



Alicja Lisiecka

Maria Curie-Skłodowska University, Poland

ORCID 0000-0003-0080-6314

Art pedagogy, or perhaps aesthetic pedagogy instead?

Pedagogika sztuki, a może jednak pedagogika estetyczna?

Abstract: The paper contributes to the discussion on the process of making the pedagogic and aesthetic discourse an academic discipline. The concept of art pedagogy developed by Dariusz Kubinowski serves as the reference point for the analysis. In the text, the author highlights the possibility of adopting a broader approach – going beyond the field of art – to the research focus of the emerging sub-discipline which is perceived as the next stage in the scientific reflection on the issue of aesthetic education. The arguments supporting this possibility will be drawn from traditional approach to aesthetic education and the achievements of contemporary aesthetics and empirical aesthetics, which are crucial for the ongoing discussion. At the same time, the author proposes to use the term “aesthetic pedagogy.” Adoption of a broader research focus, on the one hand, creates an opportunity to consolidate within the sub-discipline the existing research findings of educators exploring the aesthetic dimensions of reality in relation to upbringing/education, while on the other, it opens up new areas for inquiry.

Keywords: art pedagogy, education through art, aesthetic education, aesthetic pedagogy.

Introduction

The idea of aesthetic education has been present in pedagogical theories for centuries. This issue has received much attention also from the Polish scholars, especially in the second half of the 20th century. However,

the theoretical and empirical studies, as well as proposed methodologies of aesthetic education ultimately failed to translate into emergence of a separate sub-discipline of pedagogy in the domestic academia. An important step towards making research in aesthetics and education a scientific discipline, has been the proposal of a name and concept of a new discipline of pedagogy by Dariusz Kubinowski (2024), that is “art pedagogy”, potentially attracting academic educators interested in the relationships between art and upbringing/education. At the moment, we are at the initial stage of emergence of a new sub-discipline, and as pointed out by Kubinowski, its proposed name and, as it appears, the research focus “requires negotiation, agreement and justifications” (Kubinowski, 2024, p. 59). This paper contributes to the discussion on the process of making the pedagogic and aesthetic discourse an academic discipline. Its aim is to indicate possible adoption of a broader research focus by the emerging sub-discipline than the one proposed by Kubinowski, that is going beyond the arts. Highlighting the significance of aesthetic experience for the pedagogic and aesthetic discourse will be of key importance. Arguments in favour of the aforesaid possibility will be drawn from the tradition of aesthetic education (theory and practice), from findings of contemporary aesthetics that evidently lends the guiding idea to educators (Wojnar, 1964, p. 11), as well as from empirical aesthetics comprising a new trend in the scientific study of aesthetics. Therefore, the research problem is formulated as the question: What may be the research focus of contemporary pedagogy interested in the relationship between aesthetics and education, which at the same time draws from the tradition of aesthetic education?

The author proposes to use the term “aesthetic pedagogy” to refer to the emerging sub-discipline. When many years ago Irena Wojnar (1964, p. 16) used the term “aesthetic pedagogy” when referring to the theory of education through art, aesthetics was preoccupied primarily with the arts. Since then, the situation has changed fundamentally. Aesthetics “trickled out” to non-aesthetic areas (Pankowska, 2013, p. 189), having radically revised its fundamental tenets. This status quo has surely opened up new and reviewed old research perspectives in pedagogy. Wojnar did not develop her proposal of “aesthetic pedagogy”, devoting her writings to the theory of aesthetic education that formed a consistent theoretical and methodological concept. Today however, “aesthetic pedagogy” cannot be brought down merely to an educational concept. As a sub-discipline of pedagogy, it should be systemically, empirically and theoretically robust. At this point, that is at the beginning of its way to becoming an academic discipline, a more

fundamental question should be asked, however: what exactly is our focus of inquiry? And is it, for sure, solely art and education?

Pedagogy as belonging to applied humanities and social sciences

While reflecting upon the question of specificity of pedagogical studies, Kubinowski (2006; 2008; 2010; 2012; 2013; 2017; 2019) proposed a genuine model of pedagogy viewed as belonging to applied humanities and social sciences. This original proposal is grounded in extensive and diversified achievements of pedagogy pursued under multiple paradigms (Kubinowski, 2016, p. 9). As viewed by Kubinowski (2017, p. 16), pedagogy belongs at the same time to the humanities, social and applied sciences, and is embedded in the epistemological and methodological underpinnings of these sciences. The author assigns a particular scientific value to synergistic pedagogical studies aptly combining paradigms, orientations and approaches of the humanities, social and applied sciences. According to Kubinowski, research meeting two overlapping conditions may be regarded as pedagogical studies. The former involves the object of study, which in general is upbringing (education, teaching, formation) of man and its diversified contexts. The latter involves scholar's adoption of the so called pedagogical perspective, entailing three complementary aspects of inquiry, namely:

- description, analysis, interpretation, understanding/explanation of the examined upbringing/education related phenomena and processes, as well as their contexts;
- their humanistic valuation, assuming that humanism is a discourse category, based on the use of constructive value relativism;
- reference to research results and their valuation to the category of human potentialities and his world, that is searching for and designing the possible constructive pro-individual, pro-social, pro-democratic, pro-humanistic, pro-environmental etc. change (Kubinowski, 2024, p. 57).

The diversity of paradigms under which one may pursue pedagogy is not perceived here as a difficulty or obstacle in designing pedagogical studies, but quite the contrary, as an opportunity for gaining a more in-depth understanding of the reality (Kubinowski, 2017, p. 23). Kubinowski (2024, p. 57) does not seek to standardise the methodology of pedagogical research, instead assuming that "the principle of appropriateness of the used research method in relation to the posed research problem remains to be of key importance. Research achievements are more significant than methodological transparency and correctness however, as they bring considerable cognitive benefits and

advantages contributing to the creation of a better world for all of us.” Pedagogy viewed by Kubinowski as belonging to applied humanities and social sciences (cf. 2006, pp. 177-179; 2013, pp. 31-32) is pervaded by the humanistic concern for a man (people) in the context of their lives, which is reflected at all levels of the proposed system. Therefore, we are dealing with a coherent model which is appropriate for the present day needs.

Art pedagogy as a new sub-discipline of pedagogical sciences

Within the model of pedagogy viewed as belonging to applied humanities and social sciences, Kubinowski settles a new sub-discipline of pedagogical sciences – art pedagogy. “Art pedagogy – writes Kubinowski (2024, p. 58) – as a sub(discipline) of pedagogical sciences is merely a seed starting to manifest its presence and establish itself in the academia, although of course historical studies, theoretical inquiries, empirical studies and methodological papers addressing the relationship between art and upbringing/education have been here for a long time now.” He combines the proposed concept of art pedagogy with to-date achievements of the theory of aesthetic education, seeing it as an opportunity to update the past proposals and to organise the scattered problems subject to pedagogical reflection on the relationship between the arts and education (Kubinowski, 2024, p. 59). Inspired by the thought of an American arts educator Elliot W. Eisner (1933-2014), D. Kubinowski extends a vision of art pedagogy including three dimensions, namely ontological, epistemological and methodological. As regards the ontological aspect, he identifies three types of research scope pursued by art pedagogy: broad, medium, narrow. The broad scope involves investigation of the relationship between the arts and education in a variety of contexts. The medium scope involves education for the arts and through art, as well as their determining factors. The narrow scope on the other hand, is focused on art education in schools, including teaching of amateurs and professionals, as well as analysing methods and organisation of this process in Poland and internationally.

As regards the epistemological aspect, Kubinowski (cf. 2024, p. 62) proposes to transfer the cognitive perspective of pedagogy viewed as belonging to applied humanities and social sciences, to the specific research focus of art pedagogy as its sub-discipline. At the same time, he distinguishes three basic approaches to analysis: expert approach, critical approach to art and education, and subject-based approach. He makes an analogous shift with regard to the methodological aspect, pointing to the research potential of the methods derived from the humanities, social sciences and applied

sciences, and their creative combinations. He finds the idiographic approach to research of particular importance for art pedagogy, including educational studies through the arts (Kubinowski, 2024).

While appreciating the complementarity of the presented proposal and its research and practical potential, a question should be asked about legitimacy of limiting the research focus to the field of art, even in its broadest sense. Kubinowski, when setting the boundaries of the sub-discipline's research focus, evidently refers to aesthetic education where art has played the leading role ever since. However, the analysis of the literature, both findings of the classical and contemporary scholars, allows to draw somewhat different conclusions and to question the choice made. Revisiting the question of the research focus, which is encouraged by this paper, is significant for the constitution of the new discipline, creating opportunities for consolidation of the previous scholarly achievements of the educators in the field of aesthetics. Due to the volume of the text, presented arguments are only intended to outline the area for further discussion.

Aesthetic experience in pedagogy

When investigating the problem of *Man and the Arts*, we focus primarily on the question of feelings and aesthetic experiences, whereas to a much lesser extent we are interested in artistic creation, although it also pertains to the same range of issues (Wojnar, 1964, p. 37).

The pedagogic and aesthetic discourse is guided by the way of perceiving aesthetic experiences. According to the Polish theory of aesthetic education, the question of feelings and aesthetic experiences is built on the traditional concepts of philosophies by: Plato, Aristotle, and primarily Immanuel Kant and developers of his thought. Notions conceptualised under these approaches, determining (among others) the nature of aesthetic experience, radically narrow down its scope, setting the boundaries with such conditions as disinterest, autotelism, distance. The object of aesthetic experiences construed in this manner is art, or actually its best manifestations, comprising a carrier of the objectively existing values. According to traditional concepts, works of art – as pointed out by Krystyna Wilkoszewska (2010, p. 40) – “were assigned a special status disassociating them from real life affairs, and since then, they were supposed to be nothing more than just the sources of this special aesthetic pleasure, available only through the disinterested contemplation of an object referred to as a work of art”.

Adoption of the post-kantian (although this term is a generalisation of sorts referring to approaches assuming a radical distinction of the subject of the aesthetics from other disciplines of philosophy) vision of aesthetics, even if non-systematic, impacts the normative nature of aesthetic education. Educators' attention naturally focuses on "specific" (Wojnar, 1990, p. 19) type of art (high, artistic), enabling the emergence of a sublime aesthetic experience which, as it is assumed, may exert a positive impact on an individual. Thus, the primary objective is to enable the largest possible group of people to engage with and experience high art. For this reason, such concepts as a "classic" (Pankowska, 2007, p. 879), "masterpiece", "good art" (Olbrycht, 1987, p. 16, 19) or canon (Pankowska, 2013) have been frequently discussed. The questions of making art available and approachable (cf. Szuman, 1969) have been widely addressed by the forerunners of aesthetic education (Lisiecka, 2022a), by school curricula that shaped generations of Poles after Poland regained its independence (Lisiecka, 2020b), by writings of classical culture educators, as well as more contemporary papers attempting to re-conceptualise the theory of culture education (Maliszewski, 2013). The sublime art experience has dominated the theory of aesthetic education. This is best reflected in the continuous referral to the concept of "education to art and education through art" by Bogdan Suchodolski, as well as the extensive output of Irena Wojnar. And although nowadays art is an open-ended and multi-dimensional concept, which has also been discerned by pedagogy (cf. Kwiatkowska-Tybulewicz, 2016), it is continued to be valued in the educational context in accordance with values typical of traditional approaches (cf. Olbrycht, 2019; Szmids, 2022).

Theory and practice of aesthetic education

However, while studying writings of classical authors of aesthetic education theories, some constant trend may be observed: the fundamental question in their deliberations has been aesthetic sensitivity that may be analysed in three interrelated contexts: the arts, nature, the everyday and social life. Already the ancient Greeks would posit that beauty (and in any case they were not confined solely to the beauty category) is the property not only of objects and works of art, but also of characters, customs, people. The belief in an inseparable link between beauty, aesthetic sensitivity, art and life pervaded the writings by Friedrich Schiller (2011), John Ruskin (cf. Lisiecka, 2020a), William Morris (cf. Lisiecka, 2021), to which Janina Mortkowiczowa (cf. Lisiecka, 2022b) would refer in her book entitled *O wychowaniu estetycznym [On Aesthetic Education]* (1903), as well as the findings by Herbert Read (1976; 1982) highly appreciated by Polish theoreticians. The

above-mentioned philosophers investigated aesthetic sensitivity – sensitivity to the aesthetic aspect of the world – in consideration of the social, artistic, economic, political and even environmental aspects. Art has surely been an important component in the shaping of aesthetic sensitivity, yet not the only one, not a sufficient one and not necessarily a universal one (except for Schiller). The belief that aesthetics refers to the entirety of the human experience: sensitivity (emotionality), intellect, morality, good manners, the immediate environment (cf. Machniewicz, 1934), as well as social relationships and nature raised no doubts at the beginning of the twentieth century and translated into the way of thinking of education authorities in Poland which was reborn after the period of partitions. In the curricula of schools of general education, the group of arts- and craft-related subjects included drawing, singing and manual work, later renamed practical classes including sloyd, handicraft, house work, gardening and breeding (Lisiecka, 2020b). Aesthetic qualities were manifested in either of these activities in a different manner. This type of holistic approach was gradually fading away as the economic standing of Polish citizens was improving. Teaching a hygienic way of life ceased to be necessary when hygiene became a standard pursued at home, and woodworking or pasteurisation classes began to be regarded as archaic and unnecessary. On the one hand, this decision appears to be justified: education comprising a response to a need, successfully satisfied this need; on the other, another purpose of the presence of these subjects in the curricula was lost somewhere on the way, namely development of the general aesthetic sensitivity. Gardening was never only about gardening. At some point it was found however, that it is art that is the most important, that it has the greatest power to make a positive change, and that art education in school should encompass fine arts, music and literary instruction. No attempts were made to adjust the scope of art-and-craft subjects to the new reality. Also, the achievements of the progressive New Education Movement approaching the creative activity and sensitivity as innate and close to life instead of being detached from life and body, have never played a significant part in the Polish pedagogy. Ultimately, scholars' and practitioners' attention was primarily focused on art's institutional exchange and on the knowledge about art, putting aside all that failed to meet the refinement requirement and was insufficiently intellectually satisfying or desired in the social context. Treatment of the question of aesthetics of everyday life only as a stage in the development of the theory of aesthetic education appears to be fundamentally wrong. Everyday aesthetics is equally important as aesthetics in the arts. The latter simply is (or tends to be) more sublime and special, whereas the

former more approachable and omnipresent. Different aspects of aesthetics have their own peculiarities, therefore they require different approaches and languages: they cannot be “artified” (cf. Jastrząb, 2023) or analysed through art (cf. Gołaszewska, 1984). Analytical instruments of the theories of art are not able to embrace the entire aesthetic experience. Therefore, it is necessary to search for theoretical models having a broader scope. It appears that the theory of aesthetic education that has been developed for centuries encourages researching the entire aesthetic experience in the relation to education, for it has actually never been brought down to art only, but it referred to a more general question – that is aesthetic quality.

Prospects of contemporary aesthetics and empirical aesthetics

As emphasized by Irena Wojnar (1964, p. 11), aesthetics evidently lends the guiding idea to educators. Therefore, educators should follow this thought and take it into account in their own research explorations. In the past few decades, aesthetics has undergone a revolution of sorts. The new trends in modern aesthetics have been guided by the finding that “reducing aesthetics to the philosophy of art leads to neglecting problems related to aesthetic phenomena and needs that are essential for humans and theoretically interesting. In addition, interpretation of contemporary artistic creation solely from the aesthetic point of view offers no opportunity to develop an appropriate theory of art, but it leads to theoretical confusion” (Dziemidok, 2009, p. 25). Nowadays, aesthetics has ceased to be independent and it is not reduced solely to the philosophy of art, whereas philosophy of aesthetic phenomena has become a significant, absorbing and theoretically justified issue.

Contemporary aesthetics is distinctively interested in aesthetic qualities of various dimensions of the reality and increasingly focused on aesthetic experience that is no longer disinterested and idealised, but subjective, embodied, determined by different factors, encompassing multiple aesthetic phenomena, and involving positive as well as negative trends. Aesthetics has observed a departure from a priori assumptions to the benefit of interest in the methods used in empirical science. The distinctive concepts of the new aesthetics include those developed by Wolfgang Iser (1970) and Richard Shusterman (1998), already well known in the Polish setting. In this place, we should also list the post-kantian comprehensive understanding of aesthetic experience proposed by Arnold Berleant (2007, 2011). The philosopher builds his concept on aesthetics understood as the theory of sensitivity (Berleant, 2011, p. 25), turning to traditional research on the subjective experience predicament. His deliberations have been especially inspired by Maurice

Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology and John Dewey's pragmatic naturalism. According to Berleant, aesthetic experience sets the boundaries for understanding aesthetics. The subjective-objective nature of experience and its multiple dimensions make Berleant's proposal particularly interesting from the point of view of theoretical and empirical research in pedagogy. This theory certainly presents the broadest scope: it involves all types of aesthetic experience, including experiencing the arts, the environment, the everyday. This thread surely deserves to be addressed separately. Arnold Berleant's writings, especially those related to aesthetics of the environment, are pointed out as being of key significance for the relatively new and diversified trend, that is aesthetics of the everyday, whose representatives, including Yuriko Saito (2007) also refer to the Dewey's aesthetic experience, in order to overcome the limitations of the traditional aesthetics. Everyday aesthetics, similarly to Berleant's concept, is grounded in the sensory experience, it emphasizes interrelation of aesthetics with social, political, environmental issues, without staying indifferent to values. Everyday aesthetics investigates such everyday activities and phenomena, as: social relationships, eating, walking, caring for the body and the environment, etc. Over the last decades, aesthetics has seen the emergence of many interesting approaches which at times were applied to Polish pedagogical studies or presented in a pedagogical context, and their partial review may be found in the book by Mirosława Zalewska-Pawlak (2017). Nevertheless, Polish pedagogy very rarely regards aesthetic phenomena not being art as fully fledged objects of aesthetic experience; just like no consideration is given of the multiple dimensions and diversity of the experience, its high individual variability, we obviously come to deal with. (Art) experience continues to be idealised, since we idealise art by comparing aesthetic objects with specific works of art, ignoring the fact that they belong to completely different orders and function in different contexts. There is no place for this in aesthetics.

Changes in the manner of perceiving the aesthetic experience, that is the extension of its scope beyond the arts, are favoured by the findings of empirical aesthetics, including in particular its sub-discipline – neuro-aesthetics which comprises an inspiring development and complements philosophical inquiries. Owing to research in the area of neuroaesthetics, focused primarily on visual perception of the works of art, we have learned more about the role of the human brain and human physiology in receiving arts, however numerous issues have continued to be unclear or disputable (Kaczmarczyk, 2013; Przybysz, 2023). The reason for the status quo has been the finding made by neuroaestheticians that aesthetic experience is

something far more complex than the classic philosophers would like it to be. Research in the field of neuroaesthetics has revealed certain tendencies in the human perception that are most probably of evolutionary origin. Empirical studies have shown that aesthetic experience is not detached, that even the simplest perception-based judgements are ultimately determined by the context of specific circumstances, expectations and prejudices. In aesthetic experience, sensory processes are inextricably linked to cognitive processes. Aesthetic judgement, aesthetic perception are impacted by the knowledge, memory, context and expectations of a given person (Mather, 2023). Another turning point in the studies on the reception of the arts was refuting Kant's belief that aesthetic experience belongs to higher intellectual judgements. It was proved that while watching paintings or making aesthetic judgements about them, structures of the brain forming the so called reward system which is responsible for the processing of the basic emotions and affects are activated (Mather, 2023; Przybysz, 2023). A natural step in the development of neuroaesthetics was, therefore, the extension of the research focus on aesthetic experiences stepping beyond art, as aesthetic judgements refer to all dimensions of the human reality. Empirical aesthetics currently adopts a very broad understanding of the concept of aesthetic experience (Wassiliwizky, Menninghaus, 2021). Psychological studies have also shown that people have different equitable aesthetic needs that may involve multiple or only selected aspects of the reality (Świątek et al., 2024). What is also important, is that psychological studies of the impact of art on an individual most often avoid assigning the artistic value to the arts; this allowed scholars to prove that irrespective of the "level" or type of art (creation and its aesthetic manifestations), it can have a beneficial effect on a person. The key here is aesthetic inclination. In the light of the aforementioned findings, aesthetic experience and aesthetics present themselves as highly interesting areas for scientific inquiry, also for pedagogy.

Conclusion. Then perhaps it should be aesthetic pedagogy?

An interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary approach to science may contribute to enrichment of the knowledge about human in the world in which he has come to live. Pedagogy viewed as belonging to applied humanities and social sciences presents a potential to link different research perspectives and approaches when investigating a specific issue, which makes it an interesting point of departure for deliberations on making the pedagogic and aesthetic discourse an academic discipline. "Art pedagogy" situated by Dariusz Kubinowski within its boundaries comprises a valuable theoretical

proposal, derived from the traditional aesthetic education where art has always been assigned a special meaning. However, the proposed area for investigation reduced solely to the relationship between art and education raises certain doubts. In traditional approaches, in the writings of classical aesthetic education theoreticians, in school practice, besides art, areas immanent for aesthetic sensitivity – evoking aesthetic experiences, have nearly always been nature, as well as the everyday and social relationships. These areas appear to be incomparable as their specificities differ considerably. This fact is underscored by contemporary aesthetics which besides art explores aesthetic qualities of different aspects of the world. Stepping beyond art required philosophers to review the concept of aesthetic experience, making it subjective, determined by various factors, positive and negative, non-homogeneous, non-obvious. Also, findings of empirical aesthetics have confirmed the need to change the traditional perception and valuation of experiencing art and other aesthetic objects. Nowadays, aesthetic quality has grown to become one of the most important dimension of the human experience, influencing decisions made by individuals and groups. It is manifested in different ways in high art and high culture, but also in popular art and popular culture, communication, marketing, politics, architecture, environment, everyday objects etc. It goes beyond the arts and artistic ideals.

When addressing an important problem of making the pedagogic and aesthetic discourse an academic discipline, it is recommended to take the aforementioned facts and trends (discussed in greater detail in specific items listed in the References) into account. Even if the new sub-discipline was to restrict its research focus to art only, sooner or later it will need to redefine the concept of aesthetic experience anyway, as the post-kantian predicaments no longer describe it. Another problem consists in excessive idealisation of art, its properties, reception, a certain lack of objectivity and distancing oneself from art phenomena and their potential beneficial effect which may be observed among educators. Art educators still primarily adhere to the art history methodology offered by J.J. Winckelmann rather than for instance by Ch. Mullins, which also fails to facilitate discussion about transformation in the arts and aesthetics. In addition, highly sceptical approach to contemporary art, again investigated with application of axiomatic and normative approach, appears to be problematic and requiring consideration. Therefore, a difficult discussion on aesthetic experience is inevitable. When investigating this predicament, in its contemporary form, one will not help but see that its borders have been expanded, or actually returned to their original antique understanding, that is to sensory cognition. Sight and

hearing are no longer the basic aesthetic senses, art is not the only thing that ensures aesthetic experiences, and they are not only pleasant ones. Aesthetic experience involves biological, psychological, social, economic, religious, political issues – nothing is taken for granted. In that case, how should we design educational activities today? Specific concepts of aesthetic education may be limited to a selected type of aesthetic experience, e.g. the sublime experience of high art. The question is whether an empirical discipline should narrow down its research focus in this manner? Can pedagogy ignore other aspects of aesthetic experience which is of key and primary importance in relation to art, as art makes its impact through aesthetic experience, yet it is not reduced to it, and contrariwise? It is hard to imagine a similar limitation, for instance, in relation to emotions. Which emotion would be ousted by psychologists from the research focus?

The extended research focus of pedagogy investigating the relationship between aesthetics and upbringing proposed in this paper may prove to be useful. It surely allows to integrate within a single sub-discipline the pedagogical reflection on the arts with previous explorations addressing, e.g. such issues as the significance of aesthetic quality of the educational space (Krasoń & Tomas, 2019; Śliwerski, 2024), new and alternative predicaments/aesthetic trends (cf. Lewartowicz, 2021; Lisiecka, 2022c; Lisiecka, 2022d; Zańko, 2020), creation in a broad sense of the word (cf. Szmidt & Uszyńska-Jarmoc, 2023), or about the aesthetic aspect of popular art, which is most often disregarded in the educational studies to the benefit of social and cultural analyses (cf. Jakubowski, 2020). Extension of the research focus opens the researchers to aesthetic qualities of diverse types of art, of the environment, of the everyday, of the world accessible by the senses, and their pedagogical potentialities.

For the purpose of these deliberations, it is therefore assumed that the research focus of aesthetic pedagogy may be the relationship between aesthetics and upbringing/education, including its different contexts. Aesthetic experience construed in contemporary manner, would then become the key research category setting the boundaries of aesthetics. At this point, this general determination of the research focus of aesthetic pedagogy appears to be justified. On the one hand, we include the previous diversified research achievements of aesthetic education and art pedagogy in the conceptual framework of aesthetic pedagogy, on the other we leave out space for further research explorations. More detailed specification of the research focus of aesthetic pedagogy, which presents itself as an area for reflection and research at the intersection of educational sciences and aesthetics, would require further more in-depth discussion. Further steps will need to include

making arrangements related to all levels of the system – from ontology to praxeology, as it was done by Dariusz Kubinowski in his proposal of art pedagogy.

References:

- Berleant, A. (2007). *Przemysłać estetykę. Niepokorne eseje o sztuce*. Kraków: Universitas.
- Berleant, A. (2011). *Wrażliwość i zmysły. Estetyczna przemiana świata człowieka*. Kraków: Universitas.
- Dziemidok, B. (2009). *Główne kontrowersje estetyki współczesnej*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Gołaszewska, M. (1984). *Estetyka rzeczywistości*. Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy PAX.
- Jakubowski, W. (2020). Popkulturowe ilustracje utopii społecznych, czyli o edukacyjnym potencjale kultury popularnej. W: R. Włodarczyk (red.), *Utopia a edukacja*, t. 4 (s. 91-107). Wrocław: Instytut Pedagogiki Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Jastrząb, J. (2023). Artyfikacja jako innowacyjna metoda aktywizacji twórczej seniorów. *Parezja. Czasopismo Forum Młodych Pedagogów przy Komitecie Nauk Pedagogicznych PAN*, 2(20), 63-76.
- Kaczmarczyk, K. (2013). Mózg jako Święty Graal humanistyki, czyli o neuroestetyce w wąskim i szerokim rozumieniu. W: J. Barska, E. Twardoch (red.), *Percepcja kultury – kultura percepcji* (s. 21-35). Kraków-Warszawa: Wydział Polonistyki Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Krasoń, K., Tomas, I. (2019). *Kultura wizualna szkoły: szkice o wizerunku nauczyciela i ucznia oraz o potrzebie estetyki przestrzeni nauczania-uczenia się*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Kubinowski, D. (2006). Pedagogiczne myślenie humanistyczne jako kategoria metodologiczna. W: D. Kubinowski, M. Nowak (red.), *Metodologia pedagogiki zorientowanej humanistycznie* (s. 171-180). Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls”.
- Kubinowski, D. (2008). Wychowanie i jego konteksty w perspektywie poza-pedagogicznej i pedagogicznej. W: K. Rubacha (red.), *Konceptualizacje przedmiotu badań pedagogiki* (s. 47-56). Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls”.
- Kubinowski, D. (2010). Metodologia spod znaku χ^2 a humanistyczna tożsamość pedagogiki. W: J. Piekarski, D. Urbaniak-Zajęc, K. J. Szmidt (red.), *Metodologiczne problemy tworzenia wiedzy w pedagogice*.

- Oblicza akademickiej praktyki* (s. 79-90). Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls”.
- Kubinowski, D. (2012). Idiom pedagogiki współczesnej. W: E. Ogrodzka-Mazur, A. Szczurek-Boruta (red.), *Poza paradygmaty. Pedagogika wielostronna. Księga pamiątkowa dedykowana Profesorowi Tadeuszowi Lewowickiemu*, t. 1, (s. 196-213). Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek.
- Kubinowski, D. (2013). *Idiomatyczność – synergia – emergencja. Rozwój badań jakościowych w pedagogice polskiej na przełomie XX i XXI wieku*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Makmed.
- Kubinowski, D. (2016). Istota jakościowych badań pedagogicznych – wprowadzenie. *Jakościowe Badania Pedagogiczne*, 1(1), 5-14.
- Kubinowski, D. (2017). Badania pedagogiczne w „kalejdoskopie” paradygmatów, orientacji, podejść, metod nauk humanistycznych, społecznych i stosowanych. W: D. Kubinowski, M. Chutorański (red.), *Pedagogika jako humanistyczno-społeczna nauka stosowana: konsekwencje metodologiczne* (s. 15-24). Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls”.
- Kubinowski, D. (2019). Metodologia badań pedagogicznych między normatywnością a opisowością. W: J. Piekarski, D. Urbaniak-Zajac, S. Pasikowski (red.), *Krytyka metodologiczna w praktyce tworzenia wiedzy* (s. 79-90). Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Kubinowski, D. (2024). W poszukiwaniu komplementarnego modelu pedagogiki sztuki jako nauki o wychowaniu/edukacji. *Nauki o Wychowaniu. Studia Interdyscyplinarne*, 18(1), 52-65.
- Kwiatkowska-Tybulewicz B. (2016), *Wychowawcze aspekty sztuki współczesnej. Z perspektywy pedagogiki krytycznej*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- Lewartowicz, U. (2021). Pedagogie kabaretu – wstęp do tematu. *Kultura i Edukacja*, 1(131), 96-108.
- Lisiecka, A. (2020a). Recepcja poglądów Johna Ruskina na wychowanie w Polsce przełomu XIX i XX wieku. *Biuletyn Historii Wychowania*, 42, 145-158.
- Lisiecka, A. (2020b). *Założenia realizacji przedmiotów artystycznych w polskim szkolnictwie powszechnym w latach 1918-1939*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Lisiecka, A. (2021). O pedagogicznym znaczeniu piękna w świetle biografii Williama Morrisa (1834-1896). *Biografistyka Pedagogiczna*, 6(1), 35-49.
- Lisiecka, A. (2022a). Forerunners of the polish theory of aesthetic education. *Biografistyka Pedagogiczna*, 7(1), 173-196.

- Lisiecka, A. (2022b). The importance of on aesthetic education (1903) by Janina Mortkowiczowa (1875-1960) for the polish theory of aesthetic education. *History of Education and Children's Literature*, 2, 633-643.
- Lisiecka, A. (2022c). *Między sztuką i konsumpcją. Kategoria glamour wyzwaniem dla edukacji estetycznej*. W: A.M. Żukowska, U. Lewartowicz (red.), *Teoria i praktyka edukacji estetycznej* (s. 159-166). Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Lisiecka, A. (2022d). *Pedagogiczne spojrzenie na kategorię wstrętu w sztuce popularnej. Propozycje interpretacyjne dla wybranych fenomenów*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Machniewicz, S. (1934). *Estetyka życia codziennego. Zarysy estetyczne i zagadnienia sztuki współczesnej*. Lwów: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Książek Szkolnych.
- Maliszewski, K. (2013). *Ciemne iskry. Problem aktualizacji pedagogiki kultury*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek.
- Mather, G. (2023). *Psychologia sztuki*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Mortkowiczowa, J. (1903). *O wychowaniu estetycznym*. Warszawa: G. Centnerszwer i Ska.
- Olbrycht, K. (1987). *Sztuka a działania pedagogów*. Katowice: Uniwersytet Śląski.
- Olbrycht, K. (2019). *Edukacja kulturalna jako edukacja do wzrastania w człowieczeństwie*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Pankowska, K. (2007). Teoria wychowania estetycznego w zmieniającej się rzeczywistości. W: K. Wilkoszewska (red.), *Wizje i re-wizje. Wielka księga estetyki w Polsce* (s. 877-885). Kraków: Universitas, 2007.
- Pankowska, K. (2013). *Kultura – sztuka – edukacja w świecie zmian. Refleksje antropologiczno-pedagogiczne*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- Przybysz, P. (2023). Neuroestetyka 2.0. O wewnętrznej ewolucji naturalistycznego programu badań nad sztuką. *Sensus Historiae*, 53(4), 143-164.
- Read, H. (1976). *Wychowanie przez sztukę*. Wrocław: Ossolineum.
- Read, H. (1982). *Sens sztuki*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Saito, Y. (2007). *Everyday aesthetics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Schiller, F. (2011). *Pisma teoretyczne. „Listy o estetycznym wychowaniu człowieka” i inne rozprawy*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Aletheia.
- Shusterman, R. (1998). *Estetyka pragmatyczna. Żywe piękno i refleksja nad sztuką*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Szmidt, K. J., Uszyńska-Jarmoc, J. (2023). Pedagogika twórczości – rozwój teorii i praktyk edukacyjnych. *Przegląd Pedagogiczny*, 1, 42-70.

- Szmidt, K.J. (2022). Pedagogika twórczości a pedagogika sztuki: rzecz o korzystnym związku partnerskim. *Ars Inter Culturas*, 11, 11-26.
- Szuman, S. (1969). *O sztuce i wychowaniu estetycznym*. Warszawa: PZWS.
- Śliwerski, B. (2024). *Szkolne rewolucje*. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls”.
- Świątek, A. H., Szcześniak, M., Borkowska, H., Stempień, M., Wojtkowiak, K., Diessner, R. (2024). The unexplored territory of aesthetic needs and the development of the Aesthetic Needs Scale. *Plos One*, 19(3), 1–31.
- Wassiliwizky, E., Menninghaus, W. (2021). Why and how should cognitive science care about aesthetics? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 25(6), 437-449.
- Welsch, W. (2005). *Estetyka poza estetyką: o nową postać estetyki*. Kraków: Universitas.
- Wilkożewska, K. (2010). Arnolda Berleanta projekt estetyki postkantowskiej. *Sztuka i Filozofia*, 37, 38-47.
- Wojnar, I. (1964). *Estetyka i wychowanie*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Wojnar, I. (1990). Podstawowe problemy wychowania estetycznego (teoria i praktyka). W: I. Wojnar, W. Pielasińska (red.), *Wychowanie estetyczne młodego pokolenia. Polska koncepcja i doświadczenia* (s. 15-28). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Szkolne i Pedagogiczne.
- Zalewska-Pawlak, M. (2017). *Sztuka i wychowanie w XXI wieku. W poszukiwaniu zagubionej teorii sztuki życia i sztuki w wychowaniu*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Zańko, P. (2020). *Pedagogie oporu*. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls”.