Structural Realignment and the Case of the Protest Cycle

Jeff A. Larson
University of Arizona

jlarson@u.arizona.edu
Structural Realignment and the Case of the Protest Cycle
Jeff A. Larson
University of Arizona

The wave of protest that rolled across the U.S. in the 1960s and 70s was an event of historical proportions. As social movement scholars work to disentangle the causes and consequences of various movements that peaked in those decades, a persistent belief remains: social movements matter, they create change. As we set out to amass evidence that indeed movements do have consequences, the field of movement scholars has not yet settled on a framework for theorizing social change. With the broader sociological interest that exists in theorizing social change and the valuable theories that are being developed to account for it, it is surprising that movement scholars have not (with exceptions, of course) been more lively participants in this discussion.

One such discussion includes William Sewell and his theory of “eventful” structural change. Sewell (1992) lays out a theory of social structures as dynamic processes in which the “enactment of structures” plays a central role in maintaining, or changing, structures. Social movements are structures that must be enacted, and so are the structures that movements arise to challenge. I find Sewell’s conceptualization of structures and social change to be a useful one, and employ it here to situate social movements in a larger process of social change. I also think that theories of social movements, and particularly cycles of protest, can usefully add to the framework that Sewell offers us, and I hope to do that here. Social change, for Sewell (1996) is a process in which “a sequence of ruptures disarticulates the previous structural network, makes repair difficult, and makes a novel rearticulation possible” (p. 844). The social movements literature is amassing evidence of just such a process. In this paper I build on the work of
McCarthy and McPhail (1998) and investigate just a small but important piece of this process as it applies to social movements. Particularly, we are interested in how structures change as the result of a historical sequence of events. What results is a clearer picture, based on systematic empirical observations, of how events shape the course of history.

**Structuring Protest**

Structures consist of three elements, according to Sewell (1992): schemas, resources, and modes of power.

Cultural schemas provide actors with meanings, motivations, and recipes for social action. Resources provide them (differentially) with the means and stakes of action. Modes of power regulate action—by specifying what schemas are legitimate, by determining which persons and groups have access to which resources, and by adjudicating conflicts that arise in the course of action. (p. 842).

Schemas, resources, and modes of power must be enacted by individuals, and, I would add, collectivities. The repertoire of contention (Tilly 1978, 1986; Tarrow 1993) is one such structure, and is composed of “not always consious” rules, “metaphors, and assumptions” that can be “generalized” and “transposed” from one situation to another (Sewell 1992, pp. 7-8). What Sewell calls “transposable,” and what Tarrow (1994) calls “modular,” is the ability of actors to apply a given set of schemas in multiple settings. It is the actors’ ability to creatively apply such schemas new settings and in novel ways that provides an opening for social change (Sewell 1992). Resources empower schemas, they give wings to these creations, and in turn, schemas empower resources. Movement scholars have long acknowledged the strength that
movements find in numbers, in networks, in their organizations (McAdam, 1982; Morris, 1981; Snow, Zurcher, Ekland-Olson, 1980; Gould, 1991; McAdam and Paulsen, 1993), but a less clear understanding of how these resources act on schemas. One line of research that does move in this direction is studies of diffusion of protest tactics (Soule 1997; Soule and Zylan, 1997; Strang and Soule, 1998; McAdam and Rucht, 1993). As McAdam (1997 [1983]) puts it,

Indigenous organizations furnish the context in which tactical innovations are devised and subsequently carried out. Such organizations serve to mobilize community resources in support of new tactical forms and to supply leaders to direct their use, participants to carry them out, and communication networks to facilitate their use and dissemination to other insurgent groups. …It is the established communication network’s characteristic of existing organizations that ordinarily make this crucial process of diffusion possible. (p. 341)

The third element of social structures, modes of power, legitimates schemas and adjudicates conflicts. Who legitimates the repertoire of contention, and, when conflict arises, which clearly is central to the life of social movements, who adjudicates? Here the social movements literature is underdeveloped. What little has been written on movement tactics locates the source of legitimation within movements, in their ability to secure resources to innovate and diffuse new tactics. But social movements do not stand alone, and we should not dismiss the possibility that tactics are legitimated through interactions between movements and their environs. It is here that our discussion of protest cycles finds its footing.

Cycles of protest (Tarrow 1993, 1994) are characterized by five elements: heightened conflict, broad geographic and sector diffusion, the appearance of new social movement
organizations, new frames of meaning, and the invention of new forms of collective action. It is these new forms of action that we focus on here, but it is within the context of the cycle of protest that I argue new protest forms emerge and take root. All of the elements of a protest cycle depend upon interactions between movements and other structures, and it is these dynamics that lead to new movements, escalating conflict, diffusion of protest, new and transformed frames, and tactical innovation that social movement scholars study. This emphasis on dynamic processes is not new, but Sewell reminds us that movements are never still, but rather continually enacted “cultural schemas, distributions of resources, and modes of power [that] combine in an interlocking and mutually sustaining fashion to reproduce consistent streams of social practice” (Sewell 1996a, p. 9). The analysis in this paper examines the process of repertoire building as an interaction between movements and the state.

The Repertoire of Contention and Structures That Enable and Constrain

The repertoire of contention, as conceptualized by Tilly (1978), is the slate of options available to challengers for organizing their actions and making claims. Despite the nearly infinite possibilities for action, the theory of the repertoire recognizes that at any given time only some of those possibilities are practically available to challengers. The constraints on such options for action are cultural, based on what challengers know how to do and what others expect them to do. Tilly’s concept parallels Sewell’s notion of structure. What Sewell does that Tilly does not is to make explicit the elements of schemas, resources, and modes of power that compose and constrain the repertoire.

There are various ways to approach the study of development of the repertoire. From one direction we can say that the repertoire enables action, that is, it provides a template for action.
Questions then arise about where does the template come from, and how does it diffuse, and to whom, under what circumstances? The literature on diffusion mentioned above raises these very questions (cf. Strang and Soule, 1998). From another direction the repertoire constrains action, making clear that some actions are simply not possible or acceptable. This might lead to questions such as who limits these options, and by what means are they limited? Scholars coming from this direction are trying to shed light on the effects of “repression,” which includes the political context within which protest emerges, such as regime types and the policing of protest (cf., della Porta 1995, 1996; della Porta and Reiter 1998). A third approach recognizes that the repression of protest can be an enabling factor for the repertoire. Questions that arise include how does repression of protest shape the meaning of tactics, and can repression enable new tactics, and under what circumstances does repression help or hinder collective challenges?

If we are interested in the empowerment of schemas, resources, and modes of power that constitute the repertoire of contention, one fruitful starting point may be its interaction with the state. As Tarrow (1994) argues the social movement arose in conjunction with and as a challenge to the modern state. If true, the interaction between movements and the state plays a defining role for social movements. It is a reasonable next step to examine the interaction of state structures and movement structures (such as the repertoire of contention) as an interactive process of co-constitution. Does this interaction of state and movement structures enable and constrain the tactical repertoire of protestors and lead to durable social change? This question guides the analyses presented here in an effort to illuminate broader processes of social change. By focusing on the cycle of protest we can learn about the dynamic, interactive sequence of events that leads to the rupture and rearticulation of the network of structures (Sewell 1996, 1996a).
The analysis is in two parts, both of which look at the relationship between protest tactics and state response, specifically, police response. We begin with a correspondence analysis—a useful technique for presenting relationships in graphical form—that allows us to conceptualize the tactical repertoire over time and detect possible structural patterns. In the second part we utilize regression techniques to verify and corroborate the observed patterns identified in part one.

DATA AND METHODS

The data are collected from newspaper reports of collective action events in the US between 1965 and 1975, encompassing the peak years of the protest wave that began in the late 1950s and stretched into the 1980s. We use the *New York Times*, a common source for data in social movement research but one not without its limitations. For newspapers in the US with national daily coverage, the *Times* is among the best for the breadth and depth of coverage of the events we are interested in. It does however tend to bias New York area events as well as larger and more confrontational events. If mass media such as the *Times* are an important channel for tactical diffusion as some suggest (Soule 1997; Strang and Soule, 1998), then using it as a source may actually benefit our understanding of protest cycles and repertoire dynamics. To counter the bias effects of New York coverage we introduce controls for New York area events whenever possible.

Collective action events were coded if they meet three criteria: 1) they are collective; 2) claims are made by the participants; and 3) they are public. If these conditions are met, we coded each event for the basic who, what, when, where and why information, including activities and forms of action, initiating groups involved, claims being made, and police response at the event. Intercoder reliability checks were conducted at regular intervals across the span of data.
collection, and consistently offer reassurances of reliability above the 0.80 level throughout. All said, across the eleven years under study here 8,255 events were coded. In part one we limit our attention to protest events and include 6,211 observations, each unit of analysis being an event cross-classified by the primary tactic used by protestors and police response. The loss of observations is accounted for by the operationalization of the following concepts.

**Tactics.** Protest tactics are coded into 14 categories which are elaborated in Appendix A. We limit our attention to “outsider” tactics (Walker 1991; Soule, McAdam, McCarthy, and Su 1999), and therefore eliminate from the analysis such tactics as lawsuits, boycotts, and press conferences. Though such tactics are used throughout the protest cycle, they are not likely to induce a police response and are therefore beyond the analytical frame of this study. Also excluded are all labor movement activity and events of ethnic/racial violence, which are typically targeted attacks against individuals or groups, rather than protest events by social movements.

**Police Response.** Police response at each event is coded in one of five categories of increasing involvement and intensity as reported in the *Times*: no presence, present with no action, action taken, physical force used, and violence used. Appendix B gives descriptions and examples for these categories. The categories are coded here to reflect the greatest level of police involvement at each event. So, for example, if police are present and use force, police response is coded as "physical force used."

**Correspondence Analysis**

We first ask *What does the relationship between protestor tactics and police response look like over time?* Without pre-specifying any underlying dimensions, correspondence analysis plots data in a contingency table on a two-dimensional plane, giving graphical
representation to relationships in the data. To see the relationships over time, the data must be
disaggregated into cross-sectional snapshots. I have divided the eleven years into three
periods—an arbitrary distinction. Period 1, 1965-68, spans the peak and subsequent decline of
the civil rights movement. The Civil Rights Act which called for the desegregation of all public
facilities was signed in 1964, and by 1965 Martin Luther King, Jr. and the civil rights movement
were in full swing across the South testing the strength and enforcement of this new law. Period
two, from 1969 through 1972, includes the peak years of activity across all movements. The
student movement was particularly active in this period, the anti-war movement grew
increasingly visible, and the women's and environmental movements appeared as a force. The
third period spans 1973 through 1975 and coincides with the end of the Vietnam war (and
subsequent disappearance of that movement), as well as a general pattern of waning protest
activity. In loose terms, the three periods can be thought of as the waxing, peak, and waning of
the protest wave.

The three figures in Appendix C shows the graphical relationship of tactics and police
response for each of the three periods. First a few words about interpretation. The dimensions
of this graph have no explicit meaning. In general, proximity of coordinates implies correlation,
and greater distance from the origin suggests stronger correlation. Points that lie along similar
axes which pass through the origin are positively correlated when they lie on the same side of the
origin, and negatively correlated when the origin separates them.

The first thing to notice is indicated by the shaded regions. Tactics that lie within the
shaded areas are most likely to elude the watchful eye of the police. The boundaries of these
regions are obtained by drawing lines perpendicular to the axes (through the origin) formed by
the two nearest police responses. Therefore the shaded region represents tactics with a tendency
to have no police present. Note that the size of the shaded region increases across the eleven years. From this we might infer a certain amount of increasing confidence that this relationship becomes more defined in the 1970s. Police are even less likely to make an appearance for these protest tactics than in earlier periods. In all three periods there is a consistent set of tactics that fall in the shaded region which generally meets our expectations. It is not surprising that tactics such as vigils, ceremonies, and information distribution elude the watchful eye of the police. They are all legal and essentially non-violent or disruptive. Lack of police presence for these tactics suggests that they are institutionalized tactics widely seen to be legitimate and expected. Also not surprising is the relative proximity of seemingly violent and/or disruptive tactics to categories of greater police intensity. Riots, conflicts, and civil disobedience consistently attract police presence, and, particularly for the former two, the use of force by police.¹ Attacks follow a similar pattern, although in Period 2 the tactic break from this pattern—for no immediately obvious reason—and tends to have no police present.

If the first pattern is notable for its stability, the second is remarkable for its dynamics. One protest tactic in particular, civil disobedience, seems to be on a wandering path away from police action toward police present. It appears that this disruptive tactic, a significant and memorable part of movements of this period, moves from the illegitimate realm in the mid-1960s to become tolerated, if not legitimated, by the mid-1970s. In Period 1, civil disobedience has a negative relationship with police present, and a strong positive relationship with police action. In Period 2 the relationship with police action is still strong and positive, but police present also

¹ While the relationship between riots and violent police response is not surprising, we should call into question how riots come to be defined as riots. It may be (based on my own unsystematic observations) that events become riots when police don helmets, shields, and become violent. If there is some truth and consistency to this observation, then we should be cautioned to not assume causation here. Unlike most tactics in this analysis, riots are not a pre-planned or organized form of protest. We cannot therefore be too careful to avoid conflating police response with such a "tactic."
becomes strongly and positively correlated, even more so than police action. By Period 3 the relationship with police present remains and police action becomes weaker.

The two patterns that become apparent in the correspondence analysis are consistent with the institutional changes studied by McCarthy and McPhail, and further suggest a possible institutional change on the side of movements. If police departments institutionalize their response to protest, one might expect a pattern of increasing stability of response (as seen in the growing shaded region), or of decreasing intensity of response to common tactics. The latter pattern does not appear except in the case of civil disobedience—certainly a mainstay in the repertoire of this protest cycle. Riots and conflicts continue to elicit harsh police reactions and suggest that, despite evidence that police departments made adjustments to minimize violence and confrontation with protestors (McCarthy and McPhail 1998), infrastructural changes by police do not translate into observed changes in policing. The case of civil disobedience, however, does fit the expected pattern, and also implies a process of institutionalization of the protest tactic.

These patterns are net of the sheer number of events for each category, and are generalized across movements, groups, events, and contexts. That is, they suggest patterns that on average exist in interactions between protestor tactics and police response. If we want to better understand the institutionalization of protest tactics, we will want to know whether police response changes net of movements, groups, events, and contexts. We should also ask not just whether civil disobedience is less repressed, but if it diffuses throughout the protest cycle to other movements and groups. In the next section we turn to a more detailed analysis of the apparent institutionalization of civil disobedience.
Civil Disobedience: The Institutionalization of a Protest Tactic?

In this part of the analysis we ask whether civil disobedience as a protest tactic becomes institutionalized. Evidence of institutionalization should show 1) diffusion of the tactic and 2) increasing accommodation by the state. We will use three indicators of diffusion: an increase in the number of civil disobedience events; an increase in the number of groups that use civil disobedience; and an increase in the number of movements that use civil disobedience. State accommodation is operationalized as a decrease in the intensity of police response to events of civil disobedience.

Figure 1 shows the occurrence of civil disobedience from 1965 to 1975. Though the tactic was widely used by the civil rights movement in the first half of the sixties, there is a clear pattern here of increasing use of civil disobedience. The peak in 1969 correlates with the peak of the protest cycle in which the student movement was particularly active, and a second peak in 1972 reflects the peak of anti-war demonstrations. This trend suggests that as protest activity increased so too did the use of this tactic, possibly diffusing from the civil rights movement to students and others.

Figure 2 offers further support for the institutionalization hypothesis. This chart shows that of the 37 groups that had codes in our dataset, 12 had used civil disobedience at least once in 1965. But by 1975, 27 groups had used the tactic. This further supports the claim that civil disobedience diffused throughout the protest cycle. To approximate social movements with these data we look at the claims made by protestors at each event.

If civil disobedience diffused across movements we should find the tactic used with an increasing number of claims. Figure 3 shows just such a pattern. In 1965 civil disobedience was used in association with 22 different claims. This number steadily increased over the course of
the decade until, by 1975, 81 different claims were made using civil disobedience as the primary tactic. For all three indicators of diffusion—number of events, number of groups, and number of movements using the tactic—the data provide evidence that civil disobedience diffused to new groups and movements throughout the protest cycle. For institutionalization of a protest tactic to occur, not only must the tactic diffuse to new groups and movements, but state repression of the tactic should also decrease. In the first part of this analysis we found suggestive evidence that civil disobedience elicited a more tolerant police response as time went on. Here we subject this finding to a second test using regression techniques that will test the effects of civil disobedience on police response net of group, movement, and event characteristics, and context. We can now ask Does the intensity of police response to civil disobedience significantly decrease from 1965-75?

**Police response.** The same five categories of police response—no police present, present but no action, action taken, physical force, and violence—constitute the dependent variable. Though the categories are ordered, it is unlikely that they are evenly spaced. This is considered further as the appropriate regression technique is chosen.

**Civil Disobedience.** Civil disobedience in this dataset includes all events whose primary activity includes any illegal activity, as well as activities that may not be technically illegal, but are broadly socially unacceptable when and where they occurred (e.g., desegregation attempts following passage of the Civil Rights Act). Since we do not want to confuse civil disobedience as a protest tactic with uncoordinated acts of violence, we will not include events also coded as an attack, riot, conflict, physical attack or kidnapping.\(^2\)

\(^2\) This is the coding of civil disobedience used consistently throughout this paper, for correspondence analysis and regressions alike.
Controls. Theories of policing maintain that the intensity of police response will vary with the level of threat that they perceive in a given situation. To control for this possibility we include controls for groups, movements, and event characteristics. To operationalize movements events are characterized by the primary claims that are made by protestors, and we include controls for the two movements with the greatest rates of civil disobedience, the anti-war and civil rights movements. Three group variables are used to control for an array of group characteristics: blacks, students, and women. Characteristics of the event include such things as size, duration, dispersion, and intensity of the event. With this data we are able to control for event size, operationalized as the number of reported participants.

As research on protest policing has shown, the context of protest greatly affects the degree and kind of police that occurs [cite protest policing literature]. Although most of this research concentrates primarily on political opportunity structures at the regime level, we might also expect police response to vary region, states, or cities. Accounts of the civil rights movement highlight the intense police repression activists felt across the South, substantiating a need to control for region. We introduce dummies for the South, Northeast, Midwest, and West (the base category). The model also includes interaction terms for each of the controls with the year the event took place. This will provide a more detailed picture of where repression occurs and against whom.

Because the dependent variable is ordinal and categorical, ordinal logistic regression is a reasonable technique to begin with. However, results showed that the model did not meet the parallel regressions assumption of the technique, so multinomial logistic regression is more appropriate. The results are reported in Table 1 (Appendix D).
Figure 4 shows the probabilities, over time, that police will respond to civil disobedience with each of the response categories.\textsuperscript{3} Once again, we find clear evidence that the intensity of police response to civil disobedience declines throughout the protest cycle. The graph shows a marked decrease in police taking action and a corresponding increase in police being present but taking no action. The probability that police will not attend one of these events also increases slightly, while physical force and violence remain relatively constant across the period. The trend toward a more tolerant policing of civil disobedience events is fairly linear, with no sudden changes throughout the decade. The slight upward curve to the \textit{police present} line, and slight downward turn in the \textit{not present} line might indicate a routinization of how police handle these events. That is, as time goes on police may develop techniques to anticipate and respond to civil disobedience events that in the past they did not attend. Overall, the general pattern is of decreasing intensity of policing at events with civil disobedience, offering clear support for the institutionalization hypothesis.

The interaction effects in the model (not shown) further strengthen the confidence in this general pattern. Of all the effects included—across two social movements, three groups, four regions, and event size—only one condition departs from this pattern. In the South, where the civil rights movement was most active, \textit{police taking action} actually increased dramatically, while all other responses declined (except the use of violence, which did not vary noticeably). However, yet again we see evidence that the police developed techniques to handle these events that decreased the use of physical force—a notable feature of the early civil rights movement that likely hurt the police force more than it helped it. In all other regions, with all other groups and

\textsuperscript{3} I do not include in the graph a line for \textit{no police present}. The reader should note that because we are looking at probabilities, the five categories will sum to one. The omitted category can be easily obtained.
movements, however, the same pattern obtains. The probability of police action declines and of police being present but taking no action increases.

Figure 5 shows one interaction effect that, while not running counter to the overall pattern, does differ in interesting ways. We still see the probability of police taking action decreasing over time, and police being present but taking no action increasing. The notable difference is that police violence and physical force drop dramatically across the period. The figure shows the effect for events with 3500 participants. It shows that at civil disobedience events in 1965, police are likely to use violence or physical force at roughly one-half of the events. That number drops to about one in every ten events by 1975. As the size goes up from there so too do the slopes for violence and physical force. For events with 10,000 participants the probability that police would respond with violence in 1965 is an incredible 91 percent, whereas by 1975 it drops to 18 percent! This remarkable decline in police intensity offers further evidence for the institutionalization of civil disobedience as a protest tactic during the protest cycle of the 1960s and 70s.

DISCUSSION

Social change, according to William Sewell, is a process of structural realignment. A series of events disrupt the existing alignment to the point where it can no longer accommodate the events and is then susceptible to realignment. Protest cycles, long thought by movement scholars to be catalysts of change, have not made full use of Sewell's theory of social structures. The case that we have considered here, the 1960s and 70s wave of protest in the U.S., is a much studied example of such a process of structural realignment. Whether the structural changes observed are as dramatic as those of the French Revolution to which Sewell applies his theory is not the question. Rather, we should ask whether the dynamics of protest cycles fit the model of
structural realignment and can usefully speak to it. This paper did not set out to answer this question, but it does make use of Sewell's framework for seeing the larger picture within which social movements sit. The repertoire of contention, a cultural structure that includes the set of tactics available for use by movements, is one such structure available for realignment. If social movements set out to change governments, policies, and social relations, they incidentally have the effect of changing themselves and their own repertoires. But this does not happen in isolation. The repertoire is a cultural construct that interacts with the audiences of protest—police, protest targets, bystanders, and the state—and it changes in response to their responses.

Here we have examined the case of civil disobedience, a protest tactic that sparked a cycle of protest. We find evidence that the tactic diffused to a variety of movements and groups throughout the protest cycle, and, building on work by McCarthy and McPhail, we find that the state adjusted its response to civil disobedience, changing its own structures, and in turn facilitated structural changes among social movements. This dynamic interactive process is just the kind of sequence of events that Sewell argues changes the face of history.
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Figure 1. Use of civil disobedience as a protest tactic in the U.S., 1965-75.

Figure 2. Number of groups having used civil disobedience, 1965-75.

Figure 3. Number of claims having been made using civil disobedience, 1965-75.
Figure 4. Expected probabilities of police response to civil disobedience events in the U.S., 1965-75.

Figure 5. Expected probabilities of police response to civil disobedience events with 3,500 participants in the U.S., 1965-75.
Appendix A. Protest Tactics

1. Rally / Demonstration
Demonstration, rally, etc. without reference to marching or walking in a picket line or standing in a vigil. Reference to speeches, speakers, singing, preaching, often verified by indication of sound equipment of PA and sometimes by a platform or stage. Ordinarily will include worship services, speeches, briefings.

2. March
Reference to moving from one location to another; to be distinguished from rotating or walking in a circle with picket signs which by definition constitutes a picket.

3. Vigil
These are almost always designated as such, although sometimes “silent witness,” and “meditation” are codewords; also see candlelight vigil; hunger/fasting vigil; If you find no designations re: vigils, meditations, silent witness, etc., but also no reference to sound systems or to marches, it may well be a vigil. Most vigils have banners, placardss, or leaflets so that people passing by, despite silence from participants, can ascertain for what the vigil stands.

4. Picket
The modal activity is picketing; there may be references to picket line, to informational picketing; holding signs; “carrying signs and walking around in a circle”). Holding signs or placards or banners is not the defining criteria; rather it is holding or carrying those items and walking in a circular route, a phrase sometimes surprisingly found int eh permit application.

5. Civil Disobedience
Explicit protest that involves crossing barricade, sit-in of blacks where prohibited, use of “colored” bathrooms, voter registration drives, crossing barricades, tying up phone lines. Also, violence such as bombing.

6. Ceremony
These celebrate or protest status transitions ranging from birth, death dates of individuals, organizations or nations, seasons, to re-enlistment or commissioning of military personnel, to the anniversaries of same. Thes are sometimes referenced by presenting flowers or wreaths commemorating or dedicating or celebrating status transitions or its anniversary; e.g., annual Merchant Marine memorial service; celebrate Chanukah, Easter, birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr.).

7. Dramaturgical Demonstration
Code ONLY if this is the modal activity; many demonstrations may contain some sequence of dramturgical activity; these may be concerts, theatrical, dance, musical, artistic, or some combination of the performing arts.

8. Motorcade
Electoral campaign and other issues.
9. Information Distribution
Tabling / petition gathering, lobbying, letter-writing campaign, teach-ins.

10. Symbolic Display
  e.g., Menorah, Creche Scene, graffiti, cross burnings, signs, standing displays

11. Attack, by Instigators
  e.g., ethnic group victim of physical attack, by collective group (not one-on-one assault, crime, rape). Boundary motivating attack is “other group’s identity,” as in gay-bashing, lynching. Can also include verbal attack and/or threats, too.

12. Riot, Melee, Mob Violence
  Large-scale (50+), use of violence by instigators against person, property, police, or buildings separately or in combination, lasting several hours.

13. Strike / Slow-Down / Sick-Ins
  Employee work protest of any kind. Regular strike through failure of negotiations, or wildcat strike.

14. Conflict, No Instigator (distinct from codes 11 or 12)
  This includes any boundary conflicts in which no instigator can be identified, i.e., black/white conflicts, abortion/anti-abortion conflicts. Often, no claims will be discernable in the activity.
Appendix B. Categories of Police Response

1. Police not present
   The report does not mention police at the event.

2. Police present, but no action taken
   Police are mentioned, but they do not interact with protestors. Likely roles include observing, setting up barricades, and directing traffic.

3. Police took action
   Police are reported to have interacted in the event. For example, directing marchers, dispersing crowds.

4. Police used physical force
   This includes making arrests, restraining or coercing participants, counterdemonstrators, or bystanders.

5. Police used violence
   Reported use of equipment such as guns, tear gas, pepper spray, etc.
APPENDIX C. Correspondence analysis.

Figure 1. Protestor Tactics and Police Response, 1965-68
Figure 2. Protestor Tactics and Police Response, 1969-72
Figure 3. Protestor Tactics and Police Response, 1973-75
Appendix D. Multinomial logistic regression of effects of event characteristics on police response to events of civil disobedience in the U.S., 1965-75.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Police present</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Physical Force</th>
<th>Violence</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>p &gt;</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>p &gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>0.4041666</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>-0.063634</td>
<td>0.494</td>
<td>-0.064042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Rights</td>
<td>-31.88892</td>
<td>0.929</td>
<td>464.1431</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>798.5059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-War</td>
<td>-145.047</td>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>-99.12034</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>-83.51802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>-70.57492</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>-113.7767</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>127.3489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>-68.75073</td>
<td>0.798</td>
<td>-186.7609</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>-180.5077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>-348.5611</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>-109.9317</td>
<td>0.673</td>
<td>-47.79943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>0.2159137</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.1471492</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1974655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>871.9499</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>-648.5383</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>-23.52658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>577.3456</td>
<td>0.537</td>
<td>-302.8549</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>118.6189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>949.0215</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td>-612.2592</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>278.1818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size*year</td>
<td>-0.000109</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>-7.46E-05</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>-0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civ. Rts. * year</td>
<td>0.0158411</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>-0.235639</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>-0.405514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-War * year</td>
<td>0.0738489</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.0507124</td>
<td>0.586</td>
<td>0.0430062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks * year</td>
<td>0.0360107</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td>0.0577594</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>-0.064943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students * year</td>
<td>0.034533</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0944619</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>0.0910663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women * year</td>
<td>0.1766643</td>
<td>0.399</td>
<td>0.055669</td>
<td>0.674</td>
<td>0.0242483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South * year</td>
<td>-0.442022</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>0.3295243</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.0121726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast * year</td>
<td>-0.292595</td>
<td>0.537</td>
<td>0.1534529</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>-0.06013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest * year</td>
<td>-0.481317</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td>0.3106893</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>-0.140876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constant</td>
<td>-798.8649</td>
<td>0.366</td>
<td>125.3151</td>
<td>0.494</td>
<td>124.1616</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>