

#### David Elkind

- Born 3/11/1931 in Detroit, MI
- Spouse - Debra Elkind
- B.A. (1952) UCLA, Ph.D. (1955) UCLA

#### Major Employment:

- University of Rochester - 1966-1978, Professor and Director of Graduate Training in Developmental Psychology
- Tufts University - 1978-1983, Professor and Chairman - Department of Child Study
- Tufts University - 1983-1989, Professor of Child Study and Senior Resident Scholar at Lincoln Filene Center
- Tufts University - 1989-Present, Professor of Child Development



#### Major Areas of Work:

- Cognitive and social development in children and adolescents; causes and effects of stress on children, youth and families

#### SRCD Affiliation:

- Member since 1963

### SRCD ORAL HISTORY INTERVIEW

David Elkind

Interviewed by Donald Wertlieb  
At Tufts University, Department of Child Development  
May 18, 2006

Wertlieb: --oral history interview. The interviewee is Professor David Elkind. The interviewer is Donald Wertlieb. We are doing the interview in Professor Elkind's office at the Eliot-Pearson Department of Child Development on May 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006. And we'll be following the protocol and in a moment I'll just test and make sure we're picking up. Okay. So it's a real pleasure and a privilege for me to be able to be in this position. Also, a lot of nostalgia associated with it, sort of bringing back memories when we were sitting in the office up the hall and you were hiring me back in late '70s and such, so at this point the chance to talk together for the benefit of the SRCD oral history project is something that I've been looking forward to. We'll spend some time first on hearing about your institutional contributions. We'll first talk about general intellectual history and then look at personal research contributions, institutional contributions, experiences with SRCD and a view of the field and some personal notes. So if we could begin and you could tell me some about your family background. Let's begin and if you could describe your family background along with any of the childhood or adolescent experiences that may be of interest for a project like this, anything we could learn about your educational and occupational characteristics of your parents, where you were born, where you grew up, what your schooling was like, any time in the military, early work experience, so let's begin with an overview of those kinds of items.

Elkind: Yeah, I was born in Detroit in 1931 in a working class family. I was the youngest of six, and--because we had just a small apartment, I slept on a pillow in the living room. I had very little experience with academics or scholarship or anything, and I was an indifferent student really, until we moved to California when I was 14. My father had emphysema, but also my older brother had been in the service and loved California. I had gone back there, I had two aunts that owned a bookstore there, so my family moved to California in 1945, and I started

high school there. And again, I was an indifferent student, but I befriended a group of boys who I went out with and so on, and we would--it was California, so we ate our lunch out of doors, and we would play hearts and other games. And I was not very proficient at that, and they used to tease me all the time and say, "Oh, Elkind's so dumb." And finally that got to me and I said to myself, "Am I really dumb?" I put myself to see if I could do better, and I took a course in business law and they--I surprised everyone when I came up with the answers and so on. And so I did reasonably well, and then my friends were all going to college and I and none of my family had gone to college except my oldest sister who had gone to Wayne State and was a very determined educator. But none of my other brothers and sisters had gone to college. But I had been working for a children's clothing manufacturer, and so I thought I would go on in that business and take apparel merchandising as a major. I took the entrance examination for UCLA and was accepted. At that time I could afford it, because it cost only 50 dollars a semester or something.

So I started working in apparel merchandising, but I took a psychology course, and I still remember Richard Centers was the social psychologist who taught introductory psychology course, and I became intrigued with that, and didn't do too well in my apparel merchandising courses, so I changed my major to a psychology without knowing what in the world I could ever do with a psychology degree. And because I had not done well in high school and so on, I suddenly became very dedicated, and worked very hard, and was a straight A student, Phi Beta Kappa in my junior year, and so I got scholarships, which was very helpful, because I didn't have much money. And so I did very well, and then I discovered after I got my degree that there wasn't much I could do with a bachelor's degree in psychology. And my professors there at--at UCLA encouraged me to go on for a Ph.D., and at that time the Veteran's Administration had a program, a training program and were training clinical psychologists, and they would pay for your tuition and also give you a stipend, which to me was ideal, because that was the only way I could finance my education. And so I went on to join the clinical program and that was where I sort of became aware of psychology and of academic life. And I was fortunate of having very good teachers, Ed Schneidman, for example, I babysat for his kids and--or--but also it was a very schizophrenic department, and I suppose that may be part of my academic schizophrenia. On the one hand it was in very experimental program with very good experimental people. And then--but they also had a very good clinical program, Bruno Klopfer, for example, was a renowned Rorschach expert, and so I would take courses in research and experimental design and so on, and I would hear about how projective techniques were really not scientific at all, and then go to a class with Bruno Klopfer where he would be detecting brain tumors months before they could be detected in any medical way. And so there was always that concept I had in this department between the sort of academic and research orientation and the humanistic clinical one, and I tried to resolve that in my dissertation, although I did it with rats and I tried to bring together the theories of Hull and Freud. My idea was that a variety of needs that would be more motivating than a single need. This was in accord with both the theories of Hull and of Freud. So I ran rats under hunger and ran rats under thirst, and rats under hunger and ran rats under thirst, and indeed the rats that were running under hunger and thirst ran faster. That's what we did in those days. But the point was that I was trying to bring together different points of view, and I guess the notion of variety has always stayed with me throughout my career. And so I think the--my schooling was very sort of intense, because I was very focused on education. And I had no military experience. Actually I was very into Freud at the time because I was in the clinical program. There was a war in Korea and I tried to join the ROTC but I am inept physically and couldn't coordinate very--you were required, for example, to flip your rifles around and everybody got out of the way when I was flipping my rifle around.

Wertlieb: You were a dangerous man.

Elkind: I was a dangerous man. But I did well at--you know, give me a book and I could--I would do fine. But I guess I always was poorly coordinated from early childhood. But I loved to read, and that was one of the things I had always done. As a kid, I rode my bike to the library

and checked out my quota of books every week. So early adult experiences--I suppose the really critical one was that after I got my degree I was young, I was 24, I think, when I got my Ph.D. and I was thinking of taking a job at a VA hospital, which paid an attractive salary. But my teachers encouraged me to apply to a position at Austen Riggs Center in Stockbridge, Massachusetts. David Rappaport was looking for a research assistant, and I thought that, you know, this has some potential. And so I applied for that, and went and visited Rappaport and then I was fortunate enough to be selected as his research assistant.

Wertlieb: Yeah, I suppose you must have been attracted there to the kind of integration of research and clinical experience--

Elkind: Yeah.

Wertlieb: --that he was working on, so he was looking at the relation between Freud and Piaget?

Elkind: Exactly, and the psychiatrist Peter Wolfe was working with him at the time and attempting the same integration.

Wertlieb: --all the way the other side of the country, but a place where it was friendly to your interests?

Elkind: And I articulated it at that point, but I think that was, it was a place where he was looking for research, but also clinical experience and so when I got back home I got a bunch of books from Rappaport and I expected they would be on Freud, because he was a Freudian scholar. But the books were by strange person I never heard about, Piaget, you know, after seven years or eight years of schooling and I'd never heard of Piaget. I think there was a brief reference to him somewhere about sitting on the banks of the lake talking to children. And I began sort of reading, and then when I went to become Rappaport's research assistant he wanted me to work on Piaget things, and he was also working with Peter Wolf at the time. Peter was doing work on infants, so Peter--we were both sort of students of Freud and Piaget. Peter was the sort of pediatrician person doing baby research. And so I began reading Piaget, skeptically of course, because of my strong experimental backing from UCLA. So at Rappaport's behest I began reading Piaget, we started with *A Child's Conception of Number*, and I said, "You know, this is baloney, I'll do it systematically and I'll prove him wrong. So what I did was design a study using children at different age levels, but I designed it so that I could standardize the questions and then I gave points for the questions so I could score kids' answers. And so I got the data from the local elementary school and I recall sitting in the basement at Austen Riggs in those days we had hand run calculators even to get square roots, and I was working on the data. And lo and behold, I ran the analysis of variance and found significant differences between the age groups, and of course, I'd already seen this with the children.

Wertlieb: So the research had confirmed what you had been able to observe?

Elkind: Right.

Wertlieb: You called it a computer, but what you describe actually--

Elkind: No, it was a calculator that--

Wertlieb: --is even more like a calculator.

Elkind: --was a calculator, yeah, it was a calculator.

Wertlieb: --when we did these things by hand.

Elkind: Right.

Wertlieb: Yeah.

Elkind: That's ancient. And so Rappaport was pleased, of course, but he also told me that it was not the kind of research he would do, because it wasn't original; it was a replication. And my own sense was that I was learning a great deal in replicating these studies, and I also was making the case for Piaget, so I persisted and I ran--I did a number of different studies replicating Piaget's studies. And that's one of the points that I really would like to make. In many other sciences replication is basic to learning the discipline, whether you're in chemistry or physics and so on. And somehow we sort of put--disown that in psychology and say replication is somehow a bad thing. You have to do something original. I learned a tremendous amount from replicating those experiments. I learned, you know, how to talk to children, and I learned many--I learned so much, and so I think that this idea that we shouldn't replicate experiments is a bad tradition in psychology. I think we can learn a great deal by doing that; I certainly did.

Wertlieb: --your choice to bring what you had from UCLA and put it to work in Rappaport's lab. What boggles my mind is a situation where one can get a Ph.D. in child psychology and not have been introduced to Piaget. Thanks to your work that, of course, is no longer the case. The replication work that you were doing was an avenue to bring Piaget into the United States.

Elkind: It was happening. I mean, Bruner had already recognized his work as had John Flavell and so on, but nobody had really done the replication--

Wertlieb: empirical work--

Elkind: --right.

Wertlieb: And that Austen Riggs! What a place with the personalities, and intellects and disciplines--

Elkind: Oh yeah.

Wertlieb: --of you, and Peter Wolf, and David Rappaport and whoever else--

Elkind: David Shapiro and--

Wertlieb: --David Shapiro--

Elkind: --and Erik Erikson, it was incredible too. We had the meetings in the basement, and we had lunch, and had seminars, and case conferences and so on, and it was really remarkable to hear Erikson talk about it, you know, some of the cases. We had mostly adolescents there, although we did have adult patients, the actress Margaret Sullivan whom they called Maggie Wagg. And at that point I started teaching, of course, in child development, and so Maggie Wagg came and she was very sweet. Anyway, it was an extraordinary experience because there were all sorts of people in the community like the playwright William Inge and Philosopher Reinhold Niebuhr was there, and so the patients would put on plays so it was very exciting and challenging. For me it was a whole different cultural experience, because I'd grown up in say a working class family, and here suddenly was classical music, and *Saturday Review of Gourmet Food*, and so I was exposed to a whole new world and a whole new culture that I hadn't been exposed to before.

Wertlieb: It wasn't just psychology that was--

Elkind: No, it was learning a whole new way of life.

Wertlieb: --going on for you there.

Elkind: --it was opening up a whole new world.

Wertlieb: It was an exposure to a--

Elkind: --yeah, it was a whole new culture, because everyone there was very cultured--it was--you know, very Harvard kind of place, which was far different from the UCLA kind of atmosphere, so it was also a cultural awakening for me that--and--that was in addition to my new mentor Piaget. Also I didn't know anything about food, I didn't know anything about music, I didn't know about drama and symphony. And so I was--it was broadening in a lot of different ways. In addition, what Piaget did for me was to help me resolve that schizophrenia that I'd acquired at UCLA, which was this conflict between the clinical and the experimental, because what I liked about the experimental was it was experimental, it was scientific, you could test it. And what I liked about the clinical was it was meaningful, and I think what I didn't like about experimentation and psychology was meaningless if you studied memory, you employed nonsense syllables, if you studied learning, you ran rats, there weren't a lot of meaningful things. With Piaget I was dealing with meaning, but I was also doing research. It sort of brought those two things together and that's one of the things that I think was so important for me, and which I think really, it seemed that, when I discovered Piaget, I realized that's the way I want to go. And although I hadn't studied child psychology, I realized that I needed more experience, and so Rappaport arranged for me to get into a position with the Beth Israel Hospital in Boston in the child psychiatry department. There were some very fantastic psychoanalytic people there, and so I learned a great deal more about children, and also the whole psychoanalytic approach to children there. Anna Freud once came and visited, because she was good friends with the Bibrings, quite a stimulating place as well, and it was one fantastic psychoanalyst, Lydia Dawes, whom we met with once a week, and she was just extraordinary, just extraordinary. So I was fortunate in having good teachers and having great educational experiences. And at the same time I wanted to do research, and I wanted to get an academic position, and so an opening happened at Wheaton College, and so I took that, and I spent two years teaching there. And also, they had a children's school, so I could continue my research there and was able to do a number of replication studies. Piaget had done a lot of work on perception, but hadn't really done it in different ways that I wanted, and so I began doing perceptual studies. I guess someone described scientists as two kinds moles that burrow deep, the hedgehog types, and others who sort of--you know, sort of I guess go from subject to subject, and I guess I'm one of those people who goes from subject to subject rather than stay with one topic. And so I did the replication of cognitive development, and then I really got involved in this perceptual development and did a number of studies in perceptual development, and--but then left that and then got interested in religious development while I was in Boston trying to do a study, because what I tried to do was test out Piaget's theory on areas where he hadn't tested it to sort of test its generality, and so that's what I did with perception with ambiguous figures and so on to see whether his theories would extend to these kinds of contents. It did. And then I did some studies on religious development. Again, it was an area that Piaget hadn't explored directly, again, to test out the theory in areas where he had not and explore them. In Boston it was fairly easy to get the young Jewish kids and to get--I got--the Unitarian Church and--but to get the Catholic kids I had to see the Cardinal and at that time it was Cardinal Cushing and then they finally let me in. So I had a funny experience when I was doing my work at the Unitarian Church, because I would go every Sunday to get the kids out of Sunday school, and I would use the minister's office, and I was putting my coat on

one day, I was going out, and somebody clapped me on back and said, “That was a great sermon.”

Wertlieb: Automatically ordained.

Elkind: So that--so I began publishing those articles, both the replication studies, and the perceptual studies, and the religious studies in the *Journal of Genetic Psychology*. My family was still in California, and I was still torn about whether or not to return during that time. Sally and I got married, and were still trying to decided where we wanted to live (Sally’s parents live in Tucson), on the east coast or west coast, and a position came up at the Neuropsychiatric Institute at UCLA, and I had a friend there, and so I took that position and moved back to California and carried out some work there with Ronald Kogler, a psychiatrist in the department. But it wasn’t really satisfying, because I really wanted to teach, and I enjoyed teaching when I had been at Wheaton. The Neuropsychiatric was mainly a clinical job and I talked to John Seward, who was my thesis advisor, and there just wasn’t any opportunity to get a job at UCLA. A position came up at the University of Denver. The chairman there was an old friend of my teacher’s in California NICHHD. He wanted someone to go there and start a clinical child program, which was kind of what I would like to do. It would enable me to teach and continue my clinical work.

Wertlieb: It had your name on it.

Elkind: --yeah, so I did, and I created a child clinical training program there, which still exists. I applied for a child clinical training program at NICHHD grant and got that. And so we set up a clinical training program there, and then I was also able to teach a course or two. And it was during that time when I got a letter from Geneva from Jean Piaget. I’d been sending him my articles, and he asked me if I would like to come and spend a year with him as part of his Center for the Study of Genetic Epistemology. And of course, I was thrilled, and it was my third year running the training program , but it was a wonderful opportunity, and so I applied and got an NICH--NSF post doctorate training grant. So my wife and my two year old son and our Dachshund went to Geneva, which was an extraordinary experience, and got to meet and know and befriend Piaget, and so that was unique. A mind like that I suppose comes once in a century, and it was just extraordinary. I recall when he would be at the seminar and seemed to be dosing off. He was in his ‘60s at that time. There were a lot of different professionals like mathematicians, psychiatrists and biologists and they were talking about these very complex topics of things, and then Piaget would just sort of wake up and just summarize it in a very elegant and comprehensive way--

Wertlieb: So he had been working all along?

Elkind: --yeah.

Wertlieb: Again, the significance of these various disciplines addressing the issues was attractive to you?

Elkind: Right, yeah. I’d always--somehow the--it seemed to me that, you know, many different disciplines pediatrics, and child psychiatry, and education all deal with children. You have to look at all of those perspectives. I never felt the strain I suppose and/or constrained to stay within one domain, because I was dealing with children, and that’s what I was concerned about. But that was an extraordinary experience and Piaget was very gracious, even when I played devils’ advocate. For example, one day I asked Piaget, “Why do you use the terms assimilation and accommodation? You know, in the United States we use stimulus and response, and if you used the same terms, we could communicate much better.” And of course, the graduate students looked at me as if I was gonna get hit by a bolt of lightning

from God. But Piaget smiled and said, "Of course, Elkind, you can use stimulus response if you wish to, but if you want to understand anything, you use assimilation and accommodation."

Wertlieb: He rose to the occasion?

Elkind: --yeah. And once had--he invited us to dinner at his home, which was a wonderful evening, and he was very cute. His wife served a chocolate mousse after the meal, and it was in a large, glass bowl. He had a little twinkle in his eye after she had dished it out, took his finger and, to his wife's dismay, licked the remainder with his finger. His wife asked my wife, "Does your husband feed the baby?" and she said, "Yes, he changes the baby sometimes, yes," "Take him out sometime?" "Yes." And pointing to Piaget, "Not him."

Wertlieb: The true Piaget.

Elkind: True Piaget--

Wertlieb: Right over chocolate mousse?

Elkind: Yeah. So he took me into his study afterwards for a private conversation and to ask my burning questions, and so I had a question, but he didn't really answer it. And I think one of his really fascinating insights was that play is a means by which children create their own learning experiences. He called this kind of learning reflective abstraction, and I said, "You know, abstraction is a kind of association word, and it seems even though it's reflective it is still an abstraction. Isn't an abstraction kind of an empiricist kind of word?" And he never responded, you know, and I'm still struggling with that one. But I prefer creative abstraction. Anyway, Geneva was a great experience, and it reinforced my conviction that this was the kind of theory and approach I wanted to pursue, and so I came back to Denver. And at that point Ken Little's wife, Yvonne Brackbill, was an experimental child psychologist, and she wanted to start an experimental child psychology program, and did not want anything to do with a developmental program.

Wertlieb: No contest?

Elkind: No contest. So at that point John Flavell was leaving the University of Rochester to go to the University of Minnesota, and they were looking for a child development person to replace him. And it--again--you know, the whole child development thing was beginning, and Flavell had set the stage for a developmental program and so I was brought there to build a child development program.

Wertlieb: Some very big shoes to fill.

Elkind: Indeed, very big shoes to fill, and so I went and built the developmental training program. I wrote and received a NICHD grant, and I hired Arnold Sameroff and Michael Chandler. So we had a very, very good program. During that time, again, I did a lot of the research but I began getting interested in education and began writing for an education journal, because I was concerned about a lot of things that were going on in education. A lot of my research on cognitive and perceptual development had implications for education. But throughout I always continued my clinical work. In Denver I worked at the family court with delinquents. In Rochester I worked with the Rochester clinics, and so I always kept my hand in clinical work and published some clinical papers. In Denver I had worked with delinquents and published a paper on what I thought contributed to middle class delinquency. I wrote that it was parental exploitation or parents using their children as vehicles to promote their own position. Their children acted out so as to embarrass the parents. It was a different kind of dynamic than you see in delinquents from low-income backgrounds.

Wertlieb: So these were the beginnings of your ideas about their imaginary audience and personal fables?

Elkind: Right, right. I based the paper on experiences with adolescents in family court. I sent it to *Child Development* and the editor, Alberta Siegal, liked it, but the reviewers all didn't, because it was not based upon research. And so she published it despite the negative reviews of the reviewers. And it is interesting because this article was reprinted more than any other thing that I'd ever done and is a fixture in most textbooks. This sort of speaks to something about the discipline, I think. It is a point that I try to make again and again. In psychology we tried to skip the natural history stage of inquiry. Every science goes through a natural stage of observation and classification. We tried to skip that stage and go right to experimentation, because we wanted to emulate the physical sciences. Edward Tolman at Berkley had a brother who was a physicist and perhaps he wanted to emulate his brother, and so he was trying to do research in a more sort of scientific way. But in so doing he and others like Clark Hull at Yale skipped the natural history stage of inquiry. As a result, the people who are most cited in our textbooks and who are most well known like Erikson, Piaget, and Freud, were the observers and classifiers, not experimentalists. And so you really can't skip stages. But we did in psychology and lost decades of valuable time and brain power studying rats.

Wertlieb: And one other thing that strikes me also if I'm hearing correctly is that there was a continuity to the research you were doing and the style of the research in evaluating the observational work, but also a very important shift in terms of the audiences. So shifting to address people who were educators and people who were clinicians would have something to gain from the kinds of things you were learning, and that that became an important shift in your work.

Elkind: Right. And I started publishing in the *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, *Child Study Journal* and in *Child Development*, but I also wrote for *Young Children* and I started publishing in *Parents Magazine* and I even wrote a monthly column for that magazine for over five years. Early on I trained myself to be a writer. I worked very hard at writing, and got a lot of books on writing, and would write each morning emulating Piaget, I guess. I would rewrite paragraphs and rewrite paragraphs and went to the Bread Loaf writing conference for a week to further learn my craft. I tried writing children's stories and I published a couple. But I realized that I was not a fiction writer. I realized that was not my thing. I was essentially an essayist and not a fiction writer. I wrote a series of articles for *Psychology Today* and one of those pieces caught the eye of an editor at Addison Wesley and she said, "Well, you know, this could be a book. I'd like you to do a book on that." And so I wrote the first draft of *The Hurried Child* and she said, "Well, this is too academic." So at that point I went back and wrote it in a popular vein. I should back up and say that while I was at the University of Rochester the *New York Times* came and asked me to do a piece on Piaget for their Sunday magazine, which I did, and they liked very much, and they published that and then asked me to do another one on Carl Jung, which I did, and they published that as well. And they asked me to do one on Erik Erikson, which was also published and widely reprinted. I also wrote articles on Harry Stack Sullivan and Wilhelm Reich. So that got me into, again, doing popular writing that I guess I had a knack for and was able to do.

Wertlieb: It sounds like you had the talent and you also had a sense of reasonability for moving these kinds of powerful ideas beyond the walls of the University and out to the people, whether to the professionals or the parents or the lay people who really need to understand these things better.

Elkind: I guess, yeah. I guess someone said—I think it was George Miller—that we need to give psychology away and I guess that is what I have been doing—giving psychology away to a popular audience.



Wertlieb: Yup, and I'm so glad you followed his advice.

Elkind: An interesting sidelight on the article I did on Eric Erikson. I did call Erikson and-- because I wanted to make sure that he agreed with what I had said and he made a few comments, but in general thought it was okay, so I was pleased with that. And so I guess I was reaching beyond the usual audience of journals. Then, of course, *The Hurried Child* came out. It was in competition with two other books that were coming out at the same time, Marie Winn's book, "*Children without Childhood*" and Neil Postman's book, "*The Disappearance of Childhood*," so they hurried up to publish it and it was--and I'll think of it--

Wertlieb: I hope you recall, because I'm not recalling--

Both speaking at once

Elkind: So *The Hurried Child* came out and did extraordinarily well. So it changed my life in many ways. But I'd always done invited lectures at conferences and apparently did well in public speaking. With the book the requests for lectures increased and so I got on a lecture circuit and began doing ethnographic research rather than the traditional kind. I should back up a little bit. At Rochester I did get interested in education and became interested in a particular group of children, whom I are called curriculum disabled children, children who are of average ability but who were performing below the academic norm. It seemed to me that our textbooks were never field-tested and did not address the diversity of learning styles that children came to schools with. From my perspective the problem for these children was that there was a mismatch between the child and the curriculum. And so I started this school, the Mount Hope School, in a mansion that had been donated to the University of Rochester, and which they allowed me to use. I had an undergraduate students take a practicum course for the semester or the year and then they would tutor these kids. And after a year or two the children would go back to public schools at grade level, because after working on a one on one basis, they could find a way back into the system. So I wrote a book about that experience entitled, "*Child Development and Education*," talking about our work in the school. And so I became interested in education and--

Wertlieb: this education or--

Elkind: --have continued to write on the topic. That book is in print which talked about really what I learned from. I also published a couple of other books. One was a compilation of articles on Piaget, bringing together articles I published on Piaget and other articles relating child development to society. These both did well. So I was doing a lot of writing, and so I moved into being an author/lecturer.

Wertlieb: Yes. I guess part of what we're doing in the project is looking at distinctions between some careers that evolved in rather straightforward fashion and others that have evolved using sharp turns in theoretical views or research style. I don't know whether you would characterize your work one way or the other or--

Both speaking at once

Elkind: Well, there was a movement--perhaps not sharp. I've always seen myself as a writer as well as a psychologist. It's just that I moved much more into writing for the broader audiences and less for the traditional research audiences. I will say that I did get a number of research grants early on, and I was on committees for SRCD, and NIH, and National Science Foundation. But I got turned off to the whole research grant business; because I always felt that the research was constrained by the grants. The people on the committees had an idea of what they wanted done, and that you had to sort of conform with the kind of expectations they had as to the kind of research you wanted to do, and I thought that very limiting. And so much

of the research that I did I did on my own with undergraduate students, because I just felt that that way I could do what I wanted to do, and I didn't feel I had to follow any fixed protocol. That is also why I never worked very much with graduate students. I did in the beginning in Rochester, but I think the problem with me is that I move quickly from one thing to another, and so students are working on one thing and I'm somewhere else. And so it has never worked really. So I moved away from taking graduate students. There was another reason as well. Piaget once said something that really stuck with me, it's that to the extent that there are Piagetians to that extent I have failed. I have the feeling sometimes faculty wants to turn out students who are carbon copies or clones. I never wanted to do that. I was happy always to consult and to give any advice I could to students in terms of research and design, but I never was much of a mentor to Ph.D. students. Whether that's my personality or whether it's my conviction, I am not sure. But I only had a few Ph.D. students. That tendency was reinforced with the publication of the *Hurried Child*. After that I moved into much more popular writing, and again, a lot more popular books. But it grew out of a genuine concern of what was happening to children in the society, and I always had been a child advocate. I think that Piaget was a little disappointed that I wasn't doing as much research as I had done in the past. But he was always very supportive. But I felt that, yes, I could keep doing the traditional research, but didn't feel like I'd make any major contribution in that way. And given the talents and abilities that I had, I could do more in the way of writing about what's going on in society, and that's how I moved in this direction. But I have not stopped doing traditional research. We created a personal fable scale and related it to risk taking. It is being published in the *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*. We just submitted a paper. We finally did a scale.

Wertlieb: Well, good you had submitted that. How much of that is continuity in your work and a change in what's happening in child development, where you described that "imaginary audience" paper, got published over the objection of the reviewers, and only because the editor advocated. Now a more empirical approach to a companion concept of "personal fable" but certainly a strong continuity that child development journals continue to be an important outlet, but clearly not the sole kind of thing that you continue to have to offer to the field.

Elkind: Yeah. I was very pleased, for example, in 1988 that I was asked to be president of the National Association and Education of Young Children, NAEYC.

Wertlieb: Let me take that moment--I'm just worried about we're losing--I'm gonna check our qual--nope. It sounds like we're good quality. So you were saying that in 1988 you were invited to the presidency of the National Association for Education of Young Children--

Elkind: Yes.

Wertlieb: --which is quite a dramatic step.

Elkind: Right. It was unexpected, I never sought the office. I mean, I'd published a lot of articles in *Young Children*, and was very concerned about all the things that were going on with young children. I was very flattered and pleased by that, and it was a wonderful experience, and people were very gracious. And it was during that period that we brought out the developmentally appropriate practice idea.

Wertlieb: And you saw a solution to the curriculum disabled child--

Elkind: --right.

Wertlieb: --developmentally appropriate practice.

Elkind: Right, right. And also too I think hopefully the idea of learning styles and getting--and recognizing that the curricula have to be much more open ended than they were before. Indeed, that is my hope for the new technology. I think technology will bring about a revolution in education. Conceptual reforms have not worked. With the technology we can address individual differences to a much greater extent than we could with the textbooks, and so that opens a whole new door to curriculum construction.

Wertlieb: So that's a very optimistic view about the current situation in new technology?

Elkind: Yeah, I think that technology can be used for it, but I do believe that technology is going to create a revolution in education, indeed, it already has. I think we recognize now that we in education, whether we're professors or teachers, no longer have a monopoly on knowledge. Google may have that monopoly but we don't and so on. It brings home the fact that education was never limited to the classroom--

Phone ringing

Elkind: --that the information--education was never limited to the classroom, you know? We had libraries, we have museums, we have zoos and aquaria and trips and so on, and I think that now with the computer technology kids go outside the school and outside the classroom to bring in things. And so I think the teacher's role is going to be different as more and more teachers come in, so there's going to be a new educational reality that will change the way we really do things in education. Reforms come about through new ideas or new technologies, and new ideas weren't able to work in education, but I think the technologies will. And I think already the--changing the way in which we teach things with simulation, you can teach all kinds of things that you couldn't teach in ways before that bring things home to kids. There are obviously negatives to technology, but I do believe that we're going to see a real reformation in education.

Wertlieb: Earlier you were among the people who were most concerned about the early misuse of technology, so it sounds like you've begun to see that indeed in terms of accomplishing something, your main goals for being able to address different learning styles for instance, the solutions may actually be in some of the newer technologies--

Elkind: Yeah.

Both speaking at once

Elkind: In the beginning I think we used technology as we do with all new technologies--to do what we did with the old ones. I mean, we had propjets before we had jet planes, because we couldn't move away from props right away. And I think we began to use computers as, you know, calculators and typewriters and so on, but I think we've moved away from that now, and as we have with the internet and all the other new tech tools--we're discovering all the new things that technology can do. And I think now we are beginning to learn the true potential of electronic media.

Wertlieb: And now we've just flipped over to side two after the first 45 minutes, and we were just talking about some of the issues of technology where it seems that, again, that concept of developmental appropriateness is gonna be pretty important to your assessment of whether these new technologies are working on behalf of children or not--and we've got someone at the door. Hang on here--

Tape paused and then resumed

Wertlieb: Okay. We're back, the car is in a safe place and we can proceed. And we'll talk some about some of the important institutional contributions that you've made over the years. We've already talked about your roots at UCLA, and the wonderful kinds of things that went on at Austen Riggs, and then into Boston, and then Denver, Rochester, and of course, the very important time in Geneva as well. But it was around the time that we're just talking about, the late '70s, that you made your way here back to Boston to--from Rochester--to the Eliot-Pearson Department of Child Study as we were known then. So maybe you could share with us some of what that experience--what the goals were and so forth and the kinds of things that you've seen happening for yourself and for that institution in the past 28 years, I guess

Elkind: Yes, it's 28--yes. Yeah. Well, I was running the Mt. Hope School in Rochester and we had the child development program, but we got a new president. The former president was very supportive of what I was doing and--the educational things--but then he was replaced. I recall walking to the dining hall with him one day. He was saying he could hire two assistant professors for what he was paying me. And he was in physics and had little use for social science. I saw that my days were numbered in terms of the support I was gonna get for the kinds of things that I was doing, so I began looking elsewhere. There was a position at Brandeis that I applied for but there was also a position at Tufts that I applied for as well. It sounded kind of interesting, because it tied in with my interest in uniting education and child development. Well, it just happened that I was scheduled to go to Brandeis when the blizzard of '78 happened, so I couldn't go to Brandeis. I did make my scheduled visit to Eliot-Pearson. I was very impressed with the place, because it had a children's school, which delighted me, and--where I could combine my interest in child development and education and would not be pressured in the way I would be pressured in a department of education. I felt at this point I wanted more freedom than I had had. So when I came and met the people at Eliot-Pearson and realized that it had tremendous potential I decided I would take the job of chair. Later Brandeis came back and wanted me to come for an interview, but by that time I'd made my decision. And it was a good one. It has been a wonderful place for me. It has allowed me to do just exactly what I wanted to do, which is to pursue my interest in education and in child development without the feelings of some--places like Rochester, which are great, but are very high pressure places, and without the flexibility and openness to other sort of orientation. And when I came here what I had hoped was that I could somehow bring together child development and education. I think it's recognized now that educational psychology was a mistake, that it grew out of the wrong kinds of traditions of experimentation and measurement and so on. It has been a relatively fruitless enterprise, and that's one of the reasons for the closing so many schools of education. They do not really prepare students for the classroom. And again, it is because of people skipping the natural history stage of inquiry. It always seemed to me that in true educational psychology that you start with a child and build from there, you start with the basic things. In physics you start with physical world, and in chemistry you start with chemicals, you know, and in child development or education you start with a child.

Wertlieb: It seems so simple.

Elkind: Yes, but it's not rocket science so I had hoped to bring together people who would share my interest in both child development psychology and education and that we would have a true--what Piaget called a science of education, which would be based on child development. One of the things that I really cherish here at Eliot-Pearson is that we train teachers as child development specialists, and I think that's the way all teachers should be trained, and that all the other things they can learn afterwards, for example, curriculum, assessment, classroom management should all build on a knowledge of child development. But if you teach them about curriculum and they don't know anything about children it doesn't make a lot of sense. That ambition was not fully fulfilled here because I think people have great difficulty crossing disciplinary boundaries and I guess people's identities are set up with those things as well, I

suppose, perhaps because I didn't have an academic background, and came from a working class family I never had that kind of a bias about disciplines because academia was so new to me I was sort of open to everything.

Wertlieb: Referring to the pre college--

Elkind: Yes.

Wertlieb: --so that the things that get us into trouble these days may be fairly early experiences--

Elkind: Yeah, well, I'm not sure, but maybe so.

Wertlieb: --you didn't have the early exposure to the academic hierarchy?

Elkind: --right, you know, maybe we are so eager to give our children a college education and to getting into a profession we narrow their focus. We do it out of the best of intentions, but we may actually limit their choices. I know my wife, who teaches, told me of one of her students, an eight year old, who was talking about being a paleontologist. I never had any of those kinds of ideas. I hadn't thought about it before, but it might be that sometimes we may close down kids too early by sort of exposing them to academic prejudices, and I didn't have any of that. So I was open to doing a lot of stuff that as a psychologist I wasn't supposed to do.

Wertlieb: In contrast, I consider myself a hurried child and raising hurried children, and part of what I'm hearing now is a good portion of your success may be due to the fact that you were not a hurried child.

Elkind: I think so. I tried not to hurry my children, and they've all done very well, and they're good kids, so I'm very pleased with that. But certainly they all went to college and all have advanced degrees. But they also make time to enjoy life.

Wertlieb: So when you arrived at Eliot-Pearson this seemed also like a very--almost a match made in heaven--

Elkind: Right--

Wertlieb: --in terms of where you were with your ideas and goals, and the kind of potential that you saw, what was operating already the way that you had started at Rochester. What would you say were some of the achievements and frustrations that you encountered over the course of your tenure here at Eliot-Pearson?

Elkind: Oh, achievements was bringing in people like yourself, and Maryanne Wolf, and Fred Rothbaum and Kate Camara all have done very well, and you've made names for yourselves in the field and also have maintained the kind of openness to interdisciplinary work. And we were able to get the Ph.D. program, which I was pleased to be part of, and so I helped move the department towards a more science oriented department, still open, but still a more research oriented department, which we've done and it has continued to grow in that way and even gotten more so.

Wertlieb: Now, my memory and information, if it's correct, was that really part of the basis of your coming was your recognition that what needed to happen next here was a Ph.D. program, and that that was what you worked on.

Elkind: Right.

Wertlieb: --you came in with the--I won't call it a blank check--but you came in with the--an expectation that within those first few years we would be able to launch the Ph.D. program.

Elkind: Right. And we accomplished that and are now graduating a number of first rate Ph.D. students. The program has grown. So in that respect it has done very well. The department has grown tremendously and now is nationally and internationally known, and we have people like yourself and Richard Lerner and so, you know, we really have come a long way. And I guess my disappointments are that I never was able to bring together that science of education that I had hoped to create, and we never really became truly interdisciplinary--people still stay in their disciplines. We still have a children's school. But I think there's a sort of an antipathy amongst psychologists towards education. Perhaps because education and educational research are regarded as a lower grade activity or something. If you do anything in education it's somehow a lower grade activity. And so that's a hard prejudice to overcome not truly science. A good example is when Kathy Camara came. I brought her because she was a teacher and she was into early childhood education. She was directing a Head Start program, and I saw it as a great opportunity to hire just the kind of person that we want. She's very good, but she left the educational scene and is doing other more psychological work things. So, I think that maybe the reward system in our schools does not reward that kind of integration and only rewards people working hard in their own field. So it is the reward systems in the universities that inhibits the cross cultural and cross disciplinary work. The universities endorse interdisciplinary work in principle but not in practice.

Wertlieb: Obstacles are still there.

Elkind: Yeah, I think so.

Wertlieb: And the awareness of the need. The rubric that we used even when we launched the Ph.D. program, a Ph.D. in applied child development certainly captured in profound ways what the nature of your contributions had been prior to your arrival, and maybe that you coined that term "applied child development," my memory. In doing research for the Ph.D. program I was pulling out one of your books that was very popular at the time. So that's my memory of it. And then more recently there has been a companion term or a coordinated term of applied developmental science, and compatible with your notion--you've mentioned a couple times--the science of education. Can the science of education that you've had in mind for so long be considered an example of what we're more recently calling applied developmental science or are those very different traditions?

Elkind: --it seems to me, if I understand applied developmental science, it's really not geared towards education whereas the science of education would be. In my mind, for example, taking the subject matter like psychology, and saying, "Alright, we teach it in a certain way. We teach usually history first or something. But if we taught it psychopathology first you might motivate students more. What if you rearranged things?" Because we do things the way they've always been done, but we haven't tested out whether or not they work. It's that sort of thing I'm talking about, looking at things like the sequence of topics or subject matter.

Wertlieb: So using a scientific method to understand and solve problems.

Elkind: --how we present things to kids is important. Does it make sense to teach, for example, the planets at second grade? If you do that, does it help children learn the planets later on? There are all sorts of questions that one can ask about what we teach children. For example, early language learning. It wouldn't make much sense to teach five and six year olds Spanish or French if there's no Spanish or French in their environment. The critical thing about learning language is motivation. And yet we do these things, and so there are so many questions of a practical kind in education that need to be answered, and we just stumble along

without really studying these questions in a systematic way. And there is so much about instruction that has yet to be learned.

Wertlieb: Like each of the examples you talk about do require being able to bridge two or three or four disciplines.

Elkind: Yeah. Well, one of my hopes was that in retirement I could get people from other disciplines to work together to create a science of education, that a physicist would be interested in, and that a biologist would be interested in so we could get together. We don't have to publish, and we don't prove anything to anybody, and we can get together and say, "How can we do this?" But I'm not sure that other academics feel this way.

Wertlieb: Well, that dream sounds like it even has some echoes of what the atmosphere must have been in Geneva.

Elkind: Right. Well, that's one of the things that sort of struck me about Piaget. He was so open to other disciplines and what he did was to take things from sociology and from physics and try to put them to the test in child development. I would like to do the same in education. I think that it was his openness which really impressed, that he was not discipline bound. Indeed, he tried to bring together the disciplines, and tried to see the relationships and so on, and use child development as an organizing theme for integration. I think I was very, very fortunate in finding Eliot-Pearson as a place to spend the greater part of my career.

Wertlieb: And this--in the interview protocol this comes under institutional contributions, but it's certainly relevant there, but your comments already have pointed out that it's a broader issue than a single institution, but the kinds of tensions that we're often concerned about tensions between being a researcher, and being a teacher, or being a trainer of researchers and so the tensions between research, theory, and practice. What would be your observations around institutional setting or more broadly putting things together for yourself recognizing those tensions and resolving those tensions? Is it really a problem? Is it a pseudo-problem?

Elkind: Well, I think it's a problem. I think it gets to the fact that we're individuals, and some people are better teachers than others just by nature. They know how to do it and so I guess some people are born teachers, some become teachers, and some teachers have teaching thrust upon them. I think those people are good and it seemed to me that we in higher education usually don't train teachers. I mean that I was never trained to teach. I've taught the way I've been taught and--you know, because I never did any teaching, student teaching or anything in my undergraduate or graduate training, you know, so when I was teaching at Wheaton College, I used a textbook, you know, I tried to elaborate a little bit. I think one of the problems we have is training academics to teach. It varies from institution to institution. I think we do a much better job here and at Tufts, because we have a lot of our students doing teaching and so on, and being mentored in that. But we at the higher levels don't really train teachers that well. Many of us just sort of struggle along teaching as we have been taught. Anyway, I like teaching. I think I do a decent job, but I've never been, according to evaluations, the most popular. And I think that's partly because I've always been somewhat of a loner perhaps--a little distant. And that I think the students appreciate I'm not as open as others. I think that there's something about my personality, which is that I'm very private, because as a writer I live a lot in my head, not that I do it consciously in any way, but I see my time as my own and I may communicate something about that to students, and I'm not sure how I do that, but I think there's something about my sort of warmth and responsiveness. I try to overcome that in various ways--coffee hours, taking kids to lunch, and so on. But it's something that comes across--

Wertlieb: It sounds like we are getting another piece of the research agenda for the science of education--

Elkind: Yeah.

Wertlieb: --higher education level. So--the other--any other comments you want to make on institutional, or should I talk about a specific institution, SRCD?

Elkind: Yeah.

Wertlieb: This project is part of the SRCD enterprise, and that's important for many of us. When did you get involved with SRCD? What kinds of contacts have you had with the Society, and your impressions of how SRCD has been a factor in your career or the way you see the field evolving or devolving?

Elkind: Well, I started going to SRCD very early. I think once I started to get interested in kids, so it was certainly the '60s. I remember the first meeting was in Washington. It was very small; all the major names of the field were there and so on, and they were still a very open kind of field with a lot of physicians, there were writers as well. So it was a very sort of eclectic group at that time, and a very fun kind of group. With my working class background, moving into this whole environment, I felt awkward. I didn't socialize very well, and I remember going out with John Flavell, Jack Wohlwill and others drinking beer and so on, which was kind of a whole novel experience for me to go out with a group and drink beer--and this was after I had my Ph.D.

Wertlieb: You weren't used to hanging out in the bars?

Elkind: No. It was a whole new experience for me. I published in the journals and attended the meetings, but I never was very active in the Society as the Society in terms of administration and governance. I think I was on the editorial board of *Child Development* for a long time and did the editorial work. The Society has grown tremendously I really haven't been going the last few years. I'll probably go this year, because it's in Boston.

Wertlieb: --especially with travel budgets being what they are.

Elkind: So the Society has always been very supportive for me, and I have fond memories of the early small meetings. I do remember the first meeting I went to, because there was one presentation--I'll never forget, because they had films in which children were running in mazes with different weights on their backs. This is what they had done with rats in the heyday of learning theory. They replicated a rat experiment with children. I couldn't believe what I was seeing.

Wertlieb: The wrong kind of replication--

Elkind: Yeah. I think it's a great organization. It's just grown so tremendously and it's been a very big part of my work. As I say, I did serve on the journal's editorial board for a number of years. But I never was on the committees, I never served as an officer or anything like that. And again, I guess I am just not the organization type. It certainly played a big part in my life once I began publishing. It's certainly one of the places that I presented a great deal of my work.

Wertlieb: It remained one of the key audiences--

Elkind: Right, right.



Wertlieb: Your work, especially in the last couple of decades has been aimed at a wide audience. Despite the growth and the size of SRCD, the audiences that you're aiming for are certainly broader than that.

Elkind: Yeah. I'm--I just made that sort of shift, although as I say, I still do traditional research. But I just feel increasingly that children are getting a bad shake. My book *Ties that Bind*, which I wrote a decade ago I try to make the point that we are--we have shifted from a society which was child centered and in which children and adolescents were given priorities over adults to a society in which adults are, you know, given greater, you know, importance than children. And I think the trend has continued with the commercialization of childhood with children being seen as consumers, and the same thing that happened to women at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century when women were transformed from creators to consumers. Women were asked, "Why do you want to grind your own coffee or make your own quilt when you can buy these at a store?" The home economics movement made women who were producers of a lot of home things into consumers. Now we've made children, who were once net producers of their toys and games, to net consumers of toys and games. I think we rob children of a great deal by doing this. And that's what my new book [*The Power of Play*] is about. Anyway, early on I moved to be a child advocate, I'm not really a researcher in the sense of an objective observer. I study children, and I care about the children in a society, and I feel that there are not enough people talking about what's happening to children, and so I try to do that. Today, there's a whole group of workers writing about the commercialization of childhood. There is a whole movement geared to the education of infants and fetuses. There is even a 24-hour TV station for infants, which doesn't make any sense psychologically. And so there are a lot of things which are happening in society that are harmful to children. It seems to me that at last NICHD and SRCD are beginning to move into those areas a little bit, but it seems to me that as a field which has children as our subject matter we should be more concerned with their well being--and I've written some letters to the organization about this without any sort of response. I believe as child developmentalists we should be doing more in the way of the real issues that are confronting children in our society. I think I wrote to some of the people who seem more interested in getting grant money than in the children that we're studying, and it's a while back.

Wertlieb: Funds for children into the federal system--

Elkind: --right and then--

Both speaking at once

Elkind: No, I was writing to some psychologists, who were saying let's make our system sexier so we can get more money. I said, "Look, all this money going to research on children, but what about all the needs of children?" Are we taking money away from children's programs in order to fund research? Those are real issues that we have to be concerned about or at least asking questions about.

Wertlieb: So it's not a surprise?

Elkind: No surprise. It's just that I'm deeply concerned with what's happening to children in our society, particularly today. We are silencing children's play and in doing so we're also silencing their curiosity, and their imagination. These are critical to science, they're critical to mathematics. And as a society we're falling way back in those areas. So it's not an incidental thing that we as a society by doing this to our children, because we are also handicapping our children in many ways. We have fewer people going into science now than in the past, and it's usually the foreign students who make up the increase in the number of people going into science and so on. In recent competition on computers, you know, for 15 universities--15 different competitions between universities with us and other foreign countries, we won only

one--MIT was the only one. I think Russia and Sweden did much better than we did, and they don't start kids reading 'til seven. So I think these are very real issues that I wish our--the organization would be more concerned with. And it seems to me that if you're studying children then you should be concerned with children's lives as well.

Wertlieb: We certainly see what the thrust of the forthcoming book is going to be. It has a blurb that refers to you as a leading light in psychology. That's a light that shines on this particularly, this discrepancy between what the needs are in our society for child welfare and what we as professionals are doing about it. Are there any other personal notes that you'd want to include in this document about your personal interests, your family, special ways they've had bearing on your scientific interests and contributions and applied contributions, any other points that you'd want to be sure to include?

Elkind: Well, I think I've been fortunate in having a family that has been very supportive. I mean, I don't know about other writers. I do a lot of writing in my head, which means I may be there physically, but not there psychologically, and my children and my wife have been very, very supportive of that kind of thing. And now my granddaughters are giving me a lot of new information. And I guess I've been very lucky.

Wertlieb: The 21<sup>st</sup> century version of Piaget--

Elkind: --yeah.

Wertlieb: --learning from children growing up.

Elkind: If I look at my hobbies, sailing, and gardening, and now I've taken up pottery. And I guess they are all natural activities that humans have engaged in since early times.

Wertlieb: Can you do your writing when you're potting and sailing and so forth or--

Elkind: Except for pottery, that's total concentration. But it gets me--it's a tremendous involvement, total involvement, because you have to be totally concentrated, your whole body has to be involved because you have so many things going on, the wheel is turning at a certain rate, and your hands are moving at a certain rate, a lot of different kinds of things going on. And it's very exciting for me. So I enjoy activities closely tied to nature. I guess it's like my interest in child rearing. Child rearing is something that's always been going on. It's sort of a basic thing that I guess I've always been charmed at those sorts of things that have been something basic to human kind. And, I never thought about it before, but it seems to me that it goes along with all the other things that I've been doing. And I've been very fortunate in having wonderful children, and wonderful grandchildren, wonderful daughters-in-law as well. So I've really been very lucky in those ways. For example, my sons gave me a kiln for my birthday.

Well, of course, I have to make everybody cups now, but that's fun.

Wertlieb: The other thing that strikes me with your description of the pottery process totally involved in occupying every moment of concentration and so forth, it just brings to mind that comparable experience you and I have shared, that is running this department.

Elkind: Yes, indeed.

Wertlieb: Something in the metaphor--

Elkind: Yeah, yeah-- I think that with the pottery I found something to take you totally away from everyday concerns. I'm sure you've found your own way of doing that. But--

Wertlieb: I'll be running to borrow your kiln. So other--do you feel like we've covered the territory?

Elkind: I think we've covered a lot of material--what are my hopes and fears for the future--my hopes are that we will as an organization deal more with the real practical issues, child, health and welfare issues. I know it's hard to do at the university, we have to teach, do research, service, but if children are our subjects and our concern, then we have to be concerned with their lives and with their position in this contemporary society--and then the future, you know. I do think that technology's going to change a lot of things. I think it already has. In the *Ties that Stress* I talk about the boundaries between the work place and the home place, but now the school place and the home place are so much alike, because there are computers, and we have fax machines, we have cell phones and so the boundaries between places that were once hard and fast are opening up I think, and that's going to change things a lot. Hopefully the boundaries between disciplines will become more permeable as well. We already share a common language with computers, to be sure. There are a lot of negative things to the new technology, but there are a lot of positive things as well. And so I hope those will dominate.

Wertlieb: Well, it also sounds like that's part of what I'll get a chance to read about in your forthcoming book, if not, in the next one. The book is due out very soon, yes?

Elkind: *The Power to Play*, that does talk about the new educational reality and how things are moving. And a point I make in that discussion is that early childhood education should be the model for all education. That certainly comes from my experience at Eliot-Pearson.

Wertlieb: Well, here, here.

Elkind: What we do there, and what we do in early childhood is combine what I believe is essential to all effective education. *The Power to Play* is only fully realized when we combine play, and love and work. When you combine those three then you have the best in child rearing, you have the best in education, you have the best in business, actually.

Wertlieb: Well, thank you very much. What a joy for me to be part of sharing your story.

Elkind: Well, thank you so much for--

Wertlieb: --to be part of this, and--

Elkind: Thank you for taking your time and for doing this. I really appreciate that.

End of Interview