

Version 1.0



**General Certificate of Education
June 2012**

Law **LAW04**
**Criminal Law (Offences against Property) or
Tort AND Concepts of Law**

Unit 4

Mark Scheme

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

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

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

Copyright © 2012 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

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

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

LAW04

Assessment Objectives One and Two

General Marking Guidance

You should remember that your marking standards should reflect the levels of performance of students, mainly 18 years old, 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 students 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 student'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 student's answer does not deserve credit, then no marks should be given.

Citation of Authority

Students 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

- 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

Maxima for Substantive Law questions

Mark bands (3 potential content) – list of maximum marks

25	two sound, one clear
23	two sound, one some or one sound, two clear
21	two sound or one sound, one clear, one some or three clear
19	one sound, one clear or one sound, two some or two clear, one some
17	one sound, one some or two clear or one clear, two some
14	one sound or one clear, one some or three some
13	two sound explanation only
11	one clear or two some
09	one sound explanation only or two clear explanation only or three some explanation only
07	one some or one clear explanation only or two some explanation only
05	one some explanation only
04	fragments or substantial error/incoherence
00	completely irrelevant

Mark bands (2 potential content) – list of maximum marks

25	two sound
23	one sound, one clear
20	one sound, one some or two clear
17	one sound or one clear, one some
13	one clear or two some or two sound explanation only
11	one sound explanation only or two clear explanation only
08	one some or one clear explanation only or two some explanation only
06	one some explanation only
05	fragments or substantial error/incoherence
00	completely irrelevant

Note:

In *substantive* law questions, the two components are explanation and application. The references above to explanation only are to be understood as explanation without application. The quality of treatment of these two components, in combination, determines whether the treatment overall for that PC element is sound, clear or some. In determining the overall quality of treatment, descriptions of the quality of treatment of the individual components should be combined as follows:

sound/sound	- sound
sound/clear	- weak sound
sound/some	- clear
clear/clear	- clear
clear/some	- weak clear
some/some	- some

Descriptors for Substantive Law questions

Level	Description
Sound	Accurate and comprehensive explanation and application, so that the answer reveals strong knowledge and understanding of the correct (or sustainable) analysis, leading to satisfactory conclusions. There may be some omission, error, or confusion but it will be insufficient to undermine the basic characteristics of the answer.
Clear	<p>Broadly accurate and relatively comprehensive explanation and application, though a little superficial in either or both and with some error and/or confusion that begins to affect the quality of the analysis.</p> <p>Or</p> <p>Accurate explanation and application over a narrower area, omitting some significant aspect(s) of the analysis.</p> <p>So that an answer emerges which reveals knowledge and understanding of the broad framework of the analysis, or of some of its detailed aspect(s).</p>
Some	<p>Explanation and/or application in relation to relevant aspects but characterised by significant omissions and/or errors and/or confusion.</p> <p>Or</p> <p>Explanation (including definitions of relevant offences/defences) and/or application which is generally accurate but confined to a limited aspect.</p> <p>So that, at best, a very superficial or partial analysis emerges.</p>
Fragments	<p>Isolated words or phrases, including case names and statutes, which have potential relevance but remain entirely undeveloped.</p> <p>Or</p> <p>Mere identification of relevant offences/defences.</p>

Use of case authority

1. It is usually sufficient to associate a relevant case with an explained/applied rule. Further explanation of cases is required only where necessary to elucidate the rule or its application.
2. An answer in relation to any Pc should not be described as 'sound' unless some relevant authority appears, where appropriate. However, where there is appropriate use of authority in relation to the other Pc('s) in the mark scheme for the question, an answer in relation to a Pc where no authority appears may be given a 'lower' sound (the student will have demonstrated ability to use appropriate authority at some point in the answer to the question, albeit not in the element in issue).

Section A: Criminal Law (Offences against Property)

Scenario 1

Total for this scenario: 50 marks

- 0 1 Discuss Dan's possible criminal liability for property offences arising out of his obtaining and using the parking permit and his failure to pay for the meal. (25 marks)

Potential Content

- (A) Theft in relation to the parking permit. *Actus reus* – appropriation, property, belonging to another. *Mens rea* – intention to permanently deprive (s.6/"goodness and virtue"), dishonesty [s.2(1)(c)]/Ghosh).
- (B) In relation to the permit, sound can be achieved by a discussion of **one** (or a combination) of the following:
- Fraud by false representation. Implied representation (displaying the permit), falsity. *Mens rea* issues – dishonesty, intention to make a gain and/or cause a loss.
 - Obtaining a service by a dishonest act – obtain, service, on the basis of payment, 'by' a dishonest act. *Mens rea* issues – dishonesty, intention to avoid payment.
- (C) Making off without payment issues – making off, the spot, service done, payment required or expected. *Mens rea* issues – intention to permanently avoid payment, knowledge that payment was required or expected, dishonesty (did Dan believe that the reasonable man would think that not paying was justifiable, given his perception that the meal was of poor quality?).

Fraud by false representation issues – possible argument based on continuing representation as to payment.

Dishonestly obtaining services issues – should conclude that there is no liability because no dishonesty until after services obtained.

Theft of food consumed – should conclude that there is no liability because no dishonesty until after food consumed.

NB: Making off without payment only – **max sound**

Fraud by false representation only – **max sound**

Obtaining services dishonestly only – **max weak clear**

Theft only – **max weak clear**

Give appropriate credit to responses which refer to combinations of the above.

-
- 0 2** Discuss Ben's possible criminal liability for property offences arising out of his activities in Gwen's house. *(25 marks)*

Potential Content

- (A) Theft in relation to the money and the clothes. Appropriation, property, belonging to another ('possession or control'/no abandonment in relation to the clothes). Intention to permanently deprive, dishonesty. Robbery issues. Was force used in order to steal and at the time of the theft? Was there a continuing appropriation?

NB Theft only – max **clear**

- (B) Burglary issues. Building. Trespass (part of a building). S.9(1)(a) – conditional intent to commit theft in the bedroom. Consideration of S.9(1)(b) on the basis of possible GBH and theft of the money and the clothes.
- (C) Consideration of the defence of duress: threat of death/serious personal injury? The scope of the threat ('money only'). The elements of threat of immediate/almost immediate harm and opportunity to avoid the harm. The objective element. Credit the argument that Ben's association with Reggie might negate the use of the defence.

Scenario 2**Total for this scenario: 50 marks**

- 0 3** Discuss Tom's possible criminal liability for property offences arising out of his dealings with Sunitra and David. (25 marks)

Potential Content

- (A) Theft of the £20. Appropriation despite consent/gift (Gomez, Hinks), property, belonging to another. Intention to permanently deprive, dishonesty.
- (B) Fraud by false representation. Representation (by conduct – the clothes/by statement – the sign), falsity. Dishonesty, intention to make a gain and/or cause a loss.
- (C) Blackmail. Demand, menaces, with a view to gain or intent to cause loss. Unwarranted demand – consideration of Tom's belief as to reasonable grounds for making the demand and that the menaces were a proper means of reinforcing it.

- 0 4** Discuss the possible criminal liability of Tom and of Mark for property offences arising out of the incidents involving the fire, and of Tom in relation to his activities involving Fritz. (25 marks)

Potential Content

- (A) Criminal damage in relation to Tom. Basic criminal damage (arson). The meaning of 'damage'. *Mens rea* issues (in particular, subjective recklessness). Aggravated criminal damage issues. Intention/recklessness to endanger life and to endanger life 'thereby'. NB Basic criminal damage only – max **clear**

- (B) Criminal damage in relation to Mark. Basic criminal damage/defence issues in relation to Mark - lawful excuse [s.5(2)(b)]. Defence issues in relation to Tom/intoxication (recognition of voluntary intoxication, distinction between specific/basic intent crimes, application to criminal damage).

NB basic criminal damage re Mark + lawful excuse re Mark (no intoxication re Tom) – max **clear**

Basic criminal damage re Mark (but no lawful excuse) + intoxication re Tom – max **weak clear**

Lawful excuse re Mark + intoxication re Tom (eg mere identification of basic criminal damage) - max **clear**

- (C) Tom's possible criminal liability in relation to Fritz. **Sound** can be achieved by a discussion of any **one** (or a combination of any) of the following:

- Making off without payment – making off, the spot, service done, payment required or expected. *Mens rea* issues – intention to permanently avoid payment, knowledge that payment was required or expected, dishonesty.
- Fraud by false representation – initial implied representation by Tom that he intended to pay the fare/subsequent representation that he could and intended to get money, falsity (the fact that Tom never returned to pay suggests that he did not intend to pay from the outset). Dishonesty, intention to make a gain and/or cause a loss.
- Obtaining a service by a dishonest act – obtain, service, on the basis of payment, 'by' a dishonest act. *Mens rea* issues – dishonesty, intention to avoid payment.

Section B: Tort

Scenario 3

Total for this scenario: 50 marks

- 0 5** Consider the rights and remedies, if any, of Dale and of Mick against Imran, and of Dale against Goodview. *(25 marks)*

Potential content

- (A) In relation to Imran and Dale/Mick: the tort of negligence in relation to misstatements. The need for a special relationship/proximity. In relation to Dale, the issues of whether Imran should have foreseen reliance by Dale (the problem of the social setting and relationship of friendship) and whether reliance by Dale was reasonable. Should Imran have anticipated communication by Dale to Mick and that Mick would rely on it? The issue of breach of duty and standard of care in relation to professionals. Reference to damages.
- (B) In relation to Dale and Goodview: possible claim in the tort of negligence (duty, breach, damage, remoteness). Reference to damages. Alternative claim under the Consumer Protection Act 1987 (damage, defective product, producer, strict liability, 'development risks' defence, damage [over £275 minimum claim]). Reference to damages.

In relation to PC (B), either or both of the above approaches can achieve maximum marks (with an obviously more limited treatment where both elements are considered).

- 0 6** Consider the rights and remedies, if any, of Mo and of Jack against Ed for their injuries. Consider whether Luigi may also be liable for those injuries. *(25 marks)*

- (A) In relation to Ed and Mo – elements of the tort of negligence in relation to physical injury. Duty of care. Breach of duty. Causation, remoteness. Reference to damages.
- (B) In relation to Ed's possible liability to Jack – possible claim in the tort of negligence for psychiatric injury. Need for recognised psychiatric injury, distinction between primary and secondary victims in terms of test(s) for distinction and in terms of control factors. Application to Jack (no independent rule for the 'rescuer' and consideration whether Jack is a primary or secondary victim and application of relevant factors). Reference to damages.
- (C) In relation to Luigi and Mo/Jack: possible vicarious liability of Luigi for any tort committed by Ed. Discussion of 'in the course of employment' and employer/employee relationship. Credit any discussion of whether any tort committed by Ed which can also give rise to criminal liability (eg a driving offence) might be deemed to occur within the course of employment (eg Lister).

Scenario 4**Total for this scenario: 50 marks**

0 7 Consider the rights and remedies, if any, of Bob against Rafa. (25 marks)

Potential Content

- (A) In relation to the noise – possible liability in the tort of private nuisance. The need for an unreasonable interference with enjoyment of land and a consideration of possible relevant factors, especially the noisy, generally non-residential location and (initially) limited duration (afternoons), which, arguably might result in no liability. The importance of possible malice/intentional interference and extended duration at night, which might result in liability. In relation to the interference with the music, credit reference to suggestions in some authorities (eg Hunter) that no liability for interference with ‘recreational activities’. Remedies of damages and injunction. The issue of possible ‘public benefit’ in supplying hospitals – not a defence to liability, but might affect any possible injunction, eg might Rafa be restrained merely from night-time working?
- (B) In relation to the damage caused by the chemicals – possible liability under the Rule in Rylands v Fletcher. The need for a ‘thing liable to do mischief...’, accumulation, non-natural user, escape, damage, reference to damages. Credit for discussion of defence of public benefit (unlikely since Cambridge Water). Possible alternative in negligence.

NB Credit discussion of public nuisance.

0 8 Consider the rights and remedies, if any, of Kurt against Bob and against Dr Weeks. (25 marks)

Potential Content

- (A) In relation to Kurt and Bob - relevant requirements of the Occupiers’ Liability Act 1984. The need for a danger due to the state of the premises in relation to the broken bottles [s.1(1)]. Requirements for the duty to arise [s.1(3)]. Nature of the duty [s.1(4)]. Consideration of breach of duty (possible factors might include the risk to children getting over the fence, the risk of serious damage, the cost of raising the fence/issuing a warning notice etc). Consideration of possible contributory negligence/*volenti*. Reference to damages.
NB Consideration of the branch of the tree as a danger can enhance the response.

Credit an alternative approach of arguing that Kurt is an implied licensee on the basis that the tree might constitute an allurement to a child. Such an approach can merit sound if combined with a detailed explanation and application of the OLA 1957. Candidates who consider both OLA 1984 and 1957 approaches should be given appropriate credit.
- (B) In relation to Kurt and Dr Weeks – elements of the tort of negligence. Duty of care. Breach of duty issues. General negligence principles and principles having particular reference to medical professionals – the standard of the ordinarily competent medical practitioner, possible relevance of Dr Weeks being a consultant, the relevance of ‘general and approved practice’, possible argument that the practice adopted by Dr Weeks was non-negligent despite the existence of another professional view (Bolam), or that the risks involved in the practice rendered it negligent (Bolitho). Causation. Reference to damages. In relation to the loss of wages, credit possible reference to claim for consequential economic loss/remoteness of damage.

Maxima for LAW04 Concepts essay questions

The student deals with (A) and (B) as follows:

- Max 30:** two sound
- Max 27:** one sound, one clear
- Max 23:** one sound, one some **or** two clear
- Max 19:** one sound **or** one clear, one some
- Max 15:** one clear **or** two some
- Max 10:** one some
- Max 5:** fragments **or** substantial error or incoherence
- 0:** no relevant information

Descriptors for Concepts of Law questions (Section C)

Level	Explanation	Analysis/Evaluation
sound	The answer presents a strong explanatory framework, correctly identifying and accurately and comprehensively explaining, say, relevant rules, procedures, institutions, and theories in the central aspects of the potential content. Where appropriate, the explanations are supported by relevant examples and illustration (which is adequately developed where necessary to further elucidate the explanations). Where there are more marginal aspects of the potential content, there may be some minor omissions or inaccuracies in the explanation and/or in the treatment of the supporting examples and illustration.	Arguments are developed perceptively and coherently, making careful use of framework explanations, examples and illustration, and are directly related to the thrust of the question. Summaries and conclusions are sustainable, and demonstrably emerge from the supporting explanations and arguments.
clear	The answer presents an explanatory framework, correctly identifying and accurately explaining significant parts of, say, relevant rules, procedures, institutions, and theory in the central aspects of the potential content, though there are omissions in the explanations of some parts of the rules, procedures, institutions, and theory or errors or some confusion in the explanation, in those central aspects. There may be a little overemphasis on marginal aspects at the expense of some of the more central aspects. In the higher part of the level, relevant examples and illustration are used but there may be a little confusion and error in selection and/or explanation or the explanation may be limited. At the lower end of the level, there may be little evidence of relevant examples and illustration or more evident inaccuracies.	Appropriate arguments are introduced but may not be fully developed, or may be restricted in range. Alternatively, the arguments suffer from a little inaccuracy or confusion. The arguments make use of framework explanations (including any relevant examples and illustration) but do not always succeed in incorporating them in a fully coherent way or in demonstrating their full relevance. Summaries and conclusions may be a little tentative and may not fully address the thrust of the question. Though broadly based on the supporting explanations and arguments, summaries and conclusions may not be closely and carefully related to them in the discussion.
some	The answer presents an explanatory framework which correctly identifies and accurately explains a very limited part of, say, relevant rules, procedures, institutions, and theory in the central aspects of the potential content. There may be a very evident imbalance between explanation of central and of more marginal aspects of the potential content. Alternatively, the answer attempts explanation across a much broader range of relevant rules, procedures, institutions, and theory in the central aspects of the potential content but the explanations suffer from significant omission, error or confusion. Explanations may emerge only out of attempts to introduce relevant examples and illustration. If introduced at all, examples and illustration may be of marginal relevance or their treatment may be highly superficial or subject to significant inaccuracies or not properly used to support the explanation of the relevant rules, procedures, institutions, and theory.	There are relevant arguments but they are undeveloped and may tend to consist of simple assertions or assumptions. Alternatively, arguments may be characterised by evident confusion which significantly impedes coherence. Very limited use is made of framework explanations and any examples and illustration. Summaries and conclusions may be absent. Where present, they may barely address the thrust of the question, and be only imprecisely related to any supporting explanations and arguments.

Total for this question: 35 marks

- 0 9** Explain what is meant by 'balancing conflicting interests'. Discuss the extent to which English law balances conflicting interests **and** briefly consider whether it is important to do so. *(30 marks + 5 marks for AO3)*

Potential Content

- (A) Explanation of the meaning of the different possible 'interests' and the process of 'balancing'. Identification and explanation of the interests which may allegedly be in conflict in relation to relevant area(s) of substantive law/procedure/institutions, etc eg tort (eg nuisance, duty of care/floodgates/just and reasonableness, breach of duty issues, defamation etc), crime (eg intoxication, consent, issues of life and death etc), criminal process (eg bail, evidence, recognition of the interests of suspects/PACE), national security/terrorism issues, etc (NB – take account of breadth and depth).
- (B) Analysis of the area(s) selected in (A) to show how the relevant legal rule/process/institution enables balance to be achieved or prevents balance being achieved. Brief consideration of the importance of balancing conflicting interests – eg Bentham's view (balancing of interests needed to achieve maximum happiness), Pound (social engineering needed to build efficient society), etc.

NB Analysis without consideration of 'importance' re PC(B) – max **weak sound**

Total for this question: 35 marks

- 1 0** Consider what is meant by 'justice'. Discuss whether English law achieves, or fails to achieve, justice. *(30 marks + 5 marks for AO3)*

Potential Content

- (A) Consideration of possible meanings of 'justice', for example, justice in terms of basic fairness, equality of treatment, distributive or corrective justice, substantive or procedural justice, etc. A sound answer should include some treatment of the important philosophical theories of justice, eg utilitarianism, Rawls, etc. Use of case law/examples to illustrate where appropriate.

Credit to be awarded for reference to possible criticisms of different meanings of justice, eg problems with utilitarianism and individual liberties and equality, the problems with distributive justice (eg what is a 'just' distribution of benefits and burdens, what benefits and burdens etc?), the problems in relation to justice as equality (eg when are cases alike and different?), etc.

- (B) Analysis/evaluation of the extent to which law does or does not, achieve justice in the context of the discussion in (A). Analysis of relevant rules of the substantive law and/or aspects of the legal system, eg aspects of justice in relation to procedure, evidence, natural justice, treatment of suspects, methods of correcting injustice, etc.

Total for this question: 35 marks

- 1 1 Briefly explain what is meant by ‘fault’ and discuss the extent to which liability is based on fault. Consider the arguments for **and** against fault-based liability.
(30 marks + 5 marks)

Potential Content

- (A) Brief explanation of possible definitions of fault in the criminal and/or civil contexts. (For example, blameworthiness, responsibility, wrongdoing, etc).

Discussion of specific areas of law in order to demonstrate how they indicate the presence or absence of fault. Discussion of any relevant area of law will be credited. In the criminal law context, examples include *actus reus* issues (eg voluntariness, causation, omissions), *mens rea* issues (the distinction between intention and recklessness, whether objective recklessness and negligence indicate sufficient fault, etc), the notion of hierarchy of fault, defences, the relevance of blameworthiness to sentencing etc.

In the tort context, relevant areas include aspects of the criteria of the duty of care (eg the importance of foreseeability and the requirement that it must be just and reasonable to impose a duty) and the importance of reasonableness and the ‘risk factors’ in relation to breach of duty and the standard of care. Issues of causation and remoteness. Defences to negligence, such as volenti and contributory negligence. The importance of unreasonableness in relation to liability in private nuisance.

In the contract context, areas which arguably indicate the importance of fault include remoteness of damage (***Hadley v Baxendale***), the reduction in damages awarded due to a failure to mitigate losses, the distinction between conditions and warranties (the claimant can terminate the contract for breach of an important, but not a minor, term), the defence of frustration etc.

NB There may be some imbalance in the treatment of the discussion of the chosen area(s), where students choose to incorporate both civil and criminal law.

- (B) Consideration of arguments which are said to support fault-based liability in relation to criminal and/or civil law, eg in the criminal context, personal autonomy/freedom to choose, moral blameworthiness, the nature of criminal penalties etc, and, in the civil context, the deterrent nature of tortious liability and the importance of corrective justice, etc.

Explanation of liability without fault. Discussion of either criminal and/or civil liability will be credited. Areas of strict liability in criminal law such as offences relating to food hygiene, pollution, the protection of under-age children, drug-related offences, etc. Consideration of the presumption of *mens rea*. Situational liability. Use of case-law examples. **eg *Smedleys v Breed, Alphacell v Woodward, Winzar, Larssonneur*** etc.

Areas of strict liability in the tort context (eg vicarious liability, the Consumer Protection Act, ***Rylands v Flecher***, etc), and possible discussion of no-fault accident compensation schemes as an alternative to tortious liability. In the contract context, there are several rules which suggest strict liability by appearing to penalise an innocent party, eg the position of an offeror where the offeree accepts the offer by post.

Consideration of arguments which are said to support liability without fault, eg utilitarianism/protection of the public from harm, the 'not truly criminal' nature of regulatory offences, procedural problems involved in civil negligence claims (delay, cost etc), possible benefits of the strict liability of manufacturers, employers (eg claimant more likely to obtain damages), etc.

NB Explanation of no-fault liability with no consideration of "arguments" – max **weak clear**

Consideration of "arguments" without explanation of no-fault liability – max **clear**

ASSESSMENT GRID**A Level Law (LAW04)****(One question from *either* Section A or Section B, and one question from Section C)**

UNIT 4	AO1	A02	AO3
Section A			
Question 1 (a)	10	15	
Question 1 (b)	10	15	
Question 2 (a)	10	15	
Question 2 (b)	10	15	
Section B			
Question 3 (a)	10	15	
Question 3 (b)	10	15	
Question 4 (a)	10	15	
Question 4 (b)	10	15	
Section C			
Question 5	15	15	
Question 6	15	15	
Question 7	15	15	
QWC			5
Total marks	35	45	5

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the Results Statistics page of the AQA Website: <http://www.aqa.org.uk/over/stat.html>.

Converting Marks into UMS marks

Convert raw marks into marks on the Uniform Mark Scale (UMS) by using the link below.

UMS conversion calculator www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion