FREE SAMPLE: THE SOURCES (INTRODUCTION TO SOURCE E) AND PARTS (a) A

Question One (24 marks)

Use the resource booklet: the Introduction and Sources A–I.

(a) Cause and effect: What led to the 1981 Springbok tour causing such deep division and widespread protest in New Zealand? Use evidence from the Introduction and Sources A–E to support your argument.

[8 marks]

TEST PAPERS HUB - NOT FOR RESALE OR REDISTRIBUTION

(b) Continuity and change: In what ways do Sources A, B, E and I show continuity and change in New Zealanders' attitudes to race and sport between 1960 and 1985? You may use evidence from any of the other sources.

[8 marks]

TEST PAPERS HUB - NOT FOR RESALE OR REDISTRIBUTION

(c) Significance: How do Sources F–I show the extent to which the 1981 Springbok tour is a significant event in New Zealand history? You may use evidence from any of the other sources.

[8 marks]

TEST PAPERS HUB - NOT FOR RESALE OR REDISTRIBUTION

Free sample from NCEA Level 3 History 91436 91438 91439 (paper 1 of the set). Full papers with a worked solution for every question: testpapershub.com

THE WORKED ANSWERS TO PARTS (a) AND (b)

Question 1 (24 marks) [Analyse evidence (91436)]

Use the resource booklet: the Introduction and Sources A–I.

(a) Cause and effect: What led to the 1981 Springbok tour causing such deep division and widespread protest in New Zealand? Use evidence from the Introduction and Sources A–E to support your argument.

(a) Answer: The 1981 tour caused deep division because it brought together three older disputes that New Zealanders had never settled: whether race should decide who plays for New Zealand, whether the government should keep politics out of sport, and whether New Zealand's own treatment of Māori was fair. The first cause was a long history of racial selection. Source A shows that from 1948 to 1969 Māori players were passed over for tours of South Africa, and that by 1960 150,000 New Zealanders (6.25 percent of the population) had signed the "No Maoris, No Tour" petition. The tour went ahead anyway, which left a grievance that a group such as HART (formed in 1969) could organise around. This generalisation is supported by Source B, where the Kirk government barred the 1973 tour because South Africa still picked players by race.

• Model answer (continued): The second cause was disagreement about the role of government. Muldoon allowed the tour in 1981 on the argument that "politics should stay out of sport" (Source D), yet he had signed the Gleneagles Agreement in 1977, which committed Commonwealth governments to "taking every practical step to discourage contact" with South African sport (Source C), and his own deputy warned that a tour could harm the Commonwealth. Critics believed he allowed it for votes (Source D). Because the government seemed to be ignoring its own commitment, opponents saw the tour as a test of whether New Zealand would act on its principles, and each side felt the other was breaking the rules of the community.

• Model answer (continued): The third cause, which turned a sporting dispute into a national one, was the link to race at home. Source E shows protesters, especially young Māori, rejecting the image of New Zealand as "a paradise for racial unity", while John Minto thought the tour opened up a debate about "racism and the place of Māori in our community". The causes were not agreed even among Māori, because Kevin Taylor and others supported the tour or thought New Zealand should "fix its own issues" first. So the tour polarised New Zealand (Introduction) because it was the point where disagreements about race, government and sport met; the immediate trigger was the government's decision to let the Springboks in, but the underlying causes were older and went to how New Zealanders saw themselves.

• How this part is marked (NZQA 8-point scale, TPH marks out of 8): Cause and effect.

• Level A (3-4): Interprets the Introduction and Sources A-E and attempts to explain what led to the division, using at least ONE referenced generalisation: for example, that people had opposed race-based rugby since 1960 (Source A) or that the government allowed the tour (Source D).

• Level M (5-6): Interprets the sources in depth and explains cause and effect with at least TWO referenced generalisations: for example, a long-standing grievance about race (Sources A, B) AND a dispute about the government's role (Sources C, D), each backed with specific evidence (150,000 signatures; the 1973 ban; the Gleneagles quotation; "politics should stay out of sport").

• Level E (7-8): Interprets the sources comprehensively and shows insight: separates immediate cause (the government's decision to allow the tour) from underlying causes, links the sources to each other (Gleneagles against Muldoon's argument), and notices that causes were contested even among Māori (Source E, Kevin Taylor).

• Strong answers (E): use specific evidence from the sources (names, dates, numbers and

TESTPAPERSHUB - NOT FOR RESALE OR REDISTRIBUTION

quotations), say what each piece of evidence shows about the concept, and link the sources to each other.

KEY TAKEAWAY

A cause-and-effect answer gives several causes, separates the trigger from the long-term background, and ties each cause to a specific piece of evidence.

(b) Continuity and change: In what ways do Sources A, B, E and I show continuity and change in New Zealanders' attitudes to race and sport between 1960 and 1985? You may use evidence from any of the other sources.

(b) Answer: Between 1960 and 1985 there was continuity in the argument about whether race and politics should affect sport, but a significant change in how many New Zealanders were willing to act on it and in how they saw race inside New Zealand. Continuity first: in 1960 (Source A) and again in 1973 (Source B) the question was the same, whether New Zealand teams and visitors should be chosen by race. Source A shows 150,000 people petitioning against race-based selection, and Source B shows the NZRFU still answering with the same defence, that this was "politics in sport", and Muldoon using the same words in 1981 (Source D). The opposing sides therefore used the same arguments for more than twenty years, which suggests that the underlying attitudes had not been settled.

- Model answer (continued): What changed was how much weight the opposing view carried. In 1960 the petition did not stop the tour (Source A). By 1973 a government was prepared to bar the Springboks (Source B), by 1977 Commonwealth governments had signed the Gleneagles Agreement (Source C), and by 1985 a court stopped the NZRFU from touring South Africa (Source I). Opposition had moved from a petition to law, which shows a change in what New Zealanders expected of sport. A second change was that race at home became part of the debate: in 1960 the issue was Māori players going to South Africa, but in 1981 protesters were using the tour to question "racism and the place of Māori in our community" (Source E), and Patu! (Source I) told the story from a Māori perspective, which recognised a Māori point of view in the national story.
- Model answer (continued): The change was uneven, however. Source E shows that Māori themselves disagreed, and the tour was still allowed in 1981, with the government re-elected (Source I), so a large part of the population still held the older attitude that sport and politics should be separate. The overall pattern is therefore change in the strength and range of opposition, with continuity in the arguments and in the divided opinion about them.
- How this part is marked (NZQA 8-point scale, TPH marks out of 8): Continuity and change.
- Level A (3-4): Interprets the sources and identifies at least ONE continuity OR change, with a referenced generalisation: for example, that in 1960 a petition did not stop the tour but in 1985 a court did (Sources A, I).
- Level M (5-6): Explains BOTH continuity and change with at least TWO referenced generalisations: the same "politics in sport" argument in 1973 and 1981 (continuity) against the shift from petition to a government ban and a court injunction (change).
- Level E (7-8): Analyses the pattern over time with insight: change in the strength of opposition and in the inclusion of race at home (Source E, Patu!), continuity in the arguments, AND the unevenness of the change (Māori divided; the government still re-elected in 1981).
- Strong answers (E): use specific evidence from the sources (names, dates, numbers and quotations), say what each piece of evidence shows about the concept, and link the sources to each other.

TEST PAPERS HUB - NOT FOR RESALE OR REDISTRIBUTION

Free sample from NCEA Level 3 History 91436 91438 91439 (paper 1 of the set). Full papers with a worked solution for every question: testpapershub.com

KEY TAKEAWAY

For continuity and change, compare the same thing at two dates, say what stayed the same and what changed, and judge how much real change took place.

(c) Significance: How do Sources F–I show the extent to which the 1981 Springbok tour is a significant event in New Zealand history? You may use evidence from any of the other sources.

(c) Answer: Sources F to I show that the tour was a highly significant event in New Zealand history, mainly because of how deeply it affected people's lives at the time, how long its effects lasted and how it changed behaviour afterwards, although its effect on some matters was smaller than its reputation suggests. The depth of the effect on people at the time is shown by the violence and the policing. Source F records a pitch invasion in Hamilton, a crowd throwing bottles and a match cancelled; Murray Ball, whose father was an All Black, found it "strange for New Zealanders to feel so aggressive towards other New Zealanders". Source H records 201 arrests and more than 90 injuries at Eden Park, and the army, razor wire and shipping containers used to protect grounds. These measures show an event that disrupted a country's normal life, and Source G shows how it changed the way police and protesters behaved: the first riot squads in New Zealand with visors and long batons, and protesters putting on helmets.

- Model answer (continued): The effects also lasted. Source I shows that in 1985 a court stopped the next tour, that no official sporting contact with South Africa took place until the early 1990s, and that the tour produced a lasting cultural record in Patu!, which was added to the UNESCO register in 2012, more than thirty years later. These facts show that the event continues to be remembered by New Zealanders and affects how the country sees itself.
- Model answer (continued): There are limits to the significance, however. Source I also shows that the Muldoon government was re-elected, with a majority of one, so the immediate political effect was small and the tour did not end the government. The Introduction notes that no deaths or serious injuries resulted, and Source G shows the police actions were seen differently by Newnham and Meurant, so even the meaning of the event was contested. Overall the tour is significant because it affected many people deeply, left a lasting legacy in sport and culture, and still divides memory, but its political effects were less direct than its social ones.
- How this part is marked (NZQA 8-point scale, TPH marks out of 8): Significance.
- Level A (3-4): Interprets Sources F-I and identifies why the tour was significant with at least ONE referenced generalisation: for example, that it caused arrests and injuries (Source H) or led to the 1985 cancellation (Source I).
- Level M (5-6): Explains significance using the criteria in the explanatory notes (how deeply lives were affected; how long the effects lasted) with TWO or more generalisations, each supported with specific evidence from the sources (201 arrests; riot squads; 1985 injunction; Patu! in 2012).
- Level E (7-8): Weighs the extent of the significance with insight: both the depth and length of effects AND the limits (government re-elected; no deaths; contested meaning in Source G), reaching a judgement.
- Strong answers (E): use specific evidence from the sources (names, dates, numbers and quotations), say what each piece of evidence shows about the concept, and link the sources to each other.

KEY TAKEAWAY

To judge significance, use the criteria (how many people, how deeply, for how long, how it is remembered) and say where the event was less significant.

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

TEST PAPERS HUB - NOT FOR RESALE OR REDISTRIBUTION