration but is a little hesitant in developing the application required
or
 explains and applies any two of (A)-(C) (**max 17**) with some reference to the other.
- 11 - 15 The candidate shows understanding of the appropriate rules of law in (A)-(C), developing explanations and using illustration but is unable to extend the analysis to achieve substantial application of the rules to the facts
or
 the answer explains and applies (A) or (B) (**max 13**) with some reference to the other or to (C)
or
 there is a balanced approach in which explanation, analysis and application are present across the range of (A)-(C) but the answer is a little superficial or suffers from some confusion.
- 6 - 10 The candidate begins to indicate some capacity for explanation and analysis by introducing consideration of some appropriate rule(s) drawn from (A)-(C) but the explanations are limited and superficial
or
 the candidate adopts an approach in which there is concentration on explanation in terms of the facts presented rather than through development of explanation and application of legal rules.
- 1 - 5 The candidate merely introduces fragments of information or unexplained examples from which no coherent analysis and explanation can emerge
or
 though the candidate attempts to introduce explanation, analysis and application, this is so fundamentally undermined by error and confusion that it remains substantially incoherent.
- 0 The candidate presents no information relevant to the question.

- (b) Taking account of the rules of law concerning the effect on a contract of mistake and misrepresentation, discuss the rights and remedies of Tidygarden against Roger and Will in connection with the lawnmower. (25 marks)

Potential content

- (A) Explanation of the elements and kinds of misrepresentation with particular reference to fraudulent misrepresentation
- (B) Explanation of the concept of unilateral mistake involving a mistake as to identity
- (C) Explanation of the consequences of misrepresentation and mistake - voidable and void, and the implications where third party rights intervene

Mark bands

- 21 - 25 The candidate demonstrates the ability to recognise and explain the rules of law in (A)-(C), and to select and analyse the key facts so as to achieve perceptive application on which a sustainable solution can be based.
- 16 - 20 The candidate shows clear understanding of the rules of law in (A)-(C), developing explanations and using illustration but is a little hesitant in developing the application required
or
explains and applies any two of (A)-(C) (**max 17**) with some reference to the other.
- 11 - 15 The candidate shows understanding of the appropriate rules of law in (A)-(C), developing explanations and using illustration but is unable to extend the analysis to achieve substantial application of the rules to the facts
or
the answer explains and applies (A) or (B) (**max 13**) with some reference to the other or to (C)
or
there is a balanced approach in which explanation, analysis and application are present across the range of (A)-(C) but the answer is a little superficial or suffers from some confusion.
- 6 - 10 The candidate begins to indicate some capacity for explanation and analysis by introducing consideration of some appropriate rule(s) drawn from (A)-(C) but the explanations are limited and superficial
or
the candidate adopts an approach in which there is concentration on explanation in terms of the facts presented rather than through development of explanation and application of legal rules.
- 1 - 5 The candidate merely introduces fragments of information or unexplained examples from which no coherent analysis and explanation can emerge
or
though the candidate attempts to introduce explanation, analysis and application, this is so fundamentally undermined by error and confusion that it remains substantially incoherent.
- 0 The candidate presents no information relevant to the question.

- (c) Outline and critically evaluate any **two** ways in which a contract may be discharged. (25 marks)

Potential content

- (A) Outline and critical evaluation of rules on discharge by performance
- (B) Outline and critical evaluation of rules on discharge by agreement
- (C) Outline and critical evaluation of rules on discharge by frustration
- (D) Outline and critical evaluation of rules on discharge by breach

Mark bands

- 21 - 25 The candidate demonstrates the ability to outline and critically evaluate any **two** of (A)-(D). There may be minor imbalance in treatment as between the two elements.
- 16 - 20 The candidate demonstrates the ability to outline and critically evaluate any **one** of (A)-(D) and to present some outline and evaluation of one other
or
is sound in outlining the rules in **two** of (A)-(D) but hesitant in evaluation
or
adopts a strong evaluative approach to **two** of (A)-(D) within a more hesitant framework of outline explanation.
- 11 - 15 The candidate demonstrates the ability to outline and critically evaluate any **one** of (A)-(D)
or
outlines the rules in any **two** of (A)-(D)
or
develops some critical evaluation of any **two** of (A)-(D) with little basis in outline of rules
or
attempts a balanced approach across the range but in which the answer is superficial or suffers from some confusion.
- 6 - 10 The candidate begins to indicate some capacity for outline explanation and/or evaluation by introducing discussion of any of the material in (A)-(D) but the outline explanations and evaluation are limited and very superficial.
- 1 - 5 The candidate merely introduces fragments of information from which no coherent outline explanation and evaluation can emerge
or
though the candidate attempts to introduce outline explanation and evaluation, this is so fundamentally undermined by error and confusion that it remains substantially incoherent.
- 0 The candidate presents no information relevant to the question.

Assessment grid

One question to be answered from 4

	AO1	AO2	AO3
Question 1 (a)	7	18	
Question 1 (b)	7	18	10
Question 1 (c)	7	18	
Question 2 (a)	7	18	
Question 2 (b)	7	18	10
Question 2 (c)	7	18	
Question 3 (a)	7	18	
Question 3 (b)	7	18	10
Question 3 (c)	7	18	
Question 4 (a)	7	18	
Question 4 (b)	7	18	10
Question 4 (c)	7	18	
Total marks	21	54	10
% of A2	7.5	19	3.5
% of A Level	3.75	9.5	1.75