

ONLINE SUPPLEMENT to article in

AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, 2009, VOL. 74 (OCTOBER: 821–841)

Why Targets Matter: Toward a More Inclusive Model of Collective Violence

Andrew W. Martin
The Ohio State University

John D. McCarthy
Pennsylvania State University

Clark McPhail
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

We first describe the measures used to capture other relevant features of *campus convivial events*, each of which is included in our full models as noted. The descriptive statistics are included in Table S1.

Civilian Behaviors. We include a variety of civilian behaviors that may lead to violent outcomes. We use *underage drinking* as a proxy for the level of drinking among civilians; it is expected to shape both civilian behaviors and police responses (Steele and Josephs 1990). Our next measure presupposes the possibility of an escalation of conflict beginning with the *verbal abuse of police* that may be followed by physical acts of violence, primarily against police. While convivial gatherings typically have a less complex social structure than many protest events, on some occasions there is significant spontaneous coordination by civilians, as seen in

blocking traffic or rocking and overturning vehicles. To capture whether participants are acting together in a potentially threatening way, we code for *disruptive collective action*. Police have broad powers to command civilians to disperse, after which point the civilians who do not do so are breaking the law; thus, *refusal to disperse* captures such defiance of authority on the part of civilians. Finally, to capture a feature of some of these disturbances that might “take the edge off” an otherwise threatening atmosphere, we control for civilians’ *celebratory behavior* (e.g., collective actions of chanting, laughing, singing, and dancing, and individual activities such as climbing and jumping from utility poles and trees, males mooning the police, and females flashing their bare breasts).

Police Participant Behaviors. Our first measure of police participation is the

ONLINE SUPPLEMENT
to article in

AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, 2009, VOL. 74 (OCTOBER: 821–841)

number of police reported present, captured by a threshold, *greater than 25 police present*. Second, police have the authority to disperse a gathering that threatens to, or does in fact, violate the law. We code reports that police issued a verbal order to disperse, or engaged in physical efforts to disperse a gathering, as *police disperse*. Third, we code reports of the police’s use of physical violence against civilians, such as hand-to-hand combat, batons, tear gas, or rubber bullets, as *police use of force*. One particular analytic challenge is that police actions may be in response to prior acts of violence by civilians. Although our reading of the events indicates that police acts often precede violent responses by participants, we attempt to control for these nonrecursive relationships by including *calls for backup*, which we suspect is more likely when police are initially attacked and then respond in turn.

General Event Features. In addition to the behavior of participants and police, we also include a number of theoretically

meaningful event characteristics. Opportunities to engage in violence become greater as the duration of the event increases, so we include a dummy variable, *longer than four hours*. In addition, we surmise that civilians’ behaviors are heavily contingent on their expectation about how an event will unfold. If a campus has a history of violent events, both civilian and police participants may anticipate similar outcomes for subsequent events. *Previous event* is a dummy variable indicating there was a comparably disruptive event within the past year in the campus community.

Finally, we also control for whether the event occurred *on campus*, which could influence both the behaviors of civilians and the police responses; in particular, the destruction of private property is expected to increase when the event occurs off campus. We also include a linear and quadratic function of time (year the event occurred), and, for each outcome, we include dummies for the other three targets of collective violence.

Table S1. Descriptive Statistics of Disorderly Campus Collectivities Control Variables, 1985 to 2002

Variables	Mean/Proportion	SD
Civilian Behaviors		
Underage Drinking	.2	.4
Verbal Abuse of Police	.11	.31
Disruptive Collective Action	.25	.43
Refusal to Disperse	.13	.33
Celebratory Behavior	.27	.44
Police Behavior		
Greater than 25 Police Present	.59	.49
Police Disperse	.54	.5
Police Use of Force	.13	.13
Calls for Backup	.16	.37
General Event Features		
Longer than Four Hours	.23	.42
Previous Event	.36	.48
On Campus	.29	.47
N	208	

ONLINE SUPPLEMENT
to article in

AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, 2009, VOL. 74 (OCTOBER: 821–841)

Next, we turn to the *three protest repertoires* of interest. We include a variety of important analytic and control variables in our full models, which are displayed in Table S2.

Initiating Group Characteristics. The demographics of the protesters are important, as researchers examining the Civil Rights movement have long recognized (McAdam 1982). Here we include two major categories that capture most protest events: *racial/ethnic minority* and *students*, which we compare with all other demographic groups. As scholars (Piven and Cloward 1977) note, the formalization of social movements is generally associated with more routinized forms of action, so we also code whether the protest was reported to have an *SMO sponsor*.

Police Responses. We control for important behaviors of law enforcement agencies, *police presence*, *use of physical force*, and *use of violence* (such as guns or tear gas).

Unfortunately, we cannot assess the causal order of events (whether or not violence by civilians preceded police use of force), so any relationship should be taken as an indicator that the two are correlated, rather than a direct causal linkage.

General Event Features and Controls. As noted above, the longer an event lasts, the greater the opportunity to engage in acts like looting, so we measure the protest's *length in days*. We expect the presence of *counter-demonstrators* to be positively related to greater conflict, including violence, between citizens' groups. We include a measure for the *year* an event took place. Given the strong correlation between the location of an event and coverage in the local newspaper (McCarthy, McPhail, and Smith 1996), we include a *New York* dummy to control for the physical proximity of the event to the *New York Times*. Finally, like the convivial models, we also introduce controls for instances when the other targets were attacked during the course of an event.

Table S2. Means/Proportions for Public Protest Event Control Variables, 1960 to 1990

Variables	Riots	Rallies/Marches	Civil Disobedience
Initiating Group			
Demographics (all others are reference)			
Racial/Ethnic Minorities	.52	.29	.36
Students	.1	.15	.17
SMO sponsor	.09	.42	.35
Police Behavior			
Police Presence	.86	.35	.52
Use of Physical Force	.51	.1	.16
Use of Violence	.29	.04	.03
General Event Features			
Length in Days	1.51	2.04	2.77
Presence of Counterdemonstrators	.03	.09	.05
Year	1971	1973.45	1971.97
New York Dummy	.24	.39	.33
N	769	6,212	2,533

**ONLINE SUPPLEMENT
to article in**

AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, 2009, VOL. 74 (OCTOBER: 821–841)

REFERENCES

McAdam, Doug. 1982. *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930–1970*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

McCarthy, John D., Clark McPhail, and Jackie Smith. 1996. “Images of Protest: Dimensions of Selection Bias in Media Coverage of Washington Demonstrations, 1982 and 1991.” *American Sociological Review* 61:478–99.

Piven, Frances Fox and Richard A. Cloward. 1977. *Poor People’s Movements: Why They Succeed, How They Fail*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Steele, Claude M. and Robert A. Josephs. 1990. “Alcohol Myopia: Its Prized and Dangerous Effects.” *American Psychologist* 45:921–33.