

ALICJA LISIECKA

Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0080-6314>

ANNA MARIA PASSASEO

University of Messina, Italy

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3190-7943>

ETHICAL ISSUES OF EXPERIENCE-ORIENTED AESTHETIC EDUCATION*

Introduction: Traditional aesthetic education has focused on appreciating art and cultivating refined taste, relying primarily on classical aesthetic theories and canonical works. Contemporary currents in aesthetics challenge Kantian assumptions, expanding the discipline's scope to include everyday, embodied, and relational experiences that shape perception, ethical awareness, and social responsibility. These developments should be reflected in aesthetic education.

Research Aim: This article aims to examine the ethical challenges emerging in experience-oriented aesthetic education, which moves beyond the traditional art-centered approach. The research question is: what ethical challenges arise in this framework, and how can they be addressed responsibly in pedagogical practice? This article serves as an introduction to further, more in-depth analyses.

Evidence-based Facts: Contemporary aesthetics, inspired by Dewey, Berleant, Saito, and Shusterman, understands aesthetic experience as participatory and inclusive, encompassing everyday life and relational engagement. Aesthetic education built on these principles fosters reflective thinking, empathy, and ecological responsibility through multisensory experiences. At the same time, it generates new ethical challenges, including respecting individual experiences, balancing personal and transpersonal values, avoiding overly intrusive interventions, and preventing instrumentalization of aesthetic experiences. Educators working within this approach must create open, dialogical spaces that accommodate diverse perspectives.

Summary: Experience-oriented aesthetic education promotes holistic learning, values everyday experiences, and cultivates ethical awareness and social responsibility. It requires careful attention to ethical tensions, such as respecting student autonomy and maintaining the integ-

* Suggested citation: Lisiecka, A., Passaseo, A. M. (2026). Ethical Issues of Experience-Oriented Aesthetic Education. *Lubelski Rocznik Pedagogiczny*, 45(1), 25–39. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17951/lrp.2026.45.1.25-39>

richness of aesthetic experiences. It emphasizes inseparability of aesthetic and ethical development, positioning education as a space for nurturing reflective, sensitive, and responsible individuals.

Keywords: aesthetic education, experience-oriented aesthetic education, aesthetic experience, ethics

“It has been repeatedly pointed out that aesthetics and philosophy of art are very different disciplines” (Nanay, 2018, p. 71).

“Aesthetic experiences and aesthetic analyses are different” (Fenner, 2003, p. 52).

INTRODUCTION

Aesthetic education plays a vital role in human development, shaping not only perceptual sensitivity but also emotional responsiveness, reflective judgment, and capacity for ethical engagement with the world (D’Olimpio, 2024). Traditionally, it has been closely linked to appreciating art and cultivating taste, drawing on aesthetic theory and positioning encounters with canonical works as the primary means of developing aesthetic judgment. Within this framework, the emphasis on the so-called “sense of art” reinforced the idea that aesthetic development was inseparable from mastery of cultural codes and refinement of sensibility, hence casting art as a central vehicle for intellectual, moral, and cultural formation (Kopčáková, 2018; Kupfer, 1978; Smith, 2004).

Over the past few decades, however, the boundaries of aesthetic inquiry have expanded, challenging the primacy of art-centered perspectives and highlighting the broader terrain of lived experience (Dziamski, 2022). Work in everyday and environmental aesthetics has shown that aesthetic engagement is not confined to encounters with artworks but permeates the ordinary conditions of daily life, shaping perception, social interaction, and ethical awareness. Careful attention to the sensory, affective, and relational qualities of everyday environments cultivates not only aesthetic discernment but also a heightened sense of responsibility toward others and the world at large. Scholars such as Berleant (1997, 2010, 2021) and Saito (1998, 2010, 2021) have emphasized that even seemingly mundane experiences with objects, spaces, and social practices carry transformative potential, influencing how individuals understand themselves, relate to others, and respond to ecological and social realities.

This shift from art-centered to experience-oriented perspectives carries significant implications for aesthetic education. It invites pedagogical approaches that situate learning within the complexity of lived experience, integrating senso-

ry, emotional, social, and ecological dimensions (cf. Lisiecka, 2025a; Westerlund, 2003). Educators are thus called to foster reflective judgment, empathy, and ethical responsiveness, balancing respect for individual experience with engagement in broader social and environmental concerns.

The present article examines the ethical challenges embedded in this expanded vision of aesthetic education. It explores how experience-oriented approaches – which foreground embodiment, relationality, and the integration of everyday life into aesthetic pedagogy – require careful negotiation of boundaries between personal sensibility and educational guidance. Key concerns include cultivating autonomy, respecting diverse experiences, mediating between individual and transpersonal values, and promoting social and environmental responsibility. By situating aesthetic education at the intersection of perception, ethical reflection, and social engagement, this article highlights both its transformative potential and the complex moral terrain that contemporary, experience-oriented pedagogical practice entails. This article serves as an introduction to further, more in-depth analyses.

RESEARCH PROBLEM AND AIM

The aim of this essay (Adorno, 1984) is to illuminate the ethical challenges that emerge when aesthetic education is situated within the broader context of everyday life, embodiment, and relational engagement, moving beyond traditional, art-centered frameworks. This study is guided by the following research question: What ethical challenges may arise in experience-oriented aesthetic education, and how can they be addressed in pedagogical practice?

EVIDENCE-BASED FACTS

Transformations in Contemporary Aesthetics

Contemporary debates in aesthetics reveal profound departure from the classical frameworks established by Kant (Lorenc, 2007; Nanay, 2024). For much of modernity, aesthetic theory remained dominated by the idea of autonomous art and the cultivation of refined taste (Geiger, 2021). The Kantian legacy – anchored in the notions of disinterested judgment and universal validity – positioned fine art as the privileged object of aesthetic reflection and, consequently, the central focus of aesthetic education (cf. Kopčáková, 2018; Wojnar, 1995). This orientation produced an elitist and exclusionary model, in which aesthetic value was tied to the canon of “high art” and to the capacity to master the interpretive codes of cultural elites.

In recent decades, however, this paradigm has been decisively challenged. Critical perspectives emerging from sociology, cultural theory, and poststructuralist phi-

losophy have exposed the socially constructed nature of taste, revealing how aesthetic hierarchies sustain class divisions and reproduce ideological power (cf. Bourdieu, 1984; Bourriaud, 2002; Levine, 2013; Rancière, 2013). Simultaneously, thinkers such as Berleant (1997), Dewey (1934), Saito (2010), and Shusterman (2012) have advanced alternative frameworks that center on lived experience, embodiment, and the relational character of perception. Within these perspectives, aesthetic experience is understood not as detached contemplation of autonomous objects but as active, participatory engagement with environments, practices, and communities.

Several key developments exemplify this shift. Everyday aesthetics (Leddy, 2012; Mandoki, 2016; Saito, 2021) illuminates the aesthetic significance of ordinary life, showing that the seemingly mundane arrangements of space, daily rituals, or the sensory qualities of utilitarian objects shape sensibility and moral orientation. Environmental and ecological aesthetics (Berleant, 1997; Böhme, 2002; Carlson, 2001) emphasizes immersion and co-presence within natural and built environments, underscoring that aesthetic engagement is inseparable from ecological awareness and ethical responsibility. Some esthetics (Shusterman, 2012) repositions the body as the foundation of aesthetic reflection, demonstrating that perception and judgment are grounded in embodied practice rather than in abstract contemplation.

Together, these transformations dismantle the ideal of aesthetic autonomy and blur the boundary between art and life. Aesthetic experience is increasingly recognized as plural, situated, and ethically entangled. It is no longer the exclusive domain of the cultivated connoisseur but a constitutive dimension of human existence – accessible to all and enacted across diverse cultural, social, and ecological contexts.

This reconfiguration – from aesthetic autonomy to lived, embodied, and relational forms of experience – has far-reaching implications for education (Saito, 2025). Within this framework, experience-oriented aesthetic education emerges as a pedagogical response to the expanded understanding of the aesthetic. By grounding learning in the diversity of lived experience – bodily, sensory, ecological, and social – it fosters a more inclusive, democratic, and ethically responsive space for cultivating aesthetic sensibility and moral imagination.

Experience-Oriented Aesthetic Education – Core Elements of the Conceptual Proposal

Experience-oriented aesthetic education could redefine the aims and methods of aesthetic learning by shifting attention from the artwork itself to the learner's lived, multisensory, and ethically embedded experience. Within this framework, aesthetic education is not limited to acquiring artistic knowledge or cultivating refined taste but becomes a process of shaping awareness, sensitivity, and relational understanding through embodied engagement with the world. The focus lies on *how* individuals perceive, feel, and act within aesthetic situations rather than on *what* they know about art (cf. Carpenter, 2019).

This perspective assumes that aesthetic education functions as a form of ethical and existential formation. Through sustained attention to sensory, emotional, and imaginative experience, learners develop the capacity to respond reflectively to their environments and to recognize the aesthetic dimensions of everyday life. Such education nurtures *aesthetic literacy* understood as the ability to notice and interpret aesthetic values that permeate ordinary settings – textures, sounds, atmospheres, social interactions, or places. In doing so, it fosters not only aesthetic appreciation but also ethical awareness, ecological responsibility, and empathy toward others (cf. Saito, 2025).

Movement from transmission to participation is a central pedagogical implication of this approach. The role of the teacher changes from that of an expert who transfers artistic knowledge to that of a facilitator who creates spaces for perceptual exploration, reflection, and dialogue. Students are encouraged to become active participants in their aesthetic encounters – to interpret their sensory impressions, to share them in conversation, and to situate them within broader cultural and moral contexts. Learning thus becomes an experiential, dialogical process that integrates perception and reflection, emotion and cognition, self-expression and communal meaning-making (cf. Naukkarinen, 2021).

By embedding aesthetic inquiry in everyday experiences, aesthetic education acquires democratic and inclusive qualities. It recognizes that every person, regardless of artistic background or skill, participates in the aesthetic shaping of their surroundings. Education inspired by this model values local contexts, ordinary experiences, and personal meanings (cf. Fenner, 2003). It invites learners to explore the aesthetic and ethical implications of their choices, environments, and interactions – how spaces are designed, how materials are used, how attention is directed. Through such reflection, aesthetic education contributes to forming subjects capable of critical judgment, ecological mindfulness, and responsible participation in shared life.

A significant dimension of this framework involves narrative and self-reflective practice (Lisiecka, 2025b). Encouraging learners to articulate their own aesthetic experiences – through discussion, journaling, or creative expression – allows them to integrate perception and reflection into coherent forms of understanding. Self-narration, understood as the practice of telling one's own story through aesthetic experience, supports personal agency and the ability to relate individual perception to collective values. It transforms aesthetic learning into an act of self-discovery and ethical positioning within the world (cf. Hurren, 2017).

In sum, experience-oriented aesthetic education emphasizes participation over instruction, engagement over contemplation, and meaning-making over replication. It situates learning in the immediacy of lived experience, where aesthetic and ethical awareness emerge together. This framework envisions aesthetic education as a practice of cultivating attentiveness, empathy, and responsibility – a form of

education that enables individuals to perceive the world not only as it is but as it might be shaped through care, imagination, and shared experience.

While aesthetic education has always carried moral significance, the contemporary expansion of aesthetic experience into everyday, relational, and environmental domains introduces new ethical complexities. As educators begin to treat ordinary perception, interpersonal interaction, and lived experience as legitimate spaces of aesthetic inquiry, they encounter questions that were largely absent from traditional, art-centered frameworks. The immediacy and intimacy of such encounters – rooted in the learner’s emotions, memories, and social context – demand a heightened awareness of ethical responsibility. This emerging landscape calls for educators to recognize not only the formative potential of aesthetic experience but also the vulnerabilities and asymmetries it entails. The following section addresses these evolving ethical challenges, inviting reflection on how experience-oriented aesthetic education might navigate them with sensitivity and integrity.

Ethical Issues Arising from the Expansion of Aesthetic Experience

In its broadest sense, education is always a moral practice (cf. Bagnall, 2006; Bain, 1993; Burge, 2007). It is not only about the transmission of knowledge and skills but also about shaping attitudes, values, and modes of living with others. Every pedagogical decision – from curriculum content selection to assessment methods, from classroom management to the cultivation of interpersonal relationships – carries ethical implications. This is why philosophers and educators alike emphasize that education cannot be reduced to a neutral process; it is inevitably embedded in questions of justice, autonomy, responsibility, and care (cf. Bagnall, 2006).

Extending aesthetic experience into everyday and relational contexts underscores its inherently situated and multidimensional nature. Perception is never neutral; it is shaped by the interplay of personal dispositions, social interactions, and environmental conditions. As Fenner (2003, p. 41) observes:

Aesthetic experiences, if we are to treat them as “raw data,” must be explored without pre-conception, prejudice, or limitation. And, truly enough, the vast majority of aesthetic experiences are not focused exclusively, in terms of their contents, on formal or simple-sensory matters. Aesthetic experiences are, first, experiences. They are complex things, having to do with things as tidy as the formal qualities of the object under consideration and with things as messy as whether one had enough sleep the night before, whether one just had a fight with his roommate, whether one is carrying psychological baggage that is brought to consciousness by this particular aesthetic object.

This perspective highlights that aesthetic engagement cannot be reduced to formal analysis or detached contemplation. Every encounter is filtered through the learner’s personal history, social context, and environmental conditions, rendering aesthetic experience simultaneously intimate and relational. For educators,

this complexity carries ethical implications: fostering aesthetic sensitivity requires careful negotiation between guiding reflection and respecting the autonomy of students' experiences.

The next section explores the ethical challenges of experience-oriented aesthetic education. It proposes questions about how educators might responsibly engage students' lived experiences while supporting their aesthetic and moral growth. These questions are offered as points of reflection rather than definitive answers.

Engaging the Personal

A primary ethical challenge in experience-oriented aesthetic education concerns the delicate task of working with students' sensitivity and personal experiences (cf. Maliszewski, 2021). Unlike purely cognitive domains of instruction, aesthetic education inevitably engages the affective, emotional, and existential dimensions of the learner. Teachers are therefore confronted with the question of how far pedagogical interventions may legitimately extend into the private sphere of a student's inner life. The act of "touching" upon a student's sensibility is never a neutral undertaking; it involves power relations, vulnerabilities, and the risk of overstepping personal boundaries.

Determining what counts as a legitimate point of engagement is not straightforward. On the one hand, aesthetic education cannot fulfil its emancipatory and transformative potential if it remains at the *surface level*, avoiding confrontation with students' lived experiences. To cultivate reflection, autonomy, and value-consciousness, teachers must sometimes invite learners to explore sensitive dimensions of their identities and personal histories. On the other hand, overly intrusive interventions can easily slide into forms of coercion, exposing students to discomfort, shame, or even retraumatization. This tension raises a fundamental pedagogical dilemma: can one justify intervening in personal domains of sensibility if the educational goal is to develop freedom and autonomy?

Resolution of such dilemmas requires teachers to develop a refined ethical sensitivity. Rather than relying on fixed rules, educators must cultivate the capacity for situational judgment, weighing the pedagogical benefits of deeper engagement against the moral obligation to respect the student's privacy and self-determination. Ethical reflection thus becomes an inseparable component of teaching practice. The teacher's role is not merely to transmit aesthetic knowledge but to act as a moral agent who negotiates boundaries, constantly balancing openness to personal expression with protection of the learner's integrity.

At stake here is not only the student's personal development but also credibility of aesthetic education itself. If learners perceive that their vulnerabilities are being instrumentalized for pedagogical purposes, trust in the educational relationship may erode, undermining the very conditions for meaningful reflection. By contrast, when teachers manage to navigate these ethical boundaries with

care, they create a safe yet challenging space in which students can explore new dimensions of selfhood and aesthetic understanding without fear of exposure or violation.

Respecting Individual Experience

Closely related to the issue of personal engagement is the principle of respecting students' individual experiences. Experience-oriented aesthetic education insists that every student's encounter with the aesthetic – no matter how unpolished, fragmentary, or idiosyncratic – possesses intrinsic value (cf. Fenner, 2003). This pedagogical stance challenges hierarchical assumptions that only refined or “cultured” experiences are worthy of attention. Instead, it recognizes the formative potential embedded in even the most ordinary or unconventional aesthetic perceptions.

Respecting individual experience, however, does not entail uncritical acceptance. Rather, it demands that teachers acknowledge the subjective validity of each learner's perspective while simultaneously guiding them toward new horizons of reflection and evaluation. The ethical challenge here lies in affirming the dignity of lived experience without reducing education to mere confirmation of personal taste. Teachers must walk a fine line: to dismiss or trivialize students' experiences is to risk silencing their voices, but to valorize them unconditionally may deprive learners of the opportunity for growth.

The task, then, is to engage individual sensitivity as a starting point for further exploration. Respect becomes the foundation upon which horizons can be expanded. This may involve presenting alternative perspectives, exposing students to unfamiliar cultural forms, or inviting them to reconsider their initial judgments in light of broader criteria. The pedagogical act is dialogical: rather than imposing external standards, the teacher creates conditions in which learners can test their intuitions, refine their judgments, and deepen their reflective capacity.

Such respect also presupposes that teachers be prepared to encounter perspectives that diverge sharply from their own. In pluralistic societies, classrooms bring together a wide variety of cultural backgrounds, aesthetic sensibilities, and personal values. Teachers who rigidly impose their own standards risk transforming education into indoctrination. Instead, ethical pedagogy requires cultivating openness, humility, and willingness to listen – even when students' perspectives appear crude, unsettling, or resistant to established norms (cf. Hart, 1990). By legitimizing difference while gently challenging it, teachers foster an environment in which students feel recognized yet also encouraged to grow beyond the confines of their current sensibilities.

Ultimately, the ethic of respect for individual experience contributes to a broader vision of aesthetic education as a practice of empowerment. Students learn that their perceptions matter, that their voices can enter into dialogue with others, and that their capacity for judgment is worthy of cultivation. This affir-

mation of subjectivity becomes the very ground upon which reflective autonomy is built, enabling learners to engage critically and responsibly with aesthetic and ethical dimensions of life.

Social and Cultural Contexts

Aesthetic experience is never an isolated phenomenon; it is always situated within particular social, cultural, and economic contexts (Berleant, 2010). Teachers engaging students in experience-oriented aesthetic education must therefore consider the full range of conditions that shape how a student perceives and interprets the world. These include familial upbringing, cultural heritage, religious beliefs, life history, gender, personal interests, and social positioning (cf. Gee, 2004). Recognizing these factors is essential for creating a genuine space of openness and dialogue, where students feel understood and safe to share their experiences. Failure to attend to these conditions risks superficial engagement or inadvertent imposition of the teacher's own normative frameworks. Moreover, the teacher must navigate the delicate balance between acknowledging the student's context and fostering critical reflection that challenges unexamined assumptions. Developing this sensitivity requires ongoing self-awareness and the capacity to critically evaluate one's own perspectives, avoiding stereotypes and simplistic interpretations. In practice, it involves creating conditions in which students can explore and articulate their experiences fully, while teachers act as guides who support reflection without dominating or constraining the process (cf. Feng & Xu, 2024). This contextual attentiveness not only enriches the aesthetic experience itself but also underscores the ethical responsibility of the teacher to engage in a respectful and nuanced pedagogical practice.

Subjectivity and Collectivity

Aesthetic education oriented toward experience must simultaneously respect individual subjectivity and cultivate a sense of collective engagement. Each student's perception and valuation of objects, events, or practices is unique, shaped by personal history, preferences, and emotional responses (cf. Świątek et al., 2024; Wassiliwizky & Menninghaus, 2021). At the same time, learning environments provide opportunities to identify points of convergence among these diverse experiences, creating a space for negotiation, dialogue, and shared understanding. Teachers facilitate these processes by helping students articulate their perceptions, compare them with those of others, and consider the significance of these differences within multiple contexts – artistic, cultural, social, psychological, and economic (Berleant, 2010). Such collaborative engagement encourages critical thinking, as students must justify and reflect on their interpretations in relation to others, while also recognizing broader patterns and commonalities. Importantly, teachers are responsible for maintaining an atmosphere of respect

and recognition even in the face of aesthetic or moral disagreement. Conflicts are not avoided; rather, they are reframed as pedagogical opportunities to explore diversity, develop empathy, and strengthen the capacity to negotiate shared meanings. By integrating subjectivity and collectivity in this way, experience-oriented education fosters both personal growth and communal awareness, emphasizing that aesthetic understanding is simultaneously a deeply individual and socially situated endeavor (cf. Naukkarinen, 2021).

Individual Experience and Transpersonal Values

While aesthetic experience is inherently (inter)subjective, experience-oriented education requires careful pedagogical orientation (cf. Denac, 2014). Teachers serve as mediators between their students' personal experiences and broader aesthetic and ethical norms, introducing learners to established aesthetic values and wider human concerns (cf. D'Olimpio, 2022). This mediation raises a fundamental ethical challenge: how to support the development of individual sensitivity while simultaneously guiding students toward shared principles without imposing predetermined "packages" of values. Achieving this balance involves creating a common language for describing experiences, in which students can articulate, compare, and critically reflect on their own perceptions relative to those of others. Such a process encourages reflective judgment and fosters intellectual growth, as students learn to recognize the multiplicity of valid aesthetic interpretations.

A central question arises concerning assessment: how can teachers evaluate aesthetic and moral understanding in a manner that is fair, inclusive, and respectful of individual experiences? Evaluation practices must be transparent, dialogical, and attentive to the diversity of students' responses, ensuring that the pursuit of educational objectives does not undermine the authenticity or integrity of each learner's aesthetic engagement. In this context, teachers navigate a complex ethical terrain, balancing normative guidance with respect for autonomy, and fostering students' capacity to engage with both personal and transpersonal values critically.

Responsibility for Environment and Daily Life

Expanding the field of aesthetic experience to encompass everyday life and the natural environment introduces a dimension of practical ethics to education. Aesthetic engagement cannot be separated from responsibility; interactions with places, objects, and practices should cultivate care, attentiveness, and respect (cf. Carlson, 2010). The post-Kantian ethical imperative to act underscores the active role that aesthetic experience can play in shaping practical engagement with the world (Berleant, 2017). In school contexts, however, this can intersect with political or civic concerns, raising questions about the scope and limits of teacher involvement. Educators may face dilemmas about whether and how to engage in discussions that touch upon local or national policies, especially when institutional constraints lim-

it autonomy. The ethical challenge extends to fostering communal responsibility among students: how can educators cultivate a shared sense of care for the environment and everyday life without imposing hegemonic aesthetic or moral standards? Striking this balance requires careful negotiation, reflective practice, and the creation of spaces in which students can develop ethical awareness collectively while critically examining the normative frameworks that inform their actions. In this way, experience-oriented aesthetic education highlights the inextricable links between personal, social, and environmental responsibility, emphasizing that neither aesthetic education nor its practitioners can be considered value-neutral.

Risk of Instrumentalization

Finally, integrating experience-oriented aesthetic education into broader curricula carries the risk of instrumentalization: treating aesthetic experiences primarily as tools for achieving predetermined educational objectives rather than as meaningful engagements in their own right. Such instrumentalization threatens the authenticity and integrity of students' aesthetic encounters, reducing them to instruments for teaching values, developing cognitive skills, or enforcing specific types of behavior. Teachers face the ethical and pedagogical challenge of preserving the intrinsic value of aesthetic experience while simultaneously supporting the learning goals of the curriculum (cf. Feng & Xu, 2024). This requires careful reflection on the purpose and design of activities, as well as ongoing attention to students' engagement, ensuring that exercises facilitate genuine exploration, personal insight, and reflective growth. Maintaining the authenticity of experience-oriented education demands that teachers remain vigilant against instrumental pressure, continually balancing educational aims with the necessity of allowing students to inhabit, interpret, and respond to aesthetic phenomena in ways that are personally meaningful. By navigating this tension, educators can uphold the ethical integrity of aesthetic education while fostering deep, reflective, and autonomous engagement with art and lived experience.

SUMMARY

Experience-oriented aesthetic education represents a significant shift from traditional, art-centered models toward a pedagogy grounded in lived, embodied, and relational experience. By valuing everyday encounters, diverse cultural practices, and environmental engagement, it promotes inclusive, democratic, and ethically aware learning. However, this expansion of aesthetic experience introduces complex moral responsibilities for educators, who must balance respect for individual sensitivities with guidance toward broader aesthetic and ethical values. Teachers are called to navigate the tensions between personal exploration and communal

norms, subjective perception and transpersonal principles, as well as educational goals and the intrinsic integrity of aesthetic experience. Ultimately, experience-oriented aesthetic education underscores that aesthetic development is inseparable from ethical reflection, social responsibility, and attentiveness to the interconnectedness of self, others, and the environment.

CONCLUSIONS

Experience-oriented approach does not devalue art or knowledge about art, recognizing them as essential components of education, while simultaneously advocating for other dimensions of aesthetic experience that are equally vital for holistic learning and human development (cf. Nussbaum, 1997). While art and knowledge about art remain significant, focusing solely on them risks overlooking the open-ended and uncertain nature of aesthetic engagement. It must increasingly be acknowledged that aesthetic education ultimately offers no guarantees (cf. Gaskill & Stanley, 2023), as Nanay (2019, p. 42) points out, nothing can be taken for granted when engaging with aesthetic experience:

My claim is that things are very different when it comes to an aesthetic experience of a tomato. In this case, you attend not just to the tomato, but also to the quality of your experience of the tomato. And to the relation between the two. Aesthetic experiences are not transparent.

REFERENCES

- Adorno, T. W. (1984). The essay as form. *New German Critique*, 32, 151–171. <https://doi.org/10.2307/488160>
- Bagnall, R. G. (2006). Ethical issues in lifelong learning and education. In J. Chapman, P. Cartwright, & E. J. McGilp (Eds.), *Lifelong learning, participation and equity* (pp. 25-45). Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-5322-3_2
- Bain, L. L. (1993). Ethical issues in teaching. *Quest*, 45(1), 69-77. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00336297.1993.10484073>
- Berleant, A. (1997). *Living in the landscape: toward an aesthetics of environment*. University Press of Kansas.
- Berleant, A. (2010). *Sensibility and sense: the aesthetic transformation of the human world*. Imprint Academic.
- Berleant, A. (2017). Estetyka polityki. In K. Kaśkiewicz, R. Michalski, & T. Siwiec (Eds.), *Między etyką a estetyką. Rozważania nad problemem estetyzacji* (pp. 297-316). Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika.

- Berleant, A. (2021). Aesthetics and the arts of engagement. *Roczniki Kulturoznawcze*, 12(1), 19-29. <http://doi.org/10.18290/rkult21121-2>
- Böhme, G. (2002). *Filozofia i estetyka przyrody w dobie kryzysu środowiska naturalnego*. Oficyna Wydawnicza.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Bourriaud, N. (2002). *Relational aesthetics*. Les presses du réel.
- Burge, E. J. (2007). Considering ethical issues. *Open Learning: The Journal of Open, Distance and e-Learning*, 22(2), 107-115. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680510701306319>
- Carlson, A. (2001). *Environmental aesthetics*. Routledge.
- Carlson, A. (2010). Contemporary environmental aesthetics and the requirements of environmentalism. *Environmental Values*, 19(3), 289-314. <https://doi.org/10.3197/096327110X519844>
- Carpenter, B. S. (2019). What is (the matter) with art education? *Studies in Art Education*, 60(1), 3-6.
- D'Olimpio, L. (2022). Defending aesthetic education. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 70(3), 263-279. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2021.1960267>
- D'Olimpio, L. (2024). *The necessity of aesthetic education: The place of the arts on the curriculum*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Denac, O. (2014). The significance and role of aesthetic education in schooling. *Creative Education*, 5, 1714-1719. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/ce.2014.519190>
- Dewey, J. (1934). *Art as experience*. Minton, Balch & Company.
- Dziamiński, G. (2022). Przemiany estetyki. *Przegląd Kulturoznawczy*, 1, 127-147. <https://doi.org/10.4467/20843860PK.22.009.15754>
- Feng, Y., & Xu, L. (2024). Modernity criticism of aesthetic education. *Discover Education*, 3(124), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-024-00226-3>
- Fenner, D. E. W. (2003). Aesthetic experience and aesthetic analysis. *The Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 37(1), 40-53.
- Gaskill, N., & Stanley, K. (2023). Aesthetic education without guarantees: An Introduction. *PMLA*, 138(1), 127-136. <https://doi.org/10.1632/S0030812923000044>
- Gee, C. B. (2004). Spirit, mind, and body: Arts education the redeemer. In E. W. Eisner, & M. D. Day (Eds.), *Handbook of research and policy in art education* (pp. 115-134). Routledge.
- Geiger, I. (2021). Kant on aesthetic ideas, rational ideas and the subject-matter of art. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 79, 186-199.
- Hart, R. E. (1990). On personalism and education. *The Personalist Forum*, 6(1), 51-74.
- Hurren, W. (2017). Cultivating an aesthetic sensibility and activism: everyday aesthetics and environmental education. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education*, 22, 27-41.
- Kopčáková, S. (2018). Aesthetics education and its position in the 21st-century democratic society. *Ars Inter Culturas*, 7, 249-262.

- Kupfer, J. (1978). Aesthetic experience and moral education. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 12(3), 13-22.
- Leddy, T. (2012). *The extraordinary in the ordinary: the aesthetics of everyday life*. Broadview Press.
- Levine, C. (2013). *Od prowokacji do demokracji, czyli o tym, dlaczego potrzebna nam sztuka*. Warszawskie Wydawnictwo Literackie Muza.
- Lisiecka, A. (2025a). Art pedagogy, or perhaps aesthetic pedagogy instead? *Studia z Teorii Wychowania*, 1(50), 73-88. <https://doi.org/10.5604/01.3001.0055.0566>
- Lisiecka, A. (2025b). Włączanie estetyki codzienności do edukacji poprzez auto-narrację. *Biografistyka Pedagogiczna*, 10(2), 481-504. <https://doi.org/10.36578/BP.2025.10.22>
- Lorenc, I. (2007). O potrzebie estetyki nieautonomicznej. In K. Wilkoszewska (Ed.), *Wizje i re-wizje. Wielka księga estetyki w Polsce* (pp. 79-90). Universitas.
- Maliszewski, K. (2021). *Bez-silna edukacja. O kształceniu kruchego*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Mandoki, K. (2016). *Everyday aesthetics: prosaics, the play of culture and social identities*. Routledge.
- Nanay, B. (2018). The aesthetic experience of artworks and everyday scenes. *The Monist*, 101(1), 71-82. <https://doi.org/10.1093/monist/onx037>
- Nanay, B. (2019). *Aesthetics. A very short introduction*. Oxford University Press.
- Nanay, B. (2024). Aesthetic experience as interaction. *Journal of the American Philosophical Association*, 10(4), 715-727. <https://doi.org/10.1017/apa.2023.21>
- Naukkarinen, O. (2021). Everyday aesthetics solving social problems. *ESPES*, 10(2), 151-164.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (1997). *Cultivating humanity: A classical defense of reform in liberal education*. Harvard University Press.
- Rancière, J. (2013). *The politics of aesthetics*. A&C Black.
- Saito, Y. (1998). Appreciating nature on its own terms. *Environmental Ethics*, 20(2), 135-149.
- Saito, Y. (2010). *Everyday aesthetics*. Oxford University Press.
- Saito, Y. (2021). The role of aesthetics in world-making. *Contemporary Aesthetics*, 9.
- Saito, Y. (2025). *The role of aesthetic education in everyday life*. <https://www.philosophy-of-education.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/PESGB-Saito.pdf>
- Shusterman, R. (2012). *Thinking through the body: Essays in somaesthetics*. Cambridge University Press.
- 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. 163-185). Routledge.
- Świątek, A. H., Szcześniak, M., Borkowska, H., Stempień, M., Wojtkowiak, K., & Diessner, R. (2024). The unexplored territory of aesthetic needs and the development of the Aesthetic Needs Scale. *PLOS ONE*, 19(3), 1-31. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0299326>

- Wang, P. C., & Yu, C. Y. (2018). Aesthetic experience as an essential factor to trigger positive environmental consciousness. *Sustainability*, 10(4), 1098. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10041098>
- Wassiliwizky, E., & Menninghaus, W. (2021). Why and how should cognitive science care about aesthetics? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 25(6), 437-449. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2021.03.008>
- Westerlund, H. (2003). Reconsidering aesthetic experience in praxial music education. *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, 11(1), 45-62.
- Wojnar, I. (1995). *Teoria wychowania estetycznego. Zarys problematyki*. Wydawnictwo Żak.

ETYCZNE WYZWANIA EDUKACJI ESTETYCZNEJ ZORIENTOWANEJ NA DOŚWIADCZENIE

Wprowadzenie: Tradycyjna edukacja estetyczna skupia się na docenianiu sztuki i kształtowaniu wyrafinowanego smaku, opierając się głównie na klasycznych teoriach estetycznych i dziełach kanonicznych. Współczesne nurty w estetyce kwestionują kantowskie założenia, poszerzając pole zainteresowań dyscypliny o codzienne, cielesne i relacyjne doświadczenia, które kształtują percepcję, świadomość etyczną i odpowiedzialność społeczną. Zmiany te powinny znaleźć swoje odbicie w edukacji estetycznej.

Cel badań: Celem artykułu jest przemyślenie etycznych wyzwań, które pojawiają się w edukacji estetycznej zorientowanej na doświadczenie, odchodzącej od tradycyjnego podejścia skoncentrowanego na sztuce. Pytanie badawcze brzmi: jakie etyczne wyzwania powstają w tym podejściu i jak można je odpowiedzialnie rozwiązać w praktyce pedagogicznej? Niniejszy artykuł stanowi wstęp do dalszych, pogłębionych analiz.

Stan wiedzy: Współczesna estetyka, inspirowana myślą Deweya, Berleanta, Saito i Shustermana, traktuje doświadczenie estetyczne jako partycypacyjne i inkluzywne, obejmujące codzienne życie oraz relacje z otoczeniem. Edukacja estetyczna oparta na tych założeniach rozwija refleksyjne myślenie, empatię i odpowiedzialność ekologiczną poprzez wielozmysłowe doświadczenia. Jednocześnie generuje nowe wyzwania etyczne, związane z kwestiami: szacunku dla indywidualnych doświadczeń, równoważenia wartości osobistych i ponadindywidualnych, unikania nadmiernie inwazyjnych interwencji oraz zapobiegania instrumentalizacji doświadczeń estetycznych. Nauczyciele działający w proponowanym nurcie muszą stworzyć otwarte, dialogiczne przestrzenie uwzględniające różnorodność perspektyw.

Podsumowanie: Edukacja estetyczna zorientowana na doświadczenie wspiera holistyczne uczenie się, docenia codzienne doświadczenia oraz rozwija świadomość etyczną i odpowiedzialność społeczną. Wymaga jednak uważnego podejścia do etycznych napięć, takich jak respektowanie autonomii ucznia czy zachowanie integralności doświadczeń estetycznych. Podkreśla nierozdzielność rozwoju estetycznego i etycznego, czyniąc edukację przestrzenią kształtowania refleksyjnych, wrażliwych i odpowiedzialnych jednostek.

Słowa kluczowe: edukacja estetyczna, edukacja estetyczna zorientowana na doświadczenie, doświadczenie estetyczne, etyka