In evaluating and selecting an *instructional design* (ID) model for use for my project, I explored many of the instructional design models based on ADDIE and related functional design methodologies, and while they were all very familiar to me in form and I could speak to their directive efficacy from my experience as a software engineer, something felt incomplete. Each ID model felt like it was leaving out a major component of what I had come to understand in my own work and in the readings of many educational philosophers’ works – namely, the issue of learner motivation. In my own understanding, a learner’s motivation is the most important factor in a learning relationship and in a learning experience, and will make or break the success of such experiences. It is for this reason that I was attracted to the category of ID models under the heading of *Motivational Design*; in specific, I was drawn to John Keller’s *ARCS* model and the subsequent refinement of the motivational design model named *Motivating Opportunities Model* or “MOM” and the related seven key components mnemonic *SUCCESS* as described by Hardré and Miller.

While I am still exploring these models completely, they appeal to me because they put directly into the design concerns of personal motivation as well as having a methodology around creating motivating curriculum, instead of merely assuming that the students will be ‘engaged’ and ‘attentive’, as many of the other models assume or gloss over. *ARCS* (‘Attention’, ‘Relevance’, ‘Confidence’, and ‘Satisfaction’) focuses on individual learners’ motivational characteristics, and creates a methodology for development of curriculum that takes these characteristics in account. *MOM* focuses on the design elements and interactions within the learning and performance environments rather than on the individual learner characteristics. MOM’s *SUCCESS* (Situational, Utilization, Competence, Content, Emotional, Social, Systemic) framework provides a methodology for integrating motivational theories and strategies into the design of learning and performance environments.

Both of these models address the effect that technology can have on motivation, both positive and negative, and give practical advice as to find the best fit between technology use, individual motivation, and situational circumstances. Because motivation can vary greatly between individuals, my project will assume some general latitude of motivational styles and interests, and will employ technology in order to serve a broader collection of individual motivational styles. Technology will be used both to facilitate the modality of the instruction, and to provide access that allows a learner to follow his or her own motivational directions in relation to the instructional materials.

Motivational Design is a very good fit to my own epistemology and supporting learning theories; my own bias towards constructivist theories, as well as my understanding of situated learning contexts indicate a need to take the learner’s motivations into account, both in order to fit the modality and presentation of the curriculum to the interests and learning preferences of the learner, as well as to tailor the interactional environment to allow a learner to navigate their own experience and to allow their motivations to drive their actions within the learning context.