



Executive Functions and Behavioral Problems in Students with Visual Impairments at Regular and Special Schools

Vera Heyl and Manfred Hintermair

University of Education Heidelberg, Germany

5th ECPVI, Bratislava, November 21st 2014

- ⇒ Research Background
- ⇒ Research Questions
- ⇒ Sample
- ⇒ Measures
- ⇒ Results
- ⇒ Discussion

Research Background

- ⇒ **Behavioral problems** frequently occur in students with visual impairments (VI), at least temporarily
 - ⇒ **Stereotyped behaviors** (e.g., rocking; Fazzi et al., 1999; Gal & Dyck, 2009)
 - ⇒ High incidence of **internalizing problems** (Kammerer et al., 2003)
 - ⇒ **Emotional problems** and **peer problems** were significantly higher among adolescents with VI than among adolescents with normal vision (Pinquart & Pfeiffer, 2012)
- ⇒ Behavioral problems seem to be **less pronounced among students with VI at regular schools** (Maes & Grietens, 2004)

- ⇒ **Executive functions** are regulatory and control mechanisms that are essential for performing goal-oriented and situation-related actions(e.g., Miyake et al., 2000)
- ⇒ Initiate problem-solving processes
 - ⇒ Inhibit the effect of distracting stimuli or actions
 - ⇒ Select relevant action goals
 - ⇒ Organize complex problem-solving processes
 - ⇒ Flexibly adjust problem-solving strategies
 - ⇒ Monitor one's own course of action and evaluate its success
 - ⇒ Working memory

Research Background

- ⇒ **Executive functions might be less well developed in students with VI**
 - ⇒ **Increased prevalence of regulatory disorders** in infants with VI aged 6 to 36 months (Alon et al., 2010)
 - ⇒ Preschool children with congenital VI show a **reduced capacity to regulate their attention** as compared to children with normal vision (Tadić, Pring & Dale, 2009)
 - ⇒ Students with VI use rather **global self-regulatory learning strategies** that do not adapt to the specific demands of distinct school subjects (Argyropoulos et al., 2012)
- ⇒ **Less well developed executive functions might contribute to behavioral problems** among students with VI

Research Questions

- (1) Are there any **differences in executive functioning between students with VI** and a normative sample of children with normal vision?
- (2) Do **students with VI at regular schools** differ in their executive functions from **students with VI at schools for the blind and visually impaired**?
- (3) Does **executive functioning predict behavioral problems** among students with VI?

Sample (N=226)

Variables	Characteristics	N	%
Gender	Male	121	53.5
	Female	105	46.5
Age (M = 12.0 SD = 3.5)	5 to 8 years	52	23.0
	9 to 13 years	104	46.0
	14 to 18 years	70	31.0
Citizenship	German	152	67.3
	Other citizenship	73	32.3
	Missing data	1	0.4
Degree of Visual Impairment	0,3 to 0,05	135	59.7
	0,05 to 0,02	51	22.6
	< 0,02	33	14.6
	Missing data	7	3.1
Additional Handicap	Yes	111	49.1
	No	109	48.2
	Missing data	6	2.6
Type of School	School for the Blind and Visually Impaired	136	60.2
	Regular School	90	39.8

Sample (N=226)

- ⇒ Significantly more **students with additional handicaps** at schools for the blind and visually impaired
($\chi^2 = 43.12$, $df = 1$, $p < .001$)

N (%)	Students with VI at Special Schools (n = 136)	Students with VI at Regular Schools (n = 90)
Without Additional Handicaps	41 (30%)	68 (76%)
With Additional Handicaps	90 (66%)	21 (23%)
Missing Data	5 (4%)	1 (1%)

⇒ **All information is based on teachers' ratings**

⇒ **Executive Function**

- ⇒ ***Behavior Rating Inventory of Executive Function BRIEF***
(Gioia, Isquith, Guy, & Kenworthy, 2000)
- ⇒ 73 items (e.g., “has explosive, angry outbursts”; “does not check work for mistakes”), 8 subscales
- ⇒ *Behavior Regulation Index BRI* (cumulative value of the “Inhibition”, “Shift”, and “Emotional Control” subscales)
- ⇒ *Metacognition Index MI* (cumulative value of the “Initiate”, “Working Memory”, “Plan/Organize”, “Organization of Materials”, and “Monitor” subscales)
- ⇒ *Global Executive Composite GEC*

⇒ Behavioral Problems

- ✚ ***Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire SDQ-D***
(Rothenberger & Woerner, 2004)
- ✚ 25 items (e.g. “constantly fidgeting or squirming”; “considerate of other people’s feelings”; etc.)
- ✚ ***Total Difficulties Score:*** Emotional Problems, Conduct Problems, Hyperactivity, Peer Problems

⇒ Additional Data

- ⇒ ***Sociodemographic variables*** (gender, age, citizenship, type of school)
- ⇒ ***Variables related to impairment*** (degree of visual impairment, additional handicaps)
- ⇒ ***Communicative Competence Scale*** (Hintermair, 2013)
consisting of 4 items (e.g., “The child is able to understand the things I/people want to tell or explain to him/her.”)

Results

	(1) Students with normal vision from normative sample (N = 720)		(2) Students with VI at regular schools (N = 90)		(3) Students with VI at special schools (N = 136)				
Scale	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	F	ES	Sign. Diff.
Inhibit	12.5	4.0	14.1	5.0	16.9	5.8	58.86***	.75	1 < 2 < 3
Shift	11.9	3.0	15.5	4.1	17.7	5.0	184.26***	1.42	1 < 2 < 3
Emotional Control	10.7	3.1	12.2	4.5	14.7	5.7	68.09***	.81	1 < 2 < 3
Initiate	9.4	3.0	11.9	3.6	13.3	3.8	99.87***	1.05	1 < 2 < 3
Working Memory	12.9	3.9	16.2	5.5	18.2	5.6	97.81***	1.03	1 < 2 < 3
Plan/Organize	13.1	3.9	15.9	4.5	17.7	4.9	81.71***	.94	1 < 2 < 3
Organization of Materials	8.5	2.6	10.4	3.5	11.7	4.5	72.16***	.88	1 < 2 < 3
Monitor	13.4	3.7	16.4	4.9	18.9	5.4	113.41***	1.10	1 < 2 < 3
Behavior Regulation Index BRI	35.0	9.0	41.8	11.2	49.3	14.1	122.78***	1.12	1 < 2 < 3
Metacognition Index MI	57.4	15.4	70.8	19.0	79.8	20.5	118.67***	1.13	1 < 2 < 3
GEC (BRI + MI)	92.5	22.6	112.6	26.1	129.1	31.5	142.55***	1.23	1 < 2 < 3

Note. ***p < .001. GEC = Global Executive Composite. Higher scores indicate lower functioning.

⇒ **Differences to normative sample remain significant** when students with VI and additional handicaps are excluded from the analysis, but **within-group differences disappear**: 1 < (2 = 3)

Results

Predictor variables	SDQ Total Difficulties Score	
	β	t score
Gender	-.18	-4.11 ^{***}
Age	-.19	-4.00 ^{***}
Citizenship	.02	.50
Degree of Visual Impairment	.004	-.09
Additional Handicap	.03	.51
Type of School	-.02	-.40
Communicative Competence	-.09	-1.85 ^T
BRIEF Behavior Regulation Index	.63	10.30 ^{***}
BRIEF Metacognition Index	.21	3.55 ^{***}
R = .80; R ² = .64; adj. R ² = .62		

Note. *** p < .001; ^T p < .10

⇒ Research questions (1) and (2)

- ✚ **Highly significant differences** in all domains of executive functioning **to the disadvantage of students with VI**
- ✚ **Considerable within-group differences**, in that students with VI at regular schools showed better executive functions than those at special schools
- ✚ **Within-group differences disappeared** when students with additional handicaps were removed from the analysis
- ✚ **Students with VI and additional handicaps were overrepresented at special schools** (66% vs. 23% at regular schools)
- ➡ **Within-group differences might be due to overrepresentation**

⇒ Research question (3)

- ⇒ In addition to age, gender, metacognitive abilities, and in a tendency communicative competence, **the executive aspect of behavior regulation is particularly significant**
- ⇒ **Similar results** in studies on **students with hearing impairments** (Hintermair, 2013) and on **students with intellectual disabilities** (Janz et al., 2012)

⇒ Limitations

- ⇒ **Cross-sectional data**
- ⇒ **Teacher reports**, not data from observing or surveying the children themselves
- ⇒ **Cross-cultural comparison** of German and US data
- ⇒ Some **items might not indicate executive or behavioral problems among students with VI** (e.g., BRIEF: “Cannot find things in room or school desk”, SDQ: “Nervous in new situations, easily loses confidence”)
- ⇒ **However**, the results of the present study show an **increased occurrence** of these behaviors, and thus **a specific need for support among students with VI**

⇒ Implications for practitioners

- ⇒ A wide range of **executive functions** significant for socio-emotional development are **not sufficiently developed** in many students with VI
- ⇒ Behavior regulation issues and metacognition problems among students with VI will **require increased attention to ensure social and academic success**, especially in the context of inclusion
- ⇒ Need to **strengthen competencies** that are attributed to executive functions (e.g., impulse control, emotional understanding, shifting)
- ⇒ **Intervention programs** focusing on executive functions among children with normal vision **might be adapted** to the needs of children with VI (e.g., Bodrova & Leong, 2007; Diamond, Barnett, Thomas & Munro, 2007)
- ⇒ Educational support programs should **take executive functions into account as early as possible**, since major developmental challenges for children with VI emerge in the first years of life (e.g., Brambring, 2005)



Thank you for your attention!

heyl@ph-heidelberg.de

- Alon, L., Ophir Cohen, M., Cohen, A. & Tirosh, E. (2010). Regulation disorders among children with visual impairment a controlled study. *Journal of Developmental and Physical Disabilities*, 22(1), 57-64.
- Argyropoulos, V., Sideridis, G. D., Botsas, G. & Padeliadu, S. (2012). Assessing self-regulation in individuals with visual impairments: Generality versus specificity in self-regulatory functioning. *Assessment for Effective Intervention*, 37(3), 171-182.
- Bodrova, E. & Leong, D.J. (2007). *Tools of the mind: The Vygotskian approach to early childhood education*, second edition. Columbus, OH: Merrill/Prentice-Hall.
- Brambring, M. (2005). Divergente Entwicklung blinder und sehender Kinder in vier Entwicklungsbereichen [Divergent development in blind and sighted children in four developmental areas]. *Zeitschrift für Entwicklungspsychologie und Pädagogische Psychologie*, 37(4), 173-183.
- Diamond, A., Barnett, W.S., Thomas, J., & Munro, S. (2007). Preschool program improves cognitive control. *Science*, 318, 1387-1388.
- Fazzi, E., Lanners, J., Danova, S., Ferrarri-Ginevra, O., Gheza, C., Luparia, A., Balottin, U., & Lanzi, G. (1999). Stereotyped behaviours in blind children. *Brain & Development*, 21, 522-528.
- Gal, E. & Dyck, M. J. (2009). Stereotyped movements among children who are visually impaired. *Journal of Visual Impairment and Blindness*, 103(11), 754-765.
- Gioia, G.A., Isquith, P.K., Guy, S.C., & Kenworthy, L. (2000). *BRIEF: Behavior Rating Inventory of Executive Function*. Lutz, FL.: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Hintermair, M. (2013). Executive functions and behavioral problems in deaf and hard-of-hearing students at general and special schools. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 18(3), 344-359.
- Janz, F., Ege, H., Heitner, M. & Hintermair, M. (2012). Exekutive Funktionen, sozial-emotionale Auffälligkeiten und Assistenzbedarf bei Schülerinnen und Schülern mit einer geistigen Behinderung [Executive functioning, communicative competence and behavior disorders in students with intellectual impairment]. *Heilpädagogische Forschung*, 38(4), 181-193.

References

- Kammerer, E., Köster, S., Monninger, M., & Scheffler, U. (2003). Jugendpsychiatrische Aspekte von Sehbehinderung und Blindheit [Adolescent psychiatric aspects of visual impairment and blindness]. *Praxis der Kinderpsychologie und Kinderpsychiatrie*, 52(5), 316-328.
- Maes, B. & Grietens, H. (2004). Parent-reported problem behavior among children with sensory disabilities attending elementary regular schools. *Journal of Developmental and Physical Disabilities*, 16(4), 361-375.
- Miyake, A., Friedman, N.P., Emerson, M.J., Witzki, A.H., Howerter, A. & Wager, T.D. (2000). The unity and diversity of executive functions and their contributions to complex "frontal lobe" tasks: A latent variable analysis. *Cognitive Psychology*, 41, 49-100.
- Pinquart, M. & Pfeiffer, J. P. (2012). Psychological adjustment in adolescents with vision impairment. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 59, 145-155.
- Rothemberger, A. & Woerner, W. (Hrsg.) (2004). Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) – Evaluations and applications. *European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 13, Supplement 2.
- Tadić, V., Pring, L. & Dale, N. (2009). Attentional processes in young children with congenital visual impairment. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 27, 311-330.