

ALICJA LISIECKA

Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin

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

EXPLORING DISOBEDIENT PEDAGOGIES IN EXPERIENCE-ORIENTED AESTHETIC EDUCATION. THE CASE OF POETRY SLAM*

Introduction: This article explores the intersection between Atkinson's notion of disobedient pedagogies and experience-oriented aesthetic education, using poetry slam as an example to illustrate their shared potential to foster open-ended and unconventional learning. It challenges traditional frameworks of aesthetic education that privilege canonical knowledge and technical proficiency, proposing instead an approach grounded in a post-Kantian understanding of aesthetic engagement as an embodied and relational mode of encountering the world.

Research Aim: The study aims to explore how disobedient pedagogies intersect with experience-oriented aesthetic education to promote learning that is dynamic, participatory, and ethically attuned. Poetry slam serves as a practical example, demonstrating how such pedagogical approaches can facilitate transformative (aesthetic) experiences through unpredictability, risk-taking, and relational engagement.

Evidence-based Facts: Atkinson's disobedient pedagogies frame learning as a largely unpredictable event that resists prescriptive standards and fosters exploration and responsiveness to learners' diverse learning styles. Experience-oriented aesthetic education shifts attention from the transmission of cultural knowledge toward sensorial and socially embedded modes of engagement. Poetry slam – rooted in democratic and performative practice – encourages participants to engage with ambiguity, construct meaning collectively, and express individuality within a shared (aesthetic) experience.

Summary: This paper argues that integrating disobedient pedagogies into experience-oriented aesthetic education reconceptualizes learning as a co-constructed and anti-transference process. Poetry slam situates this process within a lived aesthetic encounter, creating spaces where learners engage intellectually, aesthetically, and ethically through performance and dialogue. Such a framework redefines aesthetic education as a site of creative and ethical becoming.

Keywords: disobedient pedagogies, experience-oriented aesthetic education, poetry slam, aesthetic engagement, school education

* Suggested citation: Lisiecka, A. (2026). Exploring Disobedient Pedagogies in Experience-Oriented Aesthetic Education. The Case of Poetry Slam. *Lubelski Rocznik Pedagogiczny*, 45(2), 237–252. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17951/lrp.2026.45.2.237-252>

“Aesthetic experiences are not transparent”
(Nanay, 2019, p. 42).

INTRODUCTION

This article examines the intersection of Atkinson’s (2018) notion of disobedient pedagogies and experience-oriented aesthetic education (Lisiecka, 2025a; 2025b). It explores how these approaches can inform more open-ended, relational, and experimental forms of learning in contemporary educational practice. By juxtaposing these frameworks, the paper aims to show how learning can move beyond rigid, prescriptive models toward dynamic processes that embrace uncertainty, creativity, and the lived experiences of learners.

Atkinson’s (2018) notion of disobedient pedagogies frames teaching as an “event” – a dynamic process through which learning unfolds via exploration, experimentation, and distinctive paths of each student. It challenges conventional, outcome-oriented education, and prioritizes attentiveness, responsiveness, and emergence of knowledge over adherence to pre-defined standards. By contrast, traditional aesthetic education remains largely anchored in canonical frameworks: transmission of knowledge about art, reinforcement of cultural hierarchies, and cultivation of taste (cf. Denac, 2014; D’Olimpio, 2022; Kopčáková, 2018; Smith, 2004; Wojnar, 1995). While historically influential, this model fails to accommodate the embodied, situated, and contextually mediated experiences of learners, thereby limiting the transformative potential of aesthetic engagement. Experience-oriented aesthetic education addresses these limitations by foregrounding perception, reflection, and relational interaction with the world. Rather than focusing solely on familiarity with canonical works, it emphasizes developing learners’ capacities to engage aesthetically with their everyday environments, fostering awareness, sensibility, and critical responsiveness (Lisiecka, 2025b).

By integrating disobedient pedagogies with experience-oriented aesthetic education, this article proposes a vision of learning as a co-constructed and anti-transference process (Miklitsch, 1994). Practices such as poetry slam illustrate this convergence, providing educational spaces in which unpredictability, relationality, and creative agency are central. In these settings, students navigate risk, express individuality, and participate in shared construction of meaning. Through such engagement, pedagogical openness transforms aesthetic education into a dynamic site of human becoming.

RESEARCH PROBLEM AND AIM

This paper aims to investigate how Atkinson's disobedient pedagogies intersect with experience-oriented aesthetic education. It explores their potential to foster learning that is open-ended and unconventionally driven. Poetry slam – a space with capacity for aesthetic experience – is employed as a practical illustration of disobedient pedagogical principles in action, showing how learning unfolds through embodied, participatory, and unpredictable encounters.

METHODOLOGY

To address the aim of this paper, a narrative review of the literature was conducted, drawing on peer-reviewed studies, theoretical writings, and critical essays relevant to aesthetic education, disobedient pedagogies, and poetry slam. In line with the interpretive nature of narrative reviews, the selection of literature was guided by its conceptual relevance and capacity to illuminate the research problem rather than by rigid inclusion or exclusion criteria. This flexible approach enabled integration of diverse theoretical perspectives and methodological orientations (Green et al., 2006; Sukhera, 2022).

EVIDENCE-BASED REVIEW

Disobedient Pedagogies

Atkinson (2018) introduces the concept of disobedient pedagogies, offering a personal perspective on education that breaks away from rigid standards and predetermined teaching pathways. The author's ideas stem primarily from engagement with artistic education, yet they carry broad relevance across all educational domains. Disobedient pedagogy frames learning as an adventure, where the methods and outcomes of education remain open-ended. Rather than a mechanical transfer of knowledge or an instrumental approach to students, learning unfolds through what Atkinson terms "events of learning." The author describes this event-adventure education as

a process of exploring in which any fixed coordinates of learning and teaching are relaxed. An adventure in which things and relations are undetermined, where we are confronted with the unexpected or the unforeseen; where we travel beyond knowledge and without established criteria. On such an adventure, thinking, in the words of Deleuze, is viewed as an experimenting, not a judging predicated upon established modes of practice or knowledge. Such thinking raises issues relating to ethics, aesthetics and politics that are grounded in established codes, representations and knowl-

edge that constitute the human, in order to move beyond these into a domain of the non-human through which understanding of becoming human is expanded. (Atkinson, 2018, p. 7)

Atkinson (2018) emphasizes that learning encompasses familiar, measurable aspects and those that are unpredictable, extending beyond conventional frameworks. The author highlights an often-overlooked yet evident truth in education: students learn in diverse ways, shaped by their social, cultural, and emotional backgrounds. The teacher's role, Atkinson argues, is to engage with students in an ongoing exploration of the possibilities and potentials of learning. The author also advocates for a renewed focus on students and their varied approaches to entering and engaging in the learning process, which Atkinson views not merely as a means of acquiring knowledge but as a process of building or enriching life.

Atkinson (2018) also asserts that "learners should not be denied modes of experiencing that constitute and expand what it is to be human" and that "a challenge within art education itself concerns trying to respond effectively to the different ways in which learning encounters are manifested in their outcomes and to the evolving sensibilities of learners in their changing social milieu" (p. 6). This approach is deeply humanistic, personalist, and infused with philosophical reflection. The student is not simply a passive recipient of pre-packaged knowledge but a subject-yet-to-come, whose experiences and learning paths may lead to the discovery of new ways of thinking, acting, and understanding the world. Atkinson (2018) challenges us "to try to think beyond the domination of education by prescribed pathways and outcomes in order to consider the eventfulness of learning through art practices and their different lines of becoming" (p. 19). Pedagogy, therefore, should be flexible and open to the diversity of learning paths, fostering a space for experimentation and discovery rather than imposing rigid criteria and standards. Atkinson (2018) claims:

What I am suggesting or speculating is the notion that we engage in pedagogic work such as responding to the immanence of children's and student's learning processes *without criteria*. A pedagogy without criteria that is able to respond effectively to the difference of learning processes and their immanent values that in some cases may expand our understanding of learning in art and of what art is. This does not mean that I am advocating a pedagogy of 'anything goes.' I am not. I am suggesting a relaxing of parameters and criteria that underpin particular forms of learning and practice so as to enable those forms of learning and their outcomes that may be marginalized or ignored, to be recognized. The same applies to teaching. This involves a process of experimentation and invention. In many contexts, in recent decades, the practice of teaching has been subject to a series of competencies or standards whose purpose is to define and monitor good teaching. For some, this is viewed as a positive and constructive approach to improving teacher quality. For others, the idea of standards, which of course is difficult to dispute, has produced a rather mechanical and prescrip-

tive approach to what they see as a creative enterprise. The latter view, which I adopt, would subscribe, I think, to a Spinozan interpretation: that we do not know fully what teaching is or can become. (p. 5)

A central element of Atkinson's (2018) theory is the notion of disobedience in teaching and learning. The author employs the term disobedience "to refer to events of practice that run counter to established frameworks and practices" (p. 6). Additionally, Atkinson (2012; cf. 2008) uses the expressions "pedagogies against the state, or pedagogies of the event, in order to respond to acts of learning that involve leaps of becoming into a new or reconfigured world" (p. 5).

Pedagogies against the state is therefore a call for pedagogies that work against themselves; anti-pedagogies or disobedient pedagogies, in that they cannot afford to become captured by particular transcendent values and modes of practice, or particular approaches to learning and teaching, but are open to embracing the different ways in which students learn and teachers teach. This is particularly important in a world where the sensibilities that learners are evolving may be incommensurate to those of their teachers. One outcome of adopting a disobedient pedagogy is that by viewing learning as an onto-epistemic event that can open new vistas and potentials, there is an obligation to expand our grasp of what learning and teaching are or can become. (Atkinson, 2018, p. 34)

Disobedient pedagogies signify educational practices that transcend established frameworks and norms, opening new avenues for thinking and action. Art plays a pivotal role in this framework, as it can (though not necessarily) destabilize familiar patterns, stimulate imagination, and enable students to engage in the learning process in a creative and authentic manner. Art naturally lends itself to disobedient endeavors, given its inherent resistance to rigid categorization. Atkinson (2018) observes that "disobedience was viewed as indissoluble from the force of art that opened up new possibilities for making, thinking, seeing and action" (p. 194). Consequently, the author proposes

to relax prescribed categories of and propositions about art education, to subdue their ideological framing and try to view the processes of practice in which learners engage as 'acategorical' events (which of course is another ideological framing) that is to say as 'evental' practices whose singularity cannot be categorized in any terms but their own. I am using the term singularity to refer to that which is singular, that which differs from the regular. So the aim is not to view these singular events according to already established criteria, though this is difficult to avoid, but to try to approach them without criteria. This suggests that the 'thisness' of art practice, its internal resonance, is a coherent 'as-it-is' event that has the potential to extend how we conceive art and learning; a singular event that has universal implications. We are therefore not concerned with prescribed subjects of teaching and learning, but with subjects-yet-to-come. (Atkinson, 2023, p. 23)

By embracing students' individual learning styles and life experiences, this approach transforms learning into an event with unpredictable outcomes, infusing the process with ethical, aesthetic, and political significance. In practice, disobedient pedagogy demands from teachers to be attentive, flexible, and ready to co-create the learning process with students. The focus shifts away from grades and predetermined results toward a shared journey of discovery, creation, and unfolding new possibilities. Naturally, within disobedient pedagogies

we might adopt some initial guiding, but not absolute principles: (1) to set up *learning encounters* rather than prescribed pathways of learning; (2) to work *attentively* with learners and the relevance of their ways of learning; (3) not to allow transcendent enunciators (criteria, established knowledge) to dominate how we respond; (4) to be alive to the unexpected. (Atkinson, 2018, p. 33)

The approach encourages a setting where students and teachers alike can nurture creativity, critical thinking, and deep engagement with a broad spectrum of educational experiences. Achieving this depends on establishing an environment characterized by trust and attentive care (Atkinson, 2018, p. 229). To sum up, Atkinson's framework proposes a pedagogy that interweaves ethical, aesthetic, and political dimensions. Here, learning evolves into an adventure and an experiment, where the true worth lies not just in anticipated outcomes but in the journey, the act of discovery, and in growing new ways of thinking, acting, and living. Disobedient pedagogies illustrate that education can be a vibrant, inventive process that embraces limitless possibilities rather than simply adhering to set standards. Like any authentic adventure, it entails risks, but ones that make the journey worthwhile.

Experience-Oriented Aesthetic Education

The concept of experience-oriented aesthetic education (Lisiecka, 2025a) proposed here emerges as a response to the persistence of a conservative paradigm that continues to shape much of aesthetic pedagogy. In many educational contexts, aesthetic education remains confined to transmitting art-historical knowledge, reproducing interpretations of canonical works, and acquiring artistic techniques from various fields (cf. Denac, 2014; D'Olimpio, 2022; Kopčáková, 2018; Smith, 2004; Wojnar, 1995). This model, grounded in the ideals of cultivation and refinement, upholds a hierarchy of taste that privileges familiarity with the cultural canon over the capacity to engage aesthetically with one's own lived experience. Although it presents itself as universal and egalitarian, it can reproduce exclusion and passivity.

In contrast, the experience-oriented approach draws upon recent developments in contemporary aesthetics, which reconceptualize aesthetic experience as complex: embodied, situated, and sensorially mediated (Berleant, 2010; Saito, 2010; Shusterman, 2012). Unlike Kantian-inspired philosophy, where experience

was considered autonomous and disinterested, these frameworks emphasize how aesthetic meaning emerges through the interaction between the perceiving subject and their material, social, and affective environment (cf. Lisiecka, 2025). Aesthetic experiences are no longer limited to art alone but extend to virtually all objects that can be perceived aesthetically (Nanay, 2019). In this sense, experience is not merely a predictable reaction to artwork but a constitutive mode of being-in-the-world (cf. Bourriaud, 2002; Naukkarinen, 2021).

Building on this understanding, aesthetic education can shift its focus from the transmitting knowledge about art to cultivating sensitivity through experience. What really matters is not only what students know about the canon, but how they perceive, sense, and interpret aesthetic phenomena as part of their everyday reality. The inquiry into *how* learners aesthetically experience their world becomes a methodological and ethical starting point for any pedagogical work that aspires to be transformative. As Fenner (2003) notes:

Aesthetic experiences, if we are to treat them as “raw data,” must be explored without pre-conception, prejudice, or limitation. And, truly enough, the vast majority of aesthetic experiences are not focused exclusively, in terms of their contents, on formal or simple-sensory matters. Aesthetic experiences are, first, experiences. They are complex things, having to do with things as tidy as the formal qualities of the object under consideration and with things as messy as whether one had enough sleep the night before, whether one just had a fight with his roommate, whether one is carrying psychological baggage that is brought to consciousness by this particular aesthetic object. (p. 41)

This reorientation challenges the transference-based model of teaching, replacing it with one centered on perceptual inquiry, embodied engagement, and reflective awareness (cf. Saito, 2021). It positions aesthetic learning as a process of attentional and affective formation rather than accumulation of cultural capital. By foregrounding the sensorial, emotional, ethical, and contextual dimensions of experience, such education opens space for diverse forms of aesthetic literacy – rooted in local environments, personal sensibilities, and collective experiences. Experience-oriented aesthetic education requires the teacher to cultivate this kind of openness, which Nanay (2019) terms “aesthetic humility.” Nanay writes:

We should always be aware of the cultural perspective that we occupy and treat our aesthetic evaluations with humility: as an evaluation made from a very specific cultural perspective. It is easy to be arrogant about aesthetics – maybe precisely because it matters so much to us personally. But this is all the more reason to be extra careful with our aesthetic evaluations. (p. 106).

An experience-oriented framework thus redefines the egalitarian promise of aesthetic education. It no longer seeks equality through shared access to canonical knowledge, but rather through recognition of multiple modes of perceiving and

making meaning (cf. Naukkarinen, 2021). In this view, aesthetic education becomes a practice of attentiveness – an invitation to notice, to feel, and to respond wisely. It teaches not merely how to *talk about art*, but also how to perceive aesthetically and act responsively within the world (cf. Saito, 2025).

Disobedient Pedagogies Meet Experience-Oriented Aesthetic Education

The intersection of experience-oriented aesthetic education and Atkinson's notion of disobedient pedagogies unfolds as a shared project of rethinking the epistemic and ethical conditions of learning. Both frameworks challenge the transmissive paradigm of education, reframing learning not as the acquisition of predefined knowledge but as a situated and unique event. What connects them is a belief that learning emerges within the unpredictable dynamics of experience – beyond the limits of prediction and instrumental purpose.

Atkinson's (2018) disobedient pedagogies conceive education as an adventure, where learning unfolds between individuals and the objects, ideas, and experiences they encounter, without readily predictable outcomes. Similarly, experience-oriented aesthetic education directs attention to students' inner life, which serve as the basis for educational activities, the results of which, for obvious reasons, cannot be fully anticipated. Both approaches share a commitment to accepting reality as it is: each student is unique, and each classroom is distinct. Consequently, educational goals and methods must be adapted to the context, guided by the overarching aim of supporting the student's holistic development. Both perspectives assume that there is no single version of reality and no *one-size-fits-all* approach to teaching and learning. Furthermore, they emphasize the importance of courage – both on the part of the teacher and the student – in taking responsibility and risks while exploring the world (cf. Holt, 2004).

The teacher's role in Atkinson's concept shifts from that of a traditional instructor to a facilitator. Rather than imposing fixed learning paths, the teacher creates conditions for student-led exploration, responds to individual learning styles, resists external pressures, and remains open to unexpected outcomes. Accordingly, in aesthetic education, teachers need to create environments that support diverse aesthetic experiences and encourage both personal and collective reflection on their cultural, social, and emotional dimensions. While accepting students' experiences as they are, teachers must also guide them through critical thinking and deeper analysis. As Zaňko (2020) emphasizes, a facilitator inspires students to create according to their own logic, as well as to question and challenge established norms and themselves.

Aesthetic education, inspired by the possibility of disobedience, can also incorporate other transformative strategies that emphasize performance and productive contradictions in the classroom (Miklitsch, 1994; Smith et al., 2017). Such approaches as punk pedagogies for instance, reflect a do-it-yourself (DIY) ethos, empowering

students to express genuine emotions and ideas while taking responsibility for their own acts of meaning-making. Although such methods carry risks – including disengagement or even clashes with institutional norms – they prioritize active, transformative learning over passive absorption (Miklitsch, 1994; cf. Gros, 2019).

Experience-oriented aesthetic education – whether more or less disobedient – requires a climate of mutual respect and openness. Such a space emerges through sustained, personal relationships between teachers and students. Without such a sense of safety, students are unlikely to open up and take intellectual or creative risks. Miklitsch (1994) notes that the primary challenge for anti-transference pedagogies lies in institutional structures. Bureaucratic systems, driven by efficiency and standardization, often constrain practices rooted in deep interpersonal connection, openness, uncertainty, and emotional engagement, reducing school relationships to transactions and leaving little room for genuine human engagement.

Despite these challenges, creating moments of pedagogical disobedience remains both possible and necessary. Slam poetry provides one such example within aesthetic education – a performative and dialogic space where students can explore alternative educational models. Through its DIY spirit, encouragement of expressive risk-taking, and emphasis on embodied reflection, slam poetry establishes a temporary space of freedom – an experimental moment in which students can reimagine what learning could be.

Poetry Slam

Poetry slam, as articulated by Gregory (2008), is a multifaceted phenomenon:

a movement, a philosophy, a form, a genre, a game, a community, an educational device, a career path, and a gimmick. It is a multi-faced creature that means many different things to many different people. At its simplest, slam is an oral poetry competition in which poets are expected to perform their own work in front of an audience. They are then scored on the quality of their writing and performance by judges who are typically randomly selected members of the audience. (p. 201)

Originating in the mid-1980s in working-class bars in Chicago, poetry slam was established by Marc Smith, a former construction worker, who aimed to offer an alternative to the exclusive and rigid poetry readings dominant in academic circles. From these local events, poetry slam developed into an international movement, offering a space where poetic expression intersects with performance, politics, and social engagement (Somers-Willett, 2014). At its essence, a poetry slam is a competition: poets perform their own work – never someone else's – within a limited time frame, typically around three minutes, and are evaluated by judges selected from the audience. Audience participation is active and immediate: reactions can include applause, booing, or other gestures, creating a dynamic interaction that shapes the event in real time.

Poetry slam is open to all, regardless of formal education or literary credentials, which makes it a democratic platform that challenges traditional literary hierarchies (Somers-Willett, 2009). Poetry slam constitutes a dynamic cultural practice that cultivates counterpublics – alternative discursive arenas wherein marginalized voices, including those of women, queer communities, economically disenfranchised individuals, and ethnic minorities, find space to articulate experiences and perspectives often silenced or overlooked within dominant cultural narratives (Somers-Willett, 2014). At the heart of this performative genre lies the poetics of identity: slam poets frequently adopt a first-person voice, weaving together corporeal presence, vocal expression, and gestural nuance to amplify the affective and rhetorical force of their performance. In this embodied mode of address, the poem transcends textual boundaries, becoming a site of political intervention and social critique. Thus, poetry slam emerges not merely as an artistic endeavor but as a form of engaged cultural resistance – an arena where aesthetic expression and political agency converge.

While related to spoken word and performance poetry, poetry slam is distinctive. Spoken word encompasses a broad multimodal practice that combines poetry, performance, music, and movement (Williams, 2018), and may take place in open mic settings or other informal venues. Poetry slam, as a subgenre of spoken word, adds a competitive structure and a countercultural edge, creating a social space where performance, critique, and political commentary converge. Both forms celebrate diversity and inclusivity, but poetry slam emphasizes competition, audience interaction, and the explicit expression of social dissent (Gregory, 2008; Williams, 2018). In sum, poetry slam exemplifies a hybrid cultural space where literature, performance, and social activism intersect. It challenges established hierarchies, democratizes poetic expression, and cultivates communities that value lived experience, identity, and dissent, all within a participatory performative framework. The practice engages multiple aesthetic modalities and their socio-cultural dimensions, making it particularly relevant for experience-oriented aesthetic education.

Poetry Slam as a Disobedient Pedagogy

Drawing on a growing body of research exploring creative and participatory approaches to learning, poetry slam has emerged as a compelling educational practice that redefines how learners engage with language, emotion, and creativity (Bagwell, 2021; Camangian, 2008; Rudd, 2012; Woodard & Coppola, 2018; Xerri, 2025). Unlike conventional classroom instruction based on textbooks and lectures, slam poetry draws on the performative power of personal narratives and emotional expression. It transforms the act of learning into a participatory and relational experience, where sharing stories in a live, interactive setting strengthens social bonds and cultivates a sense of belonging (Jones & Curwood, 2020). By inviting students to articulate their inner worlds through words, rhythm, voice, and

gesture, slam poetry nurtures their aesthetic sensitivity, linguistic awareness, and performative confidence in highly individualized ways. As Aravani and Daskolia (2025) note:

From an educational perspective, slam poetry holds significant potential. As a dynamic pedagogical tool, it bridges oral and written language, blending performance and literary expression. It fosters creative thinking, empowering students to synthesize ideas, address challenges, and approach problems innovatively. It may enhance their ability to construct meaning, expand ideas, and use metaphorical language (...). Teaching slam poetry through creative writing is argued to help students explore their emotions and express their thoughts openly, drawing upon their imagination, while also refining their linguistic skills and creativity (...). Slam poetry can cultivate agency, identity development, and social awareness among learners. (pp. 4-5)

Within the framework of disobedient pedagogies and experience-oriented education, poetry slam constitutes an alternative pedagogical space where uncertainty replaces predictability of institutional learning. The live stage introduces a condition of openness: outcomes cannot be predetermined, and reactions – whether of approval, silence, or resistance – are integral to the event. Such indeterminacy transforms the stage into a site of learning through encounter, where the affective and the intellectual coexist.

The absence of a “protective” structure typical of the classroom compels participants to negotiate real-time challenges – awkwardness, audience disengagement, misunderstanding, or even critique. This exposure transforms risk into an educational resource, cultivating adaptability, reflexivity, and sensitivity to social dynamics. Poetry slam thus functions as a laboratory of experiential learning in which knowledge arises from embodied participation rather than theoretical abstraction.

The practice also invites students to confront the aesthetical as well as ethical dimensions of expression. They must decide whether to align with audience expectations or to articulate dissenting, personal, or socially critical perspectives. The choice itself becomes pedagogically meaningful: it situates learning in the tension between conformity and autonomy. The moment of performance, fleeting and unstable, foregrounds temporality as an aesthetic and educational condition – learning happens in the immediacy of response, in the encounter between bodies, words, and affects.

Poetry slam often pushes participants beyond conventional linguistic, aesthetical, and artistic norms. The use of colloquial speech, irony, or taboo language destabilizes traditional hierarchies of taste and challenges dominant models of “appropriate” cultural expression. In this respect, the event exemplifies what Somers-Willett (2014) describes as the democratizing nature of slam – an insistence that poetic legitimacy emerges from lived experience rather than institutional validation. This is something the teacher must learn to navigate.

While poetry slam frequently celebrates authenticity and emotional directness, it simultaneously exposes the performative nature of self-expression. Authenticity may itself become a form of aesthetic strategy – a deliberate construction through which participants negotiate identity, vulnerability, and power. Rather than diminishing its educational value, this ambiguity extends it, allowing students to explore multiple modes of self-representation and to recognize expression as both personal and socially mediated.

Importantly, poetry slam generates a relational mode of learning. The collective atmosphere of the event – its call-and-response rhythm, its interplay of voices and gestures – creates a temporary community of shared attention. In this community, learning is dialogical and participatory; it occurs not in isolation but through co-presence and mutual responsiveness. The stage becomes a microcosm of democratic exchange, where artistic communication models civic engagement and the capacity to listen across differences.

Through its emphasis on risk, embodiment, and relationality, poetry slam aligns with Atkinson's (2018) notion of disobedient pedagogies as an adventure of learning – an open process in which meaning arises from interaction rather than transmission. It invites participants to inhabit uncertainty, to transform vulnerability into insight, and to reimagine education as a space of aesthetic and ethical becoming.

SUMMARY

This paper explores the intersection of Atkinson's (2018) notion of disobedient pedagogies and experience-oriented aesthetic education, situating poetry slam as a contemporary manifestation of their shared principles. Atkinson redefines learning as an open-ended adventure that resists predetermined criteria and instrumental approaches. The author's concept of pedagogies without criteria invites educators to embrace uncertainty, responsiveness, and experimentation, foregrounding the immanent value of learning events. Experience-oriented aesthetic education, informed by recent developments in everyday, relational, and environmental aesthetics, similarly shifts attention from knowledge transmission toward embodied, affective, and situated modes of engagement with the world, which can act as a medium for learning.

The paper argues that both frameworks challenge the conservative paradigm of aesthetic pedagogy rooted in canon and cultivation. Instead, it proposes a model of education grounded in perceptual inquiry, relationality, and openness. Learning is understood as an event of encounter – between the human and the non-human, the expected and the unforeseen – where knowledge emerges through participation rather than reproduction.

Within this theoretical framework, poetry slam is examined as a disobedient pedagogical tool that embodies the principles of experiential, performative, and democratic learning. Originating from grassroots, non-institutional spaces, poetry slam creates an alternative arena for aesthetic, linguistic, emotional, and social exploration. It transforms education into a relational event where risk, embodiment, and sensibility become sources of knowledge. The live, interactive format compels learners to navigate uncertainty, negotiate authenticity, and confront the ethical dimensions of expression. By privileging lived experience over institutional validation, slam poetry democratizes aesthetic participation and fosters agency, identity formation, and social awareness.

In this sense, poetry slam exemplifies the convergence of disobedient and experience-oriented pedagogies. Both of those pedagogies conceive education as an event of becoming, grounded in responsiveness, creativity, and ethical care. Together, they reimagine aesthetic education not as a reproduction of canonical forms but as a space of experimentation, dialogue, and transformation – an adventure of learning, in which learning itself becomes a form of aesthetic practice.

CONCLUSIONS

Of course, freedom lies at the heart of this pedagogical approach. Students are invited to decide whether to participate in a poetry slam, explore different modes of self-expression, and respond to audience reactions in real time. At the same time, the teacher exercises a reflective freedom, acting as a mentor who guides, supports exploration, and offers constructive feedback when appropriate. These freedoms are framed by principles of respect and democratic engagement, which inevitably create tension and require negotiation (cf. Naukkarinen, 2021). For many participants, slam functions as a therapeutic and reflective space (Williams, 2015), yet it does not shield them from critique; mutual respect encompasses both the right to voice differing perspectives and the responsibility to listen. Students may also choose to opt out of public evaluation, reinforcing agency and consent. In this context, a traditional grading system becomes largely irrelevant; instead, the emphasis is on collaboratively observing and reflecting on growth – subtle, incremental, or even systemically invisible – prioritizing meaningful development and the unfolding of potential over measurable outcomes.

REFERENCES

- Aravani, E., & Daskolia, M. (2025). Integrating literature and environmental education through slam poetry in school practice. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 1–33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19388071.2025.2496147>

- Atkinson, D. (2008). Pedagogy against the state. *International Journal of Art & Design Education*, 27(3), 226–240. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1476-8070.2008.00581.x>
- Atkinson, D. (2012). Contemporary art and art in education: The new, emancipation and truth. *International Journal of Art & Design Education*, 31(1), 5–18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1476-8070.2012.01724.x>
- Atkinson, D. (2018). *Art, disobedience, and ethics. The adventure of pedagogy*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bagwell, L. (2021). Write, speak, listen: Spoken word poetry as discussion. *The Social Studies*, 112(6), 271–280. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00377996.2021.1918616>
- Bean, E., & Brennan, K. (2014). Youth voices: Performance poetry as a platform for literacy, creativity, and civic engagement. *Journal of Applied Research on Children: Informing Policy for Children at Risk*, 5(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.58464/2155-5834.1197>
- Berleant, A. (2010). *Sensibility and sense: The aesthetic transformation of the human world*. Imprint Academic.
- Bourriaud, N. (2002). *Relational aesthetics*. Les presses du réel.
- Camangian, P. (2008). Untempered tongues: Teaching performance poetry for social justice. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 7(2), 35–55.
- Denac, O. (2014). The significance and role of aesthetic education in schooling. *Creative Education*, 5, 1714–1719. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/ce.2014.519190>
- D'Olimpio, L. (2022). Defending aesthetic education. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 70(3), 263–279. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2021.1960267>
- Green, B. N., Johnson, C. D., & Adams, A. (2006). Writing narrative literature reviews for peer reviewed journals: secrets of the trade. *Journal of Chiropractic Medicine*, 5(3), 101–117. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0899-3467\(07\)60142-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0899-3467(07)60142-6)
- Gregory, H. (2008). (Re) presenting ourselves: Art, identity, and status in UK poetry slam. *Oral Tradition*, 23(2), 201–217.
- Gros, F. (2019). *Nieposłuszeństwo*. Wydawnictwo Czarna Owca.
- Holt, J. (2004). *Instead of education. Ways to help people do things better*. Sentient Publications.
- Jones, K., & Curwood, J. S. (2020). Tell the story, speak the truth: Creating a third space through spoken word poetry. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 64(3), 281–289. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jaal.1080>
- Kirsh, C. F. (2011). Stories to yell: Using spoken word poetry in the literacy classroom. *Journal of Classroom Research in Literacy*, 4, 50–61.
- Kopčáková, S. (2018). Aesthetics education and its position in the 21st-century democratic society. *Ars Inter Culturas*, 7, 249–262.
- Lisiecka, A. (2025a). Art pedagogy, or perhaps aesthetic pedagogy instead? *Studia z Teorii Wychowania*, 1(50), 73–88. <https://doi.org/0000000300806314>
- Lisiecka, A. (2025b). Doświadczenie estetyczne Arnolda Berleanta w kontekście współczesnych rozważań nad relacją estetyczność – pedagogika. *Kwartalnik Pedagogiczny*, 70, 1(275), 7–26. <https://doi.org/10.31338/2657-6007.kp.2025-1>

- Miklitsch, R. (1994). Punk pedagogy or performing contradiction: The risks and rewards of anti-transference. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 16(1), 57–67. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1071441940160108>
- Nanay, B. (2019). *Aesthetics. A very short introduction*. Oxford University Press.
- Naukkarinen, O. (2021). Everyday aesthetics solving social problems. *ESPEs*, 10(2), 151–164.
- Rudd, L. L. (2012). Just slammin! Adolescents' construction of identity through performance poetry. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 55(8), 682–691. <https://doi.org/10.1002/JAAL.00083>
- Saito, Y. (2010). *Everyday aesthetics*. Oxford University Press.
- Saito, Y. (2021). The role of aesthetics in world-making. *Contemporary Aesthetics*, 9.
- Saito, Y. (2025). The role of aesthetic education in everyday life. Retrieved August 25, 2025, from <https://www.philosophy-of-education.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/PESGB-Saito.pdf>
- Shusterman, R. (2012). *Thinking through the body: Essays in somaesthetics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, G., Dines, M., Parkinson, T. (Eds.). (2017). *Punk pedagogies: Music, culture and learning*. Routledge.
- Smith, R. A. (2004). Aesthetic education: questions and issues. In E. W. Eisner & M. D. Day (Eds.), *Handbook of research and policy in art education* (pp. 163–185). Routledge.
- Somers-Willett, S. (2009). *The cultural politics of slam poetry: Race, identity, and the performance of popular verse in America*. University of Michigan Press.
- Somers-Willett, S. B. (2014). From slam to def poetry jam: spoken word poetry and its counterpublics. *Liminalities: A Journal of Performance Studies*, 10(3-4), 1–23.
- Sukhera, J. (2022). Narrative reviews: flexible, rigorous, and practical. *Journal of Graduate Medical Education*, 14(4), 414–417. <http://doi.org/10.4300/JGME-D-22-00480.1>
- Williams, W. R. (2015). Every voice matters: Spoken word poetry in and outside of school. *English Journal*, 104(4), 77–82. <https://doi.org/10.58680/ej201527046>
- Williams, W. R. (2018). Attempting arts integration: secondary teachers' experiences with spoken word poetry. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 13(2), 92–105. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1554480X.2018.1453817>
- Wojnar, I. (1995). *Teoria wychowania estetycznego. Zarys problematyki*. Wydawnictwo Żak.
- Woodard, R., & Coppola, R. (2018). More than words: Student writers realizing possibilities through spoken word poetry. *English Journal*, 107(3), 62–67. <https://doi.org/10.58680/ej201829468>
- Xerri, D. (2025). “Poetry is on its way back up”: a spoken word performer's contribution to young people's engagement with poetry. *Journal of Poetry Therapy*, 38(2), 115–127. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08893675.2024.2381620>
- Zańko, P. (2020). *Pedagogie oporu*. Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls.

NIEPOŚLUSZNE PEDAGOGIE W EDUKACJI ESTETYCZNEJ ZORIENTOWANEJ NA DOŚWIADCZENIE. PRZYKŁAD SLAMU POETYCKIEGO

Wprowadzenie: Artykuł analizuje związek między koncepcją nieposłusznych pedagogii Denisa Atkinsona a zorientowaną na doświadczenie edukacją estetyczną, wykorzystując slam poetycki jako przykład ilustrujący ich wspólny potencjał w kształtowaniu otwartego i niekonwencjonalnego uczenia się. Tekst kwestionuje tradycyjne ujęcia edukacji estetycznej, które uprzywilejowują wiedzę kanoniczną i biegłość techniczną, proponując zamiast tego podejście oparte na postkantowskim rozumieniu zaangażowania estetycznego jako ucieleśnionego i relacyjnego sposobu doświadczania świata.

Cel badań: Celem pracy jest przeanalizowanie, w jaki sposób nieposłuszne pedagogie łączą się z edukacją estetyczną zorientowaną na doświadczenie, wspierając uczenie się, które ma charakter dynamiczny, partycypacyjny i etyczny. Slam poetycki stanowi tu przykład praktyczny, ukazujący, w jaki sposób takie podejścia pedagogiczne mogą umożliwiać transformacyjne (estetyczne) doświadczenia poprzez nieprzewidywalność, ryzyko i relacyjne zaangażowanie.

Stan wiedzy: Koncepcja nieposłusznych pedagogii Atkinsona ujmuje uczenie się jako w dużej mierze nieprzewidywalne zdarzenie, które opiera się preskryptywnym standardom, sprzyjając eksploracji i wrażliwości na zróżnicowane style uczenia się. Edukacja estetyczna zorientowana na doświadczenie przesuwą uwagę z przekazywania wiedzy kulturowej ku zmysłowemu i społecznie osadzonym formom zaangażowania. Slam poetycki — zakorzeniony w demokratycznej i performatywnej praktyce — zachęca uczestników do konfrontowania się z niejednoznacznością, wspólnego konstruowania znaczeń oraz wyrażania indywidualności w ramach wspólnego (estetycznego) doświadczenia

Podsumowanie: Artykuł argumentuje, że integracja nieposłusznych pedagogii z edukacją estetyczną zorientowaną na doświadczenie prowadzi do rekontekstualizacji uczenia się jako procesu współtworzonego i antytransmisyjnego. Slam poetycki osadza ten proces w żywym doświadczeniu estetycznym, tworząc przestrzeń, w której uczący się angażują się intelektualnie, estetycznie i etycznie poprzez performans i dialog. Tak ujęta edukacja estetyczna staje się przestrzenią twórczego i etycznego stawania się.

Słowa kluczowe: nieposłuszne pedagogie, edukacja estetyczna zorientowana na doświadczenie, slam poetycki, zaangażowanie estetyczne, edukacja szkolna