

This is the author-created version of the following work:

Krause, Amanda, and Davidson, Jane (2021) *An exploratory study of historical representations of love in an art gallery exhibition*. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, . (In Press)

Access to this file is available from:

<https://researchonline.jcu.edu.au/67902/>

© 2021 American Psychological Association, all rights reserved.

Please refer to the original source for the final version of this work:

<https://doi.org/10.1037/aca0000391>

Note:

This is an accepted manuscript (“author accepted” version) of an article published in *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts* online on 25 March 2021.

© 2021, American Psychological Association. This paper is not the copy of record and may not exactly replicate the authoritative document published in the journal. Please do not copy or cite without author's permission. The final article is available, upon publication, at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/aca0000391>.

You may download the published version directly from the journal (homepage: <https://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/aca>).

Published citation:

Krause, A. E., & Davidson, J.W. (2021). An exploratory study of historical representations of love in an art gallery exhibition. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, advance online publication.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/aca0000391>

An exploratory study of historical representations of love in an art gallery exhibition

Amanda E Krause^{1,2,3} & Jane W Davidson^{1,2}

¹ARC Centre of Excellence for the History of Emotions,

²Melbourne Conservatorium of Music, The University of Melbourne
Gate 12 Royal Parade, Melbourne, VIC 3010, Australia

³Department of Psychology, James Cook University
1 James Cook Drive, Townsville, QLD 4811, Australia

amanda.krause1@jcu.edu.au, j.davidson@unimelb.edu.au
+61 7 4781 5159

Corresponding author: Amanda Krause

Acknowledgement

This research was funded by the Australian Research Council Centre of Excellence for the History of Emotions (#CE110001011). The authors express sincere gratitude to all of the participants who have participated in this research.

Abstract

Visitor responses to art exhibitions vary depending on visitor traits, the exhibition context, as well as on the sensory engagement between visitor and exhibition. The present investigation explored visitors' experiences of *Love: Art of Emotions*, a curated exhibition shown at the National Gallery of Victoria in 2017, which comprised a variety of artworks from the Early Modern period selected to address the broad theme of love. This paper reports on a mixed-methods research project using a short survey and brief exit interviews with visitors to consider how the visitor experience was characterised, the factors that influenced this experience, and how the exhibition content was perceived with particular focus on the emotional content portrayed in the exhibition's collection of artworks. Results of quantitative analyses indicate that familiarity with artworks and their historical period combine with motivations for attending the exhibition (such as being motivated by the exhibition's theme) and have a clear positive influence on one's emotional experience of the exhibition overall. The results of thematic analyses pertaining to the interview responses provide evidence that visitors processed both the emotional and historical content in the exhibition—indicative of having contemplative experiences, and often processing the exhibition content in relation to themselves. These findings have implications for designing future exhibitions and contribute to our broader understanding of how modern-day audiences perceive and respond to historical art exhibitions and the work they comprise.

Keywords: exhibition, early modern art, visitor studies, emotions, in-gallery experiences

An exploratory study of historical representations of love in an art gallery exhibition

Introduction

Art galleries are often rated as offering valuable and meaningful experiences, with millions of people visiting them each year. The experiences include viewing, and sometimes interacting with, artistic works, having access to educational content such as information on the work's provenance and artistic goals and also recreation outcomes such as making the visit a social trip with a friend and partaking in food and beverage and retail experiences on site, all of which have been highlighted as significant outcomes for visitors (Stephen, 2001). The current paper explored *Love: Art of Emotion 1400- 1800*, an exhibition on display from April to July 2017 at the National Gallery of Victoria, Melbourne, Australia. The research focused on how the exhibition content was perceived by the public, with particular focus on the emotional content portrayed in the exhibition's collection of artworks.

Defining Exhibition Experience

In the growing field of museum studies, there has been a growing interest in research examining visitors' exhibition experiences, with systematic visitor studies "accepted as a valid and reliable method in the field of museum studies" (Tröndle, Greenwood, Kirchberg, & Tschacher, 2014, p. 2; see also Schiele, 2016 and Yalowitz & Bronnenkant, 2009). While the visitor experience is challenging to define and measure (Packer & Ballantyne, 2016), an increasing range of methodologies such as experience sampling and tracking are beginning to make the visitor experience easier to understand. Research in this area is essential to understand visitor behavior in an exhibition context as well as the interaction between visitors and the works on display (Tröndle, Greenwood, et al., 2014).

Researchers have tried to frame and define visitors' exhibition experiences (e.g., Doering, 1999; Falk & Dierking, 2013; Kirchberg & Tröndle, 2015; Pekarik, Doering, & Karns, 1999). Pekarik et al. (1999) outline four dimensions to museum experiences: "the object experience (seeing rare, genuine, or valuable art, or being moved by beauty); the cognitive experience (gaining or enriching understanding of the artefact); the introspective experience (imagining, reflecting on, or connecting with the artefact); and the social experience (interacting with companions, strangers at the exhibition or museum personnel)" (Kirchberg & Tröndle, 2015, pp. 169-170). Similarly, Doering (1999) categorizes four categories of experiences: social experiences which focus on people, object experiences which prioritize the artefacts, cognitive experiences which focus on interpreting what is seen, and introspective experiences which emphasize the visitor's own reflections that arise from the museum or exhibition visit. Additionally, Kirchberg and Tröndle (2015), focusing on galleries, define three types of experience: the enthusing (characterised by recognising and responding to familiar and famous artworks), the contemplative (characterised by connecting with and reflecting on the exhibited art, improving their understanding of the artworks, and considers/responds/likes the art and exhibition design), and the social (characterised by the experience of companionship and entertaining situations).

Falk and Dierking (2013) define visitors in terms of their motivations as: explorers, facilitators, professionals/hobbyists, experience seekers, and rechargers. This set of definitions has striking similarities to the model developed by Kirchberg and Tröndle, suggesting some common core areas of experience, across viewing context. Although the models offer a framework for defining visitor experience, it is also necessary to identify what factors contribute to defining a visitor's response to both artworks and exhibitions.

Factors That Influence Visitor Responses

Research from museum and psychological studies that explore visitors' behaviours and responses have found many factors that influence exhibition experience. These include characteristics of the individual visitor as well as characteristics of the museum/ exhibition. Individual differences, including age, gender, education, socio-economic status, influence who visits (e.g., DiMaggio, 1996; Kirchberg, 1996), and also define visitor experiences (Pelowski, Forster, Tinio, Scholl, & Leder, 2017; Taylor, 2010; Tröndle, Kirchberg, & Tschacher, 2014). These influences are embedded in behavioural propensities, including, for instance, emotional contagion. This is the tendency people have to feel the emotions of the people or even the objects they have created (Vreeke & Van der Mark, 2003), and so emotion is induced as the actor perceives emotional expression in another person/object and then 'mimics' this expression internally evoking a parallel emotional state (see Davidson & Garrido, 2014).

Visitors do "arrive with expectations and identity-related motivations for a visit, they arrive with interest, and they also arrive with a wealth of previously acquired knowledge, skills, beliefs, and attitudes" (Falk & Dierking, 2013, p. 94). These aspects—knowledge, familiarity, and attitudes—are unique to the individual, influence why people visit, what they do and focus on during the visit, and any meaning they make of their experience (Falk & Dierking, 2013, p. 94). A visitor's experience is not a simple stimulus-response action, because personal history (which includes level of familiarity, expertise, desire to explore, and expectations) plays a role (Snodgrass, Russell, & Ward, 1988; Specker et al., 2018). Indeed people's interpretations are anchored by personal experiences (Foreman-Wernet & Dervin, 2016). Tinio and Gartus (2018) concur: people's backgrounds, knowledge, expertise and familiarity influence their emotional experience of artworks. Moreover, "culturally and historically constructed ways" of integrating sensory information also play a role (Dudley,

2010, p. 10). With these individual factors in mind, the current study drew on measures of demographics, emotional contagion, and familiarity with the exhibition's historical artwork

The Context

The museum and exhibition atmosphere is an important category of influence to consider with regard to visitor behaviour (Forrest, 2013; Höge, 2003; Kottasz, 2006; Macdonald, 2007). Kottasz (2006) detailed five categories of museum atmospherics: the exterior, the interior, layout and design, decoration and human factors. Thus, elements including the layout and positioning of works (Falk, 1993; Kottasz, 2006; Pelowski et al., 2017), the presence and content of exhibit labels (Bitgood, 2000; Fragomeni, 2010; Kjeldsen & Jensen, 2015; Temme & Elvert, 1992), exhibition/ museum size and architectural features (Holahan & Bonnes-Dobrowolny, 1978; Kottasz, 2006; Pelowski et al., 2017), and background lighting and music (Chen & Tsai, 2015; Griswold, Mangione, & McDonnell, 2013) can all influence visitor behaviour. The presence of, and interaction with, other people in the space can impact upon visitor experience (Pelowski et al., 2017; Taylor, 2010; Yoshimura et al., 2014). This includes both the people within a visitor's party (e.g., children often influence family behaviour in museums – Cicero & Teichert, 2018) as well as strangers (e.g., the number of visitors affects crowd density and congestion – Yoshimura et al., 2014; du Cros, 2008). Additionally, that there are intangible atmospheric dimensions that influence visitor behaviours, including complexity, novelty, mystery (Kottasz, 2006). Further, within a particular exhibition, the character and content of exhibition stimuli will play a role (Falk, 1993).

Human-object engagement. Visitors have limited attention and are selective in what they view in museums and galleries (Bitgood, 2000, 2010). In object rich exhibitions, the objects are the primary elements for constructing knowledge (Wehner & Sear, 2010).

However, visitors do not passively respond to exhibitions – individuals actively engage with the exhibition environment, moving through it and attending to various content with varying levels of attention (Falk & Dierking, 2013). In this way, it is the visitors in control of their focus and attention (and not the museum or exhibition) (Falk & Dierking, 2013). While the museum can influence visitor outcomes, it is the visitors who use the museum for their own purposes and create their own perspectives (Doering, 1999).

Focusing on the human-object engagement to understand visitor experience stresses that it is the dynamic interaction between object and viewer that creates meaning (Dudley, 2010; Taylor, 2010). Importantly, this model recognizes that our response includes both cognitive and affective components, and that the affective dimension to the experience is key. The affective dimension, Taylor (2010, p. 181) states, is the “single quality that matters most. Knowing that we are operating with a viewer-based experience rooted in feeling or emotion, we can then examine those factors that influence or affect viewer response.”

Emotional content in / response to exhibitions. “Emotion has long been appreciated as an important part of the museum visitor experience, but... it has been poorly understood” (Falk & Dierking, 2013, p.191). Visitor experiences are not simply descriptions of what was seen and what was done, but involve “expressions of feelings, attitudes, and beliefs” (Falk & Dierking, 2013, p. 191). Indeed, exhibition stimuli can evoke emotions in visitors (Watson, 2010). As mentioned earlier, these emotions include ‘contagion’ experiences and are amplified by connection to past events which can be imagined and therefore re-experienced tying the exhibition experience to personal histories and memories (Watson, 2010). Bennett (2003) considers the involvement of memory as a form of ‘sense memory’ as an affective, rather than cognitive, experience of the past.

Motivations to attend and participate in an exhibition certainly shapes experiences and memories (Falk & Dierking, 2013; Tzortzi, 2017), as well as satisfaction and future visiting

intentions (De Rojas & Camarero, 2006; Palau-Saumell, Forgas-Coll, & Sánchez-García, 2016). The visitor, the context, and the exhibition stimuli all interact to influence people's personalised emotional responses (Taylor, 2010). Indeed, observation of exhibition visitors shows that "visitors try, quite often desperately, to relate what they are seeing to their own experience" (Falk & Dierking, 2013, p. 124). In this way, people draw on their knowledge and contextual information to make meaning of the works/exhibitions (Specker, Tinio, & van Elk, 2017). Further, emotion is an important factor in what makes museum visits memorable for people (Falk & Dierking, 2013). Indeed, 'extra memorable' experiences are often contingent on affective/empathic reactions to exhibition content (Luebke, 2018). The current research was keen to understand which motivations visitors drew on and how they shaped their emotional engagement and experience.

With regard to interpretation, there is an element of self-referential reflection (Specker et al., 2017). Nostalgia, for example, can play a prominent role in reactions to exhibitions (Höge, 2003); and reflecting on oneself can be related to visitors reporting they had empathic and affective reactions to exhibitions (Garrido & Davidson, 2019; Luebke, 2018). Smith's (2014) museum effect model encapsulates this notion of self-reflection, stating that "people use art as a springboard to engage in reflection and contemplation of things that are important to them in their lives." Indeed, as reiterated by sense-making theory, people interpret their experiences with artworks within the context of their own everyday life (Dervin, 1998; Foreman-Wernet & Dervin, 2016). Morphy (2010, p. 279) declares that a function of the museum is as "the fulcrum between the present and past" and that the last people to interact with an object are the modern-day exhibition visitors, which are apt comments for the present study given the interest in visitors' modern-day responses to historical portrayals of emotion, and in this specific case, Love.

Art, Emotions and the *Love* Exhibition

As historians have noted, in Europe from 1400-1800, love developed as a cultural expression with many complex emotional forms conveyed through visual and material media (Lynch, 2017). Though the visual arts are rarely straightforward reflections of everyday life since they often reference several simultaneous cultural representations, they include shared, culturally significant images used to make an impact through their representations (Simons, 2017). Across the early modern period, European artists used visual arts not only to represent but also create emotion—whether through expressions, postures, and positions, shape and colour, narrative settings depicted in the art works, or through the incorporation of art objects into personal practices and rituals (Lynch, 2017).

Historical artworks provide valuable evidence about the ‘emotional repertoire’ of the piece’s time and place (Boddice, 2018). Lynch summarises (2017, p. xii), “art is an inseparable constituent and carrier of love’s many feelings, and speaks an emotional language to which we still listen”. However, the notion of love, as well as the depictions and artworks themselves, have been definitions subject to historical and cultural shifts. This is because, as historians of emotions argue, emotions (including the expressions, experiences, and interpretations) are culturally and historically placed (Boddice, 2018, 2019).

Conceptualizations of universal emotions that emerged in psychology (see Gendron, Roberson, van der Vyver, & Barrett, 2014) are becoming increasingly questioned and one of the founding premises of the history of emotions is that emotional experience is constructed in both cultural and historical context (Boddice, 2018; Champion & Lynch, 2015).

Acknowledging the role of historical and cultural context also highlights the role of emotional rules, or norms, governing emotional expression and interpretation (Boddice, 2018; see also Fernández-Dols, Carrera, Mendoza, & Oceja, 2007 on emotional conventions).

That is, the framework for evaluation of emotions is culturally embedded, such that

emotional behaviour is learned and situated (Boddice, 2018). The study of past emotional experiences, then, necessitates understanding that meaning and importance are inextricably bound up with the people, places, and things involved (Boddice, 2018, 2019).

In addition to contextual influences, psychologists have noted that there are situational influences such that emotional experiences are considered to be dynamic (e.g., Wilson-Mendenhall, Barrett, & Barsalou, 2013). Some scholars label emotions as events or episodes that are co-constructed between individuals (e.g., Barrett, Mesquita, & Gendron, 2011; Gendron & Barrett, 2018). An individual is capable of interpreting cultural emotional expression with knowledge of the culture, language, and emotional norms. As an example, empathy involves shared context, shared knowledge, and shared emotional prescriptions (Boddice, 2019).

Objects can be critical to emotional experiences, and, in the case of artworks, a dynamic relationship between the work and its perceiver exists in the interpretation of an emotional expression. If we consider the historical artworks included in a gallery exhibition, for example, these objects can elicit emotions, based on their associations in the present, but if the objects are bound to the time and place of their creation some key aspects of their meaning can additionally be revealed to modify understanding. Viewers must draw on knowledge to read the historical emotions that may be found in art (Schwartz, 2017, see also Boddice, 2018). Historians speak of the ‘period eye’: a way of seeing the artwork more fully through understanding of its cultural, historical, and political context (Boddice 2018; see Baxandall, 1972, 1988). In the exhibition studied, the information panels accompanying the artworks and information made publicly available on the NGV’s website provided some access to historical information and introduced history of emotions ideas and concepts.

Aim

Laboratory research reveals people respond emotionally to artworks (Tschacher et al., 2012) and that individuals can have enhanced emotional, aesthetic, social, and educative experiences in the exhibition (Specker et al., 2017). Recognizing the importance of context with regard to aesthetic judgement as well as art experiences (e.g., Pelowski et al., 2017) and since studies have shown differences between lab and on-site exhibition responses (Pelowski et al., 2017), the present research focused on visitors' in-gallery experiences of an exhibition focused on the theme of love.

This exhibition offered unique opportunity to explore responses and experiences in the highly pertinent context of an explicit exploration “of the theme of love in art, and the changing representations of this complex emotion in Europe throughout the early modern period” (Ellwood, 2017, p. x). It comprised more than 200 artworks, drawn from the National Gallery of Victoria's permanent collection.

In addition to the commonly associated theme of romantic love, the exhibition explored the emotion with regard to varied manifestations from a range of human exchanges, including loving familial relationships, friendship, religious devotion, altruism, patriotism, and nostalgia. Moreover, emotions often associated with love such as wonder, affection, compassion, desire, melancholy, sacrifice, betrayal, and hope were also considered (Ellwood, 2017). Indeed, when expressed in art and life, love “is not so much a single emotion as an intricate constellation of feelings. To consider love is, in effect, to consider the full spectrum of human experience” (Hesson, 2017, p. 2).

The exhibition embraced a wide range of types of art: paintings, sculptures, prints, drawings, as well as functional objects (e.g., wedding dress, spinet, pieces of jewellery). The diverse range of pieces afforded an opportunity to explore public and private experiences as well as performances of love (Ellwood, 2017). The exhibition was displayed in three loose

sections arranged in two, adjoining gallery spaces. The tripartite layout aligned to anticipation, realization, and remembrance. Labels and additional wall text provided structural/contextual information throughout the exhibition (in addition to the introductory text at the exhibition's entrance).

The study did not focus exclusively on how visitors drew upon the history of emotions information presented in the exhibition, rather it used the exhibition as an opportunity to broadly explore individual ways of recognising and responding to familiar and famous artworks and to consider how individual differences influence visitors' emotional experiences. A multi-disciplinary approach was taken to explore visitor experience (using Kirchberg and Tröndle's dimensions as a starting framework), focusing on individual experience relative to motivations, emotional contagion, perceived and felt emotions and historical awareness/context.

As an exploratory study, it was guided by the following research questions:

RQ1: How do visitors experience the *Love* exhibition? In particular, on what dimensions can the visitor experience be defined? Further, what factors (e.g., visitor demographics, motivations, psychological traits, familiarity with historical artworks) influence the visitors' experiences?

RQ2: How do visitors interpret the exhibition content, in particular, what emotions do they experience and perceive when the exhibition is centred around love, a complex emotion itself?

Method

Participants

Individuals participated as part of a wider program of research that explored *Love: Art of Emotions*, an art exhibition shown at the National Gallery of Victoria between April and

June in 2017. The present study reports on data concerning a visitor survey, which is augmented by data collected in short interviews conducted with additional visitors as they exited the exhibition. While collected as part of a larger program of research (see Krause & Davidson, 2021), the questionnaire and interview data presented in this article are not reported elsewhere. The University of Melbourne approved this research (#1748640). Participation was entirely voluntary. Individuals who completed the survey provided written consent, while the individuals who completed short interviews provided verbal consent to take part in the research.

A total of 287 individuals filled out the survey, though not every person completed every question. For example, the sample included 194 females (67.60%), 74 males (25.80%), and a further 19 (6.60%) did not report their gender. Their ages ranged from 18 to 81 ($M = 39.65$, $Mdn = 33$, $SD = 18.36$). The majority of respondents resided in Australia (76.70% of those who reported their country of residence), while 10.10% of the sample resided in the UK, New Zealand, and the USA, and the remaining participants resided in an additional 10 countries.

A total of 80 individuals took part in the short interviews. None of the interviewed participants completed the questionnaire. Because of the swift flow through of people exiting the exhibition, responses were focused only on experience. Demographic information was not recorded and so the interview sample cannot be described further.

Procedure

Data collection was carried out throughout the exhibition's viewing period, with members of the research team visiting once a week at different times on different days in order to capture the range of visitors likely to attend at different points in time (e.g., older people, overseas visitors, families, etc.). The first author and a trained research assistant

shared conducting the interviews and approaching people to complete the survey. They typically attended for a 2-hour slot and spoke to each person or group leaving the exhibition in that timeframe (unless the researcher was currently engaged with participants). They asked gallery visitors if they would be willing to take part in the research (either by completing the short interview or survey).

Materials

Survey

People who agreed to complete a survey were provided with a paper copy on a clipboard and a pen. There was space for the individuals to complete the survey (standing or seated) in the gallery's atrium located adjacent to the exhibition exit. The survey asked participants to report their gender, age, and country of residence. It also included the following measures.

Visiting motives. The authors devised a set of six items to address the visitors' motivations for attending the exhibition (e.g., "I was intrigued by the concept of this exhibition"; "I wanted to see a particular artwork"). These items were based on prior items used in audience research related to musical performance (e.g., Davidson & Garrido, 2014). Participants responded using a five-point scale (1 = *strongly disagree*; 5 = *strongly agree*). The responses to the six items were subjected to a Principal Axis Factor (PAF) analysis with Promax rotation, which resulted in three factors accounting for 40.101% of the variance (see Supplementary materials). Factor 1 was labelled as "exhibition theme motivated", because it reflected being motivated by seeing art and the exhibition's concept. Factor 2 was labelled as "specific artwork motivated", due to the motivation for seeing a particular artwork demonstrating a high loading; and factor 3 was labelled as "unplanned visit" reflecting that

viewing the particular exhibition was not planned. In subsequent analyses, the resulting PAF factor scores were used.

Personal emotional experience. Participants completed a measure concerning their personal emotional experience using five-point scales (1 = *strongly disagree*; 5 = *strongly agree*). An amended version of a 16-item performance response measure revised through iterative use by Davidson and Garrido (2014) now referred to as the emotional experience measure (EEM; see all items in Table 1) was used to capture participants' emotional responses to the exhibition. Amendments to this measure pertained to wording, such that the items made reference to "the exhibition" (rather than a "performance").

To consider the underlying structure of the EEM, a PAF analysis with Promax rotation was performed. The results indicated that, together, four factors accounted for 45.153% of the variance (see Table 1). Based on the item loadings, factor 1 was labelled as "emotional response", given it was defined by a strong, personal emotional response to the artworks. Factor 2 was defined by a deep, emotional connection to the artists and artworks, so it was labelled as "communication/connection". Factor 3 was labelled as "attention/focus", given it pertained to personal attention given to the exhibition; and factor 4 was labelled as "enjoyment without explanation", reflecting that respondents were able to enjoy the exhibition emotionally without reading panel information. The scores resulting from the PAF analysis were used in subsequent analyses.

Post-visit reflection on experience. To define visitor experience in line with previous research on the subject, namely Kirchberg and Tröndle's enthusing, contemplative, and social types of experiences, six of Kirchberg and Tröndle's (2015) 12 "post-visit experience" measure items were used. This shortened version (hereafter referred to as the KTM) included two items from each of the three subscales, given the need for brief responses in the present survey. Note that item phrasing was amended to match the style of the rest of

the survey (see all items in Table 2). Because of these amendments, the responses to the KTM were also subjected to a PAF analysis with Promax rotation. As seen in Table 2, two factors accounted for 35.317% of the variance. In the present study, factor 1 reflects a combination of Kirchberg and Tröndle's (2015) social and enthusing dimensions; factor 2 mirrors the contemplative dimension. The PAF scores were used in subsequent analyses.

-Table 1 and Table 2 about here-

Emotional contagion. To capture people's disposition for emotional contagion, participants also completed Doherty's (1997) emotional contagion measure, which uses a four-point response scale (1 = *never*, 4 = *always*). Items address positive and negative dimensions of emotional contagion (e.g., "When someone smiles warmly at me, I smile back and feel warm inside"; "I tense when overhearing an angry quarrel"). Following Doherty's coding, averaged subscale scores for positive and negative emotional contagion were computed for each participant. Cronbach's alpha values for positive and negative emotional contagion were .766 and .766 respectively.

Interview

Short, semi-structured interviews were conducted with exhibition visitors (Bhattacharya, 2017). Each interview was audio-recorded in order to retain the data, but all responses were given anonymously. Interviews were kept purposely short, lasting between one and five minutes. In total, 59 interviews were conducted with 80 participants: the majority of interviews (43) involved an individual respondent, 11 involved a pair of respondents, and five were conducted with three respondents. The present study makes use of

the responses the two interview questions, pertaining to a) the participant's key emotional experience of the exhibition and b) whether participants identified a range of emotions in the works. These questions were, *What was particularly striking content in the exhibition and why?* and *What emotions were portrayed in the artworks and what did they experience in response to the works?* Follow up questions to responses included asking the participant to clarify or expand on their response.

Results

Quantitative Survey Results

The factor analyses concerning the EEM and KTM indicate dimensions that define visitors' responses to the exhibition. In particular, these include four factors defined by the EEM - "emotional response", "communication/connection", "attention/focus" and "enjoyment without explanation"; as well as the "social and enthusing" and "contemplative" dimensions defined by the KTM.

To address the research question concerning what factors influence visitors' experiences, five Generalized Linear Mixed Model (GLMM) analyses ($\alpha < .01$) were performed using SPSS (version 25). Each of the resulting factors (namely, emotional response, communication/connection, attention/focus, enthusing and social, and contemplative) served as the dependent variable in separate analyses (note because the enjoyment without explanation factor consisted of a single item pertaining to the panel information, it was not used in these analyses). The predictor variables in each analysis included: age, gender, the three motivation factor scores, the positive emotional contagion score, and the negative emotional contagion score.

Both the 'enthusing and social' and 'contemplative' models were statistically significant (see Table 3). In both KTM models, the exhibition theme- and artwork-motivated

scores were significantly, positively associated with the visiting experience. The negative emotional contagion score also demonstrated a significant, positive association with having a contemplative experience. Age demonstrated a significant, positive association with the emotional response score.

The models concerning the three EEM factors, emotional response, communication/connection, attention/focus were also statistically significant (see Table 3). Again, the exhibition theme motivated score were significantly, positively associated with each of the three experience factors. The artwork-motivated score demonstrated a significant, positive association with emotional response and communication/connection, and the unplanned motivation score demonstrated a significant, negative association with attention/focus. The positive emotional contagion score also demonstrated significant, positive associations with visitors' scores concerning emotional response and attention/focus; the negative emotional contagion score demonstrated a significant, positive association with communication/connection. Age was also positively associated with the attention/focus score.

This pattern of results indicates that one's visiting motivations and emotional contagion disposition do influence a visitor's experience of the exhibition.

-Table 3 about here-

Visitor Impressions

The interview responses also assist in understanding how people interpreted the exhibition content. Two separate thematic analyses (Braun & Clarke, 2006) were performed to identify patterns within the visitor responses to each of the main interview questions. Following the process outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006), all of the responses were coded according to topic and then these codes guided the identification of themes.

With regard to the most striking exhibition content, four main themes were identified (see Table 4). Besides the generic statements (e.g., “*I liked them all*”), participants responded in one of three ways: they either named a specific piece (and did so by either stating the artist, a title of a work, or giving a clear description in reference to a particular piece), stated a type of art (i.e., by stating a style, or specific type of artwork included in the exhibition, i.e., furniture, lace, wedding dress, tapestry), or stated the type of content drawn to (e.g., identifying the religious content of some of the pieces or the “*heartbroken ones*”). At face value, this demonstrates that exhibition visitors were drawn to a wide range of the works. While a few of the pieces received multiple mentions (i.e., *The Garden of Love* from the studio of Antonio Vivarini [c. 1465-1470], an Italian *Aphrodite* marble statue from the second century CE, and Johan Zoffany’s *Roman Charity* [c. 1769]), much of what was included in the exhibition was mentioned (across content, historical period, art type, room, etc.).

It is perhaps the response to why the chosen item was striking that reveals even more about the visitor’s experience and interpretation of the exhibition. Thematic analysis of these reasonings indicate they pertain to five higher-order categories: mention of the content (context subsumed or separate), artistry, exhibition presentation, familiarity, or a personal connection (see Table 5).

Responses under the exhibition presentation and familiarity categories are interesting to consider with regard to the complexities of navigating historical portrayals of the emotion of love. For instance, when referencing some etchings, one participant commented that they “*liked it because of the subtleties in there were don’t understand anymore*”; and another participant interpreted a mother’s quite neutral facial expression in a painting as looking “*tired and over it*” as opposed to looking “*nurturing and loving*”. Zoffany’s *Roman Charity*, mentioned by multiple participants as a “*quite memorable*” piece, offers an interesting case

study to consider “*how you view the older work through modern eyes*”. In this painting, an old man is suckling his daughter’s breast while awaiting execution, which is meant to depict honouring one’s parents (<https://www.ngv.vic.gov.au/explore/collection/work/4493/>). It made visitors “*disgusted*” and was “*uncomfortable to view*”. A visitor remarked they were “*initially shocked, but then read the explanation which made me think about it as a whole and I thought ... about the humanity at the end*”. Indeed, people made use of the label information as a part of the exhibition’s presentation in order to engage with the exhibition, such that this helped frame their emotional responses and overall experience: as demonstrated clearly by a participant who stated, that the exhibition had “*been so well curated; the written comments excited me a lot*”. Such responses reveal how we must consider and draw on historical and cultural information to understand some of the portrayals of love shown in the exhibition (Boddice, 2018; Simons, 2017). People’s responses and, thus, the resulting categories align significantly with Kirchberg and Tröndle’s (2015) contemplative and enthusing exhibition experience dimensions. The majority of the themes address components of their contemplative dimension, characterised by visitors connecting and reflecting on exhibition to improve their understanding. Specifically, the themes pertaining to exhibition presentation, content, artistry, and personal connection demonstrate that many of the visitors had a *contemplative* exhibition experience (as one person stated, they were focused on “*explaining why these were created and thinking about the context for them*”). The familiarity theme reflects Kirchberg and Tröndle’s enthusing dimension (characterised by recognising famous works and responding to familiar works). While the social dimension (characterised by the experience of companionship and entertaining situations) is not reflected, this could be because the interview questions were not focused on capturing data about the visitors’ companions. It could also be that the social dimension of the experience

may only have been more fully explored on exiting the exhibition and moving to the café or retail outlet.

-Table 4 and Table 5 about here-

Because the exhibition itself was centred on an emotional theme (that of love), it is pertinent to further consider visitors' responses with regard to the emotions that were perceived as portrayed in the exhibition's collection of artworks.

The thematic analysis (see Table 6) indicated visitors perceived the complexity of love as an emotion. This is most clearly seen in responses that directly address this point, that love is "*not one dimensional, [but] multi-dimensional*". Other visitors remarked, "*Love is a big thing to a lot of people for different reasons, I think as a subject matter, you guys definitely nailed it*" and that the exhibition "*has been so well curated... the people who put it together really know what they're talking about, and I simply love that they've encompassed the whole concept of love, as romantic love, narcissistic, familiar love, religious love. All the paintings that express those different themes are so memorable and wonderful.*" Moreover, it is also evident in the responses that make reference to a specific depiction of an aspect of love. In fact, most of the emotions that stood out do not reflect a happy, romantic love ideal, but the more complicated facets of being in love, such as desire, anguish, and narcissism (see the discussion of Zoffany's *Roman Charity* above).

Moreover, in addition to perceiving both positive and negative emotions, in a few cases participants mentioned that negatively-valenced emotions were evoked in them. These particular examples (see Table 6) further demonstrate that individuals were processing the emotional content of the art exhibition not only with reference to the historical representations in line with the works' time period, but also, in some cases, in relation to

themselves (in the present day) and the emotions evoked by viewing the works. Apparent in comments such as “*it says more about me than the artwork*” and it “*reminded me of an ex-life—I used to live in a place with a lot of gold frames and antiques*”, these types of responses indicate that people’s interpretations of the art are influenced by the context of themselves in the present day. Just as some of the most striking pieces had personal connections (e.g., a musician being drawn to the harpsichord), it appears that these personalized connections and reflections can enhance the meaning of the artworks and exhibition. Such interpretations are in line with Dervin’s (1998) sense making theory as well as Smith’s (2014) museum effect theory.

-Table 6 about here-

Discussion

The present study used quantitative and qualitative data collection techniques to examine how visitors experienced the *Love: Art of Emotions* exhibition (RQ1). Firstly, with regard to the quantitative survey, factor analyses conducted defined people’s experiences. The resulting factors (namely emotional response, communication/connection, and attention/focus from the EEM and social/enthusing and contemplative dimensions from the KTM) provided dimensions for the definition and consideration of people’s exhibition experiences. Importantly, these dimensions mirror those used in previous museum visitor studies (e.g., Kirchberg & Tröndle, 2015; Pekarik et al., 1999) suggesting some commonality in experience across contexts. Further support for the applicability of these dimensions in defining people’s experiences arises from the congruency of its application in both the quantitative and qualitative findings.

The results of the GLMM analyses indicate a clear pattern of results with regard to the factors (e.g., visitor demographics, motivations, psychological traits) that influenced peoples’

experiences (RQ1). Firstly, while Kirchberg and Tröndle's (2015, p. 186) findings showed "almost no impact of socio-demographic traits... on the exhibition experience", in the present research, age was positively associated with the enthusing/social and attention/focus factors. Why older people were more likely to have enthusing/social exhibition experiences and devote more attention to the exhibition requires further research to tease out the role of demographics in defining people's exhibition experiences. The result could be associated with the older audiences having prepared more carefully and given more time to viewing the exhibition, but these are only speculative possibilities which need investigation.

Importantly, one's motivations for attending the exhibition have a clear positive influence on one's experience of the exhibition overall. The positive influence of being motivated by the exhibition theme was reiterated in the analysis concerning the attention/focus factor, where the unplanned visit motivation score was negatively associated with being highly engaged. Moreover, familiarity with artworks/ the period of work as a motivating factor (and leaving a striking impression on the visitors) was evident in some of the interview responses. The influences of motivation and familiarity on experience is in line with previous research (e.g., Falk & Dierking, 2013; Smith, 2014; Taylor, 2010; Tinio & Gartus, 2018). Further, previous discussion on the appropriate unit of analysis for museum (gallery/ exhibition) visits indicates "there is also a tendency for people to view their visit to the museum as the fundamental unit of analysis rather than as a collection of individual works of art. They will say that it wasn't just one work that was special, but the overall effect of their visit as a whole" (Smith, 2014, p. 38; see also Smith & Wolf, 1996). In line with this idea, it makes sense that motivations for the exhibition, rather than a particular artwork, were significantly associated with visitors' experiences.

Additionally, emotional contagion did play a role in defining the visitor experience, with positive contagion being associated with the emotional response and attention/focus

scores and negative emotional contagion also demonstrating a significant, positive association with the contemplative and the communication/connections scores. The qualitative findings demonstrated that individuals were drawn to different works and different expressions of love. It is possible that those demonstrating higher positive and negative emotional contagion may be drawn to different works; however, the present study does not allow for such analysis. Thus, additional research is needed to tease out the role of emotional contagion with regard to viewing art as well as exhibition (and museum) experiences.

With regard to the perceived emotions (RQ2), visitors' interview responses demonstrate that they processed both the emotional and historical content in the exhibition, suggesting that many factors simultaneously contributed to their overall experience. In some cases, visitors processed the exhibition's emotional and historical content in relation to themselves. This is most clearly demonstrated by the personal connection theme responses (e.g., "*the other looked like me yesterday*"; "*it reminded me of an ex-life*"), but is also present in responses concerning familiarity and artistry in the way that people have implicated themselves in their response (e.g., "*I'm an art student so I can appreciate the work*"). The findings support the notion that human-object engagement is a dynamic interaction between the exhibition objects and the viewer (Dudley, 2010; Taylor, 2010) and that the affective dimension to such interactions is key (Taylor, 2010). Indeed, these interpretations of the artworks relative to modern-day life and oneself indicate, as others have theorized, that people are stimulated by the art to reflect on themselves (Dervin, 1998; Smith, 2014).

Most of the explanations the interview participants provided concerning the exhibition elements that were the most striking aligned with Kirchberg and Tröndle's (2015) contemplative dimension, which is characterised by visitors connecting and reflecting on exhibition to improve their understanding. One interpretation of these findings is as evidence of a connection between positive learning, entertainment and aesthetics. As Tinio & Gartus

(2018, p. 326) stated, art experiences can “be personally meaningful and even transformative”. Though it would be a stretch to state that the present findings indicate *transformative* experiences, it is evident that visitors cognitively engaged with the exhibition. That is, their experiences involved processing the historical information on offer. It is possible that the *Love* exhibition offered potential ‘triggers for transformation’ (Soren, 2009, p. 240). Future work could specifically consider contemplative motivations and experiences with regard to their impact on resulting subjective, transformative experiences. Further, given recent research that has shown that museum visits have well-being benefit (e.g., Ioannides, 2016; Mastandrea, Fagioli, & Biasi, 2019; Thomson, Lockyer, Camic, & Chatterjee, 2017), it would be interesting to consider the role of the different types of exhibition experiences relative to perceived well-being.

4.1 Limitations and Future Directions

Of course, the present study is limited in that it focused on a single exhibition in one art gallery at one time. Thus, it is not possible to generalize to other types of exhibitions and galleries. Further, while the exhibition aimed to present varied manifestations of love, it was still singularly focused on that particular emotion. Interview commentary suggests that visitors did respond to changing, historical and cultural representations in the artworks (assisted, in part, by the exhibition information and consideration of personal circumstances), and further consideration of how participants navigated these complexities requires additional consideration. However, the present study offers evidence supporting Kirchberg and Tröndle’s framework for defining exhibition experiences as enthusing, social, and contemplative. While the social and enthusing dimensions were combined in the present study, this could be due to the way questions were asked (i.e., regarding company on the survey and the specific focus of the interview questions), such that the experience of sole

visitors may not be fully captured by Kirchberg and Tröndle's framework. While Pekarik et al. (1999) mention that the social experience includes interacting with people in addition to companions (e.g., strangers and museum personnel), it falls on future research to tease out the role of both companions and strangers. Moreover, the data presented here comes from two samples. While all of the participants were responding about the same exhibition, the quantitative and qualitative data cannot be considered together. The data is complimentary; however, the logistics of collecting survey data precluded inclusion of open-ended questions. It would be interesting for future research to map the alignment between exhibition motivations and the experience dimension. Indeed, future research might also make use of pre-post methodologies to explicitly compare people's expectations and motivations with the resulting experiences and "satisfactions of the visit" (Pekarik et al., 1999). For instance, the interaction between motivation, familiarity, and response deserves additional attention.

In drawing on retrospective, self-report data, the present study did not collect objective visitor behaviour data (for instance on whether or not visitors did read the label/panel information or for how long visitors spent reading the exhibition text/viewing the artworks). Future research could achieve this by making use of tracking technologies (e.g., Kirchberg & Tröndle, 2015; Tröndle & Tschacher, 2012). Additionally, the present study drew on existing measures to define visitor experience such that people's perceptions and experiences of emotions were measured but not compared and contrasted. It may not be entirely possible to disentangle the expression, perception, and experience of emotions, although it points to avenues for future research. Future work is needed to refine data collection tools (i.e., the measurement of the applicable variables) in order to advance our understanding of visitor experiences. Such work would benefit from a psycho-historical framework (see Bulloot & Reber, 2013) to account for the theories and methods from the disciplines of psychology, history, and humanities. Nonetheless, the present findings offer

novel data on present day and historical emotions. The findings suggest that visitors to the *Love* exhibition did experience emotional, aesthetic, social, and educative experiences in the exhibition and that these were shaped by historical information.

References

- Barrett, L. F., Mesquita, B., & Gendron, M. (2011). Context in emotion perception. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20(5), 286–290. doi:10.1177/0963721411422522
- Baxandall, M. (1972). *Painting and experience in fifteenth century Italy*: Oxford University Press.
- Baxandall, M. (1988). *Painting and experience in fifteenth-century Italy: A primer in the social history of pictorial style*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Bennett, J. (2003). The aesthetics of sense-memory: theorising trauma through the visual arts. In S. Radstone & K. Hodgkin (Eds.), *Memory cultures: Memory, subjectivity and recognition* (pp. 27–39). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Bhattacharya, K. (2017). *Fundamentals of qualitative research: A practical guide*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bitgood, S. C. (2000). The role of attention in the design of effective interpretive labels. *Journal of Interpretation Research*, 52(2), 31–45.
- Bitgood, S. C. (2010). An attention-value model of museum visitors. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/9159214/An_Attention-Value_Model_of_Museum_visitors
- Boddice, R. (2018). *The history of emotions*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.
- Boddice, R. (2019). *The history of feelings*. London, UK: Reaktion Books Ltd.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
- Bullot, N. J., & Reber, R. (2013). The artful mind meets art history: Toward a psycho-historical framework for the science of art appreciation. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 36, 123-180. doi:10.1017/S0140525X12000489
- Champion, M., & Lynch, A. (2015). *Understanding emotions in early Europe*. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols Publishers.
- Chen, C.-L., & Tsai, C.-G. (2015). The influence of background music on the visitor museum experience: A case study of the Laiho Memorial Museum, Taiwan. *Visitor Studies*, 18(2), 183-195. doi:10.1080/10645578.2015.1079098
- Cicero, L., & Teichert, T. (2018). Children's influence in museum visits: Antecedents and consequences. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 33(2), 146-157. doi:10.1080/09647775.2017.1420485
- Davidson, J. W., & Garrido, S. (2014). *My life as a playlist*. Crawley, WA: UWA Publishing.
- De Rojas, M. d. C., & Camarero, M. d. C. (2006). Experience and satisfaction of visitors to museums and cultural exhibitions. *International Review on Public and Non Profit Marketing*, 3(1), 49–65. doi:10.1007/BF02893284
- Dervin, B. (1998). Sense-making theory and practice: An overview of user interests in knowledge seeking and use. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 2(2), 36-46. doi:10.1108/13673279810249369
- DiMaggio, P. (1996). Are art-museum visitors different from other people? The relationship between attendance and social and political attitudes in the United States. *Poetics*, 24, 161–180.
- Doering, Z. D. (1999). Strangers, guests, or clients? Visitor experiences in museums. *Curator: The Museum Journal*, 42(2), 74–87.
- Doherty, R. W. (1997). The emotional contagion scale: A measure of individual differences. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 21(2), 131-154.

- du Cros, H. (2008). Too much of a good thing? Visitor congestion management issues for popular world heritage tourist attractions. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 2(3), 225-238. doi:10.2167/jht062.0
- Dudley, S. H. (2010). Museum materialities: Objects, sense and feeling. In D. S. H. (Ed.), *Museum materialities: Objects, engagements and interpretations* (pp. 1-17). London, UK: Routledge.
- Ellwood, T. (2017). Foreword. In A. Hesson, M. Martin, & C. Zika (Eds.), *Love: Art of emotion 1400-1800* (pp. x): National Gallery of Victoria.
- Falk, J. H. (1993). Assessing the impact of exhibit arrangement on visitor behaviour and learning. *Curator*, 36(2), 133-146.
- Falk, J. H., & Dierking, L. D. (2013). *The museum experience revisited*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, Inc.
- Fernández-Dols, J.-M., Carrera, P., Mendoza, A. H. d., & Ocejja, L. (2007). Emotional Climate as Emotion Accessibility: How Countries Prime Emotions. *Journal of Social Issues*, 63(2), 339-352.
- Foreman-Wernet, L., & Dervin, B. (2016). Everyday encounters with art: Comparing expert and novice experiences. *Curator: The Museum Journal*, 59(4), 411-pp.
- Forrest, R. (2013). Museum atmospherics: The role of the exhibition environment in the visitor experience. *Visitor Studies*, 16(2), 201-216. doi:10.1080/10645578.2013.827023
- Fragomeni, D. (2010). The evolution of the exhibit label. *Faculty of Information Quarterly*, 2(1), 1-11.
- Garrido, S., & Davidson, J. W. (2019). *Music, nostalgia and memory: Historical and psychological perspectives*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave.
- Gendron, M., & Barrett, L. F. (2018). Emotion perception as conceptual synchrony. *Emotion Review*, 10(2), 101-110. doi:10.1177/1754073917705717
- Gendron, M., Roberson, D., van der Vyver, J. M., & Barrett, L. F. (2014). Cultural relativity in perceiving emotion from vocalizations. *Psychological Science*, 25, 911-920. doi:10.1177/0956797613517239
- Griswold, W., Mangione, G., & McDonnell, T. E. (2013). Objects, words, and bodies in space: Bringing materiality into cultural analysis. *Qualitative Sociology*, 36, 343-364. doi:10.1007/s11133-013-9264-6
- Hesson, A. (2017). Silver-sweet and frantic-mad. In A. Hesson, M. Martin, & C. Zika (Eds.), *Love: Art of emotion 1400-1800* (pp. 2-15): National Gallery of Victoria.
- Höge, H. (2003). A museum experience: Empathy and cognitive restoration. *Empirical Studies of The Arts*, 21(2), 155-164. doi:10.2190/5J4J-3B28-782J-FAK7
- Holahan, C. J., & Bonnes-Dobrowolny, M. (1978). Cognitive and behavioural correlates of the spatial environment: An Interaction Analysis. *Environment and Behaviour*, 10(3), 317-332.
- Ioannides, E. (2016). Museums as therapeutic environments and the contribution of art therapy. *Museum International*, 68(3-4), 98-109. doi:10.1111/muse.12125
- Kirchberg, V. (1996). Museum visitors and non-visitors in Germany: a representative survey. *Poetics*, 24, 239-258.
- Kirchberg, V., & Tröndle, M. (2015). The museum experience: Mapping the experience of fine art. *Curator: The Museum Journal*, 58(2), 169-193. doi:10.1111/cura.12106
- Kjeldsen, A. K., & Jensen, M. N. (2015). When words of wisdom are not wise. A study of accessibility in museum exhibition texts. *Nordisk Museologi*, 1, 91-111.
- Kottasz, R. (2006). Understanding the influences of atmospheric cues on the emotional responses and behaviours of museum visitors. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 16(1-2), 95-121. doi:10.1300/J054v16n01_06

- Luebke, J. F. (2018). Zoo exhibit experiences and visitors' affective reactions: A preliminary study. *Curator: The Museum Journal, online first*.
- Lynch, A. (2017). Preface. In A. Hesson, M. Martin, & C. Zika (Eds.), *Love: Art of emotion 1400-1800* (pp. xii): National Gallery of Victoria.
- Macdonald, S. (2007). Interconnecting: museum visiting and exhibition design. *CoDesign, 3*(S1), 149-162. doi:10.1080/15710880701311502
- Mastandrea, S., Fagioli, S., & Biasi, V. (2019). Art and psychological well-being: Linking the brain to the aesthetic emotion. *Frontiers in Psychology, 10*, :739. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00739
- Morphy, H. (2010). Afterword. In S. H. Dudley (Ed.), *Museum materialities: Objects, engagements and interpretations* (pp. 275-285). London, UK: Routledge.
- Packer, J., & Ballantyne, R. (2016). Conceptualizing the visitor experience: A review of literature and development of a multifaceted model. *Visitor Studies, 19*(2), 128-143. doi:10.1080/10645578.2016.1144023
- Palau-Saumell, R., Forgas-Coll, S., & Sánchez-García, J. (2016). The role of emotions in a model of behavioral intentions of visitors to the Gaudí historic house museums in Barcelona, Spain. *Visitor Studies, 19*(2), 156-177. doi:10.1080/10645578.2016.1220188
- Pekarik, A. J., Doering, Z. D., & Karns, D. (1999). Exploring satisfying experiences in museums. *Curator: The Museum Journal, 42*(2), 152-173.
- Pelowski, M., Forster, M., Tinio, P. P. L., Scholl, M., & Leder, H. (2017). Beyond the lab: Framework for examining interactions with art in museums. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts, 11*(3), 245-264. doi:10.1037/aca0000141
- Schiele, B. (2016). Visitor studies: A short history. *Loisir et Société / Society and Leisure, 39*(3), 331-356. doi:10.1080/07053436.2016.1243834
- Schwartz, G. (2017). Love of art/ Love in art. In A. Hesson, M. Martin, & C. Zika (Eds.), *Love: Art of emotion 1400-1800* (pp. 196-203): National Gallery of Victoria.
- Simons, P. (2017). Spaces of love. In A. Hesson, M. Martin, & C. Zika (Eds.), *Love: Art of emotion 1400-1800* (pp. 56-71): National Gallery of Victoria.
- Smith, J. K. (2014). *The museum effect: How museums, libraries, and cultural institutions educate and civilize society*. New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Smith, J. K., & Wolf, L. F. (1996). Museum visitor preferences and intentions in constructing aesthetic experience. *Poetics, 24*, 219-238.
- Snodgrass, J., Russell, J. A., & Ward, L. M. (1988). Planning, mood and place-liking. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 8*(3), 209-222.
- Soren, B. J. (2009). Museum experiences that change visitors. *Museum Management and Curatorship, 24*(3), 233-251. doi:10.1080/09647770903073060
- Specker, E., Forster, M., Brinkmann, H., Boddy, J., Pelowski, M., Rosenberg, R., & Leder, H. (2018). The Vienna Art Interest and Art Knowledge Questionnaire (VAIAK): A unified and validated measure of art interest and art knowledge. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts, Advance online publication*. doi:10.1037/aca0000205
- Specker, E., Tinio, P. P. L., & van Elk, M. (2017). Do you see what I see? An investigation of the aesthetic experience in the laboratory and museum. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts, 11*(3), 265-275. doi:10.1037/aca0000107
- Stephen, A. (2001). The contemporary museum and leisure: Recreation as a museum function. *Museum Management and Curatorship, 19*(3), 297-308. doi:10.1080/09647770100601903

- Taylor, B. L. (2010). Reconsidering digital surrogates: Toward a viewer-orientated model of the gallery experience. In S. H. Dudley (Ed.), *Museum materialities: Objects, engagements and interpretations* (pp. 175-pp). London, UK: Routledge.
- Temme, J., & Elvert, V. (1992). Amount and kind of information in museums: Its effects on visitors' satisfaction and appreciation of art. *Visual Arts Research*, 18(2), 28–36.
- Thomson, L. J., Lockyer, B., Camic, P. M., & Chatterjee, H. J. (2017). Effects of a museum-based social prescription intervention on quantitative measures of psychological wellbeing in older adults. *Perspectives in Public Health*, online first. doi:10.1177/1757913917737563
- Tinio, P. P. L., & Gartus, A. (2018). Characterizing the emotional response to art beyond pleasure: Correspondence between the emotional characteristics of artworks and viewers' emotional responses. *Progress in Brain Research*, 237, 319-342. doi:10.1016/bs.pbr.2018.03.005
- Tröndle, M., Greenwood, S., Kirchberg, V., & Tschacher, W. (2014). An integrative and comprehensive methodology for studying aesthetic experience in the field: Merging movement tracking, physiology, and psychological data. *Environment and Behavior*, 46(1), 102–135. doi:10.1177/0013916512453839
- Tröndle, M., Kirchberg, V., & Tschacher, W. (2014). Subtle differences: Men and women and their art reception. *The Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 48(4), 65-93. doi:10.1353/jae.2014.0027
- Tschacher, W., Greenwood, S., Kirchberg, V., Wintzerith, S., van den Berg, K., & Tröndle, M. (2012). Physiological correlates of aesthetic perception of artworks in a museum. *Psychology of Aesthetics Creativity and the Arts*, 6(1), 96-103. doi:10.1037/a0023845
- Tröndle, M., & Tschacher, W. (2012). The physiology of phenomenology: The effects of artworks. *Journal of Empirical Studies of the Arts*, 30(1), 79–117. doi:10.2190/EM.30.1.g
- Tzortzi, K. (2017). Museum architectures for embodied experience. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 32(5), 491-508. doi:10.1080/09647775.2017.1367258
- Vreeke, G. J., & Van der Mark, I. L. (2003). Empathy, an integrative model. *New Ideas In Psychology*, 21(3), 177-2007. doi:10.1016/j.newideapsych.2003.09.003
- Watson, S. (2010). Myth, memory and the senses in the Churchill Museum. In S. H. Dudley (Ed.), *Museum materialities: Objects, engagements and interpretations* (pp. 204-223). London, UK: Routledge.
- Wehner, K., & Sear, M. (2010). Engaging the material world: object knowledge and Australian Journeys. In S. H. Dudley (Ed.), *Museum materialities: Objects, engagements and interpretations* (pp. 143-161). London, UK: Routledge.
- Wilson-Mendenhall, C. D., Barrett, L. F., & Barsalou, L. W. (2013). Situating emotional experience. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 7, : 764. doi:10.3389/fnhum.2013.00764
- Yalowitz, S. S., & Bronnenkant, K. (2009). Timing and tracking: Unlocking visitor behavior. *Visitor Studies*, 12(1), 47-64. doi:10.1080/10645570902769134
- Yoshimura, Y., Sobolevsky, S., Ratti, C., Girardin, F., Carrascal, J. P., Blat, J., & Sinatra, R. (2014). An analysis of visitors' behavior in The Louvre Museum: a study using Bluetooth data. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 41, 1113-1131. doi:10.1068/b130047p

Table 1.

Factor loadings pertaining to the principal axis factor analysis with promax rotation on the EEM items

Item	Factor			
	1 – Emotional response	2 – Communication / Connection	3 – Attention/ Focus	4 – Enjoyment without explanation
I felt that the exhibition was emotionally charged	.853			
I was imagining with some of the original scenarios of the art in my head	.796			
I felt that my own emotions reflected those of the artists who created the works	.663			
My mood was changed as a result of experiencing the exhibition	.568			
I felt uplifted after experiencing the exhibition	.563		.305	
I felt strong empathy with the emotional states depicted in the art works	.392			
I felt like the artists were able to communicate with me personally		.748		
I felt connected to the other people viewing the exhibition because we were feeling the same things together		.697		
I really ‘got into’ the exhibition, so that I lost track of time and forgot about other things		.517		
Familiar art enhanced my enjoyment		.485		
I felt strong emotions when viewing the exhibition		.390		
I found the whole thing boring			-.863	
I didn’t like the exhibition at all			-.804	
I got distracted and lost concentration			-.480	
I would have enjoyed this exhibition even without the panel information				.543
The information on the exhibition walls really added to my enjoyment of the exhibition				
Eigenvalue	5.241	1.068	0.517	0.398
% of Variance explained	32.759	6.676	3.231	2.488
Cronbach's alpha	0.835	0.748	0.662	

Note. Values < .3 supressed. EEM = emotional experience measure.

Table 2.

Principal axis factor analysis with promax rotation of the KTM items

Item	Factor	
	Social and enthusing	Contemplative
I saw famous artworks/ work by famous artists	.889	
I was entertained	.484	
I came upon something that I am familiar with, that I knew	.418	
I immersed myself in the exhibition with all my senses		.690
I improved my understanding of the arts and historical emotions through this exhibition		.536
I had a nice time with my companion(s)		
Eigenvalue	1.711	0.408
% of variance	28.524	6.793
Cronbach's alpha	0.595	0.598

Note. Values < .3 supressed. KTM = six of Kirchberg and Tröndle's (2015) 12 "postvisit experience" measure items.

Table 3.

Generalized Linear Mixed Model Analyses Concerning the Factor Scores

Predictor variable	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Beta</i>	<i>t</i>	95% CI		η^2
KTM: Enthusing and Social ^a							
Gender	0.128	0.721	-0.051	-0.358	-0.331	0.229	0.001
Age	6.742	0.010	0.009	2.598	0.002	0.016	0.040
Exhibition theme motivated score	19.393	< .001	0.399	4.404	0.220	0.578	0.106
Artwork motivated score	6.998	0.009	0.241	2.645	0.061	0.420	0.041
Unplanned visit motivation score	0.202	0.653	0.050	0.450	-0.170	0.271	0.001
Positive emotional contagion score	0.314	0.576	0.086	0.560	-0.217	0.390	0.002
Negative emotional contagion score	1.954	0.164	0.213	1.398	-0.088	0.513	0.012
KTM: Contemplative ^b							
Gender	1.012	0.316	-0.123	-1.006	-0.363	0.118	0.006
Age	1.441	0.232	0.004	1.200	-0.002	0.009	0.009
Exhibition theme motivated score	16.759	< 0.001	0.278	4.094	0.144	0.413	0.093
Artwork motivated score	10.726	0.001	0.255	3.275	0.101	0.408	0.061
Unplanned visit motivation score	0.095	0.759	-0.029	-0.308	-0.217	0.159	0.001
Positive emotional contagion score	0.822	0.366	0.124	0.907	-0.146	0.393	0.005
Negative emotional contagion score	5.658	0.019	0.291	2.379	0.049	0.532	0.033
EEM: Emotional response ^c							
Gender	1.889	0.171	-0.183	-1.374	-0.445	0.080	0.011
Age	0.015	0.901	0.000	-0.124	-0.007	0.006	0.000
Exhibition theme motivated score	27.896	< .001	0.426	5.282	0.267	0.585	0.145
Artwork motivated score	4.447	0.036	0.168	2.109	0.011	0.326	0.026
Unplanned visit motivation score	2.709	0.102	-0.159	-1.646	-0.350	0.032	0.016
Positive emotional contagion score	9.756	0.002	0.439	3.124	0.162	0.717	0.056
Negative emotional contagion score	1.232	0.269	0.152	1.110	-0.119	0.423	0.007
EEM: Communication/ connection ^d							
Gender	3.526	0.062	-0.243	-1.878	-0.495	0.012	0.021
Age	0.982	0.323	0.003	0.991	-0.003	0.009	0.006
Exhibition theme motivated score	12.832	< .001	0.265	3.582	0.119	0.411	0.073
Artwork motivated score	12.539	0.001	0.278	3.541	0.123	0.433	0.071
Unplanned visit motivation score	3.685	0.057	-0.186	-1.920	-0.378	0.005	0.022
Positive emotional contagion score	3.765	0.054	0.310	1.940	-0.005	0.625	0.022
Negative emotional contagion score	4.009	0.047	0.279	2.002	0.004	0.554	0.024
EEM: Attention/ Focus ^e							
Gender	0.147	0.702	-0.064	-0.383	-0.391	0.264	0.001
Age	4.349	0.039	0.009	2.085	0.000	0.017	0.026
Exhibition theme motivated score	12.328	0.001	0.287	3.511	0.126	0.448	0.070
Artwork motivated score	1.273	0.267	0.091	1.128	-0.068	0.249	0.008

Unplanned visit motivation score	6.542	0.011	-0.267	-2.558	-0.472	-0.061	0.038
Positive emotional contagion score	8.704	0.004	0.493	2.950	0.163	0.823	0.050
Negative emotional contagion score	0.878	0.350	0.164	0.937	-0.182	0.510	0.005

Note. Degrees of freedom for each individual predictor variable = 1, 164. CI = Confidence Interval.

KTM = six of Kirchberg and Tröndle's (2015) 12 "postvisit experience" measure items; EEM = emotional experience measure.

^a $F(8, 164) = 10.770, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .315$

^b $F(8, 164) = 13.417, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .364$

^c $F(8, 164) = 11.170, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .323$

^d $F(8, 164) = 12.236, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .343$

^e $F(8, 164) = 6.144, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .208$

Table 4.
Themes pertaining to responses concerning the most striking exhibition content

Theme	Theme	Example response
Identifying a single artwork	By title/artist	"Liked the Van Dyke"; " <i>Eurepa and the Bull</i> "; " <i>The Garden of Love</i> "; <i>Venus</i> ; " <i>Aphrodite</i> statue"
	Via a clear description referencing a particular piece	"The bunch of women under a tree"; "the Flemish mother and daughter"; "the three children with the birdcage" "the lady breastfeeding the man..."
Generic		"liked all of them"; "most of them"
Nominating content	Family	"the family portraits were charming and demonstrated a more complete love of family love than romantic love which can be so fleeting"
	Religious/holy family	"The bit about Christ and the death"; "The Jesus section"
Stated a type of art	Nominating a style	"the renaissance paintings"; "the Italian works - prefer oil on wood and darker palettes"
	Objects: Furniture	"enjoyed viewing all the furniture pieces"
	Objects: Jewellery	"the jewellery"
	Objects: Fans	"the fans, beautifully made and unique and the story behind fan language"
	Objects: Lacework	"the lace work - how admirable, patient and intricate"
	Objects: Wedding dress	"the wedding dress- awesome- the fact that it was a real dress and textile to see"; "enjoyed the different fashions compared with today's"
	Sculpture	"the sculptures, a personal preference, the 3D shapes and how you can walk around them"
	Porcelain	"the porcelain is the most amazing, the detail and I felt connected to the person who was designing it and making the piece"
	Etchings	"the satirical cartoons"
Tapestry	"the tapestry was stunning: the work, the skill, the detail, and the size"	

Table 5.

Reasons given to explain the selected striking exhibition components

Content	"The one about Venus adorning herself...it was looking at the different these of narcissism and vanity being reflected in it. it's something you see all the time but it's something that isn't really addressed"; "the sculpture with the cherubs lining hands...just seeing all the different body forms"
Familiarity	"The <i>Farinelli with friends</i> is one of my favourites. I always look for it when I come to the gallery"; " The <i>Garden of Love</i> is a favourite of mine"
Artistry	"There was one of a mother with her two children...very photorealistic and the skill attracted me"; "the detail [of the] porcelain pieces"; "Really appreciated the prints and engravings...I'm an art student so I can appreciate the work. The skills used drew me in"; "the cupids - weren't they gorgeous?"; "the way they paint faces is particularly beautiful"; "really liked the vanity with the love heart mirror -beautifully designed"
Exhibition presentation	"The re-presentation of works that you know is always very interesting because it gives you a different slant on ... the way people understand and think about and interpret them"
Personal connection	"the harpsichord - I 'm a musician so I was automatically drawn to it"; "the one with the companions dying...Cleopatra and Antony. I'm a fan of Shakespeare so I liked the whole Romeo and Juliet dying thing"

Table 6.
Themes pertaining to responses concerning perceived emotions

Theme	Example response
Recognition of love as a multi-dimensional, complex emotion	“Love is a big thing to a lot of people for different reasons”; “There’s a real complexity and multi-layered experience of emotions in the exhibition. The first impression of love is fluffy and pink, but to have a sort of cave with dark shadows when you enter—it is kind of like the pathos and the complexity and depths of the experience of emotions rather than one emotion by itself.”
Generic, positive responses	“A lot of love”
Evoked emotional responses	“Brought up emotions of a bad history”; “it didn’t evoke any feelings of love for me...it was depressing”
Specific expressions/experiences/emotions of love	<p>Eroticism: "very sumptuous, they couldn’t openly display sex, so did it in different ways"</p> <p>Suppression of feelings: "a lot of suppression in love...the shyness, to keep your love away from everyone"</p> <p>Lust/desire: "love and lust, longing for someone"</p> <p>Anguish: "love, but I saw a lot of anguish"</p> <p>Concern/ shock: "some of them looked distressed..."; "pieces horrified me"</p> <p>Vanity/ Narcissism: "vanity and narcissism"; "the role of the mirror depicting vanity"; "the one where she loves herself more than anything else"</p> <p>Comfort/Serenity: "quite comforting"; "the garden--serenity, you can't help but look at it and think it's just so ideal"</p> <p>Wonder</p>
The actor in the emotion context (e.g., Jesus, a family member)	“I suppose a lot of them were familial love situations”; “There seemed to be a religious element which was interesting”
Temporality	“The fleeting nature of love”; "innocence and youth"

Supplementary Materials

Supplementary Materials - Table 1.

Factor loadings for the principal axis factor analysis with promax rotation of the visiting motivation items

Item	Factor		
	1 – Exhibition theme motivated	2 – Specific artwork motivated	3 – Unplanned visit
I wanted to see art	.783		
I was intrigued by the concept of this exhibition	.722		
I am a supporter of the Centre for the History of Emotions	.328		
I wanted to see a particular art work		.769	
It was an unplanned visit			.603
I came to accompany a friend			
Eigenvalue	1.332	0.732	0.342
% of Variance	22.197	12.204	5.700
Cronbach's alpha	0.614	N/A	N/A

Note. Values < .3 were suppressed.

Supplementary Materials - Table 2.

Principal axis factor analysis with promax rotation of the familiarity items

Item	Factor
How familiar are you with the art on display today?	.834
How familiar are you with the techniques and practices of the artists working at that time?	.801
How much do you like art from the period 1400-1800?	.529
Is familiarity with the work important to you when attending an exhibition?	
Eigenvalue	1.669
% of Variance	41.724
Cronbach's alpha	.759

Note. Values < .3 were suppressed.