

No part of the candidate evidence in this exemplar material may be presented in an external assessment for the purpose of gaining credits towards an NCEA qualification.

3

91436



914360



NEW ZEALAND QUALIFICATIONS AUTHORITY
MANA TOHU MĀTAURANGA O AOTEAROA

QUALIFY FOR THE FUTURE WORLD
KIA NOHO TAKATŪ KI TŌ ĀMUA AO!

SUPERVISOR'S USE ONLY

Level 3 History, 2017

91436 Analyse evidence relating to an historical event of significance to New Zealanders

9.30 a.m. Friday 24 November 2017
Credits: Four

Achievement	Achievement with Merit	Achievement with Excellence
Analyse evidence relating to an historical event of significance to New Zealanders.	Analyse, in depth, evidence relating to an historical event of significance to New Zealanders.	Comprehensively analyse evidence relating to an historical event of significance to New Zealanders.

Check that the National Student Number (NSN) on your admission slip is the same as the number at the top of this page.

You should attempt ALL the questions in this booklet.

Pull out Resource Booklet 91436R from the centre of this booklet.

If you need more room for any answer, use the extra space provided at the back of this booklet.

Check that this booklet has pages 2–11 in the correct order and that none of these pages is blank.

YOU MUST HAND THIS BOOKLET TO THE SUPERVISOR AT THE END OF THE EXAMINATION.

Merit

TOTAL

17

ASSESSOR'S USE ONLY

INSTRUCTIONS

Read ALL the sources in Resource Booklet 91436R before you begin answering the questions in this booklet.

QUESTION ONE: PERSPECTIVES

One of the key tasks of the historian is to use sources to understand the past.

Using the **Introduction** and **Sources A1–A8**, analyse the TWO perspectives on the survival story of the *Rose-Noëlle* crew.

~~On June 4th 1989, the Rose-Noëlle left NZ early~~

The survival story of the crewmembers 118 days at sea is one very divisive between the sources, many finding it holds merit while others believe it to lack legitimacy.

The Los Angeles Times (source A1) reported of the event on October 22, 1989. The article seems to hold reservations on how truthful the event was, remarking the reason many people find fault in the story to do with "despite losing up to 40 pounds each, ... [the crew] survived the stormy winter in ~~in~~ such good shape people doubt their story", as well as the lack of "pressure-point or salt sores" found on the crew members.

Another source disbelieving of the event was a medical report of Phillip Hoffman a day after a few days after ~~the~~ returning to New Zealand (source A8). It claims Hoffman was seen in hospital with "no complaints" and had no "abnormalities" when clinically examined.

His blood work was also within normal limits, though "mildly anemic". These points contribute to the issues the Los Angeles Times found in regards to the physical health the men seemed to show being abnormal to the conditions they had suffered in while at sea for 118 days.

In contrast to these opinions Sail Magazine (A6) contributes their healthiers appearance to the fact they "broke into a home, helped themselves to clothes and food" before calling loved ones. Sail Magazine believes the fact the men were resourceful enough to find somewhere to recover is the reason they appear less effected by the incident as people believed they would look. Sailing Savior fame published a photograph of crew member John Glennie a few days after the event, showing "loose skin... to demonstrate the weight loss after 118 days at sea". The photo-graph does seem to be accurate with how one would look after facing such a hard terrain for an extended period of time.

Professor Brian A. Foster's report on the barnacles on the Rose-Noelle also match the time at sea recorded, stating "the size of the barnacles on the boat is proportional to the length they lived on the floating object" as well as "the largest barnacle length supporting an estimate of between 60 - 90 days" of aging at sea.

QUESTION TWO: GENERAL AND SPECIFICASSESSOR
USE ONLY

An important relationship in history is the General and Specific.

Explain how the differing accounts by Glennie in **Sources C1** and **C2** provide specific example(s) of the general arguments made by MacMillan in **Source B**.

Margaret MacMillan argues that memories are something which change with time. Following an event we can remember details more vividly but at the same time can end up doctoring our own remembrance in favour of making the experience seem more exciting and important.

Sources C1 and C2 differ quite drastically in terms of Glennie's remembrance of the food and water conditions on the boat. In the C1, Glennie speaks more joyfully about the experience at sea. He claims "our good physically condition was due to the fact I had a lot of food on board" and that the crew enjoyed his company "I was interested in keeping them alive... I got the crew to get interested in various projects and tried to simplify make them think it was their ideas in order to boost their morale".

However in C2, as a reward of the account taken in 2011, Glennie admits to have "lost

most of the food" and fresh water. He also claims his "inexperienced crew didn't like him" due to his perceived strengths on sea. He also states in the later rendition to not caring for his crew members, rather "creating" what he thought would happen next once he "got back on land" unlike the other crew who "were in despair and thought they would die" - a contradiction to his previous claims of attempting to boost morale. This was most likely due to at the event he wanted to appear as the team leader who kept everyone together.

In C1 he appears to be more nurturing to the other crew members, telling them how to "never get salt water sores" and looking ahead while C2 shows a slightly bleaker, single-person focused directive for the event. This relates to Macmillan's belief of how we as people "edit our memories to make our roles seem more attractive and important" and later on in life when reevaluating those memories they can change yet again due to "times and attitudes" changing over the years.

QUESTION THREE: HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE

A key skill of the historian is to determine the significance of events.

Using **Sources D, E, and F**, and any other sources in the resource booklet, analyse the extent to which the *Rose-Noëlle* was a significant historical event in New Zealand.

You could consider the:

- national and international impacts of the event
- personal, social, economic, and legal implications/effects
- importance of the outcomes to New Zealand and New Zealanders.

The *Rose-Noëlle* holds significance to New Zealanders ~~because of a large~~ ~~event~~ due to a sense of national pride at the fact that a group of New Zealand people managed to survive such hard circumstances. Source (F) taken from NZ On Screen show just how proud people were in 1989 of the crewmen and what they accomplished to survive out at sea.

The impact extended to parliament, resulting in the installation of satellite technology for radio beacons to pick up on other stranded vessels. The *Rose-Noëlle* acted as a means to help people understand that these events could have been avoided had the proper plans been put in. When asked by Dr Sutton

if the "installation of local terminal in NZ would save lives", Hon. Jeffery responded "Yes... the radio beacon would be picked up by the satellite (beacon of a drifted vessel)... received by the local user terminal

during questions in parliament

and show the precise location of that vessel.", pointing political/legal involvements the incident made. Source E, a recommendations ~~list~~ from an inquiry into the loss of Naele also supported more oversight and training into vessels, inclusive of their departure, and monitoring. It included a request that "all NZ yachts departing overseas be required to report their position to NZ every 24 hours" - showing that the event had large political and legal impacts on NZ. It also effected things internationally, as the monitoring system and satellite track had to be available out of NZ.

Q1	M6	Both Perspectives correctly identified and the evidence in the sources is correctly utilised to describe the reasons behind each perspective. Some attempt to provide a contrast / comparison between some of the A1-A8 sources. Better than an A due to the quantity of evidence used and the use of sources to support / contradict each other, but not at E as source A1 is treated simplistically and there is an overall lack of quality discussion of how the evidence supports either perspective.
	M6	Explicit links with B made and examples used from C1/C2. A range of ideas are extracted from the sources and used to illustrate MacMillan's points about memory, some of which reflect a more complex understanding of the source.
	M5	Several examples of significance are given. Minor attempt at categorisation, but a range of ways the Rose Noelle was significant are discussed with specific evidence from the sources. Slightly better than A4 as while there is some narration there is also some discussion of the relationship of the wreck to those events.
	17	Merit