

## Elliot Turiel

- Born in 1938 on the Island of Rhodes, Italy
- Spouse: Judy Steinberg Turiel
- B.B.A. (1960) City College of New York, Ph.D. in Psychology (1965) Yale University



### Major Employment

- At the University of California - Berkeley:
  - Jerome A. Hutto Professor of Education: 1980-Present
  - Research Psychologist, Institute of Human Development: 1980-Present
  - Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, Graduate School of Education: 2002-07
  - Chair of the Division of Educational Psychology, Department of Education: 1986-92
- Associate Professor of Education and Social Psychology, Harvard University: 1969-75

### Major Areas of Work

- Adolescence, cognitive development, moral and ethical studies, social and emotional development

### SRCD Affiliation

- Editorial Board of Child Development (1984-90), Consulting Editor of Monographs of the SRCD

## SRCD Oral History Interview

Elliot Turiel

University of California - Berkeley

Interviewed by Melanie Killen

In Dr. Turiel's Office, University of California - Berkeley  
November 11, 2010 and January 2, 2011

### Part 1: November 11, 2010

Killen: Today's November 11<sup>th</sup>, 2010, and I am at UC Berkeley talking with Elliot Turiel for the SRCD Oral History Project. This will be the interview protocol with Elliot in his office and, to begin with, Elliot, can you please give us your full name as you would like it printed and your affiliation?

Turiel: My name is Elliot Turiel and I'm in the Graduate School of Education at the University of California - Berkeley. I'm also the Co-Director of the Institute of Human Development at the same university.

Killen: Okay. And you were my PhD advisor when I was in graduate school at UC Berkeley and I'm now back here some years later to interview you for this project.

Turiel: Welcome back.

Killen: Thank you. And, as mentioned, it's 1:30 Pacific Standard Time, November 11<sup>th</sup>, 2010. Okay. Elliot, there's a number of different areas that we like to cover in these interviews and, well, I have some questions in front of me. We really want this to just be very informal and for you to talk about sort of a number of different topics that we think will be important for this oral history project. I thought maybe it would be nice to start with what we would refer to as your

**general sort of intellectual history. And maybe you could talk a little bit about your family background and your childhood and adolescent experiences that contributed to your growing up.**

Turiel: All right. I guess I can go back to my very early experiences. I was born into a Sephardic Jewish family on the island of Rhodes, which was originally part of Greece, but then became Italian and was Italian when I was born there in 1938. And there were experiences that I should probably tell you about that were related to World War II and the Holocaust. We were part of a Jewish community there and, during the war, things were relatively calm for Jews, until the end of the war when the Germans came and ousted the Italians after they had a break with the Italians. And at that point the Germans decided to deport all the Jews from Rhodes and other Greek islands and the Greek mainland. And what happened was that, because my mother had come from Turkey and maintained her Turkish citizenship, we were essentially rescued by a Turkish consul, who lived in Rhodes. He intervened with the Germans and, at much risk to himself, talked them into letting a few Jewish families go and avoid deportation to Auschwitz. And the reason he was able to do that is because Turkey was neutral at the time and the Germans wanted to keep in their good graces. But they weren't happy about it and he took great risks to do this and even deceived the Germans by telling them that there were certain Turkish laws that they had to abide by, because any Turkish citizen was under his protection and that included any family members who weren't Turkish citizens, which was the case for my father. So we all essentially escaped a close call and primarily due to what this Turkish consul was able to do.

**Killen: Why do you think that your family was one of the few families that were able to escape?**

Turiel: Well, because my mother was a Turkish citizen. Most of the families were of Italian citizenship and he could only get away -- he was trying to save as many people as he could -- but he could really only get away with doing it for families that had Turkish citizens within the family.

**Killen: That's a very dramatic story. Did you ever get to go back and find out more about this person?**

Turiel: Yes, I did, initially not by going back, but by doing some investigation about him and what he had done. And actually my brother and my mother got in touch with him because a Jewish organization in New York, B'nai B'rith, wanted to honor him for what he did. And I was living in California. I wasn't able to go there. But they went and met him when he obtained an award from them and then he was also honored in Yad Vashem, which is the main Holocaust museum in Israel. My mother actually went for that ceremony. I've read a good deal about all of this and actually met his son on a couple of occasions, who was also a Turkish ambassador. He was Chief of Protocol at the United Nations. So in recent years we had a good deal of involvement with that family.

**Killen: So what happened at that point? So then your family got to escape the Island of Rhodes. What happened next?**

Turiel: Well, yes, they deported the whole Jewish community, which consisted of about 1,700 people just from Rhodes.

**Killen: 1,700?**

Turiel: Yes, and many more from Salonica and other Greek islands. We stayed there for a while but we intended to leave and go to Turkey and join my mother's family. It took a while to make the arrangements and we had to make two tries. At one point -- I should say that Rhodes is very close to Turkey and you can go by boat in a few hours, four or five hours at that time. Now you can go on faster boats. And we initially hired somebody to take us across the way to Turkey in a big rowboat, which sprung a leak before we got too far and we had to come back and wait a couple of months. And then we tried again on a bigger boat, I think it was a sailboat, and, in any case, we made it to Turkey to a town in Southern Turkey and, from there, we went to Izmir where my mother's family lived. We

stayed there for about a year and a half and then went to New York. And so when we left Rhodes I was six years old, and we got to New York when I was eight years old.

**Killen:** So can you remember anything that was going through your mind when this was happening? I mean, what were you, as a six year old, thinking about, and what did you -- what were you -- how were you interpreting it all?

Turiel: Well, there were air raids on Rhodes because the Italians were there and I was very aware of that, and this is before the Germans came. So, for example, there was a time when we were sitting in our house eating lunch and all of a sudden we saw the building across the way go up in flames because it had been hit by a bomb.

**Killen:** Oh my goodness.

Turiel: Or there's another story--

**Killen:** Were you scared? I mean, it's frightening.

Turiel: Yeah, sure, it was very frightening. We used to go for the air raids, when there was advance notice with the usual sirens we would go down to the basement to wait it out. And there's another story I remember well, which is that I had a stomach ache one night and it was persisting so the doctor came and he thought I had appendicitis and he was getting ready to take me to the hospital for an operation. And then the sirens went off, so we had to go down to the air raid shelter and it took a while, but by the time it was all over my stomach ache was gone. So it wasn't appendicitis and I avoided the surgery because of that. But that's a side story. There were a lot of frightening moments when you had to scurry home and get into the air raid shelter.

**Killen:** Did your parents talk about it to you? I mean, was it--

Turiel: Afterwards you mean?

**Killen:** --no, during the time, did they explain to you what was happening or--

Turiel: I don't remember.

**Killen:** Yes.

Turiel: I don't remember. I'm sure we did, but I don't really have recollections of that. But I have recollections of the events. I remember all that was going on when the Germans were rounding up the Jewish community and when we left.

**Killen:** So you then came to New York when you were eight?

Turiel: Yes.

**Killen:** And where did you live in New York?

Turiel: Well, we lived on the upper west side and I went to public schools near there for elementary school--

**Killen:** Which schools did you go to?

Turiel: --and junior -- well, one was called PS9 and then I went to Joan of Arc Junior High School, and then I went to Stuyvesant, which was not in the neighborhood. That was downtown and I--

**Killen:** It's in Greenwich Village?

Turiel: --no, I mean, now it's south of the village near Battery Park, but when I went there it was on 15<sup>th</sup> Street and 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue.

**Killen:** Yes, I thought it was the east side.

Turiel: Yes. Now it's on the west side.

**Killen:** Oh, okay.

Turiel: But it used to be on the east side and I would take the subway there every day.

**Killen:** Do you remember your first impressions of New York City?

Turiel: Yes, I liked it. I found it interesting. It was fun. I made friends. I enjoyed it. I don't remember having any difficulty at all learning English.

**Killen:** That's amazing.

Turiel: I started in the second grade I think and--

**Killen:** So what was the language at home?

Turiel: --well, I actually spoke Greek and Italian, but I've forgotten that. At home we spoke Spanish, which is known as Ladino. It's Sephardic Spanish.

**Killen:** Can you spell Ladino for the--

Turiel: L-A-D-I-N-O, and what it is, is it's sort of the counterpart to Yiddish and it's a 14<sup>th</sup> century Spanish that wasn't modernized and a lot of words from other languages have been incorporated into the language. But that's what we spoke at home. There were a lot of families in New York. My parents had a whole network of friends who were from Rhodes and Turkey.

**Killen:** From Rhodes?

Turiel: Yes.

**Killen:** Do you mean they escaped as well?

Turiel: Well, they had left earlier. No, they had left earlier. There was a period in which a lot of people left to go to Africa especially to go into business. And then some of them stayed there; others went to New York, so there was a big community from Rhodes in New York and they all spoke this version of Spanish.

**Killen:** So there was a community when you got there that had been there before you got there--

Turiel: That's right.

**Killen:** --from the same community in Rhodes?

Turiel: That's right.

**Killen:** --and they left with you?

Turiel: No, there was virtually nobody of the people who left with us. That was a small number of families. Some I think went to Israel. Some maybe stayed in Turkey. I don't really know. And the rest of the community was sent to a concentration camp and very few of them survived. But my uncles were in New York and, as I say, a whole community of people from Rhodes and some from Turkey that-

**Killen: When you went to the PS9 was it--**

Turiel: Yes?

**Killen: --when you went to PS9 do you remember feeling different from the other kids or do you remember that there were other kids from different countries?**

Turiel: No, no. It was--I mean, this was in the late '40s and it was very white and middle class on the upper west side of New York. In fact, I remember that at one grade and maybe for more than one grade there was one African American boy and that was it. Otherwise it was middle class, European American.

**Killen: So did you feel different?**

Turiel: I think only at first, but then it didn't take long to just become Americanized. I was speaking English and had friends.

**Killen: And in your family you have a brother?**

Turiel: Yes.

**Killen: And tell us a little bit about your brother.**

Turiel: Well, he went through the same experiences as I did, but he is four years older so he actually had more vivid memories of it and probably remembers more than I do. But he also went to the same schools and he went to Stuyvesant too, and then to NYU, and then to NYU Law School, and he's a lawyer now and lives in New Jersey right outside the suburbs of New York.

**Killen: So after high school where did you go to college?**

Turiel: I went to City College in New York and you might be interested in knowing that through high school I didn't like school and preferred to be out playing with friends and playing ball. And I didn't do well in high school, but I actually managed to get through academic hurdles via standardized tests. And to get into Stuyvesant you have to take a standardized test. And then I didn't have a good enough grade point average to get into City College, which at the time was a good and desirable college, but you could take a standardized test and make it up, and that's how I got in. And then I became more interested in school and in various subjects in my, I would say, my sophomore year in college.

**Killen: What were the subjects you were interested in?**

Turiel: Oh, I was interested in English literature, and history, and I got interested in psychology. So I ended up becoming a psychology major. Well, there's another aspect of that I might mention, which is that when I was going to college I really didn't know what I wanted to do. And as I said, I wasn't that involved and my family wanted to make sure that I would do something that would result in my having a decent income and a decent life. So at the time engineering was very popular and fairly lucrative and they wanted me to do that, but I knew I wasn't interested in engineering. So I ended up majoring in business, because I supposedly had to have something that would lead to a career. And I went to the business school branch of City College, which was downtown rather than uptown, but I was just doing that because I needed to do something along those lines. And when I did get interested in psychology

it turned out that they had, at this branch of City College, an industrial psychology major, but that included other areas of psychology and there were some people who were very good teachers in social psychology, experimental psychology, developmental psychology and I took those courses and became very interested in it. So I became a psychology major and decided to go to graduate school in psychology.

**Killen:** Were your parents disappointed that you didn't go on in business?

Turiel: Well, yes, because they were uncertain of what psychology was about and they really didn't know what it was like. In fact, when I started to get very good grades in psychology they weren't sure that was a good thing.

**Killen:** Do you remember any of your teachers or what it was about psychology that you liked?

Turiel: Well, I remember the teachers. I don't know. I liked the topic, the subject matter being studied, I ended up liking the developmental psychology course a good deal, and I liked our experimental psychology course. I found that -- I remember we read Osgood's book, the title of which I don't remember now. Do you remember the title? It was widely used.

**Killen:** Yes.

Turiel: I think it was published in the late '50s.

**Killen:** Was it in developmental?

Turiel: No, it was in experimental.

**Killen:** Oh, experimental book?

Turiel: Yes, it was in experimental.

**Killen:** --he was an experimentalist, yes.

Turiel: Charles Osgood was his name. And I liked the experimental method.

**Killen:** What did you like about it?

Turiel: Oh, I liked the precision of it, and being able to test ideas and hypotheses.

**Killen:** Did you actually engage in any research when you were in college?

Turiel: No, no, I didn't. No, undergraduates at the time didn't engage in research at that stage of their education.

**Killen:** So you were an undergraduate and you were in courses with large groups of students or--

Turiel: Not in psychology.

**Killen:** --small seminars?

Turiel: The courses there, especially in psychology, were fairly small. I mean, we didn't have hundreds of people in classes. I took a required biology course that was fairly large, maybe, I can't remember, but it wasn't huge numbers. And I think these other courses would be like 20 or 30 people.

**Killen:** So you had a lot of discussion?

Turiel: Yes, yes, and some smaller classes. I think the experimental course is smaller.

Killen: So what did you think you wanted to do when you were a senior and you were getting ready to graduate?

Turiel: Oh, by then I had decided I wanted to go to graduate school and go into academics.

Killen: And so how did you go about that?

Turiel: Oh, well, I applied to graduate schools and I was admitted to a few. I didn't apply to a lot of places and I think they were all on the east coast, and I was admitted to Yale, so I went there.

Killen: Were your parents now getting more convinced--

Turiel: Yes, they were getting more convinced at that point.

Killen: So do you remember what year you entered Yale and graduate school?

Turiel: Yes, 1960.

Killen: 1960?

Turiel: Yes.

Killen: Okay. So you entered Yale graduate school in psychology in 1960?

Turiel: And I was interested in social psychology and developmental psychology.

Killen: And so who were some of your professors and what was your experience like?

Turiel: I actually, as I recall, had more contact with the younger professors than the older ones. And there was a very interesting group of assistant professors and Yale at the time had this system where they hired a whole bunch of assistant professors, most of whom weren't expected to stay. They wouldn't get tenure. They would usually try to go elsewhere before their term as assistant professors were up. And some of them ended up staying, especially people in developmental, because it was more of an emerging field at that time. And there were places that had strong developmental programs, but they were few I think, and Yale did not. Well, the people I can remember -- there may have been others -- when I got there were Bill Kessen, Ed Zigler and Larry Kohlberg and they were all assistant professors. Kohlberg left. I'll tell you a little bit about that soon since I worked closely with him. He left after my first year and after two years as an assistant professor there. But Kessen and Zigler stayed on and got tenure and had their entire careers at Yale. Another very interesting assistant professor that I took courses from and talked to a lot at the time was Stanley Milgram.

Killen: So let me just be sure that that's clear. So your first professors were William Kessen, Lawrence Kohlberg, who then left, and you also had Stanley Milgram?

Turiel: Yes.

Killen: So that's a pretty interesting lineup for your assistant professors. Do you have some memories of taking classes with Stanley Milgram?

Turiel: Yes, I took a social psychology course. I think it was methods in social psychology. And we also ended up observing his very early Obedience to Authority studies, which was very interesting. That's where he started that work, at Yale.

**Killen:** Yes, yes.

Turiel: First with Yale undergraduates, though I don't remember observing any studies with undergraduates. I think I observed his next set of studies, which were with adult males mostly--

**Killen:** From the community.

Turiel: --working class from the community.

**Killen:** So you actually observed the studies in the book *Obedience to Authority*?

Turiel: Well, and the studies I observed were the ones he originally published in the journals like the *Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology*.

**Killen:** Now, when you say you observed them, what does that mean? Were you an assistant on the projects or were you observing them as a student in his class or what do you mean?

Turiel: No, what happened was that after I started working with Larry Kohlberg -- which we haven't talked about yet -- Larry became interested in these studies and wanted to maybe get involved. And so Larry and I went to wherever he was conducting the experiments and we were able -- I really can't remember what the setup was, but we weren't at all part of the experiments. We were just watching what was going on, maybe through a one way mirror. I can't remember now.

**Killen:** What was your reaction?

Turiel: Let's see. I'll have to recollect that. I mean, I remember vividly and I remember that these seemed like exciting experiments. And we were observing people who would go along with the commands of the experimenter and those who wouldn't. But one thing I remember and I've always maintained is the case about those experiments is that the people who participated in them didn't just go along; they were always in a lot of agony and conflict about their actions, and that's something that I think hasn't been stressed enough in reports of the research.

**Killen:** Yes. Well, why don't you talk a little bit about Larry Kohlberg? So he was an assistant professor at Yale when you got there, and then he left you said soon after that.

Turiel: So I was thinking about social psychology and developmental psychology and taking courses in both areas and I was gravitating more to developmental than social. And I actually never took a course from Larry Kohlberg and we only overlapped during my first year there, but he did give a talk about his work and I got very interested in it as a consequence and then ended up having him, in my first year at least, as my advisor and we started to plan research together. At the time we had what was called -- I don't remember what it was called, but it was essentially a pre-dissertation project that you had to do and then the dissertation. And so we planned that pre-dissertation project together, but it was a small study which wasn't big enough for publication. And incidentally, graduate students rarely published at that time, which has certainly changed. And I actually expanded that study into my dissertation. Kohlberg decided to leave Yale for a position at the University of Chicago, which is where he had gotten his PhD, and I think it fit his intellectual style better than Yale did. Yale was much more, well, at the time it was highly influenced by behaviorism, but it was changing. Nevertheless, it was pretty experimentally oriented and Chicago had a different intellectual atmosphere. So he left. He actually went to the Center for Advanced Study at Stanford for a year and then took up his position at Chicago. And I continued working on moral development. Ed Zigler became my advisor/dissertation chair and I worked long distance with Larry Kohlberg and, when he came east, I would see him or I'd go to Chicago on occasion to talk to him about the work.

**Killen:** How did you do that work long distance before email and the Internet?

Turiel: We had telephones at the time.

Killen: Yes, so do you mean you would call him up and talk to him about designing a study?

Turiel: Yes.

Killen: --and you'd talk on the phone?

Turiel: Right, yes, and we would meet occasionally when he was coming east. I remember meeting him in New York and I remember a few trips to Chicago where we would discuss research and the study and so he was very involved in my dissertation. He just wasn't officially a part of the committee.

Killen: Can you tell us the title of your dissertation?

Turiel: Yes. The title was "An experimental test of the sequentiality of developmental stages in the child's moral judgments."

Killen: So that didn't have plus-one in the title of it, the -- well, that's your dissertation.

Turiel: No, it wasn't in the title. It involved -- what I was trying to do in that study was, well, I was working with Kohlberg's stages and he had proposed six stages of moral judgment, which are pretty well known. And I worked with I think kids from about 10 to 16 if I remember correctly. It's been a while since I looked at that study. And what I was trying to do is see if we could find out something experimentally about sequentiality of stages of development. And so I designed a study in which I exposed children to statements. And Kohlberg had an interview with a whole bunch of moral dilemmas, moral stories that were presented to assess the stages of moral development, and then they were coded with a complex system. And what I did in the study was a pre/posttest experimental design with a control group, and I assessed their initial stages and got a score of their dominant stage, and then exposed them either to statements at a stage directly above, two stages above, or one stage below with a hypothesis that if they would change at all from pre to posttest it would be because of the exposure to statements at stage one above their own, which they could somewhat understand and work with, and maybe reorganize as a consequence and the findings pretty much bore that out.

Killen: And where did--

Turiel: And they didn't take on thinking of a stage below their own.

Killen: --what motivated those hypotheses?

Turiel: Well, one way to answer that question is to say that one of the exciting things about both being a graduate student and being in the field shortly after my graduate studies in developmental psychology was all that was going on around Piaget's work. And--

Killen: Yes, Piaget, P-I-A-G-E-T.

Turiel: Jean Piaget.

Killen: Jean Piaget.

Turiel: And at the time there was a great deal of interest in his work and behaviorism was on its way out, and in developmental Piaget's work was the most interesting and influential. There are other people, like Heinz Werner, who contributed to that. And seeing development as involving some sequentiality was an important component of that at that time, put in terms of stages and the idea that one had to progress through stages in a step-like fashion. And so my experiment was designed to

test whether or not with Kohlberg's stages you could show that it had to go through that kind of sequence and it was progressive and not regressive, and that you couldn't just expose people to anything and they would take it on. It had to do with the match between their own level and what they were being exposed to, something that they could somewhat understand and work with.

**Killen:** So were you surprised when your results confirmed your hypothesis?

Turiel: I was pleased.

**Killen:** And did you then publish your dissertation?

Turiel: Yes. I wrote it up and it was published actually in 1966. I got my degree in '65 and it was published--

**Killen:** 1965?

Turiel: --yes, and it was published in the *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*.

**Killen:** So your first publication was in the *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, not a developmental journal?

Turiel: No, actually my first publication was in a journal called the *Psychoanalytic Review* of all places.

**Killen:** Tell us about that one.

Turiel: Well, this was only because I got very interested through just general reading in one of my courses in Freud, but not as a theoretical approach to take on as my own or to do work in, but it was more of an intellectual interest. His work was really fascinating--

**Killen:** That's Sigmund Freud.

Turiel: --and I ended up writing a paper I think originally for one of my courses, because I was interested in moral development, on his theories of moral development through identification. And it was partly putting together what he had said, partly analysis, some critique and I expanded a little bit and people thought it was a good paper, so I thought I'd publish in the *Psychoanalytic* journal, which I did.

**Killen:** That's ambitious, that's ambitious and impressive to do that your first time. Did--

Turiel: Yes, I--

**Killen:** --Kohlberg give you feedback on that?

Turiel: Yes, yes, he was one. He had a very broad intellectual approach so he knew Freud well, he knew a fair amount of philosophy, he knew George Herbert Mead well, James Mark Baldwin, Piaget, of course, and we were all knowledgeable about behaviorism including Skinner. So he was interested in it and he gave me feedback. I've always wondered though if having that on my vitae made people wonder what I was about early on.

**Killen:** So that was your -- do you remember what year that was published?

Turiel: Actually, maybe it wasn't my first publication, because that may have been published in '67.

**Killen:** Maybe you wrote it--

Turiel: Yes I wrote it before and--

Killen: So what was the title of that paper?

Turiel: "An historical analysis of the Freudian conception of the superego."

Killen: And so you had the dissertation on sequentiality of stages published in *JPSP*, and then the Freud paper, "Analysis of Superego," in the *Psychoanalytic Review*. And so what followed from there? What were your next steps both as sort of an academic, scholar, you know?

Okay. We're resuming the interview after a short break. And we were talking about your first publications of your dissertation and the article in the *Psychoanalytic Review*. And I guess sort of maybe thinking about the next phase, where did you go after Yale and what sort of happened next in terms of the institutions that you were with and from there?

Turiel: Well, I ended up after getting my degree in New York City in what was essentially postdoctoral work--

Killen: Well, your degree from Yale was 1965.

Turiel: That's right.

Killen: Okay.

Turiel: And well, the system was very different then in the way job searches were conducted. There was no *APA Monitor*, there were no advertisements. The way it worked was that people would write to people they knew or write to departments and tell them they had this opening and then--

Killen: It's very informal?

Turiel: Yes, much more informal -- and people would recommend their students. And I did a couple of interviews for assistant professorships and did get a pretty good offer actually. Maybe I shouldn't be revealing this. It was in an area of the country that I really didn't want to go to. Having grown up in New York, I really wanted to be on the east coast, and especially in New York, and I got this really nice opportunity to work at a place called Center for Urban Education that was--

Killen: Can you spell that?

Turiel: Center for Urban Education. And it was something they were starting and they were connecting it especially to the beginning planning of the Graduate Center of the City University. And they wanted to make connections with other universities in New York, so they offered me a research associate position to do my own research completely. I was entirely on my own, which I liked that idea. And they wanted me to have a connection to some other place in the city, so I spent a couple of days a week at the Bank Street College of Education.

Killen: Oh, okay, Bank Street College of Education, yes. Where was the Center for Urban Education located?

Turiel: It was on 42<sup>nd</sup> Street in the same building that ended up being the building for the Graduate Center. And people I got to know through that work included Herb Zimiles, who was at the Bank Street College and he was doing work on cognitive development--

Killen: And Herb Zimiles is spelled?

Turiel: Z-I-M-I-L-E-S -- and Harry Beilin was involved in this group--

**Killen: It's B-E-I-L-I-N, Harry Beilin.**

Turiel: --and other people whose names aren't as well known. In any event, I did that. It was a two-year appointment and I did some collaborative work with Larry Kohlberg, some of my own work, but working with his methods and stages of the development of moral judgment. But at the beginning of my second -- no, I guess it would have been towards the end of my first year there -- someone told me about an assistant professorship at Columbia, which was ideal for me, because I wanted to stay in New York. So I did get that position and I've always said that the reason I got it was because I was token integration.

**Killen: How so?**

Turiel: Well, the psychology department at Columbia was very behavioristic and there were a few people here in social psychology who were not behavioristic, and they split off and formed their own small department with three or four people; Richard Christie was one of them, the other person was Stanley Schacter. So the administration at Columbia -- the point of token integration is that the administration at Columbia was putting a lot of pressure on the psychology department to diversify, not ethnically or racially, but in terms of being less behavioristic.

**Killen: Really? That's interesting the administration wanted to be--**

Turiel: Yes, well, maybe the social psychologists told them about what was going on--

**Killen: --yes, maybe somebody within psychology felt they should be more--**

Turiel: --that's right, and I guess the administration understood the problems so they had this position in developmental, which I got, and I was the only developmental person in that department. But that wasn't the integration part. I thought that because I was, in their view, so far out in my theoretical or Piagetian orientation that it balanced the many behaviorists.

**Killen: But Piaget was still viewed pretty--**

Turiel: Well, by behaviorists, yes, but not by developmentalists. There were some developmental people in Teachers College like Millie Almy, and George Rand, and Brian Sutton-Smith. But I was the only one--

**Killen: So Brian Sutton-Smith and Millie Almy?**

Turiel: And I was the only one in the psychology department. But it was interesting and Columbia's a very interesting university, of course. And the undergraduates were lots of fun because they were very curious and New York feistiness, so I enjoyed that, though it was a little challenging because it was my first teaching position having to deal with people who weren't very compliant, and it was the first time I'd taught, because when I was in graduate school there was no graduate teaching. There were no TA-ships. That came later. So as you can see a lot of changes have occurred in sort of the way things are done: TA-ships, publishing as a graduate student, the way jobs are advertised, and things that people take--

**Killen: How do you view those major changes?**

Turiel: Well, I think the only one -- I mean, I think it's good that graduate students are doing research and publishing. But that's the one I have a little bit of ambivalence about. I think that maybe there's too much pressure on graduate students, especially at some universities more than others, too much

pressure on graduate students to get a lot of research projects done and a lot of publications. I think it might be better if that were scaled back some--

**Killen:** How come?

Turiel: --in expectations. Well, especially as a graduate student, other times as well, of course, but especially as a graduate student you're there to learn a lot and to figure things out and think through your ideas in the field. And if your eye is on getting as many publications as you can it can interfere with your education. Now, one of the differences that kind of compensates for that is that people take a lot longer to finish now.

**Killen:** Is that right?

Turiel: Yes, I mean, when I was a graduate student it was usually four or five years.

**Killen:** Four or five years?

Turiel: Yes, I did it in four and a half years and most of my fellow students did it--

**Killen:** So you would finish graduate school in four years, four and a half years?

Turiel: Yes, yes, or five years. And you'd do one study, at least at Yale this was the system, you'd do one study and then your dissertation. So you had time to really think about it and I think in too many cases people are just -- graduate students are inundated with demands.

**Killen:** What about the teaching?

Turiel: I think that's a good thing. That's a good change.

**Killen:** Why do you say that?

Turiel: Well, I think because it's good to get that kind of experience. You're getting it as an assistant. You're being supervised. You learn a lot I think in the process, I assume. Well, you did it, right? Did you do it as a graduate student?

**Killen:** I did it once.

Turiel: Yes?

**Killen:** With Paul Mussen, here at UC Berkeley. I was thinking about that because you were talking about being at Columbia teaching for the first time with undergraduates who were feisty and--

Turiel: Right, yes, it was difficult.

**Killen:** --maybe it wasn't so easy the first time.

Turiel: It was learning by fire, but that was okay too.

**Killen:** But that was also Columbia, what, 1967 or--

Turiel: Yes, '67.

**Killen:** --1968? 1967? So it's also pretty feisty time in general on campus.

Turiel: Yes, yes, feisty and very interesting. I was there in -- well, before I get to that I also think the changes in the way hiring is done are good. I think they worked for its time the way it was done back in the '60s, because the fields were much smaller, and there were many fewer people going into academia.

Killen: I mean, sometimes people have said that when it was very informal back then it also led to kind of an inclusive or sort of in-group kind of process, because it was by who knew who and so it was harder to break into it if you weren't part of a--

Turiel: Yes, well, I think that's true. But I think it wasn't as much of a problem in the early '60s because it was almost like everybody knew everybody in the field of developmental, for example. But it was true in other disciplines, or sub disciplines. It was fairly small. A little later things were growing and then I think what you're describing was -- until it changed, it was more of a problem. And then there were more women going to graduate school in psychology and looking for academic jobs. And I'm sure that there was bias there, and more minorities, so the system now I think is better. But going back to the political atmosphere, it was very interesting, and particularly for somebody who was doing work on moral development it was particularly interesting and a nice connection between what was going on politically, what undergraduates were thinking about, and much of what we talked about and related to research and theory in our seminars.

Killen: Did you talk about the times in seminars?

Turiel: Yes, sure.

Killen: --so like the Vietnam War and those--

Turiel: Yes, yes.

Killen: --kinds of issues were--

Turiel: And not so much--

Killen: Course discussion?

Turiel: --yes, not so much, yes, to take a position, and most people were in agreement anyway on--

Killen: Yes.

Turiel: Most agreed on those positions then. It was understood. But to bring these issues and then talking about course content.

Killen: That can be challenging moderating a group of students on topics like that, but also very invigorating.

Turiel: Yes, they were really interested and, in that way, more so than in future times. So I was at Columbia for the Columbia demonstrations. It was my first full year of teaching and this was the spring of 1968 and our spring semester got stopped in the middle. The next year I was visiting at Berkeley and that was People's Park.

Killen: So did it follow you or did you follow it?

Turiel: I don't know. But that spring semester--

Killen: So you mean 1969 you were at Berkeley?

Turiel: '69 I was at Berkeley visiting from Columbia. I spent a semester here teaching as a visitor. And so that was People's Park, but of course, connected to Vietnam and civil rights, and that semester was cut in half. But it's not only my first two, it's my first three, because then I moved from -- and I actually had already accepted a position at Harvard for the fall of '69, and so in the spring of '69 I was at Harvard. And that was Cambodia and Kent State I think, but anyway Cambodia for sure, and a lot of political activity and demonstrations around the Vietnam War, so that semester was cut in half.

Killen: Your first three spring semesters--

Turiel: Right. And so I thought this teaching business was pretty easy until the following year when I had to teach a whole year.

Killen: That's amazing. Just to have the dates straight, so you said spring of 1969 you were at UC Berkeley?

Turiel: Yes.

Killen: And then fall of 1969 you started at Harvard?

Turiel: That's right.

Killen: Okay. And when you started at Harvard that first semester it was cut short--

Turiel: No, the spring semester, second semester.

Killen: So the spring 1971 you were at Harvard and that's your first full spring semester because the previous three were all cut short due to political engagement, involvement?

Turiel: That's right.

Killen: That's quite dramatic. So how did the Harvard job come about?

Turiel: Well, to some extent because of Larry Kohlberg. As I said before, I had been teaching in the department of psychology at Columbia, but the School of Education at Harvard had a strong developmental group. It was called the Laboratory of Human Development and another person well known in the field who was there at the time was Sheldon White. Courtney Cazden was there, a few others. And Larry Kohlberg was offered a position there so he took it, left Chicago, got there in 1968. And then, to a large extent I think because he was interested in bringing me to Harvard, I was offered a position at Harvard in that same group in the School of Education. So that's how that came about.

Killen: So Larry Kohlberg was there before you got there, but just by--

Turiel: For a year--

Killen: --only a year?

Turiel: --yes.

Killen: Yes. So you came and then you had that first year there. What was it like? What did you think of Harvard?

Turiel: Do you really want to know?

Killen: Judy said that you want to talk about it.

Turiel: Well, I had mixed feelings about it. I found that -- yes, I don't know how exactly to characterize it, but it wasn't feisty and I didn't think intellectually curious in the way Columbia and Berkeley had been. I found that its reputation in some ways, of course it helped, but in some ways it hindered, because people were striving a great deal and there was a lot of sense of self importance by a lot of people, of course. I mean, it's a fine institution and a lot of people love it, but it wasn't really my style. And I had liked California and Berkeley and actually met the person who became my wife while I was at Berkeley, and she came east and we both wanted to come back to California. So my next position after Harvard was at University of California at Santa Cruz.

**Killen: What year did you go to UC Santa Cruz?**

Turiel: 1974. But I was still -- I really liked Berkeley for many reasons and Santa Cruz was different enough from Berkeley that I preferred Berkeley. I eventually did get a position at Berkeley in 1980 and that's when I moved here and I've been here since. So that gives you all my previous and current employment.

**Killen: And you mentioned that you met your wife at Berkeley. What's her name and how did that come about?**

Turiel: Well, her name then was Judy Steinberg. It's now Judy Steinberg Turiel. And she was a student here and I actually met her at Sproul Plaza. There was a lot of activity around politics and around hippies at the time. Were you still here in 1969?

**Killen: Yes.**

Turiel: Yes? So you know what that's about. And I would often go with my friend and colleague, Jonas Langer to Sproul Plaza where a lot of this activity was going on, and that's where I met her.

**Killen: And then Judy went with you to Harvard and then--**

Turiel: Yes, and she went to graduate school there.

**Killen: She was in graduate school at Harvard and got her PhD there at Harvard?**

Turiel: Yes, right.

**Killen: And then did she get her PhD at Harvard before you moved to Santa Cruz or after?**

Turiel: No, she finished her dissertation when we were in Santa Cruz.

**Killen: And her dissertation was also in moral education.**

Turiel: Well, it was more in areas related to sociology of education.

**Killen: Sociology of education. So she had her PhD in sociology of education at Harvard. And then when you came to Santa Cruz did you both move to Santa Cruz or--**

Turiel: Well, initially, but then she got a position in Berkeley, so we were doing some commuting and I would spend part of the week down there and we'd spend weekends here.

**Killen: And so as you've been at UC Berkeley since 1980, and have you had the same position, the same title since you've been here or what kinds of positions have you had as a professor here? I know you've done some administrative work in the dean's office.**

Turiel: Yes, I came as a professor and so that's been constant. I spent some time as an Associate Dean in the School of Education and now I'm Co-Director at the Institute of Human Development. The Institute of Human Development has a long history going back to 1927 and I think it's pretty well known. But Berkeley has what we call "organized research units," and they're supposed to bring together people from different disciplines. And it's mainly faculty. There are some others who are part of the Institutes and so they have some of their labs here where some active graduate students spend time in closer quarters with each other from different departments. We have a colloquium series. You gave an excellent talk yesterday in our colloquium series.

Killen: Thank you.

Turiel: But it's connected to but separate from the departments.

Killen: And your co-director is from sociology?

Turiel: Well, he's actually also from the Graduate School of Education, but he's a sociologist by training.

Killen: So it's interdisciplinary in that sense?

Turiel: Yes.

Killen: And the Institute of Human Development, of course, is famous for its longitudinal studies and for the many, many different sort of studies that were done over several decades.

Turiel: Yes. One interesting aspect of it is that there were several well-known female developmental psychologists who were able to find positions in the Institute at a time when it was hard for women to get faculty positions. So people like Nancy Bailey, and Marjorie Honzik, and--

Killen: Jean Block?

Turiel: --Jean Block, Jean McFarland, Diana Baumrind all did their work through the Institute.

Killen: And so if you're thinking about sort of your work here over the years you've been here, how would you characterize some of the major changes? You started off working with Kohlberg looking at sequentiality for your dissertation. Then you were at Harvard and you've been here. Can you just give us sort of a general sense of how you'd characterize your work in this field?

Turiel: Yes, to best explain that I'd have to go back to I guess the time at Harvard and the work I was doing around Kohlberg's stages, but closely related to Piagetian theory and looking at stages of moral development and the kind of studies we talked about earlier on sequence of movement through the Kohlberg stages. And if I can make this story short, yet comprehensible if you want me to go into some of these detail. A feature of the kinds of stages that Kohlberg proposed, which also goes back to the work that Piaget had done that he published in 1932 on the development of moral judgments is one set of studies on that topic, a feature of their approach was that the development of moral judgments goes through a differentiation process by which children really confuse -- they have some understandings of morality in their formulations, but children confuse morality with other things like authority, punishment, the customs and conventions of society, with moral issues like justice, and fairness, and harm, and welfare, and rights, and that real understandings of real moral issues do not come about until the highest stages. So that in the Kohlberg stages, for example, at first it's that children confuse their moral ideas, their moral values, their moral concepts with things like obeying, going along with authority and avoiding punishment. There are other details that we don't need to go into. And that moves very generally into a stage that Kohlberg called authority maintaining, law and order and authority maintaining, conventional morality and the idea there is that they have some understanding about laws, and rules, and social systems, and the role of authority in social systems and

they judge morality by more strictly following the authority system, what the laws dictate and going along with the conventions of the social system. And that changes maybe in late adolescence, maybe later, into what could be referred to as principled moral thinking, where you really understand issues of justice and rights. And that's the kind of idea I had been working with, and I was always interested in explaining developmental changes, which was part of the reason for studying sequentiality. So there was a finding that was getting some play or publicity in the field, which was that college students seem to be very relativistic. I think that's a common phenomenon that we all witness teaching undergraduates, particularly at that time where presumably they claim that everything is okay, all morality is relative and arbitrary and it all depends on what you want to do and what you think. And this was, in some longitudinal studies that were being done by Kohlberg and some of his students, seen by the coding system for the stages as stage two thinking rather than what I was describing before, which was stage four thinking of the six stages. And so there was this perplexing thing that college students are regressing to stage two, which is the way eleven or twelve year olds think, which didn't really make sense to me that they would be doing that. And also, my experience with undergraduates, who seemed to be very relativistic, they were, at the same time, very moralistic, particularly in the time when they were dealing with issues of war and civil rights, highly moralistic and wanting to change the society and the system for moral reasons. So there was this seeming contradiction and what I thought was going on is that they were undergoing a transition from the stage four conventional morality where they're seeing things in terms of rules, laws, authority, and conventions, starting to be critical of that and that that's where their relativism came in, but that it was in the process of forming higher level concepts of fairness, and justice and rights. So I did a whole bunch of research trying to see if that were the case, if they were in conflict and disequilibrium around a transition from one way of thinking to another with those features. So the general idea would be, to put it simply, that they were becoming critical of the conventions and customs of society, seeing them as not morally necessary anymore and as arbitrary in the process of forming these new moral concepts. So I did some research with late high school students and college undergraduates, but at the same time I got involved in looking at how they thought about morality from conventions separately. At the same time I thought it would be interesting to look at how they did this separately. The Kohlberg method didn't allow for that at younger ages, starting initially with ten year olds. And what I was finding is that the ten year olds, the youngest ones in the study, were also seeing conventions as arbitrary, and changeable, and dependent on rules and authority, but different from the way they thought about moral issues. And so that led me to a whole line of research that in some way still goes on, which--

**Killen:** I think in many ways.

**Turiel:** --yes, well, no, I mean, in many ways, but there are extensions of it that I will mention. But the initial work was to look more directly, to not assume that children are confusing these, what I call domains, with each other, but rather that they may be thinking differently about the conventional societal domain and moral issues of justice, and fairness, and rights, and welfare. And then there were these initial indications from that first study on transitions that that was the case. So I expanded that work to look at younger children, as young as five or six years of age, with a whole set of criteria for what would be the conventional domain and what would be the moral domain, so making it more systematic as to determining whether and how they're thinking about each of these--

**Killen:** Going back to your experimental roots in college when you liked experimental psychology--

**Turiel:** That's right.

**Killen:** --bringing in experimental methodology to this question or this set of issues?

**Turiel:** Right.

**Killen:** When did you start the work with the younger children? The transitional work was more at Harvard, correct?

Turiel: Yes, and I started to do some of that there, but then I did some with other people in Santa Cruz and in the early years at Berkeley. I'll tell you a little bit about that in a minute. And I did start some of the work while I was at Harvard, but it didn't get finished and published until '77, '78, '79 or so. And those studies were really beginning to yield harder data showing that children make those distinctions. So I began to really research it from that point of view, from the point of view of different domains and what implications that has for development, for social interactions, and working with the idea that a better way to look at development than the differentiation idea that I mentioned earlier is that at early ages children begin to form domains of thinking, different ways of thinking about these different areas, and that we need to look for developmental changes within domains. And I did some work that was started at Harvard on changes within conventional thinking. And then all of that ended up in the long run in a whole set of collaborations with graduate students, who then went on to continue their own work in this general area, but related to this theoretical approach, and these students have become researchers in their own right. We still collaborate with each other and they still have their own research programs and these are the extensions that I was referring to before. So at Santa Cruz I started working with Larry Nucci and Judy Smetana and they were graduate students at Santa Cruz. Then I moved to Berkeley and worked with several people who were graduate students there, Melanie Killen being one of them, Charles Helwig, Cecilia Wainryb, Marta Laupa.

Killen: Of course, there are many others, but--

Turiel: Yes, Peter Kahn and many others and all these people that I've mentioned have their own graduate students, many of whom are gone on to their own positions and their own programs of research. And I'm very fortunate that this has happened and it's a great group of people and they are all over the country, but we keep in touch with each other and collaborate. And there's a lot of work that's going on that's different and interrelated, so Melanie, of course, is doing work on social exclusion and inclusion, prejudice, discrimination, intergroup relationships and there are many more that could be mentioned.

Killen: So the work that you did, I mean, that has been referred to in many places as social domain theory, or social domain model; social domain theory I guess would be the one I've used the most and so have others, and it's really sort of an alternative way to think about social cognitive development from Larry Kohlberg's initial perspective focusing more essentially just on moral judgment. Do you want to say just a little bit about how does Kohlberg think about this model that you have developed?

Turiel: Yes, that's difficult, because as it turned out Kohlberg became pretty ill by the mid '70s.

Killen: Ill in what way?

Turiel: Well, he had gone to Central America to do some research and I think what happened was that he contracted a parasitical disease that affected his intestinal system, and it took a very long time to diagnose it, and it kind of was taking over his body and his health was deteriorating. And it was affecting his whole life and his thinking, so I make a distinction between Kohlberg's early work, which was really very important and deep -- and it's important to mention that it's not so much the six stages that he proposed, though often that's what's seen that was important, as much as it was his conceptions of development, his general theoretical approach to development, and particularly as applied to social and moral development; he published some very influential chapters in the late '60s and early '70s that were both on the development of moral judgment and more generally how to think about social development, social interactions, morality, how to define morality. And all of that was part of his earlier work. He also did a lot of writing at that time on moral education; he was involved in doing things in schools as well as in prisons to try to bring moral education into the prison system with prisoners. But then I think his work really stalled because of his illness, and there's a quality of it sort of repeating itself or stagnating and being defensive. And I don't think he really ever reacted that much to the domain approach that you're talking about, and I don't think he ever came to grips with it intellectually. I think in his pre-illness state he would have been able to think about it more clearly.

What he would have concluded I'm not sure. And then, by the way, at the same time he was dealing with strong critiques from Carol Gilligan about the relationship of morality to gender.

**Killen:** Even after she wrote her 1977 book *In a Different Voice*, or before that?

Turiel: Well, that came out in '82, *In a Different Voice*. She wrote some articles in the late '70s. I think '77 or so was her *Harvard Educational Review* paper.

**Killen:** Yes, the *Harvard Educational Review*, yes.

Turiel: And I think he addressed that more than our work on social domains, but even that wasn't clear because it was during his illness. It wasn't well formulated by him.

**Killen:** So you've written several books and do you want to sort of just briefly describe maybe the books and sort of the titles, the years, but also more, maybe some either general things that you want to say about your books?

Turiel: Okay, yes. And that maybe will lead me to mentioning some of what I've been doing more recently. There are two main books that I've published, and one was published in 1983 and it's called *The Development of Social Knowledge, Morality and Convention*, and that's where I try to put together all the work on these domains and this way of thinking about social judgments and development within domains and how the domains are thought about differently across age, so that there is not an age dimension to just the distinction of the different domains. Another domain that several of us have worked on, but especially started by Larry Nucci, is what we call the personal domain, which has to do with thinking about boundaries on the areas of personal jurisdiction and how that's different, how people, children and older people, think about that differently from conventions and morality. So that book was an attempt at putting all this together in one place. It has a chapter on methodology as well and discussion of different theoretical approaches and how our approaches differ from some of the others, particularly the ones we've been talking about like Piaget and Kohlberg. And then in that book too I tried to bring together a whole bunch of the studies that we had done up to that point, and it included not only studies about dealing with judgments about these domains, but also observational studies of social interactions that were done, especially in preschools, but also in elementary schools. And I discussed at some length the developmental sequence within convention and started to consider how the different domains may be related to each other in particular situations where decisions are being made that involve considerations from more than one domain, but that was just the beginning of that. And I also wrote a little bit about culture towards the end of that book and how to think about culture in ways that weren't the then usual way of thinking: that children learned the values of their culture, they come to accommodate what's in their culture, and what they think in one culture will be different from what they think in another culture. Well, I bring that up to say that culture became an important issue in later work after that book was published and one of the places where we dealt with this extensively was a chapter that Melanie Killen and Charles Helwig and I wrote in a book edited by Jerry Kagan and Sharon Lamb.

**Killen:** Sharon Lamb.

Turiel: --Sharon Lamb. Richard Shweder, who's a cultural anthropologist and psychologist, did some work in India trying to show that these domain distinctions are really specific to western culture and that this is what they learn in western culture, and in non-western cultures like India where he did some studies they don't learn this kind of a distinction, and convention is treated like it's moral. And so we wrote a lengthy and, I think, turns out to be influential chapter that gave a very different perspective on this.

**Killen:** And I would like to add that that was a great intellectual experience for me, because that was my sixth year of graduate school. And sometimes one thinks in graduate school, I thought, Well, I should finish in five years and, well, I said, "It's been one more year and I got this

opportunity to work on this chapter with you," and it was really an amazing experience. I mean, I learned so much and it was a very deep chapter that is very scholarly and you invited Charles and I when we were both graduate students to work with you on -- you know, we learned so much and we spent so much time thinking about things in a very different way than we had as younger graduate students. So it was influential for Charles and I as well.

Turiel: Yes, well, for me too. I learned a lot too and it turned out to be a very long chapter--

Killen: Yes.

Turiel: --and we really collaborated on it.

Killen: Yes, yes.

Turiel: So it was great. But then I became much more interested in culture for a couple reasons. One is that it's important to explain how culture is related to social and moral development in itself, but also because becoming popular at that time was this conception that you can make a dichotomy between western and non-western cultures on the basis of what was referred to as individualism and collectivism, and the idea that western cultures are individualistic, they focus on the individual and their rights and their entitlements and that non-western cultures are collectivistic and are not concerned with the individual, and people don't think about their own autonomy or their own personal entitlements, but instead are concerned with interdependence among people and not independence, and they accept a social system as it is with its hierarchies and relationships of dominance and subordination, such as social hierarchies involving social castes or classes, and then, of course, there are patriarchal cultures with distinctions based on gender with men in positions of power and dominance over women. And I really thought that these were stereotypes that didn't fit either culture, and that there's a lot of interdependence in western culture as well as independence, and that in non-western collective cultures there's also both, and then you really can't quantify them because a lot depends on the nature of the social relationships involved, the contexts, what the goals are in a particular type of situation, and particularly -- and this maybe is traceable back -- well, I think it is related to my experiences in Greece and Turkey and culture there. But I think it may be related to the moral resistance that occurred there in World War II and that I saw firsthand in that Turkish consul that I mentioned earlier. But it seemed to me that the whole idea that in hierarchical societies or patriarchal cultures that people aren't concerned with the personal, or with the individual, or with autonomy or personal entitlement was really off the mark, because people who are in these dominant positions are accorded a great deal of autonomy and independence and agency and it's very much a part of that culture and, at least at the public level, it's downplayed for people in subordinate positions. So we did some studies. First one I did with Cecilia Wainryb with the Druze, an Arab community in northern Israel, and we looked at their judgments about male/female relationships and roles, and their conflicts as they occur in those kinds of settings, particularly within the family in marital relationships, but also fathers and sons and daughters. And we found that to a large extent men accept the system, which is not very surprising. We also found that females accept the system to some extent, but there's much more to it than that, because on the one hand women accept it for pragmatic reasons like fear of consequences of what will occur to them if they try to defy or change things, but also, when we directly obtained their assessments of whether they saw the inequalities, the nature of these relationships as fair or unfair the large majority saw them as unfair. And then that led to more research in other places trying to both document that and then further look at how people who are in these subordinate positions deal with what they see as unfair. And we've done work and have drawn on the work of anthropologists, because some anthropologists have done ethnographic work where they've looked at, by living in these communities -- that tried to examine how especially women relate to these cultural practices of inequality and to the male domination. The anthropologists have found that there are many efforts, many strategies to get around this, subvert it, to oppose it, to change it. Sometimes they do it overtly, but often covertly, because it's very hard to do overtly. And we've been doing research to look at that, and that includes research to look at how people use deception in order to subvert the system, and that's also led to research on honesty and deception,

because we tend to think that honesty is a good thing, and it is a good thing, but there are many situations in which being honest is not the moral thing to do and--

**Killen:** Does this lead back to that chief of protocol?

Turiel: Well, his father -- right, the consul in Rhodes, that's right. He was lying to them to save lives, right? And philosophers have posed a question like what if you run into a murderer who is looking for his victim and you've seen that the victim went that way and he asks you, "Which way did he go?" Is it the moral thing to tell him the truth? Is it even the moral thing not to say anything? Is it the moral thing to lie and tell him he went the other way? So we looked at the whole issue of honesty, and deception, and how people think about that, and in what situations it's seen as the right thing to do to deceive people or the necessary thing to do. And part of that is to look at it in marital relationships of inequality, but that has also led us to research with adolescents because, as is pretty well known, there is a lot of deception of parents by adolescents. So we've done studies in which we've tried to examine what the basis for that is, when it's seen by adolescents as legitimate and why, and when it is not. And what we find, of course, is that adolescents don't just think that it's okay to lie all the time, and they don't think lying is the best thing in the world, but there are some situations in which it's necessary and there are many situations in which they think it's wrong, so some of these flippant ideas that adolescents just are losing their moral way and--

**Killen:** Lost in their moral values--

Turiel: Right, yes and they're just dishonest, that kind of thing. So a lot of this work on culture I then tried to put together in a book that was published in 2002 called *The Culture of Morality*.

**Killen:** So that's *The Culture of Morality*, 2002, a lot of the culture work was there and then the deception and honesty work has really been -- some of it was there, but some--

Turiel: That's right, some of it is later, that's right.

**Killen:** --yes, so that people could read that book for some of the beginnings of that.

Turiel: That's right.

**Killen:** But you've been continuing it with some recent publications in *Child Development* and other--

Turiel: Right, yes, and some publications with titles like "Resistance and Subversion in Everyday Life."

**Killen:** Yes, yes.

Turiel: And the title of that book, for which I got some help from Melanie, is meant to say that it's a culture of morality to distinguish that from the morality of the culture, that morality shapes the culture and is not determined by the culture.

**Killen:** Yes, which really goes back to sort of some of the challenges in your early career of Piagetian theory and behaviorism and--

Turiel: Right, that's socialization theory--

**Killen:** --the socialization theory is sort of top down approach and this being more sort of individuals constructing social reality but holding on to morality is something generalizable and distinct from conventions and other domains.

## Part 2: January 22, 2011

**Killen:** This is January 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2011 and we are in Washington DC and I am continuing the interview with Elliot Turiel for the SRCO Oral History Project. We began the interview in Berkeley, California and we have crossed the country to continue the interview again. When we were last talking Elliot was talking about his move to UC Berkeley, his research and we wanted to continue at that point. Elliot, did you want to talk about either being at UC Santa Cruz and then UC Berkeley or just start with sort of the research you were doing at Berkeley?

Turiel: Well, let's start with Santa Cruz, because it relates to the research I had been doing before Santa Cruz. I went there from Harvard and, as we talked about earlier I think in Berkeley across the country, I was saying that I had been researching what I thought was a transition in adolescents from stage four in Kohlberg's system to principled morality or stage five and found that it didn't quite work that way. And the idea was that I had the hypothesis that adolescents were distinguishing morality from social conventions and customs and authority in the transition to principled morality. But the research was showing that it wasn't quite like that, and I did studies of younger children to see how they thought about conventions, and rules and authority, and we obtained findings which showed that at much younger ages, in that case by eight or nine or ten, which were the youngest children we were studying, that distinction was being made already. So that led me to rethink a lot about moral development, and that led to research on what we now call the domains. And the move to Santa Cruz and then Berkeley turned out to be important, because at Santa Cruz I worked with Larry Nucci and Judy Smetana both in research with them and then they worked on their dissertations on these topics, and a number of initial studies were done with even younger children, as young as four or five years, which showed that they too made the distinction and that morality was a different domain of thought from thinking about society and its conventions. And Larry Nucci started work on what we came to call the personal domain. And Judy Smetana did work with older people actually for her dissertation on the topic of abortion, but that's a longer story. But she too did work with young kids. And then I moved to Berkeley and we continued -- they left Santa Cruz, Judy and Larry and we continued to collaborate together. And then I moved to Berkeley and, over the next ten or fifteen years, we did a good deal of work on social domains. And I did that with several students, Melanie being one, Cecilia Wainryb, Charles Helwig, Marie Tisak, and Bill Arsenio were post docs there, and Marta Laupa was also at Berkeley and some left, but there's a lot of overlap over the years. And we mounted a lot of studies on domains, some collaborative, and each of them had their dissertations on different topics that extended the work on domains and on a variety of topics. You worked on social conflicts, Marta on authority, Charles on rights, and Cecilia on culture and informational assumptions. And that all resulted in much more broad research program and long term collaborations, which are still going on. So in a way, the work at Santa Cruz and Berkeley, the initial years at Berkeley -- I'm still there, of course -- were the foundation for work that's going on several universities across the country.

**Killen:** So you moved to UC Berkeley in 1980, is that correct?

Turiel: Yes, 1980.

**Killen:** And what was the environment like there, your faculty colleagues or students or can you characterize the time there when you were working when you first got there?

Turiel: Yes, it was a very good environment. I had my primary appointment in the human development program in the School of Education. But I also had a connection and affiliation with the department of psychology and there were strong developmental programs in each department. And I worked closely, not on research, but on university matters, with several developmentalists from both departments.

**Killen:** Which developmentalists?

Turiel: Well, I knew Jonas Langer very well, and Robbie Case spent some time there in education, and there were people like John Watson and Dan Slobin, and Sue Ervin-Tripp. Who am I forgetting, anybody?

Killen: Let's see, Paul Ammon in your department--

Turiel: Paul Ammon in education--

Killen: --Paul Mussen--

Turiel: --oh, and Paul Mussen. Paul Mussen was a prominent figure in developmental psychology and at Berkeley. So it was a very interesting time.

Killen: Was it pretty interactive between psychology and education?

Turiel: Yes, for a few of us. Those who wanted to make connections between the two departments could do it pretty readily. We were all in the same building on different floors, which sometimes can be a big barrier, but it wasn't in this case.

Killen: Some of your students like myself were in psychology and at the time there was a national NIMH training program that--

Turiel: Right, in psychology--

Killen: --provided funding in psychology for the graduate students and your close connection with psychology and education enabled that to be a very productive environment.

Turiel: Yes, I'm glad you reminded me of that, because actually through the group of students working with me I think we made really good connections between psychology and education. You were in psychology, Charles was in psychology, Marta was in psychology, Cecilia, Peter Kahn, who's another person working with us--

Killen: And they were in education--

Turiel: --were both in education. And Bill Arsenio and Marie Tisak, who were doing postdoctoral work there, were doing it in education, but were involved in psychology. So it really made for connections between the two departments.

Killen: I recall you had a social development reading seminar that was very broad. I mean, it had a lot of students from different departments in it.

Turiel: Yes, and especially this group that took this seminar after semester and usually we would choose a book of a historical kind to read for the whole semester and we'd go through it--

Killen: Do you want to just--

Turiel: --chapter by chapter.

Killen: Do you want to just mention that seminar, because many of the students I know from the time still talk about how important that was for their intellectual development.

Turiel: Yes.

Killen: Two of the seminars that we were all involved with, one that you and Jonas Langer ran focused on Piaget's cognitive development and the one that you supervised in social development.

Turiel: Yes, and you could probably add a lot from memories of a student perspective. But in a way I modeled our seminar on Jonas' seminar. He started it before I got there, and what they did in their seminar -- I think you participated in that, right? And then I did too. What we did in that seminar was read books by Piaget and, in that case, part of it was struggling with understanding the writing and understanding Piaget. But it was all intellectual content that we dealt with. And we modeled our social development seminar on that one, and we didn't read just one person, but chose usually classic works, so we read Baldwin's book on social and ethical interpretations, we read Piaget's *Moral Judgment* book, of course, we read Durkheim on moral education, we read George Herbert Mead, we read some Freud.

Killen: I think we read Vygotsky.

Turiel: Yes, we read Vygotsky and I think we read Solomon Asch's book on social psychology. Anyway, the list could go on and on, but these were very interesting books and they led us to great discussions, not only about those books or historical material, but we always connected it to work we were doing at the time. So I thought it was very interesting. What was the student perspective?

Killen: The student perspective was that it was, yes, extremely valuable and connecting sort of these basic historic books to the current research we were doing, and I think it was a course we might have taken for five or six years, and for graduate students to want to take a course for five or six years, I think, tells you everything.

Turiel: Yes. Well, you really got a chance to debate among yourselves in that seminar, which was very interesting. I could sit back and listen.

Killen: Yes. And you talked about a collaborative environment there between psychology and education, which seems to be something special about that time. Of course, departments and programs change and evolve. What kinds of changes have come about over the last decade that you want to talk about generally or the kinds of things that went on more recently?

Turiel: Well, things have changed I think in psychology. I think that at Berkeley our education group has become -- our human development group in education has become stronger and there are people like Geoff Saxe and Susan Holloway who are part of that group now. And psychology still has some strong people in developmental. But they've changed their approach and they've merged developmental with other areas, and I think it was a mistake to do that. And there isn't a clear developmental area. The reasons for that are various, including some of the people who guided that program retiring and not being replaced with other people in developmental. And insofar as that's happening in other universities, which I think it is, I see that as a mistake and hopefully it will correct itself at some time soon. So I think we're stronger in developmental, in education and, as a consequence, we don't have the same kind of connections with the people in psychology.

Killen: --your program now? And I think you changed your name, didn't you?

Turiel: Well, we did that a while ago.

Killen: Okay. So what the official name is now--

Turiel: It's Human Development and Education. And so we have an emphasis on cognitive development, social and moral development, and there is an education connection as well, so we have people who work on cognition and instruction developmentally. So some of the standard areas aren't covered in our program like language development or work on theory of mind, that sort of thing. But you wouldn't necessarily expect that in a human development program in education, because it's a little geared to different issues. We wouldn't have anybody in attachment, for instance, more than likely in the School of Education. And Mary Main is still in the psychology department. So the

combination of areas covered in psychology and education I think historically was very good for developmental and, at least in Berkeley, I think that's been weakened in psychology. I think another problem is the predominance of neuroscientists in the department of psychology at Berkeley and I think this is nationwide, not that neuroscientific work shouldn't be done or is not valuable, but I think it's going in the direction of it overwhelming other areas, and that's something that I hope will change as well and that they'll take a more modest position in the world, because as important as neuroscience is, it hardly covers everything. To me, it has some of the feel of the behaviorist movement in the early part of the century, things taking over too much and more than they should. So there have been those changes, but I don't mean to emphasize the negative. Certainly our group is very strong and Berkeley is still very strong in developmental. Now, I am co-director at the Institute of Human Development, and that's always been a strong--

**Killen:** The Institute of Human Development plays a very important role in the history of SRCD and--

Turiel: Yes, right.

**Killen:** --we have child development research, and developmental science.

Turiel: Yes, well, it was started in the late 1920s and for many years its main strength was in longitudinal studies and--

**Killen:** The Berkeley growth study?

Turiel: --the Oakland -- what was it called -- the Oakland/Berkeley growth study.

**Killen:** Oakland/Berkeley growth study, yes.

Turiel: And it was also always interdisciplinary with sociologists and some anthropologists and psychologists being part of it. We've also had people from public health. And it produced some very good work in developmental throughout the years. At a certain point it served a very useful social function, which is when women were not easily getting jobs as faculty members they were able to get positions as researchers in the Institute, and this may have been happening in other institutes around the country, but it was certainly happening in Berkeley. And some very good and visible work was being done by those women who really wouldn't have been hired at the time as faculty, so that included Nancy Bailey, and Marjorie Honzik, and Dorothy Eichorn, and Diana Baumrind at some point--

**Killen:** Jean Block--

Turiel: --Jean Block, yes--

**Killen:** It was useful, but is it also possible that eventually it also enabled departments not to hire women faculty, because they could have appointments there, but the appointments didn't have the same status as of a professor?

Turiel: Well, yes, I'm not sure. Maybe, except that I think there are many examples of universities that did not have an institute like that--

**Killen:** At all, yes.

Turiel: --and still didn't hire women. I think it enabled women to become more visible and therefore force universities' hand to some extent along with other movements.

**Killen:** Who's the co-director with you now at Berkeley in IHD.

Turiel: Well, his name is Bruce Fuller. He's also in the School of Education, but his discipline is sociology and he does work on public policy, a lot of it related to preschool education. So a strength of these institutes is that they're interdisciplinary, which you don't get in departments.

Killen: That's an important part of SRCD being interdisciplinary and so the IHD kind of fits in with the same kinds of goals--

Turiel: Yes.

Killen: --and then the longitudinal studies producing a lot of important findings that have been in the textbooks in child development for a long time.

Turiel: Right, and over the years there have been directors who come from developmental and from other disciplines. Paul Mussen was director for a long time and he was, of course, very involved with SRCD.

Killen: What was the time span that Paul Mussen was the director of IHD?

Turiel: Let's see, I know he was director starting in the early '70s I think to about the mid '80s or early '80s. He was preceded by Brewster Smith, who was a social psychologist, but then after him Ed Swanson, who was a sociologist, became director; John Clausen, another sociologist, was director at some point, I don't remember exactly what years. And then Joe Campos came to Berkeley from I think the University of Illinois and became director of the Institute.

Killen: So do you follow Joe Campos?

Turiel: No, no. Then it was Phil Cowan, then Jonas Langer and I followed Jonas Langer.

Killen: It's an illustrious line of directors. Did you want to talk a little bit about your experiences with SRCD, talk a little bit about when you first attended SRCD, and what it was like?

Turiel: Yes. I remember going to the first SRCD in 1965 when I was -- so it was probably the spring of '65, I was finishing my degree at that point. I got my PhD in 1965 and then did a postdoc starting in '66, which I may have said before, and then started as an assistant professor at Columbia in '66.

Killen: Where was the first meeting?

Turiel: So the first meeting in '65 was in Minneapolis. And it was very small. I don't remember the numbers, but maybe it was -- I could be wrong about this -- but just in the hundreds, and the numbers are what now, four or five thousand--

Killen: There was six thousand I think, but yes, it is between four and five thousand that attend, yes.

Turiel: And you really could, of course, meet people and interact with people, and for me just finishing my graduate studies I got to meet people that I had been hearing about and had opportunities to talk to them.

Killen: Who are some people that come to mind either as people you heard give talks or that you met?

Turiel: Oh, people like Harry Beilin, Bernie Kaplan, I think I may have met David Elkind there, and John Flavell, those are some of the people that I remember and then there were, of course, people I knew like Larry Kohlberg, and Ed Zigler, and Bill Kessen from Yale. The next meeting was in 1967 and that was in New York and it was a little bigger, but still small. And one of the interesting things about

that time was that there was a lot of discussion and debate about different paradigms that were prominent or becoming prominent then, and a lot of debates were between people who took behavioristic, or learning theory, or social learning theory positions and people who were following Piaget in a more cognitive direction. And in the area that I was working in I remember several symposia with people like Justin Aronfreed, and Marty Hoffman, and Walter Mischel, perhaps on one side and Larry Kohlberg, and other people -- I was involved in some of that and I think Jonas Langer did a little work on morality at that time -- was involved in those too. These were very, very interesting and lively debates. And things changed during those years, I think, away from learning theory and behaviorism towards a more Piagetian perspective. And then sometime after that SRCD started to get much bigger. I remember a meeting in Santa Monica in 1969 that was still small enough and very, very interesting and involved those debates. I remember Bandura was at the '69 meeting. But then the Society did get bigger and a little more impersonal. But over the years another thing that changed is that the criticisms of Piaget started to mount, and then the debates were often about Piaget versus other approaches, particularly information processing approaches. So those were two sets of very lively debates that were going on at that time.

**Killen:** When you're talking about these debates can you be a little more specific on the forum? Are you talking about a panel and then question/answers or are you--

**Turiel:** Well, usually there was--

**Killen:** --talking about the hallway, I mean--

**Turiel:** --well, yes, certainly a lot in the hallway, but--

**Killen:** --and how did it start? Yes.

**Turiel:** --there were symposia organized with people representing different points of view and debating those points of view. And I'm not sure that happens as much now. What do you think?

**Killen:** There is some of that. I think that sometimes people don't stake our sort of position as definitively as then, and the lines aren't as clear. But I think sometimes it does still happen. I mean, for example, there have been interesting debates among -- say if you take primatology or some of those positions, there's different views about it. Is culture unique to human primates or some of those debates, but--

**Turiel:** Yes, those debates tended to revolve around theories. And just to give you an example, two people in the late '60s and early '70s working on moral development were Justin Aronfreed -- there were others involved, I'll just use this as an example -- Justin Aronfreed and Larry Kohlberg, they were friends, and they interacted a good deal, and they would, with other people, organize symposia that represented two points of view and it was designed to have a debate about theoretical approaches.

**Killen:** Well, so in the actual symposium itself what is the style, that one person would give a talk, then another person, then another person and then there was audience discussion debate, or then there was debate among the panels?

**Turiel:** Well, both, both. There was debate among the panelists and if there was time the audience would be involved.

**Killen:** Because one thing that has happened I think more recently is that, I don't know if the time's shorter or people speak longer, but there'll be a panel and there'll be four papers and then that's the entire session.

**Turiel:** Yes, no, there was more time for discussion as I recall. Maybe I'm romanticizing it, but I recall that there was more time for discussion.

**Killen:** And people stood up and just read from a text then, right?

Turiel: Well--

**Killen:** There weren't PowerPoints?

Turiel: --no, people sometimes used slides and handouts, no PowerPoint. Yes, that's very different. And I would say that in some ways, although there are a lot of benefits to using PowerPoint and I use it myself, there are some negatives, because people would get up and talk, not necessarily -- they might read, but they would talk it and some would just talk. And it forces you to focus on the ideas a little more, and PowerPoint can be distracting in that regard.

**Killen:** Things flying in and out?

Turiel: Right. That's right. I mean, I do that too now. But I think that philosophers still do it that way, the old way.

**Killen:** But these things are zeitgeist too, you know, where things come and go in terms of people being energetic around a set of issues.

Turiel: That's right.

**Killen:** We have phenomena and different viewpoints on it, you know, being that there is this phenomenon, you have to be there to participate.

Turiel: Yes.

**Killen:** So you've already talked a little about some of what you think are the important changes in SRCD in terms of the size and the kind of involvement of people and the nature of it. Do you want to talk a little bit about just the history of the field in general during the years that you've been active as a developmental psychologist and developmental scientist and educator, either main events that have changed over time, or your views on what have been the big important issues that are issues that developmental psychologists and child developmental experts think about, debate, research, study?

Turiel: I think we've touched on some of them. A big influence on the field, of course, was the work of people like Piaget and Heinz Werner, and I think that changed the field a great deal during the 1960s and '70s.

**Killen:** How so?

Turiel: Well, toward much more emphasis on understanding children and their development, from earlier and more behavioristic and mechanistic explanations, and trying to see things from children's perspectives, and seeing them as thinking beings. I think that also changed the methods in the field, which may be less well recognized, because the field was trying to be very experimental. And what the kind of work that Piaget was doing and others showed was that you could be rigorous and quantitative and still do in depth and qualitative analyses of children's behaviors and thinking. And so the clinical interview method became important and accepted, although experimentation is still important it wasn't the only way of doing things, and people used combinations of different methods that included using a clinical interview and trying to get at children's perspectives on the world. So that was a big change. And I think that even for those who take different approaches from this Piagetian structural tradition, his work has had a big influence and changed the fields, even for those who don't agree with his positions.

**Killen:** Yes, I have a question about that for you. As you said, Piaget obviously in many ways founded and created the entire field that we work in. And you've always been a very strong proponent of the Piagetian approach and Piaget theory. But like any theory, it evolves, it changes and you've been someone who's also been instrumental in moving it forward. And in what way are you Piagetian and in what way do you view yourself as sort of extending and moving Piaget's theory in a new way?

**Turiel:** Well, I see myself as a Piagetian in the general sense that thought, and development, and emotions, and behaviors need to be seen as a constructive process out of the child's understanding of experience, child environment interactions, in the social realm out of reciprocal interactions, and that's a way of thinking about children and development that comes from Piaget and others. And I keep emphasizing Piaget, but there were others like Baldwin and Werner who were big contributors to that. And then there are people in other areas like some of the Gestalt psychologists, or Solomon Asch in social psychology who generally took that approach. So I see myself as still rooted in that view of human beings and human functioning. But there were specifics about the kind of development that people were describing, Piaget and others at the time. Kohlberg was one of them from moral development that focused on a more global way of approaching children's thought and development and that everything kind of hangs together, so there were explanations of development that looked at how cognitive, and social, and moral development were all related to each other and formed one general or global system that needed to be explained. Or just within the social and moral realm, the emphasis was on how children's social thinking, and it includes moral thinking, involved a package that combined morality with personal matters and societal matters of customs and conventions. And the way we've approached it that's different is that we looked at what we call domains, again, and how thinking can be differentiated by domains. So it's not one general structural system or global system in development. And that relates to analyses and explanations of the experiential sources of development, because we've been finding that different kinds of experiences contribute to different domains of thinking. And that then raises what I think is a very interesting issue and question, which is the one of how people, in making decisions of a social or moral nature, have to confront different considerations from these different domains and have a variety of goals that they have to coordinate with each other, and that makes for a lot of conflict in life, because people have more than one goal or one agenda to worry about. And I think that the older global approach doesn't allow for an examination of these different considerations and goals that people have in social life and the conflicts that that makes for.

**Killen:** If Piaget were alive today do you think he would find this debate relevant?

**Turiel:** Well, yes--

**Killen:** --it's still interactive. Perhaps he would--

**Turiel:** Yes, I think he might.

**Killen:** It might be a way that he would have extended his own work in the logical area he had domains--

**Turiel:** Right.

**Killen:** --to extend to spatial knowledge--

**Turiel:** That's right, because he did study different areas differently. He studied space, he studied number and logic.

**Killen:** He didn't focus on moral judgment as much after really the 1930s.

**Turiel:** That's right.

**Killen:** So it's possible that if he had gone back to it he might have had the same trajectory in some ways or certainly found it interesting?

Turiel: Yes, yes, I think that's right.

**Killen:** Yes, yes. Are there other kinds of things? We've covered a lot of ground, a lot of different areas. Is there anything else either about just your personal interests, or your family that have in some ways contributed to your scientific interest and development that you'd like to comment on?

Turiel: We've talked about what may be the major one in my early family life. But no, I don't think there's anything that comes to mind in that realm.

**Killen:** Nothing about the Café Mediterranean and Berkeley?

Turiel: Well, Berkeley I liked very much as you do, and in large measure because I think it's a very open intellectual atmosphere both on campus and in the Bay area. And of course, there's a long political history that people know about regarding Berkeley that people caricature now. But I think the openness of Berkeley, the intellectual openness is important and it relates to cafés. There's a very strong sense of faculty governance on the Berkeley campus, and there's often a tension between the administrators, the deans, the provosts and the faculty and, at least so far, that could change, the faculty has been, in terms of governance, stronger than the administration.

**Killen:** That's unusual.

Turiel: Yes, and some universities really give much more power to their administrators. And all this makes for a very intellectual -- it's not just in governing the university; it makes for a very interesting intellectual atmosphere where people really do interact and discuss and debate and a lot of us like to hang out at cafés and do this, as well as enjoying coffee and just enjoying the company of friends. But we spend a lot of time in cafés discussing and debating, and I did that with you and other students, and of course, you did that among yourselves.

**Killen:** Absolutely, yes, on the way to data collection and on the way back.

Turiel: Right. Yes. And there was a -- it's still there, but there was a café that used to be much more intellectually lively than it is now, just because it's changed hands and it's not the same place. But that was the Café Mediterranean, which for those people who saw the movie *The Graduate* was shown there with David Krech's son sitting at a table.

**Killen:** Really? Is that right?

Turiel: --yes--

**Killen:** That's funny.

Turiel: You remember *The Graduate*?

**Killen:** Yes, of course.

Turiel: Well, go back to it. You'll see that. But anyway, everybody used to refer to it as Berkeley's living room, and people would just gather there and talk and do work, and people say that they've written their books at the Café Med.

**Killen:** Yes.

Turiel: --and one that was particularly popular -- it wasn't a psychology book -- was a book that probably came out in, what, the early '70s or late '60s. It's called *The Greening of America*.

Killen: Yes, yes.

Turiel: I can't remember the name of the author, do you?

Killen: Yes, no, I read it.

Turiel: Yes, yes. And in it he says that he wrote it at the Med.

Killen: Yes, yes.

Turiel: But in any case, that's all very much a part of the Berkeley culture.

Killen: And it was actually an important part of being a graduate student there, because you'd go to the café and you'd see people from philosophy, I remember John Searle, you know, would be at one of the cafés and people from different departments would be there and you sort of got to know them and you had a chance to talk--

Turiel: Yes.

Killen: --sometimes even, you know, stroll back to the office and talk about sort of research in a different context, not as formal a context as it might be, especially if you didn't know them or work with them on a daily basis and it was very special in that sense.

Turiel: Yes, and even for those who you might have worked with or taken classes with, they were probably a little looser in the café than in the office or the class.

Killen: Yes. Well, thank you very much. This was really fun and informative.

Turiel: Thank you. You're a great interviewer. You must have had good training in the clinical interview method.

Killen: It has had lots of applications in my life. Thank you and we will conclude this interview.