

GCE

Law

H018/02: Law making and the law of tort

AS Level

Mark Scheme for June 2024

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

© OCR 2024

MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

PREPARATION FOR MARKING RM ASSESSOR

1. Make sure that you have accessed and completed the relevant training packages for on-screen marking: *RM Assessor Online Training*; *OCR Essential Guide to Marking*.
2. Make sure that you have read and understood the mark scheme and the question paper for this unit. These are posted on the RM Cambridge Assessment Support Portal <http://www.rm.com/support/ca>
3. Log-in to RM Assessor and mark the **required number** of practice responses (“scripts”) and the **number of required** standardisation responses.

YOU MUST MARK 10 PRACTICE AND 10 STANDARDISATION RESPONSES BEFORE YOU CAN BE APPROVED TO MARK LIVE SCRIPTS.

MARKING

1. Mark strictly to the mark scheme.
2. Marks awarded must relate directly to the marking criteria.
3. The schedule of dates is very important. It is essential that you meet the RM Assessor 50% and 100% (traditional 40% Batch 1 and 100% Batch 2) deadlines. If you experience problems, you must contact your Team Leader (Supervisor) without delay.
4. If you are in any doubt about applying the mark scheme, consult your Team Leader by telephone or the RM Assessor messaging system, or by email.
5. **Crossed Out Responses**
Where a candidate has crossed out a response and provided a clear alternative then the crossed out response is not marked. Where no alternative response has been provided, examiners may give candidates the benefit of the doubt and mark the crossed out response where legible.

Rubric Error Responses – Optional Questions

Where candidates have a choice of question across a whole paper or a whole section and have provided more answers than required, then all responses are marked and the highest mark allowable within the rubric is given. Enter a mark for each question answered into RM assessor, which will select the

highest mark from those awarded. *(The underlying assumption is that the candidate has penalised themselves by attempting more questions than necessary in the time allowed.)*

Multiple Choice Question Responses

When a multiple choice question has only a single, correct response and a candidate provides two responses (even if one of these responses is correct), then no mark should be awarded (as it is not possible to determine which was the first response selected by the candidate).

When a question requires candidates to select more than one option/multiple options, then local marking arrangements need to ensure consistency of approach.

Contradictory Responses

When a candidate provides contradictory responses, then no mark should be awarded, even if one of the answers is correct.

Short Answer Questions (requiring only a list by way of a response, usually worth only **one mark per response**)

Where candidates are required to provide a set number of short answer responses then only the set number of responses should be marked. The response space should be marked from left to right on each line and then line by line until the required number of responses have been considered. The remaining responses should not then be marked. Examiners will have to apply judgement as to whether a 'second response' on a line is a development of the 'first response', rather than a separate, discrete response. *(The underlying assumption is that the candidate is attempting to hedge their bets and therefore getting undue benefit rather than engaging with the question and giving the most relevant/correct responses.)*

Short Answer Questions (requiring a more developed response, worth **two or more marks**)

If the candidates are required to provide a description of, say, three items or factors and four items or factors are provided, then mark on a similar basis – that is downwards (as it is unlikely in this situation that a candidate will provide more than one response in each section of the response space.)

Longer Answer Questions (requiring a developed response)

Where candidates have provided two (or more) responses to a medium or high tariff question which only required a single (developed) response and not crossed out the first response, then only the first response should be marked. Examiners will need to apply professional judgement as to whether the second (or a subsequent) response is a 'new start' or simply a poorly expressed continuation of the first response.

6. Always check the pages (and additional objects if present) at the end of the response in case any answers have been continued there. If the candidate has continued an answer there, then add a tick to confirm that the work has been seen.

7. Award No Response (NR) if:
- there is nothing written in the answer space

Award Zero '0' if:






- anything is written in the answer space and is not worthy of credit (this includes text and symbols).

Team Leaders must confirm the correct use of the NR button with their markers before live marking commences and should check this when reviewing scripts.

8. The RM Assessor **comments box** is used by your team leader to explain the marking of the practice responses. Please refer to these comments when checking your practice responses. **Do not use the comments box for any other reason.**
If you have any questions or comments for your team leader, use the phone, the RM Assessor messaging system, or e-mail.
9. Assistant Examiners will send a brief report on the performance of candidates to their Team Leader (Supervisor) via email by the end of the marking period. The report should contain notes on particular strengths displayed as well as common errors or weaknesses. Constructive criticism of the question paper/mark scheme is also appreciated.
10. For answers marked by levels of response:
- To determine the level** – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer
 - To determine the mark within the level**, consider the following:

Descriptor	Award mark
On the borderline of this level and the one below	At bottom of level
Consistently meets the criteria for this level	At top of level

10. Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	Not Relevant or no response or response achieves no credit
	Point
	Case development / Q4 & Q8 Developed point
	Developed point extended
	Correct (for Q8, indicates conclusion)
	The highlight tool may also be used to draw attention to a word or phrase which means that the statement or reasoning is inaccurate
APP	Applied point
REP	Repeated point
C	Citation of case examples / legal authority

	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	<p>Describe the stages of the legislative process that take place in the House of Commons after the second reading.</p> <p>Answers may include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee Stage - this stage allows for the detailed scrutiny of the Bill for the first time. Most Bills are considered by small Committees of between 15-60 MPs known as Public Bill Committees. Membership of these committees is always roughly in proportion to the number of seats a Party holds in the Commons. Members will often be chosen because of expertise or interest in a particular field. A separate committee is formed for the consideration of each individual Bill. The committee are entitled to scrutinise every detail and make any amendments necessary for the Bill to reflect the intention discussed in the second reading. Sometimes, if the Bill is an important one, the whole House will sit as a committee • Report Stage - after scrutiny by the Committee they will 'report' back to Parliament - to inform the House of any amendments (if there are no amendments at Committee Stage the Bill can go straight to the next stage). Amendments will be debated and voted on being either accepted or rejected. Further amendments may also be suggested from the House • Third Reading - if approved, the Bill will get its Third Reading. This gives the House a final chance to look at the Bill again as a whole, with all its amendments, and decide whether they want it to go further. The Bill cannot be changed substantially at this stage as it is, more or less, a formality. It will often go through without much attention at all (needs 6 MPs for a debate). If there are no challenges to the general theme of the Bill, it will be passed to the other House to start the whole process again. <p>To achieve level 4 the stages should be described in the correct order.</p>	8 AO1	<p>Use Levels of Response criteria</p> <p>Level 4 (7–8 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent knowledge and understanding of the English legal system, rules and principles. • The response is accurate, fully developed and detailed. <p>Level 3 (5–6 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good knowledge and understanding of the English legal system, rules and principles. • The response is detailed, but not fully developed in places. <p>Level 2 (3–4 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic knowledge and understanding of the English legal system, rules and principles. • The response may lack detail in places and is partially developed. <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited knowledge and understanding of the English legal system, rules and principles. • The response will have minimal detail. <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>

	Credit any other relevant point(s).		
--	-------------------------------------	--	--

	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	<p>Explain the Golden Rule of statutory interpretation and illustrate its use in cases.</p> <p>Answers may include the following:</p> <p>Define the golden rule: the golden rule is a modification of the literal rule and is thought to have its origins in the <i>dictum</i> of Parke B in <i>Becke v Smith</i> ... that the words of an Act should be taken literally but they can be modified or varied to avoid inconsistency with the Act or a repugnant outcome</p> <p>Judges only use the rule when the use of the literal rule would produce an absurd or unjust result</p> <p>There are two versions of the rule:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Narrow golden rule – where a word or words have two possible meanings but one would produce an unwanted or absurd outcome the court may choose between them (<i>Jones v DPP</i>, <i>R v Allen</i>) • Wide/broad golden rule – where the meaning of a word is not ambiguous but to give it its literal meaning would produce a repugnant outcome. Here the judge may ‘alter’ the meaning of the word(s) to avoid the unwanted outcome and give effect to Parliament’s intentions (<i>Re: Sigsworth</i>) <p>Use appropriate cases to illustrate: <i>Jones v DPP</i>; <i>Re: Sigsworth</i>; <i>R v Allen</i>; <i>Adler v George</i>; <i>Ruther v Harris</i>; <i>River Wear Commissioners v Adamson</i>; <i>Grey v Pearson</i>; <i>Meah v Roberts</i>; <i>Maddox v Storer</i>; <i>R v Pawlicki</i>; <i>R v Samuel</i>; <i>R v National Insurance Commissioner (ex p Connor)</i>; <i>INCO Europe v First Choice Distribution</i>.</p> <p>To achieve level 3 or above the rule should be explained <u>and</u> illustrated with case examples.</p> <p>Credit any other relevant point(s).</p>	<p>8</p> <p>AO1</p>	<p>Use Levels of Response criteria</p> <p>Level 4 (7–8 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent knowledge and understanding of the English legal system, rules and principles. • The response is accurate, fully developed and detailed. There will be excellent citation of fully relevant examples. <p>Level 3 (5–6 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good knowledge and understanding of the English legal system, rules and principles. • The response is detailed, but not fully developed in places. There will be good citation of mostly relevant examples. <p>Level 2 (3–4 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic knowledge and understanding of the English legal system, rules and principles. • The response may lack detail in places and is partially developed. There will be some citation of examples. <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited knowledge and understanding of the English legal system, rules and principles. • The response will have minimal detail. Citation of examples will be limited. <p>Level 0 (0 marks)</p> <p>No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>

	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	<p>Describe how distinguishing works within the doctrine of precedent using cases to illustrate your answer.</p> <p>Answers may include the following:</p> <p>A binding precedent must be followed. However, one method a judge can use to avoid an otherwise binding precedent is through the practice of distinguishing.</p> <p>In order to distinguish, the judge must show that there is a difference in the material facts of the two cases. If the material facts are sufficiently different then the instant judge is not bound by the earlier case (<i>Bridges v Hawkesworth</i> distinguished in <i>South Staffordshire Water Company v Sharwood</i>). Where this happens, the earlier decision need not be followed and a fresh precedent may be set</p> <p>Distinguishing is simply a way of saying an earlier case is irrelevant to the later case so it does not undermine the original decision or its bindingness to other cases. However, there is one form of distinguishing where there is implied doubt over the correctness of the earlier decision. This is where the later court says that the earlier decision should be ‘confined to its own facts’ (<i>Jobling v Associated Dairies Ltd</i> considering <i>Baker v Willoughby</i>)</p> <p>Distinguishing can be an unpredictable method of avoiding precedents as different judges will be more or less inclined to distinguish ‘disliked’ authorities than others.</p> <p>Use any relevant pair of cases to illustrate: <i>Balfour v Balfour</i> and <i>Merritt v Merritt</i>; <i>Stilk v Myrick</i> and <i>Williams v Roffey</i>; <i>Rylands v Fletcher</i> and <i>Read v Lyons</i>; <i>R v Jordan</i> and <i>R v Cheshire</i>; <i>R v Brown & Others</i> and <i>R v Wilson</i>.</p>	<p>8 AO1</p>	<p>Use Levels of Response criteria</p> <p>Level 4 (7–8 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent knowledge and understanding of the English legal system, rules and principles. • The response is accurate, fully developed and detailed. There will be excellent citation of fully relevant examples. <p>Level 3 (5–6 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good knowledge and understanding of the English legal system, rules and principles. • The response is detailed, but not fully developed in places. There will be good citation of mostly relevant examples. <p>Level 2 (3–4 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic knowledge and understanding of the English legal system, rules and principles. • The response may lack detail in places and is partially developed. There will be some citation of examples. <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited knowledge and understanding of the English legal system, rules and principles. • The response will have minimal detail. Citation of examples will be limited. <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>

	<p>To achieve level 4 distinguishing should be described <u>and</u> illustrated with case examples.</p> <p>Credit any other relevant point(s).</p>		
--	--	--	--

	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4	<p>Discuss the advantages of binding precedent.</p> <p>Candidates may develop the following points. Marks will be awarded on the basis of the quality of analysis and evaluation, given in the levels of response criteria in the guidance column.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Certainty - enables lawyers to advise clients accurately and individuals to plan their affairs according to likely outcomes. Also provides stability for business and fiscal arrangements • Fairness & consistency - like cases are treated alike which is fair, just, certain and rational. The law is not subject to whims of individual judges which lends greater credibility. Cases such as <i>Central London Properties v High Trees</i> are an example of judges trying to do justice in the instant case • Flexibility - despite a fairly rigid system overall, the system allows room for development through distinguishing, overruling and so on which means judges can develop the law to meet changing social, political or moral conditions according to shifting standards <i>R v Ireland & Burstow</i>, <i>Herrington v BRB</i>, <i>R v R</i>, or hold the moral line <i>R v Brown</i> • Precision - in a system which has been refining law over hundreds of years the law becomes very precise as minor variations on the same principles arise • Time-saving - because we have such a vast body of precise law to rely on cases do not have to be constantly re-argued from first principle saving lawyers, the court and client's time and money. <p>To achieve level 4 there should be at least one extended point.</p> <p>Credit any other relevant point(s).</p>	<p>8 AO3 1b</p>	<p>Use Levels of Response criteria</p> <p>Level 4 (7–8 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Excellent analysis and evaluation of a wide range of legal concepts. ▪ The response is wide ranging and has a well sustained focus on the question. ▪ The key points are fully discussed and fully developed. <p>Level 3 (5–6 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good analysis and evaluation of a range of legal concepts. ▪ The response has a mainly consistent focus on the question. ▪ Most of the key points are well discussed and well developed. <p>Level 2 (3–4 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Basic analysis and evaluation of legal concepts. ▪ The response is partially focused on the question. ▪ Some of the key points are discussed and partially developed. <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Limited analysis of legal concepts. ▪ The response has limited focus on the question. ▪ Discussion of any key points is minimal. <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>

	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5	<p>Explain the ways an occupier can avoid liability under the Occupiers' Liability Act 1957.</p> <p>Answers may include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Liability may be avoided in certain situations involving children. For example, situations involving unaccompanied young children where an occupier can expect parents to supervise their children - s2(3)(a), <i>Phipps v Rochester Corporation</i> • Workers/specialist visitors, in the exercise of their calling, are expected to guard against risks associated with their trade. An occupier will be able to avoid liability where workers do not guard against risks they should know about - s2(3)(b), <i>Roles v Nathan</i> • An occupier can avoid liability with sufficient warnings. The warning will be ineffective unless in all the circumstances it was enough to enable the visitor to be reasonably safe - s2(4)(a), <i>Rae v Mars</i> • An occupier may discharge their liability if damage is caused by the negligent work of an independent contractor - s2(4)(b), <i>Haseldine v Daw</i>. However, the occupier will need to show that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) it was reasonable to hire a contractor for the work (b) a competent contractor was chosen (c) the work was inspected if appropriate. • There are two defences available to the occupier: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Volenti - complete defence ○ Contributory negligence - partial defence. • Liability can be avoided by taking reasonable care to keep their visitor reasonably safe, e.g. by taking reasonable precautions – s2(2) <p>Credit any other relevant point(s).</p>	8 AO1	<p>Use Levels of Response criteria</p> <p>Level 4 (7–8 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent knowledge and understanding of the English legal system, rules and principles. • The response is accurate, fully developed and detailed. There will be excellent citation of fully relevant examples. <p>Level 3 (5–6 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good knowledge and understanding of the English legal system, rules and principles. • The response is detailed, but not fully developed in places. There will be good citation of mostly relevant examples. <p>Level 2 (3–4 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic knowledge and understanding of the English legal system, rules and principles. • The response may lack detail in places and is partially developed. There will be some citation of examples. <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited knowledge and understanding of the English legal system, rules and principles. • The response will have minimal detail. Citation of examples will be limited. <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>

	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6	<p>Advise whether or not Hugo has breached the duty of care he owes Rosa in a negligence claim.</p> <p>Answers may include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rosa will need to show that Hugo has fallen below the objective standard - that of the reasonable man • A reasonable PT would not allow a person without a booking to join his high impact exercise class after it had started • Hugo may be considered a professional as he is a qualified PT. This will raise the standard expected • He has fallen below the standard of the ordinary, competent member of the PT profession. The reasonably competent PT would not have allowed Rosa to start late and without completing the pre-exercise health questionnaire • The higher the risk of injury the higher the standard of care required. Hugo was running a high impact exercise class which would have associated risks. Hugo failed to eliminate the risks associated with the type of exercise class • Hugo did not take adequate precautions to eliminate the risk. He should have made sure that Rosa completed the pre-exercise health questionnaire and warmed up before starting. Such precautions would have cost very little in both time and money • Conclude that Hugo has breached his duty of care. <p>To achieve level 4 candidates should reach the correct conclusion on liability.</p> <p>Credit any other relevant point(s).</p>	<p>8 AO2 1a/1b</p>	<p>Use Levels of Response criteria</p> <p>Level 4 (7-8 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent application of legal rules to a given scenario. • Excellent presentation of a legal argument which is accurate, fully developed and detailed. Fully appropriate legal terminology is used. <p>Level 3 (5-6 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good application of legal rules to a given scenario. • Good presentation of a legal argument which is detailed but not fully developed in places. Appropriate legal terminology is used. <p>Level 2 (3-4 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic application of legal rules to a given scenario. • Basic presentation of a legal argument which may lack detail in places and is partially developed. Some appropriate legal terminology is used. <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited application of legal rules to a given scenario. • Limited presentation of a legal argument which has minimal detail and is unstructured and/or unclear. Minimal legal terminology is used. <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>

	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7	<p>Advise whether or not Hugo is liable for the harm caused to Rosa in a negligence claim.</p> <p>Answers may include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rosa will need to prove Hugo is the factual cause of the harm • The question to ask is 'but for Hugo's acts or omissions would the harm have occurred?' • Was it caused by him not getting her to warm up/complete the pre-exercise health questionnaire? • The hospital diagnosed Rosa with hypotension, also known as low blood pressure • The hypotension is what caused her to faint and fall • Hugh may not be/is the factual cause of her death • Rosa will also need to prove Hugo is the legal cause of the harm • The harm suffered by Rosa was foreseeable harm • Hugo would be considered the legal cause as the harm is not too remote • Fainting and falling are not too remote from the breach • Thin skull rule – Hugo would be liable despite Rosa's existing condition (hypotension) • Conclude that Hugo is not the factual cause or, is both the factual and legal cause of Rosa's harm. <p>Credit any other relevant point(s).</p>	<p>8 AO2 1a/1b</p>	<p>Use Levels of Response criteria</p> <p>Level 4 (7-8 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent application of legal rules to a given scenario. • Excellent presentation of a legal argument which is accurate, fully developed and detailed. Fully appropriate legal terminology is used. <p>Level 3 (5-6 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good application of legal rules to a given scenario. • Good presentation of a legal argument which is detailed but not fully developed in places. Appropriate legal terminology is used. <p>Level 2 (3-4 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic application of legal rules to a given scenario. • Basic presentation of a legal argument which may lack detail in places and is partially developed. Some appropriate legal terminology is used. <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited application of legal rules to a given scenario. • Limited presentation of a legal argument which has minimal detail and is unstructured and/or unclear. Minimal legal terminology is used. <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>

	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8*	<p>Discuss the extent to which the rules on establishing a duty of care in a negligence claim are fair.</p> <p>Candidates may develop the following points. Marks will be awarded on the basis of the quality of analysis and evaluation, given in the levels of response criteria in the guidance column.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The rules are fair as the law does not impose a duty for a person to act or prevent unforeseeable harm. The duty is only imposed where a person has assumed certain responsibilities and created or adopted a risk of harm to others. However, it is difficult when trying to establish a duty in respect of losses not directly related to physical harm • There is some confusion as to whether the Caparo three-part test is still relevant to establishing a duty of care following the case of Robinson - uncertainty may cause unfairness • Difficulty arises when the case involves a novel situation where existing principles cannot be applied. Can the Caparo test be used or only the incremental approach? However, it is probably only in a very small number of cases where the court will be faced with this situation • Deciding whether a duty of care exists is an effective and fair way of filtering negligence claims before issues of breach and causation are considered. This helps to reduce the number of claims brought before the court • Policy reasons remain a consideration and justification for the protection of certain groups. This can be considered unfair particularly when the reason is the 'floodgates argument'. There are situations where ordinarily a duty would be owed but, due to public policy, it is not imposed - this can be considered unfair • Whilst a duty of care may not be established due to public policy and thus unfair, there are other avenues of compensation for example via the Criminal Injuries Compensation Authority and the Human Rights Act 1998 • There is regulation of, for example, the legal profession, police etc by regulatory bodies which avoids abuse of the civil process by claimants. <p>To achieve level 4 there should be at least one extended point. To achieve full marks there should be a conclusion.</p>	<p>8 AO3 1a</p>	<p>Use Levels of Response criteria</p> <p>Level 4 (7-8 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent analysis and evaluation of a wide range of legal rules and principles. • The response is wide ranging and has a well sustained focus on the question. • The key points are fully discussed and fully developed to reach a valid conclusion. <p><i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and substantiated.</i></p> <p>Level 3 (5-6 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good analysis and evaluation of a range of legal rules and principles. • The response has a mainly consistent focus on the question. • Most of the key points are well discussed and well developed to reach a valid conclusion. <p><i>There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information on presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.</i></p> <p>Level 2 (3-4 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic analysis and evaluation of legal rules and principles. • The response is partially focused on the question. • Some of the key points are discussed and partially developed to reach a basic conclusion. <p><i>The information on has some relevance and is presented with basic structure. The information on is supported by limited evidence.</i></p> <p>Level 1 (1-2 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited analysis of legal rules and/or principles.

	Credit any other relevant point(s).		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The response has limited focus on the question.• Discussion of any key points is minimal. <p><i>The information on is limited and communicated in an unstructured way. The information on is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.</i></p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>
--	-------------------------------------	--	---

Need to get in touch?

If you ever have any questions about OCR qualifications or services (including administration, logistics and teaching) please feel free to get in touch with our customer support centre.

Call us on

01223 553998

Alternatively, you can email us on

support@ocr.org.uk

For more information visit



ocr.org.uk/qualifications/resource-finder



ocr.org.uk



Twitter/ocrextams



/ocrextams



/company/ocr



/ocrextams



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS & ASSESSMENT

OCR is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge.

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored. © OCR 2024 Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee. Registered in England. Registered office The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA.

Registered company number 3484466. OCR is an exempt charity.

OCR operates academic and vocational qualifications regulated by Ofqual, Qualifications Wales and CCEA as listed in their qualifications registers including A Levels, GCSEs, Cambridge Technicals and Cambridge Nationals.

OCR provides resources to help you deliver our qualifications. These resources do not represent any particular teaching method we expect you to use. We update our resources regularly and aim to make sure content is accurate but please check the OCR website so that you have the most up-to-date version. OCR cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions in these resources.

Though we make every effort to check our resources, there may be contradictions between published support and the specification, so it is important that you always use information in the latest specification. We indicate any specification changes within the document itself, change the version number and provide a summary of the changes. If you do notice a discrepancy between the specification and a resource, please [contact us](#).

Whether you already offer OCR qualifications, are new to OCR or are thinking about switching, you can request more information using our [Expression of Interest form](#).

Please [get in touch](#) if you want to discuss the accessibility of resources we offer to support you in delivering our qualifications.