The Perils of Integration: Conflicting Northern Black Responses to the Coleman Report in the Black Power Era, 1966–1974

Zoë Burkholder

With its findings that socioeconomically integrated classrooms could improve the academic achievement of minority students, James S. Coleman's 1966 *Equality of Educational Opportunity* augmented federal support for school integration. While we know a great deal about how scholars, politicians, and educational activists have debated the meaning and implications of the Coleman Report for the past fifty years, we know much less about how this report influenced debates over school integration in northern black communities after 1966. This paper investigates how black northerners responded to the Coleman Report and the federal support for school integration that it inspired. I find that the Coleman Report coincided with a growing skepticism among northern blacks that school integration could advance the freedom struggle and that, as a result, it fueled a heated debate over the question of which would better serve the black freedom struggle: racially integrated schools or separate, black-controlled ones.

This paper is part of a larger project that investigates the long history of northern black debates over school integration, stretching from 1840s Boston to the present day. While impulses for both integration and separation are evident from the mid-nineteenth century to the present, I argue a discernible pattern exists where either integration or separation dominated the political discourse of black educational activists during specific eras. Black educational activists included not only individuals who worked for civil rights organizations such as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and the Urban League, but also intellectuals, social scientists, parents, teachers, and students who chose to speak out or

take action in support of either racially integrated or separate, black-controlled schools. These activists were united in their belief that public education offered a powerful tool for racial uplift and economic and social justice, but they were divided over whether school integration was the most effective strategy to realize these ends.

The publication of the Coleman Report coincided with a shift in northern black educational activism in 1966. After a period of robust support for school integration that erupted throughout the North during World War II, black northerners began to question whether school integration would deliver the objectives that civil rights activists imagined, including equal educational opportunities, improved academic achievement, higher self-esteem for black students, and a reduction in antiblack prejudice by whites.[1] Drawing on a range of published sources, including newspaper and magazine articles, government reports, and academic scholarship, I contend that the Coleman Report helped fuel a backlash against school integration by black northerners frustrated by the mediocre results of school integration by 1966. As such, this research makes an important contribution to scholarship in civil rights, educational history, and educational policy by considering how the Coleman Report influenced the enduring debates over school integration among a diverse cast of black educational activists in the North.[2]

---

[1] On the surge of northern black support for school integration after 1940, see Davison M. Douglas, *Jim Crow Moves North: The Battle Over Northern School Segregation, 1865–1954* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 219–73.

[2] Matthew F. Delmont, *Why Busing Failed: Race, Media, and the National Resistance to School Desegregation* (Oakland: University of California Press, 2016); Ansley T. Erickson, *Making the Unequal Metropolis: School Desegregation and Its Limits* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016); Russell John Rickford, *We Are an African People: Independent Education, Black Power, and the Radical Imagination* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016); Dionne Danns, Michelle Purdy, and Christopher M. Span, eds., *Using Past as Prologue: Contemporary Perspectives on African American Educational History* (Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, 2015); Andrew R. Highsmith, *Demolition Means Progress: Flint, Michigan, and the Fate of the American Metropolis* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015); Dionne Danns, *Desegregating Chicago's Public Schools: Policy Implementation, Politics, and Protest, 1965–1985* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014); Jason Sokol, *All Eyes Are Upon Us: Race and Politics from Boston to Brooklyn, The Conflicted Soul of the Northeast* (New York: Basic Books, 2014), 71–102; John P. Spencer, *In the Crossfire: Marcus Foster and the Troubled History of American School Reform* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012); Thomas J. Sugrue, *Sweet Land of Liberty: The Forgotten Struggle for Civil Rights in the North* (New York: Random House, 2008), 163–99; Douglas, *Jim Crow Moves North*; Jack Dougherty, *More than One Struggle: The Evolution of Black School Reform in Milwaukee* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004); Judy Jolley Mohraz, *The Separate Problem: Case Studies in Black Education in the North, 1900–1930*

Hailed by the *Washington Post* as "the nearest thing to an educational bombshell to come out of the Federal Government in a long time," the 737-page Coleman Report represented the largest, most comprehensive, and most expensive social science investigation of racial equality in American public schools ever conducted.[3] Coleman and his research team surveyed more than 570,000 students and 60,000 teachers, and collected detailed information on the facilities available in more than 4,000 schools over a two-year period. Required by a provision of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the purpose of the study was to ascertain whether racial minorities had equal educational opportunities in the public schools.[4] While no one was surprised by Coleman's findings that black, Puerto Rican, Mexican American, and Native American children suffered educational inequality and intense racial segregation, the report nevertheless stunned social scientists and the public with its finding that the key factor in students' academic success was the background of pupils and teachers—not the school and its material resources. "In effect, the report says that pupils do more to educate each other than does the school as such to educate the pupil," surmised the *Washington Post*.[5] The *Boston Globe* was even more succinct, concluding, "the Coleman Report means that better schools do no good."[6]

In fact, *Equality of Educational Opportunity* offered more nuanced observations about the causes and consequences of racial inequality in American public schools, but the study was so enormous that journalists, scholars, and educational activists were able to cherry-pick findings that suited different agendas. Black and white liberals focused on Coleman's discovery that a child from an impoverished home benefited from attending school with large numbers of middle-class peers. What is more, middle-class children showed no decline in academic achievement in socioeconomically integrated settings, suggesting that school integration had the power to uplift poor children while leaving middle-class students unharmed. Liberals used this to argue that school integration would solve racial inequality in education, a

(Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1979); and Marion Manola Thompson Wright, *The Education of Negroes in New Jersey* (1941; repr., New York: Arno Press, 1971).

[3]Gerald Grant, "An Educational Time Bomb: Coleman Report Jolts Some Time-Honored Premises," *Washington Post*, Dec. 26, 1966, A4.

[4]James S. Coleman et al., *Equality of Educational Opportunity* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1966).

[5]Grant, "An Educational Time Bomb."

[6]Joseph Alsop, "A Report Disputes a Cure," *Boston Globe*, Jan. 23, 1967, 15; See also "U.S. Study Finds Racial Inequality Grows in School," *New York Times*, Sept. 18, 1966, 72; and Patrick J. Sloyan, "Education: Is Minority Child Still Shut Out?" *Chicago Defender*, Sept. 24, 1966, 6.

claim that conflated Coleman's finding about the value of socioeconomic school integration with racial mixing. Nevertheless, it was also true that mixing large numbers of black youth with middleclass peers would require a significant amount of racial integration, since there were not enough black middle-class students to ensure socioeconomic integration in majority-black schools.[7] Writing in the *Journal of Negro Education,* scholars Harrell Rodgers and Charles Bullock determined, "The importance of these findings is that many black children can be placed in a middle income milieu only in an integrated environment."[8]

Ironically, the Coleman Report engendered political support for school integration at the very moment when many black northerners had come to reconsider it as both a strategy and a goal of the larger civil rights movement. Self-identified black nationalists rejected liberal claims that the Coleman Report warranted more aggressive school integration, instead pointing to other aspects of the report they believed proved the benefits of separate, black-controlled schools. Of special interest was Coleman's finding that student attitudes had an enormous effect on academic achievement, regardless of the quality of educational facilities. For instance, Coleman found that, overall, black students felt in control of their fate "much less often" than whites. However, he also found that black pupils who felt they shaped their own lives had higher levels of academic achievement than white students who did not. Coleman concluded:

> Internal changes in the Negro, changes in his conception of himself in relation to his environment, may have more effect on Negro achievement than any other single factor. The determination to overcome relevant

---

[7]William E. Nelson Jr., "School Desegregation and the Black Community," *Theory Into Practice* 17, no. 2, (April 1978), 122–30; Christopher Jencks et al., *Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America* (New York: Harper & Row, 1972); Frederick Mosteller and Daniel P. Moynihan, eds., *On Equal Educational Opportunity: Papers Deriving from the Harvard University Faculty Seminar on the Coleman Report* (New York: Random House, 1972); Harvard Educational Review, eds., *Equal Educational Opportunity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969); Charles H. Thompson, "Race and Equality of Educational Opportunity: Defining the Problem," *Journal of Negro Education* 37, no. 3 (July 1968), 191–203; Earle H. West, "Progress Toward Equality of Opportunity in Elementary and Secondary Education," *Journal of Negro Education* 37, no. 3 (July 1968), 212–19; Kenneth Clark, "Alternative Public School Systems," *Harvard Educational Review* 38, no. 1 (April 1968), 100–113; Daniel Moynihan, "Sources of Resistance to the Coleman Report," *Harvard Educational Review* 38, no. 1 (April 1968), 23–36; and Thomas Pettigrew, "Race and Equal Educational Opportunity," *Harvard Educational Review* 38, no. 1 (April 1968), 66–76.
[8]Harrell R. Rodgers Jr. and Charles S. Bullock III, "School Desegregation: Successes and Failures," *Journal of Negro Education* 43, no. 2 (1974), 139–54, 141.

Figure 1: African American children on the way to P.S. 204 in Brooklyn, New York, pass mothers protesting the busing of children to achieve integration, September 13, 1965. (LC-USZ62-134434, *New York World-Telegram* and the *Sun* Newspaper Photograph Collection, Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division, Washington, DC.)

obstacles, and the belief that he will overcome them—attitudes that have appeared in an organized way among Negroes only in recent years in some civil rights groups—may be the most crucial elements in achieving equality of opportunity—not because of the changes they will create in the white community, but principally because of the changes they create in the Negro himself."[9]

Black Power activists seized upon this finding to insist that only separate, black-controlled schools cultivated black students' determination to overcome obstacles. Floyd McKissick, national chairman for the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), was one of many educational activists who bridled at the implication that black children must attend school alongside whites in order to succeed. "We are told that Negroes must be integrated into middle-class (and that means white) schools,"

---

[9] Grant, "An Educational Time Bomb"; and Coleman et al., *Equality of Educational Opportunity*, 23–24.

McKissick chided in the *New Republic* in the winter of 1966. "We are told that something called student culture really makes the difference. In other words, mix Negroes with Negroes and you get stupidity."[10]

McKissick was part of a group of younger, more militant Black Power activists who challenged the integrationist and assimilationist strategies of an older generation of civil rights warriors. He concluded that academics had only just discovered what black people in the urban North already knew: white parents would sabotage school integration by either moving out of district or transferring their children into private schools. He added, "It is difficult to live with this conclusion: that the Negro will have educational opportunity only with racial integration when it is quite clear, as [Christopher] Jencks notes, that 'white America is not ready to do what would have to be done to integrate the Negroes.'" McKissick concluded that school integration was not an effective strategy for improving black academic achievement and that community-controlled schools offered a better way to guarantee that black youth received the education they needed to advance socially, economically, and politically.[11]

Speaking at a colloquium alongside Coleman at the Harvard Graduate School of Education in the fall of 1967, New York City teacher Preston Wilcox concurred, "I don't subscribe to the view that a black kid must sit next to a white kid to learn," he told the packed audience. "The report is based on the myth of white supremacy. Schools improve only when educators become advocates of their students and not the system." John Alexander, president of the Board of Education in Orange, New Jersey, made a similar point later that same day: "As far as I am concerned the Coleman Report provides a diversion from the urgent task at hand—the education of children. It gives aid and comfort to those who do not want to see black children educated." He explained that, in Orange, mixing children of different races in school "did not correct the deficiencies that black children brought with them to school." Alexander concluded that school integration alone did little to address the academic challenges of impoverished black youth, and that new solutions were needed.[12]

The frustration and anger expressed by black educational activists like McKissick, Wilcox, and Alexander was palpable throughout the

---

[10] Floyd McKissick, "Is Integration Necessary?" *New Republic*, Dec. 3, 1966, 33–36.

[11] McKissick, "Is Integration Necessary?" See also Joseph Alsop, "Matter of Fact: Coleman and Plowden," *Washington Post*, Jan. 23, 1967, A17.

[12] Bertram G. Waters, "Schools Face Equality Task," *Boston Globe*, Oct. 22, 1967, 5. John Alexander was a pediatrician and the first African American elected president of the Orange (NJ) Board of Education. See "John Alexander, 71, A Newark Pediatrician," *New York Times*, June 8, 1990, D16.

urban North by 1967, as evidenced by a series of urban uprisings that culminated with violent clashes with the police in Newark and Detroit.[13] The following year, the Kerner Commission concluded one major source of urban unrest was the widespread belief that public schools in majority black neighborhoods failed to provide students with a quality education. The Kerner Report determined, "The hostility of Negro parents and students toward the school system is generating increasing conflict and causing disruption within many city school districts."[14] Black Power activists believed they could harness the northern black masses' growing frustration with public education and turn it into a positive force for social change. Calling for Black Power, Stokely Carmichael and Charles V. Hamilton stressed that control of "ghetto" institutions would enable blacks to reverse institutional racism and develop an effective base of political power to challenge racist structures of the city as a whole.[15] In New York City, Wilcox and other activists fought to seize community control of schools in majority black neighborhoods like Harlem and Ocean Hill-Brownsville. By this time, school integration efforts had failed to produce satisfactory results, and racial segregation and inequality had increased, to the tremendous anger and distress of black residents. As in many northern cities, school integration in New York City was undermined by an intersection of complex factors, including white parent resistance, white and middle-class flight, a rapid increase in the black and Latino school-age population, residential segregation, and political intransigence from white politicians and the local teachers union. In the fall of 1967, the US Commission on Civil Rights reported that racial segregation in American public schools continued to increase in the nation's twenty largest cities and that scholars expected this trend to continue for the foreseeable future. The

---

[13]Janet L. Abu-Lughod, *Race, Space, and Riots in Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 79–128; Thomas J. Sugrue, *The Origins of the Urban Crisis: Race and Inequality in Postwar Detroit*, rev. ed., (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2014); Kevin Mumford, *Newark: A History of Race, Rights, and Riots in America* (New York: New York University Press, 2007); and Alan B. Anderson and George W. Pickering, *Confronting the Color Line: The Broken Promise of the Civil Rights Movement in Chicago* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1986).

[14]Otto Kerner et al., *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1968), 236.

[15]Stokely Carmichael and Charles V. Hamilton, *Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America* (New York: Random House, 1967). See also Peniel E. Joseph, *Stokely: A Life* (New York: Basic Civitas, 2014); Peniel E. Joseph, *Waiting 'Til the Midnight Hour: A Narrative History of Black Power in America* (New York: Henry Holt, 2006), 132–204; and Stokely Carmichael (Kwame Ture) and Mumia Abu-Jamal, *Stokely Speaks: From Black Power to Pan-Africanism* (Chicago: Chicago Review Press, 1971).

Commission concluded, "With the continuing influx of Negroes into major cities integration is not possible unless school districts are completely revamped to provide huge educational parks taking in both urban and suburban students."[16]

While civil rights leaders doubled down on school integration efforts in the face of these dire warnings, many black parents, students, and community members were ready to consider a new tactic. Drawing on Black Power critiques of white institutions, they called for community control over school administration, curriculum development, student discipline, and teacher hiring. Although the prominence of this political strategy was new in 1967, Black Power activists situated themselves in a tradition of black protest stretching back more than a hundred years in the North.[17]

As economist Robert S. Browne explained in 1968, "It was the black masses who first perceived that integration actually increases the white community's control over the black one by destroying black institutions, absorbing black leadership and making its interests

---

[16]James K. Kent, "The Coleman Report: Opening Pandora's Box," *Phi Delta Kappan* 49, no. 5 (1968), 242–45, 243. See also John Finely Scott and Lois Heyman Scott, "They Are Not So Much Anti-Negro as Pro-Middle Class," *New York Times Magazine*, March 24, 1968, 46; US Commission on Civil Rights, *Education Parks: Appraisals of Plans to Improve Educational Quality and Desegregate the Schools* (Washington, DC: United States Commission on Civil Rights, Oct. 1967); and US Commission on Civil Rights, *Racial Isolation in the Public Schools*, (Washington, DC: US Commission on Civil Rights, March 1967). For an analysis of massive "education parks" for school desegregation, see Ansley T. Erickson, "Desegregation's Architects: Education Parks and the Spatial Ideology of Schooling," *History of Education Quarterly* 56, no. 4 (Nov. 2016), 560–89.

[17]Zoë Burkholder, "Integrated Out of Existence: African American Debates over School Integration versus Separation at the Bordentown School in New Jersey, 1886–1955," *Journal of Social History* (forthcoming); Heather Lewis, *New York City Public Schools from Brownsville to Bloomberg: Community Control and Its Legacy* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2013); Daniel Perlstein, "The Dead End of Despair: Bayard Rustin, the 1968 New York School Crisis, and the Struggle for Racial Justice," in *Civil Rights in New York City: From World War II to the Giuliani Era*, ed. Clarence Taylor (New York: Fordham University Press, 2011), 118–40; Clarence Taylor, "Conservative and Liberal Opposition to the New York City School-Integration Campaign," in *Civil Rights in New York City*, 95–117; Hilary Moss, *Schooling Citizens: The Struggle for African American Education in Antebellum America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009); Matthew J. Countryman, *Up South: Civil Rights and Black Power in Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006), 223–57; Dionne Danns, "Chicago High School Students' Movement for Quality Public Education, 1966–1971," *Journal of African American History* 88, no. 2 (April 2003), 138–50; and Jerald E. Podair, *The Strike That Changed New York: Blacks, Whites, and the Ocean Hill-Brownsville Crisis* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002).

coincide with those of the white community."[18] For Black Power activists, community-controlled schools were not simply an alternative way to achieve the same goal as civil rights activists. Instead, black-controlled schools offered a radical vision for how public education could augment black autonomy and political power in a hostile and inherently racist society. The Coleman Report's finding that black students with positive attitudes and a sense of determination did better than their despondent peers provided objective scientific evidence that community-controlled schools could work to the benefit of black students. As Alvin F. Poussaint and Carolyn O. Atkinson confirmed in their study, "Negro Youth and Psychological Motivation," "Participation in all-or-predominantly-black structures may well not be self-destructive if the black individual chooses rather than is forced to participate in them. For if he chooses, he is asserting control over his environment."[19] Unlike integrated schools, community-controlled schools promised to preserve black institutions, protect the leadership roles of black teachers and administrators, and ensure that educational objectives aligned with the needs and aspirations of black citizens.

Growing interest and support for black-controlled schools after 1966 prompted grave concern from the mainstream civil rights community. Psychologist Kenneth B. Clark had not only provided key social science data that convinced the US Supreme Court to outlaw school segregation in the 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education* decision, he had also led the school integration movement in New York City since 1955. Clark was a passionate integrationist who was appalled at the growing support for separate schools among black northerners. In 1969 at Haverford College, he brought together a group of prominent black intellectuals—Mamie Phipps Clark, Ralph Ellison, John Hope Franklin, William H. Hastie, Hylan Lewis, J. Saunders Redding, Bernard C. Watson, Robert C. Weaver, St. Clair Drake, and Adelaide Cromwell Gulliver—to challenge Black Power and to reassert the moral and political supremacy of school integration. They called themselves the "Hastie Group" and organized annual meetings to discuss their shared conviction that "racial integration was essential to racial progress and justice in America."[20]

Acknowledging that none of them expected the 1954 *Brown* decision to "function as a magic wand and immediately eliminate all

---

[18]Robert S. Browne, "The Case for Two Americas—One Black, One White," *New York Times Magazine*, Aug. 11, 1968, 12.

[19]Alvin F. Poussaint and Carolyn O. Atkinson, "Negro Youth and Psychological Motivation," *Journal of Negro Education* 37, no. 3 (July 1968), 241–51, 251.

[20]Betty Lanier Jenkins and Susan Phillis, eds., *Black Separatism: A Bibliography* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1976), xiii.

Figure 2: Doolittle East Elementary students participate in Crispus Attucks Day Commemoration in Chicago, March 5, 1968. (CULR_04_0199_2257_001, Chicago Urban League Records, University of Illinois at Chicago Library.)

past vestiges of racial cruelty and oppression and leave in its place an interracial Garden of Eden," Clark admitted that the struggle for racial equality was even harder and more complicated than the black elite had anticipated. He believed that "rigid walls of racial segregation had left very deep anxieties in many Negroes concerning their ability to compete in the larger society on a single standard of achievement."[21] This psychological interpretation was echoed by others, including Ellison, who wrote that black separatists were "frightened by the existence of opportunities for competing with their white peers on a basis of equality which did not exist for us. They suffer traumatically from the shock of sudden opportunity."[22] Hastie added that while blacks were unhappy with segregation and discrimination, they often became accustomed to it nonetheless. "This is one of the evil consequences, perhaps the worst, of a long-endured caste system," wrote Hastie. "When old restrictions of caste are relaxed, it is hard for the oppressed

---

[21] Kenneth Clark, "Some Personal Observations on Black Separatism," in Jenkins and Phillis, *Black Separatism*, xiii–xv.

[22] Ralph Ellison, in Jenkins and Phillis, *Black Separatism*, xvi–xviii.

to throw off the ways of thinking and acting that their oppression has inculcated."[23]

In case black nationalists failed to recognize these subtle critiques, Clark spelled out his distaste for the Black Power movement in a book entitled *Black Separatism*. Clark maintained that the black separatist movement in American education represented a deplorable combination of ignorance and cowardice. He pointed to high school and college campuses nationwide where black students were demanding black history courses and black student unions. He elaborated, "One dared to hope that eventually black students would become suspicious of how readily white college administrators granted their requests for separate facilities. It should have been obvious that the almost obscene haste with which these racially segregated facilities and courses were established under the guise of racial progress was quite consistent with residual racism."[24] Taking this critique a step further, Gulliver castigated young black militants for failing to learn from the lessons of their forefathers and foremothers. She wrote, "For all their separateness and proclaimed uniqueness, the young blacks of the sixties imbibed from their white peers many values, not the least of which was a culture of youth which saw no relevance in age, in experience, or in knowledge." Gulliver was disappointed that young black militants seemed unaware of the long history of the black freedom struggle and, in particular, the ways that black intellectuals like herself had played a vital role securing full and equal access to formerly segregated institutions, including public schools.[25] Finally, Watson chastised black separatists for giving up too easily when the fight for integration became bitter and fraught with unintended consequences. He despaired, "To this black American, it appears obvious that a withdrawal or a retreat—partial or complete—from the struggle for equality and full participation in all aspects of the society is a denial of our history." Watson encouraged black youth to fight on for a more just and righteous goal: "To continue to struggle for integration in a pluralistic society without sacrificing, compromising, or losing our unique identity as a people is a difficult, but worthy and necessary undertaking."[26]

As these examples illustrate, the Coleman Report provided fodder on both sides of the escalating debate in northern black communities over school integration versus separation after 1966. It provided solid social science evidence to support aggressive school integration, but it also suggested that separate schools could increase black

---

[23] William H. Hastie, in Jenkins and Phillis, *Black Separatism*, xix–xx.

[24] Clark, "Some Personal Observations on Black Separatism," xiii–xv.

[25] Adelaide Cromwell Gulliver, in Jenkins and Phillis, *Black Separatism*, xviii–xix.

[26] Bernard C. Watson, in Jenkins and Phillis, *Black Separatism*, xxii–xxiv.

students' academic achievement by improving students' self-esteem. This objective aligned with the emerging Black Power movement, which emphasized black control of key public institutions as a way to augment political and economic power.

In other words, even though most academics and many politicians believed that the Coleman Report provided incontrovertible support for school integration, a growing number of northern black parents, students, and teachers believed it offered persuasive evidence of the benefits of black-controlled schools designed to meet the needs of a majority black student body. By the end of the decade, northern black conceptions of school integration ranged from hopeful visions of political equality to angry fears of cultural annihilation. As such, it is crucial to understand how black educational activists conceived of school integration and separate, community-controlled schools as two viable strategies for advancing the black freedom struggle during the height of the civil rights and Black Power eras.

From *Sesame Street* to Prime Time School Television: Educational Media in the Wake of the Coleman Report

Victoria Cain

"Recent research has confirmed what good teachers have always known … teachers cannot be held accountable for their results in the 'cognitive domain' apart from the 'community domain'—the total learning environment in which the students function," Al Shanker wrote to the members of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) in 1976. As "98 percent of America's homes now

Victoria Cain (v.cain@northeastern.edu) is Assistant Professor of History at Northeastern University. The larger project from which this paper is drawn is supported by a generous grant from the Spencer Foundation. Thanks to Zoë Burkholder, Leah Gordon, Ethan Hutt, Nancy Beadie, Joy Williamson-Lott, and audiences at the History of Education Society and the Organization of American Historians for critical feedback and encouragement. For questions or comments about this article, please contact the author.