E-ISSN: 2708-4523
P-ISSN: 2708-4515
Impact Factor (RJIF): 5.61
AJMC 2026; 7(2): 60-62

www.allcommercejournal.com
Received: 20-11-2025
Accepted: 23-12-2025

Dr. Anurita Gautam
Associate Professor,
Department of Management,
Swayam Siddhi College of Management & Research,
Maharashtra, India

Vilas Kailas Tayde
Assistant Professor,
Department of Management,
Swayam Siddhi College of Management & Research,
Maharashtra, India

Corresponding Author:
Dr. Anurita Gautam
Associate Professor,
Department of Management,
Swayam Siddhi College of Management & Research,
Maharashtra, India

Optimizing space utilization and design for hybrid learning environments: A framework for pedagogical and facility integration

Anurita Gautam and Vilas Kailas Tayde

DOI: https://www.doi.org/10.22271/27084515.2026.v7.i2b.1004

Abstract
Hybrid learning environments, which merge physical and digital instructional spaces, demand innovative approaches to campus planning, space allocation, and pedagogical alignment. Conventional classrooms and campus infrastructures often fail to support flexible teaching models such as blended, flipped, or synchronous hybrid learning. This study introduces a comprehensive framework for optimizing learning space utilization while integrating pedagogical objectives with facility planning. Employing a mixed-methods strategy—encompassing literature review, case studies, and expert interviews—the framework identifies three essential dimensions: (1) Pedagogical Purpose, (2) Spatial Design, and (3) Technology Integration. Results indicate that effective hybrid learning environments prioritize adaptability, inclusivity, environmental quality, and seamless digital-physical integration. The proposed framework offers actionable recommendations for higher education institutions and contributes a conceptual model for holistic learning space planning.

Keywords: Hybrid Learning, Learning Space Design, Pedagogical Alignment, Flexible Classrooms, Educational Facilities, Space Optimization

Introduction
The rapid proliferation of hybrid learning—accelerated by technological advancements and global disruptions—has reshaped expectations for physical learning spaces in higher education. Hybrid instruction requires spaces that support transitions between in-person and online modalities, collaborative activities, and technology-enhanced pedagogy. Traditional classroom layouts often do not meet these needs.
With universities increasingly adopting student-centered learning, flexible timetabling, and digital ecosystems, the alignment between teaching practices and spatial design becomes critical. Yet, significant gaps remain in integrating pedagogical approaches with campus planning and facility management. This study addresses these gaps by proposing a framework that combines pedagogical principles with facility planning to optimize hybrid learning spaces.

Literature Review
Hybrid Learning: Definitions and Needs
Hybrid learning combines face-to-face and online instruction, supporting both synchronous and asynchronous participation. Research suggests that hybrid models enhance student engagement, autonomy, and flexibility when supported by suitable infrastructure. Key requirements include stable connectivity, interactive digital tools, and adaptable physical spaces that accommodate diverse instructional methods (Ellis, Steed, & Applebee, 2023; Zydney & Warner, 2021) [9].

Learning Space Theories
Theories such as constructivism, active learning, and socio-material perspectives emphasize the influence of space on student engagement and learning outcomes. Evidence indicates that flexible, technology-rich environments facilitate collaboration, active participation, and experiential learning (Veloso & Marques, 2021; Barrett, Zhang, & Moffat, 2019) [27, 1].

Facility Planning in Higher Education
Universities face challenges in managing classroom utilization, scheduling efficiency, and infrastructure investment. Facility planning often prioritizes cost minimization over pedagogical effectiveness, resulting in mismatched learning environments. Aligning instructional design with space planning can enhance learning outcomes and optimize resource use (Brooks & Solis, 2018; JISC, 2020) [30, 14].

Research Gaps
Most studies examine learning space design or pedagogy separately. Few integrate these perspectives to address the needs of hybrid learning. This research bridges that gap by proposing a unified framework linking pedagogy with space optimization.

Methodology
This study adopts a mixed-methods approach

- **Literature Review:** A systematic review of peer-reviewed studies over the past ten years identified trends and best practices in hybrid learning space design, pedagogical integration, and facility management.
- **Case Studies:** Universities with advanced hybrid infrastructures were analyzed to identify effective practices and recurring challenges.
- **Expert Interviews:** Consultations with educational technologists, architects, facility managers, and faculty provided practical insights and highlighted institutional constraints.

Data from these methods informed the development of the integrated framework.

Findings
Common Challenges

- **Pedagogy-Space Misalignment:** Many classrooms lack flexibility for hybrid activities.
- **Space Underutilization or Overload:** Demand for small-group, technology-equipped rooms often exceeds availability.
- **Technological Inconsistencies:** Fragmented equipment and digital platforms hinder seamless hybrid instruction.
- **Unequal Learning Experiences:** Variability between in-person and online engagement affects equity and learning quality.

Proposed Framework for Pedagogical-Facility Integration
The framework consists of three interrelated dimensions with associated design and policy recommendations.

Dimension 1: Pedagogical Purpose
Hybrid spaces should be guided by clear instructional goals. Essential elements include:

- **Active Learning Support:** Facilitate collaborative and inquiry-based tasks.
- **Flexible Teaching Modes:** Enable smooth transitions between lectures, discussions, group work, and remote integration.
- **Inclusivity:** Ensure equitable participation for both in-person and online learners.
- **Guideline:** Begin design with pedagogical analysis rather than adapting pedagogy to existing spaces.

Dimension 2: Spatial Design
lexibility and Modularity
Movable furniture and reconfigurable layout Zones supporting diverse activities

Environmental Comfort
Acoustic treatment for hybrid session, optimal lighting, ventilation, and ergonomic seating

Multi-Functional Spaces
Spaces should support teaching, collaboration, and digital broadcasting.

Data-Informed Utilization
Use sensors, scheduling analytics, and observational data to optimize room use.

Dimension 3: Technology Integration
Essential Technologies
AV systems for synchronous learning, High-speed internet, Interactive collaboration tools

Interoperability
Ensure compatibility across devices and platforms to prevent disruptions.

Integrated Digital Infrastructure
Embed technology in space design rather than retrofitting.

Discussion
The framework underscores the importance of treating learning spaces as active pedagogical tools. Aligning teaching goals with spatial planning ensures adaptability, equity, and long-term sustainability. Integrating analytics, universal design, and digital ecosystems further enhances strategic planning and optimizes resource use.

When institutions implement a cohesive approach, hybrid learning spaces can improve

- Student engagement
- Instructional effectiveness
- Space utilization efficiency
- Campus sustainability

Practical Implications

- **Academic Leaders:** Embed pedagogical requirements in budgeting and capital planning.
- **Architects and Facility Managers:** Prioritize modularity, comfort, and future-proofed technology.
- **Faculty:** Intentionally use spaces to support hybrid pedagogy.
- **IT Departments:** Standardize technology ecosystems and provide robust support.

Conclusion
Hybrid learning demands a reconceptualization of the intersection between pedagogy, technology, and spatial planning. This study presents a framework that integrates these elements to optimize learning environments and space

utilization. Flexible, inclusive, and technology-enabled designs aligned with pedagogical intent can enhance teaching, learning, and campus sustainability. Future research should evaluate the framework through longitudinal studies and multi-institutional comparisons.

References

1. Barrett P, Zhang Y, Moffat J. The impact of classroom design on student learning. Build Environ. 2019;160:106-118.
2. Becker S, Grabowski S. Designing hybrid learning spaces: Principles, challenges, and opportunities. Br J Educ Technol. 2022;53(6):1463-1480. doi:10.1111/bjet.13248.
3. Bennett S. Learning environment design and the integration of pedagogical intent. J Learn Spaces. 2018;7(2):1-13.
4. Brooks DC, Solis A. Campus space utilization in hybrid learning contexts. Plan High Educ. 2018;46(4):55-68.
5. Brooks DC, Solis A. Campus planning for hybrid learning: Balancing pedagogy and space. Plan High Educ. 2019;47(3):56-72.
6. Brooks DC. Space and consequences: The impact of different formal learning spaces on instructor and student behavior. J Learn Spaces. 2012;1(2):1-10.
7. Carliner S, Driscoll M. Blended learning and classroom design: Integrating pedagogy and infrastructure. Perform Improv. 2019;58(6):27-36.
8. Dede C. Hybrid learning environments: Challenges and design principles. Educ Technol Res Dev. 2020;68(2):847-865.
9. Ellis RA, Steed AF, Applebee A. Hybrid learning: Conceptualizing interactions, spaces, and student experience. High Educ Res Dev. 2023;42(3):497-514. doi:10.1080/07294360.2021.1992494.
10. Fisher K. The translational design of schools: An evidence-based approach to aligning pedagogy and learning environments. London: Routledge; 2023.
11. Gibson D, Grout I. Designing flexible learning spaces to support blended and hybrid pedagogies. Australas J Educ Technol. 2020;36(5):59-74. doi:10.14742/ajet.6325.
12. Grajek S, editor. EDUCAUSE 2021 Horizon Report: Teaching and learning edition. Louisville (CO): EDUCAUSE; 2021.
13. Gray C, Dilworth T. Flexible learning environments in higher education. Educ Sci. 2021;11(7):337. doi:10.3390/educsci11070337.
14. JISC. Learning space design: A guide. Bristol: Jisc; 2020.
15. JISC. Next-generation learning spaces: Guidance for hybrid environments. Bristol: Jisc; 2021.
16. Keppell M, Souter K, Riddle M. Physical and virtual learning spaces in higher education: Concepts for hybrid learning. In: Keppell M, *et al*., editors. Physical and virtual learning spaces in higher education: Concepts for hybrid learning and teaching. Hershey (PA): IGI Global; 2012. p. 1-20.
17. Lawson M, Lawson HA. Classroom environments and learning engagement. Learn Environ Res. 2018;21:223-238.
18. Little J, Chen R. Pedagogically aligned classroom design: Hybrid and flipped models. Interact Learn Environ. 2019;27(7):895-910. doi:10.1080/10494820.2018.1486450.
19. Moser C, Shattuck J. Designing flexible hybrid classrooms: Lessons from higher education. J Learn Spaces. 2020;9(1):45-60.
20. Oblinger D. The next generation learning spaces. EDUCAUSE Rev. 2018;53(4).
21. Oblinger D, Lippincott JK. Learning spaces and technology integration. EDUCAUSE Q. 2018;41(3):12-25.
22. Radcliffe D, Wilson H, Powell D, Tibbetts B. Learning spaces in higher education: Positive outcomes by design. Brisbane: University of Queensland; 2008.
23. Roberts J, Dixon K. Blended and hybrid learning environments as catalysts for rethinking campus design. Innov Educ Teach Int. 2021;58(2):207-219. doi:10.1080/14703297.2020.1752281.
24. Salmon G. Learning innovation and the hybrid campus. London: Routledge; 2019.
25. Thomas H. Learning spaces, learning environments and the dis'placement' of learning. Br J Educ Technol. 2010;41(3):502-511. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8535.2009.00974.x.
26. Uline C, Tschannen-Moran M. Classroom physical environment and student outcomes. J Educ Adm. 2018;56(4):456-473.
27. Veloso L, Marques JF. Active learning classrooms: Space design and pedagogical integration. Learn Environ Res. 2021;24:345-363. doi:10.1007/s10984-021-09354-x.
28. Wang M, Kinshuk, Chen NS, Chen HH. Designing smart learning environments for hybrid and flexible learning. Smart Learn Environ. 2021;8:18. doi:10.1186/s40561-021-00170-4.
29. Alavi S, Leidner D. Technology-mediated learning environments: Theory and practice. J Manag Inf Syst. 2020;37(1):10-45.
30. Brooks DC, Solis A. Campus space utilization in hybrid learning contexts. Plan High Educ. 2018;46(4):55-68.