

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 :

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

Question Part

1	a	One way to avoid trial in the period 1250-1500 was to buy a pardon off the king.
1	b	In the period 1500-1750 one example of crime of the changing nature was highway robbery.
1	c	One development of punishment in the period 1750-1900 was that you would be forced to work without pay in order for fe redemption.
0	2	Crime in the 1900's of Britain (present) was much higher than early modern Britain as new technologies emerged.
		Due to 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	2	<p>Also, due to the population being high; theft was the most common crime, leaving people on the streets known as vagabonds. A new law was set for this, making it illegal to leave your village in search for work. However this crime still continued due to the bad conditions they would face without money in pocket.</p>
0	3	<p>From the period 1250-1500 in the medieval era; law and order changed for the better in some circumstances.</p> <p>There was no police force; so the public had to police themselves on an oath of honesty. They would spot things such as theft and vagabonding and report it to the JP's or Parish constable who would then swear an oath to the king they were not lying.</p> <p>Law and order changed from this point as in Industrial Britain, a police force was formed and the parish constable would enforce the law. Because of this, Sheriff's who were the king's chief became less important and hardly had any remaining power.</p>



Question Part

0	3	<p>The law was that the felonies (most serious crimes) were held at the manor court, where juries felt more lenient as their punishment would be to be publically hanged.</p> <p>The law started to differ as JPs (Justice of peace) took over most people's rolls.</p>
		<p>Law became more organised as the police force, watchmen and JPs came more into use to capture the outlaws.</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>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

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 the knights below the hill which the castle sits on, almost as if they are guarding guarding it and 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 on the structure of the castle and how they could be negative 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>
		<p>I would investigate what happens when the motte 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	7	<p>factual research before publishing his extract. Both extracts light up their differences as Morris confirms that women were much "freer, more liberal" before the Normans arrived in 1066. When the "golden age" struck, women's blessings started started to degrade.</p> <p>Randolph didn't mention this, but only stated that women had the "right to own land" but does not say in what time era. From Morris' knowledge, I can guess that women's rights dropped after 1066 and owning 5% of the land dropped degraded for women and their golden time was over.</p>
---	---	---



Question Part

0	9	<p>I agree with David Hawarth's book "1066: The Year of the Conquest" that it took William 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. 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 this, 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>



