**History 316: Group Project: Amy B, Emily B, and Dean B.**

**Summary on decisions made when constructing Database, and any issues, and limitations encountered.**

The source we were given was Appendix 6 from ‘Well Done the 68th’ by John Bilcliffe, which is a list of soldiers who served in New Zealand but for various reasons did not receive a medal.

The first task we undertook was deciding which categories to include in our database. From the source itself we constructed categories that represented rank, types of fatalities, whether they served in Crimea, etcetera. Interestingly, some were prisoners, which raised the question why members of the regiment would be imprisoned. We were unable to answer this using the source.

On categorising the soldiers from our source it became apparent that we were going to have large amount of categories, so we were wary of the database becoming too confusing and complicated. We wanted to make it as user friendly as possible. This was a factor in deciding to leave out a soldier who was invalided home, as well as a soldier who was wounded at Gate Pah, but died in England.

After finding soldiers who served in the 2/18th Irish regiment, we conducted some research but were unable to establish the significance of this detail. Possibly they were on loan to the 68th, or just got separated from their own regiment during the battle. As we can only speculate, we omitted this information from our database.

As a point of interest, this source does not include those soldiers whom had received a medal, but for various reasons had it stripped. This source only states those who did not receive a medal.

We did question the ambiguity and accuracy of the source when we found Pte. George Pendelton, who was listed as having died in New Zealand but had died “in Sydney” after his name. We can only assume this meant Sydney, Australia and not a ship, or a place called Sydney in New Zealand.

The source we received detailed when some of the soldiers were killed. This explains why those who died before 1869 did not receive a campaign medal, but does not justify why they didn’t get any other medals. Additionally, it does not explain why those who dided after 1869 did not receive the campaign medal. A few soldiers are listed as having been imprisoned, having deserted, or being deleted from the roll, which explains their exclusion from the medal roll, but they are a minority. The source fails to explain why the majority of these soldiers did not receive a medal.

Overall, we deemed this source to be not very comprehensive. We have to question its reliability as we found an innacuracy and several amiguities. A couple of names have question marks and others are missing a regiment number, and the source fails to explain why this is.