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Abstract

This paper presents the Motivating Opportunities model, also known by its acronym MOM (Hardré, 2009). This model developed by Patricia Hardré, strives to offer an alternative to Keller’s ARCS model by focusing on design to motivate the learner. This focus differs from that of ARCS which learner-focused. MOM suggest an instructional design process which includes seven different elements. Each of the elements guides the instructional designer in the process of designing her course to design for different aspects of motivation. Following this design process the instructional design is guided to ensure motivating opportunities are taken (Hardré, 2009).
Motivating Opportunities Model (MOM)

This essay aims to present the Motivating Opportunities Model (MOM). This recent model is aimed to provide instructional designers with systematic theoretical design process for motivating learners. MOM intends to improve and add to ARCS, which for a very long time has been the most known and utilized instructional design motivation model. Hardré first pointed to the need for a new instructional design motivation model in 2003 (see Hardré, 2003), and since MOM has only been created recently it has not gained much traction. However, it is important to as it is an alternative for the very dominant ARCS model.

MOM's SUCCESS

According to MOM (Hardré, 2009) instructional designers should take advantage of motivating opportunities in their design by applying a process that includes seven non-discrete key components: Situational, Utilization, Competence, Content, Emotion, Social, and Systemic. These seven key components are captured by MOM’s mnemonic acronym ‘SUCCESS’. The first component, Situational, addresses the context of learning and performance. It guides the instructional designer to be concerned about the ability and sense of the learner of access, authenticity, choice, and control of the learning materials and tasks (Hardré, 2009). Hardré argues (2009, p. 14) that “[i]n considering situational motivational features of instruction, the designer should figuratively sit in the learner's seat and look around at what might promote or reduce motivation from that perspective.”

Utilization addresses the application of the instruction in the learner's’ context. This component highlights the need for instructional designer to identify the different circumstances
in which learning would be applied and its expected use. In other words, perception of transferability should be addressed as a motivational factor (Hardré, 2009).

In reference to the ARCS model, Hardré writes (2009, p. 15): “Competence is more than just confidence”. She explains that whereas confidence is the perception of one’s knowledge and skills, competence includes also the actual components for achieving a certain standard of knowledge and ability. Competence, therefore, includes building the learner’s confidence and also taking into account the contexts of performance during the instruction and afterwards (on the job) (Hardré, 2009).

The key component Content refers to the communication of knowledge and information. It directs the instructional designer to consider what information is being communicated and how it is communicated (Hardré, 2009).

Emotion is a key component that includes a range of emotional attitudes and reactions from general ways of feeling towards the subject matter or towards the learning activities and materials, to emotional reactions to performance and feedback. Feelings such as anxiety, value, and expectations have to be taken into account by the instructional designer (Hardré, 2009).

The Social key component draws attention to the fact that many of the aspects of motivation, such as the sense of success and confidence, and emotional reactions and attitudes, are influenced by social dynamics and construction. Instructional design strategies such as group work, competition, instructor-student interaction, must be paid close attention (Hardré, 2009). Hardré (2009) is also concerned with the similarity of the social dynamics in the instruction to
those in other context - for example, that of a work environment where what had been learned is applied.

The seventh component, Systemic, that points the instructional designer’s attention to the organizational context of the instruction. The instruction’s purpose and place in relation to the organizational expectations for performance should be taken into account to match and support the learner’s goals and expectations (Hardré, 2009).

**MOM in relation to the ARCS model**

MOM cannot be discussed without referring to the well established ARCS Model. According to Keller (2009), motivation is what drives human action, including learning, and is the result of each individual’s answer to the question “why do I do the things that I do?”. Keller’s ARCS model suggests that in order to design motivating instruction, four elements should be incorporated into the instructional design: Attention, Relevance, Confidence, and Satisfaction (Keller, 2000; Keller, 2008; Keller, 2009). These four elements intend not only to increase the learner’s motivation to interact with the instructional environment, but also to arise motivation, and to maintain and support it. The systematic design process that follows this model suggests implementing activities and interactions that call the learner’s attention to the subject taught, link the material to the learner’s context, provide the learner a sense of success, and finally to reward the learner for learning achievements (Keller, 2000; Keller, 2008; Keller, 2009).

There is an overlap between the two models, and several of components of SUCCESS can be collapsed under the four ARCS categories. However, as Hardré (2009) points out, the ARCS model is learner-focused. Hardré (2009) argues that instructional design should approach motivation from a design-focused perspective instead. A design-focus perspective considers in
addition to the learner also the context, the social setting, the task, and the standards for performance (Hardré, 2009). Therefore, there is a great emphasis on authenticity of instruction, and its relation to expected performance in other circumstances, such as at the workplace. This emphasis is evident, for example, by the the last component of MOM’s SUCCESS, Systemic, which signals that MOM is directed mostly towards the instructional design of training (in contrast to that of education).

Stemming from MOM’s design-focused approach, is its emphasis on the social aspects of design motivating opportunities. The ARCS model focus on the individual learner leaves the social aspects of motivation outside of its immediate theoretical frame, although it could be argued that the four elements composing ARCS are outcomes of in some cases of social motivating factors.

**Conclusion**

MOM presents an alternative to the dominant motivational instructional design model ARCS. It is important to compare the two because the comparison allows to shed light on the assumptions of the theories which might otherwise be taken for granted or ignored. ARCS is a clear and straightforward model whereas MOM is somewhat more complex. The seven elements of SUCCESS guide instructional design to comprehensively address specific aspects of instruction and how they can affect motivation.
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