# The Emotional Complexities of Teaching Conflictual Historical Narratives: The Case of Integrated Palestinian-Jewish Schools in Israel

ZVI BEKERMAN

*Hebrew University of Jerusalem*

MICHALINOS ZEMBYLAS

*Open University of Cyprus*

***Background/Context:*** *Emotions often accompany discussions of ethnic matters, yet there have been few sustained investigations in education of how, and with what implications, emotional responses are (de)legitimized in the classroom, especially when conflicting historical narratives are involved. Emotions have remained in the margins of educational research about the ways in which historical narratives are dealt with in schools, or at best, they are regarded as epiphenomena rather than constitutive components in teaching practice.*

***Purpose/Objective/Research Question/Focus of Study:*** *The main objective of this article is to help us better understand how both emotions and historical narratives are constituted and operate interactively at the level of both the individual and the social-political structures within school and the wider society. The particular event on which we focus the present analysis—a classroom activity on the death of Yasser Arafat—was chosen because it is representative of multiple other events in which similar phenomena were identified. Its analysis offers insights into how those involved in education (even in the context of integrated schools) draw selectively from formal and informal sources to support their emotional identification and sense of belonging within their particular political, national, and religious communities.*

***Research Design:*** *The events presented are based on rich data gathered from a long-*

*standing ethnographic research effort in the context of the Palestinian-Jewish integrated bilingual schools in Israel.*

**Conclusions/Recommendations:** *We highlight two main implications of the analysis developed in this article. The first concerns the importance of teachers critically analyzing the emotional discourses/practices through which historical narratives are authorized by, implied by, and embodied in schools; this position also entails the recognition that such discourses/practices have consequences for the ways in which affective spaces and communities are constituted within the classroom and beyond. The second is that the findings of this study concerning the teaching of controversial issues in the classroom suggest an imperative need among teachers working with multiethnic children to increase their competence in dealing with conflicting historical narratives at both the cognitive and emotional levels. This competence can be partly developed through preservice and in-service teacher education that pays attention to the emotional complexities of teaching conflicting historical narratives.*

Emotions often accompany discussions of ethnic matters (Ahmed, 2004; Svasek, 2008), yet there have been few sustained investigations in education of how and with what implications emotional responses are (de)legitimized in the classroom. There are even fewer studies of student emotional responses when the curricular topic presents conflicting historical narratives (Bekerman, 2007, 2009a; Zembylas, 2008). Educational research on historical narratives in schools has tended to leave emotional responses in the margins or at best to regard them as epiphenomena rather than as constitutive components in teaching practice.

This article presents an in-depth analysis of a classroom event that shows the emotional complexities encountered by teachers and students when dealing with conflicting historical narratives. The event presented derives from a rich ethnographic database gathered in a longitudinal research study of integrated bilingual schools in Israel. This particular event—which is based on a classroom activity addressing the death of Yasser Arafat, the past legendary president of the Palestinian Authority—was chosen to be representative of multiple other events in which similar phenomena were identified. Its analysis offers insights into how those involved in the educational activities draw selectively from formal and informal sources to support their identification and sense of belonging within their particular political, national, and religious communities. The event is an example of how folk historical knowledge of young students and their teachers, none of whom are trained as historians, interacts with educational strategies to promote or impede openings that bring Jewish and Palestinian students closer. In particular, the event shows how emotional issues can be embedded in classroom activities grounded within a wider sociocultural and political context. We also see how teacher and school efforts to support open dialogue bring to the surface

the emotional difficulties and challenges of teaching controversial issues in the classroom. At the center of this analysis is the (de)legitimation of emotions (i.e., who gets to express emotions and under what circumstances) in the classroom when dealing with controversial issues. Individual feelings and emotions are muddled up with the emotional aspects of group belonging. Using this classroom event, we argue that it is worthwhile to pay more attention to the emotional complexities of presenting conflicting historical narratives in conflict-ridden societies and to consider the implications of such complexities for teaching and teacher education.

## TEACHING CONFLICTING HISTORICAL NARRATIVES AT THE INTEGRATED BILINGUAL SCHOOLS IN ISRAEL

Teaching history is not a simple task at the integrated bilingual schools in Israel. The first attempt at bilingual desegregated education in Israel started in 1984 in the Neveh Shalom elementary school, located in a small Palestinian-Jewish settlement in the vicinity of Jerusalem. In 1997, the Centre for Bilingual Education (CBE) was established, with the aim of fostering egalitarian Palestinian-Jewish cooperation in education, primarily through the development of bilingual and multicultural coeducational institutions (Bekerman, 2004, 2009b). In 1998, the Centre established two elementary schools guided by these principles, one in Jerusalem and the other in the Upper Galilee. A third school was opened in 2004 in Kfar Karah, the first to be established in a Palestinian village and, in this sense, truly revolutionizing basic Israeli perspectives that could perhaps accept integrated schools in Jewish-majority settlements but have difficulties in considering sending Jewish children to a segregated Palestinian area. The most recent school opened its doors in 2007 in Beer Sheva. The schools today serve a population of over 800 students, and two have already opened middle school sections, hoping in the future to complete the full secondary educational cycle.

   Since their inception, these schools have challenged some of the basic educational premises of Israeli society. For example, they claim that Palestinian and Jewish children do not necessarily need to learn in segregated, monolingual educational settings. The integrated bilingual schools are nonreligious and are recognized and partially supported by the Israeli Ministry of Education. For the most part, they use the standard state curriculum for the nonreligious school system. The main difference is that both Hebrew and Arabic are used as languages of instruction. The schools have adopted what has been characterized as a strong additive bilingual approach, which emphasizes symmetry between both languages

in all aspects of instruction (Garcia, 1997). More specifically, two home-room teachers—a Palestinian and a Jew—jointly lead classes, and each school is codirected by a Palestinian and a Jewish principal. Children from both groups are equally represented in the student body. The schools offer a cooperative framework structured on the basis of equality and mutual respect while remaining committed to sustaining and strengthening participants' distinct identities.

Palestinian Israelis, though officially offered full rights as citizens, have chronically suffered as a putatively hostile minority with little political representation and a debilitated social, economic, and educational infra-structure (Ghanem, 1998; Rouhana, 1997). Within this conflicting con-text, the idea of creating educational spheres where their narrative is voiced is, in and of itself, a daring enterprise. The schools function on the premise that educational initiatives can create spheres that allow for the inclusion of diversity and the possibility of mutual recognition (Bekerman, 2004, 2005a). At the basis of the conflict are controversial historical interpretations. As such, the need to negotiate between inter-dependent and conflicting historical narratives is one of the main goals of the schools' activities. Such a negotiation is full of risks.

The Israeli educational system almost fully segregates the Palestinian and Jewish populations. Like many modern countries, it makes use of his-tory curricula to promote a strong sense of belonging among its citizenry (Al-Haj, 2005; Crawford, 1995; Nash, Crabtree, & Dunn, 1998). As in many other areas of conflict, here too these curricula become central tools in the prolongation of conflict (Bar-Tal, 1999). The standard Jewish curriculum focuses on national Jewish content and Jewish nation-build-ing, whereas the Palestinian curriculum is sanitized of any national Palestinian content. Jewish students are called on to engage in the collec-tive Jewish national enterprise while Palestinian students are expected to accept the definition of Israel as a Jewish democratic state (Al-Haj, 2002, 2005; Gordon, 2005). Palestinian schools are not allowed to teach narra-tives concerning issues related to their cultural and national histories. Thus, official history leaves little space for alternative narratives, recog-nized as a major part of a group's cultural rights.

The integrated bilingual schools try to find ways to overcome the diffi-culties concerning conflicting historical narratives, which are perceived as the main obstacle toward reconciliation. However, they need to do this under the vigilant educational supervision of Ministry of Education offi-cers, knowing very well that any perceived deviations from the official curriculum could be misinterpreted and risk the schools' existence. For example, the integrated schools introduce historical discussions at a very early age. Whereas standard monolingual schools generally introduce

history curricula beginning in the fifth or sixth grade, the integrated schools begin teaching historical topics in the first grade. In addition, some historical issues related to the major memorial days in the calendars of the two groups (e.g., Memorial Day and the Nakbe) are introduced starting in kindergarten. This does not mean that a fully integrated history curriculum has been developed. Rather, it simply shows that school shareholders see the discussion of conflicting historical narratives as one of the main goals of the schools and one that demonstrates the schools' commitment to recognition and inclusion.

The declared interest of integrated bilingual schools in confronting and discussing historical narratives, the continual political confrontation among the parties, and the regular outbursts of hostility that accompany the lives of all Israeli citizens make "talk" weaving present and past accounts a regular guest in the classrooms. This regularity is accentuated during school sessions officially demarcated to deal with commemorative national events or when outside events are so powerful, emotionally and politically, that they need to be officially acknowledged in the schools (e.g., Rabin's assassination, Arafat's death, or a suicide bombing). Addressing such events unavoidably raises questions about the place of emotions in classroom dynamics.

## EMOTIONS, POLITICS, AND HISTORY TEACHING

Since the late 1970s, scholars working in the area of emotions in different disciplines have developed sociocultural theories that challenge traditional biological and psychological approaches to emotions, thereby acknowledging the political dimension of emotional processes (Svasek, 2008). Rosaldo (1984), Lutz (1988) and Abu-Lughod and Lutz (1990), in particular, have argued that cultural and social phenomena are constitutive of emotions and affect the ways in which people feel, perceive, and conceptualize life events. In their view, emotions are public, not exclusively private, objects of inquiry that are interactively embedded in power relations. This perspective *historicizes* (a) the ways in which emotions are constituted, (b) their organization into discourses and technologies of power, and (c) their importance as a site of social and spatial control through surveillance and self-policing (Ahmed, 2004; Barbalet, 1998; Lupton, 1998; Lutz & Abu-Lughod, 1990). Because power relations are inherent in cultural processes (for example, in terms of kinship or ethnicity), domination, resistance, and sociality are at the core of emotional processes (Svasek).

The politics of emotion are manifest in many levels of social interaction, from the dynamics of everyday life to the dynamics of local,

national, and global political processes. The notion of politics here refers to "a process of determining who must repress as illegitimate, and who must foreground as valuable, the feelings and desires that come up for them in given contexts and relationships" (Reddy, 1997, p. 335). In other words, issues of (de)legitimation of emotion—again, who gets to express emotions and under what circumstances—are implicated in matters of individual agency and collective belonging. Emotions are "actions or ideological practices" that serve specific purposes in the process of creating and negotiating reality (Lutz, 1988); they make individuals into socially and culturally specific persons engaged in complex webs of power relations. Unavoidably, then, power is an integral part of discursive practices of emotions because

> power relations determine what can, cannot, or must be said about self and emotion, what is taken to be true or false about them, and what only some individuals can say about them. . . . The real innovation is in showing how emotion discourses establish, assert, challenge, or reinforce power or status differences. (Abu-Lughod & Lutz, 1990, p. 14)

Consequently, it is important to pay attention to the contextual specificity of the transaction between larger social forces (macro-political) and the internal psychic terrain of the individual, highlighting the ways that feelings are politicized in specific locales. Drawing on this perspective on emotions foregrounds the cultural, political, and historical context in which emotions are constituted (Zembylas, 2005a). Socialization practices, including corporeal and discursive signs and hierarchies of power and position, are critical to this repertoire, shaping the presence or absence, as well as the intensity, of any given emotion. The presence and intensity of emotions in turn shape the social context in which they occur. Within this transactional process, emotions are understood as embedded in culture, ideology, and power relations (Zembylas, 2005b).

Acknowledging the historicization and politicization of emotions helps educators analyze and sort through various discourses about emotion and understand how those discourses operate to fabricate particular meanings about ethnicity that are circulated through certain practices. For example, historical narratives are unavoidably embedded in particular emotion discourses about collective (national) belonging and otherness. Ahmed (2004) argued that emotions play a crucial role in the ways that individuals come together, move toward or away in relation to others, and constitute collective bodies. In other words, affective connections (for example, national imagining and sense of belonging) are not

individualized, but work to bind together a whole community. To put this differently, emotions do not come from inside us as reaction, but are produced in and circulated between others and ourselves as *actions* or *practices*. This circulation happens precisely because individuals do not live in a social, historical, and political vacuum, but move; thus, emotions become attached to individuals united in their feelings for something (e.g., a common historical narrative). It is in this sense that it may be argued that teachers and students are always caught up in the politics of emotions; emotions are (de)legitimized not only on the basis of social relations in the classroom but also in the context of larger historical narratives and power relations (Boler, 1999; Zembylas, 2008). It is worthwhile to investigate, then, the emotional struggles and challenges that take place among teachers and students, and the overarching historical narratives involved.

## METHOD

The findings reported here are based on data gathered in the context of a longitudinal ethnographic research effort that began in 1999 in the integrated bilingual schools in Israel. The schools are recognized as state schools supported by the Israeli Ministry of Education. They teach according to the regular curriculum of the state school system but differ in that both Hebrew and Arabic are used as languages of instruction. The schools have adopted what has been characterized as a strong additive bilingual approach, which emphasizes symmetry between both languages in all aspects of instruction (Garcia, 1997). In terms of aims and processes, it is to be assumed that the initiators of the bilingual project would agree with Skutnabb-Kangas and Garcia's (1995) three main benefits of an effective bilingual educational project: (1) a high level of multilingualism; (2) equal opportunity for academic achievement; and (3) a strong, positive multilingual and multicultural identity, including positive attitudes toward self and others.

### SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

The event presented derived from ethnographic data gathered in one of the schools in the 2004–2005 academic year. This school ran classes from kindergarten to 10th grade and had a population of over 400 students. The setting was a first-grade classroom that consisted of 32 students: 16 Palestinian students, 1 foreign student, and 15 Jewish students. Three of the Palestinian students were Christian, and the others were Muslim. In terms of the school's expectations, this class did not have an "ideal" reg-

istration balance because there were fewer Palestinian girls (i.e., there were 5 Palestinian girls compared with 10 Jewish girls) and fewer Jewish boys (i.e., there were 5 Jewish boys compared with 11 Palestinian boys).

As all other classrooms of this school, the first-grade classroom had two home teachers, a Palestinian and a Jew, who jointly taught most of the curriculum. The Palestinian teacher had been with the school for 4 years and was fully bilingual. The Jewish teacher had been with the school for 3 years. She understood and spoke Arabic fairly well but was not nearly as fluent in Arabic as the Palestinian teacher was in Hebrew. Both were accredited teachers and recognized by the school authorities and the community as outstanding professionals much appreciated by all.

The ethnographic data gathered throughout the years of our research suggest that coping with issues of national identity (i.e., commemoration events such as Independence Day, the Day of the Naqbe, or other contested historical events) became the ultimate educational challenge for parents and educational staff alike (for the analysis of some of these events, see, for example, Bekerman, 2007, 2008, 2009a; Bekerman & Zembylas, 2010). The classroom events reported here were chosen because they reflected a very condensed version of issues identified in our previous work; this time, we approach these issues focusing on questions related to the (de)legitimization of emotional responses.

DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURES

In general, our longitudinal research effort is being conducted using a variety of qualitative methods, including participant observation, in-depth interviewing, and documentation gathering. Throughout the years, we have gathered over 400 hours of classroom video records and hundreds of audio-recorded interviews with teachers, parents, and students, and recorded dozens of curricular and extracurricular special school events—ceremonies, outings, and so on. For the 2004–2005 academic year (of which the events reported here were a part), we conducted observations in first-grade classrooms of bilingual schools for over 70 hours and had many opportunities to formally and informally interview parents, teachers, and students. The research team included both Palestinian and Jewish researchers who were fluent in both Hebrew and Arabic.

For video recordings, we placed a camera on a tripod in the corner near the entrance to the classroom to minimize intrusion in classroom activities. With the help of a small mixer, the camera was connected to two radial microphones that were positioned according to classroom activities. All video and audio recordings were transcribed for analysis.

For the transcriptions, we used a simplified version of Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson's (1974) conversation analysis notation marks, which was deemed sufficient for an ethnographic analysis emphasizing linguistic aspects of the interaction. All Hebrew recordings were transcribed to Hebrew, and all Arabic recordings were transcribed to Arabic. All Arabic transcriptions were later translated into Hebrew, and portions were submitted to a process of translation and back translation to cross-check their veracity. Because of the attempt to preserve the authenticity of the language, in the extracts (detailed in the following), the translation contains some phrases that may seem awkward in English.

All data were analyzed according to conventional qualitative methods (Mason, 1996; Silverman, 1993). We monitored our interpretative efforts through peer debriefing, paying special attention to the ways in which we as researchers allowed or did not allow for the coding to be influenced by our prior expectations or theoretical inclinations, and we used negative case analysis to gain confidence in the hypotheses proposed. We carefully analyzed the data, looking for patterns and thematic issues of relevance. These were used in an iterative process of coding and code refinement. For the themes we focus on in this article, we provided a transcript section (see the appendix) as an example that shows the process of how we went from the data to the relevant interpretations.

In cases in which interpretations were not well aligned, consensus was reached following thorough discussions (Glassner & Loughlin, 1987). Moreover, and in line with naturalistic critical perspectives (Carspecken, 1996), the final coding scheme was further checked for validity and reliability through member checks (presenting interpretations to participants to verify that they viewed events in the ways represented by researchers).

For example, the statement made by the Palestinian teacher, Nun, regarding the need to be respectful to all—"To us, to other children, to the world, with. . . . What you said . . . is something that also when not connected to what happened today, is not acceptable to us in class"—was interpreted by one of the researchers as indicating Nun's position as a minority teacher (Palestinian in this case) needing to make sure her (all-inclusive) statement was not interpreted as one biased toward one of the groups represented (i.e., as if defending only Jews or only Palestinians). Another researcher rejected this claim, noting that given the structural changes implemented by the school (i.e., a Palestinian and a Jew coteaching class), there was no need to assume such a defensive stance on the part of Nun. Following this debate between the researchers, both Nun and Yod, the Jewish teacher, were consulted, and it was found that they interpreted the event in line with the first researcher's interpretation.

Both acknowledged that although the bilingual school had been successful in creating a much more egalitarian environment, contextual pressures following from the structural asymmetries existing in Israeli society still influenced the activities of all involved in the bilingual schools.

The classroom event on Arafat's death constitutes an excellent example of how folk historical knowledge, that of the young students and their teachers (none of whom was trained as a historian), intermingled with educational strategies to promote or discourage openings that bring Palestinian and Jewish students closer—something that undoubtedly involves deeply emotional issues. In particular, the analysis that follows will show how emotional issues are embedded in classroom events grounded within a wider sociocultural-political context. We also illustrate how the teachers' and school's efforts to support open dialogue bring to the surface the emotional difficulties and challenges of teaching controversial issues in the classroom (see Barton & McMully, 2007; McMully, 2006; Oxfam, 2006).

## THE CLASSROOM EVENT AND ITS AFTERMATH

The scenes we discuss took place during the first hour of the morning after the death of Yasser Arafat, the president of the Palestinian Authority (November 11, 2004), was announced. The political situation in Israel is such that any conversation about Arafat's death in a classroom would be controversial at best. The history of the Palestinian–Jewish conflict offers both sides only antagonistic views and sad memories of this leader. Moreover, by 2004, little was left of the optimism that followed the signing of the Oslo Accords in 1993. Since 2001, the Sharon government had adopted a strategy based on the nonacknowledgment of the Palestine leader as a valid interlocutor, and these steps truncated any attempts at negotiations. Although in late 2002, a new peace plan known as the Road Map was accepted by both sides, tensions were not reduced, the conflict escalated, and Israel proceeded to build a security fence with the aim of stopping any Palestinian extremists from attempting to enter Israel—an act condemned by the international community. Even in a school dedicated to crossing tabooed boundaries, overcoming these limitations was not easy, especially considering that Arafat's death came unannounced, and there was little time to prepare a commemoration.

Yod (the Jewish teacher) and Nun (the Palestinian teacher) cotaught the class in which this event took place. In the first hour of school, and almost unexpectedly, Yod introduced the topic of Arafat's death, emphasizing its emotional aspects. In her presentation, Yod used an all-inclusive "we" seemingly to create a sense of cohesion in the group. She

introduced the subject indirectly, talking to Nun but not mentioning Arafat's name: "Ah Nun, I know that this morning there is something a bit different, the way we feel, in . . . in yeah. When I was in my way to school I heard over the news [and wanted to speak a little bit about] here in class." The children reacted by stating that they knew Arafat died. The first intervention by Nun was one in which she tried to elicit information about who Arafat was: "Who is this Arafat, Nahla, did everyone hear? All the children heard that Yasser Arafat died." This statement was immediately followed by Yod translating (from Arabic to Hebrew) and asking a similar question. Multiple contributions were offered by the children, creating some disorder.

S', a Jewish child seated in one of the front tables where Nun was standing, said in a rather low voice, "I will spread kaka in his grave." Nun immediately picked up on this very strong, disrespectful comment. She approached S', placed her hand over his shoulder, asked him to calm down and made a comment that set the rules for the conversation. Nun set a very simple rule; everything could be said as long as it was respectful: "Shsh: I need to stop for a while, I have no problem, each one and what he thinks, how he thinks, how he feels, what he feels, S' the most important thing is respect." Although simple, it was repeated in different ways a number of times, underlying the importance that Nun attached to this principle. Nun's statement was supported by Yod, the Jewish teacher, who joined her in repeating Nun's full sentence in Hebrew: "Also respect [one to the other], and also respect, to the person we are speaking about."

Nun was quick to add that respect was something not necessarily related to that day's events but a rule for *all* times: "To us, to other children, to the world, with sentences of respect. What you said ((turning to S')) and I will not repeat it, is something that also when not connected to what happened today, is not acceptable to us in class." This last statement could be interpreted as one directed to the possibility that her previous statement might be misinterpreted as partial and dictated by the death of Arafat. Nun wanted to make sure her statement was understood as free of political bias or national preferences. As a minority teacher, Nun might feel the need to be careful. Also, as a teacher in an integrated bilingual school, Nun needed to make sure her statement was not interpreted as one biased toward one of the groups represented. Defiant, and showing again that his first utterance was not just a slip, S' challenged Nun's reference, saying, "Also if a rat that walks on the street dies?" for which he was once again strongly reprimanded by Nun and asked to keep quiet by the Jewish coteacher. The statement by S' provoked laughter in the class, after which Nun newly encouraged the children to speak about

their feelings and thoughts regarding Arafat and his death.

In the following segment, Yod and Nun tried to find out what the children knew about Arafat. A Jewish child mentioned the facts: "He had a heart attack, and the heart made a strike." A Palestinian student added, "Yasser Arafat is the president of the Arabs," to which Yod reacted by asking if Arafat was the president of all the Arabs. From the exchange, it was clear that not all children had a clear map of the local heroes, and they were confused as to who was who in local politics. Yod's answer was full of pauses and hesitations (shown in parentheses):

> Yes, he is, the president (.5), of the Palestinian authority, the Palestinian (.4) not the Arab, there are Arabs in Saudi Arabia, in Egypt . . . as we said last week, the::re are Arabs all around the world, but Arafat was the (.5) Chairman of the Palestinian Authority which is (.6) here.

The hesitations and pauses pointed at the difficulties Yod experienced when she tried to define Arafat's position in the classroom context. As a teacher, she attempted to put some facts straight; as a Jewish teacher in an integrated school, she had to be careful that the facts were understood as respecting the feelings of the two groups involved in the conflict and present in class. Yod corrected the reference to Arafat as "the President" to "the Chairman," acknowledging that although for Palestinians, he might be considered president, for Jews, he was a chairman of an authority; this idea implied that the Authority was not yet a national entity, thus lacking a president. *Chairman*, not *President*, was the accepted title for Arafat in Jewish Israel, a small hierarchical difference that went unnoticed this time, though Nun always referred to him as "President" (*Rais*). The second point of hesitation was relevant to the geographical position of the Authority. It was clearly not in Egypt or Jordan, but where it was did not become clear from Yod's statement; "here" was not necessarily Israel, yet this interpretation could not be completely rejected. Conversational turns were flooded with the realities of the outside world, though it was never clear if the sensibilities raised were relevant to the 6 year-olds present in the classroom or related to the absent (parents, ministry officials) "presence" of adults in the classroom setting.

In the following segments, children responded to the invitation for dialogue by expressing a variety of views and emotions on Arafat's death and what he represented to the Palestinian people. The session progressed without much difficulty. Yod then asked a referential question ("Do you think there are people who are happy to hear what happened?") directed to the real world of students outside the classroom. This question opened

a long string of conversation in which many students participated. What seemed to evolve, following the question put on the floor, was a true dialogue in which different views regarding Arafat were openly expressed by the children. For some, he was "a terrorist" and for others a "respected president," but all seemed to agree that these characteristics could be interpreted differently by the two groups, as exemplified by the following excerpt from the extensive dialogue:

> Nun: OK, H. thinks Arafat is bad for the Jews. What do you think? That he is also bad to the Palestinians? Or only to the Jews?
> H: only to the Jews (    ) he does them bad things.

Nun summarized the preceding section, pointing out the different views expressed by the children but not adding any final argument.

At this point, the conversation took an unpredicted turn. Some of the children brought up stories of death in their families. The deaths of a loved uncle or grandmother were mentioned. These were acknowledged by both Nun and Yod, who marked the utterances as belonging to the general sphere of death, seemingly different from the one discussed in class and dealt with the particular death of Arafat (Yod: "It is a bit different [the death of an uncle or grandmother] for today we speak about a man all the world knew . . . he was the leader of the Palestinians"; Nun: "He was the leader of a people"). This step could be interpreted as an attempt to redirect the conversation to its main course, and it seemed to be effective because a Palestinian girl then mentioned her experience of watching television with her grandmother and how hearing about Arafat's death caused her grandmother to cry and reminded her of the death of her husband. Nun used this utterance to return to the fatherly figure theme that she had commented on earlier. By referring to the child's grandmother's emotional reaction when her husband (the grandfather of the child) died, Nun drew an analogy between Arafat and the grandfather. She represented Arafat as a fatherly figure for the Palestinian people, and things ended there.

The episode was over, a difficult topic was dealt with, one initiated and guided by the teachers. The pretext of Arafat's death allowed for two social and emotional norms to be enacted. First, respect was established as the basis for freedom of speech. Second, and fully related to the first, all emotions were decreed as legitimate when dealing with issues lacking social consensus. It was clear that without the teachers initiating the topic, it might never have been put on the floor. Whether it should or should not have been brought up is a difficult question to answer. Death

might not be a subject to discuss with first graders, but death was part of what they found themselves discussing in the few moments when the students initiated the conversation. Nevertheless, death was not what originated the talk—at least not "death in general," as mentioned by Nun when she tried to redirect the conversation back to Arafat's death. Though frequently talked about, respect was also not the key point. What brought about the conversation was the school and its aim to produce spheres of encounter, emotionality, and recognition between two peoples in conflict. Arafat's death provided an opportunity to exercise this aim, and the teachers decided to cooperate. To do this, Yod introduced a difference—"I know that this morning there is something a bit different, the way we feel"—but what was different remained undecided. Were the differences ones that touch on the way individuals feel as representatives of "people" (e.g., Palestinians or Jews), or were these differences "individual" and related to the way each individual encountered death? Though until that point in the morning, the children had not focused on the events to be discussed, it was clear they knew about what had happened. S' was even ready to offer a violation that provided the opportunity to discuss respect, and all the children were able to become involved and contribute to the discussion.

Putting the topic on the floor seemed to be a call to raise group identities and emotional belonging initiated by the teachers. Emphasizing individual feelings and emotions was more of a personal call and distant from group belonging initiated by the children. Undoubtedly, both were there and might reflect both a "problem" and a "solution." The problem related to the need to account for group identities, which the surrounding resources had made available, but via conflict. The solution related to an individualized approach, which afforded other, more personal connections. But the individualized approach to enter the scene was in need of the group identities first; only in the presence of group identities could individual feelings be invited in and dealt with, with the aim of resolving some of the group tensions through them. It is this fit between the collective and the individual that we want to point at, a fit that might enclose a negation or neutralization of attempts to create renewed emotional connections (e.g., based on solidarity and mutual respect) among students coming from conflicting groups.

From a different angle, it is interesting to note that in response to the call for personal experiences, the Palestinian children first offered true, personal stories of death in their families, and then the Jewish children offered, as their individual experiences, the group's perceptions of Arafat as a political entity. Were the Jewish children lacking encounters with death? Had no grandmother died? Or was it possible that Arafat could

not become personal because if he did, it would disrupt the consensus around his image as an archenemy? The minority children felt more secure in the individual field. Whether this was a result of their training as minorities who needed to hide their political preferences was something that could not be known. Yet for Palestinians in Israel, talking about Arafat might be perceived as dangerous. Palestinian and Jewish children responded differently and shared individualized or collectivized emotions about Arafat's death, indicating in the most powerful way that power relations were at the core of emotional processes in the classroom, particularly when the issues discussed were so controversial.

## DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The analysis presented reveals the emotional complexities encountered by teachers and students when dealing with conflicting historical narratives in the context of integrated bilingual schools in Israel. The classroom event discussed shows that the transaction between the macro-sociopolitical context and micro-aspects of the working relations between the two communities in conflict is deeply emotional. As it has been argued, cultural and social phenomena are constitutive of emotions and affect the ways in which people feel, perceive, and conceptualize life events (Ahmed, 2004). In the context of the classroom event we shared, one can easily identify emotions at work in educational settings. Emotions are present, activated, and played out in all interactions taking place in the classrooms, even more so in settings in which much is at stake (Zembylas & Bekerman, 2008). Just as in other educational settings in Israel, in the integrated bilingual schools, students are unavoidably divided by adults in multiple categories such as culture, ethnicity, and religion (see also Zembylas, Bekerman, Haj-Yahia, & Schaade, 2009). Yet, what is different in integrated bilingual schools is that these groups come together in a declared effort to overcome what until today has been conceptualized as an intractable conflict. In such situations, as suggested through the example offered, the individual almost disappears, and groups take the individual's place in the discourses set in motion in class. This seems to be the main struggle taking place—that is, the tension between individual feelings and emotions of collective belonging. Whereas the adult teachers chose to discuss or highlight the overarching units of peoplehood/nation, the children pointed to more personal experiences related to their individual narratives.

For integrated schools in Israel, the death of Yasser Arafat and the need for it to be recognized in the curriculum constitute a new challenge. It is with great difficulty that schools in the past have dealt with historical nar-

ratives that divide the groups involved in the educational integrated bilingual initiative—Palestinians and Jews (Bekerman, 2003, 2004, 2005b). Dealing with conflicting historical narratives has not been easy, and they mostly seem to be able to present each narrative separately but not necessarily in dialogue with each other (Bekerman, 2009a). Time has not been able to heal the wounds of the past, and yet the past allows for some distancing that in turn allows for some recognition. But Yasser Arafat is a different ball game altogether. He is present, and for some, he is a national hero, whereas for others, he is a terrorist responsible for the death of many.

Thus, it is valuable to consider the multiple levels of power relations that are implicated in social interactions. At one level, the groups involved in the events described stand in asymmetrical positions of power; the Palestinians (Muslims and Christians) are a marginalized destitute minority representing the 20% of the Israeli population, and the Jews constitute a powerful reigning majority (80%). At another level, there is the politics of emotion as manifest in the dynamics of everyday school life. In our specific case, adult teachers seem to be the ones who define the "legitimate emotions" and foreground the valuable feelings and desires. This becomes very apparent in the manner in which teachers do not allow for expressions touching on personal experiences of mourning to take the floor. Even when left with no other options but to allow emotions, teachers try to reframe them in the discourse of nation.

Children seem to have no other resources available other than their own individual familial experiences of mourning (e.g., an uncle or a grandparent). But the relevance of these individual emotional experiences is challenged by the teachers. Its relevance is doubted as appropriate to the event of the death of the great national leader, Yasser Arafat. When left with no other choice, for otherwise they feel their efforts to be in vain, teachers co-opt the individual emotional experience of the death of a grandparent to position it in parallel to the death of the great leader (as when a grandmother cried for the death of her husband, so she cried when Arafat died).

What also stands out is that both coteachers partook in these efforts, yet they did not necessarily share the same interpretation of the events. For the Palestinian teacher, the death of Arafat was the death of the father of the Palestinian nation, her nation. For the Jewish teacher, though politically clearly positioned in the center left of the Israeli political spectrum, Arafat was, at best, a foe who recently became a friend, and at worst, just an enemy. And yet both made endless efforts to set the conversation at a macro-political level in which leaders and nations—and the emotions about them—were the only ones allowed to appear on the

stage. The teachers, regardless of their ethnic belonging, were captives of schooling as an instrument of public policy and preparation for specific forms of group organization. In this sense, teachers became, willingly or not, supracategory representatives of the ideological foundations of the nation-state. Paradoxically, this ideology was also at work for the Palestinian teacher, who clearly suffered in the present national Israeli context from that same ideology that presently represses her. Thus, it is shown here what is well known among anthropologists and cultural studies scholars in other disciplines, that is, emotional socialization in national ideological discourses is extremely powerful, especially in conflict-ridden or contested areas (Ahmed, 2004; Svasek, 2008).

As a result of the different levels of the politics of emotions in the classroom, two types of children's emotions are delegitimized in the event described. First, there are the emotions expressed by the Jewish child at the opening of the classroom event—that is, emotional expressions that are considered disrespectful of the occasion. This is interesting in itself, for the child who claimed "to spread kaka on Arafat's grave" was clearly expressing emotions that strongly related to the legitimate sphere (in the discussion as set by the teachers) of the macro-social, the public, the national level. This child seemed to be well aware of what he was doing and challenged several times the teachers' efforts to quiet him (e.g., he compared Arafat to a rat). One can say that he was the only child who, in a sense, spoke the "language" of the teachers, challenging them and "playing with" their emotions. What seemed to trigger the delegitimization of this child's emotions was not the sphere in which they were positioned, but the color with which they seemed to try to tint this sphere. To "spread kaka on Arafat's grave" was a red flag that did not fit the declared aims of tolerance, recognition, and respect in the bilingual school. These emotions were partially delegitimized by the teachers for the way in which they were said—that is, they were "disrespectful." The teachers emphasized that all statements were legitimate but needed to be said with respect. Yet most (almost all other) children who were respectful raised individual emotional experiences of mourning—the second type of children's emotions that were, to say the least, not legitimized enough. The other children clearly knew some things about Arafat, but if the death of Arafat was on the floor, it was, from their perspective, more the death than Arafat himself that needed to be attended to. What was central again in the politics of emotion in the classroom was the fact that children's stories were allowed little or no space in the classroom event. What was being reinforced in terms of power relations was not totally clear because the two levels mentioned earlier worked in parallel; it could be the power of teachers as teachers to set the rules, but it could also be the

power of the nation over the individual inscribed through the teachers' denial of space for individual emotional experiences (for similar patterns related to identity talk, see Bekerman, 2009c; Bekerman, Zembylas, & McGlynn, 2009; and Zembylas & Ferreira, 2009).

Consequently, as argued previously, it seems important for education scholars to pay attention to the contextual specificity of the transaction between the macro-political level and the micro-individual manifestations of emotions, highlighting the ways that feelings are politicized in the classroom. As Ahmed (2004) argued, these affective connections are not individualized but work to bind together a whole community. If this is so, then this process can be clearly conceived as the work of successful ideology—the national ideology. In the case described, the conflicting historical narratives are emotionally inscribed by the teachers trying to set a national agenda over the individual emotional experiences with death.

The few other studies that have sought to understand the influence of conflicting historical narratives on students' emotional knowledge of history have also found that students and teachers encounter a range of emotional difficulties (Zembylas, 2008). Therefore, it seems valuable for educators to gain a deeper understanding of the complex interplay between emotion and historical narratives in specific cultural, political, and historical contexts. It will be important to investigate this process further in schools for two reasons, as the present study suggests. First, emotions in relation to ethnicity in schools need to be understood as publicly and collaboratively formed, not as an individual psychological mechanism. At the same time, it seems important to provide pedagogical spaces for students to share their individual emotional experiences. This idea suggests that the constitution of emotional practices is an inextricable dimension of the political process (Goodwin, Jasper, & Poletta, 2001) in which ideologies and practices, such as nationalism, adapt and accommodate supremacy beliefs within specific contexts, as is shown in the conflict-ridden society of Israel. Second, teaching historical narratives in schools will profitably be seen as enacted, emotional practices rather than simply as socially expressed (Zembylas, 2007, 2008). In other words, this study suggests that it will be important to understand how both emotions and historical narratives are constituted and operate interactively at the level of both the individual and the social-political structures (Harding & Pribram, 2004) within school and the wider society.

Are there implications of this study for teaching and teacher education? We want to highlight two implications of the analysis developed here. The first implication concerns the suggestion that teachers critically analyze the emotional discourses/practices through which historical

narratives are authorized by, implied by, and embodied in schools; this position also entails the recognition that such discourses/practices have consequences for the ways in which affective spaces and communities are constituted within the classroom and beyond (Zembylas, 2009b). To take seriously the affective politics of teaching conflicting historical narratives in schools, it seems that teachers should be vigilant in exploring how such discourses and practices create specific inclusions/exclusions and how they might use the occurred events in pedagogical ways (Zembylas, 2009a). As Fenstermacher (1978) argued three decades ago, it is insufficient to change students' mistaken views simply by criticizing them as wrong or illegitimate or simply by giving counterresponses to unaccepted perceptions. Rather, changing such attitudes and beliefs (e.g. such as S's view on what he wants to do to Arafat's grave) requires

> following the process and rationales by which they were formed in the first place, and that requires having some patience with hearing out views—up to a point, at least—that one might find deeply objectionable. . . . When these views are regarded as something solely to be silenced, or condemned, or held up as an object lesson for the sake of others' educational benefit, something of potential value, educationally, has been sacrificed. (Burbules, 2004, p. xxviii)

Nun and Yod, for example, while making a strong statement against the language used by S', could have asked S' and the rest of the class to raise responses and explanations to his comment. They could have asked, "Why do you think that S' responded in such a disrespectful way? How can this be said differently? What stands behind the statement? Is S' the only one who thinks this way?"

All speech is not free, as Boler (2004) argued, in response to whether some hostile voices are tolerated in the classroom. If all speech is not free, then a teaching approach that contextualizes conflicting historical narratives in schools is needed. This approach is undoubtedly full of emotional discomforts, just like the classroom event described here; however, a critical analysis of the affective politics of teaching should help to ensure that teachers and students bear witness to all voices in the classroom, even when there are obvious emotional costs (Boler & Zembylas, 2003).

The second implication is that the findings of this study concerning the teaching of controversial issues in the classroom suggest an imperative need among teachers working with multiethnic children to increase their

competence in dealing with conflicting historical narratives at both the cognitive and emotional levels. This competence can be developed in part through preservice and in-service teacher education that pays attention to the emotional complexities of teaching conflicting historical narratives. For example, there are a number of pedagogical strategies that teachers can undertake to make the teaching of conflicting historical narratives more effective, as the literature on teaching controversial issues suggests (e.g., see Barton & McMully, 2007; McMully, 2006; Oxfam, 2006). These include dealing with emotions (including the teachers' own emotions) and encouraging empathetic understanding of others, as well as focusing attention on problem-solving, critical thinking and multiple perspectives. In addition, it seems important for teachers to give critical consideration to the tight relationship between essentialist perspectives of identity and the larger sociopolitical context (Zembylas et al., in press). Teachers can learn not only to acknowledge and explore the disturbing feelings that an event evokes, but also to construct the curriculum to support all students in dealing with open wounds without reproducing the status quo (Berlak, 2004). Collaborative teaching in the integrated bilingual school setting is an excellent way to create greater safety for a teacher who feels silenced or fears that his or her intentions might be misperceived by educational authorities or parents. This collaboration, however, can be more productive if teachers' attachments to national ideologies are somewhat relaxed (Bekerman & Maoz, 2005).

In addition, more attention can be given to children's personal narratives, such as those that were not attended to by the teachers in the examples we offered. This suggestion is in line with pedagogical considerations about young children's ages and their needs and interests, such as the need for the curriculum to be adapted to children's knowledge and experience. In our case, this means giving place to children's personal narratives of death and addressing children's contextual educational needs.

If we (educators, scholars, researchers, citizens) are to find new healthier, more just ways of living with others, perhaps it will help to do so "through the process of speaking about the past, and through exposing the wounds that get concealed by the 'truths' of a certain history" (Ahmed, 2004, p. 201). By acknowledging how teaching conflicting historical narratives in schools is inextricably linked to emotional practices and discourses, it is possible to begin exploring an alternative vision of affective spaces and communities (Gandhi, 2006) with others that is grounded in solidarity, human vulnerability, and social justice.

## References

Abu-Lughod, L., & Lutz, C. A. (1990). Introduction: Emotion, discourse, and the politics of everyday life. In C. Lutz & L. Abu-Lughod (Eds.), *Language and the politics of emotion* (pp. 1–23). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Ahmed, S. (2004). *The cultural politics of emotion.* Edinburgh, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press.

Al-Haj, M. (2002). Multiculturalism in deeply divided societies: The Israeli case. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 26,* 169–183.

Al-Haj, M. (2004). The status of the Palestinians in Israel: A double periphery in a ethnonational state. In A. Dowty (Ed.), *Critical issues in Israeli society* (pp. 109–126). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Al-Haj, M. (2005). National ethos, multicultural education, and the new history textbooks in Israel. *Curriculum Inquiry, 35*(1), 48–71.

Barbalet, J. (1998). *Emotion, social theory and social structure.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Bar-Tal, D. (1999). The Arab-Israeli conflict as an intractable conflict and its reflection in Israeli textbooks. *Megamot, 29,* 445–491. (Hebrew)

Barton, K., & McMully, A. (2007). Teaching controversial issues . . . where controversial issues really matter. *Teaching History, 127,* 13–19.

Bekerman, Z. (2003). Reshaping conflict through school ceremonial events in Israeli Palestinian-Jewish co-education. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 34,* 205–223.

Bekerman, Z. (2004). Multicultural approaches and options in conflict-ridden areas: Bilingual Palestinian-Jewish education in Israel. *Teachers College Record, 106,* 574–610.

Bekerman, Z. (2005a). Complex contexts and ideologies: Bilingual education in conflict-ridden areas. *Journal of Language Identity and Education, 4*(1), 1–20.

Bekerman, Z. (2005b). Are there children to educate for peace in conflict-ridden areas? A critical essay on peace and coexistence education. *Intercultural Education, 16,* 235–246.

Bekerman, Z. (2007). Collective memory and obstacles to reconciliation efforts in Israel. In S. T. Jassal & E. Ben-Ari (Eds.), *The partition motif in contemporary conflicts* (pp. 323–343). London: SAGE.

Bekerman, Z. (2008). The ethnography of peace education: Some lessons learned from Palestinian-Jewish integrated education in Israel. In S. Byrne, D. Sandole, J. Senehi, & I. Staroste-Sandole (Eds.), *Handbook of conflict analysis and resolution* (pp. 144–156). New York: Routledge.

Bekerman, Z. (2009a). The complexities of teaching historical conflictual narratives in integrated Palestinian-Jewish schools in Israel. *International Review of Education, 55,* 235–250.

Bekerman, Z. (2009b). Social justice, identity politics, and integration in conflict ridden societies: Challenges and opportunities in integrated Palestinian-Jewish education in Israel. In W. Ayers, T. Quinn, & D. Stovall (Eds.), *Handbook of social justice in education* (pp. 138–151). New York: Routledge.

Bekerman, Z. (2009c). Identity vs. peace: Identity wins. *Harvard Educational Review, 79*(1), 74–83.

Bekerman, Z., & Maoz, I. (2005). Troubles with identity: Obstacles to coexistence education in conflict ridden societies. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research, 5,* 341–357.

Bekerman, Z., & Zembylas, M. (2010). Fearful symmetry: Palestinian and Jewish teachers confront contested narratives in integrated bilingual education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26,* 507–515.

Bekerman, Z., Zembylas, M., & McGlynn, C. (2009). Working towards the de-essentialization of identity categories in conflict and post-conflict societies: Israel, Cyprus, and Northern Ireland. *Comparative Education Review, 53*, 213–234.

Berlak, A. (2004). Confrontation and pedagogy: Cultural secrets, trauma, and emotion in antioppressive pedagogies. In M. Boler (Ed.), *Democratic dialogue in education: Troubling speech, disturbing silence* (pp. 123–144). New York: Peter Lang.

Boler, M. (1999). *Feeling power: Emotions and education.* New York: Routledge.

Boler, M. (2004). All speech is not free: The ethics of "affirmative action pedagogy." In M. Boler (Ed.), *Democratic dialogue in education: Troubling speech, disturbing silence* (pp. 3–13). New York: Peter Lang

Boler, M., & Zembylas, M. (2003). Discomforting truths: The emotional terrain of understanding differences. In P. Tryfonas (Ed.), *Pedagogies of difference: Rethinking education for social justice* (pp. 110–136). New York: Routledge.

Burbules, N. (2004). Introduction. In M. Boler (Ed.), *Democratic dialogue in education: Troubling speech, disturbing silence* (pp. xiii–xxxii). New York: Peter Lang.

Carspecken, P. F. (1996). *Critical ethnography in educational research: A theoretical and practical guide.* New York: Routledge.

Crawford, K. (1995). A history of the Right: The battle for control of national curriculum history 1989–1994. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 33*, 433–456.

Fenstermacher, G. (1978). A philosophical consideration of recent research on teacher effectiveness. In L. Shulman (Ed.), *Review of research in education* (Vol. 6, pp. 157–185). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Gandhi, L. (2006). *Affective communities: Anticolonial thought, Fin-de-siècle radicalism, and the politics of friendship.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Garcia, O. (1997). Bilingual education. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *The handbook of sociolinguistics* (pp. 405–420). Oxford, England: Blackwell.

Ghanem, A. (1998). State and minority in Israel: The case of ethnic state and the predicament of its minority. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 21,* 428–448.

Glassner, B., & Loughlin, J. (1987). *Drugs in adolescent worlds: Burnouts to straights.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Goodwin, J., Jasper, J., & Poletta, F. (2001). Introduction: Why emotions matter. In J. Goodwin, J. Jasper, & F. Poletta (Eds.), *Passionate politics: Emotions and social movements* (pp. 1–24). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gordon, D. (2005). History textbooks, narratives, and democracy: A response to Majid Al-Haj. *Curriculum Inquiry, 35*, 367–376.

Harding, J., & Pribram, E. D. (2004). Losing our cool? Following Williams and Grossberg on emotions. *Cultural Studies, 18*, 863–883.

Lupton, D. (1998). *The emotional self: A sociocultural exploration.* London: Sage.

Lutz, C. (1988). *Unnatural emotions: Everyday sentiments on a Micronesian atoll and their challenge to Western theory.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lutz, C. A., & Abu-Lughod, L. (Eds.). (1990). *Language and the politics of emotion.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Mason, J. (1996). *Qualitative researching.* London: Sage.

McMully, A. (2006). Practitioner perceptions of their role in facilitating the handling of controversial issues in contested societies: A Northern Irish experience. *Educational Review, 58*(1), 51–65.

Nash, G. B., Crabtree, C., & Dunn, R. E. (1998). *History on trial.* New York: Knopf.

Oxfam. (2006). *Teaching controversial issues.* Oxford, England: Author.

Reddy, W. M. (1997). Against constructionist: The historical ethnography of emotions. *Current Anthropology, 38*, 327–340.

Rosaldo, M. (1984). Toward an anthropology of self and feeling. In R. Shweder & R. Levine (Eds.), *Culture theory: Essays on mind, self, and emotion* (pp. 137–157). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rouhana, N. (1997). *Palestinian citizens in an ethnic Jewish state.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language, 50,* 696–735.

Silverman, D. (1993). *Interpreting qualitative data.* London: SAGE.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T., & Garcia, O. (1995). Multilingualism for all? General principles. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas (Ed), *Multilingualism for all* (pp. 221–256). Lisse, The Netherlands: Swets and Zeitlinger.

Svasek, M. (2008). *Postsocialism: Politics and emotions in Central and Eastern Europe.* New York: Berghahn Books.

Zembylas, M. (2005a). Discursive practices, genealogies, and emotional rules: A poststructuralist view on emotion and identity in teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21,* 935–948.

Zembylas, M. (2005b). *Teaching with emotion: A postmodern enactment.* Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Zembylas, M. (2007). *Five pedagogies, a thousand possibilities: Struggling for hope and transformation in education.* Rotterdam, The Netherlands: SensePublishers.

Zembylas, M. (2008). *The politics of trauma in education.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Zembylas, M. (2009a). Global economies of fear: Affect, politics and pedagogical implications. *Critical Studies in Education, 50,* 187–199.

Zembylas, M. (2009b). Inventing spaces for critical emotional praxis: The pedagogical challenges of reconciliation and peace. In C. McGlynn, M. Zembylas, Z. Bekerman, & T. Gallagher (Eds.), *Peace education in conflict and post-conflict societies: comparative perspectives* (pp. 183–198). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Zembylas, M., & Bekerman, Z. (2008). Education and the dangerous memories of historical trauma: Narratives of pain, narratives of hope. *Curriculum Inquiry, 38,* 125–154.

Zembylas, M., Bekerman, Z., Haj-Yahia, M. M., & Schaade, N. (2009). The politics of mourning in Cyprus and Israel: Educational implications. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education.* doi:10.1080/03057920902913917

Zembylas, M., & Ferreira, A. (2009). Identity formation and affective spaces in conflict-ridden areas: Inventing heterotopic possibilities. *Journal of Peace Education, 6*(1), 1–18.

# APPENDIX

## TRANSCRIPT EXAMPLE

| Time | Actors | Transcript: 11-11-04 Starting at 29:20 (Here at 34:48) | Coding/Analysis |
|---|---|---|---|
| 34:48 | JT | He (Arafat) does bad things to the Jews. So you think that [there are people who] are happy to hear this, that he has died? | Teachers have just been able to overcome the uncomfortable event in which S', a Jewish student, made disrespectful comments on Arafat. They shift the discussion to the ways in which people in Israel might relate to Arafat. Multiple views are expressed by children. Jewish students (JS) are mostly negative toward Arafat and Palestinian students (PS) are mostly positive. **(LV=legitimizing views)** |
| | PS1 | And there are those that don't = | Responding to views expressed by JS –[pay attention that these interventions are not directly related to Arafat's death but to his persona and how it is perceived in the Israeli scene] |
| | JT | = and there are those that don't, you are also right | JT expresses support for the different perspectives. **(LV=legitimizing views)** |
| | JS2 | And also (     ) | |
| | PT | Listen to T' (PS1), O' (JS) SORRY [asking her to pay attention] | PT call for attention to make sure differing views are heard by all. |
| | JS2 | O:::k o:::k | |
| | PT | H' (JS1) said that Arafat, a:::, there are people who hate him, and T' (PS1) said that there are people who respect him, there are people who respect him | PT echoes students' views legitimizing both those who hate Arafat and those who respect him. **(LV=legitimizing views)** |
| | Student (not identified in the transcript – assumed to be J) | The Palestinians | |
| | PT | There are many arguments about him, there are people, who like him, think that he is a ve:::ry important man, ve::ry important, and there are people who say that he isn't, he did many terror attacks and do not like him (     ) we will hear, (       )... | PT echoes students' views legitimizing opposing feelings. **(LV=legitimizing views)** |
| 36:00 | JT | A' (PS2) has waited to say something [student has had his hand raised for a rather long time] | JT in this turn (maybe without the teacher knowing what will happen next) the conversation shifts back to the subject of death. **(ODO=opening dialogic options)** |
| | JS3 | (       ) | |
| | PS3 | (I:::I:::) I will not say when I, ...(       ) | |
| | PT | You were very angry at her... [meaning also upset and sad at what happened to his nanny] | PT supports the expressions of student and allows for new dialogue to develop. **(ODO=opening dialogic options)** |

| | JT | Do you remember her? | JT supports the expressions of student and allows for new dialogue to develop. **(ODO=opening dialogic options)** |
|---|---|---|---|
| | PT | [voicing PS3 unheard above] listen to what A' says. A' is talking about death in general, death in a general sense. He is speaking about his nanny that was (    ) her heart when he was little (    ). And when she died he was very sad. Right, because A', I was not sad, I didn't know her, I didn't know that she was dead, but A' was very sad, was ve:::ry sad:::, because he knew her and she (   ). NO SORRY SORRY [turning to S' the student who earlier made the disrespectful comments] (0.5) <u>I'll be happy to hear you but will also be happy if you pay attention to me, that's it …truly (   )=</u> | PT introduces differentiation between sentiments towards death. She differentiates between a death which has individual/particular (private: **P**) meaning and a death which has meaning for a much more wider context (public/political: **P**). Though at this point this is not explicitly stated it is inferred from the differentiation mentioned between A' feelings and the teachers lack of feelings). **(P<>P= public/political differentiated from private)** The end of PT statement gets back to setting the rules/limitations of dialogue in class, pay attention to rather long hesitation probably indicating unpleasantness and difficulty. **(DR=dialogue rules)** |
| 37:30 | JT | =S' do not answer, to PT and do not answer to the children, the others that are talking now, if you have something to say raise your hand with your leaps closed. <u>Do not answer do not answer</u> | JT supports PT in her quest to prevent a new break of the dialogue rules by S'. **(DR=dialogue rules)** |
| | PT | OK T' (PS1) go ahead, thank you A' (PS3) | Teacher offers the floor to next PS. |
| | PS1 | A:::: they said, they said (    ) went to the hospital | PS1 returns to the basic facts related to Arafat's death. |
| | PT | France. Did you hear what T' said? | PT trying to make sure class follows argument. |
| | JS4 | No:::: | |
| | JT | T' said that he heard earlier that Arafat was sick and he traveled in an airplane to France, to be hospitalized in a hospital in Paris = | As usual JT and PT are well tuned when directing the class activity. |
| | JS4 | Why? | |
| | JT | Because he thought he would get there the best treatment …at times people go <u>far::: far away</u> to receive the treatment they believe to be the best…..[turns to unidentified JS] | Explains facts. Pay attention to the words thought + believe, probably indicating skepticism. |
| | JS5 | A::::: (0.8) forgot | |
| | JT | You forgot? Z'(PS4) did you want to say something | Teacher offers the floor to next PS. |
| | PS4 | My uncle…a::: (    ) | Introducing personal event. **(PN=private narrative)** |

| | PT | [voicing PS4 unheard above] Z' is talking about his uncle, his uncle, who used to bring him to school every day and always brought him nice things. When he died he was sad for him. When he died he was sad for him. | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | JT | When Z' speaks about his uncle and A' about his nanny, these are people that…who was sad for them? Whom do you think was sad? You that you knew him? | PJ, as PT above, introduces differentiation between sentiments towards death. She differentiates between a death which has individual/particular (private: **P**) meaning and a death which has meaning for a much more wider context (public/political: **P**). (**P<>P=public/political differentiated from private**) |
| | PS | The family | |
| 40:00 | JT | All her family, yeah::: for sure they were sad, may be friends too. Do you think all the country heard about this death? All people in the land were sad? | Follows up on same differentiation above – pay attention to stressed segments in utterance. (**P<>P=public/political differentiated from private**) |
| | Students (PS< JS) | No::::No::: | |
| | JT | It is a bit different = | |
| | JS | =like when Arafat died | Recognizing difference set by PT and JT regarding public/political and private sorrow. |
| | JT | It is a bit different from what we are speaking about today. Today we speak about a person that many many people knew or knew about him. Why did so many people know = | JT this emphasizes the public. (**P<>P=public/political differentiated from private**) |
| | PT | PT = so many, so much media, all the world all the people… ˚the nanny of A'˚ only his family | JT accentuates the international importance of the event distancing it more form the private. (**P<>P=public/political differentiated from private**) |

Jewish student = JS; Jewish teacher = JT; Palestinian student = PS; Palestinian teacher = PT.

ZVI BEKERMAN teaches anthropology of education at the School of Education and the Melton Center, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and is a faculty member at the Mandel Leadership Institute in Jerusalem. His research interests are in the study of cultural, ethnic, and national identity, including identity processes and negotiation during intercultural encounters and in formal/informal learning contexts. In addition to publishing papers in a variety of journals, Bekerman is the coeditor (with Seonaigh MacPherson) of the refereed journal *Diaspora,*

*Indigenous, and Minority Education: An International Journal.* He has also recently edited a number of books, including, with Diana Silberman-Keller, Henry A. Giroux, and Nicholas Burbules, *Mirror Images: Popular Culture and Education* (2008); with Ezra Kopelowitz, *Cultural Education-Cultural Sustainability: Minority, Diaspora, Indigenous and Ethno-Religious Groups in Multicultural Societies* (2008); and with Claire McGlynn, *Addressing Ethnic Conflict Through Peace Education: International Perspectives* (2007).

MICHALINOS ZEMBYLAS is assistant professor of education at the Open University of Cyprus. His research interests are in the areas educational philosophy and curriculum theory, and his work focuses on exploring the role of emotion and affect in curriculum and pedagogy. He is particularly interested in how affective politics intersect with issues of social justice pedagogies, intercultural and peace education, and citizenship education. Zembylas is the author of the books, *Teaching With Emotion: A Postmodern Enactment* (Information Age, 2005); *Five Pedagogies, a Thousand Possibilities: Struggling for Hope and Transformation* (Rotterdam, The Netherlands: SensePublishers, 2007); and *The Politics of Trauma in Education* (New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2008). He is also coeditor of *Peace Education in Conflict and Post-Conflict Societies: Comparative Perspectives* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009, coeditors C. McGlynn, Z. Bekerman, & T. Gallagher,) and *ICT for Education, Development, and Social Justice* (Greenwich, CT: Information Age, 2009, coeditors C. Vrasidas & G. Glass).