

University of Groningen

Anticipating a Museum Visit

Dragija, Marta Šveb; van Zomeren, Martijn; Hansen, Nina

Published in:
Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology

DOI:
[10.1002/casp.70025](https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.70025)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2025

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Dragija, M. Š., van Zomeren, M., & Hansen, N. (2025). Anticipating a Museum Visit: The Role of Museum Design in Anticipating Hedonic or Eudaimonic Well-Being Experiences. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 35(1), Article e70025. <https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.70025>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

RESEARCH ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS

Anticipating a Museum Visit: The Role of Museum Design in Anticipating Hedonic or Eudaimonic Well-Being Experiences

Marta Šveb Dragija^{1,2}  | Martijn van Zomeren²  | Nina Hansen² 

¹Institute for Development and International Relations (IRMO), Zagreb, Croatia | ²Department of Social Psychology, University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands

Correspondence: Marta Šveb Dragija (msveb@irmo.hr; m.sveb@rug.nl)

Received: 23 January 2024 | **Revised:** 23 October 2024 | **Accepted:** 9 November 2024

Funding: The research was supported by the funds from the Ministarstvo znanosti i obrazovanja (eng. Ministry of Science and Education of Croatia).

Keywords: anticipation | experience design | museum experiences | tourism experiences | well-being

ABSTRACT

Through their design, museums can craft specific experiences for their visitors, ranging from more hedonic to more eudaimonic well-being experiences. Little is known, however, about whether potential visitors anticipate eudaimonic or hedonic well-being experiences depending on how the museum design is described. To answer this question, we conducted three social-psychological experiments with Croatian (Study 1, $N=128$ and Study 3, $N=213$) and American (Study 2, $N=289$) participants. Participants in Study 1 and 2 read about either one of the two different hedonically designed museums or one eudaimonically designed museum which was the same across the studies, and then reported their anticipated well-being and emotional experience. Particularly for Studies 1 and 3, our findings revealed strong support for the differentiation of eudaimonic and hedonic well-being in the anticipation of different museum visits. Moreover, the anticipated eudaimonic experience moved beyond the typical positive hedonic experience by uniquely including both positive and negative emotions such as compassion, awe, sadness and guilt. We discuss the implications of our findings for modern psychological theorising on well-being and emotions, and, in a more applied sense, the relevance of describing the design of museums to potential visitors to guide their anticipation of the museum experience.

Across the world, museums have become experience hubs, where visitors can expect to simultaneously be educated and mentally, socially and emotionally enriched (Kotler and Kotler 2000). As the most visited cultural tourism attraction, which accounts for over 39% of global tourism (McKercher 2004; Richards 2018), museums also have an important role in attracting international visitors with varying cultural backgrounds. To do so, they must be mindful of visitors' anticipations and needs, which are currently pointing towards emotionally engaging, psychologically meaningful and transformative museum experiences that have a profound, longer-lasting, impact on the visitors' well-being (e.g., Chatterjee and Noble 2016; Šveb Dragija and Jelinčić 2022).

This raises the question of whether and how museums can best design such experiences for their visitors.

Informed by modern psychological theories of well-being, we suggest that museums can be designed to stimulate two distinctive forms of well-being (Diener 1984; Ryff 1989). While hedonic well-being refers to the pursuit of pleasure and happiness (Diener 1984), eudaimonic well-being refers to the pursuit of meaning, reflection and personal growth (Ryff 1989). This is important with respect to what experience visitors may anticipate, as they may want to engage in a museum experience that is nuanced towards pleasure and happiness (hedonic well-being), or

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

© 2024 The Author(s). *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology* published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

they may want to engage in an experience that is more personal growth oriented (eudaimonic well-being). However, we know little about whether descriptions of museum design influence such anticipations, and whether this also relates to different anticipated emotional experiences.

Answering these questions adds value in two ways. First, understanding the anticipations visitors make in terms of well-being extends modern psychological theorising on well-being and emotions into the domain of cognitive anticipation. And second, this is important for applied purposes as well. For example, museums (and other cultural institutions) may effectively use their description of museum design to guide the anticipation of a specific form of well-being experience to attract visitors. This is why we focus our studies on the function of museums as potential ‘well-being generators’, and measure how attractive people find the museum. Specifically, we report three social-psychological experiments that seek to answer the question of whether descriptions of museum designs influence individuals’ anticipations of hedonic and eudaimonic well-being experiences. We explore how specific design features like reflectivity, interactivity and immersivity contribute to shaping these anticipations and whether they are associated with anticipated emotional experiences.

1 | Anticipating a Museum Visit: The Role of Museum Design Description

Theory and research on museum design suggest that a museum experience begins long before the visitor enters the museum. In the first phase of the visitor experience (Kirchberg and Tröndle 2012), one encounters museum information that shapes one’s anticipated experience (What will I experience? How will I feel?). Anticipation can be defined as ‘... a subjective, forward-looking, consumer-centred, cognitive process that culminates in a discrete endpoint that elicits affective reaction and appraisal, such as (dis)satisfaction’. (Polegato and Bjerke 2019, p. 4). The second phase, or the visit phase, is largely influenced by the pre-visit phase. This is because visitors’ perceptions of the museum’s physical features (cues) depend on their cognitive appraisal, which is shaped by pre-visit factors like anticipations, personal background and mood (Kemper and Lazarus 1992; Kirchberg and Tröndle 2012). Experience designers can manipulate these cues, but their impact is influenced by how visitors subjectively interpret them, leading to emotional reactions (Kemper and Lazarus 1992). The third phase, the post-visit phase, occurs after the museum visit when visitors utilise the experience they have just encountered. For instance, some visitors may want to share their experiences with others by posting on social media (Falk and Dierking 2000).

Already in the anticipation phase, people may anticipate different experiences due to how museum design is described (e.g., reflectivity, immersivity, and interactivity). In contemporary times, museums intentionally use design cues to evoke specific responses from their visitors. For instance, some use sensory engagement to immerse visitors fully in the experience (e.g., Museum of Ice Cream), while others integrate cutting-edge digital technologies and interactive exhibits to encourage

active participation with the artefacts (e.g., Exploratorium in San Francisco). Additionally, certain museums curate content that not only showcases but also prompts reflection on values, emotions, and existential themes (e.g., Anna Frank House in Amsterdam). Even a museum that could be considered ‘traditional’ such as the Museum of Modern Art in New York (MoMA), showcases thought-provoking works by artists such as Pablo Picasso, Vincent van Gogh, and Frida Kahlo to encourage visitors to ponder deeper meanings, explore diverse perspectives, and contemplate the role of art in society, hence it uses reflective cues. Consequently, it is rare to find a museum today that does not incorporate cues designed to enhance the well-being of its audience.

Therefore, in the set of experiments that we conducted, we focus on three museums that, due to their respective designs (reflective, immersive, and interactive), may have a potentially more hedonic or eudaimonic connotation, and relate to different emotional experiences. As an example of the reflective design, we use the Museum of Broken Relationships (MBR) (see <https://brokenships.com/>), whereas the Museum of Chocolate (MC) exemplifies immersive design (see <https://muzejcokolade.hr/en/>), and Museum of Illusions (MI) interactive design (see <https://muzejiluzija.com/en>). Another advantage of choosing these three museums is that they can be found in different countries and hence enable us to conduct the same study with participants from different countries (as in our case, Croatia and the USA). Below, we outline in more detail how descriptions of museum design affect anticipated well-being and emotions.

2 | Anticipating Different Forms of Well-Being

Hedonic well-being is achieved when experiencing high levels of positive emotions, low levels of negative emotions, and high life satisfaction (Diener, Lucas, and Oishi 2002). Hence, to stimulate hedonic well-being, experiences may involve pleasure, enjoyment, satisfaction, comfort, and ease (Huta 2015). Moreover, the focus should be on the present moment (Pearce 2017) and consumption, immersion in physical experiences (Huta 2015), satisfaction or fulfilment of physical or emotional needs (Waterman 1993), carefreeness (Huta and Ryan 2010), high positive affect which includes pleasure, enjoyment, joy, fun (Diener et al. 1999; Diener and Emmons 1984), and low negative affect (Diener et al. 1999). In terms of design features, hedonic experiences tend to be immersive and interactive, hence stimulating positive affect.

In the studies to come, we operationalised the hedonically designed museums as the MC and the MI. In the MC, visitors can explore the history of chocolate through the engagement of all the senses (smell, taste, sight, hearing, touch) which stimulates positive affect so this experience has immersive features and appeals to hedonic well-being (Huta 2015). In the MI, visitors are introduced to illusions that put their perception to the test. They can experience and learn about how their brains change reality through interactive games and puzzles, hence museum has interactive features that stimulate positive affect and appeal to the hedonic well-being (Huta 2015). While both MC and MI are operationalised as hedonically designed

museums, they use different cues (immersive or interactive), and how those are perceived is determined by the cognitive appraisal of the cues, which impacts the visitors' anticipations of emotional reactions as well as well-being outcomes (Kirchberg and Tröndle 2012).

By contrast, eudaimonic well-being is characterised by optimal functioning, a deeper sense of meaning and purpose, engagement, and thriving (Ryff and Singer 2006). Moving beyond hedonism, these experiences may involve meaning, personal growth, excellence, and authenticity (Huta and Waterman 2014). In addition, experiences can stimulate elevation (moral elevation, awe, inspiration, transcendence) (Henderson 2013; Huta 2013), connection to oneself (Huta 2012), personal expressiveness (Waterman 1993), feeling of accomplishment or pride (Seligman 2011), feeling of engagement or flow (Csikszentmihalyi 2000), and mixed affect involving both positive and negative emotions (Nawijn and Filep 2016). In terms of design features, eudaimonic experiences tend to be reflective in the sense that they stimulate deeper meaning, personal growth, and connection to oneself.

To illustrate, in the studies to come we operationalised the eudaimonically designed museum as the MBR. In this museum, visitors read heartbreaking stories about love and loss attached to the symbolic possessions, gifted to the museum by anonymous contributors across the world, which stimulates visitors to reflect on the stories they read and their own lives, infusing this museum with reflectivity, mixed affect, and eudaimonic appeal. Given this major difference in psychological meaning, we expect that potential visitors will anticipate a different kind of well-being when anticipating visiting a museum that is more hedonically (e.g., MC and MI) or eudaimonically designed (e.g., MBR), setting up expectations of what the experience will be like, including a set of different anticipated emotions.

3 | Anticipating Emotional Experiences

Emotions are 'multicomponent response tendencies that unfold over relatively short time spans' (Fredrickson 2001, p.2), which means that emotions occur through cognitively appraising an event as meaningful which often results in subjective experience of the emotion, change in facial expression and physiology, as well as cognitive processing of the situation. Museum visits have the potential to evoke a myriad of specific emotions, ranging from awe and curiosity to joy, contemplation, and even introspection, sadness, or loneliness. These emotional responses can greatly contribute to the overall visitor experience, shaping perceptions, knowledge acquisition, personal connections with cultural artefacts (Falk and Dierking 2016) and, in fact, visitors' hedonic and eudaimonic well-being (Chatterjee and Noble 2016).

Anticipation of a museum visit can therefore also include the anticipation of future emotions, or affective forecasts (Buehler and McFarland 2001). Theories of affective forecasting propose that when individuals anticipate specific emotions, it raises the probability of experiencing those emotions later (Baumgartner, Pieters, and Bagozzi 2008; Brown, Cron, and Slocum Jr 1997). This is because they are based on appraisal

of the cues that shape visitor's expectations about how they will feel during and after visiting a museum (Koenig-Lewis and Palmer 2014). Although people are not necessarily good at affective forecasting, such forecasts may set expectations about the museum experience and are thus relevant to understanding, particularly because distinct forms of well-being may relate to different emotions.

We know little, however, about whether and how the anticipation of specific emotions is related to what type of well-being experience is anticipated in the context of differently designed museums. Anticipating positive or negative emotions will have a different impact on potential visitors, just as is the case for the experience of positive or negative emotions (with positive emotions prompting individuals to engage with their surroundings and other people, and negative emotions prompting narrow thought-action repertoires to promote fast and directed action; Fredrickson 2004). Specifically, according to the broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions (Fredrickson 2004), positive emotions have hedonic dimensions but can also broaden people's thought-action repertoire and build their long-lasting resources, such as resilience and well-being. This suggests that hedonically designed museums should offer ample opportunities for experiencing positive emotions, whereas a combination of positive and negative emotions may better fit eudaimonically designed museums. Like eudaimonic tourism experiences, this type of experience may require both positive and negative emotions, as negative emotions often carry deeper meaning, engagement, and self-reflection, which reflects the fast and directed action nature of negative emotions (Nawijn and Filep 2016; Šveb Dragija and Franić 2023). However, the specific pattern of anticipated positive and negative emotions in hedonic and eudaimonic experiences is yet to be determined, so we explore whether potential visitors will anticipate a different pattern of emotions when anticipating visiting a museum that is more hedonically (e.g., MC and MI) or eudaimonically designed (e.g., MBR).

4 | The Current Research

The current research focuses on potential visitors' anticipation of visiting one of the three museums (MC, MI, and MBR) when they are offered descriptions of the museum and its design (Falk and Dierking 2000). We, therefore, conducted three experimental studies, guided by three research questions: (1) Do differently designed museums lead people to anticipate different experiences regarding different design features (i.e., reflectivity, interactivity, and immersivity)? (2) Does this translate to different anticipated well-being (hedonic or eudaimonic) museum experiences? and (3) Which specific pattern of positive and negative emotions do visitors anticipate feeling in hedonically and eudaimonically designed museums? We expected to differentiate the anticipation of a more eudaimonic well-being experience for those anticipating visiting the MBR due to its reflective design, from a more hedonic well-being experience for those anticipating visiting the MC or Illusions (MI), due to their immersive and interactive designs respectively. We explored the psychological anatomy of these anticipated experiences in terms of specific anticipated positive and negative emotions.

5 | Study 1

5.1 | Method

Participants and design. Participants were 128 (73 women, 55 men) Croats who were recruited through a snowballing method. The age of our participants ranged between 17 and 61, with most participants between the ages of 17 and 27 ($M = 34.90$, $SD = 12.80$). On average, participants self-reported to enjoy visiting museums in general ($M = 3.53$, $SD = 1.11$; scale range: 1–5). The results of a sensitivity power analysis conducted using G*Power (Faul et al. 2007) revealed that with $\alpha = 0.05$ and power $(1-\beta) = 0.80$, the minimum detectable effect size was $f = 0.28$, which can be considered a medium effect size according to Cohen's (1988) guidelines. The questionnaire was constructed using Qualtrics Survey Software. After gaining the approval of the Ethical Committee of Psychology from the University of Groningen, the anonymous survey link was sent to potential participants which directed them to the online questionnaire. The experimental manipulation consisted of three versions of the same questionnaire, one for each museum (MC, MI, and MBR). The content of the three versions of the questionnaire was the same, except for the description of the museum participants were asked about in the survey. The questionnaire was developed in English and then translated into Croatian by a bilingual speaker of English and Croatian (the first author). To confirm that meanings and connotations were equal in both languages, the author asked for feedback from another two bilingual speakers (please see [Supporting Information](#) for full manipulation text).

Measures. After obtaining informed consent and answering demographic questions, participants were asked to read a scenario about the specific (real) museum in Zagreb (MC, MI, or MBR). After that, they were presented with the items in the order below. All items had a 1–5 Likert-type scale (with 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*) unless noted otherwise.

To measure the anticipated experience, participants were asked about what kind of experience they anticipated in a certain museum, in terms of museum design features. Specifically, they were asked to what extent they anticipated an immersive, interactive, and reflective experience in the specific museum. Participants were then offered a list of positive and negative emotions (e.g., love, awe, interest, sadness) and were asked to what extent they expected to feel each emotion in the specific museum, to indicate the anticipated emotions. To get a better sense of the potential meaning, participants were also asked to write about what kind of emotional experience they anticipated in the specific museum, thus providing qualitative data (please see [Appendix A](#)).

Participants were then asked about the anticipated well-being effects of the museum. One of the two items ('Visiting this museum would make me feel good immediately after visiting it') pertained to hedonic well-being, while the other ('Visiting this museum would challenge how I think about myself and the world') pertained to eudaimonic well-being. For explorative purposes, we included the measure of museum attractiveness, to determine what type of museum experience (hedonic or eudaimonic) is more attractive for the visitors and anticipated

social sharing (please See [Appendix B](#)). After providing answers to all the items, participants were thanked for their participation and the questionnaire ended.

Analytical plan. We first report on the mean-level analyses which test our first expectation that different museum design features lead people to anticipate different experiences, followed by mean-level analysis testing the assumption that hedonically vs. eudaimonically designed museums differ in the type of anticipated well-being experiences (for correlational analysis across three studies between anticipated experience and well-being please refer to [Appendix C](#), while for the correlational analysis between anticipated emotions and well-being refer to [Appendix D](#)). To answer the third research question, we report on the mean-level analysis of the emotions that eudaimonically and hedonically designed museums are anticipated to elicit. For explorative purposes, we also report on the perceived attractiveness of eudaimonically and hedonically designed museums.

5.2 | Results

In [Table 1](#), all means, standard deviations, and ANOVA results of key variables across conditions are presented.

Participants anticipated a significantly more immersive experience in the MC compared to both the MI and the MBR (see [Table 1](#)). Furthermore, while the anticipation of interactive engagement was higher in MI and MC compared to MBR, there was no significant difference between MI and MC in this regard. Participants anticipated a more reflective experience in MBR compared to MC, with no significant difference between MBR and MI or between MC and MI.

Regarding anticipated well-being, participants anticipated increased hedonic well-being after visiting both MC and MI compared to MBR, yet no significant difference was found in hedonic well-being between MC and MI. In contrast, anticipation of eudaimonic well-being was significantly higher in MBR compared to MC and MI. Notably, the perceived attractiveness of the museums did not significantly differ, suggesting equal appeal regardless of their design.

Lastly, the pattern of emotions significantly differed between the three museums (please refer to [Appendix E](#) for the table with means and ANOVA of specific emotions per condition). While in MBR, participants anticipated feeling emotions such as gratitude, and compassion but also sadness and frustration, in MI and MC they anticipated feeling only positive emotions such as joy in MC and amusement in MI. This pattern fits with our suggestions that the pattern of anticipated emotions differs between the eudaimonically and hedonically designed museums, with participants anticipating a mix of positive and negative emotions in the eudaimonically designed museum and solely positive emotions in the hedonically designed museum.

5.3 | Discussion

Study 1 showed that potential visitors anticipated the most reflective experience and the highest eudaimonic well-being in an

TABLE 1 | Descriptive statistics and ANOVA for Study 1.

	Museum of broken relationships			Museum of illusions			Museum of chocolate			ANOVA					
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p	η^2
Museum attractiveness	42	4.13	0.94	45	4.18	0.74	41	4.35	0.67	1.15	2	0.57	0.92	0.40	0.01
Anticipated immersive experience	42	3.29 ^b	0.92	45	3.67 ^b	1.04	41	4.15 ^a	0.57	15.42	2	7.71	10.07	<0.001	0.14
Anticipated interactive experience	42	3.50 ^b	1.02	45	4.20 ^a	0.79	41	3.95 ^a	0.71	10.87	2	5.43	7.58	<0.001	0.11
Anticipated reflective experience	42	3.90 ^{ab}	0.85	45	3.51 ^{bc}	0.90	41	3.12 ^b	1.01	12.72	2	6.36	7.55	<0.001	0.11
Anticipated hedonic well-being	42	3.60 ^b	0.89	45	4.11 ^a	0.57	41	4.20 ^a	0.64	8.87	2	4.44	8.80	<0.001	0.12
Anticipated eudaimonic well-being	42	3.76 ^a	1.01	45	3.16 ^b	0.88	41	2.76 ^b	0.99	21.34	2	10.67	11.59	<0.001	0.16

Note: We employed the Tukey HSD post hoc test to calculate the difference between the means. The means that were significantly different are marked with different superscript letters, while those that did not significantly differ are marked with the same superscript letters.

eudaimonically designed museum (MBR). This finding fits with previous studies that showed eudaimonic well-being to be linked with personal growth, meaning, and connection to oneself which can be achieved through reflecting on one's own life and experiences (Huta and Waterman 2014). By contrast, visitors anticipated an immersive experience in the MC and an interactive experience in the MI, which corresponded to stronger anticipated hedonic well-being in these hedonically designed museums (MC and MI). This finding is in line with previous studies that linked immersion in physical experiences and enjoyment with hedonic well-being (Huta 2015). Interestingly, results further showed that visitors in eudaimonically designed museums tended to anticipate a mix of emotions encompassing gratitude, compassion, frustration, and sadness, whereas in hedonically designed museums, visitors anticipated feeling positive emotions such as joy and amusement. This finding also fits with previous research (Huta 2015; Nawijn and Filep 2016). Importantly, we also found that both types of museums were perceived as equally attractive, suggesting that the different pattern of emotions anticipated did not make one type of museum more attractive than the other. Museums thus can orient themselves to experiences beyond hedonism without having to pay the price of being anticipated as less attractive.

However, before interpreting these findings, we wanted to replicate them in Study 2 while using a sample from a different country in which the same museums were nevertheless present. This decision was also grounded in the assumption that museums serve as cultural tourism destinations attracting visitors from diverse cultural backgrounds, potentially influenced by different motivations for well-being shaped by their cultural upbringing (Disabato et al. 2016; but see Gaston-Breton et al. 2021). For instance, while some visitors may prioritise seeking pleasure, others may prioritise personal growth; and perhaps the same applies to samples from countries with stronger individualistic values related to hedonic experiences (e.g., USA) or from countries with lower individualistic values related to eudaimonic experiences (e.g., Croatia) (Minkov and Kaasa 2022). Thus, conducting the same study with an American sample would offer interesting insights about how museum design description affects anticipated well-being and emotions.

6 | Study 2

6.1 | Method

Participants and design. The second study was a replication of the first study with a different sample. We recruited 350 participants using Amazon Mechanical Turk software. This experimental study also had three conditions and participants were randomly assigned to one of the three conditions that featured a different museum based in the USA that is a franchise (MBR and MI) or replication (MC) of the museums in Zagreb used in Study 1. After excluding outliers (e.g., based on duration and failed attention checks), we were left with 289 participants (133 women, 156 men). To explain, the questionnaire included several attention check questions, such as 'Please select "strongly agree" to show you are paying attention to this question'. If participants failed to answer correctly, they were excluded from the analysis to ensure they were not bots. They were also excluded from the analysis if

the time it took them to finish the questionnaire was unrealistically short (less than 2 min). The age of the participants ranged between 22 and 73, with most participants between the ages of 22 and 40 ($M = 38.20$, $SD = 11.73$). On average, participants reported they like visiting museums in general ($M = 4.54$, $SD = 0.67$; scale range: 1–5). The results of a sensitivity power analysis conducted using G*Power (Faul et al. 2007) revealed that with $\alpha = 0.05$ and power $(1 - \beta) = 0.80$, the minimum detectable effect size was $f = 0.18$. This effect size is considered to be between a small and medium effect size, according to Cohen's (1988) guidelines. The design of the study was the same as in Study 1, except for the language (Study 2 was in English).

Measures. After obtaining informed consent and answering demographic questions, participants were asked to read a scenario about a specific (real) museum in the USA (MC, MI, or MBR). After that, they were presented with the same items we used in Study 1 but in English, rated on a 1–5 Likert-type scale (with 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*), unless noted otherwise. We measured participants' anticipated experience, anticipated emotions, anticipated well-being, and perceived museum attractiveness. The list of emotions included all the emotions from Study 1 with the addition of hope and inspiration.

6.2 | Results

In Study 2, the same type of analyses were conducted as in Study 1. All means, standard deviations, and ANOVA results of key variables across conditions can be found in Table 2.

Participants anticipated a more immersive experience in the MI compared to the MBR with the anticipation of immersion being significantly higher in the MC compared to MBR (see Table 2). While anticipation of interactive experience was higher in MI compared to MBR, no significant difference was found between MI and MC or between MBR and MC in this aspect. Additionally, although there was no significant difference in anticipating a reflective experience between the three museums, there was a non-significant trend indicating higher anticipation of reflection in MBR compared to MC and MI.

Regarding anticipated well-being, participants expected to feel significantly better after visiting both MC and MI compared to MBR. Furthermore, while anticipation of hedonic well-being was significantly higher in MC compared to MBR and in MI compared to MBR, anticipation of eudaimonic well-being showed a non-significant trend towards being higher in MBR compared to MC and MI. Thus, Study 2 replicated the hedonic part of the anticipated experience, but the pattern for the eudaimonic part was weaker. Furthermore, although qualitative data showed 'interest' to be one of the most reported emotions in the MBR (please see Appendix A), participants perceived MI as significantly more attractive than MBR, suggesting hedonically designed museums may have greater appeal.

Finally, participants generally anticipated feeling more frustration and sadness in MBR, while more amusement, joy, and awe were anticipated in MI, indicating differing emotional experiences based on museum design (please see Appendix E). Specifically, although also here the pattern was less clear than

TABLE 2 | Descriptive statistics and ANOVA for Study 2.

	Museum of broken relationships			Museum of illusions			Museum of chocolate			ANOVA					
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p	η^2
Museum attractiveness	94	4.02	0.93	94	4.31	0.64	101	4.23	0.75	4.01	2	2.01	3.26	0.04	0.02
Anticipated immersive experience	94	3.81 ^b	1.07	94	4.23 ^a	0.74	101	4.21 ^a	0.73	10.80	2	5.40	7.35	<0.001	0.05
Anticipated interactive experience	94	3.87 ^{bc}	1.00	94	4.28 ^a	0.66	101	4.03 ^{ac}	0.87	7.81	2	3.91	5.37	0.005	0.04
Anticipated reflective experience	94	3.97	0.91	94	3.89	1.11	101	3.79	1.13	1.53	2	0.76	0.68	0.51	0.01
Anticipated hedonic well-being	94	3.77 ^b	1.16	94	4.19 ^a	0.77	101	4.25 ^a	0.85	13.26	2	6.63	7.52	0.001	0.05
Anticipated eudaimonic well-being	94	3.88	1.03	94	3.88	1.09	101	3.58	1.17	5.87	2	2.93	2.44	0.09	0.02

Note: We employed the Tukey HSD post hoc test to calculate the difference between the means. The means that were significantly different are marked with different superscript letters, while those that did not significantly differ are marked with the same superscript letters.

in Study 1, the findings confirm differing patterns of anticipated emotions in eudaimonically and hedonically designed museums.

6.3 | Discussion

The findings of Study 2 supported part of the main findings from Study 1 and are also in line with the literature (e.g., Huta and Waterman 2014; Huta 2015). Specifically, Study 2 showed that the MC and MI were perceived as hedonically designed museums due to their immersive and interactive features, while the MBR, although the result of the analysis was non-significant, was perceived as a more eudaimonically designed museum due to its reflective features. However, the latter pattern was somewhat weaker than in Study 1, and the same was true concerning the differentiation of anticipated emotions, although we again found a more anticipated mix of emotions such as compassion and sadness in the MBR. As this weaker pattern, although fitting with cultural differences between Croatia and the USA, can also be explained by methodological factors (e.g., in Study 2 the Amazon Mechanical Turk sample may have provided lower quality data), we conducted Study 3 in Croatia in order to replicate the Study 1 findings in the same context. Importantly, Study 3 moved beyond the previous studies in three other important ways. First, we wanted to measure the effect using improved and more focused measures of anticipated well-being and a longer list of anticipated emotions. Specifically, in Studies 1 and 2 we assessed these constructs via single items, and because eudaimonic well-being has shown to resonate with reflective experience, and hedonic well-being with immersive and interactive experience across the two studies and samples, in Study 3 we aimed to replicate these findings with different measures (anticipated eudaimonic museum experience and anticipated hedonic museum experience) that could better operationalise these constructs. Moreover, because we observed a repeating pattern of anticipated emotions across the two studies with participants anticipating feeling emotions such as compassion, and gratitude but also sadness and frustration in MBR and emotions such as joy and amusement in MC and MI, in Study 3 we used a larger set of emotions and also grouped the emotions into two groups, mixed vs. positive affect, to understand better the pattern of anticipated emotions in relation to hedonically and eudaimonically designed museums. Second, we focused the experimental comparison on two (rather than three) museums. We decided to drop the MI because of its similarity to the MC due to both representing hedonically designed museums, with the MC representing a more hedonic experience than the MI, because of a higher positive effect (Diener et al. 1999), engagement of all senses, consumption (of chocolate), and immersion in physical experience (Huta 2015). As such, Study 3 increased the experimental contrast to offer a stronger test of our predictions.

Third, in Study 3 we wanted to also explore what participants anticipate they would do with the experience/emotions gained in the museums. To this end, we measured the participants' anticipated caring for others after a potential museum visit (because our theoretical perspective suggests that positive and negative emotions are in different ways associated with empathy; Nawijn and Biran 2018; Medeiros et al. 2023). We expected participants to anticipate stronger caring for others in a eudaimonically

designed museum (MBR) than in a hedonically designed museum (MC), because it enables reflectivity about oneself and others (and may thus stimulate action towards others), as well as experience of positive and negative emotions.

7 | Study 3

7.1 | Method

Participants and design. Participants were 213 (183 women, 29 men, and 1 nonbinary) Croatian students studying psychology at two universities in Zagreb. Participants were recruited by contacting the lecturers and arranging data collection during the lectures who allowed it, thereby trying to involve students from undergraduate and graduate studies. Their age ranged between 18 and 40, with most participants between the ages of 19 and 22 ($M=21.23$, $SD=2.77$). Most of the participants self-reported that they generally go to museums (80%). The results of a sensitivity power analysis conducted using G*Power (Faul et al. 2007) revealed that with $\alpha=0.05$ and power $(1-\beta)=0.80$, the minimum detectable effect size was $f=0.19$. This effect size is considered to be between a small and medium effect size, according to Cohen's (1988) guidelines. The questionnaire was constructed using Qualtrics Survey Software. After gaining the approval of the Ethical Committees, the anonymous survey link was sent to students which directed them to the online questionnaire. In Study 3, there were two versions of the same questionnaire, one for each museum (MC and MBR). The content of the two versions of the questionnaire was the same, except for the description of the museum participants were asked about in the survey. The questionnaire was developed in English and then translated into Croatian by a bilingual speaker of English and Croatian (the first author). To confirm that meanings were equal in both languages, the author asked for feedback from another two bilingual speakers.

Measures. After obtaining informed consent and answering demographic questions, participants were asked to read a scenario about the specific (real) museum in Zagreb (MC or MBR). Participants were presented with the same items we used in Studies 1 and 2 to measure anticipated experience (immersive, interactive, and reflective) and anticipated emotions. The list included all the emotions from Studies 1 and 2 with the addition of moved, shame, guilt, loneliness, jealousy, and failure. All items were rated on a 1–5 Likert-type scale (with 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*) unless noted otherwise.

As noted, we improved our measures for the anticipated experience. Hence, in addition to providing answers in terms of anticipating reflective/immersive/interactive experiences, participants were also asked about anticipated eudaimonic museum experience and anticipated hedonic museum experience. The anticipated eudaimonic experience was measured using 7 items, with one item about 'personal meaning', which has been recognised as a part of the eudaimonic experience (Park and Ahn 2022), and the other 6 items about the experience that enhances the six dimensions of the psychological well-being (personal growth, self-acceptance, environmental mastery, relations with others, purpose in life, and autonomy) (Ryff et al. 2007). For example, one of the items stated, 'Visiting this museum would

make me feel connected to others', which reflected increased relations with others. Another item stated, 'Visiting this museum would challenge how I think about myself and the world', which reflected personal growth through the visitation of the museum. The Cronbach Alpha of the scale was $\alpha = 0.85$. The anticipated hedonic experience was measured using 5 items that reflected two dimensions of hedonism: pleasure and avoidance-detachment (Park and Ahn 2022). For example, to measure pleasure we created an item 'Visiting this museum would make me feel good immediately after visiting it', while to measure avoidance-detachment we used an item 'This museum would help me forget the problems in the world'. The Cronbach Alpha of the scale was $\alpha = 0.81$ (please see Appendix F for evidence for the differentiation of the two subscales).

For explorative purposes, in addition to museum attractiveness we also measured anticipated caring for others, using the item 'To what extent do you agree that visiting this museum would stimulate you to check up on a friend or a family member, who might not be feeling well? Please take a moment to think about this'.

7.2 | Results

In Study 3, the same type of analyses were conducted as in the previous studies. All means, standard deviations, and ANOVA results of key variables across conditions can be found in Table 3.

As seen in Table 3, participants anticipated a more immersive and interactive experience in the MC compared to the MBR while anticipating a more reflective experience in the MBR than in the MC. Moreover, they anticipated a higher eudaimonic experience in MBR than in MC, whereas hedonic experience was expected to be higher in MC compared to MBR. Additionally, participants anticipated engaging in caring for others in need significantly more in the MBR condition compared to the MC condition. This effectively replicates the Study 1 findings about anticipated eudaimonic well-being and extends them to include an anticipation of wanting to care for others more as a potential consequence. Furthermore, these findings replicate the Study 1 and 2 findings about anticipated hedonic well-being.

Study 3 confirmed previous findings, demonstrating that participants generally anticipated emotions related to compassion, sadness, loneliness, jealousy, and feeling moved in the MBR. In contrast, higher levels of amusement, desire, joy, and contentment were anticipated in the MC (refer to Appendix E for the *t*-test of emotions across conditions). When analysing mixed and positive affect, participants expected more of both in MBR compared to MC. However, qualitative findings (see Appendix A) and previous studies indicated that participants anticipated a mix of positive and negative emotions in MBR and only positive emotions in MC.

Therefore, we conducted an exploratory factor analysis to determine if grouping emotions into mixed vs. positive categories accurately represents the anticipated emotional experiences in eudaimonic and hedonic conditions. The factor analysis revealed four distinct categories for the 22 emotion items: (1) negative

TABLE 3 | Descriptive statistics and ANOVA for Study 3.

	Museum of broken relationships			Museum of chocolate			ANOVA					
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p	η^2
Museum attractiveness	108	4.21 ^a	0.87	105	4.30 ^a	0.79	0.45	1	0.45	0.65	0.423	0.00
Anticipated immersive experience	108	3.14 ^b	0.94	105	4.14 ^a	0.73	53.66	1	53.66	108.77	0.001	0.26
Anticipated interactive experience	108	3.63 ^b	0.82	105	4.10 ^a	0.65	12.02	1	12.02	22.05	0.001	0.10
Anticipated reflective experience	108	3.94 ^a	0.77	105	2.70 ^b	0.96	81.85	1	81.85	108.77	0.001	0.34
Anticipated eudaimonic experience	108	3.48 ^a	0.72	105	2.71 ^b	0.78	23.13	1	23.13	56.31	0.001	0.21
Anticipated hedonic experience	108	3.49 ^b	0.67	105	3.72 ^a	0.68	2.84	1	2.84	6.30	0.013	0.03
Anticipated caring	108	3.31 ^a	1.12	105	2.37 ^b	0.91	47.38	1	47.38	45.48	0.001	0.18
Mixed affect	108	3.44 ^a	0.51	105	2.75 ^b	0.47	25.54	1	25.54	104.37	0.001	0.33
Positive affect	108	3.52 ^a	0.54	105	3.16 ^b	0.54	6.84	1	6.84	23.46	0.001	0.10

Note: The means that were significantly different are marked with different superscript letters, while those that did not significantly differ are marked with the same superscript letters.

emotions (high loadings on frustration, failure, shame, guilt, loneliness, jealousy, and sadness), (2) positive achievement/connection emotions (high loadings on gratitude, triumph, pride, relief, hope, and awe), (3) empathetic/compassionate emotions (high loadings on being moved, compassion, inspiration, love), and (4) joyful emotions (high loadings on joy, amusement, contentment, desire, and interest) (for detailed analysis, see [Appendix F](#)).

As shown in [Table 4](#), ANOVA results indicated that participants anticipated more joyful emotions in MC and more negative, empathetic/compassionate, and positive achievement/connection emotions in MBR. Additionally, exploratory mediation analysis revealed that anticipated joyful emotions mediate the relationship between the museum type and anticipated hedonic experience. In contrast, anticipated empathetic/compassionate and negative emotions mediate the relationship between the museum type and anticipated eudaimonic experience, with empathetic/compassionate emotions being the strongest mediator (for detailed analysis, see [Appendix H](#)).

Therefore, although these results confirm that mixed affect is anticipated in eudaimonic experiences and positive affect in hedonic experiences, the pattern of anticipated emotions is more complex, primarily revolving around the anticipation of empathetic/compassionate and negative emotions in the eudaimonically designed museums and anticipation of joyful emotions in the hedonically designed museums.

7.3 | Discussion

Study 3 replicated most findings from the first two studies, particularly Study 1, confirming findings for the three research questions on (1) anticipated experience (e.g., immersive, interactive, reflective), (2) anticipated well-being (hedonic or eudaimonic), and (3) anticipated emotions. Specifically, hedonic (immersive and interactive) experience was anticipated when visiting the MC, while the eudaimonic (reflective) experience was anticipated when visiting the MBR. Hence, the eudaimonically designed museum was anticipated to have well-being benefits beyond hedonism for potential visitors through providing meaning and stimulating personal growth, self-acceptance, environmental mastery, relations with others, purpose in life, and autonomy (which is in line with Ryff and Singer 2006), as well as elicitation of a mix of positive and negative emotions encompassing emotions such as compassion and sadness (also supported by Nawijn and Filep 2016). On the other hand, the hedonically designed museum was anticipated to have well-being benefits through simply stimulating pleasure and enabling avoidance of (every day) concerns, as well as elicitation of positive hedonic affect which included emotions of joy and amusement, which is in line with previous research that showed hedonic experiences to be oriented towards pleasure and positive emotions (Huta 2015; Diener, Lucas, and Oishi 2002).

However, our findings suggest that categorising anticipated emotions simply as mixed vs. positive affect is overly simplistic and potentially misleading (e.g., we observed a higher anticipation of positive affect in MBR than in MC). Although our research is exploratory, it indicates that anticipated eudaimonic experiences are mediated by anticipated empathetic/compassionate

TABLE 4 | ANOVA Results for Anticipated Emotions in Different Museums.

Anticipated emotions	Museum of broken relationships				Museum of chocolate				ANOVA			
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p	η^2
Negative emotions	108	3.28	0.73	105	1.87	0.67	105.59	1	105.59	215.51	0.001	0.51
Positive achievement/connection emotions	108	3.08	0.69	105	2.52	0.67	16.86	1	16.86	36.22	0.001	0.15
Empathetic/compassionate emotions	108	3.97	0.65	105	2.97	0.75	52.84	1	52.84	107.70	0.001	0.34
Joyful emotions	108	3.68	0.56	105	4.08	0.52	8.38	1	8.38	28.67	0.001	0.12

emotions (such as compassion, being moved, love, and inspiration) and anticipated negative emotions (frustration, failure, shame, guilt, loneliness, jealousy, and sadness). In contrast, anticipated hedonic experiences are mediated by anticipated joyful emotions (including joy, contentment, amusement, desire, and interest). Thus, eudaimonically designed museums seem to be anticipated to evoke a combination of empathetic/compassionate and negative emotions, while hedonically designed museums are anticipated to elicit primarily joyful emotions. These findings, although insightful, are based on a single study and require further research for validation.

In line with expectations, Study 3 also showed a clear difference between the museums regarding the anticipated caring for others, which was anticipated more strongly when anticipating a visit to the MBR than to the MC. This is a novel finding that nevertheless is in need of further replication, but it again points towards the reflectivity of eudaimonic experience and mixed affect that stimulate visitors to engage with others. This is particularly interesting given that results showed that both types of museums can be perceived as equally attractive. Thus, anticipating a eudaimonic experience does not make the museum less attractive than anticipating a more hedonic experience.

8 | General Discussion

In three experimental studies, we examined how descriptions of museum design affect the anticipation of hedonic or eudaimonic well-being experiences. We aimed to answer three research questions key to this: (1) Do differently designed museums lead people to anticipate different perceptions regarding different design features (reflectivity, interactivity, and immersivity)? (2) Does this translate to different anticipated hedonic or eudaimonic well-being experiences? and (3) Which specific pattern of positive and negative emotions do visitors anticipate feeling in hedonically and eudaimonically designed museums? Importantly, the three studies we conducted, involving participants from Croatia and the USA, yielded evidence for the hypothesised differentiation between the museums in terms of anticipated eudaimonic and hedonic well-being. Taken together, we found that eudaimonically designed museums are associated with anticipating eudaimonic well-being, likely because anticipating reflective encounters imbue visitors with meaning and potentially catalyse their personal growth, self-acceptance, environmental mastery, interpersonal connections, life purpose, and autonomy. Conversely, hedonically designed museums are linked with anticipating hedonic well-being, likely because of anticipating immersive, interactive experiences that offer pleasure and distract from concerns.

Furthermore, distinct patterns of anticipated emotions are expected to arise from visits to these two museum types. In eudaimonically designed museums, visitors anticipate mixed affect, but specifically affect that encompasses empathetic/compassionate emotions like compassion, love, and inspiration as well as negative emotions such as sadness and loneliness. In contrast, hedonically designed museums are anticipated to elicit exclusively positive affect, specifically joyful emotions such as joy, contentment, and amusement. Intriguingly, the data revealed that while Croats perceived no difference in

museum attraction between eudaimonically and hedonically designed museums, Americans displayed a slight preference for hedonically designed museums, which also dovetails with the weaker findings for the anticipated eudaimonic experience in Study 2. Furthermore, Study 3 revealed a unique potential for eudaimonically designed museums to anticipate intentions to show care for others, extending their benefits beyond individualistic (hedonic) well-being. We discuss the implications of our findings below.

8.1 | Theoretical Implications

Our findings align and move beyond social-psychological theorising and research on eudaimonic and hedonic well-being (e.g., Diener and Emmons 1984; Diener et al. 1999; Diener, Lucas, and Oishi 2002; Ryff and Singer 2006; Seligman 2011; Huta and Waterman 2014; Huta 2015), and also offer a novel contribution to the applied field of museum studies focusing on the well-being impact of museums (e.g., Chatterjee and Noble 2016; Šveb Dragija and Jelinčić 2022). Our findings yielded support for the conceptual differentiation of eudaimonically and hedonically designed museums, which enables the design of museums that can optimise hedonic or eudaimonic well-being. Specifically, our findings align with the notion that hedonic experiences should involve high levels of positive emotions, low levels of negative emotions (Diener, Lucas, and Oishi 2002), pleasure, enjoyment (Huta 2015), focus on the present moment (Pearce 2017), and consumption or involvement of senses (Huta 2015). Our findings also yielded support for the features of the eudaimonic experience which include stimulation of meaning, personal growth, excellence, and authenticity through reflectivity (Huta and Waterman 2014), pride (Seligman 2011), and mixed affect involving both positive and negative emotions (Nawijn and Filep 2016). Hence, at least in the realm of visitor anticipations, specific museum features are likely to stimulate anticipations of more hedonic or more eudaimonic experiences with their respective well-being benefits.

Consequently, our findings connect with approaches such as the broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions proposed by (Fredrickson (2001, 2004)) by extending theorising to the domain of cognitive anticipation. While positive emotions have been shown to broaden the range of behaviours and thoughts temporarily, leading to enhanced individual well-being over time, our findings suggest that negative emotions, often perceived as narrowing attention, are anticipated to also contribute to this broadening effect and longer-term well-being when experienced alongside positive (empathetic/compassionate) emotions. In this context, positive emotions like compassion and pride may enrich one's repertoire in terms of engagement, savouring, and sharing (Fredrickson 2001). On the other hand, negative emotions such as sadness and loneliness appear to expand one's scope in the realm of meaning and potential future behaviours that involve forming connections with others. Hence, achieving eudaimonic psychological well-being might necessitate the simultaneous experience of positive and negative emotions. Therefore, even at the anticipation level, hedonically and eudaimonically designed museums can be differentiated in terms of specific patterns of positive and negative emotions. To foster personal growth, then, visitors anticipate museums to offer positive emotions

such as compassion, and to a certain extent, discomfort. Indeed, this line of thought is supported by (Berrios, Totterdell, and Kellett (2018)) who found a positive correlation between mixed affect and eudaimonic well-being, linked via a search for meaning in life. Intriguingly, although moments of discomfort are anticipated regarding eudaimonically designed museums, our findings indicate that this does not make them less attractive to potential visitors than hedonistically designed museums (or at least in Study 1 and 3).

Moreover, Study 3 uniquely suggested that eudaimonically designed museums may offer psychological benefits that extend beyond the individual visitor, as participants anticipated the intention to show care for others. These findings, while exploratory, suggest a stronger inclination towards forming connections with others, after visiting eudaimonically designed museums compared to hedonically designed ones. This aligns with Pearce and Huta's study (2023), which similarly revealed a higher positive correlation between eudaimonia and altruistic behaviour compared to hedonism. This suggests that the experience of eudaimonically designed museums might stimulate visitors to think beyond their well-being, to encompass the well-being of others. As such, the current research offers important pointers that anticipating such museum experiences may nudge people in the direction of wanting to translate that experience into their actions.

8.2 | Practical Implications

Three practical implications of our research centre around (1) the importance of managing visitor anticipations, (2) the influence of design on the museum experience, and (3) the universality of anticipations and design features independent of the visitors' cultural background. Our findings underscore the importance of managing visitors' anticipations based on museum descriptions, as visitor experience and satisfaction hinge on whether these anticipations are met (Koenig-Lewis and Palmer 2014; Kirchberg and Tröndle 2012). Specifically, as our study showed, visitors hold anticipations in terms of eudaimonic and hedonic experiences, suggesting visitors may opt to visit a museum that fits their well-being desires, or needs. Some visitors may be keen on having an easy going experience filled with joy and happiness, whereas others may want to have an experience that stimulates their personal growth and challenges them to think about themselves or the world. Thus, museums can utilise branding and communication to convey the type of well-being experience visitors can anticipate. Indeed, to communicate the eudaimonic museum experience, museums should stress how the museum stimulates meaning, personal growth, self-acceptance, environmental mastery, interpersonal connections, life purpose, and autonomy as well as mixed affect encompassing both negative and positive emotions linked to sadness, empathy and compassion. In contrast, to communicate a hedonic museum experience, museums should put focus on positive (joyful) emotions, pleasure, enjoyment of the present moment, consumption, and involvement of the senses. Furthermore, even museums that do not fit into the eudaimonically or hedonically designed categories (e.g., Museum of Contemporary Art, History Museum) can use elements of both to elicit emotional reactions and well-being benefits. For instance, such museums could offer textual descriptions

of the exponents that include either stories written in the first person (which enables identification) or questions that stimulate self-reflection, hence promoting eudaimonic well-being. To stimulate hedonic well-being, such museums could include sensory experiences. For example, instead of solely displaying an artefact, museums could allow visitors to touch it. Striving for a blended experience that incorporates both hedonic and eudaimonic aspects could yield optimal results, transcending mere visitor satisfaction to offer lasting well-being benefits. Such eudaimonic or hedonic elements should be communicated to the visitors to craft their anticipations because the experience starts before the museum visit itself (Kirchberg and Tröndle 2012). Importantly, our findings suggested that such museum anticipations can be equally stirred in visitors from diverse cultural backgrounds. This opens opportunities for crafting cultural and tourism experiences that cater to a wide range of visitors.

8.3 | Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Although we conducted a systematic set of three experiments with different samples, our work is not without limitations. For example, although the research was conducted with Croatian and American participants, the clearest set of findings came from the two studies with Croats. One difference between the samples was a slight preference for the hedonic museum experience compared to the eudaimonic museum experience in the American sample, while both types of experiences were perceived equally attractive by Croats. It is doubtful, however, what these differences can be attributed to. For example, it could be that Study 2 suffered from insufficient statistical power, that the online sample (i.e., paid Amazon Mechanical Turk workers) did not offer equal-quality data as in Study 1 and 3, or that the difference can be explained because of cultural differences between Croatia and the USA. Although we did not conduct statistical power analysis before the studies (because we set out to first explore our reasoning) we calculated power post hoc (via the GPower program) to understand whether the studies were sufficiently powered. The results of these analyses showed sufficient power (> 0.90) for all studies, which rules out a power explanation for why the pattern of findings was weakest in Study 2. Future research can seek to replicate our findings with exactly the same method in different countries like Croatia and the USA to understand whether this pattern of findings reflects the method or indeed cultural differences.

Second, our participants were predominantly young (between the ages of 20 and 40), potentially influencing their museum preferences based on the general topic of the museum (e.g., chocolate, relationships). This may be a limitation, because older participants might have shown a higher preference for visiting hedonic museums, due to socioemotional selectivity and preference for the shorter-term hedonic benefits (Carstensen 1992). Hence, future studies could put more emphasis on the 'silver economy', a growing museum visitor pool, by exploring how older visitors anticipate certain museum experiences and which type of experience they find most appealing.

Third, due to the availability of anticipated eudaimonic/hedonic experience scales, we were only able to measure the pattern of

anticipated emotions associated with anticipated hedonic and eudaimonic experiences in Study 3. Although our findings suggest that anticipated joyful emotions mediate the anticipated hedonic experience, while anticipated empathetic/compassionate emotions and negative emotions mediate the anticipated eudaimonic experience, these results are exploratory and warrant further investigation. Future research should aim to replicate these findings, not only in terms of anticipated emotions but also through in situ studies within museum settings. This is particularly important as the distinction between hedonic and eudaimonic emotional experiences appears to be more complex than merely positive versus mixed affect, and investigating this pattern would enable an understanding of how different museum experiences are processed emotionally by the visitors before and during the museum visit. For instance, future research could investigate how eudaimonically designed museums can be utilised to elicit empathy for marginalised populations while at the same time prompting visitors' personal growth.

Fourth, although the findings about anticipated caring for others after visiting eudaimonically designed museums are intriguing, they were measured using single items, so more research with improved measurement is needed. For example, future research could determine how eudaimonically designed museums impact tourists' behaviour on the location and upon returning home. Are they more likely to check in with friends and family (i.e., relatives) after such a visit, and are they more likely to connect with locals (i.e., strangers)?

Finally, while participants' anticipation of their museum experience is noteworthy, it does not provide much insight into how this anticipation influences their actual experience. To address this gap, we are currently conducting studies on the actual museum experience and recommend that future research should empirically examine both the anticipation and the actual experience phases. This approach will offer a better understanding of how cognitive anticipation affects the real experience. Conducting such a longitudinal study is a promising direction for future research on museum experiences, including aspects of museum design, types of well-being, and specific emotions.

9 | Conclusion

This research is the first to examine the anticipation of eudaimonic and hedonic well-being experiences and anticipated (patterns of) emotions in the context of differently designed museums. We found across three social-psychological experiments that eudaimonically designed museums are anticipated to stimulate a distinct type of well-being by fostering meaning, personal growth, and interconnectedness, while hedonically designed museums are expected to provide pleasure and escapism. This applies modern psychological theorising about cognitive anticipation and well-being to the domain of museum design and hence offers key applied insights. For example, by harnessing the potential for differential well-being and emotional experience through museum design, museums hold the key to shaping visitors' anticipation of their museum experiences by communicating what these experiences will be like. This influence may not only impact whether individuals choose to visit a museum in the first place (e.g., aligning with

their eudaimonic or hedonic preferences, finding the museum attractive), but it also extends the museum's reach beyond the visit itself. This enables museums to become catalysts for both hedonic and eudaimonic well-being and serve a function of potential 'well-being generators'.

Ethics Statement

The research was approved by the ethics committee of the University of Groningen.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Data Availability Statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

References

- Baumgartner, H., R. Pieters, and R. P. Bagozzi. 2008. "Future-Oriented Emotions: Conceptualization and Behavioral Effects." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 38, no. 4: 685–696. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.467>.
- Berrios, R., P. Totterdell, and S. Kellett. 2018. "When Feeling Mixed Can Be Meaningful: The Relation Between Mixed Emotions and Eudaimonic Well-Being." *Journal of Happiness Studies* 19: 841–861. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-017-9849-y>.
- Brown, S. P., W. L. Cron, and J. W. Slocum Jr. 1997. "Effects of Goal-Directed Emotions on Salesperson Volitions, Behavior, and Performance: A Longitudinal Study." *Journal of Marketing* 61, no. 1: 39–50. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299706100104>.
- Buehler, R., and C. McFarland. 2001. "Intensity Bias in Affective Forecasting: The Role of Temporal Focus." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 27, no. 11: 1480–1493. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672012711009>.
- Carstensen, L. L. 1992. "Social and Emotional Patterns in Adulthood: Support for Socioemotional Selectivity Theory." *Psychology and Aging* 7, no. 3: 331–338. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0882-7974.7.3.331>.
- Chatterjee, H., and G. Noble. 2016. *Museums, Health and Well-Being*. London: Routledge.
- Cohen, J. 1988. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. 2nd ed. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. 2000. "The Contribution of Flow to Positive Psychology." In *The Science of Optimism and Hope: Research Essays in Honor of Martin E. P. Seligman*, edited by J. E. Gillham, 387–395. Los Angeles, California: Templeton Foundation Press.
- Diener, E. 1984. "Subjective Well-Being." *Psychological Bulletin* 95, no. 3: 542–575. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.95.3.542>.
- Diener, E., and R. A. Emmons. 1984. "The Independence of Positive and Negative Affect." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 47, no. 5: 1105–1117. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.47.5.1105>.
- Diener, E., R. E. Lucas, and S. Oishi. 2002. "Subjective Well-Being: The Science of Happiness and Life Satisfaction." *Handbook of Positive Psychology* 2: 63–73.
- Diener, E., E. M. Suh, R. E. Lucas, and H. L. Smith. 1999. "Subjective Well-Being: Three Decades of Progress." *Psychological Bulletin* 125, no. 2: 276–302. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.125.2.276>.
- Disabato, D. J., F. R. Goodman, T. B. Kashdan, J. L. Short, and A. Jarden. 2016. "Different Types of Well-Being? A Cross-Cultural Examination of

- Hedonic and Eudaimonic Well-Being." *Psychological Assessment* 28, no. 5: 471–482. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000209>.
- Falk, J. H., and L. D. Dierking. 2000. *Learning From Museums: Visitor Experiences and the Making of Meaning*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Falk, J. H., and L. D. Dierking. 2016. *The Museum Experience Revisited*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315417851>.
- Faul, F., E. Erdfelder, A. G. Lang, and A. Buchner. 2007. "G* Power 3: A Flexible Statistical Power Analysis Program for the Social, Behavioral, and Biomedical Sciences." *Behavior Research Methods* 39, no. 2: 175–191. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03193146>.
- Fredrickson, B. L. 2001. "The Role of Positive Emotions in Positive Psychology: The Broaden-And-Build Theory of Positive Emotions." *American Psychologist* 56, no. 3: 218–226. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.218>.
- Fredrickson, B. L. 2004. "The Broaden-And-Build Theory of Positive Emotions. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London." *Series B: Biological Sciences* 359, no. 1449: 1367–1377. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2004.1512>.
- Gaston-Breton, C., J. E. Lemoine, B. G. Voyer, and M. N. Kastanakis. 2021. "Pleasure, Meaning or Spirituality: Cross-Cultural Differences in Orientations to Happiness Across 12 Countries." *Journal of Business Research* 134: 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.05.013>.
- Henderson, R. W., ed. 2013. *Parent-Child Interaction: Theory, Research, and Prospects*. London: Academic Press.
- Huta, V. 2012. "Linking peoples' Pursuit of Eudaimonia and Hedonia With Characteristics of Their Parents: Parenting Styles, Verbally Endorsed Values, and Role Modeling." *Journal of Happiness Studies* 13: 47–61. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-011-9249-7>.
- Huta, V. 2013. *Eudaimonia*. Oxford: Oxford Handbooks Online.
- Huta, V. 2015. "The Complementary Roles of Eudaimonia and Hedonia and How They Can Be Pursued in Practice." *Positive Psychology in Practice: Promoting Human Flourishing in Work, Health, Education, and Everyday Life* 159–182. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118996874.ch10>.
- Huta, V., and R. M. Ryan. 2010. "Pursuing Pleasure or Virtue: The Differential and Overlapping Well-Being Benefits of Hedonic and Eudaimonic Motives." *Journal of Happiness Studies* 11: 735–762. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-009-9171-4>.
- Huta, V., and A. S. Waterman. 2014. "Eudaimonia and Its Distinction From Hedonia: Developing a Classification and Terminology for Understanding Conceptual and Operational Definitions." *Journal of Happiness Studies* 15: 1425–1456. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-013-9485-0>.
- Kemper, T. D., and R. S. Lazarus. 1992. "Emotion and Adaptation." *Contemporary Sociology* 21, no. 4: 522. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2075902>.
- Kirchberg, V., and M. Tröndle. 2012. "Experiencing Exhibitions: A Review of Studies on Visitor Experiences in Museums." *Curator: The Museum Journal* 55, no. 4: 435–452.
- Kotler, N., and P. Kotler. 2000. "Can Museums be All Things to All People?: Missions, Goals, and Marketing's Role." *Museum Management and Curatorship* 18, no. 3: 271–287. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09647770003031803>.
- Koenig-Lewis, N., and A. Palmer. 2014. "The Effects of Anticipatory Emotions on Service Satisfaction and Behavioral Intention." *Journal of Services Marketing* 28, no. 6: 437–451. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSM-09-2013-0244>.
- Medeiros, S. A. D., A. C. Campos, L. B. A. Freitas, T. S. Mondo, and E. Sthapit. 2023. "Capturing Eudaimonic Feelings in Tourism Experience: A Construct Proposal and Preliminary Empirical Evidence." *Tourism and Hospitality Research* 24, no. 4: 636–642. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14673584231173512>.
- McKercher, B. 2004. "A Comparative Study of International Cultural Tourists." *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management* 11, no. 2: 95–108.
- Minkov, M., and A. Kaasa. 2022. "Do Dimensions of Culture Exist Objectively? A Validation of the Revised Minkov-Hofstede Model of Culture With World Values Survey Items and Scores for 102 Countries." *Journal of International Management* 28, no. 4: 100971. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intman.2022.100971>.
- Nawijn, J., and A. Biran. 2018. "Negative Emotions in Tourism: A Meaningful Analysis." *Current Issues in Tourism* 22, no. 19: 2386–2398. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2018.1451495>.
- Nawijn, J., and S. Filep. 2016. "Two Directions for Future Tourist Well-Being Research." *Annals of Tourism Research* 61, no. C: 221–223. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2016.07.007>.
- Park, S., and D. Ahn. 2022. "Seeking Pleasure or Meaning? The Different Impacts of Hedonic and Eudaimonic Tourism Happiness on Tourists' Life Satisfaction." *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 19, no. 3: 1162. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19031162>.
- Pearce, K. 2017. *The Ripple Effects of Prioritizing Personal Excellence or Pleasure: Impacts on the Surrounding World*. Washington, DC: Doctoral dissertation, Université d'Ottawa/University of Ottawa.
- Polegato, R., and R. Bjerke. 2019. "Looking Forward: Anticipation Enhances Service Experiences." *Journal of Services Marketing* 33, no. 2: 148–159. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSM-02-2018-0064>.
- Richards, G. 2018. "Cultural Tourism: A Review of Recent Research and Trends." *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management* 36: 12–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2018.03.005>.
- Ryff, C. D. 1989. "Happiness Is Everything, or Is It? Explorations on the Meaning of Psychological Well-Being." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 57, no. 6: 1069–1081. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.57.6.1069>.
- Ryff, C. D., D. M. Almeida, J. S. Ayanian, et al. 2007. *National Survey of Midlife Development in the United States (MIDUS II), 2004-2006: Documentation of the Psychosocial Constructs and Composite Variables in MIDUS II Project 1*. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research.
- Ryff, C. D., and B. H. Singer. 2006. "Best News Yet on the Six-Factor Model of Well-Being." *Social Science Research* 35, no. 4: 1103–1119. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2006.01.002>.
- Seligman, M. E. 2011. *Flourish: A Visionary New Understanding of Happiness and Well-Being*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Šveb Dragija, M., and D. A. Jelinčić. 2022. "Can Museums Help Visitors Thrive? Review of Studies on Psychological Wellbeing in Museums." *Behavioral Science* 12, no. 11: 458. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs12110458>.
- Šveb Dragija, M., and S. Franić. 2023. "Eudaimonic Tourism: Ensuring Sustainability of Tourism through of Meaningful Tourism Experiences." In *Paper Presented at the ToSEE Conference 'Engagement & Empowerment: A Path Toward Sustainable Tourism', 25–27 May 2023*. Opatija, Croatia.
- Waterman, A. S. 1993. "Two Conceptions of Happiness: Contrasts of Personal Expressiveness (Eudaimonia) and Hedonic Enjoyment." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 64, no. 4: 678–691. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.64.4.678>.

Supporting Information

Additional supporting information can be found online in the Supporting Information section.