

Transforming art education philosophy in Indonesian teacher institutes: From production to aesthetic experience

Transformando la filosofía de la educación artística en los institutos docentes de Indonesia: De la producción a la experiencia estética

Kasiyan

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6002-9428>

Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Abstract

Art education in teacher training diverges from specialized art education geared towards professional artists. Teacher education prioritizes aesthetic competence through art production and appreciation, aiming to cultivate taste based on values. In contrast, specialized art education focuses on creating aesthetic works within established forms, targeting aspiring professional artists. These distinct emphases significantly shape their respective approaches. Teacher training institutions emphasize fostering students' appreciation for art's value and the importance of aesthetic experiences. However, confusion sometimes blurs the goals between teacher training and specialized art education, affecting art education across different levels. This confusion can lead to an overemphasis on art production over a deep understanding of aesthetics. This paper critically examines these issues and suggests solutions to align art education in teacher training with its intended goals. By clarifying these distinctions and underscoring the role of aesthetic experience, this study aims to enhance art education practices in teacher training programs.

Keywords: art education transformation, Indonesian teacher institutes, aesthetic experience in art, educational paradigm shift, revitalizing art philosophy.

Resumen

La educación artística en la formación del profesorado difiere de la educación artística especializada dirigida a artistas profesionales. La formación docente prioriza la competencia estética a través de la producción y apreciación del arte, con el objetivo de cultivar el gusto basado en valores. Por el contrario, la educación artística especializada se centra en la creación de obras estéticas dentro de formas establecidas, dirigidas a aspirantes a artistas profesionales. Estos distintos énfasis moldean significativamente sus respectivos enfoques. Las instituciones de formación de docentes hacen hincapié en fomentar la apreciación de los estudiantes por el valor del arte y la importancia de las experiencias estéticas. Sin embargo, la confusión a veces desdibuja los objetivos entre la formación docente y la educación artística especializada, afectando la educación artística en diferentes niveles. Esta confusión puede conducir a un énfasis excesivo en la producción artística sobre una comprensión profunda de la estética. Este artículo examina críticamente estas cuestiones y sugiere soluciones para alinear la educación artística en la formación docente con los objetivos previstos.

Al aclarar estas distinciones y subrayar el papel de la experiencia estética, este estudio pretende mejorar las prácticas de educación artística en los programas de formación de profesores.

Palabras clave: transformación de la educación artística, institutos de profesores de Indonesia, experiencia estética en el arte, cambio de paradigma educativo, revitalización de la filosofía del arte.

Introduction

In one of his seminal philosophical reflections, Plato expressed one of his biggest thesis regarding the relationship between arts and education field. He stated that “Art should be the basis of education” (Read, 2008; Koopman, 2010; Nasr, S. H., & Jahanbegloo, 2010:266; Bruff, 2018). The idea remains relevant today, particularly in the contexts of arts education practices in schools, starting from those conducted in elementary schools to those of secondary schools. The spirit of arts education paradigm in relation to its practice in schools, has commonly been the focus of each art education institution in Indonesia.

Art education occupies a vital position within teacher training institutions, serving as a foundational component in the development of educators who are not only proficient in imparting technical skills across various art disciplines but also adept at nurturing creativity, critical thinking, and cultural literacy among students at the primary and secondary levels of education (Gadsden, 2008; Alter, F., Hays, T., & O’Hara, 2009; Harris, A., & De Bruin, 2018). At its core, art education transcends mere skill acquisition; it serves as a dynamic conduit for fostering holistic development by encouraging students to engage deeply with aesthetic, historical, and cultural dimensions of human expression (Sullivan, 1993; Zimmerman, 2009). Through systematic exposure to visual arts, music, theater, and dance, future educators gain invaluable insights into the transformative power of artistic experiences in enriching students' lives (Gadsden, 2008; Dwyer, 2011; Wright, 2012). In perspective Cobo (2013); too Ahmadi, N., & Besançon (2017), and Thornhill-Miller, B., Camarda, A., Mercier, M., Burkhardt, J. M., Morisseau, T., Bourgeois-Bougrine, S., ... & Lubart (2023), incorporating art into teacher training curricula facilitates the cultivation of a broad spectrum of competencies essential for twenty-first-century learners. These competencies include creativity, which is increasingly recognized as a cornerstone of innovation and problem-solving in diverse professional contexts.

Moreover, art education, in the view of (de Julián, M. P. P., & Pérez, 2022; Raza, 2023; Wu, 2023) can foster emotional intelligence by encouraging students to explore and express complex emotions through the creative process, thus fostering empathy, resilience, and self-awareness. This emotional literacy is crucial in promoting mental well-being and social cohesion among students, contributing to a more inclusive and supportive educational environment (Reicher, 2010; Halliday, A. J., Kern, M. L., Garrett, D. K., & Turnbull, 2019; Juvonen, J., Lessard, L. M., Rastogi, R., Schacter, H. L., & Smith, 2019). Beyond its intrinsic

developmental benefits, art education also plays a pivotal role in advancing broader educational objectives. By integrating arts across the curriculum, teacher training institutions promote interdisciplinary learning, where artistic practices intersect with subjects such as science, mathematics, and history, enhancing students' understanding of complex concepts and fostering interdisciplinary connections (Marshall, 2014; Bautista, A., Tan, L. S., Ponnusamy, L. D., & Yau, 2016). Furthermore, art education contributes to cultural literacy by exposing students to diverse artistic traditions and perspectives, thereby promoting cross-cultural understanding and appreciation in an increasingly interconnected global society (Schuerholz-Lehr, 2007; Delacruz, 2019).

In the context of teacher training institutions in Indonesia, the emphasis on art education is particularly significant due to its potential to address socio-cultural challenges and promote national identity. By equipping future educators with comprehensive pedagogical strategies grounded in artistic practices, these institutions not only empower educators to effectively teach art skills but also to instill in students a deep appreciation for Indonesian cultural heritage and contemporary artistic expressions. This approach not only preserves cultural identities but also promotes creativity as a catalyst for social change and sustainable development.

In conclusion, the integration of robust art education programs within teacher training institutions is indispensable for preparing educators who can nurture the intellectual, emotional, and cultural growth of students (Gadsden, 2008; Burnaford, G. E., Aprill, A., & Weiss, 2013). By fostering creativity, critical thinking, and cultural understanding, art education not only enhances educational outcomes but also cultivates a generation of informed global citizens capable of navigating and contributing to an increasingly complex and interconnected world (Liao, 2016; Gibson, R., & Ewing, 2020).

The problem is that from this idea there are deviations and biases in practice that are prevalent, so that the awareness and paradigm of arts science governance in two different arts education institutions, namely between arts education for public or general schools, tends to be managed similarly to arts education institutions that specialise in managing arts science or vocational arts institutions. The field of art education in teacher training institutions in Indonesia is fraught with significant misconceptions about its orientation and purpose. These misconceptions stem mainly from the tendency to equate art education for prospective teachers with specialised training for professional artists. This conflation results in the adoption of philosophical orientations and paradigms that are not aligned with the true purpose of art education within the broader educational framework. Misapplication can have several negative impacts, including the prioritisation of art production over the development of aesthetic experience and critical appreciation. As a result, students may miss out on the holistic educational benefits that arts education can provide, such as improved emotional intelligence, cultural literacy and moral development.

Therefore, this paper mainly discusses the affirmation of the philosophy and fundamental paradigm of art education in general schools, which need to get a different perspective, compared to schools that are specifically developing art

scientific concentrations or art vocational schools. This discussion is expected to be a kind of reflection in order to revitalise the practical awareness of the scientific management of art education in general art education institutions, not specifically for art or art vocations.

In the scientific context of art education designed for public or general schools, art assumes a multifaceted role as a critical instrument for fostering a holistic human development. It serves as a unique medium that effectively bridges the dichotomies of intellect and sensibility, rationality and irrationality, and intellectual intelligence and emotional awareness (Goldblatt, 2006; Clarke, J., Lovelock, R., & McNay, 2016). This integrative function of art education is pivotal in nurturing well-rounded individuals who possess not only cognitive acuity but also emotional depth and sensitivity (Haroutounian, 2019). The educational landscape often prioritizes the development of rational and analytical skills, yet it is through the arts that students can engage with their emotions, cultivate empathy, and explore the irrational aspects of human experience that are equally integral to their development (Greene, 2000; Deasy, 2002). Art, therefore, becomes a conduit for balancing these diverse aspects of human cognition and emotion, ensuring that education transcends mere academic achievement and fosters the development of fully realized individuals (Duncan-Andrade, J. M. R., & Morrell, 2008; Macleod, K., & Holdridge, 2013).

Moreover, art education plays a significant role in moral and ethical development. It provides students with opportunities to explore complex moral dilemmas, understand diverse perspectives, and develop a nuanced sense of right and wrong. Through engagement with various forms of artistic expression—be it visual arts, music, theater, or dance—according Cabedo-Mas, A., Nethsinghe, R., & Forrest (2017) and Leavy (2020), students encounter different cultural narratives and ethical viewpoints, which broaden their understanding and appreciation of human diversity. This exposure is crucial in shaping their moral compass and character, guiding them toward becoming conscientious and ethically responsible individuals.

The transformative power of art education also lies in its ability to enhance personality traits and character. It encourages self-expression and self-discovery, allowing students to explore their identities and articulate their thoughts and feelings in a safe and supportive environment (Lawton, P. H., Walker, M. A., & Green, 2019; Karia, 2020). This process of self-exploration is essential for personal growth and self-actualization. Through the creation and appreciation of art, students learn to value their unique perspectives and contributions, fostering a sense of self-worth and confidence. Additionally, collaborative art projects and group performances cultivate teamwork, communication skills, and mutual respect among peers, further contributing to their social and emotional development.

In essence, art education should be recognized as an indispensable component of the curriculum in public or general schools, not merely as an ancillary subject but as a foundational element that enriches the educational experience. It offers a comprehensive approach to education that addresses the intellectual, emotional, moral, and social dimensions of student development. By integrating art education into the broader educational framework, schools can cultivate well-

rounded, empathetic, and morally grounded individuals who are equipped to navigate the complexities of the modern world (Hunter, M. A., Aprill, A., Hill, A., & Emery, 2018; Bertling, 2023). This holistic approach to education underscores the profound impact that art can have on personal and societal development, highlighting its vital role in shaping the future of education. Moreover, (Eisner, 1972) mentions that, one of the functions of art is to provide a sense of visionary in human experience. This function is achieved in at least two ways: art, especially the visual arts, has been used to express the most sublime human visions. For centuries art has served as a means of making the spiritual, particularly in religion, visual through images.

In a broader context, arts education holds a pivotal role in the development and perpetuation of societal culture. This transformative power of arts education is rooted in its capacity to facilitate intergenerational communication and cultural continuity, as articulated by Mc Fee (1970:26), who posits that "communication through art is one important means of culture development. It takes place as information is passed from one generation to another and as children learn from art how to respond to life patterns within their own culture." Through the lens of arts education, cultural values, traditions, and narratives are not merely preserved but are dynamically interpreted and reimagined by each new generation. This process of cultural transmission is crucial in maintaining the vibrancy and relevance of cultural heritage in an ever-evolving societal landscape (Yeom, M., Caraballo, L., Tsang, G., Larkin, J., & Comrie, 2020; Canyürek, 2022).

Moreover, arts education provides a unique platform for students to engage critically with their cultural environment. By immersing themselves in diverse artistic expressions, students gain insights into the historical and contemporary contexts that shape their cultural identity. This engagement fosters a deep understanding and appreciation of cultural diversity, promoting inclusivity and empathy within the societal fabric. As students explore different art forms, they learn to navigate and appreciate the complexities of cultural symbols, rituals, and practices, thereby strengthening their cultural literacy and intercultural competence.

In addition to its cultural and social benefits, arts education also has significant cognitive and developmental implications. The creative processes inherent in the arts—such as critical thinking, problem-solving, and emotional expression—parallel and enhance cognitive functions essential for academic success and personal growth. By integrating arts into the educational curriculum, schools can provide a more holistic education that addresses the intellectual, emotional, and cultural dimensions of student development. This holistic approach not only prepares students for academic and professional success but also equips them with the cultural and emotional tools necessary to navigate and contribute to a complex and interconnected world (Bamford, 2006; Burnaford, G. E., Aprill, A., & Weiss, 2013).

Ultimately, arts education serves as a vital conduit for cultural development and societal progress. It bridges the past and present, enabling the continuous evolution of cultural identity and heritage (Goldbard, 2006; Fahy, E., & Kenny, 2024). By fostering cultural literacy, promoting active participation in cultural life, and enhancing cognitive and emotional development, arts education lays the

foundation for a vibrant, inclusive, and culturally enriched society (White, 2009; Sabol, 2013). Therefore, the integration of robust arts education programs within the educational system is imperative for nurturing a generation of culturally competent and socially responsible individuals who are capable of contributing to the cultural and intellectual advancement of society (Fowler, 2001).

Therefore, arts education in this particular context, cannot be considered as having the same perspective as the “pure arts”, but rather conceptually and empirically needs to be considered as an educational means or instrument to reach holistically the ideal goals of education, that is, to create “real human” (Russell, J., & Zembylas, 2007; Lum, 2013). Arts education needs to be presented in its own logical paradigm that is ontologically, epistemologically and axiologically different from that of “pure arts”, the one presented in arts institutions. In these particular institutions, arts education is not seen as a means or an educational tool in its common definition, but rather as a way of educating its students to have a specific arts competence and become the professional artists. Therefore, it is very important and strategically meaningful to discuss the affirmation of the philosophy and fundamental paradigm of art education in general schools, which need to get a different perspective, compared to schools that specifically develop art scientific concentrations or art vocational schools. This discussion is expected to be a kind of reflection in order to revitalise the practical awareness of the scientific management of art education in art education institutions in general, not specifically in the arts or art vocations.

The purpose of this study is therefore twofold: first, to conduct a critical analysis of the prevailing paradigm of arts education in teacher training institutions, identifying the root causes of widespread misconceptions; and second, to propose alternative solutions aimed at revitalising arts education practices. By reorienting the philosophical foundations and pedagogical approaches of art education, this research seeks to align them more closely with the goal of promoting comprehensive human development (Gardner, 1990; Suominen, A., Hiltunen, M., & Anttila, 2021; Reimer, 2022). The significance of this research goes beyond academic discourse, offering valuable contributions to the field of arts education. Its findings and recommendations have major implications for policy-making and curriculum development, providing a framework for educators, administrators and policy-makers to develop more effective and meaningful arts education programmes. Ultimately, this study aims to improve the quality and impact of arts education, ensuring it fulfils its potential in nurturing individuals capable of critical thinking, creative expression and cultural engagement. The discussion of these issues is important for the improvement of future practices and the greater possibility of revitalising existing art education practices in art education institutions in the general context, especially those in Indonesia, and also does not rule out the possibility of being useful for other places, if there are similar problems.

Philosophy and paradigm in art education: comparison of educational philosophies: Teacher training vs. specialized art institutions

The philosophy and paradigm in art education are foundational elements that define the objectives, methods, and significance of art instruction within diverse educational contexts. Philosophically, art education explores the essential nature and purpose of art, as well as its role in human development and society (Efland, 2002; Davies, 2007). It encompasses a range of theoretical foundations that consider art both as a means of individual expression and as a cultural artifact that reflects and shapes collective values. Theoretical foundations in art education draw from various disciplines, including aesthetics, psychology, pedagogy, and sociology, to create a holistic framework for understanding how art influences and is influenced by human experience (Gadsden, 2008; Kokkos, 2010; Riley, 2024).

Key theoretical perspectives include constructivism, which emphasizes the learner's active role in creating meaning through artistic processes; phenomenology, which focuses on the experiential and perceptual aspects of engaging with art; and critical theory, which examines the socio-political dimensions of art and its potential to challenge and transform societal norms (Ahn, 1998). The philosophy of art education also considers the ethical and moral implications of teaching art, advocating for an approach that fosters empathy, critical thinking, and cultural awareness (Simpson, D. J., Jackson, M. J., & Simpson, 2004; (King, P. M., Brown, M. K., Lindsay, N. K., & VanHecke, 2007; Goldberg, 2021). By grounding art education in robust theoretical foundations, educators can design curricula that not only impart technical skills but also promote intellectual and emotional growth. This comprehensive approach ensures that art education is not merely about producing artworks but about cultivating a deeper understanding and appreciation of the artistic process and its broader implications (Gadsden, 2008; Ulger, 2018). Understanding these philosophical and theoretical underpinnings is crucial for developing effective art education programs that can adapt to and address the diverse needs of students, ultimately enriching their educational experience and personal development.

The educational philosophies underpinning teacher training institutions and specialized art institutions reflect fundamentally different goals, methodologies, and outcomes, rooted in their distinct educational missions. Teacher training institutions emphasize an educational philosophy that integrates art as a tool for comprehensive educational development, aiming to prepare future educators who can use art to enhance overall learning and personal growth across various subjects (Oreck, 2004; Andrews, 2010). This philosophy is grounded in constructivist and holistic approaches, prioritizing the development of aesthetic awareness, critical thinking, and emotional intelligence. It sees art as a medium through which students can explore and understand complex concepts, express themselves creatively, and connect with diverse cultural narratives. The pedagogical methods in these institutions often involve interdisciplinary projects, collaborative learning, and reflective practices that link art with broader educational objectives (Bautista, A., Tan, L. S., Ponnusamy, L. D., & Yau, 2016; Gaunt, H., & Treacy, 2020).

In contrast, specialized art institutions adhere to an educational philosophy focused on cultivating professional artists, emphasizing the mastery of technical skills, the development of a personal artistic vision, and the production of original works of art (A. D. Efland, 1990; Singerman, 1999; Sheridan, K. M., Veenema, S., Winner, E., & Hetland, 2022). This philosophy is often rooted in formalist and apprenticeship models, where the primary objective is to achieve excellence in artistic craftsmanship and innovation. The curriculum in specialized art institutions is typically intensive and studio-based, with a strong emphasis on individual creativity, artistic critique, and professional portfolio development. Students are encouraged to push the boundaries of their artistic practice, engage deeply with art history and theory, and contribute to contemporary art discourse (Melles, G., & Lockheart, 2012; Jochum, R., Burton, J. M., & Watson, 2023).

The divergence in these educational philosophies results in distinct pedagogical approaches and learning environments. Teacher training institutions focus on creating versatile educators who can integrate art into various educational settings, fostering an appreciation for the arts while enhancing cognitive and social skills. Meanwhile, specialized art institutions aim to produce artists who are prepared to engage with the art world professionally, exhibiting their work, and participating in artistic communities (McCarthy, K. F., & Jinnett, 2001; Byrnes, 2022; Becker, 2023). Understanding these differences is crucial for addressing the misconceptions that arise when the objectives and methods of art education in teacher training institutions are conflated with those of specialized art institutions. Recognizing and respecting the unique contributions of each educational philosophy ensures that art education is appropriately tailored to the needs and goals of its diverse student populations, ultimately enriching both educational fields and the broader cultural landscape (Renzulli, J. S., & Reis, 2007; Lawton, P. H., Walker, M. A., & Green, 2019).

Aesthetic experience in education as humanizing force

Aesthetic experience in education plays a crucial role in fostering holistic development, enriching the learning process, and nurturing a deeper understanding of the world. Rooted in the principles of aesthetic education, which emphasize the importance of sensory perception, emotional engagement, and reflective thinking, aesthetic experiences are integral to cultivating students' appreciation of beauty, creativity, and cultural diversity (Diaz, G., & McKenna, 2004; Wickman, 2006). These experiences go beyond mere exposure to art; they involve active participation and personal connection with artistic expressions, encouraging students to engage with art in ways that are meaningful and transformative.

In the educational context, aesthetic experiences help bridge the gap between cognitive and emotional learning, promoting an integrated approach to education. Through activities such as creating visual art, performing music,

engaging in drama, or analyzing literary works, students develop critical thinking skills, enhance their emotional intelligence, and build empathy (Rusu, 2017; Tee, 2024). These activities require students to interpret, critique, and express their perspectives, fostering a deeper understanding of themselves and the world around them. Moreover, the process of engaging with art stimulates creativity, imagination, and innovation, essential skills in today's rapidly changing world.

Aesthetic experiences also play a pivotal role in cultural education (McManus, I. C., & Furnham, 2006; Campbell, 2018; D'olimpio, 2022). By exposing students to diverse artistic traditions and practices, educators can cultivate a sense of cultural awareness and appreciation. This exposure helps students recognize the value of different cultural expressions and fosters respect for cultural diversity. It also enables students to explore their cultural heritage, contributing to a stronger sense of identity and belonging. Furthermore, aesthetic experiences contribute to the development of moral and ethical values. Engaging with art often involves grappling with complex themes and moral dilemmas, prompting students to reflect on their values and beliefs (Dewey, 2008; Fenner, 2008; Johnson, 2018). This reflection can lead to greater moral sensitivity and a more nuanced understanding of ethical issues. Art can also serve as a powerful medium for social critique and change, encouraging students to think critically about societal issues and their role in addressing them (Greene, 2000; Freedman, 2003).

In addition to these cognitive, emotional, and cultural benefits, aesthetic experiences have significant implications for educational practice. Incorporating aesthetic education into the curriculum requires a shift from traditional, content-focused teaching methods to more experiential, student-centered approaches. Educators must create learning environments that encourage exploration, creativity, and self-expression, providing opportunities for students to engage deeply with art. This shift involves recognizing the intrinsic value of aesthetic experiences and their potential to transform education (Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Robinson, 1990; Belfiore, E., & Bennett, 2007).

The concept of aesthetic experience is pivotal in art education, emphasizing the profound impact that engaging with art has on an individual's sensory perception, emotional response, and cognitive processes. Rooted in philosophical traditions dating back to Kant and Dewey, aesthetic experience involves a deep, immersive interaction with art that transcends mere observation, eliciting a profound sense of appreciation, wonder, and reflection (Francis, P. S., & Balmer, 2017). This engagement is characterized by a heightened awareness and an emotional connection to the artwork, fostering a holistic understanding that integrates intellectual and emotional dimensions. The importance of aesthetic experience in education cannot be overstated, as it plays a crucial role in the development of critical thinking, creativity, and emotional intelligence (Broudy, 1994; Hadzigeorgiou, 2016). By encountering and reflecting on aesthetic experiences, students learn to appreciate the nuances of artistic expression, develop empathy, and cultivate a deeper understanding of cultural and ethical contexts.

Studies on aesthetic experience in art education have demonstrated its significant benefits for students' overall development. Research by Eisner (2002) highlights that aesthetic experiences in art education encourage students to explore

multiple perspectives, fostering flexible thinking and problem-solving skills. Furthermore, aesthetic education has been shown to enhance students' emotional intelligence, as it provides opportunities for self-expression and emotional exploration (Wenn, B., Mulholland, R., Timmons, W., & Zanker, 2018). Studies by Chalmers (1996), and Gadsden (2008) emphasize the role of aesthetic experiences in promoting cultural literacy and social awareness, as students engage with diverse artistic traditions and reflect on their cultural implications. Additionally, research conducted by Burton (2001); Lindström (2012), and Ghanbari (2015), indicates that aesthetic experiences can significantly improve students' ability to make connections between different disciplines, promoting interdisciplinary learning and a more integrated understanding of knowledge.

In the realm of art education, incorporating aesthetic experiences into the curriculum involves creating environments that encourage active engagement, critical reflection, and creative expression. Educators must design learning activities that go beyond technical skill development, focusing on fostering students' ability to perceive and interpret the deeper meanings and emotional resonances of art. This approach aligns with Dewey (2008) advocacy for experiential learning, where students are not passive recipients of information but active participants in their learning journey. By prioritizing aesthetic experiences, educators can ensure that art education contributes to the holistic development of students, preparing them to navigate the complexities of the modern world with sensitivity, creativity, and critical awareness.

The concept of aesthetic experience is fundamental to art education, offering a rich, multifaceted approach to learning that integrates sensory, emotional, and cognitive dimensions (Whitehead, 2004). Its importance lies in its ability to foster critical thinking, creativity, emotional intelligence, and cultural literacy, essential skills for personal and academic growth. Studies on aesthetic experience in art education provide robust evidence of its benefits, highlighting the need for educational practices that prioritize immersive, reflective, and creative engagement with art (Sheridan, K. M., Veenema, S., Winner, E., & Hetland, 2022b). By embracing the transformative potential of aesthetic experiences, educators can cultivate a more enriched, meaningful educational experience for students, nurturing their full potential as informed, empathetic, and innovative individuals.

In conclusion, aesthetic experience in education is essential for fostering holistic development and enriching the learning process. By integrating aesthetic education into the curriculum, educators can promote critical thinking, emotional intelligence, cultural awareness, and moral development. These experiences not only enhance students' academic achievement but also prepare them to navigate and contribute to an increasingly complex and diverse world. As such, the role of aesthetic experience in education should be recognized and prioritized, ensuring that students receive a well-rounded, meaningful education that nurtures their full potential (Diaz, G., & McKenna, 2004).

Art production vs. aesthetic experience

The distinction between art production and aesthetic experience is critical in understanding the diverse objectives and methodologies in art education. Art production focuses primarily on the creation of art objects, emphasizing technical skill, craftsmanship, and the physical processes involved in making art (Risatti, 2009; Roberts, 2020). This approach is often rooted in the traditions of fine art education, where students learn specific techniques and methods to produce tangible works of art. Art production involves mastery of tools, materials, and artistic conventions, and is aimed at cultivating professional artists capable of producing original and technically proficient artworks (Grant, 2017). The educational paradigm here is centered around developing students' abilities to execute artistic concepts with precision, fostering individual artistic identities, and preparing them for careers in the art world.

In contrast, the concept of aesthetic experience in art education transcends the mere act of producing art to encompass the sensory, emotional, and intellectual engagement with art (Joy, A., & Sherry Jr, 2003; Mitias, 2012). Aesthetic experience involves a deep, immersive interaction with art that provokes contemplation, emotional response, and critical reflection (Sirois, 2008; Stamatopoulou, 2018). This approach emphasizes the value of experiencing art as a means of understanding and appreciating beauty, cultural expressions, and the human condition. The focus is on the subjective and transformative aspects of engaging with art, where the viewer or participant is encouraged to explore the deeper meanings and emotional resonances of the artwork (Bresler, 2006; Pelowski, M., & Akiba, 2011). Aesthetic experience is less about the technical production of art and more about the holistic impact that art has on an individual's perception, emotions, and cognition.

The philosophical underpinnings of art production and aesthetic experience differ significantly and shape the objectives of art education within different contexts. In specialized art institutions, the philosophy is geared towards producing artists who can contribute to the art world through their creative output. Here, the curriculum is designed to develop technical proficiency, innovation, and a unique artistic voice (Lingo, E. L., & Tepper, 2013). Students are trained to refine their skills, experiment with materials and techniques, and produce art that meets professional standards. The educational goal is to equip students with the tools and knowledge necessary to succeed as professional artists, critics, or curators.

Conversely, in teacher training institutions, the educational philosophy emphasizes the role of art in fostering overall human development and enriching the educational experience. Art is viewed as a medium for enhancing critical thinking, emotional intelligence, and cultural literacy (Gibson, R., & Ewing, 2020b). The objective is not to produce professional artists, but to prepare educators who can integrate art into various educational settings, thereby promoting aesthetic awareness and appreciation among students (A. Efland, 2002; Goldberg, 2021). This approach aligns with the broader educational goals of developing well-rounded individuals who can think creatively, empathize with others, and engage critically with the world around them. The divergent philosophies of art production and aesthetic experience lead to different curricular and pedagogical approaches. In

programs focused on art production, the curriculum is typically structured around studio practice, art history, and technical workshops. Pedagogy emphasizes hands-on learning, technical mastery, and individual artistic development. Assessments are often based on the quality of art produced, originality, and technical skill.

In contrast, a curriculum centered on aesthetic experience involves a broader range of activities, including art appreciation, critical analysis, and interdisciplinary projects. Pedagogical methods emphasize experiential learning, where students engage with art through observation, discussion, and personal reflection (Aguirre, 2004). Assessments focus on students' ability to interpret and critique art, their emotional and intellectual responses, and their understanding of cultural and historical contexts.

Understanding the distinction between art production and aesthetic experience is essential for designing effective art education programs that meet the diverse needs of students. While art production is crucial for developing professional artists, aesthetic experience plays a vital role in fostering a deeper appreciation and understanding of art's broader impact on human experience. By recognizing and valuing both approaches, educators can create a more inclusive and enriching educational environment that nurtures creativity, critical thinking, and emotional growth in all students.

Current problems of arts education practices in Indonesian teacher training institutions

If based on the principle differences between the science of art and the science of art education, as stated above, then the governance implications should also be different. Arts science governance is based on a basic principle known as "arts-based discipline" (Felton, E., Vichie, K., & Moore, 2016; White, R. E., & Cooper, 2022). An arts-based discipline typically refers to fields of study that focus on the creation, expression, and interpretation of artistic works. These disciplines can span a wide range of media and forms, such as visual arts, performing arts, literary arts, and more (P. A. Becker, 2020; Leavy, 2020). The main components of courses in arts-based disciplines often include both theoretical and practical elements, aimed at developing technical skills, creative thinking, and a deep understanding of artistic traditions and innovations (Andrews, 2004). These components collectively provide a comprehensive education in Arts, equipping students not only with technical skills but also with critical thinking abilities, historical context, and professional readiness for careers in various artistic fields. Each component contributes to a well-rounded understanding and practice of visual arts as a vibrant and evolving discipline (Crockett, 2017).

Meanwhile, educational science or arts teaching is based on the fundamental "arts-based teaching discipline". Arts-based teaching refers to instructional practices that integrate artistic processes, techniques, and forms into the teaching and learning of various subjects across the curriculum (Roldán, 2015). Art-based teaching integrates artistic practices such as visual arts, music, drama, dance, and

media arts into the curriculum across academic subjects. It emphasizes fostering creativity, self-expression, and interdisciplinary connections through hands-on, experiential learning. By engaging students in artistic activities, art-based teaching encourages them to explore ideas, emotions, and concepts in meaningful ways. It supports holistic development by enhancing cognitive, emotional, and social skills, while also promoting critical thinking and problem-solving abilities. Through reflection, collaboration, and artistic expression, art-based teaching cultivates a supportive learning environment where students can develop their individual voices and deepen their understanding of the world around them (McKay, L., & Barton, 2018; Sickler-Voigt, 2019).

In the context of arts education and teacher training institutions in Indonesia, a significant concern persists regarding the blurred distinction between the educational approaches of these institutions and those of specialized arts universities. This confusion is particularly evident in practical art activities across various courses, where there is a prevalent emphasis on the final product rather than the creative process itself. This approach mirrors the priorities typically found in specialized arts universities, where the primary objective is to cultivate technical proficiency and produce high-quality artworks. However, in the context of arts education within teacher training institutions, the emphasis should ideally be on fostering a comprehensive understanding of art as a medium for holistic development and educational enrichment (Russell, J., & Zembylas, 2007). This discrepancy highlights a fundamental misunderstanding in educational philosophy and practice, where the goals of preparing educators versus professional artists may not align seamlessly. As such, addressing this confusion is crucial for refining educational practices in arts education institutions, ensuring that they effectively cater to their distinct educational objectives and prepare educators who can integrate artistic experiences into broader educational contexts.

In the realm of arts education within Indonesian institutions, a notable issue arises from the inadvertent alignment of practical art activities with those typically associated with specialized art universities. This convergence becomes particularly apparent in the practical aspects of art creation, where the focus often gravitates towards achieving high-quality artistic outcomes akin to professional standards seen in specialized art colleges. This trend becomes glaringly evident during final project assessments, where students are expected to produce artworks that mirror the sophistication and technical prowess expected of professional artists. Consequently, it is rare to encounter final assignments that align closely with the pedagogical goals intended for primary and secondary school art education.

This phenomenon underscores a significant disconnect in educational objectives and outcomes. While specialized art universities emphasize the cultivation of artistic expertise and the production of aesthetically refined artworks, teacher training institutions should ideally prioritize fostering pedagogical approaches that cater to the developmental needs of young learners. This includes nurturing creativity, critical thinking, and emotional expression through art, rather than solely focusing on achieving professional-grade artistic results. Therefore, addressing this disparity is pivotal for refining the educational framework within arts education institutions, ensuring that they align more closely with the

educational objectives suitable for nurturing future art educators capable of enriching the artistic experiences of children and adolescents in primary and secondary schools.

In the realm of arts education within Indonesian institutions, a notable issue arises from the inadvertent alignment of practical art activities with those typically associated with specialized art universities. The practical aspects of art creation often mirror those found in institutions exclusively dedicated to art, thereby emphasizing the production of high-quality artworks akin to those created by professional artists. This phenomenon becomes particularly apparent during final project assessments, where students are expected to produce works that exhibit the technical proficiency and aesthetic finesse characteristic of specialized art colleges. As a result, final assignments frequently showcase artworks that closely resemble those intended for professional exhibition, rather than aligning with the educational objectives geared towards fostering art education for children at primary and secondary school levels.

This convergence underscores a significant divergence in educational goals and outcomes between institutions focused on arts education and those specializing in fine arts. While specialized art universities prioritize the development of technical skills and artistic excellence, teacher training institutions ideally aim to cultivate pedagogical approaches that cater to the educational and developmental needs of young learners. This includes fostering creativity, critical thinking, and emotional expression through art, with an emphasis on nurturing skills that support holistic growth rather than exclusively aiming for professional-grade artistic outcomes. Therefore, addressing this disparity is crucial for refining the educational framework within arts education institutions, ensuring that they align more closely with the pedagogical objectives essential for preparing future art educators capable of enriching the artistic experiences of children and adolescents in primary and secondary schools.

Similarly, there is a notable trend where studies and research on various forms of art, such as paintings, sculptures, and others, often lack a distinct orientation towards educational or pedagogical contexts. Instead, these endeavors frequently align with approaches typically observed in universities dedicated exclusively to arts and sciences. This mainstream tendency reflects a broader issue within arts education universities in Indonesia, where practical challenges stem from discrepancies in perspectives and paradigms. These institutions often struggle with maintaining a clear educational focus, leading to ongoing confusion regarding their mission and objectives in preparing future educators and professionals in the arts.

The practical complexities faced by arts education universities underscore the need for a critical examination of their educational frameworks and methodologies. This includes reevaluating how artistic practices and theoretical insights are integrated into curricula, ensuring they effectively serve the developmental needs of students intending to become educators. Moreover, the emphasis on aligning educational practices with the broader goals of art education, particularly at the primary and secondary school levels, remains crucial. This necessitates a shift towards methodologies that prioritize not only artistic creation

but also pedagogical strategies aimed at nurturing creativity, critical thinking, and cultural literacy among future educators (Cremin, T., & Chappell, 2021).

Furthermore, addressing these challenges requires a nuanced understanding of how educational theories and artistic practices intersect within the context of arts education. Research efforts should thus focus on exploring innovative approaches that bridge the gap between artistic expression and educational objectives. By enhancing the integration of pedagogical theories with practical artistic experiences, arts education universities can better equip their graduates with the skills and insights necessary to navigate the complexities of teaching art in diverse educational settings. Ultimately, this critical examination and enhancement of arts education practices will contribute to the advancement and refinement of arts education institutions in Indonesia, ensuring they effectively prepare educators and contribute meaningfully to the broader cultural and educational landscape.

The pressing issue at hand underscores its profound implications, both direct and indirect, on the implementation of arts education across primary and secondary schools in Indonesia. This issue stems from the practices and paradigms prevalent in arts education colleges, which inadvertently influence how art is taught at lower educational levels. As graduates from these institutions often go on to become art teachers in primary and secondary schools, their educational background heavily shapes the approach to teaching art in these settings. Consequently, the perpetuation of art education practices that prioritize the production of artworks over fostering aesthetic experiences becomes ingrained in the educational system.

This perpetuation creates a chain reaction of challenges that reverberate throughout the educational landscape. The misalignment between the intended pedagogical goals of arts education and the actual practices in primary and secondary schools results in a missed opportunity to fully harness the transformative potential of art in student growth and development. Rather than focusing on cultivating aesthetic appreciation, critical thinking, and emotional engagement through art, the emphasis often remains on technical skills and the creation of tangible art objects. This discrepancy not only limits the holistic benefits that art education can offer but also reinforces a narrow understanding of art's role in education.

Addressing this issue necessitates a comprehensive reevaluation of arts education practices at all levels. It requires fostering a deeper understanding among educators and policymakers about the distinct pedagogical approaches needed to effectively integrate art into the broader educational curriculum (Sabol, 2013). By promoting educational frameworks that prioritize aesthetic experiences alongside technical skills, art education can better contribute to nurturing well-rounded individuals capable of creative expression, cultural understanding, and social engagement (Hunter, M. A., Aprill, A., Hill, A., & Emery, 2018; Raza, 2023). Ultimately, this reorientation aims to optimize the positive impact of art in supporting the holistic growth and development of students across Indonesia's educational institutions.

Conclusion

The discourse on arts education in Indonesian teacher training institutions highlights challenges due to discrepancies with specialized arts universities. The emphasis on art production over fostering aesthetic experiences creates a gap affecting how art is taught in primary and secondary schools. This limits art's potential to cultivate aesthetic sensibilities and cultural understanding, reducing it to a product-focused discipline. This divide impacts the broader perception of art, prioritizing tangible creations over aesthetic and emotional engagement. This narrow view undermines the educational goals of fostering holistic development, critical thinking, and emotional intelligence through art.

Addressing these challenges requires realigning arts education with pedagogical goals that balance technical skills and deeper engagement with art. Integrating aesthetic experiences into the curriculum will help students explore diverse art forms, engage with cultural contexts, and understand art as a reflective and transformative process. This approach will empower students to appreciate art as a multifaceted means of expression and understanding, enriching their educational journey with insights into creativity, cultural heritage, and personal expression.

In conclusion, overcoming the paradigmatic disconnect between arts education institutions and specialized arts universities requires a concerted effort to reimagine pedagogical practices that foster holistic development, critical inquiry, and emotional engagement through art. This approach not only enhances the educational experience but also revitalizes the role of art in nurturing informed and culturally sensitive citizens capable of contributing meaningfully to society.

This study's implications extend to broader educational policies and practices in Indonesia. Firstly, curriculum reform is needed to integrate aesthetic experiences, ensuring art education contributes to overall student development. Secondly, enhancing professional development for art educators is crucial for implementing effective pedagogies. Thirdly, fostering collaboration between arts education institutions and primary/secondary schools can promote innovative teaching methods that balance artistic expression with educational goals.

Based on our findings, we propose several recommendations to enhance arts education in Indonesian teacher training institutions. First, update the curriculum to include lessons on appreciating beauty, understanding cultures, and critical thinking alongside artistic skills, encouraging deeper exploration of ideas and cultures through art. Second, provide ongoing training for art teachers through workshops and continued education to enhance teaching methods and stay current with educational trends, inspiring students to engage meaningfully with art. Third, foster stronger collaboration between art colleges and primary/secondary schools to develop interdisciplinary programs that integrate art with other subjects, improving learning experiences for students. Additionally, encourage research to innovate art education methods that promote creativity and cultural appreciation. Finally, advocate for policies that prioritize arts education, ensuring schools can offer students meaningful opportunities to learn and grow through art. These steps aim

to enrich arts education in Indonesia, nurturing creativity, cultural understanding, and essential skills for students' futures.

Bibliographical references

- Aguirre, I. (2004). Beyond the understanding of visual culture: A pragmatist approach to aesthetic education. *International Journal of Art & Design Education*, 23(3), 256–269.
- Ahmadi, N., & Besançon, M. (2017). Creativity as a stepping stone towards developing other competencies in classrooms. *Education Research International*, 2017(1), 1357456. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2017/1357456>
- Ahn, K. H. (1998). *A study of mediating factors influencing an art teacher's instructional practices: a social constructivist perspective*. The Ohio State University.
- Alter, F., Hays, T., & O'Hara, R. (2009). Creative arts teaching and practice: Critical reflections of primary school teachers in Australia. *International Journal of Education & the Arts*, 10(9). <http://www.ijea.org/v10n9/>
- Andrews, B. W. (2004). Curriculum renewal through policy development in arts education. *Research Studies in Music Education*, 23(1), 76–93. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1321103X040230011001>
- Andrews, B. W. (2010). Seeking harmony: Teachers' perspectives on learning to teach in and through the arts. *Encounters in Theory and History of Education*, 11, 81–98. <https://doi.org/10.24908/eoe-ese-rse.v11i0.2411>
- Bamford, A. (2006). *The wow factor: Global research compendium on the impact of the arts in education*. Waxmann Verlag.
- Bautista, A., Tan, L. S., Ponnusamy, L. D., & Yau, X. (2016). Curriculum integration in arts education: connecting multiple art forms through the idea of 'space.' *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 48(5), 610–629. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2015.1089940>
- Becker, H. S. (2023). *Art worlds: updated and expanded*. Univ of California Press.
- Becker, P. A. (2020). Teaching language and literacy through the visual arts: An interdisciplinary, literature-based approach. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 52(3), 166–179. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0040059919894736>
- Belfiore, E., & Bennett, O. (2007). Determinants of impact: Towards a better understanding of encounters with the arts. *Cultural Trends*, 16(3), 225–275. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09548960701479417>
- Bertling, J. G. (2023). *Art Education for a Sustainable Planet: Embracing Ecopedagogy in K12 Classrooms*. Teachers College Press.
- Bresler, L. (2006). Toward connectedness: Aesthetically based research. *Studies in Art Education*, 48(1), 52–69. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00393541.2006.11650499>
- Broudy, H. S. (1994). *Enlightened cherishing: An essay on aesthetic education*. University of Illinois Press.

- Bruff, K. (2018). Chapter Fourteen the Aesthetic in Moral Education: Schiller, Kant, Plato, and Read. In *Moral Upbringing through the Arts and Literature* (p. 174). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Burnaford, G. E., Aprill, A., & Weiss, C. (Ed.). (2013). *Renaissance in the classroom: Arts integration and meaningful learning*. Routledge.
- Burton, L. H. (2001). Interdisciplinary Curriculum: Retrospect and Prospect: New research in interdisciplinary studies provides fresh insights into ways of fostering constructive communication and fruitful exchange among the disciplines. *Music Educators Journal*, 87(5), 17–66. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1476-8070.2012.01737.x>
- Byrnes, W. J. (2022). *Management and the Arts*. Routledge.
- Cabedo-Mas, A., Nethsinghe, R., & Forrest, D. (2017). The role of the arts in education for peacebuilding, diversity and intercultural understanding: A comparative study of educational policies in Australia and Spain. *International Journal of Education & the Arts*, 18(11). <http://www.ijea.org/v18n11/>.
- Campbell, C. (2018). Toward a pedagogy of firstness: Aesthetic education as Firstness experience. *Chinese Semiotic Studies*, 14(1), 71–102. <https://doi.org/10.1515/css-2018-0005>
- Canyürek, Ö. (2022). *Cultural diversity in motion: Rethinking cultural policy and performing arts in an intercultural society* (Vol. 144). Transcript Verlag.
- Chalmers, F. G. (1996). *Celebrating pluralism: Art, education, and cultural diversity* (Vol. 5). Getty Publications.
- Clarke, J., Lovelock, R., & McNay, M. (2016). Liberal arts and the development of emotional intelligence in social work education. *The British Journal of Social Work*, 46(3), 635–651. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcu139>
- Cobo, C. (2013). Skills for innovation: Envisioning an education that prepares for the changing world. *Curriculum Journal*, 24(1), 67–85. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585176.2012.744330>
- Cremin, T., & Chappell, K. (2021). Creative pedagogies: A systematic review. *Research Papers in Education*, 36(3), 299–331. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2019.1677757>
- Crockett, J. B. (2017). *Handbook of Arts Education and Special Education*. Taylor & Francis.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Robinson, R. E. (1990). *The art of seeing: An interpretation of the aesthetic encounter*. Getty Publications.
- D'olimpio, L. (2022). Defending aesthetic education. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 70(3), 263–279. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2021.1960267>
- Davies, S. (2007). *Philosophical perspectives on art*. Clarendon Press.
- de Julián, M. P. P., & Pérez, L. J. B. (2022). Mindfulness, Yoga, and Emotional Intelligence for Music and Language Education: The Craft Program. *The International Journal of Arts Education*, 16(2), 13. <https://doi.org/10.18848/2326-9944/CGP/v16i02/13-43>
- Deasy, R. J. (2002). *Critical links: Learning in the arts and student academic and social development*. ERIC. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED466413>
- Delacruz, S. (2019). Building digital literacy bridges: Connecting cultures and

- promoting global citizenship in elementary classrooms through school-based virtual field trips. *TechTrends*, 63(4), 428–439. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-018-0350-1>
- Dewey, J. (2008). Art as experience. In *The richness of art education* (pp. 33–48). Brill.
- Diaz, G., & McKenna, M. (2004). *Teaching for aesthetic experience: The art of learning* (Vol. 6). Peter Lang.
- Duncan-Andrade, J. M. R., & Morrell, E. (2008). *The art of critical pedagogy: Possibilities for moving from theory to practice in urban schools* (Vol. 285). Peter Lang.
- Dwyer, M. C. (2011). Reinvesting in Arts Education: Winning America's Future through Creative Schools. *President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities*. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED522818>
- Efland, A. (2002). *Art and cognition: Integrating the visual arts in the curriculum*. Teachers College Press.
- Efland, A. D. (1990). *A history of art education*. Teachers College Press.
- Eisner, E. W. (1972). *Educating Artistic Vision*. Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.
- Eisner, E. W. (2002). *The Arts and the Creation of Mind*. Yale University Press.
- Fahy, E., & Kenny, A. (2024). 'Bridging the gap': The role of an arts broker in supporting partnerships with teachers. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 125(3), 174–186. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10632913.2022.2037483>
- Felton, E., Vichie, K., & Moore, E. (2016). Widening participation creatively: Creative arts education for social inclusion. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 35(3), 447–460. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2015.1107881>
- Fenner, D. E. W. (2008). *Art in context: Understanding aesthetic value*. Ohio University Press.
- Fowler, C. (2001). *Strong arts, strong schools: The promising potential and shortsighted disregard of the arts in American schooling*. Oxford University Press.
- Francis, P. S., & Balmer, R. H. (2017). *When Art Disrupts Religion: Aesthetic Experience and the Evangelical Mind*. Oxford University Press.
- Freedman, K. (2003). *Teaching visual culture: Curriculum, aesthetics, and the social life of art*. Teachers College Press.
- Gadsden, V. L. (2008). The arts and education: Knowledge generation, pedagogy, and the discourse of learning. *Review of Research in Education*, 32(1), 29–61. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X07309691>
- Gardner, H. (1990). *Art education and human development* (Vol. 3). Getty Publications.
- Gaunt, H., & Treacy, D. S. (2020). Ensemble practices in the arts: A reflective matrix to enhance team work and collaborative learning in higher education. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 19(4), 419–444. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474022219885791>
- Ghanbari, S. (2015). Learning across disciplines: A collective case study of two university programs that integrate the arts with STEM. *International Journal of Education & the Arts*, 16(7). <http://www.ijea.org/v16n7/>.

- Gibson, R., & Ewing, R. (2020a). *Transforming the curriculum through the arts*. Springer.
- Gibson, R., & Ewing, R. (2020b). *Transforming the curriculum through the arts*. Springer.
- Goldbard, A. (2006). *New Creative Community: The Art of Cultural Development*. New Village Press.
- Goldberg, M. (2021). *Arts integration: Teaching subject matter through the arts in multicultural settings*. Routledge.
- Goldblatt, P. (2006). How John Dewey's theories underpin art and art education. *Education and Culture*, 17–34.
- Grant, K. (2017). *All about process: The theory and discourse of modern artistic labor*. Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Greene, M. (2000). *Releasing the imagination: Essays on education, the arts, and social change*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Hadzigeorgiou, Y. (2016). *'Artistic' Science Education*. Springer.
- Halliday, A. J., Kern, M. L., Garrett, D. K., & Turnbull, D. A. (2019). The student voice in well-being: A case study of participatory action research in positive education. *Educational Action Research*, 27(2), 173–196. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2018.1436079>
- Haroutounian, J. (2019). Artistic Ways of Knowing: Thinking Like an Artist in the STEAM Classroom. *Converting STEM into STEAM Programs: Methods and Examples from and for Education*, 169–183. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-25101-7_12
- Harris, A., & De Bruin, L. R. (2018). Secondary school creativity, teacher practice and STEAM education: An international study. *Journal of Educational Change*, 19, 153–179. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-017-9311-2>
- Hunter, M. A., Aprill, A., Hill, A., & Emery, S. (2018). *Education, arts and sustainability: Emerging practice for a changing world*. Springer.
- Jochum, R., Burton, J. M., & Watson, J. (Ed.). (2023). *Turning Points: Responsive Pedagogies in Studio Art Education*. Teachers College Press.
- Johnson, M. (2018). *The aesthetics of meaning and thought: The bodily roots of philosophy, science, morality, and art*. University of Chicago Press.
- Joy, A., & Sherry Jr, J. F. (2003). Speaking of art as embodied imagination: A multisensory approach to understanding aesthetic experience. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 30(2), 259–282. <https://doi.org/10.1086/376802>
- Juvonen, J., Lessard, L. M., Rastogi, R., Schacter, H. L., & Smith, D. S. (2019). Promoting social inclusion in educational settings: Challenges and opportunities. *Educational Psychologist*, 54(4), 250–270. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2019.1655645>
- Karia, E. (2020). *Exploring Creativity: Splatter of Hope: Become Your Most Empowered Self*. iUniverse.
- King, P. M., Brown, M. K., Lindsay, N. K., & VanHecke, J. R. (2007). Liberal arts student learning outcomes: An integrated approach. *About Campus*, 12(4), 2–9. <https://doi.org/10.1002/abc.222>
- Kokkos, A. (2010). Transformative learning through aesthetic experience: Towards a comprehensive method. *Journal of Transformative Education*, 8(3), 155–

177. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1541344610397663>
- Koopman, C. (2010). Art and aesthetics in education. In *The Sage handbook of the philosophy of education* (pp. 435–450). Sage Publications.
- Lawton, P. H., Walker, M. A., & Green, M. (2019). *Community-based art education across the lifespan: Finding common ground*. Teachers College Press.
- Leavy, P. (2020). *Method meets art: Arts-based research practice*. Guilford publications.
- Liao, C. (2016). From interdisciplinary to transdisciplinary: An arts-integrated approach to STEAM education. *ART Education*, 69(6), 44–49. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00043125.2016.1224873>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1476-8070.2012.01737.x>
- Lingo, E. L., & Tepper, S. J. (2013). Looking back, looking forward: Arts-based careers and creative work. *Work and Occupations*, 40(4), 337–363. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888413505229>
- Lum, C. H. (2013). *Contextualized practices in arts education: An international dialogue on Singapore*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Macleod, K., & Holdridge, L. (Ed.). (2013). *Thinking through art: Reflections on art as research*. Routledge.
- Marshall, J. (2014). Transdisciplinarity and art integration: Toward a new understanding of art-based learning across the curriculum. *Studies in Art Education*, 55(2), 104–127. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00393541.2014.11518922>
- Mc Fee, J. K. (1970). *Preparation for Art*. Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc.
- McCarthy, K. F., & Jinnett, K. J. (2001). *A new framework for building participation in the arts*. Rand Corporation.
- McKay, L., & Barton, G. (2018). Exploring how arts-based reflection can support teachers' resilience and well-being. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 75, 356–365. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.07.012>
- McManus, I. C., & Furnham, A. (2006). Aesthetic activities and aesthetic attitudes: Influences of education, background and personality on interest and involvement in the arts. *British Journal of Psychology*, 97(4), 555–587. <https://doi.org/10.1348/000712606X101088>
- Melles, G., & Lockheart, J. (2012). Writing purposefully in art and design: Responding to converging and diverging new academic literacies. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 11(4), 346–362. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474022211432116>
- Mitias, M. M. (2012). *Possibility of the aesthetic experience* (Vol. 14). Springer Science & Business Media.
- Nasr, S. H., & Jahanbegloo, R. (2010). *In search of the sacred: A conversation with Seyyed Hossein Nasr on his life and thought*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Oreck, B. (2004). The artistic and professional development of teachers: A study of teachers' attitudes toward and use of the arts in teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 55(1), 55–69. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487103260072>
- Pelowski, M., & Akiba, F. (2011). A model of art perception, evaluation and emotion in transformative aesthetic experience. *New Ideas in Psychology*,

- 29(2), 80–97. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.newideapsych.2010.04.001>
- Raza, A. (2023). Art and Education: Fostering Creativity and Critical Thinking in Humanity. *Journal of Religion and Society*, 1(1), 13–25. <https://islamicreligious.com/index.php/Journal/article/view/19>
- Read, H. (2008). Art as the Basis of Education. In *The Richness of Art Education* (pp. 49–64). Brill.
- Reicher, H. (2010). Building inclusive education on social and emotional learning: Challenges and perspectives—a review. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 14(3), 213–246. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603110802504218>
- Reimer, B. (2022). *A philosophy of music education: Advancing the vision*. State University of New York Press.
- Renzulli, J. S., & Reis, S. M. (Ed.). (2007). *Enriching curriculum for all students*. Corwin Press.
- Riley, H. (2024). The Domains of Aesthetics and Perception Theories: A Review Relevant to Practice-based Doctoral Theses in the Visual Arts. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 58(2), 78–126. <https://doi.org/10.5406/15437809.58.2.06>
- Risatti, H. (2009). *A theory of craft: function and aesthetic expression*. Univ of North Carolina Press.
- Roberts, J. (2020). *The intangibilities of form: skill and deskillling in art after the readymade*. Verso Books.
- Roldán, J. (2015). Visual Arts-Based teaching-learning methods. In S. Schonmann (Ed.), *International yearbook for research in arts education* (Vol. 3, Issue 1, pp. 191–195). Waxmann Verlag.
- Russell, J., & Zembylas, M. (2007). Arts integration in the curriculum: A review of research and implications for teaching and learning. In *International handbook of research in arts education* (Vol. 16, Issue Springer, pp. 287–312). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-3052-9_18
- Rusu, M. (2017). Emotional development through art expressions. *Review of Artistic Education*, 13+ 14, 227–238. <https://www.cceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=514564>
- Sabol, F. R. (2013). Seismic shifts in the education landscape: What do they mean for arts education and arts education policy? *Arts Education Policy Review*, 114(1), 33–45. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10632913.2013.744250>
- Schuerholz-Lehr, S. (2007). Teaching for global literacy in higher education: How prepared are the educators? *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(2), 180–204. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315307299419>
- Sheridan, K. M., Veenema, S., Winner, E., & Hetland, L. (2022a). *Studio thinking 3: The real benefits of visual arts education*. Teachers College Press.
- Sheridan, K. M., Veenema, S., Winner, E., & Hetland, L. (2022b). *Studio thinking 3: The real benefits of visual arts education*. Teachers College Press.
- Sickler-Voigt, D. C. (2019). *Teaching and learning in art education: Cultivating students' potential from pre-K through high school*. Routledge.
- Simpson, D. J., Jackson, M. J., & Simpson, J. C. (2004). *John Dewey and the art of teaching: Toward reflective and imaginative practice*. Sage Publications.
- Singerman, H. (1999). *Art subjects: Making artists in the American university*. Univ

- of California Press.
- Sirois, F. J. (2008). Aesthetic experience. *The International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 89(1), 127–142. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-8315.2007.00015.x>
- Stamatopoulou, D. (2018). Empathy and the aesthetic: Why does art still move us? *Cognitive Processing*, 19(2), 169–186. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10339-017-0836-3>
- Sullivan, G. (1993). Art-based art education: Learning that is meaningful, authentic, critical and pluralist. *Studies in Art Education*, 35(1), 5–21.
- Suominen, A., Hiltunen, M., & Anttila, E. (2021). Arts Education Research, Projects and Pedagogy of Three University Programmes in Finland. In *Arts, Sustainability and Education: ENO Yearbook 2* (pp. 35–56). Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-3452->
- Tee, E. Y. (2024). Enhancing Emotional Intelligence With the Positive Humanities: A Narrative Review and Proposal for Well-Being Interventions. *Emotion Review*, 17540739241259564. <https://doi.org/10.1177/175407392412595>
- Thornhill-Miller, B., Camarda, A., Mercier, M., Burkhardt, J. M., Morisseau, T., Bourgeois-Bougrine, S., ... & Lubart, T. (2023). Creativity, critical thinking, communication, and collaboration: assessment, certification, and promotion of 21st century skills for the future of work and education. *Journal of Intelligence*, 11(3), 54. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jintelligence11030054>
- Ulger, K. (2018). The effect of problem-based learning on the creative thinking and critical thinking disposition of students in visual arts education. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-Based Learning*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.7771/1541-5015.1649>
- Wenn, B., Mulholland, R., Timmons, W., & Zanker, Y. (2018). Towards a developing construct in dance education—exploring the relation of emotional intelligence to teacher’s sense of efficacy and teaching experience among dance education student teachers in the United Kingdom. *Research in Dance Education*, 19(1), 14–38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14647893.2017.1354843>
- White, R. E., & Cooper, K. (2022). Arts-Based Research. In *Qualitative Research in the Post-Modern Era: Critical Approaches and Selected Methodologies* (pp. 287–338). Springer.
- White, M. (2009). *Arts development in community health: A social tonic*. Radcliffe Publishing.
- Whitehead, D. (2004). The pedagogical aesthetic and formative experience: educating for aletheic imagination in the fine arts curriculum. *Journal of Visual Art Practice*, 3(3), 195–208. <https://doi.org/10.1386/jvap.3.3.195/0>
- Wickman, P. O. (2006). *Aesthetic experience in science education: Learning and meaning-making as situated talk and action*. Routledge.
- Wright, S. (2012). Arts education as a collective experience. In *Children, meaning-making and the arts* (pp. 194–225). Pearson Education Frenchs Forest.
- Wu, W. (2023). Social-emotional learning in arts education. *Interdisciplinary Humanities and Communication Studies*, 1(1), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.61173/8bm4k93>
- Yeom, M., Caraballo, L., Tsang, G., Larkin, J., & Comrie, J. (2020). Reimagining

- impact: Storying youth research, arts, and activism. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 42(5), 482–503.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10714413.2021.1874850>
- Zimmerman, E. (2009). Reconceptualizing the role of creativity in art education theory and practice. *Studies in Art Education*, 50(4), 382–399.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00393541.2009.11518783>

Contact address: Kasiyan. Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Faculty of Languages, Arts, and Cultures, Department of Fine Arts Education. Email: kasiyan@uny.ac.id