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This study investigates theories of aesthetic development from 1937 to 1995. These theories fall into two categories: those which examine some specific elements of a developmental structure, and those which looked for a holistic stage structure of aesthetic development. This study shows that both of these theories indicate a universal scheme that aesthetic abilities are related to an individual's cognitive development and experiences with art. Because these empirical findings of predicting developmental levels only reflect an educated Westerner's development in this domain, this implies a non-universal possibility that individual aesthetic growth might follow different paths and speeds. Therefore, cultural differences in developmental levels needs to be further explored.

Keywords: perception cognition aesthetic judgment aesthetic ability aesthetic development

Introduction

Aesthetic development has to do with the progressive growth of an individual's ability in thinking about, and responding to aesthetic objects. This ability differs from the ability of producing a work, which is the so-called the ability of artistic expression. On the one hand, the ability of making confirms one's aesthetic ability. On the other hand, one's aesthetic ability goes through, and enhances the process of producing a work. In fact, these two kinds of abilities intertwine with individual's artistic development. Both these abilities deal with mental activities which are perceptual and cognitive. As Goodman says, "both depiction and description participate in the formation and characterization of the world; and they interact with each other and with perception and knowledge" (Goodman, 1968, p.40). Nevertheless, in the history of art education, aesthetic response has lagged behind the studio production and has had even less attention (Kern, 1984, p.219; Taunton, 1982, p.94). However, a consensus has emerged over the last few decades that production alone will not suffice (Gardner, 1983, 1989, p.76; Wolf, 1992, pp.953-956). The cognitive approach has affected educators in thinking about the arts and about issues of teaching, learning, and curriculum (Gardner, 1992; Parsons, 1992). In order to be competent in the arts, individuals require the tools of criticism to encode and decode the symbol systems that are rooted in a cultural context. Therefore, how to foster the aesthetic ability has become an important educational issue. A number of efforts call for art education which should include discussion and analysis of art works. Some educators provide individuals' aesthetic developmental levels for understanding the individuals, learning as well as for improving teaching strategies (Feldman, 1983, 1985, 1987, 1994; Gardner, 1990; Kerlavage, 1995; Housen, 1983; Parsons, 1976, 1978, 1987; Wolf, 1988). Other educators put their consideration into designing effective curricula or teaching strategies for aesthetic learning (Battin, 1994; Battin, Fisher, Moore, & Silvers, 1989; Clark, 1991; Clark, Day, & Greer, 1987; Efland, 1995; Eisner, 1985a; Erickson, 1986; Gardner, 1989; Greer, 1984, 1987, 1993; Moore, 1994; Parsons & Blocker, 1993, pp.154-180; Smith, 1995; Stewart,
1994; Wolf, 1989a, 1992). Still others study individuals’ responses to aesthetic objects in an effort to reveal valuable information of aesthetic development (see Table 1). All these efforts contribute to the development of aesthetic education.

The theories of aesthetic development

The 30 studies from 1937 to 1995, they fall into two categories: those which examined some specific elements of a developmental structure, and those which looked for a holistic stage structure of aesthetic development. Table 1 summarizes the basic methodological characteristics and results of the studies.

The studies of specific elements focused on investigating the factors that determined individual’s judgment, the tendency that individual perceived art objects, or the comparison between different groups. Basically, these investigations were guided by the individuals’ cognitive development for which Piaget (1954, 1963) has provided a schematic framework. They provided some useful points, but their scope seems limited in understanding aesthetic skills and concepts. The other studies tried to build a developmental stage structure of aesthetic ability. They tended to a widespread and descriptive grasp.

The following study focuses on the second direction of 12 studies of aesthetic development to examine their theoretical considerations and implications for future research.

The model of Machotka (1966)

The study of Machotka (1966) selected French boys from an urban and a suburban school. They ranged from 6 through 12 years, with an 18-year-old group as a special young-adult control from the same population. Fifteen color reproductions of paintings were shown to the subjects. The subjects were asked to choose and give reasons for their best preference. The findings suggested three main developmental levels which corresponded to the different types of intellectual functioning described by Piaget: (a) an appreciation based on subject matter and color (from beginning of school to age seven or eight), which appears to require no more than preoperational functioning; (b) an evaluation based on realistic representation, contrast and harmony of colors, and clarity of presentation (from about age seven to about eleven), which appears to require operational thought; (c) interest in style, composition, affective tone, and luminosity (from about age twelve on), which appears to necessitate formal thinking. While further levels of evaluation are added to the earlier ones, they do not replace them.

The model of Coffey (1968)

The study of Coffey (1968) also drew some features from Piaget’s construct which she felt were most relevant to aesthetic development. She investigated aesthetic preference as a cognitive phenomenon. The subjects ranged from kindergarten, fourth grade, and college freshman. There were an equal number of female and male subjects. Twelve pairs of nonobjective and realistic postcards of paintings were shown to the subjects. The subjects were asked to choose their most and least preferred card, and give reasons. The findings indicated three stage developments. The first is the “First stage of Respresentational Thought”. Reasoning is characterized by egocentricity, concrete thought, curiosity, centration and moment- to-moment thinking. The second is the “Second Stage of Representational Thought”. A decentering has taken place which allows the child to attain the concept of conservation. His criteria for judgment have expanded to notice realism as well as color and content. The third is the “Stage of Formal Operations”. The viewer deals with the realm of possibilities rather than concrete reality.

The model of Clayton (1974)

Clayton (1974) was interested in seeing if aesthetic development paralleled the developmental stages of Piaget or Kohlberg. Further, she was interested in the relationship between the notion of decentering and the work of Beardsley (1982), that asserted the phenomenally objective character of aesthetic experience. She investigated the systematic similarities and differences among individuals’ responses to questions concerning the visual arts. The subjects ranged from age five to seventeen. Three well-know reproductions were shown to the subjects who were asked to use reason concerning a series of questions: 1. what do you see in the painting? 2. what is the painting about? 3. what feel-
ings do you see in the painting? and 4.which one (picture) is best? and why?

Four developmental stages were reported. The first three terms of the stages were borrowed from Kohlberg (1981). The first is the "Pre-conventional Stage". Viewers are prone to list concrete items. They lack awareness of the unity of a scene, and are unable to justify their responses. The second is the "Conventional Stage". Viewers tend to accept a wider range of subject matter including negative aspects. The third is the "Post-Conventional Stage". Viewers begin to notice the themes, totality of feeling through out the painting. The last is the "Relative Stage". Viewers tend to grasp the interrelationship between subject matter and the formal elements within the art work. In her progression of stages, the viewer moves from an enumeration of items to an integrated discussion.

The model of Brunner (1975)

The study of Brunner (1975) categorized the aesthetic criteria based on the literature of aesthetics and art criticism. The description of Kohlberg's moral judgment specially influenced this work. Brunner interviewed five groups of subjects. They included third, seventh, twelfth grades, liberal arts college students, and liberal arts college students with an arts background. Eight pairs of reproductions of well-known paintings, sculptures, and photographs of buildings were shown.

Six stages were reported. The first is the "Objects Stage". The viewer makes a categorical justification depending upon the particular color or object. The second is the "Document Stage". The justification is based on the comfort the subject matter gives to the viewer. The third is the "Message Stage". The viewer tries to discover the message of the art object, and judges it by social canons. The fourth is the "Structure Stage". The focus of a viewer shifts from the content to the structure of the painting. The fifth is the "Response Stage". The judgment is based on the evocation of the art object. The last is the "Recreation Stage". The viewer becomes deeply involved in the art object, and tries to catch and judge the artist's intention as well as the achievement.

The model of Housen (1983)

The stage model of Housen (1983) draws from the work of Baldwin (1975), the parts which talk about the detailed exposition of the theory of affective logic and the equally detailed investigation of aesthetic experience. Baldwin had considered a developmental perspective when establishing a theoretical framework for analyzing aesthetic responses. Otherwise, Housen's working experience in a museum influenced her method of analyzing the data. She used the responses to set her categories that became the criteria to judge the data. She randomly selected the subjects ranging from fourteen to fifty-five who were convenient to solicit (1983, p.75). They were recruited based on their placement in a twelve cell matrix designed to test for the effects of age, education, and socio-economic level. Three reproductions of paintings were shown to the subjects who were asked to choose one to respond to. She even developed a manual for analyzing the data. A recent study (1992) of second and fourth graders were sampled using this model to test an instructional effect. Finally, she suggested this model as a validating measure of aesthetic development for museums and schools. The five stages are: 1.the Accountive Stage; respondents emphasize literal and personal observations. 2.the Constructive Stage; respondents focus on the purpose and technique of the work. 3.the Classifying Stage; respondents emphasize the intellectual understanding of the work. 4.the Interpretive Stage; respondents are interested in the meaning of the work. 5.the Re-Creative Stage; respondents are capable of reflecting on their own opinions.

The model of Parsons (1987)

The representative study of Parsons's is the model that he presented in 1987. It was developed from the studies of 1976 and 1978. The features of the studies in 1976 and 1978 had four and six assumptions respectively, but later they were revised into five stages. Basically, he characterized the stage features based on the tendencies of the responses, they were: subject matter; expression; medium; form, and style; and judgment. He attempted to accomplish for aesthetic development what Piaget and Kohlberg did for cognitive and moral development. In Kohlberg's moral development, six stages are based on the different reasons for "right" action (pp.409-412). Some of the questions that Parsons used to elicit the responses about the "good" or "bad" of the painting are related to moral judgment(e.g. p.61 & p.69). His subjects ranged from four to around fifty years old.
They were informally recruited based on their general variability and availability. Eight reproductions of paintings were shown.

The five stages are: 1. Favoritism; this stage typically encompasses the responses of preschool age children, they are attracted by the subject matter and color. 2. Beauty and Realism; it characterizes the responses of elementary school children, they concern the reality and beauty of the painting. 3. Expressiveness; this stage concerns adolescence, in which paintings are judged based on the intensity and evocation of a painting. 4. Style and Form; at this stage, viewers are interested in the formal properties of the work. 5. Autonomy; the viewer of this stage is able to assert autonomous responses, and is not limited to the norm of the tradition. They are even capable of raising questions and building their own criteria.

The model of Mockros (1989)

Mockros's work (1989) especially tries to test the validity of the models of Housen and Parsons. Otherwise, she attempts to develop a questionnaire-based technique that could yield results comparable to those obtained by open-ended (Housen's method) or structured interviews (Parsons's method). She selected the subjects ranging in age from eighteen to fifty-two. Because of his concern having to do with the question of the "male" orientation of aesthetic criticism (pp. 27-28), Mockros has fifty-one subjects of women and twenty subjects of men. They are varied in the amount of background and experience they have had in art. The assumption based on the progression from novice to expert was made to predict the developmental levels of aesthetic judgment by using the criteria of Housen and Parsons.

The study indicated that these two models are very similar but not identical. The main differences come from the method and the interpretation of the data. The samples of Parsons were selected from young children; therefore the conceptualization of the initial stage is somewhat different from that of Housen. Otherwise, Parsons and Housen have virtually reversed stages' three and four. Parsons stage three viewers are primarily interested in "Emotional Expression" and stage four viewers tend to address "Medium, Form and Style", while Housen's "Intellectual Understanding" is the feature of stage three, and her stage four emphasizes "Affective Experience" (Mockros, 1989, p. 15 & pp. 23-24). As a result, Mockros states that:

Specifically, the findings of this study support each of the two developmental stage models previously proposed (Mockros, 1989, p. 72).

The model of Wolf (1988)

Wolf develops three aesthetic stances based on Broudy's (1972) theory of aesthetic education in which the teacher directs both students' perception experiences through the scanning method and students' expression with art media (Zimmerman, 1988). These three stances consist of making, observing, and inquiring. There are three levels of acquisitions of visual skills based on the children's cognitive development. From years four-to-seven, the phase focuses on the understanding of pictures. From years eight-to-twelve, the phase focuses on the understanding of a visual system. From years thirteen-to-eighteen, the phase focuses on the understanding of artistic choice. Through sequential experiences of artistic expression and aesthetic response, a progressive growth of aesthetic development is suggested to be accomplished.

The model of Smith (1989)

Smith (1989) develops an excellence curriculum that consists of four phases for aesthetic learning. From K to third grade, the emphasis is on the informal exploration of the world of aesthetic qualities and familiarization with works of art and the art world. From fourth to sixth grade, the emphasis is on the development of perceptual skills for engaging works of art and continuing the introduction to the art world. From seventh to ninth grade, historical awareness and thinking within the context of western culture and civilization (with reference to non Western cultures) are the focus. From tenth to twelfth grade, critical appreciation of selected major works and of criteria of critical judgment, and discussions of some issues in aesthetics are the main focus smith, 1989, (p.142).

Accordingly, he provides four steps of developing aesthetic skills and concepts that derived from Beardsley's aesthetics. The skills and concepts are traced from a simple phase gradually to a more complex and intense one (Smith, 1989, pp. 214-216).
The models of Project Zero & Arts Propel

Project Zero was founded in 1967 at the Harvard Graduate School of Education by the noted philosopher Nelson Goodman. Investigators around him interested in the psychological and educational aspects of his theory of symbols, which describes those symbol systems of special importance in the arts as well as the modes of symbolization which they embody. During the first years of the project, much of the work involved interdisciplinary discussion and analysis of major concepts and processes in the arts. In the 1970's, Project Zero became more fully devoted to psychological issues. One of the two groups directed by Gardner, called the "Developmental Group", focused on the development of symbol-using skills in normal and gifted children. Through years of investigations, the project shifts from the philosophical analysis and psychological experimentation to practical efforts in educational settings. Arts Propel exemplifies this shift.

The research of Project Zero points up that perceptual, historical, critical, and other peri-artistic activities should be closely related to, and emerge from, a child's own productions. The Domain Projects of Arts Propel go in the same direction that artistic growth goes, from doing to learning the knowledge of specific domain. Moreover, Arts Propel has attempted to set down the dimensions of production, perception, reflection, and approaches to work that can be applied to student processfolios and the projects contained therein.

Basically, the assertions of Project Zero and Arts Propel focus on the deep learning of art that is based on, and should start from the individuals' direct experiences and from individuals' artistic expression to foster their aesthetic ability.

The model of Csikszentmihalyi & Robinson (1990)

This study supported by Getty Center aims to structure and identify the characteristics of aesthetic experience by using an empirical method. It is different from those which investigated the average viewer's response to art. Instead, it constructs a model of the ideal experience based on the highest forms in which it can be expressed. Three parts of open-ended questionnaires were used to investigate the experience of the professionals such as curators, educators, and directors of major collections of art. Four main dimensions structure the aesthetic experience: knowledge, communication, perception, and emotion.

The findings indicate that the depth or complexity of the aesthetic experience—but not its intensity—depends on how many of these dimensions are used in the interpretation of the work (Csikszentmihalyi & Robinson, 1990, p.180). It also states a developmental trend that many people are first attracted by the visual impact of the formal qualities of objects, such as an unusual and strong shape or a vivid color combination. Emotional content is often the second step, while intellectual challenges are usually discovered later, and sometimes unwillingly. As a result, it suggests that without skills to recognize the possibilities contained in the artwork, the experience will remain shallow (Csikszentmihalyi & Robinson, 1990, p.186).

The model of Feldman (1980, 1994)

Feldman's theory derives from the thought of Vygotsky (1962, 1978) and the developmental theory of Piaget (1954, 1963). In contrast to Piaget who ignores the environmental factor, Feldman emphasizes the importance of environmental conditions. Instead of concerning the mind of individuals, he tends to focus more on the relation between individuals and the environment. Feldman expands the notions of developmental theory by providing five basic sets of domains in continuum: universal, cultural, disciplined, idiosyncratic, and unique. From universal to unique, it is allowed to account for change in nonuniversal developmental domains. In his assertion, nonuniversal domains are stage like but do not imply that all individuals will reach the most developed stages or levels. In order to advance a developmental level, environmental conditions need to be specific, cultural and planned. Therefore, environmental contributions play a crucial role in nonuniversal development. Map drawing was used to begin the study of nonuniversal domains and the conditions under which their stages or levels are achieved.

According to Feldman, "art is inherently not a universal activity" (1983, p.19), "experience in and exposure to art are believed to lead to aesthetic sensibilities" (1985, p.88). In this sense, appropriate instruction of discipline in the arts leads to an enhancement of aesthetic judgment and appreciation.
Implication for future research

Overall, this research explained above have contributed a fundamental and universal understanding of individuals’ aesthetic abilities, and the way these aesthetic abilities could be fostered. Feldman’s theory provides a whole structure of developmental landscape. Csikzentmihalyi’s research clarifies how a discipline constitutes a discipline. Smith presents an ideal method of aesthetic learning. Gardner and Wolf give practical phases by combining artistic and aesthetic expression. While Machotka, Coffey, Clayton, Brunner, Housen, and Parsons predict aesthetic developmental levels. In contrast to explicit methodology of Housen, Parsons’s work had caused a sharp controversy (Goldsmith & Feldman, 1988, pp.85-93; Pariser, 1988, pp.93-103; Diblasio, 1988, pp.103-107). However, his and Housen’s models of understanding aesthetic experience has been supported by the empirical comparison study of Mockros. Moreover, these two models were sampled in the book of "Beyond Universals in Cognitive Development" through the study of Mockros. Feldman states that:

We were not able to break down the domain into elements at this point, making detailed analyses of transitions a goal for future research. But the domain of aesthetic judgment and reasoning does seem to conform quite well to theoretical predictions about developmental levels and sequences, leading us to conclude that further research in this domain is justified (Feldman, 1994, p.132).

Although there are some arguments about the stage points as too theoretical and inconsistent with the process of individual progress (Wilson, & Wilson, 1981), stages are simply a mean by which researchers can begin to describe and organize the cognitive strategies that individuals bring to their act (Hardiman, & Zernich, 1980, p.12). The key point is how this information concerning developmental levels can be appropriately applied. As Mockros indicates, "Moreover, since the higher levels of nonuniversal developmental domains cannot be achieved without specific deliberate instruction, a more thorough understanding of the domain will help us to better define the educational goals and curriculum by suggesting optimal means for facilitating artistic sensitivity and awareness" (1989, p.71).

From the point of view of developmental phenomena, the growth of aesthetic development may reach universal scenes. For the development itself, an individual’s progression varies from each other depending on his exposures. As the claims of Vygotsky (1962,1978), Feldman (1983, 1985, 1987, 1994), and many others indicate, environmental factors play an important role in aesthetic development.

This research indicates a universal scheme that aesthetic abilities are related to their cognitive development and the experiences with art. From novice to expert, aesthetic experiences need to be explored, and aesthetic skills and concepts have to be trained. Because these empirical findings of predicting developmental levels only reflect an educated westerners’ development in this domain, they imply a nonuniversal possibility that individual’s aesthetic growth might follow different paths and speeds. Therefore, how the developmental levels will be culturally different needs to be further explored. Moreover, other specific knowledge of this domain (except aesthetic judgment, e.g. aesthetic concepts, art historical knowledge, personal experience of art, or technical knowledge of art) would be valuable to develop.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Stimulus</th>
<th>Instrumentation</th>
<th>Statistical treatment</th>
<th>Related variables</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lark-Horowitz, B. 1957</td>
<td>Test: Choosing &amp; reasoning</td>
<td>461(6-16Y, average group)</td>
<td>12 pictures selected by children's preference. They represent 12 different subjects</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Percentage of choices &amp; categories of reasons</td>
<td>Age, Average &amp; gifted children referring to their drawing abilities, Question, Gender, Picture</td>
<td>A sharp difference in choice between boys and girls of an early age. Different aesthetic understanding of both average &amp; special groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lark-Horowitz, B. 1938</td>
<td>Test: Choosing &amp; reasoning</td>
<td>479(6-15Y, average group)</td>
<td>51 pictures exhibit for younger children, 43 pictures for older.</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Percentage of choices &amp; categories of reasons</td>
<td>Age, Average &amp; gifted abilities, Question, Gender, Picture</td>
<td>Not great difference between two groups in interesting certain personality types. Color &amp; color are most concern. Special child concerns quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, L. 1964</td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>1148(1-12 grade)</td>
<td>pairs of picture</td>
<td>Question: record sheet</td>
<td>Mean Alpha Coefficient Mean Correlation</td>
<td>Grade, Gender, Socio-economic Question, Picture</td>
<td>Primary grades tended to disagree with expert choice, this tendency reduced along with grade increased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner, H. 1970</td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>20 Grade 1 20 Grade 3 20 Grade 6 20 Grade 9 M slightly larger</td>
<td>Twenty picture arrays</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>One-way analysis</td>
<td>Grade, Location</td>
<td>No significant difference in 1,3,6 grades, 9 graders was better. Factors influence sensitivity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frechting, J.A. &amp; Davidson, P.W. 1970</td>
<td>Classify arrangement</td>
<td>50(5,6,7,12 G &amp; adults, 10 for each)</td>
<td>16 color prints of oil paintings: artistic style, subject matter, and color.</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Two-way analysis (age by stimulus dimension)</td>
<td>Grade, Types of prints</td>
<td>Children seldom based on artistic style, subject matter was important, increased with age.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 Summary of Methodological Characteristics and Results of Selected Studies of Aesthetic Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Stimulus</th>
<th>Instrumentation</th>
<th>Statistical treatment</th>
<th>Related variables</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ecker, D. 1973  
"Analyzing children's talk about art" | Class discussion an hour | A six-grade class | Theories of art & contemporary realistic & abstract | Tape-record Observation | Analyze Dialogue | Grade Question | Children's knowledge about art is not derived entirely from innate structures of the mind. Children can think creatively in language that could be called aesthetic inquiry. |
| Salkind, L. & Salkind, N. 1973  
"A Measure of Aesthetic Preference" | Classify arrangement 40(5,6 grade) | 5 sets of 6 pictures (each set consisted from a realistic to an abstract) | Score | Chi Square  
Coefficient Alpha | Grade Type of picture | Different from previous research, the majority of response were on abstract end of the continuum. |
| Moore, B. 1973  
"A Description of Children's Verbal Responses to Works of Art" | Interview choosing, reasoning. 100(1,4,7, 10,12 grades) F & M equal | 3 set of reproduction (each set consists 3, each subject responds to 1 set) | Score | Chi Square | Grade Type of picture  
Question Gender | No difference in gender, younger more objective, older more character expression. All prefer representational style. |
| Gardner, H. Wainer, E. Kircher, M. 1975  
"Children's conceptions of the arts" | Interview (20-45 minutes) 121(4:16:Y.) F & M equal | Aesthetic media (a work of art, read a poem, played a recorded passage, Broad topics | Tape-record | Analysis  
three groups compare in three categories: 1. Production of works 2.Identities of works 3. Evaluation of works | Age Questions | Specific changes occurred in the children's cognitive development in relation to their art knowledge. |
| Hardiman, G. & Zernich, H. 1977  
"Influence of Style & Subject Matter on the Development of Children's Preference" | Test 60(3-4,5,6, 7-8 grade) F & M equal | 10 color slide of paintings | Test booklet | Balanova Tukey Post Hoc Test General analysis of variance | Grade Gender Type of painting | Style was more influential than subject matter in shaping preference judgment, realistic paintings more preferred than semiabstract. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Stimulus</th>
<th>Instrumentation</th>
<th>Statistical treatment</th>
<th>Related variables</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rosenstiel, A. et al., 1978</td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>180(36, 10 G, 45 for each G) to 4 groups</td>
<td>12 pairs of reproductions</td>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>A limited ability to discriminate among the questions in the realm of the arts or to present more than superficial impressions of art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taunton, M. 1980</td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>150(48, 12, 16 grade, 30 adult, 30 each)</td>
<td>130 color reproductions in 3 categories</td>
<td>Recording in booklet of 24 pages</td>
<td>Five-factor analysis</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>4 years old can sometimes use complex dimensions in aesthetic judgment. Similar preference among 8, 12, 16, &amp; adult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, N. 1992</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>251(k-12) 4 Districts</td>
<td>Question: What is art? What do you think art is? Can you tell me what art is?</td>
<td>Tape-recorded Observation</td>
<td>Description Interpretation in categories: Types of meanings, Time and place, Act, Context, Art form, Medium, Purpose and use, Value, Personal choice</td>
<td>Age Different art requirement of districts Questions</td>
<td>Elementary grade: more often refer to time &amp; place, act, and content. Six grade began to value &amp; personal choice. Discrepancy between saying and doing Art was perceived as personally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardiman, G., &amp; Zernicke, T. 1985</td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>80(4 group, K, 3rd, College sophomores, 20 in each group)</td>
<td>15 color slides(3 array, 5 for each array)</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Two-way analysis of variance</td>
<td>Age Grade</td>
<td>Younger children were capable of classifying painting by style, older were more accurate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steinberg, D. &amp; Deloache, J. 1986</td>
<td>Test: matching painting</td>
<td>48(34, 5, F &amp; M equal)</td>
<td>36 slides of painting</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Two-way Three-way analysis, ANOVA</td>
<td>Age Gender Order Condition</td>
<td>Preschool children preferred matching painting by subject matter more often than using style clue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell, R. 1988</td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>Experimental group: 26 (5 &amp; 6 G, same class) Control group: 25</td>
<td>Teaching intensive definitions of art</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Pretest Posttest</td>
<td>Grade Question</td>
<td>Children at 5 &amp; 6 G have the intellect potential to improve verbal reasoning about defining art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>Stimulus</td>
<td>Instrumentation</td>
<td>Statistical treatment</td>
<td>Related variables</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Investigating Stage Development</em>  &lt;br&gt;Moshkota, P. 1966  &quot;Aesthetic Criteria in Childhood&quot;</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>120(6-12 Y., 15 M. for each, 15 young-adult of 18 Y.)</td>
<td>15 pictures(3 in a group, 10 triads, each picture shows twice)</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Relative frequency, Interrater reliability</td>
<td>Age, Location, Picture, Question</td>
<td>Corresponding to Piaget's three major stages in the development of intelligence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Zero 1967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffey, A.W. 1968  &quot;A Developmental Study of Aes. Preference&quot;</td>
<td>Interview choosing &amp; reasoning</td>
<td>120(K, grade, College, 40 each, F &amp; M equal)</td>
<td>12 pairs postcard of paintings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grade, Personality, Painting</td>
<td>3 stages point  Corresponding to Piaget's framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claton, J. 1974  &quot;An Investigation into the Developmental Trends in Aes.&quot;</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>35(5-17 Y.)</td>
<td>3 well-known reproductions</td>
<td>Tape-record</td>
<td>Qualitative analysis</td>
<td>Age, Question, Type of picture</td>
<td>4 stages point  Viewer moves from a rudimentary enumeration items to an integrated sophisticated discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunner, C. 1975  &quot;Aesthetic Judgment&quot;</td>
<td>Interview choosing &amp; reasoning</td>
<td>122 (26 of 3 grade, 24 of 7 G., 24 of 12 G, 24 college, 24 college &amp; art back)</td>
<td>8 pairs of postcard size print of painting, sculpture, photographs of buildings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grade, Type of print, Major</td>
<td>6 stages point  Some of evaluations were shared and developed in a systematic way with age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsons, M.J. Johnston, M. Durham, R. 1978  &quot;Development stages in children's aesthetic Responses&quot;</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>156(1-12 G.) 13 for each G</td>
<td>8 painting reproductions (4 for 1-6 G, 4 for 7-12 G) questions</td>
<td>Tape-record Rating</td>
<td>Analysis Description Interpretation in stage point by 6 categories: sameness, subject matter, feeling, artist's properties, color, judgment.</td>
<td>Grade, Questions, Painting</td>
<td>A development of aesthetic response was identified by 6 topics and stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feldman, D.H. 1980  &quot;Beyond universal in cognitive development&quot;</td>
<td>Mapping</td>
<td>63(fifth G to exam transition through a long-range lens</td>
<td>drawing</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Frequency, histogram</td>
<td>Grade, Time</td>
<td>5 regions of continuum universal, cultural, disciplined idiosyncratic unique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>Stimulus</td>
<td>Instrumentation</td>
<td>Statistical treatment</td>
<td>Related variables</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housen, A.</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>90 (14-55 Y.)</td>
<td>3 reproductions</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>age</td>
<td>5 stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>major, sex</td>
<td>Accoutive, Constructive, Classifying,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretive, Recreative,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsons, M.J.</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>300 (4-50 Y.)</td>
<td>8 prints</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td></td>
<td>Age, Question,</td>
<td>5 stages point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tape-record</td>
<td></td>
<td>Print</td>
<td>Aesthetic ability is related to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>age and experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf, D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 stances: making, observing, inquiring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, R.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 phrases &amp; steps for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>aesthetic learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mockros, C.</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>71 (18-52 Y.)</td>
<td>3 reproduction</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Age, Major</td>
<td>Two model are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reproduction</td>
<td>predictable for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>aesthetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Csikszentmihalyi, M. &amp;</td>
<td>Survey &amp;</td>
<td>52 (4 group: 12 under</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Mean ANOVA</td>
<td>Age, Education,</td>
<td>4 structures of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson, R.</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>34 Y., 13 between 35-38Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>aesthetic experience:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
<td>13 between 39-45Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>knowledge, communication,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14 over 46 Y.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>perception, emotion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housen, A.</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Two independent groups(40</td>
<td>Reproduction</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>Grade, Time,</td>
<td>A range of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
<td>each, 2, 4 grade)</td>
<td>of art work</td>
<td>Tape-record</td>
<td>Postest</td>
<td>Reproduction</td>
<td>influences of the program on their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>thinking, aesthetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>growth requires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>long-term learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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審美發展理論之探討及其對未來研究之意義

陳瓊花
國立臺師範大學美術學系

審美能力的發展，與個人在思考、及回應美感物體的能力方面之逐漸成長有關。這種能力的表現，為知覺與認知的心智活動，不同於創作一件作品的能力，但是，創作的經驗是有助於審美能力的提昇。事實上，這兩種能力的發展，交織著個人全面的藝術成長。本文檢討自1937至1995年間所發表的30件相關之研究發現，審美發展之理論與研究，大體上可歸納為兩類：一類為探討審美能力中某些特定要素的發展結構；另一類為探討整體性審美能力階段發展的結構。這些研究指出審美能力普遍性的概要，從初學者到專家，審美的能力從粗淺、大略而至於廣博、深入。審美的經驗有待拓展，審美的技巧與觀念必需加以訓練。從發展的整體現象而言，審美的能力具有階梯成長的普遍性存在，但就個人本身的發展而言，隨著個人所處環境、教育、文化等因素的影響，而有各種不同成長情況。目前的理論與研究，反應出西方文化教育的結果，審美的能力因文化差異會是如此的發展，實有待未來予以探討。此外，在審美的能力方面，除了審美的判斷之外，有關審美的觀念，美術史的知識，或是個人的藝術經驗等的發展情形，均值得作深入的瞭解。

關鍵詞：知覺 認知 審美判斷 審美能力 審美發展