

A P P E N D I X

- I. THE INTERVIEW
- II. SAMPLING PROCEDURE
- III. COMMENTS ON THE INTERVIEW SITUATION
- IV. DEFINING THE PATTERNS OF INTOLERANCE
- V. RELIABILITY OF ANALYTIC PROCEDURES
- VI. SCHEDULE OF INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
- VII. SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

I. THE INTERVIEW

This study was based on the so-called "open-ended interview." In this type of interview the questions are designed to stimulate the respondent to reply not with "yes" or "no" or a short factual statement, but to give a fairly elaborated response. If the respondent does not voluntarily offer additional associative material, probes are used to evoke it.

The use of this type of intensive interview, and the requirements of a systematic analysis of its contents made it essential that the interview situations be as highly comparable as possible. Care had to be taken that efforts at standardization were not so rigid that they interfered with the flow of associative material, or with keeping the interviewee interested and in good rapport. The elements of the interview situation singled out for the standardization were: (1) the person of the interviewer, (2) the method of approaching the subject, (3) the place of the interview, (4) the method of asking the predetermined questions and of probing for associative material, and (5) the technique for recording the entire interview. The time period during which the interviews took place was reasonably short so that changes in the political and economic situation or in other world events would be held constant for all members of the sample.

1. *Person of the Interviewer.* An effort was made to use as few interviewers as possible so that this factor too might be kept fairly constant. Because each interview and its recording took a long time and because by spreading the interviews over many weeks another extraneous factor would have been introduced, it was necessary to use six interviewers. The interviewers were all women from twenty-five to thirty-five years of age. Because of the character of the interview situation, it is possible that there was at least one area of life experience in which the veterans' attitudes were not fully revealed, namely their attitudes toward wives or girl friends. However, this was an area of relatively low significance in the context of this study.

At the outset, all the interviewers were made aware of the problem of their own bias in a series of group discussions on the schedule. At the same time, they were given an opportunity to express their opinions on ethnic attitudes and other matters to be discussed at the interviews. During the trial run of interviews great emphasis was placed on the control and elimination of interview bias, and a study of the final interview records showed no evidence of consistent bias.

2. *Method of Approaching Subjects.* A standardized procedure for establishing contact with the veteran was employed. (See pages 12-13.) During the initial contact a number of veterans asked why they had been selected. The standard answer was that the names selected for the survey were picked at random from lists of veterans. In fact, the veterans were told that every ninetieth veteran (which was the sample) was being interviewed; in virtually all cases this allayed suspicions.

3. *Place of the Interview.* The majority of the interviews took place at the homes of the interviewees. Where this was not appropriate, the subject was interviewed in a private office, at the downtown branch of the University. In the latter case, continued privacy so essential for successful interviewing was assured. When the veteran was interviewed in his home, rapport was simple to maintain because the subject felt more at ease in the familiar surroundings, but making sure of complete and continued privacy was more difficult. When interviewed at the University office, some veterans felt more self-conscious during the initial portion of the interview.

4. *Method of Asking Questions and Probing for Associations.* Basically, the interview (pages 213-219) consisted of over 160 standardized questions. In addition, twenty-four factual questions were asked. The standardized procedure for administering the questions contained the following elements: Each fixed question was asked in a verbatim fashion. If no answer was forthcoming, it was repeated in the original form. Partial answers were followed by neutral probes for fuller responses. (A neutral probe was a colorless phrase, ranging from "huh" to "what do you mean by that?" or the repetition of a phrase used by the veteran himself.) Certain questions were always carried further by neutral probes because of their special importance for the study. If at any point in the interview, whether by association or after probing on the part of the interviewer, the subject brought forth irrelevant material he was not interrupted but permitted to continue as long as he wished. If he produced material which was irrelevant to the questions, but relevant to the objectives of the interview, the interviewer was instructed to encourage the fullest responses by means of probes.

5. *Recording the Interview.* A complete interview transcript based on the interviewer's stenographic notes made during the interview was prepared immediately after the interview. The transcript included a report on each of the neutral probes, and which of the questions had had to be repeated. Material offered spontaneously by the subject was recorded in that section of the interview where it was offered. Later, such material was cross-referenced to the question it was more closely related to, so that the content analysis of each question might be exhaustive.

6. *Timing of Interviews.* Many questions dealing with political events were asked in order to gain added indications of the nature of the subject's anxiety and the character of his hostilities. Such questions dealt with problems of price control, the occupation of Japan and Germany, relief for war-devastated nations, and the like. Since opinions on these problems are subject to rapid change as objective conditions also change, an effort was made to conclude all interviews within a short span of time. Some factors were beyond the control of the interviewers and interfered somewhat with this objective. For instance, interviewees broke or postponed appointments. The interviews began on April 1, 1946 and were completed in June of that year—a time span of three months.

II. SAMPLING PROCEDURE

The sampling procedure was designed to yield a random sample of male army veterans of enlisted rank who were residents of the city of Chicago. Special definitions were introduced to delimit the population and to make the sample more homogeneous.

1. Veterans who were officers were eliminated since their war experiences were sharply at variance with those of the enlisted men. Moreover, most of them came from social and economic backgrounds which differed from those of the enlisted men.

2. Naval and marine personnel were excluded since the basis of their recruitment and their wartime experiences were sharply at variance with those of enlisted soldiers. Members of the women's auxiliary services were likewise excluded.

3. Men over thirty-five years of age were not included. This was necessary because the definition of overage in the army varied greatly as draft procedures were altered. By selecting men up to the age of thirty-five, it was not necessary to deal with those men whose army careers were limited simply to a stay within the continental United States until the rules for overaged men were changed.

4. A veteran was arbitrarily defined as a soldier who had been in the army for at least six months. It was felt that service for a shorter period of service would have been too brief for a man to have developed common identifications and to have shared experiences common to the rest of the sample.

5. Members of those main ethnic groups onto whom hostility is most often projected were not included; that is, Negroes, Jews, Chinese, Japanese, and Mexicans. No attempt was made to eliminate other ethnic or nationality groups which find themselves subject to varying degrees of prejudice. As a result, the following distribution of ethnic origin (father's origin) was encountered:

TABLE 1(A)
DISTRIBUTION OF ETHNIC ORIGIN AMONG THE SAMPLE

	Number	Percentage
Poland	31	21
Ireland	27	18
Germany; Austria	18	12
Italy	18	12
Great Britain	14	9
Czechoslovakia	8	5
The Balkans	7	5
Other	27	18
Total	150	100

6. The length of time between demobilization and the date of interview was held as constant as possible. To test some of the hypotheses it was essential that the veteran should have had some opportunity to face the problems of adjustment to civilian life. The timing of discharge from the United States Army

made it advisable that for the purposes of this study sampling should begin after August, 1945, since before that time only wounded soldiers and a very small number of combat troops had been discharged. It was about August, 1945 that mass discharges began. The sampling period was therefore limited to August through November, 1945, and the interviews were carried out six to eight months after discharge.

The sampling technique employed was to obtain a random sample falling within these definitions. This was made possible by the existence of a central file of photostatic copies of veterans' discharge records which was maintained by the Recorder of Cook County (which included the city of Chicago). At the time of discharge from the United States Army, each veteran was issued a certificate attesting to his service in the armed forces. It was impressed on the veteran that in order to legally complete his discharge, it was necessary to register a copy of his discharge certificate with the appropriate civilian authorities. The process of actually depositing a copy with the Recorder was a voluntary one. No data were available on the number of veterans who failed to comply with this routine, but statements by draft officials indicated that the County Records were almost complete except perhaps for a small margin of deviants.

During the period sampled more than 15,000 veterans registered their discharge papers. Tabulations of a random sampling of these records showed that one-third of this number were outside of the sample because of branch of service, age, sex, officer status, or the like. Therefore it was decided to select at random one out of every ninety of the total veteran population, or one out of every sixty veterans falling within the definitions of the sample.

The discharge records in the County Recorder's office are filed serially by date of registration and without any special classification system that might tend to introduce a bias in random sampling. Therefore, every ninetieth case was examined. If the case fell within the limits of the sample, it was noted as a respondent to be interviewed; if not then the next case was taken. By this method enough names were drawn to fill the sample and to replace the refusals.

Every effort was made to keep to the original sample although certain problems obviously prevented achieving such a goal. The interviewing staff was instructed to carry out at least three attempts (including home visits) to locate and communicate with each subject. It was found that most of the failures to obtain total compliance arose not from refusal, but from the fact that veterans who had registered their discharge papers in Chicago had moved to other cities. In all, total compliance failed by about 14 per cent due to refusals and other such reasons.

One special problem presented itself in connection with the elimination of members of ethnic minorities. Negroes were readily eliminated since their discharge records bore that information. Chinese and Japanese names were quite readily discernible. In the case of Jews keys to ethnic identity are not clear-cut. Though their number was slight, they presented a problem, especially since the interviewer could make no slightest attempt to discover whether they were Jewish or not during the initial contacting. Therefore, little was done to eliminate them from the sample; instead, the interviewer was instructed that

if during the course of the interview, it emerged that the subject was a Jew, the interview was to be terminated. Two such interviews occurred and these subjects were replaced.

III. COMMENTS ON THE INTERVIEW SITUATION

Social researchers have often advocated gathering data on the respondents' own view of the interview as a further aid in evaluating attitude data. To obtain such data is frequently difficult, and particularly so at the end of a long interview, when the subject is beginning to tire. For one-third of the sample, however, an adequate opportunity was provided for such inquiry during the course of a follow-up study.

In this second interview a number of general questions were asked to determine what meaning the subject attributed to the interview. There was a wide variation of responses ranging from expressions of genuine satisfaction with the cathartic aspects of the interview to outright suspicion of the whole procedure. In general, however, it appeared that the occurrence and procedures of attitude surveying had become relatively familiar to the public at large. Therefore, a survey which sought generally to inquire into the personal problems as well as a wide complex of public attitudes of the subject was accepted rather matter-of-factly with an admixture of interest or indifference. The element of indifference arose from the feeling expressed by a minority of the subjects that few or no practical results would be forthcoming generally, or for themselves in particular.

TABLE 2(A)
VETERANS' REACTIONS TO THE INTERVIEW

	Tolerant	Intolerant to some Degree	Total
	No.	No.	No.
Positive affect toward the interview	8	12	20
Neutral	14	11	25
Negative	1	6	7
Other	3	1	4
	26	30	56

In all, fifty-six veterans answered questions on their conception of the interview situation. Their reactions to the interview were classified as: (a) positive, (b) negative, or (c) showing mild interest to indifference. Only seven men were manifestly negative in their reactions. The above Table 2(A) presents the responses of the subjects according to their degree of anti-Semitism. It is interesting to note that the interview situation was viewed negatively to a higher degree by those veterans who displayed greater amounts of intolerance.

Suspicion as to the purpose of the interview was limited to intolerant veterans and does not therefore appear to have interfered with their expression of intolerance. Typical were such responses as:

"At first I was kind of leery about answering questions. You figure you got freedom of speech, but sometimes you wonder."

"I really don't know what. I think there's more behind it—some organization or political party is behind it. Everything has a purpose—just like the army—if we wanted to take an objective we didn't go straight to it, but a roundabout way. I think this is the same thing."

In one case, suspicion was mixed with general confusion:

"Well, I'll tell you—some of these questions were rather stupid. Such as how to keep industry going, and another, what we thought of our officers. If we told half of what we thought we'd be shot for treason."

Manifest statements of positive attitudes, which were three times as numerous as negative ones, were more evenly distributed between tolerant and intolerant veterans. Some veterans experienced the relief of catharsis and said as much:

"It lets you get off your mind what you think of army life and the rest of the problems. I think you should have more questions on the army, their way of living, etc. There's too much difference between the officers and the enlisted men."

More important in explaining a clear positive reaction were statements of twelve veterans who felt it was proper and useful to interview veterans in order to give expression to their needs and wants. For example:

"I guess it's a good idea to find out what the different fellows think. If more people thought about things and tried to do something, it would be better. But the trouble is nobody cares about anything."

Here was a man who according to the interview seemed lost and aimless; nevertheless, he not only felt that the interview offered an opportunity for self-expression, but that it proved somebody was interested in him. Another said:

"I think it's very good, like I talk to my friends. We agree on a lot of things, but we don't always agree. . . . I think all sorts of things to find out what people are thinking are a good thing."

In one case, a veteran showed considerable objectivity in his response. He reversed the procedure indicating that the interview helped clarify civilian opinion for him.

"It's interesting to know what the people want to know about the veteran."

In a sample this size, it was to be expected that at least one man would point out:

"I imagine most universities want to publish some sort of findings. Someone's always working up something like that, wanting to publish

some sort of findings—a cross section of what groups think of sundry questions.”

Finally, it should be noted that the intense anti-Semites merely took these questions as an additional opportunity to verbalize their hostility.

“And from all indications, it would seem the country itself thinks there’s a racial problem in the U. S. Most of your questions are foolish. I’ll bet they’ll only come to one conclusion; there’s only one thing to do—shoot the Jews.”

And:

“Well I’m not sorry I answered. I gave my true opinions and I’m not afraid of what I said. After all, the nigger knows they’ll always be crucified—and why. I’m not against talking to niggers and Jews—I have several times—I talk to them at work and joke with them, but as for living next door to them or going around with them, I can’t see that.”

IV. DEFINING THE PATTERNS OF INTOLERANCE

In analyzing the interview for expressions of hostility, a clear distinction could be made between descriptive statements and demands for restrictions against a particular group. Despite the value judgments they contained, statements such as the following were considered descriptive:

“The Negroes smell badly regardless of the amount of soap they use; it’s just a physical difference between them and us white people.”

or

“The Jews always seem to get to the top; and that’s because they stick together and help one another.”

Quite different from these were demands for aggressive action such as the following:

“The way to solve the Jewish problem is to get a Hitler over here, and then forget about the whole business once and for all.”

Negative descriptions and stereotypes about minorities might appear with or without restrictive demands. However, restrictive demands against a minority almost never appear without negative descriptions and stereotypes. In evaluating restrictive demands it was noted whether they emerged spontaneously or only on question.

In order to determine the types of anti-Semitic attitudes which could be sampled by the interview instrument, a series of interviews were conducted with a group of veterans not included in the final sample. These interviews revealed, as far as anti-Semitic attitudes were concerned, that it would be useful to isolate four types of attitude patterns which would form a continuum from tolerance to intolerance. These attitude patterns were called: *tolerant*, *stereotyped anti-Semitic*, *outspokenly anti-Semitic*, and *intensely anti-Semitic*

This method of classification took into consideration the frequency of stereotypes, the presence or absence of restrictive demands, and whether they were spontaneously elicited. All four types are defined in Chapter II, page 13.

In the light of the preliminary study, the interview was so constructed that the various patterns of ethnic intolerance could be delimited with precision and objectivity. For example, if the intensely anti-Semitic subject was to be differentiated from the outspokenly anti-Semitic one on the basis that his restrictive demands revealed themselves more spontaneously, then it became important to decide at which point in the interview restrictive statements were no longer considered to be spontaneous but to be elicited. Similarly, the question arose as to where the line should be drawn between the tolerant and the stereotyped anti-Semite, for even the most tolerant person is not entirely free of occasionally stereotyped thinking in problems of interethnic relations.

In order to allow for spontaneous expression of intolerance, the initial part of the interview was free of direct questions on ethnic minorities. Five indirect questions which made no specific mention of ethnic minorities were included; these questions were designed to permit the subject to reveal spontaneous hostile demands against minority groups. Questions in the central portion of the interview were designed to evoke stereotyped thinking on interethnic problems if such thought-patterns were present. The final section included ten direct questions enabling the subject to express a preference for restricting minority groups. Responses to these questions made it possible to differentiate between the various types of intolerance and to determine whether the veterans were persistent and consistent in their tolerance attitudes.

The responses to these questions and the subjects' spontaneous ethnic statements and stereotypes were listed on a continuum. This permitted grouping of their responses, on the basis of our definitions, as falling into the class of the intense, the outspoken, the stereotyped, or the tolerant veterans. Within each category the traits were arranged in terms of the order of their appearance in the interview. It then became possible to construct an overall chart. This chart was designed to present the full range of statements about ethnic groups and to include frequency data for those attitude traits which had a frequency occurrence. (See charts B and C which present the data in summary form.) The chart provided a convenient key to the data and this, together with the definitions, made it possible to set precise limits for each type.

Since the veterans were divided into four categories on the basis of their attitudes towards Jews, it became necessary to select three lines which would divide the categories from one another. These limits between the categories of intolerance were set arbitrarily, although in keeping with the basic assumptions and consistent with the inner logic of the data. These dividing lines separated first, the intense from the outspoken veterans; second, the outspoken from the stereotyped veterans; and third, the stereotyped from the tolerant veterans.

1. *Delimitation of the Intense Anti-Semite from the Outspoken Anti-Semite.* As noted above, approximately 160 questions were asked at each interview, not including the neutral probes whose number varied from individual to individual. The first forty questions contained nothing which would normally

CHART B

DISTRIBUTION OF ANTI-SEMITIC ATTITUDES

Legend

Column

- (1) Spontaneous restrictive response (groups)
 (2) Spontaneous restrictive response (persons)
 (3) Spontaneous restrictive response (general)
 (4) Elicited restrictions (general)
 (5) Elicited restrictions (deportation)
 (6) Elicited restrictions (intermarriage)
 (7) Elicited restrictions (housing)
 (8) Elicited restrictions (employment)
 (9) Spontaneous stereotypes
 (10) Elicited stereotypes
 (11) Total number of stereotypes
 (12) Grounds for tolerance
 A Denial of differences between Jews and non-Jews
 B Acceptance of differences between Jews and non-Jews
 C Indifference
 (13) Index of anti-Semitism
 1 Tolerant
 2 Stereotyped
 3 Outspokenly anti-Semitic
 4 Intensely anti-Semitic

<i>Intense</i>			<i>Outspoken</i>					<i>Stereotyped</i>			<i>Tol- erant</i>	<i>Index</i>	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	
1	—	x	x	x	x	—	x	—	x	x	11	—	4
2	x	—	—	x	—	x	x	—	x	x	8	—	4
3	x	x	x	x	x	—	x	x	x	x	14	—	4
4	x	—	—	x	x	x	—	x	x	x	9	—	4
5	x	—	x	x	x	—	x	x	x	x	8	—	4
6	—	—	x	x	—	—	—	—	x	x	6	—	4
7	—	—	—	x	—	—	x	x	x	x	7	—	3
8	—	—	—	x	—	—	—	x	x	x	7	—	3
9	—	—	—	x	x	x	—	x	x	x	10	—	3
10	—	—	—	x	x	—	—	—	x	x	2	—	3
11	—	—	—	x	x	—	—	—	x	x	4	—	3
12	—	—	—	x	—	—	—	—	x	x	8	—	3
13	—	—	—	x	x	—	—	—	—	x	1	A	3
14	—	—	—	x	x	—	x	—	x	x	3	—	3
15	—	—	—	x	x	—	x	—	x	x	9	—	3

CHART B—(Continued)

<i>Intense</i>			<i>Outspoken</i>					<i>Stereotyped</i>			<i>Tol- erant</i>	<i>Index</i>
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
16	—	—	x	—	—	—	—	x	x	9	—	3
17	—	—	x	—	—	—	—	—	x	4	—	3
18	—	—	x	x	—	x	x	x	x	7	—	3
19	—	—	x	x	—	x	—	x	x	10	—	3
20	—	—	x	x	—	—	—	—	x	2	—	3
21	—	—	x	—	—	—	—	x	x	6	—	3
22	—	—	x	—	—	x	—	x	x	2	—	3
23	—	—	—	x	x	—	—	x	x	4	—	3
24	—	—	—	x	—	—	—	—	x	2	—	3
25	—	—	x	x	—	—	—	x	x	4	—	3
26	—	—	x	—	—	—	—	x	x	6	—	3
27	—	—	x	—	x	x	x	x	x	10	—	3
28	—	—	x	x	—	—	—	x	x	7	—	3
29	—	—	x	x	—	x	—	x	x	8	—	3
30	—	—	x	x	—	—	—	x	x	17	—	3
31	—	—	x	x	x	—	x	x	x	6	—	3
32 ^a	—	—	x	—	—	—	—	x	x	3	—	3
33	—	—	x	—	—	x	—	x	x	8	—	3
34	—	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	7	—	3
35	—	—	x	—	—	—	—	x	x	3	—	3
36	—	—	x	x	—	x	—	x	x	12	—	3
37	—	—	x	x	—	x	x	x	x	7	—	3
38	—	—	x	—	—	—	x	x	x	6	—	3
39	—	—	x	x	—	—	—	x	x	6	—	3
40	—	—	x	—	—	—	—	x	x	9	—	3
41	—	—	x	x	—	—	—	x	x	3	—	3
42	—	—	x	x	x	—	—	x	—	1	—	3
43	—	—	x	x	x	x	—	x	x	7	—	3
44	—	—	x	x	—	—	—	x	x	6	—	3
45	—	—	x	x	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3
46	—	—	x	x	—	—	—	x	x	7	—	3
47	—	—	x	x	—	x	—	x	x	8	—	3
48	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	x	4	—	2
49	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	x	5	B	2
50	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	x	4	—	2
51 ^b	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
52	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	x	7	—	2
53	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	x	3	—	2
54	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	x	2	—	2
55	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	3	—	2

CHART B—(Continued)

<i>Intense</i>			<i>Outspoken</i>					<i>Stereotyped</i>			<i>Tol- erant</i>	<i>Index</i>
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
56	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	x	7	—	2
57	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	x	5	—	2
58	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	x	x	5	—	2
59	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	x	3	—	2
60 ^a	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	x	1	—	2
61	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	x	9	B	2
62	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	x	4	B	2
63	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	x	x	8	—	2
64	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	2	—	2
65	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	x	9	B	2
66	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	x	7	B	2
67	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	x	5	—	2
68	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	x	3	A	2
69	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	x	5	B	2
70	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	x	x	7	A	2
71	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	x	8	B	2
72	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	3	B	2
73	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	x	5	B	2
74	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	x	4	B	2
75	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	x	3	B	2
76	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	—	5	B	2
77	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	x	10	B	2
78	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	x	5	B	2
79	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	—	2	—	2
80	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	x	5	A	2
81	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	x	3	—	2
82	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	—	5	A	2
83	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	x	4	B	2
84	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	x	6	—	2
85	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	x	3	A	2
86	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	x	8	A	2
87	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	x	6	B	2
88	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	x	6	—	2
89	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	x	3	—	2
90	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	A	1
91	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	B	1
92	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	A	1
93	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	A	1
94	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	—	1	B	1
95	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	—	2	B	1

CHART B—(Continued)

<i>Intense</i>			<i>Outspoken</i>					<i>Stereotyped</i>			<i>Tol- erant</i>	<i>Index</i>
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
136	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	x	2	A	1
137	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	A	1
138	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	—	2	B	1
139	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	A	1
140	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	—	2	B	1
141	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	A	1
142	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	C	1
143	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	C	1
144	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	A	1
145	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	A	1
146	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	x	2	A	1
147	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	A	1
148	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	B	1
149	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	A	1
150	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	A	1

* Limited responses in latter half of the interview.

* Refused to answer but responses indicative of stereotyped anti-Semitism.

be interpreted as pertaining directly or indirectly to ethnic relations. However, five of the questions presented an opportunity for expression to those who tended to respond readily with interethnic hostility to questions of a general nature. They also permitted the expression of a demand or desire for restrictive actions. They were:

“Are there any organizations or groups of people whom you feel might be harmful to the country unless they are curbed?”

“Are there any groups of people you think are trying to get ahead at the expense of people like you?”

“What will interfere with our having a decent life?”

“Who do you think runs the government? What kind of people are they?”

“As things stand, would you say that some people get all the breaks and others get none?”

Subjects who mentioned the Jews in response to one of the first two questions were considered intensely anti-Semitic. If a subject responded to any one of the last three questions with *elaborated restrictive* comments, he was also considered to be intensely anti-Semitic. (See Col. 2 and Col. 3 on Chart B.)

Subjects who advocated restrictions against the Jews on any of the items which directly referred to the Jews throughout the remainder of the interview, or on direct questions, were considered to be outspokenly anti-Semitic.

2. *Delimitation of the Outspoken Anti-Semite from the Stereotyped Anti-Semite.* After the first forty nonethnic questions had been asked, six groups of questions were asked toward the end of the interview which were directly related to ethnic problems. They were so designed that responses could reveal whether a subject advocated restrictive action against the Jews. They also resulted in other types of hostile remarks about the Jews. The six main questions were the following:

"(In a depression) if there are not enough jobs to go around, who should have the first chance at them?" (After the veteran had stated his preference, several probes were used. Among them were the following: "What about native Americans? And what about Gentiles?")

"What do you think should be done about the Jews in this country?"

"Should Jews be forced to leave the country?"

"Should Jews be prevented from intermarriage?"

"Would you object to a Jew moving in next door to your house?"

"Would you be willing to have a Jew work on the job that you are doing?"

Responding to any one of these questions with discriminatory recommendations classified the subject as an outspoken anti-Semite. (The dividing line fell between Col. 8 and Col. 9 on Chart B.)

3. *Delimitation of the Stereotyped Anti-Semite from the Tolerant Veteran.* Eight questions were asked whose answers could have revealed anti-Semitic stereotypes. Most of these questions dealt with army experiences. For example, the veterans were asked who the "goldbrickers" in their outfit were and whether the Jews made good soldiers. In addition, the complete interview was combed for stereotypes which appeared as associative material. Stereotypes were analyzed in terms of their frequency and the distribution of the symbols employed. The total number of stereotypes made it possible to decide whether a subject should be categorized as a stereotyped anti-Semite or as a tolerant veteran. The next problem was to establish the maximum number of responses containing stereotypes which would still permit a subject to be considered as belonging in the category of tolerant veterans.

To arrive at such a number was not as difficult and the delimitation not as arbitrary as they may seem on the basis of a priori considerations. A careful inspection of the interviews revealed that it was possible to draw a convincing line of division between the tolerant and the intolerant veterans. The most important index with regard to tolerance proved to be the veteran's answer to the final direct question, "What shall be done with the Jews in this country?" The response to this question was markedly different in the case of veterans

who had previously used a larger number of stereotypes from the responses of those who had used only isolated stereotypes. Subjects who used no stereotypes, or at most one or two stereotypes, usually elaborated their answer to this question in such a way as to suggest that Jews should not be treated differently from the rest of the population. Veterans who had previously used more stereotypes either failed to elaborate their answers voluntarily, or supported their "tolerant" position by acknowledging that they were willing to accept the Jews *regardless of their difference*.

On the basis of this observation it was decided to classify a veteran as tolerant if he used *not more than two isolated stereotypes* and if he expressed *no restrictive demands* at any point in the interview.

The index as a whole should find its justification by the manner in which the data fitted into the scheme. It is additionally supported by the analysis of how certain traits correlated with the types of intolerance as measured by the index.

As mentioned above, this procedure was designed to measure a subject's degree of intolerance on the basis of his total response and by arranging all responses so as to form a continuum. One of the underlying assumptions was that higher degrees of intolerance contained the characteristics of intolerance which could also be found on the lower levels of intolerance. Thus the outspokenly anti-Semitic subject was supposed to show, in addition to his particular traits, those of the stereotyped anti-Semite. The intensely anti-Semitic subject was expected to display the attitudes of both the stereotyped and the outspoken anti-Semite plus the distinguishing element of a spontaneous appearance and a greater violence of such attitudes. This typology was suggested by the pre-test. Therefore the interview as a standardized instrument was so constructed that it would elicit responses which when systematically analyzed would permit such an ordering of respondents. The analysis of the results seems to indicate that the instrument was adequate in terms of this criterion. The number of cases which did not fit into the "scale" was very small, and in most cases it was possible to isolate particular conditions which explained why that was so.

The items in the interview dealing with Jewish topics were arranged in descending order of intensity on Chart B. Where the required number of items was present, the subject was classified as intensely anti-Semitic. The absence of all of them would indicate a completely tolerant attitude. It was possible to determine into which class an individual fell by noting where on the continuum the first intolerant trait appeared. It was assumed that ideally after the first trait of ethnic intolerance appeared, all the other traits would follow without interruption. The number of violations of this rule could be taken as a measure of the adequacy or inadequacy of the scheme of analysis. Such violations of this rule appeared in less than 5 per cent of the total number of cases.

Similar dividing lines were set up to delimit areas within the continuum of anti-Negro attitudes. Some modification of the definitions used in delimiting areas of anti-Semitism became necessary, but the same general procedure was applied (see Chart C).

In delimiting the "intensely" anti-Negro,¹ the spontaneity of restrictive comments was again used as the basis for categorizing. In addition, those who answered affirmatively to the question, "Should the Negroes be deported?" were classified in this group.

The most important revision of definitions was that the distinction between the outspoken and stereotyped categories was dropped. Instead, two groups of outspokenly anti-Negro veterans were isolated. First, those who made clear and unqualified demands for restrictive action with regard to the Negro were classifiable, according to the previous set of definitions, in the outspokenly anti-Negro category. These were classified as outspokenly anti-Negro, Type A. However, a number of veterans who made restrictive demands, spontaneously modified them by advocating equal opportunities and facilities under conditions of segregation. Responses of this nature were in answer to the generalized question, "What do you think ought to be done about the Negro in this country?" Veterans who responded in this way were classified as outspokenly anti-Negro, Type B. The form of their intolerance was clearly different from that of Type A. On the other hand, stereotyped thinking about the Negro unaccompanied by some form of restrictive demands almost never occurred. Stereotyped thinking about the Negro took the form of requests for segregation rather than expressions of mere negative valuations.

Therefore in relating social and economic factors to the degree of Negro intolerance as indicated by the position on the continuum, the latter type of outspoken intolerance (Type B) was included with the few veterans who displayed only stereotyped thinking about the Negro.

CHART C

DISTRIBUTION OF ANTI-NEGRO ATTITUDES

Legend

Column

- (1) Spontaneous restrictive responses (all types)
- (2) Elicited restrictions (deportation)
- (3) Elicited restrictions (general)
(Code O refers to expressions of equal opportunities under segregated conditions)
- (4) Elicited restrictions (intermarriage)
- (5) Elicited restrictions (housing)
- (6) Elicited restrictions (employment)
- (7) Spontaneous stereotypes
- (8) Elicited stereotypes
- (9) Total number of stereotypes
- (10) Grounds for tolerance

A Denial of differences between Negroes and non-Negroes

B Acceptance of differences between Negroes and non-Negroes

¹ The term "intensely" anti-Negro is a shorthand notation for veterans who had intensely anti-Negro attitudes; likewise "outspokenly" anti-Negro refers to veterans who had outspokenly anti-Negro attitudes, etc.

(11) Index of anti-Negro attitudes

1 Tolerant

2 Stereotyped

3 Outspoken anti-Negro

A Demands restrictions

B Demands segregation but equal rights and opportunities

4 Intensely anti-Negro

<i>Intense</i>		<i>Outspoken</i>				<i>Stereotyped</i>			<i>Tol-</i> <i>erant</i>	<i>Index</i>	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	
1	x	x	x	—	x	—	—	x	1	—	4
2	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	14	—	4
3	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	4	—	4
4	—	x	x	—	x	x	x	x	7	—	4
5	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	9	—	4
6	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	3	—	4
7	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	7	—	4
8	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	20	—	4
9	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	9	—	4
10	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	6	—	4
11	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	4	—	4
12	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	9	—	4
13	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	5	—	4
14	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	4	—	4
15	—	x	x	x	—	—	x	x	3	—	4
16	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	7	—	4
17	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	8	—	4
18	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	5	—	4
19	—	x	—	x	x	x	x	x	5	—	4
20	x	x	x	x	x	x	—	x	4	—	4
21	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	7	—	4
22	—	x	x	x	x	—	x	x	5	—	4
23	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	—	1	—	4
24	x	x	x	x	x	—	x	x	4	—	4
25	—	—	x	x	x	—	x	x	5	—	3A
26	—	—	x	x	x	—	x	x	5	—	3A
27	—	—	x	—	x	—	—	x	1	—	3A
28	—	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	2	—	3A
29	—	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	6	—	3A
30	—	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	2	—	3A
31	—	—	x	x	x	—	x	x	7	—	3A
32	—	—	x	—	x	x	x	x	3	—	3A
33	—	—	x	x	x	x	x	—	1	—	3A
34	—	—	x	—	x	x	—	x	1	—	3A

CHART C—(Continued)

<i>Intense</i>		<i>Outspoken</i>				<i>Stereotyped</i>			<i>Tol- erant</i>	<i>Index</i>	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	
35	—	—	x	x	—	—	x	x	5	—	3A
36	—	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	4	—	3A
37	—	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	6	—	3A
38	—	—	x	x	x	—	x	x	4	—	3A
39	—	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	7	—	3A
40	—	—	x	x	—	—	x	—	1	—	3A
41	—	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	5	—	3A
42	—	—	x	x	x	x	—	—	0	—	3A
43	—	—	x	—	x	x	x	x	4	—	3A
44	—	—	x	x	x	—	x	x	6	—	3A
45	—	—	x	x	x	—	x	x	6	—	3A
46	—	—	x	x	x	x	—	x	4	—	3A
47	—	—	x	x	x	x	—	x	3	—	3A
48	—	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	2	—	3A
49	—	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	4	—	3A
50	—	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	8	—	3A
51	—	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	4	—	3A
52	—	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	12	—	3A
53	—	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	10	—	3A
54	—	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	9	—	3A
55	—	—	x	—	—	—	—	x	2	—	3A
56	—	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	5	—	3A
57	—	—	x	x	x	—	x	x	6	—	3A
58	—	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	10	—	3A
59	—	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	7	—	3A
60	—	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	10	—	3A
61	—	—	x	x	x	—	x	—	2	—	3A
62	—	—	x	x	x	—	x	—	5	—	3A
63	—	—	x	x	x	x	—	x	3	—	3A
64	—	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	4	—	3A
65	—	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	5	—	3A
66	—	—	x	—	x	—	x	x	4	—	3A
67	—	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	6	—	3A
68	—	—	x	x	x	—	x	x	4	—	3A
69	—	—	x	—	x	x	x	x	3	—	3A
70	—	x	—	x	x	x	x	x	3	—	3A
71	—	—	x	x	x	—	—	x	1	—	3A
72	—	—	x	x	x	x	—	x	3	—	3A
73	—	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	6	—	3A

CHART C—(Continued)

<i>Intense</i>		<i>Outspoken</i>				<i>Stereotyped</i>			<i>Tol- erant</i>	<i>Index</i>	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	
74	—	—	x	—	x	—	x	x	5	—	3A
75	—	—	x	x	x	x	—	x	2	—	3A
76	—	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	4	—	3A
77	—	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	6	—	3A
78	—	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	4	—	3A
79	—	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	3	—	3A
80	—	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	4	—	3A
81	—	—	x	—	x	—	x	x	1	—	3A
82	—	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	5	—	3A
83	—	—	x	—	x	—	x	x	5	—	3A
84	—	—	x	x	x	x	—	x	3	—	3A
85	—	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	7	—	3A
86	—	—	x	x	x	—	—	x	2	—	3A
87	—	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	5	B	3A
88	—	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	5	—	3A
89	—	—	x	x	—	x	x	x	7	—	3A
90	—	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	4	—	3A
91	—	—	x	x	x	—	x	x	3	A	3A
92	—	—	x	—	x	x	x	x	6	—	3A
93	—	—	x	x	x	x	x	x	5	—	3A
94	—	—	x	x	x	—	x	x	3	—	3A
95	—	—	x	—	x	—	x	x	2	—	3A
96	—	—	x	x	x	—	x	x	2	—	3A
97	—	—	x	x	x	x	x	—	2	—	3A
98	—	—	x	—	x	x	x	x	6	—	3A
99	—	—	0	—	x	x	x	x	6	—	3B
100	—	—	0	x	x	x	x	x	4	—	3B
101	—	—	0	—	x	—	—	—	0	—	3B
102	—	—	0	x	x	—	—	x	3	—	3B
103	—	—	0	—	x	—	—	x	1	—	3B
104	—	—	0	x	x	x	x	x	6	—	3B
105	—	—	0	x	—	—	—	—	0	—	3B
106	—	—	0	—	x	—	x	—	3	—	3B
107	—	—	0	—	x	—	—	—	0	—	3B
108	—	—	0	x	x	—	—	—	2	—	3B
109	—	—	0	x	x	x	—	x	2	—	3B
110	—	—	0	—	x	—	x	x	3	—	3B
111	—	—	0	x	x	x	—	x	1	—	3B
112	—	—	0	x	x	—	x	—	1	A	3B

DYNAMICS OF PREJUDICE

CHART C—(Continued)

<i>Intense</i>		<i>Outspoken</i>				<i>Stereotyped</i>			<i>Tol- erant</i>	<i>Index</i>	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	
113	—	—	0	x	—	—	x	—	1	—	3B
114	—	—	0	x	x	—	x	x	3	—	3B
115	—	—	0	x	x	—	x	x	4	—	3B
116	—	—	0	x	x	—	x	x	5	—	3B
117	—	—	0	—	x	—	x	x	2	—	3B
118	—	—	0	x	x	—	x	—	1	A	3B
119	—	—	0	x	x	—	x	x	5	A	3B
120	—	—	0	—	—	x	x	x	4	—	3B
121	—	—	0	x	x	x	x	x	4	—	3B
122	—	—	0	x	x	x	x	x	5	—	3B
123	—	—	0	x	x	—	x	x	1	—	3B
124	—	—	0	x	—	—	x	—	2	—	3B
125	—	—	0	x	x	—	—	x	2	—	3B
126	—	—	0	x	—	—	x	x	6	—	3B
127	—	—	0	x	x	x	—	x	2	—	3B
128	—	—	0	x	x	x	—	x	3	—	3B
129	—	—	0	x	x	—	—	x	1	—	3B
130	—	—	0	—	x	—	—	—	0	—	3B
131	—	—	0	x	—	—	x	—	2	—	3B
132	—	—	—	—	x	—	x	x	3	—	2
133	—	—	—	x	—	—	x	x	7	—	2
134	—	—	—	x	x	—	—	x	3	—	2
135	—	—	—	x	x	—	—	x	2	—	2
136	—	—	—	—	—	x	—	—	2	B	2
137	—	—	—	x	x	—	—	x	1	—	2
138	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	3	A	2
139	—	—	—	x	—	—	—	—	0	A	1
140	—	—	—	x	—	—	—	—	0	A	1
141	—	—	—	x	—	—	—	—	0	B	1
142	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	1	A	1
143	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0	B	1
144	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0	—	1
145	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0	A	1
146	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	x	1	A	1
147	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0	A	1
148	—	—	—	x	—	—	—	x	1	A	1
149	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0	A	1
150	—	—	—	x	—	—	—	—	0	A	1

V. RELIABILITY OF ANALYTIC PROCEDURES

An examination of the literature on the analysis of open-ended interviews reveals a lack of progress toward the development of a suitable methodology. Advocates of the open-ended interview admit that the problem of analyzing its intensive data remains relatively unsolved, that is, the problem of translating the interview record into rigorous statistical categories of analysis. Lazarsfeld² states candidly:

"We shall agree that a well-conducted open-ended interview gives us a fascinating wealth of information on the attitude of a single respondent. When it comes to the statistical analysis of many open-ended interviews, the matter is already not so simple. It is in the nature of this technique that just the most valuable details of open-ended interviews become difficult to compare with the answers obtained in another interview. It can safely be said that the proponents of the open-ended interview technique have made much more progress in the conduct of the interviews than in their statistical analysis."

In particular, the few references make no mention of the problem of reliability in existing methods of analysis. It is most striking that in the literature on intensive interviews no cognizance is taken of experiences and techniques developed in the study of mass communications, particularly that of content analysis. The interview record is a form of communications, and therefore, should be subject to analysis in much the same way that communications content is analyzed. This is particularly the case since the various types of content analysis have attempted to deal with the reliability of their procedures.

Lasswell³ has brought this problem to the fore. Apparently the study of interpersonal relationships is held back by the absence of satisfactory categories for the description and comparison of symbols. He therefore suggests that communications be classified into categories according to the understandings which prevail among those who issued the communications, or to whom they are directed. (In the case of the interview, it would be in terms of the meanings of the respondent.)

The analyst may use a single symbol, an assertion, a sentence, a paragraph (or even a larger flow of communications) as his unit of analysis.⁴ (In the case of an intensive interview, he may use the responses to a single question, or to a number of questions, or a whole page of the interview.) Each reference or unit of analysis is classified according to explicit definitions or criteria; the definitions and criteria are obtained from the hypotheses being tested. (Lasswell has suggested and used the criteria of indulgence and deprivation; but this is only one set of criteria.) The next step is to determine the frequency

² Lazarsfeld, Paul F.: "The Controversy Over Detailed Interviews—An Offer for Negotiation," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, VIII: 38-60, 1944.

³ Lasswell, Harold: "A Provisional Classification of Symbol Data," *Psychiatry* I: 197, 1938.

⁴ Lasswell, Harold: *Analyzing the Content of Mass Communications: A Brief Introduction*, Washington: Experimental Division for the Study of War Time Communications, Library of Congress 1942.

with which these categories appear in any flow of communications. Fundamentally, the method of content analysis depends on the reliability of the judgments of different analysts in applying the same criteria to a given document or interview. It should be noted that this is the problem of reliability implicit in the procedures described by practitioners of the open-ended interview.⁵ If the methodologists of open-ended and intensive interviews were explicit in this respect, they would cite reliability data indicating the degree to which more than one analyst agreed on the application of the categories of analysis. That contents can be reliably analyzed in this fashion has been shown by numerous studies. The degree of reliability depends on the unit of analysis and the explicitness with which the criteria and definitions are made.⁶ A number of unpublished studies by the Office of Radio Research may be considered as moving in the direction of the systematic analysis of intensive interview data.⁷

Therefore, the central problem in the application of content analysis procedures to intensive interviews is to take the responses to specific questions or groups of questions and to classify them reliably under a systematic set of criteria or categories.

Two points are central in this process of content analysis: (1) The classification system (the "code") cannot be determined completely before the interviews are gathered, although in the main the hypotheses and the pre-test supply the major outlines; (2) The reliable classification of a given response means that two or more analysts using the same explicit categories are able to produce a satisfactorily high degree of agreement in their analytical judgments, and that their judgments do not vary with time.

When the interviewing was completed for this study, 20 per cent of the cases were read. For each question or group of questions, all possible alternative answers supplied the basis for constructing a category system (the "code").⁸ Three types of categories were devised: (A) symbol categories, (B) assertion or proposition categories, and (C) analytic categories.

(A) In some cases the "code" merely called for noting the presence or absence of a particular list of *symbols*. For example, the question asking "Who do you think gained through the war?" produced the following category system:

1. We, we all.
2. The people, my country.
3. Nobody.
4. The officers.
5. Big business.
6. Those men who stayed at home.
7. Others.

⁵ Skott, H. E.: "Attitude Research in the Department of Agriculture," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, VII: 280-292, 1943.

⁶ Janis, Irving L., Fadner, Raymond H., and Janowitz, Morris: "Reliability of a Content Analysis Technique," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, VII: 293-96, 1943.

⁷ In particular, Berelson, Bernard: "The Quantitative Analysis of Case Records: An Experimental Study," *Psychiatry*, X: 395-403, 1948.

⁸ The category system which was developed to encompass questions both individually and in selected groups filled more than sixty typewritten pages.

(B) In other cases the response required the categorizing of an *assertion or statement*. For example: "How did the fellows feel about religion?" The code for this question was:

1. Soldiers were more religious in combat; there were no atheists in foxholes.
2. Most soldiers followed their civilian habits.
3. Like everything else; everybody feels a little different; everybody had his own opinions.
4. Most soldiers didn't go to church; no one in the army was really religious.
5. Other.
6. Don't know.

Frequently, the responses did not employ these explicit assertions so that supplementary rules had to be constructed.

Many questions which might have been asked in a "yes" or "no" fashion were asked as open-ended questions in order to produce fuller and more representative responses. For example: "How were the Jews treated in the army?" This made the coding procedure of assertions more elaborate. The categories employed for this question were:

1. They were treated just like anyone.
2. They were treated very well (matter-of-fact).
3. They were treated very well because they always got soft jobs and special privileges.
4. They always watched out for themselves; talked themselves into good jobs.
5. The Jews were not treated too well because they held all the good jobs, and special privileges, and were disliked by the boys for this.

Because of the detail of analysis, assertion analysis developed into complicated classification systems where the question required it. For example: "If we have a large amount of unemployment, what will that do to you and your family?" Responses were coded as follows:

1. Unemployment would mean nothing to a person like me.
2. Won't do much.
3. Depends.
4. We will probably be able to get along on a reduced level; my wages will be reduced.
5. Will affect us very much; would have to go on relief; will put us in a bad fix.
6. People like me will starve.
7. Don't know.

Or, "Do you think that what the government has been doing these days is affecting the liberties of the ordinary people?"

1. We don't have any liberties.
2. The government is affecting our liberties (generally).
3. The government is affecting our liberties (mentions specific ways).
4. The government is not affecting our liberties to any great extent.
5. These restrictions are necessary; are helpful.
6. We have our freedom.
7. Some Americans have too much freedom; they don't appreciate their freedom.

8. Other.

9. Don't know.

In the final presentation of results, sub-categories of this type were often combined for special purposes.

(C) Certain questions were classified according to judgments not readily discernible from the manifest content but dependent on *analytical definitions*. For example, the series of questions on political parties, in addition to being coded for professed party affiliation, were classified according to the following criteria, after clear definitions and examples were established. Code: Attitude toward political parties in general.

1. Feeling of general deprivation (due to disregard by the leaders, incompetency, or deliberate manipulation).
2. Feeling of indulgence (due to benevolence or competency).
3. Indeterminate.

The reliability of the coding procedure was dependent ultimately on the ability of trained analysts who were familiar with the definitions to apply them to the 150 cases and independently to produce comparable results. To this end, only four analysts participated in the task, two of whom carried out the bulk of the work. All four were totally familiar with the various aspects of the study and had wide experience in social research, particularly in attitude research. To test the procedure, four of the most abstract and complicated sets of categories were tested. In all, 400 judgments drawn from one-third of the sample were made by one analyst. The same data were "coded" independently by another analyst. The classification systems tested were: (1) expressions of personal competency; (2) acceptance of present status in economic matters; (3) demands for collective vs. individual action; (4) economic apprehensions. The analysis of errors is tabulated below:

TABLE 3(A)
RELIABILITY OF ANALYTIC PROCEDURE

	No. of Differences Between Two Analysts	Total No. of Judgments	Percentage Error
1. Competency	5	100	5.0
2. Acceptance of present status	12	100	12.0
3. Demands for action	10	150	7.0
4. Apprehensions	4	50	8.0
Total	31	400	7.7

The total percentage of error for the 400 judgments was about 8. It should be noted that the largest number of errors occurred in the category on the veteran's acceptance of his present status. The overall percentage error was considered strikingly small and therefore warranted confidence in the procedure of analysis, especially since these categories were typical of the most diffi-

cult aspects of the coding procedures. Actually the data produced by the categories included under "acceptance of present status" were not employed in this report, so that the percentage error may be considered to have been even smaller.

VI. SCHEDULE OF INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. How do you think things are going to turn out now that the war is over?
 - 1.1. Why do you think so?
2. What do you think can be done to insure a decent life for us?
 - 2.1. Why do you think that?
 - 2.2. What are the chances that —— will happen?
 - 2.3. Who should do it?
3. What will interfere with our having a decent life?
 - 3.1. What can be done about it?
 - 3.2. Who should do it?
4. Now that the veterans are back, how do you think they are going to get along?
 - 4.1. Why do you think that?
 - 4.2. What are the main gripes of the veterans?
5. Do you think enough is being done for the veterans now?
 - 5.1. Why do you say that?
 - 5.2. (If not enough) What should be done for the veterans?
 - 5.3. Who should do it?
 - 5.4. Are there any groups of people you think are trying to get ahead at the expense of people like you?
6. Which party do you think is better for the veteran?
 - 6.1. In what way will the —— party be better for the veteran?
 - 6.2. How about your parents? What party do, or did, they favor?
 - 6.3. How could our government be improved?
 - 6.4. Do you think that what the government has been doing these days is affecting the liberties of the ordinary people?
7. Do you think the ordinary individual has any chance to influence politics nowadays?
 - 7.1. (If "yes") How does the ordinary individual influence politics?
(If "no") How could the ordinary individual influence politics?
 - 7.2. Who do you think runs the government?
 - 7.3. What kind of people are they?
 - 7.4. Are there any organizations or groups of people who you feel might be harmful to the country unless they are curbed?
8. Are you a member of any veterans' organization?
 - 8.1. (If "yes") Why do you prefer that (or those) organizations?
 - 8.2. (If not a member) Why don't you belong to any of these veterans' organizations?

9. We have been talking about how to get a decent life in America, but as things stand, would you say that some people get all the breaks, and others get none?
 - 9.1. Which groups get all the breaks?
 - 9.2. Are there any others?
 - 9.3. Do you think they deserve them?
 - 9.4. Why do you think so?
10. If we have unemployment how bad will it be?
 - 10.1. If we have a large amount of unemployment what will that do to you and your family?
 - 10.2. What did you and your family experience during the last depression of 1929?
 - 10.3. What's gone wrong with America that we run into depressions?
 - 10.4. What can be done about it?
 - 10.5. If there are not enough jobs to go around, who should have the first chance at them?
- 10.51. What about veterans, white people, Gentiles, native-born Americans, people who have seniority on the job?
 - 10.6. Why would you say that (for each)?
11. What are you working at now?
 - 11.1. Are you satisfied with your present position?
 - 11.2. Why?
 - 11.3. What job do you want to get into now?
 - 11.4. What do you think the chances are for this?
 - 11.5. Why?
 - 11.6. What occupation would you like to get into as your life's work?
12. About how much money would you want to be making a year?
 - 12.1. What do you think the chances are for that?
 - 12.2. Why?
13. Do you happen to be married? (If "yes" ask 14. to 15.3.)
 - 13.1. (If single) Have you thought of getting married?
(If engaged or planning to get married, ask 14.4. to 15.3.)
 - 13.2. Are you living alone or with your family?
 - 13.3. Is this a satisfactory arrangement?
 - 13.4. Why "yes" or "no"?
 - 13.5. Why don't you plan to get married?
14. (If veteran is married ask) Have you and your wife been able to continue your home life the way you wanted it since your discharge?
 - 14.1. Why?
 - 14.2. What things can you think of that would improve your home life?
 - 14.3. How many children do you have?
 - 14.4. How many children would you like to have?
 - 14.5. What do you think is the best way of bringing up your children?
 - 14.6. Do you think the ways of bringing up children have changed since your parents' time?

- 14.7. Would you bring your children up the way your mother and father brought you up?
- 14.8. How do you think you can get children to behave?
- 14.9. How did your parents do it?
- 14.10. Do you think that was the right way of going about it?
15. What do you think about wives working?
- 15.1. Why "yes" or "no"?
- 15.2. Did your mother ever work?
- 15.3. How did your dad feel about women working?
16. We've been talking about how you would like your life to be now; do you think the time you spent in the army set you back in any way?
- 16.1. By the way, how long were you in the army?
- 16.2. What type of army service did you see? (Type of work; how long
- 16.2.1-4. for each; amount of combat; special decorations.)
- 16.3. What did you lose by being in the army?
- 16.4. If you lost, who gained through the war?
17. How did you feel about going into the army?
- 17.1. Why?
- 17.2. What did you like most about army life?
- 17.3. What did you like least about army life?
- 17.4. Do you feel that you got a bad break in your army career?
- 17.5. How is that?
- 17.6. Do you feel that army life changed you in any way?
- 17.7. How is that?
18. In your experience in the army, what kind of fellows were the "goldbrickers"?
19. How did the fellows in your outfit get along with the officers?
- 19.1. What was wrong with the officers?
- 19.2. Do you think promotions were decided upon fairly?
- 19.3. Why?
- 19.4. Do you fellows feel that army discipline was too strict?
- 19.5. In what way?
- 19.6. In general, do you feel that officers deserve the special privileges which they get?
- 19.7. Why?
- 19.8. How do you feel about saluting officers?
- 20.1. Do you find you miss the fellows in your outfit?
- 20.2. Was your outfit one where everybody got along together?
- 20.3. Who were the troublemakers?
- 20.4. What kind of fellows were they?
- 20.5. Is there anything about army life that you miss now?
- 20.6. When you were in the army, did you feel the civilians treated you right?
- 20.7. In what way?

21. How did the fellows feel about religion?
- 21.1. Did you notice any change in their attitude towards religion?
- 21.2. Do you think your attitude toward religion was changed in any way by army life?
- 21.3. How about going to church?
- 21.31. Do you think you go to church more or less than you did before you entered the army?
- 21.4. May I ask what denomination you are?
- 21.5. May I ask what denomination your mother and father were?
- 21.51. How important was religion in your family?
22. Do you go around with a crowd regularly?
- 22.1. Is it the same crowd you went out with before the war?
- 22.2. Do your parents approve?
- 22.3. Do you keep in touch with your brothers and sisters who do not live with you?
- 22.4. Do you keep in touch with any of your army buddies?
23. Do you think civilians respect and understand the veterans?
- 23.1. How is that?
24. In view of what the war has cost you fellows and the rest of the country, do you think it was worthwhile?
- 24.1. Do you think the German and Japanese wars were equally necessary?
- 24.2. Why?
- 24.3. What did we gain or lose by the European war?
- 24.4. What did we gain or lose by the Japanese war?
- 24.5. What do you think are the chances for a long peace?
- 24.6. What would you say were the biggest threats coming from outside the United States?
- 24.7. Do you think there are any threats to peace inside this country?
- 24.8. Can anything be done to guarantee peace? What?
25. Do you think we should help other countries get on their feet with food, manufactured products, etc?
- 25.1. Which ones?
- 25.2. When you were in the army, did you get into contact with foreigners?
- 25.3. What ones?
- 25.4. What do you think about them?
- 25.5. What should we do with Germany? Japan?
- 25.6. What should be done about the refugees who have come to this country?
- 25.7. Should more be let in?
26. How were the Mexicans treated in the army?
27. How were the Negroes treated in the army?
- 27.1. Did the Negroes make good soldiers?
- 27.2. How did the fellows in your outfit get along with Negroes?
- 27.3. What do you think should be done about the Negro in this country?

28. How were the Jews treated in the army?
- 28.1. Did the Jews make good soldiers?
- 28.2. How did the fellows in your outfit get along with the Jews?
- 28.3. What do you think should be done about the Jews in this country?
29. Should Negroes be forced to leave the country?
- 29.1. Should Negroes be prevented from intermarriage?
- 29.2. Would you object to a Negro moving in next door to your house?
- 29.3. Would you be willing to have a Negro work on the same job that you are doing?
- 29.4. Would you eat in a restaurant where Negroes were served?
30. Should Jews be forced to leave the country?
- 30.1. Should Jews be prevented from intermarriage?
- 30.2. Would you object to a Jew moving in next door to your house?
- 30.3. Would you be willing to have a Jew work on the same job that you are doing?
- 30.4. Would you eat in a restaurant where Jews were served?
- 30.5. What should be done with the Japanese in this country?

ASKED AT THE END OF THE INTERVIEW

1. How old are you?
2. Where were you born? (City and state.)
3. Where did you live before you joined the army?
4. When were you demobilized?
5. What was your rank at the time of discharge?
6. How long have you lived at your present address?
7. Married, single, separated, divorced, how many times married?
8. How long married?
9. If not married, with whom are you living?
- 9.1. How much education have you had?
10. Are your parents living or dead? If dead, when?
11. Are there any divorces in your family?
12. How many brothers and sisters do you have? (Record sibling relationships.)
13. Where was your father born?
14. Where was your mother born? (If either parent was born in the U. S., determine ethnic stock by question, "From where did your father's family come?")
15. What is your father's occupation?
16. What is his present income?
17. What was your occupation and salary before you entered the army?
18. What is your present salary?
19. What organizations did you belong to before the war?
20. What organizations do you belong to now?
21. What is your favorite newspaper?

- 21.1. What is your favorite radio program?
 21.2. What is your favorite magazine?
 22. By the way, which political party do you favor?

VII. SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

A. Tables dealing with attitudes toward Jews.

TABLE 4(A)

RELIGIOUS DENOMINATION OF VETERANS' PARENTS

	Parents both Catholic		Parents both Protestant		Parents both Gr. Orth.		Parents of different denomination		Total
	No.	Per-centage	No.	Per-centage	No.	Per-centage	No.	Per-centage	No.
Tolerant	39	40	14	45	0	—	8	40	61
Stereotyped	26	27	9	29	1	—	6	30	42
Outspoken & Intense	32	33	8	26	1	—	6	30	47
Total	97		31		2		20		150

TABLE 5(A)

"DO YOU THINK YOUR ATTITUDE TOWARD RELIGION WAS CHANGED
 IN ANY WAY BY ARMY LIFE?"

	Tolerant		Stereotyped		Outspoken and Intense		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
It was strengthened	15	25	10	24	19	40	44	29
It's the same	38	62	26	62	21	45	85	57
I'm less religious now	7	11	4	9	4	9	15	10
Indeterminate	1	2	2	5	3	6	6	4
Total	61		42		47		150	

TABLE 6(A)

ETHNIC ORIGIN OF PARENTS

	Both parents born in U.S.		One parent born in U.S.		Neither parent born in U.S.		Total
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	
Tolerant	24	44	9	36	28	40	61
Stereotyped	16	29	5	20	21	30	42
Outspoken and Intense	15	27	11	44	21	30	47
Total	55		25		70		150

TABLE 7(A)

SALARY RANGE

	No.	Percentage
Less than \$1,500	1	1
\$1,501 to \$2,000	29	19
\$2,001 to \$2,500	29	19
\$2,501 to \$3,000	43	29
\$3,001 to \$3,500	20	13
\$3,501 to \$4,000	4	3
\$4,001 to \$4,500	0	0
Over \$4,500	4	3
Unemployed	7	5
Student	8	5
No data	5	3
Total	150	100

DYNAMICS OF PREJUDICE

TABLE 8(A)
CURRENT OCCUPATION

	No.	Percentage
Professional	3	2
Prof. and Managerial	5	3
Clerk and Kindred	27	18
Skilled	20	13
Semi-skilled	62	42
Unskilled	11	7
Unemployed	7	5
Student	9	6
On-the-job-training	6	4
Total	150	100

TABLE 9(A)
TYPE OF ARMY SERVICE

	Combat		Combat support		Noncombat		Total
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.
Tolerant	22	41	12	40	27	40	61
Stereotyped	18	34	6	20	18	27	42
Outspoken & Intense	13	25	12	40	22	33	47
Total	53		30		67		150

TABLE 10(A)
ILLNESS AND INJURY DURING SERVICE*

	Wounded		Combat exhaustion		Noncombat illness or accident		None		Total
	No.	Per-centage	No.	Per-centage	No.	Per-centage	No.	Per-centage	No.
Tolerant	11	42	1	—	8	32	43	44	63
Stereotyped	9	35	2	—	5	20	26	26	42
Outspoken & Intense	6	23	1	—	12	48	30	30	49
Total	26		4		25		99		

* Multiple entries possible.

TABLE 11(A)
LENGTH OF ARMY SERVICE

	1-3 years		3-4 years		4 and more		Total
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.
Tolerant	14	36	30	48	17	35	61
Stereotyped	12	31	16	26	14	29	42
Outspoken & Intense	13	33	16	26	18	36	47
Total	39		62		49		150

TABLE 12(A)
"NOW THAT THE VETERANS ARE BACK, HOW DO YOU THINK
THEY ARE GOING TO GET ALONG?"

	Tolerant		Stereotyped		Outspoken and Intense		Total
	No.	Per-centage	No.	Per-centage	No.	Per-centage	No. Per-centage
Well	38	62	14	33	19	40	71 47
Badly	11	18	12	29	15	32	38 25
Other	11	18	15	36	10	22	36 24
Don't know	1	2	1	2	3	6	5 4
Total	61		42		47		150

B. Tables dealing with attitudes toward Negroes.

TABLE 13(A)
ANTI-NEGRO ATTITUDE AND ETHNIC ORIGIN OF PARENTS

	Both parents born in U.S.		One parent born in U.S.		Neither parent born in U.S.		Total
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.
Tolerant	7	13	1	4	4	6	12
Stereotyped	15	27	5	20	20	29	40
Outspoken	25	45	14	56	35	50	74
Intense	8	15	5	20	11	15	24
Total	55		25		70		150

DYNAMICS OF PREJUDICE

TABLE 14(A)

ANTI-NEGRO ATTITUDE AND AGE

	Under 28		29-36		Total
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.
Tolerant	6	7	6	10	12
Stereotyped	21	22	19	35	40
Outspoken	52	55	22	39	74
Intense	15	16	9	16	24
Total	94		56		150

TABLE 15(A)

ANTI-NEGRO ATTITUDE AND EDUCATION

	Up to some high school		Completed high school		Some college or more		Total
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.
Tolerant	2	3	5	13	5	13	12
Stereotyped	16	25	10	22	14	36	40
Outspoken	32	49	27	57	15	38	74
Intense	15	23	4	8	5	13	24
Total	65		46		39		150

TABLE 16(A)

ANTI-NEGRO ATTITUDE AND PARTY AFFILIATION

	Democratic		Republican		Total
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.
Tolerant	3	6	1	4	4
Stereotyped	14	29	6	24	20
Outspoken	26	53	12	48	38
Intense	6	12	6	24	12
Total	49		25		74

TABLE 17(A)

ANTI-NEGRO ATTITUDE AND RELIGIOUS DENOMINATION

	Catholic		Protestant		Greek Orth.		No present religious denomination		Total
	No.	Per-centage	No.	Per-centage	No.	Per-centage	No.	Per-centage	No.
Tolerant	8	8	3	9	0	—	1	8	12
Stereotyped	23	22	10	30	2	—	5	42	40
Outspoken	57	55	14	43	0	—	3	25	74
Intense	15	15	6	18	0	—	3	25	24
Total	103		33		2		12		150

TABLE 18(A)

ANTI-NEGRO ATTITUDE AND FAVORITE NEWSPAPER

	Tolerant and Stereotyped		Outspoken and Intense		Total	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Chicago Times	10	20	39	80	49	100
Chicago Tribune	14	30	33	60	47	100
Daily News	12	50	12	50	24	100
Herald-American	6	29	15	71	21	100
Chicago Sun	6	43	8	57	14	100

TABLE 19(A)

ANTI-NEGRO ATTITUDE AND DIVORCE IN VETERAN'S FAMILY

	No divorces		One or more divorces		Total
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.
Tolerant	12	9	0	0	12
Stereotyped	38	29	2	12	40
Outspoken	64	48	10	59	74
Intense	19	14	5	29	24
Total	133		17		150

TABLE 20(A)

ANTI-NEGRO ATTITUDE AND CURRENT SALARY

	Under \$3,000		Over \$3,000		Total
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.
Tolerant	7	7	2	7	9
Stereotyped	27	26	4	14	31
Outspoken	49	48	19	68	68
Intense	19	19	3	11	22
Total	102		28		130

TABLE 21(A)

ANTI-NEGRO ATTITUDE AND SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS

	Unskilled; semi-skilled		Top Four Groups ^a		Total
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.
Tolerant and Stereotyped	20	25	32	46	52
Outspoken	42	53	32	46	74
Intense	18	22	6	8	24
Total	80		70		150

^a Includes students; on-the-job training