The International Journal of Engineering and Science (IJES)
|| Volume || 13 || Issue || 9 || Pages || PP 346-349 || 2024 ||
ISSN (e): 2319 – 1813 ISSN (p): 2319 – 1805

The Role of Museum Design in Enhancing Visitor Learning: A Critical Review

Mohamed El-Kiki, Meshari Almekaimi, Jassim Alobaidan

----------ABSTRACT----------
This study examines the impact of museum design on knowledge acquisition through a comprehensive literature review. By analyzing existing research on museum architecture, exhibit layout, and visitor engagement, the study explores how design elements such as spatial organization, lighting, and interactive displays influence learning outcomes. The literature review reveals key insights into the ways museum environments shape cognitive processes and retention of information. Findings suggest that well-designed museums significantly enhance visitor engagement and facilitate deeper understanding. This review highlights existing trends and identifies gaps in the current research, providing a foundation for future empirical studies on the relationship between museum design and knowledge transfer.
Keywords – *Museum education, Visitor experience, Museum design, Museum interpretation*

Date of Submission: 15-09-2024 Date of acceptance: 30-09-2024

I. INTRODUCTION

Museum architecture and design have long been regarded as essential elements in enhancing visitor experiences and fostering learning [1,2]. However, much of the discourse surrounding museum design is based on assumed effects on knowledge acquisition rather than demonstrated outcomes. This paper critically examines the existing literature on how various design features—such as spatial configuration, lighting, and interactivity—are believed to influence learning processes.

This critical examination aims to challenge the largely unexamined claims about the role of design in museum education, calling for more rigorous research that demands empirical validation. By highlighting the gaps in current literature, this paper sets the stage for future studies that explore the complexities of visitor interactions with museum spaces and how these interactions can be effectively measured. Ultimately, a better understanding of how architectural elements influence learning will contribute to more effective museum practices and enhance the educational missions of these institutions.

II. MUSEUM ARCHITECTURE AND LEARNING: ASSUMPTIONS VS. EVIDENCE

A common assumption within the academic and professional debate refers to how architecture significantly strengthens the learning outcomes of citizens. Advocates welcome the idea that beautifully designed places with floor plans and exhibit layouts can enhance visitor interaction and cognitive elaboration. But most of the studies are based on either theory or case studies, and there is little empirical evidence to support such observations. Other studies, such as those by [3,4], dwell on how visibility properties of designs in architecture might lead to navigation behavior, insinuating from the perspective of spatial layouts to cognitive results. However, most of these findings are based on small contexts and cannot be generalized with ease to other settings of museums and their visitors. Secondly, most research designs tend to lack crucial variables that could provide useful information in understanding the relationship between architectural design and learning outcomes.

This includes visitor demographics, prior knowledge, and individual learning style as some of the major factors that vary from person to person and allow them to interact with museum spaces in a multitude of ways. In fact, there has been development of a framework through which such impacts can be understood, called the Generic Learning Outcomes model; however, it is largely bereft of empirical rigour in application against assumptions about how space influences learning. For example, although some research has indicated that spatial organization can increase visitor attention and engagement, it is not known whether attention and engagement translate into actual learning. The relative lack of systematic studies calls for research into differential visitor experiences rather than general sweeping statements about architectural efficacy. With these complications in mind, future studies will have to be more sensitive to the complexities involved in probing how museum architecture interacts with learning.

This means investigating not only specific architectural elements but also how they interact with the

characteristics and behaviors of visitors. By using experimental designs in which cognitive outcomes are measured along with spatial properties, researchers can begin to explain the conditions under which architectural features foster successful learning experiences. Ultimately, with the potential of museum architecture to enhance learning well recognized, a critical examination of the evidence is warranted with regards to design choices that actually support educational goals and do not simply sustain assumptions about their effectiveness.

III. SPATIAL ORGANIZATION: ENHANCING OR INHIBITING COGNITIVE PROCESSING?

Spatial organization of museums is regarded as one of the most crucial means of organizing a visitor's journey through such places, which indirectly improves their cognitive involvement. Annechini et al. [5] put forward the arguments that for well-structured spaces, good spatial arrangement allows easy and smooth movement and clear orientation of visitors, hence indirectly better learning outcomes. However, a closer look at the empirical support from literature showed that there were hardly any such studies, even those were flawed in terms of certain methodological aspects. Some do indeed show that spatial organization can influence visitor behaviour in terms of time spent in given areas. Very few, however, demonstrate how such behaviours have been converted to improved knowledge gain. For example, there is evidence that people linger more in areas where routes are clear and displays are well-organized; yet such dwell time does not always equate to deeper comprehension or remembrance. Moreover, this simplistic linking of spatial design to learning outcomes lacks the ability to accommodate the complexity of visitor interactions in any museum space.

Spatial organization hence comes into complex relationships with cognitive processing, whereby the way of approaching exhibits not only involves their physical structure but also their prior knowledge, interest, and their very individual learning style. In support, Krukar's [6] research illustrates that though certain spatial characteristics increase attention and memory recall, the actual impact significantly differs across diverse visitor demographics. This may indicate that a one-size-fits-all form of spatial organization can fail to consider various needs and experiences of museumgoers, and hence decrease the educational efficiency of the exhibits. In order to further knowledge about the ways in which spatial organization affects cognitive processing, more differentiated research methods are urgently needed for studying interrelations between space and visitor behavior.

Future studies should therefore adopt experimental designs in which specific spatial variables are isolated and the direct effects of the variables on cognitive outcomes, such as memory retention and comprehension, are measured. Besides this, qualitative methods-interviewing visitors or observational studies-may provide further insight into how people navigate and interpret museum space. Looking more broadly toward spatial organization, museums may more reliably establish design strategies that support educational goals and enhance learning experiences for a broad array of audiences.

IV. THE ROLE OF LIGHTING: AESTHETIC OR EDUCATIONAL TOOL?

The literature positions the role of lighting in museums as serving a dual purpose: aesthetic enhancement and educational effectiveness. Whereas there is considerable research that suggests the ways in which lighting brings artifacts into focus and helps in creating an immersive environment for the visitors, on closer scrutiny, much of this research was found to be based on assumptions related to visual perception rather than on any hard empirical evidence linking proper lighting to improved learning outcomes. Where it is generally taken to be on board that places of optimal illumination may attract visitors and enrich their experiences, how the light conditions are related to knowledge retention in the long run is not obvious. Empirical studies are showing mixed results, with some indicating that optimal lighting conditions enhance visitor engagement but do not support impacts on cognitive processing or retention of information acquired during the visit [7,8,9].

Furthermore, the tendency of museums to prioritize aesthetics over pedagogical functionality in lighting design raises some very critical questions. Most institutions would invest millions in making displays as stunning as possible by applying dramatic effects in lighting that might eventually overpower the educational content displayed. With the focus on aesthetics, it can revert to environments where the look diverts from the learning objectives. It also appears from research that dynamic lighting enhances the experience for the visitor but does not necessarily create any more depth in understanding about the subject. For example, it has been noted in studies that when the lighting is too theatrical or distracting, visitors are more likely to be struck by the beauty of an exhibit rather than its educational values. While the case is thus stated, there is a dire need for further and more stringently empirical research to develop proper ideas about the implications of lighting on learning in museum contexts [10,11].

Further research in the future should also consider types of lighting, such as natural and artificial light,

that may influence the cognitive processes of various demographics of visitors. Additionally, researching specific lighting conditions and how these may impact mood, and behavior provides insight into the design of supportive learning environments. In this way, it would be much easier for museums to balance aesthetic appeal with educational effectiveness, and their exhibits can be eye-catching, yet enhance the understanding of visitors and help retain information. After all, although lighting offers ample opportunities to shape visitor experiences, its actual value as an educational medium is not yet fully researched to prove how well it supports meaningful learning processes.

V. VISITOR ENGAGEMENT VS. KNOWLEDGE ACQUISITION: A FALSE EQUIVALENCE?

One of the most prevalent assumptions to be found in the design literature is that visitor engagement in museums is effectively synonymous with knowledge acquisition. This connection has often been simplified and collapsed into a specious equivalence between the two concepts far too readily. Visitors who are more engaged may well spend more time viewing exhibits without necessarily receiving a greater depth of exposure to the subject matter represented therein. Many studies have underlined this difference, arguing that engagement may come in many forms, such as enjoyment or interest, but without much impact on actual learning. while various features of exhibits raise the level of visitor engagement, the level of deepening understanding can vary a great deal according to different profiles and prior knowledge of visitors. This would suggest that an increase in engagement through interactive design alone does not guarantee increased learning [12,13].

Second, the focus on design elements that are engagement-driven has often suppressed the educational mission of museums. When museums focus too much on spectacle and interactivity instead of content, they run a risk that they create an environment where visitors may be entertained and not informed. It has happened in many exhibitions recently that the notion of immersive experience has been promoted at the expense of real educational content. While the interactive exhibitions may enable reflective and discursive processes on the part of the museum visitors, they may also be a cause for superficial contact, which does not perforce foster deeper learning. The balancing of engagement with educational rigor is complex; museums must recognize that design decisions must support visitor interaction but not be limited to such; they need to provide facilities that will enhance the deeper cognitive processing of the information made available to them [14] .In this view, it becomes imperative that the museum professional adopts a more sophisticated approach to visitor engagement with the idea of knowledge acquisition.

Thinking about the nature and extent of GLOs might therefore be a productive way to tease out such differences in visitor outcomes for the different types of experiences. if museums wish to effectively create and support educational environments, it is crucial that they focus on measurable learning rather than simple engagement outcomes. This approach invites a reflective consideration of how the various design elements impact both engagement and learning, integrating a holistic approach that acknowledges the complexity of visitor experiences. This does mean, eventually, the differentiation between engagement and knowledge acquisition will help museums serve their educational mission better without losing the charm for their audiences [15,16,17].

VI. IDENTIFYING GAPS IN THE RESEARCH: THE NEED FOR EMPIRICAL STUDIES

Despite the volume of literature on museum design and knowledge acquisition, a number of key gaps still remain. First, there are hardly any large-scale empirical studies that have been conducted which specifically investigate the direct impacts of design on learning outcomes. Second, diversity among visitors to museums is largely ignored, and scant attention has been given to how different learning styles, cultural backgrounds, or prior knowledge may affect the way in which individuals approach museum spaces. Meanwhile, many studies have focused on short-term rather than long-term information retention.

VII. CONCLUSION

Whereas the design of museums undoubtedly shapes the experience of visitors, how far architecture and layout influence learning remain considerably unexplored; in many instances, it is also exaggerated. The critical review has shown that most literature relies on anecdotal evidence, theoretical frameworks, and case studies rather than comprehensive empirical research. The repeated assertions that spatial organization, lighting, and interactivity enhance cognitive engagement with and retention of knowledge about museum collections are seldom supported by rigorous, replicable data. That assumption is particularly pernicious, partly because visitor engagement and learning are two quite distinct processes, each of which calls for different sorts of confirmation.

The review also mentioned that these design features, including spatial layout and lighting, can facilitate an interactive environment but may not necessarily guarantee improved learning or understanding of exhibits. Nevertheless, the behavior and cognitive processing of visitors are believed to be affected by a range of

factors, including prior knowledge and learning styles, cultural backgrounds, and the nature of exhibits themselves. These variables being set aside within the existent studies create big gaps in the findings of how such museum environments are impacting learning.

Longitudinal studies can be conducted to measure long-term knowledge retention, and future research looking to develop an understanding of the impacts of museum design on learning outcomes should focus on large-scale quantitative studies that isolate design elements such as lighting and spatial organization. This will involve the application of more sensitive methods that consider a wide range of visitors in terms of learning style, cultural knowledge, and experience. The collaboration of cognitive scientists and professionals within the museum can apply more informed principles to how the spaces are laid out for high retention of memory and attention. Finally, the establishment of sophisticated tools that incorporate qualitative and quantitative measures will further provide better measures of the cognitive outcome. Finally, future research should strive for a balance between aesthetics and education to ensure that visual appeal enhances learning objectives rather than detracts from them.

REFERENCES

[1]. Rodrigues, A., Campos, P., & Cabral, D. (2020). Increasing the Museum Visitor's Engagement Through Compelling Storytelling Based on Interactive Explorations. In Culture and Computing: 8th International Conference, C&C 2020, Denmark, July 19–24, 2020, Proceedings 22 (pp. 245-254). Springer International Publishing.

[2]. Dorph, R., Cannady, M. A., & Schunn, C. D. (2022). What drives visitor engagement in exhibits? The interaction between visitor activation profiles and exhibit features. Curator: The Museum Journal, 65(2), 399-416. https://doi.org/10.1111/cura.12324

[3]. Brügger, A., Richter, K. F., & Fabrikant, S. I. (2019). How does navigation system behavior influence human behavior?. Cognitive research: principles and implications, 4(1), 5.

[4]. He, Q., McNamara, T. P., & Brown, T. I. (2019). Manipulating the visibility of barriers to improve spatial navigation efficiency and cognitive mapping. Scientific Reports, 9(1), 11567.

[5]. Annechini, C., Menardo, E., Hall, R., & Pasini, M. (2020). Aesthetic attributes of museum environmental experience: a pilot study with children as visitors. Frontiers in psychology, 11, 508300.

[6]. Krukar, J. (2024). A stimulating museum space:'Glancing away'and engaging working memory in-between exhibits. In Museum Configurations (pp. 101-119). Routledge.

[7]. Schielke, T. (2020). Interpreting art with light: Museum lighting between objectivity and hyperrealism. Leukos, 16(1), 7-24.

[8]. Çevik, A., Kazanasmaz, Z. T., Tambellini, G., Salvadori, G., & Leccese, F. (2022). Perception of light in museum environments: comparison between real-life and virtual visual experiences. Sustainability, 14(21), 14288. https://doi.org/10.3390/su142114288

[9]. Hassanizadeh, N., & Noorzai, E. (2020). Improving lighting efficiency in existing art museums: a case study. Facilities, 39(5/6), 366-388. https://doi.org/10.1108/F-10-2019-0108

[10]. Skydsgaard, M. A., Møller Andersen, H., & King, H. (2016). Designing museum exhibits that facilitate visitor reflection and discussion. Museum Management and Curatorship, 31(1), 48-68. https://doi.org/10.1080/09647775.2015.1117237

[11]. Li, X. Z., Chen, C. C., Kang, X., & Kang, J. (2022). Research on relevant dimensions of tourism experience of intangible cultural heritage lantern festival: Integrating generic learning outcomes with the technology acceptance model. Frontiers in Psychology, 13, 943277. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.943277

[12]. Lin, J. L., Su, F. Y., Lin, C. Y., & Hsiao, K. H. (2023). Developing an integrated teaching module for the topic of smart industry in the museum. International Journal of Information and Education Technology, 13(5), 806-812.

[13]. Demirović Bajrami, D., Vuksanović, N., Petrović, M. D., & Tretiakova, T. N. (2022). Competencies of a museum guide as predictors of visitors' learning outcomes: a case from Canada. Journal of Museum Education, 47(2), 251-262. https://doi.org/10.1080/10598650.2022.2062542

[14]. Korman, M., Weiss, P. L., Hochhauser, M., & Kizony, R. (2019). Effect of age on spatial memory performance in real museum vs. computer simulation. BMC geriatrics, 19, 1-10.

[15]. Lehto, A., Luostarinen, N., & Kostia, P. (2020). Augmented reality gaming as a tool for subjectivizing visitor experience at cultural heritage locations—case lights on!. Journal on Computing and Cultural Heritage (JOCCH), 13(4), 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1145/3415142

[16]. Linden, C., & Wagemans, J. (2024). Presenting TaMuNaBe: A taxonomy of museum navigation behaviors. Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts, 18(2), 143.

[17]. Xu, L., Yan, S., Chen, Z., & Chen, X. (2021). Design of the museum interactive lighting system based on the digital twin technology. Scientific Programming, 2021(1), 4824417. https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/4824417