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Chapter One: Introduction

“No. There is no choice. When you have to do right, you do right.” – Holocaust Rescuer honored by Yad Vashem

“I know more about Jews than Jews do about themselves. I've known all along you are Jewish by your voice. At first I wasn’t sure. But then one of the others told me. Then I listened and I could tell by your voice.” - Nazi defendant convicted and hanged for war crimes and crimes against humanity

“Ordinary observation of the social world is enough to verify that (1) people do different things in different situations and (2) even in the same situation, different people often do different things” (Funder & Fast, 2010, p. 668-669). During the Holocaust many people faced situations in which they chose to undertake great risk to themselves or their families in order to save Jews from the threat of death at the hand of the Nazi regime. While the rest of the population was either supportive of, indifferent to, or unwilling to challenge the Nazi regime’s actions against the Jews, this small minority, between 50,000 and 500,000 individuals, a fraction of 1% of the population, engaged in high risk activities in order to save a persecuted minority from destruction (Oliner & Oliner, 1989).

While most scientific study of psychology focuses on how human beings are flawed and damaged, the discipline of Positive Psychology focuses on “what goes right in life” (Peterson, 2006, p.4). Positive psychology seeks to challenge this paradigm by bringing greater attention to human strengths and positing that there should be an equal
focus on these strengths as there is on pathology (Peterson, 2006). Studying human strengths provides further insight into the behaviors and dispositions of Holocaust rescuers and perpetrators.

There are many studies that have explored the reasons why individuals engaged in rescue (Oliner & Oliner, 1989; Midlarsky, 2005; Monroe, 2008; Tec, 1986). Studies have found correlates to rescuing behavior including the propensity to take risks, and human attachment (Oliner & Oliner, 1989). Some researchers posit that emotional maturity plays a role as well (Baum, 2008). This study examines whether there is a correlation between the human virtue of open-mindedness and rescuing during the Holocaust. Open-mindedness, or the ability and/or willingness to adopt alternative points of view (Peterson & Seligman, 2004), will be measured using the Integrative complexity construct developed by Suedfeld, Tetlock and Streufert (1992). Using interviews of rescuers of Jews during the Holocaust and Nazi perpetrators this study revealed that integrative complexity does not appear to predict rescuing, but it does appear to predict perpetrating.
Chapter Two: Literature Review

A greater understanding of how some individuals were able to resist the tide of hatred and fear that allowed others to persecute and murder Jews during the Holocaust is important. Knowing what motivated and allowed people to take great risks to help others may provide insight into how to prevent future tragedies from occurring. Exploring the possible connections between open-mindedness and behaviors during the Holocaust may provide another avenue for researchers and practitioners trying to stem future violence and understand its dynamics.

The following literature review will begin with a brief historical overview of the Holocaust and the rescue of Jews by non-Jews during World War II. This will help provide historical context for rescuing behaviors during the Holocaust and demonstrate the significance of these behaviors.

The historical overview will be followed, in greater detail, by the context and constraints that individuals experienced as rescuers of Jews (from here on simply referred to as “rescuers”). This will provide an awareness of the great risks that individuals undertook in order to rescue Jews during World War II. The fact that so few individuals were willing to take such extreme risks, risking their own lives for altruistic reasons, is what makes them so extraordinary. In the tradition of positive psychology, the extraordinary and humanity-affirming nature of their accomplishments is what makes these individuals and their behaviors worthy of study.
Merely focusing on environmental factors during the Holocaust would not be able to explain why some helped, despite the danger, while others participated in or ignored persecution. After the historical, social, and political context of rescue has been presented, the author of this thesis will review the social scientific, demographic, and psychological literature regarding the altruistic behavior of rescuers during the Holocaust as well as helping behavior in general.

To contribute to the social psychological literature on Holocaust rescue, this thesis seeks to explore possible connections between open-mindedness and rescuing during the Holocaust, a previously unexplored intersection in the social science literature. Following the review of the social scientific literature on rescuing, the author will explain the Integrative Complexity construct and present a review of the literature on Integrative Complexity, a measure of open-mindedness (Peterson & Seligman, 2004). This will be followed by an exploration of possible theoretical linkages between Integrative Complexity and rescuing behaviors. The author will use findings from research on pro-social/helping behaviors and findings on integrative complexity in order to develop a hypothesis linking integrative complexity with helping behaviors.

**Historical Overview**

After the Nazi party took power after the German elections in March 1933, they began to organize attacks against Jews in Germany. The first anti-Jewish laws, passed in April 1933, were used to purge Jews from civil service (Gellately, 2001). Later laws passed were used to deny Jews’ civic rights, segregate them, and take their economic livelihoods. These laws were the first steps in what culminated in the Final Solution, the attempt to eradicate Jews from Europe through emigration or extermination. The mass
killing began in the summer of 1941 and was responsible for the death of over 6 million European Jews (Paladei, 1996).

Such actions would not have been possible without the cooperation and indifference of significant portions of the population (Gellately, 2001). But despite the tremendous obstacles to resisting Nazi policies, there were many non-Jews who took great risks to rescue Jews from Nazi persecution. While many who helped Jews only in exchange for payment, sometimes even turning in their wards after money ran out, many helped without the expectation of getting something in return (Paladei, 1996). The Holocaust Martyrs’ and Heroes’ Remembrance Authority, known as Yad Vashem, has honored thousands of these extraordinary and altruistic individuals and given them the title “Righteous Among the Nations”, also known as “rescuers”.

Rescuers lived in diverse social, political, and physical environments. Some worked with others to rescue Jews, while others worked on their own. The following section will present how these varying environments may have facilitated or inhibited rescue of Jews in general and in specific countries.

**Context of Rescuing**

**Geography**

Geographic location and topography had an influence on how many Jews could be saved during the war.

“Denmark’s proximity to neutral Sweden, for example, allowed the Danes to relocate most of their Jews there. Access to Spain, Switzerland, territories under Italian control, and Mediterranean sea routes to Palestine favored Jewish escape attempts from Vichy France and the countries of the Balkan Peninsula. Certain types of terrain were conducive to concealing groups of fugitives, sneaking them across borders, and mounting guerrilla maneuvers. The sparsely populated and rugged wilderness of eastern Norway, the extensive and thick forests of
Belorussia, and the mountainous regions of southern France, Greece, and Yugoslavia served as natural arenas for these kinds of activities” (Baron, 1989, p. 20).

The options that rescuers had at their disposal varied greatly with regard to location and country. Along with geographical considerations, the political and social environments also affected the difficulty or ease of rescue. In the following section, the author will provide synopses of the political, social, and geographic environments of several European countries during The War in order to show how the circumstances of rescue greatly varied between and within countries.

**Political Environment**

Although this study is psychological in nature, the author will discuss some of the historical context and situational circumstances that existed during the war in order to provide an understanding of the types of environments in which rescuers operated. The context in which individuals engaged in rescue was different from country to country, even within country. Understanding individuals’ political and social environments may help shed light on what prompted particular behaviors and psychological responses.

Some countries under German occupation had governments administered directly by the Nazis, while other governments were administered by fellow countrymen, in cooperation with the Nazis (Baron, 1989). Of those countries in which native governments remained, there were different levels of cooperation with the Nazis. These factors had an impact on the number of Jews who survived the Holocaust in their respective countries. Anti-Jewish measures were implemented in different countries at different times, as a result the timing of rescue by non-Jews varied from country to
country (Tec, 1986; Baron, 1989). The length of German occupation also varied (Block & Drucker, 1992).

In some countries anti-Semitism was stronger than in others. In countries where it was strong, Germans were more likely to receive cooperation by the local population or, at least, indifference to the persecution of Jews (Baron, 1989). For example, in order to limit the psychological burden of killing on Nazi police and soldiers, locals were often recruited to handle the majority of the killing of Jewish men, women, and children (Browning, 1998). “In countries where anti-Semitism was weak, Jewish civic equality was firmly established, German influence was limited, or the local regime and populace were or became anti-German during the war” (Baron, 1989, p.14) and the extermination of Jews became more difficult. There were greater opportunities to save Jews in the countries of Western Europe because the population of Jews was smaller, they were more assimilated, and they were closer to neutral countries, thus providing greater opportunity for escape (Shulman, 2000).

The Germans established Jewish councils to help preside over the Jewish population and the Final Solution. These councils were run by Jews themselves whom, in hope of mitigating the suffering of Jews, cooperated with the Germans. In places where the councils were directly under the supervision of the Germans, there was little opportunity for the councils to influence policy to help Jews. In areas where German control was held through satellite governments, opportunity to help Jews increased (Baron, 1989).

Outside assistance also played an important role in the rescue of Jews. In some cases, outside groups would provide funding for rescue activities and some governments,
including the United States, Sweden, and Budapest, intervened diplomatically to rescue Jews (Baron, 1989). For example, Raoul Wallenberg, who was appointed by Sweden to help stem the deportation of Jews, may have saved up to 100,000 Jews (Baron, 1989).

Political and geographical environments varied from country to country. The next sections will contain overviews of the political and geographic environments in several European countries including Germany, Poland, France, The Netherlands, and Denmark.

**Countries**

**Germany**

Even though Germany had a long history of anti-Semitism, prior to Nazi rule in Germany, Jews were highly assimilated (Block & Drucker, 1992) and some were even strongly nationalist (Gellately, 2001). Early in the regime, Jews were not the main focus. The main focus for the Nazi party was restoring law and order and ridding the country of Communist elements. Gradually the focus shifted to Jews and propaganda conflated being Jewish with being Communist (2001).

The first anti-Jewish laws were passed in Germany in 1935, expelling Jews from various professions, but, even prior to these laws, there were acts of violence against the Jews that were, if not ordered directly by the government, tolerated and encouraged (Gellately, 2001). The German people were pressured to boycott Jewish businesses. Intermarriage between Jews and non-Jews was made illegal. In 1941 a law was passed that required all Jews to wear a yellow Star of David (Block & Drucker, 1992). The many policies that culminated in Final Solution were implemented gradually so as to not turn public opinion against the Nazi policies (Gellately, 2001). The policies were so gradual that many Jews were caught off guard and chose to stay in Germany, even as
many Jews chose to emigrate. About 150,000 of the 500,000 Jews in Germany managed to leave the country (Block & Drucker, 1992). Jews continued to emigrate until it became more difficult to do so. German emigration was a specific goal of the Nazi regime until it became more difficult because of policies by surrounding European countries that prevented Jews from crossing their borders and entering their countries (Gellately, 2001).

The Nazi party considered public and international opinion to be important. Hitler carefully implemented policies in order to maintain popular support. Many times policies were reversed when popular protest emerged, such as when the Nazis began framing Jewish spouses of Germans. Even though there was worry that anti-Semitic policies could alienate Germans, Hitler’s popularity continued to grow (Gellately, 2001).

Gellately (2001) found much evidence that the German people supported anti-Jewish policies, although popular support for polices may not have been motivated by anti-Semitism for many people. Many benefited from the policies because ridding Germany of Jews opened new job opportunities for Germans while material possessions and homes left behind by deported Jews were taken by Germans or auctioned off.

The evidence that supports Gellately’s (2001) thesis, that there was strong popular support for anti-Semitic policies, was gleaned from Gestapo case files. According to some files, up to 70% of cases that the German secret police handled came from denunciations by non-Nazi Germans. Although many of those denunciations can be traced to nationalistic and anti-Semitic motivations, it appears that the majority may have been a result of personal motivations including disputes, grudges, or economic matters. So, although non-Nazis in the German population may not have been motivated by anti-
Semitism, many benefited from and took advantage of anti-Jewish policies (2001). The culture of denunciation, encouraged by the Nazi party, appeared to be common in Germany and may have dissuaded many from openly criticizing the Nazi regime or taking actions that contradicted Nazi policies. It may have also made it much more difficult to develop networks to aid Jews. This is in contrast to other countries in which fear of denunciation was minimal and, in some places, entire towns participated in the aiding of fugitive Jews (Henry, 2007).

Resistance against the Germans was a costly endeavor. In one case a group killed five Germans in Berlin. The result was the retaliatory killing or deportation of 500 Jews, followed by a threat that 250 Jews would be killed for every German that was killed (Baron, 1989). Ordinary Germans also feared being informed on by neighbors and dismissed reports of death camps as Allied propaganda (Baron, 1989) despite the fact that many were aware of concentration camps, which were openly promoted by the Nazis as a way to restore order in Germany and punish antisocial elements. There was even skepticism about death camps among Allied countries (Gellately, 2001).

Despite the risks, some forms of resistance continued to exist in Germany. A student group in Munich passed out fliers informing people of the mass slaughters of Jews in Poland (Gellately, 2001). Many Jews fled to Berlin, a politically liberal city with a large population. The large population made it easier for Jews to hide. However, of the 5,000 Jews who hid in Berlin, only 1,000 survived (Oliner & Oliner, 1989).

Geographically, the escape of Jews was also difficult. The Germans occupied every surrounding country, except neutral Switzerland. Switzerland stopped admitting
Jews in 1942, so the possibility of escaping German control by crossing the border was very difficult (Block & Drucker, 1992).

In 1943 Germany declared itself Judenrein, or free of Jews (Block & Drucker, 1992). Despite this proclamation, about 25,000 Jews survived the war inside German borders. About 60% of German Jews were able to leave Germany between 1933 and 1941 while 80% of the remaining Jews were killed (Baron, 1989).

The rescue of Jews in Germany entailed many difficulties. The culture of denunciation made engaging in rescue a risky affair because neighbors readily denounced each other to the Germany secret police, the Gestapo. (Gellately, 2001). So, openly holding pro-Jewish views or engaging in behaviors to help Jews was made nearly impossible for some. Countries that bordered Germany also had policies to keep Jews from entering their borders. These policies made smuggling Jews outside of the country more difficult. Despite these difficulties, many individuals managed to engage in rescue activities inside German borders.

**Poland**

It was estimated that about 3,300,000 Jews lived in Poland at the outbreak of the war (Baron, 1989), about 10% of the Polish population (Shulman, 2000). Approximately 90% perished. The extermination of Polish Jews was aided by the virulent anti-Semitism that existed prior to the war and the perception of Poles as being subhuman by the Nazis, thus not worrying about how the Nazi’s actions toward the Jews were perceived by Poles (Baron, 1989).

Despite the strength of anti-Semitism, many Gentile Poles engaged in rescue of Jews. Thousands of Poles died as a result of trying to help Jews (Baron, 1989). Many
Jews were helped by lone individuals, while others were helped by groups, including Zegota (the Council for Aid to Jews), which saved tens of thousands of Jews by “[locating] hiding places for Jews and [supplying] them with food, forged identification papers, and medical care when necessary” (pp. 28-29).

**France**

Patrick Henry (2007) wrote an historical account of the rescue of Jews in France during World War II in his book *We Only Know Men: The Rescue of Jews in France During the Holocaust*. The information in this section is taken largely from Henry’s book.

During the war Jews made up about 1% of the population (300,000) and about 76% survived. The Vichy government, headed by Marshal Philippe Pétain, chose to collaborate with the Nazi occupiers at the time of the war. While there were resistance fighters working against the occupiers, collaboration or resignation to Nazi control was more common. Anti-Semitism in France was very common (Henry, 2007).

The Vichy regime willingly participated in the exporting of Jews from France to concentration camps. In several instances, the French government implemented anti-Jewish laws before receiving any pressure from the Germans. French and foreign Jews were banned from taking up various professions, banned from theaters, and placed in internment camps in terrible conditions (Henry, 2007).

The French set up a series of internment camps to hold about 20,000 refugees. About 3,000 Jews died in these internment camps run by French authorities. These policies helped acclimate French citizens to the future treatment of Jews in the country (Henry, 2007).
The French police was mostly responsible for the policing of Jews. The French police, referred to as the French Gestapo, was charged with rounding up Jews and assisting with deportation. These operations took place in the Occupied, as well as the Unoccupied Zones, in France. Of all Western European countries, France was the only one that actively captured Jews for transport in the areas not occupied by the Nazis. The French also aided in the confiscation of Jewish property (Henry, 2007).

The Catholic Church was largely silent with regard to the matter of the deportation of Jews. After a series of public suicides, the church joined protests against the cruel treatment of Jews by French police, but not long after, the Church returned to supporting the Vichy government (Henry, 2007).

While some resistance groups helped rescue Jews, none of the groups acted to impede the transport of Jews to death camps by train. Approximately 76,000 Jews were transported to Nazi death camps by train (Henry, 2007).

Geographical factors played a large role in the ability to rescue Jews in France. France was contiguous with two countries where Jews were not persecuted (Switzerland and Spain). The mountainous borders allowed for organizations like La Cimade to escort refugees into safer countries. In the south of France, especially on the Vivarais-Lignon plateau, there were large forests that could be used to hide refugees from the French Gestapo. Although environment helped aid the rescue of Jews, the motivation to rescue was a prerequisite for action (Henry, 2007).

Andre Trocme, a Protestant pastor in the town of Le Chambon-sur-Lignon on the plateau Vivarais-Lignon, was the catalyst of one of the largest rescue efforts in France during the war (Ury, 2000). Trocme was a pacifist who preached a doctrine of equality
and compassion for all humans. He, along with his assistant Eduoard Theis encouraged others to help Jews, Communists, German resistors, and French people avoiding compulsory labor in German companies and on German soil. Although Trocme was responsible for starting the rescue efforts, the process took on a life of its own with nearly all residents of the plateau playing some role in rescuing. Many of the residents hid Jews and other refugees, while others helped enroll children in school with fake documents, provided extra ration cards to families hiding Jews, and transported Jews across the border, among other activities helpful to rescue efforts (Henry, 2007).

The plateau had a long history of harboring the persecuted as well as being persecuted. Throughout the centuries the people of the plateau harbored Huguenots, who were persecuted by the Catholics in France. During the French revolution the people of the plateau harbored Catholic priests. By the 1930’s the plateau had a series of boarding houses set up to help undernourished and poor children. So, prior to the war the plateau developed a culture and tradition of receiving persecuted people and minorities and had the infrastructure needed to receive and harbor children and refugees. Also, the fact that most of the residents of the plateau were Protestant, a minority long persecuted in France, played a role in the motivation to rescue. Many Protestant residents were able to identify with the plight of the Jews during the war while others, including non-believers, communists, and others also found motivation to help the persecuted minorities (Henry, 2007).

Outside organizations like the Swiss Red Cross, Quakers, American Congregationalists, and the Swedish government also aided in rescuing Jews (Henry, 2007). The Germans assigned the Italians to run several departments throughout France.
In the areas run by the Italians, Jews were also protected. Despite protests from Vichy and the Germans, the Italians refused to hand over any Jews to be transported (Henry, 2007). Many Jewish organizations also played a role in the rescue efforts (Oliner & Oliner, 1989).

Throughout France Jews were perceived security risks, diluters of French culture, and competitors for jobs (Oliner & Oliner, 1989). From 1940-42, the French largely collaborated with German policy on Jews. After 1942, when the Germans introduced a program of compulsory labor for the French, resistance began to increase and police cooperation diminished (Henry, 2007).

Leadership also played a role. The plateau’s religious leadership, headed by Andre Trocme, influenced the region’s populace to help refugees. Many helped because clergy and laity requested it of others. The isolation of the plateau also made rescue activities easier. Its geography provided many places to hide refugees and provided distance from the control of the Vichy government (Henry, 2007).

**The Netherlands**

Yad Vashem has honored over 4,000 rescuers in the Netherlands (Block & Drucker, 1992). Prior to the war the country had a long tradition of tolerance and anti-Semitism was not as common as in other European countries like France yet, despite the lack of cooperation of all but a minority of the population, between 75 and 80% of Jews were killed (Baron, 1989), over 100,000 more than any other Western European country (Block & Drucker, 1992). The Dutch government collaborated by allowing Germans to deport Jews in order to minimize the degree of German control and reprisal (Baron, 1989).
After the queen and other government leadership fled, a German civilian leadership replaced the Dutch government. The remaining government officials cooperated with the Germans by helping round up Jews for transfer to Amsterdam and ultimately to Auschwitz. Whereas other Western European countries had a history of skepticism and mistrust toward government, Holland does not. This may have led to lower amounts of resistance by government officials and civilians.

Moore (2003) suggests that there were various reasons why, compared to other Western European countries, Holland had fewer Jewish self-help and resistance groups. In Amsterdam, Jewish Councils cooperated with the Germans. In many cases, members of the Jewish Councils were offered exemptions to deportation in exchange for cooperation. Other factors that made Jewish self-help more difficult was the Dutch government’s detailed records and difficult to forge identity cards. This made going into hiding problematic because it was more difficult to pass with a false identity (Moore, 2003).

Geographically, the Netherlands made the rescuing and escape of Jews difficult. It was bordered by Germany, occupied Belgium, and the North Sea. Its topography is flat and it has few forests, thus providing less opportunity to hide. Of those Jews who were able to hide, about one third to half were caught, often from being denounced by neighbors, some of who may have done so to collect the bounty received from turning in Jews, while others were members of The National Socialist Party, which supported anti-Semitic policies (Block & Drucker, 1992). Many who rescued were pressured by rescue organizations to do so (Moore, 2003).
Resistance to occupation and rescue efforts increased when the Germans began deporting Dutch boys 16 and older to work in Germany. The networks setup to hide Dutch boys in order to avoid deportation also aided in the hiding and protecting of Jews, but by then only about 20% of the original 143,000 Jews remained. Holland was the second longest occupied country in Western Europe, after Norway. It was liberated in May of 1945 (Block & Drucker, 1992).

**Denmark**

In Denmark, where Jews were highly assimilated and had strong business and personal relationships with Jews, large numbers managed to survive (Baron, 1989). Over 95%, about 7,220, were able to survive through World War II (Shulman, 2000). It was the only country that rescued nearly all of its Jews (Berenbaum, 1993).

In the documentary *The Danish Solution*, Cantor and Kjaerulff (2010) present a picture of the social and political environment that existed in Denmark and how it affected the rescue of Jews. The Danish government agreed to surrender to the Germans when they invaded and struck a deal to allow for the police and military to remain. The fighting that did occur before surrender led to the death of only 20 Danish Soldiers. Throughout the occupation, the Danish government refused to cooperate with the German’s plans for the deportation of Jews. During this time the myth that the king of Denmark, himself, wore a yellow Star of David, was born. Initially, the Germans did not press the Danes on the “Jewish question” for fear of alienating a population they perceived as also being of Aryan descent, but as the war went on the Danish people experienced shortages while also being forced to provide resources to help the German war effort. This combination of shortages and being forced to share dwindling resources
with their occupiers increased resentment toward the Germans. In the summer of 1943, the Danish responded to this situation by engaging in acts of sabotage, and strikes, including the resignation of the entire Danish government. The Germans responded by trying to exert greater control and used this control in order to try to implement the Final Solution in Denmark (Cantor & Kjaerulff, 2010).

When the Danish government received word that the Nazis were planning on deporting Danish Jews on the Jewish New Year, the information was quickly disseminated by word of mouth and Jews were advised to leave their homes or hide out in the homes of Christian friends. Within three days, most, if not all Jews were aware of the impending *razzia*, or roundup (Cantor & Kjaerulff, 2010).

People quickly organized and provided boats to transport people to neutral Sweden. When time came for the operation to round up Jews, the Germans were only able to capture 202 Jews, less than 5% of the expected roundup. Many Jews were also checked into hospitals and made to look sick in order to prevent their deportation. Of those who were deported, the Danish government was able to strike a deal with Adolph Eichmann to assure that no Danish Jews would be sent to death camps and that they would be provided packages to keep them alive (Cantor & Kjaerulff, 2010).

Neils Bohr, the famous scientist, escaped into Sweden illegally and pleaded with the government to help escaping Jews. This resulted in broadcasts on radio stations advising all that Jews were welcome in Sweden. In Denmark, bishops requested that a message of protest against Jewish persecution be read in every church on Sunday morning. “We will fight so that our Jewish brothers and sisters maintain the same
freedom higher than life itself. We will obey God, rather than humans in this matter” (Cantor & Kjaerulff, 2010).

Because, in part, the Danish surrendered and negotiated to keep control of the government and its duties, they were able to keep German presence in Denmark to a minimum even though other governments who kept control of their countries were not able to protect as many Jews. This negotiation helped to minimize Jewish persecution (Baron, 1989). When the Danish began to resist and the Germans took greater control, there was a concerted effort by Danish society to protect Jews from persecution. The government and individual citizens played roles in hiding and transporting Jews to safety (Cantor & Kjaerulff, 2010).

Denmark was the only country that saved almost all of its Jews (Berenbaum, 1993). Jews were highly assimilated and large amounts of its population cooperated to inform, hide, or transport Jews away from danger. Its proximity to Sweden allowed for a place for refugees to escape to. And the Danish government was able to negotiate to minimize the German presence in Denmark (Baron, 1989). When the Danish began to resist German occupation, a large portion of the Danish people intervened to help protect Jews from Nazi persecution (Cantor & Kjaerulff, 2010).

There were many other countries in Eastern and Western Europe that experienced occupation by the Nazis, but exploring the differences between all of these countries is beyond the scope of this thesis. The above examples were used to show that there were many differences between and within countries with regard to the difficulties encountered and the degree of success in trying to help Jews.
Although political, environmental and geographic factors had a strong influence on the likelihood of individuals engaging in rescue activities, many still managed to engage in rescuing despite the difficulties. What allowed these individuals to engage in the rescuing of a persecuted minority in the face of such great risk? Many researchers (Tec, 1986; Oliner & Oliner, 1989; Midlarsky, et. al., 2005; Paladei, 1996) have tried to answer this question by looking into the personal factors that may have influenced the individual behavior of rescuers.

**Personal Factors Related to Rescuing**

Many studies examine the correlates for helping behavior during the Holocaust. Two prominent studies explore various possible correlates of Holocaust rescue. Samuel and Pearl Oliner (1989) conducted seminal study in which they conducted almost 700 interviews of Holocaust rescuers, non-rescuers (those who were either a part of resistance groups or did not engage in rescuing), and Jewish survivors of the Holocaust. This study sought to compare differences in demographics, environmental circumstances, developmental factors, values, and personality traits using wide-ranging surveys.

Following in the Oliner’s footsteps, Fagin-Jones and Midlarsky (2007) conducted a similar study in which they measured many of the same constructs as the Oliners, as well as other additional constructs. Along with demographic variables, empathy, social responsibility, and other constructs, Fagin-Jones and Midlarsky, additionally, measured abstract moral reasoning, risk-taking, and perceived marginality (2007).

**Demographics and rescuing**

Many demographic characteristics such as age, sex, occupation, socioeconomic class, or number of people in the home have been measured. Little evidence has been
found in supporting the thesis that demographic variables played a large role in influencing rescuing behavior (Fagin-Jones & Midlarsky, 2007; Midlarsky, et. al., 2005; Oliner & Oliner, 1989).

**Age**

Fagin-Jones & Midlarsky (2007) and Oliner & Oliner (1989) found a relationship between age and rescuing. These studies have found that rescuers tended to be older. This may be because, in Germany for example, older Germans were socialized differently than younger Germans. Younger Germans were more likely to have grown up being socialized through the Hitler Youth, a youth organization dedicated to socializing youth into the Nazi ideology. However, Browning’s (1998) examination of Police Battalion 101 trial transcripts show that there were many older individuals that engaged in the mass killing of Jews.

**Occupation and Socioeconomic Class**

No significant relationship between occupation and likelihood of engaging in rescuing behaviors has been found (Fagin-Jones & Midlarsky, 2007; Oliner & Oliner, 1988). Socioeconomic class also appears to have little influence on the likelihood of rescuing (Oliner & Oliner, 1988). People from all classes engaged in rescuing. Midlarsky, et. al. (2005) investigated whether the number of people living in one’s home had any influence on the likelihood of rescuing. No relationship was found between rescuing and one’s living arrangement.

**Gender**

In some populations more women than men were rescuers. In a small town in Rhineland, for example, female rescuers outnumbered male rescuers (Oliner & Oliner,
In other populations more men than women engaged in rescuing. The research is inconclusive about whether men or women are more likely to rescue. However, one study found a difference in the motivation behind rescuing between men and women (Anderson, 1993).

Anderson (1993) suggests that men are more likely to be motivated by an impersonal sense of justice that stems from an identity that values autonomy. Women, on the other hand, are more likely to be motivated more by relationships and a sense of justice based on connecting with others.

Anderson’s (1993) study used content analysis to search for themes in male and female Holocaust rescuer language. The study found that men and women differed in three main areas with regard to how they were socialized, thus leading to different altruistic motivations. Men were “encouraged toward self-mastery of public life and women toward active engagement in the private sphere of family life” (p.51). Men experienced more socialization toward autonomy while women experienced more social pressure to be altruistic and other-oriented. Men and women were also different in their deepest moral convictions. Women’s focus “seemed to include an awareness of self in relation to service of others” (p. 52) while men’s values tended to focus on the “self in relation to a position within the social hierarchy (p. 52). These differences were supported by psychological scales which indicated differences in “orientation toward self-esteem and internal locus of control” (p. 52) for men and “a strong sense of social responsibility and empathy” (p. 52) in women.

Researchers have examined demographic variables including occupation, socioeconomic class, living arrangements, age, and sex. There is no conclusive evidence
that demographic characteristics made an individual more or less likely to rescue, although there is some evidence that age may be correlated with rescuing behaviors (Fagin-Jones & Midlarsky, 2007; Oliner & Oliner, 1989). Sex is not correlated with rescuing (Oliner & Oliner, 1989), however there does appear to be differences in the motivation behind rescuing between men and women (Anderson, 1993).

Moving beyond demographics, researchers have found other variables that show significant relationships with rescuing. Some of the most consistent relationships have been found with personality variables (Fagin-Jones & Midlarsky, 2007).

**Personality characteristics**

Personality is the “set of traits that assure individual continuity, as the motivated core of human behavior, as a self-regulating system designed to maximize adaptation to life's challenges” (McAdams, 2009, p. 11). The study of personality is “concerned with the intrinsic human qualities that lead to differences among individuals in their characteristic patterns of behavior” (Hampson, 1995, p. 437). Whereas situational factors have an influence on individuals’ behaviors (Zimbardo, 2007), the concept of personality attempts to account for why some individuals behave differently when experiencing the same stimuli as other individuals (Funder & Fast, 2010). In the case of rescuers, personality tries to provide an explanation for why some individuals rescued during the Holocaust while so many did not.

Oliner & Oliner (1989) argued that there exists an ‘altruistic personality’. In empirical investigations, personality variables including higher empathic arousal, higher propensity for risk-taking, and higher feelings of social responsibility, have been most consistent predictors of rescuing across studies (Fagin-Jones & Midlarsky, 2007). The
person with an altruistic personality, according to Oliner & Oliner (1989), engages in altruistic behaviors as a result of dispositions that motivate altruistic behaviors, which developed in response to their adapting to their environments. These individuals did not become rescuers merely as a result of a catastrophic event, but behaved as they did because they were continuing their everyday behavior. Having an altruistic personality does not imply that one always behaves altruistically. It merely implies that one is more likely to behave altruistically than those without these personality characteristics (1989). Later in this thesis, the author will discuss research on altruism in general.

**Authoritarian orientation**

Authoritarian orientation is a measurement of one’s tendency to hold values that would support authoritarian leadership. Authoritarian individuals tend to be overly deferential to authority, have overbearing and hostile attitudes to those perceived as inferior, have conventional value systems with unambiguous views of “right” and “wrong”, and openly derogate deviant or minority groups or individuals. Authoritarianism has also been correlated with prejudice (Brown, 1995).

Adorno (1950) developed the F-Scale (Fascism Scale), which measured an individual’s tendency to hold authoritarian values. Authoritarian individuals adjust themselves and their beliefs to a perceived authority, as opposed to thinking about their own reasons for arriving at a conclusion, independent of authority (Ferraroti, 1994). Those higher in authoritarian orientation would be more likely to adhere to authority (Adorno, 1950). For example, Rudolf Hoss, who oversaw the construction of Auschwitz and became its first commander (Steinfeldt, 2002), recounted in his autobiography (1992) how his parents stressed the importance of obedience to authority:
I was taught to obey all adults, especially older people, and treat them with respect no matter what the circumstances. Most of all, it was essential to be helpful, and this was my highest duty. It was emphatically pointed out again and again that I carry out the requests and orders of parents, teachers, priests, and all adults, even the servants, and that this principle be respectfully obeyed. I was not permitted to leave anything unfinished. Whatever they said was always right. This type of training is in my flesh and blood (p. 50).

Oliner & Oliner (1989) found that rescuers scored lower on authoritarian orientation than did non-rescuers. Rescuers were more likely to be motivated by internal values, rather than authority. However, Oliner & Oliner also found that half of rescuers engaged in rescuing because they were asked to do so by a respected member of their social group.

**Risk-taking**

Risk-taking is the propensity to undertake dangerous tasks (Levenson, 1990). Fagin-Jones and Midlarsky (2007) found that rescuers scored significantly higher on measures of risk-taking as compared to bystanders. In this study risk-taking was measured using seven interview items, designed by the researchers, rated on a five-point scale ranging from “Strongly Agree” to “Strongly Disagree”. The scale included questions like: “If something seems important enough to me, I am often willing to take a risk to do it,” and “I prefer to look at situations from all angles before deciding what to do” (p. 141).

Increased willingness to take risks can explain rescuers behaviors because harboring a Jew often involved putting the rescuer, as well as family and friends, in dangerous situations. Many rescuers were killed for harboring Jews. Bystanders’ lower
risk-taking scores were indicative of being less willing to take risks (Fagin-Jones & Midlarsky, 2007).

**Emotional Intelligence**

Emotional intelligence includes the capacity to experience and strategize about emotion, including perceiving and understanding one’s emotional relationships with others and the meanings of those emotions (Peterman & Seligman, 2004). Individuals with high emotional intelligence are better able to “use emotional information in reasoning” (p. 338) which may involve understanding other people’s intentions and feelings. Emotional intelligence is divided into four branches:

- **Branch 1:** perceiving emotions: the ability to perceive emotions in oneself and others accurately
- **Branch 2:** using emotions to facilitate thought: the capacity to integrate emotions in thought and to use emotions in a way that facilitates cognitive processes
- **Branch 3:** understanding emotions: the capacity to understand emotional concepts and meanings, the links between emotions and the relationships they signal, and how emotions blend and progress over time
- **Branch 4:** managing emotions: the capacity to monitor and regulate emotions for personal and social growth and well-being (pp.342-343).

The ability to perceive and read emotions was often necessary for rescuers to be able to engage in their rescuing activities. They often had to read and understand the intentions and emotions of others in order to survive. The process of rescuing often involved large amounts of deception, secrecy, and knowing whom to trust (Oliner & Oliner, 1989). In order to survive one benefited from being able to read other’s motives accurately.
Baum (2008) posited that emotional intelligence has a strong influence on one’s likelihood of becoming a rescuer, perpetrator or bystander. Individuals who are more emotionally developed are more independently minded, emotionally self aware, and less likely to conform to larger society, according to Baum. Rescuers were found to be more independently minded and less conformist by Oliner & Oliner’s (1989) study. On the other hand, in the same study Oliner & Oliner also found that a many of the rescuers engaged in rescuing, possibly, because they were asked to by others in their social groups to help.

**Normocentric motivation to help**

The most common motivation for rescuing was normocentric, which is a desire to uphold the values of one’s social group (Oliner & Oliner, 1989). Whereas many rescuers worked on their own and in secret, more than half engaged in rescuing as a result of being asked by someone whom they respected such as a family member, clergy, or a respected other. These individuals were a part of social groups with values conducive to rescuing. On the Plateau Vivarais-Lignon in France, for example, clergy played a major role in encouraging the residents of the plateau to take part in the rescue and harboring of Jews and other refugees (Henry, 2007). Clergy also played a prominent role in influencing others in Denmark (Baron, 1989). Had many of the individuals that rescued not been asked, they might have never engaged in rescue activities. In Holland, however, there is evidence that many refused to help out of fear, even after they were asked by others to help (Moore, 2003).
Locus of Control

Another area that Oliner & Oliner (1989) explored was individuals’ locus of control. Locus of control refers to one's perception of their ability to control his or her circumstances. External locus of control is marked by seeing events as being controlled by external factors, like luck. Internal locus of control is marked by a tendency to perceive events being contingent on one’s own behavior (Försterling, 1995). Higher scores on the Internal/External Locus of Control scale indicate a higher sense of personal control (Gurin, Gurin & Morrison, 1978).

The Internal/External Locus of Control Scale is a questionnaire that asks respondents questions about their attribution of control. For each question in the scale there are two statements to choose from. For example, a respondent has to choose between “Many of the unhappy things in people’s lives are partly due to bad luck” or “People’s misfortunes result from the mistakes they make” (Gurin, et. al., 1978, p. 278). External locus of control is linked with “feelings of worthlessness and helplessness, and the inability to compete successful with others” (Wheeler & White, p. 373). Rescuers scored higher on the Internal/External Locus of Control Scale (Oliner & Oliner, 1989), indicating a higher internal locus of control.

Increased internal locus of control likely gave rescuers the sense that they actually had the ability to do something about other's suffering. Rather than perceiving their situation as one in which they had little control over their environment, as many bystanders did, they perceived themselves as having the ability to help those in need, even in extreme circumstances. However, although higher locus of control may have
played a role for some rescuers, many in Oliner & Oliner’s (1989) sample scored low on the Internal/External Locus of Control Scale.

**Extensivity**

As a result of their research Oliner & Oliner (1989) found common patterns among the rescuers they studied. They concluded that rescuers were more extensive than others. That is, rescuers were more likely to embrace the concept of a common humanity that saw others as being members of this group, as opposed to differentiating people based on their ethnic, religious, or nationalist identities. What made rescuers different was “their capacity for extensive relationships—their stronger sense of attachment to others and their feeling of responsibility for the welfare of others, including those outside their immediate familial or communal circles” (p. 249). In their sample of 406 authenticated rescuers Oliner & Oliner found four different types of rescuers: 1) those who grew up with strong family bonds, 2) those who had extensive contact with Jews, 3) those who were motivated by a strong sense of social responsibility, and 4) those who held egalitarian views. These patterns were based on the rescuers developmental patterns and upbringings (1989).

The first type of rescuer is the one who grew up in a family with strong family bonds. These rescuers had families in which they had close relationships. These individuals felt stronger attachments to parents. As a result, the closeness and connectedness that these individuals were able to experience with their family could be translated and expanded to those outside of the family. They were able to form trusting and close bonds with those outside the family, including social others (Oliner & Oliner, 1989).
The second type of rescuer had extensive contact with Jews. Individuals in this category had a lot of experience with Jews in their community. They were likely to have Jewish friends, coworkers, and neighbors (Oliner & Oliner, 1989). Their experiences with this different culture made them more aware of the experiences and perceptions of others, thus limiting bias (Pettigrew, 1998).

Intergroup contact theory attempts to explain the factors that influence intergroup prejudice when groups come into contact. Under certain conditions, contact between groups can lead to the reduction of prejudice (Pettigrew, 1998). Pettigrew suggests that there are four processes that influence one’s relationship with outgroups and outgroup members. The first process involves learning about the outgroup, which can help correct negative stereotypes about the outgroup. The second process involves behavioral change. Individuals, though a process of behaving differently among outgroup members, change their attitudes to remain consistent. Behaving in a manner that is accepting of outgroup members may lead to cognitive dissonance if attitudes remain unchanged. In order to achieve consistency, attitudes change to become consistent with behaviors. The third process involves generating affective ties. Developing friendships with outgroup members can help reduce prejudice toward outgroups. This likely played a role in making it easier to engage in rescuing activities to help a Jewish stranger. The fourth process involves ingroup reappraisal. Greater experience with outgroup members can lead to individuals reassessing the status of their ingroup. This reassessment involves adjusting the status of their ingroup relative to an outgroup. That is, one’s ingroup may be reassessed as no longer being superior to an outgroup. Individuals with outgroup
friends tend to have less nationalistic sentiments toward their ingroup and less prejudice toward an outgroup (1998).

The third type of rescuer was motivated by social responsibility. Many rescuers felt a general sense of connectedness with others. They felt a strong sense of responsibility to their communities. They valued social involvement and derived meaning from it. They were more likely to have done or said something to stand up for their beliefs, even if unpopular (Oliner & Oliner, 1989).

The final type of rescuer was the egalitarian. These rescuers had strong feelings of connectedness to humanity. They perceived themselves to be similar to out-groups. They did not generally engage in patriotic causes, likely because of the perception of exclusion of others. They also felt moved to help relieve the pain of others (Oliner & Oliner, 1989).

Many personality variables have been correlated with rescuing behaviors. The strongest predictors of rescuing have been higher empathic arousal and higher propensity for risk-taking (Fagin-Jones & Midlarsky, 2007). There is also evidence that emotional intelligence may play a role in one’s likelihood of rescuing (Baum, 2008). Rescuers also scored lower on scales measuring authoritarianism and higher on scales of locus of control (Oliner & Oliner, 1989), indicating that rescuers are more likely to view events as being contingent on their own behavior, as opposed to being at the mercy of external circumstances (Brown, 1995). Finally, Oliner & Oliner (1989) discovered four different types of rescuers: those who grew up with strong family bonds, those who had extensive contact with Jews, those who were motivated by a strong sense of social responsibility, and egalitarians, who had strong feelings of connectedness with humanity. These four
types of rescuers were viewed as being extensive, or driven by a stronger sense of attachment to others” while having strong “feeling[s] of responsibility for the welfare of others, including those outside of their immediate familial or communal circles” (p. 249).

Along with personality, there are other factors that have been explored in trying to understand what allowed or motivated individuals to engage in rescue activities. One of those factors includes the way in which individuals reason (Fagin-Jones & Midlarsky, 2007; Oliner & Oliner, 1989). This thesis will explore two types of reasoning: open-mindedness and moral reasoning. The purpose of this research is to explore possible connections between open-mindedness and rescuing behavior. The following section will review the research exploring the relationship between rescuing and moral reasoning.

**Moral reasoning**

Another factor that has been used to explain rescuer behavior is moral reasoning. Moral reasoning is differentiated from the content of one’s moral beliefs. It is the manner or structure in which one draws moral conclusions, as opposed to the content of specific beliefs about what things are morally “right” or “wrong” (Kohlberg & Hersh, 1977). Two prominent theories of moral reasoning are Lawrence Kohlberg’s theory of moral development and Carol Gilligan’s theory of the Ethic of Care.

Kohlberg’s theory of moral development is a theory that posits that moral reasoning develops in a series of six stages (L. Kohlberg & Hersh, 1977). There are three levels into which the stages are divided. Each level consists of two stages. The first level of Kohlberg’s theory of moral development (1971) is the Preconventional Level of moral reasoning. At this level, individuals interpret morality in terms of the hedonistic consequences of particular actions.
Stage 1: The punishment and obedience orientation. The physical consequences of action determine its goodness or badness regardless of the human meaning or value of these consequences. Avoidance of punishment and unquestioning deference to power are values in their own right, not in terms of respect for an underlying moral order supported by punishment and authority.

Stage 2: The instrumental relativist orientation. Right action consists of what instrumentally satisfies one's own needs and occasionally the needs of others. Human relations are viewed in terms such as those of the market place. Elements of fairness, reciprocity, and equal sharing are present, but they are always interpreted in a physical, pragmatic way. Reciprocity is a matter of "you scratch my back and I'll scratch your", not loyalty, gratitude, or justice (p.1).

At the second level, the Conventional Level, individual’s moral motivation is connected to group conformity. The individual works to maintain the expectations of his or her family, social group or nation. The individual seeks to gain or avoid approval of his or her social group.

Stage 3: The interpersonal concordance or "good boy-nice girl" orientation. Good behavior is what pleases or helps others and is approved by them. There is much conformity to stereotypical images of what is majority or "natural" behavior. Behavior is frequently judged by intention -- "he means well" becomes important for the first time. One earns approval by being "nice".

Stage 4: The "law and order" orientation. The individual is oriented toward authority, fixed rules, and the maintenance of the social order. Right behavior consists in doing one's duty, showing respect for authority, and maintaining the given social order for its own sake (p.1).

Level three, or the Post-Conventional, Autonomous, or Principled Level. The individual makes a clear effort to define moral values and principles that have validity and application apart from the authority of the groups of persons holding them and apart
from the individual's own identification with the group. The level consists of the two following stages:

Stage 5: The social-contract legalistic orientation (generally with utilitarian overtones). Right action tends to be defined in terms of general individual rights and standards that have been critically examined and agreed upon by the whole society. There is a clear awareness of the relativism of personal values and opinions and a corresponding emphasis upon procedural rules for reaching consensus. Aside from what is constitutionally and democratically agreed upon, right action is a matter of personal values and opinions. The result is an emphasis upon the "legal point of view", but with an additional emphasis upon the possibility of changing the law in terms of rational considerations of social utility (rather than freezing it in terms of stage 4 "law and order"). Outside the legal realm, free agreement, and contract, is the binding element of obligation. The "official" morality of the American government and Constitution is at this stage.

Stage 6: The universal ethical-principle orientation. Right is defined by the decision of conscience in accord with self-chosen ethical principles that appeal to logical comprehensiveness, universality, and consistency. These principles are abstract and ethical (the Golden Rule, the categorical imperative); they are not concrete moral rules like the Ten Commandments. At heart, these are universal principles of justice, of the reciprocity, and equality of the human rights, and of respect for the dignity of human beings as individual persons (p. 1-2).

This theory of moral development is not a theory that relies on the content of one’s moral beliefs to explain or predict moral behavior. This theory posits that it is the structure of moral reasoning itself that predicts people’s moral behaviors. An individual’s moral reasoning does not necessarily lead that individual to arrive at a particular moral belief. It only speaks to how an individual arrived at a particular belief (Kohlberg & Hersh, 1977).

Oliner and Oliner (1989) found that about 11% of rescuers reported being motivated by abstract moral principles. To measure individuals’ moral reasoning five
coders were trained to differentiate between principled motives and internalized normocentric motives (motivation that results from group pressures or encouragement). Although it is unknown if being at this level of moral development would make one more likely to rescue, the fact that only 11% of rescuers engaged in moral reasoning at this level, suggests that there were other forms of moral reasoning that were more common among rescuers.

The ability to engage in moral reasoning based on abstract principles does not necessarily imply that one would be motivated to behave prosocially. Psychopaths have been administered Kohlberg’s moral reasoning test (Lee & Prentice, 1988). The test involves reading vignettes and drawing moral conclusions about those vignettes (Kohlberg & Hersh, 1977). Lee & Prentice (1988) found that psychopaths generally scored lower on Kohlberg’s tests of moral reasoning, but some psychopaths were able to engage higher levels of moral reasoning. It is unlikely that a psychopath would be motivated to engage in courageous altruism, with no expectation of a reward or payment. So, one’s ability to reason according to abstract moral principles does not necessarily imply that one will engage in moral behaviors (Baron-Cohen, 2011). However, there are other forms of moral reasoning.

Oliner & Oliner (1989) found that the most common type of moral reasoning among rescuers was based on the Ethic of Care. Carol Gilligan (1982) posited another model of moral development referred to as the Ethic of Care. Gilligan posits that Kohlberg’s model is biased toward a male perspective of moral reasoning. Women develop differently than males and are more likely to be socialized in a manner that encourages relationships and connection to others. This type of socialization encourages
a different kind of moral development, one driven by the desire to be connected to others, as opposed to being driven by the desire to uphold abstract principles. A person socialized in this manner may be less likely to score high according to Kohlberg’s moral development scale.

With regard to gender differences, however, there does not appear to be strong support for the claim that one form of moral reasoning is primarily used by one sex, with men predominantly using principled moral reasoning and women predominantly using the care orientation. Jaffe & Hyde (2000) found little difference between the type of moral reasoning used between men and women.

The highest level of Gilligan’s model of moral development model is the Ethic of Care. In this level, one’s moral ethic is based on one’s concern for the other’s suffering or well being, rather than abstract concepts such as rights. In the study by Fagin-Jones and Midlarsky (2007), the authors found that rescuers “used the highest level of abstract/internalized moral decision-making based on an Ethic of Care when faced with a moral dilemma involving human needs” (p. 145). A higher level of care-based moral reasoning is related to prosocial behavior in children (Hoffman, 2000) and volunteering among older adults (Midlarsky et al., 1999).

Moral reasoning, or the thought structure that individuals use to arrive at moral conclusions, appears to be related to rescuing behaviors (Fagin-Jones & Midlarsky, 2007; Oliner & Oliner, 1989). The most common type of moral reasoning found among rescuers is moral reasoning based on the Ethic of Care, while only 11% of rescuers used Kohlberg’s principled style of moral reasoning. Along with moral reasoning, Oliner &
Oliner (1989) also examined the content of moral beliefs. One area of exploration was religion.

**Religion**

Another area in which the Oliner & Oliner (1989) explored was the connection between religion and rescuing. Religion, which often serves the purpose of regulating moral behavior (Haidt, 2012), may have played a role in promoting rescuing behaviors. However, Oliner and Oliner (1989) found that respondents in their sample did not generally credit religion as a motivation for rescuing.

Many priests and bishops in France supported Vichy’s policies toward the church’s enemies, including communists and Jews. The Vatican sanctioned Vichy’s “anti-Semitic legislation and received assurances that such discrimination against Jews was permissible so long as it was applied justly and mercifully and did not interfere with the sacramental rite of marriage” (Baron, 1989, p. 42). When some of these policies were implemented and Vichy rounded up Jews in July of 1942, many Catholics became outraged and support for aiding fugitives from Vichy increased while prominent clergymen became more outspoken (1989).

In the Netherlands, Christian churches did much to intervene to help Jews and oppose Nazism (Baron, 1989). “Eight percent of the population who belonged to the Reformed churches accounted for an estimated 25 percent of the rescues of Dutch Jews” (p. 37). In Denmark, Christian churches used their sermons to encourage support for Jews. Priests entered Jewish houses of worship and hid sacred Torah scrolls in church catacombs (Cantor & Kjaerulff, 2010).
Many non-believers also engaged in rescuing behaviors, while some rescuers have expressed that their motivation to help Jews during the Holocaust was driven by their religious beliefs. Oliner & Oliner (1989) did not find a significant correlation between religiosity and engaging in Rescuing during the Holocaust (Oliner & Oliner, 1989). It is possible that group members and members of authority (religious or non-religious) had more influence on others’ likelihood of rescuing than religion itself. However, religion may have played an indirect role by virtue of religion’s tendency to increase in-group cohesion. Increased group cohesion may make it more likely that a member would follow the request of an in-group authority figure or group member. However, ingroup cohesion can also lead to exclusion and bias toward outgroup members (Haidt, 2012).

Trying to determine whether religion played a role in motivating the rescue or persecutions of Jews is difficult (Arthur Gilbert, personal communication, March 19, 2013). Many rescuers have reported that they were motivated to rescue by their religious convictions while many attributed their motivation to something else (Oliner & Oliner, 1989). Others were encouraged by religious clergy to help (Henry, 2007). Many non-believers also engaged in rescuing (Baron, 1989). Oliner & Oliner (1989) did not find conclusive evidence that religion played a larger role in motivating rescuers to help Jews. Other beliefs, however, appear to have more conclusive evidence of being related to rescuing.

**Social responsibility**

Social responsibility is a “personal norm that requires people to help those who are dependent on them for help without expectation of gain, because it is the right thing
to do” (Fagin-Jones & Midlarsky, 2007, p.139). Whereas, moral reasoning focuses on the structure of how one arrives at moral conclusions (Kohlberg & Hersh, 1977), social responsibility is a moral belief (i.e. content) about how one ought to behave in relation to others and society (Fagin-Jones & Midlarsky, 2007). Rescuers tended to score higher on the Social Responsibility scale than bystanders (Fagin-Jones & Midlarsky, 2007; Oliner & Oliner, 1989). The Social Responsibility Scale (Berkowitz and Lutterman, 1968) is a five-point scale that consists of eight items ranging from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree”. The scale measures one’s interest in being involved with society and one’s concern with the welfare of others in society with questions like: “Every person should give some of his time for the good of his town or country” or “Letting your friends down is not so bad because you can't do good all the time for everybody” (pp. 175-176).

Rescuers, by definition, engaged in rescuing behaviors because of a moral motivation to do right, as opposed to getting something in return. Many rescuers did not want to be recognized for their efforts during the war. Some had a strong sense of responsibility to help others in society (Fagin-Jones & Midlarsky, 2007; Oliner & Oliner, 1989). Such individuals scored high on the Social Responsibility Scale (Berkowitz and Lutterman, 1968). However, Moore (2003) found evidence that some people engaged in rescuing against their will. In some cases, rescue organizations left Jewish children at people’s houses and promised to return the next day to find another place for them to hide, only to never return to retrieve the children. Another area that researchers have explored is perceived marginality (Fagin-Jones & Midlarsky, 2007).
**Perceived marginality**

Many rescuers were, themselves, members of marginalized groups or victims of persecution by other groups. In Poland, for example, many Polish were victims of Nazi oppression, however, many Polish people engaged in the oppression of Jews as well. Some rescuers perceived themselves as members of a marginalized group as did Polish rescuer Irene Opdyke (Opdyke & Armstrong, 2004). Such individuals may experience a sense of alienation that leads to a stronger sense of sympathy and solidarity with marginalized individuals or groups (Fagin-Jones & Midlarsky, 2007). The rescuers on the plateau Vivarais-Lignon also appeared to identify with victims of persecution as a result of a long history of persecution by Catholics in France (Henry, 2007).

Using a fifteen-item scale developed specifically for their study, Fagin-Jones and Midlarsky (2007) asked participants to “rate the degree to which they perceived themselves as ‘outsiders’ in relation to their own families and communities both before and during the war” (p. 141). Prior to this study no research had been conducted looking at the relationship between perceived marginality and rescuing. Fagin-Jones and Midlarsky did not find a significant correlation between perceived marginality and rescuing activities in their sample.

**Witnessing Oppression of Jews**

There is much evidence that large amounts of the population were aware of concentration camps and oppression of Jews (Gellately, 2001). Many people were aware of the oppression of Jews while less knew about the extermination of Jews. Even some rescuers did not know about death camps and the extermination of Jews until after the war (Blocker & Drucker, 1992; Oliner & Oliner, 1989). 99% of rescuers in Oliner &
Oliner’s (1989) sample said that they learned about the Nazis intentions to exterminate Jews either before the war or after it started. 93% of nonrescuers knew about Nazi intentions before or during the war. A majority of the sample learned about the Nazi’s intentions after the war started.

Many Polish people in the sample witnessed Jews being killed and brutalized. Many also saw the formation and destruction of Jewish ghettos. Outside of Poland, many only observed single instances of brutality, including a shooting, raid, or transport. More rescuers than nonrescuers reported witnessing such incidents (Oliner & Oliner, 1989).

More rescuers (69%) lived in close proximity to Jews than nonrescuers (57%) or bystanders (52%). 59% of rescuers had Jewish friends prior to the war, as compared to 34% of nonrescuers and 25% of bystanders. Although many rescuers and nonrescuers heard reports of Jewish oppression, rescuers were more likely to have reported hearing it from a Jewish person they knew. It is possible that learning about oppression from Jewish friends or acquaintances made the knowledge more personal (Oliner & Oliner, 1989).

Altruism

Oliner & Oliner (1989) and others (Faing-Jones & Midlarsky, 2007; Tec, 1986; Midlarsky, et. al., 2005 Fogleman, 1994; Monroe, 2004, 2008; Paladei, 1996) researched a specific type of altruism called rescuing, which entailed helping in a high risk, low reward context. However, there has been significant research on altruism in general. This research explores the mechanisms that explain why people engage in altruistic behavior and whether genuine altruistic behavior is even possible. Research findings
regarding altruism will also help inform about the type of altruism that is the focus of this study, rescuing.

Within altruism research there is debate as to whether altruism, or helping solely to benefit others, is even possible. While people may engage in prosocial behavior, behavior that benefits others, prosocial behaviors are not necessarily altruistic. One may have other motivations to behave prosocially (Batson, 1995).

C. Daniel Batson (1995) offers five possible motivations for which one might engage in prosocial behavior. One is sociobiological while the other four are psychological. The sociobiological explanation posits that people act to benefit one’s genes by improving reproductive potential while psychological motivation to behave prosocially may be driven by the desire to 1) help gain material, social, or self-rewards (egoism); 2) act solely for the purpose of benefiting others (altruism); 3) achieve the ultimate goal of benefiting a group; 4) achieve the ultimate goal of upholding a moral principle. Additionally, Monroe (2001) posits that individuals may be motivated to act in order to remain consistent with regard to one’s self identity. Individuals may engage or avoid engaging in a behavior if it is consistent with how one sees one’s identity or if it conflicts with that identity.

Human beings act in order to improve their reproductive chances in order to pass on their genes to future generations. The one way in which behaving prosocially may be beneficial to this endeavor is by promoting inclusive fitness (Batson, 1995). That is, behaving prosocially can help ensure that those who carry the same genes, specifically kin, survive to pass those genes on. This theory does not explain why a rescuer would risk the ability to pass on their own genes by helping out a non-relative or stranger. If
anything, rescuing during the Holocaust would increase the risk that one’s genes will not be passed down. Rescuers risked their own lives and sometimes their family’s lives (and genes) in order to help strangers or neighbors. This theory better explains kin-directed altruism and is not necessarily altruism because the ultimate goal is to pass on one’s own genes or to help those with similar genes pass theirs on to future generations (Cosmides & Tooby, 2013), as opposed to acting solely to benefit another.

An explanation that might get around the problem of helping non-kin is reciprocity. Reciprocal benefits that come from helping others would be the means in which one could improve reproductive potential (Batson, 1995). This, however, does not account for rescuers who were willing to risk their lives for those marginalized by society and could offer little to nothing in return. It is unlikely that such behaviors would help improve the rescuer’s fitness, particularly since the behavior of rescuing often increased one’s risk of death or injury at the hands of the Nazi or sympathetic regimes.

The egoist explanation of prosocial motivation posits that all actions are motivated for the purpose of benefitting the individual acting and prosocial behavior is just a means of gaining those benefits. A person may act prosocially in order to gain material, social, or self-rewards or to avoid material, social, or self-punishment, or to reduce aversive arousal (sadness, guilt, shame, etc.) that arises from seeing others suffer. So, a person acts prosocially in order to receive the reciprocal benefits that may come from this action. This reciprocal benefit can take the form of material gain, as a nonrescuer or perpetrator might help someone in exchange for material wealth or to avoid the loss of it. Social reward can come in the form of social status or honor. Self-reward or self-punishment comes in the form of mood, i.e. empathic joy, esteem, guilt, shame,
It is likely that many were motivated by the pleasure derived from helping others or maintaining or building close personal attachments to others (Oliner & Oliner, 1989). Some rescuers may have acted to avoid negative repercussions in cases where entire communities were involved in rescuing activities.

The altruistic explanation for prosocial motivation is that individuals act merely for the sake of others’ benefit. This motivation can come from an individual’s feelings of empathy that lead to helping behavior (Hoffman, 2000). Other possible explanations include the existence an “altruistic personality”. The altruistic personality may originate from habitual behavior being encouraged by parents or other role models that eventually became structured into the individual’s personality (Oliner & Oliner, 1989). The process of developing personality involves “repeated and complex transactions between genes and environments over developmental time...[these] early temperamental differences morph into the broad traits of personality that may be observed in adulthood” (McAdams, 2009).

The fourth of Batson’s (1995) explanations for the motivation to engage in prosocial behavior is collectivism. The ultimate goal of collectivist motivation is to benefit a group. This group can include a small number of people (a marriage) or the entirety of humanity or living beings. While altruism focuses on individuals for whom we can feel empathy, collectivism focuses on abstract groups, which cannot be empathized with.

It is likely that many rescuers were motivated by collectivism. Many rescuers were extensive. That is, many rescuers explained that they were motivated by feelings of connection to a larger humanity and felt compelled to act to benefit its group members,
which consists of all humanity. Many rescuers saw the world in this manner (Oliner & Oliner, 1989).

The final explanation that Batson (1995) gives for the motivation of prosocial action is principlism. This source of motivation is akin to Kohlberg’s (1971) final level of moral development. The ultimate goal of principlist motivation is to uphold a moral principle (Batson, 1995). An example of this would be someone who acted to uphold a moral principle like the Golden Rule or limited action because it would violate this principle. It may be possible that the motivation for upholding a principle may in fact be to gain some egoistic benefit, such as emotional satisfaction. 11% of Oliner & Oliner’s (1989) rescuer sample appeared to be motivated by the desire to uphold a moral principle.

An additional explanation for prosocial motivation, specifically with regard to rescuers, may come from the desire to maintain one’s personal identity (Hardy & Cairo, 2005). Kristen Renwick Monroe (2001) points out that many rescuers do not use the language of morality to explain their actions of rescuing Jews during the Holocaust. Rather, rescuers tended to explain their actions “in terms of how they saw themselves in relation to others” (p. 491). That is, the way that an individual identified himself or herself limited the decisions they were willing to make with regard to the treatment of Jews. For perpetrators, bystanders, and rescuers, identity constrains the choice of individuals by setting a menu of options for acting that are consistent with the individual’s identity. In other words, a person will generally engage in activities that do not contradict with the self-image that the person has created for herself. If a person sees themselves as a person that values the sanctity of life above all else, his or her actions
will be constrained by whether the person believes his or her actions will or will not help maintain a particular self-image (Monroe, 2008).

There are many ways to try to explain prosocial motivation. Some of these explanations imply that individuals only act for some benefit to self or one’s group, while others suggest that people can be motivated by altruism/only for the purpose of helping others. These explanations include: acting to pass on one’s genes; acting to gain a material or self-reward; acting solely to benefit others; acting to benefit one’s group; acting to uphold a moral principle; (Batson, 1995) and acting to maintain one’s identity (Monroe, 2001). The desire to pass one’s genes cannot explain rescuer behavior because such behavior was intended to benefit non-kin. It is possible that some rescuers were motivated to act by self-rewards that they received by virtue of helping others. Some may have been genuinely altruistic and acted solely to benefit others. Some rescuers may have acted to benefit one’s immediate social group or, by virtue of their extensive values, to benefit the larger human group of which they saw themselves as members. In Oliner & Oliner’s (1989) sample, 11% of rescuers appeared to be motivated by the desire to uphold a moral principle. And finally, Monroe (2001) suggests that many rescuers were motivated to rescue in order to uphold the image they held of themselves.

**Empathy**

Across studies (Fagin-Jones & Midlarsky; Oliner & Oliner, 1989), empathy has been a consistent correlate of rescuer behavior. The following section will present research on empathy and rescuing.

The experience of empathy begins as a visceral or emotional response to another person’s experience. This emotional response is then experienced as if one is living the
experience of the person that one is responding to. One responds as if the emotion of the
other person “is actually happening to oneself” (Levine, 2005, p. 17). “Empathy is the
process by which a person momentarily pretends to himself that he is another person,
projects himself into the perceptual field of the other person, [and] imaginatively puts
himself in the other person’s place” (Goldstein, 1999, p. 629).

There are five modes of empathic arousal: 1) imitation 2) feedback 3) classical
conditioning 4) mediated association and 5) role-taking. The first three are primitive,
automatic and involuntary while the last two are more cognitive (Hoffman, 2000).

Imitation happens immediately and without thought. Newborns and infants are
capable of engaging in imitation (Feldman, 2009). Newborns around other newborns
who are crying will respond by crying themselves (Sagi & Hoffman, 1876). Infants are
capable of imitating their mother’s facial expressions. Adults will sometimes adjust their
postures or facial expressions and mirror other’s with whom they are interacting with
(Hoffman, 2000).

Feedback involves the individual responding emotionally to physical cues. For
example, an individual may unconsciously mimic another’s facial expression, i.e. a
frown. As a result of frowning, the individual may react to the physical frowning by
feeling sadness (Hoffman, 2000).

Empathy can also be triggered through classical conditioning. This mode of
empathy happens when individuals observe someone experiencing distress and then
experiences distress themselves because they have been classically conditioned. The
observed event has be unconsciously associated with the individual’s own experience.
The first three modes, imitation, feedback, and classical conditioning, requires the victim
of the distress to be directly observed. The last two modes of empathy do not require direct observation of a victim's suffering (Hoffman, 2000).

The fourth mode of empathy is mediated association. This mode requires cognitive processing to take place. In mediated association the individual is able to experience empathy by associating the experiences of others with their own without direct observation. This requires the observer to think about his or her own experience in order to empathize. The observer associates his or her own experience with that of the victim, thus matching his or her emotional state to the victim’s emotional state through the use of language, rather than direct observation (Hoffman, 2000).

The final mode of empathy is role taking. This is the most cognitively demanding mode of empathy. Here the individual imagines him or herself in the role of another. This can occur in three ways: 1) self-focused 2) other-focused or 3) a combination of self and other-focused. In self-focused empathy the individual imagines how another is feeling by imagining how he or she would feel if they were in the same situation. Other-focused empathy occurs when one focuses directly on the victim and how he or she feels by using information about the victim or knowledge about how others in general feel in similar situations. Individuals can also experience empathy with a combination of self and other-focused empathy. One can go back and forth between focusing on the self and focusing on the other (Hoffman, 2000).

The ability to experience empathic concern is related to prosocial behavior (Kartner, 2010). The ability to experience the distress of others is often a motivator for trying to relieve this distress (Kartner, 2010; Spinrad & Stifter, 2006). It is also related to improved relationships, popularity (Medina, 2010; Kartner, 2010;), and increased moral
motivation (Medina, 2010; Feldman, 2009). The individual being motivated to help as a result of empathy may be motivated by a genuine concern to end the suffering of another or in order to relieve one’s own empathic suffering. Some individuals, rather than engaging in helping to relieve one’s own empathic distress, will escape from the stress-arousing situation (Hoffman, 2000).

Simon Baron-Cohen (2011) posits that lack of empathy is responsible for much of the harmful behavior that humans engage in. He equates lack of empathy with “evil”. He suggests that individuals can experience “empathy erosion”. Empathy erosion can occur as a result of “corrosive emotions, such as bitter resentment, or desire for revenge, or blind hatred, or a desire to protect” (p. 6). When this happens, the individual becomes more focused on the self and others are perceived more as objects, rather than people. For some this can happen momentarily, for others, empathy erosion can be a part of a larger, long-term, psychological or neurological problem that may be a result of physical trauma or some other condition that affects brain functioning.

Empathy does not necessarily motivate helping behaviors and the lack of empathy does not necessarily motivate hurtful behaviors. While empathy is the motivating force for many who engage in helping behaviors, for some it does not create such a motivation. It may even lead one to the decision not to help. For example, one who witnesses the suffering of another may choose to escape the situation in order to relieve his or her empathic distress. One may also choose to avoid entering a situation in which they expect to feel empathic distress (Hoffman, 2000).

One can also experience empathic over-arousal. When this happens, the observer’s empathic arousal leads to a focus on the self rather than the other. Instead of
being aroused to help relieve another’s empathic distress, the individual becomes focused on one’s own distress and becomes motivated to relieve his or own emotional distress (Hoffman, 2000).

Studies have also found that empathy can sometimes lead to individuals to act in an unjust manner. One may feel empathy toward another and choose to help them even if helping them may be unfair to others (Batson, Klein, Hightberger & Shaw, 1995). One can also experience empathic bias. This happens when a person experiences empathy with only those in a particular group or individuals with which one is more similar. This can lead to one favoring some groups or individuals over others, or even at the expense of others (Hoffman, 2000).

Consistent with other studies (Fogelman, 1994; Oliner & Oliner, 1988; Tec, 1986), Fagin-Jones and Midlarsky (2007) found that rescuers in their sample “possess an exceptional capacity to feel compassion for those who are experiencing pain or suffering” (p. 145). In this study rescuers scored higher than bystanders on the Interpersonal Reactivity Index (Davis, 1983), which measures one’s ability to empathize. The scale uses questions like "I sometimes try to understand my friends better by imagining how things look from their perspective" (p. 117) to measure an individual’s empathic concern, perspective taking, and personal distress.

Although empathy is related to helping behaviors (Kartner, 2010), empathy is not a prerequisite to engaging in prosocial behavior. Individuals with autistic spectrum disorders, who are incapable of experiencing empathy, are also capable of engaging in prosocial and helping behaviors. These individuals tend to lack the ability to read or
understand other’s emotions and have difficulty adopting the perspective of others (Baron-Cohen, 2011).

Despite the lack of empathy, many on the autistic spectrum are still able to behave morally and help others. Instead of being motivated by other’s distress, they are motivated by a desire to experience a well-ordered life. Such individuals can have a strong ability to organize and structure their perception of the world in a way that allows for the recognition of linear patterns. These individuals are more likely to have careers in more linear disciplines such as engineering and mathematics. Less linear professions like psychology are more difficult to understand.

Individuals on the autistic spectrum may function better in situations where things are very predictable and ordered. As a result they develop rules and schemas to live life by. When those rules are broken, it can cause distress. So, if another individual breaks a rule, it may lead a person with Asperger syndrome to intervene to right the rule. These individuals are not motivated by empathy, but by rules and principles which they hold strongly (Baron-Cohen, 2011). Many rescuers appear to have been motivated by the desire to uphold a principle (Oliner & Oliner, 1989), however, it is unknown if any rescuers may have been on the autistic spectrum.

The above section explains the different kinds of empathy and empathy’s relation to rescuing. The following section will discuss how empathy is developed in people.

**Developmental literature on Empathy**

One’s upbringing can have a large influence on one’s ability to empathize. Different kinds of parenting and discipline styles can influence whether one is more or less empathic. Along with genetic factors (Schroeder et. al., 1995; Medina, 2010), the
individual’s temperament (Schroeder et. al., 1995; Spinrad & Stifter, 2006), and social and environmental factors (Schroeder et. al., 1995; Spinrad & Stifter, 2006; Medina, 2010; Karen, 1994), and the way a child was parented can also play a role in the development of empathy (Medina, 2012).

Although the newborn is not born with the sense of self necessary to experience empathy (Schroeder et. al., 1995; Kartner et. al, 2010) and this ability does not come into existence until about 12 months, the manner in which an infant is treated during this time will have an effect on his or her later development (Spinrad & Stifter, 2006; Medina, 2010; Karen, 1994). For example, being warm and responsive to a child and his or her needs has been associated with increased empathy at later ages (Spinrad & Stifter, 2006; Karen 1994). By age 2 or 3 children may offer gifts and share toys with other children and adults (Feldman, 2009). Increased empathy has been associated with increased social competence, popularity, improved friendships (Spinrad & Stifter, 2006; Medina, 2010), and lower aggression (Spinrad & Stifter, 2006).

Children with secure attachments have been found to express more empathy toward peers, while ambivalently attached children had a tendency to be more inwardly focused, and children with avoidant attachments seemed to be more likely to take pleasure in the suffering of others (Karen, 1994). So, raising a child in a manner that develops a secure attachment is influential in developing empathy (Karen, 1995; Medina, 2010).

The manner in which a child is treated is also a contributor to the development of empathy (Medina, 2010; Kartner, 2010). With regard to discipline, mothers who responded to children’s’ transgressions with “high intensity and clarity, both cognitively
and affectively, and who used power assertive psychological strategies had children who were more likely to help others in situations that they had observed” (Kartner, 2010, p. 906). Oliner & Oliner (1989) found that rescuers in their sample tended to be disciplined in this manner.

Another factor that influences the development of empathy is experiencing empathy oneself (Karen, 1994; Medina, 2010). In order for a child to develop empathy “children must experience it on a regular basis to become good at expressing it” (Medina, 2010, p. 216). Rather than “trying to teach the child and admonish[ing] the child to be empathetic, you get an empathic child by being empathic with the child. The child’s understanding of relationships can only be from the relationships he’s experienced” (Karen, 1994, p. 195).

In sum, there are five modes of empathic arousal: imitation, feedback, classical conditioning, mediated association, and role taking. Some modes are pre-cognitive, while others require the use of cognition (Hoffman, 2000). Researchers have found relationships with empathy and rescuing (Fagin-Jones & Midlarsky, 2007; Oliner & Oliner, 1989). Some individuals can also be motivated to engage in prosocial behavior without the use of empathy. Such individuals, who are often on the autistic spectrum, can be motivated by the desire to maintain order and uphold rules (Baron-Cohen, 2011).

Sometimes empathy can lead individuals to not help in order to avoid distress (Hoffman, 2000). Fagin-Jones & Midlarsky (2007) found that rescuers in their sample “possess an exceptional capacity to feel compassion for those who are experiencing pain or suffering” (p. 145). Thus, for these individuals, empathy appeared to motivate action, or at least did not prevent it.
And finally, the development of empathy is influenced by many factors including parenting style, discipline style, and the opportunity to experience empathy as a child. Oliner & Oliner (1989) found that rescuers were reared using authoritative parenting, as opposed to authoritarian or strict parenting that relied heavily on corporal punishment and obedience.

**Summary of Rescuer Research**

The above literature review discussed much of the major research on courageous altruism during the Holocaust. Within the various countries in Europe, the ability to engage in rescuing varied according to geography and political environment. Yet, even in countries where rescuing was difficult, many managed to take part. The survival of Jews within various countries varied greatly.

Researchers have explored how rescuing could be related to various personality, demographic, and environmental variables. Demographic variables did not seem to have a strong relationship to rescuing (Fagin-Jones & Midlarsky, 2007; Oliner & Oliner, 1989). Personality variables tended to have the strongest relationship to rescuing (Fagin-Jones & Midlarsky, 2007). To assist the reader, below is a list of researched variables that have been reviewed in this thesis.

**Summary of Rescuer Variables**

There are many background factors that have been explored when researching rescuing during the Holocaust. Some of these background factors have been correlated with rescuing, while others have not shown any relationship. Below is a list summarizing the background factors that researchers have examined in trying to understand rescuing:
**Demographic Variables**

- There is no apparent relationship between demographic variables and rescuing (Fagin-Jones & Midlarsky, 2007; Oliner & Oliner, 1989).

**Socioeconomic Status**

- There is no apparent relationship between socioeconomic status and rescuing (Oliner & Oliner, 1989).

**Culture: Relationship to Authority**

- Relationship to authority appears to have influence on the ability to engage in rescue behaviors:
  1. In Germany, a culture of denunciation (Gellately, 2001) made it more difficult to rescue because of the increased risk that neighbors would denounce a rescuer to authorities.
  2. In the Netherlands, trust of government may have made it easier for the government to keep detailed records that were then used to easily track down and Jews and other citizens (Baron, 1989).

**Religion**

- The role of religion in rescuing is difficult to determine:
  1. Many Catholics and Catholic leaders supported or turned a blind eye to Nazi persecution of Jews (Baron, 1989; Henry, 2007).
  2. Protestants in Denmark (Baron, 1989; Cantor & Kjaerulff, 2010) and France (Henry, 2007) engaged in large-scale rescue of Jews.
  3. Some rescuers credited their religious beliefs as motivation for rescuing, but most did not. Nonbelievers also took part in rescuing (Oliner & Oliner, 1989).

**Persuasive Messages**

- Nazi propaganda likely motivated many to develop beliefs antithetical to rescuing.
- Messages from religious leaders and laity:
  1. Many religious leaders gave sermons preaching to laity to become involved in rescuing (Baron, 1989; Cantor & Kjaerulff, 2010; Henry, 2007).
  2. Religious community members may have also influenced people to engage in rescuing. A majority of those involved in rescuing were asked by people they knew (Oliner & Oliner, 1989).
**Personality**

- Propensity for risk-taking:
  1. Rescuers score higher on measures of risk-taking propensity than nonrescuers (Fagin-Jones & Midlarsky, 2007).

- Authoritarian orientation:
  1. Rescuers score lower on scales of authoritarian orientation than nonrescuers (Oliner & Oliner, 1989).

- Emotional intelligence
  1. There is evidence that rescuers may have higher levels of emotional intelligence (Baum, 2008).

- Empathic Arousal
  1. Rescuers score higher on empathy scales than nonrescuers (Oliner & Oliner, 1989).

**Values**

- Extensivity:
  1. Oliner & Oliner (1989) concluded that rescuers had extensive worldviews that viewed all individuals as being a part of a common humanity based on human connectedness. Such individuals tended to be skeptical of nationalism because they viewed it as exclusionary.

- Social responsibility
  1. Rescuers scored higher on measures of social responsibility than nonrescuers (Fagin-Jones & Midlarsky, 2007).

- Egalitarianism
  1. In Denmark (Baron, 1989) and France (Henry, 2007), religious leaders preached egalitarian values while many rescuers espoused egalitarian beliefs as a motivation to rescue. The Egalitarian was one of the four types of rescuers that Oliner & Oliner (1989) discovered.

- Moral Reasoning
  1. The most common form of moral reasoning among rescuers was moral reasoning based on the ethic of care (Fagin-Jones & Midlarsky, 2007; Oliner & Oliner, 1989). In one study 11% of rescuers used principled moral reasoning (Oliner & Oliner, 1989).

**Knowledge**

- Rescuers knew more about the persecution of Jews before and after the war than did nonrescuers and bystanders (Oliner & Oliner, 1989).

**Identity**

- Perceived marginality:
• Identity of others
  1. Extensive individuals had a broad view of what constituted one’s group (Oliner & Oliner, 1989).
• Identity of self
  1. Monroe (2001) posits that individuals act in ways that is consistent one’s self image. Rescuers’ options for actions were constrained by how they viewed themselves.

Some of the variables above have relationships with rescuing while others do not. The goal of this research is to explore the relationship between rescuing and a previously unexamined variable, open-mindedness.

**Open-Mindedness**

“Open-mindedness is the willingness to search actively for evidence against one's favored beliefs, plans, or goals, and to weigh such evidence fairly when it is available” (Peterson & Seligman, 2004, p.143) which is contrasted with the “tendency to think in ways that favor one’s current views” (p. 143). People often perceive things, people, and events in ways that reinforce what they already believe. Thinking in a way that reinforces one’s already-held views allows people to avoid cognitive dissonance and maintain cognitive consistency. People prefer to hold cognitions that are congruent and consistent with previously held values, beliefs, and attitudes (Cooper, 1995).

When someone encounters information that he or she has trouble integrating with their current cognitions they experience cognitive dissonance. Cognitive dissonance creates an uncomfortable physiological and psychological sensation that motivates one to try and achieve cognitive consistency. Often times an individual will choose to ignore the contradictory information or interpret it in a way that it does not lead to the change of strongly-held beliefs (Festinger, 1957). Individuals who are open-minded are more willing to search for and examine beliefs that contradict strongly held beliefs (Peterson &
Seligman, 2004). Rescuers appear to display some qualities that are indicative of open-mindedness. Some of these qualities include an increased ability to see the perspectives of others through empathy (Fagin-Jones & Midlarsky, 2007; Oliner & Oliner, 1989), the tendency to view other humans more broadly, as opposed to seeing them in simplistic, black and white terms (Oliner & Oliner, 1989) and the tendency to have more nuanced beliefs about group categories (Monroe, 2001). The ability to understand other’s points of view, the tendency to see people as more complex, and tolerance of ambiguity is indicative of open-mindedness (Peterson & Seligman, 2004). This research will explore whether open-mindedness is related to rescuing during the Holocaust.

Various tools have been used to measure open-mindedness, including Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levenson, and Sanford’s (1950) F-Scale which “measures the degree to which one agrees with authoritarian (fascist) notions” (Peterson & Seligman, 2004, p. 146), and Rokeach’s (1960) Dogmatism Scale, which “measures agreement with absolutist notions” ((Peterson & Seligman, 2004, p. 146). The best-known measure of open-mindedness is Suedfeld and Tetlock's measure of integrative complexity (Suedfeld & Tetlock, 1977; Suedfeld, Tetlock, & Streufert, 1992). The integrative complexity construct will be the primary source for measurement in this study.

**Integrative Complexity**

Integrative complexity is “the capacity and willingness to: 1) acknowledge the legitimacy of contradictory perspectives on a problem; and 2) integrate those contradictory considerations into an overall judgment” (Tetlock, 1995, p. 326). This concept was originally constructed in order to compare differences in social thinking. It was proposed that some individuals “dislike ambiguity and dissonance and seek rapid
cognitive closure in judging others and in making decisions” (p. 326). Such individuals tend to form impressions of other people, events, or issues that are dichotomous. They tend to view things in terms of black or white, good or bad, while other individuals “adopt more flexible, open-minded, and multidimensional stances toward the social world” (p. 326). These individuals are more comfortable with ambiguity and are better able to tolerate inconsistencies and contradictions. People, events, and issues tend not to be viewed as either good or bad, but often a mix of both (some good, some bad). They are aware that life often involves making decisions about conflicting goals and view life as “a process of continual change that requires frequent updating of basic assumptions and beliefs” (pp. 326-327).

The Integrative Complexity (IC) scoring system functions on a seven point scale, with the lowest score being a 1 and the highest a 7 (Baker-Brown, et. al., 1992). Two variables underlie the integrative complexity: differentiation and integration. Differentiation entails how many dimensions or competing perspectives are present in a statement. Integration involves connections and interactions between differentiated characteristics (Tetlock, 1984). A score of one indicates no differentiation. A statement scored as one would be a statement that is unidimensional and does not allow for or express the possibility of other points of view, dimensions, or causal attributions. Such a statement would be black and white (Baker-Brown, et. al., 1992). An example of such a statement might be: “No. There is no choice. When you have to do right, you do right” (Monroe, 2004, p. 102). In this statement, the speaker provides a one-sided evaluation with no room for alternative ways of looking at things.
A score of two would indicate differentiation without elaboration. In this case, a score of two would be given to a speaker who is alluding to other possible dimensions or perspectives without fully elaborating what those dimensions or perspectives might be (Baker-Brown, et. al., 1992). A score of 3 would be given to a statement that elaborates at least two dimensions, perspectives or causal attributions (Baker-Brown, et. al., 1992).

A score of 4 implies possible integration with a score of 5 being an elaboration of this integration, while a score of 6 or 7 displays differentiation, integration, and an allusion to or elaboration of an overarching organizing principle or theory (Baker-Brown, et. al., 1992).

In sum the integrative complexity construct is based on a seven-point scale. The lowest scores do not show evidence of differentiation. Higher scores begin to show differentiation followed by integration. The highest scores show both differentiation and integration as well as the articulation of an organizing principle that explains the nature of those interactions (Baker-Brown, et. al., 1992).

Researchers have used this construct to measure complexity experimental settings as well as in archival studies (Winter, 1992). This thesis seeks to explore the possible connections between integrative complexity and rescuing. The proceeding section will present some of the findings in integrative complexity research in general and provide evidence showing how it may relate to rescuing.

**Research on integrative complexity**

Early research on integrative complexity involved the use of paragraph completion tests (Peterson & Seligman, 2008). In these tests individuals completed sentence stems about interpersonal conflict, societal authority, and decisional ambiguity.
The completed sentences were then coded and scored on a seven-point scale on two indicators: evaluative differentiation and conceptual integration. Evaluative differentiation is “the capacity and willingness to tolerate different points of view” (Tetlock, 1995, p. 327). Conceptual integration is “the capacity and willingness to generate linkages between points of view, to understand why different people look at the same event in different ways, to confront trade-offs, and to appreciate interactive patterns of causation” (p. 327). Those who had low scores had lower levels of integration and differentiation. Such individuals tend to view things in terms of black and white and have little tolerance for ambiguity and shades of grey (1995).

The coding system for integrative complexity has been applied to various archival documents including: “political speeches, letters and diaries, newspaper editorials, Supreme Court opinions, and diplomatic communications” (Tetlock, 1995, p. 327). Individuals who are integratively complex thinkers have been found to be more likely to use more varied information to make decisions and are more likely to reach mutually beneficial compromises, recognize viable compromises, and less likely to resort to coercive tactics than integratively simple thinkers. In several experiments, integratively complex thinkers have been found to be more resistant to several judgmental biases including the fundamental attribution bias, which is the tendency to attribute negative intentions to individuals’ actions when there may be other situational explanations for the persons’ behavior. Integratively complex thinkers are also less likely to hold onto first impressions about others when contradictory evidence is presented, less likely to be overconfident about factual judgments and predictions, less likely to fall into groupthink, and “more likely to acknowledge tradeoffs in policy debates” (1995, p. 327), while more
integratively simple individuals are at greater risk of falling into group think (Tetlock, 1979). Integratively complex individuals have also, interestingly, been found to live longer than integratively simple thinkers (Peterson & Seligman, 2004). In one study it was found that integrative complexity diminished in the years prior to even accidental deaths (Winter, 1992).

Researchers, using the communications of world leaders and policy makers, have found correlations between integrative complexity and the likelihood of peaceful resolution of conflict. In coding archived diplomatic communications, researchers found that, prior to instances of armed conflict and war between nations, levels of integrative complexity in communication decreases. As the likelihood of armed conflict increases, individuals often engage in less complex thinking and are less likely to perceive alternatives to war. Evidence seems to show that those who are dispositionally complex are more likely to perceive alternatives to armed conflict than those who are dispositionally simple (Suedfeld, Tetlock & Ramirez, 1977). Although there is plenty of evidence to show that higher levels of integrative complexity can be adaptive, sometimes, integrative complexity can be maladaptive (Tetlock, 1995). While integrative complexity helps reduce many biases, it can also increase other biases. Studies have found that integratively complex individuals are more likely to lose confidence in judgments when they are accompanied by irrelevant evidence, are more likely to procrastinate or pass the buck when faced with difficult cost-benefit decisions, and more vulnerable to unreasonable adversaries in mixed motive games (Tetlock, 1995). Also, since integratively complex individuals tend to be more aware of tradeoffs, they may be more likely to engage in tradeoffs that appear to be immoral to outside observers, like many
moderates did on matters of slavery in the United States (Tetlock, Armor & Peterson, 1994).

Environmental factors also have an influence on one’s level of integrative complexity. Stress, including ill health and war are related to diminished integrative complexity, while age is positively correlated with integrative complexity (Porter & Suedfeld, 1981). Researchers have also found relationships between political ideology and integrative complexity. A meta-analysis of this research revealed that moderate and extreme liberals tend to be more complex than their conservative counterparts (Jost, et al. 2003).

There has been much research on integrative complexity. Researchers have found relationships between integrative complexity and environmental factors (Porter & Suedfeld, 1981), political ideology (Tetlock, 1983, 1984), groupthink (Tetlock, 1979), ability to find peaceful solutions to conflict (Suedfeld, Tetlock & Ramirez, 1977) and overall effective functioning. Researchers have also found relationships between integrative complexity and maladaptive behaviors. Integratively complex individuals can be more willing to make tradeoffs that appear immoral to outside observers (Tetlock, Armor & Peterson, 1994) more willing to pass on making difficult decisions, more likely to be influenced by irrelevant evidence, and are more vulnerable to unreasonable adversaries (Tetlock, 1995).

This research will investigate the previously unexplored relationship between rescuing and integrative complexity. However, before exploring the possible relationship between integrative complexity and rescuing, it may be helpful to attempt to outline the way in which other variables related to rescuing might interact. The proceeding section
will use reasoned action theory to attempt to present the manner in which the many variables related to rescuing relate or interact with each other. This section will also be useful as a summary of the research on rescuing.

**The Relationship Between Variables: Reasoned Action Theory**

This section will provide a summary of the variables related to rescuing that were reviewed in this thesis. Reasoned action theory will be used to explain how those variables relate or may have interacted to influence or dissuade individuals from participating in rescue activities. The section will begin with an explanation of reasoned action theory. Then the variables reviewed in the literature will be presented in a flowchart that includes the many rescuing correlates and how they may have interacted to lead to the behavior of rescuing.

Reasoned action theory “explains behavior by identifying the primary determinants of behavior and the sources of these determinant variables, and by organizing the relations between these variables” (Fishbein & Azjen, 1975). It attempts to identify the types of beliefs and attitudes that individuals have about various facets including, beliefs about behaviors, beliefs about self and environmental constraints, and other background factors. Figure 1 presents the various factors that can influence behavior and how these factors relate to each other (p. 121).
The above flowchart can be useful tool for organizing the many variables that affect one’s motivation to engage in a behavior. This model will be used to organize the many variables that have been studied and used to explain rescuing behavior. Figure 2 (on page 70) is a flowchart (adapted from Yzer, 2013) containing the variables that have been reviewed in this thesis regarding rescuing during the Holocaust. The flowchart is followed by a summary discussing the manner in which variables may interact. The purpose of using the reasoned action model is to show how relying on a single explanation for rescuer behavior can be deficient for trying to understand the variables related to rescuer behavior.
Figure 2: Reason Action Flowchart with Rescuer Variables. Adapted from (Yzer, 2013).
Beliefs

In reasoned action theory, beliefs play a motivational role with regard to behaviors. These include beliefs and evaluations about behaviors, beliefs and evaluations regarding normative beliefs, and beliefs about one’s ability or capacity to engage in a particular behavior (Hale, Householder & Greene, 2002).

Rescuers had beliefs and evaluations about the behavior of helping Jews. They held beliefs about whether particular behaviors will achieve a particular goal or will influence one’s affect in a positive manner. Rescuers likely held beliefs about whether their behaviors involving helping someone would help to achieve his or her goals. Rescuers also likely held beliefs about whether their helping behaviors would make them feel good.

Rescuers likely held normative beliefs about helping Jews and motivation to comply with those normative beliefs. Individuals hold normative beliefs that may be shared with one’s social groups (Yzer, 2013). The individual may consider the expectations of others and the behaviors that others are engaged in. Rescuers may have held beliefs about whether others expected them to rescue or not. In some places, entire towns engaged in rescuing, while in other places, many worked alone. A majority of rescuers in Oliner & Oliner’s (1989) sample were asked by others to help. Rescuers may have also held beliefs about whether others knew or were expecting them to rescue. Some rescuers worked alone and did not know of others who were involved in rescuing (Block & Drucker, 1992; Oliner & Oliner, 1989). For some, whether others helped may not have been a consideration.
Rescuers likely held beliefs about one’s ability or capacity to help Jews. Individuals hold beliefs about their capacity to engage in a behavior. Individuals may consider whether one is capable of completing a task and/or whether they believe the decision to engage in a task is up to them (Yzer, 2013). A rescuer may have considered whether it is physically or logistically possible to rescue Jews. The ability to rescue Jews varied from place to place. However, two people in the same environment may have had completely different beliefs about whether rescuing was possible, regardless of actual environmental constraints. Individuals with higher levels of internal locus of control are more likely to feel that they have the ability to accomplish tasks (Försterling, 1995). Rescuers may have also considered whether they have a choice in the matter. Oliner & Oliner (1989) found that rescuers scored higher on scales of locus of control. Rescuers tended to be driven by an internal locus of control. However, some rescuers scored lower on scales of internal locus of control.

**Intention**

If the individual holds the appropriate beliefs and attitudes, the individual may develop the intention to engage in a behavior (Yzer, 2013). So, while many people may have been able to help rescue Jews, they may have been constrained by their beliefs and evaluations of helping behaviors, normative beliefs and valuations, and their beliefs about their own capacity to help. However, even if an individual reached the point of intention, there are further considerations that may prevent a particular behavior. These considerations may come in the form of physical or environmental constraints.
Environmental Constraints

Many individuals may have had the intention to help, or even harm, but may have been constrained by environmental factors. In many places, engaging in rescuing placed individuals and their families at great risk. However, many chose to help despite the risks. A rescuer may have held beliefs about whether they had the skills to help rescue others. Although some individuals may have intended to help, they may not have had the skills to. For example, forged documents were needed in many circumstances (Baron, 1989). If the help needed required a specialized skill, an individual may not have been able to help in a particular situation. Rescuers also likely held beliefs about their environment and the possible constraints that it imposed on them. For example, some rescuing involved helping people escape or hide. In places like the Netherlands, escape was difficult because of German control of surrounding areas. Places to hide people also varied from place to place (Baron, 1989). Without places to hide people, the option to help by hiding people would have not been available.

Behavior

Reasoned action theory helps to show the way in which various factors interact with each other. Relying on one environmental or personality variable to explain rescuing behavior would be inadequate. There appears to be a complex web of beliefs, evaluations, background factors, and environmental factors that may inhibit or facilitate a particular behavior.

An additional factor that this research wants to consider is one’s open-mindedness. Although integrative complexity may not explain rescuing behaviors by itself, it may add another component that could be used to predict behaviors.
Connecting Integrative Complexity and Altruism: Hypotheses

The attempt to understand what motivated or enabled rescuers to take such great risks to help others has resulted in the examination of many variables. One area that has not been explored has been open-mindedness. The goal of this research is to explore any possible connections between open-mindedness (integrative complexity) and rescuing. Although no research has been conducted to specifically answer this question, there is some evidence that Holocaust rescuers might be more open-minded than bystanders and perpetrators.

First, empathy and integrative complexity appear to be related. Myyry (2002) measured the emotional empathy of 138 university students using the Questionnaire Measure of Emotional Empathy (Mehrabian & Epstein, 1972). In this study, participants with higher levels of integrative complexity scored significantly higher on empathy measures than those with lower complexity scores.

Another connection between empathy and integrative complexity exists by virtue of how the construct is defined. A score of 3 in integrative complexity can be given to paragraphs that indicate that the speaker is able to take the point of view of another person. The ability to take the point of view of another is comparable to empathic role-taking (Hoffman, 2000). So, the increased ability for a rescuer to engage in empathic role-taking, may correspond with an increased likelihood of complex statements. Rescuers have been shown to score higher on scales of empathy than nonrescuers (Oliner & Oliner, 1989). This may suggest that rescuers are more likely to be able to perceive the perspectives and emotions of others, thus be more likely to engage in complex thinking.
Higher Integrative Complexity is associated with the tendency to perceive others as being more complex, while lower Integrative Complexity can contribute to individuals perceiving others more simplistically and dichotomously (Tetlock, 1995). Thus, it is possible that higher Integrative Complexity would contribute to individuals being more likely to perceive Jews as complex individuals with some positive traits and some negative traits. Complex thinkers are less likely to “jump to strong conclusions about the personalities of others when there are plausible situational explanations for their behavior” (p. 327). So, a complex thinker who sees a Jewish person living in poverty may be more likely to attribute that individual’s poverty to situational factors, such as Nazi policies, rather than to any essential personality trait of Jews in general. Integratively complex thinkers have also been found to be less likely to engage in fundamental attribution bias (Tetlock, 1995). It may be that rescuers were better able to find environmental explanations for Jewish suffering during the War, as opposed to blaming the Jews themselves. By not placing blame on the victims, rescuers were probably more willing to help than someone who blamed Jews for their own suffering.

Integratively complex thinkers are also less likely to hold onto first impressions about others when contradictory evidence is presented (Tetlock, 1995). Many Holocaust rescuers who had limited experience with Jews prior to the war may have held unfavorable beliefs about Jews or heard peers expressing negative views about Jews before meeting them. There may be instances in which first impressions about Jews changed with more experience and interaction with Jews.

Integratively complex individuals are also less likely to engage in coercive behaviors when confronted with a conflict of interest (Tetlock, 1995). So, such
individuals might be more likely to find peaceful solutions to their problems, and possibly less likely to engage in violence (Suedfeld, Tetlock & Ramirez, 1977).

Lower Integrative Complexity may contribute to individuals being more likely to perceive Jews as dichotomously good or bad. Given the Nazi regime’s efforts to promote an anti-Semitic worldview (Gellately, 2001) it is possible that those who supported the regime might be more likely to hold a negative view of Jews. A more negative and simplistic view of Jews may allow for rationalization to justify anti-Semitic and genocidal policies toward Jews.

The Nazi regime espoused a conservative ideology based on racial and political purity (Gellately, 2001). A common theme in conservative worldviews is the desire to maintain an ideologically and culturally homogeneous group. Many rescuers espoused values that are more consistent with liberal, pluralistic ideology (Block & Drucker, 1992; Oliner & Oliner, 1989). Liberal worldviews generally value diversity and has a broader understanding of what one considers an ingroup when compared to individuals with more conservative worldviews (Haidt, 2012). Oliner & Oliner’s (1989) research found that many rescuers had a broad view of who is of value and tended to be skeptical of nationalism. Nationalism has the tendency of being exclusive of others (Marx, 2003). It is possible that rescuers are more likely to have liberal worldviews, though more analysis would be needed to support this claim.

Liberals also tend to be more tolerant of ambiguity than conservatives (Jost, et. al., 2003). Tolerance of ambiguity is indicative of a higher Integrative Complexity score (Baker-Brown, et. al.). Liberals tend to score higher on integrative complexity (Jost, et. al., 2003). If rescuers tend to think more liberally and tend to categorize members of
ingroups more broadly, it is possible that they may also be more complex than those who hold the conservative, exclusionist worldview of the Nazi party.

And finally, complex thinkers tend to be less likely to fall into groupthink (Tetlock, 1979). This may indicate another connection between integrative complexity and rescuing. Such a connection would be consistent with Oliner & Oliner’s (1989) findings on locus of control. Rescuers scored higher in internal locus of control than bystanders. Increased internal locus of control likely influenced rescuers’ ability to independent-minded and less conformist, possibly, because of an internalized sense of morality that was encouraged by authoritative, rather than authoritarian childrearing. Rescuers also tended to score lower on scales of authoritarianism. This may suggest that rescuers tend to be less conformist, thus less likely to fall into groupthink. So, evidence indicating that rescuers are more likely to have an internal locus of control and less likely to be authoritarian, may indicate lower levels of conformity (Oliner & Oliner, 1989). Lower levels of conformity may lead to greater ability to resist groupthink. Integratively simple individuals are more likely to fall into groupthink (Tetlock, 1979). For some rescuers, particularly those who acted alone and in secret, resisting social pressures to oppress or ignore Jewish victims may have been an important factor that allowed them to engage in rescuing behaviors.

With regard to the Nazi defendants, there is evidence that these individuals may be less complex. Prior to the war crimes trials, the Nazis were engaged in a military conflict. Research suggests that lower integrative complexity increases the likelihood of conflict and war, while higher integrative complexity increases the chances of peaceful resolution (Suedfeld, Tetlock & Ramirez, 1977). It is possible that defendants were more
focused on winning the war against the allies than in finding a peaceful resolution to the conflict.

In sum, there is some evidence that rescuers may be more integratively complex than perpetrators. Many similar characteristics are found among complex thinkers and rescuers of Jews during World War II including: higher empathy scores, independent mindedness, and liberal values. It is also possible that rescuers were less likely to engage in confirmation bias and categorized individuals in broader, possibly more ambiguous categories (Monroe, 2002).

There is also evidence that Nazis may be less integratively complex than rescuers. Nazis were likely less willing to seek out peaceful solutions to conflict. They also espoused a conservative ideology (Gellately, 2001) that painted Jews as unambiguously bad. Increase conflict (Suedfeld, Tetlock & Ramirez, 1977) and conservatism (Tetlock, 1983, 1984) is related to lower levels of integrative complexity.

Presently, no research has specifically measured levels of integrative complexity of among rescuers, bystanders, or perpetrators. This study will seek to fill a part of that gap. Using the integrative complexity scoring construct, the author will score archived interviews of rescuers of Jews during the Holocaust and Nazi war crimes defendants (perpetrators). The author hypothesizes that rescuers will be more open-minded. Greater open-mindedness (higher integrative complexity) will predict whether one is more likely to engage in rescuing or perpetrating.
Chapter Three: Methods

Theoretical Orientation

Positive psychology informs the theoretical approach used in this thesis. Christopher Peterson (2006) defines Positive Psychology as “the study of what goes right in life” (p.4). Most of the scientific study of psychology has focused on how human beings are flawed and damaged. People are seen as sick or damaged and the scientific study of psychology tends toward trying to alleviate these ills that are an inherent part of human life. Positive psychology seeks to challenge this paradigm by bringing greater attention to human strengths and positing that there should be an equal focus on these strengths as there is on pathology (Peterson, 2006).

There are many character strengths that may relate to rescuing during the Holocaust, including: bravery, persistence, social intelligence, hope, and kindness. This study focuses on two character strengths, open-mindedness (Peterson & Seligman, 2004) and altruism. In order for something to be considered a ‘character strength’, a positive characteristic must meet ten criteria (Peterson & Seligman, 2004):

1. Character strengths must contribute to a sense of fulfillment, as opposed to merely providing a momentary pleasure.
2. It must be morally valued in and of itself, even if the outcomes of displaying that strength may not be obvious.
3. It must not diminish others. Observers of a courageous action, for example, would respond with admiration and other positive emotions.

4. It must have a nonfelicitous opposite. One must be able to come up with another characteristic that is its opposite. For example, the opposite of ‘bravery’ could be ‘cowardice’.

5. It must be trait-like. The strength must have “a degree of generality across situations and stability across time” (p. 22).

6. It must be distinctive. A character strength should not be composed of various other character strengths. For example, combining courage and open-mindedness into a third, new virtue.

7. There must exist paragons of the virtue. For example, rescuers might be considered paragons of courage and kindness.

8. There must exist examples of prodigies who display the character strength.

9. There must be selective absence. There must be people who exist that show a “total absence of a given strength” (p. 25).

10. There must exist institutions and rituals that promote it.

Open-mindedness fits into the Positive Psychology paradigm because it meets the criteria put forth by Peterson and Seligman (2004) for being a character strength or human virtue. This thesis explores whether the character strength of open-mindedness predicts altruism.

The integrative complexity construct helps provide a means of measuring open-mindedness. The construct has been researched for decades and provides a theoretical
foundation for exploring how people think. Understanding how people think may help provide a deeper understanding for people’s behaviors.

Examining the character strength of open-mindedness may provide further insights into the behaviors and dispositions of Holocaust rescuers and perpetrators. Finding connections between integrative complexity and altruistic behavior may also help to enrich and strengthen positive psychology’s goal of finding human strengths and virtues. By finding these virtues, scholars and teachers may be able to develop interventions and curricula that may promote altruism through helping people learn to be more complex.

**Research Design**

**Instrument**

The Integrative Complexity coding instrument was selected because it is considered the best method for measuring open-mindedness by researchers (Peterson & Seligman, 2004). Other methods of measuring open-mindedness were not feasible for this project. For example, the Paragraph Completion test requires subjects to complete sentence stems (Tetlock, 1995). In order to measure the open-mindedness of Holocaust rescuers and Nazi perpetrators, it is necessary to have access to the direct words of these individuals. Many rescuers have long passed away, are of advanced age, do not speak English, or reside outside of the United States. The same limitations (death, old age, language) exist for Nazi perpetrators, including the minimal likelihood that perpetrators of genocide would speak openly about their activities. This limits the options for gathering direct testimony from these populations to published and unpublished interviews. Using archival data was the most feasible manner of gather data for these
populations (Webb, et. al., 2000). The most conveniently available data comes from published, postwar interviews. Interviews exist of rescuers of Jews honored by the Yad Vashem Holocaust memorial museum in Israel and interviews and of Nazis defendants on trial for war crimes after World War II.

Selection of subjects

Previous research on rescuing has compared differences between rescuers and the following groups: bystanders (Fagin-Jones & Midlarsky, 2007; Oliner & Oliner, 1989), members of resistance groups (Oliner & Oliner, 1989; Suedfeld & de Best, 2008), survivors (Oliner & Oliner, 1989), and Nazis (Monroe, 2008). The original goal of this study was to compare rescuers, perpetrators, and bystanders, however this study will instead only compare the differences between rescuers and Nazi perpetrators.

Holocaust rescuers and Nazi war crimes defendants were chosen because they offered, in many ways, the clearest examples of altruism and perpetrating and provided adequate archival data to score for integrative complexity. Holocaust rescuers provided a clear example of altruism because they are selected using previously established criteria that confirms their altruistic behavior (Yad Vashem, n.d.). Nazi defendants proved to be the most accessible for obtaining archival material and criteria for deciding who was a perpetrator was already established by virtue of tribunals that found them guilty of war crimes and crimes against humanity.

Finding archived testimonies of bystanders proved to be the most difficult. The author was unable to find any published interviews of bystanders. Also, it was unclear to the author the criteria to be used to determine who counted as a bystander. As a result, only rescuer and perpetrator data was utilized for this study.
Finding published interviews of bystanders or perpetrators directly involved in killing also proved to be difficult. The closest analogue to perpetrators found was Nazi war crimes defendants, some who may have been involved in direct killing, gave orders to kill, or were merely members of the Nazi party bureaucracy who did not play a role in killing but, rather, assisted in the overall functioning of the Nazi regime. Outside of tribunals and other court cases, the amount of testimony by perpetrators appears minimal.

To operationalize ‘perpetrator’ for the purpose of this project the author collected archived interviews of Nazis on trial for during World War II. The author used archived interviews during the Nuremberg trials (Goldensohn, 2004) and the interrogation of Adolph Eichmann by the Israeli Police (von Lang, et. al., 1999). Of the Nazi subjects selected, the majority were convicted of war crimes and crimes against humanity, while a few were found innocent.

With regard to selecting rescuers, the Holocaust memorial, Yad Vashem, has established the criteria used for selecting who is to be considered a rescuer. These criteria include helping without expectation of personal or financial gain and survivor testimonies (Yad Vashem, n.d.). Text of interviews of rescuers was obtained from published books.

The archival material for rescuers was taken from two books containing interviews of rescuers conducted in the 1980’s. The books contained interviews of Holocaust rescuers from books intended to display the heroism of the subjects being interviewed. The first book of rescuer interviews was *The Hand of Compassion* by Kristen Renwick-Monroe (2004). The author of this text provided three interviews in
electronic format to be used in this study. All three interviews were utilized for this research project.

The second book, *Rescuers: Portraits of Moral Courage in the Holocaust*, by Block and Drucker (1992), contains 43 interviews. Of the 43 interviews, nine contained multiple respondents. Interviews with multiple respondents were not considered for scoring in order to maintain uniformity between interviews. Only including interviews with one respondent ensured that co-respondents could not influence each other’s complexity score. Research suggests that integrative complexity scores can be influenced by prompting or prodding (Perkins, Bushey & Faraday, 1986). It is possible that one respondent could have prompted another respondent to use more complex language or give more complex explanations. One subject was removed because he was interviewed in the other book of rescuer interviews used in this research. The first 12 scorable interviews in this book were selected for scoring in order to bring the total number of rescuer respondents to 15, which equaled the total number of Nazi respondents. The interviews in this text were arranged by country, starting with the Netherlands, followed by Belgium, France, Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and the Soviet Union/Ukraine. As a result the number of subjects from the various countries was seven from the Netherlands, one from Belgium, two from France, and one from Germany.

Three books were used to collect data for Nazi perpetrators. The first is a compilation of interviews of defendants during the Nuremberg Trials conducted by Leon Goldensohn (2004). This text contains 19 interviews of Nazi officers conducted as a part of the proceedings for the Nuremberg Tribunals. These interviews are interspersed with
commentary by the interviewer. Three interviews only contained commentary the interviewer, while three more only contained small amounts of interview data. However, after data collection was completed, the author concluded that the three interviews with small amounts of data could have been used. A total of 13 interviews were selected for coding from this text.

The second text used for the Nazi sample is composed entirely of interviews of Adolph Eichmann that were transcribed from the archives of the Israeli police (Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1983). The text is written in interview format with the interrogator asking a question and Eichmann responding.

The third text was an autobiography by Rudolph Hoss (1992), the Auschwitz concentration camp’s first commander (Steinfeldt, 2002). This text was initially included in order to increase the sample size of perpetrators. However, in the end it was excluded from coding because it was not an interview. Research has found that written text tends to score higher on integrative complexity than interview data (Lucian Gideon Conway III, personal communication, July 7, 2012). All data was collected from interviews in order to maintain uniformity (Baker-Brown, et. al., 1992).

**Selection of Units for Scoring**

After each subject was selected, the researcher photocopied each chapter or section of interview that was to be coded. Starting at the beginning, the author read through each interview and crossed out all unscorable paragraphs until at least 20 scorable paragraphs could be used. Unscorable paragraphs are those that show no evidence of evidence of any process of reasoning. Unscorable units may be purely
For example:

I called Köslin again and told them that I was investigating the case and that I was interested in it. The prison director told me then and there that the woman could come to the prison and visit her husband, who until then had been held incommunicado. This was followed by a fight of three or four months’ duration (Goldensohn, 2004, p. 55).

The above statement is not scorable because it consists only of a description without any evidence of a process of reasoning. The speaker does not express any judgments, evaluations, or claims of cause and effect (Baker-Brown, et. al., 1992).

In most cases, the first 20 scorable paragraphs of each interview were selected for each subject. The limit of 20 paragraphs was only chosen to minimize the breadth this thesis project. Not limiting selection to 20 paragraphs would have entailed scanning thousands of paragraphs for unscorable units.

When selecting units for scoring from the Nuremberg Trials (Goldensohn, 2004), the researcher sometimes selected sections further into the interviews because author commentary was predominant in some sections with little text by the defendant. It is possible that, because of lack of trust, respondents may have limited the amount of information they were willing to share, thus speaking less. Selecting all data from early on in the interviews may have artificially lowered integrative complexity scores by virtue of a disproportionate number of very short statements. Whereas rescuers likely trusted the interviewers and agreed to be interviewed, the interrogative nature of the Nazi interviews increased the likelihood that respondents may have felt coerced to take part in the interview, which likely influenced how much respondents were willing to disclose. The process for selecting sections further into the interview involved scanning the
chapter, by sight, until larger sections of continuous text by the respondent was found. This process is not standard procedure and was solely based on the author’s judgment in an attempt to create uniformity between rescuer and perpetrator samples. Because rescuer data included multiple consecutive paragraphs without interviewer commentary or intervention, the author attempted to recreate this in the Nazi sample by looking for sections of continuous paragraphs.

When, at most, 20 scorable paragraphs were obtained for each subject, the researcher selected five units to score from each paragraph (Baker-Brown, et. al., 1992). Previous research has scored 10 or more paragraphs per subject to obtain an integrative complexity score (Tetlock, 1983, 1984). Other research has used five paragraphs to obtain an integrative complexity score (Baker-Brown, et. al., 1992; Thoemmes & Conway, 2007). Units to be scored consist of a single paragraph, however, occasionally paragraphs “may be broken into two or more scorable units, with each having a single idea” (Baker-Brown, et. al., 1992, p. 7) while multiple paragraphs “may be collapsed into one scorable unit” (p. 7). In this study, some paragraphs discussing one idea were combined to form one unit, while some larger paragraphs discussing more than one idea were broken into two separate units.

To provide an integrative complexity score, five random paragraphs were selected from each subject’s set of scorable units (Baker-Brown, et. al., 1992). To randomize the units to be selected, the 20 paragraphs for each subject were numbered and inserted into a random number generator (www.random.org). The researcher selected five numbers for each subject that was randomly generated. For example, each subject had paragraphs
numbered from 1-20. The random number generator produced five random numbers. The units that corresponded to those random numbers were selected for scoring.

Once the appropriate number of units to be scored was established, each paragraph was transcribed and identifying information, group identities, and city and country names was removed. Coders were not told which paragraph belonged to which subject or group. Removing identifying information helps reduce coder bias (Baker-Brown, et. al., 1992). Due to the populations being used in this study, it is possible that coders may have been influenced to score in a biased manner. Coders may score rescuers higher on integrative complexity because of positive feelings and a desire to evaluate the subjects in a more positive light. A total of 145 units were transcribed for scoring. Each unit received a number and were then the order of the paragraphs were randomized in order to reduce coder bias by making it more difficult to identify which paragraph came from which subject (Baker-Brown, et. al., 1992).

**Integrative Complexity Coding**

Integrative Complexity coding occurs on a 7-point scale with 1 being the least complex and a score of 7 being the highest level of complexity. Two variables underlie the integrative complexity construct, differentiation and integration. Differentiation entails how many dimensions or competing perspectives are present in a statement. Integration involves connections and interactions between differentiated characteristics (Tetlock, 1984). Increased differentiation and integration indicates increased complexity of thought.

A score of 1 indicates no differentiation or integration:

Well, in 1933 when the party came to power, there was very little shooting by the police or anyone. In 1933, policemen were replaced by the city;
twenty-one percent were replaced in the capital. It was very mild action. You cannot speak of a religious persecution (Goldensohn, 2004, p. 142).

The above statement by one of the Nazi defendants is a one-sided evaluation of the Nazi party taking power in Germany. The party coming into power is evaluated as being uneventful and less worthy of noting.

A score of 2 indicates emerging differentiation and no integration:

All the neighbors thought Bobby and Eef were children from Rotterdam. It may have been safer if we would have taken the kids to Sunday school, but I didn’t believe that was right. Some people did try to make their rescued children into a different religion, but we never did (Block & Drucker, 1992, p. 24).

In this extract the speaker indicates that there may be other dimensions or possibilities without articulating what they may be. The speaker suggests that things “may have been safer”, while not specifically articulating how they may have been safer or under what circumstances they would have been safer. The speaker implies that there is another dimension without articulating what it might be.

A score of 3 indicates differentiation, but no integration:

My children are twenty-seven, thirty-five, and thirty-eight years old, and on the one hand they are very proud of what I did during the war, but on the other hand, they don’t ask me questions about it like you do. My son is a doctor and helps people. My daughter helps illiterate people to learn to read; she has always done that as a volunteer. And all my children and I have tutored in the city, and we painted houses there. There was a time in the sixties when we helped fix up poor neighborhoods. It was a project called “I Give a Damn.” We cleaned out streets in the Southern part of a city, had block parties. When my husband dies, I remarried a person who worked for an international organization, helping Third World countries raise their standards of living (Block & Drucker, 1992, p. 89).

In this extract, the speaker expresses a multi-dimensional view of her children. On one hand, they are proud of their mother, but on the other, they do not ask questions. Rather
than the speaker’s children being unidimensionally good or bad, they are evaluated positively in that they are proud of their mother, yet evaluated negatively in that they do not ask questions of their mother. The highest complexity score for any subject in this study was a 3.

A score of 5 indicates differentiation as well as integration. Integrated statements indicate interaction between differentiated dimensions in a statement. Rather than the differing dimensions operating in isolation as two separate aspects of a person or event, the differing dimensions interact with each other. A score of 4 would imply integration without articulating or explaining the interaction between differentiated aspects. The following paragraph would receive a score of 5:

The market value of handcrafted furniture is determined jointly by the willingness of suppliers to produce such products at varying prices and the willingness of buyers to purchase such products at varying prices. In technical terms, price is the intersection of the supply and demand curves (Baker-Brown, et. al., 1992, p. 2).

A score of 7 indicates differentiation and integration, as well as a more complex understanding and awareness of overarching principles or nature of the relationship (Baker-Brown, et. al., 1992):

The market value of handcrafted furniture is determined jointly by the willingness of suppliers to produce such products at varying prices and the willingness of buyers to purchase such products at varying prices. In technical terms, price is the intersection of the supply and demand curves. Many factors affect exactly where that intersection point lies. For example, in periods of economic recession, demand falls sharply because people turn to less aesthetically appealing, but more functional, forms of furniture. Many artisans are thrown out of work. In periods of prosperity, the opposite pattern of preferences emerges. The result may be a costly bidding war for handcrafted furniture. However, markets usually do return to equilibrium – either as a result of shortages pushing prices up and making it more profitable for artisans to return to work or as a result of high prices forcing buyers out of the market and reducing aggregate demand (p. 3).
In sum, integrative complexity involves differentiation and integration. Differentiation entails how many dimensions or competing perspectives are present in a statement. Integration involves connections and interactions between differentiated characteristics (Tetlock, 1984).

**Selection of Coders**

**Pilot Attempt**

In order to obtain reliable results at least two independent coders are needed in order to score for integrative complexity. The use of independent coders helps minimize coder bias and ensure consistency in the use of the integrative complexity coding construct (Baker-Brown, et. al., 1992). The researcher made two attempts to code the data. The first attempt was undertaken without any assistance from experienced coders.

The author recruited two college students, a fellow graduate student and an undergraduate student at a different university, to help code the first 75 paragraphs. Each coder was provided with a randomized set of 75 paragraph units to code. Coders were instructed to read the integrative complexity scoring manual (Baker-Brown, et. al., 1992) and code each set. The undergraduate student found the task too difficult and abandoned the project. The other coder completed reviewing the manual and coded the set. Reliability for this set was 0.29.

In order to obtain valid results, coding reliability must meet the threshold of 0.85. To obtain better results and understand the coding process better, the author contacted a researcher well versed in the integrative complexity construct for assistance. The second was undertaken with the help of an experienced, qualified coder.
Second Attempt

The author contacted Dr. Peter Suedfeld, one of the developers of the integrative complexity construct. The author requested help in finding a trained, qualified coder to help code and to instruct the author in appropriate coding procedures. Dr. Suedfeld referred a qualified coder to assist in the research project.

After communicating with the qualified coder over email, a meeting over Skype was arranged. The author sent the qualified coder paragraph numbers 1-75 of 145. While the qualified coder was scoring the units, the author completed the process to become a qualified coder. To become a qualified coder the author completed the Online Integrative Complexity Workshop (Suedfeld, 2005), used for training coders in integrative complexity. The online workshop provides students with instructions and practice tests. The workshop also provides answers to these practice tests as well as explanations for how an expert coder would arrive at a particular score. To complete the workshop, the trainee must complete a final test of paragraphs to score and achieve a reliability score of 0.85 with an expert coder (Baker-Brown, et. al., 1992). The author submitted the test to be scored and became qualified on the first attempt by achieving a reliability score of 0.884 with an expert coder. After becoming qualified, the author scored paragraphs 1-75 and moved to the next phase, the reliability process.

Reliability Process

In order to achieve reliable results, two independent coders must reach agreement on, at minimum, 85% of the scored units (Baker-Brown, et. al., 1992). There are two standard approaches to obtain reliability using integrative complexity. One entails that at least two coders scoring a set of paragraphs separately and then meeting to discuss scores
in which there is disagreement. The coders attempt to achieve reliability by explaining their rationale for scoring a particular paragraph to each other until agreement is achieved on a particular score (Peter Suedfeld, personal communication, July 6, 2012). The other approach also involves coders scoring paragraphs separately, however these coders do not meet to discuss disagreements. If necessary, additional coders are added to improve reliability. Scores in which there is disagreement can also be averaged (Lucian Gideon Conway III, personal communication, July 6, 2012). The former method was chosen for this study.

The reliability process was broken down into two parts. Each coder started by scoring the first 75 paragraphs. After the first 75 were coded, reliability was calculated using an Excel spreadsheet. The second coder provided the author with a spreadsheet containing the scores of both coders and inputted with appropriate formulas used to calculate a reliability score. Using the spreadsheet, the initial reliability score for paragraphs 1-75 was 0.206. In order to achieve a reliability of 0.85, the coders engaged discussion in order to come to agreement.

The discussion between the two coders took place over Skype online video chat. The goal of the process is for both coders to have as similar scores as possible. For this project the goal was to have at least 85% agreement among scores (Baker-Brown, et. al., 1992). If both coders already agree on a score for a paragraph, it is skipped. When there is not agreement between both coders for a particular score on a particular paragraph, the coder (coder A) who gave the highest score presents her rationale for giving that score. If the other coder (coder B) agrees with her rationale, then coder B changes her score to match. If, after coder A presents her argument and there is still not agreement on the
score, coder B responds with her rationale for arriving at a particular score. If coder A agrees with the rationale, she changes her score to match coder B’s score. This conversation continues until either both coders agree on the same score, or no agreement is reached. If coders do not agree on a score, then both coders either agree to disagree on the paragraph’s score or the paragraph is revisited at a later time. Coders then move onto the next paragraph in which there is disagreement and repeat the process (Lisa Shiozaki, personal communication, August 28, 2012). The reliability process was completed when a minimum reliability of 0.85 was achieved for paragraphs 1-75. Final reliability for the first 75 paragraphs was 0.913.

Part two involved scoring and calculating reliability for paragraphs 76-145. The second coder was provided paragraphs 76-145 to score for integrative complexity. After both the author and the second coder completed scoring, coders began the reliability process again. Initial reliability for paragraphs 76-154 was 0.449. For some paragraphs in which coders could not arrive at agreement, an expert coder was consulted. Final reliability for paragraphs 76 - 145 was 0.853. Total reliability for all paragraphs was 0.884.
Chapter Four: Results

Reliability

To achieve adequate reliability coders needed to reach 85% agreement (Baker-Brown, et. al., 1992). Final reliability was for the 145 paragraphs was 0.884. Integrative complexity scoring between both coders was deemed reliable.

Integrative Complexity Scores for Rescuers and Perpetrators

15 rescuers and 14 Nazi defendants were scored for integrative complexity. The mean integrative complexity score for defendants was 1.5857 (SD = 0.396) and 1.76 (SD = 0.314) for rescuers. No significant relationship was found between integrative complexity and being a rescuer or Nazi defendant, r(29) = .25, p > .05. Using linear regression analysis, integrative complexity was not found to be predictive of whether one was more likely to be a rescuer or a Nazi defendant.

To explore mixed result, subjects were further categorized. Further examination of the texts had revealed that, although all Nazi defendants were charged with a crime, some were found innocent of war crimes and crimes against humanity. Of those convicted of a crime, sentences varied from 10, 15, 20 years, life in prison, or death by hanging (Goldensohn, 2004).

The goal of this research was to examine differences in integrative complexity between rescuers and perpetrators. However, the category of Nazi defendant does not necessarily capture the concept of perpetrator clearly. In the sample of 14 defendants,
three were found innocent by the war crimes tribunal. So, in order to compare rescuers and perpetrators, Nazi defendants were subdivided to account for innocence and guilt.

In order to clarify the category of “perpetrator” and separate innocent defendants from this group, subjects were then analyzed based on conviction versus nonconviction. This removed innocent defendants from being erroneously categorized as perpetrators. This involved grouping rescuers (n = 15) and defendants who were found innocent (n = 3) into one group (n = 18) and comparing scores with defendants who were found guilty (n = 11). Analysis found a significant negative correlation between integrative complexity and whether the subject was convicted of a crime r(29) = -.45, p = .015. When comparing only rescuers (n = 15) and Nazis who received a conviction, results were still significant, r(26) = -.42, p = .03. Figure 1 shows the difference in integrative complexity means between rescuers and defendants convicted of a crime.

![Figure 1. Mean integrative complexity scores of rescuers and Nazi defendants convicted of war crimes and crimes against humanity (perpetrators).](image)

Of the 14 defendants, three were found innocent, four were given sentences that involved time in prison, and seven were given death sentences. Using correlation analysis, a significant relationship was found between integrative complexity between verdict/sentence handed down with the severity of sentence being negatively correlated
with integrative complexity $r(14) = -.60$, $p = .02$. Those who were handed a death sentence ($n = 7$) had the lowest integrative complexity score ($M = 1.4$), followed by those sentenced to time in prison ($M = 1.6$, $n = 4$). Those who were found innocent ($n = 3$) had the highest integrative complexity scores ($M = 2.0$) among defendants.

![Integrative Complexity and Defendant's Sentence](image)

**Figure 2.** Correlation between Nazi defendants’ sentences and integrative complexity scores.

Data was also analyzed based on demographic characteristics. Integrative complexity scores for men ($n = 20$) and women ($n = 9$), all rescuers, were compared. No significant difference was found between men and women.

To examine whether country of origin played a role, subjects were split into groups according to German nationality. All Nazis ($n = 14$) and two rescuers were grouped into one group ($n = 16$) composed of only Germans and compared with the rest of the sample ($n = 13$). No significant difference was found.

Previous research has found a positive correlation between age and integrative complexity (Porter & Suedfeld, 1981). In this study subjects’ age during the war ranged from 22 to 70. This study did not find a significant relationship between age at time of war and integrative complexity.
Most Nazi defendants were interviewed soon after the war while most rescuers were interviewed over 40 years after the war’s conclusion. As a result, most rescuers were older at the time of their interview than Nazi defendants were at the time of theirs. To explore any possible influence of age on integrative complexity (Porter & Suedfeld, 1981), age at time of interview was also examined. No significant relationship between integrative complexity and age at time of interview was found.

In sum, his study found significant correlations between integrative complexity and; whether one was convicted of a crime or not; defendant’s sentence; and whether one was a rescuer or a perpetrator. Integrative complexity and whether the individual was charged, found innocent, or found guilty was also correlated. Table 1 displays all correlations.
### Table 1
Correlation Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rescuer or Nazi</th>
<th>Mean Integrative Complexity</th>
<th>Convicted of a Crime?</th>
<th>Defendant's sentence</th>
<th>Charged vs Innocent vs guilty</th>
<th>Age at time of interview</th>
<th>Rescuer versus convicted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rescuer or Nazi</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.246</td>
<td>.809**</td>
<td>.953**</td>
<td>-.679**</td>
<td>1.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Integrative Complexity</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.449*</td>
<td>-.599*</td>
<td>-.364</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>-.421*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convicted of a Crime?</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.844**</td>
<td>.950**</td>
<td>-.652**</td>
<td>1.000**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defendant's sentence</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.844**</td>
<td>-.286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charged vs Innocent vs guilty</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.700**</td>
<td>1.000**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at time of interview</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.737**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescuer versus convicted</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
b. Cannot be computed because at least one of the variables is constant.
Chapter Five: Discussion

The goal of this thesis was to investigate whether integrative complexity (open-mindedness) was linked with rescuing and perpetrating during the Holocaust. The author hypothesized that there would be a positive relationship between integrative complexity and the likelihood that someone would be a rescuer. This research was not able to find direct a relationship between integrative complexity and rescuing, per se. However, there were findings of significance in the analysis of data.

Analysis revealed that there were significant negative correlations between verdict and integrative complexity. Those convicted of war crimes had lower integrative complexity scores than innocent defendants and rescuers. This appears consistent with previous research findings on integrative complexity and conflict resolution. Those with higher integrative complexity scores are more likely to find nonviolent resolutions to conflict (Suedfeld, Tetlock & Ramirez, 1977). However, some rescuers did engage in violence when trying to protect those they were hiding (Block & Drucker, 1992). It is possible that some Nazi defendants were interested in finding a peaceful resolution to the war, but were limited in their ability to bring that about because they did not have the power to bring about peace. Defendants however, chose to remain in their positions throughout the war. Some indicated that they wanted to leave their positions, but said that they were too afraid to do so (Goldensohn, 2004). It may be that their desire to leave
the party only came after they began to believe that they lost the war, but were supportive of Nazi policies before they believed in the possibility of defeat.

Deciding who is in fact a perpetrator based on the sentence handed down may also be difficult. It is possible, with further investigation into historical context, that there were political factors that influence the verdicts. Some who were found guilty may have played little to no direct role in supporting anti-Jewish policies, while some who were found innocent may have, in fact, had hands in the extermination of Jews. The verdicts may have been handed down based on defendants defending themselves well, or defendants having particular political connections that protected them. Further investigation into the historical context would be necessary to address these concerns.

The integrative complexity scores of those involved in killing may be different than the scores of those who were a part of the leadership who did not necessarily play a direct role in killing. Likewise, determining who is or is not a perpetrator can be difficult. Fujii (2011), in her study of the Rwandan genocide, found that although much of the killing involved large groups of people banding together to search for Tutsis to kill, only a few of those individuals engaged in actually killing anyone. So, trying to articulate a “perpetrator psychology” may be hindered by the differences in involvement with killing. Psychological profiles, and complexity of thought, for those who ordered killing may be different than those who physically engaged in it or merely tolerated it while supporting other Nazi policies.

This study found a relationship between severity of sentence and integrative complexity. Comparing defendants (n = 14) showed that those who were sentenced to death had the lowest integrative complexity scores, followed by those convicted with
time in prison, with innocent defendants showing the highest integrative complexity scores. So, severity of sentence was negatively correlated with integrative complexity score.

There may be more to investigate with regard to integrative complexity scores and sentences. Conway, et. al. (2008), examined the relationship between lying and complexity. Using a subconstruct that he developed he was able to find a more nuanced picture. Conway’s construct posits two kinds of complexity, Dialectical and Elaborative. In some cases, individuals show complexity by discussing competing evaluations, while other times an individual may show complexity by offering multiple explanations of a phenomenon that lead to one evaluative conclusion. An example of dialectical complexity would be the following statement by a rescuer:

But when I got the call, I was concerned. It was the beginning of ‘44. The mountains were full of snow between the two countries. I had just received news from one of my friends in this organization that a doctor -- who wanted to join the general -- had tried to cross the mountains. He was taken in a big storm and died there in the snow. So I was not too enthusiastic to go this way, aside from the danger of being arrested on my way by the police. But I saw my duty and, with the help of my friends, I crossed the border, crossed the mountains, and went to a city called [city name], to take the train from [city name] to another city. One of my first contacts was a friend of ours, a member of our organization, a young medical student who knew the mountains very well. I asked him some advice and got good counsel: go out and avoid the guards and the snow (Monroe, 2004, pp. 104-105).

The above statement would be scored a 3 for dialectical complexity. The reason it receives a 3 is because the speaker is expressing two evaluations with differing valences. That is, the speaker suggests that he was “not too enthusiastic” (negative evaluation) but he also saw it as his “duty” (positive evaluation). The dialectically complex speaker is able to hold differing evaluations of the same idea, concept or event (Conway, 2008).
Elaboratively complex statements involve statements that elaborate on multiple dimensions, but those dimensions are of the same valence. That is, although multiple causes or dimensions are expressed, each dimension or cause is either all positive or all negative (Conway, 2008). An example of elaborative complexity would be the following statement by a Nazi defendant found innocent by the tribunal:

There was only the choice between Communism and Hitler, and I will tell you why Hitler won. People will not give up religion, rights, freedom of personality, the opportunity to develop by individual effort - which includes private property. And the other reason for Hitler's winning is that if a whole people is treated as the Germans were, everyone will say, “Are we worse people than others? Are we of a minor race?” Just as every single individual needs and must have self-respect, just as every family is proud of decent traditions, so every nation wants to maintain her individual manner, culture, language, and customs. It was in these respects that Communism failed. Communists said that God was nonsense and stupidity and preached internationalism without maintaining the natural national feelings of a nation (Goldensohn, 2004, p. 223).

The above statement offers different explanations or causes for why “Hitler won”. The speaker suggests that the reasons for Hitler’s winning was people’s tendency to not want to give up their “religion, rights, freedom of personality, the opportunity to develop by individual effort” Goldensohn, 2004, p. 223). The other reason the speaker provides is the way that Germans were treated. The speaker also provides reasons why communism failed, “Communists said that God was nonsense and stupidity and preached internationalism without maintaining the natural national feelings of a nation” (p. 223).

All causal explanations lead to one conclusion: that Hitler’s victory provided room for natural human tendencies that communism and post war policies inhibited.

Conway et. al. (2008) found that lying in a manner that was counter to one’s actual beliefs can lead to diminished dialectical complexity and increased elaborative
complexity. Due to the nature of the circumstances under which Nazi defendants were interviewed, it is likely that there was incentive to lie to the interviewer. In order to avoid a severe sentence, defendants may have spoken with increased elaborative complexity and diminished dialectical complexity. Rescuers, on the other hand, had much less to risk by speaking truthfully. So, along with less desire to lie and greater tendency for empathy, rescuers may have been more dialectically complex than Nazi defendants.

Interestingly, the defendants who received the harshest sentences were the most integratively simple, while those found innocent were the most complex. It could be that those who were found innocent or received lighter sentences were better at coming up with more elaboratively complex statements that were convincing to the tribunal. Further research that parses out the type of complexity that Nazi defendants used may be warranted.

This study examined the relationship between demographic variables and integrative complexity in this sample. This research did not find any significant relationships between integrative complexity and demographic characteristics including, gender, and German nationality. Although previous research has found relationships between integrative complexity and age (Porter & Suedfeld, 1981), this study did not find such a relationship.

Other findings with significant results included the average length of paragraph for each subject. Previous research has not found correlations between paragraph length and integrative complexity (Tetlock, 1983, 1984; Tetlock, Armor & Peterson, 1994). Long statements are sometimes given low scores, while shorter statements can be quite complex (Baker-Brown, et. al., 1992). This study found a positive correlation between
integrative complexity and paragraph word length. Higher word counts correlated with high integrative complexity scores with rescuers scoring higher than Nazi defendants. This result may be an artifact of the selection of paragraphs or a result of the context of interview. Rescuers voluntarily engaged in interviews, while defendants participated in interviews (or interrogations) as a part of their trial defense. The nature of the interrogations may have made the defendants more reticent, in order to avoid severe consequences from saying too much.

Although rescuers were more likely to be able to empathize with victims, they may not have been more open-minded generally. They may be just as likely to search for information that confirms pre-existing beliefs. For example, about half of rescuers helped because they were asked to by people they respected or in their own social group (Oliner & Oliner, 1989). So, the motivation to engage in rescue, for many, may have been influenced more by having one’s present beliefs reinforced by others, as opposed to seeing things as being more complex or being more comfortable with divergent points of view. Rescuers may have been motivated by one-sided beliefs about helping others. They may have been more closed-minded and unwilling to accept other points of view with regard to helping others.

However, empathy and integrative complexity have significant crossover. One of the indicators of a complex score is the speaker’s ability to accept that others have valid, differing perspectives (Baker-Brown, et. al., 1992). The ability to adopt different perspectives is also an indicator of perspective-taking, a higher, more sophisticated level of empathy (Hoffmann, 2000). Research has also found that there is a positive relationship between integrative complexity and empathy (Myyry, 2002). This crossover
makes it difficult to determine what exactly is being measured. If, in this study, integrative complexity is only capturing subjects’ empathy, then these research findings are less meaningful. However, the subjects in this study did talk about varying topics in the archived interviews. If integrative complexity is merely measuring empathy, then one may be able to score subjects based on topic being discuss. One may be able to distinguish between statements in which the speaker is discussing another’s experience and statements that do not make mention of others. For example, the following statement by a Nazi defendant found guilty by the tribunal:

Yes, I had access to larger libraries. I always read for two or three hours daily – it was a habit. During the last five years of my life in the capital I had hardly a spare minute, but I acquired the custom of reading between tow a.m. and for a.m., and then I would go back to sleep again. This was to keep up my spiritual well being (Goldensohn, 2004, p. 239).

The above statement does not make any mention of others or express any claims regarding the experiences of others. The following statement by a rescuer suggests that he or she is empathizing with someone:

I'll never forget what I saw there. Thousands of people crying and grabbing at me. After two hours I found the family. They took the clothes and told me to leave right away. I was pregnant, and she was afraid for me. I was afraid enough for myself. And I did have a hard time getting out. I was lucky that a man I knew was there, a friend from my office, and he told the guards, “I know this lady. She doesn't belong in here; you have to let her out.” After that I had a new fear of the police. That day I had seen what they could do (Block & Drucker, 1992, p. #).

Designing a study to control for topics discussed might help resolve this issue.

Integrative complexity may not influence motivation in one direction or another. While higher integrative complexity may lead to perceiving people as more complex, it is possible that higher integrative complexity may lead to perceiving the political situation
as more complex as well, leading to inaction. This would be consistent with findings by Tetlock, Armor & Peterson (1994) in which they found that abolitionists and pro-slavery individuals were more integratively simple than moderates. The inability to perceive the situation in any other way may have played a role in providing motivation to rescuers. Many rescuers have claimed, there was no other option but to rescue (Renwick-Monroe, 2004, Oliner & Oliner, 1989). One rescuer, for example, when asked about his decision to rescue replied “No. There is no choice. When you have to do right, you do right” (Monroe, 2004, p. 101). A more integratively complex individual may be more likely to see other options and either exercise those other options, or remain paralyzed in his or her decision-making (Tetlock, 1995). It is possible that more complex individuals may be more likely to be bystanders rather than rescuers or perpetrators as was found in Tetlock, Armor & Perterson’s (1994) study which found that moderates were more complex than abolitionists or slavery supporters. However, the study focuses on politicians who were engaging in a debate, as opposed to individuals in a war setting being forced to make decisions about engaging in specific helping behaviors (Darrin Hicks, personal communication, May 9, 2013).

The sample for this study included 15 rescuers and 14 Nazi defendants. The small samples size may play a role in the outcome of this study. Relationships were found between groups and within groups. Overall, rescuers were not significantly more complex than Nazi defendants, but significance was reached when innocent defendants were removed from analysis. So, rescuers were more complex than guilty defendants. This supports the study’s hypothesis that rescuers would be more complex than perpetrators. However, Nazi defendants found innocent of crimes, were also more
complex than perpetrators. So, integrative complexity does not appear to predict rescuing, but it does appear to predict perpetrating.

The small sample size may make it difficult to generalize this study’s findings to rescuing behaviors in general. Generalizing only to this population, Holocaust rescuers and Nazi war criminals, may be possible.

If the findings in this study are representative, results lend support to previous research suggesting that more complex individuals are more likely to be nonviolent (Suedfeld, Tetlock & Ramirez, 1977). Recognizing that increased complexity may result in less violence may inform practice. Practitioners working to reduce violence may introduce interventions that increase complexity when working with populations prone to violence. With regard to genocide, practitioners may develop interventions that increase complexity to prevent violence from taking place. However, if this study’s results were merely capturing more statements of empathy by rescuers, then practitioners may be better served by focusing on interventions that increase empathy. It may also be the case that integrative complexity and empathy feed each other. That is, interventions to increase complexity may increase empathy and vice versa.

Limitations

This study contains several limitations. These limitations pertain to the use of archival materials for research and the obstacles it poses with regard to collecting relevant data. The selection of subjects is dependent on whether interview data has been published. The classification and grouping of subjects posed difficulties as a result of trying to group individuals as perpetrators. And finally, the populations chosen as comparison groups pose problems with uniformity.
There are several limitations to using archival materials to study integrative complexity. First is that archival data is dependent on the collector of the data (Hill, 1993; Winter, 1992). The editors of the texts use to gather the interviews had their own criteria for choosing which testimony to include for each interviewee. So, the editors’ desire to include more interesting material may have influenced the complexity scores of each subject.

Studying integrative complexity in a laboratory setting allows the research to control environmental factors that can influence complexity as well as topics for subjects to speak or write about it (Winter, 1992). Archival studies do not have the luxury of controlling such factors (Hill, 1993). Thus, complexity scores may have been influenced by the topics being discussed in the interviews and by environmental influences (Tetlock, 1995).

The author used some nonstandard techniques for gathering perpetrator data. The data for 13 Nazi subjects was taken from a book that included commentary from the interviewer. In order to attempt to bring uniformity between rescuer and Nazi paragraphs, the author searched for sections of uninterrupted commentary by Nazi respondents by sight. The author visually selected sections that appeared to have continuous commentary by the Nazi defendant in order to parallel uninterrupted commentary by rescuers.

The choice of rescuers and Nazi defendants as comparison groups created challenges. Each group had different sets of limitations with regard to the research topics of integrative complexity and helping behaviors.
Perpetrators

The individuals interviewed for the Nuremburg trials may have been under duress because of trial proceedings. Increased stress levels can influence individuals’ integrative complexity scores (Tetlock, 1995). Many of the defendants may have also been advocating for themselves, thus, presenting their testimonies in a more one-sided manner. Advocating for one position over another to try and convince others may have a tendency of leading to lower levels of integrative complexity in communication (Lavelee & Suedfeld, 1997). The increased stress and the desire to advocate for one’s innocence may have a role in each subject's integrative complexity score, leading to scoring the subjects as more integratively simple than they actually may be outside of the trial setting. Greater uniformity with regard to stressors during interviews may provide more meaningful results.

In the Nuremberg sample, some of those interviewed were involved in giving orders to kill or deport Jews, while others pleaded ignorance about the mass killings of Jews. Some suggested that they did not know about it until after the war (Goldensohn, 2004). However, that Jews were being persecuted in other ways was widely known (Gellately, 2001). So, though the individuals interviewed for the Nuremberg trials may or may not have known about the mass killings, they were aware of the other ways in which Jews were persecuted and were actively involved in supporting the Nazi Party despite their actions against Jews. Many of the defendants who were found guilty of war crimes and crimes against humanity denied taking part in the extermination of Jews (Goldensohn, 2004). It may be possible that some who were found guilty did not play any direct role in the extermination of Jews, but were merely a part of the larger Nazi
bureaucracy, while some who were found innocent did play a larger role in killing. Further biographical and historical information would be needed for each defendant in order to determine the degree of involvement or knowledge regarding the extermination of Jews during the war.

**Rescuers**

The context and time of interviews was vastly different for rescuers, compared to Nazi defendants. The rescuer interviews were conducted at least 40 years after the end of World War II. Rescuers memories may not be accurate because of amount of time that had elapsed between events during the war and their interviews. This may have an influence on the level of integrative complexity (Porter & Suedfeld, 1981). However, this study did not find a significant relationship between age and integrative complexity.

Given the mount of time to reflect on the events, it is possible that these events are experienced differently than they were when they occurred. Integrative complexity scores tend to decrease when there are situational stressors present (Tetlock, 1995). So, the integrative complexity scores of rescuers during the war may be different than during the interviews. The loss of memory may also influence complexity. Events may be remembered more or less complexly with loss of memory.

The composition of each group (rescuers and perpetrators) poses limitations. Likewise, comparison between the groups also creates limitations.

**Comparison Across Groups**

There are many limitations with regard to comparing the rescuers and Nazis selected for this study. There are many confounding variables that were not or could not be controlled for. One variable is the country of origin. This study would have benefited
if all subjects were German. Although the study did find differences in Integrative Complexity, there may have been many cultural factors that were not related to Integrative Complexity that had greater influence on rescuing behaviors. Differences may be a result of culture and country of origin. However, this study did not find significant differences in complexity between Germans and non-Germans.

The small sample size and number of paragraphs used makes it difficult to generalize these findings. A larger sample of rescuers and Nazis may have made the results more significant. A larger sample would have been particularly helpful when analyzing the differences in verdict between defendants (n = 14). Also, the small number of paragraphs used per individual may have contributed to greater variation of scores within groups, thus masking significant differences in complexity scores.

In laboratory settings, subjects are given the same topic to write about and scores across subjects are compared (Tetlock, 1995). The subjects in this data set talk about various topics. It is possible that some individuals are more complex when discussing different topics. One subject, for example, discusses the nuances of classical art in a complex manner (Goldensohn, 2004). Another subject in this study that received a high complexity score, asked to discuss classical art, may have been given a much lower score. The subject that discussed classical art may be very likely to talk about Jews in a far simpler manner. If all testimonies and interviews were confined to the same topic, perception of Jews for instance, differences may have been more significant. Previous studies have found a positive relationship between empathy and integrative complexity (Myyry, 2002). Empathy for Jews would have led to more complex statements if the subject matter focused on perception of Jews. This leads to a problem with measurement.
The use of interviews provided some uniformity in order to compare data, however, there were enough differences within and between groups that limit the strength of analysis. The contexts under which interviews were conducted likely had influence on results. Rescuers were likely more willing to disclose information, participated voluntarily in their interviews and likely developed positive and trusting relationships with their interviewers, while defendants were literally communicating in order to stay alive or reduce their possible sentences. These vastly different contexts may have had a strong influence on final integrative complexity scores.
Chapter Six: Conclusion

The goal of this research was to find if there existed a connection between the human virtue of open-mindedness and rescuing. Previous research on altruism during the Holocaust has looked for relationships between rescuing and various personality characteristics, demographics, and political and environmental factors. This research explored an additional factor, open-mindedness. Previous research has not examined the connection between open-mindedness and rescuing.

To measure open-mindedness, the author compared the integrative complexity scores of two populations, rescuers of Jews during the Holocaust and Nazi war crimes defendants. The integrative complexity construct is based on a seven-point scale. It determines the complexity of a speaker’s statement by determining whether the statement shows differentiation and/or integration. Differentiation entails the expression of multiple dimensions or points of view, while integration entails the elaboration of the manner in which differentiated components interact with each other (Baker-Brown, et. al., 1992).

Using archived interviews, the researcher scored integrative complexity for 15 rescuers and 14 Nazi war crimes defendants. Integrative complexity scores were used to predict whether a subject was a rescuer or perpetrator. Results did not find a difference between rescuers and Nazi defendants. So, rescuing did not appear to be related to rescuing. However, further analysis did reveal important patterns with regard to integrative complexity and perpetrating.
Results indicated that there were patterns between integrative complexity and war crimes tribunal outcomes. Analysis revealed that severity of sentence correlated. As severity of sentence increased from time in prison to death, integrative complexity scores were lower. That is, defendants given death sentences scored lower on complexity than defendants given sentences of time in prison. Rescuers and innocent defendants were more complex than guilty defendants.

These results lend support to previous research on integrative complexity and violence. Previous studies have found that increased integrative complexity is related to increased likelihood of peaceful resolutions conflict (Suedfeld, Tetlock & Ramirez, 1977). This research is consistent with previous research in that it shows a relationship between integrative complexity and war crimes convictions, which are indicative of perpetrating.

Demographic variables, including age, German nationality, and gender, did not show any relationship to integrative complexity. Word count did appear to have a relationship with integrative complexity. The nature of this relationship is unclear.

This study contains several limitations. For one, more historical context would help provide more meaningful results. The role that defendants played in perpetrating crimes against Jewish victims is unclear. Innocent defendants may have perpetrated, while some guilty defendants may have played minimal roles in exterminating Jews. Small sample size may also limit the ability to generalize findings to perpetrating in general or perpetrating during World War II.

There are also concerns with regard to uniformity between rescuer and Nazi interviews. Rescuer interviews were conducted decades after the war and were
voluntary. The subject matter that rescuers discussed is also praiseworthy. So, rescuers may have been more willing to share more information, which may have lead to increased complexity. Nazis, however, were interviewed under duress and the stress of possible death. Under different, less stress inducing circumstances, respondents may have received higher complexity scores. So, complexity scores may be more a result of environmental factors than dispositional factors (Tetlock, 1995).

And finally, researchers have discovered a relationship between empathy and integrative complexity (Myyry, 2002). It is unclear whether integrative complexity scores are measuring complexity, or merely measuring empathy. It is possible that higher rescuer integrative complexity scores result from scoring more sentences that include expressions of empathy. The nature of the interviews may have resulted in increased expressions of empathy by rescuers and decreased expression of empathy by Nazi defendants by virtue of the topics discussed. This could bear consequences for practitioners of conflict resolution.

If increased integrative complexity does lead to reduced perpetration, then practitioners may be able use interventions to increase complexity to reduce violence. However, if integrative complexity scores are merely an artifact of empathy, then interventions would be better focused on increasing empathy. Discovering a connection between integrative complexity and helping or hurting behaviors could be useful for practitioners of conflict resolution and peace studies. Therefore, further research could be beneficial. The following includes recommendations for future study.

Future studies may be able to address limitations found in this study. In order to provide more significant results, future studies could increase sample sizes. Samples
could also be selected taking into account more historical context in order to distinguish
the types of behaviors that perpetrators engaged in during the war. So, research can take
into account whether Nazis were involved in killing of Jews during the war, irrespective
of conviction. Some perpetrators may have escaped justice even though they engaged in
genocide.

Future research can also address issues regarding uniformity. Using interviews or
other materials that do not differ with regard to context could provide more meaningful
results. For example, researchers could compare the communications of Nazis, or future
Nazis, before the war.

And finally, future research could explore the relationship between empathy and
integrative complexity. Exploring this relationship might involve scoring for integrative
complexity while controlling for expressions of empathy. It may be that controlling for
subject matter or focus of a particular communication may result in different complexity
scores.

This research examined the, previously unexplored, relationship between integrative
complexity and rescuing during the Holocaust. Results did not appear to support this
connection. However, this research did find a connection between integrative complexity
and perpetration during the Holocaust. Integrative complexity does not appear to be
related to rescuing, but it does appear to be negatively correlated with perpetrating.
These results lend support to previous findings (Suedfeld, Tetlock & Ramirez) on
integrative complexity and the likelihood of engaging in violence. This thesis may also
provide a useful beginning for future research exploring the connection between
integrative complexity and altruism, which may inform research or practice in conflict resolution.
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