

Metadata of the chapter that will be visualized online

| | | |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| Chapter Title | Multimodal Learning | |
| Copyright Year | 2011 | |
| Copyright Holder | Springer Science+Business Media, LLC | |
| Corresponding Author | Family Name | Massaro |
| | Particle | |
| | Given Name | Dominic W. |
| | Suffix | |
| | Division/Department | Perceptual Science Laboratory |
| | Organization/University | University of California- Santa Cruz Social Sciences II |
| | Postcode | 95064 |
| | City | Santa Cruz |
| | State | CA |
| | Country | USA |
| | Phone | 831-459-2330 |
| | Email | massaro@ucsc.edu |

M

1

2 **Multimodal Learning**

[Aut]

3 DOMINIC W. MASSARO
4 Perceptual Science Laboratory, University of California-
5 Santa Cruz Social Sciences II, Santa Cruz, CA, USA

6 **Synonyms**

7 [Bimodal learning](#); [Multisensory learning](#)

8 **Definition**

9 Multimodal learning refers to an embodied learning situa-
10 tion which engages multiple sensory systems and action
11 systems of the learner. This type of learning is traditionally
12 emphasized for children with learning challenges, and can
13 include a variety of visual inputs in addition to text. Some
14 examples include pictures, art, film, video, and graphic
15 organizers. Auditory inputs can include text-to-speech
16 synthesizers, various forms of singing and musical instru-
17 ments, rhyming, and spoken language games. One salient
18 example is the use of the alphabet song to learn the
19 alphabet. Tactile inputs are often manipulatives such as
20 the use of an abacus for math learning, sculpting materials
21 such as clay, paint, and paper for representing objects and
22 ideas, and puzzles for fact learning such as learning the
23 states and their capitals. Finally, kinesthetic engagement
24 includes all forms of motor behavior and gesture such as
25 jumping rope to memorize songs and hop scotch to prac-
26 tice school lessons. A recent trend is the change from fairly
27 passive computer games such as Sudoku, Tetris, and Sol-
28 itaire to much more active types of game activity such as
29 the sports and fitness games for the Wii Nitendo (2010).
30 Another trend with great promise is the creative integra-
31 tion of the physical engagement of traditional hands-on
32 board games with miniaturization technology and meth-
33 odology from wireless sensor networks, as in siftables
34 (Sifteo 2010).

35 An interactive multimedia environment is ideally
36 suited for multimodal learning. For example, incorporat-
37 ing text and visual images of the vocabulary to be learned
38 along with the actual definitions and sound of the vocabu-
39 lary facilitates learning and improves memory for the

target vocabulary and grammar. At the same time, the 40
learner is actively engaged by listening to the words, pro- 41
nouncing the words, and if literate, reading and writing 42
the words. In one typical application (Massaro 2006; Ani- 43
mated Speech Corporation 2010), a computer-animated 44
agent guides the students to (1) observe the words being 45
spoken by a realistic talking interlocutor, (2) experience 46
the word as spoken as well as written, (3) see visual images 47
of referents of the words, (4) click on or point to the 48
referent or its spelling, (5) hear themselves say the word, 49
followed by a correct pronunciation, (6) spell the word by 50
typing, and (7) observe and respond to the word used in 51
context. Although half of the exercises involve multiple 52
choice testing, there is evidence that this experience boosts 53
performance on later tests. The other half of the tests 54
involve either spoken or written generation of the 55
students' answers, which facilitates learning (Metcalf 56
and Kornell 2007). The test exercises can be viewed as 57
learning exercises because testing has been demonstrated 58
to increase learning and retention. 59

In a recent experimental test, children, whose native 60
language was Spanish, were tutored and tested on English 61
words they did not know. The research utilized a multiple 62
baseline design to insure that any learning was due to the 63
application itself rather than from outside of the lesson 64
environment. The children learned the words when they 65
were tutored but not words that were simply tested. This 66
result replicates the previous studies carried out on hard 67
of hearing and autistic children with Baldi as the animated 68
conversational tutor. In other experiments, we have also 69
observed that Baldi's unique characteristics allow a novel 70
approach to training speech production to both children 71
with hearing loss (Massaro 2004) and adults learning 72
a new language. 73

74 **Theoretical Background**

Perhaps the most germane background for Multimodal 75
Learning is Montessori's Principles of Educational Prac- 76
tice (Stoll-Lillard 2005). Montessori's Principle 1 claims 77
that motor behavior and cognition are closely intertwined 78
and that physical movement can enhance thinking and 79
learning. At first glance, this principle seems the antithesis 80
of direct computer-aided instruction with an animated 81

82 tutor. However, we have learned that our nervous systems
83 appear to be wired in a way that observations of actions
84 activate neural mechanisms involved with the actual per-
85 formance of those actions. The so-called mirror neurons
86 involved in performing an action are activated when that
87 action is observed. One possibility, therefore, would be to
88 implement lessons on Nintendo's Wii to allow the child
89 to have larger physical movements. Another would be to
90 have animated movies as well as pictures for learning.

91 Montessori's Principle 2 states that choice and per-
92 ceived control promote children's concentration and con-
93 tentment in the learning process. As is currently exists,
94 direct instruction does not appear to allow much choice.
95 On the other hand, the child can be given a library of
96 lessons and she can choose the lesson to study.
97 A precocious child might even be able to create a lesson
98 of her choosing.

99 Principle 3 assumes that personal interest enhances
100 learning in a context where interests build on prior knowl-
101 edge and the children's own questions. For example, a deaf
102 French child used the Lesson Creator to document her
103 travel and holiday pictures in a set of English vocabulary
104 lessons. Thus, learning a new language was facilitated by
105 involving her direct experience and interests with
106 a normally tedious task.

107 Principle 4 indicates that extrinsic rewards negatively
108 impact long-term motivation and learning. Rewards and
109 feedback can be controlled exactly in computer-assisted
110 learning. Directed feedback can allow errorless learning
111 without focusing on rewarding the child for correct
112 answers and punishing the child for incorrect answers.

113 According to Principle 5, collaborative (child-child)
114 arrangements are conducive to learning. Although most
115 automated instruction is one-on-one and precludes col-
116 laborative learning, this principle can be instantiated in
117 several different ways. First, the animated agent can be
118 a child who works along with the child. Second, children
119 can work together on a lesson or on creating lessons, and
120 can even distribute the required learning and thereby
121 achieve the benefits of the Jigsaw Classroom.

122 Principle 6 assumes that learning situated in and
123 connected to meaningful contexts is more effective than
124 learning in abstracted contexts. Although most automated
125 instruction can be considered relatively unsituated and
126 not connected to a meaningful context, the Lesson Creator
127 allows the immediate creation of lessons on subjects that
128 are currently taught: Just-in-time learning. Thus, the child
129 sees the value and appropriate context of the lesson when
130 it is connected to her appropriate interest and cognitive
131 level.

Principle 7 claims that sensitive and responsive (nur- 132
turing) teaching is associated with more optimal out- 133
comes. Tutors can be created and programmed to be 134
highly nurturing. For example, the difficulty of the lessons 135
can be controlled to meet the child's preferred difficulty 136
level, and errorless feedback can be provided. 137

Principle 8 assumes that order in the environment 138
promotes and establishes mental order and is beneficial 139
to the child. Direct instruction is highly orderly in its 140
functioning, which adheres to this principle. 141

Another relevant background source is the empirical 142
and theoretical literature on multimedia learning (Mayer 143
2005). This research, for example, gives principles for the 144
ideal placement of illustrations in science texts. It is 145
a challenge to have both illustrations and written text 146
appropriately placed. Usually this requires that the text is 147
placed near the referent. Gestalt principles of organization 148
could be used to insure that the text and the appropriate 149
aspect of the illustration are perceived as near one another. 150
Spoken language during the lesson is not easily localized 151
because of our perceptual limits in perceiving small dif- 152
ferences in the localization of sound. In this case, the 153
appropriate part of the illustration can be highlighted 154
while it is being discussed. More generally, it is important 155
to make it easy for the learner to hold pictorial and verbal 156
representations in working memory at the same time. 157
Finally, when illustrating a sequence of events, successive 158
or causal links in the sequence should be presented near 159
one another. 160

A theory that serves important background for Multi- 161
modal Learning is the Fuzzy Logical Model of Perception 162
(FLMP) According to this model, multiple sensory influ- 163
ences are combined before categorization and perceptual 164
experience. In face-to-face speech perception, for example, 165
the FLMP assumes that the visible and audible speech 166
signals are integrated. Before integration, however, each 167
source is evaluated (independently of the other source) to 168
determine how much that source supports various alter- 169
natives. The integration process combines these support 170
values to determine how much their combination sup- 171
ports the various alternatives. The perceptual outcome for 172
the perceiver will be a function of the relative degree of 173
support among the competing alternatives. Across a range 174
of studies comparing specific mathematical predictions, 175
the FLMP has been more successful than other competitor 176
models in accounting for the experimental data (Massaro 177
1998). 178

The FLMP has proven to be a universal principle of 179
pattern recognition. In multisensory texture perception, 180
for example, there appears to be no fixed sensory domi- 181
nance by vision or haptics, and the bimodal presentation 182

183 yields higher accuracy than either of the unimodal condi-
184 tions. Preschool as well as school children integrate audi-
185 tory and visual speech to produce a multimodal benefit of
186 having two sources of information relative to just one. In
187 addition, both hard of hearing children and autistic
188 children appear to integrate information from the face
189 and the voice. These results from typically developing
190 children as well as deaf and hard of hearing and autistic
191 children indicate that multisensory environments should
192 be ideal for speech and language learning.

193 **Important Scientific Research and Open** 194 **Questions**

195 There are, of course, many remaining research and theo-
196 retical questions to be addressed in future research. For
197 example, one might question why perceivers integrate
198 several sources of information when just one of them
199 might be sufficient. Most of us do reasonably well in
200 communicating over the telephone, for example. Part of
201 the answer might be grounded in our ontology. Integra-
202 tion might be so natural for adults even when information
203 from just one sense would be sufficient because, during
204 development, there was much less information from each
205 sense and therefore integration was all the more critical for
206 accurate performance.

207 A natural question concerns the neural mechanism
208 underlying the integration algorithm specified in the
209 FLMP. An important set of observations from single cell
210 recordings in the cat's brain could be interpreted in terms
211 of integration of the form specified by the FLMP. A single
212 hissing sound or a light spot can activate neurons in the
213 superior colliculus. A much more vigorous response is
214 produced, however, when both signals are simultaneously
215 presented from the same location. The FLMP is mathe-
216 matically equivalent to Bayes' theorem, which is an opti-
217 mal method for combining two sources of evidence to test
218 among hypotheses. The brain can implement an analo-
219 gous computation so that the response of a neuron is
220 proportional to the posterior probability that a target is
221 present in its receptive fields, given its sensory input.
222 Therefore, the target-present posterior probability com-
223 puted from the impulses from the auditory and visual
224 neurons is higher given sensory inputs of two modalities

than it is given input of only one modality, analogous to 225
the synergistic outcome of the FLMP. This type of research 226
informs questions about the neural underpinnings of Mul- 227
timodal Learning. 228

Multimodal Learning situations are often 229
implemented in virtual rather than real worlds. It is feasi- 230
ble that limiting the students' experience to the two- 231
dimensional world of computer monitors would constrain 232
learning relative to a live teacher. The success of two- 233
dimensional media such as the television and the Internet, 234
however, is a real-world experimental proof of the suffi- 235
ciency of two dimensions for learning. To date, tutoring 236
on two-dimensional surfaces appears to be as effective as 237
live tutoring, although additional research is still required 238
on this question. However, with the exploding popularity 239
of three-dimensional (3D) movies such as *Up* and *Avatar*, 240
and the increasing availability of 3D projection systems, 241
TVs, and computer monitors, learners will more often 242
find themselves in more realistic simulated 3D worlds. 243

244 **Cross-References**

[Au2]

245 **References**

- 246 Animated Speech Corporation. (2010). <http://www.animatedspeech.com/>. Accessed 19 Jan 2010. [Au3] 247
- 248 Massaro, D. W. (1998). *Perceiving talking faces: From speech perception to a behavioral principle*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 249
- 250 Massaro, D. W. (2004). Symbiotic value of an embodied agent in language learning. In R.H. Sprague, Jr. (Ed.), *Proceedings of 37th annual hawaii international conference on system sciences, (HICCS'04), (CD-ROM, 10 pages)*. Best paper in Emerging Technologies. IEEE Computer Society Press, Los Alimitos 251
- 252 Massaro, D. W. (2006). A computer-animated tutor for language learning: Research and applications. In P. E. Spencer & M. Marshark (Eds.), *Advances in the spoken language development of deaf and hard-of-hearing children* (pp. 212–243). New York: Oxford University Press. 253
- 254 Mayer, R. E. (Ed.). (2005). *The cambridge handbook of multimedia learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press. 255
- 256 Metcalfe, J., & Kornell, N. (2007). Principles of cognitive science in education: The effects of generation, errors, and feedback. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 14, 225–229. 257
- 258 Nintendo (2010). <http://www.nintendo.com/wii>. Accessed 19 Jan 2010. 259
- 260 Sifteo (2010). <http://sifteo.com/>. Accessed 19 Jan 2010. 261
- 262 Stoll-Lillard, A. (2005). *Montessori: The science behind the genius*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 263
- 264 265 266 267

Author Query Form

Encyclopedia of the Sciences of Learning
Chapter No: 273

| Query Refs. | Details Required | Author's response |
|-------------|--|-------------------|
| AU1 | Please check if author affiliation is okay. | |
| AU2 | Please provide content under the section "Cross-References", if applicable. | |
| AU3 | Please provide article title/report title for the references "Animated Speech Corporation (2010)", "Nitendo (2010)", "Sifteo (2010)", if feasible. | |