

## Abstract

This thesis reviews the history of the impasse in the debate that has continued for over one hundred years in the modern human origins research discipline. The scope of the debate was investigated. The history of the development of continuity models and the history of the development of replacement models in the discipline was then detailed. Three groups of possible causes for the impasse were outlined. These are: a poor database available to researchers in the field; methodological problems in the approaches used by participants in the debate; and the operation of opposing paradigms in the debate. These three groups of suggestions were assessed and none were found to be a complete reason for the continuation of the impasse in the debate.

Following this review a sample of sixty two bibliographies, drawn from papers written by continuity and replacement supporters was assessed. Two forms of statistical test were used, Chi squared and t-testing. Using the chi squared testing it was found that there were statistically significant differences in the true proportions of eight reference categories used by continuity supporters and replacement supporters. Furthermore the t-testing revealed that the main differences in the reference categories used was in the two categories written by continuity supporters and replacement supporters respectively. Each group of author cited literature written by members of the same group in preference to that written by the opposing group of authors.

Kuhn's concept of paradigm crisis was then compared to the situation in the debate. It was found that this concept did not fit the situation of the debate or with the results outlined in this thesis. It was suggested that a more gradualistic model of scientific change better fits both the situation in the debate and the results of this thesis.

Finally, in conclusion, it was suggested that a large portion of the cause of the continuing impasse is probably the result of an acquired culture of disagreement among the participants in the debate.