

Candidate Marks Report

Series : 6 2018

This candidate's script has been assessed using On-Screen Marking. The marks are therefore not shown on the script itself, but are summarised in the table below.

Centre No :	Assessment Code :	J411
Candidate No :	Component Code :	14
Candidate Name :		

Total Marks : 35 / 80

In the table below 'Total Mark' records the mark scored by this candidate.
'Max Mark' records the Maximum Mark available for the question.

Paper:	J411/14	
Paper	35 / 80	
Total:		
Question	Total / Max Mark	Used In Total
1a	1 / 1	✓
1b	1 / 1	✓
1c	1 / 1	✓
2	1 / 9	✓
3	7 / 10	✓
4	7 / 18	✓
5	NR / 18	
6a	3 / 3	✓
6b	5 / 5	✓
7	8 / 12	✓
8	NR / 20	
9	1 / 20	✓

Off Page Comments

Item Name	Comment
Section A.Q1-3.2	This candidate talks about new technologies - list of developments but no valid support from 20th century - Level 1 - 1
Section A.Q1-3.3	Para 1 and 2 are valid, 3 is about industrial Britain so not valid then returns to Middle Ages from then on although reference to manor courts is incorrect
Section A.Q4/Q5.Q4.4	Lack of money leads to highway robbery is Level 2 Poverty around harvests leads to vagrants is Level 3

Question Part

1	a	One way to avoid trial in the period 1250 - 1500 was to buy a pardon off the king. ✓ 1
1	b	In the period 1500 - 1750 one example of crime of the changing nature was highway robbery. ✓ 1
1	c	One development of punishment in the period 1750 - 1900 was that you would be forced to work without pay in order for your redemption. ✓ 1
0	2	Crime in the 1900's of Britain (present) was much higher than early modern Britain as new technologies emerged. ✓ 1
		Due to roads being built in the early-modern, meant that crime could increase from this point named 'highway robbery'. Gangs would trespass vehicles and rob all sorts of goods they could get hold of; this led to trade being a shortage as farmers couldn't afford to grow more crops as they were not making a profit.
		Furthermore on this point, people would leave farms when the harvest failed - causing more jobs to go out of reach.



Question Part

0	3	<p>The law was that the felonies (most serious crimes) were held at the minor courts, where juries felt more lenient as their punishment would be to be publically hanged.</p> <p>The law started to differ as JP's (Justice of peace) took over most people's rolls.</p>
	<p>✓ 4</p>	<p>law became more organised as the police force, <u>watchmen</u> and <u>JP's</u> came more into use to capture the <u>outlaws</u>.</p>
0	4	<p>I strongly agree that economic problems were the most important factor influencing crime rates in the period 1500-1750 as people were desperate to do commit crime for a better lifestyle.</p>
	<p>✓ 1</p> <p>✓ 2</p> <p>SEEN</p>	<p>Firstly, roads, railways and transportation links started to be built in early modern Britain; meaning theft was the most common crime due to highway robbery. People would commit this crime due to the lack of money they received; meaning they couldn't afford food for themselves and families - leaving the only open option was to rob goods from a cart and either eat them or sell them for worthless profit.</p>
		<p>Furthermore, this increased homicide rates as</p>



Question Part

0	4	<p>fights would break out when the crime took place. Concluding the fact the thief would be SEEN on the run to avoid the trial.</p>
		<p>Another reason why economic problems affected crime rates is because when harvest failed, food shortages would break out; creating another reason why people should <u>left to survive</u>. Not only this, farmers would have no profit from the crops causing them to become <u>vagrants</u>. Vagrants were not allowed to leave the village in search for work, many people 3 would still try and get away from this as long as they could avoid the watchmen.</p>
		<p>Altogether, I feel economic problems were the biggest influence as money represented power and a SEEN wider range of options from sufferers. Only the rich were able to afford to buy a pardon off SEEN the king and be let free, the poor risked many factors they had no choice in committing. Not only that, having was a at to huge money problem and owning land could be taken over if you didn't have the right to own it.</p>



Question Part

6	a	In interpretation A, Norman Castles are illustrated as means of control and power as having a castle stood a symbol of wealth, power and leadership.
		The artist does this by including <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> knights below the hill which the castle sits on, almost as if they are guard guarding it and <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> are prepared for battle; as the the castle is where you would seek safety during an attack, (even safer being on top of a hill).
		Control is justified through how it is organised and if others dare to take on their prepared army.
6	b	If I was to investigate further research on interpretation A, I would do further research <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> on the structure of the castle and how they could be <u>negative</u> for the motte and bailey set up.
		This would help us to understand the Norman



Question Part

6	b	<p>castles better as we can establish here ideas on thoughts and planning before battle; as I know that the wood (timber) was easy to set fire too but was much cheaper and quicker to build than a stone castle.</p>
	✓ 3	<p>I would investigate what happens when the moat fills up with water and whether it was beneficial for the Normans on the inside of it. I would investigate if the purpose of it was for enemies to draw in or if it made the castle look more threatening.</p>
0	7	<p>Both interpretation B and C differ as interpretation B strongly agrees that the life of Anglo-Saxon women was more than good enough.</p> <p>However, we may not be able to fully trust Octavia Randolph as he writes "historical fiction" which could lead to exaggeration in the true facts beneath women. Randolph claims that Anglo-Saxon women had "appropriate rights and freedoms," but Marc Morris claims it all to be a "myth."</p> <p>Furthermore, we can trust Morris more, as he is a qualified historian who may have gathered</p>



Question Part

0	9	<p>I agree with David Hawarth's book "1066: The Year of the Conquest" that it took William SEEN five years to bring the country under his power as originally, he was a nobody.</p>
		<p>William started off as William of Normandy and worked his way to the throne by giving sympathy and promises to the earl who would confront him; only to find he was also blood related to Edgar who was before him.</p>
		<p>NAQ However, before William became known as William William the Conqueror; after the battle of Stamford bridge in 1065, then there another bloody battle awakened in 1066, the battle of Hastings (taking up already 2 years to earn power).</p>
		<p>I believe William earned his power for the country by winning the battle, by killing Harold with an arrow to the eye on horseback. However, William became quickly respected by the Normans after his NAQ making him come to power rapidly with his men.</p>
		<p>Furthermore, I feel I can trust Hawarth due to being a historian; and take it as a moral that by not giving up William got what he deserved in the end, no matter how long it took.</p>



Question Part

0	a	1066 w
		<p>1066 was the year William conquered England and he didn't let no-one forget it. This was William's last biggest year for surviving and winning the battle, and no battles took place involving him again as he settled and became a successful leader and so did the fyrd. The fyrd were an army led by the eorls and promised to be used when the land king needed them, meaning William was king during the battle - explaining why Harold Godwinson was in battle for his place.</p>
		<p>I now strongly agree within the five years William's power increasingly got better, signifying why 1066 was his time to shine and why he deserved to win.</p>



