

Assessment Schedule – 2022

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

Evidence

Question One: Perspectives

The candidate analyses different perspectives surrounding the decision to continue the 1972 Olympic Games after the Munich Terrorist Attack, using the Introduction and Sources A–F.

Achievement		Achievement with Merit		Achievement with Excellence	
A3	A4	M5	M6	E7	E8
<p>Attempts to interpret the Introduction and Sources A–F to analyse different perspectives surrounding the decision to continue the 1972 Olympic Games after the Munich Terrorist Attack.</p> <p>Includes some reference to the Introduction and Sources A–F to attempt to explain the historical concept of perspectives, using at least ONE referenced generalisation that addresses the question.</p>	<p>Interprets the Introduction and Sources A–F to analyse different perspectives surrounding the decision to continue the 1972 Olympic Games after the Munich Terrorist Attack.</p> <p>Includes reference to the Introduction and Sources A–F to explain the historical concept of perspectives, using at least TWO referenced generalisations that address the question.</p>	<p>Attempts to interpret the Introduction and Sources A–F to analyse in some depth different perspectives surrounding the decision to continue the 1972 Olympic Games after the Munich Terrorist Attack.</p> <p>Includes some specific reference to the Introduction and Sources A–F to explain the historical concept of perspectives, using at least TWO substantiated generalisations that show some understanding of different perspectives surrounding the decision to continue the Olympic Games after the Munich Terrorist Attack.</p>	<p>Interprets the Introduction and Sources A–F to analyse in depth different perspectives surrounding the decision to continue the 1972 Olympic Games after the Munich Terrorist Attack.</p> <p>Includes specific reference to the Introduction and Sources A–F to explain thoroughly the historical concept of perspectives, using at least TWO substantiated generalisations that show understanding of different perspectives surrounding the decision to continue the Olympic Games after the Munich Terrorist Attack.</p> <p>Shows use of cross-referencing to other sources.</p>	<p>Interprets the Introduction and Sources A–F to analyse comprehensively, with some insight, different perspectives surrounding the decision to continue the 1972 Olympic Games after the Munich Terrorist Attack.</p> <p>Includes some specific, relevant reference to the Introduction and Sources A–F to explain insightfully the historical concept of perspectives, selecting the most relevant information and examples to support perceptive generalisations that show a clear understanding of different perspectives surrounding the decision to continue the Olympic Games after the Munich Terrorist Attack.</p> <p>Shows developed use of cross-referencing to multiple sources.</p>	<p>Interprets the Introduction and Sources A–F to analyse comprehensively, with insight, different perspectives surrounding the decision to continue the 1972 Olympic Games after the Munich Terrorist Attack.</p> <p>Includes specific, relevant reference to the Introduction and Sources A–F to explain insightfully the historical concept of perspectives, discerningly selecting the most relevant information and examples to support perceptive generalisations that show a clear understanding of different perspectives surrounding the decision to continue the Olympic Games after the Munich Terrorist Attack.</p> <p>Shows clearly developed use of cross-referencing to multiple sources.</p>

N0 = No response; no relevant evidence.

N1 = Some relevant evidence, but extremely limited.

N2 = Relevant evidence but may not have interpreted the sources correctly or may not have the historical concept of perspectives correct; or may have ignored the specifics of the question; or shows insufficient depth of analysis for Level 3.

Sample Evidence

Achievement	Achievement with Merit	Achievement with Excellence
<p><i>Interpretation of the evidence and analysis of perspectives could include, but is not limited to:</i></p> <p>Generalisations that recognise the perspectives of individuals or groups such as “Many athletes wanted the games to continue”.</p> <p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People wanted to cancel the games out of respect. • People wanted to continue, maintaining the games as a purely sporting event. 	<p><i>Interpretation of the evidence and in-depth analysis of perspectives could include, but is not limited to:</i></p> <p>Generalisations that recognise TWO different perspectives such as “A variety of different people wanted the games to continue”.</p> <p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The games were about athletic competition and so should have continued. • Keeping the games politically neutral has been important to the success of the Olympics. 	<p><i>Interpretation of the evidence and comprehensive analysis of perspectives could include, but is not limited to:</i></p> <p>Generalisations that recognise TWO different perspectives and acknowledge the complexity of those perspectives such as “Many wanted the games to continue but for a variety of reasons and motivations”.</p> <p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The games were supposed to involve a truce, which was broken by the attack. • The IOC Mission Statement discusses political neutrality and rule 50 of the Olympic Charter forbids political demonstrations. These principles were challenged by the Munich attack.
<p>Source A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some officials wanted them cancelled. • The entire Philippine athletics team and 13 Norwegian athletes went home. • Others wanted them continued as it was a career highlight, e.g. Kenny Moore. 	<p>Source A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many were very surprised that the games continued, even terrorist organiser Abu Iyad. • Highlights the determination of athletes to continue, and how they were set on their goals. • Some candidates may note that many did not want to bow to the terrorist attack and carry on, for example U.S. athlete Kenny Moore. • Israeli Shmuel Lalkin did not want to give in to the terrorists, i.e. thought the games should continue. 	<p>Source A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some may have been young or naïve in their decision to continue competing. • The IOC’s application of pressure on the German Government indicates that at least some of the decision-making power lay with the Germans, not the IOC. <p><i>(A perceptive candidate may note the resonance of the death of Israeli / Jewish athletes in Germany in any decision that was made; and / or a perceptive candidate may cross-reference the opinions with those of other sources, e.g. Moore and Shorter with that of Robert Oliver in Source C.)</i></p>
<p>Source B</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chief of Israel’s team wanted the games to continue in the spirit of the Olympics. • President of the IOC Avery Brundage wanted the games to continue. 	<p>Source B</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brundage held the ideals of the Olympics as more important than the attack. • Lalkin wanted the games to continue in “the spirit of world sportsmanship”. 	<p>Source B</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alludes to commercial pressure to carry on with the games. <p><i>(A perceptive candidate may note the decision to continue was a compromise – one day of mourning, but then the games continued; and / or a perceptive candidate may note that Lalkin’s explanation of his view has evolved from Source A; and / or a perceptive candidate may note that Brundage described the attack as ‘criminal’.)</i></p>
<p>Source C</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robert Oliver felt it was his dream, a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity. 	<p>Source C</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80,000 spectators at the final day of competition indicates that many people were happy for the games to continue. 	<p>Source C</p> <p><i>(A perceptive candidate may note that Oliver’s is the only New Zealand athlete’s perspective given; and / or a perceptive candidate may explicitly compare and / or contrast Oliver’s perspective and those in other sources.)</i></p>
<p>Source D</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A simplistic account of Quinn’s view. 	<p>Source D</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keith Quinn used the games to further his career as more than a sports reporter. 	<p>Source D</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keith Quinn’s views changed as the games went on, from gloom to shock. <p><i>(A perceptive candidate may note that Robert Oliver and Keith Quinn wanted to carry on, although Quinn thought the games would be cancelled.)</i></p>

<p>Source E</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perspectives • Cartoonists note / hint that the Olympic spirit was damaged. 	<p>Source E</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perspectives • Cartoonists' views are cynical despite the games taking place, e.g. use of caskets instead of hurdles. • (A candidate may attempt to separate the personal and letters / accounts in Source F from the cartoonist viewpoints.) 	<p>Source E</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perspectives • Cartoonists aim to make a point that is satirical / political / thought-provoking, therefore their view is not so personal. • (A perceptive candidate may note differences between the personal perspectives in Source F and the cartoonists' views.)
<p>Source F</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows various viewpoints. • Norman Harris felt it bad they carried on, worse if stopped. • Some felt the Olympic spirit was damaged. • Editorial notes that cohesion developed, not division. 	<p>Source F</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Represents a wide array of opinions. • (A candidate may note it is from The Press, therefore a Christchurch or New Zealand viewpoint.) 	<p>Source F</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Represents diversity. • Editorial from The Press, therefore a Christchurch or New Zealand viewpoint. • (A perceptive candidate may note this shows the global effect of the event.)

Question Two: Continuity and change

The candidate analyses the ways that the campaign to memorialise the 11 athletes killed shows continuity and change, using Sources G and H.

Achievement		Achievement with Merit		Achievement with Excellence	
A3	A4	M5	M6	E7	E8
<p>Attempts to interpret Sources G and H to analyse the ways that the campaign to memorialise the 11 athletes killed shows the historical concept of continuity and change.</p> <p>Includes some reference to Sources G and H to attempt to explain the historical concept of continuity and change, using at least ONE referenced generalisation that addresses the question.</p>	<p>Interprets Sources G and H to analyse the ways that the campaign to memorialise the 11 athletes killed shows the historical concept of continuity and change.</p> <p>Includes reference to Sources G and H to explain the historical concept of continuity and change, using at least TWO referenced generalisations that address the question.</p>	<p>Attempts to interpret Sources G and H to analyse in some depth the ways that the campaign to memorialise the 11 athletes killed shows the historical concept of continuity and change.</p> <p>Includes some specific reference to Sources G and H to explain the historical concept of continuity and change, using at least TWO substantiated generalisations that show some understanding of why continuity and change occurred in the campaign to memorialise the 11 athletes.</p>	<p>Interprets Sources G and H to analyse in depth the ways that the campaign to memorialise the 11 athletes killed shows the historical concept of continuity and change.</p> <p>Includes specific reference to Sources G and H to explain thoroughly the historical concept of continuity and change, using at least TWO substantiated generalisations that show understanding of why continuity and change occurred in the campaign to memorialise the 11 athletes.</p>	<p>Interprets Sources G and H to analyse comprehensively, with some insight, the ways that the campaign to memorialise the 11 athletes killed shows the historical concept of continuity and change.</p> <p>Includes some specific, relevant reference to Sources G and H to explain insightfully the historical concept of continuity and change, selecting the most relevant information and examples to support perceptive generalisations that show a clear understanding of the ways that the campaign to memorialise the 11 athletes show this concept.</p>	<p>Interprets Sources G and H to analyse comprehensively, with insight, the ways that the campaign to memorialise the 11 athletes killed shows the historical concept of continuity and change.</p> <p>Includes specific, relevant reference to Sources G and H to explain insightfully the historical concept of continuity and change, discerningly selecting the most relevant information and examples to support perceptive generalisations that show a clear understanding of the ways that the campaign to memorialise the 11 athletes show this concept (may show use of cross-referencing to other sources).</p>
<p>N0 = No response; no relevant evidence. N1 = Some relevant evidence, but extremely limited. N2 = Relevant evidence but may not have interpreted the sources correctly or may not have the historical concept of continuity and change correct; or may have ignored the specifics of the question; or shows insufficient depth of analysis for Level 3.</p>					

Sample Evidence

Achievement	Achievement with Merit	Achievement with Excellence
<p><i>Interpretation of the evidence and analysis of continuity and change could include, but is not limited to:</i></p> <p>Source G</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A simplistic account of how the campaign to get a memorial took a long time – Munich memorial opened in 2017, 45 years after. 	<p><i>Interpretation of the evidence and in-depth analysis of continuity and change could include, but is not limited to:</i></p> <p>Source G</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuity: pressure to build a memorial. • Change: Memorials built 40 to 50 years after the event. <p><i>(A candidate may note that the IOC clung to the view that “politics and sports don’t mix” and were possibly worried about further controversy.)</i></p>	<p><i>Interpretation of the evidence and comprehensive analysis of continuity and change could include, but is not limited to:</i></p> <p>Source G</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The view that “politics and sports don’t mix” is a common one in the sources, and the IOC adhered to this for a long time. • The change was due to considerable pressure from the families of the Munich victims, whose considerable letter writing led to the change. <p><i>(A perceptive candidate may note that building memorials can take a very long time.)</i></p>
<p>Source H</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It took many decades before the event was given public recognition by the IOC. • It took nearly 50 years for an official commemoration for the 11 Israeli athletes at the 2021 Tokyo Olympics. 	<p>Source H</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thomas Bach explains the change in the IOC’s attitude to any memorial. 	<p>Source H</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The change in IOC President appears to have something to do with the IOC’s willingness to have a memorial. • Spitzer claims that there has been a change in the way the 11 victims have been remembered: from politically (Israelis) to “members of the Olympic family”. • Spitzer and Romano appear to be part of an official group at the Tokyo Opening Ceremony, indicating a large change in the IOC’s attitude.

Question Three: Reliability and usefulness

The candidate analyses the reliability and usefulness of Sources D and E to historians studying the significance of the Munich Terrorist Attack.

Achievement		Achievement with Merit		Achievement with Excellence	
A3	A4	M5	M6	E7	E8
<p>Attempts to analyse the reliability and usefulness of Sources D and E to historians studying the significance of the Munich Terrorist Attack.</p> <p>Includes some reference to BOTH Sources D and E to attempt to explain the historical concept of reliability and usefulness in the context of the significance of the Munich Terrorist Attack.</p>	<p>Analyses the reliability and usefulness of Sources D and E to historians studying the significance of the Munich Terrorist Attack.</p> <p>Includes reference to BOTH Sources D and E to explain the historical concept of reliability and usefulness in the context of the significance of the Munich Terrorist Attack.</p>	<p>Attempts to analyse in depth the reliability and usefulness of Sources D and E to historians studying the significance of the Munich Terrorist Attack.</p> <p>Includes some specific reference to BOTH Sources D and E to explain the historical concept of reliability and usefulness, using at least TWO substantiated generalisations that show some understanding of the significance of the Munich Terrorist Attack.</p>	<p>Analyses in depth the reliability and usefulness of Sources D and E to historians studying the significance of the Munich Terrorist Attack.</p> <p>Includes specific reference to BOTH Sources D and E to explain thoroughly the historical concept of reliability and usefulness, using at least TWO substantiated generalisations that show understanding of the significance of the Munich Terrorist Attack at the time.</p>	<p>Analyses comprehensively, with some insight, the reliability and usefulness of Sources D and E to historians studying the significance of the Munich Terrorist Attack.</p> <p>Includes some specific, relevant reference to BOTH Sources D and E to explain insightfully the historical concept of reliability and usefulness, selecting the most relevant information and examples to support perceptive generalisations that show a clear understanding of the significance of the Munich Terrorist Attack at the time (may show use of cross-referencing to other sources).</p>	<p>Analyses comprehensively, with insight, the reliability and usefulness of Sources D and E to historians studying the significance of the Munich Terrorist Attack.</p> <p>Includes specific, relevant reference to BOTH Sources D and E to explain insightfully the historical concept of reliability and usefulness, discerningly selecting the most relevant information and examples to support perceptive generalisations that show a clear understanding of the significance of the Munich Terrorist Attack at the time (shows use of cross-referencing to other sources).</p>
<p>N0 = No response; no relevant evidence. N1 = Some relevant evidence, but extremely limited. N2 = Relevant evidence but may not have interpreted the sources correctly or may not have made valid comments on their reliability or usefulness; or may have ignored the specifics of the question; or shows insufficient depth of analysis for Level 3.</p>					

Sample Evidence

Achievement	Achievement with Merit	Achievement with Excellence
<p><i>Interpretation of the evidence and evaluation of reliability and usefulness could include, but is not limited to:</i></p> <p>Source D</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reliable to an extent because Keith Quinn is relying on his memory. Useful as Quinn was in Munich as a reporter at the time. First-hand account. 	<p><i>Interpretation of the evidence and in-depth evaluation of reliability and usefulness could include, but is not limited to:</i></p> <p>Source D</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quinn is relying on his memory, but 44 years have passed, and the human memory is not perfect. Quinn, himself, admits to being selfish and acting in his own interests. Quinn was in Munich as a paid New Zealand reporter – this could mean he may have been more prone to bias. Quinn remembers the Munich Attack as significant for him personally, but also in an international context. Quinn still remembers the event many years later, indicating that it has an ongoing, durable significance for him. Quinn’s account is useful, as it confirms that many at the Olympics assumed the games would be cancelled. <p><i>(A candidate may note this source is a blog, and a historian should always double-check sources.)</i></p>	<p><i>Interpretation of the evidence and comprehensive evaluation of reliability and usefulness could include, but is not limited to:</i></p> <p>Source D</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited reliability, as the human memory is not perfect, and Quinn is writing years later. Gives an interesting view, in that he is a reporter and not an athlete. Quinn’s account could be compared against that of Norman Harris’s in Source F to indicate that many other reporters shared Quinn’s view of the international significance of the event. Historians may wish to check Quinn’s account of his reporting of the Munich Attack by accessing the reports that he made. Historians could access reviews of Quinn’s work to see if he is considered a reliable source. Quinn’s account is useful because it extends the idea presented by Oliver that athletes at the Olympics were “narrow-minded” to journalists present at the games. Quinn’s memory of the possibility that the Olympics could be cancelled is supported by fellow journalist Harris’s account in Source F. <p><i>(A candidate may note anyone can set up a blog.)</i></p>
<p>Source E</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited reliability, as just the viewpoint of the cartoonist. Cartoons often make a point that is political, satirical, ironic. Cartoons are useful, as they offer views on the games and the nature of politics and sport. <p><i>(A candidate may note that the usefulness of cartoons is limited, as they are just one person’s view and prone to bias.)</i></p>	<p>Source E</p> <p><i>(A candidate may note, supported by a clear example, that the usefulness of cartoons is limited in some ways, as they are just one person’s view and prone to bias; and / or a candidate may note elements of the cartoons, such as the coffins or flags, and use this evidence to explain how the cartoons would be useful to a historian studying the significance of the attack.)</i></p>	<p>Source E</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reliable to an extent, but they are just the viewpoint of the cartoonists. A British and Australian cartoon feature, but there are no New Zealand cartoons, or from any other countries. The cartoonists’ use of black shading indicates their views on the dark nature of what happened. <p><i>(A perceptive candidate may note the absence of any Palestinian point of view, and that a historian would want to understand how Palestinians viewed the significance of the Munich Attack; and / or a perceptive candidate may note that both cartoons were published in the immediate aftermath of the Munich attack and that historians would also be interested in the longer-term significance of the attack.)</i></p>

Cut Scores

Not Achieved	Achievement	Achievement with Merit	Achievement with Excellence
0 – 8	9 – 12	13 – 18	19 – 24