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Etiology of Reading Comprehension Style

A body of empirical data has been accumulating recently indicating radical differences between individuals in reading comprehension style (cf. Spiro & Tirre, 1979; Spiro, Note 1). The theoretical framework guiding this research characterizes reading comprehension as involving an interaction of text-based (or bottom-up) processes and processes related to the existing knowledge schemata evoked by the text and its context of occurrence (top-down processes). Whereas early research on schematheoretic processes of understanding carried an implicit assumption that all skilled language users processed discourse in essentially the same way, it now appears that this is not the case. Experiments conducted by Spiro and his colleagues indicate substantial differences between individuals in their patterns of resource allocation to text-based (bottom-up) versus knowledge-based (top-down) processes (see Spiro, Note 1, for a review of this research). For skilled readers (adult and child), there are tendencies for an individual to employ more processes in a preferred direction (bottom-up or top-down) when characteristics of the situation permit processing in one direction to substitute for processing in the other without affecting ultimate performance. For children who are less able readers, there are tendencies to over-rely on processes in one direction, producing deleterious effects on comprehension.

What causes some individuals to develop reading comprehension styles biased toward the text while others manifest a bias toward indulging
Comprehension Style

their prior knowledge at the expense of attention to the text? At this point, the answer must be a blend of data (where it is available) and informed speculation. To provide a hint of the complexity that may characterize the eventual answer, possible sources of one comprehension style, over-reliance on text-based (or bottom-up) processes will be discussed. It should be noted that the list is not intended to be either exhaustive or composed of mutually exclusive causes.

Factors Underlying Over-Reliance on Bottom-Up Processes

Schema Availability and Activation

The most obvious cause of an over-reliance on the text in comprehension is the absence of relevant knowledge structures to utilize in top-down processing--if schemata do not exist they cannot be used. However much the vocabulary and syntax of a physics text are simplified, it is unlikely fifth graders will successfully comprehend it without first acquiring the requisite background of scientific knowledge.

It should be noted, however, that schema availability alone is not a sufficient condition for adequate comprehension (see Experiments II-IV in Bransford & Johnson, 1972). Relevant schemata must be activated. The processes by which schemata are evoked are not well understood at this time. However, it appears likely that problems of schema accessibility will be greater for written than oral conversational discourse. The latter is typically embedded in a rich nonlinguistic context which frequently signals the schemata needed to be activated. If not, the hearer
may directly query the speaker (at one extreme, "What are you talking about?"). Written discourse, on the other hand, is relatively decontextualized. Clues to which schemata need to be activated usually must be divined from the text alone; if problems arise, the text can not be queried (for further discussion of decontextualization, see Rubin, in press; Spiro, in press).

The problem of schema activation is further complicated by the level of generality typical of children's knowledge structures. Schemata tend initially to be tied to their contexts of acquisition, rather than achieving a generality permitting application to a broad range of structurally similar situations (Nelson, 1977). For example, the present writer encountered a child having difficulty understanding the well-known "Stone Soup" fable, wherein a beggar is refused food by the servants of a house and then contrives to deceive them into giving him food. The child failed to appreciate the conning element of the story, despite manifesting an understanding of that concept in a subsequent interview. The problem was that the conning schema was insufficiently general; the child understood conning as it applied to his own personal experiences with trying to gain satisfaction deceptively after being thwarted by those with authority. However, that knowledge could not be applied to an appropriate case that was somewhat alien to personal experience.

A related problem concerns the use of schemata by analogy. We can not have a pre-packaged knowledge structure to inform every situation we encounter. However, structural similarities can often be detected
between domains which are well-represented in prior knowledge and domains lacking such representation. In these cases, the existing knowledge structures may be transformed and adapted to fit the new domain. Instances of this phenomenon are common in the history of science, for example. Consider how knowledge about pumps informed the developing understanding of the human circulatory system.

Skill Deficiency

Spiro (Note 1) argues for a two-tiered approach to individual differences in reading comprehension. One tier addresses the component skills of reading comprehension; the other tier is concerned with the manifestation of skill deficiencies in a reading comprehension style. Behavior patterns in the former tier are not considered to have a determinate effect on behavior in the latter tier. At the first tier problems tend to involve skills that are predominantly text-based (e.g., decoding) or knowledge-based (e.g., pragmatic inferencing). Confronted with a skill problem of one of these two types, two options are available to readers: they may persevere in the problem area (with deleterious effects on other processes), or they may escape from the problem by shifting processing resources in an effort to compensate for the problem. Consider readers who are laborious, effortful decoders. They may persevere with their decoding efforts. Given the limitations on information processing capacity, this behavior may produce a "bottleneck" in the system (Perfetti & Lesgold, 1978). The outcome may be that higher-order, more knowledge-based processes will be
neglected. On the other hand, readers who are effortful decoders may prefer (not necessarily consciously) to avoid the unpleasant decoding task. One way to do that would be to rely on prior knowledge to infer or guess what is likely to be in the text rather than actually reading much of the text. In other words, the same skill deficiency may lead to either one of two totally different comprehension styles (text-biased or knowledge-biased) depending on whether the reader perseveres in the problem area or tries to escape from it. (See Spiro, Note 1, for discussion of an experiment in which reading comprehension styles were found to be uncorrelated with decoding accuracy or speed.)

Misconceptions About Reading

Some children seem to think that knowledge-based processing is not an appropriate activity in reading. They fail to correctly answer questions about text that require extra-textual knowledge. When informally interrogated, they are perfectly able to answer the same questions. If they are asked why they did not utilize the same knowledge to answer correctly after reading, they respond with remarks like "you are not supposed to." They suffer from what might be called a "meaning is in the text" fallacy (it is worth noting that, for some children, this fallacy applies only to their reading for school).

These conjectures about reading misconceptions, which were based on informal observation and interviews, have received empirical confirmation in a study by Spiro and Myers (in preparation). Children who responded to a formal questionnaire about reading concepts with a clear text-based
processing bias also tended to answer simple questions requiring extra-
textual knowledge incorrectly, despite possessing the requisite knowledge.

What causes misconceptions of reading as a primarily bottom-up
process? Only speculation is possible at this point. However, likely
candidates include code over-emphasis in early reading instruction, reading
texts that are insular and lacking in relevance to existing knowledge,
and tests that stress literal text content rather than its integration
with related prior knowledge.

General Cognitive Styles

For some children who under-utilize prior knowledge in understanding
text, the problem may transcend reading. Their reading style may be part
of a general tendency to process incoming information in similar fashion,
regardless of the type of information and its modality of transmission.
Text is an external stimulus with a structure. Interactive reading
requires that relevant internal knowledge structures be superimposed on
the text. Those who are overly "text-bound" in reading situations may
tend to be "stimulus-bound" in general.

Consider the requirements of an embedded figures test. A memorized
geometric shape (an internal structure) must be located within a complex
line and shading configuration in the visual field (an external stimulus
structure). Empirical studies have shown that those who have difficulty
fitting the memorized internal structure onto the external stimulus
structure in an embedded figures test also under-utilize internal knowledge
structures in reading comprehension (Spiro, Note 1; Spiro & Tirre, 1979).
"Bugs" in the Comprehension Program

Finally, there may be some individuals whose over-reliance on text-based processes is more apparent than real. That is, because of some idiosyncratic breakdown elsewhere in the system, patterns of reading behavior may elicit a mistaken diagnosis of a given reading style. A case we have identified concerns problems in schema maintenance (Spiro, Brummer, & Boggs, in preparation). Some children appear to be one-sentence-at-a-time readers; they understand individual sentences but fail to integrate information across sentences. One reason is that knowledge structures clearly signaled for activation at one point in the text are not being kept active (or maintained) at later points in the text where they are no longer explicitly evoked (a problem that is not merely one of "forgetting"). Children with this problem fail to engage knowledge-based processes when the requisite knowledge was evoked in previous sentences, but spontaneously perform knowledge-based processes within sentence boundaries. In other words, their top down processing apparatus is intact and is employed; it just frequently does not appear that way because of the schema maintenance problem.

Implications for Educators

Other causes of over-reliance on text-based processes could have been suggested, and a similar list constructed for biases towards knowledge-based processing. However, the present discussion need not be extended for some important common-sense implications to be discerned.
It seems obvious that you would not want to employ the same remediation strategy for poor readers with differing comprehension styles. For example, inducing a child to relate what is read to prior knowledge might help a child with a text bias but would reinforce the problem of a child with a knowledge bias. It may not be quite so obvious that you may have to treat children differently who have the same maladaptive reading comprehension style. Yet, if the same reading comprehension style can be attributed to a multiplicity of causes across individuals (keeping in mind that the extent to which causes co-occur for individuals has not yet been determined), instruction may have to be determined by the cause and not by its manifestation. What is likely to help a child with a text bias that results from insufficient background knowledge will probably be different from what will help other children with similar text biases that result from a misconception about what reading is or from a decoding problem. There may be a lesson for reading instruction in the dictum "treat the cause, not the symptom."
Reference Note

References


Footnote

For discussion of this orientation, see Anderson, 1977; Bobrow and Norman, 1975; Bransford and McCarrell, 1975; Cofer, 1977; Collins, Brown, and Larkin, in press; Rumelhart, 1977; Rumelhart, in press; Rumelhart and Ortony, 1977; Schank and Abelson, 1977; Spiro, 1977; and Spiro, in press.
No. 1: Durkin, D. *Comprehension Instruction—Where are You?*, October 1977. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 146 566, 14p., HC-$1.67, MF-$0.83)

No. 2: Asher, S. R. *Sex Differences in Reading Achievement*, October 1977. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 145 567, 30p., HC-$2.00, MF-$0.83)


No. 4: Jenkins, J. R., & Pany, D. *Teaching Reading Comprehension in the Middle Grades*, January 1978. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 151 756, 36p., HC-$2.06, MF-$0.83)

No. 5: Bruce, B. *What Makes a Good Story?*, June 1978. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 158 222, 16p., HC-$1.67, MF-$0.83)


TECHNICAL REPORTS


No. 4: Alessi, S. M., Anderson, T. H., & Biddle, W. B. *Hardware and Software Considerations in Computer Based Course Management*, November 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 134 928, 21p., HC-$1.67, MF-$0.83)

No. 5: Schallert, D. L *Improving Memory for Prose: The Relationship between Depth of Processing and Context*, November 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 134 929, 37p., HC-$2.06, MF-$0.83)


No. 8: Mason, J. M. *Questioning the Notion of Independent Processing Stages in Reading*, February 1976. (Journal of Educational Psychology, 1977, 69, 288-297)


No. 16: Jenkins, J. R., & Pany, D. *Curriculum Biases in Reading Achievement Tests*, November 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 134 938, 24p., HC-$1.67, MF-$0.83)


No. 20: Kleiman, G. M. *The Effect of Previous Context on Reading Individual Words*, February 1977. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 134 941, 76p., HC-$4.67, MF-$0.83)


No. 34: Bruce, B. C. *Plans and Social Actions*, April 1977. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 149 328, 45p., HC-$2.06, MF-$0.83)


No. 60: Spiro, R. J., & Esposito, J. J. *Superficial Processing of Explicit Inferences in Text*, December 1977. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 150 545, 27p., HC-$2.06, MF-$0.83)


No. 77: Nash-Webber, B. L. *Inferences in an Approach to Discourse Anaphora*, January 1978. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 150 552, 30p., HC-$2.06, MF-$0.83)

No. 78: Gentner, D. *On Relational Meaning: The Acquisition of Verb Meaning*, December 1977. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 149 325, 46p., HC-$2.06, MF-$0.83)


No. 106: Durkin, D. *What Classroom Observations Reveal about Reading Comprehension Instruction*, October 1978. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 161 000, 41p., HC-$2.06, MF-$0.83)


No. 120: Canney, G., & Winograd, P. *Schemata for Reading and Reading Comprehension Performance*, April 1979.


