

Full Length Research Paper

Differences in meta-aesthetic consciousness in students taking fine arts, design and academy education

Eylem Tataroğlu

Faculty of Fine Arts Design and Architecture, Başkent University, Turkey.

Received 24 December, 2015; Accepted 18 May, 2016

Meta-aesthetics is the aesthetic field relating to the images of products where the conversion value, separate from the product's function, takes part directly in its value. Meta-aesthetics is among the subjects that today's art and design world must address more sensitively. This study was based on a 2009 dissertation measuring university students' awareness and understanding of meta-aesthetics. In 2014, the study was repeated using a different sample and was published as an essay in 2015. Using these data, this research compared the meta-aesthetic awareness of the group of students receiving art education and trained to be art educators in 2009, and another group of students trained as artists and designers receiving art and design education in 2014. The study found that neither the teenagers training as artists and designers nor the art educator students had full knowledge of the meta-aesthetic subjects of their awareness or of aesthetics. Aesthetic function of education, and especially art education, does not meet expectations to improve and crystallize students' aesthetic awareness. This research underlines the obligation of art and design education institutions to renew their focus on aesthetic subjects. It will serve as a resource for researchers concerned with the future of art and design education.

Key words: Art and design education, meta-aesthetic, visual arts and design, aesthetics, aesthetics education.

INTRODUCTION

Aesthetics is generally considered synonymous with art. It has been a major, organic component of life throughout the time that art has existed. Since the foundation of aesthetics as a scientific discipline, philosophers, including Baumgarten, agreed that aesthetics was determined by perception. Aesthetic perception focuses on the sense of pleasure or displeasure related to everything happening around us, including ourselves,

and it reflects our attitudes toward an art object. From the most tangible to the most intangible of art, from architecture to music, we engage aesthetically with the art object. Such susceptibility and awareness is so intuitive that whatever is necessary occurs by itself. However, conscious aesthetic attitudes can be improved through a quality education and environment.

Students in all academy and higher-education faculties

E-mail: etataroglu@baskent.edu.tr. Tel: +90 312 246 66 66/1570.

Authors agree that this article remain permanently open access under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

providing art education are essentially taking consciousness and aesthetics education. Education on values and objects, constituting the axiological and subjective branches of aesthetics, may allow students to achieve substantial satisfaction. Fostering awareness of meta-aesthetics in students and reflecting on their attitudes is the basic objective of this research. This is a significant issue in the context of 21st century globalization. From the Bauhaus movement of 1919 to today, the creation and sale of industrial products with an aesthetic presentation has made aesthetics a key issue with respect to cultural values.

Aesthetics

The term “aesthetics” comes from the Greek words “aisthesis” or “aisthanesthai”. The word “aisthesis” means sensation or sensible perception, and the word “aisthanesthai” means perception through sensation (Tunali, 1998). Tunali (1998) stated that “the science of esthetics is to investigate susceptibility, *facultas cognoscitiva inferior* and downward cognition; right as the task of logic to investigate efficiency of mind, *facultas cognoscitiva superior* and upward cognition and to determine the rules of it” (Tunali, 1998).

The basic task of aesthetics is “beauty”. According to Tunali (1998), what we call an artwork or a beautiful thing is an artwork or beautiful thing only for a subject and for the aesthetic attitude or perception of that subject. While the existence of a subject is mandatory for the aesthetic phenomenon, it is not the unique bearer or determiner of the aesthetic phenomenon (Tunali, 1998). According to Hegel (1994), the beauty of art is superior to nature. “Art beauty is a beauty born from the spirit, it is a re-born beauty”. This expression implies that artistic beauty arises from the human mind, and is reproduced within the natural world by the human mind.

Traditional aesthetics deriving from Baumgarten, Kant and Hegel finds the research topics of “aesthetics” either in beauty or in art. This tradition describes natural and technical beauty as “dependent beauty” and separates this beauty from artistic beauty, described as “independent beauty”. Traditional aesthetics ties art only to the concept of “fine arts” and investigates fine arts (Tunali, 1998).

Arts and design education develops a student’s identity, consisting of the feelings, habits, attitudes, skills, and other characteristics required to be a balanced and sensorially aware human. Odenstedt (2008) criticized education as follows:

“Hegel argues that educated (gebildete) people are capable of ‘turning things (sachen) round and considering them in many aspects’.” This ability involves, Hegel says, a “power of keeping the manifold points of view present to the mind, so that the wealth of categories by which an

object may be considered [are grasped]” .

Consequently, in art education, education in the “beautiful” is important. In “Gadamer’s Aesthetics”, Davey (2011) states that “‘Substance’ is understood as something that supports us, although it does not emerge into the light of reflective consciousness, it is something that can never be fully articulated, although it is absolutely necessary for the existence of all clarity, consciousness, expression and communication”. Such an education is necessary to allow us to express ourselves most accurately and completely. To assume that aesthetic education will maintain its presence in the curriculum is naive, even though it is central to the art and design student’s personal development.

Topics of esthetics science and 20th century esthetic definitions

Topics of esthetics and the definitions made especially in and after the 20th century throughout the historical development of esthetics were included into the research in this section. Esthetic reality and basic problems addressed by the esthetics were also outlined in this section.

Esthetic reality

Esthetic reality is an esthetic philosophy composed of heterogeneous esthetic problems, and allowing establishing ontological foundations of today’s esthetics. Heterogeneous characteristics of esthetic reality express the different components and building stones of the esthetics. Each esthetic phenomenon is necessarily related to a *subject*. Such a subject participates into integrity of the esthetic phenomenon, esthetic asset as an *esthetic attitude* and as an *esthetic perception* (Tunali, 1998).

Esthetic asset does not rely only on the existence of the subject. In esthetic phenomenon, there is another asset toward which the subject is oriented in front of the subject participated into this phenomenon: Esthetic object (Tunali, 1998). Another asset creating the esthetic entity is the esthetic value or the beauty. Subject-object relationship is objectified as a judgement: Esthetic judgement (Tunali, 1998)

Esthetic subject/subjective esthetics

Esthetic subject imply a conscious asset, in other words the “self” sensing the esthetic object, comprehending it, esthetically enjoying it and having esthetic pleasure from it. Such an esthetic subject *develops an attitude* against the esthetic object while comprehending it and having

pleasure from it (Tunalı, 1998).

In modern esthetics, Croce is the pioneering philosopher exhibiting subjectivist attitudes. Cömert (2007) in a study investigating Croce Esthetics expressed the types of knowledge according to Croce as follows:

“There are two types of knowledge. The knowledge is either “intuitional or logical”; gained either through *imagination* or through *senses*; it is either the knowledge of *individual* or the knowledge of *universal*; it is either the knowledge of *single things* or the knowledge of *relationships* among those things; in brief, the producer of either *images* or *concepts*”.

Timuçin (2005) in his work defined the perception according to Bergson as “the sensual affinity allowing us tend to inside of the object to coincide with the unique and unexplainable one”. Based on the expressions, it is possible to mention about the relationship between esthetic attitude and the senses. Subjectivist attitude also known as identification (einfühlung) and expressed as “internal sensation, transfer of own senses to the objects; putting oneself into design world of another one; feeling oneself inside of an art work” (TDK, www.tdk.gov.tr) constitutes the essence of esthetic life.

Esthetic objects/objectivist esthetics

Esthetic object expresses an asset to which a subject get into a relevance. Objectivist esthetics is a perspective putting an art work and its asset layers in front of psychologist attitude.

A art work is an “artificial” thing. However, not only the art work but also the other technical products are all artificial. Technique come forefront as a significant competitor against the art of the 20th century. Technical goods have also functional targets beside their beauties. The most distinctive characteristic distinguishing an artificial art work from an artificial technical product is the fact that art works are not fabricated as the technical goods. Apart from that, while esthetic beauty is the primary objective in an art work, it is not the primary target in a technical product. Functionality is the primary target in a technical product. Right at this point, when looking abck at the notes of Tunalı (2003), we face the following efficient statement:

“The standing principle of an art work is *freedom*. On the other hand, the standing principle of a technical product is *necessity*”.

According to Marxism, both the human and human mind are the products of history and society. Marx (2006) in his work of “Capital III” expressed that capitalist production process was historically defined as the type of social production process. According to Marx:

“Social existence of humans is not the conscious,

contrarily the conscious of humans is their social existence.” (Tunalı, 2003).

According to Tunalı (2003), together with socialization and freedom of humans, a new asset is born by the human over the nature. This asset is a culture asset. Culture stars with the freedom of human from the nature and natural necessities. In place where culture exists, independent human shows up.

Esthetic value/axiological esthetics

Esthetic apprehension of an esthetic subject of an esthetic object, in other words value assign creates the “esthetic value”. As it was in general sense, some philosophers and estheticians defines the beauty through comparisons with the adjectives such as *nice*, *beneficial*, *good*, *right* (or *real*) while mentioning about the beauty or they also define with some esthetic concepts such as *pleasant*, *luxurious* and *gorgeous* (Sena, 1972).

Esthetic judgement/logic esthetics

Judgement is concept rejecting or approving the established relationship between two concepts or two terms. Esthetic judgments are not objective but subjective judgments. “In any case, subjectivity of a like-judgement means total subjectivity of it” (Tunalı, 1998).

Ludwig Wittgenstein took the issue one step further. According to Wittgenstein, “It is remarkable to point out that esthetic attributes such as “beautiful”, “fine”, “gracious” do not play ay roles in real life in which we present esthetic judgments” (Tunalı, 1998). Again according to Wittgeinstein, the attributes used for art works such as “good”, “nice”, “beautiful”, “ugly” do not have any meanings since they don’t have any *criterion* to stand for. Such criterions are to be *proper*. In other words, beforeone present esthetic judgement, it is necessary to know about the rules or norm of that object. In broader sense; the necessity of resolving asset layers in ontic integrity of an esthetic asset may be considered a way or solution to establish an objective criterion about that object.

Meta-Aesthetics

Marxist aesthetics is key to understanding meta-aesthetics, and it is mentioned in objectivist aesthetics. Marxist aesthetics specifies the aesthetic object’s relation to a consumption category.

Marx argues that there are significant distinctions among human activity-induced objects, treating targets and objectives as an “absolute nature object”. According to Marx, the object of an activity recovers from being an

ordinary object—a natural asset—and becomes a product of human activity. “The product separates from sole natural object as a product but become a product in consumption. To be a consumption object means the tendency and participation of human activity to it. Tendency of human action and activity to an existing one implies the humanization of that one. The object as a product is social-historical object” (Tunalı, 2003). Meta-aesthetics depends on the type of ‘meta’, a component that is functionally specified by exchange values. Haug (1997) defines meta-aesthetics and its functions as follows:

“In one hand, the “beauty” in another Word an appearance appealing the senses; on the other hand a design impelling the purchasing reflects and looker desires to own that meta. Well-appearance of the meta to the people puts the sensual perceptions of them into action and then sensual benefits determinates over it. Conversion of beneficial objects into meta triggers instinctual responses and consequently functional tools to renew or reshape not only the humanitarian sensitivity but also the world sensual objects is arisen. Therefore, the concept of “reshape of sensitivity” became a significant issue”.

Given the critical role meta-aesthetic education plays in student development, the objective of this study was to determine the effects of demographic characteristics and art/design education on the meta-aesthetic awareness of students studying in art, design, and education faculties.

Esthetic value in art education

Esthetic apprehension of the esthetic subject of an esthetic object—in other words, value assignment—creates “esthetic value”. In a general sense, some philosophers and estheticians define beauty through comparison with adjectives such as *nice*, *beneficial*, *good*, *right* (or *real*), or they may define beauty with esthetic concepts such as *pleasant*, *luxurious* and *gorgeous* (Sena, 1972).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The present study was developed from a 2009 PhD thesis researching 409 senior-year students in the art and design teacher departments of education faculties. To compare the results, artist/designer candidates were evaluated with a similar scale. Thus, 126 students taking fine arts and design education were subjected to the same attitude scale (Tataroğlu, 2015). The meta-aesthetic awareness levels of students in fine arts education and academy education might differ. Investigation of such differences and their causes make the present research and findings significant.

Research model

The present research follows a general screening model, with a

quantitative self-administered questionnaire ‘school survey’ design.

Location and sample

The research was conducted at Gazi University, located in Ankara, during the 2008 to 2009 school year. The research sample consisted of senior students of Art Education, Department of Fine Arts Education, Department of Gazi Education Faculty; senior students of Clothing Industry and Fashion Design, Handcrafts and Practical Arts Education, Department of Professional Education Faculty; senior students of Technical Drawing and Computer-Aided Design Education and Industrial Technology Education, Department of Industrial Arts Education Faculty; senior students of Furniture and Decoration Education, Department of Technical Education Faculty; and finally, students in the Fine Art Faculties of the foundation universities located in Ankara during the 2013 to 2014 academic year. In this category, there were six universities offering fine arts education. The research sample consisted of 126 students studying at the Fine Arts Design and Architecture Faculty of Baskent University. During this academic year, there were 437 students in the faculty. Students who had already taken the courses of “basic art/design education” and “aesthetics” were considered for the research sample.

Data gathering techniques

Sample students were administered a developed attitude scale. The scale assessed student attitudes regarding the current status of meta-aesthetics in art/design education, current beliefs about the necessity of meta-aesthetics with regard to aesthetic consciousness, and awareness of the relationships of meta-aesthetics with fashion, design and technology.

Development of the data gathering tool

The data gathering tool was an adaptation of the items of the attitude scale, which underwent validity–reliability testing in 2009, to art and design education. The revised scale also underwent validity–reliability testing and the scale validity and reliability were demonstrated statistically.

Data analysis

Data analysis was performed by statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) 11.0 statistical software (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL) and frequency tables were created for each variable.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results for the Faculty of Fine Arts are indicated by 1-ARTS and results for the Faculty of Education are indicated by 2-EDU.

1. All the responses given to attitude scale items were “valid”.
2. Given the students’ participation in the questions and substances (the items of the attitude scale), the greatest number of missing replies were found in the section where they write their score when entering the program for training. Students left more unanswered questions in

Table 1. Gender.

Gender	Female n (%)	Male n (%)	Complete Responses (n) (%)
1 (ARTS)	76 (60.3)	50 (39.7)	126 (100.0)
2 (EDU)	312 (76.4)	96 (23.5)	408 (100.0)

Table 2. Age.

Age	18 n (%)	19 n (%)	20 n (%)	21 n (%)	22 n (%)	23 n (%)	24 n (%)	-	-
1(ARTS)	1 (.8)	5 (4.0)	13 (10.3)	15 (11.9)	21 (16.7)	30 (23.8)	17 (13.5)	-	-
2 (EDU)	1 (.2)	4 (1.0)	17 (4.2)	61 (15.0)	95 (23.3)	75 (18.4)	46 (11.3)	-	-
								-	-
Age	25 n (%)	26 n (%)	27 n (%)	28 n (%)	29 n (%)	30 n (%)	32 n (%)	33 n (%)	Complete responses (n) (%)
1 (ARTS)	16 (12.7)	2 (1.6)	1 (.8)	-	2 (1.6)	2 (1.6)	1 (.8)	-	126 (100.0)
2 (EDU)	37 (9.1)	23 (5.6)	4 (1.0)	9 (2.2)	1 (.2)	-	-	1 (.2)	408 (100.0)

Table 3. University level.

University year	1 n (%)	2 n (%)	3 n (%)	4 n (%)	Complete responses (n) (%)
1 (ARTS)	46 (36.5)	26 (20.6)	21 (16.7)	33 (26.2)	126 (100.0)
2 (EDU)	All of the students were in 4th year				

articles five and six than in other sections.

Frequency tables of demographic characteristics

Gender

1. Of students participating in the attitude scale, 60.3% were female and 39.7% were male.
2. Of students participating in the attitude scale, 312 (76.5%) were female and 96 (23.5%) were male (Table 1).

Age

1. Of the participating students, 15.1% were 18 to 20 years of age; 78.6% were 21 to 25 years; 5.2% were 26 to 30 years, and 0.8% were 31 to 35 years of age.
2. Of the participating students, 5 (1%) were 18 to 19 years of age, 78 (20%) were 20 to 21 years of age, 170 (45%) were 22 to 23 years of age, 83 (22%) were 24 to 25 years of age, and (1%) were 26 years and over (Table 2).

University level

1. Of the participant students, 36.5% were registered as

1st year students, 20.6% as 2nd year students, 16.7% as 3rd year students, and 26.2% as 4th year students (Table 3).

Highest maternal educational level

1. Among mothers of the participant students, 2.4% did not have any formal education, 12.7% had primary and secondary school education, 43.7% had high school education, 4.8% had vocational collage education, 30.2% had undergraduate education and 6.3% had graduate education.
2. Among mothers of the participant students, 34 (8.3%) were uneducated, 251 (61.5%) were primary school graduates, 47 (11.5%) were secondary school graduates, 52 (12.7%) were high school graduates, 3 (7%) were associate degree graduates, 17 (4.2%) had undergraduate degrees, and 2 (5%) had graduate degrees (Table 4)

Highest paternal educational level

1. Among fathers of the participating students, 34.2% had primary and secondary school education, 30.2% had high school education, 6.3% had vocational collage education, 38.9% had undergraduate education and 11.9% had

Table 4. Highest maternal educational level.

Maternal education level	Uneducated n (%)	Primary school n (%)	Secondary school n (%)	High school n (%)	Vocational college n (%)	Undergraduate n (%)	Graduate n (%)	Complete responses (n) (%)
1 (ARTS)	3 (2.4)	12 (9.5)	4 (3.2)	55 (43.7)	6 (4.8)	38 (30.2)	8 (6.3)	126 (100.0)
2 (EDU)	34 (8.3)	251 (70.2)	47 (11.5)	52 (12.7)	3 (0.7)	17 (4.2)	2 (0.5)	408 (100.0)

Table 5. Highest paternal educational level.

Paternal education level	Uneducated n (%)	Primary school n (%)	Secondary school n (%)	High school n (%)	Vocational college n (%)	Undergraduate n (%)	Graduate n (%)	Complete responses (n) (%)
1 (ARTS)	-	11 (8.7)	5 (4.0)	38 (30.2)	8 (6.3)	49 (38.9)	15 (11.9)	126 (100.0)
2 (EDU)	10 (2.5)	163 (40.0)	77 (18.9)	89 (21.8)	15 (3.7)	48 (11.8)	5 (1.2)	407 (100)

Table 6. Parental style.

Parental style	Democratic n (%)	Authoritarian n (%)	Lenient n (%)	Complete responses (n) (%)
1 (ARTS)	92 (73.0)	26 (20.6)	8 (6.3)	126 (100.0)
2 (EDU)	314 (77.0)	78 (19.1)	13 (3.2)	405 (99.3)

Table 7. Area of study expectations.

Area of study expectations	Exceeds expectations n (%)	Meets expectations n (%)	Below expectations n (%)	Complete responses (n) (%)
1 (ARTS)	3 (2.4)	64 (50.8)	59 (46.8)	126 (100.0)
2 (EDU)	6 (1.5)	82 (20.1)	319 (78.2)	407 (100)

graduate education.

2. Among fathers of the participating students, 2.5% were uneducated, 40% were primary school graduates, 18.9% were secondary school graduates, 21.8% were high school graduates, 3.7% had vocational college education, 11.8% had an undergraduate degree, and 1.2% had a graduate degree (Table 5).

Parental style

1. Among the parents of participant students, 73% were democratic, 20.6% were authoritarian and 6.3% were lenient.

2. Three hundred and fourteen (77%) participant students reported their parents as democratic, 78 (19.1%) as authoritarian and 13 as lenient (Table 6).

Area of study expectations

1. Of the participant students, 2.4% reported that their

area of study exceeded their expectations, 50.8% reported that it met their expectations, and 46.8% stated that it was below their expectations.

2. Of the participant students, 6 (1.5%) reported that their area of study exceeded their expectations, 82 (20.1%) reported that it met their expectations, and 319 (78.2%) reported that it was below their expectations (Table 7).

Frequency tables of section two (opinions about course contents)

Opinions about course contents

Item 1: *Art and design course contents were able to teach me artistic design principles both theoretically and practically*

1. Of the participant students, 57.1% agreed that art and design courses were able to teach them artistic design principles both theoretically and practically. About 24.6% were undecided. Uncertainty that course contents were being successfully taught may be considered a negative

response, in which case the percentage of students responding negatively was 44.9%. In this case, almost half of the students responded positively and the other half negatively for this item.

2. Of the participant students, 43.4% agreed that art and design courses were able to teach them artistic design principles both theoretically and practically. About 31.9% were undecided. 27% disagreed.

Item 2: *Art education courses did not have contents that allowed me to use my creativity and composition knowledge*

1. Of the participant students, 24.6% offered undecided, 65% supportive responses, agreeing that the art education courses allowed them to use their creativity and composition knowledge, while 10.3% disagreed with this item.

2. There is little difference in percentage between “disagree” (41.7%) and “agree” (35%) responses, while the percentage of “undecided” (22.3%) responses was relatively large. More students felt that course activities allowed them to use their creativity, but such close percentages suggest that students divide into two poles on this item.

Item 3: *I think that the content of the art and design courses qualifies us to be artists or designers*

1. Of participant students, 56.4% believed that the courses they took qualified them to play the role of an artist or designer properly, while 43.7% were undecided.

2. Here, the relationship between the quality of art education and the role of art producer or consumer was suggested. Considering student opinions and the attitudes they developed, the percentage of students who agreed (31.7%) and disagreed (37.5%) were almost equal, while as in previous items the percentage of undecided students (29.9%) was remarkably high.

Item 4: *I think we have received sufficient education about the importance and necessity that aesthetic values bear the characteristics of our culture.*

1. Of the participant students, 49.2% responded positively, while 50.2% were undecided or responded negatively. Almost half of the students indicated that the education they received was insufficient on aesthetic values and the importance and function of these values.

2. The majority of participant students (50.3%) responded that sufficient education was not provided.

Item 5: *I think art teachers exhibited sufficient sincerity and sensitivity in teaching art*

1. This item evaluates sincerity and sensitivity in the attitudes of art trainers toward students and courses. The summed percentage of undecided and negative student

responses was 40.5%. Such a high percentage of dissatisfaction should be thought-provoking for art teachers.

2. Of participant students, 24 (5.9%) replied “totally agree”, 114 (27.9%) “agree”, 135 (33.1%) “undecided”, 110 (27%) “disagree” and 110 (5.1%) “totally disagree”.

Item 6: *I don't think aesthetic and meta-aesthetic topics were sufficiently present in the course contents of my education program.*

1. This item questions the sufficiency of aesthetic and meta-aesthetic topics within the education program. Of participant students, 42% reported insufficient treatment of aesthetic and meta-aesthetic topics. The sum of undecided and positive responses was 70.3%.

2. Of participant students, 16 (3.9%) replied “totally agree”, 82 (20.1%) “agree”, 125 (30.6%) “undecided”, 142 (34.8%) “disagree” and 39 (9.6%) “totally disagree” n (Table 8).

Frequency tables of section three (opinions about consumption)

Opinions about consumption

Item 1: *I don't feel uncomfortable buying products simply because they are “easy” on my senses or even when I know that false advertising is used.*

1. This item questions student purchasing behavior even with knowledge of the exaggerated or falsified advertisement of an item. Of participant students, 51.2% responded positively, 24.6% were undecided and 23.8% responded negatively to this item. The total of combined undecided and positive responses comprised 76.2%. This degree of comfort with aesthetic manipulation suggests that students are not sufficiently conscious about the training of their senses.

2. Of the participant students, 39.4% responded positively, 15.2% were undecided and 43.9% responded negatively.

Item 2: *The appearance of a product to be purchased is more important than its functions.*

1. Of the participant students, 37.3% responded positively, prioritizing appearance, while 40.7% prioritized functions and 22.2% were undecided.

2. Of the participant students, 57.3% prioritized appearance, 24% prioritized functions and 17.2% were undecided.

Item 3: *I care about buying products with advertisements.*

1. This item evaluates the role of advertising in student buying preferences. Of the participant students, 54.1%

Table 8. Opinions about course contents.

Opinions about course contents		Totally disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Undecided n (%)	Agree n (%)	Totally agree n (%)	Complete responses (n) (%)
Item 1	1	4 (3.2)	9 (7.1)	31 (24.6)	72 (57.1)	10 (7.9)	126 (100.0)
	2	25 (6.1)	81 (19.9)	130 (31.9)	144 (35.3)	25 (6.1)	405 (99.3)
Item 2	1	4 (3.2)	9 (7.1)	31 (24.6)	72 (57.1)	10 (7.9)	126 (100.0)
	2	26 (6.4)	144 (35.3)	91 (22.3)	125 (30.6)	18 (4.4)	404 (99.0)
Item 3	1	3 (2.4)	18 (14.3)	34 (27.0)	64 (50.8)	7 (5.6)	126 (100.0)
	2	37 (9.1)	116 (28.4)	122 (29.9)	112 (27.5)	17 (4.2)	404 (99.0)
Item 4	1	5 (4.0)	32 (25.4)	27 (21.4)	50 (39.7)	12 (9.5)	126 (100.0)
	2	10 (2.5)	81 (19.9)	108 (26.5)	172 (42.2)	33 (8.1)	404 (99.0)
Item 5	1	17 (13.5)	58 (46.0)	28 (22.2)	16 (12.7)	7 (5.6)	126 (100.0)
	2	21 (5.1)	110 (27.0)	135 (33.1)	114 (27.9)	24 (5.9)	404 (99.0)
Item 6	1	5 (4.0)	32 (25.4)	36 (28.6)	42 (33.0)	11 (8.7)	126 (100.0)
	2	39 (9.6)	142 (34.8)	125 (30.6)	82 (20.1)	16 (3.9)	404 (99.0)

preferred advertised products, 44.4% did not, and 21.4% were undecided. The percentages were close to each other for this item.

2. Of the participant students, 25.7% responded positively, 20.6% were undecided and 52% responded negatively.

Item 4: *I think that changes only made to the packaging of an item trick consumers.*

1. Of the participant students, 61.1% indicated that changes to the packaging of an item tricks consumers, 18.3% disagreed, and 27.8% were undecided.

2. Of the participant students, 69.1% indicated that changes to the packaging of an item tricks consumers, 15.7% disagreed, and 13.7% were undecided.

Item 5: *Because of my art and design education, I initially look for the aesthetic integrity and uniqueness of an item that I purchase*

1. This question evaluated the effect of art and design education on purchasing preferences, with 78.2% of participant students looking for integrity and uniqueness, 19% undecided, and 12.7% responding negatively.

2. Of the participant students, 65.7% responded positively, 17.9% were undecided and 14.7% responded negatively.

Item 6: *I think the institutions providing basic art and design education and training artists and designers are insufficient in creating conscious art consumers*

1. Of the participant students, 52.4% found the institutions

insufficient, 29.4% were undecided and 18.3% disagreed that institutions were insufficient in raising conscious art consumers.

2. Of the participant students, 50.7% agreed, 29.7% were undecided and 18.1% disagreed (Table 9).

Frequency tables of section four (opinions about production)

Opinions about production

Item 1: *I am hearing the concept of “meta-aesthetics” for the first time*

1. Of the participant students, 56.4% indicated that they were hearing the concept of “meta-aesthetics” for the first time when taking the survey, while 38.1% indicated that they were not hearing the concept for the first time and 5.6% were undecided.

2. Of the participant students, 101 (24.8%) responded “totally agree”, 135 (33.1%) “agree”, 48 (11.8%) “undecided”, 76 (18.6%) “disagree” and 40 (9.8%) “totally disagree”.

Item 2: *I think aesthetic appearance and functionality are equally and highly important in the design of every utility-purpose product*

1. This item solicits a comparative evaluation about the appearance and sales values of an item. Of the participant students, 76.2% agreed that appearance and

Table 9. Opinions about consumption.

Opinions about consumption		Totally Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Undecided n (%)	Agree n (%)	Totally Agree n (%)	Complete responses (n) (%)
Item 1	1	10 (7.9)	20 (15.9)	31 (24.6)	51 (40.5)	14 (11.1)	126 (100.0)
	2	35 (8.6)	144 (35.3)	62 (15.2)	129 (31.6)	32 (7.8)	402 (98.5)
Item 2	1	16 (12.7)	35 (27.8)	28 (22.2)	44 (34.9)	3 (2.4)	126 (100.0)
	2	63 (15.4)	171 (41.9)	70 (17.2)	74 (18.1)	24 (5.9)	402 (98.5)
Item 3	1	14 (11.1)	42 (33.3)	27 (21.4)	34 (27.0)	9 (7.1)	126 (100.0)
	2	51 (12.5)	161 (39.5)	84 (20.6)	93 (22.8)	12 (2.9)	401 (98.3)
Item 4	1	1 (0.8)	13 (10.3)	35 (27.8)	57 (45.2)	20 (15.9)	126 (100.0)
	2	20 (4.9)	44 (10.8)	56 (13.7)	193 (47.3)	89 (21.8)	402 (98.5)
Item 5	1	3 (2.4)	13 (10.3)	24 (19)	57 (45.2)	29 (23)	126 (100.0)
	2	14 (3.4)	46 (11.3)	73 (17.9)	188 (46.1)	80 (19.6)	401 (98.3)
Item 6	1	2 (1.6)	21 (16.7)	37 (29.4)	43 (34.1)	23 (18.3)	126 (100.0)
	2	18 (4.4)	56 (13.7)	121 (29.7)	156 (38.2)	5 (12.5)	402 (98.5)

sales values were equally and highly important, 11.9% were undecided and another 11.9% responded negatively.

2. Of the participant students, 105 (25.7%) replied “totally agree”, 193 (47.3%) “agree”, 62 (15.2%) “undecided”, 30 (7.4%) “disagree” and 10 (2.5%) “totally disagree”.

Item 3: *In a product with which I express myself, I don't care about the interests and needs of the masses with whom I share that item*

1. Of the participant students, 28.5% indicated that they do not care about other consumers' interests and needs, 57.2% indicated that they do care, and 14.3% were undecided. A 42.8% total percentage of negative and undecided is ethically thought-provoking.

2. Of the participant students, 19 (4.7%) replied “totally agree”, 67 (16.4%) “agree”, 72 (17.6%) “undecided”, 168 (41.2%) “disagree” and 74 (18.1%) “totally disagree”.

Item 4: *Advertising for a product I designed may be deceptive and may not sufficiently reflect that product. However, I don't feel uncomfortable if the advertisement is effective and is allows me to access the target market and receive their money*

1. This item was placed into the scale to evaluate the ethical attitudes of student designers regarding their own designs, advertisements and money. Of the participant students, 38.1% agreed that they preferred to gain money and mass targets, 32.5% reported discomfort, and 29.4% were undecided. In this item, the 61.9% agree–undecided majority was remarkable; unfortunately, they were placing meta in front of the value.

2. Of the participant students, 25 (6.1%) replied “totally agree”, 98 (24.5%) “agree”, 112 (27.5%) “undecided”, 113 (27.7%) “disagree” and 52 (12.7%) “totally disagree”.

Item 5: *It is possible to secretly influence people and to impart elements of a culture*

1. This item was written to foreground the aesthetic impact of meta-aesthetics. Of the participant students, 85.4% agreed, 18.3% were undecided and 6.4% disagreed.

2. Of the participant students, 64 (15.7%) replied “totally agree”, 188 (46.1%) “agree”, 95 (23.3%) “undecided”, 46 (11.3%) “disagree” and 7 (1.7%) “totally disagree”.

Item 6: *I wish to be an artist or a designer known by everyone*

1. This item evaluates the students' reputation attitudes. Of the participant students, 74.6% cared about reputation, 14.3% were undecided and 11.1% did not care about being an artist or designer known by everybody.

2. Of the participant students, 141 (34.6%) replied “totally agree”, 126 (30.9%) “agree”, 90 (22.1%) “undecided”, 26 (6.4%) “disagree” and 17 (4.2%) “totally disagree” (Table 10).

Frequency tables of section five (opinions about creativity)

Opinions about creativity

Item 1: *I think developing anything to fulfill human needs also requires creativity*

Table 10. Opinions about production.

Opinions about production		Totally Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Undecided n (%)	Agree n (%)	Totally Agree n (%)	Complete responses (n) (%)
Item 1	1	13 (10.3)	35 (27.8)	7 (5.6)	53 (42.1)	18 (14.3)	126 (100.0)
	2	40 (9.8)	76 (18.6)	48 (11.8)	135 (33.1)	101 (24.8)	400 (98.0)
Item 2	1	4 (3.2)	11 (8.7)	15 (11.9)	67 (53.2)	29 (23.0)	126 (100)
	2	10 (2.5)	30 (7.4)	62 (15.2)	193 (47.3)	105 (25.7)	400 (98.0)
Item 3	1	22 (17.5)	50 (39.7)	18 (14.3)	28 (22.2)	8 (6.3)	126 (100.0)
	2	74 (18.1)	168 (41.2)	72 (17.6)	67 (16.4)	19 (4.7)	400 (98.0)
Item 4	1	10 (7.9)	31 (24.6)	37 (29.4)	38 (30.2)	10 (7.9)	126 (100.0)
	2	52 (12.7)	113 (27.7)	112 (27.5)	98 (24.0)	25 (6.1)	400 (98.0)
Item 5	1	1 (0.8)	7 (5.6)	23 (18.3)	64 (50.8)	31 (24.6)	126 (100.0)
	2	7 (1.7)	46 (11.3)	95 (23.3)	188 (46.1)	64 (15.7)	400 (98.0)
Item 6	1	1 (0.8)	13 (10.3)	18 (14.3)	36 (28.6)	58 (46.0)	126 (100)
	2	17 (4.2)	26 (6.4)	90 (22.1)	126 (30.9)	141 (34.6)	400 (98.0)

1. This item evaluates the effects of meta-aesthetics in manipulations related to human needs. Of the participant students, 84.1% agreed on the importance of creativity, 8% disagreed and 7.9% were undecided.

2. Of the participant students, 141 (34.6%) replied "totally agree", 197 (48.3%) "agree", 36 (8.8%) "undecided", 18 (4.4%) "disagree" and 8 (2%) "totally disagree".

Item 2: *I think knowledge of meta-aesthetics by creative individuals is both necessary and significant in culture transfer*

1. This item investigates the role of meta-aesthetics in culture transfer. None of the students indicated total disagreement with this item. Of the participant students, 70.7% agreed with this opinion, 26.2% were undecided and only 3.2% indicated disagreement.

2. Of the participant students, 64 (15.7%) replied "totally agree", 170 (41.7%) "agree", 143 (35%) "undecided", 19 (4.7%) "disagree" and 4 (1%) "totally disagree".

Item 3: *I think advertising is necessary to introduce an item developed through my creativity (artwork/design items) to large masses*

1. This item evaluates attitudes toward the effects of advertising on the publicity of an item. Of the participant students, 75.5% responded positively, 7.9% responded negatively and 16.7% were undecided. No students totally disagreed with this item.

2. Of the participant students, 131 (32.1%) replied "totally agree", 181 (44.4%) "agree", 59 (14.5%) "undecided", 23 (5.6%) "disagree" and 5 (1.2%) "totally disagree".

Item 4: *I think the material value assigned to an artwork commoditizes the art*

1. This item questions the relationship between meta-aesthetics and money. Of the participant students, 54.8% agreed that money commoditized the art, 32.5% were undecided and 12.7% disagreed.

2. Of the participant students, 60 (14.7%) responded "totally agree", 115 (28.2%) "agree", 176 (43.1%) "undecided", 42 (10.3%) "disagree" and 7 (1.7%) "totally disagree".

Item 5: *The objective of making money moves the artist away from artistic creativity*

1. This item was included to point out that creativity is not a material value. Of the participant students, 59.9% indicated that the objective of making money moved artists away from creativity; 23.8% were undecided in this item and 16.7% indicated that artistic creativity was not decreased by the desire to make money.

2. Of the participant students, 113 (27.7%) replied "totally agree", 141 (34.6%) "agree", 78 (19.1%) "undecided", 57 (14%) "disagree" and 10 (2.5%) "totally disagree".

Item 6: *The most remarkable difference between an artwork and a design item is the uniqueness of the design item.*

1. This item points out a remarkable difference between artwork and design items. Of the participant students, 64.3% indicated that they knew about this difference; 15.9% disagreed, arguing for the uniqueness of artwork

Table 11. Opinions about creativity.

Opinions about production		Totally disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Undecided n (%)	Agree n (%)	Totally agree n (%)	Complete responses (n) (%)
Item 1	1	4 (3.2)	6 (4.8)	10 (7.9)	66 (52.4)	40 (31.7)	126 (100.0)
	2	8 (2)	18 (4.4)	36 (8.8)	197 (48.3)	141 (34.6)	400 (98.0)
Item 2	1	-	4 (3.2)	33 (26.2)	68 (54.0)	21 (16.7)	126 (100.0)
	2	4 (1.0)	19 (4.7)	143 (35.0)	170 (41.7)	64 (15.7)	400 (98.0)
Item 3	1	-	10 (7.9)	21 (16.7)	63 (50)	32 (25.4)	126 (100.0)
	2	5 (1.2)	23 (5.6)	59 (14.5)	181 (44.4)	131 (32.1)	399 (97.8)
Item 4	1	3 (2.4)	13 (10.3)	41 (32.5)	47 (37.3)	22 (17.5)	126 (100.0)
	2	7 (1.7)	42 (10.3)	176 (43.1)	115 (28.2)	60 (14.7)	400 (98.0)
Item 5	1	14 (11.1)	7 (5.6)	30 (23.8)	54 (42.9)	21 (16.7)	126 (100.0)
	2	7 (1.7)	42 (10.3)	176 (43.1)	115 (28.2)	60 (14.7)	400 (98.0)
Item 6	1	2 (1.6)	18 (14.3)	25 (19.8)	53 (42.1)	28 (22.2)	126 (100.0)
	2	11 (2.7)	51 (12.5)	110 (27.0)	163 (40.0)	65 (15.9)	400 (98.0)

and 19.8 were undecided in this item.

2. Of the participant students, 65 (15.9%) replied “totally agree”, 163 (40%) “agree”, 110 (27%) “undecided”, 51 (12.5%) “disagree” and 11 (2.7%) “totally disagree” (Table 11).

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The data in this study were derive from extensive representative samples of university students. The essence of this research is the necessity of art, the necessity of education, and the function of art education in integrating education and human experience. The first step of this research was a PhD dissertation, and the second step centered on the analysis of art and design students about 5 years after the dissertation. The study provides data on the degree that art education fulfills the duty of art, both as producer (artistic creation) and consumer.

In the current study, demographic traits are evaluated, which is intended to provide information and insight about the student population. Subsequent research will involve comparing demographic features with the attitude items to evaluate results for statistical significance. The results are evaluated in two stages, corresponding with the structure and purpose of this research.

For academy students

The following conclusions can be drawn from student

responses. The majority of the participants were female students students with ages between 22 and 25 years. Most of them were first year students in the Interior Architecture and Environmental Design Department. While students’ fathers mostly had undergraduate and graduate level education, their mothers mostly had high school education.

Students more closely agreed when they were asked about the teachers from whom they took art education. However, more remarkable than such an agreement was the percentage of undecided students; it was more than the total of students who agreed and disagreed. This indicates that students were not able to develop an attitude about the quality of the teachers with whom they studied for 4 years and they were not able to assign a “value” to them.

The majority of students agreed that advertisement was necessary for designs and works to become known. As observed earlier, most students believe that advertising is necessary for public awareness. Therefore, student opinions were consistent with their opinions about advertisements. Students were not able to present an overall attitude, given their undecidedness about the commodification of art, but they were aware that artistic creativity and consequent works and products may not have an economic–practical objective. The teacher candidate senior students were having difficulty transferring a concept they were aware of into their daily lives, and exhibited undisciplined and unprincipled attitudes.

A majority of the students agreed upon the necessity of creativity in product creation and design being able to

affect individuals' senses. A majority of the students were aware that it was possible to influence individuals' desires through packages and "fashion", and to impart elements of other cultures through media channels.

Students indicated supportive opinions on many items in a group fashion, resulting in conflicting outcomes for many items. Students converged on authenticity, multiplication and advertisement of art or design items, however most students exhibited attitudes disregarding ethical values for professional or financial advancement.

For education department students

Proposals related to each conclusion are located immediately below the conclusion. The majority of students in this sample of 4th year students were females aged 22 to 23 years. Majority of students are enrolled in regular education, and the education status of their parents was generally primary education. Student opinions are also predictors of their attitudes. A majority of the students agreed that aesthetic and meta-aesthetic topics were not sufficiently included in course contents. However, as in the previous sample, a substantial portion of these students were undecided on this item.

A substantial portion of the participant students stated that they do not feel uncomfortable buying products even when they know about false advertisements or just because they are "easy" on their senses. The opposite opinion was expressed by another group of the students. Haug (1997) stated the following about the delusiveness of appearances:

"The mission of meta-aesthetics is to discover the ways to get into the minds of humans, the ways through which nothing else get into; a thing about which talkable, a thing that is visible, a thing that is not forgettable, a thing desired by everyone and every time..." (Haug 1997, 60) He subsequently advanced this case further: "Aesthetic style is used by the capital as a prestigious work or an authentic outpouring. When an objective style or a general assumption is combined with the artistic style, it may be exploited by the advertiser as a meta image".

A large portion of the students disagreed with the item indicating that appearance is more important than function, and this conflicted with their responses to the previous item. Students both indicated that they do not care about content when purchasing an item, and also reported believing that functionality is more important than appearance. These two items were placed consecutively in the attitude scale, and such conflicting responses indicate that students have not developed certain principles on this issue.

It is also worth mentioning Berger's statements about the role of advertising in production-consumption integrity:

"It is hoped that the audience-buyer should be jealous

about himself considering the state he will reach when he got the product. The target herein is to have the others jealous of that product. Such a jealousy will enrich his self-esteem." (Berger, 2008).

This may explain the student trends for these items. Considering the students' educational and demographic characteristics, their responses suggest that they have been educated in a profession that is not able to "make them happy" and that is "below their expectations", and in a profession that is not oriented toward the sensual life, nor toward the development of new attitudes, principles and actions.

A majority of the students disagreed with the item emphasizing the functionality of advertisement. In an environment where media surrounds human life, it is pleasing that students exhibited unconcerned attitudes about the product advertisements bombarded over the internet in an uncontrolled and "pirated" fashion. However, it should not be disregarded that the percentages of agreeing and undecided students were also remarkably high for this item. According to Haug (1997):

"As long as meta-aesthetics achieves "success" over the purchasers and at least determines their expenses, purchasers will find themselves in a state of Tantalus surrounded by the sweetest dreams of their needs. ... Tantalus is anaesthetized purchaser".

The undecided and agreeing responses in this sample implies that they are not concerned about being "anaesthetized purchasers".

"Meta-aesthetics shifts the improvement in human capabilities, satisfaction feelings, pleasures and happiness through dictating the way to be selected by an individual. Human motivation becomes tied to tendency to conformism" (Haug, 1997).

The statistical data can be visualized and interpreted as follows:

A majority of the students were aware of the misleading nature of packaging. However, of the senior students and teacher candidates, a substantial portion responded that the products they design and serve to markets with misleading packaging will not make them uncomfortable, because they will make money and become well-known. A majority of the students wish to be well-known designers or artists. Undecided students were also remarkably high for this item. Here, the economic obligations lie at the crux of the problem. However, ethics are also undoubtedly important in art. Ambition to make money, and to be publicized through advertising may be seen as the tactics of artists and designers to "remain standing" in global culture. These students are also teacher candidates. Therefore, they are expected to develop a principled attitude against lies.

A majority of the participant students were aware that it was possible to influence the desires of people through packaging and fashion and to impart elements of other cultures through media channels. Receiving higher education, raising culturally conscious youths, consciously producing and consuming, and being able to control media and to adapt them to one's own values and customs is the natural right of every individual. The present study and similar studies may help us to provide such an education, they will also let us to do comparisons and evaluations, and will also open new ways. This study will also be compared with the previous unpublished PhD thesis. It is hoped that this study will open new doors and working areas for youth in meta-aesthetics (Peşkersoy, 2009).

Higher educational art and design faculties providing sensitivity education should focus more on aesthetics, aesthetic values, art history and critical theory. Otherwise, instructors, artists, designers and even parents of the future will turn into ethically crippled generations, and they will place the exchange value of items over their other values.

These conclusions indicate the responsibility of higher educational institutes regarding the quality and practical characteristics of the education they provide, and ultimately, the responsibility of families in every case affecting students. Physical and technological equipment to provide practical training to students; beneficial instructor attitudes; and controlled, liberal, cooperative education and training methods will help to raise aesthetically conscious youths. The internal happiness and sensual satisfaction of instructors from their professions, their awareness of national values, and their methods of passing these values on to their students will improve student satisfaction with the instructors. The common interests of all these works are happiness, transformation, adaptation and motivation. This basic pattern may bring both students and instructors to achieve success, and components of this basic pattern will only be possible with conscious programming and sorting.

Conflict of interests

The author has not declared any conflict of interests.

REFERENCES

- Berger J (2008). Types of vision, trans. Yurdanur Salman, İstanbul: Metis Publishing, P 134.
- Cömert B (2007). Croce's esthetics (1st Issue), Ankara: De Ki Publishing.
- Davey N (2011). Gadamer's aesthetics (The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, [Winter 2011 Edition] 359 p.
- Haug WF (1997). Criticism of meta-aesthetics, trans. Ayşe Gül, İstanbul: Spartaküs Publications, [1st Issue] 14(43):60-61.
- Hegel GWF (1994). Aesthetics. Trans. Taylan Altuğ, Hakkı Hünler, İstanbul: Payel Publishing, [1st Issue] P 2.
- Marx K (2006). Capital Volume Three (Translated by: Alaattin Bilgi). (5th Issue), Ankara: Sol Publishing. (Original work was published in 1867-1883).
- Odenstedt A (2008). Gadamer on Bildung, The Southern Journal of Philosophy, 46:559-580 <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.2041-6962.2008.tb00085.x/abstract>
- Peşkersoy E (2009). Effects of demogtaphic characteristics and art education on student consciousness about meta esthetics (PhD diss., Gazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences).
- Sena C (1972). Aesthetics, İstanbul: Remzi Publishing [1st Issue] 202 p.
- Tataroğlu E (2015). Effects of art/design education on meta-aesthetics consciousness of fine arts students, Educational Research and Reviews, 10(7):912-932, doi:10.589/ERR2014
- TDK, Great Turkish Dictionary, Web: <http://www.tdk.gov.tr>
- Timuçin A (2005). Aesthetics, İstanbul: Mart Publishing, [7th Issue]. 86 p.
- Tunalı İ (1998). Aesthetic, İstanbul: Remzi Publishing, [5th Issue]. 13(14):17-18.
- Tunalı İ (2003). Marxist Aesthetic, İstanbul: Analiz Publishing, [3rd Issue] 65 p.