



Agnieszka Weiner

WSB University, Poland

ORCID 0000-0001-5687-5090

Time - space – relationships – an art school student in the face of the pandemic educational experiment

**Czas - przestrzeń – relacje - uczeń szkoły artystycznej wobec
pandemicznego eksperymentu edukacyjnego**

Abstract: In this article, the author explores a niche but important problem of functioning of the artistic schools during difficult times of social isolation and virtual learning. More specifically, qualitative experiences of students of artistic schools during COVID-19 pandemic were examined and reconstructed. The unusual pandemic *praxis* was described as percolating experiences of a sense of agency and school reality. Such a narrative was inspired by J. Bruner and H. Thierch and the concept of three dimensions: time, space and relations. Considering students as experts in their own experiences allowed the author to build a statistical model which helped to discover factors associated with the sense of agency. The author describes in depth positive factors contributing to the sense of agency. These factors can therefore be used to further improve the education system and the educational experience of students.

Keywords: situation of the student, artistic school, virtual learning, pandemic Covid-19.

Introduction

Humanity's experience of the global COVID-19 pandemic continues to be a source of research and reflection. Many media reports still indulge in extreme emotionalism, e.g., statements such as: „the lockdown is a great psychological experiment for which we will pay” (Van Hoof, 2020) as well

as the theses that „it is not the pandemic that is unreal – the time before the pandemic was fictitious” (Yu, 2020), to more optimistic evaluations including the one by Microsoft CEO S. Nadella (2020), who stated that „we as a civilisation have gone through the two-year path of digitisation in two months”.

In order to interpret contemporary times, one can refer to the theory of the threefold structure of a ritual developed by anthropologists A. van Gennep and Victor Turner, in particular the transitory state in social transformation processes described as liminal (Turner, 2010). The suspension between what was and the new, emerging condition is characterised by a lack of clarity combined with uncertainty and anxiety. Therefore, thinking in terms of trends seems impossible during a crisis affecting all areas of life and the entire world. Therefore, describing liminal states and capturing the most important features of the change process to consolidate the structure of the time of isolation, social distancing and disinformation has to be considered material.

The period of remote learning in art schools where the specificity of education consists of the direct contact between the pedagogue and the young student of music, art or ballet practice can surely be considered such a liminal state. Were it not for an emergency situation necessitated by public health concerns, probably no one would have come up with the idea of teaching art remotely. However, more than 700 schools and teams in art schools with more than 85,000 students started such an experiment in March 2020. This article focuses on the daily reality they experienced during the lockdown.

Everyday school life experience

Man learns about the world and gives it meaning through experience and thanks to it. Despite its obviousness, the concept itself is elusive, ambiguous, and difficult to systematise (see Geertz, 2011; Jay, 2006; Wolska, 2006). H. G. Gadamer (2004, p. 427) describes experience as „one of the least explained concepts we have at our disposal”. J. Rutkowiak (1995, pp. 14-15) places it in the „pulsating categories” that pulsate depending on the context. It is certain that we always experience something and the very word suggests the intentionality of the act (Skarga, 2005, p. 116).

Considering the empirical position, experience is recognised as the perception of sensory feedback and their mental processing leading to concepts or judgments (Wolsza, 1999, p. 19). Hermeneutic, phenomenological and pragmatic approaches are also possible. According to the hermeneutic approach (Dilthey, 2004, p. 92), experience is what was ‘lived’ and the lived experience is a starting point in the analysis of the reality. Man assigns specific

meaning to his experiences which, in turn, influences the interpretation of future experiences (Wysocka, 2003, p. 188). Phenomenology assumes that the daily experience of the lived world is the basis for all actions (Giorgi, 2002, p. 175). The pragmatic perspective considers experience from the perspective of its causative power. Such a creative approach to experience is a novelty compared to earlier points of view. Pragmatists believe that an experience changes man, not leaving him the way he was before (Jay, 2006, p. 386; Koterwas, 2020, p. 17). J. Dewey (2014, p. 32) stresses that experiences determine progress and influences change in the living standard of an individual and of the entire society. Considering the dimensions presented above, one has to assume that experience is not limited to a passive perception of the objective reality, because it is internal and involves awareness and reflection (Koterwas, 2020, p. 20).

Everyday school life is based on experience. It is about knowledge in action, born out of direct relationships and time spent together. Some researchers believe that there is no need to construct a definition of everyday life (Sulima, 2003) because everyday life is mostly practiced. Others make attempts to define it (Sztompka, Bogunia-Borawska, 2008, p. 25), recognising reality as „the most obvious, most real form of existence present in direct experience, emphatically imposing itself on our perception”. For H. Thiersch (Schugurensky, 2014), the orientation of the world of everyday life has four dimensions: time, space, social relationships and cultural interpretations, and the highly fluid late-modern everyday life is something experienced and subjective, with elements of a personal perspective, perception, and emotions (Thiersch, 2000). Everyday school life is not limited to the passive experiencing – it is also about a reacting that Thiersch calls *acting* or „absorbing, adjusting, adapting and changing”. Such a daily action is structured by the elements of time, space and relationships in the temporal progress of the reality. It can be an action with a sense of agency and autonomy when we experience everyday life as a challenge, a problem, and a task that we are willing and able to solve. However, „the loss of the sense of agency, being passively pushed by fate, helpless exposure to foreign actions” can appear as a specific form of exclusion from the active experience of everyday life, especially in extraordinary situations that stimulate acute and distinct emotions (Krzychała and Zamorska, 2008, p. 17-19). The ejection of the school from the orbit of traditions, binding norms, and familiar rituals leads to the „unravelling” of everyday life that shares the fluidity. The experienced multidimensionality becomes too difficult, ambivalent or simply contradictory in terms of commitments (Krzychała, 2010, p. 139).

Framing everyday school life in the triple frame of temporal order, space and relationships (the common approach of the socio-cultural area) will be supplemented by Bruner's concept of education as supporting the development of students¹. As a researcher, I am interested in the student's experience of everyday school life in the context of learning in its broad sense including all its aspects, internal mental processes and social integration processes with the accompanying emotions (Illeris, 2006, p. 164). I assume after Bruner that the way in which a student experiences school determines the type of meanings such a student derives, and that the school is an area where one experiences oneself and the social world (Bruner, 2006, p. 48-61). The daily *praxis* understood in this manner cannot be an ordinary technical venture but rather a complex process of adapting the culture to the needs of its members (Bruner, 2006, pp. 68-69), and the school's activity should, according to Bruner, constitute the interrelated ideas of agency, cooperation and reflection (Bruner, 2006, p. 126).

In my research, experiencing oneself as *an agent*, the feeling that one can initiate and successfully complete school tasks, constitutes an area of the art school students' experiencing of themselves in the period of remote learning due to the COVID-19 pandemic, completing the picture they are building of the school as a social world. The students' storytelling about the school (their construction of narratives) helps them „understand the stories they construct themselves about their own worlds” (Bruner, 2006, p. 140-141).

Research issues

The purpose of the research was to reconstruct the experience of art school students during the Covid-19 pandemic by outlining a picture of everyday life in remote school education. The research was conducted using both the quantitative and the qualitative strategies. This article will only refer to the quantitative studies (diagnostic-dependence studies from the part of the material containing questions with a scale).

The main issue took the following form: what image of an art school during the pandemic has emerged from the daily experience of its students?

Detailed questions refer to the students' self-image: the sense of agency (commitment to school activities, well-being in the course of remote learning) and the students' image of the school (attractiveness of classes, their

¹ Among the many excellent studies carried out in this area in Poland, the following deserves special mention: Studium Teoretyczno-Empiryczne doświadczenia szkolne jeden rocznika reformy edukacji, T. 1 eds. M. Dudzikowa and R. Wawrzyniak-Beszterda, 2010.

adaptation to the students' abilities, the evaluation process, the sense of subjectivity in remote education, the effectiveness of remote artistic education).

The research (an anonymous online survey) was conducted in March-June 2020 and covered students of all types of art schools existing in the Lubelskie Voivodeship (exhaustive study, target sampling). 464 respondents completed the survey, with 59% of them (n = 275) attending schools that combined art education with general education (schools with a general education division, e.g., a general education music school, a secondary school for visual arts) while others (41%, n = 189) were receiving art education in evening schools (art schools in which a student does not fulfil the obligatory schooling obligation). The link to the survey was sent through art school directors after the students' parents consented to research. Results were submitted directly to the researcher (with no mediation by the educational institutions).

The statistical analysis was conducted with the use of basic descriptive statistics (the median, and quartiles 1 and 3). The Mann-Whitney test was applied to compare the selected subpopulations (Wiktorowicz and Grzelak, 2020). Spearman's correlation coefficient rho was applied to evaluate the dependencies between variables. The students' sense of agency was measured with the marker variable. Additionally, logistic regression (Hosmer, Lemeshow and Sturdivant, 2013) was applied for the purpose of the multidimensional evaluation of the relationship between the likelihood of a student having the sense of agency and the perception of the school's operation in the course of remote learning.

Self-image – sense of agency among art school students in the remote learning period

In the students' own opinion, art school student functioning was more difficult during remote education. Firstly, their well-being was worse during remote lessons than in the course of the in-house learning – more than one half of the students shared that opinion (25% answered „always worse” and 33% „sometimes worse”). According to almost every fifth student, remote learning did not change anything and almost one-quarter of them evaluated their well-being in the remote learning conditions as having been better than in the classroom. Secondly, the activity was high during remote classes (according to the students' declarations): only 1.3% of the students reported having never been active while 11% reported having been hardly ever active. Nearly 70% of students declared that they had been highly or very highly active: 36% of them had been active during all classes and 33% during certain

classes. Students of schools with a general education department (O) more often saw no changes in their well-being (as 14% respondents maintained, compared to 27% in other art schools) and slightly less often felt a change for the worse. The share of those who believed that remote learning facilitated their better well-being is similar in both groups. These differences are not statistically material ($p = 0.172$).

Table 1. Functioning of an art school student in remote learning conditions (students' self-image) – in general and by school type

Details		Percentage of answers			Q1		Me		Q3		p
		T	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	
How active are you during remote classes in an art school?	I am never active (1)	1.3	0.0	2.2	3.0	3.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	<0.001**
	I am hardly ever active	11.0	5.8	14.5							
	I don't know/hard to say	19.2	20.1	18.5							
	I am active during certain classes	33.0	23.8	39.3							
	I am active during all the classes (5)	35.6	50.3	25.5							
What is your well-being during remote classes in an art school?	Worse than in the classroom (1)	24.6	20.6	27.3	2.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	4.0	0.172
	Sometimes worse than in the classroom	32.8	30.7	34.2							
	The same as in the classroom	18.8	26.5	13.5							
	Sometimes better than in the classroom	17.2	17.5	17.1							
	Always better than in the classroom (5)	6.7	4.8	8.0							

It is worth noting that a big group (40.1%) gave the highest answer in to least one of these two questions. These persons can be described as having the best student self-image (have a sense of agency). Their share is materially higher for art schools without a general education department (51.3%

compared to 32.4% in the independence test chi-square $p < 0.001$). Only 2.2% of respondents selected the highest rating for both questions. There are no material differences between school types in this respect (in Fisher's exact test $p = 0.099$) even though the share of schools with a general education department is lower within the sample (1.1% compared to 3.7% for evening schools). 16.6% chose one of the two highest ratings to both questions (4 or 5), with an equivalent percentage for both school types (16% for O schools and 17.5% for P schools, $p = 0.704$)².

Students' image of remote art education

Art school students evaluated five dimensions of the schools' operation in the remote education period. The attractiveness of remote classes on artistic subjects is evaluated as rather good – approx. 80% of the students consider it at least moderate, one-third – high, including only 6% who answered *very high*. This evaluation differs materially depending on the school type and is better for evening schools. Even though the median is on the same level, percentages of answers demonstrate that students at schools with the general education department more rarely than others rated arts lessons highly (27% compared to 43%) and more often rated them low (24% to 13%).

Students at schools with the general education department were slightly less sceptical about the remote teaching of general subjects: approx. 30% of them rate them highly and 18% rate them low, but the largest group (52%) answered *moderately*. The adaptation of remote education to the students' capabilities is rates as slightly better in the case of art lessons in exclusively artistic institutions; although the median value is 3 in both groups, the value of the first quartile is lower (3 vs. 2) and the percentage of students who answered *always/often too difficult* is twice as low (20% vs. 41%). These differences are statistically material ($p < 0.001$). Generally speaking, almost every third student chose answers indicative of great difficulties in remote learning and 12% of respondents indicated the easiness of remote learning in an art school; however, slightly more than every other student (52%) is ambivalent about it.

Grading is mostly fair; three-fourths of art school students in the voivodeship say so, with a significantly higher percentage among evening school students than for the rest (82% vs. 65%), and the percentage of those indicating that grades are too low is nearly three times lower in this group (10% vs. 29%). Few students (1.1% or less in the case of O school students)

² These calculations were made using cross tabulation and chi-square tests

indicated that grades are often too high (no *always too high* answer). The evaluation of the possibilities to agree upon/determine grades with teachers is similar in both groups ($p = 0.221$). Quartiles one and three and the median show the same values in both groups (respectively: $Q1 = 2$, $Me = 3$, $Q3 = 4$). In general, about one-third of the respondents (32%) had no such an opportunity (never or usually), 39% had it often or always and 29% had it from time to time. As we can see, these percentages do not differ very much (ratings are not very polarised).

The sense of subjectivity was evaluated on the basis of two questions: *Do you feel respected by art school teachers?* and *Do you have an opportunity to ask questions during the lessons if you fail to understand something?* More than a half of the students responded affirmatively – 53% often or always feel respected by teachers, 85% have an opportunity to ask questions, although this was the case materially more often (in the statistical sense – $p < 0.001$) in P schools (without the general education department) – 78% of them said so (vs. 43% students in O schools) when it came to the former and 88% (vs. 78%) when it came to the latter. Especially when it came to respect from teachers, the percentage of respondents who answered *always* is higher than in other art schools (43% vs. 16%). In turn, negative answers were rare (in both school types): fewer than 1% of the students never found an opportunity to ask questions, 5% found it rarely at best and 3% never felt respected by teachers, with 10% having rarely felt respected. As for the opportunities to ask questions, it is the only functional area of an art school in remote education conditions for which the median of results reaches the maximum figure (5).

While evaluating the effectiveness of remote artistic education in general, art school students can see its downsides. They believe that their remote learning of music/visual arts is less effective than in the classroom – this was the response of 53% students, with students of O schools materially more often answering in this way than students of other art schools (48%, including 22% decisive answers vs. 56%, including 35% decisive answers). Both the median and the first quartile are lower for OSM and LP students than for other schools. These differences are statistically material ($p = 0.020$).

Table 2. Art school image in remote learning conditions by school type

Details		Percentage of answers			Q1		Me		Q3		p
		T	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	
Attractiveness of lessons											
How attractive are remote classes on artistic subjects in your school?	Very unattractive (1)	7.5	4.8	9.5	3.0	2.8	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	<0.001**
	Rather unattractive	12.1	8.5	14.5							
	moderately	43.8	40.7	45.8							
	Rather attractive	27.4	35.4	21.8							
	Very attractive (5)	6.3	7.9	5.1							
	No answer	3.0	2.6	3.3							
How attractive are remote classes on general subjects?	Very unattractive (1)	6.2	x	6.2	x	3.0	x	3.0	x	3.0	x
	Rather unattractive	12.0	x	12.0							
	moderately	52.4	x	52.4							
	Rather attractive	26.2	x	26.2							
	Very attractive (5)	3.3	x	3.3							
	No answer										
Adaptation to students' abilities											
Remote learning in an art school:	Is always too difficult (1)	3.7	2.1	4.7	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	<0.001**
	Is often too difficult	28.7	18.0	36.0							
	Is neither too difficult nor too easy	51.5	57.1	47.6							
	Is rather easy	11.4	13.2	10.2							
	Is always very easy (5)	1.1	2.1	0.4							
	No answer	3.7	7.4	1.1							
Grading											
What do you think about grades during remote classes in an art school?	Grades are always too low (1)	3.4	1.6	4.7	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	<0.001**
	Grades are sometimes too low	17.9	8.5	24.4							
	I believe that grades are fair	72.0	82.0	65.1							
	Grades are often too high (4)	6.7	7.9	5.8							
Can you agree upon/determine your grades with teachers at school?	Never (1)	12.1	14.8	10.2	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	0.221
	Rarely	19.6	18.5	20.4							
	From time to time	29.1	21.7	34.2							
	Rather often	25.4	24.9	25.8							
	Always (5)	13.8	20.1	9.5							
	No answer										
Sense of subjectivity											
Do you feel respected by art school teachers?	Never (1)	3.4	1.1	5.1	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	5.0	4.0	<0.001**
	Rarely	9.5	4.2	13.1							
	Difficult to say	34.1	27.0	38.9							
	Often	25.9	24.9	26.5							
	Always (5)	27.2	42.9	16.4							
Do you have an opportunity to ask questions during the lessons if you fail to understand something?	Never (1)	0.9	1.6	0.4	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	<0.001**
	Rarely	4.3	2.1	5.8							
	Difficult to say	12.7	8.5	15.6							
	Often	22.4	14.8	27.6							
	Always (5)	59.7	73.0	50.5							
	No answer										
General effectiveness of remote education											
You learn music/visual arts remotely:	Much less effectively than in the school (1)	29.7	22.2	34.9	2.0	1.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	0.020*
	Rather less effectively than in the school	23.1	25.4	21.5							
	As effectively as in the classroom	28.4	32.8	25.5							
	Rather more effectively	14.0	13.2	14.5							
	Much more effectively than in the classroom (5)	4.7	6.3	3.6							

Pandemic praxis – a collage of images

Results of the analysis of correlations between individual questions (Table 3) demonstrate that the students' self-image is somewhat linked to the students' image of the school in the remote learning period, although the strength of that relationship is not great – only for an overall assessment of the effectiveness of remote arts education and an assessment of well-being during remote lessons is this effect moderately strong ($\rho = 0.332$).

A similar strong connection was found when it comes to the attractiveness of remote lessons (art and general education). Students who assign a higher rating to the overall effectiveness and attractiveness of remote lessons assign a better rating to their well-being during the lessons. In turn, the activity during remote lessons is likewise strongly connected ($\rho = 0.278$) to the respect from teachers – students who are more active feel more respected, and the students who feel more respected by teachers are more active. In turn, the self-evaluation of the students' functioning in the remote learning period is not materially linked to the grading method (in none of the analysed areas) and the students' well-being evaluation is not linked to the respect felt from teachers. Other issues related to the operation of art schools in the remote learning period are statistically significant albeit weakly correlated with the students' self-image in the remote learning period. That correlation is positive, which means that a better image of the school is associated with a better image of the student. The discussed relationships are of similar strength in both types of art schools, although in some cases the moderate strength of the relationship applies to only one of the school types (Table 3). This is the case for V3 (assessment of the attractiveness of remote lessons in arts subjects) and V10 (general assessment of the effectiveness of the remote artistic education) – for O schools; V3 (see above) and V2 (students' well-being) – for other schools; V5 (adaptation to students' abilities) and V9 (opportunities to ask questions) – for other schools; V7 and V8 (both dimensions of the sense of subjectivity) – for other schools. Therefore, the evaluation of the functioning of the student and the school during remote learning has a stronger relationship in the analysed types of art schools in these cases. It is also worth noting that, for some issues, certain correlation coefficients are negative in art schools other than OSM and LP, although the strength of such relationships is not great (the relationship is not statistically significant).

An evaluation of the functioning of the school is also significantly different for the students with a sense of agency (in both questions on student self-image, they chose one of the highest answers, i.e., 4 or 5). Both the

Table 3. Evaluation of correlations between individual variables according to the art school type

	V1	V2	V3	V5	V6	V7	V8	V9	V10	V1	V2	V3	V4	V5	V6	V7	V8	V9	V10
V1 How active are you during remote classes in an art school?	1.000	0.120	0.274	0.252	0.006	0.111	0.251	0.217	0.234	1.000	0.080	0.185	0.182	0.219	0.036	0.050	0.206	0.133	0.110
V2 What is your well-being during remote classes in an art school?	0.120	1.000	0.326	0.184	-0.037	0.139	0.009	0.229	0.357	0.080	1.000	0.276	0.284	0.230	0.104	0.027	0.008	0.098	0.305
V3 How attractive are remote classes on artistic subjects in your school?	0.274	0.326	1.000	0.266	0.028	0.149	0.240	0.283	0.202	0.185	0.276	1.000	0.502	0.241	0.098	0.134	0.258	0.261	0.344
V4 How attractive are remote classes on general subjects?					N/A					0.182	0.284	0.502	1.000	0.264	0.081	0.169	0.215	0.268	0.228
V5 Remote learning in an art school:	0.252	0.184	0.266	1.000	0.069	0.239	0.228	0.303	0.080	0.219	0.230	0.241	0.264	1.000	0.145	0.010	0.205	0.230	0.210
V6 What do you think about grades during remote classes in an art school?	0.006	-0.037	0.028	0.069	1.000	0.141	0.256	0.183	-0.122	0.036	0.104	0.098	0.081	0.145	1.000	0.191	0.290	0.260	0.029
V7 Can you agree upon/ determine your grades with teachers at school?	0.111	0.139	0.149	0.239	0.141	1.000	0.374	0.353	-0.009	0.050	0.027	0.134	0.169	0.010	0.191	1.000	0.224	0.368	0.057
V8 Do you feel respected by art school teachers?	0.251	0.009	0.240	0.228	0.256	0.374	1.000	0.371	-0.104	0.206	0.008	0.258	0.215	0.205	0.290	1.000	0.376	0.086	0.086
V9 Do you have an opportunity to ask questions during the lessons if you fail to understand something?	0.217	0.229	0.283	0.303	0.183	0.353	0.371	1.000	0.030	0.133	0.098	0.261	0.268	0.230	0.260	0.368	0.376	1.000	0.110
V10 You learn music/visual arts remotely:	0.234	0.357	0.202	0.080	-0.122	-0.009	-0.104	0.030	1.000	0.110	0.305	0.344	0.228	0.210	0.029	0.057	0.086	0.110	1.000

evaluation of the attractiveness of remote lessons in arts and general subjects, the evaluation of the adaptation of lessons to students' abilities and the overall evaluation of the effectiveness of remote art education are rated more highly by students with a sense of agency. In both groups, results are similar only for the grading and the sense of subjectivity (Table 4).

Table 4. Assessment of art school operation in the remote education period according to the students' sense of agency (%)

Details	Students' self-image		p	
	Having the sense of agency	others		
How attractive are remote classes on artistic subjects in your school?	Very unattractive	3.9	8.6	0.004**
	Rather unattractive	7.9	13.4	
	Moderately	40.8	46.0	
	Rather attractive	36.8	26.5	
	Very attractive	10.5	5.6	
How attractive are remote classes on general subjects?	Very unattractive	0.0	7.4	0.040*
	Rather unattractive	4.5	13.4	
	Moderately	59.1	51.1	
	Rather attractive	34.1	24.7	
	Very attractive	2.3	3.5	
Remote learning in an art school:	Always too difficult	1.3	4.3	0.011*
	Often too difficult	19.7	31.8	
	Neither too difficult nor too easy	61.8	51.8	
	Rather easy	15.8	11.1	
	Always very easy	1.3	1.1	
What do you think about grades during remote classes in an art school?	Grades are always too low	6.5	2.8	0.781
	Grades are sometimes too low	14.3	18.6	
	I believe that grades are fair	74.0	71.6	
	Grades are often too high	5.2	7.0	
Can you agree upon/ determine your grades with teachers at school?	Never	11.7	12.1	0.520
	Rarely	19.5	19.6	
	From time to time	24.7	30.0	
	Rather often	28.6	24.8	
	Always	15.6	13.4	
Do you feel respected by art school teachers?	Never	3.9	3.4	0.955
	Rarely	11.7	9.0	
	Difficult to say	31.2	34.6	
	Often	24.7	26.1	
	Always	28.6	26.9	

Do you have an opportunity to ask questions during the lessons if you fail to understand something?	Never		1.0	0.193
	Rarely	3.9	4.4	
	Difficult to say	10.4	13.2	
	Often	19.5	23.0	
	Always	66,2	58,4	
You learn music/visual arts remotely:	Much less effectively than in the classroom	11.7	33.3	<0.001**
	Rather less effectively than in the classroom	14.3	24.8	
	As effectively as in the classroom	49.4	24.3	
	Rather more effectively	7.8	15.2	
	Much more effectively than in the classroom	16.9	2.3	

Considering the combined aspects of the functioning of an art school during remote learning analysed in Table 4 and the art school type, a logistic regression formula was constructed adopting the resulting variable of the student’s sense of agency where 1 means that a student has a sense of agency and 0 means that a student has no sense of agency (Table 5).

Table 5. Determinants of the students’ sense of agency during remote learning – results of logistic regression analysis

	B	W	p	OR	90% confidence interval for OR	
					Minimum	Maximum
Constant	-3.997	35.651	<0.001**	0.018		
School type a	0.572	7.128	0.008**	1.772	1.246	2.520
How attractive are remote classes on artistic subjects in your school?	0.271	5.374	0.020*	1.311	1.082	1.589
Assessment of the adaptation of remote lessons to the students’ abilities	0.500	10.352	0.001**	1.649	1.277	2.130
Do you have an opportunity to ask questions during the lessons if you fail to understand something?	0.256	3.821	0.051t	1.292	1.041	1.602

Of the eight issues, three significantly impact the likelihood of a sense of agency, i.e., the attractiveness of remote art lessons (in the Wald test, $p = 0.020$), the adaptation of remote lessons to students’ abilities ($p = 0.001$) and the possibility to ask questions when something is not understood ($p = 0.051$). The school type is also significant from this perspective ($p = 0.008$); conventionally assuming the other factors to be constant, students in arts schools without a general education department are nearly twice (1.8 times) as likely to have a sense of agency than other arts schools (type O). The probability of agency is also higher the better the adaptation

of the lessons to the students' abilities (OR = 1.649), the higher the attractiveness of remote art lessons (OR = 1.311) and the more often students are given the opportunity to ask questions when they do not understand something (OR = 1.292). The model has good statistical properties: both the pooled test of the model coefficients ($p < 0.05$), the Nagelkerke R^2 and the Hosmer–Lemeshow test ($p > 0.05$) indicate that its fit is satisfactory. The quality of the classification of individuals with the sense of agency is rather high; the model allows for the appropriate classification of 74% of them.

Thinking about school horizon

The everyday school life of art school students interpreted through the filter of time, space and relationships has been completed in the areas of self-image and the image of the remote education. The dimension of experience felt by students as a challenge or a task to be executed was considered of key importance in the description of the pandemic school *praxis*. For the sake of interpretation in objective categories related to situations or contextual conditions, the focus was on outlining the students' sense of agency on a continuum from its high level, to facing reality, to its loss resulting in exclusion from the active experience of everyday life, feeling disadvantaged by fate and entering – using the term coined by Fritz Schütze (1997) – a trajectory of suffering.

It was rightly assumed that the sense of agency demonstrates links to school functioning assessment and the student's evaluation of the effectiveness of a mediated artistic education formula. The applied analyses allowed for the development of a model of the probability of achieving the expected level of agency that allows one to deal with an exceptional situation. The chance for it to happen depended mostly on the adaptation of remote education to the students' abilities, the attractiveness of artistic activities and a deep connection to a teacher resulting in an opportunity for a student to ask questions and to unhurriedly explain the encountered difficulties. The research has demonstrated that such conditions were met nearly twice as often in exclusively artistic evening schools. Individual lessons, close teacher-student relationships, the adaptation of material to current abilities and even to the mental state of a young artist are characteristic for this type of schools. In the resulting more intimate atmosphere, there is time for conversation, the sharing of thoughts and for searching for the best way to explain things. According to the research, students in this type of schools survived the pandemic education experiment in a better condition and with no significant detriment to the development of their talents.

Reflections on the pandemic art education have come full circle. They began and ended with Bruner's inspirations whose continuing relevance continues to amaze. From his analysis of the individual and of the social and cultural as the context of the image of meanings of the enquiry about the school in an unpredictable world, to his educational assumptions 'about the need to adapt culture to the needs of its members and types of knowledge they have to the needs of the culture' (Bruner, 2006, p. 69) Bruner's insights most accurately reflect the summary of the obtained research results and very ably serve to chart the direction of 'thinking about the school' (Klus-Stańska, 2016, p. 53-69) – the art school in this case.

References:

- Bruner, J. (2006). *Kultura edukacji*. Kraków: Wyd. Universitas.
- Dewey, J. (2014). *Doświadczenie i edukacja*. Warszawa: Warszawska Firma Wydawnicza.
- Dilthey, W. (2004). *Budowa świata historycznego w naukach humanistycznych*. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Słowo/ Obraz/ Terytoria.
- Dudzikowa, M., Wawrzyniak-Beszterda, R. red. (2010). *Studium Teoretyczno-Empiryczne doświadczenia szkolne jeden rocznika reformy edukacji*. T. 1. Kraków: Wyd. Impuls.
- Gadamer, H. G. (2004). *Prawda i metoda, Zarys hermeneutyki filozoficznej*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Geertz, C. (2011). *Zdobywając doświadczenia, autoryzując siebie*. W: V.W. Turner, E. M. Bruner (red.), *Antropologia doświadczenia*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Hosmer, D. W. Jr., Lemeshow, S., Sturdivant, R. X. (2013). *Applied logistic regression*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Illeris, K. (2006). *Trzy wymiary uczenia się: poznawcze emocjonalne i społeczne ramy współczesnej teorii uczenia się*. Wrocław: Wyd. Naukowe DSWE TWP.
- Jay, M. (2006). *Song of Experience: Modern American and European Variations on a Universal Theme*. California: University of California.
- Klus-Stańska, D. (2016). Jak wyjść poza horyzont pomyślenia szkoły i zrehabilitować wiedzę? Pod pretekstem reminiscencji z autorskiej szkoły podstawowej „Żak”. *Studia i Badania Naukowe. Pedagogika, R. 10, Nr 1*, 53-69.
- Koterwas, A. (2020). *Doświadczenia dydaktyczne. Rekonstrukcje biografii szkolnych dorosłych absolwentów*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek.

- Krzychała, K. (2010). Badacz w szkole– o rekonstruowaniu edukacyjnej codzienności. W: M. Dudzikowa, M. Czerepaniak-Walczak (red.), *Wychowanie, pojęcia, procesy, konteksty*. Gdańsk: GWP.
- Krzychała, S., Zamorska, B. (2008). *Dokumentarna ewaluacja szkolnej codzienności*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Dolnośląskiej Szkoły Wyższej.
- Rutkowiak, J. (1995) „Pulsująca kategorie” jako wyznacznik mapę odmian myślenia o edukacji. W: J. Rutkowiak (red.), *Odmiany myślenia edukacji*. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls.
- Satya, N. (2020, 3 lipiec). Wpis na blogu Microsoft 365. Pobrano z: <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/microsoft-365/blog/2020/04/30/2-years-digital-transformation-2-months/>.
- Schugurensky, D. (2014). Social Pedagogy and Critical Theory: A Conversation with Hans Thiersch. *International Journal of Social Pedagogy*, 3(1):2, 4-14.
- Schütze, F. (1997). Trajektorie cierpienia jako przedmiot badań socjologii interpretatywnej. *Studia Socjologiczne*, 1, 11-32.
- Skarga, B. (2005). *Kwintet metafizyczny*. Kraków: Universitas.
- Sulima, R. (2003). Znikająca codzienność. W: R. Sulima (red.) *Życie codzienne Polaków na przełomie XX i XXI wieku*. Łomża: Oficyna Wydawnicza Stopka.
- Sztompka, P., Bogunia-Borawska, M. (2008) *Socjologia codzienności*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Żnak.
- Thiersch, H. (2000). *Lebensweltorientierte Sozialarbeit*, Weinheim, za: S. Krzychała, B. Zamorska. (2008). *Dokumenarna ewaluacja szkolnej codzienności*. Wrocław: Wyd. DSW.
- Turner, V. (2010). *Proces rytualny. Struktura i antystruktura*. Seria antropologiczna. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.
- Van Hoof, E. (2020, 2 lipiec). *World Economic Forum*. Pobrano z: <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2020/04/this-is-the-psychological-side-of-the-covid-19-pandemic-that-were-ignoring/>
- Wiktorowicz, J., Grzelak, M.M., Grzeszkiewicz-Radulska, K. (2020), *Analiza statystyczna z IBM SPSS Statistics*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Wolska, D. (2006). Doświadczenie jako kwestia humanistyki. *Teksty Drugie*, 3.
- Wolsza, K. (1999). *Rola doświadczenia transcendentnego w poznaniu filozoficznym*. Opole: Wydawnictwo UO.
- Wysocka, E. (2003). Hermeneutyka. W: *Encyklopedia Pedagogiczna XXI wieku*, T.2. Warszawa: WA Żak.

Yu, Ch. (2020, 2 lipiec). *The Pre-pandemic Universe Was the Fiction. The Atlantic*. Pobrano z: <https://www.theatlantic.com/culture/archive/2020/04/charlesyu-science-fiction-reality-life-pandemic/609985/>.