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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to investigate the essential structure and nature of aesthetic education as a public/in-between space for children to accomplish happiness and reveal their identity. The term aesthetic refers to the ways in which we perceive the world through sensory perception as well as the ways in which we attend fully to the particulars of our experiences. Aesthetic education, then, enables students to perceive the world through their sensory perception and to be fully conscious of the world in which they are immersed. The public/in-between space created by aesthetic education allows people to express their own voices, negotiate with others by interacting with them in intersubjective relationships, become conscious, think more deeply, and develop critical perspectives.

As political beings who perform certain actions and speak in certain ways, we human beings need a space where we can reveal ourselves and interact with others. By doing so, human beings can recognize who they are in their relationships with others and achieve happiness in terms of political meaning. Happiness relates to political human characteristics in the public space—namely, how we humans can live with others who are different (e.g., with different opinions and perspectives) harmoniously in a community through speech and action. Thus aesthetic education can be achieved in the public/in-between space, where others’ uniqueness and differences are revealed through interactions involving speech and action.

This study investigated how students interact with teachers and other students in
aesthetic education in both the public/in-between space. A hermeneutic phenomenological case study was conducted in Ms. Valenza’s art class of the Kingsley Montessori School, Boston, where aesthetic education occurs in the classroom.

Data gathered from observations and interviews with students and the teacher was analyzed (Chapter 4). The context of the class overall was based on the observations; interviews with students and the teacher were analyzed according to significant statements, formulated meanings, and cluster themes. After establishing cluster themes from the formulated meanings, a description of cluster themes was presented. Based on this analysis, the findings and discussion were provided (Chapter 5). I discussed the themes more deeply in light of the literature review, my prior experiences, and research that expands the horizon of and provides insights into aesthetic education.

Aesthetic education as public/in-between space provides a way to enable multiple people to live in harmony within the community by speaking and acting as political beings and without sacrificing their differences. This study reveals important aspects of aesthetic education by investigating how students interact with teachers and with other students in aesthetic education in both the public/in-between space. By doing so, this study emphasizes the value of aesthetic education for children in art education as a means to help students make their lives meaningful by living as subjects who think critically in a democratic society and visual culture.
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Small Questions that have Drawn Me to Aesthetic Education for Children

When I was an undergraduate student preparing to become an elementary school teacher, I thought very deeply about why we need to teach art to people—especially children. What is the meaning of art for humans? What does it mean to teach art to humans? Does it mean simply teaching skills or theory? Is it even possible to teach art to humans, and if so, how? Shortly after I began asking these questions, I graduated, but I still had not answered my questions, questions that reemerged in the field of practice.

I later realized that my questions related to aesthetics and philosophy because these are the areas that deal with the nature of art and the fundamental ideas of art education. After studying philosophy in my first PhD program, I arrived at a provisional answer: happiness. We teach art to humans to promote happiness. I emphasize provisional here because nobody knows the absolute answer to this question. We cannot know truth or reality perfectly; rather, we can only see part of reality. Therefore, the answer (i.e., happiness) could change over time, meaning it is temporal. In this paper, I refer to happiness as it relates to political human characteristics in the public space—namely, how we humans can live with others who are different (e.g., with different opinions and perspectives) harmoniously in a community through speech and action.
Actually I owe all of these ideas above to several philosophers whose work I studied. Immanuel Kant is the first philosopher who influenced my first PhD dissertation. Particularly, I was impressed by Kant’s aesthetic common sense, which is the precondition that enables people to communicate with one another even though they have different ideas or opinions from one another. Despite the fact that Kant is a representative of the modernists, it impressed me that Kant did not ignore the senses in terms of aesthetic common sense. However, I wanted to know more about how we could make this ability work. In other words, even though I studied aesthetics in my first PhD, the issue of how to relate it to aesthetic education still remained.

After encountering Maxine Greene through her writings, during the study of art education as my second PhD at The Pennsylvania State University, I connected aesthetics with aesthetic education: she provided me with concrete practices that I could relate to aesthetic education. Greene inspired me to connect aesthetics with education. Greene deals with aesthetic education in relation to being conscious, which is also related to how to see and know the world. Greene’s ideas about aesthetic education are related to the ideas of Hannah Arendt, John Dewey, and Herbert Marcuse, who all strongly influenced Greene as well as me. Among them, even though Arendt did not provide me with any practical or concrete ideas related to art education, Arendt’s ideas about plurality, whoness, whatness, thoughtlessness, freedom, public space, and the in-between in relation to art education are important to aesthetic education.

Although I started writing this dissertation at the beginning of the doctoral
program at The Pennsylvania State University, the actual starting point emerged in my childhood and was subsequently influenced by my teaching experience in Korea as well as my philosophical background.

A Childhood Memory

When I was ten years old, I participated in a citywide art contest. While I was drawing grass, one director approached and asked me, “Why do you express grass in such a way?” I replied, “Because I feel grass in such a way . . . It reminds me of the grass I play on.”

And then the director asked me again “Where did you learn how to draw in such a way?” I replied, “This is my own way. Nobody taught me this skill or method of drawing grass.” With an interesting look on his face, the director said, “Your personal expression is good.” This phrase—your personal expression—continues to resonate with me to this day, giving me self-confidence about who I am. I now realize that art enabled me to become my true self by helping me recognize my identity.

At that time, most students focused on learning special skills related to drawing objects at private institutes in order to win prizes in a contest. In the case of drawing grass, most students followed certain patterns unconsciously and drew just as they mechanically learned in the private institutes. However, I expressed grass in my own
way, breaking through the routine that most students followed at the time. My approach included my own aesthetic experience about grass. Reflecting back on that experience, I can see that the director’s questions made me think about these issues. Without this shared dialogue, I might not have realized these new perspectives on my own expression. Within a very short time, this dialogue enabled me to share my uniqueness with him and to realize who I was in relation to others.

Through this experience, I realized that art is not only a delightful activity, but it also has the power to make humans explore themselves for who they really are. All humans share commonalities, but we also have unique differences. According to Arendt (1958), commonalities make humans understand and respect one another as equals, and differences make us express ourselves as humans rather than physical objects. When both commonalities and differences are revealed, humans are happy; such disclosure often occurs through art education, particularly aesthetic education.

After becoming a teacher, this experience made me constantly think about why we need to teach art to students as well as how we can do so. Teaching art does not mean focusing exclusively on mechanical drawing skills or engaging in rote teaching. Teaching art is more meaningful than that. It is not enough to simply express something in an artistic form or appreciate artwork. We need to teach something more as art educators.
Teaching Experience and Philosophical Background

One afternoon while teaching in my afterschool art class at an elementary school, the principal knocked on my classroom door and called to me. He told me to teach the children mechanical drawing skills. “We need to select some students as representatives for our school and show their drawings at the provincial-level art fair at Center Hall. If our representative students’ drawings are worse than those from students at other schools, it will be shameful. This is your responsibility.” After delivering these instructions, he went away.

One of my students subsequently approached me and asked to be selected as a school representative for this art fair. He asked me to look at his work and give him feedback. As he showed me his work, he told me that he learned to draw at a private institution and had been recognized and honored many times. Soon, several other students approached me, stating that they too had studied art at this same private institution and wanted to represent our school at the art fair. Looking at their drawings, I noted that they were almost identical—the same mouth, the same eyes, the same trees, and so on. They all wanted to be selected to represent the school at the art fair. I turned away from them, looking down at my desk to avoid answering their questions.

My realization that students were being taught to copy other artwork rather than develop their own creativity shocked me. Once students could imitate masterpieces, they would be considered excellent students in art. Seeing these “masterpieces,” parents often sent their children to private institutes where the children—forsaking their unique
expression—learned to draw pictures based on another people’s artwork. Ultimately, they replicated the same artwork over and over again, losing confidence in their own creativity and abilities as their unique characteristics were completely ignored.

Here, the important thing is not the fact that students copied others’ artwork but the fact that they did not think about what they were doing and that they followed the routine without thinking about it; thus, they could not fully engage in aesthetic experience.

In addition, they considered others as rivals rather than as humans who live together within a community. These students’ attitudes came from a society that emphasized only high test scores or high evaluations according to rigid standards. This type of atmosphere also hindered students from fully engaging in aesthetic experience because they were not interested in the activities themselves but in the end score they would receive. In other words, using Arendt’s words (1958), their main concern was not who they were but what they were.

In a society that mainly focuses on quantification and rank ordering, it is very important for students to pay attention to the particular standards evaluators use to rank individuals in order for them to score highest. Therefore, students forsake their own uniqueness, as they become more likely to blindly follow rigid standards. While I was teaching, this phenomenon occurred in every part of the educational system, including art. Sometimes, I felt that my students were all the same person and that there was no room for students or teachers to think about this issue and become more conscious. At
that time, it was a very big consideration for me.

Later, I began recognizing the importance of aesthetic education through which students can realize who they are and live with others in their community by sharing their differences and commonalities. This issue is also related to both Greene’s and Arendt’s ideas, including consciousness, thoughtlessness, public/in-between space, whoness, whatness, freedom, and plurality.

Aesthetic Education for Children in Dr. Thompson’s Class

The class of Dr. Thompson, who is my advisor, reminded me of my childhood and teaching experience, and was the starting point of my study of aesthetic education for children. During the semester, the class dealt with the theory and culture of child art. It also connected with our teaching and learning experience. I could more closely investigate how to teach children in aesthetic education by moving back and forth through my teaching experience and childhood memory.

Dr. Thompson’s class dealt with the issue of copying, which is an important issue to me in the relation to aesthetic education. The question was: How do we consider copying in children’s drawing? Until this class, I did not think that copying was also important to children in aesthetic education. After the class, I realized that copying in itself is not bad or wrong. Copying is part of creating. However, more importantly, I also realized that we need to provide students with a way to escape and to find their own way. This is connected with aesthetic education – to being conscious. It was also the moment
that I broke through my routine way of thinking about children’s copying. So, it was also aesthetic education for me.

More importantly, while I studied with Dr. Thompson individually, I could more closely review aesthetic education from pre-DBAE to post-DBAE and reconsider the meaning of aesthetic education for children. Even though the approach of aesthetic education in DBAE was also related to the way of thinking and the knowing process about the world rather than the content of aesthetics, it was defined narrowly because the main idea of DBAE came from modernism. She provided me with significant issues and resources related to contemporary aesthetic education. By doing so, I clarified the meaning of aesthetic education—even though it was a provincial meaning, which I needed to expand more.

**Meeting with the Public/in-between Space at Penn State**

Dr. Garoian and Dr. Gaudelius (2008), who are my doctoral committee members, wrote the book *Spectacle Pedagogy*, which enabled me to encounter the public/in-between space as aesthetic education. This book examines the dangerous and great power of the spectacle of mass-mediated visual culture and seeks for a way that art education can contribute to awakening the human ability to explore, examine, and criticize the spectacle of mass-mediated visual culture, based on reflections about 9/11 terrorism and the Iraq war. Garoian and Gaudelius argue that the main cause of the war was the uncritical citizenship that was paralyzed by the spectacle of mass-mediated
visual culture.

During my first semester at The Pennsylvania State University (2008), I selected this book for a book analysis assignment in one of my art education classes. In this book, Garoian and Gaudelius argue that third, in-between space is undetermined and undecidable. This space enables students to consider who they are and what they are doing and to examine the ideology that has been established and dominant our society. I was fascinated with their concept of this space as described in the book.

While I read this book, I thought that we should jump into the third space or the in-between space in order to critique spectacle. We can challenge preexisting academic assumptions and create new images, ideas and understanding in undecidability. Ironically, undecidability provides “hope.” If in our life, everything is already determined, we do not have the possibility of hope. We can plan and cherish hope for the future in as much as everything is not determined yet. Without hope, we are as good as dead. As such, the characteristic of undecidability of collage, which Garoian and Gaudelius argue, enables unforeseen, unpredictable possible for aesthetic education, has life. I believe that life means the power and the ability of creation. Therefore, I think that jumping into the third space, that is the undecidable space, can give us life energy, which is very important to humans.

Garoian and Gaudelius (2008) also show how third space by way of collage enables students to think critically about, to be conscious about, and to examine “the essentialized and immutable codes of mass mediated delivery systems” in visual culture.
and society (p. 23). In this society, we are overwhelmed by spectacle which is “not a collection of images; rather, it is a social relationship between people that is mediated by images” (Garoian & Gaudelius, 2008, p. 24). Thus, even though an image in itself is not positive or negative, it can “teach us what and how to see and think” with a certain ideology of visual culture (Garoian & Gaudelius, 2008, p. 24). Garoian and Gaudelius (2008) characterize spectacle pedagogy of visual culture in two opposing ways: The first is as “a ubiquitous form of representation,” and the second is “a democratic form of practice” (p. 24). While the former enables us to decide our choice in terms of the dominant ideology in mass-mediated culture and society, the latter enables us to think critically and resist social injustice. Therefore, it is important how we educators enable students to think critically and to examine the ideology of spectacle. It is related to aesthetic education in how we help students to be conscious, to keep thinking about what they are doing, and to see the world critically.

This is also related to political education. Garoian and Gaudelius explain what political education is by citing Henry Giroux:

Political education means teaching students to take risks, challenge those in power, honor critical traditions, and be reflexive about how authority is used in the classroom. A politicizing education refuses to address its own political agenda and creates silence through an appeal to a specious methodology, objectivity, or a notion of balance. Politicizing education perpetuates pedagogical terrorism; a political education improves the pedagogical conditions for students to understand how power works on them, through them, and for them in the service of constructing and expanding their roles as critical citizens. (Giroux (1997) as cited in Garoian & Gaudelius, 2008, p. 108)
Thus it is in the in-between, the third space, collage where political education can occur, which enables students to think and act critically, which is related to aesthetic education in-between space. This book made me think about the space of aesthetic education.

Finally, I want to connect aesthetic education and public/in-between space with the ideas of Maxine Greene (1996; 2001), who argued about aesthetic education in relation to the public/in-between space in her books. I explain and conceptualize, in Chapter 2 of this dissertation, the forms of aesthetic education that Greene advocates. However, I would like to know more about how we could create this space because no matter how much we know about aesthetic education through books or theory, it is useless if it remains just theory. In addition, I would like to emphasize the significance of this space, where aesthetic education can occur and people can live their lives meaningfully as active subjects and achieve happiness by enjoying their freedom with others in their community.

Ms. Valenza’s Art Class

Since schools and learning centers are often reluctant to open up their teaching spaces for research, finding a research site was not an easy endeavor. In addition, some places are not open to research if the site has a particular plan or project. The first place I contacted, the Lincoln Center Institute, would not allow anyone to conduct research at

1 After receiving IRB approval, I received Ms. Valenza’s consent form. She preferred to use her real name in this study rather than a pseudonym. (Please see the Appendix A regarding consent form for teachers).
that point, even though I had participated in a course there during the summer of 2009 at which they taught aesthetic education based on Maxine Greene’s ideas. They stated that they could not permit me to research there because they were planning to conduct and publish research by themselves at that point.

My adviser, Dr. Thompson, introduced me to the blog of Ms. Valenza, a teacher who is interested in aesthetic education. She was an undergraduate student of Dr. Thompson’s at The Pennsylvania State University and is now a teacher in the Kingsley Montessori School in Boston. On her blog, I was able to learn more about her art class activities and her philosophies about teaching art. I was also able to view some video recordings in which her students told about the stories behind their art activities. Through their narratives, I was able to see how the students became conscious through various art activities, which is related to my research concerns related to aesthetic education and immediately attracted my attention. I wanted to learn more about these children’s experiences with art, and I wondered how they interacted with others through aesthetic education in their classroom. I told Dr. Thompson about my interest in Ms. Valenza’s art class, and with Dr. Thompson’s assistance, I contacted Ms. Valenza via email and introduced myself formally. She willingly allowed me to conduct research in her art class and agreed to be an informant and mediator with the principal, teachers, parents, and students at her school.

Some may argue that my selection of Ms. Valenza’s art class as my research site is too common and may also criticize my choice because, having teaching experience
myself, there is nothing new for me to learn in this context. However, that’s why I
selected Ms. Valenza’s class. Phenomenological research pays attention to the taken-for-
granted and common aspects of things that we are familiar with. As such, Ms. Valenza’s
class provided me with the perfect opportunity to re-evaluate a topic with which I
already have experience in order to see it from a different perspective.
Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Aesthetic education has been considered difficult to teach children for several reasons: the term aesthetic/aesthetics is ambiguous, sometimes it is narrowly defined, and there is a lack of teaching methods. Aesthetic education for children did not formally manifest until Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE) considered aesthetic education as a way of knowing the world rather than learning the content of aesthetics. However, aesthetic education for children in DBAE was still not easy because the term aesthetic/aesthetics is still ambiguous, has complicated meanings and is considered from a provincial point of view under modernism. As a result, it has not been easy to develop curriculum for aesthetic education.

Following DBAE, in the postmodern period, many scholars and philosophers reconsidered the meaning and value of sense, which was underestimated due to the emphasis on reason in modernism. Sense is not passive but active and not inferior to reason. In this way, aesthetic education needs to be revalued and reconsidered because aesthetic education is related not only to reason but also to the senses in terms of the etymological meaning of the word aesthetic/aesthetics—that is, sensory perception. Thus aesthetic education comes to be reevaluated in relation to both the senses and
reason, and to both other and self without separation.

However, this does not mean that aesthetic education in the postmodern era gets rid of the previous meaning of aesthetic education in modernism; instead, it expands its meaning. Along with an expanded meaning, aesthetic education relates not only to reason or to art itself but also to holistic aspects of being human—including our senses and the whole world in which we live.

More importantly, aesthetic education is related to the issue of “how,” not limited to “what (content of aesthetics itself).” In other words, aesthetic education does not involve putting theoretical contents or philosophical contents into students. It enables students to know the world through their sensory perception. Therefore, it is related to a knowing process. However, this process does not work alone or automatically (Eisner, 2002). Therefore, something is needed to make sensory organs work to interact with the outside world. Aesthetic education helps students actively interact with the world through their sensory organs. It also enables students to be conscious about the world (Dewey, 1935; Greene, 2002). To be conscious means to think about what they are doing, which enables students to participate in the process of making meaning.

Therefore, it is important in aesthetic education to enable students to be conscious and to interact with their world through their sensory perception rather than making students learn theoretical content by heart. However it is hard to describe the method of aesthetic education in one word because there might be various ways of aesthetic education according to culture, time, and place. Even in the same classroom
setting, aesthetic education can occur differently every moment because the meaning of aesthetic education related to being conscious is reborn every moment even though we see, hear, touch, smell and taste the same things (Dewey, 1935). If the way to teach students in aesthetic education could be said in one word or fixed way, then it is difficult to say it is aesthetic education. Therefore, what is important to aesthetic education is to add insight to the way we teach students through various perspectives and in different cases. It enables people who are interested in aesthetic education to enlarge their ideas using diverse perspectives.

Therefore, how can we make aesthetic education possible? In order to make aesthetic education possible, the space where students are enabled to be conscious through their sensory organs is necessary. The space means not just physical areas but also immaterial things. Without this space, there is no stage where aesthetic education can become true. Therefore, the space that makes aesthetic education actually be realized is necessary for aesthetic education. When aesthetic education can play a role in such a place, aesthetic education can occur.

In this space, students can reveal their ideas and interact with others. By doing so, they can go beyond their limitations and not take for granted their routine way, which means to be conscious. Greene (1995) and Arendt (1958) call this space the public/in-between space. According to Greene (1995) and Arendt (1958), in the public/in-between space, human beings can reveal their identity—who they are, live more closely with others in their community, and accomplish happiness by struggling with the routine way
and breaking through what is taken for granted.

Thus, my main concern of this study is how to create the public/in-between space where aesthetic education can occur. What is the essential structure of aesthetic education as public/in-between space? In order to provide aesthetic education as public/in-between space with insights, it is significant to investigate the essential structure of aesthetic education in the practical field where aesthetic education actually occurs.

However, the meaning of the essential structure of aesthetic education is not a fixed or absolute one. We never know the essence itself exactly. In this study, just one insight that can throw light on the essence of the structure can be provided. By doing so, this study can contribute to understanding aesthetic education as the public/in-between space.

I used a framework based on Maxine Greene’s work to explore the important role of aesthetic education for children living with others in their community as they try to achieve happiness. Aesthetic education can play a role as a public space as well as an in-between space where children are able to reveal their uniqueness and appreciate commonalities through dialogue. Consequently, children are able to break through their boundaries and taken-for-granted ideas in order to harmonize their uniqueness and commonalities through their intersubjective and interdependent ideas in that space.

In order to investigate the essential structure of aesthetic education as public/in-between space, I wrote this paper as follows: First, in Chapter 2, the meaning of
aesthetic education and public/in-between space is reviewed. I clarified the meaning of aesthetic education. As I mentioned above, the meaning of aesthetic education has been defined narrowly and ambiguously. In order to clarify the meaning of aesthetic education, the etymological meaning of aesthetic education is reexamined. Furthermore, I also examine aesthetic education in practice from pre-DBAE to post-DBAE. By doing so, I clarify the meaning of aesthetic education and at the same time, how aesthetic education has been practiced in the field whether as intended by educators or not.

Second, I also clarify the meaning/characteristics of the public/in-between space in this chapter.

In Chapter 3, I describe the research method used for this study. I used the qualitative research methods of hermeneutic phenomenology and case study. To explore the essential structure and the important role of aesthetic education as public/in-between space, I went to the art classroom where aesthetic education actually occurs and investigated it through a phenomenological approach. In this chapter, I present the theoretical framework for this research method, research procedures, data collection and analysis.

In Chapter 4, I analyze the data collected in interviews with teacher and students. I analyzed the gathered data based on a hermeneutic phenomenological analysis by describing significant statements, drawing formulated meanings, and finding cluster themes step by step.

After an analysis of the data, in the following Chapter 5, I present the findings
from the data analysis and discuss them more profoundly, focusing on the issues related to the research findings in aesthetic education. By doing so, I intend to expand the horizon of aesthetic education and give some insight to it. Finally, in Chapter 6, the conclusion, I summarize this study and suggest further research.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to investigate the essential structure and the nature of the role that aesthetic education could play as a public/in-between space for children to accomplish happiness and reveal their identity in their community. Hannah Arendt (1958) used the term *public space* to define the place in which human uniqueness is revealed and expanded. Public space also plays a role as an in-between space, which is an undetermined and undecided space in which dialogue can occur.

Dialogue enables children to reveal their uniqueness and “appreciate [what they have] in common [with others]; they have to find ways to make intersubjective sense” (Greene, 1995, p. 39). In doing so, children consider who they are and reveal their differences in their community. I believe aesthetic education could serve as a public/in-between space by providing a chance for children to establish dialogues and communicate with one another.
Significance of the Study

This study explored the essential structure of aesthetic education as public/in-between space, and how aesthetic education plays a role in this space. Human beings are political beings who perform certain actions and speak in certain ways. As political beings, we need a space in which we can appear as ourselves and interact with others. The public/in-between space allow people to express their own voices, negotiate with others by interacting with them in intersubjective relationships, become conscious, think more deeply, and develop critical perspectives. By doing so, human beings can recognize who they are in their relationships with others, and they can go beyond the taken-for-granted in these relationships.

This study revealed important aspects of aesthetic education by investigating how students interact with teachers and with other students in aesthetic education in both the public/in-between space. By doing so, this study will help students make their lives meaningful by living as subjects who think critically in a democratic society and visual culture.

Research Questions

In order to investigate the essential structure of aesthetic education as the public/in-between space and how aesthetic education plays a role in this space, three main research questions guided this hermeneutical phenomenology and case study. Primarily, I examined how aesthetic education can establish the public/in-between space
and how teachers and students interact with one another. More specifically, my main research questions are:

1. What role could aesthetic education play in the public/in-between space? How could aesthetic education be used to establish the public/in-between space in classrooms? How is the role of aesthetic education in a public/in-between space related to happiness as well as individual identity?

2. How do children interact with one another in the public/in-between space? How can children reveal their uniqueness and appreciate commonality in the public/in-between space?

3. How does a teacher interact with students in public/in-between space? How does a teacher enable students to interact with one another? How does a teacher make this space for students to explore their own perspectives and lived-world as well as to go beyond their limitations?
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

In order to investigate the essential structure and the important role of aesthetic education as a public/in-between space, the meaning of aesthetic education, the extensive understanding of aesthetic education for children in practical field, and the meaning and characteristics of public/in-between space need to be examined. In this chapter, first, I explore the meaning of aesthetic education. To clarify the meaning of aesthetic education, I closely overview the etymological meaning of the term aesthetic, and describe Maxine Greene’s notion of aesthetic education. To understand aesthetic education in the practical field, I examine aesthetic education from pre-DBAE to post-DBAE\(^2\). In the first section of this chapter, I define the meaning of aesthetic education. In the following section, I discuss the meaning and characteristics of public/in-between space. Clarifying the meaning and characteristics of public/in-between space will help to understand the role of public/in-between space in aesthetic education for this study.

\(^2\) Pre-DBAE means before Discipline-Based Art Education and post-DBAE means after Discipline-Based Art Education.
Part I: The Meaning of Aesthetics/Aesthetic and Aesthetic Education

Aesthetics is a branch of philosophy that deals with theoretical and conceptual inquiries related to art and aesthetic experience (Levinson, 2005). In the practical field, aesthetics, as a philosophical branch, has primarily been taught to college-age students. However, teaching aesthetics to children using theoretical and conceptual approaches has been considered difficult or even impossible because philosophical aesthetics is often considered too abstract, complicated, and profound for children to understand.

It was in Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE) that the first formal manifestation of aesthetics for children in art education was created. In DBAE, aesthetic education was defined as a branch of philosophy in which aesthetic education can be taught to children by primarily focusing on reflection and dialogue about art and aesthetic experience rather than on the theory or content of aesthetics itself. However, many scholars criticize aesthetic education in DBAE because aesthetic education was defined using modernist ideas, which suggest a dichotomy between body and mind and sense and reason. They also criticized DBAE because it did not include enough of the cultural, political, and economic aspects of aesthetics and art education. In addition, critics argue that the meaning of the term aesthetics is ambiguous, making it difficult to define what exactly aesthetic education is. For these reasons teaching aesthetics to

---

children is still a very difficult task, and even though scholars have put forth a great deal of effort to integrate aesthetic education into art curriculum, it has not yet been fully developed.

As mentioned, one reason why aesthetic education (even aesthetic education in DBAE) was not fully infused into art education was the narrow definition of the term aesthetics. As such, the meaning of term aesthetics needs to be reconsidered.

Prior to DBAE, it seems that there was not a form of aesthetic education integrated into art education; however, based on the perspectives mentioned above, it is a wonder that there had been aesthetic education for children in the practical field at all before DBAE (even though it was not called aesthetic education). To understand the practices associated with aesthetic education before DBAE, it is meaningful to examine what aesthetic education meant for children, how it was taught to them, and what kind of philosophical positions and arguments were used to explain aesthetics’ significance or meaning.

With these questions as a foundation, this section will redefine aesthetic education briefly and will reexamine aesthetic education for children in the practical field according to various educational movements. Because many scholars suggest that art education was implemented into public school curriculum in the 19th century, this section examines aesthetic education in the 19th century according to the various educational movements from that time period to the present, including the progressive education movement, creative self-expression, DBAE, and post-DBAE.
The Etymological Meaning of Aesthetic Education

The scientific term *aesthetics* was coined by Alexander G. Baumgarten in 1735 (Levinson, 2005, p. 9). Siegesmund (2010) argues, citing Welsh (1995), that Baumgarten derived this term from the Greek words “*aisthesis, aisthanesthai, aisthetos,* and *aisthetikos*” (p. 82). In the dictionary, the Greek term *aisthesis* means “sensuous perception” (Aesthetic, 1996). Therefore, we can conclude that the term *aesthetics* is related to “the senses” and “perception.”

However, the meaning of *sense* is not simple. According to Dewey (1934), “‘Sense’ covers a wide range of contents: the sensory, the sensational, the sensitive, the sensible, and the sentimental, along with the sensuous. It includes almost everything from bare physical and emotional shock to sense itself—that is the meaning of things present in immediate experience” (p. 22). Therefore, the meaning of sense is comprised of all of these aspects working though individuals’ sensory organs.

In addition, from ancient Greek to modern times, senses have been viewed as being inferior to reason, changeable, and suspicious. As such, philosophers believe that the senses always need to be controlled by reason. Therefore, when Baumgarten used the term *aesthetics*, this word was understood as having low faculty because it was based on the senses. However, according to Shusterman (2000), Baumgarten intended to discuss the potential of aesthetics rather than to denounce aesthetics’ low faculty. Baumgarten revealed the possibility that aesthetic studies could enhance knowledge in several ways, such as by “supplying better sensory perception”, “by supplying ‘good
foundation for all contemplative activity and liberal art’” and by giving “‘an individual...an advantage over others’ not just in thought but ‘in practical action of common life’” (Shusterman, 2000, p. 264). For Baumgarten, “the end of aesthetics...is perfection of sensory cognition,” believing that “aesthetics [is] a systemic discipline of perfecting sensory cognition” (Shusterman, 2000, p. 264). This indicates that aesthetics includes not only theoretical aspects but also practical factors. In addition, aesthetic studies are useful, but in order to activate the potential of aesthetics, practical action is needed.

For Baumgarten, aesthetics as a systematic discipline of perfecting sensory cognition includes two branches: the first is “a program of practical exercise or training,” and the second is a theoretical approach, including “a general ‘theory of the form of beautiful cognition’” (Shusterman, 2000, p. 265). However, Baumgarten did not develop and even discouraged the first aspect—bodily training—of aesthetic training because of philosophers’ tendency to neglect the body and senses (Shusterman, 2000).

Baumgarten’s ideas are consistent with those of modernism, supporting the dichotomy between body and mind and sense and reason. Therefore, even though Baumgarten established the term aesthetics to include both body and mind and theory and practice, in modernism, the aspects of the body and the senses have been ignored, and only the theoretical aspects of aesthetics have been developed in aesthetic education. Related to this discussion, we will rethink aesthetic education later in this section.
In the case of perception, the whole complex intentionality of a person, including his/her feelings, willingness, memory, and thinking, is inherent in his/her perception. This means that perception is not passive but is active. For Arnheim (1969), the term cognitive refers to all mental operations involved in the receiving, storing, and processing of information, including sensory perception, memory, and thinking. Arnheim argues that a visual is not a mechanical recoding of particular elements but that “the eyes are movable within their sockets and their selective exploration is amplified by the movements of the head and indeed all of the beholder’s body. Even the recording processes going on within the eyeball are highly selective” (1969, p. 21). In addition, the selective aspect of perception can be demonstrated in the discernment of depth. By keeping proper distance, the observer can adjust the size of an object according to his/her needs. Therefore, perceptual experience is an active, intelligent, and dynamic activity.

Furthermore, “According to the Oxford English Dictionary the word ‘anaesthesia’…denotes ‘loss of feeling or sensation: insensibility.’ The aesthetic, then, must be concerned with all that works through and on feeling, sensation, and sensibility…touch, taste, feel, tact” (Abbs, 1991, p. 246). Therefore, the term aesthetics is related to all of the perceptive, affective, and cognitive aspects that work through humans’ sensory organs.

Meanwhile, aesthetics is not just sense itself of subject but is also related to others or to objects. Abbs (1991) investigates the meaning of “sensing” more closely.
According to Abbs (1991), at the root of the word “taste” is the meaning “to feel, to handle, and to touch” (p. 246). Furthermore, “the Latin word for feeling (tactare) has given the English language both the notion of tact (having feeling for other people’s feelings) and of tactile (where sensory touch is indicated)” (p. 246). Based on this, sensing engages not only a feeling from a sensory organ, such as sensory touch, but also engages that sensation’s relation to other feelings. Similarly, Siegesmund (2010) examines the Greek grammar related to the verb *aisthanesthai*:

In Greek, verbs conjugate in one of three ways…an action that is done to you…an action that you do…a blend of these two actions. *Aisthanesthai*—to perceive sensuously—conjugates in this third form (called the middle voice). It is neither an action put forth, nor an action passively received. It is a relational experience between subject and object… Thought and sense inextricably weave together. (pp. 82-83)

Therefore, the term *aesthetics* has intersubjective characteristics between a subject and an object and is related to both sense and thought as well as body and mind.

On another note, in terms of sense, aesthetics is related to the lived world. According to Dewey (1934) “The senses are the organs through which the live creature participates directly in the on-goings of the world about him. In this participation the varied wonder and splendor of this world are made actual for him in the qualities he experiences” (p. 22). Therefore, aesthetics is essentially a door through which humans can meet the environment and participate in the world by means of their senses.

Since Baumgarten defined aesthetics as a science of sensory cognition, aesthetics has been considered a branch of philosophy and has been given more specific meanings
by modern philosophers, such as Kant, Hegel, and Schopenhauer. *The Oxford Handbook of Aesthetics* describes aesthetics as “the branch of philosophy devoted to conceptual and theoretical inquiry into art and aesthetic experience” (Levinson, 2005, p.3). There are three foci that one may conceive in aesthetics: “art, aesthetic property, and aesthetic experience” (Levinson, 2005, p. 4). The first focus is related to the definition of art, including practice or art-related activities and appreciating artwork. The second focus involves the properties of art, such as beauty, elegance, or sublimity. The third focus is related to attitudes, perceptions, or experiences. As the second and third foci show, the qualifier “aesthetic” applies more fundamentally to attitudes, experiences, and judgments than to modes of perceptions. These three foci are related to and often overlap with one another.

Meanwhile, from the postmodern perspective, most of the modern aesthetic theory has been challenged. The majority of the dominant aesthetic theories of today, such as autonomy of art, and the aesthetic attitudes, such as disinterestedness, originality, and universality, became problematic in postmodernism. Postmodernists insist that “art is inextricably mixed with other aspects of life and culture” and that “social and political issues, popular arts, and everyday aesthetic issues…all become important for aesthetic theory” (Shusterman, 2005, p. 781). Even though postmodernism challenges established modern aesthetic theory, postmodernism did not discard all of these modernist ideas. Postmodernism criticizes modern aesthetics on one hand; while on the other hand, it enlarges and compensates for traditional modernist values and theories.
Based on the above discussion, in terms of the origin of the term, aesthetics is related to sense itself, which occurs in the organs through which human beings participate in the world; all of the perceptual, affective, and cognitive activities that occur through sensory perception, including sense experience, sense impression, and sense datum; and the active intersubjective relationship between others, subjects, and objects. In addition, the term aesthetics is related to both body and mind as well as sense and reason, a definition that destroys the dichotomy of modern ideas. Aesthetics as a branch of philosophy has been discussed with various foci, such as art, aesthetic properties, and aesthetic experience. Even though the pervasive aesthetic theories developed by modern philosophers and scholars have been challenged by postmodernism, postmodernism has also enlarged the horizon of aesthetics by criticizing and compensating for, rather than discarding, the aesthetic theory that was established in modernism.

Then, based on this discussion above, how can we define aesthetics in art education or aesthetic education? As previously examined, given the difficulties and complications associated with the term aesthetics, it is not easy to define aesthetic education. In DBAE, aesthetics is defined as a branch of philosophy. Therefore, aesthetics is considered to be a fundamental discipline and a way to think about the world. However, the term is not actually fully defined in this context. The reason that the definition for aesthetics is limited is because the meaning of aesthetics in DBAE was defined under modernism.
As investigated earlier, aesthetics includes all of the results of sensory perception.

Thus, aesthetic education includes all of the activities that enable individuals to participate in the world through sensory perception and is related to the field on which aesthetics has been focused. Therefore, aesthetic education includes art, aesthetic properties, aesthetic experiences, aesthetic responses, and aesthetic perceptions, which are not separated from body and mind, art and life, or sense and reason. Therefore, aesthetic education, which was initially considered to be a part of formalism and elitism and was thought to enhance life, was enlarged to consider pluralistic openness and contextual, social, political, and economic aspects.

Aesthetic Education in Maxine Greene

Maxine Greene (2001) defines aesthetic education in her book *Variation on a Blue Guitar: The Lincoln Center Institute Lecture on Aesthetic Education*. For Greene, aesthetic is “an adjective…to describe…the mode of experience brought into being by encounters with works of art.” Furthermore, she defines education as “a process of enabling persons to become different, to enter the multiple provinces of meaning that create perspectives on the works” (Greene, 2001, p. 5). According to Greene, “‘Aesthetic education’ then, is an intentional undertaking designed to nurture appreciative, reflective, cultural, participatory engagements with the arts by enabling learners to notice what is there to be noticed, and to lend works of art their lives in such a way that they can achieve them as variously meaningful” (2001, p. 6). By
encountering artworks, aesthetic education enables students to reflect on their lived lives, think more, see more, hear more, and go beyond the taken-for-granted.

To clarify the meaning of aesthetic education, Greene described the opposite of aesthetics—anaesthetic—using the work of Dewey: “[Dewey] was always critical of the routine, the thoughtless, the mechanical, and what he called the ‘anaesthetic’—the opposite of aesthetic, meaning the banal, the repetitive, the solidified” (Greene, 2001, p. 162). Anaesthetic refers to the numb and unconscious. Using this antonym, Greene defines aesthetic education as a kind of consciousness of the world—not the physical or material world, which is outside and meaningless for us, but the lived world. According to Greene (2001), “[W]hat we try to do through aesthetic education is to move persons to their own creativity by means of active and participant encounters with works of art. Again, much has to do with participants’ willingness to lend the works their lives” (p. 96).

Greene’s ideas of aesthetic education are also related to the ideas of Arendt and Marcuse. For example, Arendt criticized thoughtlessness in her writing Eichmann in Jerusalem, which talks about Adolf Eichmann, a main player in the Holocaust. In this book, she indicates three inabilities: the inability to speak, the inability to think, and the inability to put oneself in the others’ shoes (Arendt, 1965, p. 49). Indeed, Eichmann did not recognize what he was doing; he lost the ability to think. In addition, when judges asked Eichmann why he did such horrible things, he answered using the conventional language of the Nazis, saying that he was undertaking “the final solution” to eliminate
the Jewish race. Arendt argues that the idea behind the Nazi language was “not to keep these people ignorant of what they were doing, but to prevent them from equating it with their old, ‘normal’ knowledge of murder and lies” (Arendt, 1965, p. 86). According to Arendt, the reason why the Nazis created these new language rules was to make people numb about what they were doing by coding words. For example, using the words “final solution” instead of the word “killing” made normal citizens numb about killing others. Indeed words can play a powerful role in conveying reality. Because of this special Nazi language, Eichmann did not realize the severity of what he did. Based on Eichmann’s case, Arendt warns us about thoughtlessness along with the banality and ordinariness of evil, which can arise in all of our lives. For Arendt, if we lose the ability to think we submerge ourselves in the banality of evil. For her, immoral behavior is not necessarily violence but is thoughtlessness. She indicates that thoughtlessness causes totalitarianism. From this, Arendt emphasizes how important thought and speech are to human beings. Even though Arendt did not emphasize aesthetic education, from the perspective of thoughtlessness, we can relate her ideas to Greene’s ideas of aesthetic education, through which students become conscious. Greene explains thoughtlessness in relation to Arendt as well as Dewey:

John Dewey had labeled as a “social pathology”…a pathology manifested “in querulousness, in impotent drifting, in uneasy snatching at distraction, in idealization of the long established, in a facile optimism assumed as a clock” ([1927] 1954, p. 170). Concerned about “sloppiness, superficiality, and recourse to sensations as a substitute for ideals,” Dewey also made the point that “thinking deprived of its normal course takes refuge in academic specialism” (p. 168). For Arendt, the remedy is “to think [about] what we are doing” (Greene, 1995, p. 126).
More specifically, according to Greene (1995) “To think in relation to what we are doing is to be conscious of ourselves struggling to make meaning, to make critical sense of what authoritative others are offering as objectively authoritatively ‘real’” (p. 126).

Meanwhile, Greene cited Herbert Marcuse’s notions, relating her ideas of consciousness and anaesthetics, “it [art] ‘breaks open a dimension inaccessible to other experience, a dimension in which human beings, nature, and things no longer stand under the law of established reality principle…The encounter with the truth of art happen in the estranging language and images” (In Greene, 1995, p.30). Therefore, according to Marcuse, art opens up new perspectives that individuals did not recognize before—that is, art makes people more conscious. Greene (2001, p. 22) also states that, “Herbert Marcuse wrote that art makes ‘the petrified world speak, sing, perhaps dance’ (1977/1978, p. 73)”. According to Harwood (2010), Greene’s ideas related to Marcuse have twofold meanings: first, “it gives us access to what has not appeared,” and second, “art can assist us to understand better what has appeared” (p. 363). Therefore, Greene’s notion of aesthetic education is related to Marcuse’s ideas about art opening up new dimensions of experience.

Greene often analogizes the petrified world in Marcuse with the metaphor of the cotton wool of dailiness, borrowed from Virginia Woolf’s in Moments of Being (1985). This metaphor means that aesthetic education enables students to break away from the “cotton wool” as well as the petrified world (Greene, 2001). Arendt also suggests that
thoughtlessness is one cause of totalitarianism, which is considered a part of the petrified world that Marcuse mentioned. Such thoughtlessness can be connected to the aforementioned “anaesthetic,” which Dewey believed was the opposite of aesthetics. Marcuse also argues that art enables people to see the invisible world. Through these ideas, we can discover ways to help students to become conscious through aesthetic education, which is also related to literacy.

The ideas of consciousness and thoughtfulness/thoughtlessness in aesthetic education as discussed above are also related to freedom. For Greene, freedom is connected to Arendt’s notions of thoughtfulness/thoughtlessness as cited in Michel Foucault (1984, p. 5): “thought is freedom in relation to what one does” (cited in Greene, 1988, p. 3). Greene also relates “thoughtlessness” to Arendt’s notion of freedom. Arendt argues that “Thought grows through language,” as demonstrated in the Eichmann example above. Using language does not simply mean speaking with conventional phrases; rather, it refers to finding and using one’s own voice. To speak with one’s own voice, a person needs to view the world with critical perspectives rather than complying and accepting the established world without thinking. Similarly, “According to Marcuse, critical thinking enables the individuals to transform their present needs, sensibility, consciousness, values, and behavior into a new radical subjectivity. This radical subjectivity practices the ‘Great Refusal’…saying no” (Ocay, n.d., p. 12). Therefore, critical thinking means to refuse injustice and break through fixed reality, which emancipates individuals from technological society. Freedom is related to critical thinking and consciousness both of which enable people to continuously grow and
change.

Thus, Greene (1988) considers human freedom as the capacity “to surpass the given and look at things as if they could not otherwise” (p. 3). In addition, she continuously connects her ideas of freedom with Dewey’s. For Dewey (1960), freedom is related to becoming different, which is also related to continuous growth and change. However, Dewey also believes that becoming different does not simply mean changing; rather, it is related to both choice and action, which occur in the lived common world with others. Therefore, for Greene, freedom is not personal liberation without others or social involvement.

Furthermore, humans are situated beings. We are not able to see the world perfectly but only partially. According to Greene (1988), “Human consciousness, moreover, is always situated; and the situated person, inevitably engaged with others, reaches out and grasps the phenomena surrounding him/her from a particular vantage point and against a particular background consciousness” (p. 21). Therefore, individuals always have multiple, yet partial, perspectives. When individuals interact with each other, multiple perspectives and interpretations—which each person grasps and develops based on his/her own lived world—accumulate and open up through dialogue and action. Thus, the common world in which we live with others is multifaceted, continuously changing, and challenging.

However, freedom in the negative sense (i.e., being isolated from others or from social involvement) separates individuals from their own landscape and makes them
passively comply to and accept a fixed reality as it is given. Greene (1988) argues, “To objectify in this fashion, to separate oneself as ‘subject’ from an independently existent ‘object’, is to sacrifice the possibility of becoming the ‘author’ of one’s world; and the consciousness of authorship has much to do with the consciousness of freedom” (p. 22). Freedom does not mean self-dependence and isolation from others but opens up possibilities and occurs in common world with others. According to Greene (1988), “Freedom is made possible only when people come together with some common notion of personal integrity… in a life consciously lived in common” (p. 5).

Thus, having freedom means that we can begin taking initiatives without fixing reality and that we can construct the world anew. By doing so, the self is not a static being but an entity that is continuously changing. For this change to occur, consciousness/thought is important. Critical thinking is also required to break through fixed reality, to refuse injustice and go beyond what we perceive. However, this change does not occur automatically. Consciousness and thinking does not mean to confine one’s thinking apart from others or the common world but to reach out to others and reinterpret the world with multiple perspectives through dialogue and action with others.

Along similar lines, Arendt is quoted as saying that “We are free and fated, fated and free” and that “We are conditioned, entangled, thrust into a world not of our choosing, but also free to understand what is happening to us, to interpret, to envision possibilities, to act against all the ‘determinism,’ to repair the deficiencies we find” (Ayers, 1998, p. 6). Reflecting on these comments, Greene argues that human beings are
conditioned to be in the world and are simultaneously able to see the world as if it could be otherwise and act based on our own freedom.

Based on the discussion above, aesthetic education is related to consciousness as well as freedom. Greene (1995) argues that “[w]hen Herbert Marcuse (1977, pp. 10-11) speaks of the qualities of art that allow it to indict established reality and evoke images of liberation, he may be suggesting, as I am here, the relevance of art in overcoming the inability to see others” (p. 136). Thus, aesthetic education enables children to be conscious, to think critically, and to look at alternatives, releasing their imaginations and enabling them to encounter artworks in dialogue and action with others.

**Aesthetic Education in the Practical Field**

**Aesthetic Education for Children in the 19th Century**

In the 19th century, the importance of art education for children in public schools was based on the significance of drawing after the Industrial Revolution. During this period, the Enlightenment, Romanticism, and German Idealism influence American education. While each of these belief systems was supported by different philosophical positions and ideas, human reason was the focal point of aesthetics education for each system. Therefore, in order to examine aesthetic education as it related to teaching children in the practical art education field, it is meaningful to examine drawing instruction for children during the 19th century as a result of the Industrial Revolution.
Early in this educational movement, Horace Mann and William Bentley Fowle contributed to the implementation of drawing instruction in public schools (Efland, 1990). Influenced by advanced common schools in Europe, including the Pestalozzian and Prussian schools, Mann insisted that drawing needed to be incorporated into public education because “it would improve handwriting,” “it was an essential industrial skill,” and “it was a moral force” (Efland, 1990, p. 73). Mann’s belief in drawing as a moral force was influenced by the Enlightenment, which was a dominant philosophical system after the mid-18th century. The Enlightenment emphasized human reason, suggesting that the perfection of human reason and spirit could guarantee a better society and happiness. According to this philosophical perspective, aesthetics also focused on human reason. From this perspective, drawing—as a moral force—could enhance human reason and spirit, thereby helping prevent crime and create a more moral world.

When formal writing instruction was introduced into public school curriculum, Chapman, who published drawing books, insisted that anyone who could write could draw and that drawing was a kind of literacy (Stankiewicz, 2001). For Chapman, literacy not only referred to reading words but also to reading the world. As such, “Drawing literacy…was more than an occupational skill. The ability to draw…could open minds to new ideas and aspirations, extend the limits of one’s world, organize experience, and create a desire for more artistic skills” (Stankiewicz, 2001, p.2). From this perspective, reading the world was related to aesthetic education, including how to perceive the world through one’s sensory organs, which forms the term aesthetics—i.e., sensory perception.
More interestingly, Siegesmund (2010) argues that aesthetic education, as it relates to caring, has been around since the establishment of public schools in America. As Siegesmud states, “Arguably, these early theorists saw the arts, and the new philosophical discipline of aesthetics, as a window for teaching authentic caring and awareness of circles of relationship that were essential to support the moral backbone of the new political experience in representative democracy” (p. 82). According to Siegesmund, when the term aesthetics is considered from its origin (as a Greek verb, Aisthanesthai), it refers to the relationship between the self and others and between thought and mind. Siegesmund bases his idea of caring in aesthetic education on the drawing methods of Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi, a major proponent of drawing in American public schools. According to Siegesmund “Pestalozzi theorized that close attention to fine-grained, hand-drawn relationship—completed within an emotionally secure space—allow connectiveness to see form” (p. 85). Therefore, according to Siegesmund, the Pestalozzian drawing method enables children to become aware of the self as it relates to the world, which reveals aesthetics as caring and as “a consciousness of human connectiveness to the world” (Siegesmund, 2010, p. 83).

Pestalozzian drawing reflects the ideas of aesthetics in the Enlightenment very well. As mentioned above, the Enlightenment emphasized human reason. Influenced by Rousseau, who believed that “nature is the best teacher,” Pestalozzi believed that “the fundamental of all human learning is based on sense impressions, Anschauungen, received by the mind from nature” and that “nature is the source of truth, and truth is obtained through the sense” (Efland, 1990, p. 77). Pestalozzi’s main concern was
training the mind, which was also the main concern of education during the
Enlightenment. According to Marzio (1976), for Pestalozzi, beauty was not a passive
perception but a tool for constructing a worldview (In Efland, 1990, p. 91). From this,
the Pestalozzian perspective on beauty is related to aesthetic education, which is an
active way to perceive the world through one’s sensory perception.

The Pestalozzian drawing method, which focused on simple lines, training the
human spirit, and enabling students to see patterns from simple forms, spread
throughout America in various ways, particularly through Walter Smith’s industrial
drawing method and the Freobelian Kindergarten Philosophy created by Amos Bronson
Alcott and Elizabeth Peabody. Aesthetic education for children was further shaped by
Smith’s teaching methods and Freobelian pedagogy. In the case of Smith, aesthetic
education for children was well expressed in his argument for industrial drawing:

  The true function of drawing in general education is to develop accuracy
  of perception and to exercise the imagination...The practice of drawing is
  necessary to the possession of taste and skill in industry, and is therefore
  the common element of education for creating an enjoyment of the
  beautiful, and for a profitable practical life (quoted in Clarke, 1885, p.
  264) (Efland, 1990, p. 101)

In this view, developing perceptual accuracy can be related to aesthetic education based
on the meaning of sensory perception. In addition, Smith emphasized the beautiful taste
of industrial society, which aesthetic education considered to be the context of industrial
society.

Meanwhile, among the influences of the Freobelian pedagogical philosophy was
Prang’s publication, The Use of Models: A Teacher’s Assistant in the Use of the Prang
Models for Form Story and Drawing in Primary Schools. This 1887 publication reflects Froebelian ideas, particularly “The Prang Elementary Course in Art Instruction” developed by Clark, Hicks and Perry, which combines ornamental industrial ideas with Froebel’s emphasis on “accurate representation rendered to create a beautiful impression” (Tarr, 1989, p.119). The Prang text also incorporated games in aesthetic education in order to keep children from becoming bored. In this method, aesthetic education was very common, as seen in the following passage:

Students might be asked to describe a series of objects to the teacher who turned her back to the table where she has placed a ball, the classroom globe, a leather-covered baseball…After the children pointed out different features of each object, the teacher asked them to describe one common trait among the objects, encouraging them to notice that the wooden sphere was the most perfectly round object on the table. When the children returned to their seats, each was given a smaller sphere and asked to pretend that it was a sponge, a snowball, a walnut, or a ripe plum…the children handled the spheres differently in response to the teacher’s suggestions. (Stankiewicz, 2001, pp. 51-52)

This example indicates that Prang’s text is closely linked to aesthetic education, as it suggests using one’s sensory organs in order to figure out the characteristics of different objects. Moreover, the text suggests that teachers encourage students to practice reflection in aesthetic education. By doing so, children could see and learn more about their world than they ever could in the past, which is the essence of aesthetic education.

Aesthetic education can also be observed in manual training, including “industrial drawing, clay modeling, paper cutting, woodworking, metal working, sewing, and cooking,” which was taught in schools from around 1880 to the early 20th century (Stankiewicz, 2001, p.45). In manual training, the factors of physical and mental
training—particularly the use of one’s hands and mind—were combined. According to Runkle and Woodward, “[educating] the mind through the hand…was liberal, intellectual training” (Efland, 1990, p.166). Aesthetic education was very apparent in the basic foundations of manual training.

Manual training was frequently justified on the basis of psychological research on brain and mind…Well organized muscles implied well-organized minds: clear and accurate ideas developed from clear and accurate sense perceptions. Carefully organized manual training activities with hand tools should be available to students during the critical learning period from ages four through fourteen. When manual skills had been learned thoroughly, they would become habits. (Stankiewicz, 2001, p. 55)

From this we see that aesthetic education was practiced in manual training from the perspective of embodied knowledge, which will be discussed later in the section related to Postmodernism. Even though manual training in 19th century was more focused on reason because of the dominant philosophy at that time, it is significant that it taught children to closely relate their body and mind, anticipating a contemporary emphasis on somatic sensibility and somaesthetics (Shusterman, 2001).

During this period, education as well as aesthetic education (which, again, was not formally manifested in art education) was influenced by philosophy and aesthetic theory—namely, by the Enlightenment, Romanticism, and German Idealism. While the Enlightenment emphasized human reason, Romanticism focused on human emotions and feelings. However, Romanticism still emphasized human reason over human emotion. German Idealism was supported by Kant and Hegel. Philosophers behind this theory believed that even though we could not see “thingness” and truth itself, truth
within God could be embodied in nature through reason. From the discussion above, we can see that all of these philosophical and aesthetic ideas were included and practiced in aesthetic education through the Pestalozzian and Freobelian drawing methods, Smith’s approach to industrial drawings, and Prang’s publication. In addition, from the interpretation of the original meaning of the term aesthetics offered by Siegesmund (2010), we can also see that aesthetic education in 18th century America was related to seeing the world and to the caring relationship between the self and others.

**Aesthetic Education for Children in the 20th Century**

In the 20th century, along with the development of science and the increased interest in the application of psychology to the education of children, child-centered education became more developed through the progressive education movement and the creative self-expression movement. Therefore, in this section, aesthetic education for children will be examined focusing on John Dewey’s theory of aesthetic experience and Victor Lowenfeld’s brief for creative self-expression.

Dewey (1916) considered art not as “luxuries or frills but [as] ‘emphatic expressions of that which makes any education worthwhile’” (cited in Dennis, 1968, p. 24). Dewey’s aesthetic theory is well expressed in his representative writing *Art as an Experience* (1934). Dewey sees humans as organic beings who can recover the continuity between aesthetic experience and daily life. According to Dewey, “Experience occurs continuously, because the interaction of creature and environing conditions is involved in the very process of living” (p. 36). However, everything does
not always happen in the same way. For example, Dewey states that, “A flight of stairs, mechanical as it is, proceeds by individualized steps, not by undifferentiated progression, and an inclined plane is at least marked off from other things by abrupt discreteness” (p. 37). According to Dewey, “we have an experience when the material experience runs its course to fulfillment” (p. 36). When one finishes an experience, one reaches a kind of “consummation” not a “cessation” (Dewey, 1934, p. 36). Therefore, aesthetic education is an experience: “because of continuous merging, there are no holes, mechanical junctions, and dead centers when we have an experience” (Dewey, 1934, p. 38). Thus, like a reader who reads poetry, Dewey—citing Coleridge’s statements in his book—states that aesthetic experience “should be carried forward, not merely or chiefly by the mechanical impulse of curiosity, not by a restless desire to arrive at the final solution, but by the pleasurable activity of the journey itself” (pp. 3-4). Moreover, Dewey’s ideas of aesthetic experience—that is when a human being, as an organic entity, reaches consummation through interacting with the environment—contributed to pragmatic aesthetics.

In the Laboratory School that Dewey established at the University of Chicago, we can see his ideas for aesthetic education in practice (Tanner, 1997). Dewey’s Laboratory School incorporated manual training (discussed above) into the curriculum, thereby making it a progressive school. Just like the manual training discussed earlier, Dewey also considered “whether the hand and other motor organs, in connection with the eye, ‘can be used to help children gain experience and come in contact with the familiar materials and process of ordinary life?’” (Mayhew & Edwards, 1936/1966, p.
27)" (Efland, 1990, p. 170). Dewey’s ideas of aesthetic education connected the body with the mind and life with art. In addition, Dewey believed that interesting occupations were the instrument that could extend children’s intellectual life (Efland, 1990).

The Laboratory School demonstrated Dewey’s ideas of “the school as a community where students would learn by doing” (Stankiewicz, 2001, pp. 57-58). By establishing the Laboratory School, Dewey intended to “discover in administration, selection of subject-matter, methods of learning, teaching, and discipline, how a school could become a cooperative community while developing in individuals their own capacities and satisfying their own needs” (quoted in Cremin, 1964, p. 134; Efland, 1990, p. 169). These ideas reveal relationships in a community and among individuals in aesthetic education. Through community projects, students can gain agency in a community and encounter aesthetics as an experience. Interestingly, however, Dewey did not limit aesthetic experience to the arts. His ideas of aesthetic education incorporated all subjects cooperating with one another.

Meanwhile, influenced by Dewey, Freud’s idea of the unconscious, and surrealism in art, Victor Lowenfeld thought that creative self-expression was vital to child development (Efland, 1990). Lowenfeld considered aesthetic education to be the most important aspect of education and argued that “the development of perceptual sensitivity, then should become a most important part of educative process” (Lowenfeld & Brittain, 1987, p. 5). In this argument, he considered sensory perception as an important part of knowing the world. Based on the fact that the original meaning of aesthetics related to sensory perception, it is clear that Lowenfeld’s ideas of the
importance of “perceptual sensitivity” are related to aesthetic education. For example, according to Lowenfeld, if we simply order the letters according to the sequence of the word *rabbit*, we cannot fully understand what a rabbit actually is. If we want to know what a rabbit is, we need to “touch it, feel its fur, watch its twitch, feed it, and learn its habits” (Lowenfeld & Brittain, 1987, p. 6). Indeed, he insists that “Aesthetics [is] an active perceptual process; it is the interaction between an individual and an object that provides a stimulating, harmonious experience” (Lowenfeld & Brittain, 1987, p. 102).

Lowenfeld (1987) continually argued for the development of aesthetic awareness. According to Lowenfeld, even though aesthetic awareness is a very basic aspect of art education, there is no standard process that will develop and teach aesthetic awareness. Rather, for Lowenfeld, “developing aesthetic awareness means educating sensitivity toward perceptual, intellectual and emotional experience so that these are deepened and integrated into a harmoniously organized whole” (Lowenfeld & Brittain, 1987, p. 102). These ideas match the meaning of aesthetic education, as both encourage enabling children to see the world through sensory perception. These concepts are also related to body and mind, sense and reason, and the self and others: “Relating to art and finding aesthetic pleasure in examining and reacting to representations are based on concrete experience. Gathering autumn leaves brings an appreciation of the variety of their forms, textures, colors, smells, and sounds” (Lowenfeld & Brittain, 1987, p. 133).

Thus, it is evident that instead of focusing on theory, Dewey and Lowenfeld approached aesthetic education based on the fact that human beings are organic entities
with senses, which not only include biological senses but also senses that interact with the environment, the self, and others.

*Aesthetic Education for Children in DBAE and Post-DBAE*

DBAE was influenced by discipline-centered curriculum, which was advocated by Jerome Bruner who believed that “the structure of a discipline” was the basis from which scholars could solve problems in curriculum. When the Penn State Seminar was held to discuss this topic in 1965, most of the seminar’s attendees agreed with Bruner’s idea about the discipline’s structure (Clark, 1984, p. 226). Specifically, Barkan insisted that “the disciplines of art are of a different order...To this extent, too, inquiry into art curriculum can be both structured and disciplined, and so can the curriculum itself” (1966, pp. 244). In addition, Barkan (1966) suggested that artists take on a representative role along with art historians, art critics, and aestheticians as models for art education just as scientists serve as models for science education (p. 253). As a result, art education began including science-based aspects within the discipline.

As philosophical aesthetics became an integral part of DBAE, the content of aesthetics in art education focused on experience—creating art, intent, and value (Greer, 1987). At the Penn State Seminar, numerous researchers and philosophers agreed that aesthetics was important in art education (Clark, 1984; Efland, 1984; McFee, 1984). After this seminar, a series of curriculum-development projects ensued, including the creation of aesthetic education and the development of the Aesthetic Eye Project (AEP)
By showing its numerous applications to various art-related situations, AEP demonstrated that incorporating aesthetics into art education was fundamental (Clark, 1984, p. 30).

In 1982, the J. Paul Getty Center adopted DBAE, further developing the ideas that were initially identified at the Penn State Seminar. Since its creation, the Getty Center played a significant role in enhancing the quality of aesthetics education, focusing on the concept that “teaching about the visual arts [which] can be rendered more effective through the incorporation of concepts and activities from a number of interrelated disciplines, namely, artistic creation, art history, art criticism and aesthetics” (Parsons & Blocker, 1993, p. ix). Similarly, aesthetics in art education emphasizes the fundamental concepts of art and its critical perspectives.

At the Getty Center’s national conference in 1987, Crawford (1987) defined “aesthetic inquiry as a philosophical discipline,” arguing that aesthetics “is concerned primarily with the nature of art as the product of artistic creative activity and as the focal point of appreciation, interpretation, and art criticism” (p. 28). Therefore, Crawford defined aesthetics as fundamental in art education, providing basic principles for three other DBAE disciplines: art creation, art history, and art criticism. Crawford (1991) also makes clear the similarities and differences in these disciplines:

Although the aims, methodologies, and vocabularies of aesthetics, art history, and art criticism differ, the boundaries among them are somewhat artificial and frequently overlap…An aesthetician is likely to believe that both art criticism and art history seek knowledge of a specific works of art and thus are less theoretical than aesthetics, which
deals with specific works…only by way of example, to test theories or to analyze concepts. (p. 29)

Thus, while art history and art criticism deal with specific works, aesthetics deals with the theoretical aspects of art and is fundamental for art history and art criticism.

If this is true, then what rationale is there for teaching aesthetics, and what does it mean to teach aesthetics to children in DBAE? Based on the characteristics of aesthetics in DBAE, Crawford (1987) provides three major reasons for teaching aesthetics to children: (1) to understand “the nature of art, our experience with it, and the concepts we use to talk about it,” (2) to participate in “critical examination,” and (3) to acquire “self-knowledge” (p. 28). Furthermore, Eisner (1988) argues that aesthetics provides resources for judgment and reflects the visual world and artworks, while arguing that the main concern of aesthetic education in DBAE is not making professional aestheticians but enabling children to engage in “continuing conversation about the nature and meaning of art in life” (p. 20). Therefore, teaching aesthetics in DBAE enables children to engage in, reflect on, and ask questions about art and the world rather than focusing on theory. Thus, aesthetic education in DBAE is mainly composed of reflection and conversation, which allow children to understand and examine art and the world.

However, aesthetic education in DBAE was created under modernism, which again emphasized reason and separated thought from sense as well as body from mind. DBAE ignored the importance and fundamental status of sense and body in aesthetic education, and aesthetic education mainly centered on thinking, reflecting, and
discussing rather than on aesthetic experience using one’s body and sensory organs. As a result, aesthetic education was too difficult and abstract to teach to children, and aesthetic education in DBAE did not show significant results as was initially expected.

The representative examples of aesthetic education in DBAE can be seen in the book *Aesthetics and Education* written by Parsons and Blocker (1993). In this book, Parsons and Blocker provide examples of aesthetic education for children, which primarily focus on aesthetics as a branch of philosophy using dialogue in the classroom. They enabled children to model aestheticians’ inquiry by introducing them to different artworks and the problems they presented. For example, when children see the artwork of Ivan Albright, *Into the World Came a Soul Called Ida*, they may be prompted to ask questions about the meaning of beauty, about issues of ugliness and beauty in art, or about the subjectiveness or objectiveness of beauty (Parsons & Blocker, 1993, pp. 2-5). These questions are related to aesthetics as philosophy. Encouraging students to ask questions about, discuss, and reflect on their ideas, teachers can guide children to approach aesthetic principles and issues that were originally a part of the philosophical field. However, aesthetic education in DBAE has been criticized because of its limitation. Because all of these principles were established under Modernism, the DBAE curriculum needs to be enlarged and supplemented rather than completely redone.

The arrival of Postmodernism brought a resistant attitude to reason-centered and universal metaphysics. In Postmodernism, there is no absolute truth; rather, this system revealed the fiction of truth through contradictory explanations. From this perspective, the dichotomy in Modernism between reason and sense, thought and sense, and mind
and body collapsed. In the traditional dichotomy, reason was above sense, thought was above sense, and mind was above body. In Postmodernism, such boundaries were broken; there was no substance or absolute essence or nature or universal truth. Therefore, in Postmodernism, differences and diversity were emphasized.

Shusterman explored the significant aspects of the body in aesthetics, which related to the embodied knowledge of aesthetic education in the manual training of the 19th century. As previously discussed, for Shusterman, the meaning of the term aesthetic as it relates to physical training centers around embodied knowledge. Shusterman believes that aesthetic education includes both physical training and the mind. Shusterman give us a good example of this training: the struggling golfer who is completely convinced that he will do well but actually fails. According to Shusterman, this golfer’s “conscious will is unsuccessful because deeply ingrained somatic habits override it; and he does not even notice this failure because his habitual sense perception is so inadequate and distorted that it feels as if the action intended is indeed performed as willed” (p. 260). Therefore, even if the golfer knows how to perform well, without somatic sensibility and embodied knowledge, he will ultimately be unsuccessful. From this, Shusterman emphasizes aesthetic education related to somatic sensibility: “Virtue itself demands somatic self-perfection” (p. 269).

Moreover, related to the body and mind and to sense and reason, scholars have been interested in aesthetic education in the East. Sheng (2003) introduced Eastern aesthetic education through Zen. According to Sheng, “Zen is the discipline of cultivating the mind to reach a state of emptiness or liberating the mind of continuous
suffering” (p. 34). Further, understanding Zen requires “an essential level of physical engagement” (Sheng, 2003, p. 34). Based on this argument, Sheng emphasizes sensory experience in aesthetic education for children. Shusterman’s (2000) idea of somaesthetics is also related to oriental aesthetics from the pragmatist aesthetic perspective, and Powell (2004) emphasizes embodied knowledge in aesthetic education through physical training by introducing Taiko drumming in Japan as an instance of Eastern Aesthetics. These approaches show the connection between body and mind and thought and sense, which is a fundamental aspect of aesthetic education.

In addition, as a way to connect children's daily lives with aesthetic education, many research studies of children's aesthetic preference in visual cultures related to their cultural contexts and ordinary lifestyles are being actively conducted. In their research, Ezan and Lagier (2009) show how visual images influence children's aesthetic preference in their lives as well as how mass media and commercials use children's aesthetic preferences for their benefit. In addition, they argue that aesthetic perception is related to children's sexual identities. Through their emphasis on the fact that our daily lives are determined by aesthetic consideration, we are becoming more aware of how much aesthetic education is related to children's daily lives and how important that connection is.

Meanwhile, in Postmodernism, rather than trying to make students seek or know a universal beauty or principle from an aesthetic experience, aesthetic education enables children to construct and re-create their world from their own positions as well as to go beyond their boundaries by interacting with others. Acer and Ömeroğlu (2008) provide
examples of this type of interaction. For instance, children interact with artists by asking question, touching works, and reinterpreting them, or by producing artworks or creating stories later. Acer and Ömeroðlu argue that there are several types of aesthetic education activities that can be undertaken but that the most important thing in aesthetic education is to "improve and enrich the aesthetic education program in line with her/[his] own interests, skills and talents" (p. 341). Therefore, in the postmodern era, aesthetic education puts more emphasis on constructive and active individuals who continuously challenge and recreate their world rather than following universal and fixed principles. Rather, this form of aesthetic education is more interested in personal stories and diversity than in objective and monolithic ideologies.

All of the approaches discussed above can be considered as attempts to recover the dichotomy that the Modernist pursuit created between the body and mind, sense and reason, self and others, and life and art as well as efforts to break through the rigid categories that have been established by Modernism, including university, objectivity, and elitism.

Based on the discussion above, what would aesthetic education be in contemporary society? Could it be an important and meaningful part of education for children? What would educators/teachers expect from aesthetic education? From the meaning of the term aesthetics, we can answer these questions. As mentioned briefly in the introduction, aesthetics refers to sensory perception, which means that aesthetic education’s starting point is the fact that human beings are organic entities. We meet, live in, and understand the world with our sensory organs. In Postmodernism, both the
body and sense are important, and there are no universal rules, no correct answers, and no absolute truth. There are so many -isms and ideas and confusions of beliefs and values. In addition, there are endless changes. Therefore, there has been no better time than right now for us to explore our decisions, judgments, consciousness, and awareness of the world, which ultimately is related to aesthetic education.

At this point, some scholars insist that aesthetic education is useless because the theory of aesthetics and its ideology only confuses students and makes them shut their eyes to the world (Lee, 2010). However, from the original meaning of the term aesthetics, we can say that aesthetic education remains important in contemporary society because it enables children to see and understand the world rather than forcing them to think in a universal manner.

**Rethinking Aesthetic Education**

Based on the above discussion, we can redefine aesthetic education. In terms of the origin of the word aesthetics, aesthetic education includes all aspects of one’s sensory perception, which, in turn, are related to one’s body and mind. However, if we examine the original meaning of the term aesthetics more closely, we can see that the term involves relationships between the self and others, between the body and mind, and between culture, politics, and economics. Therefore, aesthetic education is related to all aspects of sensory perception that enable individuals to participate in the world as well as to the areas in which aesthetics has dealt, including art, aesthetic properties, aesthetic
experiences, aesthetic responses, and aesthetic perceptions. These latter areas, in turn, are related to both body and mind, art and life, and sense and reason, enlarging to pluralistic, contextual, social, political, and economic arenas.

To clarify the meaning of aesthetic education, I refer to Greene who defines aesthetic education as being conscious. Greene mentioned the opposite of aesthetics—anaesthetic—using the work of Dewey: “[Dewey] was always critical of the routine, the thoughtless, the mechanical, and what he called the ‘anaesthetic’—the opposite of aesthetic, meaning the banal, the repetitive, the solidified” (Greene, 2001, p. 162). Anaesthetic refers to being numb and unconscious. Using this antonym, Greene defines aesthetic education as a kind of consciousness of the world—not just of the physical or outside world but of the lived world. According to Greene (2001), “[W]hat we try to do through aesthetic education is to move persons to their own creativity by means of active and participant encounters with works of art. Again, much has to do with participants’ willingness to lend the works their lives” (p. 96). Therefore, even though we see the world with our physical eyes, if we do not engage with the world aesthetically, we become numb to it.

From this review of aesthetic education in the practical field, we can see that even though scholars did not recognize aesthetic education and did not call it such, aesthetic education has been informally practiced in public schools from the inception of public school art education in America. From this, it is also evident that aesthetic education was a very primary and fundamental factor of art education. Particularly when we think of the meaning of aesthetics, it refers to the door through which we meet the
world. However, more interestingly, even though the ideology of education in modern society only highlights human reason and focuses on absolute truth, we can see in art education—more exactly, in aesthetic education—an emphasis on sense and body. We must recognize, then, that even though it has not always been recognized as such, aesthetic education has been carried out in the practical field for over a hundred years.

Second, aesthetic education reflects the ideas and philosophical arguments that dominated and influenced the 19th and 20th centuries even though it was criticized and changed after the early 1920s. Therefore, we cannot say that there was no aesthetic education simply based on the contemporary perspective and philosophy.

Third, based on this discussion, we can see that aesthetic education is influenced by time, place, culture, and politics. Therefore, when teaching aesthetics to children, the content or theory of aesthetics itself is not as important as enabling children to have sensory experience and be aware of their sense perceptions. This does not mean that we should merely teach children to see the world as objects with their physical eyes; it means that we need to help them to be conscious.

As such, aesthetics should be defined as all of the activities and practices related to humans’ sensory events. For this reason, the meaning of aesthetics cannot help but change according to time and place. When we think about what aesthetic education at this point in time is, it is important to teach our students critical thinking strategies, which can survive through changing times. We cannot see truth, and everything will change continuously. Therefore, it is essential to enable children to see the world consciously and critically in aesthetic education through sensory perception.
Part II: The Meanings/Characteristics of the Public/In-between Space

In this section, the meaning and characteristics of the public/in-between space is examined. Arendt (1957) distinguished the public from the private in *The Human Condition* and categorized human activities into labor, work, and action. Among these, labor and work relate to the private space, while action relates to public space. Moreover, the characteristics of the public space concern human beings as political beings; whereas, both action and political beings also relate the plurality of human beings.

Therefore, to explore the meaning of the public/in-between space, we first need to understand the meaning of labor, work, and action. In addition the meaning of political beings as it relates to the plurality of human beings will be examined. Based on this examination, the meaning and characteristics of the public/the in-between space is discussed.

The Public/In-between Space in Terms of the Plurality of Human Beings

In terms of “vita activa,” Arendt (1958) explores “the fundamental human activities: labor, work and action” (p. 7). According to Arendt, these are the basic conditions under which human beings live on earth. Labor includes those activities that are involved in the biological processes of the human body and are necessary to sustain life—this necessity is provided for and produced by labor. Labor is distinguished from
work in that it has destructive and exhausting characteristics and involves nature to sustain life. Work, on the other hand, includes activities that involve the “unnaturalness of human existence” by providing an “artificial world of things” that is distinguished from our natural environments (Arendt, 1958, p. 7). Work provides mortal human life with permanence and durability by transcending and outlasting individual humans. In terms of work, humans consider things outside to be objective things that create an artificial world. In addition, work has a beginning and an end, while labor is repeated until the labor power becomes exhausted and is subjected to the cycle of nature.

While labor and work deal with nature, action concerns human relationships. Action includes only those activities that are performed directly between human beings without any other medium, such as things or materials. This activity is possible due to the plurality of human beings, as Arendt explains:

> Human plurality, the basic condition of both action and speech, has the twofold character of equality and distinction. If men were not equal, they could neither understand each other and those who came before them nor plan for the future and foresee the needs of those who will come after them. If men were not distinct, each human being distinguished from any other who is, was, or will ever be, they would need neither speech nor action to make themselves understood. …Speech and action reveal this unique distinctness. Through them, men distinguish themselves instead of being merely distinct; they are the modes in which human beings appear to each other, not indeed as physical objects, but *qua* men. This appearance, as distinguished from mere bodily existence, rests on initiative, but it is an initiative from which no human being can refrain and still be human. This is true of no other activity in the *vita activa*. (Arendt, 1958, pp. 175-176)

It is natural that there are as many various perspectives as there are individual people,
which are then expressed as various opinions. In order to realize the plurality of human beings, the action that distinguishes themselves from others—realization of differences—reveals actively themselves to others beyond being itself.

Greene (1988) believes that the public/in-between space is a place for human beings to reveal their diversity. Thus, the meaning of the public/in-between space starts with the plurality of human beings. As Greene states, the goal is:

[T]o find (or create) an authentic public space, that is, one in which diverse human beings can appear before one another as, to quote Hannah Arendt, ‘the best they know how to be.’ Such a space requires the provision of opportunities for the articulation of multiple perspectives in multiple idioms, out of which something common can be brought into being. It requires, as well, a consciousness of the normative as well as the possible. (1988, xi)

The human race is full of plurality; that is, human beings are not exactly the same but are different from one another with different opinions and perspectives. Therefore, in the public/in-between space, individuals’ diverse perspectives can be expressed. For Greene, an authentic public/in-between space is related to consciousness and allows individuals to articulate multiple perspectives freely. Moreover, it is possible only through equality and through human’s unique ability to speak and act. These unique abilities create a space in which individuals can interact with others.

The Public/In-Between Space for Humans as Political Beings

The public/in-between space exists due to humans’ political nature. The ways
that humans engage in relationships with others and with the world relate to political meaning.

Arendt explores the meaning of political beings in terms of Aristotle’s “zōon politikon” which means a political animal (Arendt, 1958, p. 23). The term “zōon politikon” is related to the origin of the polis in Greek. The polis of Greek society was a “the most talkative of all bodies of politic” where human beings solved problems with action and speech (Arendt, 1958, p. 26). This ability to take action and speak—or what Aristotle called “bios politikos”—is what distinguishes humans from animals (Arendt, 1958, p. 25). In other words, human beings are political beings because of their action and speech.

The fact that human beings are political beings that speak and take action is related to the plurality of human beings—namely, that we have different opinions and beliefs. For this reason, there is conflict and disagreement among people. As Freire (1997) puts it, “In being in favor of something or someone, I am necessarily against someone” (p. 40). However, as discussed above, “As women and men, we continue to be what Aristotle said so well. We are political animals. We continue to be that into which we have turned: political animals” (Freire, 1997, p. 41). As a result, we can solve conflicts through dialogue, not through violence like in the animal world, because humans have the faculty of speech to express their uniqueness and to discuss their own opinions in public space (Arendt, 1958, p. 27). Therefore, humans as political beings engage in relationships with others who share their opinions and solve conflicts through
language, not violence.

The Public/In-between Space, Private Space, the Political, and the Social

Based on the above discussion, the meaning of public/in-between space can be clarified. At first, Arendt (1958) continuously explored the meaning of the public space by distinguishing it from the private space. Arendt explained the meaning of the term “public” using two aspects. First, the term public means that “everything that appears in public can be seen and heard by everybody and has the widest possible publicity” (Arendt, 1958, p.50). Therefore, the world in which we live together depends on the fact that there is “the appearance—something that is being seen and heard by others as well as by ourselves” (Arendt, 1958, p. 50). Thus, the term “public” means in between people and in that space where people interact. In other words, “the presence of others who see what we see and hear what we hear assures us of the reality of the world and ourselves” (Arendt, 1958, p. 50). Thus, the public space and in-between space are not necessarily separated from each other. They can be the same place; public space emphasizes the meaning of “public,” while in-between space emphasizes the webs of relationship that exist between people.

Second, the term “public” means “the world itself, in so far as it is common to all of us and distinguished from our privately owned place in it” (Arendt, 1958, p. 52). From this perspective, this space is not identical to the natural environment. The public space exists in-between people. As Arendt (1958) states, “To live together in the world
means essentially that a world of things is between those who have it in common, as a table is located between those who sit around it: the world, like every in-between, relates and separates men at the same time” (p. 52). Therefore, the public/in-between space have the power to unite and to separate people so that human beings who are different from one another can gather while simultaneously preventing them from “falling over each other” (p. 52-53).

Therefore, for Arendt, this means that reality can be created from diverse perspectives that open up a common viewpoint rather than a patchwork of different perspectives (Wilson, 2003, p. 207). Thus, through the public/in-between space, others assure a common world. In this place where human plurality appears, there is also space between each member, or what Arendt calls the “in-between” space (1958, p. 182). Greene then expanded the notion of the public/in-between space. “For Greene, the public space is an in-between brought into being through the concerted actions of distinct human beings who are related by a common purpose” (Wilson, 2003, p. 208). Fruchter (1998) also states that “Maxine [Greene] introduced us to the notion of public space as the terrain on which citizens could come together to discuss and debate how to advance the common good” (p. 229).

Meanwhile, the meaning of private space is closely related to the meaning of public space. The term “private” means “deprived of” (Arendt, 1958, p. 58). That is, the term “private” means that it is “deprived of things essential to a truly human life; to be deprived of the reality that comes from being seen and heard by others, to be deprived of
an ‘objective’ relationship with them that comes from being related to and separated from them through the intermediary of a common world of things” (Arendt, 1958, p. 58). This means that the private space lies in “the absence of others” (p. 58). Therefore, in the private space, things occur that do not need to be heard and seen by others, such as sleeping and eating. The distinction between the public space and the private space is “there are things that need to be hidden and other that need to be displayed publicly if they are to exist at all” (p. 73).

In Greek society, the things that were dealt with in the private space belong to household life. As such, the public space was protected from economic issues. However, when the economic issues entered into the public space, the nature of the public space changed. Arendt called this realm the social space in which economic issues came into public space.

Furthermore, Arendt mentioned that Aristotle’s “zōon politikon” has often been mistranslated into “animal socialis” (Arendt, 1958, p. 23). In other words, the meaning of political being that Aristotle originally described is distinctively different from social beings. For Aristotle, “bios politikos” consists of action and speech and thoroughly excluded “everything merely necessary and useful” (Arendt, 1958, p. 25). Therefore, the assertion that human beings live as political beings does not mean that we are just with others but that we are with others in the public/in-between space where we are mutually engaged with speech and action. In this sense, economic issues should not be the purpose in the public/in-between space.
However, when economic issues became the purpose in the public/in-between space, human beings had a way to accumulate capital. When economic issues become the focus of human interest, human beings do not consider one another as plural beings but as objects by leveling—evaluated from the measurement that is based on the economic. Therefore, when the political became the social, humans’ plurality, differences, and uniqueness can no longer be guaranteed.

**Time in the Public/In-Between Space**

One of the characteristics of the public/in-between space relates to time. More precisely, these spaces concern the immortality of human beings rather than eternity. Both eternity and immortality seem to be impossible for humans because humans are mortal beings. Eternity and immortality do not exist in the human world but in an outside natural world; however, humans have long desired immortality. As such, Arendt (1958) discusses the ways humans can acquire immortality in terms of the public/in-between space.

The term *immortality* is different from *eternity* in that the former belongs to human time, while the latter belongs to God’s time. Arendt (1958) further distinguished eternity from immortality: “The philosopher’s experience of the eternal...can occur only outside the realm of human affairs and outside the plurality of men” (p. 20). As such, eternity is before God’s antemundane and is beyond human affairs, while immortality belongs to the time that God created. While Augustinus suggested a way for humans to
approach eternity through God, Arendt developed her idea of action as a way for human beings to acquire immortality. Arendt explained human immortality as it relates to the indistinction of a species:

Men are “the mortals,” the only mortal things in existence, because unlike animals they do not exist only as members of a species whose immortal life is guaranteed through procreation. The mortality of men lies in the fact that individual life, with a recognizable life-story from birth to death, rises out of biological life. This individual life is distinguished from all other things by the rectilinear course of its movement, which so to speak, cuts through the circular movement of biological life...By their capacity for the immortal deed, by their ability to leave non-perishable traces behind, men, their individual mortality notwithstanding, attain an immortality of their own and prove themselves to be a “divine” nature (Arendt, 1958, pp. 18-19).

Arendt focuses on distinguishing human immortality from animal’s immortality using the perspective of “individuality.” Therefore, immortality with individual meaning—that is, each human individually transcending mortality while simultaneously recovering the indistinction of a species as well as acquiring their unique differences—can be accomplished by human action. Further, it is in the public space where such action can occur.

Arendt explains that immortality for humans is related to the present, between the past and the future. In her book, *Between Past and Future* (1961), Arendt uses a metaphor from Kafka to show that it is not the present, but the interval, that is between the past and the future:

The past… does not pull back but presses forward, and it is, contrary to what one would expect, the future which drives us back into the past. Seen from the viewpoint of man, who always lives into in the interval
between past and future, time is not a continuum, a flow of uninterrupted succession; it is broken in the middle, at the point where “he” stands; and “his” standpoint is not the present as we usually understand it but rather a gap in time which “his” constant fighting, “his” making a stand against past and future, keeps in existence. Only because man is inserted into time and only to the extent that he stands his ground does the flow of indifferent time break up into tense; it is the insertion. (Arendt, 1961, pp. 10-11)

It is in the interval between the past and the future that a human can exist. For Arendt, the time before the existence of human beings is “the flow of indifferent time.” It was only possible to use tenses after humans came into “the flow of indifferent time.” However, Arendt did not call this gap the present, here. Even though “he” was inserted into the time that interrupted the indifferent time, the point at which this interruption from his insertion occurred was still an interval, not the present. Arendt found that through remembrance and anticipation, one can bring this interval into the present:

[H]e could properly see and survey…what had come in to being only with his own, self-inserting appearance—the enormous, ever changing time-space which is created and limited by the forces of past and future; he would have found the place in time which is sufficiently removed from past and future to offer ‘the umpire’ a position from which to judge the forces fighting with each other with an impartial eye…it may well be the region of the spirit, or rather the path paved by thinking, this small track of non-time which activity of thought beats within the time-space of mortal men and into which the trains of thought, of remembrance and anticipation, save whatever they touch from the ruin of historical and biographical time…each new generation, indeed every new human being as he inserts himself between an infinite past and an infinite future, must discover and ploddingly pave it anew. (Arendt, 1961, pp. 12-13)

It is in the activity of thinking, of remembrance and anticipation, through which the interval becomes the present and can connect the past and the future.
Arendt argued that the private space’s intrusion into the public space threatens continuous action. Additionally, Arendt indicated that the intrusion of the private space into the public space collapsed the boundary between the public space and plurality, which is necessary for human beings. As discussed above, the social forms when the private space comes into the public space and acquires public interest. Arendt argued, “It is decisive that society, on all its levels, excludes the possibility of action, which formerly was excluded from the household. Instead, society expects from each of its members a certain kind of behavior, imposing innumerable and various rules, all of which tend to ‘normalize’ its members, to make them behave, to exclude spontaneous action or outstanding achievement” (Arendt, 1958, p. 40). In other words, the social atomizes humans and excludes the possibility of action.

Along with action, Arendt distinguished the time of nature and the time of humans in terms of initiation. Arendt argued that “the new beginning inherent in birth can make itself felt in the world only because the newcomer possesses the capacity of beginning something anew, that is, of acting” (1958, p. 9). Therefore, action enables human beings to realize their great accomplishments and recognize the past and the future by initiating something new in the world in which only indistinct things that are repeated exist. Therefore, for Arendt, initiation means that humans invite something new and seemingly impossible into the world. In doing so, humans can acquire concrete individual meaning from nature where only indiscrimination of species exists and can live by human time, not by animal time or that of nature, by action as an initiation. It is the point that humans approach action using human time as opposed to using nature’s
time, which separates humans from other species. Thus, human time makes action and speech possible, and it is the public space where action and speech can be made possible. Therefore, the public space reveals human time.

**The Spectator and the Actor in the Public/In-between Space**

Another thing that can be drawn from the above discussion is the spectator and the actor in the public/in-between space. Even though human time is opened in the public/in-between space, if only spectators or only actors exist in this space, then human time cannot function properly. Action makes human time possible, while spectators enable human time to continue to exist. Thus, human time can only exist when both the spectators and actors communicate with one another.

An important aspect here is the fact that the spectators are also actors. According to Ranciére (2009), “Every spectator is already actor in her/his story; every actor, every man of action, is the spectator of the same story” (p. 17). They are plural and they create in their own way, interact and communicate with each other rather than simply looking at the actor without speaking. This dialogue is a kind of action by which the spectators can enlarge their own perspectives into world perspectives.

In her book *Life of the Mind*, Arendt (1978) argued that thinking is related to the present, the will concerns the future, and judgment is related to the past. While the spectator judges an event that happened in the past and reveals the greatness of it, the actor can then plan the actions of what he/she will do in the future. Therefore, the actor
and spectator appear as the active subjects in the public space and make human time possible through judgment.

**Common Sense and Public/In-Between Space**

The public/in-between space plays a role in generating common sense and in going beyond it. In other words, common sense needs a public/in-between space in which it can be generated and recreated. Moreover, the public/in-between space makes possible the common world in which people live together. Here, I examine the characteristics of the public/in-between space as they relate to common sense by investigating the meaning of common sense historically and philosophically.

According to Merriam Webster (n.d.), common sense is “sound and prudent judgment based on a simple perception of the situation or facts.” Thus, *common sense* is understood to be the socially normal judgment of the community. However, the English term of common sense has diverse meanings along with varied historical and philosophical background (Lee, 2008)⁴. For Aristotle, common sense means commonalities of the five senses in the Greek term *aisthetrion koinon*, while Cicero believed that common sense means social common sense and normal judgment in a community in the Latin term *sensus communis*, which is tied to Kant’s belief that

---

⁴ Related to the characteristics and background of common sense historically and philosophically, see Lee (2008). “Sensus Communis in Kantian Aesthetics and the Problem of Art Education,” Soongsil University, Seoul. The explanation of common sense developed in the next few pages comes from Lee (2008).
common sense is the sense of the common (*Gemeiner Sinn*), human sense (*Menschensinn*), a common or healthy understanding of humanity (*gemainer order gesunder Menschen—Verstand*), and healthy reason (*gesund Vernunft*) (Kuehn, 1987; Litter, 1974, cited in Lee, 2008). After Kant, many scholars and philosophers continuously mentioned and defined common sense. Among these, Arendt also studied the above traditions and developed a definition of common sense related to its political aspects. Namely, Arendt considered “the rise of totalitarianism” to result in “a declining role of ‘common sense’ in the politics of modern society” (Hinchmann, 1984, p. 317).

From the above traditional background, we can discover some recurring characteristics of common sense related to public/in-between space. According to Aristotle, one’s own sense is the sense organ corresponding to a special object: “for example, sight is of color, hearing of sound and taste of flavor” (Aristotle, 1965, p. 77). Meanwhile, common sense has no special organ. Instead,

\[
\text{Perception of the common object is like none of the preceding and asserts categorically that they are essential for a common sense, i.e. a potentiality for perceiving objects which are perceptible by more than one special sense-organ and which are thus common to those sense-organs. (Hamlyn, 1968, p. 119)}
\]

In addition, “Aristotle argued that there must be a central cognitive faculty that combines our five senses” (Wenzel, 2005, p. 82). Therefore, according to Aristotle, common sense is a central faculty and relies on individuals’ perceptions of objects through proper sense organs. Although proper sense considers only one sense as its object, common sense uses more than one sense as its object (Aristotle, 1965). In
addition, common sense has integrating, analyzing, and distinguishing functions because common sense can distinguish each sense as well as integrate them as one object.\(^5\)

Therefore, for Aristotle, common sense is a kind of central sense that has the ability to integrate, analyze, distinguish, and judge.

In other words, we can see and meet an integrated world from common sense in that common sense integrates data from the five sensory organs and can then analyze and distinguish them as well. However, what we meet through common sense cannot provide validity of the world in which we live with others because the world that one draws in his/her mind through one’s common sense exists only for that one person. Therefore, the public/in-between space is necessary for human beings to live with others in a common world. Without common sense, people could not conceive the world for themselves. However, the world not only belongs to oneself but also to others.

Meanwhile, for Cicero, common sense is a kind of common understanding used to persuade others and enable people to arrive at consensus in rhetoric or politics, which is different from Aristotle’s notion of common sense as a kind of sense. “Cicero saw the sensus communis in the light of rhetoric and politics as something we should pay attention to in order to persuade others and act properly” (Wenzel, 2005, p. 82; cited in Lee, 2010, p. 344). However, Cicero’s view of common sense as a kind of common

\(^5\) “For example, common sense can recognize the white and sweet characteristics of an object while simultaneously recognizing that these characteristics belong to one object. In addition, common sense can distinguish the differences between objects” (Jang, 1997, p.8; cited in Lee, 2010, p. 344).
understanding cannot exist without a public/in-between space in which people can communicate and reveal their opinions.

On another note, for Kant, common sense is divided into three categories—logical common sense, moral common sense, and aesthetic common sense—depending on how imagination and understanding are united (Kant, 1964). For logical common sense and moral common sense, imagination is determined by understanding, while for aesthetic common sense, imagination plays freely with understanding instead of being subordinate to understanding. For Kant, aesthetic common sense is reflective judgment for which particulars are not regulated in the universe. In other words, aesthetic common sense views the plurality of humans as a precondition. Therefore, in order to activate aesthetic common sense, a public/in-between space in necessary in which diverse people who are different from each other can interact.

All of these ideas were further developed by Arendt. Arendt succeeded in further developing the two fundamental ideas of common sense proposed by Aristotle and Cicero, via Kant, while simultaneously adding in political meaning. From the Kantian aesthetic common sense, Arendt followed “Kant’s maxims which serve to liberate people from prejudiced, one-sided views of their object” (Hinchman, 1984, p. 323)—that is, “to think from the standpoint of everyone else” (Kant, 1964, p. 152). Thus, for Arendt, common sense refers to the ability to go beyond one’s subjective perspectives along with a Kantian aesthetic common sense. Arendt’s view of common sense corresponds to Kant’s aesthetic judgment in that it relates to the basic idea of politics.
For Arendt, politics relates to human plurality (Hinchman, 1984). According to Arendt, human plurality is not just a quantity but “plurality of living as distinct and unique beings among equals” (1958, p. 178). This is the same condition as political life. If we are all the same, there would be no conflict; consequently, we would not need politics through action and speech (Arendt, 1958, pp. 7-8).

Indeed, Arendt’s notion of common sense serves to attain intersubjective validity in the plurality of politics as does Kant’s subjectivity of aesthetic judgment, which provides the rationale for the public/in-between space. In Kant, a subjective judgment of aesthetic taste is “valid intersubjectively and communicable…by assuming existence of what he called the sensus communis, understood as the capacity to transcend one’s narrow, subjective viewpoint” (Hinchman, 1984, pp. 321-323). Similar to Kant, Arendt believed that common sense serves to validate intersubjectivity and communicability. Without common sense, people could not conceive of the world as it appears to others. However, more complicatedly, for Arendt, the objectivity of knowledge—of which common sense is the condition—is not generated from one’s capacity to generate objectively true cognition but rather depends on humans’ relationship to things and other people (Hinchman, 1984, p. 324). Therefore, Arendt believes that “common sense is neither a spontaneous outgrowth of our life together nor the product of detached observation, but the result of activity in which we compare perspectives on the world through speech” (Hinchman, 1984, p. 325). As such, judgment in Arendt’s view of common sense is not spontaneously given to human beings, as Kant stated, but must be achieved through public discussion. This highlights a significant difference between
Arendt’s and Kant’s viewpoints of common sense.

The public/in-between space in which people share their own opinions and generate common sense is important to Arendt, as seen below:

Although perspectives on the world can be exchanged in many settings, the generation of common sense properly belongs to our “common meeting ground,” the public arena or “space of appearances.” It requires the existence of a public realm in which we can exchange opinions and outlooks and test ideas (Hinchman, 1984, p. 325).

Therefore, one of the reasons for the rise of totalitarianism, according to Arendt, is the loss of the public space for generating common sense. Arendt demonstrated this reasoning in *Eichmann in Jerusalem*. In this book, Arendt stated that—although certain individuals opposed the Nazis—“their voices were never heard…they were neither heroes nor saints, and they remained completely silent” (1965, pp. 103-104). In other words, they had no public arena in which to generate common sense, the absence of which ultimately led to totalitarianism. For Arendt, “common sense dwells in the space [in-]between people, it cannot be captured or monopolized, and it simply withers away if an actor succeeds in imposing his or her own framework on all others” (Hinchman, 1984, pp. 325-326). Arendt also drew parallels between common sense and language:

Language, corresponding to or following common sense, gives an object its common name; this commonness is not only the decisive factor for intersubjective communication—the same object being perceived by different persons and common to them—but it also serves to identify a
datum that appears altogether differently to each of the five senses (Arendt, 1978, p. 119).

In this reference, “intersubjective communication” could be related to Cicero’s approach to common sense and could “identify a datum that appears altogether differently to each of the five senses” of Aristotle’s approach. Arendt’s view of the public space as an area to restore memory or stories is also related to Aristotle’s and Cicero’s views of common sense. According to Arendt, “A language is the repository of a particular way of apprehending the world that grows out collective symbols and memories. It contains the common sense of the past in a congealed form” (Hinchman, 1984, p. 8). Thus, common sense that corresponds to language could be a place in which to restore memories and stories. For Cicero (2003), common sense is related to the place “topica” (i.e., topic), which refers to the place in which one might hide the basis of an argument or a storehouse of data. If one knows where the information for an argument is, it could help make the argument more perfect, which is important to rhetoric. Therefore, memories are also considered important, as they are related to topica.

However, if language is restricted, common sense that needs to be “recreated and reinforced through public discourse” cannot be activated or generated (Hinchman, 1984, p. 325). Indeed, in such a scenario, “even people who begin with laudable moral principles…may imperceptibly slide into dogmatism and ideology” (Hinchman, 1984, p. 325). Therefore, doctrine or ideology results from the loss of public/in-between space in which common sense can be generated from public discourse—namely, language. Arendt provided a representative example in her book *Eichmann in Jerusalem:*
All correspondence referring to the matter was subject to rigid “language rules,” and except in the report…it is rare to find documents in which such bald words as “extermination,” “liquidation,” or “killing” occur. The prescribed code names for killing were “final solution,” “evacuation” and “special treatment”…The net effect of this language system was not to keep these people ignorant of what they were doing, but to prevent them from equating it with their old, “normal” knowledge of murder and lies (1965, pp. 85-86).

Here “their old and normal knowledge” is “common sense of the past in a congealed form” (Hinchman, 1984, p. 324). Thus, according to Arendt, when individuals are deprived of a public space in which common sense can be generated and recreated, people easily slide into ideology (e.g., Nazism) based on how closely common sense relates to language.

Common sense for Arendt connotes the ability to cope with the world without falling victim to superstitions, illusions or distortions inspired by grandiose theories. It suggest a sober, prudent attitude that recognizes the external world’s resistance to the ego’s attempt to impose patterns on it…Arendt contends that common sense in fact exists in the “web” of human relationship. It is the product of speech, memory and history, and it has both political and epistemological function (Hinchman, 1984, p. 5).

Arendt warned that people could slide into dogmatism or ideology without a public/in-between space in which common sense could be recreated. In other words, people with diverse perspectives come to this public/in-between space to discuss issues, thereby escaping the risk of sliding into believing specific doctrines. Therefore, public/in-between space makes dialogue possible and can play a role in breaking dogmatism and ideology. Through this space, learners can become critical thinkers.

Indeed, as previously discussed, Arendt stated that common sense exists in between and
within the web of relationships. Common sense is not a closed concept; rather, the
public/in-between space enables common sense to exist dialectically in individuals’
webs of relationships.
Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, I describe the research method used for this study. In order to explore the essential structure and the important role of aesthetic education as a public/in in-between space, hermeneutic phenomenology and case study methodologies were used.

Phenomenology is a kind of qualitative research method with philosophical and psychological background (Merriam, 2002). Even though all qualitative research deals with phenomena, phenomenological research is distinguished from other qualitative research in that it focuses on the essence or structure of a specific phenomenon (Creswell, 2007; Flick, 2009; Merriam, 2002; van Manen, 1997). According to van Manen (1997), “Phenomenological research is the study of essence.” This means that the purpose of phenomenological study is to reveal the structure or essence of the world in which we live and to study the phenomena of our lived world. Therefore, for phenomenological research, we need to go back zu den Sachen, or “to the things themselves,” rather than “place [the] individual in [an] experimental situation” (Husserl, 1911/80, p. 116; van Manen, 1997, p. 24, 31). Therefore, I went to the situation itself—that is, the lived world—where aesthetic education actually occurs in the classroom, and I investigated it through a phenomenological approach in order to reveal the role and
nature of aesthetic education as a public/between space.

Hermeneutic factors are also related to this study:

Phenomenology is, on the one hand, [a] description of the lived-through quality of lived experience, and on the other hand, [a] description of meaning of the expressions of lived experience…the first one is an immediate description of the lifeworld as lived whereas the second one is an intermediate…description of the lifeworld as expressed in symbolic form. When description is thus mediated by expression…description seems to contain a stronger element of interpretation.” (van Manen, 1997, p. 25)

Therefore, this study should include hermeneutic approaches, since there could be several symbolic forms in various activities that could occur in the art classroom, such as interactions between the teacher and children or between the children themselves through both verbal and non-verbal means.

**Theoretical Framework**

**Hermeneutic Phenomenological Research as Human Science**

Phenomenological research as human science deals with humans in contrast to natural science, which attempts to deals with things objectively. van Manen (1997) explores the characteristics of human science by comparing it with natural science, a comparison which was initially explored by Wilhelm Dilthey:

Dilthey developed the contrast between the *Naturwissenschaften* (the
natural or physical science) and the *Geisteswissenschaften* (human science) into a methodological program for the latter. For Dilthey the proper subject matter for the *Geisteswissenschaften* is the human world characterized by *Geist*—mind, thoughts, consciousness, values, feelings, emotions, actions, and purposes, which find their objectifications in languages, beliefs, arts, and institutions. [N]atural science studies “objects of nature,” “things,” “natural events,” and “the way that objects behave.” Human science, in contrast, studies “persons” or beings that have “consciousness” and that “act purposefully” in and on the world by creating objects of “meaning” that are “expressions” of how human beings exist in the world. (van Manen, 1997, pp.3-4)

Human beings function in the lived world, which is different from the physical environment around them. The lived world is a subjective world in which human beings live and consciously create meaning. Therefore, the lived world is distinguished from the natural world because the latter can be measured objectively and can be manifested into exact numbers and amounts. Hermeneutic phenomenological research comes from the lived world. As van Manen (1997) wrote, “We explain Nature, but human life we must understand, said Dilthey (1976). Whereas natural science tends to *taxonomize* natural phenomena … human science aims at explicating the meaning of human phenomena and understanding the lived structures of meanings” (p.4).

Therefore, hermeneutic phenomenology is important for this study because it does not view human beings as entities that can be objectified like things or generalized. As van Manen (1997) describes it;
Hermeneutic phenomenology is a human science which studies persons … W. H. Auden once said … “As persons, we are incomparable, unclassifiable, uncountable, irreplaceable” (1967). One might make a partisan claim for the sphere in which hermeneutic phenomenological research is (or should be) conducted. In the sense that traditional, hypothesizing, or experimental research is largely interested in knowledge that is generalizable, true for one and all, it is not entirely wrong to way that there is a certain spirit inherent in such a research atmosphere … In contrast, phenomenology is, in a broad sense, a philosophy or theory of the unique; interested in what is essentially not replaceable. (pp. 6)

Gadamer (1975) had insight into this point as well, but criticized the limitations of Dilthey and Husserl. In Truth and Method, Gadamer (1975) argues that the characteristics of human science cannot be explained in terms of natural science’s objective method but that “the method of human science” and “the method of nature science” are different from one other. Gadamer also argues that the ultimate purpose of the book Truth and Method is to explore how to justify the experience of truth, which is itself beyond the control of the scientific method (p. 93). Even though Dilthey (1976) already tried to establish a method of human science that could be distinguished from the method of natural science, Gadamer indicated that Dilthey and Husserl could not escape from the method of natural science because the methods they recommended still dealt with an ideal of scientific objectivity. In other words, Dilthey and Husserl pursued objectivity, which is separated from humans’ actual lives. Therefore, Gadamer distinguished the method of human science from the method of natural science, which, through experiment, examines hypotheses that are established in advance. For Gadamer, understanding is not based on fixed results from an experiment or from objectivity in
natural science but results from the hermeneutic phenomena that occur during an event. Therefore, understanding is only possible by participating in the event at hand.

As such, in hermeneutic phenomenological research, “practice (or life) always comes first, theory comes later” (van Manen, 1997, p. 15), which means that practice (or life) cannot be accounted for by a fixed universal theory that was established before the specific life event occurred. van Manen continues, “In contrast to the more positivistic and behavioral empirical sciences, human science does not see theory as something that stands before practice in order to ‘inform’ it. Rather theory enlightens practice” (1997, p. 15). Therefore, hermeneutic phenomenological research does not begin with a theory but results from participating in the real, lived world.

Thus, hermeneutic phenomenological research recognizes our diverse world and argues that it is impossible for our lived world to be reduced to one thing or a fixed principle. That is, hermeneutic phenomenological research enables us “[T]o construct a full interpretive description of some aspect of the lifeworld, and yet to remain aware that lived life is always more complex than any explication of meaning can reveal. The phenomenological reduction teaches us that complete reduction is impossible” (van Manen, 1997, p. 18). Put simply, hermeneutic phenomenological research allows us to see the world from diverse perspectives.

It is logical that hermeneutic phenomenological research starts from our lived world, from a concrete, taken-for-granted story, and broadens our horizon of understanding of the world. More specifically, “From a phenomenological point of view,
to do research is always to question the way we experience the world, to want to know the world in which we live as human beings” (van Manen, 1997 p. 5). By doing so, hermeneutic phenomenological research contributes to enhancing our insight into the world and our ability to act with thoughtfulness by enabling us to pay attention to the trivial and taken-for-granted dimensions of our daily lives (van Manen, 1997).

The Characteristics of Hermeneutic Phenomenological Human Science

van Manen (1997) describes hermeneutic phenomenology in terms of eight characteristics (pp. 8-13). First, hermeneutic phenomenological research studies individuals’ lived experiences and focuses on the meaning of these experiences in our lives. Phenomenology studies the world that we experience before we develop reflections, generalizations, and categorizations by classifying and abstracting the occurrences in our lives. By doing so, phenomenological research enables us to see the world with insight by enabling us to view the world more directly. Therefore, phenomenological research is interested in the meaning of lived experiences we live rather than occurrence or frequency of that experience as it might be represented by number.

Second, hermeneutic phenomenological research studies essence. Phenomenology describes the structure of lived experiences and the meaning of that structure. However, van Manen warns against the mystification of the word, “essence”: “By essence we do not mean some kind of mysterious entity or discovery, nor some
ultimate core or residue of meaning. Rather, the term, ‘essence’ may be understood as a linguistic construction, a description of a phenomenon” (van Manen, 1997 p. 39). Therefore, the meaning of studying essence in phenomenology is to describe the structure of lived experiences using new perspectives.

Third, hermeneutic phenomenological research explores the phenomena of consciousness scientifically. Namely, hermeneutic phenomenological research posits that nature does not have consciousness, only human beings have consciousness. Hermeneutic phenomenological research studies everything that presents itself to one’s consciousness because consciousness enables human beings to approach the world. Thus, hermeneutic phenomenological research is our experience with systemic, self-critical, explicit, and intersubjective matters.

Fourth, hermeneutic phenomenological research studies the meaning of being human. Phenomenology studies each unique person as a unique being within the world and does not concentrate on the human species in general. Therefore, phenomenological studies enable humans to recognize the meaning of being human in the world, such as one woman, one child, and one mother.

Last, hermeneutic phenomenological research resonates with the world itself. van Manen compares phenomenological research to a poem that is a result itself and cannot be summarized. Phenomenological study resonates with the world and enables us to continuously discover memories that we never recognized before.
“In the epoché, we set aside our prejudgments, biases, and preconceived ideas about things” (Moustakas. 1994. p. 85). Researchers should recognize their assumptions and pre-knowledge. More specifically, “To fully describe how participants view the phenomenon, researchers must bracket out, as much as possible, their own experience” (Creswell, 2007, p. 61).

In the tradition of the transcendental phenomenological approach that follows Husserlian phenomenology, epoché, reduction, and bracketing refer to researchers transcending their assumptions. However, no matter how much researchers attempt to set aside their experiences and pre-knowledge, it is impossible for them to completely bracket their subjective foreground. Finlay (2009) warns that novice researchers using phenomenological approaches might misunderstand bracketing as a first step for “the rigor and validity of the research” and points out one central issue that arises from bracketing researchers’ subjectivity: “Should we set aside or bring to the foreground researcher subjectivity?” (p. 7).

In dialogical phenomenology and hermeneutic phenomenological approaches, bracketing pre-knowledge means that researchers are aware of what their subjective foregrounds and biases are, which enables researchers to interact with their own experiences and those being researched. Finlay suggests that “researchers should shift back and forth, focusing on personal assumptions and then returning to looking at
participants’ experiences in a fresh way” (p. 13). By doing so, researchers move dialectically between “backing preunderstandings and exploiting them reflexively as a source of insight” (Finlay, 2009, p. 13)

Gadamer (1976) explains calls this movement “the fusion of horizons” in his book *Truth and Method* (p. 273). For Gadamer, pre-knowledge is something familiar that we understand before the present that influences our current life as “the effective-historical consciousness” (p. 274). The effective-historical consciousness refers to the notion that we are always situated in a historically traditional context that is given to us. Gadamer explains that “the given to us” aspect is a horizon that is not limited but enables us to go beyond our sight at that point. Therefore, the horizon is an open-ended concept that can be enlarged. Thus, Gadamer tries to recover prejudices rather than discard them and attempts to enlarge and fuse horizons, not to unify different horizons but to expand perspectives and go beyond limitations. Therefore, in this study, I also move back and forth between my pre-knowledge and the experience as lived in and through my research.

**Case Study and Qualitative Research Design**

I also chose to use a case study methodology for this research because of the particular phenomenon in Ms. Valenza’s class. According to Stake (1994), the case in such studies must be “a specified one…a ‘bounded system’” (p. 436). Dyson and Genishi (2005) also argue that in a case study, researchers conduct research not because
of “universal…experience” but because of “an interest in the local particulars of some abstract social phenomenon” (p. 2). Therefore, Ms. Valenza’s class seemed to be a perfect case to represent aesthetic education in practice.

**Selection of Research Methods**

I combined multiple methods in this study in order to collect rich sources and data. As Glesne (2006) suggests, “The use of multiple data-collection methods contributes to the trustworthiness of the data” (p.36). In order to explore the essential structure and the important role of aesthetic education as a public/in-between space, I used three methods for gathering data that are dominant in qualitative inquiry: “participant observation, interviewing, and document collection” (Glesne, 2006, p. 36). During my participant observations, I took notes and photographs and recorded class activities with a camcorder in order to seize important moments and scenes that I could re-watch closely and repeatedly after the activities were over. While observing class activities, I also observed the environment of the class. Through several observations, I observed the class settings, the interactions between the teacher and students and among the students themselves, and the teacher and students’ behaviors. Finally, during the interviews with the teacher and the students, I used their artwork in class to encourage and help students to answer specific questions. I recorded their interviews with both audiotapes and videotapes in order to later transcribe what they said as well as their gestures and facial expressions during the interviews. The interviews explored students’
ideas in order to understand their lives and their interactions with others in aesthetic education. In order to construct a more complete picture of aesthetic education as it is experienced by students in Ms. Valenza’s classes, I took pictures of the students’ artwork and copied their essays after class activities. I was happy to find that their drawings and other artifacts provided further understanding of the phenomenon at hand.

**Researcher Roles in the Study**

My primary role in this study was as a researcher. According to Glesne (2006), “You are a researcher when you are sitting in the nurses’ station of a hospital taking a note or in the midst of a lengthy interview: you also a researcher when you talk informally in the grocery store with someone in your study” (p. 46). As a researcher, I took notes in the classroom and interviewed the students and teachers. I also talked with the art teachers, Ms. Valenza and her student teacher, about their lesson plans and curricula for their classes. When I observed the classroom activities as a researcher, I simply watched as teachers and students talked about art in carpet meetings, and I sometimes participated in the classroom activities when they worked with groups at the table. Glesne (2006) said, “The point of the margin is that it offers the vantage of seeing without being the focus of attention, of being present without being fully participant, so that you are free to be fully attuned to what occurs before you” (p. 73). Indeed, when I was a marginal figure, I was able to research without interrupting class activities and was able observe the students more naturally by escaping their attention. However,
when I participated in group work by asking students questions about their artwork, I was able to gather more specific information and a better understanding of their interactions with each other and with artwork.

To be more precise, I was a participant observer because, while I took part in talking with the students during class and interacted with them and the teacher a little bit, I mostly observed what they were doing. I took notes and recorded the class activity behind the scenes rather than actively participating in the class. Glesne (2006) distinguished an observer as a participant who mostly remained at the margins from a participant as an observer who was involved as a member. The former places a great deal of weight on observation, while the latter is closer to the participants themselves.

As the researcher, I made an effort to form a rapport with the teacher and the students. However, it was not easy for me. By participating in the class during several observations, the students became familiar with me. As opposed to the first day of research, as time passed, some students shook hands with me or smiled at me when we encountered each other on the stairs or in the hallway. However, there were still some uncomfortable feelings, as I could not escape the thought that I was an outsider. Before interviewing the teacher and students, I waited until they were ready to willingly interview with me.

My second role was as a learner. According to Glesne (2006), “The learner’s perspective will lead you to reflect on all aspects of research procedures and findings. It also will set you up for a particular type of interaction with your others” (p. 71). While
researching as a learner, I listened carefully and continually asked questions. In addition, I strove to adopt a student’s mentality as opposed to an expert mentality in order to keep an open mind and really learn about aesthetic education in practice.

**Description of the Research Site**

My research site is Ms. Valenza’s art classroom at Kingsley Montessori School in Boston, Massachusetts. Ms. Valenza teaches art to all of the students at the school from preschoolers to sixth graders, and also teaches a combined class with the music teacher. School begins at 8:00 a.m. and finishes at 3:00 p.m., and each class session lasts 40 minutes. Ms. Valenza’s classroom is located on the second floor next to the music classroom. In pure Montessori schools, they do not have an art teacher; rather, one teacher teaches all subjects, including reading, writing, science, mathematics, music, and art. However, the Kingsley Montessori School expanded this idea and has separate teachers for art, music, science, and Spanish because they believe that approaching Montessori education this way is more enriching.
Description of the Participants

Art Teachers--Ms. Valenza and Ms. Gardner

Ms. Valenza is an art teacher at Kingsley Montessori School. She teaches 130 students from preschool to sixth grade in her art class and in a combined art/music class.

Ms. Valenza is an important participant for this study because she is strongly interested in aesthetic education and is considered an active and positive aesthetic education teacher. She usually arrives at school 7:15 a.m. to prepare the class activities and remains at school after classes have finished. Sometimes, she participates in the students’ recess, and she is tasked with decorating the school, including the school walls and hallways. She told me that she is not a Montessori-trained teacher, but she tries to take ideas from the Montessori classroom, such as the circle idea—namely, sitting in a circle for discussions.

Ms. Gardner as a student teacher assisted Ms. Valenza in October and participated in this study. She helped Ms. Valenza prepare the class in advance (however, Ms. Valenza prepared and planned the class mainly by herself), and she taught and interacted with students in the class as well.

---

6 After receiving IRB Approval, I receive each consent form of Ms. Valenza and M. Gardner. They preferred to use their real names in this study instead of pseudonym. (Regarding consent form for teachers, please see the Appendix A).
**Students**

For this study, first through fifth graders were observed but only fourth graders were formally and closely interviewed. The number of students for each grade was different. I selected fourth graders to observe and interview more specifically after examining and talking with Ms. Valenza about her normal teaching plan.

Fortunately most of students were familiar with having their classes videotaped because Ms. Valenza routinely records her classes for her blog. Students were also familiar with interviews because they had been interviewed previously for specific projects. Among the fourth graders, six students participated in formal interviews based on their willingness and permission from their parents.

**Research Procedures**

**Entering the Research Site**

To obtain permission to undertake this research, I first contacted Ms. Valenza through email. I sent her an email including a description of the purpose of my study and the research procedures. Dr. Thompson also contacted her to introduce me more formally. Ms. Valenza informed me through email that the principal would allow me to conduct my research in the school.

__________________________

7 For students’ name, I used their first initial in this study.
From September 15, 2010, to December 31, 2010, I conducted research on Ms. Valenza’s art class. Before visiting the school, Ms. Valenza sent me a video of her class activities with her fifth graders. On September 21, 2010, I visited the Kingsley Montessori School and met Ms. Valenza for the first time. Ms. Valenza introduced me to the principal of the school as well as to the students in her class. After getting the teachers’ written consent as well as the parents’ and students’ written consent to participate in my study, I observed and recorded her art classes from September 15 to November 19, 2010. The subsequent research continuing to the end of December was conducted via email. Ms. Valenza sent the final products from the latter part of the research to me via mail.

Procedure of Study

Ms. Valenza’s art classes at the Kingsley Montessori School occur from 8:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. I observed the art classes at all levels from first to fifth grade. After my observations were completed, I interviewed selected students in the classroom in which I observed. After gaining the participants’ consent at the beginning of September 2010, I collected data through ten observations via both direct observations and videos recorded by Ms. Valenza in her art classes (see Table 1). Specifically, I collected data through

---

8 Regarding consent form of teachers and parents, please see the Appendix A.
direct observation of her first-, second-, and third-grade art classes from September 21 to 24, and I collected data for her fourth- and fifth-grade art classes through video that Ms. Valenza recorded on September 15 and 29 and October 27. The subsequent observations were conducted on November 10 by video and November 17 by direct observation. On November 17 and 18, I visited Ms. Valenza’s class at the Kingsley Montessori School again and observed the fourth-grade and fifth art classes and interviewed Ms. Valenza and her students. The content of her art classes can be seen in Table 1

I also wrote field notes during my observations of all of Ms. Valenza’s classroom activities. The field notes describe the classroom setting, the teacher’s verbal and nonverbal responses to and interactions with her students, as well as the verbal and non-verbal interactions between students. Along with field notes, the observations, including the classroom environment and all of the teacher’s and students’ activities and behaviors, were videotaped and photographed.

Students were interviewed after the end of their regular classes or during a pre-arranged time that Ms. Valenza set up in order to avoid interrupting regular class activities. Each student participant was interviewed one time, and I also interviewed Ms. Valenza formally and informally in her classroom during pre-arranged time periods. All of the interviews with the students and with Ms. Valenza were recorded electronically by audiotape as well as by videotape. Additional data collection was done during the fall of 2010 through email, mail, and Ms. Valenza’s blog.
Table 1: The Content of the Activities in Ms Valenza’s Art Class during Observation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Lesson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>September 21</td>
<td>Paper Batik Animal(introduction) &amp; Token Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>September 21</td>
<td>African Mask(Introduction) &amp; Token Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>September 24</td>
<td>Surrealism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, &amp; 3</td>
<td>September 22</td>
<td>Media Literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>September 29</td>
<td>Artist Inspired Masks &amp; Artist Essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 27</td>
<td>Artist Inspired Masks &amp; Artist Essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 10</td>
<td>Artist Inspired Masks &amp; Artist Essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 17</td>
<td>Artist Inspired Masks &amp; Artist Essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>September 15</td>
<td>Aesthetic discussion &amp; Token response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 17</td>
<td>Photography Charcoal Drawing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Collection

Observations in Ms. Valenza’s Art Class

I observed ten classes of first to fifth graders between September 15 and November 17, 2010. Among the ten classes, I observed six classes directly by
participating in the class, while I observed the other four classes via video recording by Ms. Valenza. In the first round of research, I observed all of the grades directly, but during the second round of research, I focused on the fourth-grade classes.

According to Glesne (2006), “The main outcome of participant observation is to understand the research setting, its participants, and their behavior” (p. 51). Gadamer (1975) contends that understanding not only involves reflecting on the past but also entails examining the event as it happens. Participant observation enables researchers to understand the event itself at the site in which it occurs. In addition, participant observation allows the researcher to not only observe the classroom activity but also the classroom settings and atmosphere.

Glesne (2006) suggests four strategies for observation from Wolcott (1981): “observation by a broad sweep,” “observation of nothing in particular,” “observations that search for paradoxes,” and “observations that search for problems facing the group” (p. 54). In my first observations, I attempted to avoid observing with a particular viewpoint; rather, I tried to observe everything that was happening without focusing on my concrete interests. Glesne (2006) suggests that when researchers start to observe as participant observers, they should “try to observe everything that is happening: make note and jot down thoughts without narrow, specific regard for [their] research problem” (p. 53). Doing so enables researchers to become free from fixed aspects and become open to changing their own perspectives and becoming flexible, which enables them to become familiar with the strange (Erickson, 1973; Glesne, 2006). After my initial
observations, I tried to observe more deeply as a participant researcher by taking things that emerged from my initial natural and whole observations.

**Field Notes in Observation**

I took notes for all of the classroom activities, including the students’ and teacher’s behavior, interactions and conversation, as well as classroom settings. I jotted notes briefly using words that reminded me of the situations and scenes in the classroom observations, and I later completed full field notes. I tried to describe all of the classroom activities as they were rather than judging them because, as Glesne (2006) advises, “[Field] notes should be both descriptive and analytic. In recording details, strive for accuracy but avoid being judgmental” (p. 57). However, I also took notes whenever I had thoughts or questions during my observations. After the observations, I had the time to make deeper and more reflective field notes.

**Photographs, Video and Audio Recording**

Grimshaw indicates that the advantage of videotaping is in its “density and permanence” (in Glesne, 2006, p. 63). Videotaping enables the researcher to record more details that might have been missed during observations and enables the researcher to review the content repeatedly. In addition to videos, I took pictures of the classroom settings, students’ behaviors, interactions between the teacher and students, the teacher’s
behaviors, and their class products and materials. During group activities, I put audio recorders on the table in order to record the students’ conversations. I also took photographs from the side or back of participant to avoid the students’ faces for confidentiality purposes.

**Documents and Artifacts**

I collected a summary of Ms. Valenza’s class activities, curricula for each of her classes, and handouts, all of which enabled me to understand the classroom activities and the interactions between Ms. Valenza and her students as well as between the students themselves. Along with these documents, I also collected copies or photographs of the students’ artworks and materials.

**Interviews**

I chose to do interviews as one form of data collection because people often reveal their thoughts and experiences when they talk with others. According to Seidman (2005), “interviewing, then, is a basic mode of inquiry. Recounting narratives of experience has been the major way throughout recorded history that human has made sense of their experience” (p. 8). Seidman also insists that interviewing “is a powerful way to gain insight into…important social issues through understanding the experience
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of the individuals whose lives reflect those issues” (p. 14). Therefore, through interviewing, I expected to hear stories about individuals’ experiences in the art class.

All of the students from first to fifth grade in addition to Ms. Valenza and Ms. Gardner participated in informal interviews during the observations and throughout the school day. In addition, Ms. Valenza and six fourth graders were interviewed formally. All of the formal interviews with the students and the teacher were recorded, and I took notes during each interview as well. For the informal interviews, the interview questions were based on the class activities that were happening at that point. I usually took quick notes for these interviews and later completed full notes rather than recording each interview. Some formal interview questions were made in advance and others were created based on my observations. I chose this method, as “interview questions that develop through participant observation are connected to known behavior, and their answers can be therefore be better interpreted” (Glesne, 2006, p. 49). Therefore, even though I prepared some questions, I changed them according to the situation and my observations and revised and created new questions accordingly.

**Interview with Ms. Valenza and Ms. Gardner**

I talked with both Ms. Valenza and Ms. Gardner during informal interviews, but I only formally interviewed Ms. Valenza. The formal interview with Ms. Valenza was conducted at the end of the two-month study period after all of the classroom observations were completed and there was a rapport between Ms. Valenza and me.
Before the formal interview, the informal interviews proceeded as normal conversations about her ideas of her art classes, students, materials, and teaching. Then, based on my observations of her ten class activities, I interviewed Ms. Valenza more formally in order to explore her experience and interactions with students in the class.

**Interview with Students**

Informal interviews were conducted with students from all age levels, including first through fifth graders. These interviews occurred during the observations and were based on their activities and artworks. After the fourth grade classroom observations, formal interviews were conducted with six fourth graders depending on their willingness to conduct a formal interview. It was not easy to set aside time for formal interviews during school even though Ms. Valenza arranged times for the formal interviews with the students in advance and most of them were very willing to participate in interviews with me. Sometimes, the formal interview schedule was canceled because of some special plan. Even though I did not decide the number of interviewees in advance, when I interviewed the sixth student, I realized that I did not need to recruit more interviewees because I was beginning to hear similar answers to the questions from each student. Seidman (2005) argues that researchers need to discontinue interviews once a “saturation of information” occurs, which is the point in “a study at which the interviewer begins to hear the same information reported…At some point…the interview[er] may recognize that he or she is not learning anything decidedly new and
that the process of interviewing itself is becoming laborious rather than pleasurable. That is a time to say ‘enough’” (pp. 55-56). Therefore, I interviewed only six students.

During the formal interviews with the fourth graders, I allowed them to bring their artworks they made during the preceding art class I had observed. The interview questions were based on their classroom activities. I recorded the formal interview with fourth graders by audiotape and also videotaped them in order to observe their gestures, expressions, and behaviors.

**Data Analysis**

The collected data was analyzed from the beginning of this study. Since data analysis is ongoing process and there is not a special point for analysis, analysis continuously proceeds from the start of the research (Glesne, 2006; Stake, 1995).

Early data analysis was processed during data collection, simultaneously. “Data analysis done simultaneously with data collection enables you [researcher] to focus and shape the study as it proceeds” (Glesne, 2006, p. 148). During observation, I took memos freely of what I analyzed to that point—thoughts, ideas, and questions. Every day, field notes and transcriptions from the video recording and audio recording were also processed with categorization, interpretation, and searching for themes. During observation of Ms. Valenza’s class, what I saw, listened to, and described in early data
analysis helped me to understand the study and enabled me to determine the factors to be observed during the next class and to develop further questions for the interviews following the process.

After early data analysis and when all of the data was collected, I started to analyze more critically. Data analysis of qualitative research is different according to its purpose (Glesne, 2006). I analyzed the collected data based on the hermeneutic phenomenological analysis procedures drawn from models offered by van Manen, Giorgi, and Moustakas (Creswell, 2007; Moustakas, 1994; van Manen, 1997; Worthen & McNeill, 2002): Describing significant statements, drawing out formulated meanings, and finding cluster themes.

**Describing Significant Statements**

In qualitative research, statements are understood and analyzed in the context of the situation (Flick, 2009). In order to understand a statement, the researcher should read the entire written transcription after first transcribing it (Ganeson & Ehrich, 2009). To describe the significant horizon is to “list every expression relevant to the experience” (Moustakas, 1994, p 120). I read the entire transcription from the interviews with the teacher and the students carefully, and described all of statements from the entire transcription so that the original meanings in the context were not lost. After describing all of statements, I removed repetitive sentences or statements.
**Drawing Formulated Meanings**

After determining the significant sentences, I identified meaning in all significant statements in order to draw formulated meanings. “Meanings are then formulated from the significant statements and identified” (Creswell, 2007, p. 270). Worthen and McNeil (2002) explain this step as identifying meaning units by applying Giorgi’s outline. “This step consisted of identifying meaning units by listening to and reading the transcribed interview and identifying experienced shifts in meaning. Each shift in meaning was marked by a slash on the transcribed manuscript” (p. 124).

After marking each meaning of every significant statement, I found the units of meaning and organized the collection accordingly under these units. Moustakas (1994) explained this step as “reduction and elimination,” which helps “to determine the invariant constituents” (p. 120). For this step, Moustakas suggested the researcher ask two kinds of questions of him/herself as follows:

- Does it contain a moment of the experience that is necessary and sufficient constituent for understanding it?
- Is it possible to abstract and label it? If so, it is a horizon of the experience. Expressions not meeting the above requirements are eliminated. Overlapping, repetitive and vague expressions are also eliminated or presented in more exact descriptive terms. The horizons that remain are the invariant constituents of the experience (p. 121).

This step helped me find the invariant meaning units and to clarify the meanings by avoiding vague or repeated meaning units.

I described formulated meanings from the invariant meaning units by moving back and forth between the original significant statements and invariant meaning units.
By doing so, significant statements were transformed into more meaningful language (Ganeson & Ehrich, 2009).

**Finding Cluster Themes**

From the formulated meanings, I found the cluster themes, which indicate the common themes that emerged from all of the transcriptions (Creswell, 2007). Moustakas (1994) explained this step as “clustering and thematizing the invariant constituents” (p. 122): “Cluster the invariant constituents of the experience that are related into a thematic label. The clustered and labeled constituents are the core themes of the experience” (p. 121). Therefore, the cluster themes should not have redundant meanings (Worthen & McNeil, 2002)

“Once description and themes have been obtained, the researcher in the final step” is “to validate findings” by going back to “original descriptions” (Creswell, 2007). To find the validity, I went back to the original descriptions and compared each one with the others to see whether I included something that was in the original descriptions or whether I ignored something that was originally in the descriptions. Moustakas (1994) examined validity by application of “final identification of the invariant constituents and themes”:

Check the invariant constituents and their accompanying theme against the complete record of research participants. (1) Are they expressed explicitly in the complete transcription? (2) Are they compatible if not explicitly expressed? If they are not explicit or compatible, they should be deleted. (p. 122)
I examined whether there was consistency from the original description of cluster themes and whether there is any contradiction between them by moving back and forth.

After finding the cluster themes, I re-described meanings of the cluster themes as “specific statement which ‘depict the experiences’” and wrote “a general statement which synthesizes all of the specific statements” (Ganeson & Ehrich, 2009, p. 72).
Chapter 4

DATA ANALYSES

In this chapter and the next, the collected data from both observations and interviews with students and teachers are analyzed to investigate the structure of aesthetic education as the public/in-between space.

First, I describe several key factors of my observations. These factors include the context of the class, the teacher, the interaction between students and teachers, and the interactions among students. I observed various groups, including 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 5th graders, focusing on the activities of the teachers and students during each class. After my initial observations, I selected 4th graders to observe more deeply, and then conducted interviews based on these observations. For this study I observed several classes which were all conducted under the same theme—“artist inspired masks”—from the beginning of the unit.

As the next step, based on the interviews with students and teachers, significant statements, formulated meanings and clusters of meanings are extracted to explore the essential structures of aesthetic education as the public/in-between space. For significant statements, I described all of interviews with teachers and students. Nelson states, “The descriptions provided by these respondents reveal the lived meanings of the
phenomena and provide a discursive means by which these experiences may be unveiled, examined, and understood in the coming phases of phenomenological procedure” (in Wolff, 2002., p. 98). From these, I listed everything related to the structure of aesthetic education as the public/in-between space. After determining the significant statements according to the list of “horizontalization of descriptions”, I drew out the formulated meanings from each of the significant statements (Moustakas, 1994, 120). I then clustered and thematized the invariant constituents, and from the initial cluster, I identified further thematizations. Further thematizations, findings, and discussions are described in the next chapter (Chapter 5).

Part I: Observations of Ms. Valenza’s Class

The Classroom Settings

Ms. Valenza’s class is on the second floor. In the classroom, there are two doors, one of which is connected with the lounge. The other door is next to the teacher’s desk and connects to another office, enabling her to easily go into the next office. In the center of the class, one large carpet covers the floor, around which are four tables for the students. Around each table there are four or five chairs, and in front of the carpet, there are some boards. There are various colorful and textural materials on the wall and tables. On one side, there are drying racks for paper, while on the other side there is a sink for water, next to which there are many colors and inks. On the wall, there is various information for art, and directions for classroom activities. On the shelf, scissors, glue, and pencils are arranged. Next to the shelf, there are drawers where some resources are. On the desk, there were many students’ artwork displayed according to grade. Some were unfinished, while others were completed. (09:30 a.m., September 21, 2010)
Characteristics of Ms. Valenza’s classroom were drawn from these observations.

**The Characteristics of the Carpet and Table Area**

In the classroom, there are two types of meeting places for students and teachers, either on the carpet or at the tables (see Figure 1).

The carpet is for meeting with all of the students and teachers as a group at the beginning and end of each class. As the carpet is the center of the classroom, it is easy for the students to gather there, and then disperse back to the tables. The carpet is large enough to seat the entire class, which makes it possible for the students to see both the other students and each of their artworks at the same time.

The tables are for both group and individual work. They are arranged to seat three or four students at each table, with the size and shape enabling the students to easily see each other’s work. The number of students arranged at each table enables them to have proper space to work on their projects while also being able to talk to each other easily.
The Characteristics of Materials in the Classroom

There were various materials in Ms. Valenza’s classroom, including papers, inks, paints, glues, pencils, color pencils, markers, scissors, and brushes for students to create their art (see Figure 2). Some of these materials were very well arranged, while others were not. However, all of them had their own designated space, which enabled the students to remember where they were located, and access them easily. The amounts of materials are enough for all of the students to use them, so that they need not bring basic materials to class. So that this does not limit the students experience for various
materials, Ms. Valenza allows them to bring their own materials if they choose. These materials are a resource for students to use freely when making their artwork.

![Materials in Ms. Valenza’s Classroom](image1)

**Figure 2: Materials in Ms. Valenza’s Classroom**

*The Characteristics of Information and Directions in the Classroom*

On the wall, door, drawers, and board, was information and directions (see Figure 3), including information about artists, art history, and art movements. It provided students with knowledge silently and without force, drawing and dispersing their attention during class.

![Information and Directions in Ms. Valenza’s Classroom](image2)

**Figure 3: Information and Directions in Ms. Valenza’s Classroom**
There were also directions on the drawers (see Figure 4). These directions were intended to help the students to act independently without the teacher’s help or direction. It imposes the silent order in the class.

![Figure 4: Directions in Ms. Valenza’s Classroom](image)

In front of the carpet, there were two boards presenting directions, contents, and topics for the class (see Figure 1). When students meet on the carpet, all students can see easily and all together. It helps the teacher to give information to students and at the same time, students can get ideas and information from the board. Ms. Valenza’s classroom was set up for students to gather and scatter easily and smoothly as well as to act independently and autonomously.
**Interactions with Students and Teachers**

**Before the class and between classes**

After lunch time, I came back to the class again. When I entered the room, Ms. Valenza brought papers and materials and arranged them on the table. I asked her what they were, and she answered that they were for the next class (the first grade). The papers were for students to draw on, and the materials were images of various animals including photos, pictures, and explanations, which would be used by the students. (Field note, September 21, 2010).

When I entered Ms. Valenza’s class at 7:50 a.m., Ms. Valenza was busy preparing something, moving between her classroom and another classroom where computers were held. After greeting her, I asked what she was doing, and she answered that she was preparing for the class today. From the computer, Ms. Valenza selected some photos which would be used for media literacy at the beginning of the class. Ms. Gardner helped her print out the photos from the computer, and they discussed which photos they would bring to the class and how best to display them on the carpet so that all of the students could see every photo. (Field note, September 22, 2010).

At 9:15 a.m. I visited Ms. Valenza’s room to observe the 4th grade class. I arrived early. The class would start at 10:30 a.m. When I entered the classroom, Ms. Valenza was arranging the students’ art. After classifying them into each student’s artwork and worksheet, she put them on the carpet according to where each student should be seated. Moving back to the sink, she started to prepare paints, palettes and plasters. She squeezed paint from the tube onto the palette, put the water cup on the center of the palette, and then placed each palette onto the table for each student to use individually. She then placed the plasters on the table. Plasters were in the bowl with cutting as regular size (see the Figure 7). (Field note, November 17, 2010).
Whenever I visited Ms. Valenza’s class, she was very busy preparing something for the class (see Figures 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9). The things were always important resources and materials which would enable her to guide the class and help students during class time. However, I wondered why she prepares everything, even basic materials, for students; why she placed the materials at each seat in advance instead of requiring students to prepare their own materials by themselves; and if she allowed students to bring other materials to the class for their work. One day, I asked her these questions.

**Min Jung**: Why do you prepare everything such as paint, papers, and photos? You prepare palettes with paint even squeezed regularly.

**Ms. Valenza**: Well, first, it is a time issue. We do not have time for preparing it during class. If I prepare these things, we could have more time to talk about and make artwork. We have to work to make the classroom a place we can create artwork. And I try to have them do as much as they can independently, if the materials are easy for them to understand how to use.

**Min Jung**: Why do you put the materials such as students’ mask, their worksheet, and paper, on the seat of the table or carpet, in advance?

**Ms. Valenza**: It is also because of the time limitation, and for order of classroom.

**Min Jung**: Would you allow students to bring other materials from outside the classroom that they would like to use for their artwork?

**Ms. Valenza**: Yes, of course. They can bring any materials they want to use for their work, but they need to talk to me before using it.

(Informal interview with Ms. Valenza, 09:50 a.m., November 17, 2010)

To utilize time effectively, and facilitate students working independently, Ms. Valenza typically has some materials—such as paint, water cup, palette, sheet, and papers which students would use in making their art, and resources such as books and photos which students would use for their work—prepared in advance. Ms. Gardner
assists Ms. Valenza to prepare all of this, but Ms. Valenza did most of the work. In order to have this preparation completed, she usually arrives at class around 7:15 a.m.

Figure 5: Ms. Valenza Preparing Materials

Figure 6: Ms. Valenza Preparing Materials
Figure 7: Plaster

Figure 8: Materials Prepared for the Class
In the beginning of class, there is a meeting on the carpet. In this meeting, every student gets together, sits down on the carpet and talks with the teachers and students as a group (see Figure 10).

**Teacher:** “Let’s go back to artist-inspired mask. If you remember from our playing day, we did some research and picked an artist and artwork, and I have some examples that we will talk a little bit about before you begin. What you are going to see in the package with your name on it, if nobody removes them. Some of you did not have your names on your packages, it was hard for me to figure out who was who. So, make sure all the work you do in class, has your name on it. This is the last thing we will work on today because we do not have the exact thing we are going to do today. We are really going to think about many different ideas and brainstorm. So today before you begin, we are going to finish the sheet that you had here. So, the artist’s name, where they are from, when they were born, when they died and then the piece of artwork that you would like to focus on. A (A is the initial of student’s name), is that not necessary to you? Why don’t you stop? It’s not very polite. What do you observe the pieces... I made a larger image for you. So that you can say
that well I see that they are user’s reputation, I see that they used a lot of highly saturated colors, I see that maybe they don’t always add a lot of detail maybe simplify shapes...So, start by describing using descriptive words as much as you can. And then once that is all done, oh..so many pages... You want to think about a little bit materials you might want to use to create you masks. ...So, I want you to think about all different ways you can make your own mask. Kind of crazy. Think about different techniques that you might use. Just you are experimenting with this tools. I want you to think about how you might experiment with some other materials that they have been vast. ..Will I change the texture? Will I make it really flat like actual cut out of the mask itself? It’s up to you, will use material from outside, will use material from the classroom. Do you have anything that you can bring it.”

(One student raised her hand)

“Yes, M (M is the initial student’s name)?”

**Student M:** “So, first, you do this and that and back to this?”

**Teacher:** “Yes.”

**Student M:** “This and then that?”

**Teacher:** “Yes, so I am going to tell you the steps. Today we are going to finish filling out the information. And then we are looking at the artists. And then we are going back to start brainstorming ideas. Notice that you have a whole back of this page. If you want to take some notes, you want to take some notes about techniques that you might want to try. I am going to read this through and we will talk a bit about this next time, how we can make this technique happen, even it is really elaborate and tricky to do. And definitely try some experiments on what are masks or what we are drawn to conclude. So, by the end of today, the thing that I want you to complete is to have four different ideas, four how you might interpret your own mask, and I emphasize on difference. Let’s think about four really different ways to do your masks. Yes, A (A is the initial of students name)?”

**Student A:** “Well if we want a different picture...?”

**Teacher:** “If you want a different picture, you can talk to me when you are at your table. But we will stick with the artist that you picked. If you have another idea for the images, we can talk about that, okay? We will start with the people who are sitting in aisle A. There are people who may not just discuss.” (stand up and walk)

(October 21, 2011, from the video recording)
Ms. Valenza shared information, and showed some examples of what they would do that day. After her initial talking, students asked questions about it, raising their hands when they had a question (see Figure 10). The teachers point out, “Gentleman, if you’d like to share please raise your hands. We can have side conversation in a moment.” Nobody interrupted during the conversation; the students know when and how they could ask a question, or have a conversation. On the carpet, they kept in their place, and they did not go anywhere. There are rules for talking on the carpet, which the students have already learned, and these rules enable both the teachers and students to talk without interrupting or being interrupted. It is also understood that students must always pay attention to others when they are talking. If students do not pay attention, the teacher makes this known, as exemplified by, “A (A is the initial of students name), is that not necessary to you? Why don’t you stop? It’s not very polite.”

When students have a question, the teachers mostly answer it, but if it is a specific question, the teacher will ask them to discuss it not on the carpet, but at the table. Therefore, the activities and questions on the carpet are distinguished from those at other places. On the carpet, through talking with the teacher and other students, students learn what they will be doing that day, and the teacher provides guidance.

On the carpet, Ms. Valenza drew out students’ thoughts on the general topic, rather than giving information directly to them.
Ms. Valenza: “I want to ask you first, what do you think an advertisement is? Can someone raise their hand and tell me what an advertisement is? E (E is the initial student’s name)?”

Student E: “Um, you’re taking something and you want people to buy it, so you like make a commercial, or sometimes picture or whatever, and people like to watch them and see them. It makes people want to buy them.”

(September 22, 2010)

By doing so, the teacher makes the students think about the general topic and express their ideas on that. The teacher also encourages the students to share their ideas amongst one another on the carpet.

Ms. Gardner: (showing photos of a Nike advertisement) “This is a Nike advertisement. And this man right here, not everyone might know who he is, but this is LeBron James, who is very famous, very young, and one of the best basketball players playing right now.”

Ms. Valenza: “So what kind of questions can we ask?”

Ms. Gardner: “Who created this message?”

Student: “I know why they put LeBron on it. For one he’s really famous. They think a really bad basketball player will be like, ‘oh wow, Nike shoes and Lebron.’”

Ms. Gardner: “He has a lot of power to sell different things.”

Student: “Like these shoes are really good because LeBron is using them and they think their shoes are really good then.”

Ms. Gardner: “Because he (LeBron) wears them.”

Ms. Valenza: “How do you know they are convincing you to buy shoes, because there are no shoes here (in the picture)? So what made you think that they were selling shoes?”

Student: “Nike sports a bunch of sporting goods, like things that you’d wear during sports.”

Ms. Valenza: “How do we know its Nike?”

Student: “It has the Nike symbol below the letters on the left.”

Ms. Gardner: “So you all recognize this, like the Nike Swoosh?”
Ms. Valenza: “Even though it doesn’t say the name you all know what that tiny picture means? The little check mark? M (M is the initial student’s name), were you going to add something?”

Ms. Gardner: “You were going to say that you recognized this little tiny symbol?”

Student: “Yeah, it’s the Nike symbol. Yeah and a lot of times they put it on shoes.”

Ms. Gardner: “You’re right. So maybe that’s why you guys made the association in your head because you’ve seen shoes with this on it. And that’s why you first thought that they must be selling sneakers.”

Student: “My dad has Nikes.”

Ms. Gardner: “So you are familiar with that, so you recognize that? S, do you remember what you were going to say?”

Student: “We might take a picture of that when he was doing that. Sometimes when there’s a Celtics game they will put it up on the big screen…(couldn’t hear the rest)”

Ms. Gardner: “Right. So they use famous, the really good players, they use their images a lot.”

(September, 22, 2010)

Students share their ideas which come from their experience in everyday life.

Students reveal their thoughts related to the topics freely.

Figure 10: Carpet Meeting in Ms. Valenza’s Class
At the Table

After carpet meetings, students moved to the tables. Three or four students sit at each table while Ms. Valenza and Ms. Gardner moved between tables and looked around the class. Consciously moving here and there, they looked at students working and at the artwork they were creating. One student raised a hand, and Ms. Valenza came up to him and talked with him. Ms. Gardner also helped another student and talked about her work. After talking with the student, Ms. Valenza moved to another student. Ms. Valenza and Ms. Gardner never stopped moving between tables and talking with the students.

(September 21, 2010)

When students moved to the tables, Ms. Valenza and Ms. Gardner also moved between tables. Teachers continuously moved between tables, showing interest in the students’ needs, interests, and questions. Students asked more specific questions about their artwork in these one-on-one conversations with the teachers (see Figures 11 and 12).

Figure 11: Talking between Student and Ms. Valenza at the Table.
The teachers also provide specific guidance and resources to each student, relating to them on an individual level.

**Ms. Valenza:** “M (M is the initial student’s name), I added the extra group because I wanted you to see how some of her works changed a little bit as she got older. And you can see it is still very simple.”

**Student M:** “She had a lot of red.”

Student M did not know the fact that the artist’s work changed as she got older, until Ms. Valenza provided this information, and this fact influenced M’s own artwork. She colored her mask with red, which she noticed about the artist. By providing new information which related to the student’s topic, the students were able to expand their ideas and thought. However, it is only possible to provide truly effective information when the teacher really pays attention to what the students are trying to do.

When students work individually at the table, the teacher can also monitor and control individual work more specifically--any issues such as understanding the work,
what they may need, and what is going on in their processes.

Ms. Gardner: “Hey K (K is the initial student’s name), do you need help?”

Student K: “What is texture?”

Ms. Gardner: “Texture would be like how you feel something. I would say smooth, bumpy or rough.”

Student K: “How it looks?”

(One student raised his hand)

Ms. Gardner: “Yes?” (walked to the student)

Ms. Gardner: “How are you coming along … with the new sheet?”

Student: “I don’t know what to do.”

Ms. Gardner: “Just choose the first, and get a bunch of ideas.”

Student: “How did she know this idea?”

Ms. Gardner: “Probably it’s a part of determination.”

Student: “That creates life.”

Ms. Gardner: “But probably not. Have you ever exposed the next questions on this sheet?”

Student: “Probably.”

Ms. Gardner: “No. The next question of this sheet…”

Student: “On this?”

Ms. Gardner: “Yes. You need to fill this out before you start.”

Student: “Color, fantastic …So, just write the skull.”

Ms. Gardner: “So, that seems like color texture for this subject. Fold this up to pull this one. Do you mind picking this out? It’s kind of stuck.”

Student: “It’s stapled.”

Ms. Gardner: “Oh, that’s right, that’s why it’s stuck. Ok, now we need a paper clip. And what is your next question on the sheet? Color and texture… So, the subject that you are already done… And color, I am guessing what color you have seen in your piece.”

Student: “Over on this?”
Ms. Gardner: “Alright. Maybe you could write down some specific color, and also if they shared anything. Did he use a lot of colors? Or like hot or cold…”
Student: “This is the main picture that he thought.”
Ms. Gardner: “Like this, do you want the color that’s real could help?”
Student: “I don’t know.”
Ms. Gardner: “And then the texture would be like smooth, bumpy, or rough.”
Student: “I think this is bumpy.”
Ms. Gardner: “Okay, write that down. Write down what you see, not what you assume.”

Even though the student did not answer, the teacher would approach the student if he/she needed help, and would check what the issue might be. When students asked the teachers about things that they did not know or could not understand, the teachers would either provide the answers directly, or assist the students in coming up with the answer on their own.

At the table, students spend most of their time making their own artwork while at same time having conversations with the teachers and other students. These conversations enabled the students to think, and reveal what they did not know, what they were thinking, and what they were having problems with. In addition, through conversation, students make clear their issues, interests, and problem solving. The teachers also helped the students with this conversation by providing various information, materials, ideas, resources, and feedback. At the table, the students seem to speak and move about more freely, but there were also some rules that they had to obey. If they had a question, they were required to raise their hands, like when they are on the
carpet. They were not to loudly call the teacher. The students also had conversation with classmates, giving ideas to each other, but would be prevented from simply copying their classmates’ ideas blindly. It was emphasized that students were to reveal and express their own thoughts and colors.

*The Characteristics of Interaction between Teachers/Students*

**Different Conversations According to Place**

While there were always conversations between teachers and students, there were also some rules. On the carpet, students could ask about more general topics, while more specific topics would be relegated to the individual tables. The teacher would show examples, guide the procedures of the class, and share the students’ ideas with the group. At the table, students talked with the teachers moreconcertedly on individual issues. They talked about their interests, and asked more personal questions.

**Silent Rules**

In Ms. Valenza’s class, there were some silent rules. When the students entered the room, they were to automatically sit on the carpet. When they had a question, they were to raise their hand without calling loudly for the teacher, both on the carpet and while at the table. At the table, they were able to move about more freely than while on the carpet. The students, without Ms. Valenza’s asking or telling, follow these implicit
rules automatically. This makes the class flow smoothly and without interruption to the students’ work.

*Mutual Respect*

The teachers respect their students’ thoughts and ideas, and their uniqueness when they talk either at the table or on the carpet, listening to the students very intently, allowing them to express their ideas. In return, the students also show respect to their teachers; they follow directions, and do not interrupt while their teachers talk. When viewing the students’ work, the teachers neither criticized nor ignored, but rather encouraged their unique ideas, and provided proper resources to cultivate their creativity.

The teachers were careful to converse with the students, and not at them. Freire (1992) argues, “even when one must speak to the people, one must convert the ‘to’ to a ‘with’ the people. And this implies respect for the ‘knowledge of living experience’ of which I always speak, on the basis of which it is possible to go beyond it” (p. 19). Ms. Valenza and Ms. Gardner did not just impose knowledge on the students, but instead were interested in their thoughts and ideas that came from their experiences. This attitude embodied a “respect” for the students.

*Generative Questions, Consciousness and Active Learners*

During class time, there are a lot of questions, from both Ms. Valenza and from
the students. The teachers draw their questions from their students’ lives, and listen to the students’ questions about their works and ideas.

When information or knowledge is imparted to the children, it is not forced onto them, but rather shared with them, making the students more conscious of these facts and ideas. This helps liberate the students “as conscious beings” (Freire, 1970/2000, p. 79). As conscious beings, students become not just passive learners, but active subjects of the world. “Liberating education consists in acts of cognition, not transferrals of information” (Freire, 1970/2000, p. 79).

**Active and Dynamic Interaction between Teachers and Students**

Ms. Valenza continuously moved between individual students and groups of tables. She did not stay in a fixed place, instead looking over each student as they worked, answering their questions, providing for their needs, and guiding them through their processes. Whenever her students asked for assistance, she was there to help with resources, ideas, materials and helpful hints.

**Interactions between Students in the Classroom**

**On the Carpet**

As students came into the class, they sat on the carpet where their individual artwork was placed. Ms. Valenza asked them to share their artwork on the carpet before working at the tables. She said, “Today, we are going to talk about your masks from this point. Please raise your
hand and tell about your masks. Who would like to volunteer?” Student M raised her hand and Ms. Valenza called her name. She showed her mask to the class and explained why she selected it and how she made it. All of the students listened intently and nobody interrupted while she spoke. Once she was finished, Ms. Valenza asked the class, “Are there any comments or questions?” Student C raised her hand and Ms. Valenza called her name. The student asked, “Are you going to put some on that chair (see the Figure 13)?” Student M answered, “No, I am going to use only one chair.” Ms. Valenza looked around the class, and asked if there were any more questions or comments. Nobody raised a hand, so Ms. Valenza asked again for someone to volunteer to share their work. Student E raised her hand and explained her artwork while displaying it to the class. Once she finished speaking, Ms. Valenza again asked the class if there were any comments or questions. Student M raised her hand and suggested that she believed student E could add more circles on her mask, and student E accepted the comment. Other students also gave comments, discussing how she could make smaller circles, to which she agreed and decided to change the scale of the circles. After this discussion, each student showed their masks and shared their opinions (Field note, November 17, 2010).

When I visited Ms. Valenza’s class again on November 17, 2010, it was the eighth class of the unit, “Artist-inspired Masks.” In this class, students each shared their masks, which they had been working on but had not yet completed. They shared their ideas and thoughts on the masks; gathered around the carpet, the students are able to see each of their classmates and their artwork (see Figure 11). Each student displayed their work while the rest of the class had an open discussion about it. Ideas were traded and discussed, sometimes being accepted, while other times politely declined. While one student talked, the rest of the class listened carefully until the end. When a student had a question or idea, they raised their hand and were allowed to talk.

Everybody showed their masks, and each was different. Through the open group communication, new ideas were raised and new knowledge was learned by all of the
students. For example, student E showed her mask and talked about it to the class while classmates gave her various ideas. She was having difficulty in making the circles on her mask, but after her classmates shared their ideas and experiences, she discovered a new way to make the circles which improved the end-product of her work. She had not thought about these ideas prior to the discussion, and by sharing ideas and thoughts, they each could now see a broader perspective previously beyond their limitations.

*At the Table*

When students moved to the tables, they each had a seat for their individual work. At each table, there were three or four students. There was much discussion while working; they would each look at their masks, and sometimes look over to see their classmates’ face. Student A looked on over student N’s mask and stated, “Wow, it’s really cool.” They looked over each other’s masks, and shared their ideas. Student C asked student D, “How can I use this plaster?” Student D then demonstrated how to use the material to the benefit of their classmate. At another table, student M talked about Christmas, which started one of the other students to sing, “I wish you a Merry Christmas.” Soon enough, all of the students in the room were singing the carol. After the song, they chatted about Christmas gifts, and past experiences.

(Field note, November 17, 2010).

For most of the class, students work with their own projects. During the class, they are permitted to move around and have conversations as they please. They could sing songs or chat about their experiences as they relate to their work.

In contrast to their time on the carpet (where they can talk while seeing the face of their classmates), while at the table, students usually talk without looking directly at
each other because they are diligently working on their art (see Figure 14).

Another difference is that students could ask more specific questions to their classmates while at the table, as opposed to on the carpet. While doing their work, they could gather new ideas from their peers at the table, but conversely, they were usually limited to discussions with the two or three other students at the same table, (see Figure 14). Even though they were permitted to go anywhere in the room during this working period, they tended to talk with only those students who were at the same table. Therefore, while at the table, the number of classmates whom they could share their artwork and ideas to was also limited.

The Characteristics of Interactions between Students

Unlimited and Limited Interaction

Students have both unlimited and limited interaction among themselves while in the class. On the carpet, they are limited to talking about general ideas and main topics, which were directed by the teachers. However, at the tables they were free to talk about anything, regardless of the particular topic. In this sense, regarding varying topics, interactions between students on the carpet had limitations, while interactions between students at the tables did not.

In comparison, the students had discussions with a greater range of peers while on the carpet, which did not limit them to particular classmates as the tables did. On the
carpet they could see and talk with everybody, as well as share their ideas and their art in front of all their classmates. Therefore they could listen to everybody’s opinion while in that environment. However, at the tables, they usually talked with classmates who sat at the same table or close by. While this was not intended, these environmental differences created specific boundaries that limited their interactions within the tables.

**Mutual Respect**

Students listen carefully to their classmates; they never interrupt and are good listeners. Freire (1998) argues, “To accept and respect what is different is one of those virtues without which listening cannot take place” (p. 108). The fact that the students listened while their classmates spoke shows the mutual respect that was evident in the classroom.

Students also showed respect for their differences and uniqueness; and they never underestimated or criticized their classmates’ ideas or work. This is truly respect in that they did not simply submit themselves to doing whatever their classmates suggested; they sometimes would politely turn down their ideas and remained satisfied with the work for which they had put forth. Similarly, when this happened, and students’ ideas were not accepted, they did not feel bad or get angry, instead understanding this respect for their own ideas.
Figure 13: Interactions between Students at the Table

Figure 14: Student M’s Artwork
Part II: Interviews with Students and Teachers

Interviews with Students

In this section, I analyze my interviews with students in order to investigate the structure of education as the public/in-between space. For the structure of aesthetic education as the public/in-between space, I examined the students’ interactions in this space. For this examination, I more specifically divided the interviews with students into four parts: 1) Students’ interactions with artist’s artwork and making their own artwork; 2) Students’ interactions with teachers; 3) Students’ interactions with classmates; and 4) Students’ interactions with classroom settings. I analyzed these ideas respectively.

I transcribed interviews with six students and then drew out the significant statements from each transcription, before eliminating overlapping statements. These significant statements are presented in Table 2-1, Table 3-1, Table 4-1, and Table 5-1 respectively. All of the significant statements began to formulate meanings, with each formulated meaning being presented in Table 2-2, Table 3-2, Table 4-2, and Table 5-2. These formulated meanings were derived through the process of deep contemplation while reading the significant statements from the individual students’ interviews.

From each formulated meaning, cluster themes began to take shape, representing common themes from individual statements. These cluster themes are represented in Table 2-3, Table 3-3, Table 4-3 and Table 5-3. I examined the validity of these cluster themes while moving back and forth between the original interviews with the students.
After unearthing these cluster themes, the meaning of each began to take shape.

**Students’ Interactions with Artist’s Artwork, and Making Their Own Artwork**

The significant statements of students’ interactions with artist’s work and their own art were extracted from the descriptions of the students’ interviews. The significant statements of these interactions are presented in Table 2-1. (Note: there is a letter appearing parenthetically after each statement in the Table to indicate the respondent’s initial).

After drawing out the significant statements, formulated meanings became established from the students’ interactions with the artists’ work. These formulated meanings are presented in Table 2-2. (Note: the numbers appearing parenthetically after the sentences from Table 2-2 correspond to the number of the related statement in Table 2-1 in order to indicate from which respondent the formulated meaning is derived).

From the formulated meanings, I found three cluster themes: “In-between self and artist’s artwork;” “In-between self and one’s own artwork;” and “In-between self and self.” These cluster themes are presented in Table 2-3.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2-1: Significant Statements - Students’ Interactions with Artist’s Artwork, and Making Their Own Artwork</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. “It was very colorful. I like colorful things, so I didn’t want it dark.” (Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. “I didn’t think there were many steps.” (Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. “I didn’t think it would be complicated but it’s really fun.” (Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. “Before, I didn’t really know what my mask was going to look like, but now I know how it’s going to be. It’s more.” (Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. “It also made me think of fruit.” (Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. “I really like colorful things, it makes me happy.” (Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. “I was confused because I had to make different fruit, and also a big fruit.” (Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. “I thought this picture gave me a lot of ideas like I could.” (Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. “I didn’t know about the main thing when I looked at it first.” (Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. “What I knew is that there will be something, because I knew that I could do something like a basket of fruit.” (Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. “The questions I had were about what I needed to do.” (Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. “This is basically a mask I built, and it came from a painting by Andy Warhol.” (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. “It’s called skull.” (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. “I took that one mostly, but I changed it.” (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. “I’m going to use details” (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. “I chose it because I really like pop art, and this is one of the most famous people who are pop art, Andy Warhol. They decided to couple of things that I like.” (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. “Because the dark colors go well with the skull, the shapes of the skull, including like teeth, the jaw and forehead. That’s why I chose it.” (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. “I learn basically from this class plasters.” (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. “Andy Warhol’s artwork is giving me more ideas.” (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. “I like challenging things. So, I look at complicated things and then I want to put on the masks.” (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. “I like that it inspires me, and I want to do complicated things on the masks.” (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. “I really thought the complicated things.” (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. “I chose this because it’s kind of unique.” (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. “It’s different, way back and most of the painting is now all like present.” (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. “Well, I didn’t know that much about this like Egyptian one in the concept of art.” (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. “I think this is a nice picture.” (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. “I think that it is a good idea to pick this.” (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. “Sometimes, like I am writing, remembering back into what I’ve done, I recognize new ideas.” (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. “I really like abstract art. All these different colors and shapes everywhere and different pieces in different spots. So I tried to put it on this masks like a door. Put the door here, put some wrappers over here, put the warm right here.” (J)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. “It’s called warm’s eyes. It’s like warm that sees everything that’s not on the ground.” (J)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. “I see wrappers all the time. I see warm, feathers, all these shapes and stuff from where I live.” (J)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
32. “I did not really know how to make these different things. There’s just a lot more.” (J)
33. “It just really got my attention, because I see these things in my everyday life.” (J)
34. “I see these giants, and I see a leg and foot every day.” (J)
35. “I really do like making this mask.” (J)
36. “I think why they were all in the shape of like a box.” (J)
37. “Why they’re all taken apart if it’s like a junk yard something.” (J)
38. “I chose it because I just loved how much color it is, and it’s all over the place and really bright.” (M)
39. “It is inspiring to me.” (M)
40. “It can be everywhere.” (M)
41. “It made me think of something like explosions.” (M)
42. “Art is very descriptive, and it tells me why.” (M)
43. “How the artists made it.” (MC)
44. “Why she drew a lot of chairs?” (MC)
45. “It made me feel funny because anybody doesn’t really put a chair on a mask, and it’s sticking out too.” (MC)
46. “I think if I put it with 2D, I didn’t think that it stands out that much. But with 3D, it stands out much better.” (MC)
47. “I tried making this chair puffy, and now this chair is much puffier.” (MC)
Table 2-2: Formulated Meanings - Students’ Interactions with Artist’s Artwork, and Making Their Own Artwork

1. Students feel and express their likes and dislikes with artists’ artwork. (1, 6, 16, 26, 27)
2. Students learn things that they did not know before. (2, 4, 9, 32)
3. Students know the fact that there is more than they thought before. (2, 4, 10, 32)
4. Students have several questions related to artist’s artwork, related to shape, forms, and content, artist intentions, and why. (36, 37, 42, 43, 44)
5. Students get some ideas from the artists’ artwork and then change them. (8, 5, 10, 12, 1, 15, 19, 27, 41)
6. Students have some confusion and questions between making their artwork and artist’s artworks. (7, 11)
7. The colors, shapes, and forms of an artist’s artwork relates to the students’ emotion. (1, 6)
8. Student name their own artwork. (13, 30)
9. Students chose the artist’s artwork depending on their likes and interests about shapes, colors, textures and forms. (16, 17, 23, 29, 38)
10. Students decided how to make their artwork according to their likes, willingness, and interests about shapes, colors, and materials. (16, 17, 20, 21, 29, 45, 46, 47)
11. Students learned materials and art concepts from the class. (18, 25)
12. Students are inspired by art, and keep thinking about artists’ artwork and their own artwork (22, 39, 41)
13. Students think by moving between the artist’s work and their own art. (24, 28)
14. Students pay attention to things which they are familiar with in their everyday life. (31, 33, 34, 40)
15. Students like the activity of making artwork. (35)
16. Students think that art talks to them. (42)
Table 2-3: Cluster Themes - Students’ Interactions with Artist’s Artwork, and Making Their Own Artwork

**Between self and artists’ artwork**
1. Students find emotions, confusion and possibilities from artwork.
2. Students get ideas from art and use it to change their own works.
3. Art inspires students and makes them think.
4. Students have questions about art related to form, artists’ intention, and the basic concept of art.
5. Students selected artists’ artwork by themselves according to their preferences, which relate to their aesthetic tastes, and their everyday experiences.
6. Students are interested in the forms, textures, colors, and shapes in artist’s works.
7. Students move back and forth with thinking about artist’s artwork.

**Between self and their own artwork**
1. Students include their own ideas in their artwork, along with their likes, preferences, and everyday experiences.
2. Students are challenged by new things and experiment with their own work.
3. Students name their own artwork.

**Between self and self**
1. Students feel their possibilities.
2. Students feel their willingness.
3. Students respect their own ideas.
4. Students know their own preferences and tastes.
5. Students keep asking questions, and thinking for themselves.

---

**Cluster Theme 1: Between self and artists’ artwork.**

In the students’ interactions with artists’ work, they encounter a space between themselves and the artist where confusion, questions, and possibilities exist. All of these keep them thinking as they encounter new art. This space inspires the students and makes them challenge themselves and experiment with new things. By doing so, they go beyond their previous limitations and discover things they did not know before. Students select artwork that speaks to them, and from which they can transfer elements to their own artwork/mask; they chose these works depending on their aesthetic tastes,
preferences, and everyday experiences. The colors, forms, textures and shapes interact with them. At first, students pay attention to the artwork which is familiar to them or attracts their attention according to their preferences and tastes; eventually they experience a kind of chaos in this space between the artist’s work and their own, by interacting in their experiences, knowledge with questions, confusion, and possibilities which they discover through the art. Therefore, their lived world which has been embodied in them, is enlarged through the interaction with the artists’ works. This space exists in a physical, spiritual, and immaterial manner.

**Cluster Theme 2: Between self and their own artwork**

Students encounter a space between themselves and their own work when they make art. In this space, students create their own artwork with their own ideas and preferences, aesthetic tastes, and everyday experiences. When they make artwork, their lived world is represented in the artwork; they experiment with materials and challenge new methods and ideas and create meaning by giving names to their own artwork.

**Cluster Theme 3: Between self and self**

When they interact with artist’s work as well as with their own artwork, they continuously encounter a space between self and self. They ask themselves continuously about the possibilities and the intentions by themselves. They recognize their
preferences and their aesthetic tastes, and they bring a lived experience from their lives. They respect their own ideas, and in this space, the dialogue within them is continuous.

**Students’ Interactions with Teacher**

From the transcriptions of the student interviews, the significant statements of their interactions with the teachers were drawn out. The significant statements of these interactions are presented in Table 3-1.

As the next step, formulated meanings are built from the significant statements, and are presented in Table 3-2.

From the formulated meanings, I found three cluster themes: 1) The existential meaning of teaching between students and teachers; 2) Students’ learning from the teacher between students and teachers; and 3) Students’ attitudes between students and teachers. These cluster units are presented in Table 3-3.
Table 3-1: Significant Statements - *Students’ Interactions with Teachers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“When I was asking how to make this a bigger shape, I was going to use plaster to make it bigger; Ms. Valenza came in and said, ’It would take too long and it would become really heavy. You could just use foil and that made it easier.’”</td>
<td>(Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I accepted her ideas.”</td>
<td>(Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I got ideas from Ms. Valenza and Ms. Gardner about how to get these up.”</td>
<td>(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Ms. Valenza wants us to use hints with each other.”</td>
<td>(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Ms. Valenza taught us that there a lot more things.”</td>
<td>(J)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Ms. Valenza taught us how we are each different.”</td>
<td>(J)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“On the carpet, I thought that Ms. Valenza’s mask was really cool.”</td>
<td>(J)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I got a lot of ideas from Ms. Valenza’s masks which look so cool.”</td>
<td>(J)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I did not know a lot about color until we all learned how to make different colors and other techniques that Ms. Valenza taught us.”</td>
<td>(J)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“When I was making it, I had no idea what to put; and so I looked at both of these pictures because Ms. Valenza gave me extras.”</td>
<td>(MC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“From the picture that Ms. Valenza gave me, I came to know that there were carpets and ruffles and laces, chairs.”</td>
<td>(MC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-2: Formulated Meanings - *Students’ Interactions with Teachers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students learn things from teachers that they did not previously know, such as techniques, mediums, and different materials.</td>
<td>(1, 9, 10, 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students respect and accept ideas from teachers.</td>
<td>(2, 7, 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students pay attention to what teachers want them to do.</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students get hints from the teachers, which can lead them to go beyond their limitations.</td>
<td>(1, 3, 5, 9, 10, 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students think the models that the teachers show them in class are really cool and inspiring.</td>
<td>(7, 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students recognize their differences between one another by the teacher’s inspirations.</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3-3: Cluster Themes - *Students’ Interactions with Teachers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The existential meaning of teachers between students and teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. For students, teachers exist as advisers who give feedback and ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. For students, teachers inspire them, give them information, and enable them to go beyond their prior limitations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. For students, teachers are interested in their artwork, concerns, thoughts, and interactions with each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. For students, teachers exist as good helpers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. For students, teachers exist as stimulants that make students attempt new things and become aware of their uniqueness, new possibilities, and breaking limitations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The students’ learn from the teachers between students and teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Students learn new possibilities from teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Students learn new techniques and knowledge, such as how to deal with materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Students learn how to use ideas from the teachers and classmates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Students learn how to interact with classmates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Students learn how to go beyond their prior limitations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Students learn a new ways to see the world.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The students’ attitude from the teachers between students and teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Students respect teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Students respect the ideas, models, information, and other things that the teachers provide them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Students have positive attitudes towards the teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Students pay attention and listen to the teachers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cluster theme 1: The existential meaning of teachers between students and teachers.**

For students, teachers exist as good advisers, stimulants, and helpers more than initiators of knowledge. During class, teachers continuously respond to students’ concerns, interests, problems, and thoughts. Students consider that teachers are interested in their thoughts, problems, and needs. Students also think that teachers remember what, and how they did. Teachers provide students what they need with materials and the right mentally.
Cluster theme 2: The students’ learn from teachers between students and teachers.

Students consider that learning from the teachers is not just knowledge or technique transfer itself; from this interaction with the teachers, students recognize that there are new possibilities of which they had not previously been aware. When they get these new ideas from the teachers or classmates, students learn how to use them and how to interact with their classmates. Through these conversations with the teachers, they learn how to see the world.

Cluster theme 3: The students’ attitude from teachers between students and teachers.

Students have a positive attitude toward teachers, which comes naturally, and does not seem forced. Students respect and admire the teachers as well as their ideas and talents. With this attitude, students pay attention to the teachers, listen to what they have to say, follow their direction, and accept their advice. From this attitude, the authentic authority of the teachers can be established and secured.

Students’ Interactions with Classmates

From the transcriptions of the student interviews, the significant statements of their interactions with classmates were drawn out (see Table 4-1). Meanings are formulated from these significant statements, (see Table 4-2).
From these formulated meanings, four cluster themes were revealed: 1) The existential meaning of students and classmates between students and classmates; 2) Students’ attitude toward their classmates, their ideas and their work; 3) Student attitudes of him/herself between students and classmates; and 4) The subject between students and classmates (see the Table 4-3).
Table 4-1: Significant Statements - *Students’ Interactions with Classmates*

1. “One of the classmates came up and said that this side is like almost big as this, which changed my ideas.” (Q)
2. “Sometimes I take the ideas from classmates, but I don’t most of time.” (Q)
3. “I take little parts of the ideas from the classmates, and then I mix it with my ideas and make it better.” (Q)
4. “When a classmate in my group talks about the similar ideas that I had already thought before, we compare them sometimes like how they’re different and how they’re similar.” (Q)
5. “I feel good by the new ideas coming from the classmates, but also good about my ideas, when we compare our ideas with each other.” (Q)
6. “Sometimes, I disagree with the classmates’ ideas.” (Q, J)
7. “I feel like that I should stick with my own idea and not take someone else’s, and I should just do my own, because it’s really mine.” (Q)
8. “I don’t want people to do it for me because I don’t want it to turn out good because of their ideas.” (Q)
9. “When we’re sitting in the circle, we respond to Ms. Valenza and talk about general things.” (Q)
10. “If we have questions in general, we can ask for everybody’s mask.” (Q)
11. “When I talk in front of the classmates, I feel good about my thing that I made, and I also feel good that I accomplished it, and that I show everybody and I hope they like it.” (Q)
12. “I don’t feel bad, but actually feel good for other people, that they made really nice paintings, sculptures or artwork.” (Q)
13. “When my friends were sitting all at the same table, we decided to talk about masks and what we do.” (A)
14. “N said something about gorillas, and then I doubt the ideas, because how gorillas have big stuff.” (A)
15. “That’s how I got the idea from N.” (A)
16. “N pretty much inspired me.” (A)
17. “I usually keep thinking about it, when they keep saying the same topics for a little while until they stop it. And then we were talking about different things.” (A)
18. “Because all 4th graders would start masks, so we all started talking about it.” (A)
19. “We started to get ideas of what a mask would look like.” (A)
20. “When we have topics like the same things, we talk about what we were doing at the moment.” (A)
21. “Whenever we went to art, we would pretty much focus on what we are doing at art.” (A)
22. “We mostly talk about art and that we might be artists.” (A)
23. “From time to time, we adjust different ideas with each other.” (A)
24. “We follow the same topic each time, but we look ahead to see next step and then we get to the next step and figure it out, and keep looking ahead.” (A)
25. “My friend helps me a lot.” (A)
26. “They are really good.” (A)
27. “I maybe change my ideas once or twice from friends.” (A)
28. “I would draw some pictures about what we do, not just for this subject, but for
29. “I would draw about all my friends’ ideas, and then I would see if they are right or not.” (A)  
30. “I didn’t really change my ideas, but I thought about them a little, then I accepted this.” (C)  
31. “No one was going to change any of my ideas.” (C)  
32. “When classmates introduce new ideas, sometimes I take it, but sometimes I don’t think it’s good enough.” (C)  
33. “When they introduce some ideas, I wonder why they want me to change my ideas.” (C)  
34. “When classmates have the same idea as me, I would just kind of change it a little and do different things, or tell them that they have to do a different one.” (C)  
35. “We all had different answers.” (C)  
36. “Sometimes the classmates give me ideas of how to do this, and they say some different things.” (J)  
37. “I look at their mask and see some cool things. I decide to put some on my mask.” (J)  
38. “It can be all different stuff.” (J)  
39. “Sometimes, I get ideas at the table meeting and put it on my mask, or draw, or paint it.” (J)  
40. “When they tell me new ideas and stuff, if I did not use it on my mask, then I might use it in my work.” (J)  
41. “I noticed they look at my stuff. I think most of them think that’s really cool.” (J)  
42. “Once I saw that my friend looked at something that I was drawing, and then he really liked it. So, he put it on his.” (J)  
43. “I sometimes follow along with the ideas that the classmates introduce to me.” (M)  
44. “I get something if their ideas are really cool.” (M)  
45. “When somebody had similar ideas that I got before, I would say, ’Oh, I had that idea too’ and go along with it.” (M)  
46. “At the table meeting, there are more objects that help me, and more people to talk about everything.” (M)  
47. “They like my ideas, but it was just that I couldn’t think of anything, but they give me a lot of ideas. For example the laces, the ruffles, somebody told me to put ruffles around them or lace.” (MC)  
48. “I feel thankful when they give me ideas.” (MC)  
49. “They give me ideas when I was like stuck and thinking, ’What should I put on?’” (MC)  
50. “When classmates introduce new ideas to me, I would think about it and see if I want to use it, and then put it on my mask.” (MC)
### Table 4-2: Formulated Meanings - Students’ Interactions with Classmates

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Students change their ideas from classmates’ ideas or suggestions. (1, 27, 29, 32, 44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Students get new ideas that they did not know before, which enables them to go beyond their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prior limitations. (2, 5, 33, 39, 40, 44, 47, 49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Students mix the new and different ideas of classmates with their own ideas, adjusting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>them to their own way of thinking. (3, 23, 33, 39, 40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>When they have similar ideas, students keep thinking and talking about it, eventually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>going along with it, changing their own ideas and comparing them with the ideas of their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>classmates. (4, 17, 45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Students disagree with their classmates’ ideas. (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Students distinguish their own unique and different ideas from others’ ideas. (7, 34, 35,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Students respect themselves and their own ideas. (5, 7,8, 11, 31, 41, 50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Students respect classmates, their ideas, and their work. (5,12, 26, 31, 37, 43, 44, 48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Students talk about general and common things with one another in the circle. (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Students have questions about the common topics and subjects with classmates. (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Students feel good and have pride when they show their artwork to everybody. (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Students hope that classmates like their work and consider the work to be good. (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Students admit the greatness and uniqueness of one another. (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Students talk with one another about common subjects, and get ideas from discussion. (13,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18, 19, 20,21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Students become aware of what they are doing through discussion with classmates on the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>topic. (13, 21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>When classmates suggest ideas, students think about these ideas before accepting them. (14,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30, 40, 50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>New ideas of other students inspire others and can cause some doubt or confusion that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eventually breaks through their prior limitations. (14, 16, 33, 36, 47, 49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Students feel more together under the same topic. (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Students think that their classmates help them. (25, 46, 49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Students think that their classmates are good, and generally nice. (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Students consider everybody’s thoughts and positions. (28, 29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>When classmates suggest new ideas or thoughts, students consider them and keep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thinking about the idea itself, the reason behind the idea, and their intentions. (29, 30,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32, 33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Students accept classmates’ ideas if they think they are good, and if these ideas have not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>already been used. (37, 40, 47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Students notice that they are all different—they have different ideas and make different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>things, even though they are all under the same general topic. (35, 38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Students are aware of others who look at and judge their. (41, 42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Students see and judge their classmates’ artwork. (45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Students consider what classmates think about their work. (42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Students appreciate their classmates’ ideas, advice and help. (48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Students consider their own willingness before accepting the ideas of classmates. (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Similar topics and common themes enable students to start communicating with each other. (9,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10, 17, 18, 20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4-3: Cluster Themes - *Students’ Interactions with Classmates*

**The existential meaning of students and classmates between students and classmates**

1. Students and classmates exist as advisers giving ideas and comments to one another.
2. Students and classmates consider one another as good helpers who help go beyond his/her limitations when they encounter roadblocks.
3. Students and classmates exist as spectators who see and remember their actions and accomplishments.
4. Students and classmates exist as actors who communicate with one another in terms of language.
5. Students and classmates exist as stimulants that inspire each other, causing them to keep thinking and becoming aware of something.
6. Students and classmates exist as beings that provide different perspectives and enable them to break through their routines.
7. Students and classmates exist as beings that enable recognition of their uniqueness and differences.
8. Students and classmates exist as judges to evaluate them.
9. Students and classmates exist as cooperators who pursue a common good.

**Students’ attitude for their classmates, ideas, and works**

1. Students and classmates respect one another.
2. Students respect the ideas and the work of their classmates.
3. Students admit the differences and uniqueness of their classmates.
4. Students have positive attitudes towards their classmates.
5. Students hope that classmates remember their greatness and enjoy their works.
6. Students have thankfulness for one another.

**Students’ attitude for themselves between students and classmates**

1. Students respect themselves.
2. Students respect their own ideas, and works.
3. Students have pride in their own work.
4. Students recognize and put emphasis on their differences which are distinguished from their classmates.

**The subject in between students and classmates**

1. Common topics and subjects enable students to communicate with one another.
2. Each subject for each student is different from one another under common topics.
**Cluster Theme 1: The existential meaning of students and classmates between students and classmates**

The space between students and classmates exists as an advisory space, helping to impart new ideas, comments, and information. Being classmates and students enables them to escape from their narrow perspectives, and go beyond their prior limitations. They inspire one another as stimulants, giving fresh perspectives. By doing so, they encourage one another to challenge new things, and break through their normal routines. They are actors, who act with language communication and discussing one another. As spectators and judges, they see, evaluate, and remember others’ actions and accomplishments. They exist as beings who let their existence show through their differences and uniqueness. Since they are all different, students compare themselves with one another, and interact with one another. Even though they are different, through communication, students and classmates become cooperators who pursue a common good to help one another improve.

**Cluster Theme 2: Students’ attitude toward their classmates, ideas, and works.**

Students respect one another. When classmates give ideas and comments, the students respect them, consider the suggestions, and are thankful for their ideas. This mutual respect and positive attitude enables them to be open to these new ideas, and to communicate smoothly. However, they do not just follow these new ideas blindly or force their ideas onto others; they admit their differences with one another and respect
their own thoughts and ideas. Students hope that classmates like their work and remember their accomplishments as great. These attitudes allow the students to have positive expectations of others.

**Cluster Theme 3: Students’ attitudes for themselves between students and classmates.**

Students have a pride in themselves, their ideas, and their work. This attitude enables them to sincerely consider and examine the ideas and opinions of classmates before accepting them. By doing so, students can be active learners who can think critically and make decisions by themselves rather than passive learners who accept everything without thinking. This self-respect allows students to think for themselves, consider themselves as valuable, and realize that their uniqueness is precious.

**Cluster Theme 4: The subject in between students and classmates.**

Common topics exist between students and classmates; in this class, the making of the masks is their common subject. Even though each mask is different, they communicate with one another under the common topic of making the mask. This common subject allows students to communicate and interact with each other. Students exchange their ideas and talk to each other about the masks. By doing so, they assist each other in making each work be even better.
Students’ Interactions with Classroom Settings

In the classroom, students also interact with the settings of the room. In order to
investigate the structure of these interactions in aesthetic education, the interactions with
classroom settings will analyzed based on interviews with the students. The significant
statements of the students’ interactions with classroom settings were drawn out from the
descriptions of these student interviews (see Table 5-1). These formulated meanings
came from the significant statements of the students’ interactions with classroom
settings (see Table 5-2).

Two cluster themes came from the formulated meanings: 1) The existential
meaning of classroom settings for students; and 2) Characteristics of classroom settings
between students, (see Table 5-3).
**Table 5-1: Significant Statements - Students’ Interactions with Classroom Settings**

1. “I got a lot of ideas from the board as I look around the class.” (J)
2. “I see in the classroom that there are really cool different kinds of shapes and textures and stuff.” (J)
3. “At the table meeting, there are more objects that help me, and more people to talk about everything.” (M)
4. “When we met at the table, I can ask more specific questions that I have and that are more into my work.” (Q)
5. “I think maybe it would be more comfortable at the table, because I see everyone’s mask closely and we talk about stuff.” (J)
6. “The carpet meeting and table meeting give me ideas.” (J)
7. “Table talking with classmates is more comfortable.” (M)

**Table 5-2: Formulated Meanings - Students’ Interactions with Classroom Settings**

1. Students get ideas from classroom settings such as boards, shapes, and textures. (1)
2. Classroom settings draw students’ attention. (2)
3. Students consider materials as a helper. (3)
4. Students act differently according to different meeting places in the classroom. (4)
5. Students feel differently according to different meeting places in the classroom. (5,6).
6. Classroom settings give students ideas. (6)

**Table 5-3: Cluster Themes - Students’ Interactions with Classroom Settings**

**The existential meaning of classroom setting for students**

1. Classroom settings exist as a stimulant which inspires students and draws their attention.
2. Classroom settings exist as a helper which gives them the ideas and materials that they need.

**Characteristics of classroom settings between students**

1. Classroom settings make students act and feel differently according to different meeting places.
2. Classroom settings provide ideas and materials that students need.
**Cluster Theme 1: The existential meaning of classroom settings for students**

Classroom settings attract students’ attention. According to the texture, color, shape, and the place where the materials are, students are inspired and influenced. Students get some ideas from classroom settings such as boards, books and mediums.

**Cluster Theme 2: Characteristics of classroom settings between students**

Classroom settings make students feel differently, and act according to the characteristics of a particular meeting place. Students get ideas and have conversations both at the table and carpet, but at the table meetings, students feel more comfortable to talk with classmates freely than while at the carpet; conversely, while at the carpet meeting, students focus more on conversation than while at the table. Classroom settings provide students with ideas and resources which the students need.

**Interview with the teacher**

In this part, I analyze my interview with Ms. Valenza, in order to investigate the structure of education as the public/in-between space. To explore this structure, I examined the teacher’s interactions in this space. For this examination, I specifically divided the interviews into three parts: 1) Teacher’s interaction with curriculum; 2) Teacher’s interaction with students; and 3) Teacher’s interaction with classroom settings. I analyzed the three parts individually, and then synthesized all together.
I first transcribed all of the interviews with Ms. Valenza, and then extracted the significant statements from these transcriptions. I then drew out every significant statement from the interviews and eliminated any overlapping statements. These remaining significant statements are presented in Tables 6-1, 7-1, and 8-1, respectively. Formulated meanings came from each significant meaning within the process of deep contemplation while reading through the significant statements of these interviews. These formulated meanings are presented in Tables 6-2, 7-2, and 8-2.

From each formulated meaning, cluster themes were drawn out. These cluster themes represent the common themes from the individual statements, and are represented in Tables 6-3, 7-3, and 8-3. I also examined whether these cluster themes were valid by comparing them to the original descriptions of the interview with Ms. Valenza; the meaning of each cluster theme is described at the end of Tables 6-3, 7-3, and 8-3 respectively.

**Teacher’s Interactions with Students**

From the transcriptions of the interviews with Ms. Valenza, the significant statements of her interactions with the students were drawn out and presented in Table 6-1. The formulated meanings emerged from these significant statements and are shown in Table 6-2.

From the formulated meanings, four cluster themes were drawn out: 1) The existential meaning of teachers in interactions with students; 2) Teacher’s main focus,
interest, and concern in interactions with students; 3) Teacher’s attitude in interactions with students; and 4) Characteristics of physical space in interactions with students, (see Table 6-3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6-1: Significant Statements - Teacher’s Interactions with Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. “There are a lot of discussions at the beginning.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. “During studio time, if a student seems to be working without struggling, I try to leave them alone; particular ideas might help them, but I try to see what they create without my input.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. “I think that’s my major thing. I want to make them to feel confident that their work is true artwork.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. “Practice makes students feel confident. As much as possible, we talk a lot together about it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. “A lot of times, I ask them ‘what it means?’ ‘Why did you make that choice?”’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. “I want to make them care about the thought process that they go through when they do the notes and all the family arts. It’s all very important.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. “I respect the work that they put in.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. “I think that it’s mutual respect.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. “I care about their ideas and their answers.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. “If a student would not feel brave or secure, then they are not going to try something new or try to express anything new.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. “I think it's important for them to feel confident.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. “I keep my opinion to myself and try to be objective, focus on making sure the student leads the discussion when we are talking about their work.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. “I think it’s mostly student guided, student led, and I am assisting.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. “I can give them guidance, but I really want them to find their own way if they can.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. “If I force them to express something, they feel burdened.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. “If I am inserting my ideas through them, it’s less about what they want and more about my opinion of what they should do.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. “Students interact with each other naturally.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. “This environment where students are is very peaceful, friendly and cooperative, which is nice, but not does happen everywhere.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. “I am trying to give them as much practice with just talking about each other’s artwork in a respectable way.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. “Each student group is very cooperative and supportive of each other.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. “Modeling—showing an example of how I would want them to interact with each other.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. “I ask a question if I don’t understand something, asking for explanation, using real specific language with respect.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. “Making them feel comfortable that their opinions are respected.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. “They want to talk any time.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. “Students influence each other a lot.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. “It is interesting how they influence each other.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. “Some of the students influence their classmates or suggest things to others when they
are in the circle.”
28. “Most of them, they will say, ‘this is still my plan, or I will do but go with my plan.’”
29. “Each class I make students get together on the rug and speak about their ideas.”
30. “I think it is really important. Even if I have very short periods of time with students,
talking to each other is valuable and a major part of the class.”
31. “I’ve been at the end of lessons, we have circle time and then we share what we are
talking about.”
32. “If I ask them to make artwork that they had to share how they feel and had to show
their thoughts, then it would seem dismissive and I think it would not respect them.”
33. “I didn’t ask forcefully what it was, what they were doing, or why. I didn’t ask them
why. I think that’s part of making them feel uncomfortable.”
34. “I do not want to hear what they have to say. I want to make their class hear, the class
makes them hear what they have to say, and that everyone is evaluating.”
35. “The rug meeting should be something that’s fun.”
36. “Their free communication in the rug meeting is focused on learning more about what
they are doing.”
37. “They are getting ideas, but it’s also exciting because they are sharing something that’s
new that happened to them before. I think it is very important and very exciting.”
38. “‘Okay tell me your opinion about this which makes it different,’ and is important when
they share.”
39. “I usually check in later in the class with students who would not speak out in front of
friends or classmates, and then talk with them one--on-one.”
40. “I would say it would be more casual and free form at the table meeting.”
41. “At the table, students may not always be talking about what it is that they are working
on.”
42. “I would say that they probably would feel more comfortable working at the table.”
43. “I think they should focus more on conversation while on the carpet.”
44. “They guide their own conversation at the table.”
45. “They are trying to talk about more on the carpet where they might come up with a lot
of new ideas.”
46. “At the table, they could go everywhere and not necessarily anywhere either.”
Table 6-2: Formulated Meanings - Teacher’s Interactions with Students

1. Teacher notices that there are lots of discussions at the beginning of the class. (1)
2. Teacher puts emphasis on the students’ own ideas, uniqueness, and ability to create their own ideas. (2, 9, 14, 16)
3. Teacher notices whether she should give ideas to the students or not. (2)
4. Teacher focuses on helping the students have more confidence. (3, 10, 11)
5. Teacher makes the students feel confident by having them express their ideas and talk together as a group. (4)
6. Teacher makes the students conscious about their thought processes. (5, 6)
7. Teacher respects the students, their thoughts, and their work. (2, 7, 15)
8. Teacher thinks that mutual respect between teacher and student as well as between students is important. (8, 19, 23, & 16)
9. Teacher focuses that the students at the start, and challenges them with new things. (10)
10. Teacher focuses on making students active learners. (12)
11. Teacher guides and assists the students without force. (13, 15, 16, 17)
12. Teacher thinks that it is important to make the class comfortable and open to their ideas and thoughts, which is different from other places. (15, 16, 18, 23)
13. Teacher sees the students’ interactions, desires, needs, influences, and attitudes. (17, 19, 20, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28)
14. Teacher focuses on the students’ communication and on revealing their thoughts. (19, 29, 30, 31)
15. Teacher considers cooperative and supportive relationships with the students. (20)
16. Teacher shows how to interact with one another. (21)
17. Carpet meetings are more focused on discussion. (36, 43, 45)
18. Teacher considers that discussions and talking with each other is important and exciting. (37)
19. Teacher thinks that the differences and uniqueness are important, and should be revealed to each other. (38)
20. Teacher encourages the students to express their ideas in front of their classmates. (39)
21. Teacher thinks that the table meetings are more casual, free, and comfortable. (40, 41, 42, 46)
### Table 6-3: Cluster Themes - *Teacher’s Interactions with Students*  

#### The existential meaning of teachers in interaction with students  
1. Teacher exists as a guide, assistant and facilitator.  
2. Teacher exists as an actor and spectator who sees and remembers actors (students) actions and accomplishments, and communicates with students.  
3. Teacher exists as a designer of teaching content, and environment of the class.  
4. Teacher exists as a model that shows examples.  
5. Teacher exists as a learner with teaching in practice.  

#### Teacher’s main focus, interest, and concern in interaction with students  
1. Teacher focuses on students’ consciousness.  
2. Teacher focuses on students’ confidence.  
3. Teacher is interested in revealing students’ uniqueness, differences, and their own ideas.  
4. Teacher is concerned about students’ communication with each other.  
5. Teacher focuses on making the classroom a comfortable and free space where students can talk easily and reveal themselves.  
6. Teacher cares about mutual respect between students, as well as between the teacher and students.  

#### Teacher’s attitude in interaction with students  
1. Teacher respects students.  
2. Teacher values students’ uniqueness.  
3. Teacher is proud of students.  
4. Teacher is active in preparing the classroom, engaged in talking with students, and is careful when she gives out ideas to students.  

#### Characteristics of physical space in interaction with students  
1. Carpet meetings are more focused on discussion and talking with each other.  
2. Carpet meetings and table meetings occur every class.  
3. Carpet meetings are at the beginning of class and the end of the class.  
4. Table meetings are more comfortable, free, and causal than carpet meetings.  

---

**Cluster Theme 1: The existential meaning of teachers in interaction with students.**

Teachers exist as guides, assistants and facilitators, as opposed to simply giving knowledge to students. Teachers ask questions related to students’ thoughts, and based on their activities, but do not force ideas. In order to assist students, teachers care about
what the students’ needs, desires and activities are. Teachers are actors and spectators, observing students’ actions carefully while communicating with them and remembering what students said and acted. Teachers stimulate and inspire students. They know the students that do not normally talk, and engage them in classroom activities. They act as models, showing examples which are not fixed models but stimulus for students. Teachers teach students, while at the same time also learning from them.

Cluster Theme 2: Teacher’s main focus, interests, and concerns in their interactions with students.

Teachers focus on making students conscious of their surroundings and the ideas of their peers; this enables students to think about what they are doing, and pay close attention to their thought processes. Teachers are interested in their students’ confidence, allowing them to try new things and confront the unknown. Teachers consider students’ uniqueness as important, making the students care about their own ideas, and how they are different from others. Teachers are interested in students’ ideas, activities and art work as well as care about students’ desires, needs, and attitudes. Teachers put emphasis on students’ communication in classroom activities; showing concern for comfortable environments and atmospheres within the classroom. Mutual respect is considered important to assist in successful communication between students, and between students and teachers.
Cluster Theme 3: Teachers’ attitudes in their interactions with students.

Teachers respect students; if the students do not speak about their ideas, they teachers do not make them speak, but instead talk with them privately at a later time. Teachers ask students questions, but do not press them to answer if they are uncomfortable doing so. Teachers respect students’ uniqueness and their differences; and are proud of their individual talents, works, and ideas. Teachers are very active in preparing the classroom and communicating with the students, but sometimes withdraw from their active positions when it is advantageous for the students to struggle and find their own ideas.

Cluster Theme 4: Characteristics of physical space in interactions with students.

The teacher arranges different types of meetings during each class, and allows the students to reveal their own ideas and communicate with one another. In carpet meetings, students can focus on more conversation because they can interact with everyone, and are not busy making artwork. The dialogue between teachers and students focuses more on general topics. In comparison, at table meetings, teachers allow the students to talk freely and go anywhere they choose. Teachers influence interactions between students according to meeting place by preparing different physical meeting spaces.
Teacher’s Interactions with the Curriculum

The significant statements of teachers’ interactions with the curriculum are drawn from the transcriptions of the teacher interviews, and are presented in Table 7-1. The formulated meanings from these significant statements are in Table 7-2.

Four cluster themes were discovered from the formulated meanings: 1) Main focus and interest between teachers and the curriculum; 2) The aesthetic education between teachers and the curriculum; 3) The existential meaning of students between teachers and the curriculum; and 4) The characteristics of the curriculum between teachers and the curriculum, (see Table 7-3).

Table 7-1: Significant Statements - Teacher’s’ Interactions with the Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>“Just basically to have students research artists that they are drawn to, that they love, and think about the different art styles, being interpreted in different ways.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>“It’s a way for them to experiment.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>“Make them see differently.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>“I think that they might get a more personal connection with an art piece and try to make or change their own.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>“I think that’s my major thing, that I want to make them feel confident that their work is true artwork.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>“I hope students will come away thinking not only art, but also its process.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>“They can make their own choices.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>“They are not passive viewers, but active viewers.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>“They use critical thinking. So they are always asking why. That’s pretty much my goal.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>“For me, aesthetic education is training students to see things in a more sophisticated way, asking questions about what they see, and understanding what art is.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>“The definition of art for them is always changing as they learn new things, and so aesthetic education is adding to the list of what art can be, and I am helping them form their own definitions.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>“What seems to be essential for aesthetic education is the thought process, a process that they understand.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>“I think aesthetic education is a process of understanding.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>“I think it’s the active participation viewing, it’s trying to understand and letting it rush...”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
over students: ‘I am looking at this artwork; I listen to the song; I am watching the movies; I am trying to understand what the person who made this was intending; I am trying to decipher different elements that tell me more about it, and then I want to know how I feel about it, and then combining all of what I feel like.’ It’s a way of understanding pretty much anything in the world.”

15. “It’s a way of thinking critically.”
16. “I think aesthetic education is related to each class.”
17. “I think there are a lot of questions that they have about their own work, depending on the piece and what’s being asked of them.” (generative themes)
18. “I think aesthetic education—critical thinking and questioning—really changes the way they’ve interacted in the world; it changes the way they express themselves; it changes the way they understand how others express themselves. I think it’s a basic kind of human thing, but it allows them to be a little bit more perceptive than someone who has to think about it.”
19. “I do not have any formal aesthetic curriculum in the school, but actually I am working on developing that, because I saw that there was really nothing for elementary age students, and probably not even middle school or high school. I never had experience with it before college.”
20. “I think every age can understand, if it is presented properly; so I started to develop a formal aesthetic curriculum. It is kind of integrated with what I am doing right now.”
21. “This is a private independent school, which means that it’s even more important that we do whatever it is that we feel will meet national standards, and state standards. Both of them, I’m meeting or exceeding, I am sure.”
22. “Technically no one is asking me to meet anything, but I feel that it is important that they are up to the national standards. However, I think it’s focused more on art making than understanding. So, I felt like that was lacking, and I want to ask more questions of the students about the nature of artwork, which is why I am doing this now.”
23. “Although if I was in public school, I could create my own curriculum as long as I could demonstrate it could meet the standards.”
24. “I could teach any lesson that I think I would get students to the point where they would understand the standards; it doesn’t matter necessarily how I got to it.”
25. “These are lessons and units which I’ve created.”
26. “I do not have any special class such as this aesthetic class. I tried to have aspects of aesthetic education in each lesson.”
27. “I already include aesthetic education in each class.”
28. “This is a whole year program.”
29. “I am working on it. It’s in process.”
30. “Just thinking and teaching students that art can be a lot more than they’re familiar with.”
31. “I am trying to package the concept that I am working on now to share with other teachers that are in elementary schools, to make it seem easier for them.”
32. “Practice makes students feel confident. As much as possible, we talk a lot together about it.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7-2: Formulated Meanings - <em>Teacher’s Interactions with the Curriculum</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teachers plan the curriculum to make students interested, and to bring their ideas to the class, and to seek their subjects actively rather than to just give it to them. (1 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teachers want to enable students to think about and see the world in different ways other than what they are typically familiar with, and to challenge themselves with new things. (1, 2, 3, 4, 30).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teachers want students to start with their experiences, and then go beyond that by changing and thinking differently. (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. One purpose of the teaching is to make students feel confident about their ideas and work. (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teachers care about students ―thinking‖ of not only the content itself but also the process and what they are doing. (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teachers consider students as active viewers and learners who decide their own choices and express their own ideas and thoughts. (7, 8, 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. One of the goals in this teaching is to make students think critically. For this, teachers encourage students to ask “why” (9, 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Teachers consider aesthetic education as a way of seeing the world; to see the world in a more sophisticated and conscious way. For this, teachers encourage students to ask questions about what they see and understand about the world. (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Teachers think that the definition of art is not fixed, but changing. Therefore, teachers want to help students expand their horizons of understanding of art through aesthetic education rather than memorizing the fixed concept of art. (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Teachers consider aesthetic education as a thought process, and process of understanding. (12, 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Teachers want students to interact with the world actively through their sensory perceptions. (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Teachers relate aesthetic education to every class, rather than only teach it in separate class sessions. (16, 26, 27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Teachers believe that questions generated from students should be based on their own work rather than be given to the students. (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Teachers consider aesthetic education as critical thinking and questioning. (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Teachers believe that aesthetic education changes, and breaks through the way in which students have taken the world for granted. (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Teachers believe that aesthetic education enables students to consider things about others. (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Teachers do not have a formal curriculum for aesthetic education, but are currently creating and developing ways in which students of every age can understand. (20, 25, 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Teachers know about the national standards, but are creating their own curriculum freely while meeting and exceeding the standards for education. (21, 22, 23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Teachers think aesthetic education is a matter of “how” rather than just “fixed content or standards.” (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Teachers plan the curriculum for the entire year in advance, but also adjusts it as it progresses. (28, 29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Teachers intend for students to gain confidence through practice, such as talking with one another and in front of classmates. (32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7-3: Cluster Themes - Teachers' Interactions with the Curriculum

Main focus and interest between teacher and curriculum
1. Teacher focuses on students bringing their lived worlds into the class and expanding them.
2. Teacher focuses on how students see the world.
3. Teacher focused on students’ thinking and critical processes and consciousness.
4. Teacher focused on students’ confidence in their ideas and works, and how to make them feel confident through practicing conversing with each other.
5. Teacher cares about the questions that are generated by the students.
6. Teacher is interested in students’ active interactions with classmates and the world.

Aesthetic education between teacher and curriculum
1. Aesthetic education occurs in every class.
2. Aesthetic education relates to critical thinking, questioning, seeing the world, thought processes, processes of understanding, and consciousness.
3. Aesthetic education does not exist as a formal curriculum, but is being worked into the process.
4. Aesthetic education is not fixed on content, as it relates to the “how.”

The existential meaning of students between teacher and curriculum
1. Students are active learners and viewers.
2. Students are critical thinkers.
3. Students are constantly under process.

The characteristics of curriculum between teacher and curriculum
1. Curriculum is being created.
2. Curriculum is free from the normal standards.
3. Curriculum is planned in advance but adjusts during the process.

Cluster Theme 1: Main focus and interest between teacher and curriculum.

The main focus and interest of teachers exists between their intent to teach within the curriculum. This influences the curriculum content and the teaching style of the class. The teacher is interested in their students’ experiences and personal stories that occur through sensory perception, as opposed to simply giving them subjects that are separated from their experiences. This shows that the teacher cares about their interests.
and likes. However, the teacher does not want students to stay limited by the world that they bring to the class, instead expanding their world and breaking through their typical routines. The teacher is interested in their thought processes; wanting them to think critically, and consciously, and have questions about their familiar world. Regarding questions, the teacher believes in generative questions from the students, and focuses on these types of questions rather than asking forced questions. To expand their thinking, the teacher also focuses on their active interaction with other students and the outside world. For active interaction with classmates to be effective, the teacher understands that confidence is important and enables the students to be more open with their thoughts in front of classmates, and that this confidence can only be achieved through practice.

*Cluster Theme 2: The aesthetic education between teacher and curriculum.*

In the class, aesthetic education exists within the curriculum. The teacher believes that aesthetic education relates to every class and not just in a specialized class. Since the teacher believes that aesthetic education deals with a way of thinking; seeing the world; utilizing critical thinking and a process of understanding; and consciousness, it is something that should be consistent throughout every class. However, the curriculum of aesthetic education does not exist in a formal sense at this point, but is in the process of being made. Because the concept of art is always changing, the fixed content of aesthetic education cannot exist; it relates more to how the world is seen, and how students use their sensory organs and how they think consciously and critically,
rather than being fixated on static content.

Cluster Theme 3: The existential meaning of students between teachers and curriculum.

The teacher considers students as active learners, viewers, and critical thinkers while planning the curriculum. Therefore, the teacher wants to make students interact with their classmates through active communication and critical thinking, which enables them to challenge themselves and create new things. For this, teachers make curriculums which enable students to think about why, to see the world in a different way and to seek their own subject rather than receive knowledge passively and without thinking. The students are thought to be always making progress, rather than already being established and completed.

Cluster Theme 4: The characteristics of curriculum between teacher and curriculum.

There are some characteristics of the curriculum that are present in the teaching; it is free to be flexible and able to change, as opposed to being fixed as standard. The teacher can make her own curriculum freely and creatively, but also recognizes that there are national standards that she must reach as a minimum. The principal of the school does not force her to create a curriculum based on these national standards, but
the teacher creates a curriculum or the class that mixes the national standards with her own ideas. The curriculum is planned ahead for the year and then adjusted during each class.

Teacher’s Interactions with Classroom Settings

The significant statements of the teacher’s interactions with classroom settings came from the transcriptions of the interviews, which are presented in Table 8-1. The formulated meanings drawn out from the significant statements of the teacher’s interactions with classroom settings are in Table 8-2.

Two cluster themes emerged from these formulated meanings: 1) The characteristics of the classroom space; and 2) Existential meanings of the teacher in classroom settings, (see Table 8-3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8-1: Significant Statements - Teacher’s Interactions with Classroom Settings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. “If the materials are easy for students to understand and use, they can work more independently.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. “I hope it’s inviting for them to find what they need on their own.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. “I also try to use something new.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. “I try to have as many books out for students as I can so that they can find references and inspiration through other works.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. “I hope the art class environment is like a studio.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. “There are a lot of conversations, it’s fun and usually there is music.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. “It’s a place they can come and talk about their artwork.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. “I think my class is organized.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. “They guide their own conversation at the tables. They try to talk more on the carpet where they might come up with a lot of new ideas.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. “At the table, they can go everywhere and not necessarily either anywhere.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8-2: Formulated Meanings - Teacher’s Interactions with Classroom Settings

1. Teachers consider that the materials with which the students may use are important and influence their individual activities. (1, 8)
2. Teachers think that students can easily access materials physically and mentality. (1, 7)
3. Teachers want to make the classroom a place where students like to go and feel comfortable, fun, and exited. (2, 6)
4. Teachers want to make the classroom a place where there are new things which stimulate students to experiment and evoke curiosity. (3, 5)
5. Teachers want to make the classroom a place where students can find resources which inspire them. (2, 3, 4)
6. Teachers want to make the classroom a place where conversation between students can happen freely. (6, 7, 9, 10)
7. Teachers consider the organization of the classroom an important piece of teaching. (1, 8)
8. Teachers create different spaces where students can act in different ways. (9, 10)

Table 8-3: Cluster Themes - Teachers’ Interactions with Classroom Settings

The characteristics of the classroom space
1. Classroom settings influence how students act; for example, they can act independently or not.
2. The classroom is organized in a way that enables the students to easily access the things they need, have conversations freely, find resources easily, and act properly according to the place (such as while at the table or the carpet).
3. The classroom is a place which inspires students and makes them feel comfortable, fun, and excited.

Existential meaning of the teacher in classroom settings
1. Teacher is a planner who creates the classroom settings.
2. Teacher is an organizer who sets up the classroom.
3. Teacher is a resource that provides for the students needs.

Cluster Theme 1: The characteristics of the classroom space.

The classroom setting is considered by the teacher as a place which can influence students’ actions and thoughts. The teacher considers that when students can
access the classroom materials and resources easily, then they can act independently and attempt to experiment with new things. The classroom has different characteristics that vary by the differences in the room; on the carpet, students can focus on having more general discussions, while at the tables they are free to go anywhere and converse with their classmates in any way they choose but with more focus on the creation of their art.

*Cluster Theme 2: Existential meaning of the teacher in classroom settings.*

The teacher exists as a planner and organizer. She considers in advance the possible space students will move and how they will act in the classroom. According to the type of meeting, the teacher organizes the characteristics of the particular space physically and mentality. The teacher also exists as a good resource by preparing materials, books, and other supplies which the student need, and can potentially inspire them.
Chapter 5

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter presents the findings and discussion based on the data analysis in the previous chapter. This study started with the question, what is the essential structure of aesthetic education as the public/in-between space. Aesthetic education enables students’ consciousness and engages students in aesthetic experience as an experience (Dewey, 1935). The public/in-between space, in which aesthetic education plays a role, enable students to engage in such processes—namely, being conscious and an aesthetic experience. In order to investigate the essential structure of aesthetic education as the public/in-between space, I observed the class interaction between the teacher and students in Ms. Valenza’s class and interviewed both the teacher and students. I drew ten findings from the analysis of class observations and interviews with students and the teacher.

After describing these findings, I present further discussions focusing on the issues related to the research findings on aesthetic education. For this discussion, I returned to my experience as the starting point of this study and to the literature review, as recommended by Moustakas: “The researcher returns to the literature review and distinguishes her or his findings from prior research, outlines a future research project that would advance in terms of social meanings and implications as well as personal and professional values” (1994, p. 155). However, I focus here on expanding the meaning of
the data presented in the previous chapter, because the pre-knowledge and pre-understanding in the literature review are intricate and overlap the research findings. Thus, I intend to expand the horizon of and give insights into aesthetic education.

**Part I: Findings**

The ten essential themes that emerged from this study can be summarized as follows:

1. The teacher is a significant being who can create the public/in-between space of aesthetic education.
2. Students and teachers are significant others in the public/in-between space.
3. Dialectical movements occur in the public/in-between space.
4. Multiple perspectives exist in the public/in-between space.
5. Ambiguity and uncertainty exist in the public/in-between space.
6. Common topics exist in the public/in-between space.
7. The classroom environment influences interactions in the public/in-between space.
9. The measurement influences concern in the public/in-between space.
10. Students hope that their accomplishments are remembered and considered as valuable.
The Teacher is a Significant Being who can Create the Public/In-Between Space of Aesthetic Education

The teacher is a significant being who can create the public/in-between space of aesthetic education from the physical environments to immaterial area. The teacher develops the curriculum, arranges the classroom settings, and prepares resources for students’ use during class. The teacher also adjusts the relationship between students. Therefore, the teacher’s values for education, attitude, and actions influence students’ education.

The curriculum, the classroom environment, and students’ relationships can be influenced by the teacher’s educational values. In the public/in-between space, people’s opinions can be revealed and explored through speaking and acting. In these areas, individual differences should not be ignored; indeed, various opinions can exist. Therefore, how a teacher thinks about students’ ideas and the teacher’s perception of the purpose of teaching influence the existence of the public/in-between space. In the case of Ms. Valenza’s class, she cares about her students’ confidence which helps the students respect themselves, be proud of their ideas and their artwork, as well as express their thoughts easily in front of other students. In order to instill confidence in her students, Ms. Valenza focuses on making the classroom a comfortable and free space where students can talk easily and reveal themselves. Since she thinks that confidence can be cultivated by practice, she tries to provide various chances for student to speak their thoughts in front of other students. She also gives positive feedback to the students and helps them consider their thoughts and works precious. It is important for teachers to
create the public/in-between space, since this space is in which students can appear and reveal their ideas to others. They modify their ideas in dialogue with others in this space. Therefore her interest in the students’ confidence allows the students to express their thoughts in the class, which makes possible the existence of the public/in-between space.

Ms. Valenza also believes that students’ thought processes, ways of seeing the world, and differences in critical thinking as well as how they share their ideas with one another are important; the public/in-between space in which students actively interact reveal their ideas. Her beliefs in the importance of the students’ thought processes influences her classroom setting and curriculum. For example, she told me that students’ free communication during the rug meeting is focused on learning more about what they are doing. In order to enable students to think about their thought process, Ms. Valenza intentionally makes a space where students can talk to one another. She believes that her classroom is comfortable and cooperative but that does not happen everywhere. In addition, for students’ critical thinking and ways of seeing the world, she asks the question, why, which enables the students to think about what they are doing and prevents students from accepting information or others’ ideas without thinking. In addition, her belief in the value of students’ differences makes her respect their differences and creates the space where students reveal their different ideas and uniqueness. As such, Ms. Valenza’s thinking has been influenced by her understanding of the importance of each student’s distinctive identity and ideas.

The teacher’s attitude also influences the public/in-between space. Although these spaces are created physically (e.g., carpet meeting and table meeting), an authentic
the public/in-between space may not occur due to the teacher’s attitude. As discussed in
the literature review, the public/in-between space does not exist as a physical form. The
public/in-between can be created when speaking and action occur between people
(Arendt, 1958). Therefore, since it is important that people interact with one another and
share their ideas in these spaces, the teacher’s attitude influences the active interaction
and appearance of students in this space. Indeed, the teacher’s attitude can encourage
students to share their ideas with other students and make students think about what they
are doing by providing proper responses, praise, and positive feedback. If the teacher
forces students to share their thoughts or blames them for a flaw in their thinking,
students might not be open to sharing their ideas. In Ms. Valenza’s art class, when a
student would not speak out about his/her ideas in front of the other students, she did not
force him/her to speak, but instead talked with that student after class personally. When
Ms. Valenza asked questions, she did not press the students to answer. Even when she
gave some ideas or resources to students, she was always concerned about whether she
should give ideas to the students or not. She was very active and positive in preparing
the classroom and communicating with the students, but sometimes she withdrew from
her active position in order to let the students struggle and find their own ways. She
believed that if she forced students to express something, they might feel burdened. She
also valued and was proud of the students’ ideas, works and their differences. This
attitude made the students comfortable and felt that teachers respected the students.
Therefore, the teacher’s attitude should demonstrate respect for students and their ideas
while valuing their differences. Such an attitude enables students to be open and interact
with one another actively in their space.

In addition, the teacher’s role in the class is important for creating the public/in-between space. It is the teacher’s role to encourage students to share their ideas with other students and encourage students to think about what they are doing through questions. In this space, the teacher plays the role of mediator, assistant, helper, facilitator, and adviser to guide and advise students on how to understand knowledge and think about their ideas rather than cramming students’ head with knowledge. Ms. Valenza helps students whenever they do not know how to deal with materials, or even when they do not know what they need to do with their artwork. She pays attention to what the students’ needs are during class activities. She also always prepares resources before class in order to provide students with resources which will help them. She guides and assists students without force. In this way, students can be active learners rather than passive learners. When the teacher plays a role as assistant, helper, and adviser, students can actively ask the teacher questions, reveal their ideas in front of the class, and listen to others’ opinions carefully in order to seek their own way. In this space, it is important that the teacher helps and mediates students’ interactions with each other in order to ensure that their ideas are heard. By doing so, the public/in-between space can be created. Therefore, the teacher’s role has a significant effect on enabling students to be themselves in the public/in-between space as well as enabling students to interact actively with one another.

The teacher’s attitude and role create a particular kind of relationship between the teacher and students. The relationships between teachers and students also have an
important effect on the public/in-between space. When the relationship between teachers and students is vertical, with a high and a low—like master (teacher) and servants (students)—students should be obedient to the teacher’s order. In this relationship, students cannot be active learners; rather they are passive learners who always receive and comply with the teacher’s command blindly. In the vertical relationship, students do not need to think about what they are doing, what they will do, or what their own ideas are, because the teacher gives everything to them and individual student opinion is ignored. Thus, in such a relationship, conversation cannot occur. There is only command and comply. However, in a relationship in which the teacher respects students, dialogue between the teacher and students becomes possible. Ms. Valenza is interested in the students’ having their own ideas rather than forcing the students to accept her ideas. She told me that if she tries to insert her ideas into the students, it becomes less about what they want and more about her opinions of what they should do. She does not want to tell the students what they have to do or have to say. Rather, she keeps her opinions to herself and tries to be objective, relying on the students to lead discussion when they are talking about their work. Students should not be considered as objects, but rather as subjects who can make their own decisions and change their ways. Therefore, an open relationship is important in the public/in-between space.

The teacher’s values in regard to education, attitude, role, and relationship with students significantly influence the structure of the public/in-between space. The teacher designs the curriculum, sets the classroom environment, and mediates interactions among students, thereby making it possible for the public/in-between space to exist. The
public/in-between space cannot be created automatically from the physical environment. Even when we are with others in the same space, the public/in-between space are not necessarily created. Only when we interact with one another and reveal ourselves through words and actions are the public/in-between space created. To create these spaces, the teacher is an important being.

**Students and Teachers are Significant Others in the Public/In-Between Space**

Teachers and students are important others in the public/in-between space in aesthetic education. In the public/in-between space, significant others see and listen to one another when they reveal themselves there.

Teachers and students play roles as actors who speak and act as well as spectators who listen, judge, and memorize actors’ actions and accomplishments. In Ms. Valenza’s class, when students share their thoughts and opinions or their artwork, other students and Ms. Valenza watch and listen to their speaking. They remember who is speaking and what he/she is saying. Ms. Valenza is interested in what students say and how they act and then she gives feedback to the students. Students also pay attention to what classmates say and do. Based on these conversations, they talk about their artwork with one another. As a result, the individual does not disappear into the space. If students and teachers do not play the roles of spectators and actors, the public/in-between space cannot exist because, if there is nobody to see and listen to them, the revealing and appearance are impossible. Therefore, others are important beings in the public/in-between space for the possible existence of these spaces.
Moreover, teachers and students interact with one another as important others. If there is no interaction between them, the existence of the public/in-between space is impossible. As previously discussed, the public/in-between space neither exist as physical forms nor exist because of being physically with others. These spaces can be created only when people interact with one other. In the public/in-between, teachers and students actively interact with one another through dialogue. In Ms. Valenza’s class, the active interaction among students as well as between teachers and students occurs. When students get together on the carpet or at the table, they share their ideas with one another. Students and teachers play a role as important others who actively interact in the public/in-between space.

Students and teachers are also significant others who provide new perspectives and new ideas to one another. By doing so, these others provide room for them to go beyond their limitations, break through their routines, and enlarge the horizon of preconceptions and pre-knowledge that students already have. In Ms. Valenza’s class, student MC told me that classmates gave her a lot of ideas such as the inclusion of laces and ruffles on her mask. “Somebody told me to put ruffles around them or lace.” She also told me that classmates gave her ideas when she was like stuck and thinking ‘what should she put on?’ In the case of Student Q, she said that when one of the classmates told her some points in her artwork, “the side is like almost big as this,” she realized the fact that she did not know about it and then changed her ideas. Therefore, students and teachers enable the public/in-between space to play a role to awaken students and prevent them from falling into narrow perspectives. Such a role highlights the
significant characteristics of the public/in-between space. Indeed, students and teachers make it possible for the public/in-between space to function properly. Thus, students and teachers are good helpers who enable individuals to break through their boundaries and solve problems.

Ultimately, teachers and students play a role as significant others who see, listen, remember, judge, and help one another with words and action in the public/in-between space. By actively interacting with one another, teachers and students make it possible to exist in the public/in-between space as well as for students to enlarge their horizons, break free from their narrow perspectives, and break through their boundaries in the public/in-between space. Students and teachers as significant others thus become essential for the public/in-between space.

The Dialectical Movements Proceed in the Public/In-Between Space

In the public/in-between space, the ideas that students have move dialectically. One idea can be changed by others’ ideas. All students should change, although some students may stick to their own ideas; students enlarge and develop their ideas based on listening to others’ perspectives. In Ms. Valenza’s class, student Q said that when she gets some ideas from classmates, she takes little parts of the ideas from the classmates and then she mixes them with her ideas and makes them better. In the case of student A, when he drew on all his friends’ ideas, he would see if they were right or not and then decide if he would change his ideas or not. In Ms. Valenza’s class, students mix the new and different ideas of classmates with their own ideas, adjusting them to their own way
of thinking. In this way, dialectical thought enables students to escape from thinking mechanically.

Freire stated, “[I]n the context of true leaning, the learners will be engaged in a continuous transformation through which they become authentic subjects of the construction and reconstruction of what is being taught” (1998, p. 33). Freire called this dialectical thought “correct thinking” (p. 34). Correct thinking does not refer to the content of thought, but rather the way of thinking. In other words, it means that the attitude to examine their ideas continuously in light of challenges and changes is correct. In Ms. Valeanza’s class, when classmates suggest new ideas or thoughts, students consider them and keep thinking about the idea itself, the reason behind the idea, and their intention. After examining classmates’ ideas, rather than accepting them blindly or rejecting them without reason, students accept classmates’ ideas if they think they are good and if these ideas have not already been used. By doing so, students get new ideas that they did not know before, which enables them to go beyond their prior limitation. The dialectical movement enables students to grow and escape from their narrow perspectives and biases.

Multiple Perspectives and Various Voices Exist in the Public/In-Between Space

The public/in-between space includes various voices. Originally, in Greece the public space as a political realm was the noisiest space (Arendt, 1958). Therefore, the public/in-between space has a lot of various voices. The classroom is full of various voices. Students speak their own ideas and converse with one another.
The fact that various voices and perspectives exist suggests that students and teachers actively talk and interact with one another. It also means that the public/in-between space in which students and teachers interact with one another do exist. Indeed, Ms. Valenzs’s class was full of noise when various voices of students and teachers were interacting with one another. Ms. Valenza said that each class she made students get together and speak about their ideas. They freely revealed their ideas in the classes and talked to one another. Therefore, multiple perspectives make it possible for the public/in-between space to exist.

The fact that multiple perspectives can exist in the public/in-between space means that various perspectives are respected and considered in these spaces. No exact or fixed answer or opinion exists in the public/in-between space. In Ms. Valenza’s class, student C said, “We all had different answers.” Everybody’s idea is possible and valuable. In these spaces, the particular is neither ignored nor standardized, but rather significantly considered. In Ms. Valenza’s class, each student’s ideas are considered precious and valued. Ms. Valenza said that she is proud of each student’s ideas and artwork. Students respect not only their thoughts and works but also other’s thoughts and works. Student Q said, “I feel good by the new ideas coming from my classmates, but also good about my ideas, when we compare our ideas with each other.” She admitted and respected both ideas of classmates and herself. Students feel thankful when classmates provide new ideas and they believe that classmates help them with different ideas. As such, the differences and uniqueness are considered and respected in these spaces.
Various perspectives provide insights for humans to see the world. When humans see the world, we do so from particular perspectives. We do not know the reality. Everybody sees the world from their own perspective. When Ms. Valenza introduced how to make different colors into the class, student J said, “I did not know a lot about color until we all learned how to make different colors and other techniques that Ms. Valenza taught us.” Interacting with Ms. Valenza provide students such as J with new insights about color in the world. Through various perspectives from others, we can gain insights into seeing the world. In the public/in-between space, various perspectives and voices occur.

Therefore, multiple perspectives can exist, be considered, and be respected in the public/in-between space. Indeed, it is precisely because of the multiple perspectives that the public/in-between space is possible. Differences, uniqueness, particularities, and individualism are respected and considered. Multiple perspectives prevent us from being homogenized and give us insights into the world.

**Ambiguity and Uncertainty Exist in the Public/In-Between Space**

In the public/in-between space, nothing is determined or fixed. The ideas that students bring into these spaces are not fixed; they are just examples of the opinions, not a rigid orthodoxy. Opinions are things that can be changed and are distinguished from established theory (Cicero, 2003). Opinions, not fixed theory, exist in the public/in-between space; these opinions and ideas can be changed at any time.

These changeable characteristics of ideas and opinions in the public/in-between
space make it possible for uncertainty and ambiguity to exist. In Ms. Valenza’s class, new ideas from other students inspire and can cause some doubt or confusion that eventually breaks through their prior limitation. For example, when student A got an idea of gorillas from student N, student A doubted student N’s idea before accepting it. He wondered how gorillas have big stuff. It made student A challenge his own work. When teachers or classmates provide new perspectives or new ideas that students did not see or know about before, students become confused, and the existing ideas that students had before take a position as uncertain and ambiguous.

Garoian and Gaudelius (2008) explain this space in terms of Third Space which is a space that is undetermined and undecidable

[T]hese gaps of intervention represent an indeterminate “Third Space of enunciation,” where rarified cultural assumptions are challenged through performance of subjectivity. According to Bhabha, “it is that Third Space, though unrepresentable in itself, which constitutes the discursive conditions of enunciation that ensure that the meaning and symbols of culture have no primordial unity of fixity; that even the same signs can be appropriated, translated, rehistoricized and read anew.” (Bhabha(1994) as cited in Garoian & Gaudelius, 2008, p. 92)

Thus, the concept of the Third Space indicates a “gap of intervention [that] represents an indeterminate” space (Garoian & Gaudelius, 2008, p. 92). This creates a gap between new perspectives and established idea. Hongyu Wang (2006) conceptualized that this space has contradictory, and ambiguous characteristics (p. 111). Within this gap, students think, consider, and judge their ideas and the new ideas. In Ms. Valenza’s class, when students get some new ideas from their classmates, they compare their own ideas
with the new ideas and they also consider why they gave him the ideas. They are asked to examine their ideas, questioning them and thinking critically.

Meanwhile, Elizabeth Ellsworth (2005) explains the characteristics of this space based on through Winnicott’s notion of a transitional space. According to Ellsworth (2005), “As an ambiguous and paradoxical notion, transitional space resists any singular definition...[it] provokes us to keep thinking” (p. 59). Although students determine something after thinking and speaking when they encounter new ideas, these ideas are still undetermined; if students are provided with new ideas, the ideas that are newly determined will also be changed. Therefore, ambiguity and uncertainty open the way to continuous possibility.

New things continuously come into the public/in-between space. The public/in-between space are always filled with newcomers and new ideas because it is impossible to predict human affairs (Arendt, 1958). Events always happen. Therefore, the public/in-between space cannot exist with only fixed and established ideas. Nothing is forever determined in these spaces. Things are not only changeable, but can also start anew in these spaces. There is freedom to initiate something new. Therefore, ambiguity and uncertainty in the public/in-between spaces enable students to initiate something new and change something free from fixed things. In Ms. Valenza’s class, students did not stay with their own original ideas. They change and adjust their ideas freely and consciously whenever they get some new ideas from classmates, teachers and other resources. Therefore, uncertainty and ambiguity in public/in-between space enable students to keep thinking, to think critically about what they take for granted, remain
conscious, open toward endless possibilities, and start something new freely.

**Common Topics Exist in the Public/In-between Space**

Students share common topics with each other in the public/in-between space. This kind of interest exists among students as well as between the teacher and students. In Ms. Valenza’s class, when students make artwork, it seems that each artwork belongs to the individual’s area of interest. However, although the artworks created are not same, students often make their own artwork within common topics, such as artist-inspired masks, media literacy, and photocopied charcoal drawings. Students talk about their own artwork made under these common themes: how they make it, what their main idea is, why they select it, and what they are planning for it. When students reveal their ideas about their artwork, students give ideas, ask questions, and suggest new concepts. All of these actions are possible because they have something in common—namely, a common topic.

A common topic in the public/in-between space enables students to communicate and interact with one another. In Ms. Valenza’s class, student A said, “When we have topics like the same things, we talk about what we were doing at the moment.” He also said more specifically, “Because all 4th graders would start masks, so we all started talking about it.” Thus in Ms. Valenza’s class, the common topic makes students and teachers get together around this topic and discuss it. The “interest” that exists among students as well as with the teacher enables students and teachers interact with one another and makes the existence of the public/in-between space possible.
Action and speech go on between men, as they are directed toward them, and they retain their agent-revealing capacity even if their content is exclusively “objective,” concerned with the matters of the world of things in which men move, which physically lies between them and out of which arise their specific, objective, worldly interests. These interests constitute, in the word’s most literal significance, something which interest, which lies between people and therefore can related and bind them together. (Arendt, 1958, p.182)

Therefore, the common topic as an interest lies among students and enables them to communicate and talk about the topic. The common topic also relates to creating the in-between space in which students can talk and interact with one another.

**The Classroom Environment Influences Interaction in the Public/In-Between Space**

The classroom environment influences interactions among students as well as with the teacher in the public/in-between space. The place where people can be seen and heard can be called the public/in-between space because, in this place, people reveal common topics in front of in-between others. In addition, this space can also be an in-between space because, by speaking and acting, the relationship among students or between students and teachers is created.

However, according to classroom setting such as whether it is carpet meeting or table meeting, the characteristics are different from each other. In the case of the place where everybody can be seen and heard (e.g., “on the carpet” in Ms. Valenza’s class), students can appear in front of everybody. Every student in Ms Valenza’s class got together on the rug so that everybody could see what they did and hear what they said.
In such cases, everybody can be both an actor and a spectator simultaneously. In this space, students and teachers talk about general things, as common interest and themes, not concrete issues. If students try to speak about specific concerns, Ms. Valenza asked them to talk about the issues later at the table.

However, in the case of the place where students can be seen and heard by only few students who are close to student (e.g., at the table, in Ms. Valenza’s class), students can appear to only few (i.e., two or three) other students. In this case, only a few students can be actors and spectators. Although students talk to each other, the topic does not need to be general. They can talk about everything, from the general to specific things as common interest and themes. Students feel more comfortable at the table rather than on the carpet. Students even think there are more people to talk with them at the table, even though there are fewer students at the table than on the carpet. In this case, the number of people is not considered according to quantity but quality: How many things they could talk about with one another.

Both the public/in-between space plays an important role in aesthetic education which helps students be conscious and perceive the world critically by talking with others. When they reveal their ideas in front of everybody, they get new perspectives from everybody; while when they talk with classmates at the table, they could have insights of specific things and more detail from their peers. These areas interact with each other every class. By doing so, students continuously move from general to specific ideas which prevents them from staying fixed on one perspectives.

Therefore, the classroom environment influences the public/in-between space. A
place’s characteristics in the classroom setting determine the characteristics of a public/in-between space. In addition, the atmosphere of the classroom setting influences the public/in-between space. When the classroom is permissive and comfortable, students easily open their ideas and talk to each other freely.

**Classroom Rules Influence Interaction in the Public/In-Between Space**

Certain rules exist in the public/in-between space. “The public realm, as the common world, gathers us together and yet prevents our falling over each other, so to speak” (Arendt, 1958, p. 52). Since the public/in-between space includes multiple perspectives and various voices, opinions, and ideas as a result of the plurality of humans, it is natural that conflict between opinions and ideas occurs. However, certain unspoken rules exist, such that people do not use violence, but solve problems through dialogues. In Ms. Valenza’s class, nobody interrupted while their teachers or classmates talked. If they had some questions or something that they wanted to talk about, they raised their hand. When students encountered new ideas from classmates, they usually compared with each other, or tried to talk about them, rather than ignoring them impolitely or rebuking their classmates. Student A said, “From time to time, we adjust different ideas with each other.” Students like to talk each other when they disagree with other’s opinions.

Violence does not mean only physical force. It also includes teasing, bullying, ignoring, and blaming. In order to create an authentic public/in-between space, students should respect one another and interact with good manners. When students use violence,
the public/in-between space cannot exist or will disappear.

**The Measurement Influences Concern in the Public/In-Between Space**

Classrooms should be free from the measurement and standards which are influenced by economic issues. Ms. Valenza’s class does not aim to meet rigid standards or accomplish high scores which are measured with numbers. When I asked Ms. Valenza if students’ artworks would be calculated into a score, she answered that they would not. She thinks that students self-evaluate or evaluate one another during classroom activity through their dialogue and action. She does not grade students’ work according to rigid measurements. She is interested in students’ differences and their uniqueness. As examined in the literature review, economic issues should be excluded from the public space. When an economic issue infuses into the public space, the nature of the public space changes into a social space. In the social realm, humans’ plurality cannot be guaranteed because every human can be standardized for economic purposes.

When economic issues come into the classroom, students are also measured in order to reach a standard purpose. In this system, individual differences and uniqueness are not important and cannot be considered. Students’ individual voices do not have to be revealed. As a result, multiple voices, speaking, and interaction disappear. Therefore, when students are considered human capital for the wealth of the nation and for the development of the economy, the public/in-between space cannot be created. In order to establish the public/in-between space, the classroom should free from standards and measurements.
Students Hope that their Accomplishments are Remembered and Considered as Valuable

Students hope that their accomplishment is remembered and considered as a good one, yet such hope is not in order to obtain a good score or to dominate others. In Ms. Valenza’s class, student Q said, “When I talk in front of my classmates, I feel good about my thing that I made, and I also feel good that I accomplished it, and that I show everybody and I hope they like it.” Sometimes, this hope appeared as a belief that classmates consider their work to be “cool and great” and that they like their artwork. For example, student J in Ms. Valenza’s class said, “I noticed they look at my stuff. I think most of them think that’s really cool.” This belief made students feel more confident, which led them to reveal themselves confidently and freely in the public/in-between space. The expectation for recognition and agreement as well as belief led to mutual respect, which enabled students to engage in a positive competition.

Through such hope and belief, I also witnessed their desire to receive recognition from others. Recognition influences identity. Taylor (1991) stated that identity is formed through the recognition or agreement from others stemming from dialogue using language, including art, love, and gestures. More importantly, “no one acquires the language needed for self-definition on their own,” but rather from “significant others” (Taylor, 1991, p. 33). Therefore, the recognition and agreement that students sought are important components when forming self-identity.

Meanwhile, Arendt (1963) indicated that the hope for recognition and agreement come from the passion for difference. In other words, others recognize one’s differences
and agree with one’s different ideas. Therefore, this hope for recognition and agreement make it possible for differences to exist as well as the public/in-between space in which such differences can appear.

**Part II: Discussion**

**Consciousness, Thoughtlessness, Meaning Making, and Aesthetic Education**

Greene (2001) defines aesthetic education as a kind of consciousness of the world in terms of Dewey’s definition of aesthetics, in opposition to the anesthetic [an-aesthetic], which connoted being numb and unconsciousness. Therefore, aesthetic education is related to enabling students to be conscious about the world as well as how to perceive it.

To be conscious means that our consciousness is directed toward the world. Although we live in the physical world, all aspects of this material world do not automatically come into our consciousness. When we interact with the environment through our sensory organs, the outside world comes into us. “The senses are our first avenues to consciousness. Without an intact sensory system we would be unaware of the qualities in the environment to which we now respond” (Eisner, 2002, p. 2). Moreover, sensory organs are more than the passages through which we can encounter and interact with environment. “We learn to see, to hear, to discern the qualitative complexities of what we taste and touch. We learn to differentiate and discriminate, to recognize and to recall” (Eisner, 2002, p. 2). Indeed, our sensory organs are not only the path, but also an
active (not passive) system. In modernism, it is not sense, but reason that has the ability to cognate the world. Although our body accepts the outside world through the sensory organs, the body does not have the cognitive function of the world. However, nowadays, sensory organs are considered to have cognitive functions as well. Indeed, “what first was a reflex response, a function of instinct, becomes a gradual search for stimulation, differentiation, exploration, and eventually for meaning” (Eisner, 2002, p. 2). Therefore, the sensory system pursues meaning making.

Yet this process is not automatic. According to Eisner, “the sensory system does not work alone; it requires for its development the tools of culture: language, the arts, science, values, and the like” (2002, p. 2). Therefore, something makes sensory organs work to interact with the outside world. The interaction itself can be said to be “aesthetic” because the term aesthetic means “sensory perception,” as discussed in the literature review. Thus, aesthetic education refers to the effort to help students perceive the world through their sensory organs. Enabling the sensory system to work is related to aesthetic education, whether we use tools as art, language, or the like in order to promote sensory perception.

Meanwhile, Greene’s (2002) definition of aesthetic education, which is related to making students conscious, is connected with the original meaning of aesthetics: how to make the sensory system work and how to help students perceive the world. In order to make meanings, we need to direct our consciousness toward the world. Therefore, aesthetic education is related to enabling students to be conscious about the world as well as understanding how they perceive the world.
How we make things with which we interact in the world meaningful depends on aesthetic education. To be conscious means to think about what we are doing and pay attention to what we are doing. Thinking is also related to the meaning-making process. Aesthetic education enables students to think and realize what they are doing.

In this study, Ms. Valenza is interested in how to make students increasingly conscious. Related to consciousness, one of the main focuses of Ms. Valenza’s classes is to enable the students to think about what they are doing and to make students care about their thought process, rather than to work on their art work without thinking. By doing so, Ms. Valenza pursues aesthetic education, which means to make the students be conscious about the world.

Aesthetic education enables students to be conscious about engaging in experiences which then can become an experience, of the kind that Dewey (1935) emphasized in Art as experience. When we have an experience, we come to be fully conscious. When we have an experience, we experience something about which we were not conscious before or that we ignored before. Aesthetic education that enables students to be conscious further relates to intentional work. Greene defines education as an “intentional undertaking”; education is “a process of enabling persons to become different, to enter the multiple provinces of meaning that create perspectives on the works” (2001, p. 5). Thus, for Greene,

“Aesthetic education,” then, is an intentional undertaking designed to nurture appreciative, reflective, cultural, participatory engagements with the arts by enabling learners to notice what is there to be noticed, and to lend works of art their lives in such a way that they can achieve them as variously meaningful. (2001, p. 6)
In other words, understanding how we make students conscious is important in aesthetic education.

Ms. Valenza believes that being conscious does not happen automatically. She designs curriculum, creates classroom settings, and prepares resources intentionally in order to enable students to be awakened in her class. She thinks that all of these efforts impact students in her class. When students get together on the carpet or at the table in her class, students gain new perspectives from their classmates during discussion, ones that they did not know before. Ms. Valenza said, “Each class I make students get together on the rug and speak about their ideas.” By doing so, Ms. Valenza intends to make students to be conscious and form new perspectives with the help of classmates. For example, she tries to provide as many chances as she can for students to see the world differently and with new eyes. Such an “intentional undertaking” for critical thinking and consciousness can be called aesthetic education.

As one of the educationalists promoting students’ consciousness, Freire (2000) emphasized problem-posing education that enables student to think and be conscious by asking “‘why’ of the object or the content” (Freire, 2004, p. 68). In problem-posing education, students are not just listeners. Teachers work in collaboration with students in the learning process. The content of education focuses on questions from students, which do not reflect content saved forever, but information to return to students to enable them to answer their own questions. Therefore, Freire states, “It is impossible to make education both a political practice…fully, without the content stimulus of these
questions, or without our constantly answering them” (2004, p. 117). Freire emphasized asking questions so that students can think about what they are doing rather than accept the knowledge thoughtlessly.

Freire’s problem-posing education is related to aesthetic education. In *Aesthetics and Education* by Parsons and Blocker (1993), the authors state, “we prefer to think of aesthetics as thinking hard about some of questions that occur to us in our interactions with art. The topics of aesthetics arise naturally in the course of making, enjoying and discussing art” (p. 2). Thus, we can approach aesthetic education by raising questions that do not refer to content of philosophy, but rather the way in which we think about the world where we live. Parsons and Blocker also emphasize dialogue in aesthetic education because “much of aesthetics is [a] reflection on what people say about art, rather than on artworks themselves” (p. 20). As such, aesthetic education shares commonalities with Freirean problem-posing education.

Indeed, Freire’s ideas of problem-posing education and Parson and Blocker’s ideas focus on making students conscious by asking questions and engaging in dialogue. In other words, they highlight the way to become conscious. Freire (2000) stated that, in banking education, the teacher puts knowledge into students’ heads forcefully:

[There is] the assumption of a dichotomy between human beings and the world: A person is merely *in* the world, not *with* the world or the others… In this view, the person is not a conscious being (*corpo consciente*); he or she is rather the possessor of a consciousness: an empty “mind” passively open to the reception of deposits of reality from the world outside. (p. 75)

Furthermore, “It follows logically from the banking notion of consciousness that the
educator’s role is to regulate the way the world ‘enters into’ the students’” (Freire, 2000, p. 76). Therefore, putting consciousness into students is different from helping students to become conscious.

Ms. Valenza tries to make students see things in a more sophisticated way, asking questions about what they see and how they understand what art is. She believes that there are a lot of questions that students have about their own work, depending on the piece and what is being asked of them. As one of her goals in her class, she wants to enable students to use critical thinking and make them ask why. A lot of the time, she asks students, “What does it mean?” or “Why did you make that choice?” When she does not understand something, she asks for an explanation. However, she is always careful to use specific language with respect. She does not ask students forcefully about what it was, or what they are doing, or why. Ms. Valenza inspired students to ask a lot of questions by themselves based on their activities.

Based on the discussion thus far, asking questions and engaging in dialogue are important components of aesthetic education in order to make students think and be conscious. Here, we need to return to my childhood experience in the citywide art contest that I described in the introduction. When the contest director asked me, “Why do you express grass in such a way?” I became conscious about what I was doing when drawing the grass. Although it was a very short dialogue with the director, it made me think about what I was doing. The director was a significant actor who saw and spoke to me about my uniqueness, thereby making me confirm who I was.

Then how are consciousness, thought, and meaning making in aesthetic
education related to the public/in-between space? Why is the public/in-between space important in aesthetic education? Being conscious can occur to each of us when we encounter artwork or notice something that grabs our attention. Here, I want to focus on the public/in-between space as they play a significant role in being conscious in aesthetic education.

As previously discussed, asking questions and engaging in dialogue enable students to be conscious and make them think. Thus, aesthetic education requires that significant others talk and ask questions. One thing we need to note here is where the dialogue occurs. Dialogue can be created between the teacher and student in a one-on-one manner or in front of the class, between the student and another student, or among students.

The loss of the public space in which everybody can be seen and heard can lead to significant problems. In the private realm, no significant others can listen to an individual’s thoughts or opinions. Arendt (1958) defined this deprivation of others as being private, as discussed in the literature review. The loss of the public/in-between space means the loss of significant others who see and tell of one’s uniqueness and differences. In other words, it means that the loss of the public place eliminates the consideration of diversity. According to Arendt (1973), totalitarianism stems from a loss of the public space. When Nazis oppressed the Jews under Hitler’s control, the intellectuals in Germany did not have a public space in which to reveal their thoughts freely.

The loss of the public space leads people to remain trapped within their own
ideas, prejudices, biases, and even ideology and dogma because they are excluded from diverse perspectives and have lost the spectators who see, remember, evaluate, and judge by talking to each other. When students share their ideas and talk to one another in the carpet meeting in Ms. Valenza’s class, they go beyond the limitations of their own experiences by getting more ideas and perspectives from others. As discussed in the previous chapter, some students (e.g. student A or student MC) got ideas from their classmates during discussion at the table with their art work. Before talking with each other, they did not know about these ideas. Therefore, in the public/in-between space in aesthetic education, students become conscious through interactions with others who have diverse perspectives, thereby enabling them to break through their boundaries.

When I think about my teaching experience described in the introduction, my students did not have a public/in-between space in which they could talk to others and reveal their ideas. The copy itself was not bad or wrong. It was the problem that students did not think about what they were doing and there was no space in which to identify their uniqueness. They sacrificed their ideas to follow and copy some skillful ways without thinking. Wilson and Wilson (2009) state that famous artists (e.g., Picasso and Beardsley) also copied excellently, but they did not only copy expressions; rather, they extended their own approaches. Children can do the same. “The child only remains fixed on a single image or on a single way to draw... if he is not presented with other models or encouraged to seek out other ways to draw” (Wilson & Wilson, 2009, p. 70). Therefore it is important that copying itself not be perceived as bad, but rather the problem is that students do not have the space in which they can reveal their thoughts
and consider others’ perspectives.

Therefore, aesthetic education as the public/in-between space is important for enabling students to be conscious. In these spaces, students reveal their uniqueness and go beyond their limitations by talking with others and revealing themselves, their ideas, and their work. They throw light on themselves and others. Thus, aesthetic education enables students to live a meaningful life by engaging in the meaning-making process through the act of being conscious.

**Human Time and Meaning Making in the Public/In-between Space of Aesthetic Education**

Human time is related to aesthetic education as the public/in-between space as well as the living of a meaningful life. Time is related to the individual dimension as well as the dimension of interaction with others.

Humans live between the past and the future. The concept of time is linear—the past, the present, and the future—and exists as a meta-position. If we can see time outside of the human life and objectively, we may consider the past, the present, and the future. However, we humans live in the present, where the past and the future also simultaneously exist. We think about the past and the future in the present. By thinking about the past and the future, we move back and forth in the present. Therefore, humans live in the present but at the same time live in both the past and the future (in the present).

Although we are in the present, as discussed in the literature review, the present
exists as a gap between the past and the future that struggles between them, moving back and forth. In other words, the present as a gap moves between the past and the future, but the gap is not yet the present.

When students make artwork in Ms. Valenza’s class, they move back and forth continuously. They hope that their artwork becomes something good in the future. Meanwhile, students remember what they did with their artwork in the past; they think about what they need to change to make it better by reflecting and comparing their current artwork with their previous work. In this case, their artwork projects into the past. Therefore, students create their artwork newly between the future with hope and the past with memory. If there is no hope for the future, the present cannot be promised; without reflection and memory, the present cannot exist because if the present is the same as the past and if there is nothing to be changed or renewed, it is as if time has stopped. As such, the present never exists if the past is not distinguished from the present.

Dewey (1935) stated that, “It[life] is a thing of histories, each with its own plot…each with its own unrepeated quality pervading it throughout” (p. 37). It is natural that the past infuses the present, but the present does not exist until humans interact with the past. When we aesthetically experience an experience, we experience it differently every day even though we see the same things. Therefore, Dewey (1935) distinguishes the experience that the empirical philosophers speak of from an experience that “stands out as an enduring memorial” of what the experience was (p. 37). In other words, an experience in the past can be alive in the present and considered as an experience in the
present. However, it does not exist in the same manner as the experience in the past.

Gadamer explained the meaning of the present through the simultaneous fusion of the horizon and effective history:

[A]esthetic consciousness has the character of simultaneity, because it claims that it contains everything of artistic value. The form of reflection in which moves, as aesthetic, is therefore not only contemporaneous. For inasmuch as aesthetic consciousness raises everything that it admits to simultaneity in itself, it constitutes itself as historical at the same time. Not only that it includes historical knowledge and uses it as a distinguishing mark. (1975, p. 77)

For Gadamer, interpreting artwork created in the past means revealing what that artwork is saying in the present, not revealing the meaning of the artwork in the past when it was created because, no matter what effort we make to restore the meaning of the artwork in the past when it was created, we could not perfectly restore it as it was at that time.

Gadamer clarified the characteristics of interpretations in the present with simultaneity by comparing Hegel with Schleiermacher, who defined understanding in restoring the original purpose of artwork. Gadamer stated:

Hegel goes beyond the entire dimension in which Schleiermacher conceived the problem of understanding… Hegel states a definite truth, inasmuch as the essential nature of the historical spirit does not consist in the restoration of the past, but in thoughtful mediation with contemporary life. (1975, p. 150)

Therefore, the past is interpreted newly in the present. In other words, the meaning of artwork in the past exists and is revealed in the present not as it was, but through the interaction of the past and the present. Consequently, the past can acquire validity in the present. The two can connect with each other by interacting with each other—the past into the present, the present into the past.
From the characteristic of interpretations in the present with simultaneity in Gadamer (1975), we can understand what “understanding” in aesthetic education means. As discussed in the literature review, when we think about aesthetic education for children related to “understanding”, we are apt to think that it means to make students understand the content of philosophy or aesthetics. However, from Gadamer’s insight of understanding, understanding in aesthetic education means the process of meaning-making in the present which moves into the past and the future. Therefore, in Ms. Valenza’s class, she cares about students’ understanding related to aesthetic education. In other words, she is interested in the meaning making process of her students who move back (into the past) and forth (into future) in the present—what they think about what they did and what they hope their art works will become.

Gadamer (1975) refers to the present connected with the past as “tradition” (p. 267). The present is influenced by the tradition from the past, which according to Gadamer is the history effect. Consciousness of the effect of history helps us realize the fact that we are under the influence of the tradition given to us. Such consciousness enables us to go beyond the limitation of the present because tradition makes us listen to what tradition is saying and prevents us from making an arbitrary decision that depends entirely on hope in the future. Therefore, for Gadamer, pre-knowledge or prejudice from the past is not something that we need to exclude for fair understanding. Traditionally, prejudice is considered the thing that makes our judgment biased. However, for Gadamer, pre-knowledge and prejudice refer to a kind of horizon that has the possibility to be enlarged. Finally, as the present connects the past and the future, the horizon can
be enlarged by fusion and the present truly exists.

As such, the past as tradition influences us while the future is simultaneously informed that all humans’ try for the future but cannot succeed as humans plan in advance. Gadamer stated the uncertainty of the future through tragedy. If we can know everything that will happen in advance and prepare everything for the future, we would never experience tragedy. “What a man has to learn through suffering is not this or that particular thing, but the knowledge of limitations of humanity, of the absoluteness of the barrier that separates him from the divine” (Gadamer, 1975, p. 320). The plan that we make in advance for the future often comes to nothing:

Thus experience is experience of human finitude. The truly experienced man is one who is aware of this, who knows that he is master neither of time nor the future. The experienced man knows the limitedness of all prediction and the uncertainty of all plans. (Gadamer, 1975, p. 320)

In other words, the future is full of the hope that is not yet determined, so the future gives infinite possibilities while simultaneously making humans realize their limitations. The present exists by pulling and pushing the rope between the past and the future.

Such ideas come into play when students make and appreciate artwork. When students appreciate artwork in Ms. Valenza’s class, they move continuously back and forth in order to understand the artwork. They understand what the artwork is saying at that point. When they make artwork, they also move from the past to the future. They consider what they need to change or what they need to do with their artwork based on what they did before with the work as well as their hopes and expectations for their artwork in the future. They understand their artwork by moving between the past and the
future.

When we experience aesthetic experience, the present is the time continuously mixing between and interacting with the past and the future. As such, the present cannot be called the vacuum of the present as the past and the future are together within the present, when the present exists. Gadamer (1975) called the present time the “timelessness” of aesthetic experience (p.108).

However, other ideas about the present have to be considered because all of the previous discussions about the present can occur even when an individual exists alone. In other words, such experiences are within the individual, without others. Arendt (1958) explored the meaning of the present time that is considered with others. As discussed in the literature review, Arendt distinguished the time of nature from human time. The time of nature has characteristics of repetition and indistinction. When we belong to the circle of the necessity for life support, we live in the time of nature. It is the action that enables human to live in the time of humans by escaping from the time of nature.

Arendt (1958) insisted that actors who do not speak are not agents of action, which means that others are required so that the actor can exist. For Arendt, actors in whom plurality is not guaranteed cannot exist because action comes from the plurality of humans; humans reveal their differences and uniqueness through action and speech. Without plurality, action is meaningless and impossible. Therefore, in order to live in the time of humans, between the past and the future, we must have the public/in-between space in which others exist who can see, listen, act, and talk together.

For Arendt (1958), the plurality of humans means the presence of an actor and a
spectator who can see and listen to the actor. Here, for Arendt, it is important that the spectators also act and speak to one another rather than only looking without speaking. Although the actor enables the human time to exist, the spectator enables the human time to last, thereby making the immortality of humanity possible. Thus, the existence and endurance of the present as well as the time of human are possible in the memory of spectators and expectations of the actor. Therefore, human time is possible in the public space, which includes both the spectator and the actor.

The present also needs impartiality to judge rightly without bias some part of the space between the past and the future. In the public/in-between space, people can have impartiality by hearing diverse opinions and thoughts from others. In the public/in-between space, people can have fair perspectives by considering others’ positions while communicating with one another. Indeed, in Ms. Valenza’s classroom, students make artwork and interpret their work by talking to each other. In this way, they escape from their biases by revealing their opinions and seeing diverse perspectives. When students encounter different perspectives from others, they examine their own ideas and go beyond their limitations. For example, student A in her class encountered ideas, such as gorilla from student N, which he did not think of before, and at first he did not understand how it could work in his artwork within his sense. However after talking with student N with his questions about the idea, finally he went beyond his limitation. When students have good ideas, classmates and teachers encourage and compliment them. In other words, others enable the individual to interact with his/her own tradition, which influences the individual at that point and the future actively as well as enlarging
his/her horizon. By doing so, the present can exist to the student. It is the enlarged concept that Gadamer’s (1975) timelessness of the aesthetic experience expands into human time, which is considered by others in Arendt (1958). Human time can last when students remember their accomplishments with one another.

When students engage in an aesthetic experience, they are between the past and the future. Aesthetic education as the public/in-between space in which students perceive and understand the world by interacting with others enables students to live in human time and make meaning by living in the present created through the past and the future.

**Freedom in Aesthetic Education as the Public/In-between Space**

As I discussed in literature review, freedom relates to consciousness and critical thinking. As Marcuse (1978) stated, critical thinking means to refuse injustice and break through fixed reality. Marcuse criticized the underdeveloped capitalist society, in which humans have lost the ability to think critically and pursue effectiveness. Marcuse called such a society one dimensional and the people who live in this society, losing their critical abilities, one-dimensional humans. However, he believed that art’s aesthetic dimension can set humans free from the oppressed situation of the one-dimensional society. Aesthetic imagination makes humans pursue freedom. The aesthetic dimension enables humans to see more, recognize the fact that more exists, and be conscious.

When students make art and appreciate artwork, they encounter this aesthetic dimension. Students go beyond their reality through imagination. Arendt (1958) also
explained freedom as natality, which means humans’ ability to initiate new things. In Ms. Valenza’s class, students experiment with new things and create their work freely. They can start at any time and at any point without being fixed on one rigid point. Students also can select the work of an artist who interests them and decide how to create their own artworks. Ms. Valenza let students research artist that they are drawn to, rather than assign an arbitrary artist for them, allowing them to they love and think about the different art styles, being interpreted in different ways. She believes that it is a way for them to experiment and she wants them to figure out their own style. Students also want to create their work by themselves without interruption. As student Q said, “I don’t want people to do it for me.” They can select what they will do themselves, without anybody’s interruption.

However, this is only true of freedom within the individual. Under liberalism, people insist that we humans are free, independent beings who decide what we want on our own. In this idea, individuals’ responsibility is only what they select. If we do not interrupt others’ freedom, the freedom that we enjoy does not matter. Taking this idea to the extreme, when students make artwork in class, if they do not interrupt others’ activities, it does not matter. They do not need to be concerned about what their classmates are making or hear ideas and thoughts from their classmates. The same is true when students appreciate artwork. Only if students do not violate others’ freedoms can students imagine and think what they want. They do not need to talk with classmates and teachers.

However, if we do not consider freedom with others and the common world that
we share, such freedom can restrict humans. When students imagine freely by themselves while interacting with artwork, they can also become confined within their own worlds and perspectives. Therefore, although students are conscious of the artwork, a kind of bias can also exist. In order to free them from their own bias, students need the public/in-between space in which they can see and hear others’ perspectives.

When people come to the public/in-between space with their own ideas, others can give different perspectives which enable people to escape their bias. In Ms. Valenza’s class, when students bring their ideas to the meetings on the carpet or at the table, teachers and classmates give comments, multiple perspectives, and new ideas. When students encounter new ideas from others, sometimes they refuse them, but sometimes they accept them; before deciding, they consider, think, and judge from multiple aspects. In this way, they have the ability to say no and be conscious not with their arbitrary decision, but by considering others’ ideas. Therefore, the public/in-between space enable students to become free of their provincial point of view. Dewey believed that freedom is related to becoming different, which is related to continuous growth and change (In Greene, 1988, pp. 3-4). However, Dewey also believed that becoming different does not simply mean changing; rather it is related to both choice and action, which occur in the lived common world with others (In Greene, 1988, pp. 3-4).

Greene believes that “thought grows through language” (1988, p. 3). If we humans lose our voices, our ability to think will disappear as well. In other words, if people do not have the freedom to speak, their thoughts will stop growing and will be
confined in some ideas. When humans are confined within a special idea or belief, such an idea is no longer merely an idea, but an ideology or doctrine that dominates and controls their thoughts and even actions. Ultimately, humans lose their power to reject or choose freely. This has led to tragic results historically, such as totalitarianism or Nazism.

In this case, freedom without consideration of others is dangerous. During these historic times, people lost their public spaces in which they could talk together and raise their thoughts freely. In Ms. Valenza’s class, students’ thoughts and ideas grow through communication with others. They talk about their own ideas freely in the classroom, and examine their own ideas continuously without being fixed on their previous thoughts. As a result, their thoughts consciously grow through communication with others in the class. Thus, the public/in-between space provide freedom to speak to each other so that their thoughts are not confined within some ideas and can grow and be conscious—it is aesthetic education.

Returning to my teaching experience, my students did not have the freedom to interact with others to share their ideas and think about others’ perspectives. They did not have a public/in-between space in which to escape from their fixed ideas and hear and see others’ possibilities and ideas. Like the students, I as teacher also did not have the freedom to choose the way to enable students to escape from their biases. I as teacher followed the principal’s word blindly. Although I did not feel comfortable about the fact that I needed to teach students to draw only skillfully in order to excel beyond other students at other schools and I thought that such an approach was not good for students, I did not know what I needed to do or what I could do. I needed something that
made me feel awakened. However, I also did not have any public space in which I could talk about these issues. Later, when I studied philosophy and aesthetics, I realized how to escape this problem. This class, in which I talk with and listen to others, was a kind of public/in-between space for me.

What is the thing that prevented me from such freedom? When I was teacher, I thought that the school system and monolithic curriculum that I had to follow restricted my freedom. However, I did not realize my own ignorance, which needed to be enlightened. I also did not know that I alone could not make such enlightenment occur, but rather I needed others with whom to talk and who could provide me with multiple perspectives.

When I interviewed Ms. Valenza, she was free to create her own curriculum without interruptions from the principal. She was influenced by the national standard to some degree, but she was not subject to these standards. As discussed in the findings section of this dissertation, the teacher is a very important component in the public/in-between space of aesthetic education because the teacher can design the curriculum and create the classroom setting to allow for the creation of public/in-between space. In addition, during class, the role the teacher plays among students influences the public/in-between space. Therefore, the teacher’s freedom is essential. However, like students, teachers also consider others. Teachers also need to have a public/in-between space in which they can share their ideas and hear multiple voices. Ms. Valenza usually discussed ideas with Ms. Gardner and with a music teacher. When she taught a combined 1st and 3rd grade class, she talked with the teachers of those grades. She has professional
conferences she can attend, sharing and hearing diverse voices, which is important. She also learns from students. After finishing school each day, she examines her class and reflects on class activities before leaving. She applies her experience with students in the class and based on her experience she develops new curriculums for her art class, which are always changing. The public/in-between space make teachers and students free with others, not just themselves.

One more idea should be considered in regard to freedom with others. When we think about freedom without others, there is no way to consider our community. Sandel (2009) speaks about this as it relates to moral individualism:

The doctrine of moral individualism does not assume the people are selfish. It is rather a claim about what it means to be free. For the moral individualist, to be free is to be subject only to obligations I voluntarily incur…The notion that my responsibilities are limited to the ones I take upon myself is a liberating one. It assumes that we are, as moral agents, choosing our ends for ourselves…[T]he free choice of each individual is the source of the only moral obligations that constrain us. You can see how this vision of freedom leaves little room for collective responsibility. (p. 213, emphasis added)

Here, “how this vision of freedom leaves little room for collective responsibility” relates to freedom that considers others in the community. In other words, when we think about freedom, we can consider the freedom of the individual in connection to the community to which he or she belongs, resulting in the creation and growth of community consciousness. Thus, aesthetic education can be connected to social justice. As Sandel (2009) insists,

A just society can’t be achieved simply by maximizing utility or by securing freedom of choice. To achieve a just society we have to reason together about the meaning of the good life, and to create a public culture
hospitable to the disagreements that will inevitable arise. (p. 261)

This attitude of being “hospitable to the disagreements” can be created in the public/in-between pace when people talk to each other.

The “hospitality to the disagreement” does not refer to the attitude to follow disagreement blindly; rather, it is the attitude that people do not reject disagreement unconditionally, but instead consider it sincerely and are ready to accept it willingly.

When I asked students in Ms. Valenza’s class about how they felt and what they did when their classmates disagreed with their ideas or opinions, they indicated that they were fine and thought about why their peers disagreed, examining their own ideas while comparing them to their classmates’ ideas. They were familiar with disagreement and knew what they would do when they encountered disagreement.

This suggested that the attitude has grown for a long time from the class meetings. I asked Ms. Valenza how the students know what to do when they encounter different perspectives and how they deal with these conflicts in ways that respect peer’s ideas, examine their own ideas, compare with each others’ thoughts before accepting or rejecting it. She told me that it has taken a long time for their attitude to grow. Since she has taught from pre-school age to sixth graders for eight years, students could learn how they would do with different ideas from others for several years. As Sandel emphasized,

If a just society requires a strong sense of community, it must find a way to cultivate in citizens a concern for the whole, a dedication to the common good. It can’t be indifferent to the attitude and dispositions, the “habits of the heart,” that citizens bring to public life. (pp.263-265)

Therefore, the attitude that allows students to become accepting of others’ ideas—
disagreements or new ideas—need to be raised in education, which is related to social justice.

Aesthetic education as the public/in-between space can nurture this attitude. The permissive atmosphere that allows students to share discordant ideas, classroom settings that become more close-knit by talking to one another, curriculum design, teachers’ attitude in encouraging students, and similar factors relate to the freedom of the public/in-between space, contributing to raising students as citizens in a democratic society as it relates to social justice. Therefore, aesthetic education as the public/in-between space is related to freedom from two aspects: freedom in the individual dimension and freedom with others. The freedom that enables us to see more and break though routines by making and appreciating artwork belongs to individual freedom while the freedom that enables us to escape our own ideas and biases—including ideas from art-making or appreciation individually and with others—belongs to the freedom with others. Therefore, aesthetic education as the public/in-between space emphasizes the freedom with others, escaping the freedom that beings only to individual. When we consider others, the freedom in the individual dimension is expanded to include the freedom that needs others. It also enlarges to freedom related to social justice by making students consider freedom in the community to which they belong.

Finally, aesthetic education as the public/in-between space affects ethical areas. Freire indicated ethical issues related to humans as unfinishedness: “[Our] awareness of our unfinishedness makes us responsible beings, hence the notion of our presence in the world as ethical” (1998, p. 56). Freire stated that we humans can recognize the fact of
unfinishedness “among us women and men” (p. 56). Therefore, the freedom issue in aesthetic education as the public/in-between space can reach social justice and ethics by enabling students to consider the community and realize their responsibility in the community in terms of their unfinishedness with others.

**Self and Others**

In the public/in-between space, humans appear as who they are, not what they are. Arendt (1958) argues:

The problem of human nature, the Augustinian *quaestio mihi gactus sum* (“a question have I become for myself”), seems unanswerable in both its individual psychological sense. It is highly unlikely that we, who can know, determine, and define the natural essences of all things surrounding us, which we are not, should ever be able to do the same for ourselves—this would be like jumping over our own shadows. (p. 10)

Therefore, humans cannot know what they are as *whatness* is the nature/essence of humans. No one knows our human nature except God, who created humans’ *whatness*. However, unlike *whatness*, in the case of *whoness*, who we are can be informed through others. Arendt (1958) distinguished between “*whatness*” and “*whoness*.” No one can know his or her *whoness* by him- or herself. According to Arendt (1958),

> [T]he disclosure of “who” in contradistinction to “what” somebody is—his qualities, gifts, talents, and short comings, which he may display or hide—is implicit in everything somebody says and does. … “who,” which appears so clearly and unmistakably to others, remains hidden from the person himself, like the diamond in Greek religion which accompanies each man throughout his life, looking over his shoulder from behind and thus visible only to those he encounters. (pp. 179-180)

Just as no one can see his/her own face directly (without the aid of some other device),
no one can recognize who they are without the help of others. According to Greene, “when people get together as who they are and not what they are, an ‘in-between’ opens between them. There are worldly relationships and over that there is the delicate web of human relationships” (in Weiss, Candy & Slater, 1998, p. 23). Thus, whoness can be revealed by individuals’ appearance in the public/in-between space. In the public/in-between space, others are significant beings who enable the individual to know who he/she is. Therefore, no one can truly know who they are in isolation.

“The presence of others who see what we see and hear what we hear assures us of the reality of the world and ourselves” (Arendt, 1958, p. 50). Others make the individual confirm his/her reality—both the physical reality and the personality. As the personality informs through speech and action, whoness is revealed through what individuals say and do in the public/in-between space, where others can see each other’s whoness.

In addition, in these spaces, the self is not a fixed notion, but what humans can become through construction and creation. Greene (1988) clarifies this notion of whoness by relating it to Dewey’s ideas of the human self:

It is actually, in the process of effecting transformations that the human self is created and re-created. Dewey…did not believe that the self was ready-made or pre-existent; it was he said “something in continuous formation through choice of action” (1961, p. 408)…As Sartre saw it, human beings create themselves by going beyond what exist, by trying to bring something into being. (Greene, 1988, p. 22)

When we think about the notion of whoness in the in-between space, we see that it is also related to Dewey’s notion of transaction. In particular, “For Dewey, selves interact
with others in ways that both are changed as a result, thus their relationship is more accurately described as ‘transaction’” (Thayer-Bacon, 2008, p. 263). Therefore, the public/in-between space are places in which humans continuously grow and are challenged through each other’s diverse perspectives in a common world.

When students interact with one another in Ms. Valenza’s class, they encounter challenges from new ideas or disagreements. In such a situation, they expand their thoughts and horizon by seeing the world as sometimes accepting such ideas and new perspectives but sometimes discarding them. The knowledge they have also enlarges the horizon by moving dialectically rather than staying in one point. Therefore, the public/in-between space become places in which the self can grow and change. In this context, not only the self but also the community continuously weave together in order to find ways to create “intersubjective sense” (Greene, 1995, p. 39). The public/in-between space play a role “to throw light on the affair of [humans] by providing appearance in which they can show in deed and word, for better and worse, who they are and what they can do” (Wilson, 2003, p. 219).

Education means growth—“Bildung,” as Rorty (1979/1980) and Gadamer (1975) call it. For Rorty, Bildung means to become a different person; for Gadamer, Bildung is to be formed as a universal human being. Since aesthetic education is one component of education, it is natural that aesthetic education is also related to growth—namely, in the process of learning to create oneself. In this sense, education means forming that is “much more than a question of training a student to be dexterous or competent” (Freire, 1998, p. 22). Aesthetic education as the public/in-between space enables students to
grow continuously, referring to the mutual growth of both students and teachers.

Related to the self in the community, Sandel (2009) explored the existential way of self by citing MacIntyre’s storytelling beings. “Macintyre advanced a narrative conception. Human beings are storytelling beings. We live our lives as narrative quests. I can only answer the question ‘What am I to do?’ if I can answer the prior question ‘Of what story or stories do I find myself a part?’” (p. 221) In other words, whoness should be determined based on the context of the community to which one belongs.

From the perspective of individualism, “I am what I myself choose to be”; however, “it wrongly assumes that ‘the self is detachable from its social and historical roles and statuses’” (Sandal, 2009, pp. 222-223). Therefore, “the story of my life is always embedded in the story of those communities from which I derive my identity. I am born with a past; and to try to cut myself off from that past, in the individualist mode, is to deform my present relationship” (Sandel, 2009, p. 223). MacIntyre’s ideas of the self as a storytelling being enables us to think about our responsibility and live more closely in the community to which we belong. Such recognition occurs in the public/in-between space, where students talk with one another. Therefore others who are in the community with the self help the self know who he/she is in the community.

Ultimately, aesthetic education as the public/in-between space enables the self to grow continuously in the making process. The self can reveal who he or she is through words and actions. However, aesthetic education in the public/in-between space is not limited in guaranteeing whoness in the plurality of humans by which an individual’s difference and uniqueness are considered. It enlarges whoness, which can thus reveal the
self by considering others in the community in which they live together.

**Economic Issues**

When economic interest comes into the public space, the nature of the public space changes into a social space in which the plurality of humanity can no longer be guaranteed. This section examines how economic issues influence the public space of aesthetic education based on my teaching experience and existing research.

Students were once—and are still—considered to be human capital for the development of a country. The idea of developing human capital was incorporated under the name of “equal opportunity.”

In the twentieth century, one of the dominant themes in education was equality of opportunity. The differentiated curricular...were to provide equal opportunity from the perspective of improving human capital...[E]quality of opportunity was considered good for society because it increased industrial efficiency by matching individual talents to specific occupational requirements. ...Second, equality of opportunity was considered good for the individual because it allowed person to find the best place in the economic system in which to develop personal interests and abilities. (Spring, 2008, p. 290)

The term *equal opportunity* suggests giving opportunities to students in order to develop their talent freely and to guarantee diversity and differences of students. However, it in fact does not mean that. Equal opportunity refers to giving students an equal chance to get a job for economic success in order to ensure the economic success of the country. Thus, it means schools take on the role of marketplace. As such, how can the different talents of students be considered?

A major argument for making the provision for equality of opportunity a
function of the school instead of the marketplace was that the marketplace was unfair because of the influence exerted by wealth and family background. It was believed that school would be more objective about selecting people for their economic and social place through the use of scientific instruments of selection. Therefore, the science of education, particularly measurement, was considered the key to the efficient use of human resources. Scientific measurement of intelligence, abilities, and interests was to serve as an objective means of providing equality of opportunity. (Spring, 2008, p. 290)

In education, equality of opportunity for economic purposes results in the standardization of education in terms of scientific measurement rather than guaranteeing human differences. Art education is no exception. All of the students’ artwork and activity in art class come to be quantified. The number on the report is more important than students’ ability to express themselves. In this case, students’ differences might be considered an obstacle to achieving a high score as only technical skill is valued. As such, the public space in which diversity and difference can be considered has disappeared.

Returning once again to my teaching experience, when all of my students copied skillful expressions of select excellent students, sacrificing their own expressions in the process, they were influenced by a standard measurement. The public space was not necessary as they did not need reveal their uniqueness. Why would students want to be selected as excellent students? The answer relates to economic issues. Excellent students can get a good job in the future and make money. When economic issues move into the public space, the space in which students reveal whoness with others collapses.

Let’s go back to my childhood experience. When the director told me that “Your personal expression is good” while talking to me at the contest, it enabled me to share
my uniqueness with him and enabled me to realize who I was through my interaction with others (i.e., the director). Through this experience, I realized that art is not only a delightful activity, but also has the power to make humans explore themselves for who they really are. When the director asked me about my expression about drawing grass, he did not measure my expression using a standard measurement. He considered my uniqueness as I am. At that time, realism was fashionable, but I had not learned how to be skillful under such a fashion; it is hard to say that my expression was very skillful. The public space in which I revealed myself and listened to others’ opinion enabled me to survive even though it was very short in duration.

I have one another experience from my childhood and teaching experience related to economic issues. In Korea, each elementary school classroom has a board on the wall to display students’ artwork. When I was an elementary school student and later as an elementary school teacher, the boards were not big enough to display everybody’s artwork. As a result, most teachers displayed excellent students’ artwork. This also directly related to scores. As a student, I was always interested in whether my artwork would be displayed on the board. When it was, I was very proud; when it was not, I became a little depressed and lost confidence. When I became a teacher, I encountered the question of whose artwork to display. Only one third or at best half of the students’ artwork could be displayed at one time. Most teachers displayed only excellent students’ artwork because the board also played a role in evaluating teachers’ ability in the classroom. When parents or the principal came to the classroom, they could use the board to compare classes with one another. Therefore, teachers were afraid that they
would be considered ineffective if they displayed anything other than excellent artwork.

As a teacher, I seriously considered why students’ differences should not be considered. How could I consider every student without ignoring their differences? Is there any way to do so? This issue bothered me until I studied philosophy. It was a complicated issue related to economic issues. There was always a monolithic national standard curriculum connected with students’ scores, which were vital if students wanted to attend a good university and later get a job. Although teachers have little freedom to adjust the curriculum within the national standard, they should still submit students’ scores every semester, which were used to evaluate teachers’ ability to teach. The classroom board may play a role as a kind of public space where students’ differences are revealed; however, instead, it was a social space that ignored students’ differences in order to measure students according to a standard measurement. Thus, the public/in-between space can only disappear when economic issues become the ultimate purpose of education.

For this study, when I visited Ms. Valenza’s class, I wondered about how she dealt with this issue because it does not seem that American Schools are an exception. As discussed in the previous chapter, economic issues are not the purpose of Ms. Valenza’s class. She believes and considers students’ differences and uniqueness are valuable rather than quantifies their works with measurements. She does not grade each student’s artworks with scores like “who is excellent and who is poor.” However, it is not always possible. She told me that when she taught at another school before Kingsley Montessori School, she was forced to measure students’ score or to meet national
standards. So, under such school systems, she was not free to make her curriculum which considers students’ differences and respect their uniqueness. Like this, economic issues prevent creating public/in-between space where students’ differences are respected, considered and revealed.

Therefore, it is important to consider how the school curriculum deals with economic issues. The economy is truly important because it is the fundamental component of survival in the modern age. Consequently, items considered for economic development become more significant. Therefore, economic issues should be examined more in regard to the public/in-between space as well as well-being.

**Happiness**

Aesthetic education as a public/in-between space is related to happiness with others. When we think about happiness, we may think happiness is a kind of feeling when we have lots of money, a nice car and house, or good health. All of these are related to material wealth. If happiness depends only on material wealth, the modern natural science development seems to contribute to human happiness because, as Fukuyama (1993) states, “modern natural science establishes a uniform horizon of economic production possibilities [and so] [t]echnology makes possible the limitless accumulation of wealth and thus the satisfaction of an ever-expanding set of human desires” (p. xiv). However, although technology provides convenience and material richness to humans to a certain degree, it is still suspicious that humans become really happy from plenty of material wealth.
Aristotle stated that happiness came from another perspective. According to Arrington (1998), *eudaimonia* (Greek for happiness) is closer in meaning to success. As such, happiness equated to success for Aristotle. According to Arrington (1998), humans who possess eudaimonia live a successful life, where success does not just mean material success, but also success throughout one’s entire life—the ultimate good. Therefore, for Greeks, happiness meant living as perfectly as possible with unique nature with the only objective being the ultimate good. Therefore, Aristotle’s happiness dealt with the well-being and success throughout one’s entire life.

Meanwhile, Arendt’s (1963/1965/2006) happiness refers to public happiness as well as political happiness. It means the happiness that can be accomplished in the public space, where the plurality of humans can be guaranteed in revealing themselves and talking with others. Public happiness can be achieved through public freedom. It is related to freedom which means that people can initiate new things. In other words, people can struggle with being taken for granted and break through routines without being fixed on some point. The public/in-between space are always full with new comers, and new perspectives. Therefore in these spaces, people can continuously initiate something without captivating fixed and narrow perspectives. In Ms. Valenza’s class, students were not fixed on their own ideas. By talking with others, they initiated something new.

When Marcuse (1978) stated the importance of critical thinking, he referred also to the public happiness which human beings lost under the one dimensional society. In the underdeveloped capitalist society, people lost political freedom through which they
could think critically, struggle against injustice and break through fixed reality. By doing so, they also lost public happiness which they can achieve through political freedom.

Happiness in the public space is the happiness that people can experience in their relationships with others in the public space. Creating a public space requires public interest, not a private one, in which people are interested and commonly talk about. From this perspective, Arendt’s happiness does not remain individual happiness; rather, it is enlarged to happiness achieved with others. Therefore, the happiness that can be achieved in the public/in-between space enables us to consider others beyond the individual.

Aesthetic education in the public/in-between space is related to public happiness. Although it is hard to conclude that issues students bring to the public/in-between space in the classroom are always public issues, it can be said that they are public issues because the topic dealt with in the classroom are not individual interests or issues. Although common topics are given to students and temporally created in the classroom (i.e., the community of children in the art class), the topic can defined as a public issue. For example, in the case of the media literacy class in Ms Valenza’s art class, the issues of media literacy are public issues as mass media influence both children’s and adults’ lives; this issue is not dealt with in the private. When students have a common theme, they get together in the public/in-between space to discuss this theme, reveal their ideas, and listen to others’ thoughts.

Happiness in the public/in-between space refers to the happiness people feel when they are with others. In other words, without others, people cannot experience
public happiness. Therefore, happiness in the public/in-between space makes us notice the importance of others’ existence.

   Charles Taylor (1991) indicated that one of three malaises that exist in modern society is individualism.

   People lost the broader vision because they focused on their individual lives… [T]he dark side of individualism is a centering on the self, which both flattens and narrows our lives, makes them poorer in meaning, and less concerned with others or society. (p. 4)

   Therefore individualism as a malaise in modern society tells us the problems that occur from the absence of others. A highly technological society provides material richness to humans, whereas in the mental richness, it brings poverty to humans. People are so focused only on individual freedom and happiness without others that they lose the common ground and feel solitude in the absence of others. Aesthetic education in the public/in-between space enables students to live with others and experience happiness that exists with others. However, I do not think that the individual dimension of happiness is unimportant; rather, happiness in the public space is simply necessary for humans. Thus, happiness with others should also be considered. The issue of how different people can be happy is an issue of public happiness.

   When we think about aesthetic education as individuals’ free play of the imagination and satisfaction in encountering and making artwork, it suggests only individual happiness; however, when we think about aesthetic education as the public/in-between space in which students can reveal themselves and talk with others, happiness with others can be prepared.
Chapter 6
CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Conclusions

Given the questions that I have encountered as a student, and art educator, and a teacher, I have considered aesthetic education and for the time being concluded that aesthetic education for children is necessary to ensure happiness. Aesthetic education can be achieved in the public/in-between space, where others’ uniqueness and differences are revealed through interactions involving speech and action. For happiness, aesthetic education can play a role in the public/in-between space in that it enables students to reveal their differences and talk with one another. To explore the essential structure of aesthetic education as a public/in-between space, I researched Ms. Valenza’s class using a hermeneutic phenomenological case study method. In this final chapter, I summarize each chapter and describe what I have discovered about the essential structure of aesthetic education as the public/in-between space.

Chapter 1 described the background, significance, and purpose of this study. Some issues and questions that have plagued me since my undergraduate studies, in which I prepared to become an elementary school teacher, and even after becoming an elementary school teacher, led me to pursue this study. The issues and questions relate to how art education contributes to humans. The temporal answer is happiness, which
relates to political human characteristics in the public space—namely, how we humans can harmoniously live with others who are different (e.g., with different opinions and perspectives) in a community through speech and action. Thus, the current study sought to define the essential structure of aesthetic education as a public/in-between space in order to contribute to helping students live meaningful lives by thinking critically in a democratic society and visual culture.

Chapter 2 reviewed the literature related to this study carefully. When we think about aesthetic education, many people think it refers to teaching theory or content. From this perspective, aesthetic education has existed only at the college level, with no aesthetic education available for children before DBAE. However, I do not think this is appropriate. Although art educators have not explicitly considered it as aesthetic education, aesthetic education has existed with a different emphasis according to the time and place. Therefore, to explore aesthetic education for children in school formally and informally, I examined aesthetic education from the time that the public school started to the present, according to pre-DBAE, DBAE, and post-DBAE. This approach led me to conclude that aesthetic education is narrowly defined.

In order to clarify the meaning of aesthetic education, I considered the term aesthetic, which means “sensory perception” based on its origin while being conscious of its opposite term—anesthetic [an-aesthetic]—as indicated by Dewey. Thus, the term aesthetic refers to how to perceive the world through sensory perception as well as how to be conscious. From this, I define aesthetic education as enabling students to perceive the world through their sensory perception and being conscious about the world.
In addition to reviewing aesthetic education, the meaning and characteristics of public/in-between space are reviewed in Chapter 2. The public/in-between space exists because humans are diverse and political beings. In the public/in-between space, different people come together, reveal their uniqueness, and talk to one another through speech and action. Therefore, the public/in-between space includes multiple voices and various perspectives. From the plurality, we humans can encounter conflict. It is natural that conflicts occur between people because we are not the same. As political beings, humans can solve problems that arise between us through words and actions rather than violence. Happiness in these spaces is called public happiness.

Chapter 3 explored the methodology for this study. In order to explore the essential structure and the important role of aesthetic education as a public/in-between space in which children can achieve happiness and reveal identity, I conducted research based on a hermeneutic phenomenological case study of Ms. Valenza’s art class at Kingsley Montessori School in Boston. Phenomenological study reveals the structure or the essence of the world in which we live to study the phenomena of our lived world. Therefore, the research on Ms. Valenza’s class as “events themselves or things themselves” which we need to go back, rather than “place [the] individual in [an] experimental situation” (Husserl, 1911/80, p. 116; van Manen, 1997, p. 24, 31). Therefore Ms. Valenza’s class is where aesthetic education actually occurs in the classroom. My study was designed to reveal the nature of aesthetic education as a public/in-between space.

In order to explore the research design, Chapter 3 also examined hermeneutic
phenomenological research. I reviewed the meanings of hermeneutic phenomenological research as a human science by comparing it with natural science. I also investigated the characteristics of hermeneutic phenomenological research as well as case study. Along with the review of hermeneutic phenomenological research, I described the procedure I followed in observing and interviewing Ms. Valenza’s class.

Chapter 4 analyzed the data gathered from observations and interviews with students and the teacher. After analyzing the context of the class, teacher, interactions between students and the teacher, and students’ interactions with one another based on the observations, interviews with students and the teacher were analyzed according to significant statements, formulated meanings, and cluster themes. After establishing the cluster themes from the formulated meanings, I presented the description of cluster themes was presented.

Based on the analysis of Chapter 4, Chapter 5 provided the findings and discussion. After presenting the findings, I discussed them in light of the literature review, my prior experiences, and the research of Ms. Valenza’s art class. In doing so, I sought to expand the horizon of and provide insights into aesthetic education.

I discovered ten findings. First, the teacher is a significant being who can create a public/in-between space of aesthetic education from the physical environments to immaterial area such as creating the curriculum, arranging the classroom settings, and preparing resources for students’ use during class. The teacher also adjusts the relationships among students.

Ms. Valenza cares about students’ awareness of their thought process, and critical
thinking confidence. She also considered students’ differences valuable. Her belief is reflected in creating public/in-between space where students reveal their thoughts to one another and are enabled to be conscious of various perspectives during classroom activities. Ms. Valenza’s attitude also influences the public/in-between space. She encouraged student to communicate actively, provided proper response and positive feedback. Thus, the teacher’s values for education, attitude, and actions influence existence of public/in-between space of aesthetic education.

Second, students and teachers are significant to one another in the public/in-between space as they see, listen, remember, judge, and help one another with speaking and action in the public/in-between space. In Ms. Valenza’s class, the teachers and students paid attention to each other’s speech and action. They remember what they did and said. By doing so, the individual does not disappear in the space and their differences can be guaranteed. In addition, teachers and students played a significant role to each other because they can provide them with different perspectives and new ideas. In Ms. Valenza’s class, by actively interacting with one another, teachers and students made it possible for the public/in-between space to exist as well as for students to expand their horizons, free themselves from their narrow perspectives, and break through their boundaries in the public/in-between space. Therefore, students and teachers as significant others impact the public/in-between space.

Third, multiple perspectives exist in the public/in-between space. Multiple perspectives can exist, be considered, and be respected in the public space and in between space. Indeed, because of these multiple perspectives, the public/in-between
space are possible. Differences, uniqueness, and particularities of individuals are respected and considered. Ms. Valenza’s class was full of various voices of students and teachers, which means that individual differences were revealed and respected in this class. In other words, there are public spaces and in-between spaces where differences could be expressed. Every idea from them is considered significant. In her class, students and teachers actively and freely talk with one another. Based on these activities, they changed their ideas and enlarged their boundaries. Multiple perspectives prevented them from being unified and gave them insights into the world.

Four, dialectical movements proceed in the public/in-between space. In Ms. Valenza’s class, when students encountered different ideas from their peers or teachers, they examined their own ideas with each other’s different ideas and then mixed or adjusted their own ideas with them. By doing so, students enlarged and developed their ideas continuously. Thus dialectical movement enables students to grow continuously and to have a positive attitude, which makes the students think about differences and other’s opinions.

Five, ambiguity and uncertainty exist in the public/in-between space. In these spaces, nothing is fixed or determined. When students bring their ideas into Ms. Valenza’s class, their ideas were not fixed but continuously changed by others’ ideas or other resources during classroom activities. Students know that their ideas are not exact answers and that they are changeable things. Uncertainty and ambiguity in the public/in-between space enable students to keep thinking, be conscious, and be open toward endless possibilities as well as start something new freely. These factors are also
important for the public/in-between space.

Six, common topics exist in the public/in-between space. A common topic of interest exists among students and enables students to come together, communicate, and discuss the topic. In Ms. Valenza’s class, the masks which are inspired by artist works are common themes among students. Students talked about their mask based on common themes, even though each of their work is not the same as one another. Thus common topics create the in-between space in which students talk and interact with one another.

Seven, the classroom environment influences interactions in the public/in-between space. The classroom setting such as on the carpet and at the table defined the characteristics of public/in-between space for them. Ms. Valenza’s class, on the carpet meeting, students can be seen by everybody and can be heard by everybody. They talk about general things in front of others there. However, at the table, students talk with the next to them or to whomever at the same table about anything from general topics to specific things. In addition, the atmosphere of the classroom setting influences the public/in-between space. When the classroom is permissive and comfortable, students easily open their ideas and talk to each other freely.

Eight, classroom rules influence interactions in the public/in-between space. Students use certain silent rules to solve problems with speaking and dialogue without using violence (e.g., physical teasing, bullying, ignoring, and blaming). Since the public/in-between space includes multiple perspectives and various voices, opinions, and ideas because of humans’ plurality, it is natural that conflicts among opinions and
ideas exist. Yet students still respected one another and interacted with kind manners. Such silent rules and mutual respect among students as well as between teachers and students create an authentic public/in-between space.

Nine, measurement influences creating in the public/in-between space. Ms. Valenza did not evaluate students’ artwork using a standard measurement. She encouraged students’ differences and considered their unique ideas as values. This enabled students to reveal their own ideas and voices freely. By doing so, multiple perspectives from each student were guaranteed in the meeting. When students are considered to be human capital for the wealth of nation and for the development of the economy, the public/in-between space cannot be created. In order to make the public/in-between space, the classroom should be free from standards and uniform measurements.

Finally, students hope that their accomplishments are remembered and considered as valuable. Such hope was for recognition and sometimes appeared as belief of others. In Ms. Valenza’s class, when students talked about their own artworks, they hoped and believed that most of classmates liked their artwork. This hope led students to confirm their identity and differences while giving them the confidence to reveal themselves in the public and in-between spaces. Moreover, since recognition and agreement influenced students’ identity, these components are important to aesthetic education.

The discussion in Chapter 5 focused on six themes by moving with back and forth with following perspectives: consciousness, thoughtlessness, meaning making and aesthetic education; humans’ time and meaning making in the public/in-between space.
of aesthetic education; freedom in aesthetic education as the public/in-between space; self and others; economic issues; and happiness.

First, I discussed the meaning of aesthetic education more deeply in regard to consciousness, thoughtlessness, meaning making, and aesthetic education. Based on the definition of aesthetic education from its etymological meaning and ideas of Greene, Dewey, Eisner, Parsons and Blocker (i.e., an educational approach that enables students to be conscious and perceive the world through their sensory perception), aesthetic education is related to consciousness, thoughtfulness, and meaning making in the public/in-between space. That is, aesthetic education as the public/in-between space is important for enabling students to be conscious. In this space, students reveal their uniqueness and go beyond their limitations by talking with others and revealing themselves, their ideas, and their work. They throw a light on themselves and others. Thus, aesthetic education enables students to live a meaningful life by engaging in the meaning-making process and by being conscious.

However, consciousness does not happen automatically. Just as “education” means an “intentional undertaking,” aesthetic education also should be designed intentionally. Since Ms. Valenza knows that fact very well, she designed curriculums, created classroom settings, and prepared resources intentionally in order to enable student to be conscious in her class. Related to consciousness in aesthetic education, asking questions is also significant. Ms. Valenza inspired student to think why about their work and art. By doing so, students can think critically rather than receive knowledge passively.
All of these activities relate to aesthetic education which makes students conscious. When public/in-between space is created intentionally, aesthetic education can play a role in enabling students to be conscious and live their lives meaningfully.

Second, I dealt with time issues—namely, human time and meaning making in the public/in-between space of aesthetic education. Although we live in the present, ironically, we do not always live in the present. When we think about time as the time of nature and the time of human, we are not always in the time of human. The present appears when people interact between the past and the future. The present is possible when people are alone. However, human time cannot be created when people are alone. Others as actors and spectators are required to live in the time of humans. Therefore when people act and talk with people in the public space, the human time is possible. Aesthetic education as the public/in-between space in which students perceive and understand the world by interacting with others in a way that enables students to live in human time and make meaning by living in the present created through the past and the future.

In Ms. Valenza’s class, students move back and forth between the past and the future in the present by hoping that their artwork will become something good from now and remembering what they did with their artwork previously. They consider what they need to change or what they need to do with their artwork based on what they did before and what they expect for their artwork in the future. By doing so, students continuously break through the routine without being fixed on a certain point and they start new things at every moment. By moving between the past and future, the present can exist
and become meaningful.

However, in order to live in human time where people’s differences are revealed through action and speech, the public/in-between space is necessary to people. In Ms. Valenza’s class, students interact with teachers and classmates and talk with them. By doing so, they encourage one another to interact with their own tradition, and enlarge their horizon. Therefore, aesthetic education as the public/in-between space enables students to live in human time and in the present meaningfully.

Third, regarding freedom in aesthetic education as the public/in-between space, freedom stems from the individual dimension as well as freedom with others. The freedom to interact with ourselves (e.g., escaping from routines and enlarging our own understanding by making and appreciating artwork by ourselves) is individual freedom, while the freedom that interacts with others (e.g., going beyond our own ideas and biases, including within ourselves while interacting with others) is freedom with others.

When students create their artworks and appreciate artworks, they can go beyond their reality through their imagination. They could create something, and initiate new things freely. They could make decisions and select things as they want. However such kind of freedom remains within an individual dimension where others do not exist. In such case, students seem like they are free but actually, they might not be because of other’s absences. Even though they could go beyond their limitation by themselves, they could be confined by their own bias and pre-knowledge. Therefore, when they interact with others, they could be free from their limitation by diverse perspectives. Therefore, aesthetic education as the public/in-between space emphasizes the freedom that
considers others, escaping from the freedom that belongs only to the individual.

In Ms. Valenza’s class, students could freely select their materials, colors, and shapes as well as they could plan what they would do with their artwork on their own. However, at the same, they also could be free from their limitation by interacting with one another, and getting new and diverse perspectives from classmates. By doing so, they are free from fixed positions and their bias.

Thus, aesthetic education in the public/in-between space enables the freedom within the individual dimension to enlarge into the freedom with others and further into the freedom related to social justice by making students consider freedom in the community to which they belong, thereby realizing their responsibility in the community. Ultimately, aesthetic education as the public/in-between space reaches the ethical area by realizing their unfinishedness and need for others.

Fourth, regarding the self and others, I dealt with the issues of the self and the relationship between the self and others from the ontological perspectives. The public/in-between space plays a role as a place in which an individual can understand who he/she is. However, who he/she is informed not by him-/herself, but by others. Others are significant beings who see, recognize, remember, and talk with the individual, thereby giving existential reality to the individual self as well as making the self confirm one’s personality. Therefore, the public/in-between space plays a role in enabling us to know who we are because others can be in these spaces. In the relationship between others and the self, people can grow continuously by providing diverse perspectives and interact mutually in these places. When we consider that education means forming—as
in the process of becoming—the relationship with the self and others is important in aesthetic education.

Meanwhile, in the relationship between the self and others, the self and others can engage in positive competition without intending to use it as an objective or instrument for accomplishing their own purposes. This positive competition is also important factors affecting the public/in-between space. In addition, in this space, the self is considered in the context of the community in terms of storytelling, as in MacIntyre’s work. Thus, the self can be enlarged into whoness, which can be revealed by considering the self with others in the community in which they live together.

Fifth, economic issues are important in the public space because, when economic interest comes into the public space and become the purpose of the space, the public space can no longer exist. When we consider aesthetic education as the public/in-between space, economic issues influence these spaces. Although economy is important for humans’ existence, when human are used as instruments for the purpose of economy, it also creates big problems. When the economic issue comes into the classroom and become the purpose of education, students are measured in order to reach a standard purpose. In this system, individual differences and uniqueness are not important and cannot be considered because students’ individual voices do not have to be revealed. In order to make the public/in-between space, the classroom should free from standards and measurements.

Ms. Valenza considered students’ differences such as different ideas and different artworks. She did not grade students’ artworks or activities as a score in order to make
them excellent people for an economic goal. Economic issues were not the purpose of Ms. Valenza’s class. Because of this fact, the public/in-between space is possible where students’ uniqueness are considered and respected as well as they can reveal their differences freely. However, it does not always happen. Even though teachers do not want to measure students, they are used to being forced to measure students according to the school systems. Therefore, economic issues influence the existence of the public space and the in-between space as well as there are various factors which are related to economic issue’s coming into the classroom and curriculum.

Finally, aesthetic education in the public/in-between space relates to public happiness, which humans can achieve and enjoy when they are with others. Happiness according to Arendt (1958) means public happiness as well as political happiness—namely, happiness that can be accomplished in the public space, where humans’ plurality can be guaranteed by revealing themselves and talking with others. Public happiness can be achieved through public freedom. Human can struggle with routine and initiate new things. To initiate new things does not mean that human create something from nothing but that human see the world newly—even same place or same things—every moment without being fixed on some point. If human begins could not struggle against something, they could not be happy. Such kind of happiness can be achieved in the public/in-between space where humans are provided with new ideas and diverse perspectives.

In Ms. Valenza’s class, students can struggle with their art work and against being taken-for granted. They do not remain fixed on their own ideas or hold rigidly to
self-assertion. They are freely and continuously changing their ideas and initiating new things by talking with classmates. Thus the happiness that can be achieved in the public/in-between space enables us to consider others beyond the individual.

However, I do not think that the happiness in the individual dimension is not important. In terms of public happiness, it seems that happiness in the public space is also necessary for humans. Happiness with others should also be considered. How different people can be happy is an issue of public happiness.

As I have been struggling with my dissertation on aesthetic education for children, I have considered, I think, aesthetic education from an ethical foundation and political perspectives in two aspects. First, I see a kind of answer on the ethical horizon related to the issues that I have pursued since my undergraduate studies: Why do I need to teach art to children? What is the meaning of art for humans? What does it mean to teach art to humans? Does it mean simply teaching skills or theory? Is it even possible to teach art to humans and, if so, how? All of these questions related to ethical issues: How can art education contribute to human beings—more precisely, how can it equate to happiness?

The issue of happiness in this dissertation relates to ethical and political aspects rather than a psychological approach. Happiness can be gleaned from diverse aspects, such as material richness, individual feelings, objective perspectives, and public happiness. Among the diverse dimensions of happiness, I have focused on public happiness, which is related to the issue of political freedom and how to live with others.

Ethical issues arise from the fact that humans need others. This need arises from
the fact that we are unfinished beings. Since humans are not perfect or complete beings, others are required. The ethical issues become how humans can live with others in a beneficial way. Freire (1998) insisted that ethical issues arise from the fact that humans are unfinished. The issues of happiness in which I am interested relate to this ethical area.

It is also related to political freedom. When we human beings are free from the fixed reality and we struggle against being taken-for granted from injustice or ideology, we can say that we are happy in terms of political freedom. It makes us free from their limitation and enables us to think critically about the world without following or accepting reality blindly. It provides new starting points with every moment. From this, human can be a subject who create the world actively and achieve political happiness.

Second, I focused more on aesthetic education than aesthetics itself. In other words, I am interested in education. This interest might come from my background as an elementary teacher. Education deals with humans, not abstract beings. When we think about education, many definitions may come to mind, such as the implantation of knowledge, development of potential, and formation. I prefer to think of education in terms of formation. I think humans are in the process of becoming and not just fixed beings. However, this definition is too broad for education. Greene (2001) defines education as an “intentional undertaking” (p. 5). I think education refers to an intentional undertaking to enable students to grow continuously in order to live happily with others. Happiness cannot exist alone, separated from a life with others. This is related to ethical issues. Therefore, aesthetic education in the public/in-between space
tells us how to live with multiple humans by communicating with one another in the community to which we belong.

I have sought to discuss the meaning of aesthetic education in the role of the public/in-between space in this study. I believe that aesthetic education is not limited to beauty, individual aesthetic taste, or aesthetic theory; it also relates to the issue of how we live in the world with others and how we perceive the world when we interact with it using our sensory perceptions. Here, the world means the world including others. Furthermore, aesthetic education is related to how students can become conscious. In the issues of consciousness, others are included.

Indeed, the scholars in DBAE were not entirely wrong in that they at least recognized and noted the fact that aesthetic education is necessary in art education. Although it is their limitation that they thought aesthetic education existed only under modernism, they accurately believed that aesthetic education is important in art education. However, they considered modernism as a dichotomy between the body and sense, art and everyday life, and did not note the relationship between the others and the self.

Humans can continuously be reborn by going beyond more diverse perspectives when interacting with others. In modern society, humans feel a sense of alienation in the absence of others (i.e., when there is nobody else to see, listen, or talk to). Such an absence refers to the loss of the public/in-between space. Aesthetic education as public/in-between space provides a way in which to enable multiple people to live without losing their differences while simultaneously living in harmony in the
community, by speaking and acting as political beings.

**Suggestions of Further Studies**

1. **Research for developing curriculum of aesthetic education for children**
   
   I think that there is lack of the research for developing curriculums of aesthetic education for children. As I mentioned in this study, aesthetic education has been usually for college level students not for children. Therefore, I think it is needed to develop diverse curriculum of aesthetic education for children.

2. **Research of aesthetic education in diverse culture and care**
   
   This study was conducted at Kinsley Montessori School in United States. Multiple case studies should be conducted and introduced for providing better insight of aesthetic education for children.

3. **Research of Education for pre-teachers and college/university students who will be an art teacher after graduation**

   This study focused on aesthetic education for children in the class which is actually a practical field for teachers. As discussed in this study, the teacher is a significant part in aesthetic education. Thus, the education for pre-teachers is also very important. Therefore the study of how to educate pre-teachers related to aesthetic education should be conducted.
I am in the Public/In-between Space

My entire journey with aesthetic education for children in my dissertation was a process of breaking through my previous knowledge, prejudices, and limitations. It was a whole learning process for me. I could say that this study was also a public/in-between space for me that enabled me to be conscious and to break through the routine way that I might usually think about aesthetic education for children.

As I mentioned in the prologue to this dissertation, the starting point of this study was not from the point of writing the dissertation. My journey in this study includes my previous experiences such as my childhood memory, my teaching experience, and my philosophical background. By moving back and forth through my experience and pre-knowledge, I gained some insight about aesthetic education for children and enlarged my perspective. I have been continuously interacting with literature, my adviser, my dissertation committee members, and all of the things that were related to aesthetic education for children, struggling with things around me. By interacting with them, I revealed my ideas, listened to others’ perspectives, and enlarged my understanding of the scope of aesthetic education for children. I realized that I have been in the public/in-between space. For me, the most beneficial aspect of my dissertation was that I have
experienced aesthetic education in the public/in-between space.

Arriving at the point of finishing my dissertation, I would like to consider the status of aesthetic education for children in both art education and education. In addition, I would like to draw a whole picture of aesthetic education for children as the public/in-between space. Finally, I would like to finish this study with some small suggestions.

**Status of Aesthetic Education for Children**

After researching this study, I am considering the status of aesthetic education. Where would aesthetic education be in art/education? When we think about aesthetic education in art education, what part would be aesthetic education? Or would it be possible to separate aesthetic education from other activities such as art creation, art criticism, and appreciation? When we think about aesthetic education in relation to other subjects, where would aesthetic education be?

First, aesthetic education does not exist separately from all other activities in art education. In other words, aesthetic education occurs in all art activities. When I was an elementary school teacher, I often heard about where aesthetic education could be. For example, when teachers create their lesson plans for an art class, they usually considered where they should put aesthetic education in their lesson plan—at the beginning of the class or at the end of class? At that time, I also sincerely considered where I needed to place aesthetic education in my lesson plan. However, after this research, I realized that aesthetic education does not occur separately in an art class. It occurs during the whole
class during any activity. Even though the teacher intends that aesthetic education occurs at some moment or in some section of the class, it might not occur as he or she planned.

Thus aesthetic education can occur at every moment in an art class. When students create their own artwork, appreciate artwork, talk with the teacher or other students, and prepare their materials, they could encounter something that they might not have thought before or something that makes them confused, curious, and inspired---that’s what makes aesthetic education possible. Therefore, aesthetic education covers the full range of art education.

If so, does aesthetic education exist only within art education? I would say, “No.” Aesthetic education exists in all subjects—mathematics, science, sociology, and beyond the academic area. I think we are likely to think of aesthetic education within art education. However, I would say that aesthetic education is related to all the subjects in our lives, not just within art education.

As I observed Ms. Valenza’s class, I thought that these characteristics of aesthetic education are related not only to art education but also to areas from all academic fields to all aspects of our lives. Dewey (1934) argues that the reason we think about art education and aesthetics separated from our daily life is because “Art [aesthetics] is remitted to a separate realm, where it is cut off from that association with the materials and aims of every other form of human effort, undergoing, and achievement” (Dewey, 1934, p. 2). I entirely agree with Dewey’s ideas that art and the aesthetic should not be separated from our daily lives. It relates to all aspects of our
lived world. Therefore, when we think about aesthetic education for children, we need to consider aesthetic education within the whole scope of “human effort, undergoing, and achievement.”

In addition, aesthetic education for children occurs not only for children but also for the teacher. When we think about aesthetic education for children, we might think that aesthetic education occurs only for children because of the phrase: aesthetic education “for children.” However, aesthetic education for children includes all the efforts and activities that are related to aesthetic education for children. When I observed Ms. Valenza’s class and interviewed her and her students, both students and teachers were engaged in aesthetic education. When Ms. Valenza prepared materials/resources, organized classroom settings, created lesson plans and interacted with students in the classroom, she also was in the public/in-between space of aesthetic education, moving back and forth through her knowledge, experience, and ideas. Therefore, when we think about aesthetic education for children, we need to consider the status of aesthetic education for children from an enlarged scope, from art education to other subjects and all efforts of human beings in their lives.

Aesthetic Education for Children: Collage/Assemblage, and Dissensus

As the very last of part of this study, I would like to draw a whole picture of

---

10 I use the term Dissensus of Rancière (2009, 2010) in order to explain how aesthetic education as the public/in-between space is continuously possible without dropping anchor to consensus.
aesthetic education for children from a bigger view. In terms of aesthetic education for children, I imagine a kind of collage/assemblage as the whole picture. There is an in-between space between individual fragments, which are not the same as one another, even though they are in a common classroom and under a common topic. Garoian and Gaudelius (2008) argue that the “in-between dimension of collage [is] where a critical pedagogy is possible”[check original quote] (p. 4).

Thus, the whole picture of aesthetic education for children as the public/in-between space is like a collage/assemblage where association and dissociation exist at the same time. Even though teachers and students are participating in a common activity, their thoughts and their activities never go completely in the same way or arrive at consensus. “[T]here are only ever individuals plotting their own paths in the forest of the things, acts and signs that confront or surround them” (Ranciére, 2009, p. 16). Thus, students and teachers associate in the same class and simultaneously, keep distance, doing things their own way.

In the in-between space, each individual’s experience does not remain fixed at one point. His/her experience is like a rhizome that links with others’ experience and connects with their areas. Individual fragments continuously change and grow up, moving back and forth, inside and outside. Thus, the collage is always filled with newcomers and new ideas. As a result, there is never consensus—instead there is dissensus and a never ending journey in aesthetic education for children. The public/in-between space keeps aesthetic education alive for children.
An Endless Journey and a Last Suggestion

I am still learning. Even though I have almost arrived at the end of my dissertation at this point, my journey will not be finished. I still have several questions that are unsolved or have consciously emerged. I think I will never arrive at a fixed conclusion or a certain exact answer. Even the term aesthetics might change according to time and place. There is nothing that is eternal.

Rather, the most important thing that I would like to suggest in my dissertation is to keep distance from my ideas and never to arrive at consensus. I think it is impossible for people who read my dissertation to reach an agreement with my ideas on aesthetic education. The very point of this impossibility of consensus, I would say, makes aesthetic education for children possible to everybody who is interested in this task, creating an in-between space where they can continuously be reborn. I hope those who read my dissertation in the future will also be in the public/in-between space where their perspectives on aesthetic education for children can be enlarged.
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Appendix A

INFORMED CONSENT FORM
Dear Teacher:

My name is Min Jung Lee. I am a doctoral candidate in the Art Education Program at the Pennsylvania State University. I come from South Korea and live in University Park in the Pennsylvania. I've been an elementary school teacher for 10 years in South Korea, where I have endeavored to implement art education in elementary school. I believe that aesthetic education could provide a chance for students to think about their lives and their world, to reveal their uniqueness, and to share with others through dialogue. Therefore, aesthetic education could play an important role as a public/in-between space where all of these activities could be possible. By so doing, I also believe that aesthetic education can contribute to meaningful life and happiness to students’ lives as well as help teachers gain insight. For these reasons, I would like to observe the process of your students’ dialogue and activities in art in your classroom and interview your students in regard to their thoughts about the things they take for granted in their ordinary life, how their thoughts about themselves have changed through their dialogue with others, what commonalities they share with others, and what they recognize through this dialogue. Any fifth grade students enrolled Kingsley Montessori School who gives oral assent and parental permission could be included. In addition, the teacher in the class plays a very important role in these activities, so I also would like to interview you about how you interpret students’ dialogue and what you think about their activities in aesthetic education. In order to conduct this study, I would like to request your permission. You must be 18 years of age of older to participate.

If you give your permission to participate in my research project, please read the consent form closely and then sign the form. Even though you consent your participation in this study, you can withdraw yourself from this study at any time.

All of data, information and result from this project will be remained confidential. Only I and my advisor will access to the data. The qualitative research strategies in this study involve no deception. You may ask any specific questions about the procedures, and I will answer these questions to your satisfaction. There are no risks to students’ mental and physical health in this study, beyond those encountered in everyday life.

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me, 207 Art Cottage, University Park, PA 16801, (814) 321-7363, mul195@psu.edu. You may contact the Office for Research Protections, 212 Kern Graduate Building, University Park, PA 16802, (814) 865-1775 for additional information.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Min Jung Lee
TITLE OF PROJECT: AESTHETIC EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN: PUBLIC/IN-BETWEEN SPACE, IDENTITY AND HAPPINESS.

Principal Investigator: Min Jung Lee  
207 Art Cottage  
University Park, PA 16802  
Tell: (814) 865-6750  
Email: mul195@psu.edu

Advisor: Christine Marmé Thompson  
207 Art Cottage  
University Park, PA 16802  
Tell: (814) 865-7311  
Email: cmt15@psu.edu

1. **Purpose of the Study:** The purpose of this study is to investigate the role that aesthetic education could play as a public/in-between space for children to accomplish happiness and reveal their identity by harmonizing their uniqueness and commonalties.
2. **Procedures to be followed:** You will be asked about questions related to Student’ activities including dialogue and discussion, any expression forms such as storytelling and narratives, and your class. The interview with you will be recorded. During the observation of your class, you will be also observed, photographed and recorded in video.

3. **Discomforts and Risks:** There are no risks in participating in this research beyond those experienced in everyday life. Some of the questions are personal and might cause discomfort.

4. **Benefits:** You can have an opportunity to understanding more your students and to enhance your teaching skill as well as may have better knowledge and insight of aesthetic education.

5. **Duration:** The observations will be done during your normal classroom instruction time. There will be 2-4 times interview with you. It will take about 30-40 minutes for interview with you.

6. **Statement of Confidentiality:** Your participation in this research is confidential. The data will be stored and secured at my computer data base in a password protected file. The Pennsylvania State University’s Office for Research Protections, the Institutional Review Board and the Office for Human Research Protections in the Department of Health and Human Services may review records related to this research study. In the event of a publication or presentation resulting from the research, no personally identifiable information will be shared.

7. **Right to Ask Questions:** Please contact Min Jung Lee at (814) 321-7363 with questions, complaints or concerns about this research. You can also call this number if you feel this study has harmed you. If you have any questions, concerns, problems about your rights as a research participant or would like to offer input, please contact The Pennsylvania State University’s Office for Research Protections (ORP) at (814) 865-1775. The ORP cannot answer questions about research procedures. Questions about research procedures can be answered by the research team.

8. **Voluntary Participation:** Your decision to be in this research is voluntary. You can stop at any time. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer. Refusal to take part in or withdrawing from this study will involve no penalty or loss of benefits you would receive otherwise.

9. **Audio-/Video-taping, Digital Photos, Storage, Destruction, Access to others:** (a) Audio-/video taping and digital photos will be stored at my computer data base in a password protected file. (b) Only the investigator and academic advisor will access
to the files. (c) All materials will be destroyed (notes are shredded and video records are removed from the original films) when the data are completed. With your, teachers’ parents’ and students’ permission, the recordings and photographs will be used for research and teaching at the investigator’s discretion and for perpetuity as well as outside of the research for presentation and purpose.

You must be 18 years of age or older to take part in this research study. If you agree to take part in this research study and the information outlined above, please sign your name and indicate the date below.

i. _____ I do not give permission for my recordings to be archived for educational and training purposes. I understand the tapes will be destroyed on the fall, 2013 that is the date after 3 years from the data would be recorded and photographed.

ii. _____ I give permission for my recordings to be archived for use educational and training purposes.

Please print your name, sign and date.

______________________________________________  ______________________
Participant Signature                           Date

______________________________________________  ______________________
Person Obtaining Consent                        Date

You will be given a copy of this consent form for your records.
Dear Parents:

My name is Min Jung Lee. I am a doctoral candidate in the Art Education Program at the Pennsylvania State University. I come from South Korea and live in University Park in the Pennsylvania. I’ve been an elementary school teacher for 10 years in South Korea, where I have endeavored to implement art education in elementary school. I believe that aesthetic education could provide a chance for children to think about their lives and their world, to reveal their uniqueness, and to share with others through dialogue. Therefore, aesthetic education could play an important role as a public/in-between space where all of these activities could be possible. By so doing, I also believe that aesthetic education can contribute to meaningful life and happiness to children’s lives as well as help teachers gain insight. For these reasons, I would like to observe the process of your children’s dialogue and activities in art in classroom and interview your children in regard to their thoughts about the things they take for granted in their ordinary life, how their thoughts about themselves have changed through their dialogue with others, what commonalities they share with others, and what they recognize through this dialogue. In order to conduct this study, I would like to request your permission.

If you give your permission for your child to participate in my research project, please read the consent form closely and then sign the form. Since your child is a minor, parental consent is necessary. If you do not agree this study, I could not contact with your child. Even though you consent your child’s participation in this study, you can withdraw your child from this study at any time.

All of data, information and result from this project will be remained confidential. Only I and my advisor will access to the data. The qualitative research strategies in this study involve no deception. You may ask any specific questions about the procedures, and I will answer these questions to your satisfaction. There are no risks to children’s mental and physical health in this study, beyond those encountered in everyday life.

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me, 207 Art Cottage, University Park, PA 16801, (814) 321-7363, mul195@psu.edu. You may contact the Office for Research Protections, 212 Kern Graduate Building, University Park, PA 16802, (814) 865-1775 for additional information.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Min Jung Lee
INFORMED CONSENT FORM FOR PARENTS

Informed Consent Form for Social Science Research
The Pennsylvania State University

TITLE OF PROJECT: AESTHETIC EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN: PUBLIC/IN-BETWEEN SPACE, IDENTITY AND HAPPINESS.

Principal Investigator: Min Jung Lee
207 Art Cottage
University Park, PA 16802
Tell: (814) 865-6750
Email: mul195@psu.edu

Advisor: Christine Marmé Thompson
207 Art Cottage
University Park, PA 16802
Tell: (814) 865-7311
Email: cmt15@psu.edu

1. Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this study is to investigate the role that aesthetic education could play as a public/in-between space for children to accomplish happiness and reveal their identity by harmonizing their uniqueness and commonalities.
2. **Procedures to be followed:** Your child’s activities, including dialogue and discussion, related to art in classroom will be observed and interviewed about your child in regard of their thoughts about the things they take for granted in her/his ordinary life, how her/his thoughts about her/himself have changed through her/his dialogue with others, what commonalities s/he share with others, and what s/he recognize through this dialogue. The interview you’re your child will be recorded. During the observation of your child’s class, your child will be also observed, photographed and recorded in video.

3. **Discomforts and Risks:** There are no risks in participating in this research beyond those experienced in everyday life. Some of the questions are personal and might cause discomfort.

4. **Benefits:** You can have an opportunity to understanding more your child and may have better knowledge and insight of aesthetic education. Your child has a chance to think about their lived live through creative and critical thinking, which may contribute for them to live more meaningful and happy life.

5. **Duration:** The observations will be done during the normal classroom instruction time. I will interview your child, lasting 20-30 minutes.

6. **Statement of Confidentiality:** Your participation in this research is confidential. The data will be stored and secured at my computer data base in a password protected file. The Pennsylvania State University’s Office for Research Protections, the Institutional Review Board and the Office for Human Research Protections in the Department of Health and Human Services may review records related to this research study. In the event of a publication or presentation resulting from the research, no personally identifiable information will be shared.

7. **Right to Ask Questions:** Please contact Min Jung Lee at (814) 321-7363 with questions, complaints or concerns about this research. You can also call this number if you feel this study has harmed you. If you have any questions, concerns, problems about your rights as a research participant or would like to offer input, please contact The Pennsylvania State University’s Office for Research Protections (ORP) at (814) 865-1775. The ORP cannot answer questions about research procedures. Questions about research procedures can be answered by the research team.

8. **Voluntary Participation:** Your decision to be in this research is voluntary. The participant of your child is voluntary. You and your child can stop at any time. Your child does not have to answer any questions she/she does not want to
answer. You can withdraw your child’s permission for your child to participate at any time. Refusal to take part in or withdrawing from this study will involve no penalty or loss of benefits you and your child would receive otherwise.

10. **Audio-/ Video-taping, Digital Photos, Storage, Destruction, Access to others:**

   (a) Audio-/ videotaping and digital photos will be stored at my computer data base in a password protected file.  
   (b) Only the investigator and academic advisor will access to the files.  
   (c) All materials will be destroyed (notes are shredded and video records are removed from the original films) when the data are completed. With your, teachers’ parents’ and students’ permission, the recordings and photographs will be used for research and teaching at the investigator’s discretion and for perpetuity as well as outside of the research for presentation and purpose.

You must be 18 years of age or older to take part in this research study. If you agree to take part in this research study and the information outlined above, please sign your name and indicate the date below.

   **iii.** _____ I do not give permission for my child’s recordings to be archived for educational and training purposes. I understand the tapes will be destroyed on the fall, 2013 that is the date after 3 years from the data would be recorded and photographed.

   **iv.** _____ I give permission for my child’s recordings to be archived for use educational and training purposes.

Please print your child’s name and your name, sign and date.

__________________________________________________________________________
Child Name

__________________________________________________________________________
Participant Signature                  ______________  Date

__________________________________________________________________________  ______________
Person Obtaining Consent                  Date

You will be given a copy of this consent form for your records.
Appendix B

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Interview Questions for Teachers

1) What particular things do you hope that they will carry away from their time with you?

2) I wonder about the purpose of your class “Artist inspired mask” is?

3) What do you expect to students? What kind of aspects do you expect to student?

4) What is your focus on teaching students art, particularly related to aesthetic education?

5) How can you help students see, hear, and feel more through art, particularly aesthetic education?

6) What do you think is important in interacting with students in your class? Why?

7) How do you make students interact with each other?

8) What do you think about that students’ perspectives influence each other—in their identity or their thinking?

9) How the meeting on the carpet helps students?

10) Some time, some students would not speak out in front of friends or classmates. In this case, what would you do?

11) What do you think about what is difference at group meeting—carpet meeting—and their small group meeting?
Interview Questions for Students

1) Why did you select this artist and artwork in “artist inspired Mask” class?

2) What elements from this artwork inspired you? Why did you choose it?

3) What are some things that you learned through your art class, “artist inspired Mask,” that you did not know before?

4) As you worked on this lesson, what types of questions did you think about? Did you incorporate any experience from your life outside of school?

5) When you draw a picture and appreciate artworks in “artist inspired Mask” class activities, what did you think or what kinds of questions came to your mind? How they were related to your experiences before? Please tell me an example.

6) Which kind aspects in “artist inspired Mask” art class, including artworks, questions or actions from your teacher/classmates made you think about something outside of school or in other classes?

7) Tell me about/Describe how this project made you think of something outside of class?

8) In the “artist inspired Mask” class, have artworks ever made you recognize new ideas or have new perspectives of normal things you see outside of school or in other classes? Please describes specifically, what happens when?

9) Describe your classmates sometimes say or do something with their art that made you change your ideas during a discussion (in the “artist inspired Mask” class). Please describes specifically, what happens when?
10) What do you think about when students in your group talk about something that you have not thought about before?

11) What happens when a classmate introduce a new idea?

12) What do you feel/think when students in your group talk about the similar ideas that you have already thought about? Please describe specifically, what happens when?

13) What do you feel/think when students in your group disagree with that you have thought about? Please describe specifically, what happens when?

14) Describe how you feel or tell me a story about when you have had a disagreement in art class with a student.

15) Could you tell me where a sort of more comfortable talking and also where you think you get the best ideas, on the carpet or at the table talking to your classmates?
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