International Journal of Spectrum Research in Education & Humanities (IJSREH)
1(4), October-December, Pages 194-201
© Noble City Publishers ISSN: 3092-9539

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17734113

The Five Domains of Instructional Technology: A Foundational Framework for the Architecture of Teaching and Learning

Tyonyion Richard Sughnen[1] & Dr. Zakari, Muhammad Jamil[2]

[1]Instructional Technology, Department of Educational Foundations, Nasarawa State University, Keffi, tyonyion.trs@gmail.com
[2]Federal College of Education (Technical), Keana,, Nasarawa State, muhdjamilzakari77@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the enduring relevance of the five domains of instructional technology (InsTech): Design, Development, Utilization, Management, and Evaluation as defined by the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT). Drawing from the original 1994 definition, the study posits that these domains are not a rigid, linear process but a dynamic, synergistic framework that serves as the operational engine for the Architecture of effective teaching and Learning (Gibbons, 2009). While the Architecture of teaching and Learning provides the strategic vision and philosophical blueprint for creating effective learning environments, the five InsTech domains supply the systematic, theory-driven methodology required for its practical construction and continuous refinement. A detailed deconstruction of each domain clarifies its function: Design conceptualizes the learning plan; Development translates the plan into tangible resources; Utilization implements and diffuses the solution; Management coordinates the entire system; and Evaluation ensures continuous, data-driven improvement. A comparative analysis with prescriptive models like ADDIE highlights the AECT framework's role as a high-level conceptual meta-language that underpins all project-specific methodologies. The paper concludes that despite the emergence of advanced technologies like AI and virtual reality, these five domains remain the constant, foundational guide for instructional professionals, ensuring that all educational innovations are coherently integrated into a robust and effective learning architecture.

Keywords: Domains of Instructional Technology, Instructional Technology, Foundational Framework, Architecture of Teaching and Learning, AECT

INTRODUCTION

The field of instructional technology is an integrated discipline that systematically applies theory and practice to the processes of teaching and learning. One of its most widely accepted and foundational definitions as articulated by Seels and Richey in 1994 and adopted by the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT), is "the theory and practice of design, development, utilization, management, and evaluation of processes and resources for learning". This definition, with its five core domains serves as a conceptual framework for the field, providing a structured classification that organizes the intricate relationship between theory and practice. This was a pivotal moment in the discipline's history as it provided the shared knowledge base and conceptual structure needed to transform instructional technology from a mere pedagogical movement into a distinct and recognized field and profession ((Gibbons 2013); Nkom 2017). These five domains are not merely a checklist of tasks but rather a comprehensive system rooted in a diverse knowledge base derived from multiple fields of study, including psychology, engineering, communication, and computer science. In fact, Tickton (1974) went further when he defined Instructional Technology as a systematic way of designing, carrying out and evaluating the total process of learning and teaching in terms of specific objectives based on research in human learning and communication, and employing a combination of human and non-human resources to bring about more effective learning. In a simple term, Instructional Technology is the science of teaching and learning (Nkom 2017, AECT 2023). This multi-disciplinary foundation has given the field extensive reach and a remarkable ability to adapt to new instructional needs. The definitions establish a

clear scope, differentiating instructional technology from broader terms like educational technology, instructional design, and human performance technology, which are often used synonymously but are, in fact, either subsets or separate parts of the same overall framework. The systematic nature of these definitions provide the professional framework necessary for effective instructional professionals, who must master the theories in each domain to work throughout multiple domains within a single project (Gibbons 2013; AECT 2023).

The Conceptual Model of Learning Architecture

The concept of Architecture of Learning which was popularized by Andrew S. Gibbons in 2009 provides a high-level guiding philosophy for creating effective instructional experiences. It refers to a systematic blueprint for designing learning environments and activities around articulated learning outcomes. This approach fundamentally shifts the pedagogical emphasis from the act of teaching to the process of learning. The central focus is no longer on simply presenting the material but on intentionally designing student interactions with the instructor, the peers, and with the content itself to achieve deep learning (Gibbons 2009). The architecture of learning is not a prescriptive model but rather a framework that describes the desired state of a learning environment and the principles that guide its creation such as motivation, preparation, active engagement, and reflection.

While the architecture of learning outlines *what* a successful learning environment should achieve and *why* it should be designed in a particular way, the five domains of instructional technology provide the systematic, cyclical process for *how* to construct, implement, and refine this architecture. The architecture is the strategic vision, while the AECT domains are the operational blueprint and toolkit. The two concepts are deeply symbiotic; the domains serve as the practical, theory-driven engine that powers the creation and maintenance of a robust learning architecture. Without the structured approach of the five domains, the principles of learning architecture would remain abstract ideals, lacking a concrete methodology for their realization and continuous improvement (Gibbons 2013).

Consequently, this paper posits that the five domains of instructional technology: Design, Development, Utilization, Management, and Evaluation are not a linear sequence of events but a dynamic, synergistic framework that provides the foundational theory and practice for the systematic construction, implementation, and continuous refinement of a learning architecture. The following sections will provide a detailed deconstruction of each domain, a synthesis of their interconnectedness, a practical case study that illustrates their application.

The Five Domains of Instructional Technology

The five domains of instructional technology provide a comprehensive and robust framework for practitioners in the field. They were conceived not as isolated steps but as a classification structure that organizes the interrelation of theory and practice. An effective instructional technology professional must possess a working knowledge of all domains, recognizing their interdependency and how they collectively contribute to the success of any teaching and learning process (AECT 2023). Let us now look at each of the domains as shown below:

1. **The Design:** The Design domain is the initial, conceptual phase of instructional technology where the blueprint for the learning architecture is first articulated. It encompasses the theory and practice of planning for all aspects of instruction, from analyzing the learner to selecting the proper methods and materials. This domain is fundamentally about specifying the conditions for learning by applying principles, theories, and research related to instructional systems design, message design, instructional strategies, and learner characteristics (Seels & Richey 1994; AECT 2023). The design process is not an intuitive act but a systematic and theory-driven endeavour. Instructional designers use a theory framework to select instructional methods that are most likely to promote learning, which is a critical distinction from merely using a learning theory descriptively. While learning theories, such as behaviorism, cognitivism, and constructivism, explain the *what happens* of the learning process inside a learner's mind, instructional theories are prescriptive, explaining how to produce learning. This is why the design domain is so central; it is where abstract psychological principles are operationalized into concrete, actionable strategies (Clark 2002).

Key sub-components of the design domain include:

i. **Instructional Systems Design (ISD):** An organized, systematic procedure for creating instructional experiences that make the acquisition of knowledge and skill more efficient, effective, and appealing (Florida State University USA 1970s).
ii. **Message Design:** The planning process for how a message is structured to fit a particular medium and learning task which informs decisions about content presentation.
iii. **Instructional Strategies:** The selection of instructional methods that are most suitable for the learning situation, content, and objectives.
iv. **Learner Characteristics:** The analysis of the target audience, including their demographics, prior knowledge, and psychological traits, to inform and modify the instructional plan to support increased learning effectiveness.

The Design domain serves as the intellectual foundation for the entire instructional process. It is here that the intentional planning of the learning experience is meticulously crafted, setting the stage for all subsequent development, utilization, management, and evaluation (Gibbons 2013; Tyonyion & Zakari 2025c).

2. The Development Domain: According to Mayer 2021, the development domain is the process of translating the design specifications from the planning phase into a physical or digital form. This is the creative and technical phase where the abstract blueprint of the learning architecture becomes a tangible reality. It involves the production, creation, and selection of learning resources and materials based on the decisions made in the design domain.

The development domain is intrinsically linked to the technologies and media used to deliver instruction. As pointed out by AECT 2023, there are four key categories of technology involved in this process:
i. Print Technologies: The production and delivery of instructional materials such as books, photographs, and graphic representations.
ii. Audiovisual Technologies: The development of linear media like films and audio recordings that enhance teaching methods.
iii. Computer-based Technologies: The use of electronically stored data to present information, which includes a wide range of applications from basic screen displays to sophisticated software.
iv. Integrated Technologies: The combination of various components to create a unified and often interactive learning experience.

The choices made during development are not isolated decisions. The selection and production of instructional media are constrained by the intended medium for delivery and use, which is a key consideration within the Utilization domain. For instance, a designer might specify a virtual reality classroom in the design phase, but the feasibility of its development and subsequent utilization in a particular learning environment must be carefully considered. This interdependency highlights that the domains do not operate in a vacuum but are part of a continuous, synergistic cycle (Mayer 2021).

3. The Utilization Domain: The Utilization domain is the action phase of instructional technology where the developed resources and processes are applied and deployed to enhance effective teaching and learning. This domain is concerned with the practical use of instructional materials and is crucial for ensuring that a meticulously designed and developed solution does not fail due to improper implementation (Gibbons 2013).

According to AECT 2023, this domain encompasses several critical sub-components such as:
i. **Media Utilization:** The act of matching learners with specific materials, preparing them for interaction with those materials, providing guidance, and assessing the results.
ii. **Diffusion of Innovations:** The process of disseminating and gaining widespread acceptance and adoption of new instructional innovations. This involves creating awareness, fostering interest, supporting a trial period, and ultimately leading to the full adoption and institutionalization of the innovation.
iii. **Implementation:** The direct application of the instructional design and development within the actual learning setting. This includes planning for the necessary support for both instructors and learners as they adapt to new knowledge and skills.

iv. **Policy-making:** The creation of regulations and standards that govern the use of instructional technology, such as ensuring that all web-based materials are ADA compliant.

This domain is where the learning architecture encounters its real-world context. Its success depends not only on the quality of the materials but also on the effective management of social and institutional factors. It addresses challenges such as the digital divide and logistical hurdles. The successful utilization of a new technology or pedagogical approach requires overcoming barriers to adoption and ensuring that the innovation becomes a permanent part of the organization's culture (Mayer 2021).

4. **The Management Domain: The Orchestrator of the System:** The Management domain is the overarching administrative and coordination function that operates throughout all other domains. Its purpose is to plan, organize, coordinate, and supervise the instructional process by applying principles of project management, resource management, delivery system management, and information management. While the other domains focus on specific phases or actions, management is a continuous force that ensures the entire system functions effectively and coherently (AECT 2023).

The management domain is the essential mechanism that enables the synergistic relationship between the other four domains. It ensures that the development of resources relies on the original design specifications, that utilization is properly implemented, and that the evaluation process is planned to gather the necessary data. As noted by Florida State University USA 1970, 'management is involved in planning for and implementing all aspects of a single project across all domains'. This highlights the critical role of the instructional technologist as a leader and administrator who must possess the skills to oversee personnel, budgets, time, and facilities to ensure the project's success.

Key sub-components of the management domain include:

i. Project Management**:** The coordination and administration of a project from its inception to its completion.
ii. Resource Management**:** The administration of personnel, budget, time, and facilities needed to execute the project.
iii. Delivery System Management**:** The planning and support for the hardware, software, and technical infrastructure required to deliver the instruction.
iv. Information Management: The planning, monitoring, and control of the storage and transfer of information related to the instructional process.

Without effective management, the intricate, non-linear interdependencies between the domains would break down, leading to project failure. The management domain is the glue that holds the entire system together, making it an indispensable part of the instructional technology framework.

5. **The Evaluation Domain:** The Evaluation domain is the continuous process of monitoring, assessing, and judging the value of an instructional program, project, or product. Contrary to the perception of evaluation as a final, summative step, it is an integral part of the process that begins during the initial planning stages and is woven throughout the entire life cycle of a project (Anikweze 2010).

Evaluation is the domain that closes the loop in the instructional technology cycle, providing the critical feedback necessary for continuous improvement. Its sub-components include:

i. Problem Analysis: A form of evaluation that occurs at the beginning of a project to identify needs, constraints, and establish clear goals.
ii. Formative Evaluation: The gathering of information during the early stages of development to identify areas for improvement and refine the instructional product.
iii. Summative Evaluation: The final assessment of a program or project to make decisions about its overall merit, worth, or value, often for the purpose of judging its effectiveness for implementation.
iv. Criterion-referenced Measurement: A key aspect of evaluation where the adequacy of a learner's performance or a program's success is determined by the extent to which it has met specific, predefined criteria or standards.

The evaluation domain is the catalyst for iterative design and refinement. The data collected from formative and summative evaluations provides the necessary evidence to either validate the existing design or to inform a new design, modify the development process, or adjust the utilization strategy. This

is the core of what has been described as a "sustainable re-growth model," where continuous assessment drives ongoing improvement. It ensures that the learning architecture is not a static structure but a dynamic system that can adapt and evolve based on evidence of its effectiveness (Haines 2000).

The Domains as a Cohesive System for Learning Architecture

The five domains of instructional technology are not intended to be followed in a rigid, linear fashion. They are described as having a synergistic relationship where each domain contributes to and relies on the others. For example, the process of Development is entirely dependent on the specifications and plans created during Design. Similarly, the Evaluation domain relies on the output of Design, Development, and Utilization to gather the necessary data for assessment. This non-linear, interdependent relationship underscores that a decision in one domain will inevitably affect the others (Florida State University USA 1970s).

This interconnectedness can be viewed as an instructional ecosystem. A change in one part of the system, such as a new instructional strategy introduced during the Design phase has ripple effects throughout. It may require the Development of new resources, a different approach to their Utilization, increased oversight from Management, and new criteria for their Evaluation (Gibbons 2013). This is why an effective instructional technology professional must have a holistic understanding and a mastery of all five domains; the success of an entire project hinges on the seamless coordination and interplay between these functions. The Management domain, in particular, acts as the central nervous system of this ecosystem, coordinating and implementing all aspects of a project to ensure the synergistic relationship remains intact.

Operationalizing learning Architecture with the AECT Domains

The architecture of learning, with its focus on creating engaging, outcomes-driven, and deep learning experiences is fundamentally an advanced application of the AECT domains. The principles of the architecture are realized through the systematic and iterative process provided by the instructional technology framework as shown thus:

i. **Design** provides the conceptual blueprint for the learning architecture. It is in this domain that a designer articulates the learning outcomes and designs the student's journey toward achieving them. It is here that the intentional interactions with content, peers, and instructors are planed (Florida State University USA 1970)
ii. **Development** constructs the physical and digital materials that populate this architecture. This could be anything from a traditional textbook to an adaptive learning system, a virtual reality classroom, or a sophisticated e-learning platform. The resources created in this domain are the tangible elements that students will interact with (Mayer 2021).
iii. **Utilization** is the implementation of the learning architecture. It is the phase where the planned interactions are put into action and the developed resources are deployed in the learning environment. This domain is responsible for fostering the student engagement and collaborative learning that the architecture is designed to promote (West 2018).
iv. **Management** serves as the orchestra conductor, overseeing the entire process and ensuring that the project stays on schedule, within budget, and that all necessary resources (example personnel, technology) are in place to sustain the architecture.
v. **Evaluation** provides the critical feedback loop that determines if the architecture is successfully achieving its intended learning outcomes. The data gathered from evaluation allows for a continuous process of reflection and refinement, ensuring the architecture remains effective and relevant (Anikweze 2010).

Together, the AECT domains provide the operational engine for the architecture of learning. They move the concept from a theoretical ideal to a practical, measurable, and continuously improving reality.

Agreement of AECT Domains of InsTech with other Models and Frameworks

The AECT domains do not exist in isolation; they are a conceptual framework that informs and is informed by other instructional design models. Perhaps the most common of these is the ADDIE model, which stands for Analysis, Design, Development, Implementation, and Evaluation. The phases of ADDIE show a clear overlap with the AECT's domains.

Table1: Comparison of the AECT Domains and the ADDIE Model

AECT Domains	ADDIE phases	Agreement and differences
Design	**Design and analysis**	The Design domain of AECT encompasses the analysis of learner needs and the subsequent design of the instructional materials. ADDIE separates this into two distinct phases: Analysis (assessing needs) and Design (creating the plan).
Development	**Development**	Both concepts refer to the process of creating the instructional materials based on the design plan.
Utilization	**Implementation**	The Utilization domain is the act of using and diffusing the innovation. ADDIE's Implementation phase is the application of the instructional solution in the actual learning setting. The concepts are highly similar, but AECT's Utilization includes a broader focus on policy and diffusion of innovations.
Management	**N/A**	Management is not a distinct phase in the linear ADDIE model. In the AECT framework, Management is an overarching function that operates throughout all other domains, coordinating and supervising the entire process.
Evaluation	**Evaluation**	Both are concerned with assessing and judging the effectiveness of the instructional solution. In both models, evaluation is often presented as a feedback loop, with AECT specifying both formative and summative types.

The comparison reveals a crucial distinction: the AECT domains provide a high-level conceptual framework for the entire field of instructional technology, outlining the fundamental areas of practice and theory. Models like ADDIE, in contrast, are often more prescriptive, step-by-step methodologies for a specific project. The AECT framework is the theoretical foundation, while models like ADDIE are the practical tools used within that system.

CONCLUSION

The five domains of instructional technology: Design, Development, Utilization, Management, and Evaluation as defined by the AECT, constitute a robust and enduring framework for the field. They are not isolated stages but a dynamic, synergistic system that provides the essential theory and practice for constructing and sustaining a high-quality teaching and learning architecture. The architecture of learning, with its focus on intentionally designed, learner-centric experiences, represents a modern pedagogical philosophy that is uniquely enabled by the systematic, iterative process articulated within the AECT domains.

The relevance of this framework has only been reinforced by the increasing prevalence of technology in education. While new tools such as adaptive learning systems, virtual reality, and artificial intelligence continue to emerge, the fundamental processes of instructional technology remain constant. A successful educational endeavour, regardless of the technology, still requires the careful design of learning conditions, the effective development of resources, the strategic utilization of those resources, the continuous management of the entire process, and the systematic evaluation of its outcomes. The AECT domains provide a timeless guide for instructional practitioners, offering a conceptual map for navigating the complexities of modern learning environments and ensuring that new innovations are integrated into a coherent and effective learning architecture.

REFERENCES

Abuhassna, H., Adnan, M. A. B. M., & Awae, F. (2024), Exploring the synergy between instructional design models and learning theories: A systematic literature review. Contemporary Educational Technology, 16(2), ep499. https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/14289

AECT. (2023), Educational technology: A contemporary definition. *Association for Educational Communications and Technology.*

Al-Samarraie, H., & Saeed, N. M. (2022), Educational technologies and students with diverse needs: A systematic review. Frontiers in Education, 7, 916502. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.916502

Alomyan, A., & Green, J. (2019), Learning theories' implications for online learning design. ResearchGate.

Alqahtani, A., & Abumallouh, R. A. (2025), Educational technologies and assessment practices: Evolution and emerging research gaps. F1000Research, 14(17), 1–17.

Anindyarini, A., Setyaningrum, A. S., & Puspitasari, H. (2018), Online learning: A modern means of delivering instruction. ResearchGate.

Bousbahi, F., Fari, M., & Sbai, Y. (2023), Virtual reality in education: A systematic review of learning theories and approaches. Electronics, 12(13), 2832. https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics12132832

Chen, L., Chen, P., & Lin, Z. (2020), Artificial intelligence trends in education: A narrative overview. Procedia Computer Science, 136, 16–24. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2018.02.001

DeBell, M. (2020), Instructional message design in e-learning (Khindri, R., Ed.). Instructional Message Design Center.

Dick, W., Carey, L., & Carey, J. O. (2015), The systematic design of instruction (8th ed.). Pearson.

Federal Ministry of Education (2013), National policy on education (6th ed.). NERDC Press.

Gbadebo, A. D. (2024). Digital transformation and education in Sub-Saharan Africa: Challenges and sustainability strategies. International Journal of Social Sciences and Research, 5(3), 209–221. https://doi.org/10.53639/ijssr.v5i3.262

Isik, A. D. (2018). Use of technology in constructivist approach. Educational Research and Reviews, 13(8), 316–322.

Mattar, J. (2018). Constructivism and connectivism in education and educational technology: Active, situated, authentic, experiential, and anchored learning. The Journal of Open, Flexible, and Distance Learning, 22(2), 64–75.

Mayer, R. E. (2020). Multimedia learning (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Nkom, A. A. (2017). The professional teacher handbook series: University education. BI-SHAANN Publishing.

Olakulehin, F. K. (2014). ICTs in teacher education and professional development within Nigeria. Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education, 15(1), 45–54.

Reiser, R. A., & Dempsey, J. V. (Eds.). (2018). Instructional design and technology: An introduction (4th ed.). Pearson.

Salimi, F. (2025). The World Bank and EdTech in Sub-Saharan Africa: Evolving priorities, persistent gaps. Policy Futures in Education.

Sawyerr-George, O. E., & Agina-Obu, R. (2023), Internet usage among university students in Nigeria: A case study. Asian Journal of Information Science and Technology, 13(1), 16–20. https://doi.org/10.51983/ajist-2023.13.1.3411

Turugare, M. T., & Rudhumbu, N. (2020), Comprehensive evaluation of use of technology in education: Confirmatory factor analysis of an instrument. *Journal of Interactive Online Learning, 18(3), 329–358.*

Tyonyion, R. S., & Zakari, M. J. (2025a) The symbiotic nexus: Instructional videos as catalysts for heutagogy in 21st century learning. *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews, 6(7), 60–65.*

Tyonyion, R. S., & Zakari, M. J. (2025b) The right place of technological tools in the classroom: The lenses of instructional technology expert. *International Journal of Educational Technology, 1(3), 12–21.*

Tyonyion, R. S., & Zakari, M. J. (2025c) Instructional analysis: The basis of effective instructional delivery. *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews, 6(7).*

Villanova University, (2025, May 27). Instructional design and learning experience design: A shifting landscape.

Xiong, K., Xie, G., & Lin, C. (2024), Measuring technology-enhanced assessment into instructional practices. International Journal of Social Science Research, 5(1), 89–96.

Zakari, M. J., & Tyonyion, R. S. (2025a). Unveiling the instructional communication concept (TCC) model: A paradigm shift in overcoming noise in teaching. *International Journal of Research and Reviews, 6(7), 2767–2777.* https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.6.0725.25116