ABSTRACT

This article reviews the literature on children’s engagement with art and identifies a gap in the field that is concerned with the relationship between making and judging art. A project that sought to examine this is reported, focusing upon three case studies of 11 year olds attending a primary school in Cyprus. The data were collected through a variety of methods, including interviews, art class observations, document examination and questionnaires. It was found that the way these children created and responded to other children’s artworks was determined by the significance and the role they attributed to art. We conclude that individual differences play a significant part in determining children’s artistic and aesthetic development.

INTRODUCTION

This article focuses on factors influencing children’s responses to their own art making and that of their peers, looking at how their judgements are formed and the relationship between generating and responding. Research into children’s drawing has developed mainly during the twentieth century, as a result of the growth of developmental psychology and modern ideas about the nature and the qualities of ‘art’, especially in the western world. Before that, child art was treated as an unsuccessful or imperfect version of adult art and...
was therefore neglected. Adults tended to express interest only for the cases of those children whose drawings demonstrated evidence of precocity – children who could imitate adult art and use the technique and style of adult artists (Wilson 2004). However, after the second half of the nineteenth century, child art started to be seen as a special category. Later, the application of characteristics that children used in their drawings by well-respected modernist artists like Picasso, Matisse and Klee challenged the predominant trends and for the first time the idea appeared that children’s drawings were of value and that children could create images that could be construed as art.

This shift of interest in children’s drawings led to a large volume of research projects and the emergence of a number of theories trying to explore and describe the development of children’s art production (e.g. Luquet 1927; Piaget and Inhelder 1956; Lowenfeld and Brittain 1964; Wolf and Perry 1988; Golomb 1994; Pariser and Van Den Berg 1997; Kindler 1997; Kindler and Darras 1998; Anning and Ring 2004; Matthews 2004; Wilson 2004) or children’s responses to works of art (Taunton 1982; Gardner et al. 1975; Fairchild 1991; Parsons 1987; Piscitelli 1988; Savva and Trimis 2005).

When examining theoretical and empirical works in this domain, it would appear that this literature has tended to focus either on the production or the appreciation of art. Gardner et al., almost four decades ago, referred to the ‘relationship between attitudes about art and one’s ability both to respond to and make works of art’ (1975: 62), however studies investigating children’s experiences with art, that focus on both the productive and appreciative aspect of these experiences and/or investigating the relationship between the two are limited.

EXISTING STUDIES OF CHILDREN’S ENGAGEMENT WITH ART

Wilson argued that children are involved in art making for the same reasons that individuals observe art: ‘for stimulation, for tension, for relief, for cognitive orientation, and for personal involvement’ (1976: 46). Even though this is a first step towards an acknowledgement that individuals’ motivations for making and observing art can be related, Wilson’s claims are not based on any empirical work.

More recently, in a small-scale study, Gibson (2008) explored Australian children’s concepts about the nature of artworks and their attitudes towards art making. However, she notes that her study was limited and that there was a ‘need for a more sensitive and eclectic understanding of the influences informing children’s attitudes and beliefs about art’ (Gibson 2008: 190). Moreover, the kind of questions she asked in that particular project show that she investigated children’s attitudes towards the nature and the making of art separately, without exploring their relationship.

Boone (2008) conducted a project that points to the interrelation between children’s attitudes towards drawing making and their attitudes and responses towards the public display of their drawings. Boone notes that ‘two broader themes emerged, namely: 1) the creation, enjoyment and the experience of making art; and 2) the display of art following its creation. These two themes could not be separated’ (2008: 35). In Boone’s study, the children’s attitudes towards the display of their drawings seemed to be based on how happy they were with the quality of their drawings and on how they believe that other viewers will judge their drawings. Although an empirical study, Boone (2008) provides no information about how the collected data were processed and how conclusions were drawn.
The limited information derived from the literature reveals a gap in theory regarding the relationship between children’s production of and responses to art. Despite the arguments suggested by the three works mentioned above, none of them had as a primary goal the investigation of the relationship between children’s making and responding concerns and values. One of the targets of the project described in this article was to bridge this gap by investigating children’s overall involvement with artworks through a comparison of the factors influencing their production and responses to artworks and investigation of the nature of the relationship between the two.

Interestingly, there seemed to be a similar approach within each of the two groups of studies as categorized above. In particular, the group of studies of children’s experiences through encounters with art tended to be more child-centred when it comes to the justification of their findings, compared to the group of studies which looked into children’s art making. Whereas the first group was building its arguments upon what children had said about their encounters and opinions about artworks, the second group was mainly adult/researcher-oriented. The findings tended to be based on the researchers’ interpretation or criteria rather than on children’s explanations and justification of the use of specific elements, or the overall synthesis of their artworks. Only recently have studies been interested in children’s own beliefs and values about the artworks they make. One of these studies was conducted by Willats (2005), who observed that from around the age of 7 or 8 children (or at least those participating in his study) pursue realism in their drawings and, whenever they do not succeed, they are disappointed and consider their drawings as failures. There is nevertheless still very little research-based information on the way children think and make decisions about what and how to draw.

In order to understand the nature of children’s experiences with art is perhaps necessary to investigate what they have to say about their experiences, before looking into secondary (indirect) sources for evidence. The appearance of a specific element on a child’s artwork does not necessarily explain why the child decided to use it. There are several reasons why a child might draw in a specific way. How do we know that our interpretations as researchers are the right ones, unless we confirm with the child who made the artwork? The same applies for the assessment of children’s artworks, which are frequently based on adults’ evaluative criteria. It is important to hear children’s own thoughts, values and understandings about their art, letting them give their own perspective about their decisions to use specific characteristics in their artworks and also to explain how they perceive and evaluate artworks.

Of course, works of art in general can have several functions and can serve several purposes (see, e.g. Boone 2008; Hickman 2005; Matthews 2004). They can be made as aesthetic objects for decorative or similar purposes; they can be the media for expression of their creators’ ideas, emotions and beliefs; they can be used as tools for communicating social, political, cultural and other messages and ideas; and so much more. The reasons why someone draws, for example, can vary from one individual to another and even for the same individual in different occasions or contexts.

Most of the previous studies have examined children’s responses to adults’ artworks, mainly paintings of well-established adult artists (e.g. Ecker 1973; Parsons 1987; Piscitelli 1988; Savva and Trimis 2005). Despite the undeniable usefulness of the findings of these studies, we nevertheless have limited knowledge concerning children’s perceptions about artworks made by children. Knowing how children perceive and evaluate child artworks is
important because these are more directly related to their art-making experiences. We have observed that when comparing adult and child artworks, it is often the case that children tend to value the adult ones more highly than they do the child ones. So what do they think of and how do they value child drawings? Based on the above, the aim of the present study was to investigate and try to provide answers to the following research questions:

What are the factors influencing children’s decisions when making art?
What are the factors influencing children’s responses to children’s art?
What is the relationship between the factors influencing children when making and responding to children’s art?

THE PROJECT

Interviews were the primary source of information because they allowed information to come directly from the participants. They were semi-structured and completed within three to five meetings with each participant. The art class observations provided further information regarding children’s interaction with their art teachers and classmates related to their art making and also their engagement in the art-making procedure. The term ‘document examination’ is referring to examination of children’s artworks. As the study was examining children’s making and responses to them, it was necessary to include these artworks in the data as complementary sources of information. Finally, the questionnaires gathered some general information about children’s attitudes towards art and art making, and they mainly served to facilitate the selection of the project’s participants. The particular research design was tested through a pilot study that was implemented a few months before the commencement of the main study.

The project originally consisted of seven participants, but for the purposes of this article, only three are reported: ‘Antreas’, ‘Katerina’ and ‘Philippos’ who were each 11 years old and were students of a particular primary school in Cyprus. Although the school that the participants attended was selected randomly, the participants were not. They were selected purposefully for a specific reason: the aim of the project was to investigate and reveal factors that influence children when making and responding to art. Even though common characteristics and trends among the children who took part in the study were expected to appear in the findings, the existence of variations among the participants was equally anticipated and welcomed. As in the case of ‘negative case analysis’, that is ‘the exploration of cases that do not appear to fit an emerging conceptual system’ (Pidgeon 1996: 78), these variations revealed factors that shape children’s criteria and were particularly important because they could inform the relevant theories.

The coding and analysis of the collected data was done based on grounded theory principles. This involved abandoning the traditional distinction between the data collection phase and the data analysis phase and adopting a strategy based on iterative sampling and analysis. There were therefore two stages of data processing during the whole procedure. The first stage took place in parallel with the data collection. After each interview session, the information gathered was transcribed. Themes and questions which emerged through the examination of the transcripts were discussed with the participants during the next meeting. When the data collection finished the second stage of data processing started. This involved coding and then analysing the data. In the first instance, data coming from each method was coded separately, and then
everything was brought together for the analysis. The coding was done with the use of the computer software NVivo and manually. In order not to miss any useful information deriving from the data, the coding process was inductive, meaning that it was not based on predefined categories but rather the categories emerged through the data themselves.

**FINDINGS**

In the next paragraphs, the findings regarding three of this project’s participants are presented and discussed. These participants are the 11-year-old classmates Antreas, Philippos and Katerina.

**CASE STUDY 1 – ANTREAS**

*Background information*

Throughout the study, Antreas gave the impression of a child with low self-esteem with regard to art making. He repeatedly said in the interviews that he had no natural talent and no real potential in art making. He revealed that he faced great difficulties when trying to draw something, especially when he did not know how to draw it. He also stated that he did not enjoy being involved in art-making activities, and that was why he mainly did it during the art class at school, because the teacher expected him to do so. Very rarely did he make any art at home, and that was usually when he needed to prepare a work for a competition his school was taking part in. After this research project started though, and without being asked to do so, he made a number of works at home and brought them to school to show them to the researcher and talk about them during the project meetings. It seems that his apparent lack of interest in art making was not due to the fact that he considered artworks uninteresting; rather it was caused by the fact that the ones he made did not satisfy or please him.

*Factors influencing Antreas’ decisions when making art*

As it has occurred through the collected information, the factors which influenced Antreas’ decisions when making drawings can be divided into three categories: creator-related, artwork-related and viewer-related factors.

Antreas always made decisions about what and how to draw based on how confident he was that he would be able to successfully execute the task. The creation of a successful artwork, one which would look ‘right’ was a deeply embedded criterion in his mind. He was convinced that the purpose of art classes at school was to teach students how to make ‘good’ artworks, which could be sent to competitions and win prizes. He thought that he could overcome to some extent burdens that his limited artistic skills raised through instruction by others of how to draw and by dedicating time and effort for the creation of art.

Two words can better describe Antreas’ concerns when it comes to his attitudes towards artwork-related factors: precision and difficulty. He tended to believe that ‘when you make a drawing is like when you take a photograph. Now, you can’t take a photograph with flaws, can you?’ Therefore precision in the representation of the subject matter, the shapes, the proportions, the inclusion of all necessary details and the use of the right colours were among his major concerns. Antreas had preferences for specific media that he liked to use because he thought they were easy to manipulate and less risky to cause ‘accidents’ during the process of making art. He also avoided techniques which he found difficult because, as he explained, difficult techniques decreased the achievability of his goals.
The potential viewers of his drawings were of great significance for Antreas. He was convinced that artworks are made to be seen by people. In order to achieve the desirable responses from them, which were their appreciation of his drawings and their verbal or practical reward to him, he aimed at meeting their expectations. He was convinced that these expectations would be satisfied if he managed to produce works which would be neat, comprehensible and ‘right’, and which they would find interesting and attractive.

**Factors influencing Antreas’ responses to art**

Throughout the study, Antreas consistently approached artworks with an evaluative eye and always ended his comments by giving a verdict of how good he thought the artworks were or how much he liked them. He often
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also gave them a grade on a zero-to-ten scale. Similarly to his art-making concerns, precision at different levels was what he wanted to see. He attributed precision to factors such as the accuracy of the depiction of the subject matter and the use of realistic colours, with real-life prototypes that he had in his mind as reference points. In most cases, he chose to talk about things that he did not like in a work than things that he liked.

Another significant factor in his encounters with artworks was the person who made them. His responses to them varied significantly, depending on whether or not he knew their creator. When their creator was unknown to him, then he applied the criteria mentioned above, which are similar to his art-making ones. For those works that he knew who their creators were, then they were Antreas' reference point when making a judgement. He estimated how 'good' these children were at art and evaluated their artworks based on their abilities. As a result, if the child who made a work was in Antreas' opinion good at art, then his evaluative standards would be higher than for the case of another child who was not that good. Interestingly, Antreas' decision whether someone was good or not at art was based on the artworks they made. Depending on how much he liked a child's works, he classified them on a scale of artistic giftedness, and then used this very scale as a measure of how accomplished a new work of this child was. In other words, what he actually did was a comparison between all of this child's works that he had seen.

Factors influencing Antreas when making and responding to art

Antreas approached artworks from a utilitarian perspective. He thought of them as objects which are made in order to be seen and evaluated. The strict criteria he applied when judging other children's artworks were the ones that he also had in mind when making art. These had to do precision in the depiction and colouring of the subject matter, the balance of the synthesis and the avoidance of mistakes or flaws caused during the making procedure. In both cases, he thought that the role of the creator was crucial for the final outcome of their work. Factors such as talent and effort could determine the quality of a work. Especially when it comes to talent, Antreas thought it was important to have this factor in mind when evaluating artworks, and therefore, in the cases when he knew who the creator of a work was, he raised or lowered his judgements standards based on how 'good' he thought that child was at art. The degree of difficulty of the execution of an art-making task, which was crucial for Antreas as a creator, did not seem to preoccupy him as a viewer. That was perhaps because he thought that, like himself, other creators also have this criterion in mind when making art and therefore the final outcome which he was observing was one that their creator felt confident that they could make successfully. Finally, Antreas considered the role of the viewer as the one a critic; someone who would assess the success and quality of an artwork. This is what he expected others to do with his art and this is what he also did when looking at other children's art.

CASE STUDY 2 – PHILIPPOS

Background information

Philippos was regarded by all his classmates as 'the artist' of his class. Even without being asked, several of them approached me and told me how much they admired his art-making skills and how 'fantastic' his artworks were. Among them, Katerina and Antreas who was Philippos' best friend.
Philippos was aware of what his classmates thought about him and his works. He was quite confident about his abilities and was generally happy with the works he made. He accepted their compliments with respect and explained that he always tended to show his works to his friends because he wanted to give them ideas about how to draw something. At the same time, he also sought inspiration in observing other children’s works.

**Factors influencing Philippos’ decisions when making art**

Philippos enjoyed a lot the art-making procedure. His words reveal that there was something like an inner power that inspired and urged him to start drawing when he saw a picture he liked: ‘Some times for example, I see a drawing that I like and I can’t help it, I have to try [and] see how I will draw it’. Making art according to his personal preferences was of great importance for him, and that was one of the reasons he enjoyed making art on his own more than during art classes at school, because then he had no restrictions of what and how to draw. His preferences were mainly related to subject matter and different art genres.

Starting with subject matters, Philippos enjoyed drawing things that he found interesting, such as skeletons, ghosts and cartoons. These were not themes that interested him merely when making art. On the contrary, he spent time on other activities which were also related to them. For example, apart from drawing ghosts, he also explained that he often watched videos related to people investigating ghosts and his dream was to develop a method which would help him capture one.

Two of Philippos’ favourite genres were caricatures and graffiti. They both fascinated him; caricatures because of their humorous character, and graffiti because of the ‘mysticism’ surrounding its coded messages. In both caricatures and graffiti, technique was of great significance for Philippos. He appeared to be quite a perfectionist and confessed that he spent a lot of time and effort practicing in order to perfect his technique and make works which were in accordance
to the rules of their genre. He confessed that when he started doing graffiti after seeing some graffiti artists drawing with sprays on a wall, he soon got desperate and was about to abandon it because he did not know ‘how to do it’. Those who prevented him from abandoning his attempts were some older friends of his who were also engaged in graffiti and taught him the secrets of the technique.

**Factors influencing Philippos’ responses to art**

In his encounters with other children’s artworks, Philippos’ approach was similar to Antreas’. He wanted them to be perfect. He expressed evaluative judgements and made suggestions on how they could have been made in order to improve. Usually his comments were related to the selection and the combinations of colours, the amount and the synthesis of different elements on the work or the technique the child applied when making it. Unlike Antreas, though, Philippos was more open to making positive judgements of elements that he appreciated on artworks. Praising what he liked was easy because it could only please the creator. Expressing negative judgements, on the other hand, was not easy for him, even when the creator of the artwork was not present. He felt that it would have been disrespectful towards the creator and also believed that he had ‘no right’ to judge the artworks and consequently the creators. He nevertheless did comment on things that he did not like, but he tried to find an excuse for them. Most frequently, he justified his judgements by saying that the children did not dedicate sufficient time to their work. For example: ‘Ehm, I’d say it’s not that nice because, ok, he tried, it was his idea to make it like that and it’s nice. He could have done better though. He could have made it much nicer. But he rushed a lot’.

Philippos put a lot of emphasis on an artwork’s comprehensibility. He thought that usually artworks have a meaning or message and wanted to be able to grasp it. Successful communication of their message or meaning was of key importance for him. When he could not manage to extract meaning from a work he was looking at, he considered the fact as a failure of the creator or the work to ‘talk’ to him, and he therefore did not like the work. This was the main reason why he often talked in a negative way about abstract works. He found it difficult to understand what they wanted to ‘say’ to the viewer and this caused him frustration. This was also the case with representational works which he found puzzling when it comes to their meaning.

**Factors influencing Philippos when making and responding to art**

For Philippos, his involvement in art making was an interesting and enjoyable activity because it involved working on things that were of interest for him in his life in general. At the same time though it was also a challenging activity, because he did not compromise with moderation but rather tried hard in order to make his works as close to perfect as possible. With the same mindset he also responded to other children’s art. For each genre, he had certain criteria in mind, which he used to assess how successful the works were. He did not hide his frustration when he did not like the outcome of his work. On the contrary, though, he appeared very careful when choosing the words to talk about things that he did not like in another child’s work.

His fascination with certain genres that he liked making was also apparent when Philippos was responding to artworks. He spent significantly more time looking and analysing a graffiti drawing made by one of his friends than he did with other genres. He paid attention to details regarding the synthesis,
the depiction of letters and the use of colours and made thoughtful recommendations of how the drawing could have been made to improve, explaining that that was how he would have made it. It can be argued that the factors Philippos paid attention to and discussed on other children’s artworks were more or less the same as the ones he had in mind in his own art making.

CASE STUDY 3 – KATERINA

Background information

Katerina stated at the beginning of the study that she did not like making art. She said that she found this activity uninteresting and boring and confessed that some times during art classes at school she would rather sleep. Based on this statement, one would assume that Katerina would avoid being involved in any art-making activities when she was not obliged to. But, in fact, she did quite frequently at home. Sometimes she anticipated finishing school so that she could go home to her room. There, in her own space, away from the noise of the classroom, she could listen to the music she liked and make art. Art making at home was like a ritual for her. She did it mostly when she was feeling sad or angry with people or situations. She used these works as psychotherapeutic tools that helped her release the emotions that she could not keep within her: ‘if there was no art in this world, how would I express my feelings? Only art can help me express my feelings, not even my best friend can’. She was convinced that art was not just produced for art’s sake; it also had an additional value because only art could help people express their feelings.

Factors influencing Katerina’s decisions when making art

What the study has shown is that Katerina had different concerns about different artworks that she was making, depending on the reason why she was making each of them. Overall, her artworks fit into two broad categories: the private and the public.

Works which fit into the first category were mainly made by Katerina when she wanted to externalize her feelings. She made them for herself and did not necessarily intend to show them to anyone. In these cases, what was mainly important for her was the procedure rather than the product. She allowed her feelings pick the colours and guide her hands make marks on the paper. These works were usually abstract and they consisted of colours which Katerina linked to her current emotional state, and symbols, which also expressed the way she was feeling. Below is an example from one of her ‘private’ emotional drawings. She explained that she made it on a day while she was trying on some new clothes and she was happy and excited when looking at herself in the mirror. Suddenly her sister entered the room and made a negative comment about her clothes. Katerina then became very angry and looked at her sister furiously. That was when she drew the two black eyes in her work. Soon though, she thought that her sister was just jealous because Katerina was ‘prettier’ than her, so she was not angry any more and she started drawing with colours again. The interesting thing about this example is the fact that Katerina made this work while in parallel being involved in other activities. This indicates how tightly interwoven art making was with other aspects of her life.

With a completely different mindset Katerina created artworks which could be described as ‘public’ ones. These are works that she made either at school, during art classes or at home, in order to be seen by particular people. In either
case, the product was her main concern. As she explained, she wanted to make them as attractive as possible, in order to capture their viewers’ attention. With her school artworks, for example, she was aiming at getting her teacher’s compliments and was happy when they were rewarded by being put on the board. She also talked with excitement about one of her drawings her teacher liked and kept some years ago in order to show it to her future students. Similarly, she made artworks at home aiming to attract her father attention through them. She explained that she started making them when she noticed her father complimenting some of her older sister’s drawings, and decided to make drawings for him in order to achieve the same. In the cases of both her school and home ‘public’ art, she was convinced that in order to reach her goals she had to make artworks that were attractive and pleasing for their viewers. She thought that the way to do that was through an interesting synthesis and the successful application of the right technique, by avoiding mistakes or flaws.

**Factors influencing Katerina’s responses to art**

As a viewer, Katerina approached artworks in a way which was similar to the way she approached her ‘private’ emotional art. Through observing their subject matter, colours and synthesis, she tried to decode the ‘message’ of the work and access the thoughts and emotions of the person who made it. She thought that, like herself, others also make art in order to externalize their inner world and communicate it to others through their art. She believed that for this reason it was important that the creators are honest when making art and produce works that would reflect their personality and individual style, in addition to their current thoughts and feelings.

Katerina chose to discuss things that she liked about artworks than things that she did not like. She also avoided labelling them as ‘pretty’ or ‘ugly’, the way that Antreas did. Rather, she expressed preferences for works based on the degree of intimacy she thought that there was between them and herself. For example,
she talked about how much she liked a painting of a child crying, because at that moment she felt that the drawing could ‘sense’ the way she was feeling and in a way it sympathized with her. As she explained, the way she approached artworks, even the same ones, was not consistent but was determined by her current emotional state. When she was happy, she only liked ‘happy’ artworks as she called artworks with bright colours and pleasant subject matters and when she was feeling sad or angry, she preferred to look at artworks with dark colours and subject matters that reflected her emotional state, and disliked ‘happy’ ones.

**Factors influencing Katerina when making and responding to art**

As it becomes obvious, both as a creator and as a viewer, Katerina invested a lot on the emotional interaction between herself and the artwork she was making or looking at. It could be argued that she approached her artworks like she would approach her friends. She shared her emotions and concerns with them and expected them to respond and make her feel better. Similarly, when it comes to other children’s artworks, she only dedicated time looking at them if she thought that they shared something in common.

An important aspect that only applied when Katerina was making art and not during her encounters with others’ art, was the role of her ‘public’ art. In this case, technical perfection was something that she valued, because she thought that this was the key to meet the viewers’ expectations and be rewarded by them. On the contrary, technical perfection was insignificant for her when looking at artworks. This can be seen in the comparison she once made of two portraits painted by two children from her school. Her comments about the first one were rather average whereas she appeared excited about the second one. She explained that, even though the first portrait was done carefully and properly, it nevertheless lacked the liveliness of the second portrait, which was full of flaws due to technical mistakes or accidents. She identified with the second portrait because, as she explained, it was full of life and happiness due to its colours, whereas she experienced no link with the first one, because she found its colours cold and monotonous.

**DISCUSSION**

In this article, the cases of three out of the seven children who participated in the research project have been presented. Each was unique in the way he or she thought about, created and responded to art. What they shared in common was the fact that the factors influencing how they made or responded to art were determined by the way they thought of art in general and its role in their lives. For Antreas, artworks were produced to be seen by people in particular contexts, such as art competitions. It was therefore important to have certain qualities because the responses of their viewers would depend on and be determined by these qualities. Philippos linked artworks to his personality; he had a very clear idea of who he was, what he wanted and what he liked, and, perfectionist as he was. He did not compromise unless he was satisfied with what he made. As with Antreas, certain qualities were also significant for him because he also thought that there are right and wrong ways of how artworks are made. Finally, Katerina was convinced that the role of art was to facilitate people externalize their inner world. The quality that she appreciated in artworks was the extent to which they communicated certain emotions and also whether these were in accordance to her current emotional state. She nevertheless was also aware of the potentials of artworks to evoke certain
responses to their viewers and, like Antreas, she tried to make her ‘public-oriented’ works according to criteria that she thought would please the viewers and make them reward her.

What this study has shown is that the way children create and respond to other children’s artworks is determined by the significance and the role they attribute to art. It can be seen that individual differences play a significant part in determining children’s artistic and aesthetic development. It is important that educational practices take this into consideration and facilitate children’s engagement in art activities of creation and evaluation in a way that is meaningful, enjoyable and useful for them as individuals.
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