DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 402 563   CS 012 675

AUTHOR   Alexander, James C.
TITLE   The Application of Multiple Intelligences Theory to
                Reading Instruction.
PUB DATE   Mar 95
NOTE   18p.
PUB TYPE   Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.)
                (120)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Elementary Education; *Learning Processes; Models;
                Phonics; *Reading Instruction; *Reading Processes;
                *Theory Practice Relationship; Whole Language
                Approach
IDENTIFIERS   Educational Issues; *Multiple Intelligences

ABSTRACT
                Top-down and bottom-up theories have long dominated
the field of reading. Recently, interactive models have been proposed
by some researchers. One model, the interactive-compensatory model,
hypothesizes that a deficiency in one processing area is compensated
for by a relative strength in another area. The concept of multiple
intelligences is one way to explain this phenomenon. From the
multiple intelligences point of view, some reading instruction will
incorporate music, some will take a more tactile and kinesthetic
approach. Traditional approaches such as phonics instruction or whole
language methods will certainly not be abandoned--some children do
fit into the whole language category and some do learn better from an
analytical/skills approach. (Contains 17 references.) (Author/RS)

The Application of Multiple Intelligences Theory

to Reading Instruction

by

James C. Alexander

March, 1995

Running Head: MULTIPLE INTELLIGENCES

Abstract

Top-down and bottom-up theories have long dominated the field of reading. Recently, interactive models have been proposed by some researchers. One model, the interactive-compensatory model, hypothesizes that a deficiency in one processing area is compensated for by a relative strength in another area. This paper suggests the concept of multiple intelligences as one way to explain this phenomenon. Implications of multiple intelligences theory for reading instruction are suggested.

3

The Application of Multiple Intelligences Theory
to Reading Instruction

It is the nature of revolutions that excess is
generally followed by balance. The normal course
of a revolution is to "throw out" the establishment
and replace it with a radical alternative. Certainly,
this revolutionary activity is not foreign to the
field of éducation. In fact, one might say that
education has been a very fertile field for the novel
and the alternative. True, one might argue that
alternative approaches to the prevailing rationale
in the domain of curriculum and instruction often
do not tend to find their way into the teaching and
thinking of many teachers, Still, education at all
levels is effected to varying degrees by revolutionary
thinking.

Probably, at the base of all of this change and
counter-change are assumptions made about what children
need to learn; and even more specifically, the issue
of who should decide what they need to learn. It
seems that there are two very different basic
approaches to this question. One approach, which
might be termed child centered, sees the child's
personal needs and interests as the basis for
curricular decisions. The other approach, which might

be termed establishment centered, assumes that the
educational establishment knows what is best for the
child.

Of course, there have been those who have made
a plea for an approach which takes both the child's
felt needs and concerns as well as the need for
guidance from responsible others into consideration.
Dewey (1934) proposed just such a point of departure
in suggesting a philosophical base for educators.

It is the author's hope that this paper might
offer an alternative to over-zealous revolutionary
approaches to reading instruction. Dewey proposed
an educational philosophy based on common sense,
empirical evidence, human nature, and pragmatic
utilitarianism, (ie. what works?). It is our hope
to apply similar concerns to arrive at a common sense
working model of the reading process.

As in basic educational philosophy, two points
of view have come to dominate discussions about
reading. One approach, which has come to be termed
"top-down", has been suggested by such theorists as
Goodman (1976) and Smith (1971). There is little
need to elaborate on that approach here except to
state the major features. It is rooted in some of

the research coming from the field of psycholinguistics; but certainly not supported by all of related evidence from that domain. It finds special support in schema theory and other cognitive concepts related to representational systems.

It assumes reading to be comprehension driven and attaches relatively less importance to "bottom-up" processes such as those associated with word recognition and decoding. Top-down theories see an effective reader as one who is less dependent on the text and much more dependent on language structure, story schemas, and prediction in reading.

This might be viewed as the revolutionary approach. The establishment view that it attempts to counter is the more traditional bottom-up view. Such theorists as Gough and Hillinger (1980) and others see reading as being skills and text driven. Processing is thought to take place at the letter and word level. The bottom-up camp is also interested in comprehension. The difference being that the various correlates of the reading process such as decoding, structural analysis, and word identification are seen as the foundation for word recognition which is in turn seen as the major prerequisite for

6

comprehension to occur.

Actually, the similarities between reading models and educational philosophy are rather apparent. Just as educational theory might divided into child and establishment centered camps, so also reading may be viewed as being primarily either something dependent on a child's internal knowledge of language or as being more dependent on forces outside of the child (ie. text, words, letters). And the newcomer in this debate might be viewed as the top-down camp which has taken on a revolutionary model for the promulgation of their point of view.

I would argue that we are in need of common sense. One of the problems is that much of the evidence for a whole language curriculum has come from qualitative child watching, whereas the evidence for bottom-up conceptions is largely derived from quantitative methods. Even when there is an attempt to meet on common ground, the debate has raged. As a case in point, consider the study of context on word recognition from Goodman (1965). A replication of the study by Nicholson (1991) brings the results into question. And further, as Nicholson reports, some voices from the great bastions of whole language,

such as New Zealand, are beginning to question the

effectiveness of the approach. What is needed is

an approach that take into account the work of

psycholinguists who have shown the importance of

contextualization, schema, and the search for meaning

in the processing of language and the evidence, which

is considerable (Adams, 1990), that bottom-up processes

are of paramount importance in processing text.

Such a model was first suggested by Rumelhart

(1977). In the interactive model of reading,

processing occurs at all levels. By spreading

activation text is analyzed in bottom-up ways involving

letters, words, sounds, and feature analysis. Text

is also processed in terms of meaning. The reader

comes to the text with a series of expectations but

still utilizes text-driven processes such as

orthographic features, graphophonemic information,

and automaticity to process reading material. As

to which system is operating at a given time, the

question is moot. Bottom-up activity activates top-

down processing which in turn relies on more bottom-

up processes to confirm and predict. The whole

interactive scenario is carefully illustrated by Adams

(1990).

In an attempt to account for differences in word recognition methods, Stanovich (1980) has proposed the interactive-compensatory model of the reading process. Research on the model has in general supported its major components (Stanovich, 1984; Yoon & Goetz 1994; Stanovich, Nathan, West & Vala Rossi, 1985; Stanovich, Cunningham & Feeman, 1984; Nicholson, 1991; Goldsmith-Phillips, 1989). The model assumes that a deficiency in one of the interactive processes is compensated for by a relative strength in another process. In particular, and in contrast to the theories of top-down, whole language proponents,, the interactive-compensatory researchers have found that better readers actually rely more heavily on surface features of the text in processing than on semantic and syntactic processes. In the face of the increasing dependence on semantic and syntactical processes nescessary for word recocnition, less attention as devoted to overall comprehension, while effective readers recognize words with greater automaticity and are able to give more attention to global comprehension.

The evidence for the interactive-compensatory model might seem to suggest that reading should be

taught on the basis of bottom-up processes. If better readers utilize bottom-up processes in reading more than top-down processes, why not make everyone a good reader by teaching more phonics, structural analysis, feature analysis, etc.? And it is at this juncture that we need to exercise caution. First of all, we must not forget the distinction between correlation and causality. Secondly, there a better explanation for differences in processing than just to attribute reading failure to dis-use of bottom-up processes. This explanation is found in the theory of multiple intelligences.

The major theorist in the field of multiple intelligences in Howard Gardner. In two major works (Gardner, 1983, 1993) he sets forth the theory and implication of the theory for instruction.

Gardner proposes that the psychological/educational community has been in error in the understanding and measurement of intelligence. Most intelligence tests combine verbal and quantitative measures to arrive at a global measure of an individual's intelligence level. Gardner suggests that intelligence has implications quite apart from school success. Gardner sees intelligence as the

ability to solve problems or create products that
are valued in a cultural, anthropological, or societal
sense. The theory is far more complex and analytical
than learning styles theories such as that proposed
by Carbo (1986). The evidence for Gardner's theory
is rooted in research and theory regarding human
development, brain damage, evolution, anthropology,
genetics, and neuropsychology. Gardner identifies
seven intelligences. Some of the criteria used to
establish an intelligence are:

1. The extent that a given faculty can be localized
   in the brain as evident in cases of brain damage.

2. The prevalence of a given intelligence in cases
   of exceptionality such as prodigies and idiots
   savants

3. The existence of the necessary information
   processing operations to support a given
   intelligence.

4. A distinctive developmental history of the
   intelligence

5. Location of related abilities in other species.

6. Evidence from empirical psychological procedures.

7. Information from standardized tests.

8. Some sort of symbol system associated with the

intelligence.

Seven intelligences have been proposed. These are basic abilities influenced by nature and nurture. In the literature related to multiple intelligences, each of the seven have been carefully evaluated in terms of the eight criteria outlined above. The seven intelligences are as follows:

1. Musical intelligence.

2. Bodily-kinesthetic intelligence.

3. Logical-mathematical intelligence.

4. Linguistic intelligence.

5. Spatial intelligence

6. Interpersonal intelligence

7. Intrapersonal intelligence.

There is a rather subtle difference between multiple intelligences theory and the concept of learning styles; a difference that it is important to note. Most of learning styles theory has concerned itself with environmental factors and their adjustment to enhance learning. While the application of the theory of multiple intelligences certainly does suggest pedagogical directions, it is much more encompassing in outlook. The application of multiple intelligences concepts suggests a whole new way of looking at people.

People really are different; different at a deep
down neuroprocessing level. While learning styles
theory seems to suggest improvements in instructional
approaches, the idea of multiple intelligences explains
school success and the failure of contemporary
approaches at a much more deeply ontological level.
In short, the theory of multiple intelligences, if
accepted, demands an entirely different outlook.

How could this paradigm of ability be used as
part of a model of reading-let's say the
interactive-compensatory model in particular? It
fits quite nicely here. Instead of viewing differences
in terms of better and worse, we now see them in terms
of actual differences and inherent strengths. Top-down
processors who rely heavily on context can be explained
in terms linguistic intelligence. They are those
who rely on the natural structure of language in
approaching text. Logical-mathematical and spatial
intelligences would seem to lend themselves well to
bottom-up processing. These readers are analytical
rather than global and oriented toward spatial
configurations. One reader isn't good and another
poor. They are just different kinds of processors.

Musical intelligence refers to skill with tone,

rhythm pitch, etc. Those with musical intelligence would excel in an academic program which strongly emphasizes music as the means of communication. Clearly, reading instruction for these folks will capitalize on this ability and involve growing readers in musically oriented instruction. Songs, the rhythm of language and choral reading activities will take center stage.

For those with ability in bodily-kinesthetic tasks, the mode of communication will certainly involve the acting out of stories, use of the muscle groups in writing, and the involvement of students in touch and sensation experiences.

For those with logical-mathematical or spatial intelligence, learning will take a much more analytic or perhaps even synthetic approach to dealing with sound and print. Teaching will tend to be more text oriented and although this intelligence tends to be more non-verbal, an analytic approach will probably be effective in the teaching of decoding and comprehension.

Those of a more linguistic bent, will likely find a whole language, top-down approach to be effective. It would appear from studies of the

interactive-compensatory model that many "so-called" poor readers might fit into this context. The use of disconnected phonics instruction, while certainly effective with other intelligences, is much less effective here.

Intrapersonal and interpersonal intelligences define skills useful in social or self perception. Certainly an interpersonal type would do well in a cooperative learning situation. Those with intelligence of a more intrapersonal nature will probably do best in an environment which allows for individual work and reflective journal keeping.

One thing that becomes immediately apparent from this perspective is that both of the extreme ways of viewing reading must surely be wrong. There cannot be one and only one way to look at the reading process because there are so many different ways to process information.

From a multiple intelligences point of view, some teaching will incorporate music. Some will take a more tactile and kinesthetic approach. The traditional approaches such as phonics instruction or whole language methods will certainly not be abandoned; for truly some children do fit into the

Goodman/Smith category and some truly do learn better
from an analytical/skills approach.

What we need is an authentic evaluation process
that is both standardized and anecdotal. We will
not be able to make snap decisions about children
based on a 20 minute assessment. We will always be
refining and fine tuning our reading instruction.
While classroom instruction will utilize many effective
methods for teaching, grouping will be made more on
the basis of intelligence than ability. It's a tall
order and if this model is to be effectively applied
to reading instruction pedagogical concerns must be
addressed.

We started talking about child-centered and
establishment centered approaches to education. It
was stated that common sense dictated a different
way, a way that kept the child in the center while
still not abandoning the wisdom of her elders.
Incorporating multiple intelligences theory into our
understanding of the reading process could be just
such an approach; child centered, research centered,
and effective; a revolution where the child is the
winner and no one the loser.

References

Adams, M. J. (1990). Beginning to read: Thinking and learning about print. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Carbo, M. (1986). Teaching students to read through their individual learning styles. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Dewey, J. (1934). The need for a philosophy of education. The New Era in Home and School, 15, 211-214.

Gardner, H. (1983). Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences. New York: Basic Books.

Gardner, H. (1993). Multiple intelligences: Theory into practice. New York: Basic Books.

Goldsmith-Phillips, J. (1989). Word and context in reading development: A test of the interactive-compensatory hypothesis. Journal of Educational Psychology, 81, 299-305.

Goodman, K. S. (1965). A lingusitic study of cues and miscues in reading. Elementary English, 42, 639-643.

Goodman, K. S. (1976). Reading: A psycholinguistic guessing game. In H. Singer & R. Ruddell (Eds.) Theoretical models and processes of reading. (2nd. edition). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Gough, P. & Hillinger, M. (1980). Learning to read: An unnatural act. Bulletin of the Orton Society, 30, 179-196.

Nicholson, T. (1991). Do children read words better in context or in lists? A classic study revisited. Journal of Educational Psychology, 83, 444-450.

Rumelhart, D. (1977). Toward an interactive model of reading. In S. Dornic (Ed). Attention and Performance VI. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Smith, F. (1971). Understanding Reading. New York:

Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Stanovich, K. (1980). Toward an interactive-compensatory model of individual differences in development of reading fluency. Reading Research Quarterly, 16, 32-71.

Stanovich, K. (1984). The interactive-compensatory model of reading: A confluence of developmental, experimental, and educational psychology. Remedial and Special Education, 5, 11-19.

Stanovich, K., Cunningham, A., & Feeman, D. (1984). Relation between early reading acquistion and word decoding with and without context: A longitudinal study of first grade children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 668-677.

Stanovich, K., Nathan, R., West, R. & Vala-Rossi, M. (1985). Children's word recognition in context: Spreading activation, expectancy, and modularity. Child Development, 56, 1418-1428.

Yoon, Y., & Goetz, E. (1994). Context effects on word recognition and reading comprehension of poor and good readers: A test of the interactive-compensatory hypothesis. Reading Research Quarterly, 29, 179-187.

CS 012675

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC

REPRODUCTION RELEASE
(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: "The Application of Multiple Intelligence Theory to Reading Instruction"

Author(s): James C. Alexander

Corporate Source: | Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following two options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

☒ **Check here**

For Level 1 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical) *and* paper copy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

_____Sample_____

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 1

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

_____Sample_____

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 2

☐ **Check here**

For Level 2 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical), but *not* in paper copy.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at **Level 1**.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Sign here→ please

Signature: James C. Alexander

Printed Name/Position/Title: James C. Alexander Asst. Prof Lincoln Univ.

Organization/Address: 11 Southview Dr. Rolla, MO 65401

Telephone: (816) 368-3612

FAX:

E-Mail Address: dcjames@rollanet.org

Date: 1/27/97

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:

Address:

Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:

Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

Acquisitions

ERIC/REC
2805 E. Tenth Street
Smith Research Center, 150
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47408

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2d Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-953-0263
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com