

Archived version from NCDOCKS Institutional Repository <http://libres.uncg.edu/ir/asu/>



## **Drawn and Quartered: Reflections on Violence in Youth's Art Making**

By: **Victoria Grube**

No Abstract Available

**Grube, Victoria** (2012) "Drawn and Quartered: Reflections on Violence in Youth's Art Making" *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 46(2): 25-35 (summer 2012). (ISBN: 0221-8510).  
Version Of Record Available From [www.jhu.edu](http://www.jhu.edu)

## Drawn and Quartered: Reflections on Violence in Youth's Art Making

---

VICTORIA J. GRUBE

Two eleven-year-old boys face a bulletin board, arranging silver thumbtacks into shapes of fighter planes. They have arrived early for an after-school puppet workshop. Both boys are under five feet tall: the thin one sports a green terrycloth wristband and a big fro. "The girls like the poof," he says. The other boy has a fuller body, a haircut similar to the Fab Four in the late sixties, and wears wide-leg jeans and a red t-shirt that brushes his kneecaps. The boys talk while puncturing the corkboard with tacks.

I like this game. It's Star Miner. There's this thing. It's a ship that looks like this. The other ships are too detailed.

You try and blow up a jet thingy, it spirals and can catch on fire.

The evil dude's head has like big tire marks on it. The only difference between him and other villains is he has a sash thingy that are like badges. He used to be good but in his world if a good person kills an evil person that sash will clamp to his arm and infect him with an evil virus that will go through his veins. First it goes to his hand and makes his fingernails long and sharp. His arm is not completely infected. This part's really scary: his eye is infected with it. His base on his planet is shaped like that symbol on the sash. There's an X through the center where it intersects with a laser. This thing shoots it up into this laser and generates a big force field around it. It's electrified. Even if you get a foot from it, it will shoot a lightning bolt and zap you.

The boys' play revolves around the action video game, its language, strategies, heroes, villains, obstacles, and continual updates. They know which video games their friends have and who among their classmates are not into techno games. Says the boy sporting the poof, "Randy doesn't

like video games. He's into mythology and the Loch Ness monster." The boys' favorite television program is *Mythbusters*, which proves or disproves rumors such as "tooth fillings can pick up radio signals," and "tanning booths can cook your internal organs." Mutual beliefs arising from video games and television act as bonding agent among boys of this age and shape their identities.

As an after-school art teacher and student-teacher supervisor, the contact I have with young artists exposes me to the screenager culture. I observe youth freely telling stories and acting out violent scenarios that appropriate the composition, language, and narrative aspects of video games. Their art making is in sharp contrast to traditional school art, where the teacher's cautious aesthetic, the template for art production, is fabricated, uniform, and removed. The adult agenda often silences the youths whose art making must mimic the teacher's model, or in reaction to this teacher-mandated scribing, the art making of youth resembles avoidance behavior or causes disruption. As the teacher in an after-school drawing club, with the opportunity for spontaneous, non-adult-directed drawing, I observe drawing that is violent physicality in narrative—a fantastical, repulsive, aggressive imagery heavily influenced by images promoted through electronic media that permeates the language, drawings, and narratives of the youth.

Observing the boys' extreme preoccupation with violence motivated me to pursue a qualitative study where as teacher and researcher I would reflect on the authentic art making of postmodern youth through my historical position as a boomer-generation art teacher. While I feel isolated from the lure of the video game, I do share with the youth some cultural memory and the crush of consumerism.

## Methodology

To reflect on the fullness of media influence and the violence in the art making, I chose a *mystory* methodology in which contemporary discourse is built on multiple realities.<sup>1</sup> Writing from this position, I can better understand the impact of cyberspace and violence through micro- and macro-levels of analysis.<sup>2</sup> The *mystory* methodology is "always specific to its composer . . . [and] brings into relation your experience with three levels of discourse—personal (autobiography), popular (community stories, oral history, or popular culture), expert (disciplines of knowledge)."<sup>3</sup> Narrative, observation, interview, textual and electronic sources, and autobiography were used to gather data. The context was in a local after-school program in which the youths were well acquainted with the space and each other. Over a period of three years, I observed violent themes in the drawings of the nine- to thirteen-year-old boys who attended drawing club weekly. While my relationship with the young artists was relaxed and nonprescriptive, I was aware of my innate position of power as teacher.

To know and to learn about others is never a solitary act. It implies relationship.<sup>4</sup> Because the questions I research depend upon the engagement with the otherness of the youth, I believe it important to reflect on and recognize my own biases. Recognizing diverse views, examining them alongside the levels of discourse, the mystery methodology, contextual in nature, applies well to my research. Acknowledging research to be interpretative, textural, and relevant, a mystery methodology—whether or not providing definitive explanations—could imply directions for further investigation.

My intuitions and my reactions did not always intersect. I found the youth challenged with *gramatica jocosa*, poking fun at formal norms of propriety<sup>5</sup> and simultaneously were both accessible and hilarious. Their violent drawings were narratives of insurmountable problems, like an isolated swimmer being attacked by a shark, or exotic diagrams, like the shark's pathway as it dodges bombs and torpedoes. Their energy was laced with ribald humor that in Deleuzian nomenclature was *jouissance* or "a positive sense of desire."<sup>6</sup> Lacan describes *jouissance* as a paradoxical satisfaction, pleasurable eruption or a fascination coupled with a fear a vulnerability, or a risk that makes the enjoyment more pleasurable and can provide an avoidance.<sup>7</sup> My motivation to look at the violent narratives more closely was a concern that underneath this *jouissance* was a recklessness and a disregard that would bulldoze empathy and levy disrespect for others.

The two boys who stood at the bulletin board are joined by two more. The foursome sit around a table sketching. The boy with the poof draws Mario; another asks me, "Can you draw The Thing from the Fantastic Four, I think its impossible." A third announces to the table, "Hannah Montana needs to go die in a hole."

The Mario scene has agents parachuting to the Mario and the Luigi buildings. "Mario's army is fighting Luigi's army. They're shooting fire balls."

The fourth adds, "Sports are the only way I bond with my dad—cricket and soccer. I think I'll draw something evil today."

The third boy describes his battle scene, "These guys are attacking the castle and there's lots of blood pouring out of everyone. My favorite part of the drawing is the guy in the lower left, shot with an arrow, falling off a horse, blood pouring out of him."

I overhear a new arrival—a very young boy—tell another, "My dad does not like Barney. He says it's just a way for a company to make a dollar. So I was watching it once and he came in and turned it off."

I was first drawn to the boys' fantastical energy. I felt an embodied emotionality in the presence of the boys' images of killing sprees and the mangling of limbs while harboring a growing doubt that their behavior was productive to learning.<sup>8</sup> As I watched their faces, the boys were engaged and energetic, their humor unleashed. Perhaps this raucousness was a crucial foil to poke fun at their past innocence, a bravado maturity to guffaw

at danger, or possibly a self dare to imagine grotesque as miraculous. I observed peer bonding in the mutual appreciation of the violent. The images became a shared language that appeared to form a cultural group.

The pencil and paper reconstruction of violent action games, a common occurrence in the after-school drawing club, proved to support friendships; boys were accepting of others' contributions and even looked for peer audiences. When combined with art making, the shared text built community. My long-term, close relationship with the after-school artists affected how I grew to see their violent images. Their collaged drawings and stories were interpretations of teletechnologies. I overheard phrases such as, "One lucky person can bring this home!" and "The car should be equipped with an ice bucket and NPR." The young artists disrupted and reconstructed themes from their favorite music as well as movies, games, and advertising. While the images depicted terror, parodies, and buffoonery, the skill to comment on the larger culture involved creative understanding and critical thinking. In the avid concoction of garish narratives appropriated from visual and the political culture, the after-school workshop provided everyone a space to piece together the disparity of cultural meaning.

## **Turbulence**

In recent years the concept of childhood has been recognized as "socially and historically determined."<sup>9</sup> The postmodernist's perception consists of conflicting fragments built from ongoing screen stories. For example, the media projects glamorous but disturbing images of toddler beauty pageants with backstage child contestants resembling Dolly Parton, while HBO's *The Wire* broadcasts stories of impoverished preadolescents selling crack. In contrast to the romantic version of childhood is an image from Marlene Dumas's MOMA show, *Give People What They Want* (2010). A small canvas depicts a naked adolescent girl standing, facing the viewer, holding open a towel, revealing herself. With breasts budding, the naked youth is developing sexual features and invites the viewer to share her body. The child's facial expression is one of resignation. Explored through the medium of paint, Dumas offers an insight into the confusing dichotomy of how the child is represented in current society. This painting illustrates the power of the image to disrupt or to confirm beliefs and the realization that the body, sexuality, and youth have become fetishized in postmodern culture. The modernist notion of the innocence of childhood acts as a tension point rubbing against a postmodern preoccupation with youth: a desire and a repulsion of that desire.<sup>10</sup> Dumas shows this "new" construct in a haunting portraiture.

I overhear third-grade girls discuss how Michael Jackson "used tape to get his nose up like that," and "Kennedy's brains flew across the car seat

when his head exploded." Contemporary society clings to a nostalgia about childhood that is reassuring but inconsistent. The young artists inhabit a culture that portrays children both as objects of desire or as innocent youth, evident in the public school's resistance to enter into discussions with children on popular culture, the broad nature of diversity, and political and social practices.<sup>11</sup> Perhaps the oppositional tension between the mixed cultural messages intertwined with obedience to authority, an intoxicating media blitz, and peer acceptance sets a climate for this preoccupation with violent imagery.

As a student-teaching supervisor, I witness public school art teachers drawing geometric shapes on the chalkboard, demonstrating how to add shadows, and shouting, "There are the answers; now you do it." As the teacher's drumbeat fills the room, the youths' voices are silenced. Isn't this negating of another's aesthetic an act of violence? Devoid of real risk taking or polyphonus voices, public school art offers conformity, artificiality, and a narrow set of options to solve problems.

The art teacher demonstrates to second graders how to draw a farm landscape using a formulaic method. It is a linear method editing out innovation and difference. The small boy studies the teacher's marks and traces a field of sheep. Yet, left on their own to create drawings, children will sketch characters and plots from popular culture. The public school script is written for a different child, one removed from real emotion and experience, a young scribe who copies the path to enlightenment. Rare is the school discussion of race relations, gender and economic prejudices, death, ecological fears, or abandonment. Rarer is the chance to become transformed.

### **This Is Our Youth**

A boy searches the Pandora website, and Linkin Park's lyrics of teen angst play on the tinny computer speakers. A large sheet of white paper ten feet long and three feet wide is tacked on the bulletin board. The twelve after-school youth sit cross-legged on a piece of carpet. This is the first meeting of a puppet workshop. Many of the youth also had been in Drawing Club. I ask the question, "What are you worried about?" Almost everyone chooses air pollution. I suggest this be the tension in the story. A tall boy suggests, "How about a mountain of garbage that smothers commuters?" Another offers, "Let's have aliens that drive gigantic garbage trucks." A boy wearing a red bandana tied around his forehead gestures, "I think we need a radiating crystal skull that aliens use to find pollution in the galaxy" (*Indiana Jones and the Crystal Skull* had just been released). With intense concentration, the boy pantomimes death beams and adjusts his scarf as it slips to one side. His younger brother stands alongside, throws his arms above his head and says, "Kerblloom! Life on earth ends in destruction."

I write all these suggestions on the white paper wall using a wide tipped colored marker. I forget how to spell "boar," and a boy in the back corrects me.

Giant pollution gun destroys the earth  
Wild ~~boar~~ boar  
An invisible idiot sidekick  
A chicken is hit on the head with pollution  
Falling from the sky  
The chicken must die  
Nuke  
Chik-fil-A  
Evil rabid  
Giant monster eats the entire Earth  
Aliens?  
Chicken has a pet lizard  
Giant moles eat the Earth from the Inside  
Pollution could push them off the earth  
Rabid 2.0  
Death to Clockwerk  
Kill the chicken

I suggest we tie this narrative together as an alien "Chicken Little" piece. This goes over well. Two boys walk to the large paper and begin illustrating the text. The tall boy draws an enormous owl that he dubs Clockwerk. Most want a villain giant mole in the play, and the tall boy transitions his diabolical owl into a mole partnership, writing: "Clockwerk-giant robot owl boss of giant mole." Other youth draws and labels the following:

falcons  
a wild boar armed with a hatchet  
bunny rabbits on earth movers  
a cyclops alien in a spaceship trailing a vacuum cleaner hose with a broom attachment  
an enormous gap-toothed idiot-eyed bunny armed with a toilet plunger ray gun  
robots with epaulettes and recycle symbols on their breast plates  
small evil-eyed bunnies  
an owl with talons steeled for attack

The narrative disintegrates into a fractured collection of images until one boy cries that the protagonist chicken should die at the end. I am confused. Wasn't the chicken a hero? Doesn't the death of the hero imply that good does not triumph over evil? As the teacher isn't it my job to instill positive beliefs into the minds of the students? The boys chant, "The chicken has to die! The chicken has to die!" I try to change the subject, "How does the chicken die?"

"AK 47s!" is the shout from the crowd. Again I feel the gaze of the Institution. I plead, "Why must the chicken die?" The resounding cry, "She

brought this on herself!" followed by uproarious laughter. As the teacher/collaborator, I try to avoid censoring any ideas but read the enthusiasm as the rottenness of mob rule. I suggest a compromise, "Let's let the chicken live, and I will serve fried chicken at the reception."

I drove home from the workshop feeling like a fraud. Why didn't I allow their ending of death? I thought I was respectful of children's authentic art making, but I was as dangerous as every other teacher. By censoring their decisions, I detached art from personal meaning. I did not recognize their work as creative and important.<sup>12</sup> The youth were assimilating what they had decoded through the media of video games, television, advertising, movies, and the Internet to build a narrative, while I was feeling pressure to keep the story tasteful, hopeful, and placid. They were engaged and challenging while I became an actor of the Institution that spoke through me. I was performing an identity that was paranoiac, distancing, and clichéd.

I carefully reviewed the list to compare the images with broader references. Located in the social and the personal, a particular space and time of the storytellers, these narratives evidence the youth's awareness of military power, fast food, assault weapons, science fiction, domesticity, pets, and video action games. With little trouble, the boys juxtaposed diverse meanings to make unorthodox intertextual collage images. As an outsider, I took their rapid-fire combinations of images at face value. Derrida describes "aporia" as an inextricable interior repugnance—or the questioning of the truth of all knowledge.<sup>13</sup> However, like Tobin's conclusions on children and media, I found the youth's texts incoherent—*not coherent*—until I deconstructed them.<sup>14</sup> For example, the boy's idea to "kill the chicken," and the group chant, appeared not to make sense. Why would the boy want his hero dead? Until I viewed this action from various vantage points and considered other meanings, the perplexing death and chant, "The chicken has to die! The chicken has to die!" was troubling.

Then, however, I reflected on the broader context, beyond what I observed in the room. I was an outsider and, due to this status, the idea to kill the chicken and the crowd's chant were an enthymeme, "a form of syllogism one of whose premises is not expressed but assumed."<sup>15</sup> The boy depended on his audience to share the implications of the enthymeme. My ear, as an outsider, heard "kill! kill!" while the boys perhaps heard "Down with Disney!"

With this in mind I deconstructed the youths' script writing, which began with the structure and characters of a summer Disney cartoon, *Chicken Little*. Some of their decisions followed the script, but there was a point of departure where their *jouissance* lampooned the cartoon innocence. This kynicism,<sup>16</sup> or the "popular, plebian rejection of the official culture by means of irony and sarcasm,"<sup>17</sup> ridiculed the notion that the child is naïve and innocent and the accompanying banality this implies for youth.



It seems the chicken's death, in their narrative, was a mockery of Disney ideology, which perpetuates the image of the child as extremely trusting, powerless, and vulnerable. The prevalence of weapons in the boys' textual collage reads as a cynicism of the insipid features of children's movies. From a postmodern perspective, multiple meanings are possible, and though I cannot be positive about my interpretation, this reading of the boys' story follows the concept that art making is a site where multiple meanings are explored.

### **The Boys Are Back**

Twenty children ages eight to thirteen are drawing in their sketchbooks. On the center of the tables, rolls of masking tape, extra pencils, and pieces of cardboard are scattered. Seven older boys are sitting apart from the larger group drawing tiny action figures with captions like "Don't kill me," "Hi I'm ugly," "Your bum tastes good," "Stop licking my butt, snotnose," "I hate myself—life isn't worth it," "Sex and the City." Other drawings are of a tiny plane dropping a bomb over a city with "There's Tokyo" as a title; Pac man kissing Pac woman; a portrait of a smoking Ozzy Osborne titled *Prince of Darkness* with the nametag, "Hello! My name is Ozzy." An older boy uses masking tape to tie his legs together and to wrap his waist. He starts hopping.

"Sit on that chair," says one boy, "and we'll tape you to it." Soon the boy is bound. Another tapes a digital wall clock to the confined boy's chest.

Someone cries, "We need a timer," and a boy appears with a plastic bell timer taped to a small cardboard box and draws instructions on it. That is also taped to the seated boy. Several try to tape his mouth, but he says "No," and they stop. The taped boy is delighted. A five year old finds a thick silver piece of sculpture wire that he struggles to bend around the chair leg, clearly a fuse.

"How did you know about fuses?" I ask the smaller boy, aware that he is home schooled, which I assume is to shelter him from real life.

"I can't say the name. I'm not supposed to know." I ask the boys how they know about hostages and bombs. They begin to make tape grenades.

"CSI Miami," is the answer. The boys return to drawing, and I ask the captive if he wants to be released. "Yes," he replies. The younger boys peel him loose.

The violent narratives of the youth illustrate how performance can disrupt cultural beliefs. In this case, the image of the child as innocent is critiqued through the boys' transgressive performances that are narrative, risky, bloody, horrific, interactive, and diverse. Both the boys' drawn narratives and their terrorist performance scrutinize society's romanticized identity of childhood, a facile concept that is comforting and uncomplicated. This is a naïve belief, but I still found the young boys' reenactment of

an intense CSI Miami scene shocking. What does this violence say about how children think of themselves? Does the depiction of capture, power, and violence suggest the boys are curious or tantalized by the gruesome? Or is the collaborative play of ingenuity, reflection, collective memory, and shared improvisation a more apt analysis of the performance? Is the choice to exaggerate this potentially horrifying scene best understood as social commentary, an enthusiasm for extreme emotion, or freemasonry through the dramatic? How much violence is too much?

Despite the smart CSI parody, which validated the youth as cultural producers, and regardless of the importance of spontaneous art making to construct personal meaning,<sup>18</sup> my inability to frame the violence produced a scotoma, and, as Sartre describes, “overwhelms and reduces me to shame.”<sup>19</sup> While a personal relationship with the boys assured me of their genuine kindness and empathy toward others, our culture and its codified norms tugged against the *jouissance* I observed in the boys’ art making.

Perhaps I am committing an act of violence by silencing these discourses? If so, my hand wringing should overlook the violence in the parody and see the rupture between the media message and the boys’ interpretation as a site for transformation.<sup>20</sup> As the residue of visual culture infiltrates the daily lives of the students—the artificial and the natural, the crisis and the humdrum, the predictable and the freakish, the pedantic and the random—teaching must begin to engage what happens outside the classroom.<sup>21</sup> The boys’ drawn and dramatic enactments or “art of the present moment”<sup>22</sup> acts as a critique of violence and excess that they have witnessed through a plethora of media.

The boys’ performance and drawings are re-creations emerging from a desire to know. By re-creating, reenvisioning from scraps of memory, meanings can be made clear. The boys’ garish and terror-filled reenactments deconstruct the instability of the media’s portrayal of violence, morality, sex, death, revenge, and excess. In the boys’ merger of aesthetics and memory, this slippage or a dislocation can be a site where the teacher listens, asks questions, and speaks in a polyphonous voice where dialogue begins. This liberating discourse enables both teachers and youth an opportunity for transformation.

### Postscript

The boys are crammed around a table drawing cartoons. A graphite stick man balance on the edge of a balcony shouting, “I hate myself! Life isn’t worth it!”

I ask the table of artists, “Is it okay for kids to have violent games and to watch violent television?”

“It’s okay,” says one, “it gets them ready for real life.”

## NOTES

1. Ulmer describes the mystory methodology as critiquing “larger systems of personal, popular and expert knowledge.” By juxtaposing the mystory of the researcher with the story of the subjects, the reader has a clearer understanding of the experience. Gregory Ulmer, *Teletheory* (New York: Routledge, 1989), 209–11.
2. Patricia Leavy, *Method Meets Art* (New York: Guilford Press, 2009).
3. Ulmer, *Teletheory*, 209.
4. Bochner and Ellis compare the relationship between the researched and the researcher in traditional research with ethnographic research. The mystory ethnographic offers methods that are “humane, collaborative and participatory” versus the traditional “treatment research [of] subjects . . . [which is] inclined to be alienating, demeaning, and exploitative” (13). The ethnographic relationship “reduces the distance between the researcher and the researched” (15). Arthur Bochner and Carolyn Ellis, *Ethnographically Speaking* (Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press, 2002).
5. Shohat and Stam narrativize visual culture and include the carnivalesque, the artistic practice of the marginalized cultural groups with an “impulse toward social, formal, libidinal rebellion,” including “corporeal outrageousness and anti-grammaticality” (34). The carnivalesque, “an aesthetic of mistakes,” includes a “gramatica jocose,” or poking fun grammar, or making faces at the “stifling norms of correctness” (36). Ella Shohat and Robert Stam, “Narrativizing Visual Culture: Towards a Polycentric Aesthetic,” in *Visual Culture Reader*, ed. N. Mirzoeff (New York: Routledge, 1998).
6. At a certain age, the child talks back to the law. The voice of the child both transgresses the law and sees itself beyond the law. This rebellious voice is heard in the music of the youth culture. Puns, jokes, and narratives abound. The “joissance (the meaning)” . . . transgression to enjoy (jouissance) is only possible if there is a law to transgress against. See Jan Jagodzinski, *Music and Youth Culture* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005); and Jan Jagodzinski, *Youth Fantasies* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 43.
7. See Jacques Lacan, *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-Analysis*, trans. Alan Sheridan (New York: Norton, 1978).
8. Denzin discusses the service of emotion and emotionality in the text to stir an affect from the reader. The sharing of truth and mutual experience ensue validity. See Norman K. Denzin, *Interpretive Ethnography* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1997). Finley’s article on arts-based inquiry describes the nuances of an action research relationship among artists and qualitative researchers. She references Tierney and his perspective on arts-based researchers who write for readers to “make meaning from emotive and affective aspects of text” (683). Quoted in Susan Finley, “Arts-Based Inquiry: Performing Pedagogy,” in *Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, ed. N. K. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2005), 681–94. See also William Tierney, “Guest Editor’s Introduction,” *Writing Qualitative Inquiry* 5 (1999): 307–12.
9. See Paul Duncum, “Children Never Were What They Were: Perspectives on Childhood,” in *Contemporary Issues in Art Education*, ed. Y. Gaudelius and P. Speirs (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, 2002), 97–106. Also see Christine Thompson, “The Culture of Childhood and the Visual Arts,” in *International Handbook of Research in Arts Education*, ed. L. Bresler (The Netherlands: Springer, 2007), 899–913; David Buckingham, *After the Death of Childhood* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2000); Gunilla Dahlberg, Peter Moss, and Alan Pence, *Beyond Quality in Early Childhood and Care: Postmodern Perspectives* (New York: Routledge, 1999).
10. Jan Jagodzinski argues that in modernist society, a fantasy surrounds the myth of childhood—a construct of “fetishistic and magical investment” (32) and the belief in a “divine” or “innocent” child. This modernist belief of the West is interwoven with developmental stages of childhood (or societal progress). This

fantasy child “exists outside of capitalistic exploitation” (34). Postmodernism is the juncture where modernist beliefs break down. Designer capitalism exploits youth of all economic statures and creates a picture of youth as an “event in-itself” (20). Adults are confused by this postmodern image of childhood hope for the future but tension fueled by the desire to stay young. The lines are blurred between identifiable differences between youth and adults. See jagodinski, *Music and Youth Culture*.

11. See *ibid.*; Henry Giroux, *America on the Edge* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006).
12. See Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi, *Creativity* (New York: Harper Collins, 1996).
13. We know ourselves through consciousness and language, which can be ambiguous in its elucidation by the speaker and its interpretation by the listener. Meaning is therefore fluid, muddy, and can take on many meanings. See Jacques Derrida, “Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of Human Sciences,” in *The Structuralist Controversy: The Languages of Criticism and the Sciences of Man*,” ed. R. Macksey and E. Donato (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972), 247–65.
14. Tobin discusses how aporia of a text initially makes sense until it is detangled and evoking difference. Tobin did the reverse: finding the children’s comments incoherent, he considered the enthymeme (the unsaid) and sorted out the taxonomy to uncover particular beliefs of children. Joseph Tobin, *Good Guys Don’t Wear Hats* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2000).
15. Voloshinov delves into the bonds of coparticipants through the mutual understanding of an utterance. He describes these shared utterances as social “pass-words.” See V. N. Voloshinov, “Discourse in Life and Discourse in Art,” in *Freudianism: A Marxist Critique*, ed. N. Bruss, trans. I. R. Titunik (1926; New York: Academic Press, 1976), 100. Tobin offers several descriptions of the enthymeme. His own definition is quite apt, explaining that the audience must share the same understanding of the term or phrase as the speaker (*Good Guys Don’t Wear Hats*).
16. “Cheekiness” as described by Peter Sloterdijk, *Critique of Critical Reason*, trans. Michael Eldred (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987).
17. The youth enjoy mocking the larger culture’s overdetermined set of “practices.” The youth revel in the *real* kernel of enjoyment. See Slavoj Žižek, *The Sublime Object of Ideology* (New York: Verso, 1989).
18. Through a narrative in Tom Barone, “Imagining Ms. Eddy Alive; Or the Return of the Teacher and Personalized Curriculum,” in *International Handbook of Research in Arts Education*, ed. L. Bresler (The Netherlands: Springer, 2007), 899–913, readers understand the value of meaningful art making for children. As a child, Barone was faced with tedious art lessons in which he learned the flipside of aesthetic to be anaesthetic.
19. The gaze as described by Sartre is one of surprise that alters my world. Those around see me not as myself but as an object. It is my imaging of how I am perceived by the Other. Lacan, *The Four Fundamental Concepts*, 84.
20. See Charles Garoian and Yvonne Gaudelius, *Spectacle Pedagogy* (New York: State University of New York Press, 2008).
21. Barone, “Imagining Ms. Eddy Alive,” 241.
22. See Matthew Reason, *Documentation, Disappearance, and Live Performance* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 9.