



**Abstract** A fundamental tenet of much sociological, psychological and educational literature assumes that the creation of a predictable environment is crucial for nurturing a sense of well-being, as well as for generating a sense of trust in the wider social order. Still, the ways in which the environment is structured, and the very importance attached to the notion of predictability, will vary in different cultural contexts. Findings from an ethnography of daily life at an Israeli kindergarten over the 2001 school year show how the teacher, albeit unwittingly, shaped an environment that was inherently unpredictable. This unpredictability, in turn, served to mobilize personal resources and social practices among the children as a means not only of coping with the unpredictability, but of turning it to their advantage. Studies of Israeli Jewish youth reveal that the resources that are appropriate for successfully managing in an unpredictable environment are indeed salient and positively valued also at later stages in life. It is argued that socialization into an unpredictable environment at an early age reflects an enduring and characteristic facet of Israeli culture with regards to child-rearing.

**Key Words** child-rearing, early education, ethnography, Israel, predictability

Deborah Golden and Ofra Mayselless

*University of Haifa, Israel*

---

## On the Alert in an Unpredictable Environment

### Introduction

#### Predictability and Well-Being

The experience of our daily lives as more or less predictable is essential for ensuring a personal sense of well-being and security as well as for generating a sense of trust in the surrounding social order. These two dimensions—'ontological security' and 'sense of trust' in the social order (Giddens, 1984)—are deeply intertwined, not only because each enables the other, but also because both emerge out of constant engagement and immersion in routines. Indeed, the notion of routine is fundamental to Giddens' (1984) theoretical endeavour to elucidate the

reciprocal, and circular, links between social structure and practical action. Though the predominance of predictable routine may be deemed inimical to creativity and spontaneity (Misztal, 1996, p. 111), the absence of regular, routine, habitual modes of acting in the world may undermine not only our sense of the normality of the world around us, but also our very sanity insofar as we would be in a state of 'permanent uncertainty, puzzling all the time what to do' (Misztal, 1996, p. 108):

For most people the existence of social order, which dwells in day-to-day predictability, is convenient and comforting. Daily routines, in particular, create a feeling of security. Since the world of everyday life is the most important reality with which human beings are in contact, the habits of everyday life can be seen as devices to sustain the predictability and stability of social life. (Misztal, 1996, p. 102)

From a psychological perspective, the importance of predictability in the construction of reality was powerfully articulated by Martin Seligman (1975). He contended that a sense of predictability is essential for survival, and suggested that without it humans and animals alike are prone to helplessness, depression and even death. He further suggested that to develop a sense of security and efficacy, individuals need to perceive contingent predictability, namely some sense of predictable control (controllability) over outcomes. This core need for predictability pertains to achieving positive outcomes that the individual desires, as well as to having signals predicting negative outcomes such as disasters. He stressed that even if controllability over negative outcomes cannot be achieved, the existence of alarm signals that indicate when and where a negative outcome is expected (even if this is unavoidable) gives individuals a sense of security, because as long as the signal is not activated, they can feel secure.

These notions have been amply applied in underscoring that the task of caregivers, most notably parents, is to provide children with moderately predictable and controllable environments in which routines, rituals and clear contingencies are operating and are articulated (e.g. Ainsworth, 1979; Scarr, 1996). Further, in view of the difficulty of young children to observe contingencies even if they exist, as well as to self-regulate, it is stressed that caregivers should make extra efforts to construct predictable and safe environments, and that it is their task to provide such contexts and circumstances and to buffer children from unpredictability (Barnard & Solchany, 2002). In particular, the idea that parents' major task is to protect their child from physical danger and from psychological danger such as emotional or cognitive overload has been at the centre of most core theories of child

development (e.g. Ainsworth & Bowlby, 1991; Bowlby, 1988; George & Solomon, 1999). Thus, it is suggested that setting up a predictable environment and buffering children from exposure to unpredictability and, in particular, an unpredictably dangerous environment is at the heart of caring for the young. Only in a relatively predictable environment will children flourish and learn to confidently explore their selves and their world (Sroufe, 2002).

The organization of such an environment is dependent upon the structuring of time and space, the existence of rules and regulations pertaining to behaviour and social interaction, and the regular presence of a familiar adult who serves to protect the children from undue chaos and to mediate intrusions in the daily routines in such a way as to preserve the safe environment (Sroufe, 2002; Sytsma, Kelley, & Wymer, 2001). This sense of a secure base, somewhat paradoxically, helps them to explore *beyond* the bounds of these routines and to learn to cope with ambiguities and with unanticipated disruptions in them (Bowlby, 1988).

### **Predictability in Cultural Context**

The process of generating a deep sense of trust in the social order through exposure to predictable routines begins in early childhood, primarily in the home (Giddens, 1984; Misztal, 1996). Such a sense of trust, however, is not a once-and-for-all attainment in the domestic environment; rather, its maintenance consists of ongoing exposure to, and engagement in, predictable routines of daily life (Giddens, 1984). With growing numbers of women in the workforce, industrialized societies are increasingly turning to institutionalized settings to educate, nurture and socialize young children on a daily basis (see Wollons, 2000). Such early education settings are entrusted with the task of transferring young children from home to the wider society; in so doing, they present children at an impressionable age with their first extra-familial experience of organized social order. An anthropological perspective would suggest that the ways in which a predictable environment is constructed, indeed the very importance attributed to the notion of predictability, will be culturally informed and variously elaborated in specific socio-cultural contexts (see also Bradley, 2002). Given the understanding that 'classroom organization is in part a working-out of culturally embedded values' (Alexander, 2000, p. 385), how do such settings go about the task of constructing a predictable environment for the children in their care? Notwithstanding the similarities shared by many early education settings worldwide (see Wollons, 2000), detailed ethnographies of such settings in different

cultural and social contexts reveal that there are significant differences between them in the ways in which they juxtapose the need for predictable structure, on the one hand, and the requirements of a child-centred pedagogy, namely demonstrating sensitivity to children's needs and changing circumstances, on the other (see Ben-Ari, 1997; Lubeck, 1985; Norman, 1991; Peak, 1991; Polakow, 1982). For example, in Japanese preschools, fighting among children is regarded as natural and there is much leeway for them to do so; at the same time they learn to obey the rigid dictates of more organized activities: 'chaotic periods of free play are followed by silent formal ritual' (Peak, 1991, p. 78; see also Tobin, Wu, & Davidson, 1989).

In this paper, we set to understand the ways in which predictability is constructed within an Israeli early education setting, with particular attention to the effects of this structuring on the sorts of social practices, characteristics and values encouraged in the children. The Israeli context is instructive for exploring the construction of a predictable environment because it may be characterized as a society in turmoil. Since the establishment of the state in 1948, the population of the country has grown from half a million to six million citizens, mostly by way of recurrent waves of immigrants, many of whom have been refugees. These large numbers of newcomers have presented Israel with urgent and thorny economic, social and cultural issues, and the country continues to be internally divided into different social groups, each of which wages an open cultural war against the others, in a 'continuous conflict over the meaning of what might be called Israeliness, the rules of the game, and the criteria for distribution and redistribution of common goods' (Kimmerling, 2001, p. 2). Moreover, recurrent violent conflicts with Israel's Arab neighbours, and acts of terrorism inside the country, present a persistent security threat. These circumstances, as well as the pending compulsory military service for youth, reinforce themes of threat and danger for Israeli youth. Finally, this turmoil and unpredictability in the present are further reinforced by the memory of trauma in the past, especially the Holocaust, both on the part of individual refugees to Israel and on the part of the Israeli state, which keeps alive this collective memory of disaster as part and parcel of its very identity.

Given this wider context, it seemed interesting to examine how a teacher in an early education setting chose to construct the children's immediate environment. Did the turbulence of the wider environment pervade the kindergarten, unchecked? Alternatively, did the teacher invest greater efforts in setting up an orderly, predictable environment in order to buffer the children from the

intrinsic circumstantial unpredictability over which they had no control? Furman's (1994) ethnographic account highlights the daily life of four early education settings in Israel, including a day-care centre, preschool, kindergarten and first-grade class. The findings reveal an absence of clearly defined and consistently adhered-to rules and routines, particularly in regard to those pertaining to social interaction between children and teachers and among themselves. Framing her study in terms of the individual–collective dialectic, Furman claimed that Israeli children learn to be assertive, even aggressive, on the individual level, at the same time that they learn passive obedience to dictates of the collective, via ritual ceremony. In a previous paper, the first author (Golden, 2006) looked at the way in which daily life is structured at an Israeli kindergarten with a view to examining notions of social order conveyed to children. In that paper, she described two alternative sources of social order, namely, collective order and personal order, embodied by the teacher. Building upon these studies, in this paper we ask how might the ways in which the teacher structured the kindergarten environment be reflected in the sorts of characteristics, practices and values inculcated among the children? And what are the long-term developmental trajectories of Israeli children in this regard?

After a brief description of the kindergarten in which fieldwork took place and the mode of fieldwork, we turn to a fine-grained ethnographic account of daily life at the kindergarten. We first describe the ways in which the teacher mediated the outside world to the children; we then describe the ways in which she constructed the routines that made up daily life inside the kindergarten. Taken together, we show how the teacher, albeit unwittingly, shaped an environment that was inherently *unpredictable*. This unpredictability, in turn, acted to mobilize personal resources and social practices among the children as a means not only of coping with the unpredictability, but also of turning it to their advantage. We then present findings from studies of Israeli Jewish adolescents which accord with this interpretation and suggest that socialization into an unpredictable environment at an early age reflects an enduring and characteristic facet of Israeli culture with regards to child-rearing.

## **Setting and Mode of Study**

Fieldwork was carried out by the first author of this paper, who is a social anthropologist trained in ethnographic fieldwork. The study was undertaken in a regular state-run kindergarten which serves as the first

year of compulsory education in the Israeli education system, although it comes under a semi-autonomous unit in the Ministry of Education. The particular kindergarten was located in a central neighbourhood of a small town in the north of Israel. The town was selected by the first author because she had read in a local newspaper that the town was investing huge sums of money in upgrading the school system and she thought that they might not be averse to visits from an ethnographer. She received permission from the regional Ministry of Education to undertake research. The particular kindergarten was selected by the regional supervisor for early education in conjunction with the woman in charge of the same at the local municipality. The kindergarten, housed in a purpose-built building, unattached to any local school, catered to 31 children ranging in ages from 5 to 6, a third of whom were from families who had arrived from the Caucasus over the prior decade, as part of the massive wave of immigration from the (former) Soviet Union starting in 1989. There were 16 girls and 15 boys. Staff consisted of the main teacher, her assistant and a special needs teacher who came in approximately twice a week to attend to particular children.

Although we make no claims for this kindergarten as typical or representative of Israeli kindergartens, we have no reason to believe that it was atypical either—the fact that it was selected for the ethnographer by two women in authority would seem to suggest that the teacher and her kindergarten were highly thought of: that is, not only typical, but typically good. Moreover, the teacher was well esteemed among her professional colleagues, as well as among the parents, some of whom had insisted on sending their children to her kindergarten in spite of its being outside their neighbourhood. It is important to bear this in mind throughout because none of what we describe in the following was considered remarkable in any way by participants, including the ethnographer herself, who only in hindsight recognized the issue addressed in this paper as worthy of analytical attention (a belated discovery not unusual in ethnographic research).

Fieldwork consisted of participant observation at the kindergarten for two full days a week from December 2000 through until the end of the school year in June 2001. The ethnographer's initial interest in the kindergarten was wide-ranging and she made copious, detailed handwritten notes of all routines and activities as they occurred, so as to capture the natural flow of events. On the whole, the ethnographer remained at the edge of the proceedings—proffering help or otherwise actively participating in what was going on only when called upon to do so by staff or children. Apart from many informal conversations

with the teacher, her assistant and the special needs teacher during the course of the day, she held open-ended, in-depth interviews with them towards the end of fieldwork, addressing their views on early education and on their role. She also held in-depth interviews with some of the parents which addressed their general expectations of early education, and their views on this particular kindergarten. Given the agreement with the Ministry of Education, the local municipality and the teacher, according to which research was to focus on the teaching rather than the learning, observations focused on the teachers and teaching practices, and the ethnographer tried not to watch the children too obtrusively and did not hold lengthy conversations or interviews with them.

The ethnographer was primarily and most generally concerned with the ways in which the teachers sought to nurture and inculcate a deep sense of cultural, social and political belonging to Israeli society among the children in their care. Accordingly, and undertaken in the spirit of exploratory research, she made no a-priori decision to focus on specific topics; rather, these emerged as part of the subsequent process of reading and writing up the accumulated material on leaving the field. As topics of interest emerged (see Golden, 2004, 2005a, 2005b), all pertinent materials were read, organized and analysed in accordance with conventional modes of coding, classification and analysis of qualitative data, based on the constant comparative method (see Maykut & Morehouse, 1994).

## Findings

### The Broad Structure

On the whole the atmosphere at the kindergarten was relaxed and lively. The teacher was experienced and confident—though sometimes strict, she was spirited, humorous and affectionate, and the children seemed happy and forthcoming. Observed through a wide lens, life at kindergarten appeared regularly structured: the school year was organized in accordance with the religious/national calendar, which not only marked time in a formal manner, but also determined the substantive content of the curriculum. Moreover, within the broad parameters of this curriculum, the kindergarten day consisted of a regular sequence of activities which, apart from special festive days or trips outside the kindergarten, rarely changed. Both teachers and children were well aware of this sequence and, within these routinely scheduled activities, children seemed to be quite clear about what they were to do and what sort of activity, engagement and behaviours were

expected of them. Similarly, on the whole, the spatial layout of the kindergarten remained stable—from day to day there were few substantial changes in the way in which the kindergarten was physically organized. Demarcations between inside and outside, between different corners of the kindergarten, and between the objects and activities appropriate to these different spaces were clear-cut. Regarding behaviour, the teacher was quite strict regarding the outer limits of social behaviour acceptable to her. Thus, at one end of the spectrum, there was very little overt physical aggression or violence among the children, and any evidence of it was severely curtailed by the teacher. At the other end of the spectrum, children who wandered around on their own, or made it otherwise obvious that they were averse to group activities, were called to order. Thus, in accordance with the expected duty of care, this teacher has succeeded in establishing a moderately predictable environment.

### **Lurking Danger**

In the midst of this generally lively and moderately predictable atmosphere was an underlying thread of anxiety, routinely voiced by the teacher, about potential accident, danger or ill health. Clearly, we would expect that part of the adult role in relation to children consists of instructing them in taking care. Indeed, health and safety education is included, in some detail, in the national preschool curriculum as one of the basic life skills to be imparted to the children, along with intellectual skills, language and literacy, physical education and road safety (Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport, 1995, pp. 57–69). In the kindergarten under study, notwithstanding the unpredictability of external events over which the teacher had no control, in her depiction of the outside world to the children, she appeared to magnify the sense of unpredictability, even danger. How was this magnification articulated?

### *Ad-hoc, Urgent and Anxious Warnings*

In the daily run of things, on the whole, instructions to the children in taking care were not set out in advance but rather made *ad hoc*, in response to situations or discussions that arose. These warnings were often accompanied by a sense of urgency and were expressed in an anxious manner because the teacher seemed afraid that some harm might be about to befall the child there and then, unless she responded quickly and assertively. For instance, in response to the children's burst of energy on being let out to play in the outside yard, the teacher suggested that physical activity might get out of hand: 'You've

forgotten the rules of behaviour in the yard. The most important thing, you've forgotten how to take care of yourselves. Don't run. Don't jump. Don't kick', or 'You can play but don't run'. Or, in response to a child's curiosity about a stone she had found, she said, 'Gently, carefully, pick it up, check it out, move it, take care that it won't sting or bite. Don't be wild, don't snatch, make sure that nothing is hiding there, be careful, be responsible'; to children on the swing, she said: 'The most dangerous thing is the swing'; or, to one of the girls who had picked up a sack of sand: 'Don't pick that up or it'll fall on your toe'; 'Get off—that's dangerous'; or, in an endeavour to persuade one of the children not to take out a large play truck: 'What'll happen if you bump into someone?' In addition, the children themselves were portrayed as potentially harmful to each other. Such harm might occur during physical play—'Don't play football'—but also through close physical contact, even if this was friendly in nature. Two girls hugging each other in the yard were told to separate, as were two others who were running along while holding each other's hands: 'If one of you falls down, she'll drag the other one down'.

Outings outside the kindergarten evoked numerous warnings and exhortations to the children to take care of themselves, and the teacher did nothing to hide her sense of immense relief when, indeed, nothing at all went wrong.

#### *Worst-Case Scenarios*

The second way in which the teacher appeared to magnify the sense of danger was by evoking the worst-case scenario in the instructions issued to the children regarding taking care and avoiding accident. Natural elements such as water, the sun or fire might be depicted as potentially dangerous. For example, regarding cold water she said: 'Don't go and fetch water without permission. It's cold today and if you get wet you'll get sick'; regarding exposure to hot sun she cautioned: 'The sun is burning hot and you could get hurt.' The teacher further warned the children against playing with matches: 'Children mustn't play with matches because it ends up with fire and death.' An illuminative instance may be seen in a conversation between the teacher and children on the occasion of *Tu Bi-Shvat*, a festival day celebrating the new year of trees, in its religious tradition, and afforestation, in its Zionist adaptation (see Doleve-Gandelman, 1987).

The teacher was showing the children a colourful poster depicting an Israeli family having a picnic in the shade of some trees. 'That's the Jewish National Fund (*Keren Kayemet Le-Israel*) that planted trees for people to come and have picnics. God created the natural world—the sky, the earth, plants and

animals, water—he created a very, very, very beautiful world and what do you have to do? You have to take care of it. Go home and ask your parents how to take care, how to behave and, God forbid, what happened last year, there was a huge disaster—an entire forest was destroyed.’ The children intervened with various ideas of how this could have come about: ‘The trees were cut down’, ‘An earthquake’, ‘The Arabs went to war’, ‘The Arabs cut down the trees’, to which the teacher responded: ‘No children, it was a huge disaster . . . a huge disaster, something terrible, a huge disaster. There was a strong wind together with . . . should I tell you? There was fire, fire, fire . . . What do you use to make a fire? A pine cone caught fire, the fire broke out and the trees burned down, the animals were burned. They had to bring helicopters and water and it took three days to put out the fire. A very big fire . . . During the barbeque somebody forgot to put out the fire . . .’

Though evocation of worst-case scenarios might serve as sanctions for good behaviour, on the assumption (which is itself culturally embedded) that children cannot understand nuances but need extreme examples, these evocations, brought up in the midst of discussion of positive holiday experiences, still served to magnify the sense of imminent danger and the possible dire consequences of carelessness. In addition, when a child came to kindergarten after an illness or accident, the teacher might ask him or her to relate to the entire group their stories, during which she encouraged the listeners to ask questions—where it hurt, whether it bled, what the doctor had done, whether he or she had cried. The teacher’s interest in these particular stories of distress and bodily danger is noteworthy given that, on the whole, she was dismissive of the children’s domestic lives and reluctant to permit the children to relate stories from home.

#### *Unreliable Authority*

Moreover, in the face of this unpredictability and potential danger, the teacher appeared to imply some reservations about the protective capacity of adult caretakers to prevent harm from befalling the children. Thus, for instance, bringing to a close a long conversation between teacher and children about a recent suicide bomb attack, the teacher invoked the power of the state and its army to protect its citizens. Her final words of assurance, however, consisted of her routine imperative to the children that they take care of themselves: ‘The most important thing is that we take care of ourselves, that we’re on the lookout’. When all else fails to protect, even the state, she seemed to be saying to the children, you must take care of yourselves. Clearly, it could be argued, in the case of a suicide bomb attack, the teacher’s reservations about the protective capacity of adults were accurate. However, as we have seen, even in the daily run of things, on

the whole, instructions to the children in taking care were *ad hoc*, in response to situations or discussions that arose, rather than setting out clear-cut rules and regulations in advance, or arranging an appropriate environment—physical and social—to prevent harm and accident. The absence of preventive measures was apparent on a local walk, for example, during which the children were repeatedly reproached for their untidy walking and their stepping off the pavement into the road; however, no organized solution was provided for this difficulty; indeed, they were forbidden to walk in pairs hand in hand just in case ‘one of you trips up and pulls the other one down’.

In lieu of organizing a physical and social environment in which unpredictability was minimized, by implication it was the children themselves who were encouraged to take responsibility for taking adequate care. Hence, attention to issues of accident and ill health took the form of cautionary tales in which the teacher seemed to be suggesting that notwithstanding the danger lurking in an unpredictable world, things gone awry were the outcome of *not* heeding warnings and *not* taking care, and that the key to remaining unharmed lay within the children’s own grasp. In the event that the children did hurt themselves during the day or did not seem to be feeling well, the teacher took elaborate, highly visible care of the children’s illnesses and injuries: asking solicitous questions, bandaging their cuts, and massaging their sore tummies. In so doing, she seemed to assure the children that she would be there to take care of them if and when harm befell them. Responsibility for things going wrong in the first place, however, rested with the children themselves.

In sum, in her portrayal of the outside world to the children, the teacher appeared to magnify a sense of lurking danger, to express some reservations about the protective capacity of adults—both at home and elsewhere—and, hence, to imply to the children that they themselves were ultimately responsible for their own well-being and safety. As we shall see in the following sections, the sense of intrinsic unpredictability conveyed to the children by the teacher pertained not only to the outside world, but also to the daily run of kindergarten life over which the teacher, in principle, had greater control and more leeway to shape as she saw fit.

### **Daily Run of Kindergarten Life**

Writing about the establishment and maintenance of classroom routines by expert school teachers, Leinhardt, Weidman and Hammond (1987) distinguish between rules, or ‘explicit or implicit constraints’, and routines, which are clearly defined and well-known ‘shared socially

scripted patterns of behaviour'. The study, based on the observation of six teachers, showed how detailed routines (management, support and exchange routines) were established and maintained throughout the year, primarily by frequent, and precise, rehearsal. In the kindergarten under study, daily life was characterized by some rules, which set out the outer constraints on acceptable behaviour, but few routines. Routines were characterized by a degree of inconsistency that consistently served to undermine their very function as routines. This relative absence of routines would seem to be over and above what we would expect from the flexibility inherent in a child-centred approach.

### *Management Routines*

Management routines are particularly apparent during transitions between activities (Leinhardt et al., 1987). Precisely because such moments require special attention, we might expect them to be more carefully worked out by the teacher so as to ensure their smooth running. In the kindergarten under study, a close look at the transitions between activities reveals a sense of raggedness which pertained to both *when* and *how* activities began and ended. As to when activities took place, although there was a regular sequence of activities and broad time limits within which these were to take place, and in spite of the large clock on one of the walls, there was no precise time for anything. This lack of precise time would appear to be indicative of the teacher's looseness in interpreting the wider temporal structure in which daily life was anchored. This same looseness also extended to *how* activities began and ended.

Although some activities might have a formalized beginning, they seemed to peter out towards the end. Thus, for instance, the first formal gathering of the morning was usually opened by a ceremonial greeting by the teacher, accompanied by a song and rhythmic hand movements. By contrast to this formalized, ceremonial beginning, which heralded the whole group learning activity, this same activity very rarely came to a clear end. It might come to an end because the teacher had rounded off the topic and appeared to have completed the task she had set for herself and the children; or because of extrinsic factors that changed from day to day, such as a chance telephone call that interrupted the proceedings, or because some of the girls seized a pause in the activity to rush across the room and hug the teacher. Actions designed to aid the transition between activities were inconsistently used. Thus, for instance, the teacher might use a bell, or ask a child to ring the bell; at other times, the children themselves would ask to ring the bell, to which request she might or might not agree, or the bell

---

---

would lie unused for days on end. Moreover, and perhaps precisely because of the sporadic use of the bell, it seemed to command very little attention—nobody would pay it very much heed and the teacher usually needed to back it up with verbal exhortations. Alternatively the teacher might say that she was going to count to 10, during which time the children must finish a certain task, such as setting the room to order, but she would begin counting and the sequence would simply dwindle away without ever reaching completion.

Another example of the inconsistency that characterized management routines pertained to rotation. There was no rota of any kind among the children for who did what tasks (including tidying up, sweeping, cleaning, watering the plants, tending to the garden, feeding the fish, and so on, as well as participating in various activities, such as taking on parts in dramatic enactments of stories, poems and conversations); rather, these were assigned sporadically (cf. Peak, 1991). Even if the teacher might have had some rationale for the choices she made, this rationale was not made explicit and remained unclear to both observer and, presumably, children. Further, her inconsistent actions could not be easily interpreted as flexibility and sensitivity on her part in response to changing circumstances, as she would appear to respond differently even in similar circumstances, as is apparent in the following examples.

Mid-morning snack followed the group learning activity but had no fixed time: sometimes it took place as early as 9:45, at other times an hour later. During the learning activity, as time went by, the children grew increasingly restless, fidgety and otherwise disengaged. The more outspoken children might complain to the teacher that they were hungry, to which complaints the teacher might respond by glancing at the clock and saying, 'My goodness, I didn't notice the time'; or by reproaching the children who aired their complaints: 'You don't think I'm going to stop teaching because you're hungry!' Sometimes the teacher signalled to the assistant teacher that she should bring in the children's bags which were hanging on pegs or scattered on the floor in the small entrance hall; at other times she might send out one or two children to bring in the bags; sometimes the assistant teacher appeared to decide that enough was enough and simply commenced with the preparation for snack-time with or without the help of one or two children. Once the children had taken out their snacks, the mode of commencing to eat remained uncertain. Some children might begin to eat straightaway, usually very hungry by the time snack-time commenced; other children appeared hesitant, waiting for a signal or a ritualized '*bon appetit*' from the teacher, an extremely common mode of indicating the start of consuming food in Israeli everyday life. A child might ask whether they were permitted to begin eating, to which the teacher would respond with a wholehearted '*bon appetit*', or appear surprised at the request: 'Of course! Is

food for talking? Is food for asking how you're doing? Of course it's for eating.' Finally, the mode in which snack-time came to an end changed from day to day: sometimes each child went out to play as soon as he or she had finished eating; at other times he or she would have to wait—with arms folded or without—until the assistant teacher called him or her by name and permitted him or her to leave; or the entire group had to wait until everyone had finished before they were all sent out to play.

As this example shows, the point here is twofold: first, there was no consistent routine in terms of frequency of one way of doing things as opposed to another; second, the different ways were not contingent upon observable changing circumstances, apparent to the observer, who, in this regard, was in a similar position to the children themselves.

#### *Support and Exchange Routines*

During whole-class learning activities, the teacher would sometimes endeavour to monitor the mode in which the children responded to her questions and she would tell the children to put their hands up if they wished to speak. Often, however, this endeavour was short-lived, and the children would simply call out their answers, rather than putting their hands up to get permission to speak. Furthermore, the teacher's reaction to these intrusions was inconsistent, without apparent reason—she might respond in a positive manner without acknowledging the fact that the provision that she herself had put in place had been overridden, or she might just ignore the calls. At other times the teacher would declare that a particular child's contribution to the discussion was the last one, but then permit an additional child to add his or her contribution. In so doing, she herself overrode her own regulations regarding permission to speak. In similar fashion, the teacher might initiate a round in which each child took his or her turn to answer a question or participate in the task at hand, thus ensuring everyone's participation. Sometimes this mode of turn-taking would work, but at other times it would simply dwindle away. Thus, for instance, what started out as a round would end up by children shouting out answers, or the next turn would be taken by whoever happened to be ready. In another example, calling attention to themselves by calling out the teacher's name might work; on other occasions, the teacher would reprimand the child for calling out his or her name and tell the child to put up his or her hand instead.

As the following examples show, even with regards to particular children and their particular needs, similar behaviours might on some occasions call up no more than a cursory response or none at all, while on others they would meet with either approval or disapproval.

On the way to finding a seat ready for circle time, Dina approaches the teacher, and gives her a hug. The teacher returns her hug and gives her a kiss.

Towards the end of circle time, Dina rushes across the room and hugs the teacher. Annie and Ellen join in. The teacher laughs and circle time comes to an end.

Ali approaches the teacher for a hug. The teacher holds her off: 'Ali I'm in the middle of talking. I'm in the middle of talking.'

During circle time, Ellen approaches the teacher and puts her head in her lap. 'Have you forgotten the rules of behaviour during circle time?', says the teacher.

Dina approaches the teacher for a hug in the middle of the day. The teacher reprimands her by saying: 'What did we agree? Once at the start of the day, once at the end.' Still, she gives Dina a hug.

These incidents of hugging, which accompanied and punctuated most days, well illustrate the teacher's inconsistent reactions to the same behaviour, and the children's 'try your luck' strategy in response. Indeed, the inconsistent responses on the part of the teacher did not necessarily discourage the children; on the contrary, some of them seemed to rise to the challenge of the game and enjoy the gamble. Thus, throughout the year, not only did the hugging become more frequent, but more and more girls took part in it—at any one time, there might be a heap of five or six girls claspng onto any part of the teacher's body of which they could get hold. Moreover, as we have seen, the absence of rotation of tasks meant that the criteria according to which children were chosen, or not chosen, were fuzzy and unclear. In these circumstances, the children simply tried their luck. Trying their luck might mean finding ways to make themselves scarce so as to evade tasks that they did not want to take on, such as sweeping up, or, alternatively, finding ways of drawing the teacher's attention to themselves if they were keen to participate, like persuading her to let them ring the bell. Thus, for instance, when the teacher invited children to volunteer for roles in the dramatic enactment of a popular story, some of the children physically pushed themselves forward, others called out her name, while others sat quietly with arms folded in pronounced fashion. Any of these strategies might work, if not on one occasion, then on another.

Clearly, there is a thin line between what we have characterized as inconsistency, on the one hand, and the flexibility required of a child-centred approach to early education, on the other. However, we would suggest that, borrowing the notion of consistency from attribution theory (Kelley, 1967), namely the degree to which the actor performs the same behaviour towards an object on different occasions, we are justified in characterizing much of what went on at the kindergarten

as leaning towards inconsistency rather than indicating flexibility. This is particularly clear in the instances in which the teacher's response to the children's needs, both as a whole class, and on the individual level, was itself inconsistent. Thus, as we saw in the example of snack-time, the teacher's response to the children's needs, in this case for food, was inconsistent and did not seem to reflect sensitivity to circumstances or to unique needs of different children.

The incidents described above well illustrate the unpredictability that characterized daily life at the kindergarten. This unpredictability was apparent even in situations in which it would not be difficult for the teacher, in principle, to set out certain regulations and to adhere to these regulated ways, or in the case of any deviation, to provide some rationale. As the above account reveals, however, within the broad structure there appeared to be no such regulated and consistently implemented ways of handling much of daily life at the kindergarten. On the contrary, although there was some broad structure in place, the stability that might emanate from the consistent implementation of such a structure was undermined, primarily by the teacher herself. In these circumstances of intrinsic unpredictability, the children appeared to try their luck. Thus, the children learned that it might be worthwhile trying to intervene in the daily run of things, in various ways, so as to effect the unfolding of events to their advantage. This implied that children learned to be on the lookout for opportunities to act to achieve desired outcomes, but that this alertness was accompanied by a sense of uncertainty, precisely because the actions they took could never ensure a predictable desired response.

To sum up, as we have seen, at the kindergarten, the outside world was explicitly depicted as unpredictable, if not downright dangerous. In these circumstances, the teacher's responsibility for protecting the children took the form of issuing a series of prohibitions to be obeyed. In other words, in these circumstances of lurking danger, the children were to learn that they were responsible for protecting themselves: that they were fundamentally on their own, that there were no adult figures to effectively protect them from danger, and that in order to avert danger they must be on the alert, listen to warnings, and take care to act in certain ways or to refrain from various acts in order to keep safe. The world of social interaction inside the kindergarten appeared more complex, yet here too children were to learn to be on the alert, not so much to avert danger, but in order to accrue benefits. At the same time, the ways and means as to how to go about this were far more ambiguous than the ways to protect themselves from outside dangers, and the teacher herself did not appear to see herself as responsible for easing

the children's path by making clear the rules of social interaction within the kindergarten realm. In a lengthy interview with her towards the end of fieldwork she talked in detail about her understanding of her role as kindergarten teacher, which she described primarily in terms of helping each individual child discover his or her inner worth and capacities. When she did describe her role in shaping the general environment at the kindergarten, it was not in terms of creating structure or rules of behaviour, but, rather, in terms of creating a 'warm loving home'.

### **Growing Up in an Unpredictable Environment**

The ethnographic account of daily life at the kindergarten reveals the co-existence of two mutually constitutive processes: first, the children's environment, both outside and inside, was structured as inherently unpredictable; second, this unpredictability, in turn, encouraged the children to fend for themselves and take on responsibility for managing within this unpredictable environment. In this scheme of things, the children were to learn to nurture those personal resources and social practices by means of which they were able not only to avoid hazards, but also to turn the very unpredictability of the social order to their advantage.

What might be the developmental trajectories of children raised in such an environment? Studies of Israeli Jewish youth reveal a cluster of findings that would appear to resonate with the findings from the kindergarten described above. First, studies of Israeli youth paint a picture of high resourcefulness coupled with anxiety and stress. For example, findings from a representative sample of adolescents in Israel reveal that Israeli Jewish youth report high levels of efficacy, that is, a sense of capability in effecting outcomes, high levels of self-esteem, and low levels of felt helplessness, compared with adolescents in 25 other Western nations (based on multinational representative samples of adolescents—Harel, Kanny, & Rahav, 1997). Similar high levels of self-efficacy were also reported in studies examining young recruits in the Israeli army (e.g. Mayseless & Hai, 1998). This reported high level of efficacy and self-esteem, however, is coupled with high levels of psychological and physical symptoms of stress. For example, in the same multinational representative survey (Harel et al., 1997), around 40 per cent of Israeli adolescents reported feeling agitated, upset and/or distressed almost every day during the preceding six months as compared with 20 to 30 per cent in Belgium, Ireland and France. For Israeli adolescents a high sense of efficacy and esteem is coupled with physical and psychological signs of stress.

Studies also reveal that Israeli Jewish adolescents report low levels of respect for authority figures as well as non-compliance with rules and regulations, including etiquette (Mayseless & Salomon, 2003). For example, studies of peer evaluations in the United States found that among early to late adolescents, leadership was highly correlated with both politeness and compliance with rules (Chen, Rubin, Li, & Li, 1999; Morison & Masten, 1991). In contrast a similar study among Israeli youth revealed no such correlation—items referring to compliance with rules, politeness and good manners did not cluster with either the sociability or leadership factor (Krispin, Sternberg, & Lamb, 1992) and in fact were negatively correlated with them (Barzilai, 2003). Another illustration of this espousal of non-compliance to rules and regulations comes from an earlier study that compared children's responses to moral dilemmas by asking them to choose between conventional standards approved by adults and mildly 'antisocial' actions urged by peers. Unlike children in other countries, who gave their most 'moral' response when they thought that their parents would know of their responses, and the least moral response when they thought their peers would know, Israeli children gave their most moral response when they thought no one would know their answer, and gave their most 'immoral' response when they thought that either their peers or their parents would know of it (Shouval, Kav-Venaki, Bronfenbrenner, Devereux, & Kiely, 1975). In so doing, these children appeared to be adhering to the *public* approval of finding ways to get around rules and regulations. This finding corresponds to other studies on Israeli society which reveal a deeply entrenched 'culture of illegalism' consisting of a 'prestigious and influential ideology that either degrades the rule of law or assigns it a low priority' (Sprinzak, 1993, p. 177; see also Roniger & Feige, 1992).

These findings, taken together, may be seen as mutually reinforcing: the relative downgrading of the importance of rigid adherence to rules, regulations and obedience to authority serve to encourage personal initiative and resourcefulness. In turn, this need to be on the alert without being able to rely on consistent rules and routines may have its costs in moderately high levels of stress and anxiety. In sum, these studies of Israeli Jewish youth reveal a cluster of findings that resonate with the findings from the kindergarten described above. That is, the same personal resources and social practices deemed appropriate for successfully managing in an unpredictable environment, into which young children are socialized in early education settings, appear to be salient and positively valued at later stages in life.

## Discussion

The findings on Israeli Jewish adolescents may be explained as related to, and emerging out of, the complex, and somewhat troubled, circumstances of Israeli society. As the ethnographic account of the kindergarten has revealed, this wider social context does not permeate into the lives of its citizens in a somewhat vague, unspecified fashion. Rather, children appear to be socialized into this context, and into the personal resources and social practices deemed appropriate for successful management within it, in specific settings and specific ways. Given the intrinsic unpredictability built into the circumstances of Israeli society, it could be argued that the teacher at the kindergarten under study is simply reflecting in her behaviour and practices the turmoil and unpredictability characteristic of the wider context and which pervade the kindergarten realm unchecked. The ethnographic account, however, reveals that the teacher herself is deeply, albeit unwittingly, implicated in actually constructing the children's environment as unpredictable, even in situations in which she has some control over the unfolding of events. Hence, the argument according to which the teacher is merely echoing a given state of affairs is inadequate. In this regard, we suggest that what we are witnessing at the kindergarten is not mere failure to buffer the children from the unpredictability emanating from the wider context. Rather, this is a child-rearing strategy (though not necessarily consciously adopted) by means of which the children are exposed to a stressful environment in a relatively sheltered setting and thereby prepared to fend for themselves, and to cope with an unpredictable, sometimes chaotic, environment beyond the confines of the kindergarten. In other words, we suggest that these practices of the teacher are at the core of a major facet of Israeli child-rearing culture, one of whose functions is to raise children who not only show resilience to conditions of unpredictability but actually thrive on them by promoting in them resourcefulness and skills for taking care of themselves. These characteristics may then serve children and youth well in the event of having to contend with future situations of unpredictability and danger. In this regard, our ethnographic account of daily life at an Israeli kindergarten supports the assumption that underlies much of the literature on culture and child-rearing, according to which child-rearing practices are strategies appropriate to, and compatible with, local conditions (see Levine, 1980; Rogoff, 2003).

What may be the long-term implications of these findings for the development of a 'sense of trust' in the social order (Giddens, 1984)?

Paradoxically, in the very act of preparing the children to contend with an unpredictable environment outside the confines of the kindergarten, such an environment necessarily becomes an intimate part of their daily lives and their consciousness. This, in turn, may have far-reaching implications in terms of the type of environment with which these children feel familiar and at ease, and hence seek out and perhaps even contribute to shaping. In this regard, the unpredictability of the wider context is not simply there, inviting response, but rather constituted as such, through, among other cultural practices, child-rearing itself.

But does this mean that Israeli children acquire a lack of trustworthiness in the social order? Not exactly. In fact, social-psychological studies of Israeli youth demonstrate another intriguing dialectic of Israeli culture. Though Israeli adolescents mistrust rules and regulations and do not tend to obey authorities or the law, they evince a high level of conformity to societal values (Mayseless & Salomon, 2003). Israeli youth seem to be conformist with regards to their attitudes towards the country and towards military service, the general values they hold, and their emulation of their parents' political and religious values. Thus, Israeli Jewish adolescents value resourcefulness, creativity and independence in their pursuit of ways to overcome challenges and solve problems, yet they are conformist in relation to the expectations of mainstream Israeli society, as articulated by their parents, as well as strongly collectivist in orientation (Furman, 1994; Mayseless & Salomon, 2003).

How is this apparent paradox to be explained? As we have seen, growing up in an unpredictable environment may serve to instil among children a number of interlinked perceptions: that the outside world is risky, even dangerous; that the abstract, impersonal structure of rules and regulations is inherently untrustworthy and cannot serve as protection; and that it is they themselves who are ultimately responsible for fending for themselves. This sense of responsibility for self is double-edged: on the one hand, it appears to provide children and young people with a sense of self-reliance and confidence; on the other hand, this same sense of power contains its own stresses and strains. These latter pertain not only to the ongoing uncertainty of the outcomes of one's interventions, but also, and perhaps more profoundly, to the anxiety entailed in bearing ultimate responsibility for the unfolding of events with which one's own welfare is deeply entwined. It could be argued that it is precisely this experience of anxiety that fuels, and reinforces, the quest for a trustworthy community, based not on the predictability of structure but on the

predictability, albeit more elusive, of feeling or sense of togetherness (see Dominguez, 1989). Indeed, it is pertinent to recall that the teacher not only described her aspiration to create a kindergarten in terms of a warm, loving home, but also made sure that she was there to take care of the children should they need her, to tend to their cuts and bruises, and to listen attentively to their stories of illness and accident. Hence, the detailed ethnographic study reveals the complex ways in which socialization into a lack of trustworthiness in particular modes of social order may combine with, and facilitate, socialization into trustworthiness in other modes.

### **Concluding Remarks**

In this paper, we have adopted a socio-cultural perspective on culture, in the Vygotsky and Luria tradition, according to which the 'efforts of individuals are not separate from the kinds of activities in which they engage and the kinds of institutions of which they are a part' (Rogoff, 2003, p. 50). In this approach, society organizes the kinds of tasks children have to face and the type of mental and physical instruments to be provided, so that the children can achieve mastery in those tasks. In this regard, culturally organized kindergarten environments, routines and activities shape modes of thought and socialization at early ages and, in so doing, reflect societal/cultural processes and beliefs with regard to child-rearing. The study has revealed that, at the very least, the definition and implementation of what consists of a predictable environment may vary across contexts and, at the most, that the very notion of predictability as crucial for adequate child-rearing cannot be assumed across contexts. Indeed, an inquiry into the culturally specific conception and construction of a predictable routinely structured environment by adults for children may lead us to question the very cardinal importance attributed to predictability itself as crucial for adequate socialization. Clearly there is a need for further ethnographic research in other early education settings in order to ascertain, with greater confidence, which elements can be generalized to the broader Israeli context and which are specific to the particular setting and teaching style.

Methodologically speaking, the increasing exposure of young children to institutionalized care would seem to suggest that research into the 'formative years' of young children can no longer restrict itself to study of children in the home. Early education settings, serving to mediate between home and the wider social order, are crucial in introducing young children to an officially sanctioned version of the wider

social order as well as providing them with the opportunity to learn what personal resources and social practices they are to bring to bear in order to ensure their successful management in this social order. This paper, which combines an ethnographic study in an early education setting and findings from quantitative, psycho-social studies of adolescents, is quite unique. First, the reach enabled by quantitative research offsets the limitations of the possibility of drawing broader inferences on the basis of a single ethnographic case study. Second, the ethnographic study provides a grounded, nuanced, cultural understanding of quantitative psycho-social data (see Miller, 1997). Finally, each of the sources of data taken on its own taps only one point in time and may therefore suffer from being too 'present-oriented'. The ethnographic study of an early education setting that lacks a future and the study of adolescents that lacks a past complement each other in important ways by enabling a look at vital socialization practices and their aftermath over time. Thus, in more ways than one, this study demonstrates the possibility, perhaps even the necessity, of combining different research paradigms and perspectives in examining the process of growing up.

### **Acknowledgement**

Deborah Golden wishes to thank the teacher, assistant teacher and children at the kindergarten for generously sharing their daily life with her.

### **References**

- Ainsworth, M.S. (1979). Infant–mother attachment. *American Psychologist*, 34, 932–7.
- Ainsworth, M.S., & Bowlby, J. (1991). An ethological approach to personality development. *American Psychologist*, 46, 333–41.
- Alexander, R. (2000). *Culture and pedagogy: International comparisons in primary education*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Barnard, K.E., & Solchany, J.E. (2002). Mothering. In M.H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting: Vol. 3. Being and becoming a parent* (2nd ed., pp. 3–25). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Barzilai, S. (2003). *The development of social mastery motivation*. MA thesis submitted to the Faculty of Education, University of Haifa.
- Ben-Ari, E. (1997). *Body projects in Japanese childcare: Culture, organization and emotions in a preschool*. Richmond: Curzon.
- Bowlby, J. (1988). *A secure base: Parent–child attachment and healthy human development*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bradley, R.H. (2002). Environment and parenting. In M.H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting: Vol. 2. Biology and ecology of parenting* (2nd ed., pp. 281–314). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Chen, X. Rubin, K.H., Li, B., & Li, D. (1999). Adolescent outcomes of social functioning in Chinese children. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 23*, 199–223.
- Doleve-Gandelman, T. (1987). The symbolic inscription of Zionist ideology in the space of Eretz Yisrael: Why the native Israeli is called *Tsabar*. In H. Goldberg (Ed.), *Judaism viewed from within and from without: Anthropological studies* (pp. 257–284). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Dominguez, V.R. (1989). *People as subject, people as object: Selfhood and peoplehood in contemporary Israel*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Furman, M. (1994). *The new children: Violence and obedience in early childhood*. Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad (in Hebrew).
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Cambridge: Polity.
- George, C., & Solomon, J. (1999). Attachment and caregiving: The caregiving behavioral system. In P. Shaver & J. Cassidy (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications*. (pp. 649–670). New York: Guilford.
- Golden, D. (2004). Hugging the teacher: Reading bodily practice in an Israeli kindergarten. *Teachers and Teaching, 10*, 395–407.
- Golden, D. (2005a). Nourishing the nation: The uses of food in an Israeli kindergarten. *Food and Foodways, 13*, 181–99.
- Golden, D. (2005b). Childhood as protected space? Vulnerable bodies in an Israeli kindergarten. *Ethnos, 70*, 79–100.
- Golden, D. (2006). Structured looseness: Everyday social order at an Israeli kindergarten. *Ethos, 34*, 367–90.
- Harel, Y., Kanny, D., & Rahav, G. (1997). *Youth in Israel: Health behaviors in school-aged children: A World Health Organization cross-national study*. Jerusalem: Joint Brookdale Institute.
- Kelley, H.H. (1967). Attribution in social psychology. *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 15*, 192–238.
- Kimmerling, B. (2001). *The invention and decline of Israeliness: State, society, and the military*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Krispin, O., Sternberg, K.J., & Lamb, M.E. (1992). The dimensions of peer evaluation in Israel: A cross-cultural perspective. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 15*, 299–314.
- Leinhardt, G., Weidman, C., & Hammond, K.M. (1987). Classroom routines by expert teachers. *Curriculum Inquiry, 17*, 135–76.
- Levine, R.A. (1980). A cross-cultural perspective on parenting. In M.D. Fantini & R. Cardenas (Eds.), *Parenting in a multicultural society* (pp. 17–26). New York: Longman.
- Lubeck, S. (1985). *Sandbox society: Early education in black and white America*. London: Falmer.
- Maykut, P., & Morehouse, R. (1994). *Beginning qualitative research: A philosophic and practical guide*. London: Falmer.
- Maysless, O., & Hai, I. (1998). Leaving-home transition in Israel: Changes in parents–adolescents relationships and adaptation to military service. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 22*, 589–609.
- Maysless, O., & Salomon, G. (2003). Dialectic contradictions in the

- experiences of Israeli Jewish adolescents: Efficacy and stress, closeness and friction, and conformity and noncompliance. In F. Pajares & T. Urda (Eds.), *Adolescence and education: Vol. III. International perspectives on adolescence* (pp. 149–71). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Miller, J. (1997). The interdependence of interpretive ethnographic and quantitative psychological methodologies in cultural psychology. *Ethos*, 25, 164–76.
- Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport (1995). *A comprehensive framework for curricula in Israeli preschools, ages 3–6*. Jerusalem: Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport, Pedagogical Administration.
- Misztal, B.A. (1996). *Trust in modern societies: The search for the bases of social order*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Morison, P., & Masten, A. (1991). Peer reputation in middle childhood as a predictor of adaptation in adolescence: A seven-year follow-up. *Child Development*, 62, 991–1007.
- Norman, K. (1991). *A sound family makes a sound state: Ideology and upbringing in a German village*. Doctoral dissertation, Stockholm Studies in Social Anthropology.
- Peak, L. (1991). *Learning to go to school in Japan: The transition from home to preschool life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Polakow, V. (1982). *The erosion of childhood*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Rogoff, B. (2003). *The cultural nature of human development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Roniger, L., & Feige, M. (1992). From pioneer to freier: The changing models of generalized exchange in Israel. *Archives Européennes de Sociologie*, 33, 280–307.
- Scarr, S. (1996). How people make their own environments: Implications for parents and policy makers. *Psychology, Public-Policy and Law*, 2, 204–28.
- Seligman, M.E. (1975). *Helplessness: On depression, development, and death*. Oxford: W.H. Freeman.
- Shouval, R., Kav-Venaki, S., Bronfenbrenner, U., Devereux, E.C., & Kiely, E. (1975). Anomalous reactions to social pressure of Israeli and Soviet children raised in family versus collective settings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 32, 477–89.
- Sprinzak, E. (1993). Elite illegalism in Israel and the question of democracy. In E. Sprinzak & L. Diamond (Eds.), *Israeli democracy under stress* (pp. 173–98). Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Sroufe, A. (2002). From infant attachment to promotion of adolescent autonomy: Prospective, longitudinal data on the role of parents in development. In S. Landesman Ramey & J. Borkowski (Eds.), *Parenting and the child's world: Influences on academic, intellectual, and social-emotional development* (pp. 187–202). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Sytsma, S.E., Kelley, M.L., & Wymer, J.H. (2001). Development and initial validation of the Child Routines Inventory. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 23, 241–51.
- Tobin, J.T., Wu, D.Y.H., & Davidson, D.H. (1989). *Preschool in three cultures: Japan, China and the United States*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Wollons, R. (Ed.). (2000). *Kindergartens and cultures: The global diffusion of an idea*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

### **Biographies**

DEBORAH GOLDEN, Lecturer at the Faculty of Education, University of Haifa, is a social anthropologist by training and graduate of University College London. Her research consists of an ongoing inquiry into the cultural quest to nurture and inculcate a deep sense of belonging among new members of society, namely immigrants and young children. ADDRESS: Faculty of Education, University of Haifa, Mount Carmel 31905, Israel. [email: [deborahg@construct.haifa.ac.il](mailto:deborahg@construct.haifa.ac.il)]

OFRA MAYSELESS, Dean of the Faculty of Education at the University of Haifa, is a certified clinical psychologist and Professor of Developmental Psychology. She has published widely on close relationships, in particular adolescents' and adults' attachment and caregiving manifestations, with a particular focus on Israeli culture as it interacts with these. Her current research focuses on the caregiving/nurturing motivational system as it manifests itself in leadership, parenting, teaching and role reversal, as well as in how it relates to spiritual development. ADDRESS: Faculty of Education, University of Haifa, Mount Carmel 31905, Israel. [email: [ofram@construct.haifa.ac.il](mailto:ofram@construct.haifa.ac.il)]