

[FindArticles](#) > [Journal of Social Issues](#) > [Fall, 1999](#) > [Article](#) > Print friendly

## **Gordon Willard Allport: A Tribute**

Thomas F. Pettigrew

Thomas F. Pettigrew [\*]

In tribute to Gordon Allport, this article discusses four interrelated topics. First, Allport's life at Harvard is briefly described. Next three interwoven features of his work are advanced to explain why his contributions to psychology are both unique and lasting. (1) His work offered a broadly eclectic balance of the many sides of psychology. (2) He repeatedly demonstrated the ability to formulate the discipline's central problems for the future and to propose innovative approaches to them. And (3) Allport's entire scholarly work presents a consistent, seamless and forceful perspective. These three points are then applied to his classic work *The Nature of Prejudice*. Though it was his most explicit attempt to influence public opinion, this famous volume also is balanced, ahead of its time, and elegantly written. It has organized the study of prejudice over the last half century. The article concludes with an explanation in personal terms for why those who knew him remember him so warmly 30 long years after his death.

With this issue, we honor the centennial of a great psychologist and a fine human being. As a doctoral student and colleague of Gordon Allport, I am pleased to provide my personal reflections on his life and work. This article discusses four interrelated topics. First, Allport's life at Harvard is sketched. Next, I attempt to capture what made his psychological contributions both unique and lasting. Then I apply this perspective to an analysis of his classic work *The Nature of Prejudice* (Allport, 1954, 1958). Finally, I explain in personal terms why those of us who were fortunate to have had our lives touched by him remember him so fondly three long decades after his death.

### **A Life at Harvard**

Back in 1915, Harvard's undergraduate admissions procedures were far simpler than those of today. Encouraged by his older brother, Floyd, Gordon left his Cleveland home and arrived in Cambridge a few weeks before school opened to take his entrance examinations. Fortunately, but not surprisingly, he passed. Thus began his half century affiliation with the university.

The Midwestern son of a Scottish American medical doctor, Gordon was awed by Harvard. Indeed, he never lost his awe. Later he wrote in an autobiographical chapter, "In the course of fifty years' association with Harvard I have never ceased to admire the unspoken expectation of excellence" (Allport, 1967). And I recall his deep satisfaction when Harvard's President Nathan Pusey, following the tradition of the time, came to his office on the third floor of William James Hall to ask him to continue his teaching past the then limit of 65 years of age.

Gordon's undergraduate career foretold the convergence of his adult interests in personality and social psychology, in science and social issues. He majored in both psychology and social ethics, and was impressed by his first teacher in psychology, Hugo Muensterberg. He spent much of his spare time in social service: conducting a boy's club in Boston, visiting for the Family Society, serving as a volunteer probation officer, registering homes for war workers, and aiding foreign students. This convergence of interests took institutional form later when he helped to establish both the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI) and Harvard's Department of Social Relations.

Upon graduation in 1919, Gordon seized the opportunity to be an early version of a Peace Corps volunteer. He

taught English and sociology at Robert College in Constantinople (then part of Greece, now Istanbul, Turkey). He made a lasting impression upon his Greek students; 36 years later, on his return trip from South Africa, they surprised him with a reunion party in Athens. In addition to German, Gordon remained partially fluent in modern Greek throughout his life--and delighted in using it to order mysterious dishes for his friends at Greek restaurants.

Returning to Harvard in 1920, he completed his PhD in psychology in just two years. Gordon's dissertation title again reflected his dual commitment to science and social concerns: *An Experimental Study of the Traits of Personality: With Special Reference to the Problem of Social Diagnosis*. In addition, he somehow found time to assist his brother, who was then editor of the *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*--the start of more than four decades of association with the publication (Pettigrew, 1969).

Harvard then awarded him a coveted Sheldon Travelling Fellowship--"a second intellectual dawn," as he later described it. He spent the first year in Germany, where the new Gestalt school and its emphasis on cognition fascinated him. Indeed, he became a partial Gestaltist, partial because he could not accept the Gestaltists' assumptions about the hard-wiring of cognitive processes (Allport & Pettigrew, 1957; Pettigrew, 1979). He spent his second Sheldon year at Cambridge University, where the British psychologists of the day coolly received his reports on Gestalt developments. On his return home, he married Ada Lufkin Gould, a clinical psychologist herself.

In 1924, Gordon became a Harvard instructor in social ethics under Richard Clarke Cabot. Two years later he temporarily severed his connection with Harvard to accept an assistant professorship in psychology at Dartmouth. Yet even during his brief four years at Hanover, he returned repeatedly to Harvard to teach in summer school. In 1930 he came back to Harvard to stay.

His contributions to the University were many. In 1924, Gordon taught what was probably the first personality course given in a North American college. In 1931, he served on the faculty committee that established Harvard's sociology department. In the late 1940s, he fashioned an introductory course for the new social relations department into a rigorous and popular undergraduate class. More than 300 PhDs recall Gordon best for his 18-year service as the chair of the Committee on Higher Degrees of the social relations department. "He knew all the rules," admired one graduate student, "but he never internalized them."

Gordon occasionally spoke briefly at morning chapel in Memorial Church. But a corrective note for the record is in order here. He was an Episcopalian who gave several famous lectures at divinity schools and conducted research on the relationship between religious beliefs and intergroup prejudice. From these facts, a Swedish theological student somehow concluded a few years ago that Gordon was a deeply devout man who had suffered extreme religious persecution at "godless Harvard"! The student wrote me to confirm his theory. With considerable detail, I tried to correct this interpretation: devout yes, but never "persecuted." The writer never answered me, but the misconception later reappeared in Canada from yet another biographer.

### Allport's Unique Contributions

Gordon's unique contributions to psychology are best described by three interwoven features of his work. First, he offered a broadly eclectic balance of the many sides of the discipline, holding to William James's contention that there were "multiple avenues to the truth." Second, he had an uncanny ability to formulate the central problems for the future and to propose original approaches to them. And finally, his entire body of scholarly work presents a consistent, seamless, and forceful perspective. Let me illustrate each of these points.

#### Broadly Eclectic Balance

Gordon sought an eclectic balance for both methods and theory. His two famous volumes on personality--*Personality: A Psychological Interpretation* (Allport, 1937) and *Pattern and Growth in Personality*

(Allport, 1961)--illustrate this dominant feature of his work (Pettigrew, 1990). He urged, for example, the use of both ideographic (individual) and nomothetic (universal) methods. Because he thought the discipline relied too heavily on nomothetic approaches, he sought greater use of ideographic techniques. In an age of indirection, Gordon insisted, "If you want to know something about a person, why not first ask him?" (Allport, 1953). Considered scandalously naive when he introduced it, his position helped to right the balance in assessment.

Typically, this was an expansionist, not an exclusionist, view. He simply sought a reasonable trade-off between accuracy and adequacy. He thought the two approaches together would make for "a broadened psychology." Indeed, his own empirical efforts ranged from personal documents (Allport, 1942), such as *Letters From Jenny* (Allport, 1965), to two popular nomothetic tests on ascendance-submission and personal values (Allport & Allport, 1928; Allport, Vernon, & Lindzey, 1951). Gordon also developed ingenious experimental procedures to study eidetic imagery (Allport 1924, 1928), expressive movement (Allport & Vernon, 1933), radio effects (Allport & Cantril, 1935), rumor (Allport & Postman, 1947), the trapezoidal window illusion (Allport & Pettigrew, 1957), and binocular rivalry (Pettigrew, Allport, & Barnett, 1958).

His theoretical efforts also sought a balance. He vigorously advocated an open-system theory of personality with emphases on individuality, proaction, consciousness, maturity, and the unity of personality. As such, in Rosenzweig's (1970, p. 60) view, Gordon served as the field's "ego" in contrast to Henry Murray's "id" and Edwin Boring's "super-ego"! Only those who recall all three of these Harvardians can fully appreciate Rosenzweig's insight. Yet Gordon did not hold his emphases to be the only matters of importance for a psychology of personality. Rather, it was because he believed the discipline was granting these important ego concerns short shrift.

In this sense, Gordon was, to borrow from boxing, a counterpuncher. He opposed what he regarded as excessive trends in psychology that threatened his conception of an open, balanced discipline. In 1937, in his first *Personality* book, he saw as the major threat the too rigid applications of experimental psychology in the spirit of Wundt and Titchener. By 1961, in his second *Personality* volume, he saw as the major threat the too loose applications of psychoanalysis (Pettigrew, 1990).

"Although much of my writing is polemic in tone," he confessed in his autobiography, "I know in my bones that my opponents are partly right." The key word here is partly. Gordon opposed excess, "the strong aura of arrogance found in ... fashionable dogmas" (Allport, 1968, pp. 405-406). So he held fast to the open middle ground as he perceived it, and aimed his punches at the "fashionable dogmas" that existed in each period. Modern readers may miss the significance of his arguments if they are unaware of which dragons he is attempting to slay.

### Formulating Central Problems and Offering Original Solutions

Psychology recognized Gordon throughout his career as a source for specifying the discipline's central problems. Typically his solutions to the problems--functional autonomy, traits, the proprium (Allport, 1955, 1961), etc.--won limited acceptance when initially proposed. As an undergraduate psychology major at the University of Virginia in the early 1950s, I recall vividly how my instructors repeatedly used functional autonomy to illustrate "unscientific" concepts. This ridicule served as my introduction to the man I would study and work with for 15 years.

Nonetheless, many of Gordon's initial proposals for addressing basic problems now exist in our literature with new labels and enlarged meanings. Gordon only loosely sketched out his innovative ideas. Later work accepted the problem and expanded the ideas. Consider the much derided concept of functional autonomy. The notion that motives can become independent of their origins was widely considered heretical in 1937. Slowly, psychology came to accept the phenomenon if not the formulation. Today social psychologists typically reconceptualize the process in interactionist terms. Motives, established and functional in one situation, help lead individuals to new situations where the same motives persist but assume new functions.

Similarly, Allport's conception of personality traits has often been criticized. What critics attack is the mistaken notion that Gordon held a static view of traits as pervasive, cross-situational consistencies in behavior. But Zuroff (1986) has persuasively shown that Gordon advanced a far more dynamic conception of traits. In fact, he was, in Zuroff's (1986, p. 993) words, "an interactionist in the sense that he recognized behavior is determined by the person and situation."

Indeed, to reread Allport's work today is to see how he broke early ground for many ideas now fully developed and accepted. Thus, he provided in his 1937 volume what many would now call a social constructionist interpretation of identity. And his insistence on multiple indicators and methods offered an initial statement of Campbell and Fiske's (1959) multitrait-multimethod approach.

### A Consistent, Forceful Perspective

Above all, Gordon's contributions to psychology flowed from a consistent and forceful perspective presented in graceful prose. One reviewer of his 1937 *Personality* book wrote, "One has all the way through it a distinct feeling that 'This is Allport'" (Hollingworth, 1938, p. 103). This pointed observation holds true for all his writing.

Gordon's perspective remained consistent but not static throughout his career. I always admired his comprehensive knowledge of the psychological literature, a knowledge that accrued from his long years as a meticulous editor. Quite literally, a large proportion of North America's personality and social psychological literature of his time had crossed his editor's desk. His mastery of the literature also reflected his open-ended view of theory, a view more Popperian than the strict Vienna circle positivism that held sway throughout most of his career.

Yet Gordon held to his perspective forcefully. Those of us who witnessed the annual debates in the personality seminar between Harry Murray and Gordon could never doubt that both men held strongly to their contrasting perspectives. And Gordon's writing conveyed this forcefulness. Blunt prose and forthright critiques characterized his style. As one disgruntled reviewer of an Allport book put it. "There is something in it to irritate almost everyone" (Adelson, 1956, p. 68).

In their perceptive chapter on Allport, Hall and Lindzey (1957, pp. 258-259) suggest another reason for his direct style:

Against the background of ... many years of college teaching, it should come as no surprise that in much of his professional writing Allport displays a deliberate didactic intent. In contrast to most technical writers, whose primary goal appears to be the construction of irreproachable statements that defy the efforts of the critic to find a tooth-hold, Allport seems much more interested in expressing issues in a salient, provocative fashion.

To sum up, I think Gordon's contributions to psychology proved important and lasting for at least three reasons: (1) a broad balance of emphases that helped to establish a solid middle ground in an exceptionally diverse discipline, (2) the foresight and ability to formulate the field's central problems and advance initial solutions, and (3) a consistent and seamless perspective, rendered in elegant prose, that is distinctively "Allport."

### The Nature of Prejudice in Context

Consider the focus of this issue, *The Nature of Prejudice*, in this context. This influential volume again brought together Gordon's two sides, science and social action. He once told me that it was his proudest achievement because he thought it "had done some good in the world." He took particular pride in seeing it on sale in airports and drugstores. Indeed, in its Anchor Book paperback edition (Allport, 1958)--40% shorter than the original (Allport, 1954)--it became one of the best selling social psychological books in publishing history.

The *Nature of Prejudice* displays the three special characteristics of Gordon's contributions to psychology. The volume offers a broad, eclectic perspective with a lens model that ranges from history to the psychological effects of prejudice on its victims. Although I think it underrepresents social factors, it spans psychology's many subfields. Its open view of the many sides of the phenomenon again demonstrates the distinctive quality of Gordon's wide-ranging thought.

The *Nature of Prejudice* is another seamless work that is "Allportian" from start to finish. Two of my Santa Cruz colleagues, Elliot Aronson and Brewster Smith, have expressed it best "The *Nature of Prejudice*," wrote Aronson (1978, p. 92), "is a remarkable mixture of careful scholarship and humane values. . . . The book has influenced an entire generation of social psychologists, and deservedly so." Adds Smith (1978, P. 31): "His pervasive fairmindedness, his democratic values, and his concern for evidence continues to set a model for humane, problem-focused social science."

The book also is deftly crafted in a simpler style than Gordon's other writings; this made it accessible, as he had hoped, to a wider, nonacademic audience. In addition, as Aronson makes clear, it served to structure the entire study of prejudice in social psychology over the past four decades. This is true for intergroup research in the United States. And in its many translated versions, it has proven highly influential in Europe and other parts of the world as well (Pettigrew, 1998b). Indeed, the volume's many predictions, though fashioned by American intergroup data, have typically been confirmed in studies of intergroup prejudice throughout much of the world (e.g., Pedersen & Walker, 1997; Pettigrew, 1997a, 1997b, 1997c, 1998a, 1998b; Pettigrew et al., 1997).

The *Nature of Prejudice*'s useful definition of prejudice--"an antipathy based upon a faulty and inflexible generalization" (Allport, 1954, p. 9)--stressed both affective and cognitive components, but it wisely left the complex link between prejudice and behavior an open, empirical question. This definition has served the field well, and only recently have social psychologists advanced expansions of its terms (Brown, 1995; Smith, 1993).

To attain his distinctive quality of balance, Gordon again assumed the role of counterpuncher against prevailing dogmas. He gave full recognition to the importance of the psychoanalytically inspired authoritarian personality syndrome (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950), which, incidentally, he also had uncovered during the 1940s (Allport & Kramer, 1946). But he challenged the Freudian formulation of aggression. In a modest chapter that has never received the attention it deserves, Gordon presented a rival theory. Instead of the psychoanalytic steam boiler model of aggression and catharsis, Gordon proposed a feedback model with dramatically different implications for prejudice and its remediation. Aggression, Gordon argued, feeds on itself. That is, the acting out of aggression, rather than leading to less aggression, actually increases the probability that further aggression will be expressed. Armed with this insight, *The Nature of Prejudice* proceeds to advocate governmental policies that have indeed reduced levels of prejudice in the United States and elsewhere.

Gordon also challenged the central assumption of one of his own favorite groups. Once Hitler gave prejudice a bad name, the Human Relations Movement developed after World War II to improve America's intergroup relations. With Brotherhood Weeks and Dinners, the well-meaning movement hoped to combat prejudice and discrimination through formal intergroup contact. But Gordon, in what became the book's most important theoretical contribution, questioned this assumption with his intergroup contact hypothesis. Contact alone, he argued, only set the scene for change; what mattered were the situational conditions of the intergroup interaction. And the four conditions he listed--equal status in the situation, common goals, no intergroup competition, and authority sanction--have repeatedly been supported in research around the globe (Pettigrew, 1998a).

The book also countered the then fashionable assumption that group stereotypes were simply the aberrant cognitive distortions of "prejudiced personalities." Advancing the view now universally accepted, Gordon held that the cognitive components of prejudice were natural extensions of normal processes. Stereotypes and

prejudgment, he concluded, were not aberrant at all, but unfortunately all too human.

How could Gordon have foreseen the many advances, especially in research on group stereotypes, that this field has achieved over recent decades? I believe it was his early Gestalt leanings from his Sheldon scholarship year in Germany (Pettigrew, 1979). He devoted 10 of the volume's 31 chapters to cognitive factors. Psychology joined the cognitive revolution just after *The Nature of Prejudice* was published. In social psychology, social cognition-inspired by Heider (1958)- veered in a largely Gestalt direction that had molded Gordon's perspective on prejudice. In short, the same influences that shaped the study of prejudice in general and stereotypes in particular from 1960 on had earlier guided Gordon's thought.

*The Nature of Prejudice* also presents a host of original hypotheses on specific topics that have stood the test of time. Consider two examples. One currently popular theory of prejudice reduction is the Common Ingroup Identity Model (Anastasio, Bachman, Gaertner, & Dovidio, 1997; Gaertner, Dovidio, Anastasio, Bachman, & Rust, 1993; Gaertner, Rust, Dovidio, Bachman, & Anastasio, 1994). It emphasizes recategorization through identity with larger, more inclusive groups. Four decades ago, Allport (1958, pp. 41-43) advocated precisely the same mechanism. Drawing concentric circles with family in the center and humankind at the periphery, he argued that "concentric loyalties need not clash" and that prejudice is minimized by inclusive group membership. Recent research by Gaertner and his colleagues demonstrates how this process operates.

For another example, the volume devotes an entire chapter to the link between religion and prejudice. It disturbed Allport deeply that research routinely finds nonbelievers far less prejudiced on average than members of organized religions. He proposed a critical distinction between an "institutionalized" religious outlook and an "interiorized" one (Allport, 1958, pp. 420-422). The more numerous institutionally religious, he argued, are the highly prejudiced. Those of the interiorized type, who have deeply internalized their religious beliefs, are far less prejudiced.

In his last empirical publication (Allport & Ross, 1967), Gordon presented additional evidence in support of his hypothesis as well as scales to measure the two types. Recently, while analyzing survey data from seven probability samples of western Europe, I had occasion to retest his idea. And the results provide clear support. As usual, the nonreligious on average are less prejudiced against a wide variety of outgroups. But this result reflected the high prejudice of those who attend religious services only occasionally or about every week. However, low average prejudice scores emerge for those who attend services more than once a week, a crude indicator of interiorized religiosity in these samples (Pettigrew, 1997c).

From a larger perspective, Gordon's influence in structuring the study of prejudice is, perhaps, greater now than ever before. The cognitive emphasis of *The Nature of Prejudice* came into vogue in social cognition work in this area during the 1960s and 1970s. Without a doubt, the field made major advances in understanding the many facets of group stereotypes. But this single-minded concentration on stereotypes led to a serious neglect of the affective component of prejudice. Indeed, some work came perilously close to ignoring prejudice altogether in its focus on the cognitive components alone. Ironically, it was left to social psychologists in sociology to attend to emotional factors.

Had Gordon lived into the 1970s, I am certain he would have regarded this situation as a serious imbalance. And in his counterpuncher style, he would have given in rebuttal greater emphasis to emotion and motivation in any new edition he might have written. After all, he had insisted on emotion-hate, envy, fear, threat-as central to the prejudice phenomenon.

Fortunately, psychological social psychologists began to redress the imbalance in the 1980s (Pettigrew, 1997a; E. R. Smith, 1993). Two seminal volumes on stereotypes, both edited by David Hamilton, illustrate the dramatic shift. In *Cognitive Processes in Stereotyping and Intergroup Behavior* (Hamilton, 1981), the "push-cognitive-explanations-to-the-maximum" strategy was still in full force. Affect receives brief mention; motivation a bit more; mood and emotion are not even in the index. In sharp contrast, the 1993 volume on

Affect, Cognition and Stereotyping, edited by Dianne Mackie and Hamilton, centers on the topic. Intergroup relations specialists like myself are far more comfortable with this new view for it is more congruent with our nonexperimental data on prejudice and group conflict. And this more balanced approach is far closer to the research on prejudice that Allport envisioned for the future.

One last point about this classic work requires mention. Gordon addressed the book primarily to his own ingroup: White, Protestant, American males. The examples of prejudice cited throughout involve anti-Black, anti-Jewish, anti-Catholic and anti-female sentiments. He was clearly lecturing to "his own kind." It is safe, easy, and politically expedient to attack the prejudices of outgroups who hold negative views of one's own ingroup. It is quite a different matter to attack the prejudices of one's own ingroup toward others. So yet another remarkable feature of *The Nature of Prejudice* is its target audience.

All these qualities, let me assure you, make it extremely difficult to write a second edition of such a classic tome. During his final illness in 1967, Gordon called former doctoral students in one by one to his bedside to give us our last assignments. My task was to produce another edition of *The Nature of Prejudice*. He knew I would add more sociological material, but he asked me to maintain as best I could his table of contents. He was proud of the book's organization, because he knew it had served the field well. Only now, in co-authorship with Marylee Taylor of Pennsylvania State University, am I bold enough to take on this formidable responsibility. We shall call it Allport's *Nature of Prejudice*, in the manner of such other classics as *Gray's Anatomy*.

#### Allport's Unique Personality

Beyond his many accomplishments, those of us who knew him well remember Gordon as a great teacher and a fine human being. Though intellectually confident, he was actually a shy and modest man. Because of the stereotype people often harbor of professors in general and Harvard professors in particular, many mistook his shyness for aloofness. Perhaps his role as gatekeeper with the dreaded Committee on Higher Degrees added to this fearsome impression among those graduate students who never got to know him personally. But this perception of aloofness could not have been more mistaken.

One way Gordon handled his social shyness was to prepare carefully for occasions in advance. Before giving his famous Hoernle Lecture at South Africa's leading Afrikaner university at Stellenbosch in 1956, he studied Afrikaans with a tutor for six months. Given his talent for languages and his fluent German, Gordon went to South Africa linguistically prepared. He skillfully gave the introduction to his lecture in near perfect Afrikaans, gracefully apologizing for why he could not deliver his entire address in Afrikaans. I recall how the Afrikaner audience, accustomed to even their fellow South Africans not knowing their obscure language, reacted with surprise and delight. The audience arose as one with applause at the close of the introduction.

Occasionally, his considerate preparations backfired. Before meeting my mother for the first time, he prepared in advance to hold a conversation he thought would be of interest to an elderly southern lady. So he had checked on the flowers and plants of my native Virginia. But there was one problem. My mother did not know the first thing about such botanical matters!

In relating to graduate students, Gordon was typically formal yet supportive. Rather than demanding excellence, he simply expected it from his students. And toward that end, he gave unstintingly of his time in carefully editing everything we wrote--even years after we had received our doctorates. Indeed, he taught us how to write, though his old students still quake to the single word, "Recast." When scribbled in the margin, it meant the entire paragraph required a complete reworking.

A firm believer in the uniqueness of personality, Gordon practiced what he preached with his doctoral students. He let us follow our own pursuits and methods, and thus never developed a "school" of followers. Coming from an engineering background, I was fascinated with factor analysis as a graduate student and inserted one in my doctoral dissertation. Before the days of computers and statistical packages, it required a full week of

calculations. So I was quite proud of the accomplishment. But Gordon abhorred factor analysis as the ultimate expression of extreme nomothetic methods. He quietly suggested that the analysis added nothing to my thesis, but he did not insist that I remove it. Years later, I realized he was right: the factor analysis contributed nothing whatsoever to my thesis.

Gordon preferred an unpretentious lifestyle and paid scant attention to money matters. Hence, Eleanor Sprague, his loyal and efficient secretary for many years, completed his income tax forms for him annually. But, reflecting his Scottish socialization, Gordon was thrifty and regarded waste as evil. It hurt him that each year most of a large blueberry crop at his summer cottage near Lincolnville, Maine, went unharvested. So he contracted with a local farmer one year to harvest and sell the crop for him. Much to his chagrin, the farmer's bill totaled more than \$500 while the crop fetched less than \$300. Sam Stouffer, the beloved sociologist and wit of the old social relations department, never let Gordon forget the episode. To Gordon's amusement, Sam routinely called him "the blueberry king"!

### A Final Word

In 1963, 55 of Gordon's PhDs and close friends surprised him with a testimonial gathering in Washington, DC. We gave him two bound volumes containing a published article from each old student that best represented his influence on us. Inside was the dedication: "From his students--in appreciation of his respect for their individuality."

Allport was deeply moved by the occasion. Yet what I recall best from the evening was a revelation about Gordon that I had not known. One by one, we rose during the evening to express our individual appreciation for his support throughout our careers. We were especially grateful for his patient help on our dissertations.

Then European psychologists began to speak with a different message. "You thank him for your theses," remarked one middle-aged woman, "but I thank him for my life." Then others rose with similar stories. Gordon had aided them all--in many cases persuaded them--to flee Nazi Germany. And though it was in the midst of the Great Depression, he had worked hard to find them employment in North America. I knew he had helped William Stern, who went to Duke University in 1934. But he had never mentioned that he had served as a one-man refugee operation for psychologists during the 1930s.

So there are many reasons, both personal and professional, why it is highly appropriate that this issue of the journal of the organization he helped to found be devoted to Gordon Allport and his work on intergroup prejudice.

THOMAS F. PETTIGREW is Research Professor of Social Psychology at the University of California, Santa Cruz. He earned his BA at the University of Virginia (1952) and his MA and PhD at Harvard University (1955, 1956). He has taught at the Universities of North Carolina (1956-57), Harvard (1957-80), Amsterdam (1986-91) and California (1980-). In 1967-68, he served as President of SPSSI. Specializing throughout his career in intergroup relations, Pettigrew's books include *A Profile of the Negro American* (1964), *Racially Separate or Together* (1971), *Racial Discrimination in the U.S.* (1975), *The Sociology of Race Relations* (1980), and *How to Think Like a Social Scientist* (1996).

(\*.) Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Thomas F. Pettigrew, Psychology Department, Social Sciences II, University of California, Santa Cruz, CA 95064 [e-mail: [pettigr@cats.ucsc.edu](mailto:pettigr@cats.ucsc.edu)].

### References

Adelson, J. (1956). On man's goodness. [Review of *Becoming: Basic considerations for a psychology of personality*]. *Contemporary Psychology*, 1, 67-69.

Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*.



New York: Harper & Row.

Allport, G. W. (1924). Eidetic imagery. *British Journal of Psychology*, 15, 99-120.

Allport, G. W. (1928). The eidetic image and the after-image. *American Journal of Psychology*, 40, 418-425.

Allport, G. W. (1937). *Personality: A psychological interpretation*. New York: Holt.

Allport, G. W. (1942). The use of personal documents in psychological science (Bulletin No. 49). New York: Social Science Research Council.

Allport, G. W. (1953). The trend in motivational theory. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 25, 107-119.

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Allport, G. W. (1955). *Becoming: Basic considerations for a psychology of personality*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Allport, G. W. (1958). *The nature of prejudice*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday Anchor Books.

Allport, G. W. (1961). *Pattern and growth in personality*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Allport, G. W. (1965). *Letters from Jenny*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Allport, G. W. (1967). Gordon W. Allport. In E. G. Boring & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *A history of psychology in autobiography* (Vol. 5, pp. 1-25). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Allport, G. W. (1968). *The person in psychology: Selected essays*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Allport, G. W., & Allport, F. H. (1928). *A-S reaction study*. Boston: Houghton.

Allport, G. W., & Cantril, H. (1935). *The psychology of radio*. New York: Harper.

Allport, C. W., & Kramer, B. M. (1946). Some roots of prejudice. *Journal of Psychology*, 22, 9-39.

Allport, C. W., & Pettigrew, T. F. (1957). Cultural influence on the perception of movement: The trapezoidal illusion among Zulus. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 55, 104-113.

Allport, G. W., & Postman, L. (1947). *The psychology of rumor*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Allport, C. W., & Ross, J. M. (1967). Personal religious orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 5, 432-443.

Allport, G. W., & Vernon, P. E. (1933). *Studies in expressive movement*. New York: Macmillan.

Allport, G. W., Vernon, P. E., & Lindzey, C. (1951). *A study of values* (Rev. ed.). Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Anastasio, P., Bachman, B., Gaertner, S., & Dovidio, J. (1997). Categorization, recategorization and common ingroup identity. In R. Spears, P. J. Oakes, N. Ellemers, S. A. Haslam (Eds.), *The social psychology of stereotyping and group life* (pp. 236-256). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Aronson, E. (1978). Reconsiderations: The nature of prejudice. *Human Nature*, 1, 92-94,96.

Brown, R. (1995). *Prejudice: Its social psychology*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Campbell, D. T., & Fiske, D. W. (1959). Convergent and discriminate validation of the multitrait-multimethod

matrix. *Psychological Bulletin*, 56, 81-105.

Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., Anastasio, P. A., Bachman, B. A., & Rust, M. C. (1993). The common ingroup identity model: Recategorization and the reduction of intergroup bias. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 4, 1-26.

Gaertner, S. L., Rust, M. C., Dovidio, J. F., Bachman, B. A., & Anastasio, P. A. (1994). The contact hypothesis: The role of a common ingroup identity on reducing intergroup bias. *Small Group Research*, 25, 224-249.

Hall, C. S., & Lindzey, G. (1957). *Theories of personality*. New York: Wiley.

Hamilton, D. L. (Ed.). (1981). *Cognitive processes in stereotyping and intergroup behavior*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. New York: Wiley.

Hollingworth, H. L. (1938). [Review of Personality]. *Psychological Bulletin*, 35, 103-107.

Mackie, D. M., & Hamilton, D. L. (Eds.). (1993). *Affect, cognition, and stereotyping: Interactive processes in group perception*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Gordon Willard Allport: A Tribute

Pedersen, A., & Walker, I. (1997). Prejudice against Australian Aborigines: Old-fashioned and modern forms. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 27, 561-587.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1969). Gordon Willard Allport: 1897-1967. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 12, 1-5.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1979). The ultimate attribution error: Extending Allport's cognitive analysis of prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 5, 461-476.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1990). A bold stroke for personality a half-century ago: A retrospective review of Gordon Allport's *Personality: A psychological interpretation*. *Contemporary Psychology*, 35, 533-536.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1997a). The affective component of prejudice: Results from western Europe. In S. A. Tuch & J. K. Martin (Eds.), *Racial attitudes in the 1990s: Continuity and change* (pp. 76-90). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1997b). Generalized intergroup contact effects on prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 173-185.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1997c). Religion and prejudice: Retesting Allport's theory. Unpublished manuscript, University of California, Santa Cruz.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1998a). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49, 65-85.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1998b). Reactions to the new minorities of western Europe. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24, 77-103.

Pettigrew, T. F., Allport, G. W., & Barnett, E. O. (1959). Binocular resolution and perception of race in South Africa. *British Journal of Psychology*, 49, 265-278.

Pettigrew, T. F., Jackson, J., Ben Brika, J., Lemain, G., Meertens, R. W., Wagner, U., & Zick, A. (1997). Outgroup prejudice in western Europe. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 8, 241-273.

- Rosenzweig, S. (1970). E.G. Boring and the Zeitgeist: Eruditione gesta beavit. *Journal of Psychology*, 75, 59-71.
- Smith, E. R. (1993). Social identity and social emotions: Toward new conceptions of prejudice. In D. M. Mackie & D. L. Hamilton (Eds.), *Affect, cognition, and stereotyping: Interactive processes in group perception* (pp. 297-315). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Smith, M. B. (1978). The psychology of prejudice. *New York University Education Quarterly*, 9(2), 20-32.
- Zuroff, D.C. (1986). Was Gordon Allport a trait theorist? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 993-1000.

COPYRIGHT 1999 Plenum Publishing Corporation

COPYRIGHT 2000 Gale Group