



20
December 2020

Gaetano Domenici
Editoriale / *Editorial*
Journal of Educational, Cultural and Psychological Studies 11

STUDI E CONTRIBUTI DI RICERCA
STUDIES AND RESEARCH CONTRIBUTIONS

Ritu Kalgotra - Jaspal Singh Warwal
Effect of Intervention in Teaching Listening and Speaking Skills 21
on Children with Intellectual Disabilities
*(Effetto dell'intervento didattico sulle capacità di ascolto e conversazione
in bambini con disabilità intellettive)*

Antonio Rodríguez Fuentes - José Luis Gallego Ortega
Are There Any Differences between the Texts Written 41
by Students Who Are Blind, Those Who Are Partially Sighted,
and Those with Normal Vision?
*(Ci sono differenze tra i testi scritti da studenti ciechi, con problemi di vista
e quelli con visione normale?)*

- Ana Fernández-García - Fátima Poza-Vilches*
José Luis García Llamas
Educational Needs of Spanish Youths at Risk of Social Exclusion: 59
Future Challenges before School Failure
(*Bisogni educativi dei giovani spagnoli a rischio di esclusione sociale: sfide prossime per evitare l'insuccesso scolastico*)
- Veronica Riccardi - Patrizia Giannantoni - Giuseppina Le Rose*
Educational Expectations of Migrant Students in Italy: 83
Second-class Destiny or Integration's Opportunity?
(*Aspettative in ambito educativo degli studenti migranti in Italia: destino di seconda classe o opportunità di integrazione?*)
- Mara Marini - Stefano Livi - Gloria Di Filippo*
Francesco Maria Melchiori - Caterina D'Ardia - Guido Benvenuto
Aspetti individuali, interpersonali e sociali del bullismo etnico: 103
studio su un campione nazionale di studenti della scuola secondaria di primo grado
(*Individual, Interpersonal and Social Aspects of Ethnic Bullying: Study of a National Sample of First Grade Secondary School Students*)
- Ylenia Passiatore - Sabine Pirchio - Clorinda Oliva - Angelo Panno*
Giuseppe Carrus
Self-efficacy and Anxiety in Learning English as a Foreign 121
Language: Singing in Class Helps Speaking Performance
(*Autoefficacia e ansia nell'apprendimento dell'inglese come lingua straniera: cantare in classe migliora la produzione orale*)
- Michela Bettinelli - Roberta Cardarello*
Family vs School: Where the Conflict Ends. A Study of Families 139
on the Court against School in Lombardia
(*Famiglia e scuola: dove finisce il conflitto. Famiglie contro la scuola nel TAR in Lombardia*)
- Valeria Biasi - Giovanni Moretti - Arianna Morini*
Nazarena Patrizi
Attenzione ed esperienza estetica nella comunicazione didattica. 157
Indagini empirico-sperimentali condotte sul campo:
principali risultati
(*Attention and Aesthetic Experience in Didactic Communication. Empirical-experimental Investigations Conducted in the Field: Main Results*)
-

- Anna Maria Ciraci*
Le competenze valutative: un'indagine empirica su prassi e opinioni degli insegnanti del primo ciclo di istruzione della Regione Lazio 175
(Evaluation Skills: An Empirical Survey on the Practices and Opinions of Primary and Middle School Teachers of the Lazio Region)

NOTE DI RICERCA

RESEARCH NOTES

- Stefano Mastandrea*
Emotional Education through the Arts: Perception of Wellbeing 203
(L'educazione emozionale con l'arte: la percezione del benessere)

- Laura Girelli - Elisa Cavicchiolo - Fabio Lucidi - Mauro Cozzolino
Fabio Alivernini - Sara Manganeli*
Psychometric Properties and Validity of a Brief Scale Measuring Basic Psychological Needs Satisfaction in Adolescents 215
(Proprietà psicometriche e validità di una scala breve che misura la soddisfazione dei bisogni psicologici di base negli adolescenti)

- Carla Roverselli*
Pluralismo religioso e scuola pubblica in Italia: spazi per l'inclusione e questioni aperte 231
(Religious Pluralism and Public School in Italy: Spaces for Inclusion and Open Questions)

COMMENTI, RIFLESSIONI, PRESENTAZIONI,
RESOCONTI, DIBATTITI, INTERVISTE

COMMENTS, REFLECTIONS, PRESENTATIONS,
REPORTS, DEBATES, INTERVIEWS

- Raffaele Pozzi*
Novecento e postmodernità nella critica musicale di Fedele d'Amico. Riflessioni sul metodo storiografico di un corso universitario 245
(Twentieth Century and Postmodernity in the Music Criticism of Fedele d'Amico. Reflections on the Historiographical Method of a University Course)

Giovanni Moretti

Formazione e ricerca con il Master in «Leadership e Management in Educazione» dell'Università Roma Tre, Dipartimento di Scienze della Formazione 261

(Training and Research with the Master in «Leadership and Management in Education» of the Roma Tre University, Department of Education)

RECENSIONI

REVIEWS

Elisa Cavicchiolo

Fiorucci, M., & Moretti, G. (a cura di). (2019). Il tutor dei docenti neoassunti 267

Journal of Educational, Cultural and Psychological Studies 273
Notiziario / News

Author Guidelines 277

Are There Any Differences between the Texts Written by Students Who Are Blind, Those Who Are Partially Sighted, and Those with Normal Vision?

Antonio Rodríguez Fuentes - José Luis Gallego Ortega

University of Granada - Department of Didactics and School Organization (España)

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.7358/ecps-2019-020-fuga>

arfuentes@ugr.es

jlgalleg@ugr.es

CI SONO DIFFERENZE TRA I TESTI SCRITTI
DA STUDENTI CIECHI, CON PROBLEMI DI VISTA
E QUELLI CON VISIONE NORMALE?

ABSTRACT

The aim was prepared in order to analyze the linguistic ability of children with visual impairment and children with normal vision. Several features of the narrative episodes produced were investigated, including quantity, quality, the connections between them and the structural elements which they consist of. Central tendency measures and dispersion measures were applied, in addition to inferential measures. This leads us to the conclusion that the structural parts making up the texts depend on a great extent to the individual style of each subject. However, the two groups are markedly different in certain parts. Finally, pupils who were older and educated to a higher level have shown greater development of narrative ability, engaging more with the essential part quite largely forgotten in the younger pupils' texts. With regard to the connections established by the pupils between the various episodes making up their narratives, the texts produced by pupils with visual impairments show predominantly temporary connections. Significant differences were found between the texts written by students who had normal vision and those who were blind or partially sighted. The greatest differences were observed in the

length of the text and the complete episodes: both measures were greater in the texts written by students with normal vision.

Keywords: Assessment of narrative texts; Narrative texts; Pupils with blindness; Pupils with visual impairments; Written expression.

1. INTRODUCTION

The research presented in this article is part of a wider investigation into the written expression of children with visual impairment in all its facets that is, from a theoretical model encompassing all the cognitive and textual processes of writing. Written expression is the single most complex process of language learning (Salvador, 2008), which in turn makes its evaluation and analysis complex and research efforts commendable. Two very different yet compatible analytical perspectives co-exist in terms of investigation into written expression:

- On one hand, the model followed in this investigation concedes that written expression is produced as a result of a series of cognitive processes which come into play and are regulated by others of greater cognitive requirements known as metacognitives (Flower & Hayes, 1981; Hayes, 1996). These processes are: planning, transcription, revision and self-regulation.
- On the other hand, it is possible to study written composition from the point of view of the written product: the text itself, thus complementing investigation into the processes involved during writing. That is to say, if we find the processes difficult to scrutinize given the arduous task of measuring them, the texts also involve complex analytical positions as there are many different aspects of the text to study. The theoretical basis of this study is strongly influenced by the assertions of the Spanish Royal Academy's publication on textual grammar which is briefly summarized below (RAE, 2018).

Narrative text consists of diverse narrative episodes which must be linked in order to guarantee coherent discourse and thus comprehension. Four types of connections can be established between episodes (RAE, 2018):

- (a) Causal, when an episode brings about by consequence the next.
- (b) Temporary, when a temporary connection exists between one episode and another one.

(c) Additive, when a new episode is simply added.

(d) Insertion, when within one episode another is generated as part of it.

The structural composition of the episodes is identical to the overall discourse, though on a smaller scale. In effect, each episode and thus each narrative text is composed of various characteristic elements which identify it as narrative and differentiate it from other forms, such as description, dialogue, argument, news, etc. These elements are (Stein & Glenn, 1979):

(a) *Scene-setting*, the initial element which informs the reader of the context of the action and its development, that is, it tells us where and when it happens, who the central characters are and what they are like.

(b) *Initial event*, which indicates an action, changes in the central characters or the context which directly influences them and/or perception of these changes which demand a response from the characters.

(c) *Internal response*, where certain moods and feelings are expressed along with discussion of proposed actions by the characters brought about as a result of the initial event.

(d) *Action* or activity carried out by the characters with the express intention of solving problems brought about by the initial event. Several actions can come about in response to the initial event and can be considered to be the development of a single episode.

(e) *Direct consequence*, which is defined as the result of the action, that is, the achievement of their aims, or on the contrary, the inability of the characters to achieve the goals that spurred their actions, with the repercussions and decision making which come about as a result.

(f) *Reaction*, which includes appearances, feelings, thoughts and even acts, brought about by the different psychological states of the characters and/or other protagonists of the action as a consequence of the success or otherwise of the actions related to their objectives.

These various parts constitute a complete narrative text, although frequently we may find that not all elements appear, or they are not in the order described. According to the RAE (2018), for a narrative text to be considered complete it must consist of the following stages: (a) initial event, (b) action and (c) consequence or (a) initial event, (b) internal response and (c) action.

Therefore, it is of interest not only to examine the number of episodes which make up narrative discourse produced by students with visual impairments or blindness, but to analyze their quality in terms of whether they are complete or not. The importance and usefulness of this research is justified for several reasons: (a) writing ability in these subjects has not been studied enough; (b) some particularity, differences and difficulties in

specific facets and phases in writing composition may exist linked with other results in the evaluation of linguistics abilities (spoken language and reading); (c) to design and implement instructional strategies, even suitable programs, bearing in mind the difficulties that these pupils have in this area and starting from the outcome gathered in this study.

2. METHOD

The primary objective of the study was to evaluate the ability of pupils to produce narrative discourse. A secondary objective was the evaluation of their capacity to generate each of the narrative episodes that constitute the texts. The investigative procedure consisted of case studies (multiple case studies), the most appropriate way to carry out this research (Stake, 2010). In accordance with the largely qualitative nature of the investigation and the realization of case studies, the size of the evidence gathered was of lesser significance than analysis in depth of the «corpus». Specifically, «case studies are of value in refining theory, suggesting complexities for further investigation as well as helping establish the limits of generalizability» (Stake, 2010, p. 460).

On the other hand, as Schultz (2006, p. 358) collects in her chapter about *Qualitative research on writing*: «While not the exclusive methodology for writing research, many of the most significant advances in the writing field in recent years come from qualitative studies».

2.1. *Participants*

The different «cases» analyzed correspond to pupils with educational special needs which in most cases were visual pathologies. A total of 18 pupils with visual disabilities were studied and were grouped into 2 cases: the first consisted of pupils with visual impairments: 11 subjects (case 1) and the second (case 2) was made up of writers with blindness (7 subjects). One further reference case (case 3) was added, comprising 17 students who did not suffer from vision problems or difficulties in writing. The research presented in this article has the express authorization of the participants and their parents, since some of them were minors. It was overseen by the EAICDV (Integration Support Teams for the Blind and Visually Impaired), and its ethical procedures had prior approval by the ethics committee of the UGR, where the researchers work.

The average age of the subjects involved in the study was 15.8 (15 years, 8 months), being the average age of the pupils with visual impairment (15.6) and the pupils with blindness (16) together. The average age of the students in case 3 was 15.7. However, some subjects with a notably different age to the rest of the group are included in the selection. In some cases, they are far younger than the average (4 pupils were less than 13 years old) while in others they are considerably older (6 pupils were older than 18). In effect, the typical difference in age between pupils with visual impairment was 2.7 whilst that of the pupils with blindness was 4. The difference for the sighted students was 3. The strategy of widening the age range of the subjects facilitated the achievement of one of the objectives of the investigation: to analyze the influence of age on the cognitive processes involved in writing. The age of the individuals takes on special significance if we consider the «cognitive leap» experienced by pupils with visual impairment at the age of 13-14 which differentiates them from those more uniform or regular pattern of maturity of a fully sighted pupil, contradicting even Piaget's theories (Ochaita, 1993). Therefore, the cognitive development of students with visual impairment and blindness can be considered up to the age of 18.

As to genre, the three groups are made equal according to sex. They are part of a medium socio-cultural status, according to the school they are educated and the information provided by their teachers.

Pupils with visual impairments generally attend mainstream schools, in accordance with the current Spanish educational law integration proposal (although some attend specialized centers) and receive the necessary material and personal support from specialized school in looking after pupils with educational needs associated to blindness or visual impairments through the Integration Support Teams for the Blind and Visually Impaired (EAICDV). This was the link by which the pupils were located and carefully selected, according to the suggestions made in the case studies method used: «case studies [...] involve a way of choosing subjects or objects to be studied» (Colás, 1998, p. 257). The students for case 3 were chosen because they were the classmates of the former.

2.2. Data collection

The pupils involved were asked to produce a narrative text from a brief description or definition, which required them to tell a story about something that had happened to them, perhaps an adventure, a film they had seen or a book they had read. They were given two sheets of lined paper (A4 size) with appropriate lines and spaces for pupils with visual impair-

ments to use, in accordance with the guidelines suggested by several authors in this field (Rodríguez & Rodríguez, 2015). This was intended to facilitate writing, continuity within the line and adequate separation, with the double objective of improving writing and optimizing legibility of the text as well as ensuring that the pupil concentrated on processes more relevant to this investigation and more demanding cognitively than graphic design. At the same time, the pupils with blindness produced their texts in Braille which were then faithfully translated by teachers at the EAICDV, or they produced their work by Braille'n'Speak which was later saved onto a standard disc and printed out using a standard printer. The Spanish National Organization for the blind (ONCE) and the EAICDV itself provided the necessary equipment for the transcription.

Texts are produced in diverse ways whether they are dictated, copied or individually composed and each with different intentions. It was decided that our objectives were best served by the last of these: the individual composition of a narrative text, with the following characteristics:

- (a) Free choice of topic, so that the text would be produced in as spontaneous a fashion as possible, despite some recent research into the «free choice/ set topic» variable concluding that this factor is of limited relevance.
- (b) A familiar and normal context for the pupil, which was generally the same classroom in which the EAICDV teachers usually saw the pupil except for those pupils who attended the EAICDV resource centre regularly, either weekly or fortnightly, in which case this centre was chosen for the investigation.
- (c) No time or space restrictions or limitations were imposed in regard to the discourse.
- (d) Despite it being essential to observe the production of the texts, there was to be maximum discretion and it was felt important that the pupil should not feel that he or she was being constantly examined. For this reason, no record of the observations was carried out.

The structural analysis of the texts was carried out according to the method designed by Salvador (1986), taken from the Spanish textual grammar. The author analyzes the structure of the narrative productions, the elements they are made up of and the relationship between them, evaluating if they are complete or incomplete, as is reflected in the following records:

Chart 1. – Structural elements of the narrative texts.

<i>Initial variables</i>	FREQUENCY	CODE	TOTAL
SENTENCES		OR	
PROPOSALS		PR	
COMPLETE EPISODES		EC	
INCOMPLETE EPISODES		EI	
INITIAL MARKER		MI	
FINAL MARCKER		MP	
<i>Narrative episodes</i>	QUALITY	T	FREQUENCY
SCENE-SETTING			ES
INITIAL EVENT			SI
RESPONSE			RP
ACTION			AC
CONSEQUENCE			CD
REACTION			RC
<i>Connection between episodes</i>	FREQUENCY		
CAUSAL			CA
TEMPORAL			TP
ADDITIVE			AD
INSERTION			IN

3. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF THE DATA

The purpose of the research was to evaluate the low vision (weak eyes) student's skills to draft narrative texts and, furthermore, to analyse their capacity to generate substantive elements of the narration grammar.

However, the first thing to mention in this section is the following result: not all the texts produced by the pupils taking part in the investigation are narrative. Descriptions, comparisons and arguments are feature, despite the initial description. In effect, of the texts produced by pupils with visual impairment, three of them (27%) are not narrative texts but descriptive, comparative and argumentative. Of the texts produced by pupils with blindness, only one (16.7%) was deleted from our analysis because it was a descriptive text. Two pupils introduced a descriptive part before the narration. The fact that these types of texts or fragments of text appear indicates that these pupils were unfamiliar with the objectives, intentions and textual structures of a typical narration. This unfamiliarity affects a high proportion (35.3%) of the texts, including the texts which

combine descriptions with narration. In contrast, all of the students with normal vision created narrative texts in accordance with the requirements.

The data corresponding to the complete and incomplete episodes found in the texts produced by pupils with blindness, partially sighted and children with vision is shown in *Tables 1* and *2* respectively and is commented upon below.

The total number of episodes which make up the texts of the pupils with visual impairments judged to be narrative reaches 21, with an average of 2.62 per text (*Tab. 1*). However, they are not equally distributed ($s^2 = 1.51$) and the texts produced by older pupils tend to contain more episodes. These findings are consistent with other previous studies, where it was suggested that the oldest students have more control (self-regulation) in writing (Graham & Harris, 2000; Ochoa & Aragón, 2008). The total of episodes found in the pupils' texts with blindness is 17 and the average is 3 episodes per text. That said, one of the older pupils with blindness with a higher level of studies (whose text is considerably longer than the rest of the group's) has produced the greatest number of episodes (*Tab. 1*). Indeed, the scatter is high: 1.92. We can observe that the pupils with blindness produced a higher number of episodes than the visually impaired ones, especially the oldest ones, who have achieved a considerably higher number than that of the rest of their group and the pupils' group with visual impairment, since their texts are notably longer. For the students with normal vision, the average number of episodes was higher than for the former ($\bar{x} = 5.12$) and the dispersion was lower ($s = .93$), as we can see in the previous table. Their texts contained more information than those of the other groups. This may be due to the fact that they are able to obtain more important information from the events they write about, and (more plausibly) also due to the fact that the writing of the content itself within a given period of time did not require any less effort from them, compared to the extra effort inherent in the writing produced by the visually impaired students.

As for the completed episodes considered, in the 15 pupils' texts with visual impairments were counted. These were mostly found in the oldest pupils' texts. The average of complete episodes per narrative is 1.87 ($s = 1.25$). The frequency of the appearance of incomplete texts is lower, with 6 examples, giving an average of 0.75 per text ($s = .71$). These episodes are mainly produced by the youngest pupils. The text produced by the youngest pupil serves as an example, with its only episode being incomplete (*Tab. 1*). The pupils' texts with blindness contain a total of 4 complete episodes, giving an average of .86 episodes per text ($s = 1.07$). The incomplete episodes are much more frequent, rising to a total of 13, that is, 2.14 per text ($s = 1.22$).

Table 1. – Number of episodes in the narrations.

SUBJECTS/ TEXTS		COMPLETE EPISODES			INCOMPLETE EPISODES			TOTAL	
		N	%	x	N	%	x	n	x
C A S E 1	04	3	100%	$\bar{x} = 1.87$ $s = 1.25$ (71.37%)	–	–	$\bar{x} = 0.75$ $s = .71$ (28.63%)	3	$\bar{x} = 2.62$ $s = 1.51$
	06	4	80%		1	20%		5	
	07	1	100%		–	–		1	
	08	2	66.67%		1	33.33%		3	
	10	2	66.67%		1	33.33%		3	
	11	2	50%		2	50%		4	
	14	0	–		1	100%		1	
	15	1	100%		–	–		1	
C A S E 2	01	1	33.33%	$\bar{x} = 0.86$ $s = 1.07$ (25.17%)	2	66.67%	$\bar{x} = 2.14$ $s = 1.22$ 74.83%	3	$\bar{x} = 3$ $s = 1.92$
	02	1	50%		1	50%		2	
	05	1	50%		1	50%		2	
	12	0	–		1	100%		1	
	13	0	–		3	100%		3	
	16	3	42.86%		4	57.14%		7	
	17	0	–		3	100%		3	
C A S E 3	18	4	100%	$\bar{x} = 4.41$ $s = 1.18$ (85.63%)	–	–	$\bar{x} = 0.71$ $s = .69$ (14.37%)	4	$\bar{x} = 5.12$ $s = .93$
	19	5	100%		–	–		5	
	20	4	80%		1	20%		5	
	21	6	100%		–	–		6	
	22	7	100%		–	–		7	
	23	6	85.71%		1	14.29%		7	
	24	5	80%		1	20%		6	
	25	3	60%		2	40%		5	
	26	3	75%		1	25%		4	
	27	4	100%		–	–		4	
	28	3	75%		1	25%		4	
	29	5	100%		–	–		5	
	30	5	100%		–	–		5	
	31	4	80%		1	20%		5	
	32	3	60%		2	40%		5	
	33	4	80%		1	20%		5	
34	4	80%	1	20%	5				

Comparative analysis between both groups clearly shows a contrast between the proportion of complete and incomplete episodes. Pupils with visual impairment produced more complete episodes and fewer incomplete ones. Proportionally, the pupils with visual impairment produced 71.37% complete episodes and 28.63% incomplete. This percentage changes with the pupils with blindness, who produced 25.17% complete episodes and 74.83% incomplete (*Tab. 1*). The following graphs let us see these differences clearly and quickly. On top is the number of complete episodes for case 3, students with normal vision ($\bar{x} = 4.41$; $s = 1.18$), and at the bottom is the number of incomplete episodes, although there is less of a difference in this case ($\bar{x} = .71$; $s = .69$). The percentages align more with those obtained by the partially sighted students than with those obtained by the blind students; however, in any case, the students with normal vision created more episodes in total ($\bar{x} = 5.12$; $s = .93$), featuring more complete than incomplete episodes, than both the partially sighted students ($\bar{x} = 2.62$; $s = 1.51$), who also produced more complete than incomplete episodes, and the blind students ($\bar{x} = 3$; $s = 1.92$). This last group produced more incomplete episodes than complete ones.

Nevertheless, the previous researches showed that, regardless of age, the students tend to manifest an enough management of the narrative sequencing. With advancing age, the narrations of the episodes improve (Ow & Alvarado, 2013).

Definitely, from a nomothetic perspective, the proportion of incomplete episodes is high in both groups of students with visual problems, which confirms a lack of confidence in narrative ability as suspected after the initial elimination of texts. However, this deficiency increases notably in the case of pupils with blindness. In fact, the specialized literature advances the difficulties of the students in managing the temporal progression in the essay of narrative texts (Marinkovich, 2006); however, there are fewer incomplete episodes in the texts written by students with normal vision. As we can see in *Table 2*, according to the ANOVA test there are significant differences between the groups studied with regard to the dependent variables as a whole: complete episodes ($p = .000$), incomplete episodes ($p = .002$) and total episodes ($p = .000$). If we compare the groups by pair using the Tukey test, we can see that the greatest differences are found between the two groups with impaired vision and the group with normal vision. We can interpret this as showing that the students in the latter group created more complete episodes and fewer incomplete episodes than the partially sighted students, who in turn created more complete episodes and fewer incomplete episodes than the blind students, although the difference between these two groups was not statistically significant.

Table 2. – Statistical data on the differences between the 3 cases.

Differences sig. ($p < .05$) episodes	Levene (sig.)	ANOVA (sig.)	post hoc HSD Tukey (sig.)		
			Cases 1 y 2	Cases 1 y 3	Cases 2 y 3
Complete episodes	.78	.000	.231	.000	.000
Incomplete episodes	.051	.002	.008	.992	.002
Total episodes	.259	.000	.851	.000	.004

From a more idiographic point of view, it can be said that in the majority of the episodes classified as incomplete the cause is the absence of an essential element of narration which makes it what it is: «action», according to our earlier definition. One plausible explanation is that pupils confuse it with «direct consequence». The results concerning structural elements of narrative episodes are as follows:

The first part, «scene-setting», seems to be important to the pupils with visual impairment as an average of 7.12 clauses per text appear dedicated to this element ($s = 3.44$). They appear, in fact, in all the texts analyzed (*Tab. 3*). In the case of the pupils with blindness, all their texts also feature scene-setting but the average falls to 4.29 clauses ($s = 3.9$). In the third case, which corresponds to the group of students with normal vision, the average number of clauses dedicated to this particular grammatical aspect is greater than the equivalent figure for the other groups, with less dispersion ($\bar{x} = 10.71$; $s = 2.37$).

«Initial event» appears an average of 3.38 times per text in the pupils' narratives with visual impairments ($s = 1.77$). Only one of the pupils (12.5%) has failed to introduce this category (*Tab. 3*). In the pupils' texts with blindness the average is higher with 4.43 «initial events» per text ($s = 4.08$). Again there is one text here which fails to use this category (*Tab. 3*). Lastly, the students with normal vision produced twice as many clauses as the other groups ($\bar{x} = 7.82$; $s = 3.25$), as shown in *Table 3*.

Five pupils with visual impairment (62.5%) have responded to the concept of «internal response», with 3.38 ($s = 3.85$) clauses per text (*Tab. 3*). Only four pupils with blindness (40%) have used this category producing an average of 1.86 for «internal response» ($s = 1.86$). Once again, the students with normal vision produced more clauses corresponding to the «internal response» ($\bar{x} = 7.41$; $s = 1.81$).

In terms of «action», an essential part of narrative discourse, the pupils' texts with visual impairment reflect its importance, producing the greatest number of clauses with an average of 7.25 and dispersion of 5.15. Only one of them (12.5%), one of the oldest pupils, failed to generate any clauses that could be classified as «action» (*Tab. 3*).

Table 3. – Structural elements of the narrative texts.

Episode		Scene-setting		Initial Event		Response		Action		Consequence		Reaction		Total
Subject		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
C A S E 1	04	4	16	2	8	2	8	7	28	8	32	0	0	23
	06	11	27.5	0	0	2	5	18	45	7	17.5	2	5	40
	07	7	31.82	3	13.64	9	40.91	0	0	3	13.64	0	0	22
	08	13	28.89	5	11.11	9	20	9	20	9	20	0	0	45
	10	3	16.67	5	27.78	0	0	6	33.33	4	22.22	0	0	18
	11	8	20	5	12.5	5	12.5	8	20	13	32.5	1	2.5	40
	14	6	35.29	3	17.65	0	0	6	35.29	2	11.726	0	0	17
	15	5	31.25	4	25	0	0	4	25	3	18.75	0	0	16
\bar{x}		7.12	25.8	3.38	12.21	3.38	12.21	7.25	26.27	6.13	22.17	.38	1.34	27.63
s		3.44		1.77		3.85		5.15		3.8		.74		11.96
C A S E 2	01	3	25	3	25	0	0	2	16.67	3	25	1	8.33	12
	02	2	11.11	4	22.22	2	11.11	5	27.78	4	22.22	1	5.56	18
	05	3	13.04	5	21.74	4	17.39	6	26.09	5	21.74	0	0	23
	12	4	40	3	30	0	0	0	0	3	30	0	0	10
	13	3	9.68	13	41.93	3	9.68	4	12.9	6	19.35	2	6.45	31
	16	13	24.53	3	5.66	4	7.55	23	43.40	10	18.87	0	0	53
	17	2	18.18	0	0	0	0	3	27.27	6	54.54	0	0	11
\bar{x}		4.29	20.22	4.43	20.94	1.86	6.53	6.14	22.02	5.29	27.39	.57	2.91	22.57
s		3.9		4.08		1.86		7.69		2.43		0.79		15.39
C A S E 3	18	7	15.22	5	10.87	7	15.22	15	32.61	11	23.91	1	2.17	46
	19	10	23.81	3	7.14	6	14.29	12	28.47	9	21.43	2	4.76	42
	20	12	29.27	4	9.76	9	21.95	9	21.95	6	14.63	1	2.44	41
	21	11	19.64	9	16.07	10	17.86	10	17.86	13	23.21	3	5.36	56
	22	15	28.30	8	15.09	5	9.43	15	28.30	9	16.98	1	1.89	53
	23	14	25	15	26.78	6	10.71	13	23.21	8	14.29	0	0	56
	24	12	23.08	11	22.92	8	16.67	9	17.31	10	19.23	2	3.85	52
	25	10	21.28	9	19.15	11	23.40	8	17.02	8	17.02	1	2.13	47
	26	11	25	8	18.18	7	15.91	11	25	6	13.64	1	2.27	44
	27	13	26	6	12	9	18	8	16	9	18	4	8	50
	28	9	20	5	11.11	8	17.78	14	31.11	7	15.56	2	4.44	45
	29	11	18.33	9	15	5	8.33	20	33.33	14	25	1	1.67	60
	30	7	13.46	4	7.69	7	13.46	15	28.85	16	30.77	3	5.77	52
	31	13	28.89	8	17.78	6	13.33	9	20	9	20	0	0	45
32	10	20	6	12	8	16	17	34	7	14	2	4	50	
33	7	12.73	12	21.82	5	9.09	24	43.64	5	9.09	2	3.64	55	
34	10	16.95	11	18.64	9	15.25	16	27.12	10	16.95	3	5.08	59	
\bar{x}		10.71	22.17	7.82	15.41	7.41	15.09	13.24	26.22	9.24	18.44	1.71	3.38	50.18
s		2.37		3.25		1.81		4.47		2.95		1.11		5.87

The pupils with blindness produce fewer clauses expressing «action» with an average of 6.14. Dispersion is also high here ($s = 7.69$) due to the difference between older and younger pupils in this category (*Tab. 3*). The average for the texts written by the students with normal vision is twice that of the others ($\bar{x} = 13.24$), with less dispersion ($s = 4.47$).

The average number of clauses classified as «direct consequence» in the pupils' texts with visual impairments is 6.13 ($s = 3.8$) and they appear in all the texts analyzed (*Tab. 3*). This also occurs in the pupils' texts with blindness (*Tab. 3*) with an average of 5.29 clauses per text ($s = 2.43$). The number of clauses for this particular grammatical aspect is higher than that of the previous group ($\bar{x} = 9.24$), although the level of dispersion similar is ($s = 2.95$).

Only two pupils with visual impairment (25%) have used a clause that can be labeled «reaction» (*Tab. 3*). For this reason the average per text falls to .4. Two pupils with blindness (40%) have used this category, giving an average of .6 per text (*Tab. 4*). Following the pattern of the sections above, the number of clauses used in each text to describe the «final reaction» is higher for the group of students with normal vision ($\bar{x} = 1.71$; $s = 1.11$).

We can observe differences between the pupils' texts with visual impairment and those produced by pupils with blindness in terms of the structural elements of the narrative episodes. We can also note the frequent and substantial individual differences between pupils in the same group. This leads us to the conclusion, firstly that the structural parts making up the texts depend to a great extent on the individual style of each person. However, the two groups are markedly different in certain parts, namely «scene-setting», «initial event» and «internal response». Finally, in both cases, the pupils who were older and educated to a higher level have shown greater development of narrative ability, engaging more with the essential part (action) something largely forgotten in the youngest pupils' texts. In general terms, the data show that the partially sighted students created texts that had more clauses ($\bar{x} = 27.63$) and less dispersion among their components ($s = 11.96$) than those of the blind students ($\bar{x} = 22.57$; $s = 15.39$). Undoubtedly, however, and as indicated in the analyses by section, the greatest differences result from the comparison with the texts written by the students with normal vision. The overall average number of clauses is higher for this group ($\bar{x} = 50.18$), while the level of dispersion is less than a half ($s = 5.87$). Essentially, and with the exception of the grammatical variable of «consequence», the differences between the datasets obtained for each group are significant, according to the figures resulting from the ANOVA test. Using Tukey's HSD test to take a closer look at the differences between specific groups, we can see that although there are no significant differences between the groups of visually impaired students, and

there are significant differences between the visually impaired students and the students with normal vision. These differences are greater between the blind students and the students with normal vision than they are between the partially sighted students and the students with normal vision (*Tab. 4*).

Table 4. – ANOVA and post hoc HSD Tukey.

Differences sig. ($p < .05$)	Levene (sig.)	ANOVA (sig.)	post hoc HSD Tukey (sig.)		
			Cases 1 y 2	Cases 1 y 3	Cases 2 y 3
Scene-setting	.553	.000	.181	.025	.000
Initial Event	.351	.005	.797	.002	.000
Response	.004	.000	.470	.002	.000
Action	.691	.008	.919	.019	.041
Consequence	.320	.011	.859	.064	.021
Reaction	.278	.004	.919	.009	.036
<i>Total</i>	.120	.000	.605	.000	.000

It should also be noted that there were no significant differences between the proportions of clauses dedicated to each grammatical aspect. All of the students dedicated a greater amount of text to the description of the scene, the action taken, and the consequence of the narrative event, and less text to the final reaction and the internal response.

With regard to the connections established by the pupils between the various episodes making up their narratives, the texts produced by pupils with visual impairment show predominantly temporal connections. Only two texts show additive connections between episodes. The other types of connections (insertion and causal) are not found here. The pupils with blindness also used temporal connections and to a lesser extent additive connections. There was one case of insertion but no causal connection was found between episodes.

4. DIDACTIC IMPLICATIONS

In this section we present some activities and tasks that can be useful in improving students' ability to produce narrative texts. Rather than closed activities, they are open suggestions proposed to be included more easily in the didactic Units, support intervention or educational reinforcement. These suggestions are useful when applied to groups of students with visual impairments, working alongside the principles of inclusion in schools.

- To describe the grammatical parts of the narration, according to its temporary sequence: scene-setting, initial event, internal response, action, direct consequence and reaction, elucidating each one and giving illustrative examples.
- To encourage the generation of contents for narrative texts, in function with the structural part that it corresponds to. To help students with visual impairment in the generation of contents of the parts of a more visual nature, such as scene-setting (Graham, Harris, & Larsen, 2001).
- To carry out analysis and make comments on narrative texts, emphasizing the structural elements or episodes that they are made up of. This can take place in heterogeneous groups which include pupils with visual impairment, and with the teacher's help.
- To reproduce a narrative history appropriate to the interests and ability of the students, and to request them to repeat it vocally in their own words, indicating each element and justifying it. If the reproduction is carried out in videotape or DVD form it is necessary to clarify whether it is a completely accessible production (a universal design for all including the blind and visually-impaired) or whether it needs to be adapted pertinently (Rodríguez, 2005).
- To reiterate the reproduction, asking the student to keep in mind during the reproduction the episodes which it is composed of, identified in the previous phase. In this way understanding and memorization of the message is increased.
- To carry out a series of questions about the different parts of the text, to reinforce the understanding of the premeditation of each one. For example, to ascertain that scene-setting tries to describe the context and the characters of the event (Graham & Harris, 1989; Ukrainetz, 1998; Staal, 2001; Graham & Harris, 2005).
- To tell students to carry out the narration with their own words but this time in written form, pointing out in the margin each structural part (De la Paz *et al.*, 2000). The students with blindness will simply make some indicative sign with their instrument writer (Perkins, PC Braille) to identify the different parts.
- To review each student's production individually, analysing the purposes and established relationships between each one of the parts, giving the student the word for this activity (Gersten & Baker, 2001; Zimmerman & Kitsantas, 2002; García & Arias-Gundín, 2014).
- To recommend appropriate narrative readings, repeating the previous didactic sequence, so that the student generates a narrative text starting from the one they have read. To motivate reading achievement, through strategies and appropriate resources in order to improve the reading abil-

ity of children with visual deficiencies (Wong, 2000; Zimmerman & Kitsantas, 2002; Rodríguez, 2005).

- To give incomplete narrative texts so that the student will have to identify the grammatical part that it lacks and to complete it. This work will be carried out in groups, so that the texts will be hand-written, although the total participation of the pupil with visual impairments must be guaranteed. On previous occasions comic strips and drawings have been used for illustrating the elements and these resources and techniques could be continued in the case of students with good remaining vision able to make good use of it. Obviously, it is not appropriate for other students with less visual use and still less for the students with blindness.
- To encourage the production of narrative through, for example, competitions with interesting themes. To put the texts together individually or in groups, and to exchange them between groups so they can be revised grammatically, assessing their structural composition and to make subtle improvements where necessary (Chanquoy, 2011).

REFERENCES

- Chanquoy, L. (2011). How to make it easier for children to revise their writing: A study of text revision from 3rd to 5th grades. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 71(1), 15-41.
- Colás, P. (1998). Métodos y técnicas cualitativas de investigación en psicopedagogía. In L. Buendía., M. P. Colás, & F. Hernández (Coords.), *Métodos de investigación en psicopedagogía* (pp. 252-283). Madrid: McGraw-Hill.
- De la Paz, S., Owen, B., Harris, K. R., & Graham, S. (2000). Reading Elvis's motorcycle: Using self-regulated strategy development to Plan and Write for a state writing exam. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, 15(2), 101-109.
- Flower, L., and Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32, 365-387.
- García, J. N., & Arias-Gundin, O. (2014). Intervención en estrategias de revisión del mensaje escrito. *Psicothema*, 16(2), 194-202.
- Gersten, R., & Baker, S. (2001). Teaching expressive writing to students with learning disabilities: A meta-analysis. *Elementary School Journal*, 101(3), 251-272.
- Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (1989). Components analysis of cognitive strategy instruction: Effects on learning disabled student's compositions and self-efficacy. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 81(3), 353-361.

- Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (2000). The role of self-regulation and transcription skills in writing and writing development. *Educational Psychologist*, 35(1), 3-12.
- Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (2005). *Writing better: Strategies for teaching students with learning difficulties*. Baltimore: Brookes Publishing.
- Graham, S., Harris, K. R., & Larsen, L. (2001). Prevention and intervention of writing difficulties for students with learning disabilities. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, 16(2), 74-84.
- Hayes, J. R. (1996). A new framework for understanding cognition and affect in writing. In C. M. Levy & S. R. Ransdell (Eds.), *The science of writing* (pp. 1-27). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Marinkovich, J. (Ed.). (2006). *La escritura como proceso. Fundamentos y práctica en el aula*. Santiago: Frasis.
- Ochaita, E. (1993). Ceguera y desarrollo psicológico. In A. Rosa & E. Ochaita (Coords.), *Psicología de la Ceguera* (pp. 111-202). Madrid: Alianza Editorial.
- Ochoa, S., & Aragón, L. (2008). Funcionamiento metacognitivo de niños escolares en la escritura de un texto narrativo antes y después de una pauta de corrección conjunta. *Acta Colombiana de Psicología*, 11(2), 77-88.
- Ow, M., & Alvarado, C. (2013). Niños que narran. Aumento en la complejidad discursiva y sintáctica durante la edad escolar. *Literatura y Lingüística*, 28, 149-168.
- RAE (2018). *Nueva gramática de la lengua española*. Madrid: Espasa.
- Rodríguez, A. (2005). *¿Cómo leen los niños con ceguera y baja visión?* Málaga: Aljibe.
- Rodríguez, A., & Rodríguez, L. (2015). Necesidades educativas especiales derivadas de la discapacidad visual y respuesta educativa. In A. Rodríguez (Coord.), *Un currículo para múltiples adaptaciones* (pp. 69-113). Madrid: EOS.
- Salvador, F. (1986). El análisis de textos infantiles. Aportaciones teórico-metodológicas y didácticas. *Enseñanza*, 4(5), 221-236.
- Salvador, F. (2008). *Psicología de la lengua escrita*. Madrid: EOS.
- Schultz, K. (2006). Qualitative research on writing. In C. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (pp. 357-402). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Staal, L. A. (2001). Writing models: Strategies for writing composition in inclusive settings. *Reading and Writing Quarterly: Overcoming Learning Difficulties*, 17(3), 243-248.
- Stake, R. (2010). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stein, N. L., & Glenn, C. G. (1979). An analysis of story comprehension in elementary school children. In R.O. Freedle (Ed.), *Advances in discourse processes*, Vol. 2: *New directions in discourse processing*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

- Ukrainetz, T. A. (1998). Stickwriting stories: A quick and easy narrative representation strategy. *Language, Speech and Hearing Services in Schools*, 29(4), 197-206.
- Wong, B. Y. L. (2000). Writing strategies instruction for expository essays for adolescents with and without learning disabilities. *Topics in Language Disorders*, 20(4), 29-44.
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Kitsantas, A. (2002). Acquiring writing revision and self-regulatory skill through observation and emulation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94(4), 660-668.

RIASSUNTO

L'obiettivo dell'indagine è stato diretto all'analisi le capacità linguistiche dei bambini con disabilità visive e dei bambini con visione normale. Sono state studiate diverse caratteristiche degli episodi narrativi prodotti, tra cui la quantità, la qualità, le connessioni tra gli elementi strutturali. Sono state calcolate misure di tendenza centrale e misure di dispersione, oltre a misure inferenziali. I risultati delle analisi condotte indicano che le parti strutturali che compongono i testi dipendono in larga misura dallo stile linguistico individuale. Tuttavia, i due gruppi sono notevolmente diversi per alcuni aspetti: gli alunni più grandi e con livelli di istruzione superiori hanno mostrato un maggiore sviluppo delle capacità narrative, impegnandosi maggiormente nella descrizione dei contenuti centrali, in gran parte invece trascurati nei testi degli allievi più giovani. Per quanto riguarda le connessioni stabilite dagli alunni tra i vari episodi narrati, i testi prodotti dagli alunni con disabilità visive mostrano connessioni prevalentemente temporanee. Sono state riscontrate differenze significative tra i testi scritti prodotti da studenti con visione normale e quelli non vedenti o ipovedenti. Le maggiori differenze sono state osservate per quanto concerne la lunghezza del testo e la descrizione di episodi completi: entrambe queste caratteristiche erano maggiori nei testi scritti da studenti con visione normale.

Parole chiave: Alunni con cecità; Alunni con disabilità visive; Espressione scritta; Testi narrativi; Valutazione di testi narrativi.

How to cite this Paper: Fuentes, A. R., & Gallego Ortega, J. L. (2019). Are there any differences between the texts written by students who are blind, those who are partially sighted, and those with normal vision? [Ci sono differenze tra i testi scritti da studenti ciechi, con problemi di vista e quelli con visione normale?]. *Journal of Educational, Cultural and Psychological Studies*, 20, 41-58. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.7358/ecps-2019-020-fuga>