

Enriching Arts Education through Aesthetics

Enriching Arts Education through Aesthetics examines the use of aesthetic theory as the foundation to design and implement arts activities suitable for integration in school curricula in preschool and primary school education. This book suggests teaching practices based on the connection between aesthetics and arts education and shows that this kind of integration promotes enriched learning experiences.

The book explores how the core ideas of four main aesthetic approaches – the representationalist, the expressionist, the formalist, and the postmodernist – translate into respective ways of designing and implementing experiential aesthetics-based activities. Containing relevant examples of interventions used in classes, it analyzes the ways in which the combination of different aesthetic approaches can support varied, multifaceted, multimodal and balanced teaching situations in school.

This innovative book will appeal to academics, researchers, professionals and students in the fields of arts education, early childhood and primary education and curriculum studies.

Marina Sotiropoulou-Zormpala is Professor in Arts Education at the University of Crete, Greece.

Alexandra Mouriki is Associate Professor of Aesthetics and Aesthetic Education at the University of Patras, Greece.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Enriching Arts Education through Aesthetics

Experiential Arts Integration
Activities for Pre-School
and Early Primary Education

**Marina Sotiropoulou-Zormpala
and Alexandra Mouriki**

First published 2020
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2020 Marina Sotiropoulou-Zormpala and Alexandra Mouriki

The right of Marina Sotiropoulou-Zormpala and Alexandra Mouriki to be identified as authors of this work has been asserted by them in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A catalog record for this book has been requested

ISBN: 978-0-367-17932-8 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-0-429-05851-6 (ebk)

Typeset in Times New Roman
by Apex CoVantage, LLC

to an inspiration named Tata



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Contents

<i>List of figures and tables</i>	ix
1 Introduction	1
2 Theoretical framework	4
2.1 <i>Representationalism</i>	5
2.2 <i>Expressionism/cognitivism</i>	8
2.3 <i>Formalism</i>	11
2.4 <i>Postmodernism/contextualism</i>	14
3 Designing experiential aesthetics-based arts integration practices	18
3.1 <i>General characteristics</i>	18
3.2 <i>Aesthetics-based characteristics</i>	20
3.2.1 <i>Representationalism-based arts integration activities</i>	20
3.2.2 <i>Expressionism/cognitivism-based arts integration activities</i>	22
3.2.3 <i>Formalism-based arts integration activities</i>	24
3.2.4 <i>Postmodernism/contextualism-based arts integration activities</i>	26
4 Implementations	29
4.1 <i>Why conduct these implementations?</i>	29
4.2 <i>Who participated?</i>	30

4.3	<i>How were the data collected?</i>	31
4.4	<i>How were the data analyzed?</i>	32
4.5	<i>What was implemented? What were the findings?</i>	35
4.5.1	Aesthetics-based teaching of “parts of speech – adverbs” (Language Arts Syllabus)	37
4.5.2	Aesthetics-based teaching of “first numbers” (Mathematics Syllabus)	41
4.5.3	Aesthetics-based teaching of “the human body” (Syllabus of Human Environment Studies)	45
4.5.4	Aesthetics-based teaching of “botany-flowers” (Natural Environment Studies Syllabus)	51
4.5.5	Aesthetics-based teaching of “water – the cycle of water” (Natural Environment Studies Syllabus)	55
4.5.6	Aesthetics-based teaching of “surrealism” (Visual Arts Syllabus)	61
4.6	<i>Other results</i>	65
5	Discussion	68
5.1	<i>Discussion on the findings of the representationalism-based activities</i>	69
5.2	<i>Discussion on the findings of the expressionism/cognitivism-based activities</i>	71
5.3	<i>Discussion on the findings of the formalism-based activities</i>	73
5.4	<i>Discussion on the findings of the postmodernism/contextualism-based activities</i>	75
5.5	<i>Discussion on the combinations of the activities</i>	77
6	Conclusions and proposals	81
	<i>References</i>	85
	<i>Index</i>	99

Figures and tables

Flowcharts

3.1	Designing of representationalism-based arts integration activities	22
3.2	Designing of expressionism/cognitivism-based arts integration activities	24
3.3	Designing of formalism-based arts integration activities	26
3.4	Designing of postmodernism/contextualism-based arts integration activities	28

Concept map

4.1	Data analysis criteria	35
-----	------------------------	----

Tables

4.1	Positive indications (>50% of the sample) for the aesthetics-based teaching of “adverbs”	40
4.2	Positive indications (>50% of the sample) for the aesthetics-based teaching of “first numbers”	46
4.3	Positive indications (>50% of the sample) during the aesthetics-based teaching of “the human body”	50
4.4	Positive indications (>50% of the sample) during the aesthetics-based teaching of “botany-flowers”	56
4.5	Positive indications (>50% of the sample) during aesthetics-based teaching of “water – the cycle of water”	60
4.6	Positive indications (>50% of the sample) during aesthetics-based teaching of “surrealism”	66
5.1	Indications of the characteristics of children’s learning experience in the representationalism-based activities	70

x *Figures and tables*

5.2	Indications of the characteristics of children's learning experience in the expressionism/cognitivism-based activities	72
5.3	Indications of the characteristics of children's learning experience in the formalism-based activities	74
5.4	Indications of the characteristics of children's learning experience in the postmodernism/contextualism-based activities	76
5.5	Most frequently observed types of behavior identified during the aesthetics-based activities	80

1 Introduction

Over the last few decades scholars have come increasingly to consider that the arts must have a central part in curricula. A decisive factor in this has been the fact that the arts have been shown to be adaptable to different and complex educational situations, which frequently constitute the environment in today's schools (Copple & Bredeckamp, 2009; Dailey & Hauschild-Mork, 2017; Parsons, 2004). In particular, and of specific pedagogical interest, is investigating the educational contribution of "arts integration", that is, creating "relationships between learning in the arts and learning in the other skills and subjects of the curriculum" (Deasy, 2003, p. 3).

It has become clear that integrating the arts supports not only the teaching of the arts but also the teaching of other academic disciplines (Burnaford, Brown, Doherty, & McLaughlin, 2007; Deasy, 2002; Goldberg, 2012; Hardiman, Rinne, & Yarmolinskaya, 2014; Robinson, 2011; Scripp, Burnaford, Vazquez, Paradis, & Sienkiewicz, 2013). Examination of numerous instances of arts integration has shown that they can be successful and function pedagogically as transformative zones (Bresler, 2002; Eisner, 2002; Russell & Zembylas, 2007; Upitis, 2011), in which children can explore, discover, interpret, cooperate and exchange ideas during the teaching of every subject.

However, the design and ways of implementing arts integration activities are issues that concern recent research and are of theoretical and methodological interest. More specifically, although there are studies that show a need for arts integration in education to have a theoretical underpinning, they do not point to a structured framework (Booyeun, 2004; Cornett, 2011; Efland, 2002; Eisner, 2002; Gandini, Hill, Cadwell, & Schwall, 2005; Hetland, Winner, Veenema, & Sheridan, 2013; Snyder, 2001; Winner, Goldstein, & Vincent-Lancrin, 2013). Furthermore, these studies do not seem to have examined aesthetics as a basis to design arts integration activities. Yet another issue is the fact that even the studies that have proposals for concrete didactic approaches

2 Introduction

(Argyriadi & Sotiropoulou-Zormpala, 2017; Bastos & Zimmerman, 2015; Denac, 2014; Fleming, Bresler, & O’Toole, 2015; Krug & Cohen-Evron, 2000; LaJevic, 2013; Sousa & Pilecki, 2013) do not have a common orientation. For example, using the arts in aid of students’ academic improvement is an issue that has divided the research community (Bresler, 2002; Deasy, 2002; Mouriki-Zervou, 2011; Smith, 1995; Winner, 2003; Winner & Cooper, 2000; Winner & Hetland, 2000). Given these issues, both those responsible for the policy of arts education and those who implement arts integration in classrooms feel baffled (Attwood, 2015; Gormley & McDermott, 2016).

From our point of view, coming from the disciplines of aesthetics and arts education, what has concerned us – and this is a concern we share with educators, researchers and theoretical scholars of arts education – is that the integration of the arts in school curricula is being attacked by two sides. At times, the implementers of arts education – frequently individuals who are not specialized in the arts – deal with the aesthetic act as a concept with a loose definition and use activities whose aesthetic nature is dubious. At other times, educators simply do not engage in aesthetic acts because they are intimidated by the arts and believe themselves to be incapable of dealing with them. In this book, we aim to provide a theoretical framework educators seem to need in the first case, and on this basis, we suggest concrete, practical approaches that could encourage educators in the second category to act.

This work contains a specific teaching design for arts integration in kindergarten and primary school. Initially, we examine the theoretical underpinnings of arts integration on key ideas and aspects of different aesthetic theories and approaches. Then we endeavor to organize a structured practice consisting of types of arts activities that correspond to the aesthetic views presented. Finally, the book sheds light on the possible benefits that can be derived when *experiential aesthetics-based arts integration*, as the proposed practice is called, is implemented in school classrooms.

The issue that oriented and guided this study is that arts education could constitute a practical (evidence-based) where aesthetics can be applied to education and where the scope and significance of the “aesthetic teaching” of any subject can be established (Granger, 2006; Macintyre-Latta, 2004; Pike, 2004; Sotiropoulou-Zormpala, 2012b, 2016). This book is based on two assumptions. The first is that every subject taught in school can be dealt with by the children as an aesthetic stimulus. In other words, during the teaching of a subject, children can participate in arts activities that encourage them to explore the aesthetic qualities of the subject and discover its aestheticity. The aesthetic teaching of a subject arises in this way and its content is based on a second assumption: criteria can emerge for the aesthetic teaching of school subjects based on the different approaches to aesthetic theory. The approaches of aesthetic theory can offer different yet corresponding ways of

treating the aesthetic stimuli that constitute or emerge from, or more generally are related to, the subjects taught in school. These considerations guide the following study of aesthetic theory as the necessary theoretical underpinning to design and implement arts integration. We examine how each aesthetic approach can be utilized as a base to design respective teaching situations. Moreover, we explore the possibility of a combinatory use of activities based on different aesthetic approaches to create the contents of aesthetic teaching for every subject taught.

We would also like to make clear that in this book, the term *art* shall refer to the processes of all artistic modes of expression: musical/audio, kinetic, theatrical, visual arts, literature, etc., as well as to the arts as a whole. Moreover, the reader should broadly interpret the term, as it frequently refers to activities undertaken by children from 3–12 years old. With this in mind, *art* (and/or *artistic activity*) shall refer to children's engagement with the structural elements of the various arts such as with tone, intensity, timbre and sound in music; movement in bodily expression and dance; colors, shapes, forms, textures and size for the visual arts; facial expressions, roles, mimesis and theatrical objects for drama; and symbolic language in poetry and literature. Based on this, the "arts activities" proposed as suitable for children in kindergarten and primary school are designed to be opportunities for them to use artistic materials and to master "proto-aesthetic" skills.

Following the introduction is a presentation of the theoretical background, in which the core ideas of four main aesthetic approaches (the representationalist, the expressionist/cognitivist, the formalist and the postmodernist/contextualist) are outlined and discussed in connection to arts education theories. It is also critically considered up to which point these approaches can serve the purposes of meaningful and well-documented arts integration practices that appear to be connected to each of them. A section follows analyzing the ways in which the main elements of each approach translate into respective ways of designing arts activities suitable to be integrated in teaching, and indeed in the aesthetic teaching of any subject in preschool and early primary school education. Design models of activities usable with young children are described, and in particular activities which aim to have children participate in learning not only verbally but also bodily, and call upon children not only to respond to aesthetic stimuli, but also to create and/or perform artworks. The next chapter examines the position that respective arts activities can have in primary education. There is then a description and analysis of interventions that took place in kindergarten and first and third grade classes. The purpose of the interventions, the sample of pupils, the manner of collecting data, and the criteria on which the data were analyzed are described, as are the results of the interventions. Finally, the findings are discussed and the educational perspectives are presented in the form of conclusions.

References

- Abbs, P. (1996). The new paradigm in British arts education. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 30(1), 63–71.
- Abell, K. (2006). Realism and the riddle of style. *Contemporary Aesthetics*, 4, 376.
- Adams, G. L., & Engelmann, S. (1996). *Research on direct instruction: 25 years beyond DISTAR*. Seattle, WA: Educational Assessment Systems.
- Aguirre, I. (2004). Beyond the understanding of visual culture: A pragmatic approach to aesthetic education. *Journal of Art Craft and Design*, 23(3), 256–269.
- Allison, B., & Hausman, J. (1998). The limits of theory in art education. *Journal of Art & Design Education*, 17(2), 121–127.
- Alperson, P. (1991). What should one expect from a philosophy of music education? *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 25(3), 215–242.
- Anderson, E. (2016). Learning from an artistically crafted moment: Valuing aesthetic experience in the student teacher's drama education. *International Journal of Education & the Arts*, 17(1). Retrieved from www.ijea.org/v17n1/
- Anderson, T. (1997). Toward a postmodern approach to art education. In J. Hutchens & M. Suggs (Eds.), *Art education: Content and practice in a postmodern era* (pp. 62–73). Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.
- Anderson, T. (2003). Art education for life. *The International Journal of Art & Design Education*, 22(1), 58–66.
- Anderson, T., Gussak, D., Hallmark, K., & Paul, A. (Eds.). (2010). *Art education for social justice*. Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.
- Anderson, T., & McRorie, S. (1997). A role for aesthetics in centering the K-12 art curriculum. *Art Education*, 50(3), 6–14.
- Anderson, T., & Milbrandt, M. K. (2005). *Art for life: Authentic instruction in art*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Argyriadi, A., & Sotiropoulou-Zormpala, M. (2017). Engaging first-graders in language arts through “arts-flow activities?”. *Curriculum Perspectives*, 37(1), 25–38.
- Aristotle. (1995). *Poetics (together with Longinus, on the Sublime & Demetrius, on style)*. (D. Halliwell, Trans.). Loeb Classical Library Vol. 199. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Attwood, A. I. (2015). *Aesthetic literacy through the avant-garde: Establishing an aesthetically responsive curriculum*. Doctoral dissertation. Washington

- State University, 3715154. Retrieved from <https://pqdtopen.proquest.com/doc/1710106661.html?FMT=AI>
- Baker, D. (2013). Art integration and cognitive development. *Journal for Learning Through the Arts*, 9(1).
- Barnes, R. (1987). *Teaching art to young children*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Barrett, T. (1997). Modernism and postmodernism: An overview with art examples. In J. Hutchens & M. Suggs (Eds.), *Content and practice in a postmodern era*. Reston, VA: The National Art Education Association.
- Barrett, T. (2017). *Why is that art? Aesthetics and criticism of contemporary art* (3rd ed.). New York, NY and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bastos, F., & Zimmerman, E. (Eds.). (2015). *Connecting creativity research and practice in art education*. Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.
- Beardsley, M. (1981). *Aesthetics: Problems in the philosophy of criticism* (2nd ed.). Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc.
- Bell, C. (1958). *Art*. New York, NY: Capricorn Books (Original work published 1913).
- Bilhartz, T. D., Bruhn, R. A., & Olson, J. E. (2000). The effect of early music training on child cognitive development. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 20, 615–636. doi:10.1016/S0193-3973(99)00033-7
- Blocker, G. (1979). *Philosophy of art education*. New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Blumenfeld-Jones, D. S. (2012). *Curriculum and the aesthetic life: Hermeneutics, body, democracy, and ethics in curriculum theory and practice*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Booyeun, L. (2004). Aesthetic discourses in early childhood settings: Dewey, Steiner, and Vygotsky. *Early Child Development and Care*, 174(5), 473–486.
- Borich, G. D. (2007). *Effective teaching methods: Research-based practice*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Merrill/Prentice Hall.
- Bresler, L. (1992). Visual art in primary grades: A portrait and analysis. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 7(3), 397–414.
- Bresler, L. (2002). Out of the trenches: The joys (and risks) of cross-disciplinary collaborations. *Council of Research in Music Education*, 152, 17–39.
- Bresler, L. (Ed.). (2007). *International handbook of research in arts education*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Brinkema, E. (2014). *The forms of the affects*. Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press.
- Broudy, H. S. (1987). *The role of imagery in learning*. Occasional Paper 1. The Getty Centre for Education in the Arts.
- Broudy, H. S. (1994). *Enlightened cherishing: An essay on aesthetic education*. Urbana, IL and Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Brouillette, L. (2010). How the arts help children to create healthy social scripts: Exploring the perceptions of elementary teachers. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 111(1), 16–24.
- Brown, D. J. (2006). *Teachers implicit theories of expression in visual arts education: A study of western Australian teachers*. Ph.D. dissertation. Edith Cowan University. Retrieved from <http://ro.ecu.edu.au/theses/52>

- Bruner, J. (1977). *The process of education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (Original work published 1960)
- Burden, P. R., & Byrd, D. M. (2010). *Methods for effective teaching: Meeting the needs of all students* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Burnaford, G., Brown, S., Doherty, J., & McLaughlin, H. J. (2007). *Arts integration frameworks, research and practice: A literature review*. Washington, DC: Arts Education Partnership.
- Burton, J. M. (2000). The configuration of meaning: Learner-centered art education revisited. *Studies in Art Education, 41*(4), 330–339.
- Butler, C. (2002). *Postmodernism: A very short introduction*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Cannatella, H. (2008). *The richness of art education*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Carroll, N. (1999). *Philosophy of art: A contemporary introduction*. London and New York, NY: Routledge.
- Carroll, N. (2001). *Beyond aesthetics*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Catterall, J. S. (2002). The arts and the transfer of learning. In R. J. Deasy (Ed.), *Critical links: Learning in the arts and student academic and social development* (pp. 151–157). Washington, DC: Arts Education Partnership.
- Cazden, C. (2005). The value of conversations for language development and reading comprehension. *Literacy Teaching and Learning, 9*(1), 1–6.
- Chapman, L. H. (1982). *Instant art instant culture: The unspoken policy for American schools*. New York, NY: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Chapman, S. (2015). Arts immersion: Using the arts as a language across the primary school curriculum. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 40*(9), 86–101.
- Charlton, W. (2016). *Aesthetics: An introduction*. London and New York, NY: Routledge.
- Chatzipanteli, A., Grammatikopoulos, V., & Gregoriadis, A. (2014). Development and evaluation of metacognition in early childhood education. *Early Child Development and Care, 184*(8), 1223–1232.
- The College Board. (2013). *International standards for arts education: A review of standards, practices, and expectations in thirteen countries and regions*. Retrieved from www.nationalartsstandards.org/sites/default/files/College%20Board%20Research%20-%20International%20Standards_0.pdf
- Collingwood, R. G. (1958). *The principles of art*. London, Oxford, and New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Collins, A., Joseph, D., & Bielaczyc, K. (2004). Design research: Theoretical and methodological issues. *The Journal for the Learning Sciences, 13*(1), 15–42.
- Constantino, T., & White, B. (2010). *Essays on aesthetic education for the 21st century*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (Eds.). (2015). *A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Learning by design*. London: Palgrave.
- Copple, C., & Bredeckamp, S. (Eds.). (2009). *Developmentally appropriate practice in early childhood programs serving children from birth through age 8*. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

- Cornett, C. (2011). *Creating meaning through literature and the arts: Arts integration for classroom teachers* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Croce, B. (1995). *Aesthetic as science of expression and general linguistic* (D. Ainslie, Trans.). New York, NY: Routledge (Original work published 1902).
- Csikszentmihályi, M. (2014). *Applications of flow in human development and education: The collected works of Mihaly Csikszentmihályi*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Dailey, R., & Hauschild-Mork, M. (2017). Making it all count: A cross-disciplinary collaboration model incorporating scholarship, creative activity, and student engagement. *InSight: A Journal of Scholarly Teaching*, 12, 64–78.
- Danto, A. (1981). *The transfiguration of the commonplace*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Danto, A. (1992). *Beyond the brillo box: The visual arts in post-historical perspective*. New York, NY: Farrar, Strauss, and Giroux.
- Davey, E. (1989). The cognitive in aesthetic activity. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 23(2), 107–112.
- Davydov, V. V. (1990). *Types of generalization in instruction: Logical and psychological problems in the structuring of school curricula*. Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.
- Deasy, R. (Ed.). (2002). *Critical links: Learning in the arts and student academic and social development*. Washington, DC: Arts Education Partnership.
- Deasy, R. (2003). *Creating quality integrated and interdisciplinary arts programs: A report of the arts education national forum*. Washington, DC: Arts Education Partnership.
- DeCarvalho, R. J. (1991). The humanistic paradigm in education. *The Humanistic Psychologist*, 19(1), 88–104. doi:10.1080/08873267.1991.9986754
- Denac, O. (2014). The significance and role of aesthetic education in schooling. *Creative Education*, 5, 1714–1719.
- Dewey, J. (1934). *Art as experience*. New York, NY: Minton, Balch & Company.
- Dewey, J. (1966). My pedagogic creed. In W. Baskin (Ed.), *Classics in education* (pp. 177–188). London: Vision Press.
- Dickie, G. (1979). *Aesthetics: An introduction*. Indianapolis, IN: Pegasus.
- Dislen, G. (2013). The reasons of lack of motivation from the students' and teachers' voice. *The Journal of Academic Social Science*, 1(1), 35–45.
- D'Olimpio, L., & Teachers, C. (2016). Philosophy for children meets the art of living: A holistic approach to an education for life. *Philosophical Inquiry in Education*, 23(2), 114–124.
- Dorn, C. M. (2000). The renewal of excellence. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 101(30), 17–18.
- Dorn, C. M. (2005). The end of art in education. *Art Education*, 58(6), 47–54.
- Dowling, C. (n.d.). Aesthetic formalism. In *Internet encyclopedia of philosophy*. Retrieved from www.iep.utm.edu/aes-form/#H3
- Duncum, P. (2000). How art education can contribute to the globalisation of culture. *Journal of Art and Design Education*, 19(2), 170–180.
- Duncum, P. (2001). Visual culture: Developments, definitions, and directions for art education. *Studies in Art Education*, 42(2), 101–112.

- Duncum, P. (2002a). Theorising everyday aesthetic experience with contemporary visual culture. *Visual Arts Research*, 28(2), 4–15.
- Duncum, P. (2002b). Clarifying visual culture. *Art Education*, 55(3), 6–11.
- Duncum, P. (2009). Visual culture in art education. *Visual Arts Research*, 35(1), 64–75.
- Eaton, M. (1988). *Basic issues in aesthetics*. Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Efland, A. D. (1990a). *A history of art education: Intellectual and social currents in teaching the visual arts*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Efland, A. D. (1990b). Art education in the twentieth century. In D. Soucy & M. A. Stankiewicz (Eds.), *Framing the past: Essays in art education* (pp. 216–236). Reston, VA: The National Art Education Association.
- Efland, A. D. (2002). *Art and cognition: Integrating the visual arts in the curriculum*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Efland, A. D. (2004a). Emerging visions of art education. In E. W. Eisner & M. D. Day (Eds.), *Handbook of research and policy in art education national art* (pp. 691–700). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. Publishers.
- Efland, A. D. (2004b). The entwining nature of the aesthetic: A discourse of visual culture. *Studies in Art Education*, 45(3), 234–251.
- Efland, A. D. (2007). Arts education, the aesthetic and cultural studies. In L. Bresler (Ed.), *International handbook of research in arts education* (pp. 47–54). Dordrecht, NL: Springer.
- Eisner, E. W. (1972). *Educating artistic vision*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Eisner, E. W. (1976). *The arts, human development and education*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Eisner, E. W. (1992a). Aesthetic education. In *Encyclopedia of educational research* (Vol. 1, pp. 39–42). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Eisner, E. W. (1992b). Curriculum ideologies. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research curriculum* (pp. 302–326). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Eisner, E. W. (1996). *Cognition and curriculum reconsidered*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd.
- Eisner, E. W. (1999). Does experience in the arts boost academic achievement? *Clearing House*, 72(3), 143–149.
- Eisner, E. W. (2002). *The arts and the creation of mind*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Elkjaer, B. (2000). The continuity of action and thinking in learning: Re-visiting John Dewey. *Outlines: Critical Social Studies*, 2, 85–101.
- Elkjaer, B. (2009). Pragmatism: A learning theory for the future. In K. Illeris (Ed.), *Contemporary theories of learning: Learning theorists . . . in their own words* (pp. 74–89). London and New York, NY: Routledge.
- Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (2001). Participant observation and fieldnotes. In P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delamont, J. Lofland, & L. Lofland (Eds.), *Handbook of ethnography* (pp. 356–357). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Entwhistle, H. (1970). *Child-centred education*. London: Methuen.
- Epstein, A. S. (2007). *The intentional teacher: Choosing the best strategies for young children's learning*. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

- Eurydice. (2009). *Arts and cultural education at school in Europe*. Brussels. Retrieved from http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/thematic_reports/113EN.pdf
- Feldman, E. B. (1992). Formalism and its discontents. *Studies in Art Education*, 33(2), 122–126.
- Fleming, M. (2012). *The arts in education: An introduction to aesthetics, theory and pedagogy*. London and New York, NY: Routledge.
- Fleming, M., Bresler, L., & O'Toole, J. (2015). *Routledge international handbook of the arts and education*. London: Routledge.
- Flewitt, R. (2013). Multimodal perspectives on early childhood literacies. In J. Larson & J. Marsh (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of early childhood literacy* (pp. 295–309). London: Sage.
- Freedman, K. (2000). Social perspectives on art education in the U.S: Teaching visual culture in a democracy. *Studies in Art Education*, 41(4), 314–326.
- Freedman, K. (2003). *Teaching visual culture: Curriculum, aesthetics, and the social life of art*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Freedman, K., & Stuhr, P. (2004). Curriculum change for the 21st century: Visual culture in art education. In E. W. Eisner & M. D. Day (Eds.), *Handbook of research and policy in art education national art* (pp. 815–827). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. Publishers.
- Freeland, C. (2001). *But is it art? An introduction to art theory*. Oxford and New York, NY: Oxford University Press Inc.
- Fried, M. (1998). *Art and objecthood: Essays and reviews*. Chicago, IL and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Fry, R. (1920). *Vision and design*. London: Chatto and Windus Ltd.
- Gandini, L., Hill, L., Cadwell, L., & Schwall, C. (2005). *In the spirit of the studio: Learning from the atelier of Reggio Emilia*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Gardner, H. (2009). Multiple approaches to understanding. In K. Illeris (Ed.), *Contemporary theories of learning: Learning theorists . . . in their own words* (pp. 106–115). London and New York, NY: Routledge.
- Garrett, C. E. (2013). Promoting student engagement and creativity by infusing art across the curriculum: The arts integration initiative at Oklahoma City University. *About Campus*, 18(2), 27–32.
- Gee, J. P. (2004). *Situated language and learning: A critique of traditional schooling*. London: Routledge.
- Gelineau, R. P. (2012). *Integrating the arts across the elementary school curriculum* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage.
- Goldberg, M. (2012). *Arts integration: Teaching subject matter through the arts in multicultural settings*. Boston, MA: Pearson/Allyn and Bacon.
- Goldsmith, L., Hetland, L., Hoyle, C., & Winner, E. (2016). Visual-spatial thinking in geometry and the visual arts. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity and the Arts*, 10(1), 56–71.
- Goldstein, L. S. (2008). Teaching the standards in developmentally appropriate practice: Strategies for incorporating the sociopolitical dimension of DAP in early childhood teaching. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 36, 253–260.

- Gombrich, E. H. (2000). *Art and illusion: A study in the psychology of pictorial representation* (Millennium, Ed.). Princeton, NJ and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Goodman, N. (1976). *Languages of art: An approach to a theory of symbols* (2nd ed.). Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company.
- Goodman, N. (1978). *Ways of worldmaking*. Indianapolis, IN and Cambridge, MA: Hackett Publishing Company.
- Goodman, N., Perkins, D., & Gardner, H. (1972). *Basic abilities required for understanding and creation in the arts: Final report*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, Graduate School of Education. Project no. 9-0283.
- Gormley, K., & McDermott, P. (2016). The exclusion of the creative arts from contracted school curricula for teaching the common core standards. *Journal for Learning Through the Arts*, 12(1), 1–12.
- Granger, D. (2006). Teaching aesthetics and aesthetic teaching: Toward a Deweyan perspective. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 40(2), 45–66.
- Greenberg, C. (1961). *Art and culture*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Greenberg, C. (1982). Modernist painting. In F. Francina & C. Harrison (Eds.), *Modern art and modernism: A critical anthology* (pp. 5–10). London: Harper & Row and Open University Press.
- Greene, M. (2001). *Variations on a blue guitar, the Lincoln center institute lectures on aesthetic education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Greer, W. D. (1984). Discipline-Based Art Education: Approaching Art as a Subject of Study. *Studies in Art Education*, 25(4), 212–218.
- Griffin, S. M., Rowsell, J., Winters, K.-L., Vietgen, P., McLauchlan, D., & McQueen-Fuentes, G. (2017). A reason to respond: Finding agency through the arts. *International Journal of Education and the Arts*, 18(25), 1–24.
- Gude, O. (2004). Postmodern principles: In search of a 21st century art education. *Art Education*, 57(1), 6–14.
- Gude, O. (2008). Aesthetics making meaning. *Studies in Art Education*, 50(1), 98–103.
- Gude, O. (2013). New school art styles: The project of art education. *Art Education*, 66(1), 6–15.
- Habermas, J. (1981). Modernity versus postmodernity. *New German Critique*, 22, 3–14.
- Hagaman, S. (1990). Philosophical aesthetics in the art class: A look toward implementation. *Art Education*, 43(4), 22–39.
- Hardiman, M., Rinne, L., & Yarmolinskaya, J. (2014). The effects of arts integration on long-term retention of academic content. *Mind, Brain, and Education*, 8(3), 144–148. doi:10.1111/mbe.12053
- Hawkins, B. (2002). Children's drawing, self-expression, identity and the imagination. *Journal of Art and Design Education*, 22(3), 209–219.
- Hellenic Pedagogical Institute–Hellenic Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs. (2003). Ministerial Decisions 21072a/C2 and 21072b/C2. *Cross-curricular thematic framework and curricula of primary and secondary education* [available in Greek]. Official Government Gazette 303 v. A² and 304 v. B². Athens: National Printing Office.

- Henry, C. (2002). Reflections on Manuel Barkan's contributions to art education. *Art Education*, 55(6), 6–11.
- Herberholz, B., & Hanson, L. (1995). *Early childhood art* (5th ed.). Dubuque, IA: Brown.
- Heron, J. (1992). *Feeling and personhood: Psychology in another key*. London: Sage.
- Heron, J. (2009). Life cycles and learning cycles. In K. Illeris (Ed.), *Contemporary theories of learning: Learning theorists . . . in their own words* (pp. 129–146). London and New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hesterman, S. (2013). Early childhood designs for multiliteracies learning. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, 36(3), 158–168.
- Hetland, L., Winner, E., Veenema, S., & Sheridan, K. (2013). *Studio thinking 2: The real benefits of visual arts education* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Hetland, L. & Winner, E. (2000). The arts and academic achievement: What the evidence shows. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 34(3/4), 3–10.
- Ho, C. (2016). In search of an aesthetic pathway: Young children's encounters with drama. *Early Child Development and Care*, 187(1), 1–12.
- Hobbs, J. A. (1993). In defense of a theory of art for art education. *Studies in Art Education*, 34(2), 102–113.
- Hobbs, J. A. (1997). The interaction between art education and theories of art. In J. Hutchens & M. Suggs (Eds.), *Content and practice in a postmodern era* (pp. 47–61). Reston, VA: The National Art Education Association.
- Hospers, J. (1969). The concept of artistic expression. In J. Hospers (Ed.), *Introductory readings in aesthetics* (pp. 142–167). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Hurwitz, A., & Day, M. (2007). *Children and their art: Methods for the elementary school* (8th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Hutchens, J., & Suggs, M. (Eds.). (1997). *Art education: Content and practice in a postmodern era*. Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.
- Illeris, K. (2009). A comprehensive understanding of human learning. In K. Illeris (Ed.), *Contemporary theories of learning: Learning theorists . . . in their own words* (pp. 7–20). London and New York, NY: Routledge.
- jagodinski, J. (1991). A para-critical/sitical/sightical reading of Ralph Smith's excellence in art education. *Journal of Social Theory in Art Education*, 11, 119–159.
- Jameson, F. (1991). *Postmodernism, or, the cultural logic of late capitalism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Jarvis, P. (2006). *Towards a comprehensive theory of human learning*. London: Routledge.
- Jeffers, C. S. (1999). Lessons for art education from reading education: A commentary. *Studies in Art Education*, 40(3), 275–278.
- Jewitt, C. (Ed.). (2009). *The Routledge handbook of multimodal analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Jimenez, M. (1997). *Qu'est-ce que l'esthétique ?* Paris : Gallimard.
- Kant, I. (2000). *Critique of the power of judgment* (P. Guyer & E. Matthews, Trans.). Cambridge, MA and New York, NY: Cambridge University Press (Original work published 1790).

- Kegan, R. (2009). What “form” transforms? A constructive-developmental approach to transformative learning. In K. Illeris (Ed.), *Contemporary theories of learning: Learning theorists . . . in their own words* (pp. 35–52). London and New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kieran, M. (2005). *Revealing art: Why art matters*. London: Routledge.
- Kivy, P. (1997). *Philosophies of arts: An essay in differences*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Kress, G. (2010). *Multimodality: A social semiotic approach to contemporary communication*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Krug, D. H., & Cohen-Evron, N. (2000). Curriculum integration positions and practices in art education. *Studies in Art Education*, 41(3), 258–275.
- Kulvicki, J. (2006). *On images*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kurt, M., & Kurt, S. (2017). Improving design understandings and skills through enhanced metacognition: Reflective design journals. *International Journal of Art & Design Education*, 36(2), 226–238.
- LaJevic, L. (2013). Arts integration: What is really happening in the elementary classroom? *Journal for Learning Through the Art*, 8(1). Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1018332.pdf>
- Langer, S. (1953). *Feeling and form: A theory of art*. New York, NY: Charles Scribner’s Sons.
- Larkin, S., & Flannery, Q. S. (2015). Metacognitive experiences: Taking account of feelings in early years education. In S. Robson (Ed.), *The Routledge international handbook of young children’s thinking and understanding* (pp. 189–198). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Lave, J. (2009). The practice of learning. In K. Illeris (Ed.), *Contemporary theories of learning: Learning theorists . . . in their own words* (pp. 200–208). London and New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lilliedahl, J. (2018). Building knowledge through arts integration. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 13(2), 133–145.
- Lindström, L. (2012). Aesthetic learning about, in, with and through the arts: A curriculum study. *International Journal of Art & Design Education*, 31(2), 166–179. doi:10.1111/j.1476-8070.2012.01737.x
- Lopes, D. (1996). *Understanding pictures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lowenfeld, V., & Michael, J. A. (1982). *The Lowenfeld lectures: Viktor Lowenfeld on art education and therapy*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Luftig, R. (2000). An investigation of an arts infusion program on creative thinking, academic achievement, affective functioning, and arts appreciation at three grade level. *Studies in Art Education*, 41(3), 208–227.
- Lyotard, J.-F. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge* (G. Bennington & B. Massumi, Trans.). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Macintyre-Latta, M. (2004). Traces, patterns, textures: In search of aesthetic teaching/learning encounters. In D. M. Callejo-Perez, S. M. Fain, & J. J. Slater (Eds.), *Pedagogy of place* (pp. 79–96). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Manzella, D. (1963). *Educationists and the evisceration of the visual arts*. Scranton, PA: International Textbook Company.

- Markovic, S. (2011). Components of aesthetic experience: Aesthetic fascination, aesthetic appraisal, and aesthetic emotion. *I-Perception*, 3, 1–17. doi:10.1068/i0450aap
- Martin, L., & Schwartz, D. L. (2014). A pragmatic perspective on visual representation and creative thinking. *Visual Studies*, 29(1), 80–93. doi:10.1080/1472586X.2014.862997
- McCombs, B. L., & Whisler, J. S. (1997). *The learner-centered classroom and school: Strategies for enhancing student motivation and achievement*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mello, R. (2007). Teaching for meaning-making and deep understanding in a general education theatre course. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 7(2), 90–109.
- Mezirow, J. (2009). An overview on transformative learning. In K. Illeris (Ed.), *Contemporary theories of learning: Learning theorists . . . in their own words* (pp. 90–105). London and New York, NY: Routledge.
- Michaels, S., O'Connor, C., & Resnick, L. (2008). Deliberative discourse idealized and realized: Accountable talk in the classroom and in civic life. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 27, 283–297.
- Miller, J. P. (2007). *The holistic curriculum*. Toronto: OISE Press.
- Moore, R. (1998). History of aesthetic education. In *Encyclopedia of aesthetics* (2nd ed., pp. 89–93). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Morgan, D. (1988). *Focus group as qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mouriki-Zervou, A. (2003). *Metamorphoses tis aisthitikis* [metamorphoses of aesthetics]. Athens: Nefeli.
- Mouriki-Zervou, A. (2011). The cognitive dimension of art: Aesthetic and educational value. *The International Journal of Learning*, 18(1), 1–12.
- Narey, M. (Ed.). (2008). *Making meaning: Constructing multimodal perspectives of language, literacy, and learning through arts-based early childhood education*. New York: Springer.
- Nathan, L. (2014). Why arts? *The Educational Forum*, 78(4), 351–354. doi:10.1080/00131725.2014.944075
- The National Coalition for Core Art Standards. (2013). *The national core arts standards: A conceptual framework for arts learning*. Retrieved from <http://nccas.wikispaces.com/>
- Neuendorf, K. (2002). *The content analysis guidebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Newall, M. (2011). *What is a picture? Depiction, realism, abstraction*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Omrod, J. E. (2014). *Educational psychology: Developing learners* (8th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (O.E.C.D.). (2006). *Starting strong II*. Early childhood education and care. O.E.C.D.
- Orlich, D. C., Harder, R. J., Callahan, R. C., Trevisan, M., Brown, A., & Miller, D. (2007). *Teaching strategies: A guide of effective instruction*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

- Parsons, M. J. (2004). Art and integrated curriculum. In E. W. Eisner & M. D. Day (Eds.), *Handbook of research and policy in art education* (pp. 775–794). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Parsons, M. J., & Blocker, H. G. (1993). *Aesthetics and education*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Pearse, H. (1992). Beyond paradigms: Art education theory and practice in a post-paradigmatic world. *Studies in Art Education*, 33(4), 244–252.
- Pearse, H. (1997). Doing otherwise: Art education praxis in a postparadigmatic world. In J. Hutchens & M. Suggs (Eds.), *Art education: Content and practice in a postmodern era* (pp. 31–39). Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.
- Pike, M. (2004). Aesthetic teaching. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 38(2), 20–37.
- Plato. (1974). *The republic* (D. Lee, Trans.). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Pope, D. C. (2001). *Doing school: How we are creating a generation of stressed out, materialistic, and miseducated students*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Rabkin, N., & Redmond, R. (Eds.). (2004). *Putting the arts in the picture: Reframing education in the 21st century*. Chicago, IL: Columbia College Chicago.
- Rasanen, M. (1997). *Building bridges, experiential art understanding: A work of art as a means of understanding and constructing self*. Helsinki: University of Art and Design Helsinki.
- Read, H. (1956). *Education through art* (3rd ed.). London: Faber & Faber.
- Reid, L. (1969). *Meaning in the arts*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Reimer, B. (1992). What knowledge is of most worth? In B. Reimer & R. A. Smith (Eds.), *The arts, education and aesthetic knowing* (pp. 20–50). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Richardson, D. (1992). *Teaching art, craft and design*. Melbourne: Longman Cheshire.
- Rimm-Kaufman, S. E., La Paro, K. M., Downer, J. T., & Pianta, R. C. (2005). The contribution of classroom setting and quality of instruction to children's behavior in the kindergarten classroom. *Elementary School Journal*, 105(4), 377–394. doi:10.1086/429948
- Robinson, A. (2011). Research review of the effects of arts integrated curriculum on student success. *International Journal of Arts and Sciences*, 4(11), 289–303.
- Rogers, C. (1983). *Freedom to learn for the 80s*. Columbus, OH: Charles Merrill.
- Rollins, M. (2001). Pictorial representation. In B. Gaut & D. Lopes (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to aesthetics* (pp. 297–312). London: Routledge.
- Rooney, R. (2004). *Arts-based teaching and learning: Review of the literature*. Washington, DC: WESTAT Rockville, Maryland. Retrieved from www.kennedy-center.org/education/vsa/resources/VSAarts_Lit_Rev5-28.pdf
- Rousseau, J.-J. (1921). *Emile, or education* (B. Foxley, Trans.). London and Toronto: J. M. Dent and Sons (Original work published 1762).
- Russell, J., & Zembylas, M. (2007). Arts integration in the curriculum: A review of research and implications for teaching and learning. In L. Bresler (Ed.), *International handbook of research in arts education* (pp. 287–301). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

- Rymes, B. (2016). *Classroom discourse analysis: A tool for critical reflection* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Sandell, R. (2009). Using form+theme+context (FTC) for rebalancing 21st-century art education. *Studies in Art Education*, 50(3), 287–299.
- Scripp, L., Burnaford, G., Vazquez, O., Paradis, L., & Sienkiewicz, F. (2013). *Partnerships in arts integration research final reports*. Washington, DC: Arts Education Partnership.
- Shusterman, R. (2005). Aesthetics and postmodernism. In J. Levinson (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of aesthetics* (pp. 771–782). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, R. A. (Ed.). (1970). *Aesthetic concepts and education*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Smith, R. A. (1989). *Discipline-based art education*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Smith, R. A. (1991). Philosophy and theory of aesthetic education. In R. A. Smith & A. Simpson (Eds.), *Aesthetics and art education* (pp. 134–148). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Smith, R. A. (1995). The limits and costs of integration in arts education. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 96(5), 21–25.
- Smith, R. A. (2002). The new pluralism and discipline-based art education. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 104(1), 11–16.
- Smith, R. A. (2004). Aesthetic education: Questions and issues. In E. W. Eisner & M. D. Day (Eds.), *Handbook of research and policy in art education* (pp. 163–86). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Smith, R. A., & Simpson, A. (Eds.). (1991). *Aesthetics and arts education*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Snyder, S. (2001). Connection, correlation, and integration. *Music Educators Journal*, 87(5), 32–39, 70.
- Sotiropoulou-Zormpala, M. (2012a). Reflections on aesthetic teaching: An approach to language arts in early childhood curriculum. *Art Education: The Journal of the National Art Education Association*, 65(1), 6–10.
- Sotiropoulou-Zormpala, M. (2012b). Aesthetic teaching: Seeking a balance between teaching arts and teaching through the arts. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 113(4), 123–128. doi:10.1080/10632913.2012.719419
- Sotiropoulou-Zormpala, M. (2016). Seeking a higher level of arts integration across the curriculum. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 117(1), 43–54. doi:10.1080/10632913.2014.966288
- Sotiropoulou-Zormpala, M., & Mouriki-Zervou, A. (2018). Aesthetics-based arts integration in elementary education. *The International Journal of Arts Education*, 13(1), 33–44. doi:10.18848/2326-9944/CGP/v13i01/33-44.
- Sotiropoulou-Zormpala, M., Trouli, K., & Linardakis, M. (2015). Arts education in Greek Universities for future pre-school and primary school teachers: Departmental programs and students' views. *Preschool and Primary Education*, 3(1), 34–52. doi:10.12681/ppj.105
- Sousa, D. A., & Pilecki, T. (2013). *From stem to steam: Using brain-compatible strategies to integrate the arts*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Spidell-Rusher, A., McGrevin, C., & Lambiotte, J. (1992). Belief systems of early childhood teachers and their principals regarding early childhood education. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 7(2), 277–296.
- Tafa, E. (2011). The education of preschool children and the teachers' role. In C. Chryssafidis & R. Sivropoulou (Eds.), *Principles and perspectives of preschool education* (pp. 205–232). Thessaloniki: Kiriakidis Brothers.
- Tarr, P. (2001). Aesthetic codes in early childhood classrooms: What art educators can learn from Reggio Emilia. *Art Education*, 54(3), 33–39.
- Tavin, K. (2005). Hauntological shifts: Fear and loathing of popular (visual) culture. *Studies in Art Education*, 46(2), 101–117.
- Tavin, K., & Hausman, J. (2004). Art education and visual culture in the age of globalization. *Art Education*, 57(5), 47–53.
- Tolstoy, L. (1964). What is art? In W. E. Kennick (Ed.), *Art and philosophy: Readings in aesthetics* (pp. 7–18). New York, NY: St. Martin's Press (Original work published 1897).
- Uptis, R. (2011). *Arts education for the development of the whole child*. Toronto: Elementary Teachers' Federation of Ontario.
- Van de Kamp, M. T., Admiraal, W., Van Drie, J., & Rijlaarsdam, G. (2015). Enhancing divergent thinking in visual arts education: Effects of explicit instruction of meta-cognition. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 85(1), 47–58.
- Van den Akker, R., Gibbons, A., & Vermeulen, T. (Eds.). (2017). *Metamodernism: Historicity, affect and depth after postmodernism*. London: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Van Leeuwen, T. (2015). Multimodality in education: Some directions and some questions. *TELOS Quarterly*, 49(3), 582–589.
- Vattimo, G. (1992). *The transparent society* (D. Webb, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (2004). Imagination and creativity in childhood. *Journal of Russian and East European Psychology*, 42(1), 7–97.
- Walton, K. (1970). Categories of art. *The Philosophical Review*, 79, 334–367.
- Webster, S., & Wolfe, M. (2013). Incorporating the aesthetic dimension into pedagogy. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 38(10), 21–33. doi:10.14221/ajte.2013v38n10.2
- Wellmer, A. (1984). On the dialectic of modernism and postmodernism. *Praxis International*, 4(4), 337–362.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- White, B. (2009). *Aesthetics primer*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Winner, E. (2003). Beyond the evidence given: A critical commentary on Critical Links. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 104(3), 1–13.
- Winner, E., & Cooper, M. (2000). Mute those claims: No evidence (yet) for a causal link between arts study and academic achievement. *The Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 34(3–4), 11–75.
- Winner, E., Goldstein, T., & Vincent-Lancrin, S. (2013). *Art for art's sake? The impact of arts education*. OECD Publishing.
- Wolin, R. (1984). Modernism vs. postmodernism. *Telos*, 62, 9–31.

- Wright, R. (2006). Walking the walk: Review of learner-centered teaching. *Life Sciences Education*, 5(311), 311–312.
- Zangwill, N. (2001). *The metaphysics of beauty*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Zevin, J. (2000). *Social studies for the twenty-first century: Methods and materials for teaching*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Ziehe, T. (2009). “Normal learning problems” in youth: In the context of underlying cultural convictions. In K. Illeris (Ed.), *Contemporary theories of learning: Learning theorists . . . in their own words* (pp. 184–199). London and New York, NY: Routledge.

Discography

- Hadjidakis, M. (music), Roussos, G. (lyrics). (1970 first recording). *Thalassa plateia* [Wide sea]. Vinyl record: *Mythos*. Athens: Lyra.