

570

'O' and 'A' Level Examinations in History - a content analysis,
its implications for Teaching and for the Reform of the G.C.E.
Syllabus

W.F.J. INGLIS

Thesis submitted in fulfilment

of the

requirements for the degree

of

Doctor of Philosophy

of the

University of Stirling

Department of Education
February 1978



IMAGING SERVICES NORTH

Boston Spa, Wetherby

West Yorkshire, LS23 7BQ

www.bl.uk

**TEXT CUT OFF IN THE
ORIGINAL**



IMAGING SERVICES NORTH

Boston Spa, Wetherby

West Yorkshire, LS23 7BQ

www.bl.uk

**PAGE NUMBERING AS
ORIGINAL**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my particular thanks to my two supervisors Professor R. Campbell for his overview of the whole thesis and for his thorough and illuminating criticism of the general arguments used in the study and to Mr D. McIntyre for his detailed and helpful advice on the methodology, statistical processes and presentation of the results.

I would also like to give my thanks to the Joint Matriculation Board and the Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and in particular to their two officials with whom I dealt, Mr Forrest at the J.M.B. and Mr Pritchard at the Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate. Without the help of these two boards and of their officials I would have been unable to conduct this study.

Finally my thanks are also due to Miss Helen Crawford, who has typed this thesis, and who has battled through a very lengthy and complex manuscript, and, in addition, to Alec Rose, Peter Carter, Robin Lapsley and Eivind Nerberg who helped me with some of the coding and with the reliability trials.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME 1

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

Preface

| | | |
|-----------|---|----------|
| CHAPTER 1 | INTRODUCTION | 1 - 6 |
| CHAPTER 2 | METHODOLOGY | 7 - 19 |
| | (a) Methods | 7 - 10 |
| | (b) Materials | 10 - 19 |
| CHAPTER 3 | CONTENT ANALYSIS AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF A CATEGORY SYSTEM | 20 - 120 |
| | (a) Methods of Analysis | 20 - 22 |
| | (b) The Rationale for the Inclusion of Certain Types of History in the Category Systems | 22 - 55 |
| | (c) Overlap between the Categories and the Problem of their Definition | 55 - 119 |
| | Introduction | 56 - 60 |
| | Category A (Political History and its Sub categories) | 60 - 66 |
| | Sub category A1A1(s) (Foreign Politics) | 66 - 69 |
| | Sub category A2 (Structure of Government) | 69 - 71 |
| | Sub category A3 ⁴ (Domestic Politics without structure of Government) | 71 - 73 |
| | Category E (Political History - Non Government) | 73 - 79 |
| | Sub category A1(s) (Foreign Politics Individual) | 79 - 82 |
| | A2(s) (Structure of Government Individual), A3 (Domestic Politics Individual) | |
| | Category B / | |

| | | |
|-------------|---|-----------|
| | Category B (Economic History) | 82 - 86 |
| | Categories C and D (Social History) | 86 - 96 |
| | Category G (Religious History) and its sub categories | 96 - 100 |
| | Category H (Cultural History) | 100 - 104 |
| | Category J (Military and Naval History) and its sub categories | 104 - 106 |
| | Category L (Geographical History) and its sub categories | 106 - 108 |
| | Category N (Archaeology) | 108 |
| | Category M (Human and Animal Disease) | 108 - 110 |
| | Category P (Nature of History) | 110 - 111 |
| | Category X (Colonial History) | 111 |
| | Category Y (Uncodable Materials) | 111 |
| | General Issues | 111 - 119 |
| CHAPTER 4 | THE ASSESSMENT OF THE RELIABILITY OF THE CATEGORY SYSTEM | 120 - 138 |
| | The Conduct of the Reliability Trials | 120 - 121 |
| | The Unit of Analysis and the Calculations of Reliability | 121 - 122 |
| | Alternative Methods of Assessing Reliability | 123 - 130 |
| | Discussion | 131 - 138 |
| CHAPTER 5 | AVAILABILITY OF MARKING GUIDES AND THE PROBLEM OF UNCODABILITY | 139 - 155 |
| | Uncodability Within Marking Guides | 151 - 155 |
| CHAPTER 6 | INTRODUCTION TO THE RESULTS | 156 - 174 |
| | The Selection of the Most Significant Variables | 156 - 168 |
| | Tests of Significance Involving the Five Major Variables | 168 - 174 |
| CHAPTER 7 / | | |

| | | |
|-----------|---|-----------|
| CHAPTER 7 | COMPARISON OF JMB AND CAMBRIDGE LOCAL EXAMINATIONS SYNDICATE 'A' and 'O' LEVEL PAPERS ON BRITISH AND EUROPEAN HISTORY WITHIN PERIODS | 175 - 225 |
| | (a) Papers on Modern History | 175 - 193 |
| | The Influences of Exam Boards on the Categories and Sub categories in Papers on Modern History | 185 - 187 |
| | The Influences of Levels, Advanced and Ordinary, on the Treatment of Categories and Sub categories in Papers on Modern History | 187 - 190 |
| | The Influences of Types of History, British and European, on the Treatment of Categories and Sub categories in Papers on Modern History | 190 - 192 |
| | Conclusions - papers on Modern History | 192 - 193 |
| | (b) Papers on Early Modern History | 193 - 209 |
| | The Influences of Exam Boards on Categories and Sub categories in Papers on Early Modern History | 199 - 203 |
| | The Influences of Levels, Advanced and Ordinary, on the Treatment of Categories and Sub categories in Papers on Early Modern History | 204 - 206 |
| | The Influences of Types of History, British and European, on the Treatment of Categories and Sub categories in Papers on Early Modern History | 206 - 208 |
| | History | |
| | Conclusions | 209 |
| | (c) Papers on Mediaeval History | 209 |
| | The Influences of Types of History, British and European, on the Treatment of Categories and Sub categories in Papers on Mediaeval History | 215 - 224 |
| | Conclusion | 225 |
| | (d) General Conclusions on the Impact of the Boards, Levels and Types of History Within Periods | 225 - 226 |

| | | |
|------------|---|-----------|
| CHAPTER 8 | COMPARISON OF JMB AND CAMBRIDGE LOCAL EXAMINATION SYNDICATE 'A' AND 'O' LEVEL PAPERS ON BRITISH AND EUROPEAN HISTORY ACROSS PERIODS | 226 - 247 |
| | Introduction | 226 |
| | The Influence of Periods of History on 'O' and 'A' Level Papers on British and European History | 230 - 245 |
| | The Influence of Types of History, British and European, in the Comparison between Papers on Modern, Early Modern and Mediaeval History | 246 |
| | Conclusion | 246 - 247 |
| CHAPTER 9 | A COMPARISON BETWEEN TRADITIONAL AND INNOVATORY PAPERS | 248 - 255 |
| | The Influence of Methods of Examining, Traditional and Innovatory, on Categories and Sub categories in JMB 'A' Level Papers | 253 - 255 |
| | Conclusion | 255 |
| CHAPTER 10 | COMPARISONS INVOLVING JMB AND CAMBRIDGE LOCAL EXAMINATION SYNDICATE PAPERS ON BRITISH IMPERIAL AND COMMONWEALTH HISTORY | 256 - 269 |
| CHAPTER 11 | COMPARISONS INVOLVING JMB AND CAMBRIDGE LOCAL EXAMINATION SYNDICATE PAPERS ON BRITISH ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL HISTORY | 270 - 304 |
| | Section (a) Comparisons between different groups of Papers on British Economic and Social History | 270 - 281 |
| | Section (b) Comparisons between Papers on British Economic and Social History and Papers on British History | 281 - 304 |
| CHAPTER 12 | DISCUSSION OF RESULTS (1) | 303 - 359 |
| | Section A - The Impact of the Main Variables | |
| | (1) The Boards | 306 - 309 |
| | (2) The Levels of Examination | 308 - 309 |
| | (3) British and European History | 309 - 311 |
| | (4) Periods of History | 311 - 313 |
| | (5) Traditional & Innovatory Techniques in Examining | 313 - 314 |

CHAPTER 12 (continued)

Section B - The Role of Individual Categories and Sub categories in Papers on British and European History 314 - 345

- (1) Political History (Category A and its Sub categories, Category E) 315 - 326
- (2) Social and Economic History (Categories B,C and D) 326 - 329
- (3) Religious History (Categories G and its Sub categories G(a) and G(b)) 329 - 334
- (4) Cultural History (Category H) 334
- (5) Military and Naval History (Category J & its sub categories) 334 - 336
- (6) Geographical Factors, Exploration and Human Disease (Category L,L1 and L2, Category M) 336 - 338
- (7) Archaeology and the Nature of History (Categories N & P) 338 - 339
- (8) General Conclusions on the Content of Papers on British & European History 339 - 345

Section C

- (i) Papers on Imperial History 345 - 348
- (ii) Papers on Economic & Social History 349 - 359
 - (a) Economic History (Category B) 349
 - (b) Social History (Categories C & D) 349 - 352
 - (c) Religious History (Category G and sub categories G(a) & G(b)) 352 - 353
 - (d) Political History (Category A and its Sub categories, Category E) 353 - 354
 - (e) Cultural History (Category H) 355
 - (f) Military and Naval History, Geographical Factors, Exploration and Human Disease (Categories J, L, M and their dependent Sub Categories) 355 - 357
 - (g) Archaeology and the Nature of History (Categories N and P) 357 - 358
 - (h) Main Conclusions on Papers Concerned with British Social & Economic History 358
- General Conclusions 358 - 359

CHAPTER 13 A CONSIDERATION OF THE DOMINANCE OF POLITICAL HISTORY IN G.C.E. 'A' AND 'O' LEVEL PAPERS

- (a) A Description and Critique of the General Arguments which can be put forward in defence of the current Syllabus at 'A' and 'O' Level 360 - 404
 - (i) The Case against Social and Economic History 362 - 373
 - (ii) The Importance of National and Political History 373 - 386
 - (iii) /

CHAPTER 13 (continued)

- (iii) The Influence of Government Actions on the Community 386 - 399
- (iv) Political History as a Vantage Point for Surveying the Whole of Society 400 - 402
- (v) Politics as the Highest Form of Human Activity 402 - 404
- (b) Evidence in Favour of the Dominance of Political History in the 'O' and 'A' Level Syllabus 404 - 408

CHAPTER 14 AN ALTERNATIVE 'O' AND 'A' LEVEL SYLLABUS OUTLINED AND DEFENDED 409 - 476

- Section A An Alternative 'O' and 'A' Level Syllabus 409 - 426
- Section B A Broad Syllabus and the Historians' Attitudes to Their Subject 426 - 431
- Section C The Attitudes of Pupils to Different Types of History 431 - 433
- Section D General Advantages of a Broad Syllabus for the Pupils 433 - 439
- Section E The Influences of a Broad Syllabus on the Teachers' Methods 439 - 476
 - Sub Section (1) The Approaches to the Teaching of History Currently Used in Schools 439 - 444
 - Sub Section (2) The Advantages of Studying Local History and the Influences of the Present and a Broader Syllabus on its Adoption in Schools 444 - 456
 - Sub Section (3) The Patch, Era and Project Approaches to the Teaching of History and the Influence of a Narrow and a Broad Syllabus on their Adoption in Schools 456 - 465
 - Sub Section (4) The Historians' Method of Enquiry and the General Use of Historical Sources as Teaching Methods and in Relation to a Broad and Narrow Syllabus 465 - 476

TABLE OF CONTENTSVOLUME 2

| | | |
|------------|---|-----------|
| APPENDIX A | The Primary Category System | 477 - 503 |
| | (1) Category A (Politics at Home and Abroad) | 477 - 486 |
| | (1) Sub Categories A1 (Foreign Policy- Collective) and A1(s) (Foreign Policy - individual) | 477 - 479 |
| | (2) Definitions of sub categories A1 and A1(s) | 479 - 480 |
| | (3) Sub Category A2 (Structure of Government) | 480 - 482 |
| | (4) Sub Category A3 (Domestic Politics - individual) and Sub category A4 (Domestic Politics - collective) | 482 - 485 |
| | General Comments on Category A | 485 - 486 |
| | (11) Category E (Political History - Non Government) | 486 - 487 |
| | (111) Category B (Economic History) | 487 - 489 |
| | (iv) Category C (Social History - Social Custom) | 489 - 490 |
| | (v) Category D (Social History - Social Structure) | 490 - 491 |
| | (vi) Category G and its sub categories (Religious History) | 491 - 494 |
| | (vii) Category H (Cultural History) | 494 - 495 |
| | (viii) Category J (Military and Naval History) | 495 - 498 |
| | Sub Category J1 (Military and Naval History - Government) | 496 - 497 |
| | Sub Category J2 (Military and Naval History - Non Government) | 497 - 498 |
| | (IX) Category L (Geographical History) | 498 |
| | Sub Category L1 (Geographical Factors) | 498 |
| | Sub Category L2 (Exploration) | 498 |
| | (X) Category M (Human Disease) | 499 |
| | (XI) Category N (Archaeology) | 499 |
| | (XII) / | |

APPENDIX A (Continued)

| | | |
|------------|--|-----------|
| | (XII) Category P (The Nature of History) | 499 |
| | (XIII) Category Y (Uncodability) | 499 - 502 |
| | (XIV) How to Divide Up a Marking Guide for Coding | 502 - 503 |
| APPENDIX B | The Secondary Category System | 504 - 509 |
| APPENDIX C | The Calculation of the Percentages of the Marking Guides in each Category and Sub Category for Individual Papers | 508 - 509 |
| APPENDIX D | Comparison of JMB and Cambridge Local Examination Syndicate 'A' and 'O' Level Papers on British and European History Within Periods | 510 |
| | (a) Comparison of JMB & Cambridge 'O' & 'A' Level Papers on Modern British and European History | 510 - 517 |
| | (b) Comparison of JMB & Cambridge 'A' and 'O' Level Papers on Early Modern British and European History | 518 - 525 |
| | (c) Comparison of JMB 'A' & Cambridge 'O' Level Papers on British and European Mediaeval History | 526 - 530 |
| APPENDIX E | Comparison of 'A' and 'O' Level Papers on Modern, Early Modern and Mediaeval British and European History Across Periods | 531 - 538 |
| APPENDIX F | Comparison of "Innovatory" and "Traditional" 'A' Level Papers set by the JMB on British and European History | 539 - 543 |
| APPENDIX G | Comparisons Involving JMB and Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate Papers on British Imperial and Commonwealth History | 545 |
| | (a) Comparison between Sections A and B of Cambridge 'O' Level Papers on the History of the British Empire and Commonwealth | 544 - 546 |
| | (b) Comparison of Section B of Cambridge 'O' Level Papers on the History of the British Empire and Commonwealth and JMB 'O' Level Papers on the History of the British Empire and Commonwealth | 547 - 549 |
| | (c) Comparison of Papers on Early Modern Imperial and British History set by the Cambridge Board | 550 - 552 |

APPENDIX G (continued)

- (d) Comparison of 'O' Level Papers on Modern Imperial and Modern British History set by the Cambridge Board 553 - 555
- (e) Comparison of JMB 'O' Level Papers on Modern Imperial and Modern British History 556 - 558

APPENDIX H

Comparisons Involving JMB and Cambridge Examination Syndicate Papers on British Economic and Social History

- (a) Comparison between JMB 'A' Level Papers on British Economic History and JMB 'A' Level Papers on British Economic and Social History 559 - 561
- (b) Comparison of JMB 'A' and 'O' Level Papers on Modern British Economic and Social History 562 - 564
- (c) Comparison of JMB 'O' Level Papers on British Economic and Social History with Section B of Cambridge 'O' Level Papers on British Economic and Social History 565:- 567
- (d) Comparison between Sections A and B of the Cambridge 'O' Level Papers on British Economic and Social History 568 - 570
- (e) Comparison of JMB and Cambridge 'O' Level Papers on Modern Economic and Social and Modern British History 571 - 575
- (f) Comparison of JMB 'A' Level Papers on Modern British Economic and Social History and Modern British History 576 - 578
- (g) Comparison of Cambridge 'O' Level Papers (Section A) on British Social and Economic History (1066-1763) and Cambridge 'O' Level Papers on British History covering the period (400-1815) 579 - 581

BIBLIOGRAPHY

582 - 591

PREFACE

The interdisciplinary and exploratory nature of this thesis has made it difficult to write.

The thesis is interdisciplinary in the sense that it touches on a number of broad areas of study. The methodology which was adopted, in particular the use of content analysis and of certain statistical processes rests on a knowledge of psychology. The category system which is made up of a number of types of history could only be constructed after an extensive consideration of the nature of history. The discussion of the case for and against the current syllabus, and the proposal for a new alternative syllabus at 'O' and 'A' level (see Chapters 13 and 14), draws mainly on an understanding of the theoretical debates about the teaching of history which have occurred since the Second World War. Finally throughout the thesis references are made to the evidence and ideas put forward by historians about particular periods of history.

The thesis is also exploratory. The findings which are reported arise from the use of a category system drawing on the different types of history developed by historians. No other research has attempted to create such a broad category system, to assess its validity and reliability and then to employ it to code material dealing with extensive periods of British and European history. At the same time the arguments, which are employed to defend and to attack the existing syllabus (see Chapter 13), and to construct the outlines of a new syllabus (see Chapter 14), had to be created almost ab initio, since /

since the dominance of particular types of history, both at university and school level, has not been debated extensively, either by historians, or by those writers, who discuss the teaching of history.⁽¹⁾

These two aspects of the thesis have had a number of repercussions. First of all vast topics have had to be discussed in a cursory fashion. For example all the arguments for the inclusion or exclusion of particular types of history in the category system had to be reviewed in one chapter, a few pages being devoted to each of the types of history. Secondly major themes and arguments relating to the nature of history, and to history teaching, have had to be exemplified with disturbing brevity. Thus the debate over the impact of particular types of history on the community⁽¹⁾ had to be illustrated by a small number of examples when the whole thesis could have been devoted to the discussion. Thirdly, and finally, the wide ranging nature of the thesis has made it impossible to conduct the exhaustive study of every aspect of the subject which would have been appropriate had the topic been more narrowly defined.

However, despite these disadvantages, it is to be hoped that this interdisciplinary and exploratory study will throw light on a vital area of the history syllabus in schools.

(1) See below p.4-6

INTRODUCTION

The initial impetus for this study arose from two sources, first, from an awareness of the importance of G.C.E. papers for the teaching and learning of history in schools and secondly from the discovery that, despite the significance of the papers, their content had not been studied by other researchers and had not been discussed in detail by writers who deal with the teaching of history. In this opening chapter both of these issues will be considered, as well as an outline of the organisation of the thesis, which is influenced by the nature of the topic.

Though, as will be indicated in chapter 2, it is not possible to determine the exact nature of the influence of GCE papers in history on pupils and teachers, there were sufficient a priori grounds for believing that the content of the papers was important for the pupils' experiences of history, and for the teachers' approach to the subject, to undertake the project. Four areas in which the aspects of history dealt with at 'O' and 'A' level could be of significance will, therefore, be discussed briefly, three of them of particular relevance to the pupils, and one to the teachers.

First of all, the pupils' knowledge of history will be influenced to a great extent by the type of history which they study at 'A' and 'O' level. Only a very small percentage of the pupils who take G.C.E. examinations in history continue a systematic study of the subject after leaving school. Their knowledge of history will, therefore, be largely /

largely determined by their last experience of the subject, which will be at 'A' or 'O' level. As a consequence, it is important to determine the quality of the history with which they are presented when preparing for their G.C.E. examinations, a task which may involve answering some or all of the following questions. Are the pupils being given a broad or narrow knowledge of the subject? Are they being made aware of at least a selection of the different types of history, which make up the academic content of the subject? How far are they being exposed to the different methodologies pursued by historians and to what extent are new areas and methods of study being made available to them?

Secondly the pupils' understanding of, and even attitude to, past societies may well be affected by the types of history which they have studied. Thus if the pupils' attention has been focussed solely on political history their knowledge may be confined to the domestic and foreign policies of individual statesmen and governments. They will be unlikely to be familiar with the social structure, religious conventions, or artistic products of a period. Similarly if a pupil has been limited to the study of economic affairs their knowledge of the past may not extend beyond a broad acquaintance with the development of the industry, trade and agriculture of a community over a period of one hundred years. At the same time unless a pupil has been exposed to a broad syllabus they may be unaware of the degree to which the different aspects of society interact, for example the importance of having a knowledge of the economic and social structure of a society to explain its politics adequately. ⁽¹⁾

Thirdly/

(1) See below ps.396-397 and 416-417

Thirdly the examination papers set by the boards may not permit pupils and teachers much choice in the types of history which are taught at 'A' and 'O' level. Thus it is possible that one or two types of history dominate most of the papers offered at 'O' level by a particular board, that the situation is the same at 'A' level, and that other boards set papers which are of an identical flavour. At the same time the analysis of the types of history which play a part in the papers will indicate how far pupils who take 'O' and 'A' levels are exposed to the same repetitive diet at both levels. If appropriate, such findings can then be compared with the evidence which exists on the attitude of pupils to different types of history, and with the possibility that adolescent boys and girls with their broad ranging interests require a certain type of syllabus.

Fourthly the types of history employed at 'O' and 'A' level may have implications for the methods employed by the teachers. In recent years a number of innovations have been suggested in the teaching of history which could be facilitated by certain types of syllabus. For example, the emphasis on sources, which has gained momentum in recent years,⁽¹⁾ and the use of documents to improve the pupils' understanding of the enquiry methods of the historian,⁽²⁾ could be encouraged by the setting of certain types of question. Thus parts of papers could be devoted to the analysis of documents and questions could be set in which the pupil has to make an assessment of the quality of the available sources, which could throw light on a particular historical problem. Equally other innovations could probably be encouraged, or discouraged, according to the types of history being employed in the papers. This/

(1) I. Steele "Developments in History Teaching" (London 1976) p.55.

(2) See, for instance, The Schools Council Project HISTORY 13-16, described by R. Parkin "A View from the Lower Desk", Teaching History 3, No.12. Nov. 1974, pp. 354-358.

This probability will be pursued in Chapter 14, but it is worth mentioning that certain writers already consider that the content of G.C.E. papers is, at least in part, responsible for the failure of the schools to adopt the innovations which they are recommending. Douch, for instance, who is perhaps the foremost protagonist for the study of local history in the schools, states that "the reproduction of memorised national factual information" in external examinations has "done little to encourage the study of the locality"⁽¹⁾ while Steel and Taylor argue that the emphasis on political and national history "has a desiccating and demoralising effect on history teaching".⁽²⁾

Thus the types of history which play a part in 'O' and 'A' level papers appeared to be of considerable importance. As a consequence, the literature dealing with the teaching of history was read to see how far this particular aspect of the content of 'O' and 'A' level papers had been studied and to what extent the feasibility of alternative syllabi had been discussed.

This survey of the relevant literature revealed that no serious study of the different types of history, which were incorporated into G.C.E. examinations, had been conducted. Though writers who discuss the teaching of history often comment adversely on the impact of 'O' and 'A' level papers,⁽³⁾ very few even mention the types of history which play a part in the papers and, those who do, comment in a summary fashion. Thus Steel and Taylor assert that G.C.E. papers are dominated by political history,⁽⁴⁾ Fines that political and constitutional history play the main part in the syllabus,⁽⁵⁾ and Gibson that the papers have become/

-
- (1) R. Douch "Local History and the Teacher" (London 1967) p.125
(2) D.J. Steel and L. Taylor "Family History in Schools" (Portsmouth 1973) p.3
(3) For example, J. Fines "History" (London 1969) p.v., A Jamieson "Practical History Teaching" (London 1971), p.1, D.G. Watts, "The Learning of History" (London 1972) p.8.
(4) Steel and Taylor op cit p.3
(5) Fines op cit p v.

become too broad for the pupils, since they include questions on social, economic and cultural history, as well as foreign and domestic policy. (1) None of these commentators make any attempt to define the types of history which they mention, or indicate how they arrived at their conclusions. The impression is also created that their remarks apply equally to papers on different periods of history, for example, the mediaeval, early modern and modern periods and to papers dealing with different geographical regions, in particular, Britain and Europe.

In addition to the absence of any detailed analysis of the types of history employed in 'O' and 'A' level papers, little consideration has taken place of what aspects of history should be included. Only Burston has attempted a general defence of syllabi dominated by political history, (2) while those who have attacked the content of the papers have not attempted a systematic discussion of which types of history ought to be included in G.C.E. syllabi. (3) Indeed a most surprising feature is the absence of any proposal by commentators for a broad syllabus at 'O' and 'A' level. This neglect does not arise from any reluctance among writers on the teaching of history to recommend change. In recent years a wide selection of innovations have been suggested which could be implemented by history teachers ranging from local (4) and family (5) history to the proposal that the historians' methods of enquiry should play a central role in the teaching of history. (6)

(1) M. Gibson " 'O' Level History Some Doubts and Suggestions" Teaching History 1 No.1. May 1969, p.19

(2) W.H. Burston, "Principles of History Teaching (London 1972)" p. 152-172

(3) This statement is even true of writers who discuss alternative methods of examining history at 'A' and 'O' level, for example, W.H. Lamont "Uses and Abuses of Examinations" in M. Ballard "New Movements in the Study and Teaching of History" (London 1970) p.192-203 and of M. Roberts "A Different Approach to 'O' level" and R.B. Jones and K. Dawson "History and the Eighteen Plus" in R.B. Jones "Practical Approaches to the New History" (London 1973) p.109-132 and 196-226 respectively.

(4) Douch op cit.

(5) Steel and Taylor op cit.

(6) Parkin op cit.

This lack of theoretical or empirical consideration of the emphasis placed on the different types of history in G.C.E. examination papers combined with the clear indications of the significance of the subject created an opportunity for studying a topic which was of central importance for the teaching of history. As a result of the selection of this subject, the thesis fell into two sections, the first, dealing with the content of the 'O' and 'A' level papers, and the second with a general discussion of the case which could be advanced for the dominance of particular types of history in 'O' and 'A' level papers and with the possibility of developing alternative syllabi.

Once this subject had been selected the structure of the thesis was easy to design. The empirical analysis of the papers clearly had to be considered first so that the subsequent theoretical discussion could be soundly based. Thus Chapters 2 to 5 deal with the materials and methods which were appropriate for the analysis of the papers, Chapters 6 to 12 describe the results which were obtained, while the general discussion of the main emphasis in the papers and the proposal for a new syllabus were delayed until Chapters 13 and 14. The organisation of the chapters, therefore, follows conventional lines, with one exception namely the omission of a chapter in which the relevant literature is discussed. The absence of studies of 'O' and 'A' level papers and the marked tendency to avoid any discussion of the types of history employed in G.C.E. syllabi make it inappropriate to devote a chapter to a consideration of the literature, especially as the main defence of the present syllabus is discussed in detail in Chapter 13.

The section dealing with the methodological aspects of the study will, therefore, begin in Chapter 2 with a consideration of the methods and materials available for the analysis of the content of G.C.E. papers.

CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGY

In this chapter two problems will be discussed. In section (a) the different approaches which might be adopted to the analysis of the effect of the content of 'O' and 'A' level papers on the teaching of history will be considered, while section (b) will be devoted to a review of the materials, which were available for the analysis of G.C.E. examination papers.

(a) Methods

Since even at this stage of the project the significance of the content of 'A' and 'O' level papers for the teaching of history was evident the first task was to consider whether the exact nature of the impact of the 'O' and 'A' level paper on the teacher and pupils could be gauged. The only method by which such an objective could be realised was through an analysis of the activities and attitudes of the teachers and pupils who were involved in preparing for these examinations. As a consequence, the feasibility of such an undertaking had to be considered, initially as it might apply to one school, and then to a group of schools.

The extensive nature of an attempt to assess the influence of the content of 'O' and 'A' level papers on even one school quickly became evident. The areas in which 'O' and 'A' level papers might have an impact were far reaching, ranging from the pupils' attitudes to the subject, to the teacher's methodology. The attitudes of teachers and pupils to the content of the papers and its effect on their teaching and/

and learning would have to be explored by questionnaire or by interview. At the same time to provide additional information and to act as a check on the results of the questionnaire an assessment would be necessary of the syllabi drawn up by the teachers to prepare pupils for particular papers, as well as some observation of the methods employed in teaching the courses.

The time consuming nature of the tests and observations, which would be necessary in one school, created serious doubts about the feasibility of this approach especially when it was realised how many schools would have to be surveyed in a similar manner before general conclusions about the impact of the papers could be established. Since most schools select one paper at 'O' level and two at 'A' level, from a series of alternatives offered by the boards, an investigation in one school only throws light on the influence of three G.C.E. papers. But even these findings would need to be confirmed by research in a number of other schools before any general trends indicating the influence of even this limited number of papers could be outlined. While an investigation of this nature might be carried out into the impact of a small number of papers, the problems became insuperable when the number of boards which set papers at 'O' and 'A' level, and the wide range of alternatives, which they offer was realised. Thus eight boards set papers at 'O' and 'A' level and each of them provides a wide choice of papers for the candidates. In 1971, for example, when this project was started the Joint Matriculation Board⁽¹⁾ offered eight alternative papers at 'O' level and 24 at 'A' level.⁽²⁾ If the influence of each of these papers were to be assessed at school level it was possible that no fewer than 200 schools would have to be incorporated into/

(1) Henceforth referred to as the J.M.B.

(2) See below p. 140, 141 and p. 143

into the project. On the assumption that a questionnaire needed to be administered to the pupils and teachers in each school, that the outline of the syllabus used by the teachers would have to be discussed with them, and that some observation of the teachers' methodology would have to take place, the collection of the data alone would be likely to take a number of years and even then only the impact of one board on the schools would have been considered.

As a result of the difficulties, which would be created by a study at school level, the possibility of analysing the papers themselves was considered. This had a number of advantages. Already, in the Introduction the significance of the papers for the pupils' experience of history and for the teachers' approach to the subject has been indicated - an analysis of the papers can, therefore, provide a general picture of a factor which is of great importance for history in schools. Furthermore by concentrating on the 'A' and 'O' level examinations the exact nature of the content of papers taken by literally thousands of pupils can be determined.⁽¹⁾ In addition, the papers can be studied over a span of years to gauge the extent to which they change and comparisons can be mounted between the papers set by different boards, between 'A' and 'O' level papers set by one or more boards, between papers dealing with different periods of history or different geographical areas and between papers, which are ostensibly concerned with different types of history. Finally, an accurate description of the content of the papers can provide firm ground for a debate on the appropriateness of the present syllabi at 'O' and 'A' level and for suggesting new syllabi, which might be introduced.⁽²⁾

(1) For example 6774 candidates took 'A' level papers in History with the Cambridge Local Examination Syndicate in the year 1976 and 20,937 candidates took 'O' level papers.

(2) See below chapters 13 and 14

Once the decision to attempt to analyse the papers had been made the next stage was to consider if any materials existed which could provide an accurate picture of the types of history, which were playing a part in G.C.E. examinations. While the different materials, which could be used in the study, were being considered, a rudimentary category system was employed to determine the extent to which each of them could be analysed. The system included political history, which was defined as the actions of kings, statesmen and governments, economic history, which incorporated industrial, agricultural and trade affairs, cultural history, including the history of art, architecture, literature and drama and religious history, which dealt with the history of churches and religious groups.

(b) Materials

Three types of document issued by the boards appear to throw light on the types of history, which play a part in G.C.E. examination papers, namely the syllabi, the examination questions themselves and the marking guides issued by the boards. In the early stages of the project the appropriateness of each of these sets of materials for the analysis of 'O' and 'A' level papers was considered.

The syllabi were quickly found to be of little use, either because the boards fail to publish them for some of their papers, or, because those that are issued are impossible to analyse successfully. For a number of papers, particularly at 'A' level, the boards do not provide syllabi,⁽¹⁾ while for others they limit themselves to a list of books which the candidates/

-
- (1) For example (a) J.M.B. 'A' Level, Syllabus A Papers 1 and 11 (1971)
(b) Oxford and Cambridge Schools Examination Board, Papers II, III, IV and V at 'A' level and papers 1-7 and 10-17 at 'O' level (1971)
(c) Cambridge Local Examination Syndicate at 'A' level papers 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 and all papers at 'O' level except the ones on World Affairs and West Indian History (for Caribbean centres only)-1971

candidates are advised to read.⁽¹⁾ Even when a syllabus is outlined it is of such a general nature that analysis is very difficult. The following extract from the syllabus provided for Alternative H set by the J.M.B. at 'O' level is typical.

"Foreign History

1. The Normans in Sicily
2. The Papacy : Gregory VII, Innocent III, The Great Schism, the Conciliar Movement, Heresy.
3. France : Philip Augustus, Louis IX, the Hundred Years' War, Charles V, VI, and VII" (2)

Statements of this nature are uncodable if an attempt is being made to determine the types of history, which will play a part in this section of the syllabus. Thus no indication is provided of the aspects of Norman dominance in Sicily, which should be considered, whether, for example, the main focus should be placed on military, political, cultural or economic affairs, or whether each should receive similar treatment. At the same time, the topics listed under the heading of "the Papacy" do not reveal to what extent the attitudes and policies of secular governments to the Papacy and its problems should be emphasised and whether the examiners who drew up the syllabus intended teachers to concentrate solely on the actions of Popes as opposed to dealing with the Church as a whole. Equally, reference to /

(1) For example (a) JMB 'A' level syllabus C Alternative P, Paper 11 (1971)
 " " " " " " " Q, " " (1971)
 " " " " " " " R, " " (1971)
 " " " " " " " S, " " (1971)
 " " " " " " " T, " " (1971)

(b) Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate 'A' level papers 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 20 and 21. (1971)

(c) Oxford and Cambridge Schools Examination Board Paper 1 which deals with the special subject options. (1971)

(2) JMB General Certificate of Educ.Regulations & Syllabuses (Manchester 1971)p.22

Though these questions involve a consideration of the policies pursued by the younger Pitt and by Henry VIII a review of other aspects of society could be important in questions of this nature. It would be difficult, for instance, to write a critical account of the financial and commercial policies of the younger Pitt without some discussion of the state of the British economy in the late 18th century. Similarly, a description of the problems bequeathed by Henry VIII would involve a consideration of the religious and economic situation in the country, in particular, an account of the relative strength of the Protestants and Catholics, and some discussion of the general impact of inflation on industry and agriculture at that time. In these circumstances both of these questions are impossible to code, since the degree of importance that should be attached to the policies of the younger Pitt and Henry VIII, and to the other types of history, which might be included, cannot be determined accurately. Finally, as the analysis of the questions proceeded, the significance of political history became increasingly evident, especially in papers on modern British history, with more than fifty per cent of the questions being devoted to the affairs of political leaders and governments. As a result, some attempt to divide political history into subsections became important to determine the different aspects which were receiving emphasis. For example, the division of political history into domestic and foreign policy⁽¹⁾ which so often occurs in the work of historians was of particular interest to determine how far foreign affairs dominated papers on European history. In some papers, diplomacy appeared to play such an important part that candidates at 'O' and 'A' level might be able to find enough questions to/

(1) See below ps. 31, 41-44 & 60,73

which were drawn up by the chief examiners of the boards to assist the teams of markers.

Letters were, therefore, sent in November 1971 to the six English boards offering 'O' and 'A' level examinations in history, as well as to the Scottish Certificate of Education Board and to the Welsh Central Committee. Three boards, the Joint Matriculation Board, the Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and the University of London Schools Examination Board agreed to lend a sample of their marking guides. Of the remainder, two, the Oxford Local and the Southern Universities Board refused to release their marking guides and four, the Welsh Central Committee, the Associated Examination Board, the Scottish Certificate of Education Examination Board and the Oxford and Cambridge Schools Examination Board stated that they did not employ marking guides and did not possess comparable material.

The London University Schools Examination Board was the first to release material in January 1972 despatching marking guides covering the five years 1967-71 at 'O' and 'A' level. Unfortunately very few of the guides proved to be capable of analysis, comments on questions being mostly limited to general remarks such as "reward a knowledgeable approach to this topic". As a consequence, the marking guides made available by the London board could not be incorporated in the study.

The J.M.B. and the Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate were the only boards left and they pursued a cautious policy. Initially the/

the Boards were only willing to release a sample of their marking guides for analysis. The J.M.B. sent marking guides for 24 questions at 'A' level and the Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate 34 at 'A' level and 45 at 'O' level. After an interval, in which the marking guides were studied and found to be of a high quality visits, were made to Manchester and Cambridge in 1972 to see the other material, which was available, and to ask for permission to borrow a wide range of marking guides. This application was ultimately granted though the years for which marking guides were requested was limited to the five years 1968 to 1972 because of a certain reluctance on the part of the Cambridge board to make the marking guides available.⁽¹⁾ However, the two boards did release marking guides, which covered some 120 papers and more than 2,000 'O' and 'A' level questions, which, in the event, provided sufficient material for a number of different types of paper to be analysed and compared with each other.

Once the marking guides had been acquired two problems had to be considered, first, whether they were of the necessary quality in terms of legibility and detail to be included in a study of this nature, and, secondly, whether they were reliable, in that they reflected the views of the examiners about the types of history, which should appropriately be included in an answer to a question.

A general review of the marking guides revealed that they were sufficiently detailed, and well enough presented, for an analysis to be conducted. The marking guides fell into three broad groups. Some/

(1) This reluctance evinced itself in conversations with officials of the board.

Some were extremely thorough, covering between twenty and twenty-five points which could be included in an answer, and in a few cases reaching essay length, though presented in noteform. (1)

The majority consisted of a list of ten to fifteen points per question, usually with some attempt to indicate which were the most important. (2) Finally a small proportion of the marking guides either provided no relevant information, being confined to general comments such as "reward good argument here", or limited to two or three major aspects of the appropriate answer, some of which were vague. (3) Though most of this third group were likely to prove uncodable, at least in part, the quality of the remainder was so high that an analysis of their content was clearly feasible.

Secondly the marking guides also appeared to be an accurate reflection of the examiner's views of the content, which should play a part in the answer to a particular question. Both the J.M.B. and the Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate attach a lot of importance to marking guides since they employ them as a means of standardising the assessment of the candidates' scripts. The guides are used to ensure that the different individuals involved in marking particular papers apply the same standards. A significant proportion of the marking guides, for example, either provide an indication of the points, which should occur in an answer for certain overall standards to be reached. (4) or list the number of marks, which should be /

-
- (1) For example marking guides for JMB 'A' level papers Syllabus A Paper 11 Alternative J and K British History (1815-1939) for the years 1968 to 1971.
 - (2) For example marking guides for Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate 'O' level papers British and European History (1688 to 1939) for the years 1968 to 1972.
 - (3) For example marking guides for JMB 'A' level papers Syllabus C Alternative D(S) Paper 1 European History (1789-1870) for the years 1970 to 1972.
 - (4) For example, marking guides for JMB 'A' level papers Syllabus A Paper 11 Alternative F British History (1485-1603) for the years 1969, 1971 and 1972.

be awarded for dealing with certain aspects of a question.⁽¹⁾

Even when a looser approach is adopted, that is simply listing the number of points, which are relevant to an answer, the procedure is taken seriously, annual meetings being recorded in which the inclusion or exclusion of particular points is debated.⁽²⁾ Thus the importance of the marking guides for standardisation and ultimately for the assessment of the candidate makes it reasonable to assume that the marking guides are drawn up with great care and represent a closely considered view of the content suitable for a particular question.

Once the different methods for determining the impact of the papers had been assessed and the appropriate materials had been acquired the next task was to consider how they should be analysed, a problem which will be discussed in Chapter 3.

-
- (1) For example, marking guides for JMB 'A' level papers Syllabus B Paper 11 British Economic and Social History (1850-1939) for the years 1968, 1969, 1970 and 1971.
 - (2) For example, marking guides for the Cambridge Local Examination Syndicate 'O' level paper on the British Empire & Commonwealth are amended after discussion between the examiners.

CHAPTER 3

CONTENT ANALYSIS AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF A CATEGORY SYSTEM

In this chapter section (a) will be devoted to considering how the marking guides should be analysed, section (b) to a discussion of the rationale for selecting certain types of history to form the main categories and sub categories that will be used in coding the marking guides and section (c) to an explanation of the principal reasons for establishing certain boundaries between each of the categories and sub categories.

Section (a) Methods of Analysis

As has already been indicated in Chapter 2, the marking guides provided by the boards were of a detailed nature, generally outlining between ten and fifteen points, which the pupils could include in their answers, and for which they could be given credit. In addition, as was demonstrated in the discussion of the feasibility of coding the questions themselves, a number of types of history can play a part in a question. Thus a method had to be chosen, which would make it possible to determine what type or types of history were being employed in each of the points, which together made up the marking guide.

Only the use of content analysis could ensure that such a detailed task was performed satisfactorily. In the first place the employment of content analysis makes it imperative to develop a category system in which the boundaries between the categories and sub categories are clearly defined - if the boundaries overlap clearly no reliance can /

can be placed on the results. In the case of this project where complex marking guides were being analysed such a procedure was obviously essential. Secondly, the use of content analysis enables an exact calculation to be made of the contribution of each category to a particular question or paper or group of papers. With a sensitive category system each point in a marking guide can be coded and the role of each category in a marking guide determined. For example, if a marking guide comprised ten points, each of equal importance, and five were coded in category A and five in category B, 50% of the question would be attributable to each of the categories. If this process is carried out with each marking guide a profile can be created for each of these categories or sub categories in a particular paper or group of papers. ⁽¹⁾ Thirdly, when a category system is employed the reliability of the researcher as a coder, and of the category system as a whole, is usually tested. Such a procedure prevents the investigator from manipulating his coding to buttress certain preconceived ideas, a considerable danger in a study of this nature which arose in part from the researcher's own teaching experience. Finally the employment of content analysis can only be effective if a category system is developed which is valid, that is in Holsti's terms "is measuring what it is intended to measure". ⁽²⁾ In the context of this project the validity of the category system is extremely important, since the results derived from its use will be employed to indicate the role of different types of history in particular papers. As a consequence, it is essential that an adequate justification is provided for the inclusion and definition of the different types of history, which are incorporated into the category system.

Thus/

- (1) For a detailed description of the way in which the results in each category and sub category were calculated in the different papers see Appendix C
- (2) O.R. Holsti - "Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities" (Philippines 1969) p.142.

Thus the problems created by the need to analyse complex material and the clear advantages of using content analysis ensured that the next step was to explore the possibility of devising a category system which would be sufficiently detailed to give a full picture of the types of history, which were being employed by the boards.

Section (b) The Rationale for the Inclusion of Certain Types of History in the Category System

In section (a) the importance of establishing the validity of the category system was mentioned, but only discussed briefly. In the early part of this section the ways in which the validity of the category system affects this study will, therefore, be explored in more detail, and, in addition, the means by which this validity might be ensured will be outlined. The remainder of the section will then be devoted to a discussion of the reasons for the general structure of the category system, that is for the inclusion of certain types of history, as opposed to a rationale for the exact definition of each type of history which will be delayed until section (c).

Attempts to find a satisfactory basis for determining the validity of a category system based on different types of history were initially discouraging. For various reasons the four main methods of assessing the validity of a category system, which are normally adopted, namely predictive, concurrent, construct and content validity⁽¹⁾ proved to be either totally inapplicable or difficult to employ in the context of this study.

Three /

(1) *ibid.* p.142-149

Three of these approaches, predictive, concurrent and content validity are inappropriate because they are designed to assess the validity of a different type of content analysis. Predictive validity can, for instance, be attributed to a category system if the results obtained from its use make the successful prediction of events or phenomena possible. Such a test is clearly not relevant to the category system employed in this study, since the results derived from it could not conceivably facilitate the prediction of events or phenomena. On similar grounds any attempt to employ concurrent validity could be rejected, because it operates in the same manner as predictive validity, except that it applies to events occurring at the same time as the study being undertaken. Even the use of content validity which had apparent relevance to the category system being employed in this study was problematic. Content validity is assessed by devising a test to determine whether the results obtained from a content analysis are plausible.⁽¹⁾ In the context of this project an approach of this nature was fraught with difficulties since a major part of the study would have to be completed before the plausibility of the results could be gauged. Thus there would be no point in testing the plausibility of the results before the category system was completed and operating reliably. To reach this point would involve a lengthy procedure, since categorisation could not begin until a system had been constructed, which could ensure the coding of the wide range of historical data which was incorporated in the marking guides. In addition, before the plausibility of the results could be tested a general sample of the marking guides for different papers would have to be coded. To test the plausibility of the results for a small selection of papers, for example, /

(1) *ibid.* p.143

example, those on 20th century British history, would be inadequate, since the papers set by the two boards cover British and European history from 500 to 1945, as well as a number of papers on specific types of history. As a result, papers dealing with a variety of periods would have to be coded before any test of the plausibility of the results could be mounted. This delay meant that there was a considerable risk in relying on content validity. As a consequence, it was decided to seek other means of ensuring the validity of the category system.

Only construct validity appeared to be of relevance in the context of this study. Holsti defines construct validity as being concerned not only with validating the category system, but also with the theory underlying it.⁽¹⁾ The latter part of this definition is of particular importance to this category system,⁽²⁾ since the system was based on the types of history used by historians in their study of the subject. While this division of history into different aspects may not be regarded as a theory in the conventional sense, for example, providing an explanation of some feature of human behaviour, it does represent the way in which historians have organised and structured their subject, an organisation out of which a number of specialist types of history have emerged with distinct concepts and even methodologies.⁽³⁾ Thus construct validity is of relevance to the attempt to establish the validity of the category system being used in this project.

Difficulties/

- (1) *ibid.* p.148
- (2) This is the aspect of the definition on which Holsti himself concentrates.
- (3) The concepts and methodologies appropriate to particular types of history are discussed at length in H.P.R. Finberg - "Approaches to History - A symposium" (London 1965), see in particular the articles by W.H.B. Court on Economic history, by H.J. Perkin on Social History, by H.P.R. Finberg on Local History, by D. Talbot Rice on the History of Art, and by A.Rupert Hall on the History of Science.

Difficulties arise, however, when the procedures which are normally adopted to test the construct validity of a measure are applied to the category system employed in this study. As Holsti states the normal method by which the construct validity of a category system is tested is by empirical means.⁽¹⁾ Thus, hypotheses are usually derived from the theory underlying the category system and are assessed empirically. Unfortunately, in the case of the category system being used in this study no such tests can be devised. As has already been indicated the category system is based on different types of history which historians have developed to permit them to specialise on particular aspects of society. While means can be found to defend this approach to the study of history, hypotheses cannot be generated from it, which can be tested empirically.

But though the empirical tests, which are normally employed, cannot be adopted in this case the validity of the theoretical structure of the category system can still be considered. The obvious alternative to empirical tests, in a situation like this, is to advance arguments which will justify the categories employed in the category system. For such an objective to be achieved a number of aspects of the category system have to be discussed. First of all, the extent to which the types of history employed in the category system can be justified has to be considered. Then, since the category system purports to incorporate the major types of history studied by historians, the types of history included in the category system have to be surveyed to see if there is a broad consensus among historians about their individual and collective importance. Finally, as the content of each type of history employed in the category system is described in detail

(1) Holsti, op.cit. p.148

It is essential to ensure that these descriptions are acceptable to historians. If this procedure is adopted, two results follow; a justification is provided for the theoretical background of the category system, and the closeness of the links between the category system and this theoretical background is demonstrated. Thus, by means of argument, the construct validity of the category system can be established.

The first problem, therefore, was to consider whether each of the types of history employed in the category system could be justified. Two approaches can be adopted to this task, one, relevant to well established types of history, and, the other, to types of history, which are vague, and about whose content historians are disagreed. The justification of well established types of history, which are incorporated into the category system, does not create great difficulties. Over the last one hundred and fifty years historians have developed different types of history, for example, political and economic history, so that they can concentrate on particular aspects of the past without considering every aspect at the same time. In so doing, they have adopted a pragmatic policy, since it was clearly not possible to study all the features of a society in detail at one time. The success of this policy (indeed no other alternative seems possible) can be judged from the development of a number of types of history over the last one hundred and fifty years, and from the capacity of these different specialisms to attract historians into their respective fields. Thus the main justification for the different types of history, which have been established, rests on the empirical grounds of their existence and success with historians. As a result, a major/

major part of the rest of this chapter will be devoted to identifying well established types of history, which might be incorporated into the category system. The types of history, which are vague, and about whose content historians are disagreed, create greater difficulties than those types of history which are widely used and accepted. Fortunately, as will be indicated later in this chapter, they are relatively few.⁽¹⁾ However, where they did occur, it was essential to review the main opinions of historians on their nature and content and to assess which of their arguments were most persuasive.

The second task, which was to consider whether there was a general consensus among historians about the individual and collective importance of the types of history employed in the category system, also proved to be feasible. Various procedures were adopted, which will be described below, to survey the types of history used by historians and, as a result, a link was established between the types of history widely accepted by historians and the category system.

The third stage in the procedure was to define the categories and sub categories. This stage was extremely important. As a result of the first two stages only the undoubted existence of certain types of history, and their acceptance by historians, had been demonstrated. Though essential in establishing the construct validity of the category system, the first two stages cannot ensure the viability of the category system. Thus, the existence of different types of history does not guarantee that a category system can be based on them. Historians may, for example, have developed types of history, which are so/

(1) See in particular, the discussion of social history on pages 86-89 below.

so ill-defined, that categories cannot be developed from them, or they may have constructed types of history, which overlap to such a degree, that coding is impossible. Equally, the category system may incorporate the types of history used by historians, but the definitions employed in the category system may not reflect those generally accepted by historians. Thus, it was essential to establish a clear definition of each of the types of history included in the category system and check their definition against the views of historians.

This approach to the assessment of the validity of the category system was strengthened by a number of other factors. Instead of the types of history employed in the category system being determined subjectively by the researcher a firm reference point, namely the types of history used by historians, existed against which the categories could be assessed. In addition, and, most important, this reference point was shared by all those who are concerned with the teaching of history professionally and to whom this study is especially relevant.

Furthermore, a broadly similar approach had been adopted by other researchers dealing with different aspects of the teaching of history. In particular, those studies of the attitudes of pupils to different types of history had been completed in which most of the categories used were based on the types of history devised by academic historians.⁽¹⁾ Thus, because of the common basis shared by the category systems used in these studies of pupil attitudes and the one devised for this project, it was possible to integrate the findings about pupil attitudes into the argument about the syllabi most appropriate for pupils at 'A' and 'O'

level/

- (1) For example J. Cairns "Interest in History shown by secondary school pupils with special reference to the aims of history teaching" unpublished M.Ed. thesis 1953 Kings College, Newcastle. A.S. and L. Ward "Variables influencing attitudes to aspects of history" History Teaching IV, 14, November 1975, pp. 154-158. I. Jones "An Investigation into the Response of Boys & Girls Respectively Towards the Content of the History Syllabus in Grammar Schools," Brit.Jr.of Ed.Psychology Vol.29, 1959, p.267-269.

level, which arose as a result of the analysis of the G.C.E. papers.⁽¹⁾ Finally employing categories based on the types of history used by historians ensured that the discussion of 'A' and 'O' level syllabi at the end of the thesis could be related to the view of history taken by historians themselves, which is an important issue to consider in the context of G.C.E. courses.⁽²⁾

Once the decision to base the categories on the types of history employed by historians had been reached a procedure had to be adopted for determining which types of history should be included. This task had to be undertaken before the exact boundaries between the different categories could be determined. Two approaches, which will now be described, were adopted to the general problem of deciding which types of history should be incorporated in the category system.

First of all an exhaustive survey of the literature dealing with the nature of history was conducted to find out whether any historians had systematically divided the subject into different types of history and provided justification for these divisions.⁽³⁾ When it became apparent that very few historians had attempted this task, a second approach was adopted, namely, to examine the historical writing of a sample of historians to discover what divisions they actually employed in their writing of history. The results of both these approaches will now be outlined and discussed.

The survey of literature on the nature of history proved difficult.

Almost/

(1) See below, p. 431-433

(2) See below, p. 426-431

(3) The survey of the literature relating to types of history was completed up to 1972 i.e. the time when the category system took final shape and the analysis of the main data began. Once this process had begun no further alterations in the category system could be made.

Almost immediately it became apparent that the types of history employed by historians was not an area of major debate. Indeed only one work was discovered, which dealt specifically with the types of history used in their work by contemporary academic historians, namely Finberg's "Approaches to History".⁽¹⁾ As a result, extensive reading had to be undertaken of books concerned with other aspects of the nature of history to see if they included sections in which different types of history were discussed. Given the vastness of the available literature on the subject it is not possible to be certain that every discussion of the types of history employed by historians has been identified, but even with this proviso the results of the survey were disappointing. Only one historian could be discovered, Renier, who in his "History its Purpose and Method"⁽²⁾ tried, both to divide history into a number of types of history, and to justify his choice of topics. Others discussed particular types of history, but did not attempt to subdivide the whole subject.⁽³⁾ As a result, their remarks were more applicable to the discussion of the boundaries between individual categories, which will take place in section (c) of this chapter, than to the debate about the number of overall divisions within the subject. Thus, at this stage, only the views of Renier and Finberg will be outlined.

Renier begins his discussion of the types of history employed by historians by postulating a threefold division, namely political history, social history and the history of ideas.⁽⁴⁾ Political history is described as "the story of human experiences undergone within, or about,
or/

(1) Finberg, op.cit.

(2) G.J. Renier "History, its Purpose and Method" (London 1950) pp.54-78.

(3) In particular the historians whose writings are included in F.Stern: "Varieties of History" (London 1970).

(4) Renier, op. cit. p.58

or through the state";⁽¹⁾ social history as covering "the experiences where the state plays no part, or a subordinate, or secondary, or unimportant one"⁽²⁾ and the history of ideas as a residual category "a home for any kind of history known, or as far as can be seen at present, still to be born".⁽³⁾

Renier then outlines a second more detailed series of divisions. Political history, to which he attaches great importance, is divided, first of all, into the internal and external history of states,⁽⁴⁾ and then into the following subdivisions (a) constitutional history, which deals with the methods adopted by men in governing the state,⁽⁵⁾ (b) parliamentary history which is regarded as a subsection of constitutional history,⁽⁶⁾ (c) legal history, the enactments, for example, of Parliament and their applications by the courts of the Realm,⁽⁷⁾ and finally (d) diplomatic history, that is the history of the relations between states.⁽⁸⁾ Next Renier deals briefly with the history of warfare and colonial history. The history of warfare is divided into three sections, military history, which he regards as concerned with fighting on land,⁽⁹⁾ and naval and aerial warfare, with conflict at sea and in the air.⁽¹⁰⁾ Colonial history is only mentioned in passing, the close relationship between colonial and political history being emphasised.⁽¹¹⁾ More attention is given to economic and social history, though Renier seems unable to decide/

-
- (1) *ibid* p.58
(2) " p.58
(3) " p.58
(4) " p.59
(5) " p.59
(6) " p.60
(7) " p.61
(8) " p.61
(9) " p.62
(10) " p.69
(11) " p.69

decide whether the two types can be viewed as separate entities. Initially he adopts Blok's view that economic history should be included within social history.⁽¹⁾ He next admits that economic history has grown into an autonomous area and is more precisely defined than social history, and that social history should not incorporate economic history.⁽²⁾ Then, instead of attempting to reconcile these two views he concludes, with doubtful logicity, that the two cannot be identified separately.⁽³⁾ Yet, despite this vagueness about the boundaries between the two categories, Renier makes some observations about the content of each. He defines economic history as the "story of the experience of men in so far as they were concerned with matters of which economists take cognizance",⁽⁴⁾ while social history is treated at a macro and a micro level. Thus, on the one hand, he quotes with approval Blok's definition of social history as "the thought and the words, the daily life, the belief, the needs, the habits of our ancestors"⁽⁵⁾ and, on the other, he identifies two subsections within social history, the first dealing with social custom⁽⁶⁾, and the second with issues raised as a result of the connections between social history and sociology.⁽⁷⁾ The remaining types of history selected by Renier are only mentioned cursorily. Brief accounts are given of the history of ideas,⁽⁸⁾ biography,⁽⁹⁾ historical geography,⁽¹⁰⁾ local history,⁽¹¹⁾ and ecclesiastical history,⁽¹²⁾ and of these only the comments /

-
- (1) *ibid* p.70
(2) " p.70
(3) " p.73
(4) " p.70-71
(5) " p.70
(6) " p.74
(7) " p.73
(8) " p.74-75
(9) " p.75-77
(10) " p.77
(11) " p.77
(12) " p.78

comments on ecclesiastical history proved surprising. Renier distinguishes between ecclesiastical history and the history of religion.⁽¹⁾ He then points out the links between ecclesiastical history and other types of history, in particular political history, though he states that "it would be difficult to tell the story of monasteries or of the secular clergy without taking into account the findings of economic and social history."⁽²⁾ Renier's argument is strange. While his assertion that ecclesiastical history is closely linked with other types of history is unremarkable, his statement that there is a difference between ecclesiastical history and the history of religion is undeveloped. He makes no attempt to define the two types of history and provides no additional support for his statement.

A different procedure is adopted by Finberg. He invites a number of historians, each specialists in a particular type of history, to contribute chapters to his book, in which they give an account of their approach to the subject. Finberg does not attempt himself to survey all the types of history and he makes no claim that his symposium achieves that objective. However, his book is extremely important in this context, since it is the only work to draw on the ideas of a number of different historians about the content, and other related issues, connected with their own specialist form of history. At this stage, however, the types of history dealt with in Finberg's book will only be outlined, the major problem of definition posed by each of the authors will be considered in detail when the boundaries between each of the categories is discussed later in this chapter.

Political/

(1) *ibid* p.78

(2) *ibid* p.78

Political, economic and social history are dealt with first of all.⁽¹⁾ Bindoff's main objective in his chapter is to put forward a case for the pre-eminence of political over other types of history,⁽²⁾ but in so doing he identifies at least three subsections of political history, namely diplomatic history, administrative and constitutional history.⁽³⁾ Court, in contrast, discusses the relationship between economics as a subject and economic history,⁽⁴⁾ emphasising that the study of economic choice forms the centre of economic history.⁽⁵⁾ He then considers certain aspects of economic history, such as economic change,⁽⁶⁾ economic welfare,⁽⁷⁾ and the relationship between economic history and both universal and general history.⁽⁸⁾ In discussing social history Perkin returns to some of the themes touched upon by Renier. He discusses and rejects definitions of social history which incorporate every facet of society within its scope.⁽⁹⁾ Instead, he regards social history as concerned with the "structure of society its growth and decline"⁽¹⁰⁾ and "the physical distribution of its members by region and district".⁽¹¹⁾ In Perkin's view the structure of society can be approached by studying subjects like demography⁽¹²⁾ and the changing class system.⁽¹³⁾

The two types of history considered next in Finberg's book are defined in/

-
- (1) Each of these types of history will be discussed in detail below
 - (2) Finberg op cit p.1-15
 - (3) *ibid* p.3
 - (4) " p.17-21
 - (5) " p.22-26
 - (6) " p.26-31
 - (7) " p.31-41
 - (8) " p.41-50
 - (9) " p.51-56
 - (10) " p.56
 - (11) " p.56
 - (12) " p.56-58
 - (13) " p.64-65

in terms of geographical boundaries. Barraclough extrapolates on the need for,⁽¹⁾ and the methodological problems associated with,⁽²⁾ universal history. He defines this type of history loosely as world history⁽³⁾ and more precisely as "advancing from a view of the past in which Europe is the centre to universal, world-wide standards of judgment".⁽⁴⁾ Finberg's own chapter is concerned with local history. He defines local history as dealing with the history of social entities, that is the organisation, growth, development and fall of a local community, where the local community is viewed primarily as the parish or borough.⁽⁵⁾

The remaining types of history, which are discussed have little relationship with each other. Darby outlines the content of historical geography, which concerns, in the main, the study of the human and physical environment and its influence on history.⁽⁶⁾

D. Talbot Rice and A.R. Hall consider the history of art and of science respectively. Rice sees the art historian as focusing upon the analysis and interpretation of works of art and associating them with their historical background.⁽⁷⁾ Hall discusses the difficulties faced by historians of science, for example, the range of relevant documents,⁽⁸⁾ which they have to study, and points to their failure to develop suitable methods of analysis,⁽⁹⁾ and, as a result, to produce penetrating accounts of their subject. Finally, Wainwright considers archaeology and place names, pointing to their importance for the study of periods with few or no written records.⁽¹⁰⁾

The

- (1) *ibid* p.83
- (2) " p.92-100
- (3) " p.83
- (4) " p.101
- (5) " p.116-117
- (6) " p.131-151
- (7) " in particular p.162-163
- (8) " p.179-180
- (9) " in particular p.181-188
- (10) " p.199

The categories suggested by Renier and by the contributors to Finberg's book, not only overlap to a considerable extent, but they are also numerous. As a result, for the sake of clarity, a summary of the categories and sub categories provided by the two sources will now be presented. In the case of each category and sub category (listed below) only the title is provided and its source, that is whether it comes from Finberg or Renier.*

A Political History (Renier and Finberg)

1. Diplomatic History (Renier and Finberg)

2. Domestic Politics (Renier)

Constitutional History (Renier)

History of Government (Finberg)

Parliamentary History (Renier)

Legal History (Renier)

B Economic History (Renier and Finberg)

C Social History (Renier and Finberg)

1. Sociology and Social History (Renier and Finberg)

Social structure (Finberg)

2. Social Custom (Renier)

D History of Warfare (Renier)

1. Military History (Renier)

2. Naval History (Renier)

3. History of Aerial Warfare (Renier)

E History of Ideas (Renier)

F History of Art (Finberg)

G History of Science (Finberg)

H /

(1)*The lettering of the categories and sub categories is provisional at this stage and will alter as new categories and sub categories are added. The final lettering of the categories used in this study can be seen in section (c) below.

- H Historical Geography (Renier and Finberg)
- J Ecclesiastical History (Renier)
- K History of Religion (Renier)
- L Archaeology and Place Names (Finberg)
- M Biography (Renier)
- N Universal History (Finberg)
- O Local History (Renier and Finberg)
- P Colonial History (Renier)

Before the types of history employed in the actual writing of history are considered, one major observation on the nature of the categories that have been presented should be noted. When Renier and Finberg's contributors discuss a category they describe it primarily in terms of its content, that is of the particular aspect of a society with which it deals, not in terms of a methodology.⁽¹⁾ Thus the types of history suggested by these writers focus on different aspects of society as opposed to concentrating on the same features of a period, but employing different methodologies. Of course, such an approach does not prevent overlap between the types of history proposed, a problem which will be considered later in this chapter.

The second major source for the development of the category system was the actual writing of historians. In contrast to the first approach, in which the historians discussion of the nature of history was being considered, the material available for analysis was superabundant. Every historian who deals with a whole society or with the major aspects of a period divides his work into different types of history. A survey of the writing of all these historians was clearly impossible and, as a result, /

(1) See above p. 30-35

result, an appropriate sample had to be selected for consideration. Since the papers set by the candidates for the JMB and Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate dealt almost exclusively with British and European history, and predominantly with the periods after 1450,⁽¹⁾ the field from which a selection could be made was reduced. Given these prerequisites the claims of the New Cambridge Modern History of Europe to be used as the core of the sample were overwhelming. The academic prestige of the series was second to none and its structure is suitable for an analysis of this nature. The volumes are designed to cover every aspect of the period on which they are written and each volume involves contributions from a number of historians (usually from fifteen to twenty), who are generally specialists in the type of history on which they are writing. As a consequence, an analysis of the types of history employed in the New Cambridge Modern History ensured that the survey incorporated the work of over two hundred historians, each dealing with a topic in which they were particularly expert. No other series involves a similar number of historians or the same degree of specialisation, since one historian normally deals with each major aspect of a particular period.

The only problem, however, with employing the New Cambridge Modern History was its tendency to concentrate on European, as opposed to English, or British history, an important consideration when half of the papers set by the boards are on English or British history. A sample of work dealing with the different periods of British history had, therefore, to be selected. Again, choice was difficult, but the selection of a series appeared to be advantageous because of the number/

(1) See below p. 140-144

number of historians involved in such a venture, which therefore created the opportunity to incorporate different classifications of the major aspects of a period. Though no single series dealing with English history has gained the prestige of the New Cambridge Modern History, the Oxford History of England was chosen because the individual descriptions of the different periods of English history was more thorough than in any other series. Thus the historians contributing to the Oxford History of England dealt with a wide range of aspects for each period and in greater depth than those involved in other series. In addition, more historians participated in the Oxford Histories of England than in other Histories of England.⁽¹⁾ The analysis of a sample of work published on European and English history was confined, therefore, to the New Cambridge Modern History⁽²⁾ and the Oxford Histories of England.

A detailed page by page analysis of the volumes included in these two series was unnecessary, since the objective was to determine whether the categories suggested by Renier and the contributors to Finberg's "Approaches to History" broadly reflected the division, which historians themselves imposed when writing European and English history. As a result, the chapter headings used by the writers /

-
- (1) For example, nine different historians contributed to the Oxford Histories of England for the period 1485-1945, six to the History of England edited by W.N. Medlicott and published by Longmans and five to the History of England published by Thomas Nelson, both of which series cover the same period as the Oxford Histories of England.
 - (2) For the sake of brevity the New Cambridge Modern History will be referred to in the footnotes from this point as the N.C.M.H. In addition since there are so many volumes in the series, only the number of the volume cited will be mentioned in the footnotes - not the authors and different titles of each volume.

writers of the New Cambridge Modern History and the Oxford Histories of England were the most appropriate focus of attention, since they represented the major divisions, which were employed by the historians. Once this decision had been reached the actual chapter headings had to be checked to see if they could be analysed successfully.

One question needed to be answered to determine if these chapter headings could provide the basis for such an analysis, namely whether the titles of the chapters reflected their content accurately. The content of each chapter was, therefore, checked by studying the page headings and only a small number of chapter titles were identified which did not give an accurate picture of their contents. The majority of the chapter headings which could not be analysed were entitled "Introduction" and concentrated on broad accounts of conditions in the period about which the book was written.⁽¹⁾ A second, much smaller group, which were confined to one volume, had titles that gave no indications of the content of the chapter, such as "Half Time" or "Normal Times". Though these chapters had to be excluded from the analysis they only numbered five, being in a minority even in the volume of which they were a part.⁽²⁾ A third and final group was made up of chapters with very general titles like "The Achievement of the Age" and which, as a consequence, concentrated on a wide range of topics.⁽³⁾ However, when all the chapters /

- (1) For example, N.C.M.H. Vol.V (Cambridge 1961) ch.1, Vol.VII (Cambridge 1963) ch.1 and Vol.X (Cambridge 1967) ch.1.
- (2) A.J.P. Taylor "English History, 1914-45" (Oxford 1965) Chs.IV,V, VII,IX and XIII.
- (3) For example J.D. Mackie "The Early Tudors 1485-1558" (Oxford 1952) ch.XVI and J.B. Black "The Reign of Elizabeth 1558-1603" (Oxford 1959) ch.VII.

chapters involved in these three groups are summated they only account for 2% of all the chapters in these volumes the remainder having titles which reflect their main content accurately.

Before the categories involved in these two series are presented one final point needs to be made which concerns the New Cambridge Modern History only. Each of the volumes of the New Cambridge Modern History incorporates two types of category, one, following the lines already delineated by Finberg's associates and Renier, and the other, dividing the categories along geographical boundaries. The latter is an extension of the two categories "Universal History" and "Local History" which have already been mentioned. These two approaches to the definition of the categories will be employed in the account which follows.

The relations between states is a consistent theme in both the New Cambridge Modern History and the Oxford Histories of England. In the New Cambridge Modern History two tendencies are evident - to devote chapters, on the one hand, to general descriptions of international relations or diplomacy and, on the other hand, to the analysis of specific events, such as treaties and congresses. The titles used to describe the general chapters employ terms like "diplomacy",⁽¹⁾ "International relations"⁽²⁾ and "international diplomacy!"⁽³⁾ The specific phenomena delineated by the titles of chapters are, in particular, peace settlements,⁽⁴⁾ /

-
- (1) N.C.M.H. Vol.V op.cit. ch.IX, Vol.VIII (Cambridge 1971) ch.VIII, Vol XII (Cambridge 1960) ch.V.
 - (2) N.C.M.H. Vol.III (Cambridge 1968) ch.V.
 - (3) N.C.M.H. Vol.I (Cambridge 1964) ch.IX, Vol.IV (Cambridge 1970) ch.XIV, Vol.VI (Cambridge 1971) ch.V, Vol.VII op.cit. ch.IX, Vol.XI (Cambridge 1962) ch.XX, Vol.XIII (Cambridge 1970)ch.XI.
 - (4) For example, N.C.M.H. vol.XII op.cit. ch.VIII.

systems of alliances,⁽¹⁾ and the diplomatic aspects of struggles between powers.⁽²⁾ The chapters in the Oxford Histories of England deal partly with the 'foreign policies' of governments or political leaders,⁽³⁾ and partly with specific aspects of foreign affairs, for example, 'appeasement'.⁽⁴⁾ But though the terminology may vary, the number of chapters devoted to the relations between states, and their persistent appearance in virtually every volume of these two series, demonstrates the importance of diplomacy or international relations as a theme.

Constitutional history plays a less important role than diplomatic history, though the same tendency to parade under a number of different titles is evident. The number of chapters devoted to constitutional history, especially in the New Cambridge Modern History, are fewer than to diplomatic affairs and they by no means occur in every volume of either series. The terminology employed, however, follows the lines indicated by Renier.⁽⁵⁾ Some chapters refer to constitutional history,⁽⁶⁾ while others deal with more specific aspects of government, for example the "machinery of government,"⁽⁷⁾ "institutions"⁽⁸⁾ and "political structure."⁽⁹⁾ Of these terms only political structure is not employed by Renier, but the three major subheadings of the chapter so entitled, 'local government' /

-
- (1) For example, N.C.M.H. Vol.X op.cit. ch.X
 - (2) For example, N.C.M.H. Vol.VI op.cit. ch.XIX
 - (3) For example, Mackie op.cit. chs.IV and VI, Sir George Clark "The Early Stuarts 1603-1660" (Oxford 1955) chs. III and VIII.
 - (4) For example, Taylor op.cit. ch. XII
 - (5) Renier op.cit. p.59
 - (6) For example, N.C.M.H. Vol II (Cambridge 1965) chs. XIV and XV and Black op.cit. ch.VI
 - (7) B. Williams "The Whig Supremacy" (Oxford 1939) chs. II and III
 - (8) For example N.C.M.H. Vol. XIII op.cit. ch. IV
 - (9) J.S.Watson "The Reign of George III 1760-1820" (Oxford 1960) ch.III

government', 'central government' and the 'composition of Parliament' indicate that it is concerned with constitutional history and the machinery of government.

The remaining major sub category of political history suggested by Renier, namely the 'history of politics' is more difficult to identify in the New Cambridge Modern History and the Oxford Histories of England. Renier describes the history of politics as an account of the struggle for the mastery of the state and as the story of party life.⁽¹⁾ This theme is clearly identifiable in the Oxford Histories of England, though general terms such as domestic politics and political strife are rarely used. In general, the actions of particular political leaders and governments are highlighted in chapter headings with titles such as "Gladstone's Prime",⁽²⁾ "Three Party Politics"⁽³⁾ and "Carteret and Pelhams",⁽⁴⁾ and together, chapters of this type provide an important narrative theme for each of the Oxford Histories, accounting, in total, for as many as a third of the chapters.⁽⁵⁾ This sub category cannot be identified with such ease in the New Cambridge Modern History. The material dealing with domestic politics is generally incorporated in chapters concerned with events in particular countries and thus has been subsumed under chapter headings such as "France under Charles VIII and Louis XII"⁽⁶⁾ or "the Austrian Habsburgs and the Empire"⁽⁷⁾ or simply the name of a country "the Ottoman Empire". However, a consideration /

(1) Renier op.cit. p.59

(2) Sir R. Ensor "England 1870-1914" (Oxford 1936) ch.1

(3) Taylor op.cit. ch.VI

(4) Williams op.cit. ch. IX

(5) In fact for 52 chapters out of the 144 included in the Oxford Histories of England vols. VII - XV

(6) N.C.M.H. Vol.1 op.cit. ch.X

(7) N.C.M.H. Vol.III op.cit. ch.X

(8) N.C.M.H. Vol.II op.cit. ch. XVII

consideration of the page headings of particular chapters in each of the volumes reveals that domestic politics, as described by Renier, though not so clearly identifiable as diplomatic and constitutional history, is a significant ingredient in both the New Cambridge Modern History and the Oxford Histories of England.

The one remaining sub category of political history outlined by Renier received virtually no attention in these volumes. At the level of chapter headings legal history is virtually ignored in both the New Cambridge Modern History and the Oxford Histories of England, and unlike domestic politics it is not subsumed under other titles. A survey of the page headings revealed that reference to legal history was rare in these volumes, a trend, which will be considered in more detail later, when the final structure of the category system is considered.

Economic history is given a position of importance in both the New Cambridge Modern History and the Oxford Histories of England. The word 'economic' is used to describe at least one chapter in all except one volume in the Oxford series.⁽¹⁾ The titles in the two series vary from "economic change"⁽²⁾ to "the economy of Europe"⁽³⁾ and from "economic problems and policies"⁽⁴⁾ to "economic activities."⁽⁵⁾ Within these chapters different aspects of economic history are considered, such as trade, agriculture and industry.⁽⁶⁾ At the same time, as was the case with the other categories, whole chapters are also devoted to these specific aspects, in particular, trade and commerce.⁽⁷⁾

The/

- (1) Ensor op.cit.
- (2) For example N.C.M.H. Vol.II op.cit. ch.II
- (3) For example N.C.M.H. Vol.III op.cit. ch.I
- (4) For example N.C.M.H. Vol.V op.cit. ch.II
- (5) For example N.C.M.H. Vol.VI op.cit. ch. XIV
- (6) For example N.C.M.H. Vol.X op.cit. ch.II and Watson op.cit. ch.XX
- (7) For example Davies, op.cit. ch.XI and Watson op.cit. ch.II and N.C.M.H. Vol.VIII op.cit. ch.I and Vol.XIII op.cit. ch.II

The problems involved in defining social history, which were evident in the discussions by Renier and Perkin, reappear in the chapter headings employed in the New Cambridge Modern History and the Oxford Histories of England. The term 'social' is used vaguely and is linked to general aspects of a period, phrases such as, "the transformation of social life,"⁽¹⁾ "social developments,"⁽²⁾ "the arts and social life,"⁽³⁾ being employed as chapter headings. Only in the case of three chapters does a clearer definition emerge, one which is discussed by Perkin,⁽⁴⁾ namely the importance of treating the social structure of the community as the central problem to be studied by the social historian. These three chapters all appear in the New Cambridge Modern History, the following headings being used, "the Social Foundations of States,"⁽⁵⁾ "Social Classes and the Foundation of States,"⁽⁶⁾ and even more explicit, "Social Structure, Office Holders and Politics in Western Europe."⁽⁷⁾

The history of religion, which is ignored by Finberg, and given scant attention by Renier, achieves prominence in some of the volumes of the New Cambridge Modern History and the Oxford Histories of England. The main focus of the chapters is on the activities of particular churches and church leaders,⁽⁸⁾ though occasional chapter titles refer simply to "religion"⁽⁹⁾ or "religious history"⁽¹⁰⁾ One subordinate topic/

-
- (1) N.C.M.H. Vol XII op.cit. ch.II
 - (2) N.C.M.H. Vol.IX (Cambridge 1965) ch.XIII
 - (3) Clark op.cit. ch. XIV
 - (4) See below p. 91-96
 - (5) N.C.M.H. Vol.V op.cit. ch. VIII
 - (6) N.C.M.H. Vol.VII op.cit. ch. III
 - (7) N.C.M.H. Vol.III op.cit. ch. IV
 - (8) For example N.C.M.H. Vol.I, op.cit. ch.IV, Vol.II op.cit. chs.II, VIII, Mackie op.cit. ch.XI and Black op.cit. ch.X
 - (9) For example, N.C.M.H. Vol.VII op.cit. ch.VI
 - (10) Davies op.cit. ch. III and VIII

topic, appearing in four volumes of the New Cambridge Modern History, and one of the Oxford Histories of England, and also playing a part in chapters on more general religious themes is church/state relations.⁽¹⁾ No attention appears to be given in the two series to a division between ecclesiastical and religious history along the lines suggested by Renier,⁽²⁾ though church/state relations may form a part of Renier's view of ecclesiastical history.

The arts, that is art, architecture, music and literature are given prominence in both the New Cambridge Modern History and the Oxford Histories of England, but particularly in the former. The titles of the chapters refer specifically to one of the arts,⁽³⁾ broader terms like cultural change,⁽⁴⁾ being only rarely used. Of the different arts, which might have received attention, literature was by far the most popular,⁽⁵⁾ though art, architecture and music were given consistent attention.⁽⁶⁾

Science, technology and the different aspects of human thought also received some prominence. Science is a common theme especially in the New Cambridge Modern History,⁽⁷⁾ while technology is given particular attention in four volumes of the New Cambridge Modern History⁽⁸⁾ and in one of the Oxford Histories of England.⁽⁹⁾ The subject of human thought is approached in two ways, the first is to devote /

-
- (1) For example N.C.M.H. Vol. V op.cit. ch.VI, and Black op.cit. ch.1
 - (2) Renier op. cit. p.78
 - (3) In the two series 41 chapters were devoted to different aspects of the arts
 - (4) Three chapters dealt with cultural change - N.C.M.H. Vol. VI op.cit. ch.111 and Watson op. cit. chs. XIII and XX
 - (5) Sixteen chapters in the two series concentrated on literature
 - (6) Twelve chapters in the two series were devoted to art, seven to architecture and five to music
 - (7) A chapter on "science" is included in every volume of N.C.M.H. except Vols. 1 and XII
 - (8) N.C.M.H. Vol. VIII op.cit. ch. IV, Vol. IX op.cit. ch.V, Vol.XI op.cit. ch.111, Vol. XIII op.cit. ch.V
 - (9) Watson op.cit. ch. XIII

devote chapters, entitled, for example, "Thought"⁽¹⁾ to the different aspects of human thought, which the author considers appropriate to the period under discussion, and the second to write chapters on specific types of thought, for instance, philosophy,⁽²⁾ political,⁽³⁾ religious,⁽⁴⁾ and social thought.⁽⁵⁾

Two cognate subjects, education and learning, were difficult to relate directly, either to the arts or to thought. Learning played little part, only being highlighted in two chapters of the New Cambridge Modern History,⁽⁶⁾ but education was a consistent theme.⁽⁷⁾ As a consequence, the importance of this interest in education as a subject amongst historians will be considered when the final structure of the category system is established.

The history of warfare was a popular topic in the volumes of the New Cambridge Modern History. Chapters were devoted to particular aspects of warfare, for example, the army and the navy,⁽⁸⁾ as well as to general themes like "the Armed Forces and the Art of War."⁽⁹⁾ At the same time, chapters were written on specific wars,⁽¹⁰⁾ in which the main emphasis lay on strategy and tactics, though other elements, such as diplomatic relations during a war, and the economic and social consequences of wars, played a minor role. Together, both these groups of chapters revealed a concentration on warfare which was both detailed and persistent.

Like /

- (1) For example N.C.M.H. Vol.V op.cit. ch.XI and Vol.VI op.cit. ch.III
- (2) For example N.C.M.H. Vol.V op.cit. ch. IV
- (3) For example N.C.M.H. Vol.III op.cit. ch. XVI
- (4) For example N.C.M.H. Vol.IV op.cit. ch.V
- (5) For example N.C.M.H. Vol.II op.cit. ch.IV
- (6) For example N.C.M.H. Vol.I. op.cit. ch. V and Vol.III op.cit. ch.XIV
- (7) In the two series nine chapters were devoted to education
- (8) For example N.C.M.H. Vol.II op.cit. ch.XVI, Vol.III op.cit.ch. VI and Vol.X op.cit. ch. XII
- (9) For example N.C.M.H. Vol.VII op.cit. ch. VIII and Vol.VIII op.cit.ch.VI
- (10) For example Taylor op.cit. ch.I, XV and XVI

Like the history of warfare, colonial history was given prominence in the New Cambridge Modern History and the Oxford Histories of England.⁽¹⁾ Most of the chapters in both series were concerned with the relations between a specific power and its colonies,⁽²⁾ though general chapters were written on the rivalries of European powers in particular areas,⁽³⁾ and on the relationship between European powers and different areas of the world.⁽⁴⁾

The final major category or group of categories to play a part in these series only appears in the New Cambridge Modern History. In the volumes of the New Cambridge Modern History chapters are devoted to the history of particular geographical areas, under titles such as "the Habsburg Empire" or "Poland". It is possible therefore to create categories relating to these geographical areas. At this stage in the argument, however, no attempt will be made to develop such categories, because, as yet the appropriateness of including categories defined in terms of geographical areas has not been considered, an issue, which will be discussed at the end of this section.

This survey of the New Cambridge Modern History and the Oxford Histories of England has given considerable support to the majority of the categories suggested by Renier and Finberg, and, at the same time, has been responsible for the addition of new categories, which they did not mention. Thus, to avoid confusion, a list of the categories which /

-
- (1) Twenty-four chapters being devoted to colonial and imperial history in the two series.
 - (2) For example N.C.M.H. Vol.V op.cit. chs. XV and XVI
 - (3) For example N.C.M.H. Vol.IV op.cit. ch. XVII
 - (4) For example N.C.M.H. Vol. II op.cit. ch.XX and Vol.IV ch XXI

which has been included so far in the category system, will now be presented

A Political History

1. Diplomatic History
2. Domestic Politics
 - Constitutional History
 - (a) History of Government
 - (i) Parliamentary History
 - (b) Legal History

B Economic History

C Social History

- 1 Sociology and Social History
 - Social Structure
2. Social Custom

D History of Warfare

1. Military History
2. Naval History
3. History of Aerial Warfare

E History of Ideas (History of Thought)

1. Philosophy
2. Political Thought
3. Social Thought
4. Religious Thought

F History of Arts

1. History of Literature
2. History of Art
- 3 History of Music
- 4 History of Architecture

- G History of Science
- H History of Technology
- J Historical Geography
- K Ecclesiastical History and the History of Religion⁽¹⁾
 - (a) Church/State Relations
- M Archaeology and Place Names
- N Biography
- O Universal History
- P Local History
- R Colonial History
- S European History divided according to countries and geographical areas.

At this point in the development of the category system a period was spent attempting to code a selection of marking guides so that the usefulness of particular categories could be determined. As a result, a few of the categories were eliminated at this stage. The reasons for their rejection will now be considered.

The preliminary coding of the marking guides revealed that virtually no attention was paid to category E, The History of Ideas, and its sub categories, or to category F, The History of the Arts and its sub categories, while category G The History of Science and category H The History of Technology were equally neglected. In the initial sample of the marking guides coded none of these four categories reached more than 1% of the marking guides in any one paper. Thus
In /

(1) These two categories were combined since the division between them suggested by Renier was clearly not accepted by the contributors to the New Cambridge Modern History and the Oxford Histories of England.

In a typical 'A' or 'O' level paper in which sixteen questions are normally included none of these categories were allocated more than a quarter of a question. As a consequence, a preliminary decision was made to abandon the sub categories in category E and in category F and to combine categories G and H into one, a decision which could be rescinded if the categories proved to be important in a later set of marking guides.⁽¹⁾

The value of including category O, Universal History, was also questioned at this stage. As has already been indicated category O was concerned with world history, in particular with the history of areas outside Europe, and with adopting a universal, as opposed to a European, view of world history.⁽²⁾ Since the papers being analysed in this study were confined to British and European history, and the other areas of the world were only incorporated in so far as they became involved in the colonial ambitions of European powers, category O appeared to have little relevance and was, therefore, eliminated from the category system at this stage.

The grounds for the inclusion of category S (the division of European history into different countries and areas) were also suspect. In the first place, the incorporation of category S was unnecessary, because the study of the actual questions set at 'A' and 'O' level could determine the countries and geographical areas involved in each paper. Almost every questions in a G.C.E. paper gives a clear indication/

-
- (1) i.e. the sub categories dealing with the histories of philosophy, political, religious and social thought and those concerned with the histories of art, architecture, music and literature.
- (2) See above p. 35.

indication of the country or part of Europe to which the candidate should refer, and, as a result, the creation of a set of definitions to facilitate the use of category S in the analysis of the marking guides appeared to be superfluous. Secondly, the value of establishing which countries or geographical areas are given most prominence on papers on European history was not clear. If such an analysis were conducted it is likely that certain trends would be indicated, for example, that the countries of Western Europe received more attention than those of Eastern Europe, and that particular European countries were highlighted in the centuries during which they were close to obtaining general dominance of the continent. This information is not only of a very obvious nature, but is of little help to this study, because its concern is with the types of history employed in the papers. Finally, as is evident from the above comments, category S is defined in terms of geographical criteria, whole societies or countries being placed in different categories. In contrast, the other categories deal with particular aspects of past societies or countries. Thus category S runs counter to the remainder of the categories, its use involving coding all the marking guides twice - an additional labour for little gain. As a consequence category S was excluded from the category system at this stage.

The final category eliminated at this stage because of difficulties encountered in defining and coding it was local history. Two definitions have been advanced for local history. The first by R.B. Pugh, states that local history "is a method of ascertaining certain facts about the history of England by the minute examination of/

of those areas smaller than the realm that combine to make the realm."⁽¹⁾

This definition is extremely broad. Thus, if it is accepted, any material dealing with a sub unit of the nation, for example, the history of an industry, or of agriculture, or the social structure of a particular social class, becomes local history. Such a definition is unhelpful in the context of this study, since it bears no relationship to local history as it is understood by teachers. As far as they are concerned, local history involves the study of the community in which the school is situated - pupils being able to study local buildings, topography, documents and even interview local people.⁽²⁾

A more promising definition is suggested by Finberg. His starting point is the declaration of the Leicester School that the business of the local historian is "to re-enact in his own mind and to portray for his readers the origin, growth, decline and fall of a local community".⁽³⁾ In his discussion of this definition Finberg concentrates on the word "community" and argues that the extent of a community is determined by the sense of identity experienced by its inhabitants.⁽⁴⁾

In the past Finberg suggests that this sense of identity only extended to a small area, such as a village or borough. In his view this description of local history makes it distinct from national history, its subject matter is different, and can be studied to a large extent independently of national history.⁽⁵⁾ His definition is clearly in accord with the teachers view of local history and the category would, therefore, appear to be extremely useful. However, difficulties were encountered when the category was employed for coding marking guides.

Even/

- (1) R.B. Pugh "How to write a Parish History" (London 1954) p.9
- (2) Douch op.cit. p. 7-8
- (3) Finberg op.cit. p.116-117
- (4) *ibid* p.117-118
- (5) *ibid* p.119-120

Even a superficial survey revealed that no questions were set, which invited pupils to analyse their own community, nor were they specifically asked to discuss any aspect of local history. Thus the only use made of local history in the marking guides is to provide illustrations of national themes. But when coders are faced with such an illustration they have no means of deciding whether it arises from the study of local history, in the sense described by Finberg, that is as part of a protracted study of the community, or is simply an isolated example gathered from local sources to provide evidence for a more general theme. For example, in a marking guide outlining an answer to a question on conditions in industry during the early nineteenth century reference might be made to descriptions of conditions in the pottery industry, but there would be no way of determining whether the illustration arose out of a detailed study of the industrial community of Stoke-on-Trent in the early nineteenth century, or were simply local examples gathered to prove a particular point. This problem made it impossible to determine whether references to local evidence in the marking guides sprang from local history studied in the manner suggested by Finberg or not. Thus category P had to be eliminated from the category system.

As a result of these modifications, the category system at this stage was made up of the following categories and sub categories:-

A Political History

1. Diplomatic History
2. Domestic Politics
 - (a) (Constitutional History
(History of Government
 - (1) Parliamentary History
 - (b) Legal History

B/

B (Economic History

(
C (Social History

1. Sociology and Social History

"Social Structure"

2. Social Custom

D History of Warfare

1. Military History

2. Naval History

3. History of aerial Warfare

E History of Ideas

F History of the Arts

G History of Science and Technology

H Historical Geography

J Ecclesiastical History and the History of Religion

(a) Church/State Relations

L Archaeology and Place Names

M Biography

N Colonial History

With the general review of the categories suggested by historians completed, the next stage is to consider the related problems of the overlap between different categories and of establishing the definitions of individual categories. Section (c) will be devoted to a discussion of these crucial issues, a full description of each category used in the coding being in Appendix A.

Section (c) Overlap between the Categories and the Problem of Their Definition.

This section/

This section will be divided into a number of sub sections, the first being an Introduction, and the remainder being devoted to the discussion of particular categories and sub categories.

Introduction

In this introduction the problem of overlap between the categories and sub categories will be discussed, as well as a number of general issues which apply to the whole category system.

Both Renier and Finberg state that hard and fast lines between categories cannot be established and that there is inevitable overlap between them.⁽¹⁾ Renier, in particular, is concerned that any attempt to divide history into different specialisms may lead to rigidity, or to the creation of a hierarchy.⁽²⁾ Unfortunately, neither Renier nor Finberg take this issue any further, so that the problem of overlap between the categories has to be discussed almost ab initio.

There is little doubt that overlap exists between the different types of history. Thus historians may focus on a particular aspect of society, for instance, its economic activities, but their analysis of those activities is unlikely to be confined to economic factors. An economic historian, for example, who is explaining the advent of the Industrial Revolution, may incorporate references/

(1) Finberg op.cit. p. VIII
Renier op.cit. p.56-57

(2) Renier op.cit. p.57

references to the geographical conditions of England, such as the availability of raw materials, and the suitability of the climatic conditions. The same is true of the explanations employed in other types of history - the objective of historians is to provide a satisfactory explanation of the events they are considering and they will incorporate all the factors, which they regard as relevant, whether restricted to their own specialism or not. Equally, historians may be concentrating on one type of history, and thus be concerned with particular aspects of society, but when they consider the consequences of the events in which they are specialising they may find that they have an impact on aspects of society with which they are not primarily concerned. A political historian, for instance, who, in the course of an evaluation of Walpole as a statesman, is discussing his economic policy, will be unable to avoid a consideration of the consequences of Walpole's actions for trade, industry and agriculture.

The difficulties presented by this type of overlap are not insuperable. While historians who concentrate on a particular type of history may incorporate material from other aspects of history their primary focus is what defines the type of history with which they are concerned. The economic historian, for example, who is dealing with the advent of the Industrial Revolution in Britain may incorporate the work of geographers in his description of the early stages of the Industrial Revolution, but his primary emphasis, as is indicated later in this section, will be on factors like capital, labour supply, technical innovation, the organisation of production/

production and the availability of markets.⁽¹⁾

Similarly, the political historian discussing the career of Walpole, may rely on the economic historian to assist him in his assessment of Walpole's economic policy but, as will be shown below,⁽²⁾ he will be concerned, in the first instance, with Walpole's acquisition and maintenance of power, with his relationship with other politicians, with his constitutional innovations and the broad strategy lying behind his domestic and foreign policy. Indeed even in his discussion of Walpole's economic policy he may be more interested in its formulation than in its effects. Thus, although both these historians may employ the findings and expertise of other specialists they have areas on which they focus primarily. This point, but with rather different examples, is made by one of Finberg's contributors, Perkin, in his discussion of the relationship between economic and social history.⁽³⁾ As a result, the primary objective when defining the categories is to determine the areas, which are the main centres of interest for particular types of history.

Once the category system is seen in these terms coding presents no problems. The types of history are defined in terms of foci and each point in a marking guide is coded accordingly. A question may, for instance, be set on a problem associated with a particular type of history, for example, the fall of a government. The marking guide may deal with the statesmen and/

(1) see below p.85

(2) see below p 71-73

(3) Finberg op.cit. p. 54-56

It is also evident from the descriptions of different types of history offered by Finberg's associates and Renier

and political parties who were involved in the collapse of the government, but may also make reference to economic factors, like world trade, which contributed to the government's fall, but were outside its control. When coded the sections of the marking guide concerned with statesmen and political parties would be coded A (political history), while the discussion of world trade would be coded B (economic history). Thus a solution to the problem of overlap is available both at the theoretical and practical levels.

While the problem of overlap is the main general issue which applies to the whole category system, there are other general considerations which need to be discussed, before the content of each category and sub category is outlined. First of all, it is important to remember that this category system is the only one, in which an attempt has been made, both to incorporate the major types of history, and to ensure that the category system operates successfully. Though Renier developed a category system, he made no attempt to apply it and, as a consequence, avoided all the problems of ensuring that his system could be used to code a wide range of data, dealing with different periods of history and different geographical areas. Secondly, though every care will be taken to remain faithful to the views, which historians express about the content of different types of history, a cautious attitude has to be taken to their statements. Most of the comments, which historians make about the types of history, on which they are working, are delivered on/

on occasions like inaugural lectures, or in general articles about the nature of their specialism. They are statements made for the ears of fellow specialists, often with the purpose of legitimising or expanding the territory of their particular type of history.⁽¹⁾ They are not statements whose accuracy is going to be tested against the views of other historians, or in the development of a category system. As a result, though the description of different types of history, put forward by historians will be incorporated into the definition of the categories and sub categories more emphasis will be placed on the results of the survey of the New Cambridge Modern History and the Oxford Histories of England, when the content of the categories and sub categories is being described. Lastly, while the categories were being constructed the purpose of the study had to be borne in mind. The aim was to discover the effect, which the content of 'O' and 'A' level papers, had on the teaching of history. As will be seen later in this section, this objective led in a number of cases to the creation of certain categories and sub categories, and influenced the selection of the content of others, when the views of historians were virtually irreconcilable.

Category A (Political History and its Sub Categories)

Two approaches will be adopted to the definition of category A (political history). At this stage, a general definition will/

(1) For example Bindoff's attempt to argue for the pre-eminence of political over other types of history in Finberg op.cit. p.1-15

will be discussed and the sub categories, into which political history can be divided. Then once the sub categories have been selected, and their content established, the detailed boundaries between political history and other categories will be determined.

Those historians who have attempted to define political history have viewed it as centred on the activities and nature of government. Bindoff, for example, when contributing to Finberg's "Approaches to History" sees political history as dealing with diplomacy, and "the history of government in its widest sense."⁽¹⁾ Sir George Clark, when discussing the primacy of political over other types of history, points to the importance of public institutions for the study of the past.⁽²⁾ Renier also, whose views have already been outlined, sees political history as made up primarily of diplomatic history, the story of domestic politics and the development of political institutions.⁽³⁾ As a result of this consensus, political history was defined as dealing primarily with the structure of government and with the foreign and domestic policies of governments and political leaders. At the same time, it became clear that the history of the activities of governments/

-
- (1) Here Bindoff is echoing a statement made by Elton in his preface to England under the Tudors (London 1955) p.3. Bindoff, however, goes to much greater lengths than Elton to justify this point of view (Finberg op.cit. p.8-9)
- (2) Sir George Clark's Inaugural Lecture (Cambridge 1944) p.5
- (3) Renier op.cit. p.59

governments and political leaders could not be covered adequately without a consideration of the policies and attitudes of those politicians who were not in power. Thus, the definition was extended to include, not only the actions of governments, but also the views and activities of their opponents.

Possible sub categories, into which political history could be divided, were described by Renier and by Bindoff, while the review of the New Cambridge Modern History and the Oxford Histories of England revealed that certain of these sub categories are widely used by historians. Renier divided political history into diplomatic history, constitutional history (of which parliamentary history was a sub category) domestic politics and legal history,⁽¹⁾ while Bindoff, though mentioning administrative history in passing,⁽²⁾ concentrates his attention on diplomatic history, constitutional history and the history of governments and their leaders.⁽³⁾ Of these subcategories, three were given prominence in, either, or both, of the New Cambridge Modern History and the Oxford Histories of England. Diplomatic and constitutional history were treated as major sub categories by both the series, with domestic politics being persistently emphasised only in the Oxford Histories of England. As has already been indicated, the tendency to divide European history into the history of different countries/

-
- (1) Renier op.cit. p.59-61
(2) Finberg op.cit. p.3
(3) ibid p.6-12

countries ensured that domestic politics was not employed as a major sub category in the chapter headings used in the New Cambridge Modern History, though much of the material on the history of individual countries was devoted to domestic politics.⁽¹⁾

The case for incorporating diplomatic history, constitutional history and domestic politics into the category system appeared overwhelming. In the first place, all three were highlighted by Renier and Bindoff and played an important part in the New Cambridge Modern History and the Oxford Histories of England. Secondly, unless the major sub categories of political history were employed the results of this study were likely to be unrevealing. Already in the early stages of the survey of the marking guides the importance of political history in some of the papers on modern history became evident, it being clear that at least half of these papers were devoted to political affairs. As a result, if political history was undifferentiated in the category system a real danger existed that the main finding, which would be reported from the study of certain papers was that political history was the predominant category, no indication being given of the varied use being made of different types of history from one paper to another. In particular, it would be impossible to determine whether political history was interpreted widely or narrowly by the examiners and thus to what extent the preparation of the pupils for certain papers was dominated by one, as opposed to, a number/

(1) See above p. 43-44

number of aspects of political history - whether, for example, papers on European history were overshadowed by diplomatic history and those on English history by domestic politics. Thirdly, the use of the sub categories of political history made it possible to analyse the extent to which constitutional history was studied by the pupils. As defined by Renier and Bindoff constitutional history is seen as the analysis of how governments work. Such a sub category is in marked contrast to the sub categories concerned with diplomatic history and domestic politics. These two sub categories are centred on the actions of governments and political leaders at home and abroad and deal, to a large extent, with policies whose impact was limited to the decade in which they took place, and, which were quickly overtaken by subsequent events. The focus of a sub category concerned with the machinery of government is rather different, dealing mostly with aspects of politics which were relatively permanent in their influence. For example, Notestein's analysis of the structure of Elizabethan Parliaments,⁽¹⁾ and of how the government controlled the House of Commons, with its relevance to the reign of Elizabeth as a whole, as well as that of James, would be coded as dealing with the machinery of government, while the year by year manoeuvres of individual nobles such as Burleigh, Norfolk, Leicester, Walsingham and Essex and Elizabeth's detailed relations with countries like Scotland, the Netherlands and France would be placed in the categories concerned with domestic politics and diplomatic history. These two approaches /

(1) W. Notestein "The Winning of the Initiative by the House of Commons" (London 1924)

approaches to political history are complementary, the one providing the framework within which political events occur and the other the narrative of these events. As a result, the degree to which each of these aspects of political history are emphasised in the papers is an important indication of the extent to which the pupils are studying a balanced syllabus of political history at 'A' and 'O' level.

Neither of the two sub categories, which remain to be discussed, namely parliamentary history, a sub section of constitutional history, and legal history, has a strong case for inclusion in the category system. Renier's choice of parliamentary history as a sub category of constitutional history is strange. It is difficult, for instance, to understand why he selects parliamentary history as the only sub category of constitutional history - Parliaments are only one aspect of the constitution of a country, others which are equally important, for example, are the monarchy, the executive and the civil service, not to mention the system of local government. In addition, parliamentary history only has relevance to certain countries, being of particular importance in English history, but of little relevance to much of European history. Finally, only Renier mentions parliamentary history, Bindoff makes no reference to it as a separate category and the historians who contribute to the New Cambridge Modern History and the Oxford Histories of England do not isolate parliamentary history as being/

being of special importance when they are dividing their subject into specific topics. Though legal history has a clear tradition, the arguments for its use in this category system are also weak. In the first place, legal history requires a knowledge of the law for its full understanding. As a consequence, it is not an aspect of history which pupils at 'A' and 'O' level can, or should be, expected to study. Indeed, even undergraduates preparing for an honours degree in history rarely study the history of law in any detail. Secondly, as was the case with parliamentary history, Bindoff makes no mention of legal history and it is virtually ignored as a major subject by the historians, who contributed to the New Cambridge Modern History and the Oxford Histories of England. Thus, both parliamentary history and legal history were excluded in the category system employed in this analysis.

At this stage in the development of the category system three sub categories had been accepted, namely, diplomatic history, constitutional history and the history of domestic politics. These sub categories and the detailed problems involved in their use will now be considered.

Sub Category A1, A1(s) (Foreign Politics)

Considerable agreement exists between Renier, Bindoff and the authors of the New Cambridge Modern History and the Oxford Histories of England on the content of diplomatic history. Renier describes it as the history of relations between/

between states and such a description clearly includes all the titles used by the contributors to the New Cambridge Modern History and the Oxford Histories of England, such as foreign policy, international diplomacy and international relations. In addition, three of the four elements suggested by Bindoff are also incorporated within Renier's definition, namely, foreign policy, international relations and international institutions.⁽¹⁾

The only discordant note is struck by Bindoff's assertion that the comparative study of governmental institutions should be included in diplomatic history.⁽²⁾ This aspect of political history is hard to classify - it has affinities with constitutional history, as it involves the comparison of the institutions of different countries, and also with diplomatic affairs because of the spread of governmental institutions from one country to another. Though this problem might have been severe if this category system had been developed to analyse academic history, in the context of this study it was unimportant, since none of the marking guides surveyed, when the category system was being created, or subsequently, revealed any reference to the comparative study of governmental institutions. As a consequence, no reference was made to the comparative study of governmental institutions in the category system. Thus, sub category AI, AI(s) (foreign politics) was defined as dealing with the relations between states, a phrase, which was understood to incorporate the foreign policies of governments and politicians, as well as all the material dealing with international relations and the development of international institutions.

(1) Finberg op.cit. p.9-11

(2) ibid p. 10-11

This definition of diplomatic history was the furthest stage, which could be reached, as a result of the analysis of the work of historians like Renier and Bindoff, and of the major divisions in the subject postulated by the contributors to the New Cambridge Modern History and the Oxford Histories of England. From this point on, any further problems had to be solved by following the logic of the definition and by considering any relevant historical arguments. Fortunately, in practice, this definition of diplomatic history led to few difficulties though, in drawing up the regulations for the operation of the category, boundaries had to be established between diplomatic and other types of history, in particular, military history, and domestic politics. In addition, the coding of especially difficult types of material, for example, marking guides dealing with the Holy Roman Empire had to be considered.. The boundaries between diplomatic and other types of history can be determined without the creation of major problems. As will be seen later in this section military history is defined as the strategy and tactics pursued by military leaders and governments on land and at sea. If this definition is employed at the same time as the description of diplomatic history, which is outlined above, no clash should occur between the two categories. Any reference, therefore, to negotiations between governments would be coded as diplomatic history and descriptions of the military manoeuvres of different states would be categorised as military history. The relationship between diplomatic history and domestic politics was equally straightforward to code. The only areas in which a clash appeared even possible was/

was in the reaction of the public to foreign affairs and in the discussion of international relations by politicians in Parliament and elsewhere. Though such reactions and discussions may take place in the arena of domestic politics, they are so completely concerned with international affairs that a coding of A1, A1(s) (foreign politics) appeared appropriate. A final, and perhaps the most serious difficulty, arose with the coding of material dealing with the relations between the Holy Roman Empire and the princes of Germany. This problem was resolved on historical grounds. Though the princes were nominally the vassals of the Holy Roman Emperor their independence of him was almost total.⁽¹⁾ As a result, any of the very small amount of material describing this relationship was coded A1, A1(s) (foreign politics).

Sub Category A2 (Structure of Government)

In earlier discussions some progress has already been made in developing a definition of sub category A2 (the structure of government). Renier's broad definition of constitutional history has already been outlined, namely that it is concerned with "the methods, the conventions, the body of practice adopted by men in governing the state,"⁽²⁾ in other words with how government works. A similar concern for the structure of government was betrayed by Bindoff, though he did not indicate whether it should be equated with constitutional history.⁽³⁾ However, his concern with the study of the structure of government, /

-
- (1) A.J.P. Taylor The Course of German History (London 1945)p.16-22
(2) Renier op.cit. p.59
(3) Finberg op.cit. p.8-9, p.12

government, that is both central and local government, appears to be identical to Renier's definition of constitutional history. At the same time, the tendency of the authors of the New Cambridge Modern History and the authors of the Oxford Histories of England to discuss different aspect of the government of the state, ranging from constitutional history, to more specific aspects of government has been pointed out.⁽¹⁾ As a result, sub category A2 was defined as dealing with the structure or machinery of government, concerned that is, not only with the constitution of the state, but also with how governments work, including within that definition all the different institutions, which were an integral part of central and local government.

This definition of sub category A2 proved easy to operate, though in two areas, affecting a very small percentage of the marking guides, further consideration of the applicability of the sub category had to take place. The most important issue that arose was how to code material that described the policy adopted by governments and political leaders towards the constitution of the state, the choice being between sub category A2 (the structure of government) and sub category A34 (domestic politics without structure of government). Since the policies of the governments and political leaders and the debates over the nature of government were concerned exclusively with the structure of government it seemed logical to code this material in sub category A2. The second area in which the use of this sub category might create difficulty was in dealing with the occasional reference to the law and the legal/

(1) See above p. 42-43

legal system. Here the coders had to use their own judgment and decide if the reference in the marking guide indicated that the government controlled the administration of the law and was employing it as an arm of the government. In these circumstances coders were instructed to place the reference in sub category A2, since it dealt with the machinery of government.

Sub Category A34 (Domestic Politics without structure of Government)

Less guidance was obtained from historians like Renier and Bindoff, and from the contributors to the New Cambridge Modern History and the Oxford Histories, in the construction of sub category A34 (domestic politics without structure of government), than in the creation of sub category A1A1(s) (foreign politics) and A2 (structure of government). Renier refers to a category which he calls the history of politics which is distinct from constitutional and diplomatic history, and which deals with the internal politics of the state.⁽¹⁾ Unfortunately, however, he does not describe the contents of this category in any detail, limiting himself to the assertion that it deals with the actions of men, as opposed to the study of governmental institutions, and that it concerns the story of party life, as well as describing the struggle for the mastery⁽²⁾ of the state. Bindoff also does not identify precisely a category concerned with domestic politics, but he does discuss the actions of political leaders.⁽³⁾ Only the contributors to the /

(1) Renier op.cit. p.59

(2) ibid p.59

(3) Finberg op.cit. p.6

the Oxford Histories of England employ domestic politics as a major category viewing it as the narrative of the policies and careers of political leaders, political groups and governments.

From the sketchy indications of the nature of the sub category the different aspects of its content can, however, be constructed without difficulty. The sub category has two main foci. The first deals with the narrative of the struggle for political power in the state, and, as a result, includes a description of the actions of those politicians and political groups who were in opposition, as well as those who were in power. The second is concerned with the policies of political leaders and governments, including for example economic, social, religious and cultural policies, which collectively and individually can be of great importance for the inhabitants of the state.⁽¹⁾ These two elements, which covered the aspects of political history, not dealt with by diplomatic history, and the structure of government formed the sole ingredients of sub category A34 (domestic politics without the structure of government)

When the definition of sub category A34 was tried in practice no major difficulties were experienced in its use. As with sub category A1A1(s) (foreign politics) and A2 (structure of government) the reaction of the public to political issues, and in this case to domestic politics, and, in particular, to the policies/

(1) See below p112-5 for a discussion of the overlap here between political and other types of history.

policies of governments was incorporated within the category, but this was the only further development of the above description of sub category A34, which was necessary.

Up to this point in the discussions of the sub categories of political history three criteria have been important, namely the divisions in political history which are identified by historians, the usefulness of these divisions for a study of this nature and the need to apply the definitions, which have been established in a logical manner. At this stage, however, it was decided to review the possibility of incorporating other divisions in political history in which the main, if not the only criteria, were the light that such categories might throw on the impact of these papers on the schools.

Category E (Political History - Non Government)

One very important issue, which needs to be discussed in detail, is the extent to which pupils are given a broad or narrow interpretation of political history. For the full significance of this issue to be realised it is essential to define the phrase broad and narrow interpretation of political history and then to discuss its importance for the teaching of history in schools.

The difference between a narrow and broad interpretation of political history turns on the range of political groups and interests, which are included in the study of politics. A narrow approach would simply involve a description of the actions/

actions and policies of governments and their leaders and of their main opponents at the centre of politics, that is at court or in parliament. A broad approach is to consider the political activities of the whole community, whether they are members of the ruling group, or not.

Whether a broad or a narrow interpretation of political history is adopted in the papers is significant for history teaching in schools. As has already been emphasised in Chapter 2, one of the main objectives of this study is to determine how far pupils are being given a broad picture of the periods of history which they are studying. With political history playing a dominant role in some of the papers, especially those on modern history, it is important to find out, to what extent the pupils gain a complete picture of the political history of a period. Secondly, if the pupils are given a narrow interpretation of political history a real danger exists that they will gain a biased picture of a period of history. If pupils only deal with the history of governments and their policies they will receive the impression that the political concerns of the ruling class were the only important political issues of the period. For example, if papers are set on English history in the nineteenth century, which consistently ignore Chartism, the early socialist movements and the Campaign for Women's Suffrage, and concentrate solely on issues like the Balance of Power, Reform Bills, and the Irish problem, the pupils will be likely to view politics from the point of view of the rulers, as opposed to the ruled. Thirdly, a complete picture of the political/

political history of a period allows pupils to gain insight into the nature of the community as a whole. A study of the different political groups in any one period gives a picture of the prevailing ideologies and aspirations of different sectors of the community, as well as valuable information on the degree to which different social groups had any vestiges of political organisation and a conscious political philosophy. At the same time, the disarray of movements which were hostile to the prevailing system, or indeed at certain periods their total absence, can often throw significant light on the ease with which the dominant social groups maintained their control. Thus a study of the utopian and millenarian philosophies of movements like the Peasants' Revolt make an important contribution to an explanation of the hold which the land owning classes had over the community in the Middle Ages.

As a result of these arguments, a category dealing with political movements, which were completely separate from the prevailing political system, was created and to ensure that the coders were aware of this separation a distinct category was developed, as opposed to a sub category of political history. Category A, therefore, became concerned solely with the actions and policies of governments and political leaders and their opponents in the central political arena, for example, at court, or in Parliament.

While the arguments in favour of category E appeared to be strong the difficulties involved in the definition of the category were considerable./

considerable. Though movements like Chartism and the Peasants' Revolt were clearly distinct from the prevailing political system the classification of other social movements, for example British Trade Unions in the nineteenth century were more difficult to code. A number of criteria were considered and only one was found to be satisfactory. First of all the movements which could be placed in category E could not be defined by the type of support, which they attracted, since political leaders, factions and parties are capable of attracting a popular following whether they are associated with the official system or not. Secondly, the movements could not be identified by the means which they employed to achieve their ends, for instance, a tendency to pursue their objectives by violent or illegal methods. Thus clashes between major factions in the state, for example, the Wars of the Roses, or the Civil War of 1642, can end in war. Thirdly, even the objectives pursued by these movements could not provide an accurate indication of the categories in which they should be placed. Though an important characteristic of movements, which are not part of official politics is that they promote radical change, such proposals can also be put forward by major factions or groups operating through the legislature or the executive. The members of the Estates General, for example, in France during August 1789 decreed the abolition of feudalism and the nationalisation of all church land. The only criterion which created a workable boundary between categories A and E centred on the nature of the leadership of the different movements being coded.⁽¹⁾

(1) The use of this criterion is justified below, see p.78

coded. If the leadership of a movement were drawn in the main from individuals, who were members of the main political bodies in the state, then the material was placed in category A, if not, it was coded as category E. As a result, movements like the Peasants' Revolt, the jacqueries of the Middle Ages and Chartism would be placed in category E, as well as the early socialist and trade union movements in England provided their objectives were of a political nature. At the same time the actions of the States General in 1789 and the political activities of the main factions in the Civil War of 1640 would be coded A, since the leaders were members of the legislature or executive. In addition, rebellions and protest movements in the colonies could be categorised satisfactorily, though in this context the appropriate test was the extent to which the leadership of a movement was involved in the political system set up by the ruling power, either in the parent country or in the colony itself. The political aspects of the American War of Independence would, therefore, be coded A, since the rebellion was led, to a large extent, by men who were members of the different state legislatures, while the political features of the Indian Mutiny whose leaders were not part of the colonial administration could be placed in category E.

Though only one criterion was available for its identification, and though it was not generally accepted by historians, category E was incorporated into the category system. The reasons, which have already been advanced, were important indicators of the usefulness of category E in a study of this nature. In addition though only one criterion could be employed to define category E, in the /

in the light of our limited knowledge of most political movements it was a vital indicator. Thus, for example, little is known about the rank and file of movements in the earlier centuries of British history, especially those which lay outside the official political system, only the leadership can be satisfactorily identified and their attitudes described.⁽¹⁾ Finally before category E was incorporated every measure was taken to ensure that it did not damage the results obtained from other categories and sub categories. The only ones with which it overlapped were category A (political history) and sub categories A2 (structure of government) and A34 (domestic politics without structure of government), no reference being made to foreign affairs in the material coded E in the marking guides. Category A was not seriously affected - it now dealt with the material relevant to the official political system and if there was any need to find out the exact percentage of the marking guides in a paper, which was devoted to political history as a whole, it could be calculated by adding the results for categories A and E. Some more direct action had to be taken to deal with the overlap between category E and sub categories A2 and A34. The creation of category E had clearly reduced the percentage of the marking guides, which would be attributable to these sub categories. As a result, a small amount of double coding/

(1) This statement is even true of the Peasants' Revolt. In describing it historians rely heavily on contemporary accounts of the leaders. Their knowledge of the rank and file is extremely limited - they cannot tell, for example, whether the Revolt was carefully planned and organised beforehand or was a virtually spontaneous movement. (McKisack M. "The Fourteenth Century, Oxford 1959, p.419-423)

coding was introduced into the category system. Where references were made to the constitutional changes proposed by movements like Charism double coding took place, that is A2/E. Since all the remaining material in the marking guide coded E dealt with domestic politics this decision made it easy to divide the results for category E into sub categories A2 and A3⁴ if it proved necessary later in the study. Thus the incorporation of category E did no damage to the category system.

Sub Categories A1(s) (Foreign Politics Individual) A2(s) (Structure of Government Individual), A3 (Domestic Politics Individual)

Three sub categories of political history were created, all of them dealing with biography in the context of political affairs. The relevance of biography, however, to all aspects of history makes it logical, at this stage, to discuss its applicability to the category system as a whole, as well as to political history.

As has already been mentioned in section (b) of this chapter, little attention has been paid to biography by writers like Renier and Finberg and by the contributors to the New Cambridge Modern History and the Oxford Histories of England. Only Renier singles it out as a special category of historical study⁽¹⁾ with the historians who are involved in the New Cambridge Modern History and the Oxford Histories of England restricting themselves to intermittent use of the careers and achievements of individuals as the main foci of their writing. Even Renier does/

(1) Renier op.cit. p.75-77

does not attempt to describe biography in detail, simply drawing the reader's attention to some of the dangers faced by biographers, and to the importance of giving a description of the historical background of a period, which is sufficient to make the study of an individual's life and career intelligible.

But though neglected as a category by historians, biography is of some interest in the context of this study because of the problems it creates for the historian and for the teaching of history. Renier points out how dangerous biography is even in the hands of historians. He states that the biographer inevitably tends to exaggerate⁹ the part played by his subject in a particular period and he asserts that English historians are particularly prone to this fault.⁽¹⁾ If historians experience such problems with biography the perils of giving it prominence in the schools will be considerable. Thus, if pupils concentrate to a large extent on the careers of individuals, for instance, the exploits of generals, the achievements of artists and the rise and fall of politicians, there is a danger that their view of history will be too simple. Pupils will tend to ignore other factors, which are important in history, such as the attitudes and behaviour of those who are led, in particular, the part played by different religious, social and political groups in a period of history. At the same time, they may ignore the role of human organisations, for example, political institutions like the executive and legislature, and business units, such as companies, firms and factories.

However, /

(1) *ibid* p.76

However, though the degree to which a biographical approach to history was employed in the schools was of interest, the difficulties involved in using the category made its inclusion problematic. If a category dealing with biography was to be introduced it would involve dividing every category into two sub categories, one dealing with the biographical content of the category, and the other with the remainder of the material and also dividing all the existing sub categories along similar lines. Only in this way could the full extent of the attention given to biography be calculated and its importance assessed in each category and sub category. This procedure would have resulted in the total number of categories and sub categories being doubled, with important consequences for the study as a whole. First of all, the creation of such a number of new sub categories⁽¹⁾ would make the task of establishing the reliability of the category system much more difficult. As will be shown in chapter 4, the problems encountered in establishing the reliability of the category system, given such a large number of marking guides, drawn up by different examiners, covering so many periods of history and already including twenty-five categories and sub categories, were formidable. In addition, the main difficulties experienced in ensuring reliability arose with the sub categories⁽²⁾ and if the proposal to assess the part played by biography were implemented twenty-five new sub categories would be created. Secondly the time which would have to be allocated to the calculation of the results and of the impact of the main/

(1) All the material dealing with biography would be placed in sub categories, for example, category B (economic history) would now be divided into sub category B1 (economic history - biographical) and sub category B2 (economic history - non biographical).

(2) See below p.135-136.

main variables, was already considerable and would be greatly increased by the introduction of so many new sub categories.

As a result, a compromise was reached, namely to test how far biography was employed in the dominant category or sub category in the papers. Already the preliminary survey of the marking guides had revealed that political history was probably the most important category. It was, therefore, decided to develop sub categories which would determine, in the first instance, the extent to which biography played a part in political history and to create similar sub categories for other types of history if they clearly played a major role in a high proportion of the papers. The objective was to assess the role of biography in as high a percentage of the marking guides as possible, while keeping the development of new sub categories to a minimum. Even this very limited initial decision, however, involved the development of three new sub categories, the individual in foreign affairs A1(s), in constitutional affairs A2(s), and domestic politics A3. The definition of these sub categories led to no major problems, the material referring to individuals and their achievements in the different aspects of politics, being placed in their respective sub categories.

Category B (Economic History)

Category B (economic history) proved difficult to define because of the vague manner in which economic historians have described their specialism. To prove this point four typical definitions, taken from /

from a number which are available,⁽¹⁾ have been selected for consideration and their inadequacy in the context of this study will be demonstrated. Then a different approach will be adopted to the definition of the category, the writings of a number of economic historians will be surveyed to identify the aspects of the past on which they primarily focus their attention.

Four general definitions of economic history will be considered. The first two by Renier are of little help, because they are almost tautological. Renier states that economic historians in recent years have "widened their scope" as they "perceived that trade was only one aspect of the economic activities of men"⁽²⁾ and again that economic history is "the story of the experience of men in so far as they were concerned with matters of which economists take cognizance."⁽³⁾ In the context of this study these two definitions provide little assistance, in the one, economic history was regarded as the history of the economic activities of men, and, in the other, of the matters of which economists take cognizance. In both cases the definition is not advanced, in the first, the crucial word is 'economic' and, in the second, 'economist' neither of which is defined. A similar approach is taken by Court, the historian who/

-
- (1) Others available, but not discussed in detail here, are, for example, Sir William Ashley's description of economic history as "the history of actual human practice with respect to the material basis of life" ("The Place of Economic History in University Studies" *Economic History Review*, January 1927, p.1) and N.S.B. Gras' definition that "economic history is the story of the various ways in which man has obtained a living" ("The Rise and Development of Economic History" in *Economic History Review*, January 1927, p.12.)
- (2) Renier op.cit. p.70
- (3) *ibid* p.70-71

who gives an account of economic history in Finberg's Approaches to History. He defines economic history as the record of economic choice,⁽¹⁾ though he does redeem himself by giving some precise information about the content of economic history during the course of this chapter.⁽²⁾ The remaining description is perhaps more helpful but it is still vague. Clapham defines economic history as "a branch of general institutional history, a study of the economic aspects of the social institutions of the past."⁽³⁾ Unfortunately once Clapham has presented this definition he concentrates on the need for a quantitative study of these economic aspects. In so doing he points to the importance of the provision of precise data on prices, wages and volumes of production, but he does not define what he means by "social institutions" or by "economic aspects".

As a result, of the vagueness of economic historians when describing their specialism, it was decided to attempt a survey of the writings of a number of economic historians to isolate the topics on which they concentrate their interest. Once again the relevant Cambridge series, the Cambridge Economic History of Europe,⁽⁴⁾ was selected for this survey. This series not only enjoys a high reputation, but it also incorporates the work of some fifty leading economic historians, no other series drawing^{on} a similar number or range of historians.

When/

- (1) Finberg op.cit. p.20
- (2) Finberg op.cit. p.26-41
- (3) J.H. Clapham "Economic History as a Discipline" Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences Vol. V, New York 1943, p.327
- (4) From this point forward referred to as the Cam.Ec.H.Eur.

When the titles of the chapters employed in the Cambridge Economic History of Europe were surveyed the following topics effectively covered all the subjects mentioned in the series - agriculture and industry and their respective institutions, ⁽¹⁾ trade and transport, ⁽²⁾ the nature of financial institutions, ⁽³⁾ the policy of governments with regard to trade, finance, industry and agriculture, ⁽⁴⁾ the rise and fall of towns and their organisation in relation to production and marketing, ⁽⁵⁾ demographic trends, ⁽⁶⁾ technological change with special reference to industry and agriculture, ⁽⁷⁾ the development of colonial territories ⁽⁸⁾ and finally surveys of prices and national incomes. ⁽⁹⁾

These topics, therefore, formed the basis of category B and only with two of them were difficulties encountered, namely the policy of governments and demography. With both of these subjects overlap occurs with other categories, in the case of government policy with category A (political history) and in the case of demography, with categories C and D (social history). Both of these problems will be dealt with later, demography, when the categories in social history are being defined, ⁽¹⁰⁾ and, economic policy, when the treatments of specific types of government policy, for example, economic, social, cultural, religious and military and naval policy are discussed at the end of this chapter. ⁽¹¹⁾

-
- (1) For example Cam.Ec.H.Eur. Vol.I (Cambridge 1966) chs. II, IV and V, Vol.IV (Cambridge 1967) ch.V and Vol.VI (Cambridge 1966) chs.VI, VII, IX and X.
 - (2) For example Cam.Ec.H.Eur. Vol.III (Cambridge 1963) chs.II and III, Vol.IV op.cit. ch.III and Vol.VI op.cit. ch.IV
 - (3) For example Cam.Ec.H.Eur. Vol.III op.cit. ch.VII
 - (4) " " " " " " " ch.VI & Vol.VI op.cit. ch.VIII
 - (5) " " " " " " " chs.II & III & Vol.IV op.cit.ch.III
 - (6) For example Cam.Ec.H.Eur. Vol.IV op.cit. ch.I & Vol.VI op.cit. ch.II
 - (7) " " " " " " " ch.IV " " " ch.V
 - (8) " " " " " " " ch.VI " " " ch.III
 - (9) " " " " " " " ch.VII " " " ch.I
 - (10) See below p. 94-95
 - (11) See below p. 112-115

Categories C and D - Social History

The definition of categories C and D (social history) created considerable difficulties, largely because of the variety and vagueness of the descriptions of social history, which historians have put forward. (1) The problem was compounded, because there was no series concentrating on social history which would make it possible to examine the aspects of history on which social historians concentrated. As a result, a choice had to be made amongst the definitions which were available. This section will, therefore, be devoted to a review of descriptions of social history from which, one will be chosen and the selection justified.

Of all the definitions of social history, which are available, Renier's is perhaps the most confused. He begins by asserting that social history is "the story, which leaves out the state" incorporating "the thought and the works, the daily life, the beliefs, the needs, the habits of our ancestors and as such must include economic history." (2) Almost immediately Renier contradicts this position, stating that social history is "history without politics, almost without the state, but also without economics" and that though the social historian may take cognizance of the story told by the economic historians, as he does/

-
- (1) Definitions of social history, not discussed here, because of their extreme vagueness, are (a) Rowse's description of social history, as being concerned with "how society consumes: what it has produced" (Rowse A.L. "Study of History" London 1935 p69) - the weaknesses of this definition are ably pointed out by Rostow, W.W.: British Economy of the 19th century (Oxford 1948) p.134-135, and (b) Unwin's description of social history as dealing "with Life, Truth and Beauty - with the energizing souls of men in community" Unwin, G. "The Teaching of Economic History in University Tutorial Classes" Studies in Economic History: The Collected Papers of George Unwin, (London 1927,) p.38.
- (2) Renier op.cit. p.70

does of the work of other types of historians, he will not push his research deeply into economic matters.⁽¹⁾

The approaches to social history adopted by Trevelyan and Rostow are along similar lines. Both provide a broad definition of the contents of social history and both describe three levels in society, the economic, social and political.

The descriptions of social history, provided by Trevelyan and Rostow, are very wide ranging. Trevelyan states that social history should deal with "the daily life of the inhabitants of the land in past ages":⁽²⁾ and that "this includes the human as well as the economic relation of different classes to one another, the character of family and household life, the conditions of labour and leisure, the attitudes of man to nature, the culture of each age as it arose out of these general conditions of life and took ever changing forms in religion, literature and music, architecture, learning and thought."⁽³⁾ Rostow's definition is similar. He asserts that social history "includes the way people live, the culture and religion, which they generate, and regard as acceptable, their scientific pursuits and above all the general political concepts which serve to rationalize their relationship to the community."⁽⁴⁾

Though both Trevelyan and Rostow see society as made up of three levels the political, social and economic, Rostow goes into greater detail in explaining this view of society than Trevelyan. Trevelyan simply asserts/

(1) Renier op.cit. p.72

(2) Trevelyan, G.M. English Social History (London 1942) p.viii

(3) ibid p. vii

(4) Rostow, W.W. op.cit. p.134

asserts that social history provides "the link between economic and political history."⁽¹⁾ He sees "the social scene" as "growing "out of economic conditions, to much the same extent that political events in their turn grow out of social conditions."⁽²⁾ Rostow goes beyond the mere assertion that three levels exist in society and attempts to indicate how they interact. He asserts that changes in the economic system provide the main framework within which concepts develop. These concepts blend with existing social ideals and eventually lead to the creation of political objectives.⁽³⁾ Though Rostow attaches importance to influences arising as a result of changes in the economic system, his theory is not one of simple economic determinism. The blending of concepts, developing as a consequence of economic change, with existing social concepts, allows for great variety in the creation of social and political ideas.

Though the descriptions of social history presented by Trevelyan, and by Rostow, are clearer and more subtle than Renier's definition, they still proved impossible to use as a basis for the development of categories relating to social history. On the one hand, the accounts given of the topics covered by social history by Trevelyan and Rostow proved to be too broad, while, on the other hand, the description of the social level, even by Rostow, was not sufficiently precise. Each of these criticisms will now be considered in turn.

The range of topics incorporated in their descriptions of social history by Trevelyan and Rostow is disconcerting. First of all, their/

-
- (1) Trevelyan op.cit. p.vii
(2) ibid p.vii
(3) Rostow op.cit. p.142

their descriptions embrace a number of types of history, which have an existence, which is distinct from social history. Thus Trevelyan's definition includes the history of religion, literature, music, architecture, learning and thought, while Rostow's incorporates people's religion and culture, their scientific concepts and their general political ideals. Both these definitions are, therefore, incorporating within social history types of history, for example, of religion, of the arts, and of scientific thought, which have their own separate existence, a separateness, which is demonstrated clearly in the survey of the New Cambridge Modern History and the Oxford Histories of England. Secondly, some of the important phrases and terms used by Trevelyan and Rostow are too vague. Trevelyan refers to the 'attitudes of man to nature' and to the 'general conditions of life',⁽¹⁾ and Rostow to "the way people live" and "their culture" without further definition.⁽²⁾ Finally, as Perkin points out these definitions saddle the social historian with a wide-ranging and non specific series of topics, in his words "social history, on this pattern is still auxiliary, peripheral, invertebrate, not an intelligible field of study, or even an articulation of one."⁽³⁾

The attempt by Trevelyan and Rostow to divide society into three levels is also unsatisfactory. Trevelyan's description cannot be evaluated because it is undeveloped - he simply states that the three levels, political, social and economic, exist, without further illustration or explanation. Though Rostow's description of the levels is more detailed, it is still vague. First of all, as has already/

(1) Trevelyan op.cit. p.vii

(2) Rostow op.cit. p.134

(3) Finberg op.cit. p.55

already been indicated, Rostow incorporates in the social level, subjects which are conventionally studied as separate types of history, for example, people's religious beliefs and their scientific pursuits.⁽¹⁾ Secondly, his main illustration of the operation of the three levels betrays the absence of definition at the social level. Very briefly, Rostow describes the transition from a belief in responsible aristocratic government in the late 18th century, to the acceptance of laissez-faire in the mid 19th century and finally to the adoption of a defensive British nationalism and an enthusiasm for Empire in the late 19th century.⁽²⁾ Unfortunately Rostow's main explanation of the changes in these important ideas lies with the economic level of society, the role of the social level not being fully developed.⁽³⁾ In addition, the central ideas, which Rostow employs in his example are political, as opposed to social concepts. Thus Rostow's main illustration of the three levels does not throw any precise light on the role of the social level. Thirdly, Rostow gives no indication of the way, in which the social level should be analysed - he sees social life as producing a series of concepts and ideas, but he does not define social life. He does not state, for example, whether the social level should be analysed in terms of social groups or social classes, no attempt being made to utilise any of the concepts developed in sociology to show how the social level might be studied.

These

-
- (1) See above p. 87
(2) Rostow op.cit. p.137
(3) ibid p.137

These weaknesses evident in the ideas of Renier, Trevelyan and Rostow are not repeated in the much clearer views of Perkin. As a result, Perkin's ideas will now be described and assessed as a possible basis for the creation of categories dealing with social history.

Perkin believes that social history can be established as "an intelligible field of study!" He attempts a comprehensive definition of social history. In his view social historians should present "the natural history of the body politic exploring and explaining its ecology, anatomy, physiology, pathology and ... its psychology too: its awareness of itself, its conscious aims, criteria and ideals."⁽¹⁾ Each of the main aspects of this description is then explored. Perkin regards the study of a society's ecology as the analysis of its adaptation to its environment and of the interplay between the environment and society.⁽²⁾ The anatomy of a society he views as its structure and he points out that the study of the social structure of a community should not be limited to the class system, but should include such elements as the pattern of social institutions.⁽³⁾ Perkin then describes the physiology of society as the analysis of how it works, how it distributes its resources, how social control is maintained and how society "regenerates itself."⁽⁴⁾ Here Perkin is at pains to point out that the historian should extract the juices of the social from all aspects of society.⁽⁵⁾ He is not acting as a political or economic or cultural historian that is studying these specific features of the community, instead he is analysing the relationship /

-
- (1) *ibid* p.61 - A similar approach is adopted by E.J. Hobsbaum "From Social History to the History of Society" in M.W. Flinn and T.C. Smout: "Essays in Social History" (London 1974) p.1-20
- (2) *ibid* p. 62-64
- (3) *ibid* p.64-66 - this is the aspect on which Hexter concentrates in his article "A New Framework for Social History" (J.N.Hexter "Reappraisals in History" (London 1961) p.14-25)
- (4) *ibid* p.66 (5) *ibid* p.66-69

relationship of the different elements of society to each other. A society's pathology is easier to describe. In Perkin's view this aspect of social history deals with the social problems of a community and the remedies, which are put forward to solve these difficulties.⁽¹⁾ Finally, Perkin describes the psychology of society, which he argues has two main ingredients.⁽²⁾ The first is the degree to which society has self awareness and an ability to control its own development, and the second, concerns its social ideals, namely "of what constitutes the good life and how society should help individuals to pursue it."⁽³⁾ The latter aspect can in Perkin's view be reduced to "the ideal of what the individual is".⁽⁴⁾

In contrast to the definitions of social history put forward by Trevelyan, Rostow and Renier, Perkin's view of social history is defensible. In the first place, he isolates a distinct territory for social history, which though it may involve co-operation with other types of historians, does not lead to serious encroachment on their area of specialism. In the study of a society's ecology he is concerned with how a community adapts to its environment, rather than concentrating on the geographical background to a period of history, though that is relevant.⁽⁵⁾ When he defines a society's anatomy he focuses on the structure of the community, namely the nature and number of the different social groups of which it is comprised.⁽⁶⁾ His description of social problems deals with issues such as conflict, want, disease, ignorance and squalor and the remedies provided for them. Though other historians make a contribution/

(1) *ibid* p.70-71

(2) *ibid* p.71-74

(3) *ibid* p.73

(4) *ibid* p.73

(5) *ibid* p.62-64

(6) *ibid* p.64-66

contribution to the analysis of such topics, in particular economic historians, Perkin is focussing on the pathology of society, namely on the study of its malfunctioning.⁽¹⁾ At the same time, in his description of society's physiology Perkins distinguishes between the social historians' concern with the relationship between the different elements of society and the study of specific features, such as agriculture and industry.⁽²⁾ Perhaps only in his reference to the psychology of society does Perkins fail to establish a distinct boundary between social and other types of history, his discussion of the social ideals of a community clearly involving a consideration of religious and other types of thought.⁽³⁾ Secondly, Perkin's definition of social history rests on a coherent framework, which is drawn from sociology. Though he emphasises that sociology does not share the same objectives as social history,⁽⁴⁾ in particular, the search for general laws, Perkin focuses on the issues which sociologists regard as important. Like the sociologist his aim is to explain the nature of society as a whole and how it operates as a unit.⁽⁵⁾ Thus in his definition of social history he concentrates on a society's ideals, on how it adapts to its environment, on the relationship between the different elements of a society and on its pathology or malfunctioning. Even when he is concerned ostensibly with the 'anatomy' of the different features of society he lavishes his attention on concepts like social class by which

(1) *ibid* p.70-71

(2) *ibid* p.67-68

(3) *ibid* p. 73

(4) *ibid* p.59-60

(5) For example, *ibid* p.61 "He should try to see his society as a structured, functioning, evolving, self regenerating, self-reacting whole."

which the coherence of or disunity within a society can be explained. These two factors, the way in which he distinguishes between social and other types of history, and the coherent framework which he creates for social history, as well as the absence of other satisfactory definitions, which had been developed in such a detailed manner, led to the adoption of Perkin's description of social history as the basis for the construction of the category or categories dealing with social history.

When Perkin's outline of the contents of social history was used in the analysis of the marking guides a number of difficulties arose. As has already been mentioned during the discussion of category B (economic history), an area of overlap exists between political and other types of history - the policy of governments being common territory between them. This problem arose with the coding of governmental social policies and will be considered later in this chapter when the categorisation of governmental policy in general is discussed.⁽¹⁾ A second difficulty, which was also mentioned, while the contents of category B were being outlined, was the problem of how to code material dealing with demography, since both economic and social historians include studies of population in their analyses. The solution was to code each reference to demography according to the aspect of population studies on which it was laying emphasis. Thus material dealing with social mobility and with social influences on fertility and mortality would be placed in the categories dealing with social history. For example, if the statistics on mortality for a period were analysed to show how the life/

(1) See below p. 112-115

expectancy of certain social groups was higher than that of other groups the coding would be in category C or D (social history). On the other hand, if demography is seen in economic terms, for instance, a growth in population is linked to an increased demand for agricultural produce, the reference would be placed in category B (economic history). This type of solution is not innovatory in the context of this category system - it simply follows the guidelines laid down for approaching the problem of overlap, which were described at the beginning of this section.⁽¹⁾

The third difficulty, which was concerned with the coding of references to the ideals of society, and was defined by Perkin in such a vague manner, will be discussed when the general problem of different types of human thought is considered later in this section.⁽²⁾

The fourth and final difficulty arose with material, which was simply descriptive of the way of life of the population during a certain period, for example, accounts of the sports played by the community or of the food they ate.⁽³⁾ Such material could not be incorporated within Perkin's definition of social history, since he was concerned with the analysis, as opposed to the mere descriptions, of social phenomena. In his chapter on social history, for instance, Perkin even points out how the type of dress worn during a period of history can be analysed to indicate the nature of social status within a community.⁽⁴⁾ This distinction between an analytic and a descriptive approach to social history was particularly important in a study of this nature, since 'O' level papers might favour the descriptive and 'A' level papers the analytic approach. As a result, social history/

-
- (1) See above p. 56-59
(2) See below p. 100-102
(3) cf Renier op.cit. p.73-74
(4) Finberg op.cit. p.69

history was divided into two categories, category C dealing with descriptions of the daily life of the population and category D following the lines laid down by Perkin.

Category G (religious history) and its subcategories

As will be evident from the writings of historians like Renier, the history of religion has not been defined in detail.⁽¹⁾

However, a basis for a category or categories dealing with the history of religion was provided by the contributors to the New Cambridge Modern History and the Oxford Histories of England.⁽²⁾

Not only was it evident that the history of religion was regarded as a distinct aspect of a period, but also the outlines of the

content of a category or categories was provided by the topics on

which the two series focused: Five topics were particularly

emphasised, namely the history of churches, of religious groups,

of church leadership, for example, the Papacy, of individual church leaders like Luther and Calvin and of church/state relations.

These main features of the history of religion were therefore

employed as a framework for the construction of the categories dealing

with religious history. When the coding of marking guides was first

attempted using a category defined along these lines a number of

difficulties arose, which will now be outlined.

Two of the problems will only be mentioned at this stage, since they

form part of more general difficulties affecting a number of categories

and will,/

(1) Renier op.cit. p.78

(2) See above p. 45-46

will, therefore, be discussed later in this section. The first and most important concerns church/state relations, which is a facet of the problem of coding the policy of governments, a difficulty, which has already been mentioned when the contents of categories B,C and D were discussed.⁽¹⁾ The coding of references to religious thought was the second problem. Again the consideration of this aspect of the history of religion will be postponed until the category dealing with the different aspects of human thought is discussed.⁽²⁾

Of the three remaining problems, the major issue was to decide whether the category dealing with religious history should be subdivided. The case for the development of a number of categories dealing with the different aspects of religious history was quite strong, in that religious history clearly played an important part in some of the 'O' and 'A' level papers set by the boards, and an attempt to subdivide the material concerned with religious affairs could throw light on the different facets of religious history, to which the pupils were exposed. When the topics outlined above, which formed the basis of the category were reviewed they appeared to deal with two aspects of religious history, namely the history of the leadership of religious movements, whether the individual or corporate, and the history of religious movements as a whole, in which the activities and attitudes of the rank and file are considered, as well as that of the leadership. This type of division was of interest, since if a category were established, which included references to the leadership of religious movements, and one which dealt with the activities of the rank and file of religious groups the extent/

(1) See below p.115-117

(2) See below p 100-102

extent to which the examiners focused on the leadership of religious movements and neglected the rank and file could be determined. This analysis of the dominance of leadership in religious history would permit comparisons to take place between the results for category A (political history) and the categories dealing with religious history. As has already been mentioned above, category A was defined so that the attention paid by the examiners to the political activities of the ruling groups in the state could be determined, and the effect on the teaching of history in the schools discussed. The same question could now be asked in relation to the history of religion. As a result, category G (religious history) was divided into two sub categories, G(a), dealing with the leadership of religious groups, and G(b) with the attitudes and activities of the rank and file. The taking of this decision, which now applied to two important categories, prompted a broader issue, namely the extent to which each of the major categories could be divided in the same manner. Since this problem will arise again, especially in relation to category J, a general discussion of the applicability of a similar distinction to other categories will be delayed until that point. ⁽¹⁾

Two issues remain to be considered, namely the coding of references to Papal affairs, in particular Papal foreign policy, and materials dealing with Crusades. The coding of marking guides, which were concerned with Papal affairs, presented considerable difficulty in that the Pope was both a religious leader and a temporal ruler of a state.

To solve/

(1) See below p. 117-118

To solve this problem a general rule was created, that when material had to be coded, in which the Pope acted as head of the church, the category employed would be G(a) (religious affairs - leadership) and when he was clearly adopting the role of a temporal ruler the coding to be used was the appropriate sub category of category A (political history). Thus references, for example, to the Pope's regulation of church affairs, to his involvement in church/state relations and to his foreign policy when it was aimed at the furtherance of Catholicism in Europe should be coded G(a) (religious history - leadership), since the Pope was acting as leader of the Catholic Church and not as a temporal ruler. But when the Pope's objectives were those of a temporal ruler, for instance, if a Pope were pursuing a dynastic policy, such as the Medici attempted early in the 16th century, the relevant material would be coded in category A.⁽¹⁾ Clearly, with a ruling of this nature, indeed with almost any regulation in a category system, an area of discretion has to be left to the coders. As a result, it is important to note that no difficulty was experienced by the coders who were employed to test the reliability of the system in coding material dealing with the Papacy. The coding of references to the Crusades was almost as difficult as the categorisation of material dealing with the Papacy, since a Crusade has many facets, religious, economic, military, social and even cultural. As a result, the coders were instructed to classify references to the Crusades according to the aspect, which was being emphasised, for instance, if the marking guides were dealing with the religious characteristics/

(1) In the marking guides which were coded for this study there was no material which dealt with the dynastic policy of a Pope.

characteristics of a Crusade coding would be category G (religious history). This ruling appeared to operate successfully, except for references to Crusades, in which no specific aspect was identified, in such cases the coders were instructed to classify the material as uncodable.

Category H (Cultural History)

The next categories to be considered were those dealing with human thought, science and technology and the arts, each of which will be discussed in turn.

In section (b) of this chapter the tendency (albeit rather slight) of the contribution to the New Cambridge Modern History and the Oxford Histories of England to regard human thought as a separate category was noted.⁽¹⁾ As was indicated at that stage, however, human thought was not given a major role and no specialist aspect was given consistent attention. A category entitled human thought was, therefore, suggested tentatively (category E).⁽²⁾

When the comments of historians on the content of different types of history were considered and the marking guides were studied this category proved impossible to maintain. First of all historians like Renier and Perkin emphasised the need for specific aspects of human thought to be incorporated into the content of the specialist types of history to which they were most relevant. Perkin, for example, included the ideals of society and social thought as one of the main /

(1) See above p. 46-47

(2) See above p. 49 - here the provisional lettering of categories employed in section (b) is being used.

main ingredients of social history,⁽¹⁾ while Renier⁽²⁾ refers to the importance of incorporating the history of economic thought into economic history. These views are understandable-if the purpose of social history is to study the different elements of society and their interrelationship it is difficult to see how references to the ideals of society and social thought can be excluded. Similarly the economic history of a period is impossible to explain adequately without a consideration of the economic theories, which were prevalent and which influenced the behaviour of individuals and groups. Secondly, and most important, in the context of this study, the initial analysis of the marking guides showed that references to specific aspects of human thought were extremely difficult to identify. In marking guides dealing with political history, occasional references were made, which might be related to political thought, for example, to the prevalence of notions like absolutism or democracy. Unfortunately, no attempt was made in these marking guides to indicate whether such comments referred to the history of political thought, or were simply an expression of public opinion at that time. Since the history of political thought is concerned with the analysis of political concepts and their development, to classify such references as political thought seemed a doubtful procedure. The same dilemma occurred in marking guides dealing with economic history where occasional references were made to the popularity of ideas like free trade. It was difficult to decide whether such comments could be coded as economic thought, since no attempt was made to analyse the ideas or trace their /

(1) Finberg op.cit. p.71-74

(2) Renier op.cit. p.71

their development. Finally, the most difficult problem of all was to classify references to religious thought, since any description of the beliefs of a religious leader and their influence, which was an integral part of sub category G(a) (religious affairs - leadership) could be viewed as religious thought. As a result, the attempt to create a category dealing with human thought was abandoned - any such material being coded in the most relevant category, for example, references to political thought being placed in category A and its sub categories.

The description of the categories dealing with the arts and science and technology did not present serious problems. Already the contributors to the New Cambridge Modern History and the Oxford Histories of England had given prominence to a number of specific arts, for example, architecture, music, art, literature and sculpture. As a consequence, category H (the history of the arts) was defined as incorporating all the references to these arts, which occurred in the marking guides. The contents of category J⁽¹⁾ were decided in a similar manner, all material dealing with science and technology being incorporated within its boundaries.

Even categories apparently as straightforward as categories H and J created a few difficulties. The problem arose once again of how to code references to government policy in the field of the arts, science and technology. The same difficulties had occurred with categories B,C,D and G and, as with them, the discussion of government policy will be delayed until the end of this chapter.⁽²⁾ A second/

(1) Once again the provisional lettering employed in section (b) is used here.
(2) See below p.112-115

second problem was created by the extremely limited number of references to these two categories, which occurred in the marking guides. At the time when the category system was being constructed, and tested for reliability, only half the marking guides had been obtained from the boards. In these, category H and J played a very small part, neither of them exceeding 2% of the marking guides in any one paper (that is one third of a question out of the normal total of 16, which is the number usually set in papers at 'A' and 'O' level by the two boards). This minute role meant that it was extremely unlikely that the teachers would pay any attention to either of these aspects of history in their preparation for the papers, especially where other categories reached more than 30%. As a result, the decision was made to combine the two categories into one. This decision was a mistake. When all the marking guides were ultimately obtained one group of papers was identified in which category H played an important part, largely because of references to scientific and technical developments.⁽¹⁾ These marking guides were only coded when the category system had already been tested for reliability twice and had already been employed to code 90% of the material, and it was, therefore, too late to alter the category system. However, in any future analysis the two categories should be separated. A third, but less important difficulty was presented by the problem of coding references to the history of education. Though the history of education is generally recognised as a separate type of history it was decided not to create a category concerned exclusively with education. The main reason for this decision was the tendency for the history of education to be seen almost entirely as an aspect of government policy in the papers./

(1) In 'O' level papers dealing with economic and social history

papers. Thus references to the history of education were coded in category A, which deals with the actions of governments. Other characteristics of education, which occurred extremely rarely, were coded according to the particular aspect of history with which they were linked, for example, references to the economic importance of education would be coded in category B. When material dealing with the history of education was not connected with a specific type of history it was classified as part of category H, since that category with its emphasis on the arts, science and technology was closest to the history of education.

Category J (Military and Naval History) and its Sub Categories

Military history was clearly identified by Renier and by the contributors to the New Cambridge Modern History and the Oxford Histories of England. Renier argued that four aspects of military history were important, tactics, strategy, the development of military technology and morale.⁽¹⁾ The contributors to the New Cambridge Modern History and the Oxford Histories of England paid particular attention to tactics and strategy and, in general, gave considerable prominence to military history.⁽²⁾ As a result, military history was defined as the history of armies, navies and airforces, with special interest being attached to tactics and strategy.

Once this definition had been established the next task was to decide whether sub categories dealing with the different types of military/

(1) Renier op.cit. p.63-69

(2) See above p.47

military history, for example, the history of land warfare, of aerial warfare and naval history should be created. After careful consideration no attempt was made to develop these sub categories for the following reasons. First of all, historians tend to combine these three aspects of the history of warfare, either under the title of military history, or as closely related subjects in the description of a war. This tendency is true of Renier, and of most of the contributors to the New Cambridge Modern History and the Oxford Histories of England. Secondly, any variation in the inclusion of these different aspects of military history in the papers is likely to occur because of the period of history, or geographical area (England or Europe), on which the papers are set and will not, therefore, reflect a purposeful decision on the part of the examiners. Finally, whether pupils were exposed to the history of warfare, on land, at sea, or in the air, appeared to be unlikely to have much impact on the teaching of history, since in all three cases historians put their main focus on strategy, tactics and accounts of battles and campaigns.

A more pressing case for sub-dividing the material dealing with military history was created by the influence of governments over military affairs. Though historians generally treat military and political history as separate types of history, governments are the dominant influence on military affairs. They recruit the armies and navies, appoint the generals and admirals, raise money for wars and by their disagreements with other governments provide the occasion for armed conflict. In the context of this project, the influence of governments over military history is important, because/

because one of the main objectives of the study is to determine the extent to which 'O' and 'A' level papers are concerned with the actions of governments. As a result, sub categories J1 and J2 were created, sub category J1 for dealing with material in which governments were controlling military affairs, and, sub category J2, for developments in the field of military history, which are independent of governmental influence. Once these sub categories were incorporated into the category system, no difficulties were experienced in using them for coding the marking guides.

Category L (Geographical History) and its sub categories

Geographical history was also incorporated in the category system. Though the contributors to the New Cambridge Modern History and the Oxford Histories of England did not give geographical history any prominence it is, as Darby points out, an important aspect of historical study.⁽¹⁾ Geographical history marks the meeting point between geography and history, where the contribution, which the geographers can make to the study of history, becomes evident. In the same way, economic and social history are aspects of history, through which two disciplines, which are related to history, make an impact on its study. Furthermore, in some of the 'O' and 'A' level papers references were made to the geographical environment and its influence on historical events, and, without a category dealing with geographical history such material in the marking guides could not be coded adequately.

As/

(1) Finberg op.cit.p.156.

As will be seen from a study of Appendix A the description of category L (geographical history) is not detailed.⁽¹⁾ Though Darby indicates that historians writing geographical history may incorporate factors drawn from other types of history he asserts that the main preoccupation of the historical geographer is 'with physical circumstances, with the changing character of areas, and so with distributions frequently expressed in maps.'⁽²⁾ When this definition was employed to code marking guides no problem was found with references to the geographical environment and its impact on history.⁽³⁾ A problem was encountered, however, with the coding of descriptions of geographical exploration, which has a strong claim to be incorporated as an aspect of historical geography. As a result, the definition of category L was extended to include both aspects of historical geography, that is references to the environment and to exploration. But this new definition was not satisfactory, since it included two disparate aspects of historical geography, one, dealing with the impact of the environment on various aspects of the life of a society, and the other, giving a narrative account of voyages with considerable attention being paid to the courage and skill of the explorer. As a result, category L was broken into two, sub category L1, dealing with the geographical environment and its impact on historical development, and sub category L2, with exploration. Both of these sub categories proved to be satisfactory during the coding of all the marking guides.

Category N (Archaeology)

The/

(1) See below p.498-499

(2) Finberg op.cit. p.143

(3) Other aspects of 'historical geography' or 'geographical history' are mentioned by Darby, for example, the development of geographical thought (Finberg op.cit. p.151), but they are not discussed here, since the only two aspects of geographical history to arise in the marking guides are references to its geographical environment and to exploration.

Category N (Archaeology)

The case for the inclusion of a category dealing with archaeology is certainly as strong as the one for historical geography. Archaeology is a specialist activity, which supports the work of historians, particularly for periods where there are few or no written records. Though they are by no means the most popular, papers are set at 'O' and 'A' level, by the JMB and the Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate, dealing with such periods, for example, the Dark Ages and the Saxon and Viking eras. In addition, archaeology has attracted considerable attention in recent years among writers who discuss the teaching of history, since it is an activity, in which pupils can become involved, both at a practical and at an academic level.⁽¹⁾ As a result, a category dealing with archaeology was included in the category system. The description of the category was straightforward, any reference to archaeology, or evidence drawn from archaeology, was to be placed in the category and this definition created no difficulty when the marking guides were coded.

Category M (Human and Animal Disease)

Category P (Nature of History)

After the initial survey of the marking guides had been carried out two other categories were created which are not normally regarded as separate types of history. First of all a number of references to disease/

(1) For example M. Bryant "Archaeology" in W.H. Burston and C.W. Green "Handbook for History Teachers" (London 1972) p.431-435.

disease which did not fit into the coding system were discovered. A category was, therefore, created entitled "human and animal disease."⁽¹⁾ A more difficult problem was encountered with the occasional reference in the marking guides to the quality of the sources available to the historian and with the questions set at 'A' level, by the JMB, in which pupils had to assess the reliability of particular historical documents. These references and questions could not be placed in any of the existing categories, which were designed to assess the role of different types of history in the papers, not the historian's methodology. However, they were of interest, since it is important to assess the degree to which pupils are required to understand the methodology of the historian. Only by studying the limitations of the historians' methods can the pupil become aware of the tentative nature of historical writing and escape from the tendency to regard historical facts as absolute and inviolate. In addition, the concern expressed in recent years by writers on the teaching of history and by teachers themselves at the failure of the schools to allow the pupils to gain an understanding of the historians' methodology makes this aspect of the papers important to analyse.⁽²⁾ As a result, a category was created dealing with the nature of history, in which all references to the methods of the historians, for example, his use of sources were included.

Category X (Colonial History) /

- (1) Only references to descriptions of disease were incorporated in this category - the social, economic or other implications of disease were coded in the most relevant category
- (2) See below p.465-466

Category X (Colonial History)

The only other major category concerned with a type of history, which remains to be discussed, is category X (colonial history). This category caused considerable difficulty. The inclusion of a category dealing with colonial affairs made the category system very complicated. Colonial history is not confined to a study of the policies of Imperial governments and their representatives overseas, but includes all aspects of colonial life. Indeed to do justice to all the characteristics of colonial society all the categories and sub categories, outlined above, had to be replicated, but in this case, as sub categories of category X. Thus sub categories would have had to be created, for example, to code economic, social, religious and cultural developments in the colonies. This procedure had a number of drawbacks. First of all, the reliability of these categories and sub categories of colonial history was difficult to establish. In most of the papers set by the two boards, for which marking guides were available, the percentage of the material attributable to colonial affairs did not exceed 5% and in many fell as low as 1%. As a result, the percentage of the marking guides concerned with each of the sub categories of colonial history was extremely small and reliability was difficult to establish because there were so few references to each of these different sub categories. Secondly, the sub categories revealed little of interest. Thus when colonial history in general plays such a small part in 'A' and 'O' level papers, there is little point in discussing the role of the sub categories within colonial history. At 'O' level this is especially/

especially the case, since both the JMB and the Cambridge Local Examination Syndicate set whole papers on Imperial history where the contribution of the different categories to colonial history can be satisfactorily assessed. Thirdly, the inclusion of category X, and its sub categories, involved the doubling of the number of categories and sub categories in the system as a whole, and, as a consequence, an appreciable increase in the time, which would have to be allocated for the analysis of the results. Thus the plan to include categories and sub categories on colonial history was abandoned - the material being coded in the appropriate category in the overall category system.

Category Y (Uncodable Material)

Only one category remains to be outlined, category Y, dealing with uncodable material. Some of the material in the marking guides was uncodable, either because the remarks made by the examiner were vague, or because, in some cases, no marking guide was provided. Unfortunately, uncodability proved to be a major problem, sometimes affecting 10% of the available material and, as a consequence, the implications of uncodability, and the measures taken to assess its impact, will be considered in Chapter 5.

General Issues

Two major issues, which affect a number of categories, and which have therefore, been postponed until this stage will now be discussed. The first concerns the coding of marking guides dealing with government policy/

policy and the second, the extent to which references to dominant ruling groups play a part in these papers.

The coding of government policy created a major problem. The different aspects of government policy were seen by some writers as a part of political history, and by others, as important features of other types of policy. Thus, in the New Cambridge Modern History and the Oxford Histories of England, the economic, social and religious policies of governments are included both in chapters dealing with political history⁽¹⁾ and in chapters concerned with economic,⁽²⁾ social⁽³⁾ and religious history.⁽⁴⁾ Some device had, therefore, to be found to solve the problem of overlap between the categories.

The first solution to the problem, that was attempted, was to develop separate sub categories dealing with economic, social, religious and cultural policy. If these four sub categories could be established the overlap between political and other types of history would not create any difficulty, since the results for category A (political history) could be calculated with government policy included as could the results for categories B (economic history), C and D (social history), G (religious history) and H (cultural history). Unfortunately, when an attempt was made to delineate the boundaries between these different types of policy insuperable problems were faced because of the way in which government policy was defined in some of the marking guides. A tendency existed in a restricted/

-
- (1) See above p. 43
(2) See above p. 44
(3) See above p. 45
(4) See above p. 45-46

restricted number of marking guides, especially at '0' level, to describe government policy by listing the Acts passed by a particular administration without further development. Though this approach only occurred when domestic policy was one aspect of a broader question it nevertheless prevented the employment of sub categories dealing with different types of policy. Thus references to a Poor Law Act or a Factory Act, or a Public Health Act, or the introduction of Old Age Pensions, without additional comments, were impossible to code as specific types of policy, since they could involve either government economic, or social policy, or both.⁽¹⁾ Thus despite the relative infrequency of this approach to the description of government policy, its presence in a minority of marking guides was sufficient to prevent a satisfactory picture being created of the role of different types of government policy in the papers.

Once the difficulties involved in defining the sub categories dealing with different types of policy became clear, a second approach was considered, which involved adopting the strategy towards coding that has already been outlined in this section.⁽²⁾ Thus material dealing with different types of policy was carefully scrutinised. If it simply provided a description of government policy it was placed in category A. If, however, an account of the consequences of that policy were given, then they were classified according to the category to which they referred. For example, a description of the steps taken by Sir Robert Peel to bring about the repeal of the Corn Laws would be classified as political history, but an analysis/

-
- (1) Reference to these and other acts without further explanation occurs for example in '0' level marking guides drawn up by the examiners of the Cambridge board for the papers on British and European history (1688-1939) during the years 1968-1972.
- (2) See above p.57-59

analysis of the consequences for the price of corn in the following decades would be coded in category B (economic history). Equally if the causes of a particular type of policy were described, care would be taken to ensure that material involving categories other than political history would be coded accurately. If, for instance, as a prelude to a discussion of the economic policy of the Labour Government of 1929-31, a description were given of the Wall Street crash, and its implications for world trade, such references would be placed in category B. As a result, while care was taken to ensure that material dealing with governments was placed in category A, coders were instructed to ensure that reference to the role of other categories in the description of the causes and consequences of government policy were classified accurately.

Two sets of arguments can be advanced to support this strategy for the coding of references to the policies of governments. First of all, this approach is in accordance with the attitude of the only historians, namely Court and Perkin, who discuss in detail the role of government policy in relation to types of history, which are not primarily concerned with politics. Though Court sees the study of government economic policy as an essential ingredient of economic history, he is not concerned with a description of the political manoeuvres, by which such a policy was decided, but with its impact on the economic activities of the community. As he states in his chapter in Finberg's "Approaches to History," ... "economic policy has to be looked at by the economic historian primarily as a means to given ends, to be judged in terms of its economic effectiveness in distributing means between ends."⁽¹⁾ While Perkin does not attach as much/

(1) Finberg op.cit. p.39

as much importance to government policy as Court, he is just as unequivocal in his insistence that he is concerned with the impact of government policy. Thus, in the course of his discussion of the part played by the study of social policy in social history, he writes "the social historian cannot ignore the social implications of politics, legislation and administration."⁽¹⁾ Secondly a division between the different categories, along the lines suggested above, facilitates the realisation of perhaps the most important objective of the study, namely to determine the extent to which the examination papers encourage teachers and pupils to study the major aspects of society. Thus, the incorporation of the descriptions of government policy into a category dealing with political history makes it possible to determine what proportion of the different papers are devoted to the actions of governments. Equally, a definition of the economic, social, cultural and religious activities of the community, which includes a discussion of the relevant aspects of the causes and consequences of government policy, allows an assessment to be made of the extent to which pupils are being required to study these different features of the past. The approach, therefore, which had to be adopted as a result of the failure to employ sub categories dealing with particular types of history, did not have serious repercussions for the study, or involve a major clash with the views of different types of history, which are put forward by historians.

While the general regulations outlined above apply to the coding of references to religious history, certain aspects of church-state relations/

(1) Finberg op.cit. p.68

relations need to be considered in more detail. Not surprisingly, a number of questions set on mediaeval and modern history focus on the relations between the state and the church, in particular, concentrating on the relative power of the two institutions. The approach taken to the coding of such references was similar to the strategy adopted throughout the category system. Thus, in a discussion of church-state relations, references to the role of the state would be placed in category A (political history) and to the part played by the church in category G (religious history) and, on the rare occasions when both church and state were involved in the same statements, both categories would be employed for coding. Difficulties were also experienced in coding marking guides in which references occurred to the religious policies of rulers, who were both heads of state and heads of the church, a state of affairs, which applied particularly to England from 1536 until modern times. Given the emphasis within the papers, however, this problem only arose on rare occasions. Thus in papers set on English history, from 1536 to the present day, many of the references to religious history concerned the activities of religious groups, other than the Established Church, and their coding was, therefore, not affected by the fusion of the offices of the head of state and of the church. Another group of marking guides dealt with conditions in the Church of England and the actions of its ecclesiastical hierarchy without any reference to the state - such material was placed in category G (religious history). The only marking guides to cause acute difficulty were those in which rulers adopted policies aimed at altering the structure of the church, for example, the Elizabethan religious settlement or the imposition of strict Episcopalianism by Charles 1st in Scotland. In such cases, which were/

were infrequent, the references were placed both in category A (political history) and category G (religious history). These regulations with regard to the coding of references to religious history, though complex, created no major difficulties for the coders.

The final general issue, which affects a number of categories, has already been posed in the discussion of categories A and E (political history) and G (religious history). Part of the reasons for the creation of category E and sub category G(a) was to assess how far political and religious history in G.C.E. papers was centred on the activities and institutions of ruling groups and individual leaders. Unfortunately, the testing of this hypothesis could not be extended to other types of history, because of the manner in which references to them were presented in the marking guides. Thus, in the case of economic history, with the exception of material dealing with economic policy and occasional references to industrialists and inventors, no attempt was made to isolate the actions of any dominant group in economic affairs. Instead, developments were described in collective terms with general factors being isolated as in the phrase below, which is typical

" population expansion in the 18th century provided a market for agricultural products"

The same tendency was true of references to social history, with descriptions of social activities (category C) or of the influence of social groups (category D) and of references to cultural history, which was generally discussed in terms of artistic trends, mention only /

only being made occasionally of individual artists. Finally, in accounts of military and naval history, while the actions of individual leaders were discussed from time to time, a tendency existed to describe campaigns in impersonal terms, namely as a series of events. As a result, the attempt to gauge the extent to which the papers concentrated on the activities of ruling groups had to be confined to two categories only.

The category system which, therefore, emerged at the end of this lengthy sifting process and which was employed to code the marking guides was as follows,

Category A (Politics at Home and Abroad)

- Sub category A1 + A1(s) (Foreign Politics)
- " " A1 (Foreign Politics - collective)
- " " A1(s) (Foreign Politics - individual)
- " " A2 + A3 + A4 (Domestic Politics)
- " " A2 (Structure of Government)
- " " A3 + A4 (Domestic Politics without structure of Government)
- " " A3 (Domestic Politics - individual)
- " " A4 (Domestic Politics - collective)
- " " A1(s) + A3 (Politics at Home & Abroad - individual)
- " " A1 + A4 (Politics at Home & Abroad - collective)

Category B (Economic History)

- " C (Social History - Social Custom)
- " D (Social History - Social Structure)
- " E (Political History - Non Government)
- " G (Religious History)
- Sub category G(a) (Religious History - Leadership)
- " " G(b) (Religious History - Movements)

Category H (Cultural History)

- " J (Military and Naval History)
- Sub category J1 (Military and Naval History - Government)
- " " J2 (Military and Naval History - Non Government)

Category L (Geographical History)

- Sub category L1 (Geographical Factors)
- " " L2 (Exploration)

Category M (Human Disease)

- " N (Archaeology)
- " P (Nature of History)
- " Y (Uncodable Material)

Throughout/

Throughout the development of this category system the main objectives of this study have been borne in mind. Despite the vagueness with which historians define types of history, the categories were kept as close as possible to the types of history used by historians. In addition, the categories were modified and new categories developed to throw additional light on the extent to which particular aspects of history were emphasised in the papers, and thus influence the teaching of history in the schools. At the same time, as these objectives were being pursued, adjustments had to be made in the category system to ensure that the marking guides could be coded satisfactorily and that the reliability of the categories could be ensured.

This category system has, therefore, been developed against a background of considerable difficulty, which explains its provisional nature. However, its structure, and the descriptions of the problems faced in its development, should provide future researchers with a springboard for the construction of a more sophisticated and effective system.

CHAPTER 4

The Assessment of the Reliability of the Category System

This chapter will be divided into four sections, in the first, the conduct of the reliability trials will be described, in the second, the relationship between the unit of analysis in the marking guides and the calculation of reliability, in the third, the different methods of assessing reliability and the tables indicating the degree of agreement between the coders will be presented, and in the fourth, the results of the reliability trials will be discussed.

The Conduct of the Reliability Trials

Two reliability trials, one at 'A' and one at 'O' level, were conducted in August 1974. At this stage in the study all the J.M.B. 'A' level and Cambridge 'O' level marking guides had been obtained, so that there was a broad range of marking guides, catering for different periods and types of history, from which a sample could be selected to assess the reliability of the category system. Three coders were involved in the reliability trials, the researcher and two recent Honours Graduates in History. Three sets of marking guides were selected for the trials, one for the training of the two new coders and two for the actual trials themselves. Since the 'A' level marking guides were likely to be more difficult, a sample of 33 questions was chosen for training the coders. Both of them were introduced to the category system and then coded ten questions from the initial sample. The results were satisfactory, so the full trials/

could begin. At this stage two further samples were selected, 33 at 'A' level, every 20th question being chosen, and 41 at '0' level, every 15th being selected. The full reliability trials were then conducted.

The Unit of Analysis and the Calculation of Reliability

Whatever method is used to calculate reliability a unit of analysis has to be established in which the degree of agreement between the coders can be assessed.⁽¹⁾ In dealing with the marking guides employed in this study no such unit can be straightforwardly identified. Questions vary in their structure from one or two comments to a large number of points, as illustrated below.⁽²⁾

- (i) Outline the main causes of the Industrial Revolution in Britain in the late 18th century.

political stability existed from 1715; in general government economic policy ensured a low interest rate making borrowing easy; markets existed in Europe, India, the West Indies and the American Colonies; there was access from the main industrial areas to ports or navigable rivers; scientific and technological expertise was well advanced.

- (ii) Account for Napoleon's failure to retain control over Europe.

Napoleon's campaigns in Spain and Portugal; his generals failed to control these areas, thus there was a consistent drain on manpower and materials; provided an ideal opportunity for the British to fight an effective land war; Napoleon's campaign in Russia weakened his army; also European armies were beginning to counter French military methods, e.g. Wellington established the superiority of the line over the column; in the field of foreign policy Napoleon totally alienated Austria and Prussia; with Russia he failed to consolidate on the admittedly fragile agreement of Tilsit; Napoleon's ideas did not provoke an active response in Germany and Italy, instead a 'nationalist' reaction occurred, at least in Prussia.

If/

(1) Holsti O.R. op.cit. p.136

(2) These two marking guides have been devised by the researcher, since the two boards will not permit anybody to quote their actual marking guides publicly.

If these two questions were to be divided into units for purpose of coding the obvious divisions would be at each semi-colon, making five units in the first question and eight in the second. This procedure raises immediate problems. If the results were calculated in terms of units those questions with a large number would predominate giving a false picture of the paper as a whole. It, therefore, seemed wisest to treat each question equally even though this might mean that units within questions have varying weights.

This approach had a considerable effect on the calculation of reliability. Each coder was asked to classify each point in the marking guides into one or more categories. When the degree of agreement between the coders was assessed each question was considered separately, the units on which they agreed and disagreed being counted. As a consequence, the percentage of the questions, on which they were agreed, could be calculated and this procedure could be applied to the whole sample of questions being used to test reliability. Thus a common formula, which is used to calculate percentage agreement

$$\frac{100 \times \text{number of decisions on which coders agree}^{(1)}}{\text{number of decisions on which coders agree} + \text{number of decisions on which they disagree}}$$

number of decisions on which coders agree + number of decisions on which they disagree

is transformed in this case into

$$\frac{100 \times \text{number of questions on which coders agree}}{\text{number of questions on which coders agree} + \text{number of questions on which they disagree}}$$

number of questions on which coders agree + number of questions on which they disagree

Alternative /

(1) Costello A.J. "The Reliability of Direct Observations" Bulletin of British Psychological Society, Vol. 26 Number 91 April 1973, p.106.

Alternative Methods of Assessing Reliability

Three approaches are commonly used to assess the reliability of a category system.⁽¹⁾ In the first, the correlation between the overall results gained by the individual coders is calculated. In the second, an attempt is made to ensure that the agreement between the coders is assessed with allowance being made for chance agreement, while in the third, formulae are employed to calculate the extent of the agreement between the coders, when their classification of each item is compared.

The first two procedures are unsuitable for this study. If a correlation is worked out between the overall results of the coders much disagreement may be concealed. For example, if two coders classify ten points, one placing the first seven in category A and the last three in category B, and the other putting the first three in category B and the rest in category A the correlation between the overall results provided by the two coders would be perfect, but, in reality, their coding would only agree on four out of ten points. While this example may be extreme it does highlight two weaknesses of this approach. First of all, a comparison between the overall results does not give the assessment of the agreement between the coders which a comparison of their classification of each item would yield and, secondly, as is indicated by the example above, there will be a tendency to exaggerate the extent of the agreement among the coders. The use of formulae, which are designed to ensure that the agreement between the coders is assessed, with allowances being made for chance agreement, is also unsuitable for this study. The category system, used in this project, has a total of twenty-six categories/

(1) Ibid p.106

categories and sub-categories and the possibility of chance agreement is, therefore, extremely low. As a result such formulae were not employed.

The third alternative is to calculate the percentage agreement between two coders. A commonly used formula is the following⁽¹⁾

$$\text{C.R.} = \frac{2M}{N_1 + N_2} \times 100$$

(where M is the number of coding decisions, or in the case of this study questions on which the judges are in agreement and N₁ and N₂ refer to the number of coding decisions, or questions classified, by coder 1 and coder 2 respectively.)

This formula permitted the comparison of the coding of each item by pairs of coders thus ensuring that every agreement and difference of opinion was recorded. A faithful record could, therefore, be kept of the extent of the agreement between the coders even for categories and sub categories, which appeared rarely in the marking guides. As a consequence, the formula was adopted for use in this reliability study.

Once the appropriate formula had been chosen three further aspects of reliability needed to be considered.

First of all the significance of reliability for this particular study had to be examined. For this project the reliability of the researcher was

(1) Holsti op cit. p.140

was the most important aspect to test, since he was responsible for coding all the marking guides. As a result, the formula suggested by Holsti was adapted so that the percentage agreement between the researcher and his coders could be determined. Thus the percentage agreement between the researcher and one of his coders can be calculated by employing the formula

$$Aq : \frac{100 Ma}{Nr}$$

and between the researcher and both of his coders by using the formula

$$Aq : \frac{100 (Ma + Mb)}{2Nr} \quad \text{(Henceforward referred to as formula A.)}$$

(where Aq represents the percentage agreement with the researcher, Nr is the total number of questions coded by the researcher and Ma and Mb are the number of questions on which coders a and b are in agreement with him).

A second aspect of the reliability of the category system, which it is important to consider, is the extent to which it can be employed in contexts other than this project, in other words, how far it can be used to analyse other types of material, for example the writings of historians. Clearly the transferability of the category system can only be determined finally by reliability trials in other contexts. However, indications of the extent to which it is transferable can be gained by considering the variability of the marking guides and by further calculations using Holsti's formula. The marking guides employed in the sample used for the reliability trials are in fact so variable /

variable that they provide a number of contexts for assessing the transferability of the category system. Marking guides are included in the reliability samples which are constructed by ten different individuals at 'A' level, and four at 'O' level. Each of the examiners, who designed these marking guides, has a different approach to the task, so in effect the category system is being tested against different ways of presenting historical information. In addition, the marking guides employed in the sample cover a wide range of periods and types of history. An indication of the transferability of the category system can also be gained by further calculations using Holsti's basic formula. If the category system is to be used in other contexts then individuals other than the researchers must be able to use it reliably. Thus far Holsti's formula has only been employed to test the reliability of the researcher; but it can be converted to assess the extent of the agreement between each pair of coders. If this is done the researcher is no longer being treated as of central importance and an overall assessment is being made of the extent of the agreement between three coders, thus checking how far the system can be used by independent workers. The further adaptation of Holsti's original formula to achieve this objective is as follows

$$OA = 100 \frac{Ma + Mb + ab}{Nr + Na + Nb} \quad \text{(Henceforward referred to as formula B.)}$$

(Where OA represents overall agreement between the coders, Ma, Mb and ab indicate the number of questions on which these pairs of coders are in agreement and Nr, Na and Nb the number of questions coded by the researcher and his two assistants)

The third and final aspect of reliability which had to be considered was the calculation of the percentage agreement between the coders for the categories and sub categories, which played no part, or virtually no part, either in the marking guides, or in the sample chosen for the reliability studies. Thus categories M (Human Disease), N (Archaeology) and P (the Nature of History) are not employed by any of the coders in the reliability trials, category N being also totally ignored in the marking guides as a whole, and categories M and P having minute roles. Almost equally neglected, both in the sample and in the marking guides, are, at 'A' level, sub categories J₂ (military and naval history - non government), L₁ (geographical factors) and L₂ (exploration) and at '0' level, category D (social structure). When categories and sub categories are almost totally neglected in this manner, the percentage agreement between the coders is difficult to assess. In the case of all these categories and sub categories, the coders have, either not used them at all, or have employed them to code a small number of points in the reliability studies. As a result, the coding of these categories and sub categories is not being tested extensively in the samples.

This problem is not serious. Four of these categories and sub categories were tested either at 'A' or '0' level in the reliability trials, category D at 'A' level, and sub categories J₂, L₁, and L₂ at '0' level, an indication, therefore, being provided, of the reliability with which they can be coded. The remainder, categories M, N and P are so neglected in the marking guides as a whole, at both '0' and 'A' level, that the calculation of percentage agreement in relation/

relation to them is not of prime significance. Rather it is important to show that the coders are agreed about the absence of these categories and sub categories, a point which is clearly demonstrated by their tendency to ignore them almost completely when coding the marking guides in the reliability trials. As a result, in table 1 below, no percentage agreement is quoted for those categories and sub categories where no coding takes place or only a very small percentage (less than 0.50 per cent of all the marking guides in the sample).

Table 1, which lists the percentage agreement for each category and sub category⁽¹⁾ at 'A' and 'O' level using formulae A and B, will now be presented.

TABLE 1 /

(1) Sub category A2(s) (structure of government - individual) see above p.82 was abandoned during the reliability trials because it played a minute role in the paper and because the coders could not establish a satisfactory level of agreement between them.

Table 1

| Category | Sub Category | Title of Category or Sub Category | Percentage agreement at 'A' level (using formula A) | Percentage agreement at 'O' level (using formula A) | Overall percentage agreement at 'A' level (using formula B) | Overall percentage agreement at 'O' level (using formula B) |
|----------|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| A | | Politics and Home and Abroad | 84.38 | 80.00 | 85.79 | 83.58 |
| | A ₁ + A ₁ (s) | Foreign Politics | 78.94 | 79.66 | 81.54 | 83.21 |
| | A ₁ | Foreign Politics (Collective) | 84.37 | 72.45 | 83.88 | 76.54 |
| | A ₁ (s) | Foreign Politics (Individual) | 61.76 | 72.79 | 65.46 | 79.08 |
| | A ₂ +A ₃ +A ₄ | Domestic Politics | 79.16 | 79.48 | 78.05 | 76.99 |
| | A ₂ | Structure of Government | 69.63 | 66.44 | 72.28 | 65.36 |
| | A ₃ + A ₄ | Domestic Politics without Structure of Government | 66.00 | 74.96 | 62.35 | 70.34 |
| | A ₃ | Domestic Politics (Individual) | 67.12 | 64.69 | 64.83 | 63.60 |
| | A ₄ | Domestic Politics (Collective) | 58.47 | 84.84 | 48.99 | 76.02 |
| | A ₁ (s)+ A ₃ | Politics at Home and Abroad ⁽¹⁾ (Individual) | 81.05 | 81.98 | 80.63 | 83.53 |
| | A ₁ + A ₄ | Politics at Home and Abroad ⁽¹⁾ (Collective) | 77.90 | 76.66 | 73.84 | 77.09 |
| B | | Economic History | 82.29 | 83.60 | 84.78 | 74.57 |
| C | | Social History (Social Custom) | 42.17 | 44.44 | 51.08 | 46.64 |
| D | | Social History (Social Structure) | 63.75 | * | 52.11 | * |
| E | | Political History (Non government) | 76.60 | 66.44 | 77.18 | 63.02 |
| G | | Religious History | 94.94 | 99.03 | 88.22 | 93.34 |
| | G (a) | Religious History (Leadership) | 92.61 | 98.75 | 90.14 | 96.21 |
| | G (b) | Religious History (Movements) | 84.10 | 94.15 | 74.50 | 71.98 |
| H | | Cultural History | 73.31 | 84.26 | 64.17 | 78.34 |
| J | | Military and Naval History | 65.39 | 85.62 | 68.02 | 83.47 |

These sub categories were combined to assess the role of the individual in foreign and domestic politics (A1(s)A3) & of the collective in foreign & domestic politics (A14) - the purpose of this procedure is explained below, see p.138.

| Category | Sub Category | Title of Category or Sub Category | Percentage agreement at 'A' level (using formula A) | Percentage agreement at 'O' level (using formula A) | Overall percentage agreement at 'A' level (using formula B) | Overall percentage agreement at 'O' level (using formula B) |
|----------|----------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| | J ₁ | Military and Naval History (Government) | 64.66 | 85.62 | 66.78 | 82.47 |
| | J ₂ | Military and Naval History (Non Government) | * | 66.66 | * | 60.41 |
| L | | Geographical History | * | 91.29 | * | 82.38 |
| | L ₁ | Geographical Factors | * | 74.00 | * | 66.33 |
| | L ₂ | Exploration | * | 91.75 | * | 79.97 |
| M | | Human Disease | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| N | | Archaeology | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| P | | Nature of History | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| Y | | Uncodable Material | 84.51 | 82.10 | 64.50 | 69.14 |

* = Less than 0.50% of the sample coded in this category

** = No positive coding in this category

DISCUSSION

An assessment of the percentage agreements reached in these reliability trials caused considerable difficulty. As Holsti states,

"Defining an acceptable level of reliability is one of the many problems in content analysis for which there is no single solution. The question, which can only be answered within the content of a given research problem, sometimes poses dilemmas for the investigator." (1)

As a result of the absence of general criteria for the assessment of reliability, two measures were adopted to determine whether the level of percentage agreement reached in the reliability trials was adequate. These measures will now be considered first as a means of assessing the reliability of the coder, and second as a way of determining whether the category system is transferable to other contexts. Then, once these two measures have been described, the review of the reliability trials will be conducted.

The first measure involves a survey of the percentage agreements that were obtained in the reliability trials to indicate those where the level was high and those where it was low. In the context of this study percentage agreement above 70%, and in particular above 80%, was regarded as high. In the papers analysed in this project one category is usually dominant with two sub categories playing important roles.⁽²⁾ The dominant category, in general, reaches a mean/

(1) Holsti op.cit. p.142

(2) See below for example, p.181,195 and 211

mean of between 50 and 70% and the sub categories means of 20 and 40%. (1). In circumstances like this, a percentage agreement of 70%, or above, will confirm the trends identified by the principal coder. However, if the percentage agreement drops as low as 50% the coding of the researcher cannot be regarded as reliable with papers of this nature. Such a percentage agreement, for example, would not provide strong support for the researcher if he placed 70% of the marking guides in a paper in one category and his coders could only agree that 35% of the material should be placed in that category.

Secondly, throughout the review of results of the reliability trials, the relative importance of the categories and sub categories in the marking guides as a whole, and in the sample, will be considered. Clearly, with particular categories and sub categories playing dominant roles in the papers, it is important to concentrate on the percentage agreement obtained with them, less attention being paid to those categories and sub categories which play only a small part in the marking guides. For example, if the results for a particular paper as coded by the researchers are as follows - category A 65%, category B 30% and category C 5% and the percentage agreement for categories A and B is 80% and for category C is 50% then the overall percentage agreement on the paper will be 78.5%. However, if the percentage agreement for categories A and B was 50% and for category C 80% the overall percentage agreement on the paper would only be 51.5%. As a result, particular attention will be paid to categories and sub categories, which play an important part in the papers.

The/

(1) See below for example p.181, 195 and 211

The application of these criteria to the assessment of the transferability of the category system was more problematic. Though as Holsti has stated the acceptability of a level of reliability can only be determined within the context of a particular study, there is sufficient similarity between the marking guides used in this project and the sort of material on which it might be employed in the future for the percentage agreement between the coders (using formula B) to be of significance. In the future the category system is most likely to be used to analyse school textbooks in history and the writings of historians. Such materials are similar to the marking guides analysed in this study. Like the marking guides they tend to be dominated by one or two types of history and the criteria already described for determining whether the percentage agreement obtained in a category or sub category is high or low would be applicable. A further similarity applies to the school textbooks in history, but not to the writings of historians. The types of history, which predominate in the examination papers, are those which are likely to dominate school textbooks, especially those written for the upper years of the secondary school. This trend, is, however, unlikely to be the case with the writings of historians, which cover every type of history. Thus there may be categories or sub categories where the percentage agreement is low (using formula B) and, as a result, little reliance could be placed on the category system if it were employed to code material in which these categories or sub categories played an important role.

The percentage agreement obtained by using formulas A and B will
now

now be surveyed with these two criteria being employed throughout.

Perhaps the most striking aspect of the results of the reliability trials was the high percentage agreement attained between the coders for the categories, which play a major role in the marking guides. Thus when formula A was used to test the reliability of the researcher as a coder, the most crucial aspect of reliability in a study of this nature, categories A (political history), B (economic history), G (religious history), H (cultural history) and Y (uncodability), which play the most important part in the 'A' level papers,⁽¹⁾ all reached percentage agreements of 70% and over and, in the case of categories A,B,G, and Y, in excess of 80%. At '0' level a similar situation exists. The vital categories in '0' level papers, categories A, B, G, H, J (military and naval history) and Y all reach percentage agreements over 80%.⁽²⁾ Of the remainder, categories M (human disease) N (archaeology) and P (nature of history) are not employed by any of the coders while categories L (geographical history) and E (non official politics), though only having small roles in the papers, attain percentage agreements of 91.29% in the case of category L at '0' level and 76.60 and 66.44 at 'A' and '0' level in the case of category E. Categories C (social custom) and possibly D (social structure) are the only two categories where a low percentage agreement is reached and they will be considered in more detail below. The situation is similar when formula B is employed, which tests the transferability of the category system to other contexts, except that the percentage agreements are, in general, slightly lower. Of the categories, which play an important part at '0' level, categories A, B, and G reach percentage agreements of more than 80%, only category H dropping below 70% and of those which are prominent at '0' level, categories/

(1) See below for example p.181-182, 195-196 and 211-212

(2) " " " " " " " " " " " "

categories A,B,G,H and J all reach percentage agreements of 70% or more. The only important category to suffer a severe drop in percentage agreement is category Y (uncodable material), a result brought about by the tendency of one of the coders to place more material in category Y than the other two.⁽¹⁾ As will be explained in chapter 5, uncodability generally arises because of the way in which the examiners present their marking guides, either failing to provide one for a particular question or making points which are too vague to code. Thus, while uncodability is important, it is an issue which arises not because of the category system but because of the material being analysed and no problem should develop with uncodability in future studies provided the data being studied is of sufficient clarity. The percentage agreements for the remaining categories show little variation whether formula A or B is being used, categories C and D continuing to be suspect.

The reliable coding of the sub categories was more difficult to ensure. With most of the sub categories two or even three stages of coding were necessary and at each stage disagreement accumulated. Thus, for example, two stages of coding are required with the sub categories of category G (religious history). First of all the coder has to decide whether a point in a marking guide should be classified as category G and then whether it should be coded as sub category G(a) (religious history leadership) or G(b) (religious history - movements). With category A (political history) the position is even more complicated. Once a coder has classified a portion of a marking guide as category A, he has to decide whether it is concerned with foreign or domestic politics./

- (1) The number of questions coded Y by the different coders were as follows:
at 'A' level coder r 2.0864, coder a 2.7107, coder b 4.632
at '0' level coder r 5.3775, coder a 5.8231, coder b 8.8485
As a result coder b had lower scores in category A, and in sub categories A₁ and A₂ than coders r and a.

politics. If he selects foreign politics he has to choose sub category A_1 , (foreign politics - collective) or $A_1(s)$ (foreign politics - individual) and in the case of domestic politics between sub categories A_2 (structure of government), A_3 (domestic politics - individual) and A_4 (domestic politics - collective). As a result percentage agreement in the coding of sub categories is often difficult to obtain because of the increased chance of disagreement between the coders.

Despite this difficulty the percentage agreement obtained for most of the sub categories, especially those which play an important part in the papers, is high. Thus with seven sub categories A_1 , $A_1(s)$ (foreign politics), A_1 (foreign politics - collective) A_{234} (domestic politics), $G(a)$ (religious history - leadership) $G(b)$ (religious history - movements), L_2 (exploration)⁽¹⁾ and J , (Military and Naval history- government)⁽²⁾ percentage agreements of over 70% are attained with both formulas being used, while in the case of a further five sub categories A_2 (structure of government), L_1 (geographical factors), $A_1(s)$ (foreign politics individual), A_{34} (domestic politics without structure of government) and J_2 (military and naval history - non government) percentage agreements are either totally or predominantly above 65%. Only two sub categories A_3 (domestic politics - individual) and A_4 (domestic politics - collective) drop consistently below 65%, in the case of sub category A_4 sinking as low as 58.47 and 48.99% when formula A and B are employed at 'A' level. Since these sub categories were testing the same hypothesis, namely the extent to which domestic politics were dominated by individual or/

(1) at '0' level only

(2) at '0' level only

or collective actions, and as both of them had relatively low percentage agreements, they will be considered in more detail in the next paragraphs.

The results for categories C (social custom) and D (social structure) and for sub categories A₃ (domestic politics - individual) and A₄ (domestic politics - collective) remain to be considered in more detail. When the actual coding of categories C and D was examined it was found that the coders consistently confused these two categories at '0' and 'A' level and that this tendency accounted to a large measure for the markedly lower percentage agreement which was obtained for categories C and D as compared with other categories.⁽¹⁾ While this failure to distinguish between categories C and D is regrettable it is not of major significance for this project. As will be seen later both categories play a very small part in the marking guides as a whole⁽²⁾ and the main conclusion of the study relevant to them is that social history is ignored in these papers. Thus the tendency of the coders to confuse the two categories is not important since the significant finding as regards these two categories is that they are neglected in the papers. However if these categories were to be used to code school textbooks or the writings of historians, which dealt primarily with social history, further attention would have to be paid to the definition of categories C and D and to the assessment of their reliability. When the coding of sub categories A₃ (domestic politics - individual) and A₄ (domestic politics - collective) was surveyed it was clear that the percentage agreement between the coders, especially in the case of sub category A₃, was low. Though this absence/

(1) If the two categories are combined percentage agreements are as follows:
using formula A - at 'A' level : 70.54 at '0' level : 67.20
using formula B - at 'A' level : 64.46 at '0' level : 72.01

(2) See below p. 328-329 and 350-352

absence of agreement is regrettable a number of factors need to be borne in mind in partial mitigation. First of all in the case of sub category A_4 a high percentage agreement is obtained at '0' level, the low percentage agreements only apply at 'A' level. Secondly, partly as a result of the low percentage agreements, and partly because of the need to test the role of the individual and collectivity in politics as a whole, two new sub categories were formed by combining existing sub categories. These sub categories $A_1(s)$ A_3 (politics at home and abroad - individual) and A_{14} (politics at home and abroad - collective) were created, a procedure which had considerable advantages. On the one hand percentage agreement was high and on the other a broad picture of the role of the individual and collectivity in politics could be obtained. Finally it is important to note that sub categories A_3 and A_4 which were designed to test the role of the individual in domestic politics would be unlikely to be employed in the analysis of school text books or of the writings of historians. As has already been explained the purpose of these sub categories was specific to this project.⁽¹⁾

Thus the failure of the two sub categories to reach a high level of agreement when formula B is used is not serious.

When the high percentage agreements obtained for nearly all these categories and sub categories is considered, and the limited impact of those categories and sub categories with low percentage agreements on the study is acknowledged, the results of the reliability trials would appear to support the view that the researcher was a reliable coder and that this category system could be transferred to other contexts without reliability presenting serious problems for the coders, except in the case of categories C and D.

(1) See above p.79-82

CHAPTER 5

AVAILABILITY OF MARKING GUIDES AND THE PROBLEM OF UNCODABILITY

The initial aim of this project was to code all the marking guides for the papers set at 'A' and 'O' level for the two boards during the years 1968-72. But when the boards' central files, at Manchester and Cambridge, were examined it was discovered that many of the marking guides had not been retained. In addition, some of those which had been kept, were found, on perusal, to be so vague that they were uncodable. It was, therefore, necessary to prepare a list of those papers with marking guides that were both available and codable for the years 1968 to 1972. This data and also information relating to the number of candidates attempting each paper is laid out in tables 1 - 4. In these tables the following notation is employed, NA indicates that the marking guide was not available, A that it was available, but not codable, AC that it was both available and codable, and NS that the paper was not set in a particular year.

TABLE (1)

AVAILABILITY OF MARKING GUIDES FOR 'A' LEVEL PAPERS IN JMB CENTRAL FILES FOR THE YEARS 1968-72

| TITLE OF PAPERS | YEARS | | | | | Average number of candidates per annum 1968 - 1972 | Percentage of total number of candidates per annum 1968 - 72 |
|---|-------|------|------|------|------|--|--|
| | 1968 | 1969 | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | | |
| Syllabus A Paper 1A Greek History (500-323 B.C.) Roman History (133 BC-AD 69) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 27 | 0.12 |
| Syllabus A Paper 1B European History (800-1494) | AC | NA | NA | AC | AC | 268 | 1.20 |
| Syllabus A Paper 1C European History (1494-1939) | A | A | A | AC | AC | 7857 | 35.43 |
| Syllabus A Paper 11 D British History (1066-1307) | NA | A | A | A | AC | 228 | 1.02 |
| Syllabus A Paper 11 E British History (1307-1485) | NA | A | A | A | AC | 40 | 0.18 |
| Syllabus A Paper 11 F British History (1485-1603) | NA | AC | NA | AC | AC | 1758 | 7.92 |
| Syllabus A Paper 11 G British History (1603-1714) | A | A | A | AC | NA | 1808 | 8.15 |
| Syllabus A Paper 11 H British History (1714-1815) | NA | AC | NA | AC | AC | 833 | 3.75 |
| Syllabus A Paper 11 J British History (1815-1914) | AC | AC | AC | AC | NA | 2378 | 10.72 |
| Syllabus A Paper 11 K British History (1865-1939) | AC | AC | AC | AC | NA | 601 | 2.71 |
| Syllabus A Paper 11 L British Economic History (1700 - 1914) | AC | AC | NA | AC | NA | 376 | 1.69 |
| Syllabus A Paper 11 M History of the USA (1785 to present day) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 127 | 0.57 |
| Syllabus B Paper 1 British Economic and Social History (1700-1850) | AC | AC | NA | AC | AC | 1275 | 5.75 |
| Syllabus B Paper 1 British Economic and Social History (1850-1939) | AC | AC | NA | AC | AC | 1275 | 5.75 |
| Syllabus C Alternative A(P) ⁽¹⁾ Paper 1 European History (1193-1214) | NA | NA | NA | A | A | 47 | 0.21 |
| Syllabus C Alternative A (P) Paper 2 The Reign of Henry III | NA | NA | NA | A | A | 47 | 0.21 |
| Syllabus C Alternative B (Q) Paper 1 European History (1450-1610) | A | NA | AC | AC | AC | 588 | 2.65 |

(1) In 1972 the alternatives available under Syllabus C were renamed.

TABLE (2)

AVAILABILITY OF MARKING GUIDES FOR 'A' LEVEL PAPERS IN CAMBRIDGE CENTRAL FILES 1968 - 72

| TITLE OF PAPERS | YEARS | | | | | Average Number of Candidates per annum 1968 - 72 | Percentage of Total number of Candidates per annum 1968 - 72 |
|--|-------|------|------|------|--------|--|--|
| | 1968 | 1969 | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | | |
| Paper 1 English History to 1485 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 155 | 1.39 |
| Paper 2 English History (1485 - 1939) | AC | AC | AC | AC | AC | 4234 | 38.30 |
| Paper 3 English Social & Economic History from 1815 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 283 | 2.56 |
| Paper 4 European History (AD337-1494) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 123 | 1.11 |
| Paper 5 European History (1494-1939) | A | AC | AC | AC | AC | 4151 | 37.55 |
| Paper 6 Ancient History | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 48 | 0.04 |
| Paper 7 World Affairs since 1939 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 172 | 1.55 |
| Paper 8 Structure and Working of Brit. Government | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 163 | 1.47 |
| Paper 9 Art (Historical & Critical) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 22 | 0.02 |
| Paper 10 and subsequent papers: Special Subjects (1) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA (2) | 1781 | 16.01 |
| | | | | | | | |

(1) The number and title of special subject papers available for candidates varies from year to year, 14 were set in 1968 and 1970, 13 in 1969, 16 in 1971 and 15 in 1972.

(2) The only marking guide, which was available and codable, was Paper 20, Russia in the Era of Revolution for the year 1972.

TABLE (3)
AVAILABILITY OF MARKING GUIDES FOR 'O' LEVEL PAPERS IN JMB CENTRAL FILES FOR THE YEARS 1968-72

| TITLE OF PAPERS | YEARS | | | | | Average Number of Candidates per annum 1968 - 72 | Percentage of Total Number of Candidates per annum 1968 - 72 |
|---|-------|------|------|------|------|--|--|
| | 1968 | 1969 | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | | |
| Alternative A Aspects of British and Foreign History from about 1500 to the present day | A | A | A | A | A | 4647 | 11.51 |
| Alternative B The British Empire and Commonwealth (1763 - 1939) | AC | AC | AC | AC | AC | 566 | 1.40 |
| Alternative C British Economic and Social History from the early 18th century to the present day | AC | AC | AC | AC | AC | 9958 | 24.68 |
| Alternative D The Renaissance and Reformation 1450 - 1600 | AC | AC | AC | AC | AC | 781 | 1.93 |
| Alternative E British Limited Monarchy and European Autocracy 1660-1789 | AC | AC | AC | AC | AC | 850 | 2.10 |
| Alternative F Revolution Reaction and Reform 1789-1870 | AC | AC | AC | AC | AC | 11941 | 29.59 |
| Alternative G (1) Europe and the Modern World 1870 to the present day | AC | AC | AC | AC | AC | 11421 | 28.30 |
| Alternative H (J in 1968) Aspects of British and Foreign History from about 1066 to about 1500 | A | A | A | A | A | 182 | 0.45 |

(1) The period covered by Alternative G was dealt with by two different papers in the year 1968 that is, Alternative G The Great Powers 1870-1919 and Alternative H Democracy and Dictatorship 1870-1939, in 1969 both papers were amalgamated into one alternative as above.

AVAILABILITY OF MARKING GUIDES FOR 'O' LEVEL PAPERS IN CAMBRIDGE
CENTRAL FILES FOR YEARS 1968 - 72

| TITLE OF PAPERS | YEARS | | | | | Average Number of Candidates per annum 1968 - 72 | Percentage of Total Number of Candidates per annum 1968 - 72 |
|--|-------|------|------|------|------|--|--|
| | 1968 | 1969 | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | | |
| British and European History to 1688 | AC | AC | AC | AC | AC | 699 | 3.33 |
| British and European History (1485-1815) | AC | AC | AC | AC | AC | 1344 | 6.42 |
| British and European History (1688-1939) | AC | AC | AC | AC | AC | 16487 | 78.78 |
| History of the British Empire and Commonwealth (1558-1939) | AC | AC | AC | AC | AC | 237 | 1.13 |
| English Economic and Social History | AC | AC | AC | AC | AC | 1433 | 6.84 |
| History of Europe (1902-64) (inc. Britain) | NS | NS | NS | AC | A | 304 | 1.45 |
| World Affairs since 1919 | NS | NS | A | A | AC | 576 | 2.71 |
| Britain in World History | NS | NS | NA | NA | NA | 39 | 0.00 |
| West Indian History | NS | NS | NA | NA | NS | 1 | 0.00 |
| History of the U.S.A. | NS | NS | NA | NA | NA | 38 | 0.00 |
| British History 1066 - 1603 | NS | NS | NS | NS | NA | 3 | 0.00 |

As can be seen from Tables 1 - 4 the provision of codable marking guides varies from one paper to another. This variability, which has important implications for this study will now be considered at both 'A' and 'O' level.

At 'A' level the provision of codable marking guides is erratic. Plenty of marking guides are available at 'A' level for JMB papers, but they do not, by any means, cover all the papers, while for the Cambridge board at 'A' level, marking guides are restricted to two groups of papers only.⁽¹⁾ It is clearly necessary to consider the explanation for this and its impact on the study.

There are two explanations for the presence and absence of marking guides. First, marking guides are not prepared for some papers. Enquiry at the Cambridge board revealed that marking guides are generally not prepared for papers with a small number of candidates at 'A' level. The second explanation applied to the JMB only. The distribution of the marking guides available for different papers set by the JMB at 'A' level varies from paper to paper. This is almost certainly the result of the storage system employed by the JMB, marking guides being withdrawn by examiners and other individuals and frequently not replaced.⁽²⁾

(1) See above p.142.

(2) I applied to the JMB for certain marking guides in 1972, which were withdrawn from the files and not replaced by photocopies.

The impact of the limited availability of 'A' level marking guides needs to be considered carefully, since some of the papers are more significant for this study than others. First of all, since this project is concerned with the influence of the examination system on the content of the history syllabi taught in schools it is more important to analyse those papers which are popular, than those which are unpopular. For example, it is far more vital to have an accurate knowledge of the types of history which play a part in J.M.B. Syllabus A Paper 11J in British History (1815-1914) taken by 2,398 candidates than Syllabus A Paper 1A Greek History (500-323 B.C.) and Roman History (133 B.C. - A.D. 69) attempted by only 27 candidates. Secondly, as will be indicated in Chapter 6 there are a number of different variables, for example, the Boards, the levels, Advanced and Ordinary, and the periods of history, modern, early modern and mediaeval, which may have an impact on the papers, and thus on the history syllabi employed in the schools. It is important, therefore, to ensure that none of the groups of papers representing these variables sinks to such a small number that an analysis of variance becomes difficult. With these problems in mind, the 'A' level papers for both boards had to be considered carefully, as well as the most likely remedies for such difficulties.

The absence of marking guides for Cambridge papers at 'A' level appears at first glance to be very serious. Of the twenty papers available only two had marking guides that were codable. But, when the percentage of candidates taking the papers is considered the situation does not seem as grave. Thus the two papers, for which marking guides exist, account for 75.85% of all the 'A' level candidates. ⁽¹⁾ However, though/

(1) See above p. 142

though the two papers were taken by a high percentage of the candidates and therefore had an important influence on the schools, the range of periods and types of history which they covered appeared to be narrow, since they were limited to British and European history from 1485 to 1939. Again appearances are, to a certain extent, deceptive. The two papers cover a period, which is unusually long, in the context of examinations in 'O' and 'A' level history, other boards breaking it down into a series of separate papers. For example, the papers set by the JMB at 'A' level to cover English history from 1485 to 1939 are as follows, Syllabus A Paper 11 F British history (1485-1603), Syllabus A Paper 11 G British history (1603-1714), Syllabus A Paper 11 H British history (1714-1815), Syllabus A Paper 11 J British history (1815-1914) and Syllabus A Paper 11 K British history (1865-1939), while in the case of 'A' level European history, though one paper is set, it is divided into sections for each century. Further, at 'O' level both boards divide the period 1494 to 1939 into a number of different papers. In reality, therefore, the Cambridge 'A' level papers on English and European history represent a series of alternatives, which permit comparisons between broad periods of history, for example, the early modern 1490 to 1714 and the modern 1714 to 1939.⁽¹⁾ However, though the 'A' level Cambridge papers available for coding are considerably broader than at first appear, important groups of papers are not covered by marking guides. For instance, no codable marking guides could be obtained for papers on mediaeval, or social and economic history at 'A' level.

As a result, two methods of increasing the number of marking guides available/

(1) See chapter 6 for a discussion of the periods of history appropriate for use in the analysis of variance.

available for analysis were essayed. First of all, a survey of the marking guides prepared for the years 1965 to 1968 ⁽¹⁾ was conducted to see if a wider choice of papers could be included in the study, but without any success. Secondly, the possibility of asking the examiners of certain papers to draw up marking guides covering a number of years, for example 1972 to 1975, was explored. A letter was sent to the Cambridge board asking for permission to approach the examiners with this suggestion, but the request was refused. ⁽²⁾ It was, therefore, necessary to rest content with the 'A' level papers on English and European history, for which marking guides existed.

The situation was different with the JMB 'A' level papers, marking guides being available and codable for a broad selection of papers. Unfortunately, a number of very popular papers and ones dealing with particular periods of history were, either without marking guides, or had marking guides that were uncodable. Two papers, which were very popular, and only had one and two codable marking guides, respectively, were Syllabus A Paper 11 G, taken by 8.15% and Syllabus A Paper 1C European history (1494-1939), by 35.43% of the candidates. Other papers which were not popular, but were set on periods of history where there were few or no marking guides available and codable, and which could throw light on the examiners approach to different periods and types of history, were Syllabus A Paper 1A Greek history (500-323 B.C.) and Roman history (133 B.C. - A.D.69), Syllabus A Paper 11 D and E, British history (1066-1485), Syllabus C Alternative A(P), Paper 2 The Reign of Henry III and Syllabus A Paper 11 M (The History of the U.S.A. 1785 to the present day) ⁽³⁾

In/

- (1) Negotiations with the Cambridge board were conducted in 1972, so the additional years surveyed had to be before 1968.
- (2) The Cambridge board felt that agreeing to my request would involve a lot of administration and would be very expensive.
- (3) See above p. 140-141

In the case of two papers it was decided not to approach the board for further marking guides. No attempt was made to borrow more marking guides for Syllabus A, Paper 1A and Syllabus A Paper 11 M for the following reasons. These papers were taken by only a minute number of candidates, and no similar papers were set by either of the boards on these aspects of history, making any comparison between boards, or levels, or periods of history such as were feasible for other papers in the sample, impossible. The case for trying to secure more marking guides for the other papers was stronger. Syllabus A Paper 11 G and Syllabus A Paper 1 C were both popular papers, the latter extremely so, and, as a result, a thorough knowledge of their content is vital for understanding the impact of JMB 'A' level papers on the schools. The remaining papers are all concerned with British mediaeval history. Thus far only two marking guides dealing with British mediaeval history were both available and codable, one of them was for Syllabus A Paper 11 D, and covered the period 1066-1307, and the other for Syllabus A Paper 11 E and relates to the years 1307 to 1485. Together, therefore, these two marking guides only provided information for one year out of the five being surveyed. In contrast, marking guides for the equivalent period of mediaeval European history were available and codable for three out of the five years. Thus the provision of marking guides for British mediaeval history was not only inadequate, but was not comparable with those available and codable for European mediaeval history. As a result it was decided to attempt to secure more marking guides for the papers dealing with British mediaeval history, as well as for Syllabus A Paper 1C and Paper 11G.

In/

In the case of the JMB no request was made to approach the examiners to ask if they would either draw up marking guides for the years in which they did not exist or to elucidate uncodable marking guides. The very understandable response of the Cambridge board⁽¹⁾ made it unlikely that the JMB would welcome such a request, and it was important to preserve a good relationship with the board. In addition, if the examiners had agreed to draw up marking guides one of the major advantages of this study would have been lost - namely that the examiners wrote the marking guides without being aware that they might be analysed by an outsider. Had they known this, and the nature of the project, the content of the model answers, which they designed, might have been seriously affected. The only way, therefore, of securing more marking guides was through a survey of the boards' records for the years 1965 to 1974. This survey met with a considerable measure of success. Codable marking guides existed for the years 1973 and 1974 for the following papers, Syllabus A Paper 1 C European history 1494-1939, Syllabus A Paper 11 D British history 1066-1307 and Syllabus Paper 11 E, British history 1307-1485.⁽²⁾ As a result, four codable marking guides were available for Syllabus A Paper 1⁽³⁾ C and three each for Syllabus A Paper 11 D and E..⁽⁴⁾ The impact of this development was very important. Syllabus A Paper 1 C, which covered all European history after 1494 and was attempted by 35.43% of the candidates, could now be reliably analysed. Thus papers catering for 78.64% of the candidates at JMB 'A' level now had three or more marking guides, which could be coded satisfactorily. Further, the marking guides available for British mediaeval history, Syllabus A Paper 11 D and E had increased from two to six. It was, therefore, decided to incorporate these new marking guides into the study.

(1) See above p.148

(2) but not for Syllabus A Paper 11 G and Syllabus C Alternative A(P) Paper 2

(3) i.e. for the years 1971, 1972, 1973 and 1974

(4) i.e. for the years 1972, 1973 and 1974

The situation at '0' level was much more satisfactory. Marking guides were available and codable for the five years 1968 to 1972 for papers taken by 88% of the candidates for JMB '0' level and 95.84% for Cambridge '0' level. In addition, the range of papers, which could be analysed was broad, covering social and economic history, imperial history, British and European history, and, in the case of the Cambridge board, mediaeval, as well as modern history. The only omission was the absence of codable marking guides for papers on mediaeval British and European history, set by the JMB. Unfortunately, when the marking guides for the JMB's '0' level papers dealing with British and European mediaeval history were surveyed for the years 1965 to 75 no codable marking guides were discovered and, this aspect of JMB's '0' level papers therefore had to be omitted.

As a result, though the availability of marking guides at 'A' and '0' level for the two boards was by no means perfect, a fair spread of different alternatives, which were attempted by a high percentage of the candidates, was available for analysis.

UNCODABILITY WITHIN MARKING GUIDES

Unfortunately when the category system was employed to code the marking guides there was a tendency for some of the material to be uncodable. there were two main reasons for this uncodability. First of all examiners occasionally regarded the answer to a question as so obvious that no marking key was necessary. Secondly examiners tended to lapse into vague statements when constructing an answer to a question. A good example is the following question and its marking guide:

Was Walpole a good statesman?
"Walpole's policy"
"Its results"
"His fall"

None/

None of the three statements in the marking guide are codable "Walpole's policy" could apply to his foreign or domestic policy and so cannot be categorised, "its results" might refer to political, or economic, or social results and therefore, is not codable, finally "his fall" might be concerned with any aspect of his fall and cannot be coded.

Uncodability created considerable difficulties for this study. The mean percentage of uncodable marking guides in various groups of papers ranging from 0.4% for JMB 'A' level papers on European history (800 - 1494) to 22.5% in JMB 'O' level papers on the British Empire and Commonwealth, with an overall mean for all papers of 9.5%. Clearly this degree of uncodability had to be reduced if the credibility of the results were not to be called in question.

The obvious solution was to develop a second category system which would make it possible to categorise the majority of the hitherto uncodable material. A second category system was, therefore, prepared in the summer of 1975.⁽¹⁾ In this system the same definitions were employed as in the first category system, but only the categories were included, since the marking guides being coded were too vague for sub categories to be used. The only other difference between the first and second category systems arose out of the purpose for which the latter was designed. In the second category system the coders were instructed to classify marking guides and parts of marking guides according to the type of history which provided their main focus. Thus the comments on Walpole mentioned above would be placed in category A

as/

(1) See appendix B

as they were mainly concerned with political history. Similarly a question such as the following with no marking guide:

Describe the work of

(a) Columba and

(b) Aidan, in spreading Christianity in Britain

would be placed in category G because it is clearly concerned, in the main with religious history. After initial trials by the investigator the system was tested for reliability. A sample of every tenth question, that was wholly or in part uncodable was selected and one coder was chosen in addition to the investigator. After half an hour's training the coder had achieved a sufficient understanding of the category system for the reliability trial to take place. The overall percentage agreement for the whole sample was then calculated and found to be 85.0% when formula A was used (which tested the reliability of the researcher as a coder) and 85.9% when formula B (which threw light on the transferability of the category system to other contexts), was employed. No attempt was made to calculate percentage agreement for individual categories, since many of them were hardly represented in the sample, or in the marking guides as a whole.

Once the reliability of the second category system had been satisfactorily tested all the previously uncodable material was analysed. The percentage of the marking guides that were, as a consequence, still uncodable dropped to a mean of 3.5% for all the papers, the highest percentage for a set of papers being 9.4%⁽¹⁾ and the lowest 0%.⁽²⁾ Though this decrease in uncodability was most encouraging there was still

-
- (1) JMB '0' level Papers Alternative B. The British Empire and Commonwealth- for the years 1968 to 72
 - (2) For example in JMB 'A' level papers Syllabus A Paper 11F British History (1485-1603)- for the years 1969, 1971 and 1972

still one major problem to be solved - namely the relationship between the scores obtained by using the two category systems.

Two sets of percentages can be quoted for each paper, the results for each category and sub category after using the primary coding system and the results for each category when the percentage accruing from the employment of the primary and secondary coding systems are combined. An immediate problem is to determine how far the scores obtained by using the crude second category system alter the general results for each category. If considerable distortion does occur doubt must be thrown on the comparability of the percentages resulting from the two systems and whether they can be combined. In addition, if the material coded by the second category system causes a major alteration in the emphasis of the results, reliance on the scores, for the sub categories will be difficult to sustain. It was therefore, decided to calculate a rank order correlation between the results obtained by employing the primary coding system and the scores from using both systems combined. Correlative coefficients were calculated for each of the 110 papers; in 78 cases the correlation was perfect in all but 5 cases it was at least 0.96 and the lowest correlation was 0.88.

These very high correlations are encouraging. It is clear that the results obtained from employing the primary and secondary coding systems are very close to those gained from the primary system only. As a consequence, the percentage for all the categories resulting from the use of both systems can be presented in the overall results, thereby reducing the problem of uncodability to a minimum. In addition, the/

the similarity between the two sets of scores for the categories makes it reasonable to suppose that the results which were obtained from employing the primary category system only, for example the percentages for the sub categories, are close in emphasis to those which would have been available had there been no problem of uncodability.

Though the incidence of uncodability in different groups of papers has yet to be outlined in the chapters dealing with the results in general the difficulties, posed by uncodability have been greatly reduced by the procedures described in this chapter.

CHAPTER 6

INTRODUCTION TO THE RESULTS

The Selection of the Most Significant Variables

Before outlining the results for each category and sub category a discussion of the variables affecting the papers is essential. There were five major sets of variables, which could influence the treatment of a category.

- | | | |
|-------|----------------------------|--|
| (i) | The Boards - | J.M.B. or Cambridge |
| (ii) | The Levels | Ordinary or Advanced |
| (iii) | The Type of History | British, European, Economic and Social or Imperial History |
| (iv) | The Period of History | Modern or Mediaeval |
| (v) | The Technique of Examining | New or Traditional |

Thus Category B, Economic History, might receive considerable attention in Advanced, but not in Ordinary level papers. Tests of significance were vital to determine whether such a variable was significant or not, thus great care had to be taken in deciding which comparisons between boards, types, levels and periods were appropriate.

Three of these groups of variables presented no problem in the analysis of the results. Every paper was set by one of the two boards, either the J.M.B. or the Cambridge board, and was either at Advanced or Ordinary level. Further, the type of history being examined was always identifiable from the title of each paper. Thus there were four main types "British", "European", "Economic and Social" and "Imperial".

Nor/

Nor did the variables concerned with the techniques of examining cause any serious difficulty. Virtually all the papers adopted the traditional series of essay questions at 'A' level and the combination of essay and short note questions at 'O' level. The only exceptions were the options, set in Syllabus C at 'A' level, by the J.M.B.s as alternatives to the traditional outline papers. These options comprised papers on British and European history and differed from the outline papers in two important respects, - first, in the papers on British history there were two compulsory questions on historical documents carrying 65 marks out of a total of 120, second the options concentrated in both papers, on a much narrower period of history than the traditional papers, being virtually "Special Subject papers" These options were so markedly different from the traditional alternatives, that comparison seemed appropriate.

Difficulties did arise, however, when the periods of history were considered, since the papers covered from 20 to 1,000 years with little matching between boards, types and levels. The most obvious "periods" to isolate were the traditional centuries in which British history is studied, for example, the Tudor age 1485-1603, or broader spans of time like the medieval^{ly} and modern periods.

The possibility of comparing the papers century by century was considered, but had to be abandoned. The exam^{ination} boards utilise a wide variety of periods as can be seen from the list of papers set by the J.M.B. and Cambridge boards which follows (See Table 1 below)

Papers covering the period 400 - 1485 /

(a) Papers covering the period 400 - 1485JMB 'A' Level BritishSyllabus A Paper 11 D British
History 1066-1307Syllabus A Paper 11 E British
History 1307 - 1485Cambridge 'O' Level British and European (400 - 1494)

Section A (1) British History - from Roman Britain to 1485

Section A (11) European History - (518 - 1494)

JMB 'A' Level EuropeanSyllabus A Paper 1 B European History
800 - 1494(b) Papers covering the period 1485 - 1939JMB 'A' Level BritishSyllabus A Paper 11 F British
History (1485 - 1603)Syllabus A Paper 11 G British
History (1603 - 1714)Syllabus A Paper 11 H British
History (1714 - 1815)Syllabus A Paper 11 J British
History (1815 - 1914)Syllabus A Paper 11 K British
History (1865 - 1939)JMB 'A' Level European

Syllabus A Paper 1 C

Section 1 1494 - 1648

Section 2 1648 - 1715

Section 3 1715 - 1789

Section 4 1789 - 1870

Section 5 1870 - 1939

(Syllabus C Alternative B Paper 1
(Syllabus C Alternative B Paper 11European History (1450 - 1610)
The Reign of Elizabeth 1 (1558 - 1603)(Syllabus C Alternative C Paper 1
(Syllabus C Alternative C Paper 11European History (1610 - 1789)
British History (1660 - 1714)(Syllabus C Alternative D Paper 1
(Syllabus C Alternative D Paper 11European History (1789 - 1870)
British History (1815 - 1870)(Syllabus C Alternative E Paper 1
(Syllabus C Alternative E Paper 11European History 1870 - present day
British History 1870 - present dayCambridge 'A' Level British

English History 1485 - 1939

Cambridge 'A' Level European

European History 1494 - 1939

JMB /

(1) This list of papers only includes papers on British and European history but they are sufficiently numerous to illustrate the point.

JMB 'O' Level British and European History

- Alternative D The Renaissance and Reformation (1450 - 1600)
Alternative E British Limited Monarchy and European Autocracy (1660 - 1789)
Alternative F Revolution Reaction and Reform (1789 - 1870)
Alternative G Europe and the Modern World (1870 to present day)

Cambridge 'O' Level British and European History

- | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| British History 1485 - 1688 | European History 1494 - 1688 |
| British History 1688 - 1815 | European History 1688 - 1815 |
| British History 1815 - 1939 | European History 1815 - 1939 |

From these papers alone the difficulties in using the traditional centuries studied in British History can be deduced. First, there is a tendency for papers to treat much larger periods than a century, for example JMB Syllabus A Paper 1 B and Cambridge 'A' and 'O' level English and European history. Second even where the periods do approximate to centuries there is little comparability across boards and levels. Thus the paper on the Tudor Age 1485 to 1603 set by the JMB at 'A' level would be difficult to match. Other papers on British history only correspond approximately - Paper 11 of Syllabus C Alternative B covers the second half of the Tudor age, namely the reign of Elizabeth I, the Cambridge 'O' level papers on British history, begin in 1485 but end in 1688, and the JMB 'O' level papers on the Renaissance and the Reformation, which includes questions on English history, begins in 1450. A paper on the Tudor age runs into even greater difficulty when compared with papers on European history. The basic period used for European history is 1450 - 1610, except for Cambridge 'O' level European history, which ranges from 1494 - 1688. It may be argued that these problems can be overcome by analysing the questions/

questions in a paper that relate to a particular century.

Unfortunately a process of this nature is likely to be arbitrary, since questions straddle key dates like 1603 and, in a paper covering a long period, for example, 1485 to 1939, the paper would have to be divided at least four times. Finally the whole basis of the trend in British history to deal with the century as a period is highly questionable. These periods originate partly from dynastic landmarks, for instance 1485, 1603 and 1688 and partly from wars and treaties, good examples being 1714, 1815, 1870 and 1939. Periods based on dynasties are not very reliable units of study. Dynasties generally have their main impact on the politics of a country and the crucial dynastic dates vary from country to country. If however, the emphasis lies with wars and treaties only certain aspects of history are being considered. Thus economic, social, cultural and many domestic political issues are being ignored. As a result, therefore, of the insuperable problems in comparing papers, and of the historical difficulties, it was decided to concentrate on periods of broader than "traditional centuries."

Any attempt to divide British and European history into broad periods is bound to create a major debate. However, in the context of these papers an argument will be developed for comparing the papers within three periods - the mediaeval (pre 1450), the early modern (1500 to the early 18th century) and the modern (the early 18th century to 1939 or the present day). The crucial dates that would be employed as the dividing points between periods are c 1450 and c 1700.

The dates employed by the examiners to terminate one paper and start another/

another are important indications of the dividing lines which they perceive in British, European, economic and imperial history.

Table 2 below lists the dates used in the papers set by the two boards, which are being analysed in this study.

Table 2

JMB 'A' Level British

Syllabus A 1307; 1485; 1603;
1714; 1815; 1870

Syllabus C Individual short
periods of history e.g. the
Reign of Elizabeth I

Cambridge 'A' Level English

1485

JMB 'O' Level British & European

1450; 1660; 1789; 1870

JMB 'A' Level European

Syllabus A 1450

Syllabus C 1450; 1610; 1789; 1870

Cambridge 'A' Level European

1494

Cambridge 'O' Level British & European

1485; 1688; 1815

JMB 'A' Level Economic History, and British Economic and Social History
early 18th century to present day

JMB 'O' Level Economic and Social
History

early 18th century to present day

Cambridge 'O' Level Economic and Social
History

1066 - 1939

Section (A) 1066 - 1763

Section (B) 1700 - 1939

JMB 'O' Level British Empire and
Commonwealth

1750 to present day

Cambridge 'O' level British Empire and
Commonwealth

1550 - 1939

Section A (1550 - 1763)

Section B (1763 - 1939)

With the exception of Cambridge papers on Economic and Social History at 'O' Level there is universal agreement about the importance of the late 15th century/

15th century as a dividing line in British and European history.

In fact here the examiners are accepting the traditional demarcation point between mediaeval and modern history so widely used by historians. (1)

The selection of the late 15th century as the major dividing line in British and European history by the examiners of the two boards is supported by historical factors. Not that the late 15th century saw a sudden break in historical development, but rather that it marks the point where movements began or gained impetus, leading to fundamental changes in the following centuries. Thus the Reformation had considerable repercussions for society in the 16th and 17th centuries. Religion became a major source of conflict and division, the old dominance of society by one church disappeared, and the relationship between state and church was transformed. The Renaissance was equally significant. The classical revival led to a major revolution in art, architecture, literature and thought (including scientific thought) and contributed to the laicising of normal life. Then, the discovery of the New World had major repercussions, at least for Western Europe. Trade routes were dramatically changed, economies transformed by the influx of gold and silver and European political conflict was extended and broadened. Finally, the fifteenth century saw the emergence of three states who were to have a dominant influence in Europe in the coming centuries. Thus during the fifteenth century France finally destroyed the continental power of English kings making it possible for her to emerge as a powerful state. At the same time the defeats of the Hundred Years' War, the War of the Roses and the establishment of the Tudor dynasty turned England into an island power/

(1) Cf Cambridge mediaeval and modern history

power while the discovery of America and the route to the East ultimately led to ^{the} development of her maritime empire. Thirdly Spain was united under Ferdinand and Isabella and began to play a role as a major European power. As a result, both on historical grounds, and on account of the divisions which the examiners themselves employed, a comparison between papers on mediaeval and modern history appeared to be appropriate.

Once the late 15th century had been selected as a dividing point between the mediaeval and modern periods other possible boundaries between periods were considered for the years from 400 to 1500 and from 1500 to 1939.

Though a case could be put forward on historical grounds for the establishment of different periods between 400 and 1500, for example, before and after 1066, in the case of English history, no attempt was made to create such divisions.

In the first place any division at or around the year 1000 or before was rendered impossible by the structure of the papers. Very few sets of papers in this study covered the period from 400 to 1500 and only two dealt with the years between 400 and 800 and three from 800 to 1066. In addition, in these papers a very small number of questions was allocated to the years before 1066. In the case of Cambridge 'O' level papers on British and European history the average number was four, while in JMB 'A' level papers on European history only three were set, on average, for the period between 800 and 1066, the number of questions available in each paper for comparison with papers in other periods was, therefore too small for any reliable judgement/

judgement to be made about the categories and sub categories employed in them. At the same time, since the three papers concerned had no dividing points at 800 and 1066 some of the questions straddled the boundary between periods and would have had to be allocated arbitrarily to one side or the other. As a result, no attempt was made to divide the papers set on the period from 400 to 1500 at or before the year 1066.

Secondly any dividing point after that date proved equally difficult to sustain. The only boundary employed in any of the papers was at 1307 between the two JMB 'A' level papers on English mediaeval history. This dividing line was not employed in any of the other papers analysed in this study, either in papers on European history set by the JMB or in papers on English and European history set by the Cambridge board. Further, no historical grounds other than the death of Edward 1 of England could be adduced for regarding 1307 as a significant boundary between periods. Finally, when the whole period from 1066 to 1500 was reviewed no satisfactory boundary could be established. If any dividing line were chosen other than 1307 every paper would have had to be divided arbitrarily at the point selected with all the attendant difficulties of allocating questions to one or other side of the boundary. In addition no historical grounds could be found for selecting a particular date as a dividing point, which would apply both to English and European history. Thus the papers dealing with the period 400 to 1500 were left undivided.

The possibility of selecting dividing lines was then considered for the period 1485 - 1939. Study of the dates on Table 2 show that the examiners/

examiners attached a lot of importance to the late 17th/early 18th century, the late 18th/early 19th century and to 1870 as divisions between periods. Each of these dividing lines will now be considered dealing first with 1870, then with the late 18th/early 19th century and finally with the late 17th/early 18th century.

The year 1870, if chosen as a dividing line, would have created great difficulties in the analysis of the papers, leading to papers being divided up along lines not intended by the examiners. Thus, if 1870 were employed as a boundary between periods, Cambridge papers on 'A' level English and European history, Cambridge 'O' level papers on British and European history, JMB 'A' level and 'O' level papers on Economic and Social history, Cambridge 'O' level papers on Economic and Social history and JMB and Cambridge 'O' level papers on British imperial history would have been arbitrarily divided into two sections, with all the problems of allocating questions, which straddled the boundary.

In addition the year 1870 is not a particularly significant historical watershed. This is especially the case in British history, an equally valid case in the political sphere could be argued for dates like 1815, or 1832, not to mention 1688, while in British social, religious, cultural, and imperial history, 1870 and the decade either side of it, are not especially important as points of demarcation. In European history 1870 is more important, marking as it does the decline of France and the rise of Germany. However, these two trends apply only to Western Europe and, in general, 1870 is not a particularly important dividing line in religious, cultural or social development. In addition/

addition there are other dates with a greater claim to significance in European history, for example 1714, or 1789 or 1815.

If the late 18th/early 19th century is used as a major boundary, problems also arise. Two dates, 1789 and 1815, are employed in the papers as dividing points between periods. Unfortunately the two of them cannot be used together, with one, the French Revolution, Napoleon and the associated major conflicts are INCLUDED in the modern period, and with the other, they are EXCLUDED. Further, if either date is chosen papers will have to be split in an arbitrary fashion, both dates being unsuitable for the papers on economic and imperial history while of the other papers half have a boundary line at 1789 and half at 1815.⁽¹⁾ Finally, on historical grounds, neither date is significant when considering social and economic history the papers set on British Economic and Social history for example, starting in the early, or mid 18th century so that the antecedents of the Industrial and Agrarian Revolutions can be included.

Fewer difficulties arise if the late 17th/early 18th century is selected as a dividing line. Certainly less disruption occurs among the papers. More variation is possible in the actual boundaries ~~so~~ that can be permitted between papers for the late 17th/early 18th century, as opposed to the late 18th/early 19th century. No date in the period 1660-1714 has quite the central importance of 1789 for the late 18th/early 19th century. Significant boundaries, for example, 1689 or 1714, are vital only for particular countries or particular aspects of the period. As a result, only Cambridge papers on 'A' level British and European history had to be arbitrarily divided at 1714.

The

(1) See above p. 161

The late 17th/early 18th century is also a major watershed in British and European history. In Britain, the late 17th/early 18th century witnessed the end of the long standing conflict over the role of the King in Government, and the successful reduction of religious conflict as a result of the Revolutionary Settlement. In addition, the wars of 1689 - 1714 marked the establishment of Britain as a significant Imperial and European power.⁽¹⁾ Among European countries the late 17th/early 18th century marks a very definite watershed when all the factors are considered. As in Britain religion ceased to be central in domestic politics and the constitutional wrangles of the 16th and 17th centuries ceased to be important. From approximately 1714 most European countries experienced a period of political stability. In France, this was of course broken by the Revolution of 1789, but elsewhere in Europe, aside from the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars political conditions remained unchanged - in most Western European countries until 1848 and in Eastern Europe until the late 19th century. In foreign politics the late 17th/early 18th century is also a crucial dividing line. In Eastern and Northern Europe Russia becomes the dominating power, as opposed to Sweden or Turkey, and maintains the position even today, while in W.Europe France replaced Spain⁽²⁾ as the most important power until replaced by Germany in 1870. Even outside political history the late 17th/early 18th century is an important boundary. The significance of the early 18th century for the papers on British social and economic history has already been considered. Additional factors are the scientific revolution of the late 17th century and the tendency for religious ideas and conflict/

(1) N.C.M.H. Vol. VIII op cit p.192

(2) From 1660 onwards

conflict to be less central to society with their secular rationalism of the 18th century.

Tests of Significance Involving the Five Major Variables

As a result of the discussion in the first section of this chapter the following variables emerged,

- (a) The Boards - JMB and Cambridge
- (b) The Levels - Ordinary and Advanced
- (c) The Type of History - British, European, British Economic and Social and British Imperial
- (d) The Period of History - Mediaeval, Early Modern, Modern
- (e) The Technique of Examining - JMB traditional 'A' level v
JMB innovatory papers at 'A' level

The papers influenced by these variables had to be organised into cells so that the impact of the variables could be assessed.

Papers set on British Imperial and British Economic and Social history were separated from the mass of the papers set by the Joint Matriculation and Cambridge Boards because only very limited comparison was appropriate. So also were the innovatory papers on British and European history set by the JMB which involved a study of documents and were concerned with shorter periods. Comparisons involving each of these three groups of papers will be discussed briefly at this stage - a more detailed analysis, for instance of the size of cells involved in the tests of significance, will be delayed until the results are actually presented.

Papers concerned with British Imperial history only numbered ten and showed/

showed little variety as regards level, period or type of history (see below)

JMB The British Empire
and Commonwealth

'0' level from 1763 to 1939

5 papers

Cambridge History of the British
Empire and Commonwealth

'0' level (1558 - 1939)

5 papers

Obviously it is important to compare these papers with each other and with papers on British history at '0' level, but beyond this point comparison is pointless. Little purpose will be served, for example, by comparing papers on '0' level British Imperial history with 'A' level European history, or papers on '0' level British Imperial history for the period from 1763 to 1939 with papers on British history from 1066 to 1485. In these cases more than one variable is involved in the comparison making any conclusion highly debateable. However, comparisons are appropriate between papers on British Imperial and British history if matched for periods, and levels to determine how far the examiners view British history and British Imperial history as similar. Thus, as far as British Imperial history is concerned, comparison will be first between the two groups of papers on Imperial history, and second, between papers on British Imperial history and papers on British history.

The same arguments apply to British Economic and Social history.

The papers available for comparison are listed below. (See Table 3 below)

Table 3

JMB /

Table 3

JMB 'A' Level British Economic History and Economic and Social History (1)

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Syllabus A Paper 11 L | British Economic History 1700 - 1914 |
| Syllabus B Paper 1 | British Economic and Social History 1700-1850 |
| Syllabus B Paper 11 | British conomic and Social History 1850-1939 |

JMB 'O' Level British Social and Economic History

Alternative C British Social and Economic History from early 18th century to the present day

Cambridge 'O' Level British Economic and Social History

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Section A | British Economic and Social History 1066-1760 |
| Section B | British Economic and Social History 1760-1939 |

Though the papers on British Economic and Social history show greater variety than those on British Imperial history opportunities for comparison with other papers are still limited. Thus papers on British Economic and Social history centre solely on British history, and are primarily concerned with modern history. Comparison, therefore, between papers on British Economic and Social history is not possible with most of the groups of papers in this study. For example, a comparison between JMB 'A' level papers on modern British Economic and Social history and Cambridge 'A' level papers on modern British history would be inappropriate. After such a comparison it would be impossible to determine which of the variables, the boards or the types of history, was responsible for the differences between the two sets of papers. As a result, the analysis of the papers on British/

(1) a comparison between 'A' level papers on British Economic and British Economic and Social history was carried out and no significant differences between the two types of paper were identified (see Appendix H)

British Economic and Social history was limited to comparisons between different types of papers on British Economic and Social history and papers on British history, matched for boards, levels and periods of history.

The papers set by the JMB at 'A' level, involving a study of documents and a relatively short period of history, also need to be isolated from the mass of the papers. The various alternatives in this category of paper are listed below. (Table 4)

Table 4

| | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Syllabus C Alternative B(Q) Paper I | European history (1450-1610) |
| Syllabus C Alternative B(Q) Paper II | The Reign of Elizabeth I (1558-1603) |
| Syllabus C Alternative C(R) Paper I | European history (1610-1789) |
| Syllabus C Alternative C(R) Paper II | British history (1660-1714) |
| Syllabus C Alternative D(S) Paper I | European history (1789-1870) |
| Syllabus C Alternative D(S) Paper II | British history (1815-1870) |
| Syllabus C Alternative E(T) Paper I | European history (1870-the present day) |
| Syllabus C Alternative E(T) Paper II | British History (1870-the present day) |

These papers can only be appropriately compared with JMB papers on British and European history at 'A' level, which follow traditional lines, since the results of comparisons with other sets of papers would be impossible to interpret because of confusion over the effect of the main variables. It is no use, for example, comparing these papers set by the JMB with Cambridge 'A' level papers on British and European history, since there would be no way of determining whether the differences between the two groups of papers arose because they were set by different boards or because they dealt with different types of history. These/

These papers were therefore only compared with JMB 'A' level papers on British and European history which followed traditional lines.

The remainder of the papers or sections of papers fall into a number of clear groups (see Table 5 below)

Table 5

MEDIAEVAL PERIOD

JMB 'A' Level British

JMB 'A' Level European

Cambridge 'O' Level British

Cambridge 'O' Level European

EARLY MODERN PERIOD

JMB 'A' Level British

JMB 'A' Level European

Cambridge 'A' Level British

Cambridge 'A' Level European

JMB 'O' Level British

JMB 'O' Level European

Cambridge 'O' Level British

Cambridge 'O' Level European

MODERN

JMB 'A' Level British

JMB 'A' Level European

Cambridge 'A' Level British

Cambridge 'A' Level European

JMB 'O' Level British

JMB 'O' Level European

Cambridge 'O' Level British

Cambridge 'O' Level European

The limited numbers of papers available for the mediaeval period created immediate problems for any comparison across the periods. Thus a full comparison between the mediaeval, early modern and modern periods cannot be mounted because of the absence of Cambridge 'A' and/

and JMB 'O' level papers on British and European mediaeval history. Any such attempt using the above papers would involve a comparison for example between 'A' level papers on mediaeval British and European history set by one board and 'A' level papers on modern and early modern British and European history set by two boards. To avoid this problem a comparison between papers on the mediaeval, early modern and modern periods can only include papers for each period, which are directly comparable with each other (see below Table 6).

Table 6

MEDIAEVAL PERIOD

JMB 'A' Level British

JMB 'A' Level European

Cambridge 'O' Level British

Cambridge 'O' Level European

EARLY MODERN PERIOD

JMB 'A' Level British

JMB 'A' Level European

Cambridge 'O' Level British

Cambridge 'O' Level European

MODERN PERIOD

JMB 'A' Level British

JMB 'A' Level European

Cambridge 'O' Level British

Cambridge 'O' Level European

Unfortunately even the results of this comparison of papers on mediaeval, early modern and modern history (which was eventually carried out - see chapter 8) were difficult to interpret. The comparison had to be conducted, since it was the only way of comparing papers on different periods, but it could not yield a satisfactory picture/

picture of the other variables, in particular, the levels and boards. In the comparison these variables were superimposed upon each other, the 'O' and 'A' level papers being set by different boards. As a result, differences between 'A' and 'O' level papers could be attributed either to the level or the board. The position was better when the impact of the period on the papers was being considered, since four papers were included in each cell, though interaction between the periods and other variables could not be fully analysed, because of the absence of certain papers, which has already been mentioned.

As a consequence of the difficulties arising with the comparison across or between periods, an analysis of the variables within each of the periods was carried out. This analysis involved three comparisons, the first between the eight groups of papers set on the modern period, the second between the papers dealing with early modern history and the third between papers concerned with mediaeval history. As a result of these comparisons a picture could be obtained of the impact of boards, levels and types of history on papers set on the modern and early modern periods. With the papers on mediaeval history this objective could not be attained because only four papers were involved in the analysis, though the calculation was nevertheless completed. Thus, as well as a comparison across the different periods (see chapter 8), a comparison within the periods was conducted (see chapter 7).

In chapters 7 - 11 these comparisons affecting papers on British, European, Economic and Social, and Imperial history will be presented, the details of the comparisons and the detailed results being considered in these chapters.

CHAPTER 7

COMPARISON OF J.M.B. AND CAMBRIDGE LOCAL EXAMINATIONS SYNDICATE
'A' AND 'O' LEVEL PAPERS ON BRITISH AND EUROPEAN HISTORY WITHIN
PERIODS

This chapter will be divided into four sections. In section (a) the 'A' and 'O' level papers on modern British and European history will be analysed, in section (b) those on early modern history and in section (c) those on mediaeval history while section (d) will be devoted to a summary of the main conclusions resulting from this analysis of the papers within the three periods. In each of the sections three topics will be dealt with. First of all the papers available for comparison will be listed and the problems of mounting a comparison between them will be discussed, secondly tables will be presented which summarise the results of the comparison and finally the results will be described and the important aspects identified.

(a) Papers on Modern History

The papers or sections of papers available for comparison on modern history are listed below.

JMB 'A' Level British History

Syllabus A Paper II Alternative
H British History (1714-1815) -

- 3 papers

Syllabus A Paper II Alternative
J British History (1815-1914)

- 4 papers

Syllabus A Paper II Alternative
K British History (1865-1939)

- 4 papers

JMB 'A' Level European History /

Cambridge 'A' Level English History

Paper 2 - English History (1485-1939)
(questions on the period after 1714)

- 5 papers

JMB 'A' Level European History

Syllabus A Paper 1 Alternative
C European History 1494-1939 -
4 papers

Section (2) 1715-89

Section (3) 1789-1870

Section (4) 1870-1939

Cambridge 'A' Level European History

Paper 5 - European History 1494-1939
(questions on the period after 1714) -
4 papers

JMB 'O' Level British History

Questions on British History
from

(i) Alternative E British Limited
Monarchy and European Autocracy
(1660-1789) - 5 papers

(ii) Alternative F Revolution Reaction
and Reform(1789-1870) - 5 papers

(iii) Alternative G Europe and the
Modern World 1870 - present
day - 5 papers

Cambridge 'O' Level British History

British and European History (1688-1939)¹

Section C (1688-1815) - 5 papers

Section D (1815-1939) - 5 papers

JMB 'O' Level European History

Questions on European History
from

(i) Alternative E British Limited
Monarchy and European Autocracy
(1660-1789) - 5 papers

(ii) Alternative F Revolution Reaction
and Reform (1789-1870) - 5 papers

(iii) Alternative G Europe and the
Modern World 1870 - present day-
5 papers

Cambridge 'O' Level European History

British and European History (1688-1939)

Section C (1688-1815) - 5 papers

Section D (1815-1939) - 5 papers

The papers and sections of papers listed above reveal that the two boards have varying approaches to the examining of a period of history. Thus papers on JMB 'A' level European and Cambridge 'O' level English and European history cover 300 to 500 years, with substantial sections being devoted to particular periods of English and European history. In contrast/

(1) These papers on British and European history are divided into sections - each section contains three sub-sections, one dealing with British history, one with European history and one containing short notes drawn from both British and European history.

contrast, JMB 'A' level British history is divided into three sets of papers, each on a different period, while questions on British and European history, set at 'O' level by the JMB are combined into one paper. Finally Cambridge 'A' level papers on English and European history deal with 500 years, without any division into sections. The differing methods employed in organising the exams and the varying numbers of papers, or sections of papers in each cell, created obvious difficulties when designing a comparison.

The first problem was to decide how far papers and sections of papers were comparable. There appeared to be little difference between boards setting papers on individual periods and dividing a lengthy period into sections. For instance, the sections in JMB 'A' level papers on European history and Cambridge 'O' level papers on British and European history cover substantial periods and contain from six to twelve questions. Nor did the papers which combined British and European history set at 'O' level by the JMB., lead to much difficulty. The total number of questions in each paper was at least 16 and identifying the questions on British and European history was straightforward. Only the Cambridge 'A' level papers on English and European history presented serious problems. The papers only numbered four and five respectively and covered the years 1485-1939 without interruption. Had the papers been left undivided a disastrous imbalance would have been created between the number of papers or sections of papers in each cell. Thus only four and five scores for each category and sub category would have been available from Cambridge 'A' level papers on English and European history, while JMB 'A' level papers on British/

British history would have yielded 11 scores and JMB 'O' level papers on British and European history 15 on each type of history. As a consequence the 'A' level papers set by the Cambridge board were divided into sections. Because of the danger of questions straddling boundaries between sections the process of division was reduced to a minimum. Thus one boundary, the early 19th century, was created for papers on English history, ten questions being either side of that dividing line. Unfortunately one boundary was not sufficient for the papers on European history because only eight scores would have been available for each cell. It was, therefore, necessary to create three sections following the dates employed in the papers set by the JMB on 'A' level European history. As a consequence of these decisions, the groups or sections of papers being compared were now as follows:

JMB 'A' Level British History

Syllabus A Paper 11 Alternative H British History (1714-1815) - 3 papers

Syllabus A Paper 11 Alternative J British history (1815-1914) - 4 papers

Syllabus A Paper 11 Alternative K British history (1865-1939) - 4 papers

Total number of scores ⁽¹⁾: 11

JMB 'A' Level European History

Syllabus A Paper 1 Alternative C European History (1494-1939) - 4 papers

Section (3) (1715-89)

Section (4) (1789-1870)

Section (5) (1870-1939)

Total number of scores : 12

Cambridge 'A' Level English History

Paper 2 English history (1485-1939) 2 sections created

(a) (1714 early 19th century)

(b) (early 19th century - 1939)

Total number of scores : 10

Cambridge 'A' Level European History

Paper 5 European History (1494-1939) 3 sections created

(a) (1714-93)

(b) (1793-1870)

(c) (1870-1939)

Total number of scores : 12

(1) For each category and sub category

JMB 'O' Level British History

Questions in British History
from
Alternative E British Limited
Monarchy and European (1660-1789)
Autocracy - 5 papers

Alternative F Revolution Reaction
and Reform (1789-1870)-
5 papers

Alternative G Europe and the Modern
World (1870-1939) - 5 papers

Total number of scores : 15

Cambridge 'O' Level

British and European History (1688-1939)

Section C (1688-1815)

Section D (1815-1939)

Total number of scores : 10

JMB 'O' Level European History

Questions on European History
from
Alternative E British Limited
Monarchy and European
Autocracy (1660-1789) - 5 papers

Alternative F Revolution and
Reform (1789-1870) - 5 papers

Alternative G Europe and the
Modern World (1870-1939) -
5 papers

Total number of scores : 15

Cambridge 'O' Level European History

British and European History (1688-1939)

Section C (1688-1815)

Section D (1815-1939)

Total number of scores : 10

The lack of proportionality between the cells above was a final problem that had to be solved before a comparison of papers and sections of papers on modern history could be conducted. A minor difficulty was the lack of balance in the JMB 'A' level papers on British history, three papers being available for the period 1714-1815 and four for the two later periods. The easiest solution to this problem was to calculate the mean for the three papers on the 18th century and add it to the scores already assembled, thus creating a numerical balance between the three periods. As a result of this decision, there were twelve scores in each of the two JMB 'A' level cells and fifteen in the two

two '0' level cells, while three of the Cambridge cells numbered 10 and one 12. Proportionality would, therefore, be achieved easily if the JMB cells each numbered twelve and the Cambridge ten.

Consequently a random sample of twelve scores was selected from each of the JMB '0' level British and European groups of scores and a random sample of ten from Cambridge 'A' level European history.

The number of scores in each cell was, therefore, as follows:

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| <u>JMB 'A' Level History</u> | <u>Cambridge 'A' Level English History</u> |
| 12 scores | 10 scores |
| <u>JMB 'A' Level European History</u> | <u>Cambridge 'A' Level European History</u> |
| 12 scores | 10 scores sampled from 12 |
| <u>JMB '0' Level British History</u> | <u>Cambridge '0' Level English History</u> |
| 12 scores sampled from 15 | 10 scores |
| <u>JMB '0' Level European History</u> | <u>Cambridge '0' Level European History</u> |
| 12 scores samples from 15 | 10 scores |

The results for papers on modern history will now be presented and discussed.

This section of the results will be presented in two tables (below). Table 1. lists the average frequency (in percentage terms) of each category and sub category in papers on modern history. This table is included so that the reader can obtain a general impression of the relative importance of the different categories and sub categories, a major theme which will be considered in chapter 12. Table 2. gives a summary of the significance of the different effects involved in the comparison - the detailed figures and calculations being placed in Appendix D.

- 181 -

TABLE I
AVERAGE FREQUENCY OF EACH CATEGORY AND SUB CATEGORY IN THE PAPERS ON MODERN BRITISH AND EUROPEAN HISTORY (In percentages)

| CATEGORY | | TITLE OF PAPER | | | | | | | |
|-------------|---|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| | | JMB 'A' Level British | JMB 'A' Level European | Cambridge 'A' Level British | Cambridge 'A' Level European | JMB 'O' Level British | JMB 'O' Level European | Cambridge 'O' Level British | Cambridge 'O' Level European |
| A | Political History | 66.17 | 70.67 | 66.10 | 68.40 | 69.66 | 77.00 | 54.20 | 76.00 |
| A1A1(s) | Foreign Politics | 20.67 | 29.33 | 20.50 | 33.10 | 17.50 | 38.75 | 12.60 | 44.30 |
| A1 | Foreign Politics (Collective) | 12.30 | 19.75 | 14.20 | 27.10 | 12.67 | 26.33 | 6.80 | 27.10 |
| A1(s) | Domestic Politics (Individual) | 8.00 | 8.75 | 6.30 | 6.00 | 4.83 | 12.50 | 5.90 | 17.20 |
| A234 | Domestic Politics | 44.80 | 32.30 | 36.40 | 28.30 | 45.50 | 30.40 | 39.90 | 28.60 |
| A.34 | Domestic Politics (without structure of government) | 37.20 | 25.10 | 26.40 | 25.30 | 32.60 | 24.80 | 29.60 | 24.00 |
| A2 | Structure of government | 7.70 | 7.25 | 10.00 | 2.80 | 13.00 | 5.50 | 10.30 | 4.60 |
| A3 | Domestic Politics (Individual) | 14.10 | 15.90 | 14.40 | 14.30 | 19.10 | 17.30 | 15.60 | 15.70 |
| A4 | Domestic Politics (Collective) | 22.90 | 9.30 | 12.00 | 11.20 | 13.50 | 7.60 | 13.80 | 8.30 |
| A1(s) A3 | Political History (Individual) | 22.30 | 24.50 | 20.40 | 20.30 | 23.70 | 29.80 | 21.50 | 32.80 |
| A14 | Political History (Collective) | 35.00 | 29.10 | 26.20 | 38.20 | 26.20 | 34.00 | 20.00 | 35.20 |
| B | Economic History | 7.50 | 5.30 | 13.00 | 7.20 | 2.20 | 2.00 | 15.90 | 2.00 |
| C | Social History (Social Custom) | 4.30 | 0.40 | 1.30 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 4.10 | 0.30 |
| D | Social History (Social Structure) | 1.80 | 2.40 | 1.10 | 1.90 | 0.10 | 0.60 | 0.30 | 1.30 |
| E | Political History (non government) | 5.30 | 1.40 | 3.80 | 3.60 | 6.70 | 2.10 | 6.30 | 6.00 |
| G | Religious History | 3.50 | 2.90 | 3.90 | 1.40 | 0.80 | 1.00 | 3.10 | 1.00 |

AVERAGE FREQUENCY OF EACH CATEGORY AND SUB CATEGORY IN THE PAPERS ON MODERN BRITISH AND EUROPEAN HISTORY

| CATEGORY | | TITLE OF PAPER | | | | | | | |
|----------|---|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| | | JMB 'A' Level British | JMB 'A' Level European | Cambridge 'A' Level British | Cambridge 'A' Level European | JMB 'O' Level British | JMB 'O' Level European | Cambridge 'O' Level British | Cambridge 'O' Level European |
| G (a) | Religious History (Leadership) | 0.90 | 0.80 | 0.70 | 0.50 | 0.20 | 0.50 | 1.20 | 0.60 |
| G (b) | Religious History (Movements) | 1.80 | 0.80 | 3.30 | 0.80 | 0.60 | 0.10 | 1.10 | 0.30 |
| H | Cultural History | 3.30 | 2.90 | 4.00 | 6.60 | 1.40 | 0.90 | 2.40 | 1.30 |
| J | Military and Naval History | 4.50 | 7.80 | 4.90 | 5.70 | 11.90 | 7.50 | 11.40 | 11.90 |
| J1 | Military and Naval History (government) | 4.30 | 7.70 | 4.90 | 5.60 | 10.90 | 7.00 | 11.20 | 11.90 |
| J2 | Military & Naval History (non government) | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.40 | 0.10 | 0.20 | 0.00 |
| L | Geographical History | 0.60 | 0.30 | 1.00 | 0.30 | 2.50 | 3.40 | 0.90 | 0.20 |
| L1 | Geographical Factors | 0.00 | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.30 | 1.50 | 1.80 | 0.00 | 0.20 |
| L2 | Exploration | 0.50 | 0.00 | 0.30 | 0.00 | 0.50 | 0.90 | 0.00 | 0.20 |
| M | Human Disease | 0.60 | 0.00 | 0.30 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.50 | 0.00 |
| N | Archaeology | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| P | Nature of History | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Y | Uncodable material | 1.80 | 5.80 | 1.90 | 4.20 | 2.80 | 4.30 | 1.10 | 0.80 |

TABLE 2

PAPERS ON MODERN HISTORY

| CATEGORY | | SIGNIFICANCE OF EFFECTS | | | | | | |
|-------------|---|-------------------------|--------|-------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| | | Boards | Levels | Type | Boards x Levels | Boards x Types | Levels x Types | Boards x Levels x Types |
| A | Political History | <.05 | N.S. | <.001 | N.S. | N.S. | <.05 | <.05 |
| A1A1(s) | Foreign Politics | N.S. | N.S. | <.001 | N.S. | <.05 | <.001 | N.S. |
| A1 | Foreign Politics (Collective) | N.S. | N.S. | <.001 | N.S. | N.S. | N.S. | N.S. |
| A1(s) | Foreign Politics (Individual) | N.S. | N.S. | <.01 | N.S. | N.S. | <.01 | N.S. |
| A234 | Domestic Politics | <.05 | N.S. | <.001 | N.S. | N.S. | N.S. | N.S. |
| A34 | Domestic Politics (without structure of government) | <.05 | N.S. | <.001 | N.S. | N.S. | N.S. | N.S. |
| A2 | Structure of Government | N.S. | N.S. | <.001 | N.S. | N.S. | N.S. | N.S. |
| A3 | Domestic Politics (Individual) | N.S. | N.S. | N.S. | N.S. | N.S. | N.S. | N.S. |
| A4 | Domestic Politics (Collective) | N.S. | <.05 | <.001 | N.S. | <.05 | N.S. | <.05 |
| A1(s) A3 | Political History (Individual) | N.S. | <.05 | <.05 | N.S. | N.S. | N.S. | N.S. |
| A14 | Political History (Collective) | N.S. | N.S. | <.05 | N.S. | <.01 | N.S. | N.S. |
| B | Economic History | <.001 | .001 | <.001 | N.S. | .001 | N.S. | .01 |
| C | Social History (Social Custom) | N.S. | N.S. | <.001 | <.01 | N.S. | N.S. | <.01 |
| D | Social History (Social Structure) ⁽¹⁾ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| E | Political History (non Government) | N.S. | N.S. | <.01 | N.S. | <.05 | N.S. | N.S. |
| G | Religious History | N.S. | <.05 | N.S. | N.S. | N.S. | N.S. | N.S. |

The results of the comparison between the different groups of papers (outlined in Table 2) will now be discussed, each variable (boards, levels and types of history) being considered in turn.

THE INFLUENCE OF EXAM BOARDS ON THE CATEGORIES AND SUB CATEGORIES
IN PAPERS ON MODERN HISTORY

The papers set by the Joint Matriculation and Cambridge boards are remarkably similar. When the means for the two sets of papers are considered, and no account is taken of interaction between the main variables, the absence of major differences between the scores for the categories and sub categories is striking. The only ones where the mean differences reach a level of statistical significance are listed below (Table 3) and even with them the differences are slight.

TABLE 3

| Category | Mean for JMB papers | Mean for Camb papers | Difference | Significance |
|----------|---------------------|----------------------|------------|--------------|
| A | 70.88 | 66.18 | 4.70 | .05 |
| A234 | 38.30 | 33.33 | 5.00 | .05 |
| A34 | 29.92 | 26.33 | 3.55 | .05 |
| B | 4.25 | 9.53 | -5.28 | .001 |
| L | 1.69 | 0.60 | 1.09 | .01 |

When the interaction between the variables is considered, persistent trends cannot be established. There is a tendency, for instance, which affects a few categories and sub categories (see Table 4 below) for interaction, which is significant at the five, one per cent or 0.1 per cent level to take place between boards and types of history, but no consistent trends/

trends can be established. Thus, in the case of sub categories A1A1(s)(foreign politics) and A14 (political history - collective) the variance is mainly accounted for by the markedly higher mean difference between Cambridge papers on British and European history than between the equivalent papers set by the JMB, while with category B (economic history) category E (political history - non government) and sub category A4 (domestic politics - collective) variance is largely brought about by the mean for one group of papers diverging from the others. In the case of category B the mean for Cambridge papers on British history is markedly higher than the other three means, with sub category A4 the outstanding mean is for JMB papers on British history and with category E the mean for JMB papers on European history is much lower than for the other groups of papers.

TABLE 4

| <u>Category</u> | <u>Interaction between boards and types</u> | | <u>Significance</u> |
|-----------------|---|-------|---------------------|
| | JMB | CAMB. | |
| A1A1(s) | BR | 19.10 | .05 |
| | EUR | 34.00 | |
| A14 | BR | 30.60 | .05 |
| | EUR | 31.54 | |
| B | BR | 4.83 | .001 |
| | EUR | 3.67 | |

TABLE 4 (continued)

| <u>Category</u> | <u>Interaction between boards and types</u> | | <u>Significance</u> | |
|-----------------|---|-------|---------------------|-----|
| A4 | | JMB | CAMB | .05 |
| | BR | 18.21 | 12.95 | |
| | EUR | 8.46 | 9.75 | |
| | | | | |
| E | | JMB | CAMB | .05 |
| | BR | 5.96 | 5.05 | |
| | EUR | 1.73 | 4.8 | |
| | | | | |

The remaining interactions between variables to reach a level of statistical significance also betray no general trends. First of all, in the case of categories C and L the means reached in the different groups of papers are too small (see Table 1) for any meaningful tendencies to be established. Secondly, interaction between the boards, levels and types of history which reach the five per cent level of statistical significance occurs in the case of categories A, B and sub category A4 but without any clear pattern being indicated. (see Table 1). With category A the interaction between the variables results largely from the low mean attained in Camb '0' level papers on British history, in the case of category B from the wide range of the means reached in the different groups of papers, the lowest being 2 per cent and the highest 15.9 per cent and with sub category A4 from the high mean reached by JMB 'A' level papers on British history.

THE INFLUENCE OF LEVELS, ADVANCED AND ORDINARY, ON THE TREATMENT OF CATEGORIES AND SUB CATEGORIES IN PAPERS ON MODERN HISTORY

At first glance the composition of the '0' and 'A' level papers on modern/

modern history appear to be very different. Thus sub category A4 (domestic politics - collective), A14 (political history - collective) categories B (economic history), G (religious history) and H (cultural history) receive greater emphasis at 'A' than at 'O' level, while category J (military and naval history), sub category J1 (military and naval history - government) and category L (geographical history) are given greater attention at 'O' level. However, though these mean differences reach a level of statistical significance as can be seen from Table 5 they are in general slight.

TABLE 5

| Category | Mean for 'A' level | Mean for 'O' level | Difference | Significance |
|----------|--------------------|--------------------|------------|--------------|
| A4 | 14.09 | 10.77 | 3.32 | .05 |
| A14 | 32.20 | 28.11 | 4.09 | .05 |
| A1(s)A3 | 22.08 | 26.93 | -4.85 | .05 |
| B | 8.09 | 5.20 | 2.89 | .001 |
| G | 2.95 | 1.41 | 1.54 | .05 |
| H | 4.09 | 1.48 | 2.61 | .01 |
| J | 5.75 | 10.93 | -5.18 | .001 |
| J1 | 5.65 | 10.61 | -4.96 | .01 |
| L | 0.52 | 1.86 | -1.34 | .001 |

Further the means for the really important categories and sub categories do not differ significantly in 'A' and 'O' level papers.

Category A (political history) has a mean of 67.89% in 'A' level

Papers/

Papers and 69.59% in '0' level papers, while the percentages for sub category A1A1(s) (foreign politics) are 25.80 at 'A' and 28.27% at '0' level and for sub category A234 (domestic politics) 35.78% at 'A' levels and 36.30 at '0' level.

When the interactions between the different variables are considered there is little to note. Aside from category C (social history - social custom) and category L (geographical history) where the means for the various groups of papers are extremely low, the only interactions where a level of statistical significance is reached is between levels and types of history for category A, and sub categories A1A1(s), and A1(s)⁽¹⁾. (See Table 6)

TABLE 6

| <u>Category</u> | <u>Interaction between levels and types</u> | | <u>Significance</u> |
|-----------------|---|-------|---------------------|
| | A | 0 | |
| A | BR | 66.14 | .05 |
| | EUR | 69.64 | |
| A1A1(s) | BR | 20.55 | .001 |
| | EUR | 31.05 | |
| A1(s) | BR | 7.23 | .01 |
| | EUR | 7.50 | |

In/

(1) N.B. sub categories A1, A1(s) (foreign politics) and A1(s) (foreign politics - individual) are distinct sub categories.

In the case of category A, and these two sub categories concerned with foreign policy variance can largely be explained by the tendency for the means for '0' level papers on British history to be lower than those for the other groups of papers involved in the comparison and for the means for '0' level papers on European history to be markedly higher. These trends are, however, limited to category A and sub categories A1 A1(s) and A1(s) no other tendencies being identifiable which reach a level of statistical significance.

THE INFLUENCE OF TYPES OF HISTORY, BRITISH AND EUROPEAN, ON THE
TREATMENT OF CATEGORIES AND SUB CATEGORIES IN PAPERS ON MODERN
HISTORY.

The degree of variance in the papers on British and European history is greater than between 'A' and '0' level papers, because it occurs within category A and its sub categories, which are so vital to these papers. (See Table 7).

TABLE 7 /

TABLE 7

| Category Sub Category | Mean for papers on British history | Mean for papers on European history | Difference | Significance |
|--------------------------|--|---|------------|--------------|
| A | 64.39 | 73.09 | -8.70 | .001 |
| A1A1(s) | 17.93 | 36.16 | -18.23 | .001 |
| A1 | 11.59 | 24.89 | -13.30 | .001 |
| A1(s) | 6.27 | 11.07 | -4.8 | .01 |
| A234 | 42.00 | 30.05 | 11.95 | .001 |
| A34 | 31.75 | 24.82 | 6.93 | .001 |
| A2 | 10.27 | 5.23 | 5.04 | .001 |
| A4 | 15.82 | 9.05 | 6.77 | .001 |
| A1(s)A3 | 22.36 | 27.16 | -4.80 | .05 |
| A14 | 27.36 | 32.90 | -5.54 | .05 |
| B | 9.20 | 4.09 | 5.11 | .001 |
| C | 2.52 | 0.39 | 2.13 | .001 |
| E | 5.55 | 3.14 | 2.41 | .01 |
| Y | 1.93 | 3.91 | -1.98 | .05 |

Though the greater prominence of category A in papers on European as opposed to British history is of interest the really important aspect to note is the tendency for the two groups of sub categories on foreign and domestic politics to diverge markedly in these two sets of papers. Thus there is a consistent tendency for papers on European history to lay much greater emphasis on foreign politics, the mean difference between the two groups of papers being as high as 18.2%, in the case of sub category A1A1(s) while, in contrast, the sub categories dealing with domestic politics (with the exception of sub category A3) receive greater prominence in papers on British history.

Other differences between the two sets of papers are of much less significance. A few categories, namely categories B, C and E do receive more attention in papers on British history and category Y and the two sub categories, A1(s) A3 (political history - individual), A14 (political history - collective) are more favoured in papers on European history, but the mean differences do not exceed 6.0%. Otherwise, the only remaining variance arising as a result of interaction between the variables has already been discussed and the absence of consistent trends has been established.

Conclusions - papers on Modern History

- (1) The variance in the papers which is attributable to differences between the boards is minimal.
- (2) The divergence between the papers which results from the levels at which they are set is more apparent than real, the significant mean/

(2) (continued)

mean differences only applying to categories that are largely ignored in any case, and little significant variation being found in category A and its sub categories which dominate the papers.

- (3) In contrast variation resulting from the types of history on which the papers were set was marked principally because it occurred among the sub categories of category A which play such an important role in their papers.

Section (b) Early Modern History

The papers or sections of papers available for comparison on early modern history are listed below.

JMB 'A' Level British History

Alternative F British History
(1485 - 1603) - 3 papers

Alternative G British History
(1603 - 1714) - 1 paper

- 4 papers

JMB 'A' Level European History

Syllabus A Paper 1 Alternative C
European History (1494 - 1939)

Section (1) (1494 - 1715) - 4 papers

JMB 'O' Level British History
(1450 - 1600)

Questions on British History
from

Alternative D - Renaissance and
Reformation (1450 - 1600)

- 5 papers

Cambridge 'A' Level English History

Paper 2 English History (1485 - 1939)

(questions dealing with the period
1485 - 1715)

- 5 papers

Cambridge 'A' Level European History

Paper 5 European History (1494 - 1939)

(questions dealing with the period
1494 - 1715)

- 4 papers

Cambridge 'O' Level British History
(1483 - 1688)

British & European History 1485-1815

Section B - (1485 - 1688)

- 5 papers

JMB '0' Level European History

(1450 - 1600)

Questions on European History
from

Alternative D - Renaissance and
Reformation (1450 - 1600)

- 5 papers

Cambridge '0' Level European History

(1485 - 1688)

British and European History
(1485 - 1815)

Section B -(1485 - 1688)

- 5 papers

The treatment of the papers and sections of papers listed above is similar to the handling of the papers on modern history. Thus a section of the JMB 'A' level papers on European history is included in the comparison, the Cambridge 'A' level papers on English and European history are divided at 1714, and questions on British and European history are selected from the paper on the Renaissance and Reformation set at '0' level by the JMB. In addition, four papers were sampled from the five in each of the following cells, Cambridge A' level English history, JMB. '0' level British and European history and Cambridge '0' level British and European history so that four papers in each group were involved in the comparison.

As was the case in section (a), there is a need at this point for a table in which the means for each of the categories and sub categories employed in papers on early modern history are tabulated, so that a context can be provided for the discussion of the impact of the main variables on these papers. Also as in section (a) a summary table of the significance of the effects of the variables will be presented while the detailed calculations will be found in Appendix D. Tables 8 and 9 will now be presented.

TABLE 8 /

TABLE 8
AVERAGE FREQUENCY OF EACH CATEGORY AND SUB CATEGORY IN THE PAPERS ON EARLY MODERN BRITISH & EUROPEAN HISTORY

| CATEGORY | | TITLE OF PAPER | | | | | | | |
|-------------|---|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| | | JMB 'A' Level British | JMB 'A' Level European | Cambridge 'A' Level British | Cambridge 'A' Level European | JMB 'O' Level British | JMB 'O' Level European | Cambridge 'O' Level British | Cambridge 'O' Level European |
| A | Political History | 59.00 | 55.75 | 67.50 | 59.00 | 59.25 | 47.50 | 64.25 | 63.00 |
| A1A1(s) | Foreign Politics | 15.50 | 24.50 | 20.25 | 25.25 | 24.75 | 24.00 | 21.00 | 30.00 |
| A1 | Foreign Politics (Collective) | 6.75 | 15.00 | 10.25 | 18.25 | 10.00 | 10.50 | 7.50 | 10.75 |
| A1(s) | Domestic Politics (Individual) | 8.75 | 10.00 | 10.00 | 7.00 | 14.75 | 13.50 | 13.75 | 19.25 |
| A234 | Domestic Politics | 42.75 | 26.30 | 43.80 | 26.00 | 33.75 | 18.50 | 36.75 | 25.00 |
| A34 | Domestic Politics (without structure of government) | 29.00 | 23.00 | 33.50 | 23.50 | 30.75 | 16.25 | 32.50 | 19.75 |
| A2 | Structure of government | 13.50 | 3.50 | 10.00 | 2.75 | 3.00 | 2.25 | 4.25 | 5.25 |
| A3 | Domestic Politics (Individual) | 14.50 | 18.00 | 18.25 | 17.75 | 18.75 | 12.00 | 20.50 | 13.50 |
| A4 | Domestic Politics (Collective) | 14.50 | 5.00 | 15.25 | 5.50 | 12.00 | 4.25 | 12.00 | 6.35 |
| A1(s) A3 | Political History (Individual) | 23.25 | 28.00 | 28.25 | 25.00 | 33.50 | 25.50 | 33.75 | 32.75 |
| A14 | Political History (Collective) | 21.25 | 20.00 | 25.50 | 23.75 | 22.00 | 14.75 | 19.50 | 17.00 |
| B | Economic History | 13.00 | 6.50 | 6.00 | 6.75 | 10.75 | 4.75 | 4.50 | 1.50 |
| C | Social History (Social Custom) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| D | Social History (Social Structure) | 1.25 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.25 | 0.50 | 1.00 |
| E | Political History (non government) | 1.00 | 0.25 | 1.75 | 0.80 | 7.75 | 5.00 | 2.25 | 0.75 |
| G | Religious History | 14.75 | 13.00 | 7.75 | 15.25 | 12.25 | 18.25 | 5.25 | 12.50 |

TABLE 8 (continued)

AVERAGE FREQUENCY OF EACH CATEGORY AND SUB CATEGORY IN THE PAPERS ON EARLY MODERN BRITISH & EUROPEAN HISTORY

- 196 -

| CATEGORY | | TITLE OF PAPER | | | | | | | |
|----------|---|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| | | JMB 'A' Level British | JMB 'A' Level European | Cambridge 'A' Level British | Cambridge 'A' Level European | JMB 'O' Level British | JMB 'O' Level European | Cambridge 'O' Level British | Cambridge 'O' Level European |
| G (a) | Religious History (Leadership) | 7.00 | .7.50 | 1.00 | 10.25 | 6.25 | 15.25 | 2.50 | 6.50 |
| G (b) | Religious History (Movements) | 6.25 | 3.25 | 5.75 | 5.25 | 5.75 | 2.75 | 1.50 | 4.00 |
| H | Cultural History | 5.25 | 5.00 | 8.50 | 8.25 | 1.00 | 9.00 | 6.00 | 4.00 |
| J | Military and Naval History | 4.50 | 8.75 | 5.25 | 6.00 | 3.25 | 6.25 | 10.75 | 12.75 |
| J1 | Military and Naval History (government) | 3.75 | 8.25 | 5.00 | 6.00 | 2.75 | 6.75 | 7.25 | 10.00 |
| J2 | Military & Naval History (non government) | 0.50 | 0.75 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| L | Geographical History | 1.00 | 1.75 | 0.25 | 1.00 | 2.50 | 7.75 | 2.00 | 1.25 |
| L1 | Geographical Factors | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.00 | 0.75 | 0.00 | 3.25 | 0.00 | 1.25 |
| L2 | Exploration | 0.50 | 0.75 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 2.50 | 6.00 | 2.00 | 0.00 |
| M | Human Disease | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| N | Archaeology | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| P | Nature of History | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Y | Uncodable material | 0.00 | 8.25 | 2.25 | 1.50 | 2.75 | 1.75 | 3.00 | 3.75 |

| CATEGORY | | SIGNIFICANCE OF EFFECTS | | | | | | |
|----------|---|-------------------------|--------|-------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| | | Boards | Levels | Types | Boards x Levels | Boards x Types | Levels x Types | Boards x Levels x Types |
| E | Political History (non Government) | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS |
| G | Religious History | .05 | NS | .05 | NS | NS | NS | NS |
| G(a) | Religious History (Leadership) | .01 | NS | .001 | NS | NS | NS | .05 |
| G(b) | Religious History (Movements) | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS |
| H | Cultural History | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS |
| J | Military and Naval History | NS | NS | NS | .05 | NS | NS | NS |
| J1 | Military and Naval History (Government) | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS |
| J2 | Military and Naval History (non Government) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| L | Geographical History | .05 | .01 | .05 | NS | .05 | NS | NS |
| L1 | Geographical Factors | NS | .05 | .01 | NS | NS | NS | .05 |
| L2 | Exploration | .01 | .01 | NS | .05 | .05 | NS | .001 |
| M | Human Disease | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| N | Archaeology | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| P | Nature of History | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Y | Uncodable Material | NS | NS | | NS | NS | NS | .05 |

The impact of each of the main variables will now be considered in turn.

THE INFLUENCE OF EXAM BOARDS ON CATEGORIES AND SUB CATEGORIES IN PAPERS
ON EARLY MODERN HISTORY

The papers set by the JMB and Cambridge boards are very similar. Though the mean for category A (Political history) in papers set by the Cambridge board is 8.06% higher than in JMB papers, none of the sub categories of category A show a mean difference that reaches the five per cent level of significance. Further the means for categories C (social history - social custom), D (social history - social structure), E (political history - non government), H (cultural history), M (human disease), N (archaeology), P (the nature of history), and sub categories G(b) (religious history - movements), J1 (military and naval history - government), and J2 (military and naval history - non government) in the JMB papers do not differ significantly from the means for the Cambridge papers. (See Table 9)

Among the few categories and sub categories where a divergence does take place the difference is small and, in every case except one, is largely explained by an interaction between the variables, which is significant at the 5% level. The one exception where such an interaction is not relevant is category G, the mean for JMB papers being 14.5% and for Cambridge papers 10.23%, a difference of only 4.34%. (See Table 8)

With the remaining categories and sub categories interaction between some or all of the variables is an important element in explaining the variation in the different groups of papers (see Table 10 below).

Thus/

Thus, though category B (economic history) plays a greater role in JMB., as opposed to Cambridge papers, the mean difference between the two is only 4.06%. In addition, this result is overshadowed by interaction between the boards and types of history and between the boards, levels and types of history. In papers set by the JMB, on British history, category B achieves a mean of 11.88%, in contrast to 5.25% in Cambridge papers on British history, and 5.65% and 4.13% for Cambridge and JMB papers on European history, while, when the interaction between the boards, levels and types of history is considered, the variance can largely be attributed to the mean of 13.0% achieved by JMB 'A' level papers on British history. (See Table 10)

Comparable trends can be established for other categories and sub categories involved in this comparison. In the case of sub category G(a) (religious history - leadership) the mean difference between the papers set by the JMB and Cambridge boards is small (3.93%), though statistically significant, but this tendency can be explained by the high mean reached by one group of papers, JMB 'O' level papers on European history, which causes an interaction, significant at the 5% level, between boards, levels and periods of history (see Table 10 below). With category J a similar small mean difference occurs between the papers set by the two boards, and can be accounted for by interaction between the boards and levels, the mean for 'O' level papers set by the Cambridge board being 11.75% in contrast to 4.75% for JMB 'O' level papers and 6.63% and 5.63% for JMB and Cambridge 'A' level papers. In the case of category L and its sub categories the situation is even more complicated. Though the percentages involved are extremely low, category L and its sub categories do receive more attention/

attention in JMB as opposed to Cambridge papers. This variation can, however, be explained largely by interaction between the variables. (see Table 10 below). With category L interaction at a significant level takes place between boards and types of history, the mean for papers on European history set by the JMB being 4.75% in contrast to the means for the other groups of papers involved in the comparison which do not exceed 2.0% while in the case of sub categories L1 and L2 the differences between the JMB and Cambridge papers are attributable to the relatively high percentage reached by European papers set by the JMB at '0' level, which led to an interaction between the boards, levels and types of history, which was significant at the five per cent level. Finally, with category Y the only identifiable trend, which has little bearing on a general tendency for the papers set by the boards to differ, is for an interaction, significant at the 5% level, between boards, levels and types of history, caused largely by the high mean (8.25%) attained in JMB 'A' level papers on European history, the means for the other papers ranging from 0.0% to 3.75%.

Thus, though variations do occur between the papers set by the two boards, they are limited to a small number of categories and sub categories, do not involve large mean differences, and can be, to a great extent, explained by interactions between the variables.

TABLE 10 /

TABLE 10

- 202 -

| Category Sub Category | Interaction between Boards and levels | Significance | Interaction between boards and types | Significance | Interaction between boards, levels and types | Significance | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--------------|---|--------------|--|--------------|------|---|-------|-------|-----|---|--|-----|------|----|-------|------|-----|-------|------|-----|---|--|--|-----|------|---|----|-------|------|-----|------|-------|---|----|-------|-------|-----|-------|-------|-----|
| B | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB</th> <th>CAMB</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>9.75</td> <td>6.38</td> </tr> <tr> <td>O</td> <td>7.75</td> <td>3.00</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB | CAMB | A | 9.75 | 6.38 | O | 7.75 | 3.00 | NS | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB</th> <th>CAMB</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>BR</td> <td>11.88</td> <td>5.25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EUR</td> <td>5.63</td> <td>4.13</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB | CAMB | BR | 11.88 | 5.25 | EUR | 5.63 | 4.13 | .05 | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th></th> <th>JMB</th> <th>CAMB</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="2">A</td> <td>BR</td> <td>13.00</td> <td>6.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EUR</td> <td>6.50</td> <td>6.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">O</td> <td>BR</td> <td>10.75</td> <td>4.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EUR</td> <td>4.75</td> <td>1.50</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | | JMB | CAMB | A | BR | 13.00 | 6.00 | EUR | 6.50 | 6.75 | O | BR | 10.75 | 4.50 | EUR | 4.75 | 1.50 | .05 |
| | | JMB | CAMB | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A | 9.75 | 6.38 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| O | 7.75 | 3.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | JMB | CAMB | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BR | 11.88 | 5.25 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EUR | 5.63 | 4.13 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | JMB | CAMB | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A | BR | 13.00 | 6.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | EUR | 6.50 | 6.75 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| O | BR | 10.75 | 4.50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | EUR | 4.75 | 1.50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| G(a) | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB</th> <th>CAMB</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>7.25</td> <td>5.63</td> </tr> <tr> <td>O</td> <td>10.75</td> <td>4.50</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB | CAMB | A | 7.25 | 5.63 | O | 10.75 | 4.50 | NS | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB</th> <th>CAMB</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>BR</td> <td>6.63</td> <td>1.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EUR</td> <td>11.38</td> <td>8.38</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB | CAMB | BR | 6.63 | 1.75 | EUR | 11.38 | 8.38 | NS | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th></th> <th>JMB</th> <th>CAMB</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="2">A</td> <td>BR</td> <td>7.00</td> <td>1.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EUR</td> <td>7.50</td> <td>10.25</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">O</td> <td>BR</td> <td>6.25</td> <td>2.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EUR</td> <td>15.25</td> <td>6.50</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | | JMB | CAMB | A | BR | 7.00 | 1.00 | EUR | 7.50 | 10.25 | O | BR | 6.25 | 2.50 | EUR | 15.25 | 6.50 | .05 |
| | | JMB | CAMB | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A | 7.25 | 5.63 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| O | 10.75 | 4.50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | JMB | CAMB | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BR | 6.63 | 1.75 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EUR | 11.38 | 8.38 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | JMB | CAMB | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A | BR | 7.00 | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | EUR | 7.50 | 10.25 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| O | BR | 6.25 | 2.50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | EUR | 15.25 | 6.50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| J | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB</th> <th>CAMB</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>6.63</td> <td>5.63</td> </tr> <tr> <td>O</td> <td>4.75</td> <td>11.75</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB | CAMB | A | 6.63 | 5.63 | O | 4.75 | 11.75 | .05 | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB</th> <th>CAMB</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>BR</td> <td>3.88</td> <td>8.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EUR</td> <td>7.50</td> <td>9.38</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB | CAMB | BR | 3.88 | 8.00 | EUR | 7.50 | 9.38 | NS | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th></th> <th>JMB</th> <th>CAMB</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="2">A</td> <td>BR</td> <td>4.50</td> <td>5.25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EUR</td> <td>8.75</td> <td>6.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">O</td> <td>BR</td> <td>3.25</td> <td>10.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EUR</td> <td>6.25</td> <td>12.75</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | | JMB | CAMB | A | BR | 4.50 | 5.25 | EUR | 8.75 | 6.00 | O | BR | 3.25 | 10.75 | EUR | 6.25 | 12.75 | NS |
| | | JMB | CAMB | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A | 6.63 | 5.63 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| O | 4.75 | 11.75 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | JMB | CAMB | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BR | 3.88 | 8.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EUR | 7.50 | 9.38 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | JMB | CAMB | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A | BR | 4.50 | 5.25 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | EUR | 8.75 | 6.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| O | BR | 3.25 | 10.75 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | EUR | 6.25 | 12.75 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

THE INFLUENCE OF LEVELS ADVANCED AND ORDINARY ON THE TREATMENT OF
CATEGORIES AND SUB CATEGORIES IN PAPERS ON EARLY MODERN HISTORY

The papers set at 'A' and 'O' level, though showing some signs of variations, are fundamentally similar. Only sub categories A1(s) (foreign politics- individual), A2³⁴ (domestic politics), A2 (structure of government), A3 (domestic politics - individual), category B (economic history), J (military and naval history), L (geographical history, etc.), sub category L1 (geographical factors) and L2 (exploration) show any significant difference of treatment in 'A', as compared with 'O' level, papers.

None of the sub categories of category A reveal important trends. (see Tabel 11). Though sub category A1(s) is given markedly more attention at 'O' level, the tendency is reversed with sub category A1, and, when the two are combined into sub category A1A1(s) (foreign politics), the mean difference between 'A' and 'O' level papers is not statistically significant. Sub category A2³⁴ is favoured in 'A' level papers, but the average percentage reached at 'A' level is only 6.18% higher than at 'O' level. In addition, this is almost entirely attributable to the higher mean reached by sub category A2 in one group of papers, which led to a significant interaction between types of history and levels of examination (see Table 11). There remains the case of sub category A3 where the only comparison to achieve significant results was between levels and types of history. Unfortunately, the divergence between 'A' and 'O' level papers was contradictory, sub category A3 reached a higher mean in 'A' as opposed to 'O' level papers on European history, a trend which was reversed in the papers on British history (see Table 11 below).

TABLE 11

| Category Sub Category | Mean for 'A' level papers | Mean for 'O' level papers | Difference | Significance |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------|--------------|
| A1A1(s) | 21.19 | 24.25 | -3.06 | NS |
| A1 | 12.56 | 9.69 | 2.87 | NS |
| A1(s) | 8.94 | 15.31 | -6.37 | .01 |
| A234 | 34.68 | 28.50 | 6.18 | .01 |
| A34 | 27.25 | 24.81 | 2.44 | NS |
| A2 | 7.44 | 3.69 | 3.75 | .01 |
| A3 | 17.19 | 16.19 | 1.00 | NS |
| A4 | 10.06 | 8.63 | 1.43 | NS |

Category
Sub Category

Interaction between
levels and types

Significance

| | | | | |
|----|-----|-------|------|------|
| | | A | O | |
| A2 | BR | 11.75 | 3.63 | .001 |
| | EUR | 3.13 | 3.75 | |

| | | | | |
|----|-----|-------|-------|-----|
| | | A | O | |
| A3 | BR | 16.5 | 19.63 | .05 |
| | EUR | 17.88 | 12.75 | |

Among the remaining categories and sub categories there is little divergence between 'A' and 'O' level papers. In the case of category B and sub categories L1 and L2 any variation between 'A' and 'O' level papers is attributable to the interaction between boards, levels and types of history which has already been pointed out,⁽¹⁾ while with category J it can be accounted for by interaction between boards and levels which has been described above.⁽²⁾ Only in the case of category L is there a small mean difference between 'A' and 'O' level papers, which is not complicated by interaction between the variables, and is statistically significant, but it is very small, the mean reached by 'A' level papers being 0.88% and by 'O' level papers 3.38%.

THE INFLUENCE OF TYPES OF HISTORY, BRITISH AND EUROPEAN, ON THE TREATMENT OF CATEGORIES AND SUB CATEGORIES IN PAPERS ON EARLY MODERN HISTORY

More variance arises in papers on early modern history from the types of history, British and European, than from the levels of examination or the boards

Papers on British history pay more attention to category A (political history), its sub categories, relating to domestic politics and category B (economic history) (see Table 12). Of these the sub categories dealing with domestic politics are by far the most important. Categories A and B certainly play a greater part in papers on British as opposed to European history, but the mean differences are only 6.19 and 3.68% respectively. Further in the case of category B, as mentioned above the high mean reached by JMB papers on British History at 'A' level is largely responsible for the variation.⁽³⁾

(1) See above p. 200 and 201

(2) See above p. 200

(3) See above p. 200

In contrast the sub categories of category A which relate to domestic politics diverge markedly in papers on British and European history (see Table 12)

TABLE 12

| Category | Mean for papers on British history | Mean for papers on European history | Difference | Significance |
|----------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------|--------------|
| A | 62.50 | 56.31 | 6.19 | .05 |
| A234 | 39.25 | 23.94 | 15.31 | .001 |
| A34 | 31.44 | 20.68 | 10.81 | .001 |
| A2 | 7.69 | 3.44 | 4.25 | .001 |
| A3 | 18.06 | 15.31 | 2.75 | NS |
| A4 | 13.44 | 5.25 | 8.19 | .001 |
| B | 8.56 | 4.88 | 3.68 | .001 |

The mean reached by sub category A234 (domestic politics) in papers on British history is 15.31% higher than in papers on European history and this trend is replicated in sub categories A34 and A4 and to a certain extent in sub categories A2 and A3.

Papers on European history place more emphasis on the sub categories of category A concerned with foreign politics, on category G (religious history), sub category G(a) (religious history - leadership) and on category L (geographical history) and its sub categories (see table 13). Foreign politics receives more attention in papers on European as opposed to British history, the mean for sub category A1A1(s) (foreign affairs) being 5.68% higher in European history. The same trend is evident in sub category A1 (foreign affairs - collective) where the mean/

mean difference is 5.0% in favour of European history. Category G (religious history) and sub category G(a) (religious history - leadership) also clearly achieve greater prominence in papers on European compared with British history. The mean for category G in papers on European history rises as high as 14.75%, that is 4.75% higher than the mean for category G in papers on British history. The mean difference between the two sets of papers is slightly higher for sub category G(a) reaching 5.69%, though this variance can be largely attributed to the high mean gained in 'O' level papers on European history set by the JMB which leads to an interaction at a significant level between boards, types and levels of history.⁽¹⁾ Category L and sub categories, L1 and L2, also receive more emphasis in papers on European as opposed to British history, though, as has already been pointed out this variation is brought about by interaction between the different variables involved in this comparison.⁽²⁾

TABLE 13

| Category | Mean for papers on British history | Mean for papers on European history | Difference | Significance |
|----------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------|--------------|
| A1A1(s) | 20.38 | 26.08 | -5.68 | .05 |
| A1 | 8.63 | 13.63 | -5.00 | .01 |
| A1(s) | 11.81 | 12.44 | -0.63 | NS |
| G | 10.00 | 14.75 | -4.75 | .05 |
| G(a) | 4.19 | 9.88 | -5.69 | .001 |
| L | 1.48 | 3.44 | -1.96 | .05 |
| L1 | 1.13 | 1.44 | -1.31 | .01 |
| L2 | 1.31 | 1.69 | -0.38 | NS |

(1) See above p. 200

(2) See above p. 201

Conclusions

The papers on early modern history follow the lines established by the papers on modern history with the variance resulting from the boards and levels of examination being minimal, while the contrast between papers on British and European history is quite marked.

(c) Papers on Mediaeval History

As has been mentioned already only four cells are available for the analysis of papers on mediaeval history (see below)

| | |
|---|---|
| <u>JMB 'A' Level British History</u> (1066 - 1485) | <u>JMB 'A' Level European History</u> (800 - 1494) |
| Alternative D British History (1066 - 1307) - 3 papers | Alternative B European History (800 - 1494) |
| Alternative E British History (1307 - 1485) - 3 papers | Section (1) (800 - 1215) - 3 papers |
| | Section (2) (1215 - 1494) - 3 papers |
| - 6 scores | - 6 scores |
| Cambridge 'O' Level British History (400 - 1485) | Cambridge 'O' Level European History (450 - 1494) |
| Section A from Roman Britain to 1485 | Section B European History (518 - 1494) |
| - 5 scores | - 5 scores |

The main difficulty with the papers on mediaeval history is the apparent lack of comparability between the periods covered by the two boards.

As has already been indicated this problem is not serious because only a small number of questions in the JMB 'A' level papers on European history and the Cambridge 'O' level papers on British and European history are set on the period before 1066. Consequently the majority of the questions (ten out of twelve) in each of these three papers cover the/

the years from 1066 to 1485 or 1494, thus making the four papers broadly comparable. As a result the papers were included in the comparison without any adaptation.

Otherwise no difficulties arose except that five scores had to be sampled from the papers on JMB 'A' level British and European history so that there could be equal numbers in each cell.

As was the case with the discussion of the papers on modern and early modern history two tables (14 and 15) will now be presented, one listing the average frequency (in percentage terms) of the categories and sub categories in papers on mediaeval history and the other summarising the significance of the effects of the variables involved in the comparison of these different groups of papers.⁽¹⁾

TABLES 14 and 15 /

(1) For the detailed figures and calculations see Appendix D.

TABLE 14

AVERAGE FREQUENCY OF EACH CATEGORY IN THE PAPERS ON MEDIAEVAL BRITISH AND EUROPEAN HISTORY

| | CATEGORY | JMB 'A' Level British | JMB 'A' Level European | Cambridge 'O' Level British | Cambridge 'O' Level European |
|-------------|---|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| A | Political History | 54.00 | 51.40 | 48.80 | 52.60 |
| A1A1(s) | Foreign Politics | 8.80 | 33.20 | 11.40 | 37.40 |
| A1 | Foreign Politics (Collective) | 2.60 | 24.40 | 6.40 | 9.00 |
| A1(s) | Foreign Politics (Individual) | 6.00 | 8.80 | 5.00 | 28.40 |
| A234 | Domestic Politics | 43.20 | 17.40 | 35.00 | 13.00 |
| A34 | Domestic Politics (without structure of Government) | 26.80 | 13.40 | 28.00 | 9.00 |
| A2 | Structure of Government | 16.40 | 4.00 | 7.00 | 4.00 |
| A3 | Domestic Politics (Individual) | 16.20 | 6.40 | 22.60 | 8.00 |
| A4 | Domestic Politics (Collective) | 10.60 | 7.00 | 4.40 | 0.80 |
| A1(s) A3 | Political History (Individual) | 22.20 | 15.20 | 27.60 | 36.60 |
| A14 | Political History (Collective) | 13.00 | 31.40 | 11.80 | 9.80 |
| B | Economic History | 8.80 | 7.00 | 7.00 | 3.00 |
| C | Social History (Social Custom) | 2.20 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.40 |
| D | Social History (Social Structure) | 4.60 | 1.80 | 0.40 | 0.40 |
| E | Political History (non Government) | 1.20 | 0.00 | 1.60 | 0.00 |
| G | Religious History | 11.60 | 24.00 | 17.00 | 24.60 |
| G(a) | Religious History (Leadership) | 4.20 | 12.80 | 10.80 | 17.20 |
| G(b) | Religious History (Movements) | 6.40 | 11.20 | 6.20 | 6.20 |
| H | Cultural History | 3.40 | 8.60 | 3.60 | 2.00 |
| J | Military and Naval History | 9.00 | 5.20 | 14.00 | 10.40 |
| J1 | Military and Naval History (Government) | 6.80 | 4.20 | 12.20 | 7.40 |
| J2 | Military and Naval History (Non Government) | 2.20 | 1.00 | 0.80 | 0.00 |

TABLE 14 (Continued)

AVERAGE FREQUENCY OF EACH CATEGORY IN THE PAPERS ON MEDIAEVAL BRITISH AND EUROPEAN HISTORY

| | Category | JMB 'A' Level British | JMB 'A' Level European | Cambridge 'O' Level British | Cambridge 'O' Level European |
|----|----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| L | Geographical History | 0.40 | 3.60 | 0.80 | 1.80 |
| L1 | Geographical Factors | 0.20 | 2.00 | 0.20 | 0.40 |
| L2 | Exploration | 0.00 | 1.40 | 0.00 | 0.40 |
| M | Human Disease | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.40 | 0.00 |
| N | Archaeology | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| P | Nature of History | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Y | Uncodable Material | 2.40 | 0.80 | 6.20 | 5.00 |

TABLE 15

PAPERS ON MEDIAEVAL HISTORY

| CATEGORY | | SIGNIFICANCE OF EFFECTS | | |
|-------------|---|-------------------------|-------|------------------------|
| | | Boards Levels | Types | Boards, Levels x Types |
| A | Political History | NS | NS | NS |
| A1A1(s) | Foreign Politics | NS | .001 | NS |
| A1 | Foreign Politics (Collective) | NS | .001 | .01 |
| A1(s) | Foreign Politics (Individual) | .01 | .001 | .001 |
| A234 | Domestic Politics | .05 | .001 | NS |
| A34 | Domestic Politics (without structure of Government) | NS | .001 | NS |
| A2 | Structure of Government | .01 | .001 | .001 |
| A3 | Domestic Politics (Individual) | NS | .001 | NS |
| A4 | Domestic Politics (Collective) | .001 | .05 | NS |
| A1(s) A3 | Political History (Individual) | .001 | NS | .05 |
| A14 | Political History (Collective) | .01 | .05 | .01 |
| B | Economic History | NS | NS | NS |
| C | Social History (Social Custom) | - | - | - |
| D | Social History (Social Structure) | .01 | NS | NS |
| E | Political History (non Government) | - | - | - |
| G | Religious History | NS | .05 | NS |
| G(a) | Religious History (Leadership) | NS | .05 | NS |
| G(b) | Religious History (Movement) | NS | NS | NS |
| H | Cultural History | NS | NS | .05 |
| J | Military and Naval History | NS | NS | NS |
| J1 | Military and Naval History (Government) | NS | NS | NS |
| J2 | Military and Naval History (Non Government) | - | - | - |
| L | Geographical History | NS | .05 | NS |
| L1 | Geographical Factors | - | - | - |

TABLE 15 (continued)

PAPERS ON MEDIAEVAL HISTORY

| CATEGORY | | SIGNIFICANCE OF EFFECTS | | |
|----------|--------------------|-------------------------|-------|---------------------------|
| | | Boards Levels | Types | Boards, Levels x Types |
| L2 | Exploration | - | - | - |
| M | Human Disease | - | - | - |
| N | Archaeology | - | - | - |
| P | Nature of History | - | - | - |
| Y | Uncodable Material | NS | NS | NS |

The tables, for mediaeval history are unfortunately incomplete. Instead of three comparisons, between JMB and Cambridge, Advanced and Ordinary levels and British and European there are only two, the first British against European, and the second JMB and 'A' level in contrast to Cambridge and 'O' level. Interpretation of the second table, involving both boards and levels superimposed upon each other, is pointless, there being no way of determining which variable is important. Only the table concerned with British and European history can be analysed and, even then, the interaction effects between the variables are difficult to interpret because of the inextricable involvement of boards and levels.

THE INFLUENCE OF TYPES OF HISTORY, BRITISH AND EUROPEAN ON THE
TREATMENT OF CATEGORIES AND SUB CATEGORIES IN PAPERS ON MEDIAEVAL
HISTORY

The results for the categories and sub categories in papers on British and European mediaeval history follow predictable lines. The papers on European history pay more attention to foreign politics and religious affairs, while the papers on British history place greater emphasis on domestic politics.⁽¹⁾ However, within, and additional to these broad trends, are other tendencies involving interaction between the variables which creates a complex picture.

The emphasis on foreign politics in papers on European mediaeval
history/

- (1) The only category or sub category which does not follow a clear pattern is sub category A1(s)3 (the individual in political history) which combines domestic and foreign politics. An interaction takes place significant at the 5% level between boards, levels and periods of history in the case of this sub category with contradictory trends being revealed. Thus in JMB 'A' level papers the sub category is favoured in papers on British history when compared with European, while this trend is reversed in Cambridge 'O' level papers.

history is very marked, the difference between the means for sub category A1A1(s) in European and British mediaeval history being 25.2% (see Table 16). The same trend is identifiable with sub categories A1 and A1(s), though the situation here is complicated by interaction between the variables (see Table 16). In each case one group of papers has a mean markedly higher than the other sets of papers involved in the comparisons. Sub category A1 achieves a mean of 24.4% in JMB 'A' level papers on European mediaeval history, in contrast to 2.6% in papers on British mediaeval history set by the JMB., a mean difference of 21.6%. With the Cambridge '0' level papers, however, though sub category A1 attains a higher average percentage in papers on European history, the difference between the means for papers on European and British history is only 2.6%. The situation is similar with sub category A1(s) except that the other group of papers on European history, those set by the Cambridge board at '0' level, gain prominence with an exceptionally high mean. This is fortunate, since it means that the high average percentage reached by sub category A1A1(s) is brought about by both groups of papers on European history rather than one only.

Category G (religious history) and sub category G(a) (religious history - leadership) receive their customary emphasis in European, as opposed to British, mediaeval history (see Table 16). Category G clearly plays a greater role in papers on European mediaeval history attaining a mean 10.0% higher in papers on European, compared to British, history. Sub categories G(a) and G(b) follow the same trend as category G, though only in the case of sub category G(a) does the difference between the means in British and European history reach a level of statistical significance.

TABLE 16

| Category Sub Category | Mean for papers on British history | Mean for papers on European history | Difference | Significance | Interaction between boards, levels and types of history | Significance | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|---|------------|--------------|---|--------------|----------|-----------|----|------|-------|-----|-------|-------|------|
| AIAI(s) | 10.10 | 35.30 | -25.20 | .05 | <table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>JMB A</td> <td>CAMB O</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BR</td> <td>8.80</td> <td>11.40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EUR</td> <td>33.20</td> <td>37.40</td> </tr> </table> | | JMB A | CAMB O | BR | 8.80 | 11.40 | EUR | 33.20 | 37.40 | NS |
| | JMB A | CAMB O | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BR | 8.80 | 11.40 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EUR | 33.20 | 37.40 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AI | 4.50 | 16.70 | -12.20 | .001 | <table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>JMB A</td> <td>CAMB O</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BR</td> <td>2.60</td> <td>6.40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EUR</td> <td>24.40</td> <td>9.00</td> </tr> </table> | | JMB A | CAMB O | BR | 2.60 | 6.40 | EUR | 24.40 | 9.00 | .01 |
| | JMB A | CAMB O | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BR | 2.60 | 6.40 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EUR | 24.40 | 9.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AI(s) | 5.50 | 18.60 | -13.10 | .001 | <table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>JMB A</td> <td>CAMB O</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BR</td> <td>6.00</td> <td>5.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EUR</td> <td>8.80</td> <td>28.40</td> </tr> </table> | | JMB A | CAMB O | BR | 6.00 | 5.00 | EUR | 8.80 | 28.40 | .001 |
| | JMB A | CAMB O | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BR | 6.00 | 5.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EUR | 8.80 | 28.40 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

TABLE 16 (continued)

| Category Sub Category | Mean for papers on British history | Mean for papers on European history | Difference | Significance | Interaction between boards, levels and types of history | Significance | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|---|------------|--------------|---|--------------|----------|------------|----|-------|-------|-----|-------|-------|-----|
| G | 14.30 | 24.30 | 10.00 | .05 | <table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>JMB A</td> <td>CAMB. O</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BR</td> <td>11.60</td> <td>17.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EUR</td> <td>24.00</td> <td>24.60</td> </tr> </table> | | JMB A | CAMB. O | BR | 11.60 | 17.00 | EUR | 24.00 | 24.60 | NS. |
| | JMB A | CAMB. O | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BR | 11.60 | 17.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EUR | 24.00 | 24.60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| G(a) | 7.5 | 15.0 | -7.5 | .05 | <table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>JMB A</td> <td>CAMB. O</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BR</td> <td>4.20</td> <td>10.80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EUR</td> <td>12.80</td> <td>17.20</td> </tr> </table> | | JMB A | CAMB. O | BR | 4.20 | 10.80 | EUR | 12.80 | 17.20 | NS. |
| | JMB A | CAMB. O | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BR | 4.20 | 10.80 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EUR | 12.80 | 17.20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| G(b) | 6.3 | 8.7 | -2.4 | NS. | <table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>JMB A</td> <td>CAMB. O</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BR</td> <td>6.40</td> <td>6.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EUR</td> <td>11.20</td> <td>6.20</td> </tr> </table> | | JMB A | CAMB. O | BR | 6.40 | 6.20 | EUR | 11.20 | 6.20 | NS. |
| | JMB A | CAMB. O | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BR | 6.40 | 6.20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EUR | 11.20 | 6.20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Other categories and sub categories also play a greater role in European as opposed to British history, but either the low percentage involved or interactions between the variables make them less important (see Table 16). Sub category A14 (political history - collective) achieves a markedly higher mean in papers on European mediaeval history when compared to the means for papers on British mediaeval history, but this trend is entirely the result of the mean difference between JMB 'A' level papers on British and European mediaeval history which reaches 18.4%. In contrast, the mean for Cambridge '0' level papers on British mediaeval history is only 2.0% higher than the mean for Cambridge '0' level papers on British mediaeval history. Category H (cultural history) provides a similar picture, the important point to note being that category H reaches a mean of 8.6% in JMB 'A' level papers on European mediaeval history, 5.2% higher than the means for the equivalent papers on British history, while there is virtually no difference (1.6%) between the Cambridge '0' level papers on British and European mediaeval history, with the papers on British history attaining the higher mean. Finally, category L (geographical history, etc) receives more attention in papers on European, as opposed to British, mediaeval history, but the percentages involved are extremely low, category L only reaching a mean of 2.7% in papers on European mediaeval history.

TABLE 17 /

TABLE 17

| Category Sub Category | Mean for papers on British history | Mean for papers on European history | Difference | Significance | Interaction between boards, levels and types of history | Significance | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|---|------------|--------------|---|--------------|----------|-----------|----|-------|-------|-----|-------|------|-----|
| A14 | 12.40 | 20.60 | -8.20 | .05 | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB A</th> <th>CAMB O</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>BR</td> <td>13.00</td> <td>11.80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EUR</td> <td>31.40</td> <td>9.80</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB A | CAMB O | BR | 13.00 | 11.80 | EUR | 31.40 | 9.80 | .01 |
| | JMB A | CAMB O | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BR | 13.00 | 11.80 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EUR | 31.40 | 9.80 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| H | 3.50 | 5.40 | -1.90 | NS | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB A</th> <th>CAMB O</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>BR</td> <td>3.40</td> <td>3.60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EUR</td> <td>8.60</td> <td>2.00</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB A | CAMB O | BR | 3.40 | 3.60 | EUR | 8.60 | 2.00 | .05 |
| | JMB A | CAMB O | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BR | 3.40 | 3.60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EUR | 8.60 | 2.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| L | 0.60 | 2.70 | -2.10 | .05 | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB A</th> <th>CAMB O</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>BR</td> <td>0.40</td> <td>0.80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EUR</td> <td>3.60</td> <td>1.80</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB A | CAMB O | BR | 0.40 | 0.80 | EUR | 3.60 | 1.80 | NS |
| | JMB A | CAMB O | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BR | 0.40 | 0.80 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EUR | 3.60 | 1.80 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

This emphasis on a wide range of categories and sub categories in papers on European history is balanced by concentration on domestic politics in papers on British history. (See below Table 18)

Domestic politics plays a much greater role in papers on British mediaeval history when compared with papers on European mediaeval history.

Sub categories^A234 (domestic politics), A34 (domestic politics without structure of government, A2 (structure of government), A3 (domestic politics individual) and A4 (domestic politics collective) all show a marked tendency to have more prominence in papers on British as opposed to European mediaeval history. This trend is only complicated by interaction between variables in the case of the sub category A2. The mean difference between JMB 'A' level papers on British and European mediaeval history for sub category A2 is 12.4%, in comparison with a mean difference of 3.0% between Cambridge '0' level papers on British and European mediaeval history.

TABLE 18

TABLE 18

| Category Sub Category | Mean for papers on British history | Mean for papers on European history | Difference | Significance | Interaction between boards, levels and types of history | Significance | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|---|------------|--------------|--|--------------|----------|-----------|----|-------|-------|-----|-------|-------|-----|
| A234 | 39.10 | 15.20 | 23.9 | .001 | <table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>JMB A</td> <td>CAMB O</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BR</td> <td>43.20</td> <td>35.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EUR</td> <td>17.40</td> <td>13.00</td> </tr> </table> | | JMB A | CAMB O | BR | 43.20 | 35.00 | EUR | 17.40 | 13.00 | NS |
| | JMB A | CAMB O | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BR | 43.20 | 35.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EUR | 17.40 | 13.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A34 | 27.40 | 10.20 | 16.20 | .001 | <table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>JMB A</td> <td>CAMB O</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BR</td> <td>26.80</td> <td>28.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EUR</td> <td>13.40</td> <td>9.00</td> </tr> </table> | | JMB A | CAMB O | BR | 26.80 | 28.00 | EUR | 13.40 | 9.00 | NS |
| | JMB A | CAMB O | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BR | 26.80 | 28.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EUR | 13.40 | 9.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A2 | 11.70 | 4.00 | 7.00 | .001 | <table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>JMB A</td> <td>CAMB O</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BR</td> <td>16.40</td> <td>7.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EUR</td> <td>4.00</td> <td>4.00</td> </tr> </table> | | JMB A | CAMB O | BR | 16.40 | 7.00 | EUR | 4.00 | 4.00 | .01 |
| | JMB A | CAMB O | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BR | 16.40 | 7.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EUR | 4.00 | 4.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

TABLE 18 (Continued)

| Category Sub Category | Mean for papers on British history | Mean for papers on European history | Difference | Significance | Interaction between boards, levels and types of history | Significance | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|---|------------|--------------|--|--------------|-----|------|--|---|---|----|-------|-------|-----|------|------|----|
| A3 | 19.40 | 7.20 | 8.20 | .001 | <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">JMB</td> <td style="text-align: center;">CAMB</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">A</td> <td style="text-align: center;">O</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">BR</td> <td style="text-align: center;">16.20</td> <td style="text-align: center;">22.60</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">EUR</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6.40</td> <td style="text-align: center;">8.00</td> </tr> </table> | | JMB | CAMB | | A | O | BR | 16.20 | 22.60 | EUR | 6.40 | 8.00 | NS |
| | JMB | CAMB | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | A | O | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BR | 16.20 | 22.60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EUR | 6.40 | 8.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A4 | 7.50 | 3.90 | 3.60 | .05 | <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">JMB</td> <td style="text-align: center;">CAMB</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">A</td> <td style="text-align: center;">O</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">BR</td> <td style="text-align: center;">10.60</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4.40</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">EUR</td> <td style="text-align: center;">7.00</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.80</td> </tr> </table> | | JMB | CAMB | | A | O | BR | 10.60 | 4.40 | EUR | 7.00 | 0.80 | NS |
| | JMB | CAMB | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | A | O | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BR | 10.60 | 4.40 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EUR | 7.00 | 0.80 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Conclusion

Within broad limits the variance between papers on mediaeval British and European history follows familiar lines. Papers on European history pay more attention to foreign politics while papers on British history give greater prominence to domestic politics. In addition, as was the case with papers on the early modern but not the modern period, religious history is markedly favoured in papers on European history while cultural and geographical history are given slightly more emphasis.

(d) General Conclusions on the Impact of the Boards, Levels and Types of History Within Periods

1. Little variation could be established in these papers which was attributable to the boards or levels of examination.
2. The type of history being examined has a more marked effect on the content of the papers. In the three sets of papers foreign affairs is emphasised in papers on European history and domestic politics in papers on British history. Other important tendencies to apply to more than one period are for economic history to be given prominence in papers on modern and early modern British, as opposed to, European history and for religious history to receive more favourable treatment in papers on early modern and mediaeval European history when compared with papers set on British history for the same period.

CHAPTER 8

COMPARISON OF JMB AND CAMBRIDGE LOCAL EXAMINATION SYNDICATE 'A' and 'O' LEVEL PAPERS ON BRITISH AND EUROPEAN HISTORY ACROSS PERIODS

Introduction

As has already been explained comparisons between the papers drawn from the modern, early modern and mediaeval periods are inhibited by the absence of Cambridge 'A' level and JMB 'O' level papers on mediaeval history.⁽¹⁾ Since only JMB 'A' and Cambridge 'O' level papers exist any comparison with another period has to be limited to the two sets of papers so that strict comparability can be maintained. Thus, any assessment of the influence of boards and levels on these sets of papers is clearly impossible, because the variation attributable to the two variables cannot be separated. Also the comparison of papers on British and European history, and on the periods of history, is incomplete because of the interaction with boards and levels. However, the comparison is worth attempting because the overall mean attained in papers on modern, early modern and mediaeval history can be compared and the interaction between periods and types of history can be interpreted satisfactorily.

The papers chosen for the comparison were, therefore, determined by those that were available on mediaeval history. These four sets of papers (see below) were matched with the equivalent groups of papers on modern and early modern history.

Mediaeval History

JMB 'A' level British History

5 scores

JMB 'A' Level European History

5 scores

Cambridge 'O' Level British History

5 scores

Cambridge 'O' Level European History

5 scores

(1) See above p.172-174

Early Modern History

JMB 'A' Level British History

4 scores

JMB 'A' Level European History

4 scores

Cambridge 'O' Level British
History

4 scores

Cambridge 'O' Level European
History

4 scores

Modern History

JMB 'A' Level British History

12 scores

JMB 'A' Level European History

12 scores

Cambridge 'O' Level British
History

10 scores

Cambridge 'O' Level European
History

10 scores

The only slight problem was a lack of proportionality in the papers on modern history, 12 scores being available for each of the two JMB 'A' Level papers and 10 for the Cambridge papers. As a result, 10 scores were sampled from the 12 available for the two JMB groups so that proportionality could be established among the papers being compared.

RESULTS OF THE COMPARISON OF PAPERS ON MODERN, EARLY MODERN AND MEDIAEVAL
HISTORY

Below in Table 1 the results for the comparison between the different groups of papers are summarised.⁽¹⁾

TABLE 1 /

(1) For the detailed figures and calculations see Appendix E.

| CATEGORY | | SIGNIFICANCE OF EFFECTS | | | | | | |
|----------|---|-------------------------|-------|---------|------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|
| | | Boards Levels | Types | Periods | Boards/ Levels x Types | Boards/ Levels x Periods | Types x Periods | Boards Levels x Periods x Types |
| A | Political History | NS | .001 | .001 | .01 | NS | .01 | NS |
| A1A1(s) | Foreign Politics | .05 | .001 | NS | .001 | NS | .05 | .01 |
| A1 | Foreign Politics (Collective) | NS | .001 | .01 | NS | NS | NS | .01 |
| A1(s) | Foreign Politics (Individual) | .001 | .001 | NS | .01 | NS | NS | NS |
| A234 | Domestic Politics | .001 | .001 | .001 | NS | NS | .05 | NS |
| A34 | Domestic Politics (without structure of Government) | NS | .001 | .001 | NS | NS | NS | NS |
| A2 | Structure of Government | .05 | .001 | NS | NS | NS | NS | .01 |
| A3 | Domestic Politics (Individual) | NS | .05 | NS | NS | NS | .01 | NS |
| A4 | Domestic Politics (Collective) | .001 | .001 | .001 | .05 | NS | NS | NS |
| A1(s)/A3 | Political History (Individual) | .01 | NS | NS | .05 | NS | NS | NS |
| A14 | Political History (Collective) | .01 | NS | .001 | NS | NS | .NS | .01 |
| B | Economic History | NS | .001 | NS | .01 | .01 | NS | .05 |
| C | Social History (Social Custom) | | | | | | | |
| D | Social History (Social Structure) | .001 | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS |
| E | Political History (non Government) | .05 | .05 | .001 | NS | NS | NS | NS |
| G | Religious History | NS | .05 | .001 | NS | NS | .001 | .05 |

The main interest of this comparison between the papers on modern, early modern and mediaeval history centres around the extent to which particular categories and sub categories are employed in the papers on different periods. This aspect of the comparison will be given special attention below. For reasons which have already been stated ⁽¹⁾ the other comparisons, which were inevitably involved, that is between types of history and between boards and levels of examination will either be summarised or ignored completely.

THE INFLUENCES OF PERIODS OF HISTORY ON 'O' AND 'A' LEVEL PAPERS
ON BRITISH AND EUROPEAN HISTORY

The variation in the importance attached to different categories and sub categories in the papers on mediaeval, early modern and modern history though clearly evident from the table above, is still limited in nature. In the following paragraph the absence of any major variation in the case of a number of categories and sub categories will be pointed out before those which receive variable emphasis are considered.

Certain categories and sub categories are generally neglected in these papers, whatever the period on which they are set. ⁽²⁾

Categories/

(1) See above p.226
(2) See Appendix E for detailed figures

Categories M (human disease), N (archaeology) and P (the nature of history) are totally ignored in these three sets of papers, while category C (social history - social custom) and sub categories L1 (geographical factors) and L2 (exploration) do not rise above 2.5% in any single group of papers. Category D (social history - social structure) is almost as neglected though it does attain a mean of 4.6% in 'A' level papers on British history set by the JMB.

Other categories and sub categories, which play a more important part in the papers, betray either no signs of variation or only limited indications of a different emphasis from one period to another. Category J (military and naval history), sub category J1 (military and naval history - government) and sub category A1(s) A3 (political history - individual) are given very similar treatment in the papers set on the different periods, none of the mean differences between groups of papers reaching the five per cent level of statistical significance.⁽¹⁾ Only slight variation is evident with categories B, E, H, L and Y (see below Table 2). In the case of category B (economic history) the picture is complex. The mean differences between the papers set on the three periods are negligible, the only signs of a variation, which reaches a level of statistical significance, occurs when the interactions between the main variables are considered.

An /

(1) See Appendix E for detailed figures

An interaction between the boards, levels and periods of history (see Table 2) betrays contradictory trends, the mean for JMB 'A' level papers being higher in papers on mediaeval and early modern history than those set on the same periods by the Cambridge board at '0' level, but lower in the papers on modern history. Equally, in the case of category B interaction between the boards, levels, periods and types of history does not reveal very clear trends, the variation being largely brought about by two groups of papers, reaching relatively high means - JMB 'A' level papers on early modern British history attaining a mean of 13.0% and Cambridge '0' level papers on modern British history a mean of 15.9%. With category E (political history - non government) there is also little to note. The means for the different groups of papers are in general very low, only papers on modern history reaching above 2.3% and the only variation to attain the 5% level of statistical significance being between papers on modern history, as opposed to those on mediaeval and early modern history. In the case of category H (cultural history) the means are also low, though the examiners place rather more emphasis on category H in papers on mediaeval and early modern history, than in papers on modern history. The lowest means attained in the group of categories and sub categories being discussed in this paragraph occurred with category L (geographical history). The only trends of interest are slight tendencies to place more emphasis on category L in the papers on the early periods and to give more prominence to papers on mediaeval European history, than to other groups of papers.⁽¹⁾ Finally interactions significant at the 5% level are evident between the boards, levels and periods of history, and between the types and periods of history, in the case of category Y. These interactions are/

(1) See Table 2 - the interaction between types x periods of history in the case of category L.

are of little importance, because they appear to arise as a result of contradictory trends. The interaction between boards, levels and periods of history is caused by category Y attaining higher means in papers on mediaeval and modern history set by the Cambridge board at 'O' level, than in the equivalent papers set by the JMB at 'A' level, a tendency which is reversed in papers on early modern history. Similar contradictory trends are evident with the interaction between types and periods of history. Category Y reaches a higher mean in papers on early modern and modern European history as opposed to British history, while in the case of the papers on mediaeval history. it reaches a higher mean in papers on British history.

TABLE 2 /

TABLE 2

| Category Subcategory | Mean for papers on modern history | Mean for papers on early mod. history | Mean for papers on mediaeval history | Difference modern - early modern | Difference early modern - mediaeval | Significance | Interaction levels/boards x periods of history | Significance | Interaction types x periods of history | Significance | Interaction boards levels x types x periods of history | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|---|--------------|--|--------------|--|------|------|-------|------|------|-----|------|------|-----|--|--|----|-----|-----|------|------|-------|------|------|-----|-------|------|----|---|--|----------|-----------|-----|--------|------|---|------|------|-------|---------|------|---|------|------|---|------|-------|---|------|------|-----|
| B | 7.28 | 6.37 | 5.95 | 0.91 | 0.42 | NS | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB A</th> <th>CAMB O</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>6.90</td> <td>5.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E Mod</td> <td>9.75</td> <td>3.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mod</td> <td>5.60</td> <td>8.95</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB A | CAMB O | Med | 6.90 | 5.00 | E Mod | 9.75 | 3.00 | Mod | 5.60 | 8.95 | .01 | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Br</th> <th>Eur</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>7.90</td> <td>4.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E Mod</td> <td>8.75</td> <td>4.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mod</td> <td>11.20</td> <td>3.35</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | Br | Eur | Med | 7.90 | 4.00 | E Mod | 8.75 | 4.00 | Mod | 11.20 | 3.35 | NS | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB A</th> <th>CAMB O</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>B 8.80</td> <td>7.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E</td> <td>7.00</td> <td>3.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E Mod</td> <td>B 13.00</td> <td>4.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E</td> <td>6.30</td> <td>1.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>6.50</td> <td>15.90</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E</td> <td>4.70</td> <td>2.00</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB A | CAMB O | Med | B 8.80 | 7.00 | E | 7.00 | 3.00 | E Mod | B 13.00 | 4.50 | E | 6.30 | 1.50 | B | 6.50 | 15.90 | E | 4.70 | 2.00 | .05 |
| | JMB A | CAMB O | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | 6.90 | 5.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E Mod | 9.75 | 3.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod | 5.60 | 8.95 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Br | Eur | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | 7.90 | 4.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E Mod | 8.75 | 4.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod | 11.20 | 3.35 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | JMB A | CAMB O | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | B 8.80 | 7.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E | 7.00 | 3.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E Mod | B 13.00 | 4.50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E | 6.30 | 1.50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B | 6.50 | 15.90 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E | 4.70 | 2.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E | 4.73 | 1.06 | 0.70 | 3.67 | 0.36 | .001 | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB A</th> <th>CAMB O</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>0.60</td> <td>0.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E Mod</td> <td>0.63</td> <td>1.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mod</td> <td>3.30</td> <td>6.15</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB A | CAMB O | Med | 0.60 | 0.50 | E Mod | 0.63 | 1.50 | Mod | 3.30 | 6.15 | NS | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Br</th> <th>Eur</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>1.40</td> <td>0.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E Mod</td> <td>1.63</td> <td>0.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mod</td> <td>5.65</td> <td>3.80</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | Br | Eur | Med | 1.40 | 0.00 | E Mod | 1.63 | 0.50 | Mod | 5.65 | 3.80 | NS | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB A</th> <th>CAMB O</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>B 1.20</td> <td>1.60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E Mod</td> <td>B 1.00</td> <td>2.25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E</td> <td>0.25</td> <td>0.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>5.00</td> <td>6.30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E</td> <td>1.60</td> <td>6.00</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB A | CAMB O | Med | B 1.20 | 1.60 | E | 0.00 | 0.00 | E Mod | B 1.00 | 2.25 | E | 0.25 | 0.75 | B | 5.00 | 6.30 | E | 1.60 | 6.00 | NS |
| | JMB A | CAMB O | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | 0.60 | 0.50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E Mod | 0.63 | 1.50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod | 3.30 | 6.15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Br | Eur | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | 1.40 | 0.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E Mod | 1.63 | 0.50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod | 5.65 | 3.80 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | JMB A | CAMB O | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | B 1.20 | 1.60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E Mod | B 1.00 | 2.25 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E | 0.25 | 0.75 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B | 5.00 | 6.30 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E | 1.60 | 6.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| H | 2.35 | 4.94 | 4.40 | -2.59 | 0.54 | .01 | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB A</th> <th>CAMB O</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>6.00</td> <td>2.80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E Mod</td> <td>5.13</td> <td>4.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mod</td> <td>2.55</td> <td>1.85</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB A | CAMB O | Med | 6.00 | 2.80 | E Mod | 5.13 | 4.75 | Mod | 2.55 | 1.85 | NS | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Be</th> <th>Eur</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>3.50</td> <td>5.30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E Mod</td> <td>5.63</td> <td>4.25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mod</td> <td>3.11</td> <td>1.60</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | Be | Eur | Med | 3.50 | 5.30 | E Mod | 5.63 | 4.25 | Mod | 3.11 | 1.60 | NS | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB A</th> <th>CAMB O</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>B 3.40</td> <td>3.60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E</td> <td>8.60</td> <td>2.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E Mod</td> <td>B 5.25</td> <td>6.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E</td> <td>5.00</td> <td>3.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>3.80</td> <td>2.40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E</td> <td>1.90</td> <td>1.30</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB A | CAMB O | Med | B 3.40 | 3.60 | E | 8.60 | 2.00 | E Mod | B 5.25 | 6.00 | E | 5.00 | 3.50 | B | 3.80 | 2.40 | E | 1.90 | 1.30 | NS |
| | JMB A | CAMB O | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | 6.00 | 2.80 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E Mod | 5.13 | 4.75 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod | 2.55 | 1.85 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Be | Eur | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | 3.50 | 5.30 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E Mod | 5.63 | 4.25 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod | 3.11 | 1.60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | JMB A | CAMB O | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | B 3.40 | 3.60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E | 8.60 | 2.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E Mod | B 5.25 | 6.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E | 5.00 | 3.50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B | 3.80 | 2.40 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E | 1.90 | 1.30 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

TABLE 2 (Continued)

| Category Subcategory | TABLE 2 (Continued) | | | | | | Significance | Interaction types x periods of history | Significance | Interaction boards levels x types x periods of history | Significance | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|--|--|---|---|--|--------------|--|--|--------------|---|--------------|---|--|---|--|-----|------|------|--|------|------|------|--|-----|------|------|--|-----|--|----|--|-----|--|-----|------|------|--|------|------|------|--|-----|------|------|--|------|--|-----|--|------|--|---|--|---|--|-----|---|------|------|--|---|------|------|------|---|------|------|--|---|------|------|-----|---|------|------|--|---|------|------|----|
| | Mean for papers on modern history | Mean for papers on early mod. history | Mean for papers on mediaeval history | Difference modern - early modern | Difference early modern - mediaeval | Significance | | | | | | Interaction levels/boards x periods of history | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| L | 0.53 | 1.38 | 1.75 | -0.85 | -0.37 | .001 | <table border="1"> <tr><td colspan="2">JMB</td><td colspan="2">CAMB</td></tr> <tr><td colspan="2">A</td><td colspan="2">O</td></tr> <tr><td>Med</td><td>2.00</td><td>1.30</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>EMod</td><td>1.75</td><td>1.63</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>Mod</td><td>0.50</td><td>0.55</td><td></td></tr> </table> | JMB | | CAMB | | A | | O | | Med | 2.00 | 1.30 | | EMod | 1.75 | 1.63 | | Mod | 0.50 | 0.55 | | NS | <table border="1"> <tr><td colspan="2">Br</td><td colspan="2">Eur</td></tr> <tr><td>Med</td><td>0.60</td><td>2.90</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>EMod</td><td>1.38</td><td>1.50</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>Mod</td><td>0.80</td><td>0.25</td><td></td></tr> </table> | Br | | Eur | | Med | 0.60 | 2.90 | | EMod | 1.38 | 1.50 | | Mod | 0.80 | 0.25 | | .001 | <table border="1"> <tr><td colspan="2">JMB</td><td colspan="2">CAMB</td></tr> <tr><td colspan="2">A</td><td colspan="2">O</td></tr> <tr><td>Med</td><td>B</td><td>0.40</td><td>0.80</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>E</td><td>3.60</td><td>1.20</td></tr> <tr><td>EMod</td><td>B</td><td>0.75</td><td>2.00</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>E</td><td>1.75</td><td>1.25</td></tr> <tr><td>Mod</td><td>B</td><td>0.70</td><td>0.90</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>E</td><td>0.30</td><td>0.20</td></tr> </table> | JMB | | CAMB | | A | | O | | Med | B | 0.40 | 0.80 | | E | 3.60 | 1.20 | EMod | B | 0.75 | 2.00 | | E | 1.75 | 1.25 | Mod | B | 0.70 | 0.90 | | E | 0.30 | 0.20 | NS |
| JMB | | CAMB | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A | | O | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | 2.00 | 1.30 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EMod | 1.75 | 1.63 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod | 0.50 | 0.55 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Br | | Eur | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | 0.60 | 2.90 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EMod | 1.38 | 1.50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod | 0.80 | 0.25 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| JMB | | CAMB | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A | | O | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | B | 0.40 | 0.80 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | E | 3.60 | 1.20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EMod | B | 0.75 | 2.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | E | 1.75 | 1.25 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod | B | 0.70 | 0.90 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | E | 0.30 | 0.20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Y | 2.58 | 3.75 | 8.60 | -1.17 | 0.15 | NS | <table border="1"> <tr><td colspan="2">JMB</td><td colspan="2">CAMB</td></tr> <tr><td colspan="2">A</td><td colspan="2">O</td></tr> <tr><td>Med</td><td>1.60</td><td>5.60</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>EMod</td><td>4.13</td><td>3.38</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>Mod</td><td>4.20</td><td>6.95</td><td></td></tr> </table> | JMB | | CAMB | | A | | O | | Med | 1.60 | 5.60 | | EMod | 4.13 | 3.38 | | Mod | 4.20 | 6.95 | | .05 | <table border="1"> <tr><td colspan="2">Br</td><td colspan="2">Eur</td></tr> <tr><td>Med</td><td>4.30</td><td>2.90</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>EMod</td><td>1.50</td><td>6.00</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>Mod</td><td>1.55</td><td>3.60</td><td></td></tr> </table> | Br | | Eur | | Med | 4.30 | 2.90 | | EMod | 1.50 | 6.00 | | Mod | 1.55 | 3.60 | | .05 | <table border="1"> <tr><td colspan="2">JMB</td><td colspan="2">CAMB</td></tr> <tr><td colspan="2">A</td><td colspan="2">O</td></tr> <tr><td>Med</td><td>B</td><td>2.40</td><td>6.20</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>E</td><td>0.80</td><td>5.00</td></tr> <tr><td>EMod</td><td>B</td><td>0.00</td><td>3.00</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>E</td><td>8.25</td><td>3.75</td></tr> <tr><td>Mod</td><td>B</td><td>2.00</td><td>1.10</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>E</td><td>6.40</td><td>0.80</td></tr> </table> | JMB | | CAMB | | A | | O | | Med | B | 2.40 | 6.20 | | E | 0.80 | 5.00 | EMod | B | 0.00 | 3.00 | | E | 8.25 | 3.75 | Mod | B | 2.00 | 1.10 | | E | 6.40 | 0.80 | NS |
| JMB | | CAMB | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A | | O | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | 1.60 | 5.60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EMod | 4.13 | 3.38 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod | 4.20 | 6.95 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Br | | Eur | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | 4.30 | 2.90 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EMod | 1.50 | 6.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod | 1.55 | 3.60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| JMB | | CAMB | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A | | O | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | B | 2.40 | 6.20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | E | 0.80 | 5.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EMod | B | 0.00 | 3.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | E | 8.25 | 3.75 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod | B | 2.00 | 1.10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | E | 6.40 | 0.80 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Two categories (G and A) and their sub categories remain to be discussed, but they are extremely important because they account for virtually all the variation between the papers set on the different periods.

Interesting trends are evident in the case of category G (religious history) and its sub categories. The earlier the period of history under consideration the more importance is attached to category G and its sub categories. As is evident from Table 3, they are given greater prominence in papers on early modern, as opposed to modern history and this trend is continued with more emphasis being placed on them in papers on mediaeval history, when compared with papers on early modern history. When the interactions between the variables are considered one interesting trend can be established. Thus in the case of category G and sub category G(a) interaction, which is significant at the 0.1% level, occurs between types and periods of history, which can be largely explained by the high means attained by papers on mediaeval European history (see Table 3).

The remaining results which relate to category G and its sub categories do not betray any clear tendencies. With category G the interaction between boards, levels, types and periods of history (significant at the 5% level) occurs because of contradictory trends. For example, in the case of JMB 'A' level papers on mediaeval history and Cambridge 'O' level papers on mediaeval and early modern history the mean difference between papers on British and European history is very marked, while with the remaining pairs of papers involved in the comparison the mean for papers on British history is slightly higher than for papers on European history. The only other interaction to reach/

to reach the five per cent level of statistical significance is between boards, levels and periods of history and is confined to sub category G(a). The mean attained by Cambridge '0' level papers on mediaeval history is markedly higher than the means for the other groups of papers, but this result is impossible to interpret, with the superimposition of the two variables, boards and levels, in the comparison.

TABLE 3 /

TABLE 3

| Category | Mean for papers on modern history | Mean for papers on early mod. history | Mean for papers on mediaeval history | Difference modern - early modern | Difference early modern - mediaeval | Significance | Interaction levels/boards x periods of history | Significance | Interaction types x periods of history | Significance | Interaction boards levels x types x periods of history | Significance | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|--|--------------|--|--------------|--|--------------|-------|-------|-------|------|-----|------|------|-----|---|--|----|-----|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|------|------|------|---|--|----------|-----------|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|-------|------|--|-------|-------|---|------|------|---|------|------|-----|
| G | 2.65 | 11.38 | 19.05 | -8.73 | -7.67 | .001 | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB A</th> <th>CAMB O</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>17.40</td> <td>20.70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E.Mod</td> <td>13.88</td> <td>8.88</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mod</td> <td>3.25</td> <td>2.05</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB A | CAMB O | Med | 17.40 | 20.70 | E.Mod | 13.88 | 8.88 | Mod | 3.25 | 2.05 | NS | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Br</th> <th>Eur</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>13.80</td> <td>24.30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E.Mod</td> <td>10.00</td> <td>12.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mod</td> <td>3.35</td> <td>1.95</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | Br | Eur | Med | 13.80 | 24.30 | E.Mod | 10.00 | 12.75 | Mod | 3.35 | 1.95 | .001 | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB A</th> <th>CAMB O</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>11.60</td> <td>16.80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E.Mod</td> <td>24.00</td> <td>24.60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mod</td> <td>14.75</td> <td>5.25</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>13.00</td> <td>12.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>3.60</td> <td>3.10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E</td> <td>2.90</td> <td>1.00</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB A | CAMB O | Med | 11.60 | 16.80 | E.Mod | 24.00 | 24.60 | Mod | 14.75 | 5.25 | | 13.00 | 12.50 | B | 3.60 | 3.10 | E | 2.90 | 1.00 | .05 |
| | JMB A | CAMB O | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | 17.40 | 20.70 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E.Mod | 13.88 | 8.88 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod | 3.25 | 2.05 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Br | Eur | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | 13.80 | 24.30 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E.Mod | 10.00 | 12.75 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod | 3.35 | 1.95 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | JMB A | CAMB O | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | 11.60 | 16.80 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E.Mod | 24.00 | 24.60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod | 14.75 | 5.25 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 13.00 | 12.50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B | 3.60 | 3.10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E | 2.90 | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| G(a) | 0.98 | 5.88 | 11.25 | -4.90 | -5.37 | .001 | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB A</th> <th>CAMB O</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>8.30</td> <td>14.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E.Mod</td> <td>7.25</td> <td>4.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mod</td> <td>1.05</td> <td>0.90</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB A | CAMB O | Med | 8.30 | 14.00 | E.Mod | 7.25 | 4.50 | Mod | 1.05 | 0.90 | .01 | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Br</th> <th>Eur</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>7.50</td> <td>13.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E.Mod</td> <td>4.75</td> <td>7.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mod</td> <td>1.15</td> <td>0.80</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | Br | Eur | Med | 7.50 | 13.00 | E.Mod | 4.75 | 7.00 | Mod | 1.15 | 0.80 | .01 | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB A</th> <th>CAMB O</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>4.20</td> <td>10.80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E.Mod</td> <td>12.80</td> <td>17.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mod</td> <td>7.00</td> <td>2.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>7.50</td> <td>6.80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>1.10</td> <td>1.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E</td> <td>1.00</td> <td>0.60</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB A | CAMB O | Med | 4.20 | 10.80 | E.Mod | 12.80 | 17.20 | Mod | 7.00 | 2.50 | | 7.50 | 6.80 | B | 1.10 | 1.20 | E | 1.00 | 0.60 | NS |
| | JMB A | CAMB O | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | 8.30 | 14.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E.Mod | 7.25 | 4.50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod | 1.05 | 0.90 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Br | Eur | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | 7.50 | 13.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E.Mod | 4.75 | 7.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod | 1.15 | 0.80 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | JMB A | CAMB O | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | 4.20 | 10.80 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E.Mod | 12.80 | 17.20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod | 7.00 | 2.50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 7.50 | 6.80 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B | 1.10 | 1.20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E | 1.00 | 0.60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| G(b) | 1.00 | 3.75 | 7.50 | -2.75 | -3.75 | .001 | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB A</th> <th>CAMB O</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>8.80</td> <td>6.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E.Mod</td> <td>4.75</td> <td>2.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mod</td> <td>1.30</td> <td>0.70</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB A | CAMB O | Med | 8.80 | 6.20 | E.Mod | 4.75 | 2.75 | Mod | 1.30 | 0.70 | NS | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Br</th> <th>Eur</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>6.30</td> <td>8.70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E.Mod</td> <td>3.88</td> <td>3.63</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mod</td> <td>1.65</td> <td>0.35</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | Br | Eur | Med | 6.30 | 8.70 | E.Mod | 3.88 | 3.63 | Mod | 1.65 | 0.35 | NS | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB A</th> <th>CAMB O</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>6.40</td> <td>6.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E.Mod</td> <td>11.20</td> <td>6.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mod</td> <td>6.25</td> <td>1.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>3.25</td> <td>4.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>2.20</td> <td>1.10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E</td> <td>0.40</td> <td>0.30</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB A | CAMB O | Med | 6.40 | 6.20 | E.Mod | 11.20 | 6.20 | Mod | 6.25 | 1.50 | | 3.25 | 4.00 | B | 2.20 | 1.10 | E | 0.40 | 0.30 | NS |
| | JMB A | CAMB O | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | 8.80 | 6.20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E.Mod | 4.75 | 2.75 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod | 1.30 | 0.70 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Br | Eur | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | 6.30 | 8.70 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E.Mod | 3.88 | 3.63 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod | 1.65 | 0.35 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | JMB A | CAMB O | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | 6.40 | 6.20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E.Mod | 11.20 | 6.20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod | 6.25 | 1.50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 3.25 | 4.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B | 2.20 | 1.10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E | 0.40 | 0.30 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Since the impact of the papers concerned with different periods of history on the role of category A and its sub categories is so complex their means in papers on modern, early modern and mediaeval history will be considered first, and then the interaction between the variables.

Two trends can be established when the variation in the emphasis placed on category A and its sub categories is considered in these different sets of papers (see Table 4). The first and perhaps the most important tendency is for category A, sub category A14 (political history - collective) and three sub categories concerned with domestic politics, A234, A34 and A4 to decrease in importance the more remote the period of history on which the papers are set. Secondly, but less pronounced, is the tendency for two sub categories dealing with foreign policy (sub categories A1, A1(s) and A1)⁽¹⁾ to attain markedly higher means in papers on modern as opposed to early modern history, a trend which is not maintained in papers on mediaeval history, the means for the two sub categories in papers on mediaeval and early modern history being virtually identical.

TABLE 4 /

(1) N.B. sub categories A1A1(s) (foreign politics) and A1 (foreign politics - collective) are distinct sub categories

TABLE 4

| Category Sub Category | Mean for papers on Mod History | Mean for papers on Early Mod.Hist | Mean for papers on Mediaeval History | Difference Mod - Early Modern | Difference Early Mod- Mediaeval | Significance |
|-----------------------------|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| A | 67.43 | 60.50 | 51.70 | 6.95 | 8.80 | .001 |
| A1A1(s) | 26.42 | 22.70 | 22.70 | 3.73 | 0.00 | NS |
| A1 | 16.33 | 10.00 | 10.60 | 6.33 | 0.60 | .01 |
| A1(s) | 10.13 | 12.94 | 12.05 | 2.81 | 0.89 | .05 |
| A234 | 36.98 | 32.69 | 27.15 | 4.29 | 5.54 | .001 |
| A34 | 29.20 | 26.06 | 19.30 | 3.14 | 6.76 | .001 |
| A2 | 7.80 | 6.63 | 7.85 | 1.17 | -1.22 | NS |
| A3 | 15.33 | 16.69 | 13.30 | -1.36 | 3.39 | NS |
| A4 | 13.88 | 9.44 | 5.70 | 4.39 | 3.74 | .001 |
| A1(s),A3 | 25.30 | 29.44 | 25.40 | -3.94 | 4.04 | NS |
| A14 | 30.68 | 19.44 | 16.50 | 10.74 | 2.94 | .001 |

When the results for the sub categories where an interaction (at least significant at the 5% level) between types and periods of history are considered no clear trends can be established (see Table 5). In the case of category A one mean for papers on modern European history is particularly high and accounts for most of the variation between the different groups of papers, while with sub category A3 the relatively low mean attained by papers on mediaeval European history is responsible. With sub categories A₁, A1(s) and A234 the picture is more complex. The mean differences between the papers set on British and European history varies markedly in the case of sub category A1, A1(s) from 25.4% in papers on mediaeval history to 9.90% in papers on early modern history and with sub category A234 from 23.9% in papers on mediaeval history to 11.75% in papers on modern history.

TABLE 5 /

TABLE 5

| Category Sub Category | Interaction Levels / Boards X Periods of history | Significance | Interaction Types x Periods of History | Significance | Interaction Boards Levels x Types x Periods of History | Significance | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--------------|--|--------------|---|--------------|-------|--------|-------|-------|------|-------|-------|----|---|--|----|-----|-----|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|------|-------|-------|-----|--|--|----------|-----------|-----|---------|-------|--------|---------|-------|--|---------|-------|--------|---------|-------|------|---------|-------|--|---------|-------|-----|
| A | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB A</th> <th>CAMB O</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>52.00</td> <td>50.70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E.Mod.</td> <td>57.38</td> <td>63.63</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mod.</td> <td>69.75</td> <td>65.10</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB A | CAMB O | Med | 52.00 | 50.70 | E.Mod. | 57.38 | 63.63 | Mod. | 69.75 | 65.10 | NS | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Br</th> <th>Eur</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>51.40</td> <td>52.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E.Mod.</td> <td>61.63</td> <td>59.38</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mod.</td> <td>61.20</td> <td>73.65</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | Br | Eur | Med | 51.40 | 52.00 | E.Mod. | 61.63 | 59.38 | Mod. | 61.20 | 73.65 | .01 | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB A</th> <th>CAMB O</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>B 54.00</td> <td>48.80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E.Mod.</td> <td>E 51.40</td> <td>52.60</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>B 59.00</td> <td>64.25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E.Mod.</td> <td>E 55.75</td> <td>63.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mod.</td> <td>B 68.20</td> <td>54.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>E 71.30</td> <td>76.00</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB A | CAMB O | Med | B 54.00 | 48.80 | E.Mod. | E 51.40 | 52.60 | | B 59.00 | 64.25 | E.Mod. | E 55.75 | 63.00 | Mod. | B 68.20 | 54.20 | | E 71.30 | 76.00 | NS |
| | JMB A | CAMB O | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | 52.00 | 50.70 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E.Mod. | 57.38 | 63.63 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod. | 69.75 | 65.10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Br | Eur | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | 51.40 | 52.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E.Mod. | 61.63 | 59.38 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod. | 61.20 | 73.65 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | JMB A | CAMB O | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | B 54.00 | 48.80 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E.Mod. | E 51.40 | 52.60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | B 59.00 | 64.25 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E.Mod. | E 55.75 | 63.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod. | B 68.20 | 54.20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | E 71.30 | 76.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A, AI(s) | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB A</th> <th>CAMB O</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>21.00</td> <td>24.40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E.Mod.</td> <td>20.00</td> <td>25.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mod.</td> <td>24.40</td> <td>28.45</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB A | CAMB O | Med | 21.00 | 24.40 | E.Mod. | 20.00 | 25.50 | Mod. | 24.40 | 28.45 | NS | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Br</th> <th>Eur</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>10.10</td> <td>35.30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E.Mod.</td> <td>18.25</td> <td>27.25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mod.</td> <td>16.55</td> <td>36.30</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | Br | Eur | Med | 10.10 | 35.30 | E.Mod. | 18.25 | 27.25 | Mod. | 16.55 | 36.30 | .05 | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB A</th> <th>CAMB O</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>B 8.80</td> <td>11.40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E.Mod.</td> <td>E 33.20</td> <td>37.40</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>B 15.50</td> <td>21.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E.Mod.</td> <td>E 24.50</td> <td>30.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mod.</td> <td>B 20.50</td> <td>12.60</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>E 28.30</td> <td>44.30</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB A | CAMB O | Med | B 8.80 | 11.40 | E.Mod. | E 33.20 | 37.40 | | B 15.50 | 21.00 | E.Mod. | E 24.50 | 30.00 | Mod. | B 20.50 | 12.60 | | E 28.30 | 44.30 | .01 |
| | JMB A | CAMB O | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | 21.00 | 24.40 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E.Mod. | 20.00 | 25.50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod. | 24.40 | 28.45 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Br | Eur | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | 10.10 | 35.30 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E.Mod. | 18.25 | 27.25 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod. | 16.55 | 36.30 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | JMB A | CAMB O | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | B 8.80 | 11.40 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E.Mod. | E 33.20 | 37.40 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | B 15.50 | 21.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E.Mod. | E 24.50 | 30.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod. | B 20.50 | 12.60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | E 28.30 | 44.30 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AI | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB A</th> <th>CAMB O</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>13.50</td> <td>7.70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E.Mod.</td> <td>10.88</td> <td>9.23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mod.</td> <td>15.70</td> <td>16.95</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB A | CAMB O | Med | 13.50 | 7.70 | E.Mod. | 10.88 | 9.23 | Mod. | 15.70 | 16.95 | NS | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Br</th> <th>Eur</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>4.50</td> <td>16.70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E.Mod.</td> <td>7.13</td> <td>12.88</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mod.</td> <td>9.35</td> <td>23.30</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | Br | Eur | Med | 4.50 | 16.70 | E.Mod. | 7.13 | 12.88 | Mod. | 9.35 | 23.30 | NS | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB A</th> <th>CAMB O</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>B 2.60</td> <td>6.40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E.Mod.</td> <td>E 24.40</td> <td>9.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>B 6.75</td> <td>7.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E.Mod.</td> <td>E 15.00</td> <td>10.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mod.</td> <td>B 11.90</td> <td>6.80</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>E 19.50</td> <td>27.10</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB A | CAMB O | Med | B 2.60 | 6.40 | E.Mod. | E 24.40 | 9.00 | | B 6.75 | 7.50 | E.Mod. | E 15.00 | 10.75 | Mod. | B 11.90 | 6.80 | | E 19.50 | 27.10 | .05 |
| | JMB A | CAMB O | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | 13.50 | 7.70 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E.Mod. | 10.88 | 9.23 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod. | 15.70 | 16.95 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Br | Eur | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | 4.50 | 16.70 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E.Mod. | 7.13 | 12.88 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod. | 9.35 | 23.30 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | JMB A | CAMB O | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | B 2.60 | 6.40 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E.Mod. | E 24.40 | 9.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | B 6.75 | 7.50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E.Mod. | E 15.00 | 10.75 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod. | B 11.90 | 6.80 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | E 19.50 | 27.10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A234 | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB A</th> <th>CAMB O</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>30.30</td> <td>24.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E.Mod.</td> <td>34.50</td> <td>30.88</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mod.</td> <td>39.80</td> <td>34.15</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB A | CAMB O | Med | 30.30 | 24.00 | E.Mod. | 34.50 | 30.88 | Mod. | 39.80 | 34.15 | NS | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Br</th> <th>Eur</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>39.20</td> <td>15.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E.Mod.</td> <td>39.75</td> <td>25.60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mod.</td> <td>42.75</td> <td>31.00</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | Br | Eur | Med | 39.20 | 15.20 | E.Mod. | 39.75 | 25.60 | Mod. | 42.75 | 31.00 | .05 | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB A</th> <th>CAMB O</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>B 43.20</td> <td>35.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E.Mod.</td> <td>E 17.40</td> <td>13.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>B 42.75</td> <td>36.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E.Mod.</td> <td>E 26.25</td> <td>25.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mod.</td> <td>B 46.20</td> <td>39.70</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>E 33.40</td> <td>28.60</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB A | CAMB O | Med | B 43.20 | 35.00 | E.Mod. | E 17.40 | 13.00 | | B 42.75 | 36.75 | E.Mod. | E 26.25 | 25.00 | Mod. | B 46.20 | 39.70 | | E 33.40 | 28.60 | NS |
| | JMB A | CAMB O | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | 30.30 | 24.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E.Mod. | 34.50 | 30.88 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod. | 39.80 | 34.15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Br | Eur | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | 39.20 | 15.20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E.Mod. | 39.75 | 25.60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod. | 42.75 | 31.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | JMB A | CAMB O | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | B 43.20 | 35.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E.Mod. | E 17.40 | 13.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | B 42.75 | 36.75 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E.Mod. | E 26.25 | 25.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod. | B 46.20 | 39.70 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | E 33.40 | 28.60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

TABLE 5 (Continued)

| Category Sub Category | Interaction Levels / Boards x Periods of History | Significance | Interaction Types x Periods of History | Significance | Interaction Boards Levels x Types x Periods of History | Significance | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--------------|--|--------------|---|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|-------|-------|----|--|--|----|-----|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|-------|-------|-----|--|--|----------|-----------|-----|---------|-------|---|-------|------|-------|---------|-------|---|-------|-------|-----|---------|-------|---|-------|-------|-----|
| A2 | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB A</th> <th>CAMB O</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>10.20</td> <td>5.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E.Mod</td> <td>8.50</td> <td>4.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mod</td> <td>8.15</td> <td>7.45</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB A | CAMB O | Med | 10.20 | 5.50 | E.Mod | 8.50 | 4.75 | Mod | 8.15 | 7.45 | NS | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Br</th> <th>Eur</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>11.70</td> <td>4.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E.Mod</td> <td>8.88</td> <td>4.38</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mod</td> <td>9.03</td> <td>6.53</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | Br | Eur | Med | 11.70 | 4.00 | E.Mod | 8.88 | 4.38 | Mod | 9.03 | 6.53 | NS | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB A</th> <th>CAMB O</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>B 16.40</td> <td>7.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E</td> <td>4.00</td> <td>4.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E.Mod</td> <td>B 13.50</td> <td>4.23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E</td> <td>3.50</td> <td>5.25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mod</td> <td>B 7.80</td> <td>10.30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E</td> <td>8.50</td> <td>4.60</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB A | CAMB O | Med | B 16.40 | 7.00 | E | 4.00 | 4.00 | E.Mod | B 13.50 | 4.23 | E | 3.50 | 5.25 | Mod | B 7.80 | 10.30 | E | 8.50 | 4.60 | .01 |
| | JMB A | CAMB O | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | 10.20 | 5.50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E.Mod | 8.50 | 4.75 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod | 8.15 | 7.45 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Br | Eur | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | 11.70 | 4.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E.Mod | 8.88 | 4.38 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod | 9.03 | 6.53 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | JMB A | CAMB O | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | B 16.40 | 7.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E | 4.00 | 4.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E.Mod | B 13.50 | 4.23 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E | 3.50 | 5.25 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod | B 7.80 | 10.30 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E | 8.50 | 4.60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A3 | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB A</th> <th>CAMB O</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>11.30</td> <td>15.30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E.Mod</td> <td>16.38</td> <td>17.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mod</td> <td>15.00</td> <td>15.65</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB A | CAMB O | Med | 11.30 | 15.30 | E.Mod | 16.38 | 17.00 | Mod | 15.00 | 15.65 | NS | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Br</th> <th>Eur</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>19.40</td> <td>7.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E.Mod</td> <td>17.63</td> <td>15.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mod</td> <td>15.15</td> <td>15.50</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | Br | Eur | Med | 19.40 | 7.20 | E.Mod | 17.63 | 15.75 | Mod | 15.15 | 15.50 | .01 | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB A</th> <th>CAMB O</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>B 16.20</td> <td>22.60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E</td> <td>6.40</td> <td>8.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E.Mod</td> <td>B 14.75</td> <td>20.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E</td> <td>18.00</td> <td>13.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mod</td> <td>B 14.70</td> <td>15.60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E</td> <td>15.30</td> <td>15.70</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB A | CAMB O | Med | B 16.20 | 22.60 | E | 6.40 | 8.00 | E.Mod | B 14.75 | 20.50 | E | 18.00 | 13.50 | Mod | B 14.70 | 15.60 | E | 15.30 | 15.70 | NS |
| | JMB A | CAMB O | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | 11.30 | 15.30 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E.Mod | 16.38 | 17.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod | 15.00 | 15.65 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Br | Eur | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | 19.40 | 7.20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E.Mod | 17.63 | 15.75 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod | 15.15 | 15.50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | JMB A | CAMB O | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | B 16.20 | 22.60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E | 6.40 | 8.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E.Mod | B 14.75 | 20.50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E | 18.00 | 13.50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod | B 14.70 | 15.60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E | 15.30 | 15.70 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A14 | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB A</th> <th>CAMB O</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>22.20</td> <td>10.80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E.Mod</td> <td>20.63</td> <td>18.25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mod</td> <td>32.45</td> <td>27.90</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB A | CAMB O | Med | 22.20 | 10.80 | E.Mod | 20.63 | 18.25 | Mod | 32.45 | 27.90 | NS | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Br</th> <th>Eur</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>2.40</td> <td>20.60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E.Mod</td> <td>20.38</td> <td>18.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mod</td> <td>28.05</td> <td>32.30</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | Br | Eur | Med | 2.40 | 20.60 | E.Mod | 20.38 | 18.50 | Mod | 28.05 | 32.30 | NS | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB A</th> <th>CAMB O</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Med</td> <td>B 13.00</td> <td>10.80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E</td> <td>31.40</td> <td>9.80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E.Mod</td> <td>B 21.25</td> <td>19.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E</td> <td>20.00</td> <td>17.30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mod</td> <td>B 35.50</td> <td>20.60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E</td> <td>29.40</td> <td>35.20</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB A | CAMB O | Med | B 13.00 | 10.80 | E | 31.40 | 9.80 | E.Mod | B 21.25 | 19.50 | E | 20.00 | 17.30 | Mod | B 35.50 | 20.60 | E | 29.40 | 35.20 | .01 |
| | JMB A | CAMB O | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | 22.20 | 10.80 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E.Mod | 20.63 | 18.25 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod | 32.45 | 27.90 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Br | Eur | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | 2.40 | 20.60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E.Mod | 20.38 | 18.50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod | 28.05 | 32.30 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | JMB A | CAMB O | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Med | B 13.00 | 10.80 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E | 31.40 | 9.80 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E.Mod | B 21.25 | 19.50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E | 20.00 | 17.30 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mod | B 35.50 | 20.60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E | 29.40 | 35.20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

The picture is even more confusing when the interactions between the boards, levels, periods and types of history are considered. In the case of four sub categories interaction occurs between these variables, which is at least at the 5% level of significance. This variance is brought about by an absence of general consistency in the means reached in the different papers for these sub categories. This inconsistency can be illustrated by comparing the means attained by each of these sub categories in the pairs of papers on British and European history set by the two boards. As can be seen from Table 5, while there may be an underlying tendency for either papers on British or European history to reach higher means, the extent of the differences between the pairs of papers is extremely variable in all the sub categories and in the case of sub categories A2 and A14, contradictory trends are evident.

TABLE 6 /

TABLE 6

| Category Sub Category | Mean difference between JMB 'A' level papers on mediaeval British and European History | Mean difference between JMB 'A' level papers on early modern British and European History | Mean difference between JMB 'A' level papers on modern British and European History | Mean difference between Cambridge 'O' level papers on mediaeval British and European History | Mean difference between Cambridge 'O' level papers on early modern British and European History | Mean difference between Cambridge 'O' level papers on modern British and European History |
|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| A1,A1(s) | -24.40 | -9.00 | -7.80 | -26.00 | -9.00 | -31.70 |
| A1 | -21.80 | -8.25 | -7.60 | -2.60 | -3.25 | -20.30 |
| A2 | 12.40 | 10.00 | -0.70 | 3.00 | -1.00 | 5.70 |
| A14 | -18.40 | 1.25 | 6.10 | 2.00 | 2.00 | -15.20 |

THE INFLUENCE OF TYPES OF HISTORY; BRITISH AND EUROPEAN, IN THE
COMPARISON BETWEEN PAPERS ON MODERN, EARLY MODERN AND MEDIAEVAL
HISTORY

The results of the comparison between papers on different types of history will be considered briefly because they reveal familiar trends and because the interaction between the variables have either been discussed or cannot be interpreted satisfactorily. The differential emphasis placed on the categories and sub categories in papers on British and European history follows the lines already explored in Chapter 7. Thus category A (political history), its sub categories dealing with foreign politics, category G (religious history) and sub category G(a) (religious history - leadership) are favoured in papers on European history, while the sub categories of category A relating to domestic politics, category B (economic history) and category E (political history - non government) are given more prominence in papers on British history. The interactions between the variables can be discussed just as briefly. Already those interactions between types and periods of history and between boards, levels, types and periods of history which reach the 5% level of statistical significance have been considered. The only interactions remaining are between boards, levels and types of history and the inextricable involvement of the boards and levels make accurate interpretation of the results impossible.

Conclusion

Despite the problems associated with the superimposition of boards and levels in this comparison clear trends are evident. Category A (political history) and some of the sub categories dealing with domestic politics decrease in importance the more remote the period of history.

A similar, but by no means identical tendency is for the sub categories of category A concerned with foreign policy and category E (political history - non government) to be more prominent in papers on modern, as opposed to early modern and mediaeval history. These trends are balanced by the marked tendency for category G (religious history) and its sub categories to play a greater role in papers on the earlier periods, especially in papers on European mediaeval history, and for category H (cultural history) to be slightly more important on the earlier periods.

CHAPTER 9

A COMPARISON BETWEEN TRADITIONAL AND INNOVATORY PAPERS

As has already been indicated the 'A' level papers on British and European history set in syllabus C by the JMB are the only innovatory papers available for coding for the years 1968-1972. (1) The innovations consist of the pupil being required to study shorter periods of history and to answer two compulsory questions on British history, involving an analysis of historical documents. The papers, which had these features, and for which there were marking guides for the years 1968-1972, are listed below.

Innovatory Papers

JMB 'A' Level British History

| | | |
|---|---|----------|
| Syllabus C Alternative B(Q) Paper 11 Reign of Elizabeth I | - | 2 papers |
| Syllabus C Alternative C(R) Paper 11 British History (1660-1714) | - | 1 paper |
| Syllabus C Alternative D(S) Paper 11 British History (1815-1870) | - | 4 papers |
| Syllabus C Alternative E(T) Paper 11 British History (1906-1939) | - | 2 papers |
| | = | 9 papers |

JMB 'A' Level European History

Syllabus C /

(1) See above p.157.

JMB 'A' LEVEL EUROPEAN HISTORY

- Syllabus C Alternative B(Q) Paper 1
European History (1450-1610) - 3 papers
 - Syllabus C Alternative C(R) Paper 1
European History (1610-1789) - 3 Papers
 - Syllabus C Alternative E(T) Paper 1
European History (1870-1939) - 3 papers
- = 9 papers

These papers cover both the modern and early modern periods, but attempting to devise a comparison involving separate groups of papers dealing with these different periods was not feasible. The papers on British history, set on the early modern period, were only three in number and the papers on European history for the years 1610 to 1789 would have had to be divided in two if a comparison between the modern and early modern periods were to be carried out. Thus it was decided to limit the comparison to a matching of the papers above with 'traditional' 'A' level papers set by the JMB⁽¹⁾ (see below).

'Innovatory' Papers

JMB 'A' Level British History

Syllabus C

- Alternative B(Q) Paper 11
Reign of Elizabeth I - 2 papers
- Alternative C(R) Paper 11
British History (1660-1714)- 1 paper
- Alternative D(S) Paper 11
British History (1815-1870) - 4 papers
- Alternative E(T) Paper 11
British History (1906-1939) 2 papers

= 9 scores

JMB /

'Traditional' Papers

JMB 'A' Level British History

Syllabus A Paper 11

- Alternative F(1485-1603)- 3 papers
- Alternative G(1603-1714)- 1 paper
- Alternative J (1815-1914) 4 papers
- Alternative K (1865-1939) 4 papers

= 12 scores

(1) i.e. those papers comprising essay questions only

JMB 'A' Level European History

Syllabus C

Alternative B(Q) Paper 1
European History (1450-1610) - 3 papers

Alternative C(R) Paper 1
European History (1610-1789) - 3 papers

Alternative E(T) Paper 1
European History (1870-1939) - 3 papers

- 9 scores

JMB 'A' Level European History

Syllabus A Paper 1C
European History (1494-1939)

Section 1 (1494-1648) - 3 papers

Section 2 (1648-1715) - 4 papers

Section 3 (1715-1793) - 4 papers

Section 5 (1870-1939) - 4 papers

- 15 scores

The papers in each cell matched each other closely, except that two of the cells had 9 papers each, one cell had 12, and the other 15. As a consequence, to ensure proportionality a sample of 12 'A' level papers from the 15 set by the JMB was selected. The results of the comparison are summarised below (Table 1) while the detailed figures are available in Appendix F.

TABLE 1 /

TABLE 1

- 251 -

COMPARISON BETWEEN 'INNOVATORY' AND 'TRADITIONAL' JMB 'A' LEVEL PAPERS ON BRITISH AND EUROPEAN HISTORY

| | CATEGORY SUB CATEGORY | SIGNIFICANCE OF EFFECTS | | |
|---------|--|--|--|-----------------|
| | | Types of History (Brit. & European) | Methods of Examining (Innovatory & Traditional) | Types x Methods |
| A | Political History | NS | NS | NS |
| A1A1(s) | Foreign Politics | .001 | NS | NS |
| A1 | Foreign Politics (Collective) | .001 | NS | NS |
| A1(s) | Foreign Politics (Individual) | NS | NS | NS |
| A234 | Domestic Politics | .001 | NS | NS |
| A34 | Domestic Politics (without structure of Gov) | .01 | NS | NS |
| A2 | Structure of Government | .01 | NS | NS |
| A3 | Domestic Politics (Individual) | NS | NS | .05 |
| A4 | Domestic Politics (Collective) | .001 | .01 | .01 |
| A1(s) | Political History (Individual) | NS | NS | NS |
| A3 | | | | |
| A14 | Political History (Collective) | NS | NS | .05 |
| B | Economic History | .05 | NS | NS |
| C | Social History (Social Custom) | .001 | NS | NS |
| D | Social History (Social Structure) | NS | NS | NS |
| E | Political History (non Government) | .05 | NS | .05 |
| G | Religious History | NS | NS | NS |

COMPARISON BETWEEN 'INNOVATORY' AND 'TRADITIONAL' JMB 'A' LEVEL PAPERS ON BRITISH AND EUROPEAN HISTORY

| | CATEGORY SUB CATEGORY | SIGNIFICANCE OF EFFECTS | | |
|------|---|---------------------------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | Types of History (Brit.& European) | Methods of Examining (Innovatory & Traditional) | Types x Methods |
| G(a) | Religious History (Leadership) | NS | NS | NS |
| G(b) | Religious History (Movements) | NS | NS | NS |
| H | Cultural History | NS | NS | NS |
| J | Military and Naval History | NS | NS | NS |
| J1 | Military and Naval History (Government) | NS | NS | NS |
| J2 | Military and Naval History (non-Government) | - | - | - |
| L | Geographical History | NS | NS | NS |
| L1 | Geographical Factors | - | - | - |
| L2 | Exploration | - | - | - |
| M | Human Disease | - | - | - |
| N | Archaeology | - | - | - |
| P | Nature of History | .05 | .05 | .05 |
| Y | Uncodable Material | .001 | NS | NS |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

For completeness the variation which resulted from the papers being set on British and European history had to be assessed as well as the variation arising from the different methods of examining. Little comment will be made, however, on the differences between the papers on British and European history, for three reasons. First, the different emphasis in papers on British and European history has been discussed elsewhere with a more varied range of papers,⁽¹⁾ secondly the interaction effect between the types of history and the techniques of examining will be considered below, and, thirdly, the trends already established in papers on British and European history, for example their differential emphasis on foreign and domestic politics, is replicated here.⁽²⁾

THE INFLUENCES OF METHODS OF EXAMINING, TRADITIONAL AND INNOVATORY,
ON CATEGORIES AND SUB CATEGORIES IN JMB 'A' LEVEL PAPERS

The content of JMB 'A' level papers, which employ 'innovatory' methods of examining, is virtually identical with that of 'traditional' 'A' level papers set by the JMB. Only sub category A4 (domestic politics collective) and category P (the nature of history) have means which differ at the 5% level of statistical significance. Even in these two cases, however, the results are brought about by interactions between the two sets of variables. Thus the mean for 'traditional' 'A' level papers on British history is 23.4% in contrast to 11.0% in the innovatory 'A' level papers on British history and 7.83% and 8.7% in the papers on European history, while category P only plays a part in 'innovatory' papers on British history, reaching a mean of 3.30% and not exceeding 0.10% in the other groups of papers (see Table 2).

TABLE 2 /

-
- (1) See above p.190-192 and 206-209
(2) See above p. 251 and Appendix F

TABLE 2

| Category Sub Category | Mean for Innovatory Papers | Mean for Traditional Papers | Difference | Significance | Interaction between methods of Examining and types of history | Significance | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------|--------------|--|--------------|----------------|---------------|----|-------|-------|-----|------|------|-----|
| A 4 | 9.83 | 15.63 | -5.80 | .001 | <table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>JMB (Innov)</td> <td>JMB (Trad)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Br</td> <td>11.00</td> <td>23.40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Eur</td> <td>8.70</td> <td>7.83</td> </tr> </table> | | JMB (Innov) | JMB (Trad) | Br | 11.00 | 23.40 | Eur | 8.70 | 7.83 | .01 |
| | JMB (Innov) | JMB (Trad) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Br | 11.00 | 23.40 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Eur | 8.70 | 7.83 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| P | 1.67 | 0.04 | 1.63 | .05 | <table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>JMB (Innov)</td> <td>JMB (Trad)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Br</td> <td>3.30</td> <td>0.10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Eur</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0.00</td> </tr> </table> | | JMB (Innov) | JMB (Trad) | Br | 3.30 | 0.10 | Eur | 0.00 | 0.00 | .05 |
| | JMB (Innov) | JMB (Trad) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Br | 3.30 | 0.10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Eur | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Other interactions between methods of examining and types of history occur in the case of sub categories A3 and A14 and category E, but, as can be seen from Table 3, no clear trends can be established.

TABLE 3

| Category Sub Category | Interaction between Methods of Examining and types of History | Significance | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--------------|--------|-------|----|-------|-------|-----|-------|-------|-----|
| A3 | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Innov.</th> <th>Trad.</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Br</td> <td>19.90</td> <td>14.10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Eur</td> <td>11.90</td> <td>18.42</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | Innov. | Trad. | Br | 19.90 | 14.10 | Eur | 11.90 | 18.42 | .05 |
| | Innov. | Trad. | | | | | | | | | |
| Br | 19.90 | 14.10 | | | | | | | | | |
| Eur | 11.90 | 18.42 | | | | | | | | | |
| A14 | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Innov.</th> <th>Trad.</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Br</td> <td>19.30</td> <td>32.80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Eur</td> <td>35.00</td> <td>27.50</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | Innov. | Trad. | Br | 19.30 | 32.80 | Eur | 35.00 | 27.50 | .05 |
| | Innov. | Trad. | | | | | | | | | |
| Br | 19.30 | 32.80 | | | | | | | | | |
| Eur | 35.00 | 27.50 | | | | | | | | | |
| E | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Innov.</th> <th>Trad.</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Br</td> <td>2.40</td> <td>4.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Eur</td> <td>2.60</td> <td>0.30</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | Innov. | Trad. | Br | 2.40 | 4.20 | Eur | 2.60 | 0.30 | .05 |
| | Innov. | Trad. | | | | | | | | | |
| Br | 2.40 | 4.20 | | | | | | | | | |
| Eur | 2.60 | 0.30 | | | | | | | | | |

Sub category A3, for example, is given prominence in innovatory papers on British history, and in traditional papers on European history, while this trend is completely reversed in the case of sub category A14 and category E. Thus no clear tendency for one group of papers to be favoured in these sub categories can be identified.

Conclusion

This comparison of the traditional and innovatory papers set by the JMB shows that the techniques of examining have virtually no effect on the content of these papers.

CHAPTER 10

COMPARISON INVOLVING JMB AND CAMBRIDGE LOCAL EXAMINATION SYNDICATE PAPERS ON BRITISH IMPERIAL AND COMMONWEALTH HISTORY (1)

Only ten papers on British Imperial and Commonwealth history were available for coding, five '0' level papers set by the JMB., and five '0' level papers by the Cambridge board. Unfortunately the periods covered by the two papers did not match, the JMB papers ranged from 1763 to 1939, while the Cambridge papers were divided into two sections, Section A dealing with the period from 1558 to 1783, and Section B with the years from 1783 to 1939. Two initial comparisons were, therefore, carried out involving papers on Imperial history. In the first, Sections A and B of the Cambridge papers were compared to find out if questions on Imperial history were affected by the period on which they were set. In the second, Section B of the Cambridge papers was compared with the complete papers set by the JMB to throw light on the approaches of the two boards to the content of Imperial history. Once these analyses had been completed, comparisons were attempted between papers on Imperial and British history to see if the papers on Imperial history added variety to '0' level papers in terms of content, or were simply replicas of the papers on British history.

The results of the first comparison between Sections A and B of the Cambridge '0' level papers on the history of the British Empire and Commonwealth are listed below (Table 1).

TABLE 1 /

(1) For the detailed figures and calculations relating to the comparisons in this chapter see Appendix G.

TABLE 1

- 257 -

COMPARISON BETWEEN MEANS FOR SECTION A AND B OF CAMBRIDGE 'O' LEVEL PAPERS ON THE HISTORY OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE & COMMONWEALTH

| Category Sub Category | Means for Section A (1558 - 1783) | Means for Section B (1783 - 1939) | Difference | Significance |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------|--------------|
| A | 44.30 | 73.00 | -28.60 | .01 |
| A, A1(s) | 19.40 | 25.60 | -6.20 | NS |
| A1 | 17.00 | 21.20 | -4.20 | NS |
| A1(s) | 2.20 | 4.40 | -2.00 | NS |
| A2,A3,A4 | 21.60 | 41.80 | -20.20 | .01 |
| A3, A4 | 14.60 | 25.00 | -9.40 | .05 |
| A2 | 7.00 | 16.60 | -9.60 | .05 |
| A3 | 6.80 | 10.80 | -4.00 | NS |
| A4 | 8.20 | 14.40 | -6.20 | NS |
| A1(s), A3 | 9.20 | 15.20 | -6.00 | NS |
| A1, A4 | 25.00 | 35.60 | -10.60 | .01 |
| B | 19.40 | 9.60 | 10.2 | NS |
| C | 0.80 | 0.00 | 0.80 | - |
| D | 3.00 | 0.60 | 2.40 | - |
| E | 0.40 | 3.00 | 2.60 | - |
| G | 3.60 | 1.20 | 2.40 | - |
| G(a) | 0.40 | 0.00 | 0.40 | - |

TABLE 1 (Continued)

COMPARISON BETWEEN MEANS FOR SECTION A AND B OF CAMBRIDGE 'O' LEVEL PAPERS ON THE HISTORY OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE & COMMONWEALTH

| Category Sub Category | Means for Section A (1558 - 1783) | Means for Section B (1783-1939) | Difference | Significance |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|--------------|
| G(b) | 2.20 | 1.20 | 1.00 | - |
| H | 2.60 | 0.40 | 2.20 | - |
| J | 16.20 | 3.40 | 12.8 | .001 |
| J1 | 15.00 | 3.20 | 11.80 | .01 |
| J2 | 0.80 | 0.20 | 0.60 | - |
| L | 6.40 | 4.60 | 1.80 | NS |
| L1 | 0.20 | 0.40 | -0.20 | - |
| L2 | 6.00 | 3.40 | 2.60 | NS |
| M | 0.00 | 0.20 | -0.20 | - |
| N | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| P | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| Y | 4.00 | 5.00 | -1.00 | NS |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

In Table 1 a clear outline emerges of the composition of papers on Imperial history set by the Cambridge board at '0' level. The first major difference between the two sections of the papers centres on category A, (political history). In the section on the modern period the examiners pay a great deal of attention to category A, which reaches a mean of 73.0%, in comparison with a mean of 44.4% for the earlier period. This trend is particularly evident with sub category A234, (domestic politics), where the mean difference between the two sections reaches the 1% level of statistical significance.. As a consequence, virtually all the non political categories and sub categories play a greater role in section A (1550 - 1783) than Section B (1783 - 1939). This applies particularly to category B (economic history), J (military and naval history) and sub category J1 (military and naval history - government), which achieve means that are respectively 10.2%, 12.8% and 11.8% higher in Section A than Section B, while the remaining categories and sub categories, with the exception of sub category L1 (geographical factors) and category M (human disease), show a slight, but nevertheless persistent tendency to reach a higher mean in Section A than Section B. Thus, whereas the Cambridge papers on modern Imperial history are dominated by political history, the questions set on the earlier period achieve a broader balance.

The next stage was to compare JMB '0' level papers on Imperial history with Section B of the Cambridge papers. The years covered almost matched,, those for the JMB being from 1763 to 1939, and for Cambridge from 1783 to 1939. The means for each category and sub category of these papers are listed below (Table 2).

TABLE 2

COMPARISON OF SECTION B OF THE CAMBRIDGE 'O' LEVEL PAPERS ON THE HISTORY OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE AND COMMONWEALTH AND JMB 'O' LEVEL PAPERS ON THE HISTORY OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE AND COMMONWEALTH.

| Category Sub Category | Means for Cambridge Papers (Section B) | Means for JMB Papers | Difference | Significance |
|--------------------------|---|-------------------------|------------|--------------|
| A | 73.00 | 59.20 | 14.20 | NS |
| A, A1(s) | 25.60 | 16.80 | 8.80 | NS |
| A1 | 21.2 | 15.20 | 6.00 | NS |
| A1(s) | 4.40 | 1.60 | 2.80 | NS |
| A2,A3,A4 | 41.80 | 31.60 | 10.60 | NS |
| A3, A4 | 25.00 | 18.80 | 6.20 | NS |
| A2 | 16.60 | 12.80 | 3.80 | NS |
| A3 | 10.80 | 8.20 | 2.60 | NS |
| A4 | 14.40 | 10.40 | 4.00 | NS |
| A1(s), A3 | 15.20 | 9.80 | 5.40 | NS |
| A1, A4 | 35.60 | 25.60 | 10.00 | NS |
| B | 9.60 | 13.00 | -3.40 | NS |
| C | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| D | 0.60 | 0.40 | 0.20 | - |
| E | 3.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | NS |
| G | 1.20 | 1.00 | 0.20 | - |
| G(a) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |

TABLE 2 (Continued)

- 261 -

COMPARISON OF SECTION B OF THE CAMBRIDGE 'O' LEVEL PAPERS ON THE HISTORY OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE AND JMB 'O' LEVEL PAPERS ON THE HISTORY OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE AND COMMONWEALTH

| Category Sub Category | Means for Cambridge Paper (Section B) | Means for JMB Papers | Difference | Significance |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------|------------|--------------|
| G(b) | 1.20 | 1.00 | 0.20 | - |
| H | 0.40 | 0.00 | 0.40 | - |
| J | 3.40 | 9.80 | -6.40 | .01 |
| J1 | 3.20 | 8.80 | -5.60 | .01 |
| J2 | 0.20 | 0.60 | -0.30 | - |
| L | 3.60 | 7.20 | -3.60 | NS |
| L1 | 0.20 | 4.80 | -4.60 | .01 |
| L2 | 3.40 | 2.40 | 1.00 | NS |
| M | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| N | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| P | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| Y | 5.00 | 9.40 | -4.40 | .05 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

In both these groups of papers familiar tendencies assert themselves with category A (political history) predominating and the other categories playing a minor role. Within these parameters, however, category A and its sub categories are more important in papers set by the Cambridge board though the mean differences do not reach the 5% level of statistical significance. This emphasis on category A in the Cambridge papers is balanced by a tendency for categories B, J, L and Y and sub categories J1 and L1 to play a greater part in JMB papers, though the largest mean difference is only 6.4%.

The comparisons within Imperial history being completed, the one major question remaining is how far papers on Imperial history differ from papers on British history. The JMB and Cambridge papers on Imperial history cover very different periods and are extremely difficult to match with papers on British history. The papers that need to be compared with those on British history are as follows.

JMB '0' level papers on the History of the British Empire
and Commonwealth (1763-1939) - 5 papers

Cambridge '0' level papers on the History of the British
Empire & Commonwealth (1550-1939) 5 papers

Section A 1550 - 1783

Section B 1783 - 1939

The papers on British history that could be most appropriately compared/

compared with those on Imperial history are laid out in Table 3 below.

TABLE 3

| <u>Imperial History</u> | <u>British History</u> |
|--|--|
| <u>JMB</u> | <u>JMB</u> |
| History of the British Empire and Commonwealth (1763-1939) | Questions on British History in |
| - 5 papers | (i) Alternative F - Revolution Reform (1789-1870) |
| | - 5 papers |
| | (ii) Alternative G - Europe and the Modern World (1870 to the present day) |
| | - 5 papers |
| <u>Cambridge</u> | <u>Cambridge</u> |
| History of the British Empire and Commonwealth (1550-1939) | British and European History (1495-1815) |
| - 5 papers | - 5 papers |
| Section A (1558-1783) | Section B 1 British History (1485-1688) |
| Section B (1783-1939) | Section C 1 " " (1688-1815) |
| | British and European History (1688-1939) - 5 papers |
| | Section D 1 British History (1815-1939) |

To attempt one test of significance for each category and sub category embracing all these papers appeared to be unwise. Section A of the Cambridge paper stood out as distinct from the rest of the questions on Imperial history, not being matched by an equivalent section in the JMB papers. Thus any comparison would involve confusing two variables the boards and the periods of history. It was, therefore, decided to compare Section A of the Cambridge paper on Imperial history separately with appropriately matched papers on British history, see comparison (a) below

Comparison (a) /

Comparison (a)

Imperial History

Cambridge

History of the British Empire
and Commonwealth (1550-1939)

- 5 papers

Section A (1550-1783)

- 5 scores

British History

Cambridge

British and European History
(1485-1815)

- 5 papers

Section B 1 British History
(1485-1688)

Section C 1 British History
(1688-1815)

- 10 scores

The remaining papers covered approximately the same periods of history and could, as a consequence, be compared. However, a major difficulty was created by the number of papers in each cell (see below)

Imperial History

JMB

Cell (a) - History of the British Empire
and Commonwealth (1763-1939)

- 5 papers

- 5 scores

British History

JMB

Cell (b) Questions on British
History in

(I) Alternative F - Revolution
Reaction and Reform (1789-
1870)

- 5 papers

(II) Alternative G - Europe and
the Modern World (1870- to
the present day)

- 5 papers

- 10 scores

Cambridge

Cell (c) - History of the British Empire
and Commonwealth (1550-1939)

- 5 papers

Section B (1783-1939)

- 5 scores

Cambridge

Cell (d) - British and European
History (1688-1939)

- 5 papers

Section D 1 British History
(1815 -1939)

- 5 scores

Three/

Three of these groups number five and one ten, thus making it impossible to attempt a test of significance because the cells are not in proportion to each other. Only if five of the ten papers in cell (b) were sampled would proportionally be achieved. This seemed to be a drastic procedure and it was therefore decided to compare the JMB and Cambridge papers separately.

Comparison (b)

| <u>Imperial History</u> | <u>British History</u> |
|--|--|
| <u>Cambridge</u> | <u>Cambridge</u> |
| History of the British Empire and Commonwealth (1550-1939) | British and European History (1688-1939) |
| - 5 papers | - 5 papers |
| Section B (1783-1939) | Section D 1 British History (1815-1939) |
| - 5 scores | - 5 scores |

Comparison (c)

| <u>Imperial History</u> | <u>British History</u> |
|--|--|
| <u>JMB</u> | <u>JMB</u> |
| History of the British Empire and Commonwealth (1763-1939) | Questions on British History in |
| - 5 papers | (1) Alternative F - Revolution Reaction and Reform (1789-1870) |
| | - 5 papers |
| | (11) Alternative G - Europe and the Modern World (1870 to the present day) |
| - 5 scores | - 5 papers |
| | - 10 scores |

To avoid confusion the results of these comparisons will be summarised in one table, the mean differences and their levels of statistical significance being indicated. (See Table 4 below). More detailed figures, listing the means attained by each category and sub category in the papers will be presented in Appendix G. and, where appropriate, in the discussion of the comparisons which follow this table.

TABLE 4 COMPARISON BETWEEN MEANS REACHED IN 'O' LEVEL

| | PAPERS IN IMPERIAL & BRITISH HISTORY | | Comparison (a) Mean difference between papers on E.Mod.Imperial & Brit.hist.set by the Cambridge Bd. | Significance | Comparison (b) Mean difference between papers on Mod.Imperial & Brit.hist.set by the Cambridge Bd. | Significance | Comparison (c) Mean difference between papers on Mod.Imperial & Brit.hist.set by the IMB. | Significance |
|-------------|--|--------------|---|--------------|---|--------------|--|--------------|
| | CATEGORY | SUB CATEGORY | | | | | | |
| A | Political History | | -11.10 | .05 | 12.20 | NS | -12.60 | .01 |
| A1A1(s) | Foreign Politics | | 6.60 | NS | 7.20 | NS | -3.30 | .01 |
| A1 | Foreign Politics (Collective) | | 11.90 | .01 | 11.20 | .001 | 2.30 | NS |
| A1(s) | Foreign Politics (Individual) | | -5.70 | NS | -3.40 | NS | -5.70 | NS |
| A234 | Domestic Politics | | -17.10 | .001 | 1.60 | NS | -14.20 | .05 |
| A34 | Domestic Politics (without structure of Gov) | | -16.20 | .001 | -6.20 | NS | -14.90 | .01 |
| A2 | Structure of Government | | -1.10 | NS | 7.40 | NS | 1.10 | NS |
| A3 | Domestic Politics (Individual) | | -12.50 | .001 | -1.6 | NS | -10.10 | .05 |
| A4 | Domestic Politics (Collective) | | -3.30 | NS | -4.40 | NS | -5.0 | NS |
| A1(s) A3 | Political History (Individual) | | -17.70 | .001 | -5.20 | NS | -15.70 | .01 |
| A14 | Political History (Collective) | | 8.40 | .05 | 6.80 | .01 | -2.80 | NS |
| B | Economic History | | 9.80 | NS | -4.40 | .05 | 9.50 | .01 |
| C | Social History (Social Custom) | | -2.00 | NS | -4.20 | NS | -0.80 | - |
| D | Social History (Social Structure) | | 2.80 | .01 | 0.00 | - | 0.30 | - |
| E | Political History (Non Government) | | -3.40 | .05 | -4.20 | .05 | -6.5 | NS |
| G | Religious History | | -0.90 | NS | 0.00 | - | 0.40 | - |
| G(a) | Religious History (Leadership) | | -2.10 | NS | -0.40 | - | 0.00 | - |
| G(b) | Religious History (Movements) | | 1.40 | NS | 0.80 | - | 0.40 | - |

Though category A, (political history) is predominant in each of these sets of papers this very important similarity masks confusing and contradictory trends, which affect category A and its sub categories dealing with foreign politics. Thus category A achieves a markedly higher mean in papers on British as opposed to Imperial history in comparisons (a) and (c), a tendency which is reversed in comparison (b), while in the case of sub category A1, A1(s) a higher mean is reached in papers on Imperial history in two of the comparisons, but not in the third. This confusion is increased by the tendency for sub category A1 to be favoured in papers on Imperial history and sub category A1(s) in papers on British history. The only clear trend which is evident among the sub categories of category A is for domestic politics to be given more prominence in papers on British as compared with Imperial history. This tendency applies particularly to sub categories A234, A34, A3 and A4.

But this confusing picture should not conceal the marked similarity between the papers on British and Imperial history. In addition to the importance attached to category A in both sets of papers, all the other categories and sub categories, with the exception of only five, show no consistently significant difference between the means for papers on British and Imperial history.

The five categories and sub categories where divergence occurs are categories B, E, L, sub category L2 and category Y. Of these category B, (economic history) alone presents a confusing picture. In comparisons (a) and (c) category B achieves considerable importance in papers on Imperial history achieving means of 19.4% and 13.0% respectively/

respectively in contrast to 9.6% and 3.5% in the equivalent papers on British history,⁽¹⁾ while in comparison (b) the situation is reversed with category B reaching a score of 14.0% in papers on British history and only 9.6% in papers on Imperial history.⁽²⁾ With categories E, L and sub category L2 the pattern is much clearer. Category E (political history- non government) is considerably more important in the papers on British history while category L, (geographical history) and sub category L2, (exploration) both play a greater role in papers on Imperial as opposed to British history, though even categories L and E do not achieve means higher than 7.5%.⁽³⁾ Finally in the case of category Y (uncodable material) the only trend to note is the mean difference between JMB papers on modern Imperial and British history which reaches 7.2% because of the relatively high mean attained by category Y in JMB papers on modern Imperial history(9.4%).⁽⁴⁾

Conclusions

1. The Cambridge papers on early modern and modern Imperial history diverge markedly - category A dominates the papers on the modern period, but plays a much more restricted role in papers on the early modern period. As a result, categories B and J are more prominent in papers on early modern as opposed to modern Imperial history.
 2. The Cambridge and JMB papers on modern Imperial history are very similar.
 3. Despite some contradictory tendencies the content of papers on early modern and modern Imperial history were found to differ very little from papers on early modern and modern British history.
-

(1) See Appendix G
(2) " " "
(3) " " "
(4) " " "

CHAPTER 11

COMPARISONS INVOLVING JMB AND CAMBRIDGE LOCAL EXAMINATION SYNDICATE PAPERS ON BRITISH ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL HISTORY (1)

This chapter will consist of two sections, section (a) dealing with comparisons between different groups of papers on British Economic and Social history and section (b) with comparisons between papers on British Economic and Social history and papers on British history.

SECTION (a)

COMPARISONS BETWEEN DIFFERENT GROUPS OF PAPERS ON BRITISH ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL HISTORY

The groups of papers set by the Joint Matriculation and Cambridge boards on British Economic and Social history are set out in Table 1 below.

TABLE 1

JMB 'A' Level British Economic and Social history

| | | |
|---|-------------|-----|
| Syllabus A Paper 11 L Brit.Econ. & Soc. History | (1700-1914) | (2) |
| Syllabus B Paper 1 " " & Soc " " | (1700-1850 | |
| Syllabus B Paper 11 " " " " " " | (1850-1939) | |

JMB 'O' Level British Economic and Social History

Alternative C British Economic and Social History from early 18th century to the present day.

Cambridge/

- (1) For the detailed figures and calculations relating to the comparisons in this chapter see Appendix H.
- (2) A comparison of the JMB 'A' level papers dealing with British Economic History (Syllabus A Paper 11 L) and those dealing with British Economic and Social History (Syllabus B Papers 1 and 11) revealed that they were virtually identical in content (see Appendix H). As a result, the papers set for Syllabus A Paper 11 L were included in these comparisons.

TABLE 1 (continued)

Cambridge 'O' Level British Economic and Social History

Section A British Economic and Social History (1066-1760)

Section B " " " " (1760-1939)

The first problem in comparing the papers listed above is that they do not cover the same periods, the JMB 'O' and 'A' level papers running from the early 18th century to 1939 and the Cambridge papers from 1066 to 1939. As a result, the JMB papers could only be strictly compared with section B of the Cambridge papers, while section A of the Cambridge papers had to be treated separately. A second problem centred on the absence of marking guides for Cambridge 'A' level papers on British Economic and Social history. Thus one comparison embracing 'A' and 'O' level JMB papers and 'O' level Cambridge papers would be impossible to interpret, since the variables, boards and levels, would be superimposed. It was, therefore, decided to conduct the comparisons piecemeal as listed below.

- (I) A comparison between JMB 'A' and 'O' level papers on British Economic and Social history to determine the effect of the level of examination on these papers.
- (II) A comparison between Cambridge 'O' level papers section B, and JMB 'O' level papers on British Economic and Social history to find out the impact of the boards on the content of these papers.
- (III) A comparison between sections A and B of the Cambridge 'O' level papers on British Economic and Social history to throw light on the influence of the different periods of history on the approach of the examiners to these papers.

The/

The results of these three comparisons will now be outlined individually.

Comparison 1

The comparison between JMB 'A' and 'O' level papers on British Economic and Social history involved the two groups of papers listed below (Table 2).

TABLE 2

JMB 'A' Level Papers on British Economic History

Syllabus A Paper II L British Economic History (1700-1914) 3 papers

Syllabus B Paper I British Economic & Social History (1700-1850) 3 papers

Syllabus B Paper II British Economic & Social History (1850-1939) 4 papers

- 10 scores

JMB 'O' Level Papers on British Economic & Social History

Alternative C British Economic History from early 18th century to the present day

- 5 papers

- 5 scores

These two groups of papers were closely matched with regard to periods of history and in proportion to each other. The tests of significance were, therefore, carried out and the results are laid out in Table 3 below.

TABLE 3 /

TABLE 3 COMPARISON OF JMB 'A' and 'O' LEVEL PAPERS ON BRITISH ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL HISTORY

| Category Sub category | Mean for JMB 'A' level Papers on Brit. Economic & Social History | Mean for JMB 'O' level Papers on Brit. Economic & Social History | Difference | Significance |
|--------------------------|---|---|------------|--------------|
| A | 19.60 | 23.80 | -4.20 | NS |
| A1, A1(s) | 1.50 | 0.20 | 1.30 | - |
| A1 | 1.50 | 0.20 | 1.30 | - |
| A1(s) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| A2,A3,A4 | 18.40 | 21.60 | -3.20 | NS |
| A3, A4 | 17.30 | 18.80 | -1.50 | NS |
| A2 | 1.10 | 2.60 | -1.50 | NS |
| A3 | 2.80 | 2.20 | 0.60 | NS |
| A4 | 14.50 | 16.60 | -2.1 | NS |
| A1(s), A3 | 2.80 | 2.20 | 0.60 | NS |
| A1, A4 | 16.00 | 16.80 | -0.80 | NS |
| B | 62.70 | 40.80 | 21.90 | .01 |
| C | 4.10 | 4.60 | -0.50 | NS |
| D | 2.60 | 2.20 | 0.40 | NS |
| E | 4.30 | 6.00 | -1.70 | NS |
| G | 0.60 | 0.20 | 0.40 | - |
| G(a) | 0.00 | 0.20 | -0.20 | - |

These two sets of papers are remarkably similar. The only categories and sub categories whose means differ significantly are categories B, H, and L and sub category L1. Category B (economic history) received a lot more emphasis in 'A' than 'O' level papers, reaching a mean of 62.7% in the Advanced compared with 40.8% in the Ordinary level papers. This difference is, to a great extent, balanced by the tendency for category H (cultural history) to play a more important part in the 'O' level papers and for category L (geographical history) and sub category L1 (geographical factors), to receive more attention at 'O' than 'A' level. This emphasis on category H at 'O' level needs some explanation. A survey of the material coded in category H revealed that it was not concerned with general cultural trends for example with art, architecture and literature but instead with descriptions of scientific and technical developments - an understandable tendency in papers on economic and social history.

Comparison II

Comparison II juxtaposes section B of the Cambridge 'O' level papers on British Economic and Social history with the 'O' level papers on British Economic and Social history set by the JMB. The tests of significance were straightforward, since there were five papers in each cell and the periods of history involved were closely matched. The means for the categories and sub categories in the JMB and Cambridge papers follow in Table 4 below.

TABLE 4 /

TABLE 4 COMPARISON OF JMB 'O' LEVEL PAPERS ON BRITISH ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL HISTORY WITH SECTION B OF CAMBRIDGE 'O' LEVEL PAPERS ON BRITISH ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL HISTORY

| Category Sub Category | Means for JMB 'O' Level Papers on Brit. Economic & Social History (1700-1939) | Means for Cambridge 'O' level papers on Brit. Ec. & Soc History (Section B) (1760-1939) | Difference | Significance |
|--------------------------|---|---|------------|--------------|
| A | 23.80 | 32.40 | -8.60 | NS |
| A1, A1(s) | 0.20 | 1.20 | -1.00 | - |
| A1 | 0.20 | 1.00 | -0.80 | - |
| A1(s) | 0.00 | 0.20 | -0.20 | - |
| A2, A3, A4 | 21.60 | 30.80 | -9.20 | NS |
| A3, A4 | 18.80 | 27.60 | -8.80 | NS |
| A2 | 2.60 | 3.00 | -0.40 | - |
| A3 | 2.20 | 6.00 | -3.60 | NS |
| A4 | 16.60 | 21.60 | -5.00 | NS |
| A1(s), A3 | 2.20 | 6.20 | -4.00 | NS |
| A1, A4 | 16.80 | 22.60 | -5.80 | NS |
| B | 40.80 | 31.80 | 9.00 | NS |
| C | 4.60 | 8.00 | -3.40 | NS |
| D | 2.20 | 1.00 | 1.20 | NS |
| E | 6.00 | 5.80 | 0.20 | NS |
| G | 0.20 | 1.00 | -0.80 | - |

TABLE 4 (Continued)

COMPARISON OF JMB 'O' LEVEL PAPERS ON BRITISH ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL HISTORY WITH SECTION B OF CAMBRIDGE 'O' LEVEL PAPERS ON BRITISH ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL HISTORY

| Category Sub Category | Means for JMB 'O' Level Papers on British Economic & Social History (1700-1939) | Means for Cambridge 'O' Level papers on British Econ.& Soc.Hist (Section B) (1768-1939) | Difference | Significance |
|-----------------------------|---|--|------------|--------------|
| G(a) | 0.20 | 0.60 | -0.40 | - |
| G(b) | 0.00 | 0.40 | -0.40 | - |
| H | 15.60 | 18.20 | -2.60 | NS |
| J | 1.40 | 0.10 | 1.30 | - |
| J1 | 1.20 | 0.00 | 1.20 | - |
| J2 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.00 | - |
| L | 4.00 | 0.20 | 3.80 | .001 |
| L1 | 3.60 | 0.20 | 3.40 | .001 |
| L2 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| M | 0.40 | 0.80 | -0.40 | - |
| N | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| P | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| Y | 1.00 | 0.80 | 0.20 | - |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

These two groups of papers do not differ significantly. The major variations in percentage terms namely in categories A (political history) and B (economic history) and in sub categories A234 and A34, which deal with domestic politics, do not reach the 5% level of statistical significance. Indeed the only categories where the mean difference between these two sets of papers does attain such a level are category L (geographical history) and sub category L1 (geographical factors), but the means reached are extremely low. Thus it is safe to assume that these two groups of papers are very similar.

COMPARISON III

The only comparison remaining involving the papers on British Economic and Social history is between sections A and B of the '0' level papers set by the Cambridge Board, section A covering the period 1066 to 1760 and section B 1760 to 1939. The comparison between these two sections was straightforward, five papers being involved in each cell (see Table 5 below).

TABLE 5 /

TABLE 5 COMPARISON BETWEEN SECTIONS A AND B OF THE CAMBRIDGE 'O' LEVEL PAPERS ON BRITISH ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL HISTORY

| Category Sub category | Mean for Camb. 'O' level papers on Brit. Economic & Soc. History (Section A) | Mean for Camb. 'O' level papers on Brit. Econ. & Soc. Hist. (Section B) | Difference | Significance |
|--------------------------|---|--|------------|--------------|
| A | 27.00 | 32.40 | -5.40 | NS |
| A1, A1(s) | 1.20 | 1.20 | 0.00 | - |
| A1 | 1.20 | 1.00 | 0.20 | - |
| A1(s) | 0.00 | 0.20 | -0.20 | - |
| A2, A3, A4 | 25.00 | 30.80 | -5.80 | NS |
| A3 ⁴ | 18.80 | 27.60 | -8.80 | NS |
| A2 | 6.20 | 3.00 | 3.20 | NS |
| A3 | 0.00 | 6.00 | -6.00 | NS |
| A4 | 18.80 | 21.6 | -2.80 | NS |
| A1(s), A3 | 0.00 | 6.20 | -6.20 | NS |
| A1 ⁴ | 20.20 | 22.40 | -2.20 | NS |
| B | 48.40 | 31.80 | 16.60 | NS |
| C | 3.60 | 8.00 | -4.40 | NS |
| D | 4.40 | 1.00 | 3.40 | NS |
| E | 1.40 | 5.80 | -4.40 | .05 |
| G | 2.00 | 1.00 | -1.00 | - |
| G(a) | 0.00 | 0.60 | -0.60 | - |
| G(b) | 2.00 | 0.40 | 1.60 | - |

The results for sections A and B of the Cambridge '0' level papers on British Economic and Social history show little divergence. Only in the case of two categories does the variation between the two groups of papers reach the 5% level of statistical significance. Categories H (cultural history) and E (political history non government) are given greater prominence in papers on modern economic history, but even with these two categories, the mean differences between the two sets of papers are below 10%⁽¹⁾.

Conclusion to Section (a)

These comparisons reveal that papers on British Economic and Social history do not differ markedly - only two categories showing tendencies to diverge sharply. Category B (economic history) is clearly more favoured in JMB 'A' level papers than in JMB or Cambridge '0' level papers, while category H (cultural history) receives more attention in '0' level papers dealing with the modern period as opposed, on the one hand, to '0' level papers which are concerned with the early modern and mediaeval periods and, on the other, to 'A' level papers which concentrate on the modern period. With these two exceptions, however, the papers on British Economic and Social history are similar in their content..

Section (b)

COMPARISONS BETWEEN PAPERS ON BRITISH ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL HISTORY AND PAPERS ON BRITISH HISTORY

Though/

- (1) The difference between the means for category B in sections A and B is 16.6%, but the difference does not reach the 5% level of statistical significance.

Though the papers on British Economic and Social history are concerned with a specific type of history they are clearly similar in many respects to papers on British history and it was, therefore, decided to attempt a comparison between the two types of papers. The papers available for comparison on British Economic and Social history are listed below (Table 6)

TABLE 6

JMB 'A' Level British Economic and Social History

Syllabus A Paper 11 L British Economic History (1700-1914)

Syllabus B Paper 1 British Economic & Social History (1700-1850)

Syllabus B Paper 11 " " " " (1850-1939)

JMB 'O' Level British Economic and Social History

Alternative C British Economic & Social History from early 18th century to the present day.

Cambridge 'O' Level British Economic & Social History

Section A British Economic & Social History (1066-1760)

Section B " " " " (1760-1939)

First of all the possibility of comparing all these papers on British Economic and Social history with appropriately matched groups of papers on British history in one test of statistical significance was considered. The form of such a test is laid out below in Table 7.

TABLE 7 /

TABLE 7

| | |
|---|---|
| Cell (a) | Cell (e) |
| JMB 'A' level papers on British Economic and Social History | JMB papers on 'A' level British History |
| Cell (b) | Cell (f) |
| JMB 'O' level papers on British Economic and Social History | JMB papers on 'O' level British History |
| Cell (c) | Cell (g) |
| Cambridge 'O' level papers on British Economic and Social History pre 1760 | Cambridge papers on 'O' level British History pre 1760 |
| Cell (d) | Cell (h) |
| Cambridge 'O' level papers on British Economic and Social History post 1760 | Cambridge papers on 'O' level British History post 1760 |

Four main variables were involved in this comparison (i) the Boards, Cambridge and Joint Matriculation, (ii) the Levels, Advanced and Ordinary, (iii) the types of history, British Economic and Social and British, (iv) the periods, 1066 - 1763 and 1763 or the early 18th century to 1939. Unfortunately, if such a comparison had been attempted, a number of variables would have been superimposed upon each other, thus making the interpretation of the results extremely arbitrary. Comparisons, therefore, between 'A' and 'O' level papers could not have been distinguished from the Boards which set the papers, the only sets of 'A' level papers being provided by the JMB. In addition, confusion would have arisen over the papers set on the period before 1760, since the only examples were from the Cambridge board. It was, therefore, decided to break this comparison into smaller units for which conclusions would be clearly established. Three comparisons were possible which would not involve confusions amongst the variables -

Comparison A between JMB and Cambridge 'O' level papers on modern British Economic and Social history and on British history, allowing the impact of two variables the boards and the types of history, to be analysed.

Comparison B between JMB 'A' level papers on British Economic and Social History and on British history in which the influence of the types of history could be isolated.

Comparison C between Cambridge 'O' level papers on British Economic and Social history and British history for the period 1066 to 1763, which would throw further light on the impact of the different types of history.

Comparison A involved four groups of papers matched for periods, levels and boards.

Group A

JMB 'O' Level papers on British Economic and Social History

Alternative C British Economic and Social history from the early 18th century to the present day - 5 papers

- 5 scores

Group C

JMB 'O' level papers on British History

Questions on British history from

(I) Alternative E British Limited Monarchy and European Autocracy (1660-1789) - 5 papers

(II) Alternative F Revolution, Reaction and Reform (1789-1870) - 5 papers

(III) Alternative G Europe and the Modern World 1870 to the present day - 5 papers

- 15 scores

Group B

Cambridge 'O' level papers on British Economic and Social History - 5 papers

Section B British Economic and Social History (1760-1939)

- 5 scores

Group D

Cambridge 'O' level papers on British and European History (1688-1939) - 5 papers

Section C 1 British History (1688-1815)

Section D 1 British History (1815-1939)

- 10 scores

Ten out of the fifteen papers in Group C were sampled so that proportionality between the variables and cells could be realised. The results, once the tests of significance were completed, are as follows (Table 8).

TABLE 8 /

TABLE 8 COMPARISON OF JMB AND CAMBRIDGE 'O' LEVEL PAPERS ON MODERN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL HISTORY AND MODERN BRITISH HISTORY

SIGNIFICANCE OF EFFECTS

| | Category - Sub Category | Boards | | Types of History Br.Soc & Econ & Bri | Boards x Types of History |
|----------|--|--------|-----------|---|------------------------------|
| | | JMB | Cambridge | | |
| A | Political History | | NS | .001 | .01 |
| A1A1(s) | Foreign Politics | | NS | .001 | NS |
| A1 | Foreign Politics (Collective) | | NS | .001 | NS |
| A1(s) | Foreign Politics (Individual) | | NS | .01 | NS |
| A234 | Domestic Politics | | NS | .001 | NS |
| A34 | Domestic Politics (without structure of Government) | | NS | NS | NS |
| A2 | Structure of Government | | NS | .001 | NS |
| A3 | Domestic Politics (Individual) | | NS | .001 | NS |
| A4 | Domestic Politics (Collective) | | NS | .01 | NS |
| A1(s) A3 | Political History (Individual) | | NS | .001 | NS |
| A14 | Political History (Collective) | | NS | NS | NS |
| B | Economic History | | .05 | .001 | .001 |
| C | Social History (Social Custom) | | .05 | .05 | .05 |
| D | Social History (Social Structure) | | - | - | - |
| E | Political History (non Government) | | NS | NS | NS |
| G | Religious History | | NS | NS | NS |
| G(a) | Religious History (leadership) | | - | - | - |

The comparison between papers on British Economic and Social history and papers on British history throws up interesting results (see Table 8 above and Table 9 below). As might have been expected, category A plays a much greater part in British, as opposed to British Economic and Social history, though the mean difference between JMB papers on British Economic and Social history and British history is much greater than between the equivalent papers set by the Cambridge Board. This accounts for the interaction significant at the 1% level between boards and types of history observable for category A. With most of the remaining sub categories of category A trends are predictable. Thus, foreign and constitutional affairs play no part in papers on British Economic and Social history whereas their role in British history is important. The only results that cause surprise are for sub categories A34, A4 and A14, with the means for papers on British Economic and Social history coming close to, and surpassing, those for British history. This trend is entirely attributable to the high percentage reached in sub category A4 in papers on British Economic and Social history, a clear 7.05% greater than in papers on British history.⁽¹⁾

TABLE 9 /

(1) For further comments on this particular trend see below p.354

TABLE 9

| Category Sub Category | Mean for JMB & Camb.papers on Mod.Br.Soc.& Economic history | Mean for JMB & Camb.papers on Modern British history | Difference | Significance | Interaction between boards and types of history | Significance | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|---|------------|--------------|--|--------------|-----|------|---------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|
| A | 28.10 | 61.05 | -32.95 | .001 | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB</th> <th>CAMB</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Ec. & Soc.</td> <td>23.80</td> <td>32.40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Brit.</td> <td>67.90</td> <td>54.20</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB | CAMB | Ec. & Soc. | 23.80 | 32.40 | Brit. | 67.90 | 54.20 | .01 |
| | JMB | CAMB | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ec. & Soc. | 23.80 | 32.40 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Brit. | 67.90 | 54.20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A1, A1(s) | 0.70 | 15.85 | -15.15 | .001 | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB</th> <th>CAMB</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Ec. & Soc</td> <td>0.20</td> <td>1.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Brit.</td> <td>19.10</td> <td>12.60</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB | CAMB | Ec. & Soc | 0.20 | 1.20 | Brit. | 19.10 | 12.60 | NS |
| | JMB | CAMB | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ec. & Soc | 0.20 | 1.20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Brit. | 19.10 | 12.60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A1 | 0.60 | 9.70 | -9.10 | .001 | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB</th> <th>CAMB</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Ec & Soc.</td> <td>0.20</td> <td>1.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Brit.</td> <td>12.60</td> <td>6.80</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB | CAMB | Ec & Soc. | 0.20 | 1.00 | Brit. | 12.60 | 6.80 | NS |
| | JMB | CAMB | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ec & Soc. | 0.20 | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Brit. | 12.60 | 6.80 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

TABLE 9 (Continued)

| Category Sub Category | Mean for JMB & Camb. papers on Mod.Br.Soc.& Economic history | Mean for JMB & Camb.papers on Modern British history | Difference | Significance | Interaction between boards and types of history | Significance | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---|---|------------|--------------|--|--------------|-----|------|---------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----|
| A2 | 2.80 | 11.55 | -8.75 | .001 | <table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>JMB</td> <td>CAMB</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ec. & Soc.</td> <td>2.60</td> <td>3.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Brit.</td> <td>12.80</td> <td>10.30</td> </tr> </table> | | JMB | CAMB | Ec. & Soc. | 2.60 | 3.00 | Brit. | 12.80 | 10.30 | NS |
| | JMB | CAMB | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ec. & Soc. | 2.60 | 3.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Brit. | 12.80 | 10.30 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A3 | 4.10 | 16.75 | -12.65 | .001 | <table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>JMB</td> <td>CAMB</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ec. & Soc.</td> <td>2.20</td> <td>6.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Brit.</td> <td>17.90</td> <td>15.60</td> </tr> </table> | | JMB | CAMB | Ec. & Soc. | 2.20 | 6.00 | Brit. | 17.90 | 15.60 | NS |
| | JMB | CAMB | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ec. & Soc. | 2.20 | 6.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Brit. | 17.90 | 15.60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A4 | 19.10 | 12.05 | 7.05 | .01 | <table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>JMB</td> <td>CAMB</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ec. & Soc.</td> <td>16.60</td> <td>21.60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Brit.</td> <td>10.30</td> <td>13.80</td> </tr> </table> | | JMB | CAMB | Ec. & Soc. | 16.60 | 21.60 | Brit. | 10.30 | 13.80 | NS |
| | JMB | CAMB | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ec. & Soc. | 16.60 | 21.60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Brit. | 10.30 | 13.80 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

TABLE 9 (Continued)

| Category Sub Category | Mean for JMB & Camb. papers on Mod.Br.Soc. & Economic history | Mean for JMB & Camb. papers on Modern British history | Difference | Significance | Interaction between boards and types of history | Significance | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|------------|--------------|---|--------------|-----|------|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----|
| A1(s) A3 | 4.20 | 22.80 | -18.60 | .001 | <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB</th> <th>CAMB</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Ec. & Soc.</td> <td>2.20</td> <td>6.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Brit.</td> <td>24.10</td> <td>21.50</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB | CAMB | Ec. & Soc. | 2.20 | 6.20 | Brit. | 24.10 | 21.50 | NS |
| | JMB | CAMB | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ec. & Soc. | 2.20 | 6.20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Brit. | 24.10 | 21.50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A14 | 19.70 | 21.40 | -1.70 | NS | <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB</th> <th>CAMB</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Ec. & Soc.</td> <td>16.80</td> <td>22.60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Brit.</td> <td>22.80</td> <td>20.60</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB | CAMB | Ec. & Soc. | 16.80 | 22.60 | Brit. | 22.80 | 20.60 | NS |
| | JMB | CAMB | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ec. & Soc. | 16.80 | 22.60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Brit. | 22.80 | 20.60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

The results for category B (economic history) are also not entirely predictable (see below Table 10). Though it is hardly surprising that the scores for category B should be considerably higher in papers on British Economic and Social history, as opposed to British history, the contrast between the part played by category B in the papers set by the two boards is startling. Thus the mean difference between the average percentage for category B in JMB papers on British Economic and Social history and British history is 37.9% compared with a difference of only 15% between Cambridge papers on British Economic and Social history and British history, leading to an interaction effect, significant at the 0.1% level. From this result, it is clear that the JMB examiners place a lot of emphasis on category B when the paper is concerned with British Economic and Social history and virtually ignore it in papers on British history, whereas the Cambridge examiners pay considerable attention to category B in papers on British Economic and Social history, while allowing it to play a moderate role in British history.

TABLE 10

| Category Sub category | Mean for JMB & Camb.papers on mod.Br.Ec. & Soc.history | Mean for JMB & Camb papers on mod. Brit history | Diff. | Sig. | Interaction between boards and types of hist. | Sig. | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|---|-------|------|---|------|-----|------|--------|-------|-------|-----|------|-------|------|
| B | 36.30 | 9.40 | 26.90 | .001 | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>JMB</th> <th>CAMB</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Ec Soc</td> <td>40.80</td> <td>31.80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Br.</td> <td>2.90</td> <td>15.90</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | JMB | CAMB | Ec Soc | 40.80 | 31.80 | Br. | 2.90 | 15.90 | .001 |
| | JMB | CAMB | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ec Soc | 40.80 | 31.80 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Br. | 2.90 | 15.90 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

The results for category C (social history - social custom) and D (social history - social structure) are also intriguing - category D is effectively ignored/

ignored both in papers on British Economic and Social history and in papers on British history. Category C, on the other hand, plays a greater role in papers on British Economic and Social history, than in papers on British history, though this conclusion is complicated by the tendency for Cambridge papers on British and British Economic and Social history to include more material concerned with category C, than papers set by the JMB. In fact the mean for category C in JMB papers on British Economic and Social history was 4.6%, only 0.5% higher than the mean for category C in papers on British history set by the Cambridge board. This last result led to an interaction between boards and types of history, which reached the 5% level of significance. Finally, the combined average percentages of category C and D (which together cover social history) only reach 7.9% for papers on British Economic and Social history, a mere 5.4% higher than for papers on British history.

TABLE 11

| Category Sub category | Mean for JMB & Camb.papers on mod.Br.Ec. & Soc.history | Mean for JMB & Camb papers on mod.Brit. history | Diff. | Sig. | Interaction between bds. & types of history | Sig | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|---|-------|------|---|-----|-----|------|---------|------|------|-----|------|------|-----|
| C | 6.30 | 2.30 | 4.0 | .05 | <table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>JMB</td> <td>CAMB</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ec. Soc</td> <td>4.60</td> <td>8.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Br.</td> <td>0.50</td> <td>4.10</td> </tr> </table> | | JMB | CAMB | Ec. Soc | 4.60 | 8.00 | Br. | 0.50 | 4.10 | .05 |
| | JMB | CAMB | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ec. Soc | 4.60 | 8.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Br. | 0.50 | 4.10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| D | 1.60 | 0.20 | 1.40 | - | <table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>JMB</td> <td>CAMB</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ec. Soc</td> <td>2.20</td> <td>1.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Br.</td> <td>0.10</td> <td>0.30</td> </tr> </table> | | JMB | CAMB | Ec. Soc | 2.20 | 1.00 | Br. | 0.10 | 0.30 | - |
| | JMB | CAMB | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ec. Soc | 2.20 | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Br. | 0.10 | 0.30 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Two other categories receive different treatment in papers on British Economic and Social history as opposed to British history (see Table 12 below). Category H (cultural history) plays an important part in papers on British Economic and Social history, but receives very little attention in papers on British history. As has already been mentioned, this results from the concentration in '0' level Economic and Social history on scientific and technical development as related to industry. Category J (military and naval history), and, in particular, sub category J1, (Military and naval history - government) are favoured in papers on British history, being not surprisingly largely ignored in British Economic and Social history, the mean difference in both cases being over 10% and significant at the 0.1% level.

TABLE 12

| Category Sub Category | Mean for JMB & Camb.papers on mod.Brit. Econ.& Social history | Mean for JMB & Camb.papers on mod.Brit. history | Diff. | Sig. |
|--------------------------|---|--|--------|------|
| H | 16.90 | 1.85 | 15.05 | .001 |
| J | 0.70 | 12.45 | -11.75 | .001 |
| J1 | 0.70 | 11.25 | -10.55 | .001 |

There are, therefore, marked divergences between papers on British Economic and Social history and papers on British history in the emphasis placed on different categories and sub categories. In papers/

papers on British history particular importance is attached to category A (political history), sub categories A1, A1(s), (foreign politics) and J, J1 (military and naval history). The examiners who draw up the papers on British Economic and Social history, in contrast, pay marked attention to category B (economic history), H (cultural history) and take some notice of category C (social custom). But these trends should not be allowed to obscure the undoubted similarities between these two sets of papers. Thus, even some of the sub categories of category A, namely sub categories A34 and A4, received as much, if not more attention in papers on British Economic and Social history. In addition, there was no significant difference between the means for the following categories and sub categories in the two groups of papers, categories D,E,G (and its sub categories) L (and its sub categories), M, N and P, all of them being either largely or totally ignored. Thus, though the two groups of papers diverge markedly in the categories and sub categories which are given emphasis, they reach a striking measure of agreement on those categories and sub categories, which are virtually omitted.

The means for each category and sub category in JMB 'A' level papers on British Economic and Social history were then compared with the equivalent scores for the same period in JMB 'A' level papers concerned with British history (Comparison B). The two groups of papers were composed as follows.

Syllabus A Paper 11 L British
Economic History (1700-1914)
- 3 papers

Syllabus A Paper 11 H
British History (1714-1815)
1 3 papers

Syllabus B /

Syllabus B Paper 1 British Economic
& Social History (1700-1850)
- 3 papers

Syllabus A Paper 11 J British
History (1815-1914)
- 4 papers

Syllabus B Paper 2 British Economic
& Social History (1850-1939)
- 4 papers

Syllabus A Paper K British
History (1865-1939)
- 4 papers

- 10 scores

- 11 scores

Since the periods involved in the two groups of papers appeared to match tests of significance were carried out on the results (see Table 13 below).

TABLE 13 /

TABLE 13 COMPARISON OF JMB 'A' LEVEL PAPERS ON MODERN BRITISH ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL HISTORY AND MODERN BRITISH HISTORY

| Category Sub Category | Means for JMB 'A' Level papers on Mod. Brit.Econ. & Social history | Means for JMB 'A' level papers on Modern British history | Difference | Significance |
|--------------------------|---|---|------------|--------------|
| A | 19.60 | 67.10 | -47.50 | .001 |
| A1,A1(s) | 1.50 | 21.00 | -19.50 | .001 |
| A1 | 1.50 | 12.10 | -10.60 | .001 |
| A1(s) | 0.00 | 8.60 | -8.60 | .01 |
| A234 | 18.40 | 46.10 | -29.70 | .001 |
| A34 | 17.30 | 38.50 | -21.20 | .001 |
| A2 | 1.10 | 7.60 | -6.45 | .001 |
| A3 | 2.80 | 14.00 | -11.20 | .01 |
| A4 | 14.50 | 24.50 | -10.00 | .05 |
| A1(s)A3 | 2.80 | 22.60 | -19.80 | .001 |
| A1, A4 | 16.00 | 35.60 | 19.60 | .001 |
| B | 62.70 | 8.50 | 54.30 | .001 |
| C | 4.10 | 4.60 | -0.50 | NS |
| D | 2.60 | 1.90 | 0.70 | NS |
| E | 4.30 | 5.30 | -1.00 | NS |
| G | 0.60 | 3.30 | -2.70 | .05 |
| G(a) | 0.00 | 0.80 | -0.80 | - |

The comparison between the means for categories and sub categories in the JMB 'A' level papers on British Economic and Social history and British history establishes very clear trends. The examiners for JMB papers on British history place a much greater emphasis on category A (political history) and its sub categories than the examiners setting the papers on British Economic and Social history. This trend applies as much to foreign as to domestic politics. The examiners also give slightly more attention in papers on British history to categories G (religious history), and J (military and naval history) though the percentages reached are respectively only 3.3% and 4.0%. Not surprisingly, category B (economic history) predominates in the papers on British Economic and Social history and has a very small role in papers on British history. However, it is surprising, that the papers on British Economic and Social history do not place greater emphasis on categories related to social history than the papers on British history. But they clearly do not. There is no significant difference between the means in the two sets of papers for categories C (social history - social custom) and D, (social history - social structure). The remaining categories, which have not been discussed, category L (geographical history) and its sub categories, category M (human disease), category N (archaeology) and category P (the nature of history) are also ignored by both sets of examiners. As a result, it is clear that the divergence between the two groups of papers is only once again in the most obvious spheres, namely category A (political history) and category B (economic history), and that there is agreement on the marked tendency to ignore other types of history.

It remains to compare Section A of the Cambridge 'O' level papers on British Economic and Social history with an appropriately matched group of/

of papers on British history (Comparison C). The years covered by the papers on British Economic and Social history are from 1066 to 1760, which makes comparison with papers on British history difficult. The papers on British history approximating most clearly to this period are the three sets of papers covering the years 400 to 1485, 1485 to 1688 and 1688 to 1815 respectively leading to the two groups of papers below.

Cambridge 'O' level British
Economic and Social history

- 5 papers

Section A (1066-1760)

- 5 scores

Cambridge 'O' level papers
on British and European
history to 1688

- 5 papers

Section A1 British history
(400 - 1485)

Cambridge 'O' level papers
on British and European
History (1485-1815)

- 5 papers

Section B1 British history
(1485-1688)

Section C1 British history
(1688-1815)

- 15 scores

This was the closest matching of the papers that was possible without arbitrarily dividing papers into sections. The results of this comparison are laid out in Table 14 below.

TABLE 14 /

TABLE 14 COMPARISON OF CAMBRIDGE 'O' LEVEL PAPERS ON BRITISH SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC HISTORY (1066-1765)
AND ON BRITISH HISTORY (400-1815)

| Category Sub Category | Mean for Camb. 'O' level papers on Brit. Econ.& Soc.history(section A) (1066-1765) | Mean for Camb.'O' level papers on British history (400 - 1815) | Difference | Significance |
|--------------------------|--|---|------------|--------------|
| A | 27.00 | 53.26 | -26.26 | .001 |
| A1 A1(s) | 1.20 | 11.93 | -10.72 | .01 |
| A1 | 1.20 | 5.53 | -4.33 | NS |
| A1(s) | 0.00 | 6.53 | -6.53 | .05 |
| A234 | 25.00 | 37.13 | -12.13 | .01 |
| A34 | 18.80 | 29.46 | -10.66 | .01 |
| A2 | 6.20 | 7.53 | -1.33 | NS |
| A3 | 0.00 | 20.40 | -20.40 | .001 |
| A4 | 18.80 | 9.13 | 9.67 | .001 |
| A1(s) A3 | 0.60 | 26.93 | -26.13 | .001 |
| A14 | 20.20 | 14.60 | 5.60 | .001 |
| B | 48.40 | 9.73 | 38.67 | .001 |
| C | 3.60 | 1.93 | 1.67 | NS |
| D | 4.40 | 0.26 | 4.13 | .001 |
| E | 1.40 | 9.00 | -7.60 | .05 |
| G | 2.00 | 9.80 | -7.8 | NS |
| G(a) | 0.00 | 7.90 | -7.90 | .05 |

The differences between these two sets of papers on British Economic and Social history and British history follow trends already identified in Comparisons A and B. The papers on British history lay far more emphasis on category A (political history) sub category A1, A1(s) (foreign politics) and sub category A3, (domestic politics - individual). They also give more prominence to category J (military and naval history) and to sub category J1 (military and naval history - government), with mean differences of 12.70% and 12.46% respectively, and slightly more attention to sub category G(a) (religious history - leadership) and category E (political history - non government). In contrast the papers on British Economic and Social history concentrate on category B (economic history) and sub category A4 (domestic politics - collective). They do, in addition, give more consideration to category H (cultural history) and category D (social history - social structure) though the means reached in papers on British Economic and Social history for these two categories are only 8.20% and 4.40%. In the case of the remaining categories, including category C (social history - social custom) the difference between the means does not reach the 5% level of statistical significance. Thus, the results for comparison C are very similar to those for comparisons A and B.

Conclusion to Section(b)

Though the differences between the papers on British Economic and Social history and British history are very clear, perhaps the most striking aspect of the three comparisons is the limited extent of variation between the two groups of papers. The main differences are few. Thus category A (political history) and the sub categories dealing/

dealing with foreign politics and domestic politics individual are consistently favoured in papers on British history, while category B (economic history) and sub category A4 (domestic politics collective) are prominent in papers on British Economic and Social history. The only two other categories where the mean difference between the two sets of papers rise above 10% are categories H (cultural history) and J (military and naval history). Category H is given more attention in papers on British Economic and Social history and category J in papers on British history, but these two tendencies only apply to '0' level papers. Other differences between the two sets of papers are of minor importance, and do not apply to all the comparisons. The categories concerned with social history are given slightly more consideration in papers on British Economic and Social history while category G (religious history) and its sub categories and category E (political history - non government) have a greater role in papers on British history. However, none of these categories or sub categories plays a significant part in either group of papers. The differences between the two sets of papers are, therefore, largely confined to categories A and B.

CHAPTER 12

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS (1)

Three chapters will now be devoted to the discussion of different aspects of the results. In the first, the importance of the main variables and the content of the papers on British, European, imperial and social and economic history will be considered fully. In the second, the case for and against the dominance of political history in papers on British and European history will be discussed, and, in the third, an alternative syllabus for the papers will be presented and defended. Meanwhile, throughout all these chapters, where appropriate, the general influence of the content of the papers on the teaching of history, whether from the point of view of the teachers, or the pupils, will be indicated.

The first chapter will contain three sections. Section A will be devoted to a discussion of the impact of the main variables, Section B to an outline of the part played by each category and sub category in papers on British and European history, and Section C to a detailed consideration of the content of the papers on imperial and social and economic history.

Section A The Impact of the Main Variables

The influence of the following main variables will be considered in this section, the boards, the levels of examination, the types of history, the periods of history and the different approaches to examining.

(1) The Boards/

(1) The Boards

The detailed comparison of the papers set by the two boards, which was carried out in chapters 7, 10 and 11, revealed a marked similarity. In the papers on British and European history little significant variation could be identified which was attributable to the boards.⁽¹⁾ Differences certainly did exist, but they were rare, did not apply consistently across the two periods being considered and did not affect the main trends, such as the dominance of sub category A1, A1(s) (foreign politics) and A234 (domestic politics). The papers on social, economic and imperial history set by the two boards, were also broadly similar. In social and economic history only one category showed a variation that reached a level of statistical significance⁽²⁾ and in the papers on Imperial history the differences were small and did not obscure the close parallel between the two groups of papers.⁽³⁾

The similarity between the papers set by the two boards is surprising. In the case of papers on Imperial history and of papers on British and European history no necessary relationship exists with any type of history. The questions could emphasise any aspect of history from the cultural and social, to the economic, political and religious, yet, with all this potential freedom the papers set by the two boards are virtually identical. Even with the papers on social and economic history, which are more circumscribed in content, the extent of the agreement between the papers set by the two boards/

-
- (1) See above p. 185-187, 199-204 and 225
(2) See above p. 277
(3) See above p. 262

boards is remarkable. Thus an observer could not have anticipated that social history would be virtually ignored in the papers of both boards, and that government policy should play such an important part, being second only to economic history itself. This almost telepathic agreement between the boards indicates that they are drawing on common models of social, economic, imperial and British and European history - models, which are presumably shared with, and have a major influence over, the papers set by other boards in England and Wales.

The similarities between the papers set by the two boards and the probability that this tendency to agree on the content of the papers applies to other boards has important implications. First of all, it indicates that the results of this study have a much wider application than initially appeared to be the case. Secondly, the lack of choice available to pupils becomes an important issue. At 'O' level both boards offer four types of papers on British, European, imperial and social and economic history, while at 'A' level they concur in providing papers on British, European, social and economic and ancient history, together with a series of "Special Subject Papers" on British and European history. Appropriate material has not been available for analysing all the papers, but the similarity between those that have been studied shows that the two boards could be amalgamated without any serious loss of choice for the candidates. The two boards may, of course, not examine exactly the same periods of history, or have precisely the same marking procedures, but these are small differences where the major papers have content which is nearly identical. If these similarities extend to other boards, /

boards, as seems likely, the advantages of a decentralised system of examining are being sacrificed. Boards, which apparently cater for local needs, are in reality performing nearly identical functions, and creating the same uniformity as a centralised system. This state of affairs is regrettable, on the one hand work is being duplicated in the boards, and on the other hand, opportunities are being lost for providing candidates with a real choice. For instance, two boards could construct different papers on British history, one emphasising political history and the other, possibly, a balance of political, economic, social and religious history. If the boards co-ordinated their activities in this manner, a wide variety of syllabus could be provided for the schools without the autonomy of the individual boards being affected.

(2) Levels of Examination

As has already been demonstrated in chapter 7, papers on British and European history for the period from 1500 to 1939 differed little at 'A' and 'O' level.⁽¹⁾ In the case of social and economic history, however, a clear difference of emphasis was established in the papers with category B (economic history) reaching a mean of 62.7% at 'A' level, in contrast to 40.8% at 'O' level, with, as a result, cultural and geographical history playing a more important part at 'O' than 'A' level.⁽²⁾

The tendency for the 'O' and 'A' level papers on British and European history to be very similar is important. Of course, this similarity does not mean that the examinations are of the same

(1) See above p.187-190, 204-206 and 225

(2) See above p.273-274

same standard, the difficulty of a question being determined by its phrasing and the mental procedures demanded of the candidate. But it does demonstrate that pupils who study British and European history at 'A' and 'O' level, and who constitute a high percentage of the candidates, will face papers that are broadly similar in both examinations. As a consequence, teachers and their senior pupils will not be able to sample different types of history at the two levels. Ironically, any candidate who attempted papers on social and economic history at both levels will have a more varied syllabus than those studying for papers on British and European history for the period 1500 to 1939. This lack of variety, which affects the majority of the pupils, is a most important issue, which will be considered in detail below.

(3) British and European History

Two aspects of the content of the papers on British and European history will be considered in this section, namely, the extent to which the types of history emphasised in the two papers are similar and the impact, which this similarity has on pupils studying history at 'O' and 'A' level.

The only consistent difference that could be established between papers on British and European history across all the periods was for papers on British history to give greater prominence to domestic politics and for papers on European history to place more emphasis on foreign affairs.⁽¹⁾ However, within each period there were contrasts./

(1) See above p. 190-192, 206-208 and 215-225

contrasts. The only two, which applied to more than one period, were the tendencies for economic history to receive more attention in papers on modern and early modern British history ⁽¹⁾ and for religious history to be favoured in papers on early modern and mediaeval European history. ⁽²⁾

Though the difference between the papers on British and European history are clear, they are surprisingly limited. With some modifications the same type of paper is employed in both cases. Thus domestic politics are given less prominence in European history, presumably because of the large number of states involved, and foreign affairs are the main focus, because the papers deal with conflicts covering the whole continent. However, both types of politics remain important, and together, they comprise between 47.5% ⁽³⁾ and 77.0% ⁽⁴⁾ of the questions set in the papers. The other main trend, which was identified, that of the greater significance attached to religious history in papers on European early modern and mediaeval history, is also understandable in the light of the significance of the Papacy during the period.

This lack of difference between the two sets of papers is a serious omission by the examiners. Already the tendency for papers at 'A' and 'O' level to be virtually identical has been pointed out, and now, in addition to this, the papers on British and European history are found to be very similar. Thus, since most pupils attempt papers on British and European history at 'A' and 'O' level, the three G.C.E. papers, which they take while at school, (one at 'O' level on, either British or European history, and two at/

(1) See above p. 191 and 207

(2) See above p. 236-238

(3) Category A reaches its lowest mean in J.M.B. 'O' level papers on early modern British history (see above p. 195)

(4) Category A reaches its highest mean in J.M.B. 'O' level papers on mod. European history (see above p. 181)

at 'A' level, one being usually on British history and the other on European) will have very similar content. As a result, it is clear that the examiners are losing an opportunity to vary the types of history studied by the pupils and, therefore, to increase the pupils knowledge of different types of history and of the different methodologies adopted by historians. (1)

(4) Periods of History

The most important determinant of the content of the papers is the period of history, which they cover. As has already been pointed out, the categories concerned with political history, that is categories A and E, and the sub categories of category A concerned with domestic politics, in general, play a greater role in papers on modern history, as opposed to those dealing with the early modern and mediaeval periods. (2) This trend clearly applies to papers on British, European and Imperial history, (3) but not to papers on social and economic history. (4) As a result of this tendency, other categories fill the gap left by political history in papers on British and European early modern and mediaeval history & in papers on early modern Imperial history. In papers on British and especially in papers on European history, category G (religious history) and its two sub categories play an important role, while category H is given rather more attention in papers on early modern and mediaeval history than in papers on the modern period. (5) In papers on early modern Imperial history the categories, which benefit as a consequence of the relative neglect of category A, are categories B (economic history) /

-
- (1) See below p. 433-435
(2) See above p. 239-240
(3) See above p. 239-240 and 257
(4) See above p. 279
(5) See above p. 232- 236

history) and J (military and naval history).⁽¹⁾

These results indicate that there is a considerable variety in the papers set on the different periods of British, European and imperial history. At one extreme are groups of papers dominated by political history with category A attaining a mean of at least 70% and no other category reaching a mean of 10%. JMB 'A' level papers on modern British and European history and papers on modern imperial history set by the Cambridge board at 'O' level fit this model. At the other end of the continuum are papers where one category is important, but at least one other category plays a major role. Good examples are papers on mediaeval European history and early modern imperial history. Category A (political history) reaches a mean of 52.0% in papers on mediaeval European history⁽²⁾ and 44.3% in papers on early modern imperial history set by the Cambridge board⁽³⁾ and in each case another category or categories play an important part, category G (religious history) in the papers on mediaeval history with a mean of 24.30%⁽⁴⁾ and categories B (economic history) and J (military and naval history) with means of 19.4% and 16.2%⁽⁵⁾, respectively, in the papers on early modern imperial history. The remainder of the papers, which comprise the majority, lie somewhere between the two extremes - the papers on modern history tending to be dominated by one category, those on early modern and mediaeval periods to have at least one other category playing an important part.

The variations in the papers attributable to the different periods of/

-
- (1) See above p. 257 and 258
 - (2) See above p. 211
 - (3) See above p. 257
 - (4) See above p. 211
 - (5) See above p. 257 and 258

of history on which they are set though modest, is an important finding. First of all, the period of history with which a paper deals is seen to be more influential than whether it is at 'A' or 'O' level, on British or European history, or set by the JMB or Cambridge board. Secondly, it indicates that if teachers are determined to concentrate on papers dealing with British and European history at both 'O' and 'A' level, which the majority appear to be, they can still ensure that their pupils can experience some variety in the types of history they study by submitting them for different periods at the two levels. Thirdly, the variety in the content of the papers, arising as a result of the different periods, on which they are set, shows that papers and syllabi can be constructed, which draw, to a large measure, on two or three types of history with others playing very minor roles. Without this sort of evidence the dominance of one category in a paper could be defended on the grounds that pupils can only deal adequately with one type of history at a time, and that, as a consequence, change is not feasible. Such a view is difficult to maintain in the face of papers which have given prominence to two or more types of history for a number of decades. Further, as will be shown below,⁽¹⁾ the presence of such papers can be used as a powerful argument for syllabi to be drawn up catering for four or five types of history, so that papers of a more general nature can be included as alternatives to those at present offered.

(5) Traditional and Innovatory Techniques in Examining

In chapter 10 the comparison between papers of an 'innovatory' nature

(1) See below p. 412-413

nature set by the JMB at 'A' level and a matched group of 'traditional' papers revealed no significant difference of content.⁽¹⁾ This lack of variation is perhaps surprising, since the new approach to examining in the JMB papers might have been expected to lead to a change in the content of the papers. The use of original documents, for instance, might have made it possible for the boards to recommend more sources of a local nature, involving social, economic and religious history, as opposed to the official documents that provide the staple diet of political historians. Likewise, the reduction in the length of the period studied might have allowed other types of history to play a greater role in the papers, but this is not the case. The absence of concern with the content of the papers is characteristic of all the innovations in examining in history suggested, either by the examination boards, or by individual teachers and lecturers in recent years. A number of new techniques have been advocated, ranging from the use of sources to the employment of objective questions and the testing of skills, but no experiment has been attempted with the different types of history and their possible combination in papers at 'A' and 'O' level.

Section B The Role of Individual Categories and Sub Categories
in Papers on British and European History

Perhaps of even more importance than the impact of variables, like the boards and periods of history, is the part played by the categories and sub categories in the different papers. This section /

(1) See above p. 251-255

section will be devoted entirely to identifying the relative importance attached to these categories and sub categories in papers on British and European history and discussing aspects of the results which are specific to them. No attempt will be made to debate the extent to which the different types of history SHOULD be employed in the papers. Such a discussion can only take place in the context of arguments about the nature of history and of history teaching and will, therefore, be delayed until chapters 13 and 14.

(1) Political History (Category A and its Sub Categories, Category E)

As must already be clear from the discussions above, category A is of great importance in the papers on British and European history, though its role can vary markedly, depending principally on the period of history on which the papers are being set. From the pupils' point of view, however, this variation is more apparent than real. Most of the candidates taking 'A' and 'O' level history concentrate on the modern period of history, and, as a result, study for papers which are dominated by one type of history - only a very small percentage of the pupils attempt the papers on mediaeval history, where dependence on category A is much less than those on modern history. This dominance of political history in the syllabi studied by the majority of the pupils at 'A' and 'O' level, with its repercussions on the part played by other types of history, is such an important trend that further discussions will be delayed until chapters 13 and 14 when the case for and against political history in the schools will be considered.

Perhaps/

Perhaps more significant than the overall importance of category A is the evidence available about the roles of its different categories and sub categories. Certainly a study of the actual papers, without recourse to the marking guides, would indicate a bias towards political history, but not the relative weight attached to the different sub categories. Only by such an analysis can the nature of the approach to political history be satisfactorily gauged.

The sub categories of category A were designed to test a number of hypotheses. The only one affecting virtually every sub category is whether political history is seen in individual terms, that is being organised around the actions of particular leaders, as opposed to those of collectivities, for instance, governments or political parties. As was explained in chapter 3, an examination paper in which political history is viewed entirely or almost entirely as a series of individual actions would give a naive picture of politics - it being important that pupils, even at 'O' level, should be aware of the collective aspect of political activities. Unfortunately, when the means for different groups of papers are considered, it is difficult to determine what criteria are satisfactory for assessing the proportion of the marking guides devoted to the collectivity, as opposed to the individual in political history. Nevertheless, certain points are clear. First of all sub categories A1(s), A3 (politics at home and abroad - individual) and A14 (politics at home and abroad - collective) are a better guide to the importance attached to the individual and collectivities, like governments, than their component sub categories. The scores reached individually by sub categories/

sub categories A1, A1(s), A3 and A4 can be very erratic, especially in papers with a limited number of questions. For example, in papers on British history, with only nine questions, references to the foreign policies of individual leaders might be very limited. Secondly, while criteria for judging the appropriateness of the relative emphasis placed on the individual and the collectivity are difficult to establish, a comparison between them will reveal glaring anomalies, for instance, a tendency for the examiners of a particular set of papers to see virtually all politics in individual terms.

The emphasis placed on the collective aspect of political history in these papers on British and European is both consistent and considerable. In papers on modern and early modern history sub category A14 never drops below means of 20 and 14% respectively.⁽¹⁾ In other words, out of the sixteen questions which are customarily set in papers at 'O' and 'A' level, at least 2.2 will be devoted to the sort of political history that is concerned with the actions of governments or other groups. Only in papers on mediaeval history does sub category A14 drop below 15%, the relevant scores being 13.0% in papers on British mediaeval history set at 'A' level by the JMB, 11.8% in the equivalent papers set at 'O' level by the Cambridge board, and 9.8% in the Cambridge 'O' level papers on European mediaeval history.⁽²⁾ /

(1) See above p. 181 and 195

(2) See above p. 211

history. But even in this last case the proportions devoted to the collective aspect of political history are considerable when it is realised that political history plays a more restricted role in papers on mediaeval history, than in papers on modern and early modern history.

When the balance between the emphasis placed on the individual and collective aspect of political history is discussed only a limited number of papers need cause concern. In the papers on modern and early modern history the two approaches to political history appear to receive similar treatment. For example, in the papers on modern history the mean for sub category A1(s), A3 is 24.6% and for A14 29.9%,⁽¹⁾ while in papers on early modern history the means for the two sub categories are respectively 28.8% and 20.3%.⁽²⁾ In addition, in those papers where sub category A14 reaches a relatively low mean, the discrepancy between the two sub categories is not very marked. Only in the papers on mediaeval history do marked differences occur between the treatment of the individual and the collective elements in political history. The overall means for the two sub categories in all papers on mediaeval history does not betray this, but comparisons within certain groups of papers make it plain. Two very clear examples are the Cambridge '0' level papers on European mediaeval history and Cambridge '0' level papers on British mediaeval history where the means reached by sub category A14 are 9.8% and 11.8% respectively while the means attained by sub category A1(s) A3 in the same papers are 36.6% and 27.6%.⁽³⁾ The discrepancy in both these/

-
- (1) These figures are obtained by calculating the overall means for all the papers set on modern history (for the means of these sub categories in the different groups of papers on modern history see above p.181)
 - (2) These figures are obtained by calculating the overall means for all the papers set on modern history (for the means of these sub categories in the different groups of papers on modern history see above p.195)
 - (3) See above p.211.

these sets of papers is very marked and undoubtedly candidates for these papers are being asked to study political history largely in individual terms. This neglect of the collective facet of political history would be serious but for two points. First of all, very few candidates sit for papers on mediaeval history, and secondly, the notion of a 'government' is foreign to mediaeval politics and, as a consequence, more emphasis on the actions of individual rulers and political leaders is to be expected. Thus, with the exception of certain groups of papers on mediaeval history, for which a special case can be argued, no undue emphasis appears to be placed on the individual in political history.

Sub category A1,A1(s), which includes all the material on foreign policy, provides a clear picture. As has already been mentioned, the means reached by sub category A1 A1(s) are consistently higher in papers on European, as compared to British history, with none of the other variables having a significant impact.⁽¹⁾ The role of foreign policy in papers on European history is especially important, sub category A1 A1(s) reaching very high means in papers on modern and mediaeval European history. In one group of papers on modern European history set at '0' level by the Cambridge board sub category A1 A1(s) achieves a mean of 44.3%, that is close to half the content of the paper.⁽²⁾ Other groups of papers provide close competition. For example, sub category A1,A1(s) reaches means of 33.1% and 38.75% in Cambridge 'A' and JMB '0' level papers on modern European history⁽³⁾ and 33.2% and 37.4% in JMB 'A' and Cambridge '0' level papers on mediaeval history.⁽⁴⁾

Even /

(1) See above p.191-192, 207-208 and 216-217

(2) See above p.181

(3) See above p.181

(4) See above p.211

Even when the means attained by sub category A1, A1(s) are more modest, for example, in papers on early modern European history, they are still substantial, never dropping below 24.0%.⁽¹⁾

This emphasis on foreign affairs, especially in papers on modern and mediaeval European history has very important consequence for the pupils, since they will have to devote a high proportion of their time to what is only one aspect of one type of history and to neglect, as a consequence, many other types of history. With papers on British history the position is more confused. On the one hand, examiners on British mediaeval history only give limited attention to foreign politics, the means for sub category A1 A1(s) being respectively 8.8 and 11.4% in JMB 'A' level and Cambridge 'O' level papers on British mediaeval history,⁽²⁾ while on the other hand, the proportion of papers on early modern and modern British history devoted to foreign policy can reach as high as 24.75%⁽³⁾ with a number of groups of papers having means in the region of 20%.⁽⁴⁾ As a result, even in papers on modern and early modern British history pupils need to place considerable emphasis on foreign policy.

The variability of the means reached by sub category A1, A1(s) in papers on mediaeval British, as opposed to modern and early modern British history, is worthy of some comment. The assumption lying behind a variation of this type is presumably that foreign affairs are less important in British history before 1500 than in the centuries/

(1) See above p.181, 195 and 211

(2) See above p.211

(3) JMB 'O' level papers on early modern British history (see above p.195)

(4) For example JMB and Cambridge 'A' level papers on modern British history (see above p.181) and Cambridge 'A' and 'O' level papers on early modern British history (see above p.195).

centuries following that date. Such a view is difficult to sustain. In the middle ages British history was much affected by foreign affairs. In the period before 1066 there was the continual threat of foreign invasion, and, in the years after 1066, so many English kings had continental possessions that they were inevitably involved in European conflict - in particular the continental warfare in France. At home, the situation was similar, England and Scotland were separate kingdoms, with all the consequent diplomatic manoeuvres and conflict. An exact qualitative assessment of the importance of foreign affairs before and after 1500 is, of course, not possible, but there would not appear to be grounds for giving foreign affairs more than twice as much emphasis in papers on modern and early modern British history, compared with those on mediaeval history. Of course, the explanation may be that other categories are given more prominence in papers on mediaeval and early modern history on legitimate historical grounds and, as a consequence, the role of foreign affairs in the papers is reduced. This hypothesis will be considered later in this section when all the other apparently arbitrary variations among the categories and sub categories have been identified.

Sub categories A234 and A34 should be treated together, since their results show very similar tendencies. Sub category A234 covers the whole of domestic politics, while sub category A34 includes all domestic politics, except the structure of government. As a consequence, sub category A34 deals with the actions and policies of governments and political leaders on the domestic scene, /

scene, as opposed to the machinery of government. As has already been mentioned, both sub categories receive much more emphasis in British, as compared with European history. The importance of these two sub categories for papers on British history is very clear. In papers on modern, early modern and mediaeval British history, sub category A234 never drops below 33.75%⁽¹⁾ and rises as high as 45.5%,⁽²⁾ while the equivalent scores for sub category A34 ranges from 26.8%⁽³⁾ to 37.2%⁽⁴⁾. Domestic politics must, therefore bulk very large in the course planning of any teacher who is preparing pupils for papers on British history. The part played by these two sub categories in papers on European history is more complex. The more recent the period of history being examined the more emphasis is placed on sub categories A234 and A34.⁽⁵⁾ In papers on modern European history sub category A234 ranges from 32.3% to 28.30%⁽⁶⁾ in papers on early modern history from 18.5% to 26.3%⁽⁷⁾ and in mediaeval history from 13.0% to 17.40%⁽⁸⁾. A similar trend occurs with sub category A34 the relevant percentage being from 24.0% to 25.3% in modern history⁽⁹⁾ from 16.25% to 23.50%⁽¹⁰⁾ in early modern history and from 13.4% to 9.0% in mediaeval history.⁽¹¹⁾ This tendency for domestic politics to play a smaller role as the papers on /

-
- (1) JMB 'O' level papers on Early Modern British history. (see above p.195)
(2) JMB 'O' level papers on modern British history (see above p.181)
(3) JMB 'A' level papers on British mediaeval history (see above p.211)
(4) JMB 'A' level papers on modern British history (see above p.181)
(5) See above p.239-240
(6) See above p.181
(7) See above p.195
(8) See above p.211
(9) See above p.181
(10) See above p.195
(11) See above p.211

on European history become more remote from modern times is difficult to justify in historical terms. Domestic politics would appear to be as varied and as central to European affairs, in the mediaeval, as in the modern period. But however consistent the importance of domestic politics across different periods, it is possible that other categories show marked variations, which can be justified historically, and that a readjustment has to take place in the role of domestic politics. This possibility will be considered below, at the same time as the part played by foreign affairs in the papers dealing with the different periods of British history.

Sub category A2 performs a vital function, since it deals with the general nature of government and of political groups, as opposed to the year by year actions of governments and individual leaders. This is an important aspect of the politics of a period for pupils to understand and only an emphasis on this type of history in the papers will ensure that it is covered in the schools. It is, therefore, disappointing that sub category A2, in general, plays such a small part in these papers. This is particularly true in papers on European history the highest mean being 7.25% in JMB papers on modern European history at 'A' level,⁽¹⁾ dropping to the lowest mean of 2.25% in JMB 'O' level papers on early modern European history.⁽²⁾ In a paper of 16 questions, which is the norm, even 7.25% is only equivalent to 1.16 questions while 2.25% equals 0.36 of a question only. In papers on British history the position is rather different. In each period of history the overall /

(1) See above p.181

(2) See above p.195

overall mean reached by sub category A2 is significantly higher in papers on British compared with European history.⁽¹⁾ But this trend does not prevent the scores for sub category A2 in papers on British history overlapping with means for papers on European history, the range being from 16.4⁽²⁾ to 3.00%.⁽³⁾ In fact, of the ten groups of papers set on British history that are being considered here, sub category A2 only reaches 10% in six.⁽⁴⁾ Thus even in the papers on British history the attention paid to constitutional affairs and the machinery of government is small, except in a minority of papers.

These trends, which have been established for sub category A2, are both unexpected and important. With the papers giving such prominence to political history the general neglect of sub category A2 is surprising. Indeed commentators who have discussed the 'O' and 'A' level papers in the past have generally assumed that constitutional history would play a major part,⁽⁵⁾ but this is not the case. The results are also important on two counts. First of all, if teachers by continual perusal of the papers become aware of the tendency to give little attention to constitutional affairs and the structure of government, they can safely ignore a most important aspect of political history. Secondly, the tendency for types of history to receive variable treatment on doubtful historical grounds, which was noted in the discussions of domestic and foreign politics re-appear in the case of sub category A2. The greater emphasis placed on constitutional affairs and the structure of government in papers on British, as opposed /

(1) See above p.191, 207 and 223

(2) JMB 'A' level papers on mediaeval British history (see above p.211)

(3) JMB 'O' level papers on early modern British history (see above p.195)

(4) See above p.181, 195 and 211

(5) For example, Fines op.cit. p.v.

opposed to European history, is difficult to understand. European history, like British history, covers the domestic politics of individual countries and, as a consequence, this aspect of political history would appear to be equally important in both sets of papers. Of course, this trend may be related to the variations in the types of history which examiners consider appropriate in papers as different as those on European and British history, a possibility which will be discussed later in this chapter.

Category E (political history - non government) is largely ignored in these papers. In mediaeval history category E has virtually no role to play the highest mean reached being 1.6% in papers on British mediaeval history set at '0' level by the Cambridge board,⁽¹⁾ while in early modern history aside from two papers in which category E reaches means of 7.75 and 5.0%, the scores are all below 2.5%.⁽²⁾ Only in papers on modern British history can any reliance be placed on category E playing a part, the means in the four sets of papers ranging from 6.70 to 3.8%.⁽³⁾

The neglect of category E is revealing. The category was included to identify the amount of attention given to political activities that were not concentrated round the actions of the central government and its main opponents, whether at court or in a representative assembly. The point was made in chapter 3 that if political history were concentrated solely on the activities of the ruling groups in the state there was a danger that the pupils would receive/

-
- (1) See above p.211
(2) See above p.195
(3) See above p.181

receive a biased account of a period, studying only those issues and ideas which were of importance to the ruling class.⁽¹⁾ At the same time arguments were advanced in which the importance of considering the political activities of the whole community was discussed. Not only would such an approach to political history provide a picture of the ideologies, aspirations and degree of political organisation of different groups in the community, but it would also throw light on the reasons for the dominance of a particular ruling group.⁽²⁾ Given these objectives the small role of category E, as opposed to category A, in these papers is disturbing. Clearly little or no attempt is being made to ensure that pupils consider the political activities and views of the population at large, the focus being solely on the ruling elite in the state.

(2) Social and Economic History (categories B, C & D)

As will have been evident after reading chapters 7 and 8, the use made of category B, (economic history) in the papers is complex to describe. In the papers on modern history category B is favoured by the Cambridge board,⁽³⁾ is more prominent in papers on British history⁽⁴⁾ and is given great attention in 'A' level papers,⁽⁵⁾ while in the papers on early modern history the trends are the same,⁽⁶⁾ except that the papers set by the JMB reach higher means than/

-
- (1) See above p. 74-75
(2) See above p. 74-75
(3) See above p. 185
(4) See above p. 191
(5) See above p. 183
(6) For levels see above p. 206
For types see above p. 207

than those set by the Cambridge board.⁽¹⁾ At the same time, in both groups of papers interaction between the main variables occur, which accounts for these trends to a large extent. In papers on modern history particularly high means are attained by Cambridge papers on British history⁽²⁾ and in papers on early modern history by JMB papers on British history.⁽³⁾

But, when the impact of economic history on these sets of papers is considered the modesty of its role is striking. In only four groups of papers does category B reach a mean of 10% or 1.6 questions out of a total of 16⁽⁴⁾ with the highest mean being 15.9% or 2.5 questions.⁽⁵⁾ Among the remaining groups of papers category B receives very little attention, the range of the means being from 8.8 to 1.50%, six being below 5% or 0.8 questions from 16.⁽⁶⁾

While the full implications of the examiners treatment of economic history can only be discussed in the context of the consideration of the case for and against the dominance of political history in G.C.E. papers, and in the light of the possible introduction of a broader syllabus, the relative neglect of economic history has to be pointed out at this stage. Thus economic history, with a well established tradition of study, its own methodology, its own departments at universities and a content which ranges over/

(1) See above p. 200 and 202

(2) See above p. 186

(3) See above p. 202

(4) (Cambridge 'A' and 'O' level papers on Modern Brit.history (see above p.181)
(JMB " " " " Early " " " (see above p.195)

(5) Cambridge 'O' level papers on modern British history (see above p.181)

(6) See above p. 181 and 195

over agriculture, industry, trade, transport, technological change and finance is relegated to a minor role in these papers - to the extent that, in general, political history receives between five and ten times the attention given to economic history, while even aspects of political history, such as foreign and domestic politics, are between three and five times as prominent in these papers. As a result, pupils who take papers on British and European history presumably do not pay much attention to economic history, and, at the same time, neglect all the aspects of society on which it concentrates.

Category C (social history - social custom) and D (social history-social structure) which together represent social history, are given virtually no attention in these papers.

Category C was created to find out what part the descriptive aspect of social history played in these papers, with the assumption that it would be more prominent in 'O' than 'A' level history.⁽¹⁾

From the results, the only possible conclusion is that category C is generally neglected, and that no tendency exists to give it greater attention at 'O' level. Category C is ignored in early modern and mediaeval history, the highest mean reached in a group of papers being 2.2%⁽²⁾ in 'A' level papers, set by the JMB, on British mediaeval history. In modern history, the situation is little better, the highest means being respectively 4.3 and 4.1% in JMB 'A' and Cambridge 'O' level papers on British history, while the means for the remaining six groups of papers, involved in the comparison, do not rise above 1.5%⁽³⁾

(1) See above p. 95-96

(2) JMB 'A' level papers on British mediaeval history (see above p211)

(3) See above p.181

Category D (social history - social structure) has an even smaller role to play. Of the twenty groups of papers set on modern, early modern and mediaeval history category D has a mean of less than 1% in eight, of between 1 and 2% in nine,⁽¹⁾ of 2 to 3% in two sets of papers⁽²⁾ and a highest mean of 4.6% in JMB 'A' level papers on British mediaeval history.⁽³⁾ This neglect has to be viewed against the background of the broad range of topics, which Perkin incorporated in his definition of social history, and on which this category is based. Thus, in Perkin's view, social history should include a study of society's ecology, or of the relationship between the environment and society, of its anatomy, in particular, its social structure, of its physiology, that is an analysis of how all its different elements interrelate, of its pathology, dealing, in the main, with its social problems and the cures found for them, and, finally, of its self-awareness and social ideals. But, despite the comprehensive nature of this definition, and the light that such an approach could throw on the history of a period, the examiners virtually ignore social history. This issue is of such importance that a detailed discussion of the role of social history in present and future G.C.E. syllabi will be incorporated into chapters 13 and 14.⁽⁴⁾

(3) Religious History (categories G and sub categories G(a) & G(b))

As has already been indicated earlier in this chapter, category G (religious history) receives variable treatment in these papers. Category G is virtually ignored in papers on modern history, but plays/

(1) See above p.181, 195 and 211

(2) JMB 'A' level papers on mod.Eur.history (see above p181) and Cambridge 'A' level papers on early modern British history (see above p.195)

(3) See above p211

(4) See below p 396-397 and 415-417

plays an important part in papers on early modern and mediaeval history.⁽¹⁾ The highest mean reached by category G in any group of papers on modern history is 3.9% and it drops as low as 0.80%.⁽²⁾ In contrast, in papers on early modern history the means reached by category G range from 5.25 to 18.25%⁽³⁾ and reach as high as 24.00% and 24.6% in mediaeval history.⁽⁴⁾ This variation between the early modern and mediaeval periods results, in the main, from a tendency for category G to be markedly more important in papers on mediaeval European history, as opposed to those on early modern European history,⁽⁵⁾ while the means reached by category G in papers on early modern and mediaeval British history do not differ in such a consistent manner.⁽⁶⁾

The results for sub categories G(a) and G(b) follow similar lines. These two sub categories deal with different aspects of religious history, sub category G(a) is concerned with the actions of the leadership in churches and religious groups, whether by individuals or through institutions, and sub category G(b) deals with the activities of the membership of religious groups. Both sub categories play an insignificant part in papers on modern history, the highest mean attained by sub category G(a) in any one group of papers being 1.2% and by sub category G(b) 3.3%.⁽⁷⁾ The two sub categories are generally given much greater prominence in papers on early modern and mediaeval history, and of the two sub categories G(a) receives rather more attention.⁽⁸⁾ Thus, within category G/

-
- (1) See above p. 236-237
 - (2) See above p. 181
 - (3) See above p. 195
 - (4) See above p. 211
 - (5) See above p. 238
 - (6) See above p. 238
 - (7) See above p. 182
 - (8) See above p. 196 and 212

category G the questions focus more on the leadership of religious groups than the collective activities of the mass of the membership, though sub category G(b) is never completely ignored in papers on early modern and mediaeval history.

The results for category G and its two sub categories reveal interesting trends. First of all, the tendency to emphasise the activities of the ruling groups in religious organisations raises the whole issue of the percentage of the papers devoted to the actions of the leadership in church and state. If the scores for category A and sub category G(a) are combined for papers on mediaeval, early modern and modern history, the percentage of the marking guides devoted to the actions of the ruling groups in church and state ranges from 61% to 73%,⁽¹⁾ sub category G(a) making a major contribution in papers on mediaeval and early modern history, and virtually none in papers on modern history. Though the dominance of material dealing with the activities of the ruling groups in church and state will be considered in more detail in chapters 13 and 14,⁽²⁾ it is worth emphasising at this stage, that the majority of the marking guides are devoted to this aspect of history, while the political and religious activities of the population at large are neglected,⁽³⁾ and other types of history, for example, economic social and cultural history receive scant attention.

Secondly/

-
- (1) See Appendix D
 - (2) See below p386-400 and 436-437
 - (3) i.e. category E and sub category G(b)

Secondly, some of the variations in the roles of category G and its two sub categories in these papers are difficult to justify on historical grounds. The marked tendency to ignore religious affairs in papers on modern history and, in contrast, to give them considerable prominence in papers on early modern and mediaeval history may not be logical when examined closely. The explanation that immediately springs to mind is that religious history achieves a certain importance in the papers set on the years before 1700 because of its relationship to politics and, that with the connection between religion and politics being greatly reduced after 1700, papers on modern history can safely ignore religious affairs. This explanation cannot be sustained when the references to religious history in papers on early modern and mediaeval history are considered. A survey of the marking guides, dealing wholly or in part with religious history in the two sets of papers, shows that only 22% of the references to religious history can be clearly linked to political issues. With this possibility removed the only other explanation is that religious affairs are of considerable importance to the community in the period before 1700 and of little significance afterwards. Such a hypothesis is difficult to maintain. Religious worship continued in the 18th and 19th centuries to be important to a large section of the population and churches remain the chief source of social welfare and of education until the late 19th century. Only in the 20th century have religious groups been of less general importance to the community. Thus historical grounds for a marked contrast between the part played by /

by religious history on early modern, as opposed to modern history, would appear to be difficult to establish.

An additional anomaly is the variation in the treatment of religious history in the papers on early modern and mediaeval European history. As was mentioned above, category G achieves means of 24.0% and 24.6% in JMB 'A' and Cambridge 'O' level papers on mediaeval European history, in contrast to means ranging from 18.25% to 12.5% in papers on early modern European history set by both boards at 'A' and 'O' level.⁽¹⁾ This divergence is difficult to understand on the following grounds. First of all, it is not paralleled in papers on British history where the means achieved by category G do not differ markedly when they are compared for the two periods. Secondly, religious history appears to be of equal importance in the centuries before and after 1500. Religion interpenetrates almost all the aspects of both periods. In the middle ages the church played an important role in domestic and foreign politics and provided a general framework for the activities of the people living in the period. In the early modern period the changing nature of churches and religious groups was a major factor in the conflict that was endemic both within and between societies during these centuries, and religious concerns continued to play an important role in the daily lives of the general population. Of course, this variation may be brought about by the examiners' overall view of the importance of different types of history in each of the three periods. This possibility will be discussed later in this chapter and in chapters 13 and 14 where the general role of religious/

(1) See above p. 195

religious history in present and future 'O' and 'A' level syllabi will be considered.

(4) Cultural History (category H)

The overwhelming impression gained from studying the results for category H is that cultural history is largely neglected in these papers.⁽¹⁾ Though category H does play a greater part in 'A' than 'O' level papers, and though cultural history is given slightly more prominence in papers on mediaeval and early modern, as opposed to modern history,⁽²⁾ these trends pale beside the general tendency to ignore category H. The highest mean reached by category H in any single group of papers is 8.6%⁽³⁾ and the means attained by category H are, in general, below 5%.⁽⁴⁾ This result is surprising, since it indicates that the study of the arts and of the development of science and technology are generally neglected in these papers and, therefore, in the schools. While these topics may be too difficult for pupils at 'O' level, their virtual absence at 'A' level is difficult to understand.

The study of the arts and technical development are both within the compass of 'A' level pupils and would create considerable interest amongst at least a minority of them. The possibility of the introduction of such studies at 'A' level will, therefore, be considered when the reform of the G.C.E. syllabus is discussed in chapter 14.⁽⁵⁾

(5) Military and Naval History (category J and its sub categories)

Sub category

- (1) See above p. 181, 195 and 211
- (2) See above p. 188 and 211
- (3) JMB 'A' level papers on mediaeval European history (see above p. 211)
- (4) See above p. 181, 195 and 211
- (5) See below p. 425

(5) Military and Naval History (category J and its sub categories)

Sub category J2 (military and naval history - non government) will be considered first because its role in the papers is of considerable importance for category J and sub category J1.

Sub category J2

Sub category J2 is almost entirely ignored in these papers, only rising to a mean higher than 1% in one group of papers.⁽¹⁾ The neglect of sub category J2 is not very serious. When the category system was devised category J was split into two sub categories, one concerned with the military and naval strategy of governments and the campaigns of their generals and admirals, and the other with military and naval developments that were not inspired by governments. As military and naval affairs tend to be dominated by the conflicts between governments the results for sub category J2 are not surprising. In addition though sub category J1 is entitled military and naval history (government) it is far removed from the politics described in category A, most of the questions and fractions of questions coded J1, being concerned with the exploits of military and naval leaders.

Category J and sub category J1

The results for category J (military and naval history) and sub category J1 (military and naval history - government) only reveal two trends which are significant. In papers on modern history category J /

(1) JMB 'A' level papers on British mediaeval history (see above p211)

category J and sub category J1 play a greater part in 'O' than 'A' level papers, ⁽¹⁾ while in papers on early modern history the only group of 'O' level papers to reach a higher mean than the 'A' level papers are those set by the Cambridge board. ⁽²⁾ This tendency of the examiners to give military and naval history greater prominence in 'O' than 'A' level papers is not surprising given the popularity of these types of history with pupils in the middle years of the secondary school. ⁽³⁾ However, despite this trend, category J and sub category J1 do not receive consistent attention even at 'O' level. In 'O' level papers category J can reach as high as 14.2% ⁽⁴⁾ but can also drop as low as 3.25% ⁽⁵⁾ while with sub category J1 the range is from 12.2% ⁽⁶⁾ to 2.75% ⁽⁷⁾ Thus only in certain 'O' level papers can candidates expect military and naval history to play a significant role.

(6) Geographical Factors, Exploration and Human Disease
(Category L, L1 and L2, category M)

Since the content of categories L and M are so disparate, discussion will be limited to a consideration, in turn, of each of the sub categories of category L and of category M.

Sub category L1, geographical factors is virtually ignored in all these groups of papers except five ⁽⁸⁾ Even then the means reached by sub category/

(1) See above p. 188

(2) See above p. 200

(3) See below p. 432

(4) Cambridge 'O' level papers on mediaeval British history (see above p211)

(5) JMB 'O' level papers on early modern British history (see above p195)

(6) Cambridge 'O' level papers on mediaeval British history (see above p.211)

(7) JMB 'O' level papers on early modern British history (see above p. 196)

(8) See above p. 182, 196 and 212

sub category L1, are very low, the highest being 3.25% in papers on early modern European history⁽¹⁾ and the other four ranging from one to two per cent.⁽²⁾ This total absence of attention to geographical factors in most 'O' and 'A' level papers on British and European history is surprising. Consideration of geographical influences is an important aspect of historical explanation. Geographical factors, for example, can play an important part in accounting for the foundation and growth of towns and industries, for the type of agricultural community existing in a country, for the success or failure of military campaigns and for the emergence and development of colonies. At the same time, such factors can be incorporated in the marking guides by occasional references, which demand an awareness of geographical factors, without whole questions having to be devoted to their analysis. Thus, in the description of the growth of an industry geographical factors would be considered alongside such factors as capital, markets, labour supply and technological innovation. In the light, therefore, of the importance of geographical factors and the economical manner in which they could be included in the marking guides, their almost total absence from most of the papers is a cause for concern.

Sub category L2 (exploration) is in general ignored⁽³⁾ except in three groups of papers on early modern history at 'O' level, reaching means of 6.0% and 2.5% and 2.0% respectively in JMB British /

-
- (1) See above p.196
(2) See above p.182,196 and 212
(3) See above p.182, 196 and 212

British and European history and Cambridge British history.⁽¹⁾

The neglect of a topic like exploration need not cause great alarm. First exploration only has sporadic influence on British and European history, being of negligible importance, for example, between 1000 and 1400. Secondly the consequences of exploration not the description of particular journeys are of interest and, if mentioned in papers, such consequences will probably be coded in categories other than L2. For instance, the economic impact of the discovery of the New World would be coded B.

Category M (human disease) plays effectively no part in these papers, never rising above 0.60%⁽²⁾ in a single group of papers, but again the same arguments apply as with sub category L2.

Discussion of disease, for example, is likely to concentrate round its cure (category H or category A if involving government action) or its influence on other aspects of a period, for instance, the impact of the Black Death on the social and economic structure of Britain in the 14th and 15th centuries (categories B and D).

(7) Archaeology and the Nature of History (categories N and P)

Category N, archaeology was completely ignored in these papers on British and European history.⁽³⁾ This neglect is surprising, since some of the papers deal with periods of history⁽⁴⁾ where written sources are rare and archaeological evidence is of crucial importance. Further, the increasing interest in archaeology in recent years as an activity which arouses the interest and involvement/

(1) See above p.196
(2) See above p.182,196 and 212
(3) See above p.182,196 and 212
(4) the period 400-1000, for example

involvement of pupils is an added reason for its incorporation in G.C.E. papers.⁽¹⁾ Yet, despite its relevance to certain periods of history, and its importance for the teaching of the subject, no references to archaeology are made in these papers.

Category P, the nature of history, is completely ignored in these papers, none of the marking guides dealing with any aspect of the methodology of the historian, for example, their use of sources.⁽²⁾ In the light of the growing awareness among writers on the teaching of history of the advantages of giving pupils an insight into the methodology of the historian, this is a very surprising result.⁽³⁾

(8) General Conclusions on the Content of Papers on British and European History

Three main issues of general significance for the papers, which could not be discussed in the content of each individual category and sub category, remain to be considered. The first, and perhaps the most important, is the case for and against the sort of emphasis that is apparent in these papers, for instance, the tendency to give prominence to the domestic and foreign policies of governments and to ignore social and cultural history. This trend is so vital that it will be discussed in chapter 13. The second tendency that was noted in a number of categories and sub categories, was for particular types of history to receive more prominence in one period, than another, without apparent historical grounds for the variation. The third issue, which has not been central to this thesis, but is, nevertheless, of great significance, is the origin/

(1) For a full discussion of the importance of archaeology in school history (see below p.474)

(2) See above p.182,196 and 212

(3) For a full discussion of the relevance of the study of the historians methodology to history teaching (see below p.467-468)

(4) See below p.100-101

origin and development of the approach to history, which is portrayed in these papers.

The main tendencies for particular categories and sub categories to vary from one period to another were as follows. In papers on European history it was noted that religious history became markedly more important the more remote the period of history on which the paper was set⁽¹⁾ and that domestic politics played a greater role the more recent the period being examined.⁽²⁾ In papers on British history a similar variation was evident. Religious history achieved more prominence the earlier the period of history under consideration,⁽³⁾ while foreign politics received much less attention in papers on mediaeval, as opposed to early modern and modern, history.⁽⁴⁾

Each of these four variations have already been considered on historical grounds and doubts have been expressed about the inconsistency of their treatment.⁽⁵⁾ Inevitably such arguments are, to a certain extent, unsatisfactory, because of the lack of criteria for evaluating the role of a particular type of history in a period, but the differences were so pronounced from one period to another that a historical justification was difficult to find. These arguments are, however, made more compelling when the arbitrary relationship between these categories and sub categories is considered. Even if a case existed for treating religious /

-
- (1) See above p. 236-238
 - (2) See above p. 239
 - (3) See above p. 238
 - (4) See above p. 242
 - (5) See above p. 320-321, 322-323 and 332-333

religious history with greater emphasis in papers on early modern and mediaeval history, as opposed to modern history, a consequent reduction in domestic politics in papers on European history, and of foreign affairs in papers on British history could not have been reasonably predicted. Strangest of all is why one type of political history should suffer in British history and another type in European history. The only possible reason for this sort of trend must lie with the examiners themselves. The influence of the examiners is, of course, inevitable because somebody has to select the types of material that candidates will deal with in papers, but, in this case, the examiners appear to be particularly arbitrary in their selection of content. It is one thing for them to place a consistent emphasis on one type of history and vary this according to its importance to the period being examined - it is quite another thing when the variation has no historical foundation and could not be reasonably predicted given the known bias of the examiners. If the content of the papers is partly determined by arbitrary factors of this nature, there is cause for some concern. On the one hand, the historical basis of the paper is called in question, and on the other, success in the papers is determined, at least in part, by the capacity of pupils and teachers to establish a telepathic relationship with the examiners.

The extent, origin and development of the approach to history, which is encapsulated in these 'A' and 'O' level papers, are not issues which have been central to this thesis. An adequate exploration of these topics would involve a separate study. However, some examination/

examination of them should be attempted, if only to indicate possible lines of future investigation.

It is unlikely that the approach to history evident in these papers is confined to the examiners of the JMB and Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate. The blend of different types of history which has been indentified in this study, with political history playing a major, but variable role, and the other types of history, subsidiary, but necessary parts, is a familiar ingredient of British history at all levels. As has already been mentioned, it is likely that the papers on British and European history set by the other English examination boards have a similar content.⁽¹⁾ The model is also familiar even in university examination papers, especially in outline papers on British and European history.⁽²⁾ Even amongst academic historians the approach outlined in these papers is common. It can be identified particularly in histories of England, which purport to be of a general nature. The most outstanding example is the Oxford series on the History of England. In each volume political history is given the most important role, with economic, cultural and religious history being of less significance and social history being largely ignored.⁽³⁾

Indeed this approach to the study of history is so much part of our historical experience that there is a tendency to regard it as unproblematic or, at least, as an inevitable part of studying history in England. This observation is confirmed by the attitude to examination/

(1) See above p.307

(2) For example in the Honours School of Modern History at Oxford

(3) The same pattern is evident in other series, for instance, the Longmans, Methuen and Collins Histories of England.

examination papers prevailing amongst the writers on the teaching of history over the last fifty years. Criticisms of school examinations are frequently made, but the content of the papers is rarely mentioned. Instead reference is made to the pressure of the external examinations on the pupils, putting a premium on factual recall and encouraging teachers to cram pupils for the papers.⁽¹⁾ Comments upon the actual content of the papers are rare, being limited to the view, on the one hand, that papers are too broad, since they require the pupils to cover economic, social and cultural, as well as political history, and on the other hand, that they are too narrow, being concerned largely with 'politics and the nation state'.⁽²⁾ As a consequence, the schemes suggested for the reform of the examination papers over the last fifty years have not been directly concerned with content. Before the Second World War the chief advocate of change was Happold who argued that pupils should be assessed, at least in part, on their capacity to understand and make use of historical documents.⁽³⁾ In recent years suggestions for reform have concentrated on the testing of historical skills in the examination papers, rather than on the content of the papers⁽⁴⁾ and trials to facilitate this form of testing have been carried out in England⁽⁵⁾ and Scotland.⁽⁶⁾ In the light of the importance of the papers' content in determining the type of history taught in the senior years of the secondary school/

-
- (1) For example, Steel and Taylor op.cit. p.3 and Fines op.cit. p.v.
 - (2) See above p.4-5
 - (3) See Lamont's account of Happold's campaign in M.B. Ballard 'New Movements in the Study and Teaching of History (London 1970) p.192-195.
 - (4) Ben Jones, Practical Approaches to the New History (London 1973) p.109-128
 - (5) *ibid* p.121-128
 - (6) Trials of this nature were conducted by H.M.I.'s in Scotland in the early seventies but the results were not published.

school this absence of criticism is difficult to explain unless a deeply ingrained and longstanding acceptance of this approach to history is postulated.

To establish the origin of this blend of different types of history, which is so ubiquitous in Britain, is not an impossible task.

Almost undoubtedly the predominance of political history in papers on British and European history, which has been established in this study, goes back to the earliest papers set by the boards.

In their turn the boards probably acquired this approach to the study of history from the university courses prevalent at the time.

These university courses themselves probably originated from the syllabus drawn up by the Honours School of Modern History^{at Oxford} in 1860 which placed its main emphasis on political history.⁽¹⁾ If this

line of descent can be established it provides an interesting picture of the relationship between university and school courses in history. The Oxford School of Modern History was designed

for the preparation of politicians and civil servants for work at home and abroad.⁽²⁾ Then because of the prestige of Oxford it was

adopted by other universities, then by the examination boards who were founded by these universities. As a result, a syllabus,

which was designed as a vocational education for an imperial ruling class, may have become the main syllabus for secondary schools

in general, a development which has taken place despite the

tendency of historians themselves to adopt a broader approach to the study of history.⁽³⁾ At present, of course, this outline of the

origin/

(1) R.W. Southern: The Chichele Inaugural Lecture delivered to Oxford University 1961 (printed in full in Stern op.cit. p.418)

(2) *ibid* p.419

(3) See below p. 428-431

origin and development of the approach to history evident in the 'O' and 'A' level papers is only speculative, but the similarity between the approach and that of university syllabi in the late 19th and early 20th centuries indicates that an account of the emergence and generally uncritical acceptance of the 'O' and 'A' level syllabi could be profitable.

Section C (1) Papers on Imperial History

The content of the papers on imperial history which is so similar to that of papers on British history⁽¹⁾ reveals a biased interpretation of colonial history, which is difficult to justify.

The importance attached to category A and its sub categories on foreign and domestic policies⁽²⁾ in questions on modern imperial history indicates that the focus of the papers is on the acquisition and administration of the empire, as opposed to the attitudes and activities of the inhabitants of the colonies and imperial territories. The questions set on domestic politics are almost entirely concerned with the policies adopted by the imperial government and its representatives overseas,⁽³⁾ while the references to foreign affairs in the marking guides concentrate on the conflict between Britain and native rulers over the ownership and acquisition of particular territories.⁽⁴⁾

In contrast, the political, economic, social, religious and cultural activities/

(1) See above p.266-269

(2) See above p.257 and 260

(3) See, for example, in marking guides for 'O' level papers on the History of the British Empire and Commonwealth set by the Cambridge board for the years 1970-72.

(4) See, for example, in marking guides for 'O' level papers on the British Empire and Commonwealth set by the JMB for the years 1968-71

activities of the colonists or of the subject populations in the colonies receive scanty and unsystematic attention in these papers.

With the attention being focused on the policies of imperial governments and their representatives it might have been reasonably predicted that the examiners would also give some prominence to category E (political history - non government), in particular, in the case of imperial territories, with the reaction of the population to, and their attempts to resist, the imperial power. Such a prediction would be without foundation even for papers on modern imperial history. Indeed the emphasis placed on category E is even less in papers on imperial history than in papers on British history. Category E reaches means of 3.0 and 1.0% respectively in Cambridge and JMB papers on modern imperial history,⁽¹⁾ the equivalent means in papers on British history being 7.2% and 7.5%.⁽²⁾

Categories C (social history - social custom), D (social history - social structure), G (religious history) and H (cultural history), which together cover the social, religious and cultural history of the colonies are equally neglected. Indeed a mere 10% of the examiners marking guides on early modern imperial history is attributable to these four categories combined⁽³⁾ and only 2.2% and 1.4% in the papers, or sections of papers, set on modern imperial history by the two boards.⁽⁴⁾ Though these aspects are neglected in papers on British history it is interesting to note that the means for these categories, when combined, are slightly higher in/

(1) See above p.260

(2) See above p. Appendix G.

(3) See above p.257-258

(4) 2.2% in section B of Cambridge 'O' level papers (see above p.260) and 1.4% in JMB papers (see above p.260)

in papers on British history than in papers on imperial history.⁽¹⁾ This absence of any serious consideration of the social, religious and cultural development of the imperial territories is perhaps more serious than is the case with British history. A defender of the type of paper that is set on early modern and modern British history might argue that these aspects of British history are likely to have received some attention in the early years of the secondary school, but no such arguments can be advanced in favour of the present structure of the papers on imperial history. Further a great opportunity is being missed for the study of the social, religious and cultural development of communities which are entirely different from our own.

Only with categories B (economic history) and J (military and naval history) is an attempt made to give serious attention to topics which are not related to political history, but even in the case of these two categories their treatment is erratic and their presence does little to correct the bias of the papers towards the activities of the ruling powers. First of all though categories B and J play an important part in papers on early modern imperial history they are not as prominent in papers on modern imperial history. Category B reaches a mean of 19.4% in papers on early modern history set by the Cambridge board, but only /

(1) See above p. 266-267

only attains means of 9.6% and 13.0% in Cambridge and JMB papers on modern imperial history, while category J is as high as 16.2% in papers on early modern imperial history, but falls to 3.4% and 9.8% in Cambridge and JMB papers on modern imperial history.⁽¹⁾

Secondly, the attention paid to category J in papers on early modern imperial history simply reinforces the importance attached to government actions, since sub category J1 (military and naval history - government) reaches a mean of 15.0%.⁽²⁾ Thirdly, a survey of the references in the marking guides to economic history, both in the papers on early modern and modern history reveals that the examiners see the questions on economic affairs as dealing mainly with imperial trade and only with the economic activities of the colonial people in so far as they relate to British trade.⁽³⁾ Thus, emphasis placed on categories B and J reinforces the tendency of the examiners to concentrate on the politics and actions of the imperial power as opposed to the attitudes and activities of the subject population.

While papers on imperial history clearly should deal with the actions of the imperial power the neglect of any other facet of imperial history in particular of the reactions and concerns of the subject population betrays a surprising degree of bias. Such an approach might be understandable if the papers were set for Victorian children in the heyday of our Empire, but not in the last quarter of the 20th century, when our Empire has ceased to exist and a less one-sided picture would be more appropriate.

(11) Papers /

-
- (1) See above p.257-258 and 260-261
(2) See above p.258
(3) See, for example, in marking guides for 'O' level papers on the History of the British Empire and Commonwealth set by the Cambridge board for the years 1970-72.

(II) Papers on Economic and Social History

This review of the papers on economic and social history will concentrate on the manner in which economic and social history and the types of history closely related to them are dealt with in these papers, starting with a discussion of the roles of categories B,C and D.

(a) Category B (Economic History)

Two points only need to be made about the role of category B in papers on economic and social history. First of all, as can be seen from the results category B plays an important part in the papers, never dropping below a mean of 30%. Secondly, and perhaps unexpected, is the variation in the emphasis given to category B in these groups of papers. Category B is clearly the dominant ingredient in JMB 'A' level papers on economic and social history, reaching a mean of 62.7%.⁽¹⁾ In contrast, category B attains a mean of 40.8% in JMB 'O' level papers on economic and social history,⁽²⁾ and 48.4% and 31.8% in sections A and B of the papers set by the Cambridge board.⁽³⁾ This indicates a much greater degree of specialisation in 'A' than 'O' level papers and is a departure from the tendency noted among the papers so far analysed, for the content of 'O' and 'A' level papers to be very similar.⁽⁴⁾

(b) Categories C and D (Social History)

Though

-
- (1) See above p. 273
(2) See above p. 273
(3) See above p. 279
(4) See above p. 187-190 and 204-206

(b) Categories C and D (Social History)

Though ostensibly concerned, as much with social, as with economic history, a study of the results for categories C (social history - social custom) and D (social history - social structure) reveals that social history is given very little attention. The highest mean reached by category C is 8%⁽¹⁾ in section B of the Cambridge '0' level papers on social and economic history and the lowest is only 3.6%.⁽²⁾ Category D has even worse treatment, with means ranging from 4.4%⁽³⁾ to 1.0%.⁽⁴⁾ Even if a really generous view is taken of the results and categories C and D are combined the highest mean would be 9.0% and the lowest 6.7%. It is clear, therefore, that social history is largely ignored in these papers. Indeed the emphasis placed on social history in these papers, which are nominally on economic and social history, is only slightly more than in the papers on British history, which have already been discussed above. In the JMB 'A' level papers on economic and social history the mean for categories C and D combined is 6.7%, while that for 'A' level papers on British history is 6.5%.⁽⁵⁾ At '0' level the means for both categories combined in JMB papers and sections A and B of the Cambridge papers on social and economic history are 6.8%, 8.0% and 9.0% respectively, the equivalent percentages in '0' level papers on British history being 0.6%, 2.16% and 4.4%.⁽⁶⁾

This /

-
- (1) See above p.276
 - (2) In section A of Cambridge '0' level papers on English Social and Economic History (see above p.279)
 - (3) In section A of Cambridge '0' level papers on English Social and Economic History (see above p.279)
 - (4) In section B of Cambridge '0' level papers on English Social and Economic History (see above p.279)
 - (5) See above p.297
 - (6) See above p.293 and 301

This neglect of social history' in papers entitled economic and social history is difficult to credit. Despite the breadth of category D, which was based on Perkin's wide ranging definition of social history,⁽¹⁾ and the comprehensive nature of category C⁽²⁾ the two combined do not reach 10% in papers which are meant to be dealing with economic and social history. The possibility exists, of course, that the examiners have an even broader definition of social history than Perkin. Thus they may define social history like Trevelyan as "history with the politics left out."⁽³⁾ If this definition is being used, however, the examiners cannot legitimately incorporate economic history into their view of social history, since they have already identified it as a separate aspect of history in the titles of the papers. As a result, the most generous definition which they could adopt, is that social history deals with all aspects of the past, except politics and economics. But even when this broad definition of social history is employed, the proportion of the marking guide, which can be attributed to it, never rises above 29%⁽⁴⁾ and drops as low as 12%.⁽⁵⁾ Another possibility is that the examiners regard social policy as part of social history. This aspect of history cannot, of course, be added to Trevelyan's definition because of his view that social history is history with the politics left out. But it is plausible to argue that the material dealing with social policy should be incorporated in a definition of social history. Unfortunately, no final conclusion can be reached on the percentage of the marking guides attributable to a combination of categories C and D and social policy, because, as has already/

(1) See above p.91-92

(2) See above p.95

(3) Trevelyan op.cit. p.vii

(4) In JMB 'O' level papers on Brit.Economic & Social History (see above p. 273-4)

(5) In JMB 'A' level papers on Brit.Economic & Social History (see above p. 273-4)

already been explained, separate categories could not be established for social and economic policy.⁽¹⁾ However, despite this problem, the absence of social policy in categories C and D cannot be employed as an apology for the neglect of the two categories. First of all, care was taken, while coding the marking guides dealing with the papers, to ensure that the consequences of social policy were incorporated in categories C and D. Secondly, with the small percentage of the marking guides at present attributable to categories C and D the examiners would have to pay considerable attention to social policy if social history were to play an important part in these papers. But, if they adopted this strategy, they would be concentrating on one aspect of social history to the detriment of all its other ingredients. Though Perkin does incorporate social policy into social history, it is only one of a number of topics, which he considered, should be included in social history.⁽²⁾ Thus whatever definition of social history is adopted it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that social history is woefully neglected in these papers.

(c) Religious History (category G and sub categories G(a) & G(b))

The results for religious history should be considered next, because religious affairs are closely related to social issues. In past centuries churches and religious groups have provided much of the social organisation of the community. Thus, for example, the Church of England, in the period from 1600 to the mid nineteenth century/

(1) See above p. 112-113

(2) See above p. 92

century, was responsible for the administration of the Poor Laws, for much of the limited provision of education and for whatever rudimentary social services existed at the time. Despite this, very little attention is given to religious history in papers on economic and social history, the mean for category G and its sub categories never rising above 2%.⁽¹⁾ In contrast, the highest mean reached by category G and its sub categories in papers on British history, which are matched for period and board, are 3.3%⁽²⁾ on modern history and 9.8% for the questions covering the years 1066-1763.⁽³⁾ Thus, though religious history is neglected in papers on British history, the position is even worse in papers on economic and social history, despite the affinity between religious and social history.

(d) Political History (category A and its sub categories, category E)

Category A plays an important part in papers on economic and social history. The lowest mean reached by category A is 19.6. In JMB 'A' level papers,⁽⁴⁾ while the highest is 32.4% in section B of the Cambridge 'O' level papers,⁽⁵⁾ the latter score being so high that it equals the mean reached by category B (economic history) in the same section of the Cambridge papers.

The results for the sub categories of category A give a clear picture of the types of political history gaining prominence in these papers. Foreign affairs, not surprisingly, receive little attention/

-
- (1) See above p.279
 - (2) See Appendix G.
 - (3) See above p.301
 - (4) See above p.272
 - (5) See above p.279

attention, all the emphasis being placed on domestic policy.⁽¹⁾

But even within domestic affairs interest centres on sub category A4, government domestic policy (collective).⁽²⁾

Undoubtedly the examiners are aiming to ensure that candidates have a good coverage of government social and economic policy. Indeed the means reached by sub category A4 in papers on economic and social history tend to be significantly higher than in papers on British history.⁽³⁾ Though this concern with government social and economic policy is understandable, the emphasis it receives does smack of the approach that was so evident in the papers on British history, especially in the light of the neglect of categories C and D.

Category E (political history - non government) has a modest role in papers on economic and social history with means ranging from 1.4% in section A of the Cambridge '0' level⁽⁴⁾ papers to 6.0% in JMB '0' level papers.⁽⁵⁾ These results match closely the scores reached by category E in papers on British history⁽⁶⁾ - only one mean, that for section A of the Cambridge '0' level papers being significantly lower in papers on economic and social as opposed to British history.⁽⁷⁾ This conclusion need not cause either surprise or concern, since papers on economic and social history are unlikely to give much prominence to the material covered by category E.

(1) See above p.273,276 and 279

(2) See above p.273,276 and 279

(3) See above p.288 and 290

(4) See above p.279

(5) See above p.273

(6) See above p.286 and 297

(7) See above p.301

(e) Cultural History (category H)

As has already been noted in chapter 11, category H can be of considerable importance in 'O' level economic and social history with means of 15.6% and 18.2% in JMB papers and section B of the Cambridge papers respectively.⁽¹⁾ In contrast, category H only reaches a mean of 3.9% in JMB 'A' level⁽²⁾ papers on economic and social history and 8.2% in section A of the Cambridge 'O' level papers.⁽³⁾ All these scores are significantly higher than the means for category H in equivalent papers on British history,⁽⁴⁾ with the exception of the JMB 'A' level papers on economic and social history.⁽⁵⁾ But this emphasis on category H does not imply a general concern with cultural affairs. A perusal of the marking guides shows that the material coded category H in these papers is almost entirely concerned with scientific and technical developments in industry and agriculture.⁽⁶⁾ This explains the tendency for category H to achieve high means in modern 'O' level economic and social history.

(f) Military and Naval History, Geographical Factors, Exploration and Human Disease (categories J,L,M and their dependent sub Categories)

None of these categories or sub categories have an important role in papers on economic and social history. Not surprisingly, military and naval affairs play little part in the papers never attaining a mean greater than 1.4%.⁽⁷⁾ The sub categories of category L are almost/

-
- (1) See above p. 277
(2) See above p. 274
(3) See above p. 280
(4) See above p. 294 and 302-303
(5) See above p. 298
(6) See above p. 275
(7) See above p. 274,277 and 280

almost as neglected. The score for sub category L1, (geographical factors), only exceeds a mean of 1% in one group of papers⁽¹⁾ JMB '0' level papers, while sub category L2 never rises above 1%.⁽²⁾ Category M (human disease) is treated in a similar manner, its highest mean being 1.6%.⁽³⁾

Little objection can be raised to the neglect of topics like military and naval history, exploration and disease in papers on economic and social history. Military and naval history is concerned with the strategy and tactics of military commanders and their governments, not with economic and social history, and, though military and naval affairs do have an impact on the economy of a country, such references will be coded in category B, not category J. As was explained in section B of this chapter, topics like exploration and disease only have an intermittent effect on British and European history and much of the material dealing with them will be coded in other categories. Thus their role in papers on economic and social history is likely to be restricted.

The neglect of the geographical factors in the papers is more serious, however. Earlier in this chapter, the impact of geographical factors on historical explanation was emphasised with particular reference being made to the study of the creation and development of urban and agricultural communities and of industry and trade.⁽⁴⁾ As a consequence, references to geographical factors should be persistent in papers on economic and social/

-
- (1) In JMB '0' level papers on British Economic and Social History (see above p 274)
(2) See above p.274,277 and 280
(3) See above p.274,277
(4) See above p.337

social history. While the term 'persistence' cannot be readily quantified, it is certainly more than the 0.5% attributable to geographical factors in three out of four groups of papers on economic and social history.⁽¹⁾ Such a percentage indicates that a passing reference to geographical influence is made in one question in one paper every two or three years. As a result, teachers can safely ignore geographical factors in their analysis of economic and social history.

(g) Archaeology and the Nature of History(Categories N and P)

No reference is made to archaeology⁽²⁾ and only one to the nature of history in the twenty papers analysed on economic and social history.⁽³⁾ The total neglect of archaeology is difficult to comprehend. Archaeology is particularly important for the study of economic and social conditions in the earlier centuries covered by the papers, namely from 1000 to 1500. For this period, written evidence of industrial and agricultural processes, of the extent of particular types of industry and trade, and of the growth and decline of industrial and agricultural communities is often dependent, to a large degree, on archaeological evidence. Even for the modern period industrial archaeology can throw valuable light on industrial processes and provide realistic illustrations for the teacher to use.⁽⁴⁾ At the same time, the failure to include some consideration of the historian's methodology is surprising. The need for pupils studying British and European history to be aware of the problems faced by the historian has/

-
- (1) See above p. 274, 277 and 280
(2) See above p. 274, 277 and 280
(3) See above p. 274, 277 and 280
(4) See below p. 475

has already been pointed out,⁽¹⁾ and applies with equal force to those who are preparing for papers on economic and social history.

(h) Main Conclusions on Papers Concerned with British Social and Economic History

Papers on British economic and social history are dominated by a limited number of categories. JMB 'A' level papers concentrate on two types of history, economic affairs (category B) and government domestic policy (sub category A234). If the means for these two are combined the total percentage is 81.10%.⁽²⁾ At 'O' level the three important categories are, category B, category H and sub category A234. If their scores are added together the results are 78.0%, 81.6% & 81.8% in JMB 'O' level papers and sections A and B of Cambridge 'O' level papers respectively.⁽³⁾ The remaining categories, for instance, those concerned with social custom, social structure, religious and cultural affairs and geographical factors are largely neglected. In the light of the professed title of these papers the actual emphasis of the examiners seems an odd amalgam of different types of history.

General Conclusion

In this chapter a wide range of issues such as the impact of the boards, levels and periods of history, as well as the role of the individual categories in the papers, have been analysed. One major trend, however, that affects most of the papers, namely, the emphasis /

(1) See above p. 339

(2) See above p. 273

(3) See above p. 273-274, 276-277 and 280-281

emphasis placed on the actions of governments and political leaders, as opposed to other types of history, has not been discussed. This tendency is so important that the whole of the next chapter will be devoted to a consideration of the case for and against this approach to history in the schools.

CHAPTER 13

A CONSIDERATION OF THE DOMINANCE OF POLITICAL HISTORY IN G.C.E.

'A' AND 'O' LEVEL PAPERS

In this chapter the emphasis placed on different types of history in papers on British and European history will be discussed, and the arguments, which can be advanced in its defence, will be outlined and criticised. In particular, the prominence given to political history and the tendency for other categories to play minor roles will be considered.

The approach to the study of history, which is encapsulated in these papers, can be justified in two ways. General arguments can be put forward on historical or educational grounds to support the type of syllabus, which is necessitated by the papers and empirical evidence can be provided to show that this type of paper is favoured by the majority of teachers at 'A' level. Since the empirical evidence is of a limited nature the general arguments will be discussed first of all.

(a) A Description and Critique of the General Arguments which can be put forward in defence of the current Syllabus at 'A' and 'O' Level

The type of syllabus, in which political history is predominant, and other types of history play a limited part, has found few defenders in recent years. A number of academic historians have referred to the importance of various aspects of political history,⁽¹⁾ but only/

(1) For example, Renier op.cit. p.59

only Bindoff has constructed a general case for the dominance of political history.⁽¹⁾ The situation is not substantially different among the numerous writers who have discussed the nature of the history syllabus in the schools over the last three decades. One only, Burston, advances a detailed and coherent case for the predominance of political history in the school curriculum.⁽²⁾

With this dearth of general argument the most appropriate policy is to concentrate on the case presented by Burston. Not only does he incorporate most of the important points made by Bindoff⁽³⁾ and the other historians, who refer to the significance of political history, but he also favours a syllabus where all types of history play a part, with political history being by far the most prominent - exactly the particular blend of types of history evident in the examination papers being analysed in this study. As a result, the arguments employed by Burston will be used as a general framework in describing the case for the dominance of political history, with the points made by Bindoff and others, which are most relevant, being incorporated.

Since Burston's argument is complex, a brief outline will be presented before /

(1) Finberg op.cit. p.1-16

(2) Burston op.cit. p.152-172

(3) Bindoff's article on political history in Finberg's Approaches to History is of an uneven quality and not every argument, which he employs, is incorporated directly into this chapter. In particular, he devotes the first section of his chapter to pointing out the dominance of political history in school syllabi, university courses and in "Histories of England", and then states that the well trodden path makes for easier and swifter progress, than the half opened track (Finberg op.cit. p.1-5). Since Bindoff merely asserts this point of view, and since the arguments incorporated in this, and the concluding chapter, deal with the different aspects of the difficulty of studying political and other types of history, this section of Bindoff's argument is not incorporated in the precise form which he employs.

before its individual components are considered in detail. In the first section of his argument Burston questions the appropriateness of the concepts and methodology employed by social and economic historians for study in schools,⁽¹⁾ and contrasts social and economic history with a course of general (predominantly political)⁽²⁾ history.⁽³⁾ Secondly he asserts that the most appropriate unit of study for pupils is not the local, but the national unit,⁽⁴⁾ and that the adoption of a national unit presupposes the predominance of political history.⁽⁵⁾ Finally, he argues that political history should play an important role in general history, because it is of such significance for the community as a whole.⁽⁶⁾ Burston, therefore favours a course of general history with a large component of political history.

Each section of Burston's argument, together with additional points from other sources, will now be considered in detail. At the same time, contrary arguments will be put forward to demonstrate that the type of syllabus which he advocates, is by no means appropriate for schools. These arguments and counter arguments are so complex that to avoid confusion each will be dealt with in a separate section, the case advanced against the methodologies employed by social and economic historians being discussed first of all.

(i) The Case against Social and Economic History

At first sight arguments against the concepts and methodologies employed by social and economic historians may not appear to be particularly/

(1) Burston op.cit. p.152-158

(2) ibid p.152, 161, 160

(3) ibid p.161

(4) ibid p.160

(5) ibid p.160

(6) ibid p.170

particularly relevant to a discussion of the dominance of political, as opposed to other types of history, in the school syllabus. But a number of factors make the role of social and economic history of considerable importance in this context. As has already been noted, papers on social and economic history are the only alternative to the traditional papers on British and European history offered by the boards,⁽¹⁾ which are successful in attracting a sizeable number of candidates. Thus a writer, who is concerned to defend the traditional papers, is likely to develop a trenchant critique of social and economic history. In the case of Burston this attack is so severe that any but a very minor contribution from social and economic history in the school syllabus is ruled out, as is any proposal, such as will be made below, which would reduce the role of political history and increase that of social and economic history. As a result, the case against the concepts and methodologies employed by social and economic historians must receive very careful consideration.

A major obstacle to the introduction of a course on economic and social history to replace the traditional syllabus in schools is the type of concept employed by economic and social historians.⁽²⁾

Pupils studying economic history at 'O' level will need to be familiar with terms like profit, balance of trade, inflation, mercantilism and monopoly⁽³⁾ and at 'A' level with more fundamental notions, for example, with concepts like productivity, the multiplier, resource endowment and economic infra-structure.⁽⁴⁾ In social history 'O' level candidates will be expected to employ concepts such as social /

(1) See above p. 140-144

(2) Burston op.cit. p.163-4

(3) These are all terms which are used in JMB and Cambridge 'O' level marking guides. See for example, Cambridge 'O' level papers on English Social and Economic History (1969-71)

(4) These terms are used in JMB 'A' level marking guides. See for example Syllabus B, Papers 1 and 11 in the year 1971

social class, social status and social hierarchy,⁽¹⁾ while at 'A' level they will need to comprehend terms like urbanisation, and the main concepts relating to demographic trends.⁽²⁾ Concepts of this type are essential if social and economic history are to rise above a simple descriptive level, but their use creates difficulties for pupils. Not only are they abstract, each of them with a background of theoretical debate within economics and sociology, but they are drawn haphazardly from their associated discipline, as is appropriate for the analysis of the particular problem, which the economic or social historian is considering. Thus, at the same time as facing terms which are intrinsically difficult, there is no guarantee that pupils will encounter the concepts in a logical sequence moving from the easy to the difficult as would be the case if they were studying economics or sociology.

The narrow perspective of economic and social history, and the methodology used by its practitioners can also be employed as arguments against a course of economic and social history in schools.⁽³⁾ Economic and social history are only concerned with a limited aspect of the past.⁽⁴⁾ Thus, if their specialism is to have any real substance economic historians will confine themselves to the economic features of a particular event. They will not, like the general historian, consider all the aspects of an event, for example, the political, economic, social and cultural.⁽⁵⁾ The argument, which might be advanced in reply, namely that economic and social historians consider other aspects of history in their analysis /

-
- (1) These terms are used in JMB and Cambridge 'O' level marking guides - see for example Cambridge 'O' level papers on English Social & Econ.Hist.1970-72
 - (2) These terms are used in JMB 'A' level marking guides - see for example Syllabus B, Paper I and II in the year 1971.
 - (3) Burston op.cit. p.155
 - (4) Ibid p.156
 - (5) Ibid p.155-156

analysis is weak, since if this tendency is applied too thoroughly their work merges with that of general history.⁽¹⁾ Two consequences follow from the limited focus of the economic and social historian, first an incomplete picture of the past is presented and, second, the concentration on one facet of an event may encourage a tendency to generalise about the economic aspects of a number of similar events, rather than treating each incident as unique.⁽²⁾ Thus a historian who is concerned with the economic aspect of a war may start to generalise about the economic consequences of wars, as opposed to concentrating on the analysis of the war, which he is examining. In extreme cases the economic or social historian may use his data to test economic or social theory, becoming an applied social scientist, rather than a historian.

In contrast, Burston sees general history as a more beneficial form of study for pupils in schools.⁽³⁾ Though he later argues that political history should play a major part in general history.⁽⁴⁾ at this stage he views general history as a composite of the political, economic, social and religious aspects of a period, whose relative importance he does not determine. This permits him to argue that a course of general history, as compared with one concerned/

(1) Ibid p.156

(2) It is difficult to determine whether Burston regards economic historians as guilty of this approach. On page 156 in his "Principles of History Teaching" he appears to argue that this is the case when he asks the following question. "The question is whether he (the economic historian) can limit his field in this way and still claim to be an historian and concerned with the uniqueness of events. Does he not become a student of applied economics and does not his criterion of limitation - the study of one aspect only - force him to generalize and to be concerned other than with the uniqueness of events?" Yet in a subsequent paragraph he states "In practice the limitation of the field by studying certain aspects of it does not mean that no events can be unique".

(3) Ibid p.161-162

(4) Ibid p.169-70

concerned largely with social and economic history, is comprehensive in that it deals with many facets of the life of the community, and at the same time, permits the synthesis of different aspects of the past. (1) Certainly a realisation of the importance of the synthesis of different types of history is crucial for any school syllabus in history. If this awareness is not accepted explanation of historical events is, to a great extent, confined within the specialist type of history, which is being studied. It becomes difficult, for example, to relate the social, economic and political structure of the community, not to mention the type of synthesis postulated by historians like Tawney in Religion of the Rise of Capitalism and G.N Clark in Science and Social Welfare in the Age of Newton. (2)

Thus far Burston's arguments provide much to applaud. His support for a course of general history, as opposed to one drawing on one or two aspects of the past, and for an emphasis to be placed on the interrelationship between different types of history, is particularly apposite in the context of this study. Indeed Burston's recommendations have much in common with those which will be outlined early in the next chapter as a possible alternative to the present syllabus. However, even at this stage, and before Burston develops his arguments in favour of a dominant role for political affairs in a course of general history, there are a number of disquieting elements in his case that need to be considered.

In the first place, an apparent clash occurs between Burston's attack on social and economic history as a separate syllabus in schools and his/

(1) *ibid* p.161
(2) *ibid* p.162

his desire to include them in a course of general history. Burston's criticisms are so wide ranging that they would appear to apply to the inclusion of social and economic history in any course. Thus pupils who studied economic and social history as part of a general course, would still need to understand a number of theoretical concepts, even though the time available for their mastery would be more limited with the introduction of a broad syllabus covering a number of types of history. At the same time, Burston's criticism of the methodology employed by social and economic historians appears to be applicable, both to a full and partial course in social and economic history. A syllabus of general history would not be able to call upon a different type of economic and social history from the one currently in existence. Thus, for example, in courses on, either the general history of 18th century Britain, or the social and economic history of Britain in the 18th century, reference would be made to the work of the same social and economic historians, though in the latter case, the attention they received would be more detailed.

Secondly, by juxtaposing social and economic with general history Burston seizes an unfair advantage in the argument. Social and economic history are criticised on the grounds that they compare unfavourably with general history, which draws on four types of history, economic, social, religious and political. In particular, the possibility of synthesising these different types of history into a course of general history is put forward, with each aspect apparently contributing equally. As a consequence, social and economic history are rejected in favour of general history. Up to this point the argument is legitimate and few would disagree with/

with Burston's conclusions. But the comparison becomes misleading when Burston ultimately reveals that he views general history as dominated by political history.⁽¹⁾ Thus his initial comparison of social and economic with general history does not reflect his real view of general history, and social and economic history are, as a consequence, criticised unfairly, whatever the strengths or weaknesses of the later argument in favour of the role of political history in general history.

As a result of this shift in Burston's argument, it is essential to point out that a major criticism of social and economic history, which is possible because of the comparison with general history, is also true of other types of history. A particular weakness of social and economic history, in contrast to general history, is the tendency to consider only one specialised aspect, as opposed to every feature, of a historical event. This criticism of social and economic history applies equally to other types of history and, most important, in the context of this argument, to political history. As is the case with social and economic historians, political historians concentrate principally on one aspect of the events which they are considering. Thus a political historian, who is studying a period of modern British history, will focus his main attention on the actions of governments and political leaders, and only discuss the country's economy in relation to the policy of a government or political leader. He will be unlikely to give a detailed account of the changing fortunes of particular industries and of the different types of farming. On the other hand, an economic historian /

(1) *ibid* pp.152,160,161

historian will focus on the industry, agriculture, finance and trade of a period and only discuss the actions of governments in so far as they impinge on the economy. He will not, for example, discuss at length the foreign policies of governments or the careers of political leaders. The same tendency to focus on a particular aspect of events is also true of religious, military and cultural historians. Thus, it is not only social and economic history, which suffers in comparison with general history, but all specialist types of aspect history.

Thirdly though the difficulties faced by pupils as a result of the transfer of theoretical concepts by social and economic historians from their related disciplines is a cause for concern, this trend is to a certain extent inevitable, and the concepts have been so widely employed, and for so many years, that they have become an integral part of social and economic history. At the same time, other types of history are affected by a similar tendency to draw on concepts from other disciplines and make them an essential ingredient of the analysis of their data. The transfer of concepts from sociology and economics into social and economic history is inevitable. Without concepts such as investment, capital, inflation, supply and demand, social class, social mobility and status, social and economic history would be inconceivable. Indeed the terms and others like them are so much a part of social and economic history that to talk of their transfer from sociology and economics is misleading. The concepts are, in reality, held in common by social and economic history and their related theoretical disciplines. Other types of history betray similar trends, political history being a particularly /

particularly appropriate example in the context of this study.

Thus political history freely employs concepts drawn from political theory, politics and the study of law, terms which are as much a part of political history as of the parent discipline from which they originated. From political theory and politics, terms like

liberalism, socialism, Nihilism, Divine Right and Revolution are freely used in 'O' level marking guides,⁽¹⁾ while at 'A' level concepts such

as autocracy, absolutism, Communism, Anarchism and Fascism are employed.⁽²⁾ Concepts drawn from the study of law, which play a

part in the marking guides, even at 'O' level, are notions like, criminal and civil jurisdiction,⁽³⁾ prerogative⁽⁴⁾ and the independence

of the judiciary.⁽⁵⁾ As was the case with social and economic

history the study of political history without these concepts and an understanding of the theory lying behind them is impossible.

In reality Burston's criticism of the tendency for social and economic history to borrow concepts from disciplines external to history would be better directed at history in general, though if the criticism were taken seriously, the subject would be left without any structure and would effectively cease to exist.

Finally, the argument that social and economic historians are concerned more with general tendencies, than analysing the characteristics of particular events, and are, as a consequence, applied economists/

-
- (1) For example, in marking guides for the Cambridge 'O' level papers on British and European history 1688-1939 for the years 1970-1971
 - (2) For example, in marking guides for the Cambridge 'A' level papers on European history 1494-1939 for the year 1972
 - (3) For example, in marking guides for the Cambridge 'O' level papers on English Social and Economic history for the year 1968
 - (4) For example, in marking guides for the Cambridge 'O' level papers on British and European history 400-1485 for the year 1971
 - (5) For example, in marking guides for the Cambridge 'O' level papers on British and European history 1688-1939 for the year 1971

economists and sociologists, as opposed to being historians, is open to question. Certainly economists and sociologists do use historical data to test the validity of their theories, but this is not true of economic and social historians. They employ theory but only to assist in amassing the unique blend of factors which may explain a particular event or change.⁽¹⁾ This approach which is particularly evident in the writings of economic & social historians who are studied in schools can only be demonstrated by considering the work of two historians, one typifying the technique of the economic historian and the other of the social historian. A good example of the technique of the economic historian is provided by Ashton⁽²⁾ in the first chapter of his book on the Industrial Revolution.⁽³⁾ In this chapter he summarises the main causes of the industrial revolution from his point of view, discussing successively the influence of population growth and capital, the role of entrepreneurs and inventors and the impact of religious dissent. In each case theoretical concepts and historical evidence are interwoven to demonstrate the impact of the particular factor on the industrial revolution. Thus his discussion of the importance of capital includes an analysis of the governments policy towards the National Debt, the impact of settled political and social conditions, the widening market for capital with the advent of country banks and the influence of a declining interest rate /

-
- (1) Court puts this point of view in defence of economic historians in Finberg op.cit. p.18
 - (2) Ashton's work has been selected for two reasons, first, that it is widely used in schools, and, secondly, that his approach is the same as that of other economic historians who are also used extensively in schools, for example, Court, Clapham, Flinn, Checkland and Chambers
 - (3) T.S. Ashton: The Industrial Revolution (Oxford 1948) p.1-22

rate on investors' willingness to lock up financial resources for a length of time.⁽¹⁾ Throughout the chapter economic theory is employed in this manner, no attempt being made to establish a general theory of industrialisation, or to test economic theory. An interesting and recent example in the field of social history, which employs the techniques of demography is Bank's "Prosperity and Parenthood".⁽²⁾ Banks has two objectives in his book, to distinguish which groups in British society first adopted a policy of limiting their family size and then to examine in detail the reasons which prompted this decision. With the use of simple statistical procedures Banks establishes a drop in fertility in the period after 1870, which was especially noticeable among professional groups.⁽³⁾ His explanation of their behaviour rests on a broad range of social, economic and cultural trends that influenced professional people during this period.⁽⁴⁾ In particular, he isolates the following factors - the Bradlaugh-Besant trials and the resulting publicity for contraceptive techniques,⁽⁵⁾ the general economic uncertainty after 1870,⁽⁶⁾ the higher standard of life expected of professional people,⁽⁷⁾ the rising cost of domestic help,⁽⁸⁾ and most important the need for paper qualifications after 1870 and for children, as a consequence, to be educated expensively.⁽⁹⁾ Though Banks makes use of demographic techniques/

(1) *ibid* p.--10

(2) Since so little social history is studied in schools the selection of a work by a social historian proved difficult. J. Banks "Prosperity and Parenthood" (London 1954) was eventually chosen for the following reasons, first because his work is comprehensible to pupils in schools, secondly because he is dealing with demographic problems, an aspect of social history which is particularly applicable to schools (see below p.451) and thirdly because he does employ sociological concepts in his analysis.

(3) *ibid* p.5

(4) *ibid* chapters III, IV, V, VI, X, XI, and XII

(5) *ibid* p.154

(6) *ibid* p.129 et seq

(7) *ibid* ch.VI

(8) *ibid* ch.V

(9) *ibid* ch.XI

techniques in his study, his explanation is sparing in the use of technical terms and he attempts, like other historians, to account for the declining birthrate by the use of a set of factors, which are particular to the problem he is considering and he makes no attempt to establish general trends, which apply to a number of societies. The approach adopted by Ashton and Banks is typical of social and economic historians in that they employ theory to assist their explanation of the economic and social aspects of a period, but they do not use their conclusions to validate either economic or sociological theory.

But though his critique of social and economic history is important Burston's main case rests on the importance of national and political history and their interrelatedness,⁽¹⁾ which comprises the second section of the argument.

(II) The Importance of National and Political History

This second section of Burston's argument is made up of four stages. First of all, he argues that courses in schools are best organised round one unit of study, for example the locality, or the nation, to avoid confusion amongst the pupils.⁽²⁾ Secondly, he identifies national history as superior to local history as a unit of study.⁽³⁾ Thirdly he refers to the close relationship between political and national history.⁽⁴⁾ Finally, he argues that the other types of history, for example, economic, cultural and religious history, with their broader international context, can be incorporated into a course/

(1) Burston op.cit. p.167-170
(2) ibid p.160-161
(3) ibid p. 168-169
(4) ibid p. 169

course of national and political history by means of occasional excursions into European history as a whole, arriving as a consequence, at a justification for a course of general history in which political history plays a predominant part.⁽¹⁾ Each stage of this section of the argument will now be described before being criticised in detail.

The first strand in the case for national, and thus for political history, rests on the confusion that pupils will face in courses organised around different units of study.⁽²⁾ To justify this point of view Burston discusses the difficulties pupils will encounter in generalising about economic history. Not only will they face a bewildering range of data, including business histories, accounts of different industries and national trends, such as government policy, but the type of economic activity, and even its stage of development, may vary from locality to locality.⁽³⁾ It is extremely difficult, for example, to generalise about the degree of industrialisation in Britain in the 18th century, with the cotton industry being well advanced and other industries, for instance, leather and lace, still operating on the old household system. In contrast, political history does not, in Burston's view betray the same bewildering diversity, since the legislation passed by the central government, for example, taxation laws, acts of Parliamentary Reform or even Corn Laws, apply to the whole nation.⁽⁴⁾

The superiority of the nation, as opposed to the locality, as a unit of study, is the important second section of the argument.⁽⁵⁾ If historical/

-
- (1) *ibid* p.172
 - (2) *ibid* p.160-161
 - (3) *ibid* p.160
 - (4) *ibid* p.160
 - (5) *ibid* p.168-169

historical events are only considered within the context of a locality only a limited number can be explained satisfactorily.⁽¹⁾

As Burston asserts, it might be possible, with minimal reference to factors outside the locality, to create an adequate narrative of the development of an industry, but not events in other spheres of history.⁽²⁾ Thus, for example, the growth of the pottery industry during the 18th century in Stoke-on-Trent can be explained to a large extent in terms of such factors as the abundance of the right raw materials, the presence of a pool of skilled labour, the existence of a rudimentary factory organisation and the easing of the problem of transport with the creation of canals. But other types of activities, for instance, the political and religious history of a locality, cannot be explained within such a limited context. The mass of laws, which regulate the behaviour of individuals in any locality of a country, including the structure of local government itself, have over recent centuries been created at national level. Even local political leaders and the factions they represent can only be fully understood in a wider context than the locality. The same difficulties apply when the religious activities of an area are being described. Churches and religious sects in towns and villages are almost always component parts of national or international religious movements to which they owe their origin, organisation and doctrinal beliefs.

After establishing that the nation should be the unit of study round which courses in schools should be organised Burston asserts that a close relationship exists between national and political history.⁽³⁾

Unfortunately/

-
- (1) *ibid* p.168
 - (2) *ibid* p.168
 - (3) *ibid* p.169

Unfortunately, neither Burston nor Bindoff,⁽¹⁾ who are protagonists of this point of view, actually define 'nationality'. If, however, it is taken to refer to the nation states which emerged in Western Europe in the 16th century and which play such an important part in school history, then their close relationship to the political history of their countries is clear. Already the inadequacy of any explanation of local politics without reference to the national scene has been pointed out. Of equal significance is the role of the nation state in international affairs. During the last 500 years the diplomatic history of Europe has centred around 'nation-states' like Britain, France and Spain, and more recently, Germany, Italy, Russia and the United States, though whether the last two can be termed 'nation-states' is doubtful.

In the fourth section of the argument the problem of integrating movements 'like the Renaissance, the Reformation and the Counter Reformation' into a course of national history are discussed.⁽²⁾ Though admitting their importance, Burston does no more than state that 'such movements can be taught by means of occasional excursions into European history.'⁽³⁾ It is a pity that Burston does not take his argument any further, because he could have advanced a case for treating important aspects of the Reformation and Counter Reformation, and even some features of the Renaissance, as part of the history of 16th century states. In Northern Germany, Luther's cause was quickly championed by the princes, partly as a method of checking the power of the Emperor, and partly for the/

-
- (1) Finberg op.cit. p.8 & 14
(2) Burston op.cit. p.169-170
(3) " " p.170

the creation of state churches within some of their principalities. In England and, to a certain extent, in the United Provinces the new Protestant churches were also identified with the state, while Spain provided the main impetus for the Counter Reformation. At the same time, the religious divisions of the period were an important factor in the conflicts between and within states. In the latter portion of the 16th century the struggles between England and Spain, and between Spain and the United Provinces, and the internal tensions in France, England and Scotland had significant religious overtones. To a more limited degree, even aspects of the Renaissance prompted the wide use of the vernacular in literature and the consequent development of a national literary tradition in Britain, France and Spain, while in architecture, specific styles, for example, the English country house, or the French chateau, were the property of a particular nation.

A number of arguments advanced by Burston in his case for national, and thus for political history, are important. No other writer had identified the problems that pupils are likely to face when dealing with types of history, which draw their data from different units of study, and, in which generalisation is difficult because evidence may vary from one part of a community to another. But, in his enthusiasm for the nation state as a unit round which to organise school history, Burston ignores a number of important points each of which will be considered at length below. First of all, in his determination to link national and political history, and thus to put social and economic history in an unflattering light, he does not appear to realise the dangers of concentrating on the nation state/

state as the unit of study in political history. Not only does he make no mention of those areas of Europe, and periods of history, in which the role of the nation state was extremely limited, even in political history, but he also ignores the risks involved at 'O' and 'A' level of highlighting the part played by the nation state, and thus neglecting political trends that transcended national boundaries. Secondly, Burston is criticising economic historians unfairly when he emphasises the variety in economic conditions in a particular country, an equally viable approach to economic history is by means of international trends. Thirdly, he only gives cursory attention to the problems of dealing with cultural and religious history in the context of the nation state, and finally he appears to want pupils to study a dangerously simplified form of history, while they are capable of more complex analysis. Each of these four arguments will now be discussed in detail, dealing firstly with the problems associated with Burston's attempt to link national and political history.

The assumption that the nation state can be employed as a unit round which to organise a course of European political history is a misleading simplification, which enables Burston to portray economic and social history in an unfavourable light. In his criticism of economic and social history he argues that generalisation is difficult, because of conditions which vary from one locality to another, while in contrast political history, being centred round the nation state, facilitates generalisations covering large communities. The examples employed in support of the argument were drawn from the 18th and 19th centuries and clearly supported the case being put forward. However, had examples been chosen from other areas of Europe and from other/

other periods of European history, political history might have appeared less uniform. Thus, in Germany and Italy, national unification only took place in the second half of the 19th century, both countries being previously made up of a myriad of states differing in size and structure. As a consequence, the political history of Germany and Italy is very complex and generalisation at any one time is hazardous. For instance, the narrative of the 30 Years' War is hard for pupils to master, the large number of states involved, their intricate relations with powers outside Germany and their tendency to change sides making comprehension difficult. At the same time, the more remote the period of European history, which is under consideration, the more complex the political scene. In the Middle Ages even the British Isles, France and Spain were not ruled by single governments. In the British Isles, Scotland was divided between the kings of Scotland and Norway until 1263, Ireland was in part controlled by the English, and in part by Irish chiefs, and Wales enjoyed virtual independence until the reign of Edward I. France was habitually divided into those provinces ruled by the king of France and those ruled by the king of England, the situation being complicated by large territorial fluctuations from one period to another. Finally, Spain from 1270 until the late 15th century was divided into a number of kingdoms, including Castile, Aragon, Navarre and Moorish Granada. If to this complexity is added the variety of states in Italy and Germany in the Middle Ages the capacity of the mediaeval political historian to employ generalisations covering more than limited localities is open to serious doubt.

Equally/

Equally units of analysis which are larger than the nation state are essential for an effective course of political history in schools. If the political history of Europe is confined to that of nation states important general tendencies that apply to a large part of the continent are ignored. Three examples, in particular, drawn from centuries studied by a high percentage of 'O' and 'A' level candidates are especially appropriate in this context. In a country by country analysis of European political history in the seventeenth century it is easy to ignore the general tendency toward autocracy in all the states except the Netherlands, Switzerland and Britain, which provides a framework for national events.⁽¹⁾ Secondly, the consideration of the actions of individual rulers in the 18th century, which is so typical of 'A' level papers, conceals similarities, both in the policies they adopted and in the factors which limited their success. Thus Lindsay and Brock in the chapter on Monarchy and Administration in Volume VII of the New Cambridge Modern History demonstrate the marked tendency for virtually all European monarchies to increase the degree of specialisation in the administrative machinery of their central governments⁽²⁾ and to develop a professional and efficient civil service⁽³⁾ during the 18th century. At the same time they show how virtually all the European rulers, with the exception of the kings of Prussia, were unable to solve the financial chaos of their administrations⁽⁴⁾ and to balance their budgets consistently.⁽⁵⁾ The limitations on the policies pursued by 18th century monarchs have not been explored so thoroughly, but Lefebvre has indicated the extent to which the policies of the rulers were curtailed by the /

(1) Sir George Clark *The Seventeenth Century* (Oxford 1966), p.36-39.

(2) N.C.M.H. Vol.VII, op.cit. p. 144 et seq

(3) *ibid* p.153 et seq

(4) *ibid* p. 150-152

(5) *ibid* p. 152

the need to win the support of their aristocracies.⁽¹⁾ Third, and perhaps the most important, is the tendency in 'O' and 'A' level papers to ignore the international nature of Fascism in the twenties and thirties in Europe, little attempt being made to link the Spanish, Italian, German and Portuguese dictatorship with each other, or with similar movements in France and Britain, and to search for explanations applying to the continent in general.⁽²⁾

Secondly, as well as exaggerating the importance of the nation state as a unit of analysis Burston places economic history in an unnecessarily pessimistic light by concentrating on the variations in economic conditions from one area of a country to another and by choosing an example where the variation was so marked. An equally legitimate argument is that economic history reveals trends, which are best analysed in international terms, and which permit broad generalisation across national boundaries. Already the importance of the international framework has been emphasised for European political history, but its significance for European economic history is even more marked. Thus instead of organising their material exclusively around national economics, the authors of the Cambridge Economic History of Europe devote much of the space available in their books to general themes whose applicability to various areas and countries is then considered. For example, in Volume VI, while industrialisation in Russia and the U.S.A. is dealt with along national lines,⁽³⁾ world population,⁽⁴⁾ transport,⁽⁵⁾ technological change/

(1) G. Lefebvre "A Compromise with Aristocracy" (in *Wines "Enlightened Despotism"* (Boston 1967) p.70-72

(2) At 'A' and 'O' level only three questions were set by the JMB and Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate between 1967 and 1972, either asking the pupils to compare Fascist dictatorships or to discuss Fascism in general.

(3) Cambridge Economic History of Europe Vol.VI op.cit. p.673-870

(4) *ibid* p. 60-139

(5) *ibid* p.212-274

change and development in Western Europe⁽¹⁾ and European agriculture⁽²⁾ are discussed as general themes with extended illustrations from the economies of individual countries, a dual approach of a similar nature being adopted in the earlier volumes.

Two major aspects of the case for national and thus for political history remain to be considered - the assumption that religious and cultural history can be incorporated into a course of national history by means of occasional excursions into European history, and the simplification of history, which is implied if a course organised round the nation state is adopted in schools and which underestimates the potential of the pupils. Religious and cultural history will be discussed separately and then finally the problem of undue simplification.

Though, as has already been pointed out, certain aspects of religious history can be incorporated into national history the international context is essential for a full understanding of religious affairs. In the Middle Ages this was especially the case, the church was an international movement with its major characteristics being European, as opposed to merely local. Theology was extensively debated in the universities, but there was a fundamental consensus on essential doctrine, services were identical throughout Europe, even being spoken in one common international language, Latin. The monastic and mendicant orders spread to every country in Europe the former being heavily endowed by the laity, while despite constant interference by the state, the Papacy exercised a considerable influence over appointments and the general regulation of the Church.

At

(1) *ibid* p.274-604

(2) *ibid* p.604-673

At the time of the Reformation churches developed stronger local ties, but a full understanding of religious affairs still demands an international framework. Most important Catholicism remained an international movement, while Protestant churches owed their origin to important European leaders like Luther, Calvin and Zwingli, and their place within the Protestant movement can only be understood by studying Protestantism in general. Even in recent centuries to confine religious history to the nation state can impede the understanding of religious affairs. A study of Nonconformist sects, which is confined to Britain, can, for instance, give a misleading impression of the varied roles which they can play in society. The Methodists, for example, acted as a radical force in the West Indies in the first half of the 19th century with their determination to convert the slaves to Christianity and with their opposition to slavery,⁽¹⁾ while in England, in the early 19th century, they adopted primarily a conservative stance.⁽²⁾

An international framework is even more essential for the cultural history of Europe. Cultural affairs cannot be dealt with by occasional excursions into European history unless their role is limited to brief considerations at times of particular cultural importance, for example, the Renaissance. Since 1500 virtually every movement in art and architecture has spread over the whole of Europe. In art the classical style of the Renaissance had a general impact throughout Europe. In certain areas it was, of course, quickly supplemented by the Northern Renaissance, but even this more parochial movement dominated the art of three areas, North Germany, the Netherlands and Britain. During later centuries movements/

-
- (1) At least they were viewed as such by the planters, colonial governors and the Established Church (J.H.Parry and P.Sherlock: "A Short History of The West Indies"(London 1971) p.181-183
(2) Woodward E.L. The Age of Reform 1815-70 op.cit. p.524

movements like the Baroque, Impressionism and the different forms of Modern Art had a similar influence. The architecture of Europe has been dominated by similar general trends. After the Renaissance came the Baroque, Rococo, neo Gothic and finally modern phases all of them having an impact that extended far beyond Europe. Even in the world of literature, limited as its generality is by the use of the vernacular after 1500, general movements like Romanticism⁽¹⁾ and Realism⁽²⁾ had a broad impact throughout Europe.

Finally as a result of Burston's concentration on the nation state there is a danger that secondary school courses in history will be oversimplified and that they will not do justice to the pupils' capacities.

All the arguments so far put forward in this section of the discussion have pointed to the inadequacy of the nation state as the unit round which to organise school courses and, as a consequence, to the danger of oversimplification. Despite the close relationship between political and national history, the appropriateness of the nation state even for the study of politics has been questioned. At the same time, the close connection between international trends and economic, religious and cultural history has been indicated. As a result, a danger exists that the pupil, if confined to the study of history organised round the nation state will gain a distorted view of history. What is certain is that pupils will not develop an awareness of the variability of international/

(1) J.B. Holsted Romanticism (Boston 1965) p.vii-ix

(2) N.C.M.H. Vol X op.cit. p.159,165

international, national and local trends and their interrelationship, which is so important in the study of history.

In addition, Burston's argument that pupils find it easier to understand a course of history organised round one unit of analysis underestimates the pupils' capacity to study the subject. Firstly, while pupils may find it difficult because of varying local and national conditions to generalise about a topic like the Industrial Revolution in the 18th century they are unlikely to face insuperable problems with subjects of this nature. Already pupils have to answer questions of equal difficulty at 'A' and 'O' level, which require similar skills, and there are no indications from the boards of a general failure to deal with such topics satisfactorily. A common type of question at 'O' and 'A' level is to ask "how far" or "to what extent" a certain statement is true. A relatively simple version of this type of question is the following example, "How far was Napoleon responsible for his own downfall?" To answer a question of this type pupils may have to draw on evidence of a personal nature dealing, for example, with Napoleon's state of health, his capacity as a general and his ability as a politician. At the same time, they may have to discuss the morale and tactics of the French Army and compare it with those of other countries. In addition pupils will have to examine the policies of those European states which were opposed to Napoleon. If the pupils incorporated a discussion of the Continental system and its effects they would have to consider economic trends that applied to the whole of Europe. In a question of this nature pupils are dealing with material drawn from different units of analysis, from that of the personal and individual, to the national and international. This complexity is certainly/

certainly paralleled, but not exceeded, by the problem of synthesising evidence from different local and national trends in economic history. Thus, the difficulties foreseen by Burston in the study of economic history are already being encountered, and apparently overcome, by pupils who are dealing with topics in political history. Secondly, Burston's assertion that political history is superior to economic history for courses in school history, because it is limited to a larger unit of analysis has an important hidden assumption, namely that those types of history should be studied which employ the largest unit of analysis, since they permit generalisation over the widest area and thus create fewer difficulties for the pupils. If this assumption is correct it provides a powerful argument for giving prominence to cultural and religious history and to the international aspects of economic history as opposed to political history, a conclusion quite contrary to the one put forward by Burston.

Though Burston attaches most importance to the link between national and political history in his case for the dominance of political history, the next section of this argument, which is concerned with the impact of government actions on the community, and to which he only refers briefly⁽¹⁾ is possibly of equal significance.

(III) The Influence of Government Actions on the Community

This section of the argument will highlight the impact of government domestic and foreign policy on the community, as well as the power wielded/

(1) Burston op.cit. p.170-171

by political institutions. (1)

The power of governments can be judged by the range of the populations' activities, which they are capable of controlling, and by the impact of even those governments, which ostensibly pursue a policy of laissez-faire. A government can exercise almost complete control over the activities of a community. Thus governments like those of Prussia in the 18th century and Russia since 1917 have endeavoured with considerable success to regulate at least the economic, social and religious (ideological) activities of their subject populations. But perhaps more impressive than the regulatory capacity of governments, which are admittedly extreme examples, is the impact of governments, which apparently eschew more than a minimal control of the population, and yet contrive to have a considerable degree of influence. Perhaps British governments of the mid to late 19th century are the best examples of administrations whose policy was to allow the population to pursue their activities free of governmental control. Yet even these governments created a legislative framework, which was of considerable importance in guiding, if not controlling, the general activities of the population. Between the years of 1820 and 1900, for example, an overall policy was pieced together, which broadly favoured the interests of the industrial entrepreneur, its main features being free trade, low taxation, combined with virtually non-existent social services, a policy of limited liability for firms and laws making trade unions difficult to organise and strikes a hazardous procedure.

Governments/

(1) Bindoff op.cit. p.15

Governments are also responsible for the foreign policy of the state which, though of less day to day significance for the community than domestic politics, may still be of major importance for the life of the population. (1) A disastrous foreign policy can lead to the loss of territory and, even in extreme circumstances, of a state's independence. Such territorial changes can mean major alterations in the type of government, to which a community is subjected, with consequences for the population as a whole. In the 20th century the states of central Europe, for instance, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary have been particularly vulnerable to failure in diplomacy. These three states failed in the twenties and thirties to create a system of alliance with sufficient power to guarantee their independence against Germany and the U.S.S.R. This failure led first to rule by the Nazis, then to a brief period of independence, and ultimately to Russian domination with the establishment of Communism in each of the states. Though, perhaps less dramatic, the impact of diplomatic conflict on the communities of the states involved is of considerable importance in other centuries. For instance, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the success or failure of a state in the diplomatic struggles of the period could have dramatic consequences. As a result, of the Treaty of Westphalia and the stalemate in the Thirty Years' War the principle of *cuius regio, eius religio* was confirmed, (2) giving the ruler the right to determine what denomination should dominate in his principality. Similarly, in the early 19th century as a result of the Napoleonic wars, reforms such as the abolition of feudalism, the reduction of customs dues and the introduction of the Napoleonic/

(1) Renier History op.cit. p.59 Finberg op.cit. p.9-10

(2) The granting to rulers and princes "of territorial superiority in all matters ecclesiastical as well as political" originally occurred in the Peace of Augsburg

Napoleonic codes were widespread throughout Italy⁽¹⁾ and parts of Germany,⁽²⁾ some of which even survived the Congress of Vienna, and the restoration of the ancient regime.⁽³⁾

While most writers who advance a case for the dominance of political history content themselves with pointing out the widespread influence of governments Bindoff asserts, in addition, that

"with the possible exception, at some periods, of the church, no form of human association has wielded such power as the state, nor has any activity been of such consequence as the politics of the state." (4)

Unfortunately, Bindoff does not elaborate on these statements.

However, the claim that "no form of human association has wielded such power as the state" would appear to be well founded, at least as far as the last 900 years of British and European history are concerned. During this period, only the church has challenged the power of the state with any measure of success. In the early Middle Ages the church triumphed in turn over the Emperors Frederick Barbarossa and Henry IV and over Henry II of England, but could not maintain its predominance. Throughout the remainder of the Middle Ages the chief rulers of Western Europe gradually acquired more control over the church with legislation, such as the Act of Praemunire in England during the reign of Richard II. The decline in the church's power culminated in the Reformation with Protestant churches/

(1) N.C.M.H. Vol. IX op.cit. p.421-423

(2) Particularly in the southern states of Germany

(3) In Naples, and the German states on the left bank of the Rhine, the Code Napoleon survived - in the case of the German states until 1900

(4) Finberg op.cit. p.15

churches being set up in Britain, North Germany and the United Provinces, which were under the direct control of the state, while in the 16th and 17th centuries the Catholic countries established Concordats with the Pope, in which the Pontiff surrendered his control over the most important church appointments in France, Spain and Austria. Unfortunately, the second half of Bindoff's statement, "nor has any activity been of such consequence as the politics of the state" is obscure, since he does not explain what type of consequence he has in mind, or for whom. If, however, the statement indicates that political associations can have a greater impact on the community than other institutions then his statement is difficult to refute. Already the power of political, as opposed to other institutions, in recent European history, has been pointed out as has the determination of governments, like the Prussian in the 18th century and the Russian after 1917, to make full use of this pre-eminent power. But if Bindoff is arguing that throughout history politics has been the chief influence in people's lives then his point of view is difficult to sustain in the light of the varying degrees of control exercised by governments as will be demonstrated below.

The arguments, so far outlined in this section, which have dealt with the influence of governments domestic and foreign policies, and with the power of political institutions will now be criticised on a number of grounds, each of which will be developed at length. In the first place the influence of a government's domestic policy can be problematic, since there are periods when political leaders have either not had sufficient control over their subject populations for their policies to take effect, or have not desired to exercise a detailed regulation of the lives of the community. Secondly, though a mistaken/

mistaken foreign policy can be disastrous, there are periods in which diplomacy has had little effect on the countries involved in such interchanges. Thirdly, emphasis on the impact of domestic and foreign policy leads one to simplify historical analysis overlooking the point that the explanation of political events is normally dependant to a large degree on other types of history. Finally, while the superior power of political over other types of institutions will be accepted, the significance of this point in the context of this argument will be questioned. Each of these criticisms will now be considered in detail.

Those writers who assert that political history should be dominant in school syllabi because of the impact of a government's actions on the community ignore the frequent failure of governments to have sufficient control over their subject population to ensure the successful application of their policies. This failure may take three forms, the total collapse of authority occurring during a civil war, the inability of a government to enforce its authority in the remoter geographical regions nominally under its control and the periods of British and European history, in which the power struggle in a state, though falling short of civil war, is so intense that a government has very limited influence over the community. Examples of the virtual breakdown of governmental authority in civil wars can be quoted for every European country, but perhaps the most striking are the Frondes in France during the 17th century, the anarchy of Stephen's reign in England in the 12th century and the Wars of the Roses in the 15th century. The failure to control the remoter regions of a country is particularly evident during the Middle Ages/

Ages, but also occurs in modern times. For instance, in England the authority of the king over the Northern Counties was in doubt until the Tudor period and, in Scotland, control over the Highlands was not secured till after 1745, while on the Continent of Europe the French monarchs experienced difficulty in dominating areas like Navarre and Brittany until the late 15th century and in Eastern Europe even a powerful dynasty like the Romanovs had not acquired full authority over their territory until the late 17th century. Finally, an intense power struggle, which just fails to break into civil war, can debilitate a government's authority. Two examples illustrate this point particularly well. In England, Charles I's quarrel with Parliament, and consequent shortage of money, made it impossible for him to pursue an aggressive foreign policy in the years 1629-39 and even made his attempt to establish Episcopalianism in Scotland abortive, while on the Continent in more modern times both in Italy and Germany the struggle between Right and Left rendered the government virtually powerless, facilitating the success of Mussolini and Hitler. Thus circumstances exist, which occur frequently, in which the impact of a government's domestic policy is limited by its lack of power.

At the same time, not all governments try to exercise a comprehensive control over the community, a trend, which is especially evident among the governments which ruled Britain in the 18th and 19th centuries. Their attitudes to four different types of policy, religious, cultural, social and economic is worth careful consideration. The control over religious affairs attempted by governments between 1688 and 1900 was extremely limited. As a result of the Toleration Act of 1689, both the Roman Catholics and Nonconformists were permitted freedom of worship and could develop their own doctrine and/

and organisation without fear of interference by the state. Only political preferment and access to Oxford and Cambridge were denied to them, but these barriers were removed in 1829 and 1868. Even the Established Church experienced little political interference during the major part of this period, governmental interest, being largely confined to a number of modest reforms between 1834 and 1840, such as the abolition of pluralities and the commutation of tithes and, in the second half of the 19th century, support for Church of England schools. Thus churches of all types were left free to develop in their own way with little control being exercised by the politicians. Though the cultural history of the period between 1700 and 1900 is too vast to be considered in detail the absence of governmental influence over cultural affairs is clear. This assertion can be illustrated by examining the development of art and architecture in these two centuries. British politicians had virtually no impact on the art and architecture of the period. Unlike the governments of the 20th century they did not provide grants to the Arts Council or give a hidden subsidy to artistic interests through large building contracts. In the 18th and 19th centuries the most ambitious government project in the field of architecture was Blenheim Palace and at the local level the financing of buildings, like town halls and schools, while patronage of artists was limited to the occasional statue or portrait of a famous public figure. In contrast, government social and economic policy during this period was designed to have a significant impact, though its actual influence fell short of this aim. In the 17th and 18th centuries the detailed social and economic legislation, which was a legacy of the Elizabethan government, either fell into disuse, or, was /

was gradually repealed.⁽¹⁾ As a result, the series of laws, which favoured the industrial entrepreneur, came into existence.⁽²⁾

Though, as was pointed out above, these laws collectively created a framework for the economic and social activities of the population in 19th century Britain, the structure was extremely loose and was the only type of control, which was attempted. Thus, the governments of the 19th century did not try to influence industry and agriculture by a system of taxation and investment subsidies as it does in the 20th century. In addition, governments in the 19th century did not provide the wide range of social services, which have become available in recent decades - its chief area of expenditure being in education and this only after 1870.

The impact of diplomacy, which is the other aspect of a government's policy, is also questionable. Though the failure of a government to pursue a successful foreign policy can lead to disastrous consequences for the population of a state, the risks involved in diplomacy are not always of such a desperate nature. There have been periods in the history of European diplomacy, when the impact of the foreign policies of governments on the populations living under their control has been very limited. For example, the diplomatic history of the years from 1719 to 1763 involved intricate manoeuvring and two major and two minor wars, yet led to virtually no territorial alterations on the Continent of Europe. At the Treaty of Paris the only major areas to suffer a change of control, India and the province of Quebec, were both outside Europe. Yet this period of diplomatic history receives considerable attention in the

(1) Ashton : op. cit. p.132-141

(2) See above p.387

the school syllabus. Though concentration on only those diplomatic exchanges, which had important consequences, would involve the dangers of reading history backwards, there is little doubt that schools are spending valuable time analysing the foreign affairs of periods like the mid 18th century, which were of little long term significance. If this is the case the arguments for concentrating on diplomacy, because of its impact on the community, lose some of their force.

Thus far the critique of those writers who emphasise the predominant influence of government policy on the community has been restricted to pointing out that there are numerous circumstances, in which governments' domestic and foreign policy have a restricted influence on the community. At this stage, therefore, the discussion will be broadened to show how the study of political history is dependant on other types of history.

Arguments citing the importance of the actions of governments ignore the heavy involvement of other types of history in any analysis of political affairs. A consideration of the background to the Congress of Vienna and to the events in the early days of the French Revolution should illuminate this statement. At the Congress of Vienna the representatives of the states met to discuss the future settlement of Europe and, though some of the individuals, most notably Talleyrand, displayed personal skills, which influenced the course of events, the main decisions were reached because of the power of the individual countries that were involved. For instance/

instance, Russia the strongest power in Eastern Europe⁽¹⁾ played the major role in the settlement of the two major issues, which caused conflict in that area, namely the disposal of Poland and Saxony. The Czar got his way over Poland and played a crucial part in persuading Prussia to accept only half of her territorial demands in Saxony. If the reasons for Russian power, in contrast to the relative weakness of Prussia and Austria, are considered, the factors which explained Russian power, for example, the recent defeat of Napoleon in Russia become relevant. As a consequence a full explanation of Russian influence at the Congress of Vienna is dependant on factors which lie outside diplomatic history, drawing on aspects such as military history, and in this case even on geographical factors. Equally, major events in domestic politics can generally only be explained within a framework which relies on other types of history. For instance, a full knowledge of French society and the major social, intellectual and economic forces which were determining the actions of groups and individuals is necessary to comprehend the political history of France in the early stages of the French Revolution. The government of Louis XVI, for example, certainly created difficulties for themselves by their failure to achieve even partial solvency, but the unwillingness of any social group to give them effective help can only be explained by drawing on a wide range of factors. The nobility sapped by the persistent criticism of the Ancien Regime by the philosophes divided into two groups in 1789, a liberal wing who joined the Estates general⁽²⁾

-
- (1) Of the three Eastern powers Russia had the strongest land army and her troops actually occupied the disputed areas of Poland and Saxony
- (2) Approximately a quarter of the Nobles voted for conciliation with the Third Estate on May 6, 1789, and ultimately joined them after the unification of the Estates

General and the majority who retired to the provinces and only took action to defend their social and economic privileges when the position became irretrievable.⁽¹⁾ The middle class, particularly the lawyers and wealthy businessmen, were united in their determination to abolish feudal privileges and to reform the social and political system⁽²⁾ and for these purposes, the Estates General proved an ideal implement in 1789. The peasants were determined to be free of the economic burdens under which they laboured, particularly the tithes, feudal dues and the inequitable system of royal taxation, which fell heavily on them, but left other social groups largely unaffected. As a consequence, they actively supported the actions of the Constituent Assembly during the summer months of 1789, refusing to pay the tithe, the champart, royal taxes and, on occasion, destroying feudal records.⁽³⁾ In contrast, the urban proletariat who often provided the crucial mob support for political change in the year 1789⁽⁴⁾ were influenced more by the price and supply of bread, than by longstanding social and economic grievances.⁽⁵⁾ Other major political events at home and abroad rely in a similar manner on influences drawn from different types of history. Thus, even though foreign and domestic politics have an impact on the community they cannot be fully understood without a detailed study of other types of history.

The power/

- (1) For example, the nobles failed to control the Grande Peur or to defeat the municipal revolution of 1789
- (2) G.Lefebvre 'The Coming of the French Revolution'(Princeton 1967) p.46-50
- (3) G.Lefebvre 'The French Revolution from its Origins to 1793'(London 1965) p.127-128
- (4) For example, the capture of the Bastille, & the October 1789 march on Versailles
- (5) G.Rudé 'The Crowd in the French Revolution'(Oxford 1967) p.21

The power of political, as opposed to other institutions, was the final argument in the case which was put forward in favour of the predominant influence of governmental policy over the community. Unfortunately, this argument is based on a logical fallacy.

The assumption is made that since political history involves the study of the most powerful institutions that man has created it is the most important type of history. The weakness in this argument is that institutions are seen as the sole source of influence in a community, when, in reality, they are only one of a number of factors employed in the analysis of historical events.

The impact, for example, of the Black Death in England in the Middle Ages, or of the spread of technical innovation in the 17th or 18th century, are of considerable importance, but do not have any connection with institutions. The importance of the Black Death in a country like England in the period 1348-1450 is almost impossible to assess. In the years 1348-50 approximately one third of the total population died, and in the following 100 years periodic epidemics curtailed any rapid recovery in the size of the population. The principal social and economic consequences included the reduction of the labour available in the countryside and the consequent replacement of labour services by financial arrangements⁽¹⁾, the abandonment of numerous village sites⁽²⁾ and the relative prosperity of the rural economy, as compared with the period before 1348.⁽³⁾ The main political repercussion of the Black Death was related to the greater bargaining power of the village labourers with the government trying to restrict wages to pre 1348/

(1) M. McKisack The Fourteenth Century (Oxford 1959) p.333 et seq

(2) ibid p.347

(3) ibid p.329-331 and 347- 348

1348 levels and thus, in part, provoking the rebellion of 1381.⁽¹⁾ The technical innovations of the 17th and 18th centuries were a major factor in the emergence of the Industrial Revolution. Britain, through its willingness to accept immigration and exploit foreign inventions gathered the main industrial techniques of the continent in the 16th and 17th centuries.⁽²⁾ The combination of this pool of labour with native skills made it possible to solve every technical bottleneck that emerged in the 18th century in the period directly preceding the Industrial Revolution. Thus, as wood became scarce for iron smelting, coke was developed as a replacement,⁽³⁾ when deeper seams needed to be exploited in the coal industry, better drainage techniques emerged,⁽⁴⁾ while in the textile industry blockages in the smooth and speedy flow of production, such as the handloom weavers and household spinners, were removed by technical innovation.⁽⁵⁾ Other instances of the impact of the Black Death and technical innovation could be supplied, but enough have been provided to show that factors, which bear no relationship to institutions, can be of great importance. As a consequence, the argument that the sector of history which deals with the most powerful institutions should on that account receive primary consideration breaks down.

The fourth line of argument which can be adopted in defence of political history, namely that it provides a vantage point from which the whole of society can be surveyed will now be outlined and discussed./

-
- (1) R.Dobson "The Peasants' Revolt"(London 1970) p.69
 - (2) J.U.Nef "The Progress of Technology and the Growth of Large Scale Industry in Great Britain 1540-1640" Econ.Hist.Review 1934 p.3-24
 - (3) 1709 Darby's successful use of coke to make pig iron, and, 1783-4 Cort's invention of puddling and rolling
 - (4) Newcomen's atmospheric engine 1708
 - (5) Kay's spinning frame (1765) turned spinning into a factory process and Cartwright's power loom (1784) ultimately achieved the same for weaving

(IV) Political History as a Vantage Point for Surveying the Whole of Society

An argument which is totally neglected by Burston and other writers is the way in which the important aspects of the life of the community can be integrated into one theme around the study of political history. As has already been pointed out, governments develop a wide range of policies, covering the economic, social, religious, military, and even cultural aspects, of the life of the community. If these policies are to be fully understood and their effectiveness assessed adequately the activities in the community, to which they apply, need to be given careful consideration. Two examples, both drawn from the same period, should be sufficient to illustrate this near truism, the Dissolution of the Monasteries and the Acts against Enclosure passed during the Tudor period. An analysis of the Dissolution of the Monasteries immediately prompts certain questions - for instance, what were the aims of the monasteries, to what extent did they realise them in the 16th century, and what were the consequences of the Dissolution for the Catholic Church in England? Once these questions have been posed some review of the state of the monasteries is essential, if not of the religious condition of Tudor England. Equally, the Acts against enclosure, which were passed repeatedly during the Tudor period, cannot be comprehended without some knowledge of the increased demand for wool and the growth of the native cloth industry, and their lack of success, can only be explained by the unwillingness of the gentry, who controlled local government, to take action against the enclosing landlord. Virtually every major/

major action taken by a government, in the different spheres to which its policy applies, has to be explained in a similar manner. As a result, a general picture of the activities of a population can be gained by a fully developed assessment of the policies of its government.

Before the weaknesses of this argument are discussed it is worth pointing out that if political history were employed as a centre piece for the study of a period, with other types of history playing a supporting role, as has just been outlined, then these other types of history would receive consistent and systematic attention, which is more than they receive at present. Each aspect of a government's policy, economic, social, religious, cultural and military would be described and its context outlined. As a result, this approach to the study of a period cannot be used as a defence of the existing type of syllabus employed by the examination boards. However, even if current syllabi were reformulated along the lines of this new model they would have grave weaknesses.

The main difficulty in using political history as the vantage point from which to review the activities of a society is that the syllabus will, to a large extent, be organised around the actions of governments and their opponents. An element of distortion will, therefore, creep into the course. In the first place, as has already been pointed out above, there are aspects of the life of the community which politicians ignore or virtually ignore, and, therefore, will be in danger of neglect. Secondly, the objectives pursued by politicians in different areas of /

of policy often do not provide even an approximate guide to the actual development taking place in particular sectors of society. For example, Walpole's economic policy with its reduction of the National Debt and of the rate of interest and concern to preserve the traditional mercantilist policy with regard to the colonies, would not act as a framework within which the agrarian and industrial developments of the period could be considered. Similarly, the preoccupation of rulers like Henry II of England with church state relations would not facilitate a general analysis of the state of the church and the most important developments to affect it during his reign. Finally, even if these difficulties are overlooked the argument itself is distorted. If, for example, topics such as the economy or the state of the church are to be studied, they should be considered in their own right, the most important developments in each section being analysed, not mediated through another type of history.

The fifth and last line of argument, namely that politics is the highest form of human activity, will now be considered.

(V) Politics as the Highest Form of Human Activity

This final section of the argument, in which politics is seen as the highest form of human activity, is difficult to describe, because it is not elaborated by its main protagonist. Towards the end of his discussion of political history in Finberg's *Approaches to History* Bindoff makes a number of explicit statements, which/

which he regards as self evident truths. Thus, he asserts that politics deals with man's highest activity as a social being, that man is "by nature a political animal"⁽¹⁾ and, therefore, "by the same token man's history is in the last analysis political."⁽²⁾ Clearly in these statements Bindoff is advancing an argument, which rests almost entirely on ideological grounds. Like Aristotle, he sees man's capacity only being fully developed in the state and that, as a consequence, political history should be given more prominence than other types of history.⁽³⁾

The view that politics deals with man's highest activity as a social being is difficult to interpret and, therefore, to criticise. The statement "as a social being" implies that there are some activities in which man engages where he is not acting "as a social being". The only two types of activity which might be in this category are activities, which a man carries out, in complete isolation from society, or which are aimed at damaging society. That Bindoff does not intend his use of the term "social being" to imply the latter interpretation is clear from the way in which he defines politics as

"the wielding of, or aspiration to, power
in the state for certain ends : and
whether those ends be good or bad their
pursuit is the raison d'etre of government..."

Thus, when Bindoff states that politics are man's highest activity as a social being he presumably means all politics, whether it benefits or damages society. If then the term "as a social being" refers/

-
- (1) Finberg op.cit. p.15
(2) ibid p.15
(3) ibid p.15

refers to actions within society virtually all activities are included. If this is the case Bindoff is asserting a fundamental belief, which he holds. Equally, another writer might assert that religious worship, or artistic creation, or scientific and technical development, are man's highest activity as a social being. No argument, however complex and thorough, can establish satisfactorily which of these activities is the most important, since each of them spring from a basic premise, which an individual either accepts or rejects, for example, whether to believe in God or not. Bindoff's statement cannot, therefore, be evaluated.

(b) Evidence in Favour of the Dominance of Political History in the 'O' and 'A' Level Syllabus

Thus far only general arguments in favour of the dominance of political history in the school syllabus have been presented and discussed. None of the empirical evidence relating to the attitudes of pupils or teachers to the present courses has been considered.

Unfortunately this empirical evidence is of a very limited nature. Only four studies have been completed, three of pupil attitudes to different types of history and one of teacher attitudes to 'A' level history. The three surveys of pupil attitudes are all favourable to courses drawing on a number of types of history and will, as a result, be discussed in the next chapter, ⁽¹⁾ in which an alternative syllabus to the one at present employed at 'O' and 'A' level will be put forward. The survey on/

(1) See below p. 431-433

on teacher attitudes conducted by Holley, on the other hand, appears to support the current syllabus and will, therefore, be described at this stage and its implications considered.

Holley asked 56 teachers of varied experience how much time they devoted to different aspects of history in preparing pupils for 'A' level and how much they would ideally like to spend.⁽¹⁾ Each teacher had to respond on a five point scale ranging from (1) indicating no time at all to (5) equalling a substantial proportion, when assessing the time actually spent on different types of history, and on a four point scale from (1) being equivalent to "no study" to (4) equalling a major part of the course, when considering the time that ideally should be devoted to various sectors of history.⁽²⁾ Holley's findings on the actual time spent on different types of history are presented in Figure 1.⁽³⁾

FIGURE 1 /

-
- (1) Holley B.J. 'A' Level Syllabus Studies History and Physics (London 1974)
p.14-15
- (2) *ibid* p.15
- (3) *ibid* p.15

FIGURE 1

TIME SPENT BY 56 TEACHERS OF HISTORY ON 13 ASPECTS OF HISTORY

| Rank | Item No | Item description | Distribution* of responses | | | | | Mean rating | SD ⁺ |
|------|---------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|----|----|----|----|----------------|-----------------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | |
| 1 | 11 | Pol.& Constitutional history | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 47 | 4.84 | 0.37 |
| 2 | 12 | Rel.& ecclesiastical hist. | 2 | 8 | 18 | 15 | 12 | 3.49 | 1.09 |
| 3 | 13 | Social history | 0 | 8 | 20 | 23 | 5 | 3.45 | 0.84 |
| 4 | 2 | Econ.history | 0 | 3 | 31 | 16 | 5 | 3.42 | 0.73 |
| 5 | 3 | Hist.of ideas | 3 | 19 | 26 | 6 | 1 | 2.69 | 0.81 |
| 6 | 9 | Military history | 4 | 22 | 20 | 9 | 0 | 2.62 | 0.84 |
| 7 | 8 | Indust.history | 6 | 20 | 21 | 5 | 1 | 2.53 | 0.88 |
| 8 | 10 | Nature of history | 11 | 19 | 20 | 5 | 0 | 2.35 | 0.90 |
| 9 | 7 | Hist.Art/Music ^{etc.} | 15 | 18 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 2.00 | 0.80 |
| 10 | 4 | Hist.of literature | 14 | 35 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1.87 | 0.60 |
| 11 | 5 | Hist.of science | 19 | 25 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1.87 | 0.73 |
| 12 | 6 | Hist. of tech. | 28 | 18 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1.63 | 0.73 |
| 13 | 1 | Archaeology | 50 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1.11 | 0.37 |

- * 1 - no time at all
- 2 - hardly any time
- 3 - small proportion
- 4 - good proportion
- 5 - substantial proportion.

Where these rows do not total 56, this is due to one or more respondents not making a response.

+ SD- standard deviation

As can be seen from figure 1, teachers concentrate their attention to a large measure on political and constitutional history, which achieves a mean rating of 4.84. However, Holley points out that religious and ecclesiastical history, social and economic history reach relatively high mean ratings.

The teachers' view of the time that should ideally be spent on different types of history, which is especially important from the point of view of this study, is summarised in figure 2

FIGURE 2
DEGREE OF EMPHASIS ON 13 ASPECTS OF HISTORY IN IDEAL SYLLABUS ⁽¹⁾

| Rank | Rank from Table 2.2 | Item No. | Item description | Distribution of responses* | | | | Mean rating | SD |
|------|---------------------|----------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|----|----|----|-------------|------|
| | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | |
| 1 | 1 | 18 | Pol. & Constitutional history | 0 | 1 | 10 | 44 | 3.78 | 0.46 |
| 2 | 3 | 20 | Social history | 0 | 8 | 18 | 29 | 3.38 | 0.73 |
| 3 | 4 | 9 | Econ. history | 0 | 6 | 22 | 26 | 3.37 | 0.68 |
| 4 | 5 | 10 | History of ideas | 2 | 11 | 33 | 8 | 2.87 | 0.70 |
| 5 | 2 | 19 | Rel & ecclesiastical hist. | 2 | 19 | 18 | 14 | 2.83 | 0.87 |
| 6 | 8 | 17 | Nature of hist. etc. | 5 | 18 | 19 | 12 | 2.70 | 0.92 |
| 7 | 7 | 15 | Industr. history | 5 | 22 | 21 | 6 | 2.51 | 0.82 |
| 8 | 6 | 16 | Military history | 8 | 28 | 14 | 3 | 2.23 | 0.78 |
| 9 | 11 | 12 | History of science | 7 | 31 | 14 | 0 | 2.13 | 0.63 |
| 10 | 9 | 14 | Hist. vis. arts/music | 7 | 35 | 10 | 1 | 2.09 | 0.63 |
| 11 | 10 | 11 | Hist. of literature | 5 | 39 | 8 | 0 | 2.06 | 0.50 |
| 12 | 12 | 13 | Hist. of Technology | 13 | 26 | 14 | 0 | 2.02 | 0.72 |
| 13 | 13 | 8 | Archaeology | 32 | 18 | 3 | 0 | 1.45 | 0.61 |

* 1 - no study, 2 - incidental study only, 3 - minor part of course, 4 - major part of course

Once /

Once again political and constitutional history is the most popular with a score of 3.78, compared with 3.38 and 3.37 for social and economic history ranked second and third respectively. From these results, and from the comments of the teachers, Holley concluded that "teachers are by and large satisfied with the present structure of the syllabus⁽¹⁾" i.e. with the predominance of political history.

Though only incorporating 56 teachers, Holley's survey is probably an accurate reflection of the attitudes of teachers to the current syllabus. Certainly, the absence of complaints to the JMB and the Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate about the content of their examinations, despite the readiness of the boards to try new approaches, is additional evidence of a general acceptance of the present situation.

The existence of such an attitude need not, however, be a barrier to change. In the discussion of the content of examinations in History at 'O' and 'A' level no alternatives other than papers on specific types of history, for example, social and economic, have been either discussed, or made available to teachers. Nobody has proposed a syllabus incorporating a number of types of history, or pointed out the advantages that would accrue to history as a school subject from such a change, or considered the implications for the syllabus of the attitudes of pupils to different types of history. A general outline of a different type of syllabus will be put forward, therefore, in the final chapter of this thesis, together with the arguments and evidence, which can be advanced in its support.

(1) Ibid p.17

CHAPTER 14

AN ALTERNATIVE 'O' AND 'A' LEVEL SYLLABUS OUTLINED AND DEFENDED

The purpose of this final chapter is to present an alternative to the current examination syllabus in history at 'O' and 'A' level and consider the main arguments, which can be put forward in its favour. In section A, the alternative syllabus will be outlined, and its viability discussed, while in section B, C, D and E different aspects of the case for this broader 'O' and 'A' level course will be advanced.

Section A - An Alternative 'O' and 'A' Level Syllabus

Though a general outline of an alternative 'O' and 'A' level syllabus will be presented in this section, a detailed description of the content of the syllabus and the structure of the examination papers will not be attempted. Such a detailed description can only be provided as a result of trials in a number of schools. Only then can the syllabus be matched against the capacity of the pupils and the time available. At this stage, for example, it is impossible to determine exactly how many types of history pupils are capable of studying at 'A' and 'O' level. At the same time, the content of the types of history, which have not traditionally received much attention at 'A' and 'O' level, is difficult to determine. For instance, cultural history has been so neglected that the difficulties associated with teaching the history of the art and architecture of a period, or of its scientific and technical development/

development, have not been experienced.⁽¹⁾ Such problems, together with deciding the most appropriate form the examination papers should take, can only be resolved by carefully monitored trials of a new syllabus.

However, the main features of a new syllabus to replace the one dominated by political history can be outlined. In this study the dominance of political history has been established, especially in papers on modern history,⁽²⁾ and the arguments, which can be put forward in defence of the pre-eminence of political history have been discussed in detail and found to be unacceptable.⁽³⁾ Thus the first, and perhaps the most important modification to the present syllabus, is to reduce the emphasis placed on political history.

This reduction would have to be drastic. At present, with up to 70% of the questions in papers being set on political history,⁽⁴⁾ a teacher is foolish if he does not allow political history to dominate his course. To avoid this tendency recurring in the new syllabus the proportion of questions set on political history would need to be decreased to well below a half. Only then will teachers find it advisable to give serious consideration to aspects of the past, which are not concerned with politics.

As a consequence of this reduction, a second modification to the present syllabus would be the incorporation of other types of history so that a broader syllabus is available for pupils. This modification/

-
- (1) See below p. 419-421
(2) See above Ch. 7 and 8
(3) See above Ch. 13
(4) See above p. 181

modification prompts immediate questions, namely, how many, and which types of history should be employed, and in what proportions? In the light of the absence of empirical evidence on this subject, the answer to the question can only be reached by considering the following related problems - the capacity of the pupils to study a broad syllabus, its acceptability to teachers in schools, the nature of history as a subject and the pedagogical difficulties in teaching certain types of history. Each of these problems will now be considered in turn.

The capacity of pupils to study a broad syllabus is clearly the first question to answer. However attractive a new proposal is on pedagogical or historical grounds, it will obviously fail if it is too difficult or too wide ranging for the pupils. Though no definite answer to the question can be reached without empirical trials, a tentative solution can be achieved by considering first of all, whether pupils could study a syllabus made up of all the main types of history, and secondly, whether the analysis of the papers set by the JMB and Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate, which was completed in the first part of this thesis, gives any indication of the capacity of the pupils to study a broad syllabus.

Syllabi, which include all the main types of history, would create insuperable practical difficulties if adopted in schools. A syllabus which embraced, for example, political, economic, social, cultural, religious, military and naval history would swamp the pupils with a bewildering range of specialisms. Thus such a syllabus would include at least the history of foreign and domestic politics, /

politics, of agriculture and industry, of social custom and of the development of social groups, of art, architecture, literature, music and, if the definition of cultural history adopted in this thesis is accepted, of science and technology, of religious practice and finally of the strategy of commanders at sea and on land. Clearly a syllabus of this nature would not be feasible in schools, and any proposal which is advanced to replace the present syllabus could only deal with a restricted proportion of the topics for any period of history.

Though pupils obviously cannot be expected to cope with such a broad syllabus, there is evidence, as a result of the analysis of the 'O' and 'A' level papers set by the JMB and Cambridge Local Examination Syndicate, that pupils can study syllabi drawing on at least two or three different types of history. Three groups of papers were identified in the first section of this thesis, one at 'A' level, and two at 'O' level, in which more than one type of history played an important role. At 'A' level two types of history play a major part in papers on European mediaeval history, political history reaching a mean of 52% and religious history at 24.3%.⁽¹⁾ At 'O' level three types of history are important in papers on early modern imperial history, political history with a mean of 44.3% and economic and military and naval history with means of 19.4% and 16.2% respectively,⁽²⁾ while the same is true of papers on social and economic history, set by the JMB and Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate, with means for economic history ranging from 31.8% to 48.4%,⁽³⁾ for political history from 23.8% to 32.4%⁽⁴⁾ and for cultural history from 15.6% to 18.2%.⁽⁵⁾

-
- (1) See above p. 211-212
 - (2) See above p. 257
 - (3) See above p. 257 and 258
 - (4) See above p. 276 and 279
 - (5) See above p. 276 and 279

to 18.2%. In none of these groups of papers is there any indication from the examiners that pupils find any difficulty with the papers or concentrate markedly on the most important category. If pupils have the capacity, even at 'O' level to deal with papers of this type, it would seem reasonable to assume that they have the ability to study for papers drawing on at least three types of history.

Thus far the impossibility of designing a school syllabus made up of all the main types of history has been demonstrated, and, the capacity of pupils to study papers drawing on at least three types of history⁽¹⁾ has been indicated. The acceptability of a broad syllabus to the teachers in the schools is the second problem, which needs to be considered.

The attitude of teachers to an innovation of this nature is crucial to its success. If an examination board did decide after trials in the schools to introduce a new syllabus it would exist side by side with the present syllabus and would only be chosen by teachers if they were attracted by it.⁽²⁾ As a consequence, the alternative syllabus which would be most likely to attract teachers has to be given careful attention. Holley's study of the different types of history, which might be included in an 'A' level course, is a useful guide to the syllabus favoured by teachers. Three types of history were selected to play a major role in an ideal syllabus by at least half the teachers, political history was chosen by 44 out of/

-
- (1) The survey of the JMB and Cambridge 'O' and 'A' level papers revealed that pupils find no difficulties with papers drawing on three types of history, but gives no indication of how many types of history could be included without candidates experiencing major difficulties.
 - (2) i.e. it would not be imposed on teachers. Thus the sort of syllabus that teachers would chose, if they were free to do so (see below), is an important indicator of the viability of a broader syllabus at 'O' and 'A' level.

out of a sample of 55 teachers, social history by 29 and economic history by 26.⁽¹⁾ These three types of history were by far the most popular. In comparison religious and ecclesiastical history was chosen by only 14, the history of ideas by 8, military history by 3, the history of visual arts and music by one and the remaining types of history namely the history of science, of technology and of literature were not selected by any teachers at all.⁽²⁾

Unfortunately, Holley's study, which is the only one of its kind, does not extend to the attitude of teachers to the 'O' level syllabus. However, though the evidence is limited to 'A' level, it does indicate that a syllabus made up of political, social and economic history could be attractive to teachers.

So far, as a result of considering the capacity of pupils to study a broad syllabus, and of outlining the attitudes of teachers to different types of history, a tentative syllabus made up of political, social and economic history has been put forward as an alternative to the present syllabi offered at 'O' and 'A' level. However, a general defence of such a syllabus (see sections B, C and D and E) cannot possibly be mounted until the arguments relating to the inclusion of different types of history have been explored further. The arguments are of two kinds, historical, concerned mainly with the interrelationship between different types of history, and practical, dealing with the problems which would be encountered by teachers and pupils if certain types of history were included in the syllabus. In the case of political, social, economic and religious/

(1) Holley op.cit. p.17
(2) ibid p.17

religious history the historical arguments will be emphasised. Already the major practical difficulties which are likely to be encountered in the study of social and economic history have been discussed⁽¹⁾ and three of these types of history, political⁽²⁾ economic⁽³⁾ and religious history,⁽⁴⁾ each play an important role in at least some of the 'O' and 'A' level papers without the schools experiencing major difficulties in teaching them. With the other types of history, the history of art, architecture, science, technology and ideas and military history⁽⁵⁾ considerable attention will be paid to the practical problems of incorporating them into school syllabi, since they are generally ignored in the papers set at 'O' and 'A' level.⁽⁶⁾

The interdependence ^{among} ~~between~~ political, social and economic history makes it important to include all three in an 'O' and 'A' level syllabus. A close relationship certainly exists between political, social and economic history based partly on the nature of society and partly on the way in which historians have related these three types of history in recent years. This interdependence can be indicated by pointing out how political actions affect the economic and social affairs of a community and how the economic and social structure of a society influences its politics. In Chapter 13 the degree of influence exerted by government actions over the community/

-
- (1) See above p.362-373
 - (2) See above p.181,195 and 211
 - (3) See above p.273,276 and 279
 - (4) See above p.196 and 212
 - (5) Both historical and practical arguments will be explored in the case of military history, though, since it plays a significant role in some 'O' level papers the practical arguments will relate to the attitude of pupils and teachers to military and naval history rather than to the feasibility of teaching its subject matter
 - (6) See above p.182,196 and 212

community was debated.⁽¹⁾ Though the case for its predominance over all other influences was rejected, its importance as one strand in the history of a period was accepted.⁽²⁾ Indeed the impact of the actions of governments on social and economic affairs during most periods of history is so obvious that it is almost self-evident. Governments influence economic and social affairs by a mass of policies, they regulate trade by means of customs dues and internal regulations, they influence personal wealth and the status of groups within society by their system of taxation. They create laws, which partially determine the form of economic and social activities, and they may even seek to administer, directly or indirectly, the process of production in agriculture and industry. Indeed the importance of political actions is clearly recognised by social and economic historians, since they rarely ignore the policies of governments in their accounts of a period.⁽³⁾ At the same time the social and economic structure of a period has a major influence on political affairs. During the last forty years historians have explored this relationship in great detail especially for periods of crisis. Already the importance of social and economic factors during the early days of the French Revolution has been outlined in Chapter 13⁽⁴⁾ one further example, namely the social and economic explanations of the antecedents of the Revolution of 1640 in England, is perhaps appropriate, especially in the light of the number of pupils who study this period of history at 'A' level. The exact nature of the impact of social and economic factors on the political scene in the early 17th century in/

-
- (1) See above p. 386-400
(2) See above p. 387-389
(3) See above p. 85
(4) See above p. 396-397

in England has been a continuous debate amongst historians for the last twenty years. The main centre of interest has been the role of the gentry and whether their opposition to the king was prompted by a sense of growing or declining social and economic power.⁽¹⁾ Though the gentry have attracted the most attention other areas of analysis for the same period have included the impact of inflation on the Church⁽²⁾ and the importance of the new merchants of the towns and their support for a career open to talents in the years before 1640.⁽³⁾

The arguments relating to the inclusion of religious history, which are primarily of a historical nature, will be considered now.

Religious history, though not as popular with teachers as political, social and economic history, is difficult to exclude on historical grounds from a central core of school history. At least until the 18th century religious affairs are closely integrated with political and social history. During the Middle Ages, both within individual countries and across Europe, as a whole, the extent of clerical jurisdiction was a major source of political controversy. In the early modern period this association between religion and politics is even closer. Many of the major political struggles of the years 1500 - 1700 are overlaid or interwoven with religious issues. In the Elizabethan period, for example, the only/

-
- (1) See J.H. Hexter 'Storm over the Gentry' Reappraisals in History (London 1961) p.117-162
 - (2) C. Hill, Economic Problems of the Church from Archbishop Whitgift to the Long Parliament (Oxford 1956)
 - (3) W.K. Jordan, Philanthropy in England (London 1959) p.131-40

only major internal revolt occurred in the North of England and was led by Catholic noblemen, while the one sustained domestic threat to the Queen came from Catholics who supported Mary Queen of Scots, and who were prepared to plot the assassination of Elizabeth. On the other religious wing, the Puritans were an increasing source of opposition to the Crown. In the Parliaments of 1571, 1572, 1576 and 1586-7 bills were presented to modify the religious settlement of 1559 in favour of the Puritans, all of them were either rejected or vetoed, but not without a major controversy developing, as a consequence, about the extent of the royal prerogative. As well as having a strong link with political affairs, religious history is closely related to social history. In describing society in the Middle Ages it is impossible to ignore the church. In England the Church owned a third of the land, provided the few rudimentary social services that existed, controlled education, both at school and university level, and determined the moral code that was at least in theory accepted by the population. Even in the years from 1500 to 1900 religious groups retained a considerable degree of social influence. In England, though the Church lost much of its wealth and some of its authority, it remained a centre for most of the social activities of rural communities and through its lay officials played an important part in administering local affairs, in particular the poor law. At the same time the church and the different Nonconformist groups made an important contribution to the life of the new towns, not only providing a centre round which a significant proportion of the inhabitants organised their lives, but also creating and supervising/

supervising a rudimentary form of national education. Thus religious history has a significant claim to being closely involved with political history up to 1700, and with social history up to 1900, and to be regarded, therefore, as part of the central core round which 'O' and 'A' level courses should be organised.

The case for the inclusion of the history of the arts, of the history of science and technology and of the history of ideas, as well as that of military affairs, will now be considered on both practical and historical grounds. (At this stage in the argument the history of ideas will be treated as a separate specialism or series of specialisms,⁽¹⁾ not as aspects of other types of history as was the case in the category system used earlier in this study).⁽²⁾

Various features of the history of the arts make them difficult to incorporate into a syllabus at 'A' and 'O' level. In the first place the history of the arts involves the comprehension of difficult abstract notions. In the study of architecture, for example, the idea or concept behind a building style has to be understood, and they are often of a most complex nature. According to Pevener, for instance, the definition of Mannerism involves a consideration of terms like classical, classicist and classic⁽³⁾ and an understanding/

-
- (1) As they were in the New Cambridge Modern History (see above p.47)
- (2) The issue here is whether the history of ideas should be included as a separate specialism in the new syllabus being proposed in this chapter, and thus play a major role. Clearly aspects of the history of ideas are already incorporated in the school syllabus and would play a minor role in a syllabus made up of political, social, economic and religious history. Thus in political history references are made to the development of political institution, for example, the House of Commons, and to the agreements of contemporaries about the developments.
- (3) N. Pevsner 'An Outline of European Architecture (London 1949) p.135

understanding of the tendency for architects of the Mannerist period to imitate classical models slavishly, in contrast to their predecessors of the early Renaissance who interpreted the spirit of Roman building.⁽¹⁾ At the same time the pupils will need to appreciate that the term Mannerism has only been employed in recent years by art critics and is not a concept in use during the 16th century.⁽²⁾ Secondly, though art historians pay attention to the political, economic, religious, or social context of an age, they place a lot of emphasis on their specialist roles as connoisseurs and as art critics. As connoisseurs according to D.Talbot Rice they perform two tasks, distinguishing between the genuine and the false and "attributing a work to some particular period or some specific artist or craftsman"⁽³⁾ While this aspect of the art historians' work may not play a major part in the sources available to pupils the art historian's function as a critic will be of great importance.⁽⁴⁾ In this context the art historian concentrates on the aims and techniques of the artist and, at the same time, implicitly or explicitly evaluates their artists' merit. This tendency is particularly true of books and sections of books, which may be read by pupils, and which deal with the history of art and architecture. It certainly applies to the works of men like Pevsner,⁽⁵⁾ Levey⁽⁶⁾ Panofsky⁽⁷⁾ and Hamilton,⁽⁸⁾ and the writers who contribute to the later volumes of the New Cambridge Modern/

(1) *ibid* p.136

(2) *ibid* p.136

(3) D.Talbot Rice, *The History of Art in Finberg op.cit.* p.162

(4) *ibid* p.164-166

(5) N. Pevsner *op.cit.*

(6) M. Levey, *High Renaissance* (London 1975)

(7) E.Panofsky, *Renaissance and Renascences in Western Art* (London 1965)

(8) G.H. Hamilton, *Painting and sculpture in Europe 1880-1940* (London 1967)

Modern History and the Oxford Histories of England. Finally the history of the arts includes a number of major specialisms with their own technical language which together would form a comprehensive 'O' or 'A' level course without the incorporation of other types of history. Thus, though the history of art and architecture has been discussed in this context the history of music and of literature could legitimately be included in the history of the arts. As a result, even if the history of the arts were to be incorporated in this proposed new syllabus only a small proportion of the available material could be included.

Similar problems, especially in the field of comprehension, will arise if the history of science and technology are included in the syllabus. To make sense of the history of science and technology pupils will have to acquire, not only a sound knowledge of scientific concepts and technical processes, but also of science and technology, as a whole, to assess the significance of individual developments. For example, it is of little use knowing that Newton developed a law of gravity without understanding what gravity is and what place the law of gravity has in the context of scientific thought. In addition, the history of science and technology, with a few notable exceptions,⁽¹⁾ tends to concentrate on a detailed description of the development of particular concepts and techniques, attempts to explain scientific development with the help of other types of history being of limited success.⁽²⁾

The arguments which relate to the inclusion of the history of ideas in the school syllabus will now be considered.

As

-
- (1) H. Butterfield, *Origins of Modern Science* (London 1949)
(2) A. Rupert Hall, *The History of Science in Finberg* op.cit. p.180-184

As has already been indicated the main emphasis of the arguments will be on the practical problems which would be created for pupils and teachers if the history of ideas were to play a major as opposed to a minor part in the school curriculum. The first and perhaps the major difficulty would arise from the range of ideas covered by this aspect of history. Thus it would incorporate at least the political, philosophical, economic and religious thought of a period. Secondly each of these different types of thought would tax the comprehension of the pupils and the teaching ability of the staff. For example, a study of the political and philosophical thought of the 18th and 19th centuries would involve a consideration of the ideas of men like Locke, Kant, Hegel, Rousseau, & Marx ideas which are difficult even for university students. Thirdly and finally, the teachers whose attitudes were surveyed by Holley were not in favour of the history of ideas playing a major role in G.C.E. papers even at 'A' level. Only eight out of the fifty-three respondents in Holley's sample thought that the history of ideas should play a major part in an ideal syllabus, while thirty-three thought it should only play a minor part and eleven considered that its role should only be incidental.

The case for the inclusion of military history as a compulsory element in a new syllabus is perhaps stronger than for the history of ideas though the objections are still formidable, both on practical and on historical grounds. The military history, currently examined at 'O' and 'A' level, concentrates on the tactics and strategy of individual commanders and their governments.⁽¹⁾ Such material is easy for pupils to comprehend and if taught well can be

(1) See for example in marking guides for JMB 'A' level papers on British history (1485-1939) for the years 1968-72

be dramatic and exciting. Though these factors may point towards the inclusion of military affairs in the compulsory element of the syllabus there are other considerations which are less favourable. Perhaps of greatest significance is the attitude of teachers to military history revealed by Holley's study. In his survey only three out of a total of fifty-five teachers saw military history as playing an important part in an ideal 'A' level syllabus.⁽¹⁾ Though Holley throws no light on the reasons for the teachers' hostility their attitudes to military history represents a serious barrier to its adoption. Secondly, the type of military history, which is favoured by school textbooks, and is currently accepted by examination boards, and would, therefore be difficult to change, places its emphasis on strategy and tactics, little attempt being made to relate military affairs to other types of history.⁽²⁾ Finally surveys of the attitudes of pupils at 'O' level to military history show that it appeals very much to boys, but is less popular with girls.⁽³⁾ Though the preferences of the pupils should not be a sine qua non in the selection of the types

(1) Holley op.cit. p.17

(2) In the case of school textbooks some attempt is made to link military and social history, but its limited nature can be seen from bibliographies of school textbooks on military history (for example, W.H. Burston and C.W. Green "Handbook for History Teachers" (London 1972) p.515-518). The approach of the examination boards can be judged by reading the marking guides analysed in this thesis (for example for Cambridge 'O' level papers on English and European history (1485-1939) for the years 1968-72)

(3) Ward op.cit. p.155 - see the pupils' response to the category "Adventure and exploration" which is subtitled "Adventurous deeds in warfare and exploration"

types of history appropriate for a syllabus at 'O' and 'A' level, the inclusion of military history as a compulsory part of the syllabus clearly favours the boys, and, in addition to the arguments which have already been mentioned further weakens the case for the incorporation of military history. Thus the arguments for the inclusion of military history, even at 'O' level, are not strong, especially in the light of the likely inclusion of political, social, religious, economic and possibly other types of history.

Thus, despite the lack of empirical evidence, good grounds can be established for a syllabus of political, social, economic and religious history. Such a syllabus is within the capacity of the pupils, would to a great extent be supported by teachers and can be justified on practical and historical grounds. However, though the case for this syllabus is strong, two consequences could arise if it were employed, which need to be considered at this stage.

First of all, the adoption of a compulsory core of four types of history at both 'O' and 'A' level might lead to the pupils facing a monotonous diet of similar materials at both levels. This danger is more apparent than real, since the pupils would presumably study for different periods of history at 'O' and 'A' level. In each period variation would occur in the emphasis placed on the different types of history according to the examiners' view of their relative importance for each era. Thus religious history would be likely to achieve more prominence in the period before, as opposed to, after 1700, and be largely ignored/

ignored in questions set on the period after 1914. In addition, once the new syllabus has been in operation for some time it might be possible to incorporate a limited number of options at 'A' level, for example, the history of art or military history. The pupils would choose one and a section of one of their two papers could be devoted to questions on the option, allowing them the opportunity for a degree of specialist study in an area of their own choice.

Secondly in the construction of this new syllabus considerable importance has been attached to the interdependence between the main types of history, which are being included. Already questions at 'O' and 'A' level are set in which pupils have to incorporate evidence drawn from a number of types of history, for example, the explanation of major events, like the Industrial Revolution or the Great Reform Bill, but such questions are rare. If the advantages of studying closely related types of history in the new syllabus were to be fully realised more questions on the interrelationship between the different types of history would need to be set, though the increase in this type of question would have to be monitored carefully in case the pupils, especially at 'O' level, found them too difficult.

Three major arguments will now be put forward in favour of a syllabus, such as has been outlined above. In section B the degree to which a syllabus drawing on a number of types of history is in tune with the attitudes of historians to their subject will be/

be considered,. In section C and D the limited evidence, which is available on pupil attitudes to different types of history, and the advantages which pupils would gain from a broad based syllabus at 'O' and 'A' level will be discussed. Finally, in section E the impact of a syllabus comprising more than one type of history, on the methods of the teacher will be outlined.

Section B A Broad Syllabus and the Historians' Attitude to Their Subject

Though no general debate has taken place amongst historians about the predominance of different types of history,⁽¹⁾ a consideration of the attitudes and activities of academic historians can give an indication of whether a syllabus drawing on a number of types of history is closer to their view of the subject than a syllabus based largely on one type of history.

Even in the late 19th century when political history was the main concern of professional historians the importance of other types of history was acknowledged by influential groups of historians and by prominent individuals. Thus the founders of the most significant historical journals to emerge in the second half of the 19th century emphasised the need for breadth in the study of history. The first circular for the *Historische Zeitschrift* called for "contributions in legal, constitutional, literary and church history..... as much as works dealing with political history."⁽²⁾ The *Revue Historique* insisted on the importance /

(1) See above p.360-361

(2) "Preface" *Historische Zeitschrift* (Munich, 1859) quoted in Stern op.cit.p172

importance of historians being concerned with all the major aspects of society⁽¹⁾ and the English Historical Review states that Seeley's view that "history is past politics and politics is present history" is too narrow.⁽²⁾ At the same time, some of the most eminent historians of the time, though concentrating on politics, betrayed great interest in other types of history. Perhaps the most notable examples of this trend are Von Ranke and the two English historians Stubbs and Maitland. Besides his great contributions to the history of the modern state Von Ranke devoted long periods to religious history with his famous History of the Popes⁽³⁾ and his study of the Reformation in Germany.⁽⁴⁾ Stubbs, although famous for his concentration on constitutional history and his part in the creation of the Honours School of Modern History, with its primary focus on political history, could still view his specialism in a broad context. As Hale states, in his Evolution of British Historiography, it was "Stubbs insistence on seeing the dependence of constitutional changes on specific political, or military, or economic needs," which made his Constitutional History "the best available general history of mediaeval England."⁽⁵⁾ A similar attitude is betrayed by Maitland whose study of the development of English law is centred on the emergence of English political institutions. Maitland argues that legal documents, which were his main historical source, provide "the best, often the only evidence, we have for social and economic history, for the/

-
- (1) Preface Revue Historique "AvantPropos" (Paris 1876) quoted in Stern op cit p.173
(2) " Prefatory Note, "English Historical Review (London 1886) quoted in Stern op cit p.175
(3) L.Von Ranke "History of the Popes" (London 1913)
(4) " " "History of the Reformation in Germany" (London 1905)
(5) J.R. Hale, "The Evolution of British Historiography" (London 1967) p.59.

the history of morality, for the history of practical religion"⁽¹⁾

In addition, the concentration of 19th century historians on political affairs was at least in part an accident of circumstance. From 1850 onwards the only documents available to historians were those released by governments and in most cases these had only been freed recently.⁽²⁾ Other collections of material, for example, the Papal Archives were not available, except on very rare occasions, and to exceptional people, like Lord Acton.⁽³⁾ Archives containing material relating to many aspects of history did not exist - as yet local record offices containing documents relating to family life, to estate and business management, to the administration of local government and to demographic trends had not been created. Those who wished to consult documents systematically and make use of the critical methods developed by Ranke and others were forced to concentrate on state documents, which were largely of a political nature.

In the 20th century the assumption that all types of history are worthy of equal consideration has been implicit rather than explicit. Outbursts, such as that by Bury, in his inaugural lecture at Cambridge, where he attacked the dominance of political history,⁽⁴⁾ or by Robinson in his demand for a broad treatment of all types of history are extremely rare.⁽⁵⁾

Instead/

-
- (1) Quoted in Hale op.cit. p.65
 - (2) H. Butterfield, "Man on His Past" (Cambridge 1955) p.79 gives an account of the opening of the archives
 - (3) ibid p.80
 - (4) J.B. Bury, "The Science of History Inaugural Address" quoted in Stern op.cit. p.221.
 - (5) J.H. Robinson "Preface" The Development of Modern Europe, Vol.1 (Boston 1907) quoted in Stern op.cit. p.258-261.

Instead the development of different types of history during the last seventy years, each with an impressive corpus of research, is a sufficient indication of the general acceptance by historians of the need for virtually every aspect of society to be studied in depth. This trend is so clear in the major types of history that detailed bibliographies of the main works on cultural, social, economic, political, constitutional, military and naval and religious history can be produced for individual countries, like England.⁽¹⁾ A survey of the progress made in every major type of history would, therefore, be in danger of being repetitive and, as a consequence, only the developments in two types of history will be outlined as examples of a general trend.

In the last 70 years, for example, religious and economic history have steadily grown in importance. Detailed research on the economic aspects of virtually every period of British and European history has been completed, major controversies have developed around phenomena like the Industrial Revolution and authoritative syntheses, such as the Cambridge Economic History of Europe, have been written. In addition courses in economic history have been created in universities alongside the traditional outlines of British and European history in which political affairs predominated. Though perhaps not receiving the attention given to economic affairs, religious history has generated consistent interest among historians in recent years. The research completed on the religious history of/

(1) For example, G.R. Elton, 'Modern Historians on British History 1485-1945 A Critical Bibliography 1945-69' (London 1970)

of English society from 1500 to 1900 provides a good example of this interest and one which is particularly appropriate in this context given the importance of the period for exams at 'A' and 'O' level. Three areas have been given especially careful consideration. Accounts of the attitudes, organisation and development of religious groups have proliferated,⁽¹⁾ major issues have been extensively examined, for example, the Reformation,⁽²⁾ and the nature of Puritanism⁽³⁾, and the religious thought of the period has been studied consistently, even if it has not been a major focus of debate.⁽⁴⁾

In the light of this growth of different types of history and their general acceptance by historians the arguments outlined in Chapter 13, which were put forward by those who supported a syllabus dominated by political history, appear to be anachronistic. Clearly in recommending a syllabus drawing mainly on one type of history, they are ignoring, not only the attitudes of historians to their subject, but also developments in the study of history, which have been taking place, since the early part of the century. Though the syllabus which is being suggested as a replacement does not include every type of history, it is in much greater sympathy with current trends, since it draws on four types of history at 'O' level and possibly five at 'A' level. In short, the new syllabus permits the pupils to experience a more up to date view of history than the one at present/

-
- (1) *ibid* p.37-43, 62-64, 92-93 and 141-145
(2) *ibid* p.37-43
(3) *ibid* p.62-64
(4) *ibid* p.195-198

present being employed at 'O' and 'A' level.

The second main argument for the new syllabus will now be considered in section C.

Section C The Attitudes of Pupils to Different Types of History

In this section of the argument the attitudes of the pupils to different types of history and the implications of these attitudes for the adoption of a broad 'O' and 'A' level syllabus will be discussed.

The evidence available on pupil attitudes to different aspects of the school history syllabus is unfortunately limited to three surveys. Two of these were conducted in the fifties, one by Cairns assessed the response of second and fourth years grammar and secondary modern school pupils to the various types of history, which they had studied,⁽¹⁾ while, the other by Jones, was confined to the attitudes of 4th year grammar school pupils.⁽²⁾ The third survey, and the only recent one, was carried out by the Wards with a sample of second and fourth year comprehensive school pupils and employed the same category system as was used by Cairns, so that comparisons between the two studies could be attempted.⁽³⁾ In the context of this thesis these surveys are of restricted value, since they only deal with the attitudes of second and fourth year pupils, and do not include the responses of pupils who have completed their 'O' and 'A' level courses.

However/

-
- (1) Cairns op.cit.
(2) Jones op.cit. p.267-269
(3) Ward, A.T. & L op cit.154-158

However the findings of the three surveys are so unequivocal that they provide clear support for the view that pupils prefer a broad based to a narrow syllabus. In the studies by Cairns and the Wards the pupils were asked to indicate their own response to eleven types of history ranging from biography, social history and the development of practical things to constitutional, political and local history,⁽¹⁾ while Jones's survey followed more conventional lines including political, social, economic, cultural religious and military history.⁽²⁾ The only type of history to be rejected by a majority of the pupils in two of the studies, namely those by Cairns and the Wards, was constitutional affairs.⁽³⁾ The other aspects of the syllabus, which were unpopular to a similar degree, but only in individual studies, were cultural history in Jones's survey⁽⁴⁾ international problems in Cairns study⁽⁵⁾ and economic history in the analysis by the Wards.⁽⁶⁾ Thus the pupils responded favourably to a wide range of history, the only type of history to show any consistent signs of unpopularity being constitutional affairs. Additional evidence for a broad based, as opposed to a narrow syllabus, is provided by the tendency for boys and girls to differ in their preferences for various types of history. This sex variation is particularly evident in the Wards' survey, which is the most up to date. Girls, for instance, show a stronger preference than boys for biography, social and political history, while boys, in contrast favour the history of practical things, adventure and exploration and economic history.⁽⁷⁾

(1) Cairns op.cit. p.77 Wards op.cit. p.154

(2) Jones op. cit. p.268

(3) Cairns op.cit p.189 Wards op.cit. p.157

(4) Jones op cit. p. 269

(5) Cairns op cit. p.189

(6) Wards op.cit. p.155

(7) Wards op.cit. p.157

This variation makes it important to construct 'O' and 'A' level syllabi with a broad range of types of history so that both boys and girls can experience equal satisfaction. Thus on two counts, the attitude of pupils to a wide selection of types of history and the differing preferences evident among boys and girls, a broad course is likely to receive greater support from the pupils than a syllabus dominated by one type of history.

Section D General Advantages of a Broad Syllabus for the Pupils

In this section of the argument five general advantages, which would accrue to the pupils, if the present 'O' and 'A' level courses were replaced by broader syllabi will be considered. The first advantage is that the pupils experience of history as a subject would be enhanced since four types of history would be playing important roles in school history as opposed to only one.

The only experience of history as a disciplined study available to the great majority of the population is at school. That pupils in school should be provided with as broad a picture of the subject is therefore vital. To confine pupils largely to the actions of statesmen and governments when historians have covered such vast fields of human experience is, therefore, to present the subject in a very narrow light. The new syllabus proposed in this chapter, though not encompassing every aspect of the historians activities, would permit the pupils to sample a number of different types of history. In addition to the narrative/

narrative of political history pupils will be able to study economic , social and religious history at 'O' and 'A' level and in the case of the 'A' level syllabus possibly one other type of history of their own choice, each broadening the pupils' experience of the subject.

Economic history will provide pupils with an opportunity to appreciate how numerically precise historians can be. The study of economic history, even at school level, will encompass a consideration of statistics relating to phenomena like industrial production, or a nation's trade, or the inflation or deflation, prevalent in a period. Even when such statistics are merely estimates it is illuminating to see the measures which the economic historian takes to ensure the greatest possible accuracy. Also the blending of statistics into a well argued case, which is so much a feature of the writing of the economic historian, will become a familiar technique for pupils at 'A' if not 'O' level.

Social history would also broaden the pupils' experience of the work of the historian. Social historians can operate at three levels. The simplest is the graphic description of social conditions which will appeal to pupils working for 'O' level.⁽¹⁾ The second involves the more complicated tasks of employing major concepts like social class, and social mobility, round which a description of a whole or part of a community can be organised.⁽²⁾

-
- (1) Particularly good descriptions are contained in the "They Saw it Happen" series (see the footnote below page 473)
- (2) For a general discussion of this aspect of social history see H.J. Perkin "Social History" in Finberg op.cit. p.64-66 & p.70-71

organised. If this aspect of social history is well taught pupils should become aware of the dangers of the loose generalisation about the attitudes of social groups, which is so prevalent among political historians⁽¹⁾ and, hopefully, themselves become cautious in the use of such global concepts. At the third level, and as a necessary antidote to the tendency to generalise at the second level, pupils should be introduced to some of the new statistical studies, which are being attempted by social historians, in which generalisations about the nature of society can be tested against demographic data.⁽²⁾

Finally the inclusion of religious history at 'O' and 'A' level and the opportunities to study an additional type of history will further widen the pupils' experience of the subject. The study of religious history, though not necessarily providing additional insight into the technical skills of the historian, should allow the pupils to appreciate the capacity of the historian to recreate and evaluate a spiritual and moral world, which is unfamiliar to the twentieth century. In addition, the chance to incorporate an optional type of history at 'A' level should add appreciably to their knowledge of the subject whether they choose to study cultural history, where historians concentrate on the interpretation of particular works of art, or military history, which has attracted so many historians with an exciting narrative style.

The/

(1) G.K. Clark, *The Making of Victorian England* (London 1962) p.4
(2) Finberg *op.cit.* p.56-58

The second general advantage of the new syllabus is that it will enable pupils to gain a more comprehensive picture of the societies they are studying than they do at present.- not only will the pupils consider the actions of governments, but they will also study the main economic, social and religious trends which affect the community. At this stage it is interesting to recall Burston's attempt to justify the dominance of political history over the curriculum. His argument now appears very strained, his main case for concentrating on political history rested on the tendency of governments to develop policies, which had a general impact on the population, thus enabling the pupils to study the activities of a community as a whole through its political affairs.⁽¹⁾ Burston did not take what appears to be a more logical stance, which is to consider those types of history dealing with main activities of the community, for example, social, economic and religious history, as well as the study of politics. Such a syllabus would appear to be more consistent with Burston's clear concern for pupils to obtain a general picture of the particular period of history, which they are considering.

A third general advantage is that a broader curriculum avoids the danger, inherent in a syllabus dominated by political history, of giving the pupils a distorted view of society. Political history, however wide ranging in its treatment, concentrates to a great degree on the activities of a small ruling class. In the case/

(1) See above p. 387-389

case of most European states this ruling group until the 20th century has been drawn from a hereditary aristocracy and the political debate has been cast mainly in terms of their concerns. Only in this century have political parties emerged, which are dependent on the support of major sectors of the community, and which, therefore, represent broader interests. Thus if pupils are confined in their courses very largely to the political history of a country there is a serious likelihood that they will be concerned mainly with the actions and rivalries of a very small section of society and view that society, to a certain extent, through the eyes of this small group. If to political history is added social, economic and religious history, however, this danger is obviated, since these types of history included the activities of virtually all the groups in the community.

The fourth general argument in favour of a broad course is that the explanation of historical events will be made easier for pupils. The use made by historians of a wide range of different types of history, when explaining past events, has already been pointed out.⁽¹⁾ In addition, the prevalence of questions requiring this form of explanation at 'O' and 'A' level has been indicated. Clearly if pupils are required to master explanation of this order it will be a great deal easier if they are conversant with the types of history which historians employ in their explanation of major events. Thus the pupil who is trying to assess the relative importance of the different causes of the outbreaks of the French Revolution will perform the tasks more satisfactorily if equipped with a sound knowledge

(1) See above p. 395-397

knowledge of the political, social, economic and religious history of the period, as opposed to being well versed in political history alone.

The fifth and final argument relates to the greater freedom which teachers and pupils would enjoy in studying a broad as opposed to a narrow syllabus. As has already been indicated pupils who take papers on modern British and European history are confined very largely to a consideration of the domestic and foreign policies of governments and political leaders. Such a syllabus is extremely monotonous and repetitive. In contrast, a course drawing mainly on political, social, economic and religious history would give both the teacher and the pupils greater variety. For instance, pupils studying British history in the late 19th century would no longer be limited to the examination of the changing domestic Imperial and foreign policies of men like Gladstone, Disraeli and Salisbury,⁽¹⁾ but could also concentrate on topics such as the relative decline of British industry, the growth of the new urban areas, the structure of the family and the nature of the education available during the period.

Thus far three different types of argument have been advanced in favour of a broad syllabus. The approach, which the historians themselves adopt to the study of history, has been considered, while the attitudes of pupils to different types of history, and the advantages of a broad syllabus for the pupils, have been discussed. Up to this point, however, no attempt has been made to examine the impact/

(1) See JMB and Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate 'A' and 'O' level papers 1968-72

impact of a broad syllabus on the methods adopted by teachers in secondary schools. This topic, which is perhaps the most important aspect of the case for a broader syllabus, will be considered in section E.

Section E - The Influence of a Broad Syllabus on the Teachers' Methods

This section of the argument is so complex that it will have to be divided into sub sections to avoid confusion. The first sub section will incorporate a general outline of the types of methods used by teachers of history in secondary schools, particular reference being made to the influence of current 'O' and 'A' level syllabi. This description will provide a background to the discussion of the impact of a broad, as opposed to a narrow, syllabus on the methods of teaching employed in the schools. In each of the remaining sub sections the relative influence of the present, and of a possible broader syllabus, on the adoption of a particular approach to the teaching of history will be considered.

Sub section (1) Approaches to the Teaching of History Currently Used in Schools.

A general outline of the types of methods, used by teachers of history, both in the pre examination and examination years, has to be constructed from a number of sources because of the limited nature of the evidence. Only two systematic studies have been completed on the subject which are of relevance to G.C.E. examinations.⁽¹⁾

(1) A number of studies of the curriculum and methods employed in history teaching in secondary schools have been conducted, for example, The Enquiry by the Cambridge Institute of Education on the Teaching of History to the 11-14 age group (Cambridge 1971) but they are confined to the early years of the secondary school.

examinations. Unfortunately both of these studies are confined to the 'O' level and pre 'O' level years and one of them is methodologically unsound.⁽¹⁾ As a consequence, the evidence gleaned from these two surveys needs to be supplemented by the observations of a wide assortment of individuals who are habitually in contact with classroom teaching.⁽²⁾

Of the two studies Sirrett's is the less convincing. Sirrett conducted a survey of the syllabus and methods employed by history departments in London comprehensive schools during the mid sixties, sending a questionnaire to 68 schools of whom 50% responded.⁽³⁾ After an analysis of the replies Sirrett concluded that the teaching of history in the first five years of the comprehensive school was largely of a traditional nature.⁽⁴⁾ He found, for example, that only three schools employed original sources in the classroom, only seven included aspects of local history, only two used lines of development in their teaching and only six made any attempt to use group methods as opposed to teaching a class as a whole.⁽⁵⁾ Though Sirrett's findings appear to be unequivocal a number of aspects of his study are disquieting. In the first place, as with all surveys by questionnaire, it is impossible to determine how far those who respond to the questionnaire are representative/

-
- (1) M. Sirrett, "History in the Secondary School with Special Reference to Comprehensive Schools" unpublished M. Ed. thesis, London University 1966, and M. B. Booth, "History Betrayed," (London 1969)
 - (2) For example, the observations of teachers, inspectors and college and university lecturers concerned with the teaching of history.
 - (3) Sirrett op.cit. p.83
 - (4) *ibid* p.143
 - (5) *ibid* p.143 et seq.

representative of the group as a whole. Secondly, and more serious, Sirrett made no attempt to check whether the replies represent an accurate picture of what actually takes place in schools. He did not even send a questionnaire to a sample of pupils to find out how they viewed the methods adopted by teachers. Finally, and this criticism only applies to the topic under discussion here, he does not distinguish between the methods used in the schools in the '0' level and pre '0' level years. As a result, Sirrett's conclusions have to be treated with some caution.

Booth's study of the '0' level and pre '0' level years in five Southampton grammar schools is more satisfactory methodologically and yields more detailed information. In contrast to Sirrett, Booth checked the statements of the teachers by asking the pupils for similar information.⁽¹⁾ At the same time pupils were asked to compare their experience of '0' level and pre '0' level courses, which is important in the context of this study.⁽²⁾ As a result, greater reliance can be placed on Booth's study than that of Sirrett. Booth found that both teachers and pupils thought that the methods employed at '0' level were more traditional and less varied than those used during the pre '0' level years, particularly in relation to field studies and project work.⁽³⁾ This finding was depressing because Booth/

-
- (1) Booth op.cit. p.20-25 and 57-72
(2) ibid p.60
(3) ibid p.59 and p.60-62

Booth concluded that the methods used in the pre '0' level years were themselves very largely of a traditional type.⁽¹⁾ Though the teachers claimed that they used a wide variety of different approaches in the first three years of secondary school,⁽²⁾ the reports from the pupils indicated that the traditional ones tended to predominate.⁽³⁾ Thus the main activities, according to the pupils, were learning facts, reading textbooks and listening to the teacher, with very little discussion, few projects and virtually no reference to local history or documents.⁽⁴⁾ From Booth, therefore, a bleak picture emerged of the approaches adopted in the pre '0' level years and he concludes that the situation is even worse during preparation for '0' level.

The description of the methods employed during the '0' level and pre '0' level years outlined by Sirrett and Booth is corroborated by the observations of a broad assortment of individuals who are professionally concerned with the teaching of history. Though their opinions are not based securely on evidence, such as Booth provides, their views need to be taken seriously. Not only are they in broad agreement about the syllabus and methods employed in teaching history in secondary schools, but they are also a group who have little personal interest in denigrating teachers' methods. They are concerned, in most cases, to encourage/

-
- (1) *ibid* p.61-69
(2) *ibid* p.55-58
(3) *ibid* p.61-69
(4) *ibid* p.61-69

encourage practising and prospective teachers to adopt new approaches and any falsification of the state of teaching would be likely to antagonise their audience and, therefore, be unwise. As a consequence, these writers are likely to portray the methods used by teachers in as favourable a light as possible and the situation, which they reveal, is unlikely to be exaggerated.

These observers all comment on the traditional nature of history teaching in secondary schools.⁽¹⁾ They complain that the teachers dominate the classroom swamping the pupils with a one way flow of information.⁽²⁾ In particular, they attack the emphasis placed by teachers on the making of notes,⁽³⁾ especially those dictated by the teacher⁽⁴⁾ and the teachers use of lecturing and talks and chalks.⁽⁵⁾ At the same time most of the observers argue that G.C.E. examinations have a stultifying effect on classroom practice.⁽⁶⁾

This general condemnation of the methods employed in the schools,/

-
- (1) For example, Watts, op.cit. p.8, Jamieson op.cit. p.1-2, Douch op.cit. p.7-8, and W. Lamont "The Past and the Future" T.E.S. April 26, 1968 p. 1387
 - (2) For example, M.Price, "History in Danger" History Liii 1968, p.346 P. Carpenter, "History Teaching, The Era Approach" (Cambridge 1964) p.30, S. Ferguson "Projects in History" (London 1967) p.10, and Douch op.cit. p.7-8
 - (3) For example, Fines op.cit.p.v, Watts op.cit.p.8, Douch op.cit.p.8 and Price op.cit. p.346
 - (4) For example, Watts op.cit. p.8, Fines op.cit.pv., Lamont op.cit. p 1387 and C.Hannam, "Project and Group Work", Teaching History 1 No.2 November 1969, p.72
 - (5) For example, Douch op.cit. p.8, Carpenter op.cit.p.30 & Hannam op.cit p.72
 - (6) For example, Steel & Taylor op.cit.p.3, Jones op.cit.p.202, Jamieson op.cit.p.1, Watts op.cit. p.8 and Fines op.cit. p.v.

schools, together with the evidence provided by Sirrett and Booth, indicates the need for drastic changes in the teaching of history. One aspect of this problem, which is particularly germane to this thesis, is the impact of G.C.E. syllabi on teaching methods. As a result, the rest of this chapter will be devoted to discussing the impact of present syllabi on teaching in the schools and the possible benefits springing from the introduction of a broad syllabus, such as is being suggested in this chapter. Six varied innovations, namely, the use of local history in schools, the employment of the project, patch and era approaches, the study of the historian's method of enquiry and the general use of sources by history teachers will be considered. In each case the advantages of introducing each of the methods into the teaching of history will be discussed, then the degree, to which the current syllabus prevents their adoption, and finally the extent to which the new syllabus, such as is being proposed in this chapter, would facilitate their use.

Sub section (2) - The Advantages of Studying Local History⁽¹⁾
and the Influence of the Present and a Broader Syllabus on its
Adoption in Schools.

The introduction of local history as an element in the school syllabus /

(1) The discussion in this sub section refers to England only.

syllabus has been a popular theme in recent years.⁽¹⁾

Three main arguments have been put forward in its favour.

The most common, and perhaps the most important, is the sense of reality which a study of local history brings to history teaching in the schools.⁽²⁾ The pupils have a chance to investigate their own community, not only dealing with its origin and growth, but also with all the visible signs of its past, whether these are its churches, castles and three field systems, or the development of its housing and town planning over the last 100 years.⁽³⁾

A second, and related advantage, is the opportunity, which local history provides, to get away from the traditional talk and chalk methods of the teacher. A course on local history allows teachers, at the very least, to organise frequent visits outside the school and, if they are more ambitious, to encourage projects, where groups of pupils can study different aspects of the life of the community at particular periods in the past.⁽⁴⁾ Finally, the relevance of local history to pupils of all ages in the secondary school has been pointed out. In Journals and in the Times Educational Supplement teachers describe with enthusiasm how visits, for example, to a derelict industrial site can be employed/

-
- (1) For example, Douch op.cit., L.W. Stewart, "History and the Environment" Teaching History 11 No.7, May 1972, p.201-206, C. Brent "Archive kits" in W. Lamont, "The Realities of Teaching History" (Sussex 1972) p.93-110, A.M.A. "The Teaching of History in Secondary Schools" (Cambridge 1975) p.217-227 and frequent articles in "Teaching History".
 - (2) Douch op.cit. p.7-9, Stewart op.cit. p.203, Rowse, A.L. "Uses of History" (London 1963) p.31
 - (3) Douch op.cit. p.7-9, Stewart op.cit. p.204, Brent op.cit. 100-101 T.D. Cook "Local History: some Practical Approaches" Teaching History 1 No.2, May 1970, p.164
 - (4) Douch op.cit. p.7-8, Rowse op.cit. p.31, Cook op.cit. p.166-169, R.H. Thomas "On the Trail of the Industrial Revolution" Teaching History 11 No.11, May 1974, p.209-215

employed as a starting point for a project in the first or second years of secondary school,⁽¹⁾ while those concerned with the later years of the secondary school point to the opportunities provided through county archives to permit pupils to study collections of documents relating to particular aspects of local history. Colin Brent, for instance, writing in Lamont's *Realities of History Teaching*, cites a wide selection of topics which could be studied in secondary schools from collections of local documents, ranging from the analysis of Victorian institutions, for example, workhouses, hospitals and asylums, to the turnpike trusts and enclosures of the 18th century.⁽²⁾

The present syllabus offered by the examination boards at 'O' and 'A' level gives little opportunity for pupils to study local history.⁽³⁾ As has already been demonstrated, the syllabus is predominantly concerned with the domestic and foreign policies of political leaders and governments. Such a syllabus gives teachers little opportunity to consider local affairs. Teachers can only incorporate local incidents as illustrations of a national theme, for example, a local Chartist riot or national events, which happen to occur locally, such as battles in the Civil War. An approach of this nature does not do justice to local history, since no major facet of the history of the locality is considered, local history/

(1) Thomas op.cit. p.209-215

(2) Lamont op.cit. p.97-103

(3) Douch op.cit. p.125-6

history being used simply as a source for occasional examples of a national theme.

A defender of the present syllabus might point out, however, that if the examination boards paid more attention to local politics teachers would be able to incorporate local history into their courses. Though such a change might bring about some improvement, the degree of attention, which could be given to local history, is likely to be very limited. In the first place, only one aspect of the life of the local community would be receiving consideration. Secondly, the analysis of local politics may well involve the study of a unit as big as a county, rather than the affairs of the community, in which the school is located. Thirdly, as has been pointed out in a previous chapter, the study of local politics is heavily dependent on national affairs. This point is well illustrated by the questions already set by the examination boards on local politics. Most of these questions deal exclusively with the machinery of local government and, to judge by the marking guides constructed by the examiners, pupils are expected to confine themselves largely to the legislation passed by Parliament, which defines the structure of local government.⁽¹⁾ Thus even when questions are set on local politics the material, which the pupils are expected to use in their answers, is drawn very largely from national politics. In the light of these three/

(1) For example all the questions set at 'A' level by the JMB in the years 1968-72 on the nature of local government required the pupils to discuss the organisation of local government as laid down by Parliament.

three factors, therefore, even if the role of local politics in the syllabus were increased, there is no guarantee that teachers will give serious consideration to local history.

The impact of a broader syllabus on the study of local history in the schools will now be outlined. Throughout the argument the difficulties faced by teachers in incorporating local history into their courses will be acknowledged. The dependence of local history on the availability and suitability of sources will be recognised, as well as the possibility that schools will be located in communities, which have only come into existence since 1900. As a result, emphasis will be placed throughout the discussion on the range of opportunities which a broader syllabus would provide, for the study of local history so that most schools will be able to incorporate an important aspect of local history at some point both in 'O' and 'A' level courses.

The nature of the opportunities created by a broader syllabus for the study of local history will now be discussed. First of all, the relevance of local history to certain aspects of economic history will be considered. Secondly, the importance of employing local history in the illustration of general themes in religious history will be explored. Thirdly, the close relationship between local and social history, both for illustrating and for checking broad generalisations, will be analysed. Finally, the reported experience of a number of teachers, who have introduced courses or part courses on local history will be discussed.

The/

The impact of a course in which economic history plays an important part on the study of local history should be considerable. Already in chapter 13 the extent to which economic conditions vary from one locality to another has been indicated. Thus, for example, at the time of the industrial and agrarian revolutions the degree of mechanisation varied from one area and one industry to another, while the movement towards larger industrial units, which becomes evident from about 1850, proceeded rapidly in some sectors, for example, steel and shipbuilding, and slowly in others, for instance, the pottery and woollen industries.⁽¹⁾ This lack of uniformity illustrates clearly the dependence of certain aspects of economic history on the study of local history. As a consequence, the incorporation of an aspect of local history into a course, in which economic history plays an important part, is most appropriate. Not only do pupils have an opportunity to check whether the general trends outlined by the textbook on a particular subject are accurate, but they can also examine the sort of materials which economic historians use when building up a picture of local conditions as a first step in the creation of a general synthesis. Actual examples of topics, which teachers could select, would depend on the period of history being studied,⁽²⁾ the area in which the school is located and the available documents, but at 'O' level subjects like the impact of canalisation⁽³⁾ or of railways on an area would be suitable and at 'A' level a possible subject is the degree of poverty in a locality and the nature of the treatment received by those who were dependent on the parish.⁽⁴⁾

(1) W. Ashworth, 'An Economic History of England 1870-1914', (London 1948) p89-92

(2) Brent, op.cit. p.98-109

(3) Cook op.cit. p.165, F.P. McGlyens, 'An Approach to Archives & Local History' Teaching History II, No.5, May 1971, p.31

(4) Lament op.cit. p.97

Secondly the study of religious history should also provide opportunities for the incorporation of local history though more as an illustration of general trends than as an indicator of the variability of local conditions. The religious history of different areas is likely to be more uniform than local economic conditions. The dogma, rites and organisation of a religious group, whether worshipping in a church or chapel, will have normally been constructed, either as a result of parliamentary legislation, or through the direction of its leadership, which is normally at a national, but can be at an international, level. Thus the analysis of the religious history of an area will enable pupils to illuminate general themes. Unfortunately, however, the sources, which are available for the study of the religious history of a locality, are unlikely to be plentiful. The documents, which can be consulted locally, will probably provide an adequate picture of the administrative role of the established church, but those that could help pupils to recreate the specifically religious activities of a community are unlikely to be stored locally, most of them being kept either at diocesan or national libraries. But this weakness is made good to a certain degree by the range of churches, chapels and other centres of religious worship in a locality. The survival of these buildings makes it possible to study various aspects of religious history by reference to the area in which the school is situated.⁽¹⁾ Thus a carefully designed visit to/

(1) Stewart, op.cit. p.204

to a church or chapel can help the pupil to appreciate the interpretation of Christianity held by a particular religious group and, in certain cases, its aesthetic expression. At the same time, provided a variety of buildings are in existence, comparisons will be possible of the differing attitudes to Christianity adopted by a number of religious groups during one period, and of one group over a number of centuries.

Thirdly, the importance of local history to social history can be demonstrated by considering two aspects of social history, namely the study of demography and of social conditions.

In recent years demographic studies have begun to shed light on important aspects of social history.⁽¹⁾ Not only do they indicate the size of the population, the expectation of life, the major causes of death and the degree of geographical and social mobility, but they can also reveal the relative significance of nuclear and extended families from one period to another and the social composition of households, for example the number and types of servants available to different social groups. Each of the topics can be studied at local level provided the relevant documents are available.⁽²⁾ For the last hundred years the appropriate evidence should be accessible in the form of census returns, but for the period before 1872 sources may be more sparse. However, all county records/

(1) Perkin in Finberg op.cit. p.56-58

(2) For example D Turner, "Population Studies in the History Syllabus" Teaching History III, No.11 May 1974 p.230-232

record offices will have parish registers, some of which go back to the 16th century, and from them attempts can be made to calculate the growth of the population, birth and mortality rates and the main causes of death. One important additional source, which will be discussed in more detail, because of their neglect by historians and by teachers, and because of the care with which they could be used, are settlement forms.⁽¹⁾ These forms were given to people when they left their village of birth and indicated that the parish of origin accepted responsibility for the individual and his dependents if they became chargeable on the parish, in which they ultimately settled. These documents, which are available in a number of County Record Offices and parishes in the South of England, can throw light on certain aspects of economic and social history between 1660 and 1833. Geographical and social mobility within a local community and further afield, can be determined by testing the areas from which the population originated and the occupations, in which they were employed. At the same time, if records exist of those individuals and families who were returned to their birthplace, because of poverty or lack of work, an interesting picture can be constructed of the prosperity of a region, which can be compared with generalisations made in textbooks about the situation in the country as a whole. In addition, to parish registers and settlement forms other documents may exist of demographic interest, for example, tax returns and ecclesiastical censuses, /

(1) Studies employing settlement forms by historians are extremely rare.

censuses, but the use to which they are put will depend on those which have survived and their appropriateness for illustrating certain aspects of the syllabus.

The nature of social conditions can also be illuminated by the study of local history. Social conditions vary as markedly as economic conditions from one locality to another. For instance, during the 19th century the housing conditions of the urban proletariat ranged from the model dwellings of purpose built settlements like Saltaire to the streets of "two up and two down" in the Midlands of England and to the tenements of big cities like Manchester and Glasgow, where families often lived in one or two rooms only. Thus, as was the case with the study of economic conditions, pupils are dealing with the sort of research into local conditions, which is the starting point adopted by social historians. The sources used by the pupils will be of two types. First of all there are abundant opportunities for pupils to study visible evidence, which has survived from former periods, for example, types of houses and public buildings.⁽¹⁾ By so doing they can compare the varied life styles of the main social groups in a community. In Stoke-on-Trent, for instance it is possible to study the actual lay-out of houses built in the 19th century for the pottery owners, for shopkeepers, for master craftsmen and for ordinary factory workers. At the same time, pupils can analyse the design of a suburb or an area of housing considering the social facilities of a region and/

(1) Stewart, op.cit. p.204, Cook op.cit. p.167, Brent op.cit. p.100-101

and the likely leisure activities of its inhabitants. Secondly documents will be available for use in schools. For a period like the 18th and 19th centuries such materials would be abundant, ranging from documents of a public nature like newspapers and town council records, to family sources, for example, private letters and photographs, while even for remote periods, as far back as the 15th century, evidence of social conditions can be gleaned from documents, such as the inventories taken of a person's possessions after death, many of which are stored in local county archives. Thus the study of social conditions at the local level should provide teachers with abundant opportunities, either for analysing sources in the classroom, or for taking pupils to study some of the visible remains of the past.

Finally the accounts of courses and part courses, where local history is involved which are reported in journals, newspapers and books by teachers, and those concerned with teacher training, confirms the two main themes, which have been advanced in this section of the argument. First of all, the difficulty of studying the local politics of previous periods is illustrated by the tendency for teachers who experiment with local history in schools to ignore politics. Indeed, after a broad survey of the literature, no reports have been found of teachers who include even an aspect of local politics in their courses on local history. Secondly the importance of a broad syllabus, in particular, the inclusion of economic, social and religious history, for the introduction of local history in the schools is

is well illustrated. All the sources on local history described by the teachers dealt with an aspect of economic, religious or social history and most of them covered all three types of history.⁽¹⁾ Of special interest in the light of the discussion earlier in this chapter of whether cultural or military history should be included in the broader syllabus, which is being proposed in this chapter, is the absence of any reference to military history in the reports of these teachers and the tendency to ignore cultural history except on rare occasions.

The patch, era and project approaches to the teaching of history will now be discussed as a group because of their interrelatedness.

Sub Section (3) The Patch Era and Project Approaches to the Teaching of History and the Influence of a Narrow and a Broad Syllabus on their Adoption in Schools.

In this sub section the following procedure will be employed. The patch, era and project approaches to the teaching of history will be described, their similarities pointed out and their merits as teaching methods. Then the comparative effects of a curriculum dominated by political history, as opposed to one drawing equally on political, social, economic and religious history, on the use of these innovations in schools will be considered.

The /

(1) Note especially Brent op.cit. p.93-110, Stewart op.cit.p.201-206

The patch and era approaches to the teaching of history are similar. The patch involves concentration on a short period of history, for example a decade, or at the most the reign of one monarch, as opposed to the study of a lengthy period, such as two centuries. It leads to the temporary abandonment of the linear chronological approach to school history and, in its place, to the adoption of an intensive study of the principal aspects of a society at one chosen time.⁽¹⁾ When teachers adopt the era approach they are simply expanding the ideas which lie behind the use of the patch. A syllabus constructed around the era approach would be made up of a series of different periods of history joined by very short bridging units between one patch and another.⁽²⁾ This approach involves, as a result, concentrations on a number of carefully selected periods of history, with only limited attention being paid to chronological development.

Both of these approaches provide a welcome antidote to the defects evident in the traditional chronological syllabus still favoured by a majority of secondary schools. This type of syllabus, which usually involves a survey of ancient civilisations, followed by an account of British history from 55 B.C. to modern times, all in the first five years of the secondary school,⁽³⁾ has a number of weaknesses which are overcome to a great extent by the patch and era approaches. The first difficulty with the chronological syllabus is the danger/

(1) Jamieson op.cit. p.4

(2) Jamieson op.cit. p.4 The main description of the era approach occurs in Carpenter op.cit. especially p.37-58

(3) Jamieson op.cit. p.3, Carpenter op.cit. p.15, D. Sylvester, "The Cinderella Subject" T.E.S. March 23, 1973, p.62, Price op.cit. p.343-347, D.B. Heater "What History Should We Teach" Education for Teaching, No.65, November 1964 p.45-49

danger of superficiality,⁽¹⁾ teachers having to cover substantial periods, for example the age of the Tudors and Stuarts, in one year of school history. Secondly the pressure to cover so much material must increase the temptation for the teacher to use traditional methods, such as dictated notes, and not permit the pupils to study topics at their own pace. Thirdly, adherence to chronology means that what is presented to the pupils is determined by the sequence of events not by the difficulty of the material for the different age groups.⁽²⁾ Thus, for example, periods such as the Middle Ages, which may tax the understanding of pupils because of their remoteness from modern times, are dealt with by the youngest pupils. Each of these problems, is overcome, though to differing extents, by the patch and era approaches. Both permit the pupil to study a particular period in depth and in both the teacher is freed from the need to adopt traditional teaching methods and can synchronise the difficulty of the material to the age and ability of the pupil. Of course these two approaches do not necessitate the complete abandonment of the traditional syllabus, but act mainly as a relief from its rigours. Thus the adoption of the patch and era approaches, possibly at the same time as the acceptance of a chronological syllabus covering a less prolonged period, will provide a much needed opportunity for teachers and pupils to experience more flexibility in the methods which are employed in secondary school history.

Though projects/

(1) J. Chaffer, "What History Should We Teach?" in Jones op.cit.p.54
(2) Carpenter op.cit. p.28-29

projects may take many forms certain distinguishing features can be identified. First of all, a project normally involves the pupil or a group of pupils working on a subject, chosen by themselves, or selected by them, from a number of topics provided by the teacher.⁽¹⁾ The pupils generally work with a very limited amount of guidance from the teacher, who does not attempt to give a formal course of instruction on the subject which has been chosen. Secondly, an attempt is normally made to ensure that the findings of the individual pupils or groups of pupils are made available to the whole class. The material produced by the pupils is commonly either read out to the class or put together into an exhibition which can be studied by all the pupils.

The advantages gained by pupils and teachers from a well organised project are considerable. Pupils have the opportunity to work by themselves or in groups, studying a topic of their own choice, consulting a wide range of secondary and even some primary sources, and experiencing, but hopefully overcoming, the difficulties involved in constructing a coherent narrative. Projects would, at the same time, allow teachers to vary their strategy.⁽²⁾ While a project is in progress teachers do not have to employ their traditional didactic methods, they can adapt the tasks the pupils are attempting to their ability and they can pay a great deal of attention to individuals and their problems. These projects provide both pupils and teachers with an opportunity for much needed variation in the teaching/

(1) Jamieson op.cit. p.8-9

(2) Ferguson op.cit. p.10-11 & 14-15

teaching and learning of history.

The effect of the present 'O' and 'A' level syllabi on the adoption of these approaches will now be outlined at the same time as the likely influence of the introduction of a broader syllabus is being considered.

As the present syllabus offers virtually no opportunity for the use of the patch and era approaches in schools a discussion of the implications of a broad, as opposed to a narrow syllabus, for the adoption of these two approaches need only be very brief. Since the current syllabus concentrates primarily on one type of history over a period of at least one hundred and fifty years the patch and era approaches, which involve the study of the different aspects of a relatively short period of history, are virtually excluded from use by teachers, who are preparing pupils for G.C.E. With such a syllabus a teacher who adopted a patch or era approach would be forcing his pupils to study aspects of the period, which were not relevant for the examination, and would be reducing their chance of passing. In contrast, if a syllabus were made up equally of political, social, economic and religious history and covered, as a consequence, a shorter period the patch and era approaches would be the appropriate methods for teachers to adopt. The few accounts of the use of the patch and era, which are reported in the journals and books describing teaching methods in schools, confirms this view. (1)

(1) Carpenter op.cit. p.37 & 60-62, Jamieson op.cit. p.9

view. All the descriptions presuppose a consideration of a number of the features of a period, as opposed to a chronological study of one type of history.

The impact of a broad or narrow syllabus on the adoption of the project approach in schools is not as clear as in the case of the patch and era approaches and will necessitate far more detailed discussion. As will be demonstrated below, a teacher who is preparing pupils for a paper, which draws on one type of history, for example political or economic history can utilise projects. However, it will be pointed out that a syllabus, drawing primarily on only one type of history, makes the employment of projects difficult and that a broad syllabus is far more likely to facilitate their adoption. In particular, two important aspects of projects, which would be affected by the nature of the syllabus, will be discussed, namely the degree of choice of topics available to pupils and the difficulties in providing pupils with practical work during a project.

As has already been pointed out above one of the main advantages of the project approach is the opportunity for individual pupils or groups of pupils to select a topic, which particularly interests them, and study it in depth. Thus the range of subjects made available by a syllabus is very important if teachers are considering whether to adopt the project approach or not. As a result, though it is possible to design a project on aspects of a syllabus based on one/

one type of history, a syllabus drawing on a number of types of history is clearly more suited to the project approach. The restricted range of choice available from a syllabus based on one type of history can be demonstrated by considering the problems a teacher would face in mounting a project on particular periods of political and economic history, for example, the politics of the first half of the 18th century, or the impact of the Industrial Revolution on the British economy between 1800 and 1830, given the context of the type of examination paper set at 'O' and 'A' level by the boards. The likely range of subjects made available by a project on the politics of the first half of the 18th century would be unlikely, in such circumstances, to extend beyond the foreign, domestic and imperial policies of the main political leaders, together with some analysis of constitutional developments. Similarly a project on the impact of the Industrial Revolution on the British economy between 1800 and 1850 would be restricted to topics like wages, production, markets and transport. With so few 'O' and 'A' level questions being set on social and religious history, the impact of the Industrial Revolution on social conditions, or the new problems posed for religious groups by rapid urbanisation, would have to be ignored. Even the influence of the Industrial Revolution on politics would have to be limited to its effect on the policies of governments, since this is the only aspect of political affairs to receive any attention in these papers. In contrast a project, for example, on the age of Walpole, which could draw on a number of types/

types of history, could offer pupils a wide choice of topics incorporating, not only studies of social and economic conditions, but also a consideration of the political and religious developments of the period. Thus syllabi, which deal predominantly with one type of history, by limiting the choice of topics available to the pupils make it more difficult for teachers to use projects, whereas syllabi drawing on a number of types of history would facilitate this approach.

The second major aspect of project work which is difficult to implement in the context of the present syllabi, especially those dominated by political history, is the opportunity for varied practical work. Most projects, which are reported in the literature, mention the importance of the practical work associated with a project.⁽¹⁾ This practical work may take many forms. The use of model making is very popular, whether the models are of castles, houses, factories or of simple machinery. Illustrations are also of crucial importance. They include flow charts, explaining the reasons for a particular event or change, pupils paintings, depicting scenes from the past, or illustrating the interior of a building, and diagrammatic representations, for instance, of the plan of a town or village. The project may also involve work outside school, though this will depend on the topic chosen. Thus a project can lead to the use of field studies for certain groups

(1) For example, D. Mack, *Industrial Archaeology in the Primary School*, Teaching History III, No.9, May 1973, p.9.
For example, AMA op.cit. p.77

groups with visits, for example, to industrial sites for systematic study of particular features of their development. Practical work of these different types perform a crucial function for the project. Not only does it provide pupils with a variety of activities, which are in striking contrast to the sedentary nature of most history teaching, but they also make the problems involved in the presentation of the work to others in the class less intractable. Though practical work is clearly possible in a project on political history, a project arising out of a syllabus drawing on social, economic, political and religious history would provide greater opportunities for practical activities. Thus the project, which has already been discussed on politics in the first half of the 18th century, would only prompt certain types of practical work. In the case of foreign policy maps would be essential and diagrams of different types would be helpful in outlining, for example, the achievements of particular statesmen and governments. But the use of model making, the possibility of work outside the school, like field studies, and even the feasibility of illustrating by painting and diagram are extremely limited. In contrast, a project on Britain in 1730 would make it possible to use all these types of practical work, from models of machinery, to illustrations of Georgian houses and visits to industrial sites. Thus, once again, though projects on political history are possible the broader syllabus would make them a more viable proposition.

Two related innovations in the teaching of history, which would be facilitated by the introduction of a broader syllabus, remains to be considered, namely the study of the historian's methods of enquiry and the general use of sources by history teachers.

Sub section (4) The Historian's Method of Enquiry and the
General Use of Historical Sources as Teaching Methods and in
Relation to a broad and narrow syllabus

In this sub section the use of the historian's method of enquiry and of historical sources as methods of teaching history will be described and their advantages pointed out. Then the extent to which these two approaches will be facilitated by a syllabus drawing mainly on one type of history, as opposed to one made up of a number of types of history, will be considered.

The idea that history teaching should place a considerable emphasis on the historian's method of enquiry goes back as far as 1910. In that year M.W. Keatinge recommended that pupils should be trained in historical skills and that historical documents should be employed for the purpose.⁽¹⁾ As has already been mentioned in chapter 12, this notion really bore fruit in Happold's campaign to introduce the study of historical documents into the teaching and examining of history.⁽²⁾ This belief that the pupil should simulate the activity of the historian/

(1) M.W. Keatinge, *Studies in the Teaching of History* (London 1910) p.38
(2) See above p. 343

historian has been very popular in recent years. Particularly notable has been the part the idea has played in The Schools Council Project 13-16, in which considerable emphasis has been placed on the pupils' understanding of the historians' use of evidence.⁽¹⁾ Thus the project highlights the range of the sources available to historians, the importance of detection as part of the work of the historian and the way in which bias can affect historical evidence and the conclusions of the historian.

The concern for the use of sources in history teaching is so widespread that it overlaps all the other innovations, which have been outlined in this section. Clearly sources are important, for example, in the study of the methodology of the historian and to local history, as well as to the patch, project and era approaches. But one aspect of the interest in sources, which is not highlighted by a consideration of the other innovations, is the importance of sources for day to day classroom teaching. This point is demonstrated by the number of articles in journals in which teachers describe the use of unusual sources and documents in their teaching, ranging from trade tokens,⁽²⁾ as illustrations of economic activities, to a series of punch cartoons, as a centrepiece for the study of British political history in the first decade of the 20th century.⁽³⁾

Two/

-
- (1) Parkin op.cit. p.354-358
 - (2) J.R.S. Whiting, "Trade Tokens in the Classrooms," Teaching History 1, No.1 May 1969, p.36-41
 - (3) S. Smith, "Some Aspects of 1903 - A Source Pack based on Cartoons," Teaching History III, No.11, May 1973, p.198-203

Two major advantages are gained by the inclusion of some study of the methods of historians. In the first place history teaching will share in the trend, evident in other school subjects, to lay more emphasis on methodology.⁽¹⁾ An approach of this nature allows pupils to gain some insight into how knowledge is acquired in a subject, as opposed to spending their whole time accumulating information. This argument is particularly important in the case of history, since, so often the evidence is limited in nature, and its interpretation by historians is debateable, yet all too often pupils treat history as a collection of facts whose truth is unassailable. Secondly a consideration of the methods of the historian should allow teachers to vary their classroom strategy. Instead of the traditional 'talk and chalk' approach teachers can set the pupils particular problems to solve associated with the historian's methodology and, provided the solution to the problem is sufficiently open ended, such work should lead to general discussion. This approach is already adopted, to a limited extent, by the examiners for Syllabus C, set by the JMB at 'A' level, though unfortunately Syllabus C only attracts a small proportion of the boards 'A' level candidates.⁽²⁾ The use of documents which is required in these papers, does indicate, however, the sort of work which could be widespread at 'A' if not 'O' level. The problems, which pupils are asked to consider, are varied. For example,/

(1) c.f. Nuffield Science

(2) 7.46% of all 'A' level candidates 1968-72

impressive. They include documents of an official and personal nature, many of them in published form, literary sources, often much neglected in schools, such as novels newspapers and magazines, as well as maps, reproductions of paintings and buildings, photographs (including aerial photography) and, in the case of recent history, films and television documentaries. Finally this rich range of material can be employed without the expense and disturbance of leaving the classroom. Inevitably, with history being timetabled generally for three or four forty minute periods a week, visits are difficult to organise without encroaching on the time available for other subjects. Thus, the illustrations provided by sources may be the main opportunity for pupils to encounter the written and visual evidence for the historical themes, which they are studying.

A syllabus which is largely confined to the consideration of political history, limits the degree to which the study of the methodology of the historian can be developed in schools, as well as curtailing the use which may be made of a wide range of sources. Firstly the types of sources, which can be studied in a course on political history, are narrow. Though the sources for the study of recent political history may include, not only documentary evidence, but also films, newspapers and even televised interviews with retired statesmen, the main sources for the political history of the years before 1914 will be documentary. History teachers will not be able to make much use of literary, pictorial or photographic sources. Secondly the documents which are available, will be very largely of an official kind, for example, Acts of Parliament and political/

political speeches, often requiring a well developed understanding of legal and constitutional history. A study, for instance of seventeenth and eighteenth century political history, in which documents were used as a major source, would inevitably involve the consideration of collections of documents, such as those edited by Gardiner⁽¹⁾ and by Costin and Watson,⁽²⁾ which are more appropriate for students working for an Honours degree. These problems of interpretation become increasingly severe the more remote the century being studied, a knowledge of Latin, being essential for the study of political documents in the period before 1485. Thirdly the teacher will find it difficult to arouse the pupils' interest in the documentary sources, which are generally employed in the study of political history. The pupils will soon find out that these documents have already been examined, in detail by historians and that textbooks provide commentaries, which are far more sophisticated than they themselves could attain. In contrast, as has already been pointed out, it is possible for teachers to employ collections of documents on social and economic history dealing for example with topics like population movement, which have not received a great deal of attention from historians.⁽³⁾ Thus the study of a syllabus dominated by political history restricts the range of sources available to the pupils and the degree to which they can study the methodology of the historian.

These/

-
- (1) S.R. Gardiner, Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution (Oxford 1889)
 - (2) W.S. Costin, and J.S. Watson, "The Law and Working of the Constitution: Documents 1660-1914" (London 1952)
 - (3) See above p. 452

These disadvantages which arise with a syllabus drawing primarily on political history are not evident if the syllabus is made up of social, economic and religious, as well as political history.

Even for the last hundred years of British and European political history where documentary film and photographic sources are available a broader syllabus can draw on a wider and richer range of materials. Thus, for example, British television in the last ten years has produced a wealth of programmes dealing with such topics as military tactics in the First and Second World Wars, the emancipation of women, the social and ideological antecedents of the Nazis in Germany and the impact of the slump of 1929 on different parts of Europe. In addition, pupils are continually exposed to plays and serials, which portray the lives of different social groups in British, European and American society during the 19th and 20th centuries. Though any history teacher would treat these plays and T.V. dramas with some caution, they usually provide an authentic picture of the social convention of the period and offer a starting point for the consideration of a period of history. These trends can be paralleled in literature, in films and in biographies, dealing with aspects of the history of the last century. Perhaps even more immediate and, especially important for pupils at 'O' level, is the degree to which a broader syllabus can draw on the history of the pupils' own families. In recent years a number of writers have described courses in secondary schools drawing heavily on family history.⁽¹⁾

(1) For example Steel and Taylor op.cit. and B.J. Murphy, "History through the Family" Teaching History II, No.5 May 1971, p.1-9

history. They have pointed to the wealth of material which families can provide, that relates to recent history, ranging from experiences of modern warfare to day-to-day memories of living conditions since 1920.⁽¹⁾ This approach, provided it does not dominate the study of a period, permits the teacher, from time to time, to incorporate the experiences of the pupils' own relatives, thus lessening the remoteness of much recent history. Though some of the material provided by the pupils will deal with issues of a political nature, the majority will be concerned with social and economic history.⁽²⁾ Thus any course on recent history, which makes some use of family history, will need to be of a broad nature.

But the advantages of a broader syllabus are even more evident in the study of periods of British and European history before 1850. Already during the discussion of local history in schools the availability of a wide selection of documents for the study of social and economic history has been indicated.⁽³⁾ Also the advantages of studying these documents, as opposed to those generally available in the context of a course on political history, has been outlined. In addition, however, a broad syllabus allows teachers to draw on a mass of contemporary accounts of most periods of history. These might include descriptions of particular events, such as battles, or of general trends, such as are evident, for example, in social history. Fortunately teachers should not have to search for their own documents, since collections have been published which/

(1) Steel and Taylor op.cit. p.52-164

(2) *ibid* p.52-164

(3) See above p. 448-449 and 451-454

which cover different types and periods of history.⁽¹⁾ But perhaps of even greater importance is the range of sources made available by a broad syllabus. Thus, while a course dominated by political history has to rely mainly on documentary sources, a broader syllabus can draw on a wide selection of materials. Four types of sources would be particularly applicable, though their relevance would vary from one period to another. First of all teachers could make use of the visible remains of previous periods of British and European history. Though a study of cultural history is not incorporated in the broader syllabus being advocated in this chapter a consideration of the art and architecture of a period can throw on its economic, social and religious history. Thus, for example, a discussion of the layout and decoration of churches, cathedrals and monasteries is an important means by which the role of religion in the Middle Ages can be illustrated. Equally an analysis of the structure and style of the English country house can throw considerable light on social life during different periods. Studies of this nature are not, of course, confined to periods of British history, books of illustrations being generally available for other countries, both inside and outside Europe. By the same means pupils can study the economic activities of former centuries. Illustrations can be obtained easily, which allow pupils to discuss industrial and/

(1) For example W.O. Hassall, "They Saw It Happen 55BC-1485 AD" (Oxford 1957)
G.R.N. Routh, "They Saw It Happen 1485-1688" (Oxford 1956)
T.C. Edwards, " " " " 1689-1897" (Oxford 1958)
B. Richardson, " " " "
For selections of documents see also M Bryant "Documentary and Study Material for Teachers and Pupils," Teaching History 1, No.3. May 1970, p.195,199-200

and agricultural processes, as well as the conditions of work and the control exercised over the labour force, from mediaeval to modern times.⁽¹⁾ A third and much neglected source is the literature of a period. Though teachers would need to make careful and selective use of literature as a historical source, it could provide considerable support for the study of certain periods. Thus, for example, Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* provide a lively commentary on different aspects of religious and social life in the late 14th century, while the novels of writers like Fielding, Austen, Dickens and Bennett give an interesting portrayal of different strata of the social life of the 18th and 19th centuries. Perhaps it is also important to point out that many 'A' and 'O' level candidates in history are also studying for 'A' and 'O' level English literature and, thus, a degree of cross fertilisation is possible between the two subjects. Archaeology is a final major source of evidence, which would be facilitated by a broader syllabus. The findings of archaeologists generally throw light on the social, cultural, religious and economic conditions of a community. Only rarely are archaeologists able to make a direct contribution to the analysis of the politics of a period when they discover, as has happened in the Middle East the archives of a kingdom or of a region.⁽²⁾ A broad syllabus would, therefore, encourage the teacher to make references to the work of the archaeologists. Of course with/

(1) See Burston and Green op.cit. p.540-578

(2) For instance, the archives of the rulers of the Hittite Empire discovered by Winckler at Boghaz Koy in 1906.

with the exception of isolated areas, for example, where industrial sites have been excavated and the results reported,⁽¹⁾ teachers would not be able to draw significantly on the findings of archaeologists to illuminate recent history. However, any teacher dealing with a period of history before 1485 could make effective use of archaeological evidence. In the centuries before 1100 the work of archaeologists often provide the main indications of the social, economic and cultural conditions of a period and even after that date can throw detailed light on the life of mediaeval towns and villages.⁽²⁾ Thus, though archaeology may not play a major role when pupils are studying modern history, it is of considerable importance for the analysis of earlier periods and certainly is given greater prominence by a broader syllabus.

This last section of the argument has been devoted to indicating how a broader syllabus would enable teachers to use a wider range of sources in their 'O' and 'A' level courses. This greater use of sources would make it possible for teachers to employ both the innovations which have been discussed in the last section of this chapter. If they wished they could allow pupils to gain some experience of the methodology of the historian by studying a particular issue employing one or more types of evidence. At the same time the greater abundance of sources could be employed to enliven and give authenticity to the day-to-day classroom teaching of the subject.

In/

-
- (1) For example the British Archaeological Research Groups Field Guide to Industrial Monuments in the Mendips, South Cotswold and Bristol region by N. Cossons (Bristol 1967)
 - (2) For example M.W. Beresford, The Lost Villages of England (London 1954)

In this final chapter a new broader syllabus has been proposed and defended made up of political, religious, social and economic history, as opposed to the current syllabus, which tends to be dominated by one type of history. Thus in this thesis three tasks have been completed, the content of 'O' and 'A' level papers has been analysed, the case for the dominance of political history has been evaluated and finally a new alternative syllabus has been advocated. While the reader may not be in full accord with particular features of this study it is to be hoped therefore that the objective laid out in the preface has been attained - namely to throw light on a vital aspect of the teaching of history in secondary schools.