Year 11 Modern History

Assessment Task 1 2024

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TOPIC**: Decline and Fall of the Romanov Dynasty – Source Analysis | **MARKS:** /35 |
| **SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS:**  This task must be submitted via Canvas by midnight on Thursday 14th of March 2024 (Term 1, Week 7)  *Please follow the correct illness/misadventure process if you cannot submit the task by the required time.* | **WEIGHTING:**  35% |
| **OUTCOMES TO BE ASSESSED:**  MH11-2: **Proposes** ideas about the varying causes and effects of events and developments.  MH11-4: **Accounts** for the different perspectives of individuals and groups.  MH11-7: Discusses and **evaluates** differing interpretations and representations of the past. | |
| **DIRECTIONAL VERBS:**  **Account:** State reasons for, report on. Give an account of; narrate a series of events or transactions.  **Evaluate:** Make a judgement based on criteria; determine the value of.  **Propose -** Put forward (for example a point of view, idea, argument, and suggestion) for consideration or action. | |
| **TASK DESCRIPTION:**  The Romanov dynasty is full of conspiracy and mystery, historians widely debate their reigning years and downfall. Demonstrate your understanding of the perspectives of the life and legacy of the last Romanov family by choosing a range of historical sources which highlight the role of Nicholas a leader as demonstrated during the event ‘Bloody Sunday’ of 1905.  Choose a variety of **3** historical sources and **evaluate** the interpretations of each piece of evidence. This should include both primary and secondary sources, as well as visual and written sources. **Account** for the differing perspectives of Nicholas leadership as highlighted by this event. You are to conclude each source analysis by **proposing** a reason as to why the Romanov dynasty fell. | |
| **ASSESSMENT CRITERIA:**  You are to choose a mixture of primary, secondary, and visual sources to demonstrate your knowledge of the chosen are of debate. You are to **evaluate** the value and validity of each source and must **account** for the perspectives revealed. For each source you also must **propose** the reason why the Romanov Dynasty ended.  The assessment must:   * Include **3** historical sources that directly relate to the chosen area of debate * Be approximately **3 A4 pages in length**, a page dedicated to each chosen source. * Evaluate the value and validity of the source in showing the decline and fall of the Romanov dynasty by commenting on:   + Perspective, Reliability and usefulness to determine value and validity.   **Your source analysis should consider the following points**  Propose reasons why the Romanov Dynasty ended: Here you are essentially looking at cause and effect. What happened during Bloody Sunday, what was the reaction of Tsar Nicholas II (or others) and what impact did this have on the Romanovs and their ability to maintain their rule? What does this reveal about Russia under Nocholas’ leadership.  Account for the different perspectives on the effectiveness of Tsar Nicholas II as a ruler and the Romanov Dynasty in general: Here you should be presenting the different viewpoints of Tsar Nicholas, and the Romanovs. For example, what are the positive representations of the Romanovs? What are the negative representations of the Romanovs? This would be a good place to use your pieces of evidence. Remember, you should present both primary and secondary evidence.  Evaluate the interpretations presented by your pieces of evidence: How well do your pieces of evidence present an interpretation of Tsar Nicholas II? What are the factors that might impact on the usefulness and reliability of your evidence? How might your evidence have impacted on our views towards the Romanovs today?  Account for the different theories revolving around the decline of the Romanovs: Explain the different theories of what may or may not have impacted the rule of the Romanov dynasty. Here you need to conclusively explain what the largest contributor to the decline of the Romanovs was. Was it Bloody Sunday?  Task check list:   * Word document format, no less than 3A4 pages. Size 12, plain font. * Mixture of text and visual materials. * At least 3 sources. * Mixture of primary and secondary sources. (Visual and written) * **Propose** a reason why the Romanov Dynasty ended. (Specifically, what about Nicholas’ leadership shown in the Bloody Sunday event) * **Account** for the different perspectives of Nicholas’ leadership. * **Evaluate** the interpretations presented by your pieces of evidence.   **SOURCE ANALYSIS GUIDE**  **Use the information above to help you consider PRU (value and validity)**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Test for reliability | Test for perspective | | * Type of source * Date * Author * Purpose * Audience * Factual content * Partisanship * Underlying ideology * Choice of words * Evidence in support * Degree of specific detail * Consistency within itself * Verifiability * Source acknowledgement | * Time * Gender * Power/Authority * Partisanship * Proximity * Social class * Nationality (be careful!) | | REMEMBER: **P**erspective + **R**eliability = **U**sefulness | |   **Perspective**: What is the point of view being portrayed and what are some of the influencing factors of this? i.e. gender, nationality, etc.  **Reliability**: Can we trust this source? Here you need to make a judgement. Consider the bias of the source, if there are corroborating accounts or other evidence available to support the assertions made by this source.  **Usefulness**: Consider the perceptive and reliability of this source, as well as the content, etc. Can we use this source to support our historical argument? Remember: Unreliability or bias does not preclude a source from being useful, but rather it depends on the context in which we wish to use this source.  **Formula to use in a Value and Validity response:**  Please note that in the sections highlighted yellow you will need to provide your own information and judgements when you apply this formula to your specific question.  Source (A) is a (primary/secondary) source. It is a (cartoon, diary entry, speech extract, photograph, table of statistics etc.) from (comment on the origin of the source in as much detail as you can). It shows (describe the content of the source in detail).  The **perspective** of Source (A) is that of (talk in detail about the perspective – consider nationality, class, gender, age, politics, involvement in the event, time source created – see table above).  Source (A) (would/would not) be considered **reliable** because (say why we can or cannot trust the information in the source – is it an accurate reflection of events, is it for personal or public consumption, can the information be verified by other sources).  In consideration of the perspective and reliability it can be concluded that Source (A) (is / is not) **valid** because (state your reasons – make it a strong evaluative statement).  By examining Source (A) we can see that it is (very/partially) **useful** to an historian studying (restate the topic from the question) because (give a reason for your judgement based on the tests that you have applied for perspective and reliability).  Therefore Source (A) (can / cannot) be seen as (extremely, very, reasonably, somewhat) **valuable** to an historian studying (restate the topic from the question) because (state your reason).  **PLEASE DO NOT USE THIS SOURCE / COPY THIS INFORMATION**  **Example layout**  **Nicholas Leadership**  **Source A Information:** Alexander Kerensky, Russian politician and Prime Minister in 1917   |  | | --- | | Alexander Kerensky, Russian politician and Prime Minister in 1917  ‘The daily work of a monarch he found intolerably boring. He could not stand listening long or seriously to ministers’ reports or reading them. […] He liked such ministers as could tell an amusing story and did not weary the monarch’s attention with too much business.’ |   **Evaluation:**  Source A is a primary source written not long before Nicholas’ death. It is a written extract by Alexander Kerensky who was a lawyer, revolutionary and later a key political figure in the newly formed Russian provincial government, who was later overthrown by the Bolsheviks. It describes a perspective of Nicholas’ leadership as Tsar of Russia by stating he was disinterested in the roles and responsibilities of his position. This might suggest Nicholas was not interested in being Tsar which may have impacted his ability to lead Russia throughout a highly contentious time.  The **perspective** of Source A is that of a Russian politician who had a variety of roles on the provincial government. He began as a lawyer and played a key role in the multiple revolutions in Russia at the time. He was not supportive of the monarch and joined the newly formed provincial government following the abdication of Nicholas. He had many roles including War minister, Justice minister and the governments second minister-chairman.  Source A would be considered **reliable** because it shows the valuable perspective of a Russian politician that saw may events that shaped the decline of the Romanov dynasty. Kerensky privy to the social discontent of Russia under Nicholas’ leadership which reveals a valuable perspective of the time. His on Nicholas is reflective of many people at the time, however it may be influenced by his opinions on the Russian monarch at the time.  In consideration of the perspective and reliability it can be concluded that Source A is **valid** because it demonstrates Nichola’s disinterest in being the tsar of Russia from someone that experienced the events. When considering the difficult political and social environment that Nicholas inherited from his father, it can be concluded that a strong and committed leader was required to successfully navigate the discontent. This source shows the lack of effort and drive by Nicholas which reveals his poor leadership and eventual abdication. This made Nicholas’ very unpopular and contributes strongly to the decline of the Romanov Dynasty.  By examining Source A we can see that it is somewhat **useful** to an historian studying the effectiveness of Nicholas’ leadership the largest contributing factor of the decline of the Romanov Dynasty. This is because of the opinions revealed by Kerensky as a key political figure in the last years of Nicholas’ life reveals an insightful perspective of the troubled times. We must also keep in mind his role as a revolutionary as a potential bias in speaking negatively about Nicholas’ leadership.  Therefore, Source A can be seen as reasonably **valuable** to an historian studying the effectiveness of Nicholas as a leader because it reveals the opinions of Nicholas’ abilities as tsar of Russia at the time of his rule, abdication and eventual death. It highlights the frustration of Kerensky and reflective of the opinions of key political figures of the time. Furthermore, the source provides an insight into Nicholas’ weak image and unpopularity in Russia, This recognises his inability to be authoritative and reflective the principles of tsarism that he did not, or neglected to inherit from his father. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ASSESSMENT MARKING CRITERIA** | | |
| MH11-2 **Proposes** ideas about the varying causes and effects of events and developments.  MH11-4 **Accounts** for the different perspectives of individuals and groups.  MH11-7 Discusses and **evaluates** differing interpretations and representations of the past. | **Mark** | **Grade** |
| An outstanding and sophisticated source analysis has been produced which meets the stipulated requirements for the task. The student outlines with detail and clarity, the chosen area of debate and **proposes** a sophisticated and relevant argument for the fall of the Romanovs. In-depth and consistent, **evaluation** of a variety of sources has been used to effectively comment on the value and validity of the sources. The different perspectives of individuals and groups has been **accounted** for in a detailed and relevant way. | 29-35 | A |
| A thorough source analysis has been produced which meets the stipulated requirements for the task. The student outlines, in detail, the chosen area of debate and **proposes** an argument for cause of the fall of the Romanovs. A clear **evaluation** of a variety of sources has used to comment on the value and validity of the sources. The different perspectives of individuals and groups has been **accounted** for in a relevant way. | 22-28 | B |
| A sound source analysis has been produced which mostly meets the stipulated requirements for the task. The student effectively outlines some of the relevant issues of the chosen area of debate, as well as some reason for the fall of the Romanovs. An **evaluation** of the sources is attempted which may comment on the value and/or validity, and there is some **accounting** for the differing perspectives of sources. | 15-21 | C |
| A basic source analysis has been produced which attempts to meet the stipulated requirements for the task. The student identified some of the relevant issues of the chosen area of debate and may describe a reason for the fall of the Romanovs. A description of the sources is evident which may lack appropriate detail when indicating the value and validity of the sources. The differing of perspectives may or may not be attempted. | 8-14 | D |
| A limited source analysis has been produced which does not meet the stipulated requirements for the task. Limited identification of the chosen area of debate and reasons for the fall of the Romanovs. Sources may or may not be included in this task. | 0-7 | E |