

# The Rogers Multiple Intelligence Indicator

## Interpretation

To some degree, we possess all of these intelligences. We are each a unique combination of all seven; however, we all differ in the degree to which we prefer and have the competence to use each of the intelligences. Below are presented tentative interpretations for the scores in three ranges.

(J. Keith Rogers., Ph.D., BYU. Jan. 94)

| <u>Score Range</u> | <u>Possible Intensity of Preference and/or Competence</u>  |
|--------------------|--|
| 7 --15             | <b>Low Intensity</b> (You tend to "avoid it," with some discomfort when required to use it.) This intelligence [type] probably is not one of your favorites. In most circumstances, you will go out of your way to avoid situations involving intense exercise of this intelligence. Your competence is probably relatively low. Gaining expertise might be frustrating unless you are unusually motivated, and likely would require great effort.   |
| 16-26              | <b>Moderate Intensity</b> (You tend to "accept it," or use it with some comfort and facility.) You could take or leave the application or use of this intelligence. Though you accept it, you do not necessarily prefer to employ it. But on the other hand, you would not necessarily avoid using it. This may be because you have not developed your ability, or because you have a moderate preference for this intelligence. Your competence is probably moderate also. Gaining expertise would be satisfying but probably would require considerable effort.          |
| 27-35              | <b>High Intensity</b> (You tend to "prefer it," and use it often with comfort and facility.) You enjoy using this intelligence. Applying it makes you happy. You are excited and challenged by it, perhaps even fascinated. You prefer this intelligence. Give your preference, you will usually select it. Everyone knows you love it. Your competence is probably relatively high if you have had an opportunity to develop it. Becoming an expert should be rewarding and fulfilling, and will probably require little effort compared to a low or moderate preference. |

There may be many identifiable "intelligences" as literature on the subject reveals. This particular view (of seven) is that of Howard Gardner, who says in his 1983 book, *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences* published by Basic Books, Inc., New York: ". . . It becomes necessary to say, once and for all, that there is no, and there can never be, a single irrefutable and universally accepted list of human intelligences. There will never be a master list of three, seven, or three hundred intelligences which can be endorsed by all investigators. . . Why, then, proceed along this precarious path at all? Because there is a need for a better classification of human intellectual competences than we have now; because there is much recent evidence emerging from scientific research, cross-cultural observations, and educational study which stands in need of review and organization; and perhaps above all, because it seems within our grasp to come up with a list of intellectual strengths which will prove useful for a wide range of researchers and practitioners and will enable them (and us) to communicate more effectively about this curiously seductive [elusive] entity called the intellect." (p. 60) Gardner defines intelligence as follows: "To my mind, a human intellectual competence must entail a set of skills of problem-solving -- enabling the individual to resolve genuine problems or difficulties that he or she encounters and, when appropriate,

To create an effective product -- and must also entail the potential for finding or creating problems -- thereby laying the groundwork for the acquisition of new knowledge . . . A human intelligence must be genuinely useful and important, at least in certain cultural setting." [Emphasis added.] Gardner's list of seven intelligences is based on eight specific criteria which follow, found in *Frames of Mind* on pages indicated.

# Criteria of an Intelligence

**POTENTIAL ISOLATION BY BRAIN DAMAGE:** To the extent that a particular faculty can be destroyed, or spared in isolation, as a result of brain damage, its relative autonomy from other human faculties seems likely. (p. 63)

**THE EXISTENCE OF IDIOT SAVANTS, PRODIGIES, AND OTHER EXCEPTIONAL INDIVIDUALS:** The existence of these populations allows us to observe the human intelligence in relative --even splendid --isolation. (p. 63)

**AN IDENTIFIABLE CORE OPERATION OR SET OF OPERATIONS:** Central to my notion of an intelligence is the existence of one or more basic information-processing operations or mechanisms, which can deal with specific kinds of input. (p. 64)

**A DISTINCTIVE DEVELOPMENTAL HISTORY, ALONG WITH A DEFINABLE SET OF EXPERT "END-STATE" PERFORMANCES:** An intelligence should have an identifiable developmental history, through which normal as well as gifted individuals pass in the course of ontogeny. (p. 64)

**AN EVOLUTIONARY HISTORY AND EVOLUTIONARY PLAUSIBILITY:** All species display areas of intelligence (and ignorance), and human beings are no exception. The roots of our current intelligences reach back millions of years in history of the species. (p. 65)

**SUPPORT FROM EXPERIMENTAL PSYCHOLOGICAL TASKS:** The relative autonomy of an intelligence can also be investigated. Especially suggestive are studies of tasks that interfere (or fail to interfere) with one another, that transfer (and those that do not), across different contexts; and the identification of forms of memory, attention, or perception that may be peculiar to one kind of input. (p. 66)

**SUPPORT FROM PSYCHOMETRIC FINDINGS:** Outcomes of psychological experiments provide one source of information relevant to intelligences; the outcomes of standard tests (like IQ tests) provide another clue. (p. 66)

**SUSCEPTIBILITY TO ENCODING IN A SYMBOL SYSTEM:** While it may be possible for an intelligence to proceed without its own special symbol system, or without some other culturally devised arena, a primary characteristic of human intelligence may well be its "natural" gravitation toward embodiment in a symbolic system. (p. 66)