

Assessment Schedule – 2017

History: Analyse evidence relating to an historical event of significance to New Zealanders (91436)

Assessment Criteria

Achievement	Achievement with Merit	Achievement with Excellence
<i>Analyse</i> involves using historical skills to interpret evidence in order to demonstrate an understanding of historical concepts.	<i>Analyse in depth</i> involves using historical skills to interpret evidence in order to demonstrate a thorough understanding of historical concepts.	<i>Comprehensively analyse</i> involves using historical skills to interpret evidence in order to demonstrate an insightful understanding of historical concepts. <i>Insightful</i> includes 'reading between the lines' to draw conclusions that go beyond the immediately obvious, and demonstrating a high degree of engagement with the evidence.

Evidence

Question	Achievement	Achievement with Merit	Achievement with Excellence
ONE Perspectives	<p>Analyses the evidence by explaining the differing perspectives on the <i>Rose-Noëlle</i>.</p> <p>Candidate has interpreted the evidence to show an understanding of the differing perspectives.</p> <p>Some reference to the sources made.</p> <p>Response may be limited and / or be a generalisation created from a superficial examination of the sources. They MUST discuss the TWO perspectives: (1) It was a hoax, and (2) the men are telling the truth.</p> <p>For A4, candidate responses need to be explicit in identifying the two perspectives.</p> <p>Response could include some of the following points:</p> <p>Evidence for hoax could be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some saw the event as a “hoax” as their journey went against the prevailing / main wind currents. Winds should have taken them in opposite direction. Men look healthy in photo. <p>Evidence for truth could be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Photo of John Glennie showing weight loss. Barnacles on boat (reference to photo). <p>Achieved responses may:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> examine the sources sequentially, treat the sources as containing distinct, individual perspectives that see the story of the Rose-Noëlle as true or not. 	<p>Evaluates the evidence by explaining, in depth, the differing perspectives on the <i>Rose-Noëlle</i> survival story.</p> <p>Analyses and explains the differing perspectives on the <i>Rose-Noëlle</i> with specific and detailed evidence.</p> <p>In-depth reference to the sources made.</p> <p>Candidate can refer to perspectives / evidence as listed for Achievement, but they must develop and expand on them.</p> <p>A developed and balanced response may include mention of the following:</p> <p>Hoax:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The healthy nature of the survivors led some to think it was a hoax. For M6 this idea should be expanded by drawing on sources A1 and A8, which mention lack of pressure sores or salt sores, and no noticeable medical conditions in the hospital report. A strong candidate would perhaps mention that these sores are “almost universal” in other similar incidents of long sea voyages. Wind patterns: Winds should have taken them to South America. <p>Truth:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The barnacles on the boat pointed to a very long time at sea, therefore it was not a hoax. A strong Merit candidate would draw on both A2 and A3 when discussing this point. Official inquiry found it to be true (Introduction). Changed wind pattern to take them toward NZ not away from it. <p>Merit responses may:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compare and contrast evidence from sources A1–A8 when examining the sources. 	<p>Evaluates with discernment the evidence by explaining, in depth, the differing perspectives on the <i>Rose-Noëlle</i> survival story.</p> <p>Comprehensive reference to the sources made.</p> <p>Appropriate and relevant evidence from the specified sources is used to support perceptive generalisations. Candidate analyses and explains the differing perspectives of the <i>Rose-Noëlle</i> with specific and detailed evidence showing insight.</p> <p>Response could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion of the nature of hoaxes in history – often people bring forward a debate around the legitimacy of events. Considers possible motives for the hoax such as gaining wealth / money / fortune. One of the crew was offered money, as supported by Source from <i>LA Times</i>. (However, candidate could also note this would not be a sufficient amount to make a “hoax” worth it). Candidate may note the original search area and the failure to find the boat. This led some to think it was a hoax. Initial investigator, Capt. Melvyn Bowen, concluded it was the truth. <p>Excellence responses may:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effectively use relevant evidence from sources other than the introduction and A1–A8 in analysing either / or perspective. <p>For E8 candidate draws a conclusion as a historian about the most plausible perspective.</p> <p>Consider other relevant answers; the list above is not exhaustive.</p>

Question	Achievement	Achievement with Merit	Achievement with Excellence
<p>TWO General and Specific</p>	<p>Interprets the evidence by identifying the general argument provided by MacMillan and describing how it specifically applies to Glennie's accounts.</p> <p>Response is limited, and / or evidence from the specific sources lacks depth.</p> <p>Response could include:</p> <p>A discussion on the nature of memory from Source B. Such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We often remember some details more vividly than other details. • We do not always remember accurately. • We are selective in what we remember. <p>Considers the account directly after the event as Glennie's recount of "fact"; experiences and how they survived are the key details recalled. The vivid details centre around the food and drink etc. Statement was taken straight after the event so likely to be more accurate.</p> <p>OR the personal account written in 2011. This account is very different. A lot more emotive.</p> <p>Candidate may not explicitly / directly link the arguments from Source B to the examples of C1 and / or C2.</p> <p>Differing accounts of food, i.e. Source C1 notes they ate well, but this changes in Source C2.</p> <p>Achieved responses may:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only contain a superficial understanding of the ideas contained in B. • Implicitly connect B to C1 and / or C2. • Only refer to C1 or C2, but must refer to B. • Accurately comment on Source B, and accurately compare C1 and C2, but the general idea from B may not be fully congruent with the example from C1 and C2. • Typically include reference to ONE general idea from B. 	<p>Evaluates evidence by explaining the general argument provided by MacMillan and how it specifically applies to Glennie's accounts.</p> <p>Response must include specific reference to the sources indicated in the question.</p> <p>Response could include:</p> <p>Discussion of memory from Source B as with Achievement but also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Memory changes / is malleable. • We edit our memory. <p>Candidate explicitly links arguments made by MacMillan to C1 and / or C2.</p> <p>Candidate discusses how the memory has CHANGED, could include some of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Account C2 much more narrative and story-like in its tone • Focuses on attitude / morale of the crew • Adds crew dynamic into the account more • Makes himself the "hero" • Reference to different timings of the accounts given. • Source C2 highlights his happiness, which means his memory has been altered years after the event. <p>Merit responses may:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Typically include TWO general ideas from B. • Typically refer to both C1 AND C2 in showing how Glennie's memory has changed. 	<p>Evaluates with discernment the evidence by analysing the general argument provided by MacMillan and how it specifically applies to Glennie's accounts.</p> <p>Responses must include specific and detailed reference to the sources indicated in the question.</p> <p>Response could include:</p> <p>Discussion of memory from Source B: as with Achievement / Merit but also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Memory shared too often becomes an embellished story that replaces the "raw memory". • Memory changes, to reflect changing attitudes or subsequent knowledge. <p>Candidate links arguments made by MacMillan to C1 and / or C2 as in Merit.</p> <p>Candidate makes perceptive comments such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May explore the comment "experience is personal truth" or "you can manifest whatever you desire into reality". • Mentions how lack of food etc. could have impacted on the clarity of the memory. • Time distorts / changes memory, highlights happiness when he saw the plane. <p>Consider other relevant answers; the list above is not exhaustive.</p>

Question	Achievement	Achievement with Merit	Achievement with Excellence
THREE Significance	<p>Assesses the evidence and explains some issues of significance.</p> <p>Response is limited, and / or evidence from specific sources lacks depth.</p> <p>Response could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evidence contained in these sources shows that the event was of some significance. • The evidence in these sources is useful because it shows that they survived for a long time. This makes it significant. • It led to some television shows. • Was newsworthy. • Talked about in parliament (Source D). • Was an inquiry (Source E), and several recommendations were made. • Deeply affected family members of the crew (Source F). <p>At least two valid issues relating to significance are discussed for Achieved.</p>	<p>Evaluates the evidence and explains issues of significance of most sources.</p> <p>Response must include specific reference to the sources indicated in the question.</p> <p>Response could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some sources show that it was a huge event, e.g. it appeared in overseas papers. • The fact that the media gave it attention at the time, and since, means it is a large event. E.g. turned into books, and TV programmes. • Some sources suggest that the event drew a negative view. Some viewed it as a hoax, but a more detailed examination revealed it to be true. This adds to the event's significance. • Discussed in parliament in terms of maritime safety. • The fact that the <i>Rose-Noëlle</i> led to a change in our laws is mentioned. There may be only limited explanation of this. • The fact it drew an official government inquiry highlights its importance. • Candidate places this event into context, but not convincingly. E.g. "This event is relatively important but it is not as important as other maritime events or disasters such as the Wahine disaster where lives were lost." Other NZ survivor stories may also be used to place this into context. • Candidate categorises significance inconsistently / superficially: personal, national, international. 	<p>Evaluates the evidence with discernment and explains issues of significance.</p> <p>Responses must include detailed and specific reference to the sources indicated in the question.</p> <p>Response could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The event was very significant, as it was discussed in parliament with the Minister of Transport, and this led to the introduction of new technology that would cost 2–3 million dollars. • The event drew overseas attention. This would be rare for a small country like New Zealand. It appeared in the <i>LA Times</i>. • That (assuming recommendations were taken up by the government) the fact that the <i>Rose-Noëlle</i> led to a change in our laws is expanded upon. It is a significant event as it led to legal change. • New Zealand is a maritime / island country and events like this are significant. Many New Zealanders live by the water. • Candidate places this event into context convincingly. E.g. "This event is significant but it is not as important as Gallipoli, WWII, or the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi. E.g. Gallipoli led to ANZAC day, which is a day of national remembrance." • It is significant, but it needs to be seen in relation to other events, e.g. WWI and WWII. • Candidate categorises significance such as personal, national, international, or legal, economic, social. <p>Consider other relevant answers; the list above is not exhaustive.</p>

N0 = No response; no relevant evidence.

N1 = some relevance to the question or sources, but extremely limited.

N2 = Relevant to the question and sources, but may not have interpreted sources correctly, or does not explain the historical concepts, may not have perspectives correct, or references to general and specific, or has not explained a relevant issue related to significance.

Cut Scores

Not Achieved	Achievement	Achievement with Merit	Achievement with Excellence
0 – 8	9 – 13	14 – 18	19 – 24