

The Societal and Institutional Causes of School Riots in the Late 1960s*

A Research Report by:

Beth Kirvida

and

Francisco Sanchez

Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program

Institute for Scholarship in the Liberal Arts

College of Arts and Letters

University of Notre Dame

Submitted July 12, 1999

* This project was advised by Professor Daniel J. Myers as part of the Notre Dame Research Workshop on Riots and Protest.

INTRODUCTION

With the number and severity of wars our country has had since its birth, it is safe to say that America was raised on fighting. As a result, it is also easy to see how violence still permeates American society. Our nation's children have been raised reading history books describing bloody battles, and they see a nearly constant barrage of violence on television. Primary and secondary schools are far from immune as evidenced by recent events in Columbine High and others throughout the country. As much as we would like to have seen change since the 1960s, the tensions of those times are just as relevant today. As Bailey (1970) put it nearly 30 years ago, the leading themes and feelings behind school violence are fear, prejudice, poverty, arrogance, insensitivity, and brutality. Lessons that might have been learned from the 1960s have not been learned, perhaps in part because research did not focus on violence in schools. This report represents one step in addressing this omission.

There certainly has been no shortage of studies conducted to determine the cause of racial violence during the late 1960s and early 1970s (see reviews by McPhail and Wohlstein 1983; McPhail 1994; Useem 1998). However, that research has generally excluded the riots that were related to organizations and institutions (e.g., schools, universities, and businesses, see Spilerman 1970; 1976; Carter 1983; Myers 1997; Olzak and Shanahan 1996; DiPasquale and Glaeser 1998). Scholars believed school riots, in particular, were of a different nature than non-institutional riots, and therefore removed school riots from their research. These riots were thought to have occurred because of conditions within the institution, not because of economic or structural conditions within each community that were thought to be most relevant to the street rioting that dominated the 1960s urban protest.

In recent years there has been a revival in the study of non-institutional riots (e.g., Myers 1997; Olzak 1992; Olzak and Shanahan 1996; Shanahan and Olzak 1998; Bergesen and Herman 1997; DiPasquale and Glaeser 1996; Myers 1996). However, the study of institutional riots is still being neglected by scholars, which may be producing erroneous conclusions. Between 1967 and 1969, the three peak years of racial rioting, 39% of riot events happened in colleges and universities, prisons, or schools. (In this report, we will use the term "schools" to indicate those educational facilities teaching kindergarten through twelfth grade students. The term "college" will represent both colleges and universities.) Approximately 70% of these institutional riots occurred in schools. In the worst case, where school and college riots are not independent of urban riots, the neglect of such a huge number of riots could introduce serious bias into the results found by prior riot studies (evidence is mounting toward this claim with respect to college racial riots; see Buoye and Myers 1999). Even if school and campus riots were shown to be distinct kinds of events, our knowledge of school riots and their sources is very underdeveloped.

Stephen Kemp Bailey, who produced a report on school riots in 1970, forwarded the notion that there is a continuum along which school disruptions occur--societal causes are on one extreme and within-school causes on the other, with most school disorders falling somewhere between the extremes. He believed that the causes of school disruptions usually began within the larger society, then became focused on in-school issues, and then eventually were again drawn from the outer society. Despite presenting a plausible argument about these disorders, Bailey did not present much evidence to support his thesis. In this research report, we present data from several sources that corroborate and qualify Bailey's claims.

DATA AND METHODS

We compiled data from several sources for this project. First, we analyzed a set of riot event data generated by the Lemberg Center for the Study of Violence at Brandeis University. The Lemberg Center systematically collected newspaper articles from 1967-1969, processed them, and tabulated them into a compilation that reported the date, location, severity information, and a narrative summary for each riot event. From this information, we coded each event according to whether it occurred in a school, college, other institution, or urban environment and ran several regression analyses to demonstrate that racial disturbances in schools were not independent of occurrences outside of the schools (in the community or in colleges).

Beyond a quantitative demonstration that the school, community, and college riots were inter-related, we also wanted to carefully examine the causes of school riots. Our research objective required a thorough examination of individual riots. Determining which race-related issues were most prevalent and most caused the escalation of racial unrest is a time-consuming task which would have been impossible to conduct for the over 500 school riots that occurred from 1967-1969. Therefore, we narrowed our study of in-school riot causes to two cities: San Francisco, California, and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. We chose these two cities because of the level of detail recorded about the two school districts in the Lemberg Center data and the possibility of tapping supplementary materials related to each city (such as the Roper Associates Survey and the Lemberg Leadership Interviews discussed below). These two cities also provided a contrast due to the differing levels of racial violence observed in each city.

Our next task, then, was to search through the original newspaper articles and to extract detailed data about each school-related riot in the focus cities. These clippings

provided the essential background for the study by explaining the details and context of each individual riot. The newspaper articles not only allowed us to document the existence of each riot, but they also provided explicit, first-hand accounts of the riots, their precipitating incidents, and the subsequent fall-out from the riots.

In addition, we were able to use a survey commissioned by the Lemberg Center and conducted by Roper Associates to further determine the opinions and attitudes of Blacks and Whites towards conditions in their communities and schools. This survey, conducted from October 26, 1966, through April 9, 1967, was administered to 500 Black and 500 White respondents in each of our target cities (San Francisco and Pittsburgh). The questionnaire covered a multitude of race-related and riot-related attitudinal questions.

The final element of our data came from the Lemberg "Leadership" interviews. These interviews were conducted in 1967 and 1968 by employees of the Lemberg Center with forty to sixty individuals in 12 cities including our target cities. The respondents ranged from common citizens to people with professional roles in civic organizations or governmental institutions. The recorded and transcribed statements of school officials and parents were especially useful for obtaining unique insights into the context of each riot, as well as community factors contributing to them.

The four sets of data allow us to demonstrate that the majority of the causes of school riots are neither independent of what was happening outside schools, nor a result only of tensions within the schools. The regression analyses give evidence of the interdependence between society's and schools' racial problems. The in-depth study of San Francisco and Pittsburgh poignantly illustrates that the issues, tensions, and conflicts leading to school riots consisted of both community and school influences, while

only a few arose solely from problems within the schools. In the remainder of this report, we illustrate how societal and in-school causes, as well as a mix of the two, contributed to school racial unrest in the 1960s.

RESULTS

Other studies have theorized the effects of society on school riots, but none have offered empirical evidence to prove their theories. Through a statistical approach to the tabulated article data, we produced regression analyses to illustrate that there is a positive relationship between community riots and school riots. These results suggest that whatever is causing the school riots is related to those issues and problems causing riots outside of schools. The regression analyses do not tell us why they are related, however, so the in-depth study of riots in Pittsburgh and San Francisco helps us to better understand these relationships.

Regression Analyses

Our first step in preparing the regression analyses was to separate the riots into five¹ categories depending on where they occurred and who was involved: in-school riots, college riots, off-campus riots by school students, off-campus riots by college students, and riots in the community by non-students. Next, we counted the number of riots occurring each day in each of the five categories between January 1, 1967 through December 31, 1969 (including zeros for each day in which no riots occurred). Also, we included another "dummy" variable named "Summer," in which we placed a 1 for the days of the summer months June through August. The summer dummy was used to account for the fact that during the summer there is no school and thus no in-school riots.

Using the number of riots occurring each day in schools as our dependent variable, and the number of riots occurring each day in each of the other four categories as our independent variables, we first regressed the occurrence of school riots on each individual category of riots (and included the summer control in each model). The regression between school riots and college riots (presented in Table 1) show that for each college riot, there was a highly significant and positive relationship with school riots: for each additional college riot, there was a .394 increase in the number of school riots on the same day. Regression results giving the relationship between the school riots and the other three types of riots also yielded positive results: each additional off-campus riot by school students, off-campus riot by university students, and community riot resulted in, respectively, a 0.833, 0.724, and 0.075 increase in school riots occurring the same day. (The summer dummy variable had the expected negative effect on school riots in all models calculated).

Because more than two riots may occur on any particular day, and we wished to see the effects of other types of riots in their complete context on school riots, we ran multiple regressions of school riots on all of the independent variables. The results (presented in Table 2) show that there was not a meaningful relationship between school riots and community riots ($p > .05$) when the other types of riots were controlled. Further investigation into the Pearson correlation matrix (Table 3) that underlies the regression analyses revealed a problem of strong collinearity among the variables. The relatively high standard errors in Table 2 and the associated p-values appear to be the result of multicollinearity between the three non-institutional variables. This essentially means that the three non-institutional variables are

¹ We eliminated the five prison riots found in the data because they had little influence on our study.

Table 1: Individual Regressions of School Riots per Day to Riots per Day of the Other Categories

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Riots in College	.394*** (.050)			
Riots Off-Campus by School Students		.833*** (.100)		
Riots Off-Campus by College Students			.724*** (.119)	
Riots in the Community				.075*** (.012)
Summer	-.321*** (.054)	-.370*** (.053)	-.378*** (.054)	-.453*** (.055)
Constant	.368*** (.028)	.409*** (.027)	.426*** (.027)	.404***
R-squared	.095	.100	.076	.077

*** $p < .001$ (two-tailed tests). SEs in parentheses.

Table 2: Multiple Regressions of School Riots and All Other Riots

	Model 1	Model 2
Riots in College	.336*** (.049)	.351*** (.011)
Riots Off-Campus by School Students	.638*** (.107)	
Riots Off-Campus by College Students	.274* (.136)	
Riots in the Community	.021 (.014)	
Non-Institutional Riots		.066*** (.011)
Summer	-.330*** (.054)	-.382*** (.054)
Constant	.339*** (.028)	.340*** (.028)
R-squared	.152	.126

* $p < .05$, *** $p < .001$ (two tailed tests). SEs in parentheses.

likely to be measuring the same thing and are not distinct constructs.

A common diagnostic tool for identifying problematic multicollinearity is when the correlation coefficient between two independent variables is larger than the correlation coefficient of either or both of the independent variables with the dependent variable. As can be seen in Table 3, the correlations between school riots and each of the non-institutional riots are less than the correlations among the non-institutional riots. To defeat this problem, we created a new category called "Non-institutional Riots" by adding and combining the numbers of riots that occurred in the three non-institutional categories for each day. We then ran another multiple regression with our new variable and again with our "Summer" variable. These results (Model 2 of Table 2) show how the occurrence of non-institutional riots, together with the occurrence of college riots, markedly increase the incidence of school riots in any given day. We kept college riots as a separate variable because colleges have institutional problems of their own that, in many cases, cause riots but have insignificant effect on the schools' environments.

Mixed Causes

As our data above points out, there is a positive relationship between societal (community and off-campus) riots and in-school occurrences of riots. Our regression analyses in Table 2 show that for each additional college or non-institutional riot, there was an increase of 0.351 and 0.066 riots in schools, respectively. The results led us to hypothesize that when racially provoked issues arise in students' community environments, they are likely to respond inside the schools. A large majority of the riots we examined in depth were caused not only by school issues, but were also greatly influenced by the current events in the city and nation, as well as the leadership of college student activists.

Local Influences. Riots in schools became more probable when students were involved in the issues causing tension in the community, or when they participated in riots not occurring on school grounds--both are good indications of tension. For each riot occurring off campus in which students were involved, an additional 0.833 riots occurred in schools on the same day. Contrary to previous studies that excluded school riots, reasoning that they were solely a result of intra-institutional issues,

Table 3: Correlation Coefficients among the Occurrence of Different Types of Riots

	Schools	College	OC-school	OC-college	Community
Schools	1.0000				
College	0.2572	1.0000			
OC-school	0.2466	0.0940	1.0000		
OC-college	0.1847	0.1639	0.2907	1.0000	
Community	0.1387	0.0957	0.3703	0.5139	1.0000

our results suggest that tensions outside the classroom were very likely to be brought inside the schools. An alternative perspective might be that riots or tensions outside the school were influenced by in-school unrest, which in turn influenced school riots. This perspective would suggest that even those school riots that appeared to result from street riots were actually the result of prior school incidents. The chain of events required for such a pattern is highly implausible, however. It is not likely that a riot would have erupted in a ghetto because of demands for curriculum change and then another riot would erupt the next day in school because of the street riot.

Second, the demographics of the school--reflecting demographics of the local population--also affected the likelihood of unrest. When Black and White student were more equally represented in a school, tensions were more likely to erupt. In a school that consisted of mostly Black students, a more "Black" point of view was present, just as a "White" point of view dominated in a school with a majority of White students. Thus, points of views had more opportunities to clash when Black and Whites students were more equally represented.

This also means that the likelihood of confrontation between White and Black students increased with the integration of the school (Bailey 1970: 12). As the schools were more integrated, the opinions of both races were more equally voiced, increasing the incidence of riots; whereas a school with a majority of either race had less disruptions since one opinion overpowered the other. Thus the challenge of integration was exacerbated by students bringing outside racial tensions into the schools and the result was an increased chance for a riot.

An example of this type of process occurred in October of 1968 in San Francisco, when a Black student at Denman High School was killed in a hit and run accident. Although this incident was not a riot, it intensified

tension in the community. Rumors spread that the student had been shot to death by some White youths. Students responded to this event with several assault incidents at the school, ultimately leading to a riot where 100 to 200 Black students roamed the halls, smashed glass display cases, and terrorized students and teachers. The police had to be called to disperse the students. Preceding these incidents, the Black students (comprising 53% of the school) had been demanding courses in Black history and "soul food" in the cafeteria. The combination of both the hit and run and the demand for a change in curriculum provoked the riot. Had the outside occurrences not happened at the same time students had demanded changes in the curriculum, it is highly unlikely that the riot would have been as severe, if it would have occurred at all. This case is but one example of how school rioting was not caused by school issues alone.

National Influences. Local incidents were not the only external sparks for school rioting; nationwide events influenced the incidence of riots as well. Among others, the nomination of Wallace for president in 1968 and the appearance of the slogan "Black Power" on t-shirts and posters added fuel to several disruptions in our focus cities. During September of 1968 in Pittsburgh, many fights between Black and White students were brought on by White students' reactions to Blacks wearing "Black Power" sweatshirts, and Black students' anger at White students for wearing "Wallace-for-President" buttons.

In an incident in 1967, the principal of Oliver High School had banned sweatshirts displaying the slogan "Black Power." Tension between the two races rose, and soon after, a group of Blacks students from the school were kicked, pushed, and pelted with bottles by White youths on the way to a Halloween party. Following this event, students responded with several riots at the school. The incident was brought on by the tensions about a school issue

(the banned shirts) that arose from a national issue ("Black Power"). Again we see how the mix of an in-school decision and a national issue spurred rioting.

College Influences. We also found a close relationship between the occurrence of riots on and off college campuses by college students with the outbreak of riots in schools. The latter relationship may reflect the fact that college students were rioting about community issues and sometimes influenced school students to participate in riotous behavior at school. The reason for the relationship between on-campus college riots and school riot is not clear because we do not know whether a college riot occurs because of issues within the college or because of societal issues. Societal issues may affect the incidence of college campus riots just as they affect the incidence of school riots. But the relationship is not completely clear because the relationship between college rioting and community rioting is relatively weak (although statistically significant).

Nevertheless, there is evidence that college students directly contributed to events in schools. One such incident occurred in December of 1968 in San Francisco. Ten Black youths at Balboa High School created a disturbance when they broke two windows and assaulted a teacher. A student from City College of San Francisco was reported to have instigated and led the riot. We found similar patterns of college influence on school riots in several other incidents.

Purely Societal Causes

School riots were not always the result of a combination of school issues and societal issues; occasionally, societal issues were the only influence. In our in-depth study of San Francisco and Pittsburgh, we found a few riots that were solely initiated and fueled from outside sources. In October of 1969 in Pittsburgh, trouble arose at South Hills High

School when 14 "outsiders" moved through the school armed with knives. When students went outside during lunch, a Black non-student read something from a piece of rolled cardboard. She and two other youths were arrested, during which time 200 students yelled, shoved, and pushed, protesting police action and the use of dogs. Two weeks later at the same high school, 200 Black students walked out of school to protest the arrest of a student for drinking. Protestors claimed that police had been unnecessarily rough with the arrested student. The actions of police had been the cause for the disruptions and did not have anything to do with school issues. In both cases, outside influences were the singular precipitants of unrest.

Another cause of unrest was the success of civil rights protests in the 1960s. Black Americans were protesting against unjust laws, and they were doing so by directly opposing established authority. Adolescents across the country saw that authority can, indeed, be wrong, and those subject to authority can cause change. Not only did protests and riots *occur*; they were *broadcast* on national television, so that the riot climate could rapidly diffuse from one end of the country to another. The media also broadcast images and printed powerful words related to school riots, and press coverage of school problems was rarely helpful. Instead, it exacerbated troubles within schools and help spread unrest from one school to another.

In-School Causes

Internal causes of school riots stemmed from three main sources: school administrative practices, school curriculum, and desegregation efforts. The general category of school administration includes all the supervisory components of a city's school system: principals, teachers and staff, the school board or board of education, and the school superintendent. In both San Francisco

and Pittsburgh, desegregation usually took the form of busing students from one district to another, often for the purpose of relieving overcrowding in some schools, but more so to achieve a more racially-balanced school composition.

School Administration. In San Francisco, Reverend Douglas Siden summarized the main problems of Blacks in that city during his personal interview. First, Blacks lacked a sense of their own community; second, they needed more jobs; third, they wanted a better educational system; and finally, they desired decent housing. Education was a paramount issue in the civil right movement leading up to the outbreak of rioting, and this did not change with the onset of violence. Unfortunately, progress was extremely slow. In San Francisco, many interviewees reported that no efforts were being made to raise standards in all-Black schools. These schools were academically inferior because of school curriculum, facilities, student-teacher ratios, classroom conditions, and especially, the attitudes of White teachers. Teachers, interviewees felt, were not dedicated to motivating Black children. And the low numbers of minority (especially Black) teachers on staff in most schools alienated minority students and exacerbated tensions in schools. Tensions were further inflamed because school employees felt that the school system had become a "punching bag" for anybody with a complaint or dissatisfaction.

Certain school practices were also known to multiply student dissatisfaction and trigger serious disruption. Unimaginative and traditional control devices produced counterproductive results; students felt like victims of authoritarian whims, not subjects of equitable law. Tensions and violence increased, especially with the presence of uniformed policemen (and their dogs) in the schools. Our research in these two cities leads us to believe that more disruptions were

caused, rather than deterred, by police. Furthermore, the principal's place in this mess was an extraordinarily uncomfortable one. Principals' prime role was conflict management. They believed that disruptions were rarely planned, and they usually worked hard to create a setting that would minimize the probability of explosion, but prepare the staff if it did occur. They were responsible for convincing the school and community that the administration would make the most of its limited personal and financial resources to ensure a positive and controlled learning environment.

Not all principals achieved this image, however. Interviewees in both focus cities had complaints with certain principals. The principal of Mission High School in San Francisco was called "psychotic" and "prejudiced" by more than one respondent. Pittsburgh residents voiced considerably more anger. Mrs. Marian Finkelhor, director of the Pittsburgh Neighborhood Youth Corps, stated in her interview that:

...when you get down to the school system itself, the caliber of the school, the morality of the school, the openness of the school, and so forth, it's very dependent on who's the principal. The principal operates as a little duke and the superintendents may come and go but the principal goes on and on forever and we've got some people who've been hanging around the school system for an awful long period of time ... and this, I think, is quite a big problem.

She went on to say that the main problem is convincing individual principals to institute a complete change in their approach to their schools. For example, the principal was a major cause of grief in the Oliver High School riots. Some protestors said that Principal Crowley was not listening to the students'

problems. One mother declared that Crowley couldn't enforce discipline. He separated himself from the students, and was afraid of the "tough ones." A number of other students' mothers claimed that neither he nor the school superintendent could maintain order in school, and the police, once called to the riot scene, were the only ones who could achieve a semblance of order. At the same time, the mothers were critical of the police intervention and their behavior in the schools. The Parent-Teacher Association asked Superintendent Marland to fire Principal Crowley, while mothers of Gladstone High School students also called for the resignation of their "racist" school principal.

Many principals understood the importance of student and parental involvement in school policy, but did not always know how much and what types of involvement to allow. Generally, the four main issues in which students wanted a voice were social codes (dress and grooming), policies regarding extracurricular activities, athletics and cheerleading, and curriculum planning. Most principals knew it would be absurd to refuse to allow students to help form conduct policy. Moreover, engagement of a school's "natural community" was of utmost importance. Parental involvement often curbed disaster, and standing, versus ad hoc, crisis groups maintained positive school climates. Large city school systems were forced to do a lot to dissipate the distance and impersonality associated with them and with the school board.

Oftentimes problems in the schools were attributed to school boards that were seen as uninvolved or unsupportive of the faculty and principals' efforts to deal with disorders and address the concerns of parents. In his personal interview, one captain in the San Francisco police department stated that the school board was too lax: kids didn't have enough discipline or structure at home, and they didn't have it at school, either. An

editorial in a Pittsburgh newspaper voiced disappointment in the school board's failure to deal promptly and firmly with student agitators.

Mrs. Lois Barnes, a White Education Committee chairwoman of the San Francisco NAACP, as well as chairwoman of the Central City Branch of the Education Committee, called San Francisco schools "the worst in the nation in terms of rigidity and attitudes." And Clinton Jeffers, Black president of the Ingleside chapter of the NAACP, Assistant Attorney General, and a member of the Department of Justice, had more harsh comments to add. According to this man, the board, like the school superintendent, was not in favor of doing anything more than busing, and never made a sincere attempt to integrate schools in the fourteen years since the Brown vs. the Board of Education decision. "This call by the militant sector of the Black community for all-Black schools had now given the administration the rationalization it needed for not doing anything on the basis of the proposition of the Black community doesn't want to integrate its schools, and we are trying to be responsive to its demands." Lieutenant Andreotti of the San Francisco Police-Community Relations Department expressed the sentiments that, in general, the community of San Francisco was very disenchanting with the whole school system in terms of educating minority groups youth, despite the fact that a couple of new board members were more progressive and had commitments to minorities.

In Pittsburgh, the school board seemed to be more progressive, according to Superintendent Dr. Sidney Marland. He himself maintained a policy of being available and ready to talk at all times. Under his direction, a formal Negro history course was being developed to become part of the regular program. He said that the School Board, his office, had arranged for Black schools and classes to be smaller than other classes.

Another important group in the school setting is the teachers and staff. Because these people represented the frontline contact with students, their behavior was critical. San Francisco newspaper articles often focused on the prejudicial treatment of Black students by teachers and faculty in predominantly White schools. At Pittsburgh's Braddock High School, approximately 75 students walked out on October 14, 1969, to protest what they said was the refusal of a teacher to make a public apology for slapping a Black student.

Finally, the school superintendent himself was a major cause of strife in school riots. In San Francisco, former Superintendent Spears (prior to Dr. Briggs taking office in September of 1967) was accused of being "...weak and more concerned with keeping a lid on ghetto schools, rather than doing anything to constructively change the educational system. He failed to deal with problems, and instead ignored them and waited for them to go away." Just as the principals were in a difficult position, so were the superintendents. On the other hand, another interview respondent said that: "the superintendent was getting clobbered pretty badly by some groups fearful of integration and busing." Charles Shreve, a White man and the regional director of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, thought that Superintendent Spears was excellent. He claimed that the school system had all the funding that was available, and was using the most innovative programs. The only criticism he was aware of was the busing situation: "White racism raised its head when busing was introduced to the public."

School Curriculum. Demands for greater participation in the decision making of societal and political institution was another important contributor to school disruptions. Outside of schools, marginalized and low-income groups had begun to insist on being participants in the formation of American public policy. Students

in schools followed this model demanding more say in their educational environments. Students wanted to participate in school government, social affairs, and creation of policies over rules on hair, clothing, attendance, smoking, and other aspects of student life and behavior. Yet they often felt that they had no voice in decision making, and they often complained that their classes lacked real-life relevance.

Dissatisfaction with the curriculum eventually led to some of the riots in the schools. Black students in the November 1-3, 1967 Oliver High School (Pittsburgh) riots threatened to boycott the school until the Board of Education would discuss curriculum demands, such as replacing history books with more Black-representative texts. On September 26, 1968, 50 to 75 Black students from various Pittsburgh schools charged into the superintendent's office to demand curriculum changes. When he refused to agree to their demands, the students threw chairs around his office and shouted threats. Nick Flournoy, a Black man and the Director of the Religious Agency for Human Renewal, effectively reiterates the feelings of many Pittsburgh Blacks at this time.

...Most of our schools are segregated, I don't object to that. The curriculum is what I do object to. There is no consciousness of the Negro having spent any time in this country as an historical figure, there is now a resurgence of feeling among Negroes that there should be some representation of Negroes in history and current events and the kiddy tot books that they use in grade school-primers.... But the Pittsburgh School Board has made no real progress in this direction...they're not really out there doing anything for the ghetto schools, the school which is totally cut off from the outside world in terms of

curriculum.... Kids must be taught something about Negro history, something about Negro culture and contribution to America. I went to schools and they had a paragraph on Carver I think and the peanuts. I think it has to be a little more serious than that.... This is what gives a kid a sense of identity.... We come out of school thinking the White man freed us.... This is a warped concept of history.

San Francisco residents expressed similar opinions. Mr. E.A. Anderson, principal of Mission High School in San Francisco, had personal experience with rioting in his school, and in one incident, "outside agitators" invaded the school and distributed fliers. In his June 8, 1967 interview, he reiterated the content of one of these fliers: "Something's got to give. African History, Negro History, and African culture must be taught. Latin-American History and how the U.S. has unjustly dominated must be taught. Blacks and Latinos of the ghetto must teach these classes, not the anti-poverty phonies or those 'community people' who walk the halls guarding against a riot." Nevertheless, Mr. Anderson said that Negro history and culture *were* emphasized in his classes, and there were Human Relations courses available in the school curriculum. In addition, there was a showcase of famous Blacks in the main hallway of the school. It included usual names like Martin Luther King, but also lesser known artists and statesmen.

Desegregation and Busing. Underlying many manifest precipitants of school riot events was enduring racism. 1960s America was built on separate Black and White societies. More straightforwardly put, White racism and overt and covert discrimination were fundamental causes for most of the trouble. At the same time, Blacks often sought revenge in the form of riots, to get back at "whitey" for the injustices Blacks faced. Some Blacks believed

that all Whites are racist, and that only Black rage against historic oppression would bring Whites to their knees. The most overt expression of these kinds of sentiments came through reaction to school integration attempts. When districts bused numerous students to other schools in order to achieve more integrated institutions, it often highlighted racial, ethnic, and income differences that produced disruption. Generally speaking, disruption in schools increased as integration, or desegregation, increased.

33 of 122, or 27%, of San Francisco schools were "highly segregated" in the late 1960s, while the remaining 99 were in the low segregation category. In contrast, 89 of 122, or 72%, of Pittsburgh schools were in the highly segregated category and only 23 were slightly segregated. In addition, only two of the forty most segregated schools on the list were located in San Francisco, while the others were Pittsburgh schools. Therefore we conclude that Pittsburgh area schools were considerably more segregated than those in San Francisco. In other words, San Francisco had made more progress in desegregation efforts by the time rioting became a common tactic and therefore tensions over new desegregation efforts were more extreme and prevalent in Pittsburgh.

Many parents of both the Pittsburgh and San Francisco school districts were not necessarily pushing for, or in favor of, school desegregation. They were more likely to accept busing as based on efforts to improve the quality of education. Pittsburgh School Superintendent Sidney Marland stated: "We're busing some youngsters from over-crowded Negro neighborhoods to less crowded or slightly under-populated schools in White neighborhoods. This is working reasonably well...." Parents also knew that predominantly White schools offered better education, but integrating these schools was not seen as a step that would solve all problems. Nick Flourney stated in his interview that:

We shouldn't really be talking about such things as busing our kids or talking too strongly about integrating our kids in classrooms with White kids cause all it does- it teaches the kids that you got to be over there with them White folks in order to be right, in order to make progress you got to be with the White folk. This teaches Negro kids to dislike other Negro kids.... I don't think that solves the problem.

The racial climate at Oliver High School, the site for the highest number of Pittsburgh school riots, had been tense since May of 1967. At that time, an announcement was made of a new Columbus school and the plan to send Black and White students back and forth to blend the racial composition. Some opponents of busing went as far as starting their own school, which they held inside a local church, to avoid busing. Meanwhile, Pittsburgh School Superintendent Sidney Marland was trying to remedy the school problems through the Great High Schools plan. Calling it the largest single effort in the country, he thought that building five new Great High Schools could also improve racial integration in the middle schools by moving those students to existing high schools. The schools would be "reaching over larger service areas, thereby embracing a more planned articulation of racial balance.... Ideally it would be good to have all of our elementary schools integrated as the first concern."

Across the nation in San Francisco, there was also a great swing away from demands for school integration, according to Alan Cline, Educational Editor of the *San Francisco Examiner*. In his June 15, 1967 interview, he said: "Whites never wanted integration; Negroes are saying 'to hell with it!'... I think what they want is good schools!"

He went on to add that schools in San Francisco were very sharply segregated, and approximately 1600 students were bused because of overcrowding. He claimed: "...if integration is going to be done, it has to be done right—there has to be cooperation, and I don't think you're going to get away with one way busing." Moreover, the NAACP wanted total integration, while the group Mothers for Neighborhood Schools opposed any busing whatsoever. For the most part, the White community was against busing, as were Black mothers. Their major concern, as they saw it, was more about the inequities of education rather than the racial mix of students.

In summary, the data we examined revealed that the greatest complaints among Blacks during this period were over a lack of quality education for their children, and problems with integration. The numerous riots in schools symbolized the nation-wide, extensive hostility and resentment that citizens felt toward an educational system they believed to have failed them. Schools in both San Francisco and Pittsburgh were overcrowded, and standards were not "up to par." Discipline in schools (when it was overzealous and when it was lacking) was a major ingredient in school riots, especially in San Francisco. Often discipline was seen as completely lacking: "[The situation in schools] is not one of self-discipline or administrative discipline, but almost one of letting students do what they want in the classroom just as they do it on the street," but even when present, discipline was not administered justly or wisely.

COMMENTARY

Trajectory of School Riots

We have already seen from the regression analyses that situations outside schools can influence what happens inside

them. However, it is difficult to fully see how outside and inside factors combined to affect the propensity for school riots. In our report we have presented evidence that helps us better explain the dynamic contribution of both types of influences.

In our in-depth study of the two target cities, we found that San Francisco had a total of 16 school riots between 1967-1969, while Pittsburgh had 17. The total number of school riots in each city does not reveal much, but the total number of school riots per year in each city does. The distribution of riots is as follows: Pittsburgh, 1967: 2; 1968: 2, 1969: 13; and San Francisco, 1967: 3; 1968: 5; 1969: 8.

The patterns in both cities are consistent with our previous findings concerning how societal issues affected school riots. Pittsburgh showed a dramatic increase in 1969 while San Francisco showed a steady increase throughout all three peak years. Also, our study unveiled that in San Francisco, both school and non-school issues were significantly present in school riots, with school issues having the strongest effect at the end of this period. On the other hand, more of the school riots occurring in Pittsburgh were solely school-related. Throughout the three-year period, San Francisco experienced a large number of societal riots, while only a few had erupted in Pittsburgh. Not coincidentally, issues about integration, busing, and curriculum also became stronger at the end of 1968 and throughout 1969. The dramatic increase in the occurrence of riots in 1969 in Pittsburgh was due to the school issues previously mentioned, combined with the fact that there had been no earlier riots caused by societal tensions. However, in San Francisco there was a steadier increase in school riots because at the beginning, there were several school riots caused by societal issues. Our findings suggest that school-related issues did not have much of an impact on the incidence of school riots until 1969, and the riots

occurring before 1969 were mainly influenced by societal issues.

Future Directions

While we have demonstrated several important patterns related to school riots in this study, a wider range of cities should be studied to verify our observations. Additional cities should vary along a number of characteristics including the amount of rioting that occurred and the progress of desegregation efforts. Furthermore, cities in the South should be examined in addition to cities outside the South.

If the patterns documented represent a more general pattern of school rioting, then they suggest certain strategies for preventing and coping with school riots. Of chief concern is a respect for, and inclusion of, cultural differences within the school curriculum. Learning can proceed through less rigid and circumscribed approaches to subject matter. Furthermore, administrators should be more aware of the kinds of problems that can develop when students and teachers from different backgrounds are present in the same school. Whether this mixing of cultures occurs from an attempt to reduce segregation or simply from American society becoming more diverse, proactive efforts to promote understanding, reduce apparent socioeconomic differences, allow for cultural pride, and to minimize turf wars will be essential to achieving and maintaining peace in schools.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Armour, D. 1972. "The Evidence on Busing." Public Interest 28:90-128.
- Aronson, E. and D. Bridgeman. 1979. "Jigsaw Groups and the Desegregated Classroom: In Pursuit of Common Goals." Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin 5:438-446.
- Bailey, S. K. 1970. Disruption in Urban Public Secondary Schools. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- Bergesen, A. and M. Herman. 1997. "Immigration, race, and Riot: the 1992 Los Angeles Uprising." American Sociological Review 63:39-54.
- Buoye, A. J. and D. J. Myers. 1999. "Campus Racial Rioting, Community Ties, and Institutional Characteristics, 1967-1969." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association.
- Carter, G. L. 1983. Explaining the Severity of the 1960's Black Rioting. Unpublished Dissertation. Columbia University.
- Cook, S. W. 1984. "Cooperative Interaction in Multiethnic Contexts." In N. Miller & M. Brewer (eds.), Groups in contact: The Psychology of Desegregation. New York: Academic Press.
- DiPasquale, D. and E. L. Glaeser. 1998. "The Los Angeles Riot and the Economics of Urban Unrest." Journal of Urban Economics 43:52-78.
- Lieske, J. A. 1978. "Group Disorders in Urban Schools: The Effects of Racial Desegregation and Social Emancipation." Urban Affairs Quarterly 14: 79-101.
- McPhail, C. 1994. "Presidential Address--The Dark Side of Purpose: Individual and Collective Violence in Riots." The Sociological Quarterly 35:1-32.
- McPhail, C. and R. T. Wohlstein. 1983. "Individual and Collective Behavior within Gatherings, Demonstrations and Riots." Annual Review of Sociology 9:579-600.
- Myers, D. J. 1996. "The Diffusion of Collective Violence." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association.
- Myers, D. J. 1997. "Racial Rioting in the 1960s: An Event History Analysis of Local Conditions." American Sociological Review 62:94-112.
- Olzak, S. 1992. The Dynamics of Ethnic Competition and Conflict. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- Olzak, S. and S. Shanahan. 1996. "Deprivation and Race Riots: An Extension of Spilerman's Analysis." Social Forces 74:931-961.
- Riordan, C. A. 1978. "Equal-Status Interracial Contact: A Review and Revision of a Concept." International Journal of Intercultural Relations 2:161-185.
- Shanahan, S. and S. Olzak. 1998. Collective Conflict in the United States, 1869-1924: Understanding the Impact of Diversity Upon American Race Relations. Paper presented at the 1998 Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Spilerman, S. 1970. "The Causes of Racial Disturbances: A Comparison of Alternative Explanations." American Sociological Review 35:627-49
- Spilerman, S. 1976. "Structural Characteristics of Cities and the Severity of Racial Disorders." American Sociological Review 41:771-93.
- U.S. Department of Education. 1967. Elementary and Secondary Education Directory. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare and the John F. Kennedy Center for Research on Education and Human Development. 1968. Adolescent Participation in Civil Disorders. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Useem, B. 1998. "Breakdown Theories of Collective Action." Annual Review of Sociology 24: 215-238.