Aesthetic Pedagogy as Emotional Architecture: A Conceptual Framework for B.Ed. Classrooms

Srijita Sarkar[1], Arpita Pal[2], Ratan Pramanick[3]

[1,2]Assistant Professor, Bhimpur Mohanananda College of Education, West Bengal, India

[3]Teacher-In-Charge, Bhimpur Mohanananda College of Education, West Bengal, India

ABSTRACT

Aesthetic dimensions of teacher education are frequently marginalized in favor of curriculum delivery and assessment, despite substantial evidence that learning environments significantly influence emotion, cognition, and professional identity. While existing research has examined learning environments and affective processes largely as separate domains, **few conceptual frameworks theorize their systematic integration within teacher education**. Addressing this gap, this conceptual paper advances the notion of **aesthetic pedagogy as emotional architecture**, proposing it as a unifying construct that explains how designed learning environments function as affective, cognitive, and identity-shaping structures in Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) classrooms.

Drawing on environmental psychology **(Evans, 2006; Barrett et al., 2015),** aesthetic education **(Eisner, 2002; Greene, 1995),** sociocultural theory **(Vygotsky, 1978),** affective neuroscience **(Immordino-Yang & Damasio, 2007),** and teacher identity research (Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009), the paper develops a five-dimensional conceptual framework comprising spatial aesthetics, visual culture, multimodal creative practice, emotional climate, and professional identity formation. The framework theorizes **emotional climate as a mediating mechanism** linking aesthetic design and pedagogical practice to the formation of professional dispositions. By conceptualizing aesthetic pedagogy as a foundational emotional infrastructure rather than a decorative enhancement, the paper contributes a theoretically generative model for understanding how teacher education environments sustain emotion, meaning-making, and identity development. Implications are discussed for curriculum design, institutional policy, and future empirical research in teacher education.

Keywords: aesthetic pedagogy; emotional architecture; teacher education; learning environments; professional identity.

INTRODUCTION

Despite growing scholarly attention to social-emotional learning, reflective practice, and teacher well-being, teacher education research continues to **under-theorize the material, spatial, and aesthetic conditions through which emotions are structured, regulated, and sustained**. Much of the existing literature approaches emotion as an individual psychological variable—managed through strategies, dispositions, or competencies—while treating learning environments as neutral backdrops rather than as active pedagogical agents. At the same time, outcomes-driven and accountability-oriented models of teacher education have reinforced instrumental conceptions of teaching, privileging technical competence and measurable performance over the affective, imaginative, and ethical dimensions of professional formation. As a result, the emotional work of becoming a teacher is frequently acknowledged but insufficiently anchored in the designed environments that shape everyday experience, belonging, and meaning-making in teacher education classrooms. This conceptual gap limits the field's capacity to explain how pedagogical values are embodied, internalized, and later reproduced in professional practice.

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

Environmental Psychology and Learning Spaces

Environmental psychology establishes that physical features such as lighting, color, spatial organization, and materiality influence attention, stress regulation, and social interaction **(Evans, 2006; Küller et al., 2009).** Empirical studies demonstrate that well-designed classrooms enhance engagement, well-being, and learning outcomes **(Barrett et al., 2015).** Conversely, visually sterile and rigid teacher education spaces may implicitly reinforce instrumental views of teaching.

Aesthetic Education and Imagination

Theorists of aesthetic education argue that aesthetic experience refines perception, imagination, and emotional awareness. **Eisner (2002)** contends that engagement with the arts cultivates sensitivity to nuance and judgment, while **Greene (1995)** emphasizes the role of imagination in fostering empathy and ethical responsibility. These capacities are central to humane teaching but remain underdeveloped in many teacher education programs.

Sociocultural Mediation and Meaning-Making

From a sociocultural perspective, learning is mediated through culturally situated tools and symbols **(Vygotsky, 1978).** Visual artifacts, spatial arrangements, and aesthetic representations function as mediational means that communicate institutional values and shape shared meanings within learning communities. In teacher education, such cues influence how pre-service teachers conceptualize the nature and purpose of teaching.

Emotion, Cognition, and Regulation

Affective neuroscience underscores the inseparability of emotion and cognition. Emotional states influence attention, decision-making, and memory **(Immordino-Yang & Damasio, 2007). Fredrickson's (2013)** broaden-and-build theory further suggests that positive emotional climates expand cognitive flexibility and resilience. Aesthetic coherence and sensory balance therefore play a critical role in emotional regulation within demanding professional programs.

Teacher Identity Formation

Teacher identity is shaped through sustained emotional, social, and reflective experiences **(Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009).** Aesthetic encounters encourage pre-service teachers to conceptualize teaching as relational, creative, and ethically grounded, influencing their future pedagogical practices **(Flores & Day, 2006).**

Positioning Emotional Architecture Among Related Constructs

Research on learning environments, school climate, social-emotional learning (SEL), and the hidden curriculum has significantly advanced understanding of how contextual factors influence educational experience. Studies of learning environments have primarily focused on physical design variables—such as lighting, acoustics, and spatial configuration—and their effects on engagement and achievement **(Barrett et al., 2015).** School and classroom climate research, meanwhile, has emphasized interpersonal relationships, norms, and perceptions of safety and belonging **(Steele, 2010).** Social-emotional learning frameworks have further contributed by conceptualizing emotional competence as a set of individual skills to be developed through instruction and intervention **(Fredrickson, 2013).**

While these bodies of work offer valuable insights, they tend to remain **analytically segmented**, addressing space, emotion, and pedagogy as parallel or loosely connected domains. The concept of **emotional architecture** is introduced in this paper to address this fragmentation by theorizing the *designed environment itself*—material, visual, and aesthetic—as an active affective infrastructure that organizes emotional experience over time. Unlike school climate, which is often measured perceptually, emotional architecture foregrounds

how spatial and aesthetic arrangements *structure* emotional regulation and interaction. Unlike SEL, which locates emotion primarily within individual competencies, emotional architecture emphasizes the relational and environmental conditions through which emotions are elicited, sustained, and normalized. Similarly, whereas the hidden curriculum highlights implicit value transmission, emotional architecture specifies the aesthetic and sensory mechanisms through which such values are embodied and internalized.

By positioning emotion not solely as a psychological state but as an environmentally mediated pedagogical phenomenon, emotional architecture extends existing constructs and offers a theoretically integrative lens for understanding how teacher education environments shape affect, meaning-making, and professional identity formation. This positioning enables a more precise analysis of how pedagogical values become materially embedded in teacher education spaces and subsequently reproduced in future classroom practice.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: AESTHETIC PEDAGOGY AS EMOTIONAL ARCHITECTURE

The proposed framework conceptualizes B.Ed. classrooms as emotional architectures constituted through five interrelated yet analytically distinct dimensions:

1. **Spatial Aesthetics** – physical and sensory design of learning spaces;
2. **Visual Culture** – symbolic representations and visual narratives;
3. **Multimodal Creative Practice** – engagement through artistic and embodied modes;
4. **Emotional Climate**—the shared affective atmosphere mediating learning;
5. **Professional Identity Formation**—internalization of pedagogical values and dispositions.

The model positions emotional climate as a mediating dimension linking environmental design and pedagogical practice with professional identity development.

Methodological Positioning of the Conceptual Review

This paper adopts an **integrative, theory-building conceptual review** approach rather than a systematic or meta-analytic review. The literature was purposively selected to represent influential and widely cited scholarship across environmental psychology, aesthetic education, sociocultural theory, affective neuroscience, and teacher identity research. Selection criteria emphasized conceptual relevance, theoretical rigor, and the capacity of sources to illuminate relationships among space, emotion, pedagogy, and professional formation, rather than exhaustive coverage. The proposed framework is situated within an intellectual lineage that draws on Dewey an and post-Dewey a traditions of aesthetic experience **(Eisner, 2002; Greene, 1995),** sociocultural mediation **(Vygotsky, 1978),** and contemporary affective science **(Immordino-Yang & Damasio, 2007**), extending these perspectives by foregrounding the material and aesthetic organization of learning environments. Through this synthesis, the paper advances emotional architecture as a generative theoretical construct for rethinking aesthetic pedagogy in teacher education.

DIMENSIONS OF THE MODEL

Spatial Aesthetics

Spatial aesthetics refer to classroom layout, lighting, color, and materiality. Flexible seating arrangements promote collaboration and dialogue **(Gillies, 2016),** while access to natural light and balanced color palettes supports emotional calm and focus **(Küller et al., 2009).** Such environments model pedagogical values that pre-service teachers may later reproduce in their own classrooms.

Visual Culture

Visual culture encompasses images, displays, and artifacts that communicate cultural values and inclusivity. Purposeful visual representation supports belonging and psychological safety **(Hooks, 1994; Steele, 2010).**

Aesthetic pedagogy emphasizes intentional design rather than decorative excess; as visual clutter can undermine emotional clarity.

Multimodal Creative Practice

Multimodal practices such as drawing, collage, drama, and music enable pre-service teachers to externalize tacit beliefs and emotions. Arts-based reflection extends metacognition beyond text-based modes and supports pedagogical imagination **(Eisner, 2002; Sinner et al., 2006).**

Emotional Climate

Emotional climate refers to the collective affective tone emerging from interactions, pedagogy, and environment. Calm, aesthetically coherent spaces support emotional regulation, while collaborative creative activities foster trust and belonging **(Fredrickson, 2013).** Exposure to beauty and natural elements has also been shown to reduce stress **(Ulrich et al., 1991).**

Professional Identity Formation

Through sustained exposure to aesthetic pedagogy, pre-service teachers internalize teaching as an ethical, relational, and creative practice. The emotional architectures they experience shape the learning environments they later construct as professionals **(Flores & Day, 2006).**

IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

The framework suggests several implications for B.Ed. programs. First, institutional infrastructure should be designed to support emotional and aesthetic engagement as a pedagogical priority. Second, curriculum design should integrate aesthetic pedagogy and arts-based reflection across courses. Third, faculty development initiatives should cultivate aesthetic literacy and emotional design competence among teacher educators. Finally, assessment practices may incorporate multimodal portfolios and reflective artifacts alongside conventional examinations.

LIMITATIONS AND CONTEXTUAL CONSIDERATIONS

Limitations and Critical Considerations

As a conceptual contribution, this paper does not present original empirical data, and the proposed framework requires systematic empirical testing across diverse teacher education contexts. Beyond this limitation, several critical considerations warrant attention. First, aesthetic pedagogy and emotional architecture are inevitably shaped by **relations of power, access, and institutional inequality**. Decisions about spatial design, visual representation, and material resources are often constrained by funding structures, policy mandates, and hierarchical governance, which may reproduce inequities between well-resourced and under-resourced teacher education institutions. Without critical reflexivity, aesthetic interventions risk privileging dominant cultural norms while marginalizing alternative aesthetic traditions and ways of knowing.

Second, there is a risk that aesthetic pedagogy may be **misappropriated as decorative enhancement or symbolic compliance**, particularly within accountability-driven systems. Superficial aestheticization—such as visually appealing spaces without corresponding pedagogical depth—may obscure rather than transform inequitable or emotionally impoverished learning conditions. In such cases, aesthetics function as spectacle rather than as a meaningful pedagogical architecture, limiting their capacity to support emotional regulation, ethical reflection, or professional growth.

Finally, the framework cautions against **aestheticization without pedagogy**, wherein attention to beauty, creativity, or ambiance is detached from critical teaching practices and relational engagement. Emotional architecture is not neutral; it must be intentionally aligned with inclusive pedagogy, reflective practice, and dialogic learning. Failure to integrate aesthetic design with pedagogical purpose risks reinforcing passive

consumption rather than cultivating agency, imagination, and professional responsibility among pre-service teachers.

These limitations underscore the necessity of **context-sensitive, ethically grounded, and critically informed applications** of aesthetic pedagogy. Future research and practice must attend not only to what is aesthetically designed, but also to who designs, whose values are represented, and how emotional architectures serve—or fail to serve—equitable teacher education.

DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Future empirical research may examine the relationship between aesthetic pedagogy and teacher resilience, compare emotionally rich and emotionally neutral B.Ed. classrooms, investigate longitudinal effects on professional identity, explore cross-cultural interpretations of aesthetic values, and develop measurement tools for emotional architecture.

CONCLUSION

Conceptualizing aesthetic pedagogy as emotional architecture reframes learning environments as active pedagogical agents in teacher education. Aesthetic choices shape emotional regulation, belonging, creativity, and professional identity. By intentionally designing emotionally and aesthetically nourishing B.Ed. classrooms, teacher education can cultivate reflective, empathetic, and resilient educators. Aesthetic pedagogy, therefore, constitutes not an optional enrichment but a foundational architecture for meaningful and humane teaching.

REFERENCES

1. Barrett, P., Zhang, Y., Moffat, J., & Kobbacy, K. (2015). A holistic, multi-level analysis identifying the impact of classroom design on pupils' learning. Building and Environment, 89, 118–133.
2. Beauchamp, C., & Thomas, L. (2009). Understanding teacher identity: An overview of issues in the literature and implications for teacher education. Cambridge Journal of Education, 39(2), 175–189.
3. Eisner, E. W. (2002). The arts and the creation of mind. Yale University Press.
4. Evans, G. W. (2006). Child development and the physical environment. Annual Review of Psychology, 57, 423–451.
5. Flores, M., & Day, C. (2006). Contexts that shape and reshape new teachers' identities: A multi-perspective study. Teaching and Teacher Education, 22(2), 219–232.
6. Fredrickson, B. L. (2013). Positive emotions broaden and build. Oxford University Press.
7. Gaines, R. E., & Chang, M.-L. (2025). Teachers' emotional appraisals and the reframing of student change in post-pandemic schools. Frontiers in Education.
8. Gillies, R. M. (2016). Cooperative learning: Review of research and practice. Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 41(3), 39–54.
9. Greene, M. (1995). Releasing the Imagination: Essays on Education, the Arts, and Social Change. Jossey-Bass.
10. Hooks, b. (1994). Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom. Routledge.
11. Immordino-Yang, M. H., & Damasio, A. (2007). We feel, therefore we learn: The relevance of affective and social neuroscience to education. Mind, Brain, and Education, 1(1), 3–10.
12. Küller, R., Mikellides, B., & Janssens, J. (2009). Color, arousal, and performance. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 29(1), 76–85.
13. Ma, Y., Zhang, X., & Chen, L. (2024). Emotional tensions in identity transition from teachers to teacher educators: voices from early-career teacher educators. Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education.
14. Sinner, A., Leggo, C., Irwin, R., Gouzouasis, P., & Grauer, K. (2006). Arts-based educational research. The International Journal of Education & the Arts, 7(5), 1–20.
15. Steele, C. (2010). Whistling Vivaldi: How stereotypes affect us and what we can do. W. W. Norton.

16. Tao, J., Xu, Y., Wang, S., & Gao, X. (2025). The emotions of language teachers: A systematic review of studies between 2015 and 2024. Language Teaching.

17. Ulrich, R. S., Simons, R. F., Losito, B. D., & Fiorito, E. (1991). Stress recovery during exposure to natural and urban environments. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 11(3), 201–230.

18. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Harvard University Press.

19. Wulandari, D. (2025). Exploring novice teachers' emotions in post-pandemic digital classrooms. Journal of Educational Innovation and Research.