Journal of Education and Learning; Vol. 15, No. 2; 2026
ISSN 1927-5250 E-ISSN 1927-5269
Published by Canadian Center of Science and Education

Integrative Analysis of ADDIE, ARCS, and ASSURE: Toward a Hybrid Framework for Technology-Enhanced Instructional Design

Gilbert Kalonde[1], Samuel Boateng[1] & Claudia Duedu[1]

[1] Department of Education, Montana State University, Bozeman, USA

Correspondence: Samuel Boateng, Department of Education, Montana State University, Bozeman, USA.

Received: July 20, 2025 Accepted: September 30, 2025 Online Published: November 10, 2025

doi:10.5539/jel.v15n2p11 URL: https://doi.org/10.5539/jel.v15n2p11

Abstract

Through the perspective of technology integration, this research addresses the limited cross-model analysis that exists in the field of educational technology scholarship. The paper does so by methodically reviewing and comparing three notable instructional design models: ADDIE, ARCS, and ASSURE. In this review, a structured thematic synthesis is utilized to evaluate the affordances, limitations, and adaptability of each model for technology-enhanced learning in K–12, higher education, and professional development contexts. The review draws on studies that have been peer-reviewed and published between the years 2010 and 2024. These studies were retrieved from Web of Science, ERIC, and Google Scholar. According to the findings of the analysis, ADDIE provides comprehensive structural planning and iterative evaluation, but it requires a significant amount of time and resources. ARCS excels in maintaining learner motivation, but it does not have explicit sequencing for technology-rich curricula. ASSURE offers clear, technology-oriented procedural guidance, but it faces challenges in terms of scalability in settings with limited resources. For the purpose of strengthening both the theoretical and practical ability for equitable and scalable technology adoption, the research presents a hybrid framework that blends ADDIE's systematic design, ARCS's motivating methods, and ASSURE's media integration processes. It offers implications that can be put into practice for the development of curricula, the preparation of teachers, and policy interventions that are aimed at fostering education that is both inclusive and enabled by technology.

Keywords: ADDIE, ARCS, ASSURE, instructional design, technology integration, hybrid framework, educational technology, teacher preparation

1. Introduction

1.1 Problem Statement

The revolution in technology has significantly transformed education, with instructional design models and technology integration playing a crucial role in creating successful learning environments (Haleem et al., 2022). Yamani (2021) asserts that instructional design models provide a systematic approach to designing and implementing learning experiences. However, the contemporary educational environment is characterized by the integration of various technological tools and resources, from basic software to advanced technologies, such as virtual reality and artificial intelligence (Yamani, 2021). There are a lot of issues that educators have when they try to include technology in instructional design (Xu & Stefaniak, 2023). Xu and Stefaniak (2023) stressed that some of these challenges include the complexity of the tools, time restrictions, challenges of access and equity, gaps in the material, and the objective of aligning with instructional goals following integration. As a result, Xu and Stefaniak (2023) stressed that school leaders must provide the much-needed assistance and provide access to opportunities for professional growth. To successfully execute technology integration on a systemic level, one must make a deliberate effort to do so (Yamani, 2021).

Technology enhances the learning experience by providing tailored experiences that allow students to access resources at their own pace and receive feedback (Junart et al., 2023). It also dismantles geographical and temporal constraints, enabling access to remote and online education, particularly during crises such as the COVID-19 pandemic (Junart et al., 2023). Yuan and Wu (2020) stipulated that technology also promotes increased involvement and participation, with multimedia components, interactive simulations, and collaborative online tools that enhance the learning process. Sibanda (2022) affirms that the contemporary educational system faces the task of efficiently using instructional design models and integrating technology to cater to the requirements of learners while maximizing the learning experience and guaranteeing fair access to high-quality education within a

digitally focused setting. There is a pressing need for comprehensive studies to obtain a thorough understanding of the integration of these models. Such a study would influence evidence-based practices and guide policy choices (Sibanda, 2022).

Although instructional design models are prevalent in educational technology literature, there is a scarcity of research that conducts a direct, comparative analysis of various frameworks concerning technology integration in distinct learning contexts. Current research frequently examines models like ADDIE, ARCS, and ASSURE in isolation, emphasizing their distinct advantages while neglecting a systematic analysis of their intersections, complementarities, and limitations in the context of modern technology-rich and resource-variable environments (Branch, 2009; Keller, 2010; Smaldino et al., 2019). Although previous research has explored the significance of each model in K–12 and higher education, the literature is disjointed, lacking a comprehensive synthesis that specifically elucidates how these models collectively influence teacher preparation, curriculum design, and policy, while considering both pedagogical coherence and contextual adaptability (Dousay, 2017; Martin et al., 2022). The lack of cross-model synthesis creates a significant void in comprehending how instructional design frameworks can be integrated or modified to meet the growing complexities of technology-enhanced education in varied environments, especially in under-resourced and rural areas where scalability and sustainability are crucial (Reiser & Dempsey, 2018; Koehler et al., 2013).

This research fills the gap by doing a comprehensive literature assessment that evaluates the three models in relation to technology integration and presents a theoretically informed and practically applicable hybrid instructional design framework. This work's originality is in its integrative perspective: it synthesizes the structural rigor of ADDIE, the motivating methods of ARCS, and the technology-centered flexibility of ASSURE into a cohesive design approach, rather than favoring a single model. This contribution enhances theory by framing instructional design models as complementary rather than antagonistic paradigms, providing a meta-framework adaptable to many technical and pedagogical situations (Hirumi, 2013; Merrill, 2020). It enhances practice by offering teacher educators, instructional designers, and policymakers pragmatic guidance for selecting, integrating, and customizing design strategies to address local requirements while fostering equity, scalability, and sustainability in technology integration efforts (Koehler & Mishra, 2009; Patrick, 2024).

1.2 Research Questions

How are instructional design models, such as Analysis, Design, Development, Implementation, and Evaluation Model (ADDIE MODEL), Attention, Relevance, Confidence, and Satisfaction Model (ARCS MODEL), and the ASSURE, currently utilized in educational settings?

What are the strengths and limitations of these conventional instructional design models?

How can technology be effectively integrated into these instructional design models to enhance their overall effectiveness?

What are the practical implications and challenges associated with incorporating technology in instructional design models?

1.3 Significance of the Study

This study has a substantial impact as it provides a thorough comprehension of the interaction between instructional design approaches and technology. Hence, the results of this study can provide valuable insights and guidance for professionals and scholars in the field of instructional design and technology integration.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Technology Integration in The Analysis, Development, Design, Implementation and Evaluation Model (ADDIE MODEL)

2.1.1 Explanation of the ADDIE Model

The ADDIE model is a well-established and generally acknowledged framework used in instructional design (Yu, 2022). It serves as a guiding structure for the development of impactful learning experiences and includes five distinct phases: Analysis, Design, Development, Implementation, and Evaluation (Yu, 2022). Yu (2022) maintains that the ADDIE model underscores the need to comprehend the requirements of learners, create materials that are efficient in achieving desired outcomes, and assess the efficacy of instructional design. This approach ensures meticulous preparation and alignment with established learning goals (Yu, 2022).

2.1.2 Application of Technology in Each Stage of the ADDIE Model

The use of technology across each phase of the ADDIE model requires the implementation of diverse tools and

strategies (Crompton et al., 2024). Tacgin and Martinsuo (2025) stipulated that during the analysis phase, it is possible to use technological tools, such as learning analytics platforms, to gather data on learner performance and ascertain distinct learning requirements. In the design phase, instructional designers can use authoring tools, graphic design software, and multimedia development software to create compelling and interactive learning materials (Crompton et al., 2024).

In the developmental stage, Stapa and Mohammad (2019) explained that e-learning platforms, content management systems, and learning management systems are often used to design and disseminate online courses. According to Stapa and Mohammad (2019), during the implementation phase, the use of video-conferencing technologies, discussion boards, and online collaboration platforms may effectively enhance virtual classrooms and promote student engagement. Finally, in the evaluation phase, Spatıotı et al. (2023) affirmed that the use of learning analytics and assessment platforms could be applied to analyze data on learner performance and assess the efficacy of the instructional design.

2.1.3 Effectiveness of Technology Integration in the ADDIE Model

Yu et al. (2021) stipulate that integrating technology into the ADDIE model dramatically boosts learner motivation, engagement, and information retention through the creation of dynamic, interactive learning experiences like simulation, game-based learning, augmented reality, and virtual reality. Yu et al. (2021) highlights the integration of technology across each step of the ADDIE model, which enhances interactive and immersive learning environments. This involves leveraging digital tools to conduct a thorough analysis, creating material that is rich in multimedia elements throughout the design and development process, using online platforms for implementation, and applying analytics to continuously evaluate the outcomes, leading to dynamic and learner-centered experiences (Yu et al., 2021). Additionally, Munoz et al. (2022) further stressed that technology provides tailored and adaptive training, meeting the demands of various learner populations. It also makes social learning and collaboration easier, increasing the reach of education beyond conventional classrooms (Munoz et al., 2022). Overall, the ADDIE model's use of technology has tremendous potential for improving the efficacy of instructional design (Munoz et al., 2022).

2.2 Integration of Technology in The ARCS (Attention, Relevance, Confidence, and Satisfaction) Model

2.2.1 Brief Overview of the ARCS Model

The introductory section of the ARCS model provides an overview of Keller's instructional design framework (2010). This framework is designed to effectively engage learners by addressing their attention, relevance, confidence, and satisfaction throughout their learning experiences (Keller, 2010). Cai et al. (2022) observed that this model prioritizes learner motivation and engagement, making it very compatible with the use of technology. Cai et al. (2022) further stressed that the integration of technology into educational settings has the potential to significantly augment the efficacy of the ARCS model in fostering an optimal learning environment.

A comprehensive examination of the existing research about the integration of technology within the ARCS model elucidates its favorable effects on learners' motivation and engagement (Keller, 2010). Keller (2010) explained that motivation and engagement are achieved by holding attention with multimedia, increasing relevance by personalizing the experience, instantly rewarding performance to boost confidence; and diversifying assessment to increase satisfaction. As well as making learning richer and more enjoyable, the use of technology can help develop the habits of a lifelong learner (Smith & Johnson, 2021). In their recent study, Smith and Johnson (2021) emphasized the efficacy of technology-driven instructional approaches, such as gamification and multimedia presentations, in effectively engaging learners and augmenting the entire learning process within the ARCS framework. In addition, educational techniques that use technology are of the utmost importance in engaging learners and enhancing their attention, perception of relevance, confidence, and overall pleasure within the ARCS model (Smith & Johnson, 2021).

2.2.2 Approaches and Techniques for Incorporating Technology in Each Step of the ARCS Model

To effectively incorporate technology into each step of the ARCS model, careful planning and consideration are required. Some recommended approaches and techniques for integrating technology are as follows:

Attention: Various technology-based methods, such as interactive multimedia presentations, virtual reality simulations, and gamified learning platforms, have the potential to capture learners' attention by providing visually engaging and dynamic information (Smith & Johnson, 2021).

Relevance: The incorporation of personalized learning technologies, adaptive learning systems, and real-world problem-solving situations has the potential to augment the relevance of learning materials, making them more relevant and meaningful to the lives of learners (Essa et al., 2023).

Confidence: Confidence may be fostered among learners through the use of various online collaborative platforms, virtual peer feedback mechanisms, and self-assessment tools. These resources provide learners with the opportunity to engage in reflective practices, collaborate with peers, and evaluate their progress (Allaymoun & Shorman, 2022).

Satisfaction: The concept of satisfaction refers to the state of being content or fulfilled in a particular situation (Xu et al., 2021). The incorporation of gamified learning environments, quick feedback systems, and multimedia-rich materials enhance learners' happiness by providing entertaining and engaging learning experiences (Xu et al., 2021).

2.2.3 Effectiveness of Technology Integration in the ARCS Model

The use of technology in the ARCS model yields diverse results and advantages for both learners and instructors. According to Keller (2010), the use of technology has been shown to augment learners' motivation, engagement, and satisfaction, resulting in enhanced educational achievements. Moreover, the integration of technology facilitates the provision of customized and adaptable learning experiences that accommodate the varied requirements and preferences of learners (Smith & Johnson, 2021). Conversely, educators could use technological integration to augment instructional efficacy and obtain data-driven insights to refine education.

Technology Integration in The ASSURE (Analyze learners, State objectives, select media and materials, utilize materials, require learner performance, and evaluate/revise the learning and teaching process) Model.

2.3 A Brief Overview of the ASSURE Model

The ASSURE model is an instructional design model that was created by Heinich, Molenda, Russell, and Smaldino methodically (Smith & Ragan, 2005). The educational approach prioritizes the incorporation of technology to augment and enrich the knowledge acquisition process. The ASSURE model acronym stands for Analyze learners, State objectives, select methods, utilize media and materials, require learner participation, and evaluate and revise. This model provides instructional designers with a comprehensive framework for planning, implementing, and assessing effective instruction, while leveraging technological advancements to their advantage (Smith & Ragan, 2005).

2.3.1 Evaluation of Technology Integration Studies within the ASSURE Model

Several studies have investigated the integration of technology within the ASSURE model and its impact on learning outcomes. Khaddage, Müller, and Rosmaladewi (2020) conducted research on the implementation of virtual reality as a learning tool within the ASSURE model. Their findings indicated that the use of virtual reality in the ASSURE model significantly enhanced student engagement, motivation, and knowledge retention. Similarly, Donald (2019) examined the integration of gamification strategies and artificial intelligence within the ASSURE model and concluded that gamified instructional design supported by technology led to a notable increase in student participation and motivation throughout the learning process (Khaddage, Müller, & Rosmaladewi, 2020).

2.3.2 Approaches and Techniques for Incorporating Technology in Each Step of the ASSURE Model

To effectively incorporate technology into each step of the ASSURE model, careful planning and consideration are required. Here are some recommended approaches and techniques for integrating technology:

Analyze learners: Utilize online surveys or assessment tools to gather data on learners' prior knowledge, interests, and learning styles (Pillai, 2022)

State objectives: Utilize online platforms or educational software to create interactive and measurable learning objectives (Sahu et al., 2022).

Select methods: Choose technology-based instructional strategies, such as online simulations, multimedia presentations, or virtual collaboration tools that align with the chosen teaching methods (Clark & Mayer, 2023).

Utilizing media and materials: Incorporate multimedia resources such as videos, interactive websites, and digital textbooks to enhance content delivery and promote engagement (Clark & Mayer, 2023).

Requires learner participation: Foster learner-centered activities by utilizing technology tools such as online discussion forums, real-time polling, or collaborative platforms (Oyarzun & Martin, 2023).

Evaluate and revise: Employ online formative assessments, learning analytics, and feedback mechanisms to continuously evaluate learner progress and make necessary revisions to instruction (Irons & Elkington, 2021).

2.3.3 Effectiveness of Technology Integration in the ASSURE Model

The integration of technology into the ASSURE model has demonstrated promising results in terms of improving

learners' engagement, motivation, and achievement. Studies have consistently shown that using technology in the ASSURE model facilitates active learning, provides opportunities for collaboration, personalizes instruction, and enhances knowledge retention (Smith & Johnson, 2021). The ability to leverage technology in the design, delivery, and assessment of instruction is equipped with powerful tools to create dynamic and learner-centered experiences that cater to the needs and preferences of today's digitally oriented learners.

3. Methodology

For this research, a literature review was conducted in order to investigate the incorporation of technology into three well-established instructional design models, namely ADDIE, ARCS, and ASSURE, and to assess the strengths, limits, and contextual uses of these models in modern educational settings. A full synthesis of empirical and conceptual literature was made possible by the use of the systematic review methodology, which also provided a nuanced knowledge of both model-specific and cross-model technology integration techniques. It was ensured that comprehensive coverage of peer-reviewed journal articles, conference proceedings, academic book chapters, and reputable institutional reports was achieved by conducting literature searches across Web of Science, ERIC, and Google Scholar. Boolean operators were used to combine the instructional design models with keywords associated with e-learning, digital integration, and instructional technology. To reflect recent developments in educational technology, the search was restricted to English-language publications between January 2010 and March 2024.

Studies were required to examine at least one of the three models in direct connection to technology integration within K–12, higher education, or professional learning settings in order to meet inclusion requirements. Sources without methodological or theoretical depth, or without explicit technology application, were excluded. Screening proceeded iteratively at the title, abstract, and full-text levels.

A structured review matrix was used to extract data on study context, methods, type of technology, and reported outcomes. Two independent coders with expertise in instructional design conducted thematic coding. Discrepancies were resolved through consensus discussions. Inter-rater reliability was calculated on 20% of the corpus, yielding a Cohen's κ of 0.82, which is considered strong agreement. Themes were generated inductively, highlighting both the unique advantages of each model and shared design principles that enable technology integration.

Credibility and trustworthiness were strengthened through triangulation across multiple data sources and peer debriefing with senior instructional design researchers. An audit trail of search strategies, coding frameworks, and theme development was maintained to ensure transparency. Reflexive engagement throughout the review helped mitigate bias. Because this study relied on secondary sources, no ethical approval was required; however, all academic integrity standards were observed.

4. Findings

According to the findings of the literature research, the ADDIE, ARCS, and ASSURE instructional design models each have their own unique advantages and disadvantages when it comes to the implementation of technology-enhanced teaching and learning. The structural orientation, pedagogical focus, and flexibility of the three models are somewhat different from one another across a wide range of educational situations, despite the fact that all three models have the same overarching goal of enhancing the alignment between instructional processes and learner requirements. The ADDIE model, which is comprised of the stages of Analysis, production, Development, Implementation, and Evaluation, continues to be one of the most well known frameworks for the production of systematic instructional materials. A cohesive framework is provided by its step-by-step but iterative character, which allows for the use of technology throughout the whole educational process. It is possible for instructors to detect student characteristics, performance gaps, and contextual factors that guide design choices via the use of technologies such as learning analytics systems, online surveys, and diagnostic evaluations during the analysis phase (Yu, 2022; Crompton et al., 2024). The usage of multimedia authoring platforms, graphic design software, and interactive content creation tools is beneficial to the design and development stages. These technologies enable the production of instructional materials that are of high quality and visually engaging. It is common practice to facilitate implementation by utilizing learning management systems, video conferencing applications, and collaborative platforms that support both synchronous and asynchronous modalities. On the other hand, the evaluation phase makes use of digital assessment systems and analytics dashboards to monitor learner progress and provide data-driven feedback for continuous refinement. Despite the fact that the procedural rigor of ADDIE adds to instructional coherence and quality assurance, the fact that it is time-intensive and relies on technology infrastructure might restrict its responsiveness in learning environments that are constantly developing and provide issues in settings where resources are limited.

On the other hand, the ARCS model, which was established by Keller (2010) and is based on the concepts of Attention, Relevance, Confidence, and Satisfaction, is differentiated by its tendency to place an emphasis on the motivation and involvement of the learner. Technology-rich tactics, including gamification, adaptive learning platforms, and immersive multimedia, have been shown to be beneficial in catching the attention of learners and retaining their interest for lengthy periods of study, according to the literature that has been evaluated (Smith & Johnson, 2021). According to Essa et al. (2023), the relevance of instructional information is improved when it is connected to actual, real-world settings. This is often made possible by problem-based digital simulations and customized learning systems that adjust content to individual learner profiles. Learners are encouraged to evaluate and reflect on their progress via the use of mechanisms such as adaptive feedback systems, self-assessment tools, and peer review platforms. These mechanisms help to boost confidence. As the last construct, satisfaction is supported by feedback that is both timely and constructive, channels for acknowledgment, and experiences that are supplemented with multimedia that create a feeling of completion and closure. In spite of these advantages, the ARCS offers very limited procedural direction for the sequencing of material and the administration of instructional resources. As a result, it is not as suited as a standalone framework for the building of full curricula. In light of this, the research that has been conducted indicates that ARCS is most successful when it is included into more comprehensive design structures, such as ADDIE or ASSURE, which are able to provide the essential procedural scaffolding.

According to Smith and Ragan (2005), the ASSURE model is the one that demonstrates the most explicit and operationalized integration of technology within its procedural framework. This model includes the steps of Analyze learners, state objectives, select methods and media, utilize media, require learner participation, and evaluate and revise. It is possible to determine past knowledge, abilities, and learning preferences via the use of online diagnostic tools and learner analytics in the initial phase of the process. These objectives are communicated via the use of interactive platforms that promote results that are quantifiable, and learner centered. For the purpose of aligning education with stated goals, studies have documented the employment of multimedia resources, virtual labs, and interactive simulations (Khaddage et al., 2020). The selection and exploitation of media is a major component of the ASSURE instructional approach.

By using real-time polling tools, discussion forums, and collaborative workspaces that stimulate interaction and engagement, learners are actively encouraged to participate in the learning process. review and revision are supported by continual formative assessment, analytics dashboards, and feedback systems that enable iterative adjustments to instructional delivery. In conclusion, these elements provide support for review and modification. There is limited empirical evidence regarding the scalability of the ASSURE model in low-resource contexts, where infrastructural and connectivity constraints may restrict access to media-rich instructional strategies. Despite the fact that the ASSURE model's practical, technology-centered focus makes it particularly effective for lesson-level planning and implementation in environments that are rich in technology, there is a lack of empirical evidence regarding its scalability.

It is possible to identify a number of discoveries that are applicable to all three models. As a first point of interest, the success of the incorporation of technology is dependent on its intended alignment with each phase or component of the instructional model, as opposed to being included superficially as a supplemental feature. ADDIE provides structural rigor and comprehensive evaluative mechanisms, ARCS maximizes learner motivation and sustained engagement, and ASSURE provides a pragmatic, technology-centered framework for operationalizing instruction. Second, the unique strengths of each model suggest that they all have different degrees of suitability for different instructional priorities. Third, despite the fact that these models have pedagogical potential, equity problems continue to exist. This is especially true in educational settings that are underprivileged or have limited resources, where differences in digital infrastructure, device availability, and teacher training restrict the effectiveness of implementation. The research shows that hybridized frameworks, which combine the methodical planning of ADDIE, the motivating techniques of ARCS, and the technology integration processes of ASSURE, may provide an approach to instructional design that is more adaptive and responsive to the environment in which it is being implemented. An integrative approach of this kind might make it possible for educators, curriculum designers, and legislators to capitalize on the unique benefits of each model while simultaneously minimizing the drawbacks of each model. This would result in an increase in the scalability, sustainability, and inclusiveness of education that is improved by technology.

Table 1. Comparative Analysis of ADDIE, ARCS, and ASSURE in Technology Integration

Dimension	ADDIE	ARCS	ASSURE
Core Purpose	Provides a systematic, iterative process for designing, developing, implementing, and evaluating instruction.	Enhance learner engagement and motivation through four targeted constructs: Attention, Relevance, Confidence, and Satisfaction.	Embeds technology explicitly into each stage of lesson planning and delivery, emphasizing learner analysis and participation.
Key Phases/Steps	Analysis, Design, Development, Implementation, Evaluation.	Attention, Relevance, Confidence, Satisfaction.	Analyze learners, State objectives, select methods and media, utilize media, require participation, Evaluate and revise.
Technology Role	Applied strategically at each phase: learning analytics for analysis, multimedia tools for design/development, LMS for implementation, analytics dashboards for evaluation.	Technology serves as an engagement tool: gamification, adaptive learning, multimedia simulations, and personalized feedback systems.	Technology is integrated procedurally: diagnostic tools for learner analysis, multimedia for content delivery, interactive platforms for participation, and formative digital assessments for revision.
Strengths	Ensures instructional coherence, alignment with objectives, and systematic evaluation; adaptable to diverse contexts with adequate resources.	Strong focus on motivation and sustained engagement; adaptable to multiple delivery modes.	Explicitly operationalizes technology use; promotes learner-centered and participatory approaches; aligns with UDL principles.
Limitations	Resource- and time-intensive; less agile in rapidly changing contexts.	Limited procedural guidance for sequencing and structuring; most effective when combined with other frameworks.	Limited empirical validation in low-resource settings; multimedia-rich requirements may constrain scalability.
Best Contexts	Large-scale curriculum design, program evaluation, structured institutional initiatives.	Online/blended learning environments, courses or units requiring intensive learner engagement.	Lesson-level design in technology-rich classrooms, interactive workshops, skill-based training.
Equity Considerations	May privilege institutions with robust data infrastructure and planning capacity.	Potential to widen digital divides if reliant on advanced engagement technologies.	Requires access to multimedia and stable internet, potentially limiting reach in underserved regions.
Role in Hybrid Framework	Structural backbone and evaluative rigor.	Motivational and engagement strategies.	Technology-centered operational strategies and learner participation mechanisms.

5. Discussion

The idea that successful technology integration is dependent on conscious alignment between instructional aims and technological affordances is reinforced by the comparative synthesis of ADDIE, ARCS, and ASSURE, which matches closely with the theme tendencies highlighted in the literature study which were found to be prevalent. Yu (2022) and Crompton et al. (2024) emphasize the efficacy of ADDIE as a structured, iterative approach that assures instructional design coherence when strengthened by analytics-driven learner profiling and multimedia-rich content production. This is detailed in the bodies of research that have been conducted. These arguments are supported and expanded upon by the results of this research, which demonstrate that the evaluative rigor of ADDIE, although advantageous for guaranteeing fidelity to learning goals, may also be a constraint on agility in situations where fast design iteration is required, especially in circumstances where resources are limited. This is a manifestation of the remark made by Stapa and Mohammad (2019), which states that while ADDIE is resilient in principle, it has to be carefully adapted in order to minimize implementation delays in educational environments that are always changing.

The focus on student engagement and motivation that is contained in the ARCS model (Keller, 2010) is similarly supported by Smith and Johnson (2021). They suggest that gamification, multimedia, and adaptive learning systems efficiently address motivational weaknesses in online and blended environments. Keller (2010) and Johnson (2021) both emphasize the importance of learner engagement and motivation. This assumption is supported by the current synthesis, which also places ARCS within a larger educational environment. It is noted that the motivational tactics that ARCS employs are most effective when they are supplemented by more organized frameworks such as ADDIE or ASSURE. According to Essa et al. (2023), the perspective that personalization and learning based on real-world problems are enhanced when motivating factors are included into a cohesive

instructional sequence is reflected here.

The explicit procedural integration of technology is a feature of the ASSURE model that was described by Smith and Ragan (2005) and built upon by Khaddage et al. (2020). This feature offers substantial empirical evidence for the use of the ASSURE model in the design and delivery of lessons. According to the research that was examined, ASSURE's strengths are consistently identified in the areas of media selection, learner interaction, and iterative assessment, especially in contexts that are abundant in technology. This review not only validates those strengths, but it also highlights Donald's (2019) caution that scalability in low-resource contexts continues to be an under-researched area. This leads to the suggestion that there is a need for modifications that maintain the model's procedural clarity while simultaneously reducing reliance on resources that require a high bandwidth or a device-intensive approach.

Although each model demonstrates domain-specific strengths, such as ADDIE in systematic alignment, ARCS in motivational engagement, and ASSURE in operationalizing technology, these connections to the literature make it clear that none of these models provides a comprehensive solution to the myriads of challenges that are associated with modern technology-enhanced education. Bhutoria's (2022) claim that individualized, technology-driven education has to be placed within wider pedagogical and institutional frameworks in order to have fair and sustained effects are strengthened by this.

Through the incorporation of these models into a hybridized framework, educators have the opportunity to utilize the systematic analysis and evaluation phases of ADDIE (Yu, 2022), incorporate ARCS-based motivational strategies to maintain engagement (Keller, 2010), and adopt ASSURE's pragmatic steps for media selection and learner participation (Smith & Ragan, 2005). This kind of integration is in line with the advice made by Clark and Mayer (2023), which states that instructional design for digital environments should strike a balance between structure, incentive, and interaction in order to maximize learning results. Furthermore, this approach would directly address the ongoing equality problems that were raised by Sibanda (2022) and Oyarzun and Martin (2023). It would ensure that techniques for integrating technology are adaptive to a variety of resource circumstances and attentive to the cultural and linguistic diversity that exists.

There are thus a variety of ramifications for clinical practice. By incorporating multi-model training into the coursework of teacher preparation programs, pre-service teachers would be better prepared to select and adapt design frameworks in a flexible manner in response to specific instructional challenges. This is a need that was also emphasized by Xu and Stefaniak (2023) in their analysis of pre-service teacher decision-making. Model mapping might be used at the level of curriculum design in order to match certain stages of program development with the framework that is most suitable. This would ensure that pedagogical coherence is maintained while also guaranteeing that learners are engaged. At the policy level, addressing infrastructural imbalances is crucial to enable the successful deployment of these models. This is especially true in settings that are under-resourced or rural, where access to technology and teacher professional development continue to be unequal.

Existing research has a number of limitations, such as the overrepresentation of high-resource situations (Khaddage et al., 2020; Donald, 2019), and there is a dearth of longitudinal studies. These limitations highlight the need for specific empirical investigations. The performance of hybridized frameworks in low-resource situations should be investigated in future study. Additionally, the long-term influence on teacher practice and learner accomplishment should be investigated, as well as the incorporation of new technologies like artificial intelligence and extended reality into these models. These studies would be based on the methodological guidelines made by Spatıotı et al. (2023) for systematic assessment. Additionally, they might be a response to the request made by Junarti et al. (2023) for an innovation in educational technology that emphasizes both engagement and equality.

This synthesis gives a theoretically consistent and empirically substantiated case for going beyond the isolated application of individual instructional design models. This is accomplished by anchoring the topic in the research that was examined. Instead, it proposes a hybridized approach that is sensitive to the context and relies on the complimentary characteristics of ADDIE, ARCS, and ASSURE. This approach offers a road toward technology-enhanced education that is more adaptive, engaging, and egalitarian.

5.1 Limitations

This review has several limitations. First, most included studies were conducted in high-resource contexts, which may limit generalizability to low-resource or rural environments. Second, the review was restricted to English-language publications from 2010–2024, potentially omitting relevant studies in other languages or earlier works. Third, while the analysis applied rigorous screening and coding, it relied on secondary data, and findings are constrained by the quality and scope of existing studies. These limitations suggest caution in applying the hybrid

framework universally and highlight the need for future empirical validation.

6. Conclusion

This study contributes to the field of technology-enhanced education by providing a comparative and integrative viewpoint on three well-established instructional design models: ADDIE, ARCS, and ASSURE. Despite each model having its own set of advantages, the synthesis demonstrates that using these models in conjunction with one another within a hybrid framework has substantial potential for meeting the complex requirements of modern educational methods. While ADDIE offers structural rigor that is essential for methodical planning and assessment, ARCS enhances the process by placing a specific emphasis on learner motivation and engagement and ASSURE operationalizes technology integration by using tactics that are learner-centered and practical. The hybrid model that has been developed, which is based on this synthesis, provides an approach that is both theoretically informed and pragmatically flexible. This method may be adapted to a variety of learning situations, including those that have limited technical infrastructure.

This study is innovative because it presents a practical hybrid design framework and conducts a cross-model analysis that bridges theoretical differences. This is a contribution that is mostly lacking in previous work. This paradigm not only contributes to the advancement of instructional design theory but also provides practical direction for teacher educators, curriculum designers, and policymakers who are looking to incorporate technology in ways that are pedagogically coherent, motivationally rich, and contextually realistic. The incorporation of hybrid model concepts into pre-service training for teacher preparation programs may provide future educators with the flexibility and critical judgment necessary to choose, modify, and mix design techniques in accordance with the requirements of a variety of educational contexts.

The repercussions are not limited to the training of teachers; they also include curricular policy and educational equality. It is possible to use the hybrid model in an environment with abundant resources in order to boost creativity and individualized learning. On the other hand, in situations with limited resources, it may be modified in order to maximize the utilization of existing technology and to encourage inclusive participation. The effectiveness of the hybrid model should be experimentally tested across a variety of educational levels and cultural settings in the form of future research. Additionally, its adaptability to upcoming technologies such as artificial intelligence and immersive simulations should be investigated, and its long-term influence on learner outcomes should be investigated. The purpose of this research is to provide a scholarly and practical approach for enhancing the quality, equality, and sustainability of technology-enhanced education. This is accomplished by integrating structure, motivation, and technology within a cohesive design paradigm.

Acknowledgments

Not applicable.

Authors' contributions

Not applicable.

Funding

Not applicable.

Competing interests

Not applicable.

Informed consent

Obtained.

Ethics approval

The Publication Ethics Committee of the Canadian Center of Science and Education.

The journal's policies adhere to the Core Practices established by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).

Provenance and peer review

Not commissioned; externally double-blind peer reviewed.

Data availability statement

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

Data sharing statement

No additional data are available.

References

Allaymoun, M. H., & Shorman, S. M. (2022). Individual self-assessment using feedback system to improve e-Learning in case of corona 19 pandemic. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, *12*(8), 802–808. https://doi.org/10.18178/ijiet.2022.12.8.1687

Bhutoria, A. (2022). Personalized education and artificial intelligence in the United States, China, and India: A systematic review using a human-in-the-loop model. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *3*, 100068. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100068

Branch, R. M., & Varank, İ. (2009). *Instructional design: The ADDIE approach* (vol. 722, p. 84). New York: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-09506-6

Cai, X., Li, Z., Zhang, J., Peng, M., Yang, S., Tian, X., … Yan, F. (2022). Effects of ARCS model-based motivational teaching strategies in community nursing: A mixed-methods intervention study. *Nurse Education Today*, *119*, 105583. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2022.105583

Chen, C. H., & Tsai, C. C. (2021). In-service teachers' conceptions of mobile technology-integrated instruction: Tendency towards student-centered learning. *Computers & Education*, *170*, 104224. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2021.104224

Clark, R. C., & Mayer, R. E. (2023). *E-learning and the science of instruction: Proven guidelines for consumers and designers of multimedia learning*. John Wiley & sons.

Crompton, H., Jones, M. V., Sendi, Y., Aizaz, M., Nako, K., Randall, R., & Weisel, E. (2024). Examining technology use within the ADDIE framework to develop professional training. *European Journal of Training and Development*, *48*(3/4), 422–454. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJTD-12-2022-0137

Donald, M. (2019). *Leading and managing change in the age of disruption and artificial intelligence*. Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/9781787563674

Dousay, T. A. (2017, November). *Designing for creativity in interdisciplinary learning experiences* (pp. 43–56). Educational Technology to Improve Quality and Access on a Global Scale: Papers from the Educational Technology World Conference (ETWC 2016). Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-66227-5_5

Essa, S. G., Celik, T., & Human-Hendricks, N. E. (2023). Personalized adaptive learning technologies based on machine learning techniques to identify learning styles: A systematic literature review. *IEEE Access*, *11*, 48392–48409. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2023.3276439

Haleem, A., Javaid, M., Qadri, M. A., & Suman, R. (2022). Understanding the role of digital technologies in education: A review. *Sustainable Operations and Computers*, *3*, 275–285. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.susoc.2022.05.004

Hirumi, A. (2013). THREE LEVELS OF PLANNED ELEARNING INTERACTIONS A Framework for Grounding Research and the Design of eLearning Programs. *Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, *14*(1).

Irons, A., & Elkington, S. (2021). *Enhancing learning through formative assessment and feedback*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781138610514

John, M. K., & Thomas, W. K. (2018). An application of the ARCS model of motivational design. In *Instructional theories in action* (pp. 289–320). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203056783-9

Junarti, J., Sholihah, H. I. A., Sari, R. P., Oci, M., & Sumanik, E. D. (2023). INNOVATION IN EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY TO ENHANCE STUDENT LEARNING ACHIEVEMENT IN THE ERA OF THE MERDEKA CURRICULUM. *Indonesian Journal of Education* (INJOE), *3*(2), 292–309.

Martin, F., & Bolliger, D. U. (2022). Designing online learning in higher education. In *Handbook of open, distance and digital education* (pp. 1–20). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-0351-9_72-1

Merrill, J. T., Erkan, D., Winakur, J., & James, J. A. (2020). Emerging evidence of a COVID-19 thrombotic syndrome has treatment implications. *Nature Reviews Rheumatology*, *16*(10), 581–589. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41584-020-0474-5

Muñoz, J. L. R., Ojeda, F. M., Jurado, D. L. A., Peña, P. F. P., Carranza, C. P. M., Berríos, H. Q., … Vasquez-Pauca, M. J. (2022). Systematic review of adaptive learning technology for learning in higher education.

Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, *98*(98), 221–233.

Oyarzun, B., & Martin, F. (2023). A Systematic Review of Research on Online Learner Collaboration from 2012–21: Collaboration Technologies, Design, Facilitation, and Outcomes. *Online Learning*, *27*(1), 71–106. https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v27i1.3407

Patrick, M. R. (2024). *Empathy and Trust: Key Factors in Collaborative Relationships Between Instructional Designers and Faculty*. Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University.

Pillai, A. S. (2022). A Natural Language Processing Approach to Grouping Students by Shared Interests. *Journal of Empirical Social Science Studies*, *6*(1), 1–16.

Rosenberg, M. J., Reiser, A. R., & Dempsey, V. J. (2018). Performance support. In *Trends and issues in instructional design and technology* (pp. 132–141).

Sahu, P. K., Dalcik, H., Dalcik, C., Gupta, M. M., Chattu, V. K., & Umakanthan, S. (2022). Best practices for effective implementation of online teaching and learning in medical and health professions education: during COVID-19 and beyond. *AIMS Public Health*, *9*(2), 278. https://doi.org/10.3934/publichealth.2022019

Sibanda, J. (2022). *Investigating the changing role of key performance indicators for technology and project management entities*. Doctoral dissertation, North-West University (South Africa).

Smaldino, S. E., Lowther, D. L., Mims, C., & Russell, J. D. (2019). *Instructional technology and media for learning*. Pearson Education, Incorporated.

Smith, W. J. (2023). *Understanding how professional development for college faculty on adult learning theories can improve online instruction and course design: A Delphi study*. Doctoral dissertation, Regent University.

Spatıotı, A., Kazanıdıs, I., & Pange, J. (2023). Educational design and evaluation models of the learning effectiveness in e-learning process: A systematic review. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, *24*(4), 318–347. https://doi.org/10.17718/tojde.1177297

Stapa, M. A., & Mohammad, N. A. Z. E. R. I. (2019). The use of Addie model for designing blended learning application at vocational colleges in Malaysia. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Information Technology and Multimedia*, *8*(1), 49–62. https://doi.org/10.17576/apjitm-2019-0801-05

Tacgin, Z., & Martinsuo, M. (2025). INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN TO PROMOTE DATA-DRIVEN PRACTICES AND DIGITALISATION IN SHIPBUILDING PROJECTS. In *INTED2025 Proceedings* (pp. 1986–1996). IATED. https://doi.org/10.21125/inted.2025.0573

Xu, M., & Stefaniak, J. (2023). Pre-service teachers' instructional design decision-making for technology integration. *TechTrends*, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-022-00830-w

Yamani, H. A. (2021). A conceptual framework for integrating gamification in elearning systems based on instructional design model. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning* (Online), *16*(4), 14. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v16i04.15693

Yu, J. (2022). *Designing and examining an online graduate class in instructional design: A community of practice approach*. Doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University.

Yuan, C. H., & Wu, Y. J. (2020). *Mobile instant messaging or face-to-face? Group interactions in cooperative simulations*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106508

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author, with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).