

NAEP 12th Grade World History Assessment:
Issues and Options

Robert B. Bain

University of Michigan
bbain@umich.edu

Commissioned Paper for
The National Assessment Governing Board

14 May 2004

Introduction¹

In one form or another, courses in world history seem to be the fastest growing segment of the American school curriculum. Over the past twenty years almost every state has added world history related content to its curriculum guides at some grade level and in some form. Many states now require students to earn credit in a world history course to graduate from high school, while some test world history on state assessments. Perhaps the most dramatic indicator of world history's popularity has been the development and growth of College Board's Advanced Placement (AP) World History course. Tested in the spring of 2002 with the largest first-time subscription in College Board's history,² the AP World History test has increased significantly with each subsequent assessment. Beyond its growing presence in the curriculum, world history is acquiring added legitimacy with endorsements of reform commissions and educational commentators, typically calling for adding at least one year of world history—variously defined—to the high school curriculum.³ The decision in the early 1990s to give world history co-equal status with United States history in the National History Standards added to its prestige, but also stirred controversy. To be sure, there are many dissenting voices, raising serious and legitimate concerns about the educational and historical quality, purpose and direction of world history courses. Yet the curricular growth of this subject at state and district levels makes world history a logical and valuable addition to the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP). On the surface, this appears to be a sensible and essentially unproblematic decision.

¹ I would like to thank Tamara Shreiner for her assistance in reviewing state documents.

² Indeed, the unanticipated number of students taking the first exam overwhelmed the capacity of readers to evaluate student papers in the allotted time, forcing the Educational Testing Service (ETS) to extend the grading period for an extra week.

³ For example see Ross E. Dunn, *The New World History: A Teacher's Companion* (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2000), Paul Gagnon and The Bradley Commission on History, eds., *Historical Literacy* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1989), Diane Ravitch and Chester E. Finn, *What Do Our 17-Year-Olds Know?: A Report on the First National Assessment of History and Literature*, 1st ed. (New York: Harper & Row, 1987).

However, in creating a common framework for a 12th grade NAEP in world history the National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB) faces two issues that challenge this enterprise. First, in trying to fit (or often add) world history standards, content or courses into social studies curriculum, many states spread world history throughout and across the grades. Thus, students often come upon world history content during their middle school years or in the 9th and 10th grades. One set of issues, therefore, involves assessing 12th grade students on content they had in the 9th or 10th grades—or even earlier.

A second challenge—maybe even greater for developing a common national assessment—involves the variation in the type of world history that U.S. students encounter in their schools. Indeed, the key phrases in my opening paragraph were the conditionals that accompanied my description of world history’s popularity—“in some form or another” or “some type” or “variously defined.” In short, states and local school districts use the world history label to describe curricular practices with different structures, goals, historical approaches, periodization schemes, and content. Such diversity combined with NAGB’s charge to assess what is being taught across the nation rather than determining curriculum presents another serious challenge to creating a 12th grade NAEP world history exam.

In this paper I present a snapshot of world history education to illuminate the challenges NAGB faces in creating a NAEP world history framework.⁴ Using state standards documents, statutes concerning high school graduation, results from the NAEP transcript studies, and materials on the AP World History exam, I will begin with a brief

⁴Over the past fifteen years, I have been actively involved in world history education. Though a U.S. historian by training (Ph.D.), I taught high school world history in one form or another for 26 years. Further, I have participated in a number of world history related projects and research. For example, in 1994 I was a member of the Council for Basic Education’s panel that reviewed the National World History Standards. I also was a member of the AP course development committee, recommending the course framework that College Board adopted for the AP World History program

overview of the expansion of world history in the schools.⁵ In the next section, I describe what I see as the four distinctive patterns to world history education as reflected in state standards documents and AP World History curriculum. Finally, I discuss a few options for developing a NAEP world history framework and the possible consequences of each.

The Growth of World History Education in the United States

Even a cursory review of the social studies standards in the fifty states and the District of Columbia demonstrates that world history is a growth industry in the United States curriculum.⁶ As Chart 1 shows, at least 22 states require a world history course in some form or another for high school graduation.⁷ Eighteen states test their students on world history content by either giving an exam at the end of a course or by including world history content on the state's social studies assessment. Further, given that many of the most populous states require world history for graduation, (e.g., California, Florida, New York, Texas), it follows that a substantial number of U.S. students—probably a majority—are required to take a course in world history. Though my review focused only on state level requirements, I suspect that an analysis of school districts would reveal that either by local board fiat or the fact of limited course offerings (e.g. world history is the only social studies option for, say, 9th

⁵ Methodological Note: To write this paper, I used current state standards documents (2004) in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. I also looked at legislative statutes in each state concerning graduation and course requirements. Since the passage of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), these are in a more heightened state of flux. With Tamara Shreiner's assistance, I contacted state departments of education for corroborating information. Initially, I intended to look at certification requirements for world history teaching across the states, but halted that process as NCLB has made credentials even more unsettled than standards and testing. Finally, I only cast a cursory eye at world history textbooks. While this might be a fruitful investigation to ascertain the state of world history education, it was not part of my initial charge from NAGB.

⁶ See for example Ane Lintvedt, *The Demography of World History in the United States* (November 2003 [cited December 1, 2003 2003]); available from <http://www.worldhistoryconnected.org/1.1/lintvedt.html>. and Jonathan Burack, "The Student, the World, and the Global Education Ideology," in *Where Did Social Studies Go Wrong?*, ed. James Leming, Lucien Ellington, and Kathleen Porter (2003).

⁷ In a number of cases, state officials said that world history was required for graduation, yet I could not find corroboration within statute. Occasionally, I found a note on a state's website that said change in a state's graduation requirements was pending. In Chart 1, I used at least two corroborating pieces of evidence before determining if world history was or was not a graduation requirement.

grade students), world history is required of most high school students. Michigan, for example, does not require world history for graduation, but the Ann Arbor schools require two semesters of world history related courses and Detroit one semester.⁸ The NAEP comparative transcript study supports this pattern of growth, reporting that 69% of high school students earned world history credit in 2000, a hearty increase from the 36% of students who had earned world history credit in 1982 (see Chart 2).⁹

It appears that the majority of students taking world history do so before their junior year. Most of the states that specify a grade level designation for a world history course place it in the 9th or 10th grades. Further, the studies of NAEP transcripts over the past 10 years show that the overwhelming majority of world history is taken by underclassmen. For example, in the most recent transcript study, over 70% of high school students with world history on their transcripts took that course before entering 11th grade (See Chart 2).

Data from the first three AP World History exams corroborates these growth patterns. As noted earlier, ETS offered an AP exam in world history for the first time during the 2001-2002 school year. To its surprise, 998 schools offered at least one AP World History course and 20,995 students took the exam in the first year (see Chart 3). This created the largest student pool for any first time AP exam, ranking AP World History in the top half of all AP exams in 2002, ahead of French and Physics and just below the Economics exams (see Chart 4). During the second year of the program (2002-2003), the number of participating schools increased to 1,464 (almost a 50% growth) with 34,286 students taking the exam,

⁸ Thanks to Lauren McArthur for calling the Ann Arbor and Detroit requirements to my attention.

⁹ U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. *The 1998 High School Transcript Study Tabulations: Comparative Data on Credits Earned and Demographics for 1998, 1994, 1990, 1987, and 1982 High School Graduates*, NCES 2001-498, by Stephen Roey, Nancy Caldwell, Keith Rust, Eyal Blumstein, Tom Krenzke, Stan Legum, Judy Kuhn, Mark Waksberg, and Jacqueline Haynes. Project Officer, Janis Brown. Washington, DC: 2001: a-207; *The 2000 High School Transcript Study*, National Center for Education Statistics

approximately 64% more than in the previous year. On the most recent AP World History exam (May 5, 2004), ETS estimates that over 47,000 students took the exam, creating at least a 37% increase over the previous year and a 125% increase in just three years. Though final numbers are not yet available, it is safe to assume that World History is moving closer to the AP “top ten” and within hailing distance of AP European History (see Charts 4 and 5).

The AP data also supports findings regarding the grade level at which students study world history (see Charts 6 and 7). In the first year of the exam, approximately 75% of the students were 9th or 10th graders, with most of the exams (71%) taken by sophomores. In year two, the percentage of under-classmen (9th and 10th graders) grew to slightly over 80% of students taking the exam. Not surprisingly, performance on the exam appears related to the grade level of the student, with juniors and seniors doing much better on the exam than the under-classmen (see Charts 6 and 7). It is important to remember that students typically take the AP exam the same year they take their world history course. To apply these patterns to a 12th grade NAEP in world history would mean that 9th and 10th grade students, who initially score below their older classmates on the AP exam, would not be tested on the NAEP world history until at least two years after taking their world history course. It is safe to assume the scores of these 9th and 10th graders would decline.

Patterns of World History Curricula

Such growth in world history education suggests a consensus that U.S. students should learn about the world and its past. Curriculum documents and course taking patterns show that an increasing number of states, school districts and students are “voting” for world history with their credits. With so many commentators and reform groups calling for world history, it does appear as if agreement is widespread among states, school districts,

educational reformers and students that world history is a valuable addition to the school curriculum.

However, we should not assume this leads to agreement on what constitutes the history of the world that students study. As Ross Dunn, the former Coordinating Editor of the National World History Standards project, has written, “no single version of world history prevails across the United States.”¹⁰ Dunn posits four models for the world history curriculum, seeing the diversity as a sign that healthy public debate is informing world history education.¹¹ However, such diversity presents serious challenges for NAGB’s efforts to assess what students are learning from their world history lessons.

My review of state standards documents, curricular guides for teachers and the AP World History materials also suggests four patterns constitute world history education in the United States.¹² I hesitate to call these “models” of curriculum, recognizing that the lines between them are often blurred. Still, there seems to be four distinct patterns to the structure of world history that I call Western Civilization Plus, Social Studies World History, Geographic/Regional World History and Global World History. Below is a short description of each pattern in the order of its popularity in the state standards documents. Though these patterns are contested and defended—often quite vehemently—in this essay I have tried to describe each without fixing educational value to them. Each has its proponents and

¹⁰ Ross E. Dunn, *Introduction: Contending Definitions of World History: Which One Should We Choose for the Classroom?* (151) [url] (American Forum of Global Education, 1999 [cited April 18, 2004 2004]); available from <http://www.globaled.org/issues/151/>.

¹¹ Dunn goes on to argue that the range of world history models is evidence that there is no “dogmatic consensus to official narratives.” However, not everyone agrees with this description. Burack (2003) argues that a “global education ideology has taken hold in social studies education” suggesting that dogma does indeed shape world history education. My review of world history standards in states and the AP World History did not find the prevalence of any particular approach or stance, which as I will argue challenges the creation of a NAEP framework. However, it is important to remember that I did not review world history textbooks where one might be more likely to find such a stance.

¹² Dunn calls his models the Western Heritage Model, Different Cultures Model, Contemporary Studies Model and Patterns of Change. While my review of state standards and AP course materials also suggests four patterns, they differ from the way Dunn describes the curricular topography.

opponents. As an experienced high school history teacher, at one time or another I have taught curriculum structured in all four and see the potential contributions each offers teachers and students. However, it is the differences between them, not their relative value that I think is most challenging to NAGB in creating a NAEP world history framework at this time.

Western Civilization Plus: This model has its origins in the Western Civilization framework that became a staple in U.S. history teaching as early as the 1920s. Because it was so prevalent in American schools it has a familiar narrative line, tracing the development of western civilizations from ancient river valleys to Greece and Rome; through an interregnum variously called the Dark or Middle Ages; followed by a cultural rebirth and Reformation; and then transformation created by enlightened and scientific thinking, the rise of the nation-state, growth of national economic systems, democratic revolutions, and industrialism. The narrative structure, developed over years, has a coherence to it and is filled with familiar and important events (e.g. the rise and fall of Rome, French Revolution) and famous people (e.g. Galileo, Bismarck), stressing political and intellectual changes over time. In short, the course tells the story of the “rise” of the west, often using other parts of the world to show their contributions or connections to the west’s development.

The world history version of Western Civilization expands this pattern of study by adding cultures and civilizations beyond Europe without dramatically shifting the key events or the underlying narrative structure. While adding important content outside Europe, such as 20th century Third World independence movements, this curricular pattern continues to place Europe and civilization in the west at the center of study. Indeed, approximately 70% or more of the content of this world history curriculum is devoted to the study of Europe, continuing to use the Western Civilization periodization schemes and organizing features. This pattern

appears to be the most prevalent among state standards documents, with about 28 states adding non-western content to what appeared to be a western civilization model (see Chart 7).

Social Studies World History: A second pattern in state standards, what I have called Social Studies World History, uses the structure of the National Council for the Social Studies standards document, *Expectations of Excellence: Curriculum Standards for Social Studies*.¹³

While the social studies movement has long promised the curricular integration of many different disciplines,¹⁴ this pattern uses the social studies banner to put the disciplines in distinctive strands, themes or topics (e.g. “Individuals, Groups and Institutions” or “Power, Authority and Governance”). Within such a framework, history (often called “Time, Continuity and Change”) is one strand among many in a curriculum that neither weaves strands together nor fully develops any one of the strands. Social Studies World History focuses upon large and often grand generalizations that stress broad themes or intellectual processes. While drawing attention to these big ideas, the standards often do so at the expense of specific historic content.

Consider, for example, the “Comprehending the Past” standard from the Michigan Social Studies Standards and Benchmarks (Standard I.2): “All students will understand narratives about major eras of American and world history by identifying the people involved, describing the setting, and sequencing the events.” The document continues to explain that students will meet the standard if they can “select events and individuals from the past that

¹³ National Council for the Social Studies, *Expectations of Excellence: Curriculum Standards for Social Studies, Bulletin / National Council for the Social Studies*; 89 (Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1994).

¹⁴ The National Council for the Social Studies defines social studies as “the integrated study of the social sciences and humanities to promote civic competence. Within the school program, social studies provides coordinated, systematic study drawing upon such disciplines as anthropology, archaeology, economics, geography, history, law, philosophy, political science, psychology, religion, and sociology, as well as appropriate content from the humanities, mathematics, and natural sciences.” (emphasis added)

have had global impact on the modern world and describe their impact.”¹⁵ As this one example shows, though valuable for framing large ideas, the Social Studies World History pattern often leaves specificity of events and people to local districts or requires other documents to provide more detailed content and integration.¹⁶ Many states exhibiting this pattern appear simply to have appended the words “and world history” to their social studies standards.

Other social studies strands, such as economics (typically called “Production, Distribution and Consumption”) or geography (“People, Places and Environment”) also include world historical content—challenging teachers to search for world history among various strands. The Social Studies World History pattern has influenced at least 20 of the state standards (see Chart 7) and at least ten state level assessments (see Chart 1). Such assessments partially test world history while also assessing subjects such as economics, civics or geography.

Geographic/Regional World History: A smaller number of state documents also reflect features of an area or regional studies approach to world history. This pattern treats regions of the world separately (e.g., Africa, Asia, the Middle East) typically folding the history, geography and economics into one combined study. In many ways, this is analogous to the traditional Western Civilization course applied to civilizations or regions outside of Europe or the United States. This pattern typifies middle school social studies or specialized high school courses. While no state exclusively embraces this approach for secondary history, I found a number of states whose standards reflected significant features of Geographic/Regional

¹⁵ Of the 53 Michigan benchmarks for social studies, only 5 mention world history, while 18 specify Michigan history and 19 U.S. history. I am grateful to Lauren McArthur for pointing out this fact.

¹⁶ For example, to integrate its history, geography, civics and economics standards into one course, the state of Washington recently created a separate world history framework that reflects the Global World History pattern.

History approach. Further, many school districts are using a regional history pattern in offering world history courses to students. For example, though the state of Michigan does not require world history for graduation, the Ann Arbor Public Schools requires students to take one semester of Western Civilization and then one semester of African, Latin American, Middle Eastern or Asian history.

Global World History: The last pattern, Global World History, constitutes a self-conscious attempt to locate history at different scales of time and space, specifically adding trans-regional historical processes to the study of regions and civilizations. This approach to history asks students to move among different scales of time/space—sometimes focusing on a person or group, while at other times, on the nation, civilization, region, trans-region or even the globe. The new AP World History course is the best example of an approach that combines trans-regional or cross-civilizational studies that require students to look at and across regions of the world.

According to the AP World History guide, one of the distinctive features of a global history course is that it requires students to study large patterns over time and space, “while also acquiring the ability to connect local developments to global ones and move through levels of generalizations from the global to the particular.”¹⁷ For example, while studying the development of civilizations, the AP course also looks specifically at global processes and interactions, such as trade and migration, across different types of societies over time. Because a global world history course, at times, unties school history from its typical mooring of the nation or civilization, AP provides specific guidance to teachers to help them balance attention to global processes with other features that constitute history. For example, AP

¹⁷ AP World History Acorn Book, May 2004, 2005, pg. 7.

limits its course of study to five chronological periods, five key themes, and the major civilizations within four regions.¹⁸ The AP course guide also specifies that

coverage of European history does not exceed 30 percent of the total course.

This encourages increased coverage of topics that are important to Europe in the world and not just to Europe itself, as well as attention to areas outside Europe.¹⁹

Comparative history plays a significant role in the AP global approach stipulating that students must look across different political, economic and social systems, (e.g. compare Industrialism in Japan and western Europe, or compare Haitian, American French, Mexican or Chinese revolutions).

The AP World History course remains the best example of the global world history approach, though it appears that more states are now using a similar chronological framework to organize world history. The standards in at least six states show significant global, comparative and chronological features of this pattern. Because of its growing popularity and increasing success among both school districts and students, the Global World History pattern as typified by AP World History is an important approach for NAGB to consider.

Issues in Constructing a 12th Grade World History NAEP: Given the diversity in curricular approaches, NAGB faces an unusually difficult challenge in creating an exam that will assess students' knowledge of world history. As my review has demonstrated, there is a

¹⁸ The eras studied in AP World History are: Foundations - 600 C.E.; 600 - 1450; 1450 -1750; 1750 - 1914; and 1914 - present. The themes studied in AP World History are key themes that cut across any single civilization or society: patterns and impacts of interactions among major societies, (e.g. trade, war, diplomacy); impact of technology and demography on people; comparing features of social and gender structure systems within and among societies; culture and intellectual interactions; and changes in functions and structures of states. AP World History also studies major civilizations in Africa, Americas, Asia and Europe.

¹⁹ AP World History Acorn Book, pg. 6.

tension between the wide-spread agreement of world history's instructional importance, the need for information about what our students are learning, and the different patterns of world history education in play in the United States. By all accounts, world history constitutes a growing element of state standards, graduation requirements and students' course taking patterns. It seems that most high school students take some version of that people call "world history." Unfortunately, there is virtually no national information about what students understand about the history of the world, a data void that hampers attempts to improve education. However, the variations in the scope and sequence of what people call world history education challenges the creation of a common assessment to provide that information.

In many ways, creating a 12th Grade NAEP in world history is a more complicated enterprise than the one NAGB faced when establishing the U.S. history framework. While U.S. history in schools has been and continues to be a site of dissension, at least there was a general agreement around the temporal and spatial scope of the topic. As this review has suggested, that is not the case with world history. This complicates the problems we typically face when trying to construct a common framework for assessing education in the United States. I now turn to several options that NAGB might consider when embarking on this process.

NAEP 12th Grade World History Assessment: Some Options

I see three possible options for meeting these challenges, each with advantages and disadvantages. In defining these options, I have kept in mind key features of the problem: (1) NAGB's goal of assessing students' understanding of what is being taught; (2) the apparent consensus that knowledge of the world and its past is important, and is already a significant

part of schooling in the United States; and (3) the different approaches that now seem to constitute world history education in the schools. In thinking about these options, I have tried to consider both the possibilities of creating assessment frameworks and the policy implications of each option.

Option #1: Choose among the different patterns to assess one of the four

Judging from state standards documents, the most likely candidates for an assessment framework might be what I have been calling the Western Civilization Plus pattern or the Social Studies History pattern, as these appear to be the patterns most in play. Each, however, has its challenges.

Probably the easiest pattern around which to construct a framework would be the Western Civilization Plus pattern. Similar to U.S. history, there is general agreement about its underlying structure, chronology and content. However, there are important areas of dispute in this approach, not the least of which concerns which cultures and areas should be added to the Western Civilization story, and, as the west remains central in its narrative, how those cultures should be approached. More significantly, a NAEP reflecting this structure with at least 70% of its content coming from European history could not effectively assess students taking a global history course, such as AP World History (with 30% of its content being European) or a geographic/regional approach to history.

Due to its vague and variegated content as reflected in standards documents, the Social Studies World History pattern presents even more dramatic challenges in constructing a framework needed to develop an assessment. Though there are similarities in themes across states using the Social Studies History pattern, the generalities of the state standards means that there are fewer commonalities in identified historical content. State standards structured

along this framework make it difficult to determine exactly what constitutes the world history within high schools in the state.

While the other two patterns—Geographic/Regional History and Global World History—are very promising, at this time they do not appear to be sufficiently prevalent in the high school curriculum to constitute the framework for a national assessment.

However, there are two dangers inherent in building a framework from one of the extant patterns. First, even in selecting the most common pattern (Western Civilization Plus), NAGB would be constructing a framework that would not assess appropriately what many students are studying in their world history courses, including the growing number of AP World History students. A second and I think an even greater danger might be in prematurely sanctioning a particular pattern of world history as “the” national pattern—an issue that I will discuss in a bit more detail below as it applies to that option as well.

Option #2: Create an assessment that evaluates a cross-section of various models

Rather than resolve the tension among the patterns by selecting one pattern, NAGB might construct an assessment to see how well students are learning from any of these approaches. In short, NAGB could design a framework that would assess a cross-section of the approaches to teaching world history, identifying overlapping as well as distinctive features of each pattern. Such an assessment might be unique in asking students to demonstrate what they understand of global, regional (including Europe), comparative and thematic history, while recognizing that most students will not have had instruction in all these. Pursuing such an option would, I suspect, require assessing a common but narrower periodization scheme than most students now study (such as the 20th and 21st century) and allow students latitude in selecting civilizations and regions they could use for comparison.

The chief advantage of an amalgam assessment would be the data it would yield at a time when world history is an ever more significant element in history education. Further, since many states place the early eras of world history study in the middle school years (regardless of which approach), assessing a more contemporary periodization scheme might also reduce the problems inherent in testing 12th grade students on content they had learned years before.

This option, however, like the previous one, runs the risk of constructing a “new” national curricular model based on the NAEP assessment. Rather than merely testing what schools teach—albeit in different configurations—the assessment might signal that states and districts should construct a course to meet this amalgam framework. With many states looking to the NAEP frameworks, some even required by statute to attend to the frameworks, NAGB would have to consider the role a blended assessment model might play in defining state standards and curricula.

Option #3: Table the decision temporarily, watching carefully the changes in world history education

The third option recognizes the importance of world history, but also the dangers in trying to assess prematurely instructional practices that have not “settled” around a particular framework or approach. While my own preferences lie with the global world history pattern, I also see great value in concentrated and/or comparative historical studies of specific regions and civilizations. Indeed, I would like to see states try to expand their history requirements to make room for each approach, using history—U.S., global and regional—to meet other social studies standards (e.g. geography, economics), and thus provide the integration long sought in

social studies education. The presence of a NAEP World History at this time, regardless of its form, however might close off emerging and promising curricular trends and innovations.

On the other hand, a delay might signal to some a victory for or against one of the patterns of world history education. Worse still, tabling the decision might suggest waning interest in the history of the world. Given the broad consensus about the value of world history and the fact that the majority of our high school students take world history in some form or another, the Board would have to be clear that a delay does not mean abandoning the goal of constructing a 12th Grade World History NAEP. It would have to continue to monitor evolving patterns. Of course, this option also delays the chance for the public, policy makers and educators to learn what students understand about the world and its history at a very critical point in our national history.

Conclusion:

In this paper, I have tried to present the National Assessment Governing Board with clear and concise information about the growing popularity of world history in the United States and what I see to be the various patterns that the content seems to be taking in state standards and curriculum documents. Further, I have attempted briefly to illuminate the implications of either creating or delaying the creation of a 12th grade NAEP in world history. These are challenging decisions for the Board, beyond just the pragmatic issues of designing an assessment to determine what students across the United States know and understand about the history of the world. If, as my study suggests, world history education, while growing steadily, has not yet settled around a common scope and sequence, then the more challenging question for the Board might be the impact of the new NAEP. I hope this report and further discussion of it will contribute to NAGB's deliberations.

Chart 1: World History Required and Tested by State²⁰

State	World History Required?	World History Tested?
Alabama*	Yes	No
Alaska*	No	No
Arizona	Yes	No
Arkansas	Yes	No
California	Yes	Yes (10 th grade)
Colorado	No (decided by districts)	No
Connecticut	No	No
Delaware	No	In part (some world history content on the Delaware Student Testing Program)
District of Columbia	Yes	No
Florida*	Yes	No
Georgia	Yes (but may also take world geography. For college prep diploma, students must take world history)	Yes
Hawaii	No	No
Idaho	No	No
Illinois	No	In part (some world history standards are tested on the Prairie State tests)
Indiana*	Not by the state but by most districts. If students plan to attend college in Indiana they must take world history as a Core 40 requirement.	No (except for students seeking a Core 40 diploma who opt to take the end of course assessment)
Iowa	Determined by district	No
Kansas*	Not by the state, but by most districts	In part (On 11 th grade SS exam)
Kentucky*	Not by the state, but by most districts	In part (On 11 th grade SS exam)
Louisiana	Students must take world history, world geography, or western civilization for standard & regents diploma.	In part (20 th century world history content is on the Graduation Exit Examination, which is given in grade 11)

*Some information confirmed via email with member of state Department of Education

²⁰ Data gathered from Department of Education websites, relevant legislation and correspondence with state departments of education. The data is constantly changing as states modify their standards, assessments and requirements. I settled discrepancies through email contact with state officials.

Chart 1: World History Required and Tested by State (con't.)

State	World History Required?	World History Tested?
Maine	No	In part (Tested on Maine Educational Assessment social studies component in 11th grade)
Maryland	Yes	No
Massachusetts	Yes	No
Michigan	No	No (although it is stated that students should have some knowledge of world history)
Minnesota	Yes (1/2 credit)	No
Mississippi*	No	No
Missouri	No	No
Montana	No	No
Nebraska*	No	No
Nevada*	No	No (not at the state level but some districts have developed common assessments)
New Hampshire	No	In part (there is some world history content on social studies test in 10 th grade)
New Jersey	No	No
New Mexico*	Yes	Yes
New York	Yes	Yes
North Carolina	Yes	In part (social studies is tested but it is not quite clear whether or not world history content is included)
North Dakota	No	
Ohio	No/ change pending in 2004	No/ change in history test pending for 2004
Oklahoma	No (though students have option to use world history to meet elective)	No
Oregon*	No (there is not a required course but students should be given information in a course that meets world history content standards)	Yes

*Some information confirmed via email with member of state Department of Education

Chart 1: World History Required and Tested by State (con't.)

State	World History Required?	World History Tested?
Pennsylvania*	Schools must offer classes that include world history standards	No (no statewide assessment in world history, but local districts must devise assessments to determine if students are reaching a proficient level in knowledge and application of the state standards)
Rhode Island	Requirements set by local districts	No
South Carolina*	No	No
South Dakota	No	No
Tennessee	No (though students have option to meet requirement)	No
Texas	Yes	Yes
Utah*	Yes (10 th grade)	No
Vermont	No	No
Virginia	Yes	Yes
Washington*	No (Class is not required but students should meet world history content standards by the end of 10 th or 11 th grade)	No (tests being developed)
West Virginia	Not clear (appears that world studies is required in grade 10 and there is world history content in 20 th century studies in grade 11)	It appears that W.V. is in the middle of changing testing procedures in high school. Currently, the state does not test social studies past 8 th grade.
Wisconsin*	Yes	Yes (10 th grade)
Wyoming*	No (not by the state—locally controlled)	No

*Some information confirmed via email with member of state Department of Education.

Chart 2: Percentage of High School Students Who Completed a World History Course, by Grade: 1990, 1994, 1998, 2000

Grade/Year	1990	1994	1998	2000
9 th	22.02	19.63	21.51	23.48
10 th	29.14	38.21	40.81	41.81
11 th	8.42	10.23	7.74	9.06
12 th	6.71	6.95	7.20	7.43
All students	59.59	66.72	66.41	68.93

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, NAEP High School Transcript Study (HSTS), 2000, 1998, 1994, 1990

Chart 3: AP World History: Number of Schools and Students Participating

STATE	Schools 2002	Students 2002	Schools 2003	Students 2003
ALABAMA	1	1	1	1
ALASKA	0	0	1	7
ARIZONA	12	279	16	347
ARKANSAS	20	306	24	446
CALIFORNIA	140	2893	223	4771
CANADA	7	19	9	26
COLORADO	10	175	19	325
CONNECTICUT	9	60	14	160
D. OF COLUMBIA	1	1	0	0
DELAWARE	2	6	4	16
FLORIDA	64	1901	103	3371
GEORGIA	51	1226	74	2054
HAWAII	1	25	5	78
IDAHO	0	0	1	1
ILLINOIS	23	233	42	622
INDIANA	15	53	12	222
IOWA	11	165	8	176
KANSAS	3	46	3	36
KENTUCKY	19	208	21	478
LOUISIANA	8	61	5	64
MAINE	3	25	6	64
MARYLAND	33	1532	53	2248
MASSACHUSETTS	21	402	28	657
MICHIGAN	21	85	29	178
MINNESOTA	16	159	17	218
MISSISSIPPI	3	39	8	47
MISSOURI	13	145	22	308
MONTANA	0	0	2	8
NEBRASKA	0	0	4	15
NEVADA	2	2	1	1
NEW HAMPSHIRE	5	34	6	26
NEW JERSEY	22	208	30	299
NEW MEXICO	8	96	13	343
NEW YORK	94	2377	137	4027
NORTH CAROLINA	25	405	34	935
NORTH DAKOTA	0	0	0	0
OHIO	13	74	15	153
OKLAHOMA	28	419	39	334
OREGON	1	1	3	16
PENNSYLVANIA	16	172	24	251
RHODE ISLAND	2	10	3	39

**Chart 3: AP World History: Number of Schools and Students Participating
(con't.)**

STATE	Schools 2002	Students 2002	Schools 2003	Students 2003
SOUTH CAROLINA	5	117	5	160
SOUTH DAKOTA	2	2	2	2
TENNESSEE	10	150	12	197
TEXAS	160	4649	237	7539
UTAH	8	329	14	398
VERMONT	4	22	3	43
VIRGINIA	24	938	35	1118
WASHINGTON	17	557	29	968
WEST VIRGINIA	2	2	4	5
WISCONSIN	24	278	28	259
WYOMING	2	21	5	59
US Territories	1	1	3	10
Other	16	46	28	160
Totals	998	20,955	1,464	34,286

Chart 4: Number of Students & Schools by AP Exam – May 2002

	Total Students	Total Schools
1. U.S. HISTORY	227,757	8,901
2. ENG LIT/COMP	215,313	10,671
3. CALCULUS AB	157,524	10,296
4. ENG LANG/COMP	156,193	6,253
5. BIOLOGY	97,762	6,921
6. GOVT. & POL. - U.S.	90,937	4,622
7. SPANISH LANG	74,240	5,351
8. EUROPEAN HIST	68,876	3,550
9. CHEMISTRY	61,584	5,448
10. PSYCHOLOGY	51,831	2,442
11. STATISTICS	49,824	3,049
12. CALCULUS BC	41,785	3,559
13. PHYSICS B	37,447	3,370
14. ECONOMICS - MACRO	32,184	2,020
15. ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE	24,376	1,388
16. ECONOMICS - MICRO	23,108	1,728
17. WORLD HISTORY	20,955	998
18. PHYSICS C - MECH	19,252	2,186
19. FRENCH LANG	17,372	3,095
20. COMP SCI - A	15,660	2,216
21. ART HISTORY	12,728	977
22. SPANISH LIT	10,895	1,142
23. GOVT. & POL. - COMP.	10,461	956
24. STUDIO ART - DRAWING	9,972	2,209
25. PHYSICS C - E&M	9,439	1,317
26. COMP SCI - AB	7,799	1,404
27. STUDIO ART - 2-D DESIGN	7,170	1,683
28. INTL. ENGLISH LANGUAGE	7,104	83
29. MUSIC THEORY	6,859	1,550
30. HUMAN GEOGRAPHY	5,286	402
31. GERMAN LANG	4,171	1,193
32. LATIN - VERGIL	3,740	624
33. LATIN - LITERATURE	2,857	446
34. FRENCH LIT	1,697	405
35. STUDIO ART - 3-D DESIGN	1,358	649

Source: AP Program Summary Report, 2002

<http://apcentral.collegeboard.com/members/article/1,3046,152-171-0-22533,00.html>

Chart 5: Ranking, Number of Students Taking the AP Exams – May 2003

	Total Students	Total Schools
1. U.S. HISTORY	242,699	9,202
2. ENG LIT/COMP	229,367	10,871
3. ENG LANG/COMP	175,860	6,557
4. CALCULUS AB	166,821	10,484
5. GOVT. & POL. - U.S.	104,636	4,977
6. BIOLOGY	103,944	7,167
7. SPANISH LANG	83,811	5,544
8. EUROPEAN HISTORY	73,807	3,643
9. CHEMISTRY	65,698	5,680
10. PSYCHOLOGY	62,666	2,810
11. STATISTICS	58,230	3,356
12. CALCULUS BC	45,973	3,710
13. PHYSICS B	40,926	3,534
14. ECONOMICS - MACRO	38,177	2,201
15. WORLD HISTORY	34,286	1,474
16. ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE	29,906	1,568
17. ECONOMICS - MICRO	25,667	1,871
18. PHYSICS C - MECH	20,491	2,341
19. FRENCH LANG	18,496	3,216
20. COMP SCI - A	14,674	2,082
21. ART HISTORY	13,720	1,048
22. GOVT. & POL. - COMP.	12,001	1,054
23. SPANISH LIT	10,848	1,117
24. STUDIO ART - DRAWING	10,642	2,372
25. PHYSICS C - E&M	10,019	1,407
26. MUSIC THEORY	7,894	1,617
27. STUDIO ART - 2-D DESIGN	7,601	1,796
28. HUMAN GEOGRAPHY	7,329	473
29. COMP SCI - AB	7,071	1,374
30. GERMAN LANG	3,973	1,128
31. LATIN - VERGIL	3,942	626
32. LATIN - LITERATURE	2,703	451
33. FRENCH LIT	1,862	412
34. STUDIO ART - 3-D DESIGN	1,491	687

Source: AP Program Summary Report, 2003

<http://apcentral.collegeboard.com/members/article/1,3046,152-171-0-29472,00.html>

Chart 6: Comparison of Candidate Performance by Grade Level on 2002 AP® World History Exam

Total students in analysis: 20,261

Grade Level	9th	10th	11th	12th
Number and Percentage of Students	715 (3.5%)	14,535 (71.7%)	3,122 (15.4%)	1,889 (9.3%)
% Receiving:				
5	4.1	7.9	17.8	19.8
4	9.9	16.0	22.8	24.7
3	18.6	29.2	30.1	29.0
2	28.1	26.9	18.0	16.4
1	39.3	20.0	11.2	10.1

Note: Among the candidates excluded from the analysis were: 2 who reported a grade level of college; 2 who reported a grade level of other; and 455 who did not respond

Chart 7: Comparison of Candidate Performance by Grade Level on 2003

AP World History Exam

Total students in analysis: 32,762

Grade Level	9th	10th	11th	12th
Number and Percentage of Students	1,198 (3.7%)	25,079 (76.5%)	4,067 (12.4%)	2,418 (7.4%)
% Receiving:				
5	6.2	9.8	16.1	20.6
4	11.9	17.9	23.4	25.3
3	19.6	26.3	26.2	25.1
2	25.1	25.1	18.8	17.2
1	37.2	20.9	15.6	11.9

Note: Among the candidates excluded from the analysis were: 3 who reported a grade level of college; 8 who reported a grade level of other; and 1,090 who did not respond.

Chart 8: Type of World History in State Standards²¹

State	Social Studies History	Western Civ. Plus	Geographic/Regional History	Global - World History
Alabama		X		
Alaska	X			
Arizona		X		
Arkansas	X			
California		X		
Colorado	X			
Connecticut	X			
Delaware		X		
District of Columbia		X		
Florida	X			
Georgia		X		
Hawaii	X			
Idaho	X			
Illinois		X		
Indiana		X		
Iowa				
Kansas		X		
Kentucky		X		
Louisiana	X			
Maine	X			
Maryland		X		
Massachusetts		X	X	
Michigan	X			
Minnesota	X			X
Mississippi	X			
Missouri		X		
Montana	X			
Nebraska		X		
Nevada		X		
New Hampshire		X		
New Jersey		X		

²¹ In classifying state standards, I looked for evidence of the salient features of the Social Studies, Western Civilization Plus, Regional/Geographic, and Global World History patterns within the state documents. Often, a state organized its standards using one pattern, but provided another document suggesting a second pattern. In such cases, I checked off two columns in this chart. In trying to decide when to classify a state as Western Civilization Plus or Global World History, I used three criteria: (1) Evidence of the Western Civilization narrative and chronological structure; (2) Percentage of content inside and outside of Europe; (3) Evidence of trans-regional and comparative benchmarks.

Chart 8: Type of World History in State Standards (con't.)

State	Social Studies History	Western Civ. Plus	Geographic/ Regional History	Global - World History
New Mexico		X		
New York			X	X
North Carolina	X	X		
North Dakota	X			
Ohio		X		
Oklahoma		X		
Oregon		X		
Pennsylvania				X
Rhode Island				X
South Carolina	X	X		
South Dakota		X		
Tennessee		X		
Texas		X		
Utah			X	X
Vermont		X		
Virginia		X		
Washington	X			X
West Virginia	X			
Wisconsin	X			
Wyoming	X			