

# An Examination of Student Protest in the Late 1960's: A Case Study of San Francisco State and UC Berkeley

Susan N. Gieg & Emily C. Miller

*This historical case study of the 1960s student strikes at San Francisco State College and University of California-Berkeley determines what reforms related to multicultural engagement were sought by the protestors and the methods used to achieve these goals. Strikers at each school were seeking the creation of ethnic studies academic programs. Findings suggest that with support from community leaders and faculty, student strikes can remain peaceful and result less frequently in violence.*

Students have been protesting since the establishment of the university. The dissatisfaction and resistance of institutional authority can evolve into eruption of active protest on campuses. The first American college to encounter a large, organized protest was Harvard University in 1766 (Van Dyke, 2012). This protest came to fruition over spoiled butter served in the dining hall and resulted in a student walk out. The climate of protest spread to other universities in the Colonies, and over the next decade students protested issues that were both personal and political (Van Dyke, 2012). According to Howard (1974), student activism and organizing has the potential to produce meaningful reform in higher education.

Due to students' lack of full time careers or family responsibilities, they are typically more available to protest (Van Dyke, 2012). They are also at the time in their life when they are exploring new ideas and forming their own identities. Therefore, they are more likely to want to spread ideas and raise the consciousness of the more "conservative" campus and community population (Van Dyke, 2012). According to DeGroot (2014), student protest is a culture similar to any other, with myths, rituals, language, and formalized behavior passed down from generation to generation. As a result, each topic of student protest is not an isolated incident, but is instead entwined with all

student protest that has paved the way for this occurrence. Colleges with a more selective admissions process experience more protest activity, and it seems that the culture of the college is what encourages student political activity, not economic reasons (DeGroot, 2014).

It is imperative that those who work on a college campus know the history of student protest. By knowing the history, we can attempt to create a productive outcome for those involved in future student movements on college campuses. While the researchers were exploring this topic, there was an uprising of protests on college campuses around the country, starting with a protest at the University of Missouri over the lack of support for students of color by campus administration. The striking similarity of these recent protests to those in the late 1960's on the San Francisco State College (SF State) and University of California-Berkeley (UC Berkeley) campuses displays the need to examine the history of student protest and gain a better understanding of how student movements create reform. The events at SF State and UC Berkeley resulted in significant higher education reforms in relation to the creation of ethnic studies departments and requirements on their respective campuses.

In order to better understand how student movements lead to education reform, the researchers will compare two institutions

that were in the forefront during arguably the most active time for student protest (1960's). While these institutions are similar in their geographical location, they differ in student population and governing body.

The following research questions will guide this work:

1. What can student affairs professionals learn from the successful movements for ethnic studies that occurred at SF State and UC Berkeley in the 1960s?
2. How do student protests with the same goals (e.g. development of an ethnic studies department) utilize a variety of methods (claims, arguments, and strategies) in their pursuit of reform and are these methods more effective in one situation versus another?

This paper will aim to answer these guiding questions by conducting a historical look at the protests and student movements at the SF State and UC Berkeley college campuses. To do this, the researchers will identify and examine historical literature, news articles, and related publications with relevant information about these events.

### **Literature Review**

A plethora of previous research examines the relationship between student involvement and satisfaction or sense of belonging to campus (Astin, 1984; Astin, 1999). This extends to student involvement in protest and activism on college campuses, which tends to have a liberalizing effect on students who participate (Astin, Astin, Bayer, & Bisconti, 1975). Existing literature also suggests that the campus environment has an influence on student involvement, outcomes, experiences, and perceptions of college (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Strange & Banning, 2015). However, legislation in 1960's California threatened to

drastically change campus environments across the state.

The *Donahoe Higher Education Act 1960* was one change in environment that greatly impacted those admitted and not admitted to institutions of higher education in California. This act included a section dubbed the Master Plan for Higher Education. This plan codified a "tripartite system of public research universities, comprehensive four-year undergraduate campuses, and open-access community colleges" (Douglass, 2000). Public institutions make up 93% of postsecondary enrollment in California, and this plan limited eligibility for these colleges and universities (Geiser & Atkinson, 2010). The plan was developed by a committee as part of a cost-cutting move, and limited admission to the UC system to the top 12.5% of high school graduates and the CSU system to the top third of graduates, with everyone else was diverted to the 2-year community colleges (Douglas, 2000). This plan changed the racial and ethnic makeup of the different institutions in the state, and decades later lead to dissension over affirmative action in admissions (Geiser & Atkinson, 2010). The protests at SF State were a direct response to the Master Plan for Higher Education's restriction of the top third of high school graduates for state colleges, as this would severely limit admission of ethnic populations (Yamane, 2001).

Certain environments can prove to be problematic for some student populations. For example, there is evidence that campus environments at predominantly white institutions (PWIs) can be troublesome because they can convey messages of insignificance and exclusion to undergraduates of color (Feagin, Vera, & Imani, 1996; Gonzalez, 2003). Goals behind involvement in student protest and activism seem to vary. Many students who participate

in these movements wish to advocate for educational change and reform (Howard, 1974) in order to create outcomes and experiences that are more inclusive of all students, despite how they identify.

For the purposes of this study, multicultural engagement is defined as the degree to which one participates in or is involved with creating mutually respectful relationships in which cultural meanings and patterns are openly explored. This definition underscores the reasoning behind the student protests that occurred at SF State and UC Berkeley. In these cases, minority students were attending PWIs, and the exclusion they felt was amplified by the desire to create an environment in which they could engage in multicultural conversations. This research team is particularly interested in these types of student movements that aim to create reforms related to inclusion and multicultural engagement, specifically with the creation or development of ethnic studies departments or programs at collegiate institutions.

SF State and UC Berkeley are two collegiate institutions in history that have been active in student protest with the goal of creating reforms to enhance multicultural engagement outcomes for students (Yamane, 2001). These two protests in the 1960's both resulted in educational reforms that brought ethnic studies departments and curriculums to their campuses (Yamane, 2001). Among the extant literature examined above, few have examined and analyzed the ways that faculty and student affairs professionals can influence the outcomes. Therefore, it is important that more research is done to determine the most effective methods of staff involvement in advocating for educational change on college campuses.

### **UC Berkeley Overview**

UC Berkeley has been a hotbed of protest throughout its history. The Sixties was the most active time for student protest, and in 1964 protests began to fight for the freedom of speech and continued protesting this issue, along with others, until 1969. The Afro-American Students Union (AASU) had demanded a Black Studies Program in the Spring of 1968, and Chancellor Heyns had worked to begin to offer classes and had a proposal for a Black Studies program by the fall of 1969 (Heyns, 1969), but this offer was turned down by the AASU when they joined with other ethnic organizations to form the UC Berkeley branch of the Third World Liberation Front (TWLF).

On January 22, 1969, a student strike was organized to demand, among other things, the establishment of a Third World College, which would include 4 departments, one of Asian Studies, one of Black Studies, one of Chicano Studies, and one for Native American Studies and requirement of more Third World faculty and staff in all departments (Third World Liberation Front, 1969). This strike was a partnership between the AASU, the Asian-American Political Alliance, and the Mexican-American Student Confederation (The Strike: Understand It, 1969), who wanted a college that could coordinate totally new programs (Third World College Proposal, 1969).

The strike at UC Berkeley was partially successful in that a department of ethnic studies was created, but it was not its own college due to a compromise by students because of the inability “of the faculty and administration of UC Berkeley to create outright and put into operation by Fall 1969 a Third World College” (Yamane, 2001, p. 14). Due to the prestigious nature of UC Berkeley, and the immense power its administrators had when it came to multicultural requirements, the student activists had to make sure their suggestions

were beneficial for the administration in order for their demands to penetrate the bureaucracy (Brown, 2007). The development of an ethnic studies Department at UC Berkeley was in some ways a win for the student protesters. However, because of the organization of the University of California system, it survived but did not “challenge the dominant paradigm” (Brown, 2007, p 76).

### **SF State Overview**

During this time of unrest at UC Berkeley, students at San Francisco State College were also advocating for change at their own institution. In late 1968, student-led protests at SF State were sparked by the firing of G. M. Murray, an English faculty member who was also a member of the Black Panther Party. Murray was alleged to be teaching courses that were too radical and revolutionary in nature and was accused of telling black students to bring guns to campus (Turner, 1968). Murray was fired almost unanimously by the Board of Trustees (Brown, 2007). In addition, the new Master Plan for Higher Education in California was put in place that would increase exclusivity and decrease access to racial minorities on SF State’s campus. These two critical events were catalysts for the first large-scale minority student-led protest in the sixties (Yamane, 2001).

This protest was led by two student organizations, the Black Student Union and the Third World Liberation Front. Together, these organizations brought a list of fifteen demands to the university. Among these, students demanded that all non-white students who wished to attend SF State be admitted the following year, that Murray retain his position, a School of Ethnic Studies created to house, among others, a Black Studies department, and that 50 faculty positions be appropriated to the School of Ethnic Studies, 20 of which would

be for the Black Studies program (Whitson, 2015). With some compromise, many of these demands were met, including the establishment of a School of Ethnic Studies and the admittance of approximately 500 qualified nonwhite students for the Fall 1969 semester (Whitson, 2015).

The use of the case study design as a research tool is expanding and is prominent in educational research (Gerring, 2007). Through the examination of these two cases of student protest at SF State and UC Berkeley, the researchers are hoping to find patterns in the methods used in the pursuit of educational reforms as well as examples of how student affairs professionals can understand why protest is happening, and how to help both sides come to an agreement. Because these two historically significant cases acted as a springboard for other campus movements, the examination of these two demonstrations is relevant and may provide insight into successful methods of enacting significant change on college campuses.

### **Methods**

To achieve the goals of this study, the researchers used a constructivist epistemological framework. This framework allowed the researchers to understand accounts of the events at SF State and UC Berkeley as socially constructed, with multiple viewpoints being held and varying meanings being attributed to the events (Creswell, 2003). The researchers sought to understand the meaning of the student activism and protest from the perspectives present in historical documents and publications. The researchers used a qualitative, historical case study approach to the research to understand these historically and socially constructed meanings (Creswell, 2003).

Data was collected by identifying historical documents related to the student protests at SF State and UC Berkeley, including newspaper periodicals, historical essays, and first hand sources. In total, the researchers collected and analyzed 34 different historical periodical articles, 19 from the UC Berkeley case and 15 from the SF State case. The researchers also examined a variety of literature about these protests. The time that has passed since the protests, along with the distance from the site, created a limitation in that the periodicals were gathered only from the New York Times and the Washington Post. These sources were used because their archives were thorough and digital, however it does provide a limited lens for this study.

The historical documents were coded for key words and phrases related to two ideas: (1) education reform, curriculum reform, and university change and (2) methods and tactics used in the student protest and activism. The researchers then evaluated and aggregated these codes to see if themes and patterns emerged that shed light onto the type of education reform practices that typically result from student protest and organization on college campuses, as well as methods that are common in the pursuit of those reforms. Throughout this process, the researchers adjusted the codes to reflect the information gathered from the sources. Finally, the researchers compared and contrasted the themes and patterns that were identified for each case to determine the similarities and differences in the methods of protest and reforms that were sought and/or brought to fruition. This method of analyzing qualitative data was borrowed and supported by Creswell (2012).

## Findings

Upon analysis of the historical sources related to the student movements at SF State and UC Berkeley in the 1960s, themes emerged related to methods used to acquire reforms and specific demands, as well as types of reforms.

### Method Themes

Four themes emerged in relation to methods used in the student protests at SF State and UC Berkeley in 1968-1969. These methods included (1) student strike and campus closure, (2) violence and intimidation, (3) peaceful protest, and (4) community leader and faculty support. Each of these themes will now be further elaborated and their influence determined.

#### **Student strikes and campus closures.**

There are many articles that mention the UC Berkeley and the SF State strikes, either separately or together, and the amount of time they had been going on (Special to The New York Times, 1969, March 5; Special to The New York Times, 1969, January 29; Roberts, 1969, November 23; Davies, 1969, January 22; Flax, "Another view of Berkeley"; From News Dispatches, 1968, November 22; Greider, 1968, December 8; Gustaitis, 1968, December 1; Special to The New York Times, 1968, November 21; Special to The Washington Post, 1968, December 5; The Washington Post, 1968, November 11; The Washington Post, 1968, December 9; Turner, 1968, November 28; Turner, 1968, December 4). The strike at SF State was considered the longest student strike in the sixties (Yamane, 2001). It began on November 6, 1968 and lasted a total of 5 months, ending in March of 1969. The strike at UC Berkeley was the only a few months shorter, beginning on January 21, 1969 and also ending in March of 1969. This strike created a sense of support for the demands of an ethnic studies department (Special to

The New York Times, 1969, January 29; Davies, 1969, January 24). The students suspended the strike on one occasion in hope that the Chancellor would “demonstrate good faith in implementing ethnic studies programs” (Davies, 1969, March 15).

One of the main habits of the UC Berkeley Third World student supporters was to set up picket lines blocking the entrances to campus (Police use clubs in Berkeley Fight, 1969, February 28; Special to The New York Times, 1969, January 29; Turner, 1969, February 9; Davies, 1969, February 7; Alsop, 1969, April 9). Sometimes these picket lines would be peaceful and move aside when bystanders had to get through, but there were times they became violent and would throw things at the police and crowd. This violence was also occurring at SF State. The strike began with “mobile teams of Third World students enter[ing] buildings, dismiss[ing] classes, set[ting] trash cans on fire, and otherwise disrupt[ing] campus operations. Meanwhile, 400 white students marched to President Smith’s office in support of TWLF demand” (Yamane, 2001, p. 14). Periodicals also noted that students were disrupting classes in session by banging on doors, ordering people to leave, and setting off the fire drill alarm to empty buildings (Gustaitis, 1968, December 1).

**Violence and intimidation.** Historical sources noted violence and intimidation tactics used by both sides during the events at SF State and UC Berkeley. At SF State, these violent methods were mentioned by the accounts more frequently than any other. Specifically, sources refer to protesters using guerilla tactics and would resort to intimidation and violence when peaceful methods failed to achieve their goals (Gustaitis, 1968, December 1; Special to The New York Times, 1968, November 21).

Among the violent acts described in the historical SF State documents were police harassment (From News Dispatches, 1968, November 22; Gustaitis, 1968, December 1; Turner, 1968, December 10), jumping and kicking a TV newsmen in the back (Gustaitis, 1968, December 1), setting fire to flags and offices (Gustaitis, 1968, December 1), surrounding the university president and shouting and shoving him (Turner, 1968, December 3), and bringing firearms to campus (From News Dispatches, 1968, November 22; Turner, 1968, November 28; Turner, 1968, December 4).

At UC Berkeley, this included breaking windows and disrupting classes (Police use clubs in Berkeley Fight, 1969, February 28), as well as violence within protests, mostly against the police (From News Dispatches, 1969, February 21; Police use clubs in Berkeley Fight, 1969, February 28; Roberts, 1969, November 23; Special to The New York Times, 1969, February 5). During the strike the governor of California, Ronald Reagan, declared a state of emergency, allowing the California Highway Patrol to “maintain order” (Turner, 1969) which increased the amount of violence on the campus. Police violence against protestors was highlighted with examples such as “club-swinging policemen” (Police use clubs in Berkeley Fight, 1969, February 28; Special to The New York Times, 1969, February 5), fistfights, and the use of birdshot (Davies, 1969, May 16).

**Peaceful protests.** Although there were frequent references to violent tactics in the historical sources, there were also articles highlighting the peaceful methods used for protest at SF State. For example, notes were made about several thousand people gathering on campus the quadrangle in solidarity (Turner, 1968, December 4), non-violent sit-ins (Gustaitis, 1968, December 1), and peaceful marches through campus and on city hall (From News Dispatches,

1968, November 22; Gustaitis, 1968, December 7; Special to The Washington Post, 1968, December 5). This explicit reference to peaceful types of protests was not as prevalent in the sources examined for UC Berkeley. There were references to the fact that some picket lines were peaceful and would let people through, but these were typically followed by information about these same lines turning violent.

**Community leader and faculty support.** Another important theme that emerged was the influence and support of community leaders and faculty on the methods used for protest in both cases. At SF State, prominent black community leaders appeared for the rallies to help support the cause (Gustaitis, 1968, December 7; Turner, 1968, December 4). The strike at UC Berkeley included students and community members, including some members of the Black Panther Party (Special to The New York Times, 1969, March 5). The presence of the Black Panther Party at the strike lent a political edge to the protests.

At the beginning of the UC Berkeley strike, the faculty were aloof and unsupportive of the students' protest (Turner, 1969, February 9). Eventually the Academic Senate gave their support to the strike on March 4th, 1969 (Special to The New York Times, 1969, March 5; Davies, 1969, March 15; Roberts, 1969, November 23). Some faculty decided to support the students in asking for the establishment of a department of ethnic studies (Davies, 1969, March 15; Roberts, 1969, November 23), putting more pressure on the administration to give in to the students' demands. However, most faculty did not actively participate in the student protests at UC Berkeley.

In contrast, faculty and students at SF State came together to organize "crisis convocations" involving discussions between protesting students and faculty to

share ideas and create a space for engaging multicultural dialogue (From News Dispatches, 1968, November 22). The demonstrations were held around the time of the holiday break, and after students returned to campus for classes in the spring semester, faculty members joined in on the efforts significantly, striking alongside of the students (Yamane, 2001) to show their support and solidarity.

### **Reform Themes**

In regard to the education reforms and university changes sought by the student protesters at SF State in 1968, the Black Student Union and Third World Liberation Front (TWLF) had a list of fifteen total demands. At UC Berkeley, the TWLF had a similar list of demands, however, upon analysis of the historical documents for both cases, there were five themes identified in relation to the types of reforms protesters desired. These reforms and changes included (1) curriculum reform relating to minority populations (2) the development of ethnic studies departments on both campuses, (3) increased student responsibility for university decision making, (4) an increase in non-white student enrollment and faculty and staff representation, and (5) equal rights on campus for minority student populations. Each of these themes will now be further elaborated and their influence determined.

**Curriculum reform.** One of the most recognized reforms mentioned by the periodicals for SF State was the hope for curriculum changes within the institution. Specifically, protesters called for the establishment of academic programs that would teach students about historically disenfranchised and minority populations with an emphasis on black culture (Greider, 1968, December 8). Contrary to the desire for more diverse curriculum from SF State, there was a variety of courses established for

the study of various cultural and ethnic areas at UC Berkeley. There were courses in Black Studies (Davies, 1969, January 22; Roberts, 1969, November 23; Turner, 1969, February 9), as well as Chicano, Asian, and Native American Programs (Roberts, 1969, November 23). UC Berkeley was also the site of the first Asian-American studies program (Ching, 1973, July 26). The portrayal of these programs in the media is positive, and to the researchers seems like a point of pride for the community.

**Ethnic studies department development.** The media frequently reports on the demanded ethnic studies departments at both UC Berkeley and SF State (From News Dispatches, 1968, December 8; Greider, 1968, December 8; Gustaitis, 1968, December 1; Gustaitis, 1968, December 7; Special to The New York Times, 1968, November 21; Turner, 1968, November 28; Turner, 1968, December 10; Turner, 1969, January 9). Specifically, at UC Berkeley, there had been a plan for a Black Studies department before the strike occurred, and this is mentioned in an article at the start of the strike (Turner, 1969, February 9). At UC Berkeley once an experimental department was established (Alsop, 1969, April 9; Ching, 1973, July 26; Evans & Novak, 1968, September 29; Roberts, 1969, November 23) the media shared news of, and discussed the faculty's urging for, the department to be converted eventually into a full college (Special to The New York Times, 1969, March 5).

**Student responsibility.** Students wanted to have more responsibility, specifically with the control and decisions regarding the ethnic studies department. This responsibility was given back to the students in two different ways. The first was to invite the students to participate in the course design of ethnic studies courses (F.M.H., 1969, January 9). The faculty worked with the students to change and

update the course offerings. They spoke about learning from the students and coming to an agreement for the sake of innovation (F.M.H., 1969, January 9). The second way responsibility was returned to the students was to return the Associated Students' control of funds that was taken from them during the protest. This return occurred on February 5, 1970 (Wicker, 1970, February 5), two years after it was initially taken from the students.

**Non-white representation.** The main event that sparked the SF State protests of 1968 was the firing of George Mason Murray, a black faculty member on campus. Therefore, as is to be expected, student strikers were calling for his reinstatement (From News Dispatches, 1968, December 8; From News Dispatches, 1968, November 22; Gustaitis, 1968, December 1; Gustaitis, 1968, December 7; Special to The New York Times, 1968, November 21; The Washington Post, 1968, November 9; The Washington Post, 1968, November 11; Turner, 1968, November 28; Turner, 1968, December 3; Turner, 1968, December 4) as well as increased non-white faculty and staff representation.

At UC Berkeley, there was in depth discussion about the difficulty in finding qualified black faculty to teach as requested by the TWLF (Davies, 1969, May 16; Roberts, 1969, November 23). The main concern was with regard to obtaining qualified faculty without stealing them from Historically Black Colleges or Universities (Roberts, 1969, November 23). There was use of graduate assistants for teaching courses, (Roberts, 1969, November 23) but some concern was mentioned about their inexperience or lack of completed terminal degree. In regards to staff, students demanded that a non-white Associate Director of Financial Aid be appointed to handle non-white student problems and concerns (Gustaitis, 1968, December 7).

They also asked for the retention of Dr. Juan Martinez, a faculty member who supported the TWLF and was scrutinized for this support (Gustaitis, 1968, December 1).

The new Master Plan for Higher Education in California at that time was increasing exclusivity and decreasing access to racial minorities on SF State's campus (Yamane, 2001). Historical sources indicated that student protesters were seeking an increase in enrollment of non-white students at SF State as a result of this master plan (Gustaitis, 1968, December 1). Specifically, protesters wanted unlimited admission of non-white students the following year, regardless of qualifications (From News Dispatches, 1968, December 8; Gustaitis, 1968, December 1; Turner, 1969, January 9). Additionally, there was a call for the establishment of programs to meet the needs of this more diverse population (Gustaitis, 1968, December 1).

**Equal rights.** In addition to these changes in curriculum and representation, periodicals noted the desire for student protesters to achieve equal rights on the SF State campus (The Washington Post, 1968, November 11; Turner, 1969, January 9). These equal rights refer to minority and black students being seen as equal in the eyes of university administration compared to their white student counterparts and being offered the same resources and support towards their development. Specifically, students were requesting implementation of policies and procedures on campus that would support all students, despite personal identities they may claim.

### Discussion

The current study aimed to better understand how student movements on college campuses lead to education reform that encourage multicultural engagement and what methods are most effective in

achieving these goals. The researchers used a case study of historical sources and documents to analyze the protests at UC Berkeley and SF State in the late 1960s. These two protests were revolutionary for their emphasis on curriculum and other reforms contributing to multicultural engagement on college campuses. There were several interesting trends in the findings that will now be discussed.

First, the periodicals indicated that the student movements at SF State and UC Berkeley seemed to use different methods to achieve similar goals. While both campuses seemed to use violence and intimidation to get their voices heard, SF State was noted for using peaceful protests, sit-ins, and marches much more frequently than UC Berkeley. This may be a result of the community and faculty support that was prevalent for the SF State protests. In the researchers' observation, this support of authoritative figures standing in solidarity with student strikers may have made the protests seem more acceptable to the rest of the nation, increasing the perception of less violent movements. This observation validates and builds upon previous research that suggests faculty generally support student protest unless it interferes with educational proceedings (Francis et. al., 1973). In contrast, the lack of support, specifically from faculty members, during the UC Berkeley protest could have created more resistance against the student strikers demands, which may have incited the use of more violent methods instead of peaceful ones.

There were some differences in the actual reforms sought by each campus. Compared to UC Berkeley, the SF State protest had demands rooted deeper than curricula changes. The student protesters at SF State were also driven to advocate for increased enrollment of non-white students as a result of the Master Plan for Higher

Education in California in the 1960s, which had increased exclusivity of admission and decreased diversity among the student population. However, the student strikers at UC Berkeley had no demands surrounding enrollment, just a call for non-white representation in the faculty. This is an interesting finding because it suggests that different types of reforms demanded by the protesters may require different methods to acquire them.

### **Limitations**

The researchers recognize that limitations exist in this study that may impact the generalizability of these findings. First, the student protests that took place at both SF State and UC Berkeley in the 1960's reflect issues that were highly political during that era. The socially constructed individual perspectives of the authors of the historical documents analyzed may reflect a bias towards these political issues. Additionally, as mentioned earlier, due to ease of access, the data collected in analysis of both cases was mainly from the New York Times and Washington Post. Therefore, the data collected may reflect limited or biased accounts and may not be representative of all perspectives important to these events.

Along with the potential bias of the news reporters, the researchers understand they have their own bias, and have to consider this when analyzing these documents. Both researchers are white, middle-class women, and therefore can not truly, fully, and objectively understand the student reasoning behind the protests. One of the researchers has knowledge of the events from family members who were present for these protests. The researchers discussed their bias before beginning, and were aware of its presence throughout the study.

The research conducted for the purposes of this paper analyzed very limited amounts of first hand accounts of students, faculty, or administrators that were present during the events at SF State or UC Berkeley. Mostly historical periodical documents, considered second hand sources, were collected and analyzed. James Harvey Robinson (1904), author of "Readings In European History" pleads with the reader to use primary sources when studying history, as "the study of the sources enables us to some extent to form our own opinions of the past" (p. 6). The use of secondary sources in this study may have created a potential bias in the reporting of the studied historical events, and there was a potential inaccuracy to these reports. If research done in the future is primarily first hand accounts, such as letters written during the protests by members involved, or discussions with people who were active in the protests, the researchers will be able to form their own conclusions about the events, which could lead to drastically different implications and recommendations.

### **Implications for Future Research**

Student protests occur at almost all colleges and universities, and have been happening in America since the start of Harvard (Van Dyke, 2012). For student affairs administrators the need to understand why students' protest is important, but the actions necessary to support both the university and the students are also a critical part of this understanding. This research that was conducted on the protests at SF State and UC Berkeley leads to implications for both future research and a call to action for administrators at colleges and universities today.

The first implication is the need for further research on student protests and their outcomes using first hand accounts. In

future research, this team recommends creating a partnership with the universities that are being studied. This would allow the researchers to obtain primary sources that may be held in archives or museums on location. The university would also be able to inform the researchers about individuals who may have had personal involvement with the protests and could participate in interviews with the researchers.

Another important research implication for administrators on college and university campuses is the ability to look at students asking for reform as an opportunity to hear what students feel like they need, and are not receiving, from their campus. If administrators can truly be open to discussing with the students what they need, we should never reach the point where students feel like they have to conduct protests that can turn violent in order to get what they need. By conducting research on protests that have led to successful reforms, we can understand where students are coming from and what methods work to appease them, while still maintaining a fully functional university system.

Overall, it is essential to support these minority populations by providing space on campus where they feel comfortable and safe. Looking at the protests at SF State and UC Berkeley in the late 1960's that led to the establishment of ethnic studies departments, it's clear that these students wanted a space where they were valued and could have an active role in their education. Student affairs administrators and faculty on campus should critically examine the environments created for students to determine who is being excluded from the space and make every effort to create a more harmonious environment. It is difficult to attempt to view an environment from a different perspective than your own, but this

is a necessary discomfort if we want to create a space for all students on our campuses.

### **Conclusion**

Overall this study discovered some thought-provoking information about student activism and its effectiveness in education reform. Both protests at SF State and UC Berkeley were partially successful, and resulted in curricular changes at the respective universities due to the organized student movements that occurred. The methods used by these two campuses in their student protest varied, from peaceful protests to violent picket lines, and the support from the faculty and staff made a difference in the pursuit of curriculum reform, which manifested in the form of a department of ethnic studies.

Knowing how to understand people and what their needs are is an important part of creating successful education reforms within colleges and universities. From these successful movements we have learned that support from faculty and staff is crucial, and makes a big difference in the methods the student activists choose to take. By understanding the historical results of protest and the theory behind these actions we can put into practice methods for successful mediation of student activism from an administrative view. Although achieving different goals can utilize varied methods, the findings of this study indicate that by supporting students administrators can create a more positive message of the activism. Rather than fighting each other administration, faculty, and students should attempt to work together to efficiently realize goals for an inclusive and supportive community.

### References

- Alsop, J. (1969, April 9) Department of ethnic studies won't satisfy Berkeley blacks. *The Washington Post*, p. A23.
- Astin, A.W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of college student personnel*, 25(4), 297-308.
- Astin, A.W. (1999). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40(5), 518-529.
- Astin, A.W., Astin, H.S., Bayer, A.E., & Bisconti, A.S. (1975) *The power of protest*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brown, C. (2007). *Dude, where's my black studies department?: The disappearance of Black Americans from our universities*. Berkeley, CA: North Atlantic Books.
- Calif. college hit by fire. (1968, Dec 09). *The Washington Post, Times Herald (1959-1973)*  
Retrieved from  
<http://ezproxy.lib.indiana.edu/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/143351053?accountid=11620>
- Ching, F. (1973, July 26). Expansion of Asian-American studies on U.S. campuses reflects growth of ethnic consciousness. *The New York Times*, p. L34.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. (4th ed.) Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education Inc.
- Davies, L.E. (1969, February 7). Berkeley quiet as police watch. *The New York Times*, p. L20.
- Davies, L.E. (1969, January 22). Berkeley seeks to head off student strike today. *The New York Times*, p. L23.
- Davies, L.E. (1969, January 24). 380 arrested at San Francisco at students clash with police. *The New York Times*, p. L73.
- Davies, L.E. (1969, March 15). Berkeley strike halted by students and teachers. *The New York Times*, p. L22.
- Davies, L.E. (1969, May 16). Shotguns and tear gas dispense rioters near the Berkeley campus. *The New York Times*, pp. L1, L50.
- DeGroot, G. J. (2014). *Student protest: The sixties and after*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Douglass, J.A.. (2000). *The California idea and American higher education: 1850 to the 1960 master plan*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Evans, R. & Novak, R. (1968, September 29). Berkeley crunch. *The Washington Post*, p. B7.
- Feagin, J. R., Vera, H., & Imani, N. (1996). *The agony of education: Black students at white colleges and universities*. New York: Routledge.
- Flax, J. Another view of Berkeley. *The Washington Post*, p. A18.
- F.M.H. (1969, January 9). Reform at Berkeley brings its own problems. *The New York Times*, p. L53.
- Francis, J., Lewis, S., & Rubin, I. (1973). Faculty attitudes toward student protest. *Research In Higher Education*, 1(4), 347. doi:10.1007/BF00991669
- From News Dispatches (1968, November 22). Students clash with police in Wis., California. *The Washington Post, Herald Times*. p. A3
- From News Dispatches (1968, December 8). Faculty support seems to be eroding. *The Washington Post, Herald Times*. p. A3.

- From News Dispatches. (1969, February 21). Police gas ends Berkeley clash. *The Washington Post*, p. 3.
- Geiser, S. & Atkinson, R.C. (2010). Beyond the master plan: The case for restructuring baccalaureate education in California. *California Journal of Politics and Policy*, 5(1), 67-123.
- Gerring, J. (2007). *Case study research: Principles and practices*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Gonzalez, K. P. (2003). Campus culture and the experiences of Chicano students in a predominantly White university. *Urban Education*, 37(2), 193-218.
- Greider, William. (1968, December 8). College under seige: Hayakawa demands order on campus. *The Washington Post, Times Herald*. p. A3.
- Gustaitis, Rasa. (1968, December 1). No peace seen at troubled college. *The Washington Post, Times Herald*. p. F1.
- Gustaitis, Rasa. (1968, December 7). Black studies program is granted at strike-hit San Francisco College. *The Washington Post*. p. A3.
- Heyns, R.W. (1969, January 21). [Memo to students, staff, faculty, and friends of the university]. University of California, Berkeley Chicano Studies Program Records, 1961-1996, Chicano Studies Archives (Carton 1, Folder 1), U.C. Berkeley Ethnic Studies Library, Berkeley, CA.
- Howard, J.R. (1974). *The cutting edge: Social movements and social change in America*. J. B. Lippincott Company.
- Negro star 'strikes' at opposition. (1968, Nov 11). *The Washington Post, Times Herald (1959-1973)* Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.lib.indiana.edu/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/143366474?accountid=11620>
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- "Police Use Clubs In Berkeley Fight" (1969, February 28). *The New York Times*, p. L19.
- Roberts, S.V. (1969, November 23). Black studies off to a shaky start: Beset by rivalries. *The New York Times*, p. L1, L85.
- Robinson, J.H. (1904). *Readings in European history* (Vol 1). Boston: Ginn.
- San. fran. st. negro players declare strike. (1968, November 09). *The Washington Post, Times Herald (1959-1973)* Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.lib.indiana.edu/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/143208421?accountid=11620>
- Special to The New York Times. (1969, February 5). 20 at Berkeley are held in clash. *The New York Times*, p. L26.
- Special to The New York Times. (1969, January 29). Cyanide gas scare at coast college. *The New York Times*, p. L17.
- Special to The New York Times. (1969, March 5). Student demand backed on coast. *The New York Times*, p. L23.
- Special to The New York Times. (1968, November 21). College reopens to empty rooms. *The New York Times*.
- Special to The Washington Post. (1968, December 5). California campus is peaceful. *The Washington Post, Herald Times*. p. A3.
- Strange, C. C., & Banning, J. H. (2015). *Designing for learning: Creating campus environments for student success* (2nd ed.) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- The Strike: Understand It. (1969, January). [Information about the history of the strike]. University of California, Berkeley Chicano Studies Program Records, 1961-1996, Chicano Studies Archives (Carton 1, Folder 18), U.C. Berkeley Ethnic Studies Library, Berkeley, CA
- Third World College Proposal. (1969). University of California, Berkeley Chicano Studies Program Records, 1961-1996, Chicano Studies Archives (Carton 1, Folder 23), U.C. Berkeley Ethnic Studies Library, Berkeley, CA.
- Third World Liberation Front. (1969, January). [Strike Demands]. University of California, Berkeley Chicano Studies Program Records, 1961-1996, Chicano Studies Archives (Carton 1, Folder 3), U.C. Berkeley Ethnic Studies Library, Berkeley, CA.
- Turner, W. (1968, November 28). Campus on coast remains closed. *The New York Times*. p. 37.
- Turner, W. (1968, December 3). Classes resume after protest at college on coast. *The New York Times*. p. 29.
- Turner, W. (1968, December 4). Police disperse a campus crowd: Students in San Francisco withdraw peacefully. *The New York Times*. p. 36.
- Turner, W. (1968, December 10). Protest on coast dispersed by rain: Suspension of 44 students lifted by Dr. Hayakawa. *The New York Times*. p. 31.
- Turner, W. (1969, January 9). Years of bitterness boil over at San Francisco State College. *The New York Times*. p. 53.
- Turner, W. (1969, February 9). Berkeley strike halts program. *The New York Times*, p. L59.
- Van Dyke, N. (2012). *The return of student protest*. Retrieved from <https://mobilizingideas.wordpress.com/2012/05/02/the-return-of-student-protest/>
- Whitson, H. (2015). *The San Francisco State College strike collection: introductory essay*. Special Collections/Archives, J. Paul Leonard Library, San Francisco State University, San Francisco, CA. Retrieved from: <http://www.library.sfsu.edu/about/collections/strike/essay.html>
- Wicker, T. (1970, February 5). In the nation: Ideology, yes; Idealism, no. *The New York Times*, p. L38.
- Yamane, D. (2001). *Student movements for multiculturalism: Challenging the curricular color line in higher education*. Baltimore, MD. Johns Hopkins University Press.

*Susan N. Gieg is graduating from the HESA master's program in 2016. She received her bachelor's from the University of California, Santa Barbara in 2012. At Indiana University she serves as the Graduate Assistant for Curriculum Development for Residential Programs and Services.*

*Emily C. Miller will be graduating from the IU HESA master's program in May 2016 where she served as the Graduate Assistant for the School of Informatics and Computing Career Services office. She received her Bachelor of Arts from The Ohio State University in 2014 and hopes to work with orientation, transition, and retention efforts in the future.*