

PRINCIPLES OF LAW II – PAPER 6**1.0 General Performance**

- The pass rate was approximately 71.08% up from 62.69%, in the December 2010 examinations diet.

2.0 PERFORMANCE IN INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS**2.1 Question 1:**

- This was a set of 20 multiple choice questions taken from the entire syllabus and tested candidates' understanding of the subject as laid out in the syllabus.
- These questions were overall well attempted; the majority of the candidates scored above 10 out of the 20 marks allocated.
- It seemed that the candidates had covered the whole syllabus while preparing for the examination

2.2 Question 2:

- Part (a) was a case study question based on company law whereby candidates were required to raise and resolve issues arising from the facts and part (b) required candidates to give possible defences for the intended defendants.
- The question was not well answered; about a half of the total number of candidates attempted it and scored below 10 marks out of 20.
- In part (a) candidates failed to raise and resolve issues. Part (b) of the question was also poorly answered.
- Poor performance was as result of failing to raise issues. Failure to raise issues led to failure to resolve them as there was nothing to resolve.

2.3 Question 3:

- Part (a) of the question was another case study question whereby candidates were required to raise and resolve issues while part (b) required candidates to explain the duties of the director of a company.
- The question was not well answered; most candidates scored below 10 out of 20 marks allocated.
- It was clear candidates had not adequately prepared in this area of the syllabus.

2.4 Question 4:

- Part (a) was another case study requiring candidates to raise and resolve issues disclosed by the facts in the scenario and part (b) required candidates to give possible defenses available to the defendants.
- It was poorly answered; most candidates scored below 10 out of the 20 marks allocated.
- Poor performance was as a result of failure to raise issues and resolve them as required by the question.

2.5 Question 5:

- It required candidates to explain the ways in which a private company differs from a public company.
- The question was well answered; about 70% of the candidates who attempted it scored above 5 out of the 10 marks allocated.

2.6 Question 6:

- Required candidates to explain the merits and demerits of incorporating a company as a business entity.
- This question was attempted by more than half of the candidates, the majority of whom scored above 5 out of the 10 marks allocated.

The question was generally well answered.

2.7 Question 7:

- Required candidates to explain the rights of members of a company.
- It was attempted by more than a half of the candidates the majority of whom scored above 5 out of 10 marks allocated.
- The question was generally well answered.

2.8 Question 8

- Required candidates to describe 5 major general defences of a tort of negligence.
- It was attempted by less than a half of the total candidates majority of whom scored less than 5 out 10 marks allocated
- This was not well answered as most of those who attempted it seemed not to have understood the defences of tort of negligence.

2.9 Question 9

- Part (a) required candidates to define defamation while part (b) required the candidates to give general defences for tort of defamation.
- Part. (a) of this question was well answered and part (b) was also well answered as majority of the candidates who attempted both parts scored 5 or more marks out of 10.