The Level Of Language Social Use Among Children With Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) In Jordan And Its Relationship To Some Selected Variables

Bayan Izzeddin Mahmoud Aldagamseh

Department of Special Education - Faculty of Educational Sciences
Jadara University – Jordan
adakkamsh.bayan@yahoo.com

Abstract

The study aims to reveal the level of language social use among children with autism spectrum disorder (ASD) in Jordan and its relationship to some selected variables. The study sample consisted of (120) children, divided into (92) males and (28) females, and their ages ranged from (10-20 years), while the social use scale was applied to reach the results. The results showed that the language social use was at moderate level, where the variable "The language use for different reasons" came in the first rank with an arithmetic mean (1.90) at a moderate level. The second rank was for the variable "Following the rules of conversations and storytelling" with an arithmetic average (1.52) at a moderate level, while the last rank was for the variable "Adapting language to meet the listener's needs and the situation" with an arithmetic mean (1.47) at a moderate level. Moreover, there were no statistically significant differences at the level of ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the total score and all variables of the social use scale of language according to the gender variable. In addition, there were significant differences at the level of ($\alpha = 0.05$) in all dimensions of the Language Social Use scale between the moderate disability category and the severe disability category, where the arithmetic mean of the moderate disability category was greater than the arithmetic means of the disability category.

Keywords: Social, Language, Sample, Children, Autism, Spectrum, Disorder, Jordan, Relationship, Selected Variables.

1. Introduction

There have been many studies dealing with the issue of autism spectrum disorder (ASD). Presumably, the key characteristic of Individuals with ASD is that they suffer from deficiencies in (Social communication and interaction, and stereotyped behaviors that repeat themselves). One of people with ASD distinctive manifestations is that they suffer from a clear deficit in language in different proportions, since we note that some of these people develop language somewhat naturally. Other people with ASD have an insufficiency in social functioning language and hardly initiate social interactions through language. In addition, otherpeople with ASD lack spontaneity and do not use suitable communication methods of communication can compensate for language limitations, where some members of this group acquire some functional language and there is great difference in their rate of progress (Rivard& Forget, 2012). ASD considered as a developmental disorder that has become promptly spreading and in the latest estimate of the prevalence depending on "The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention" in America (CDC, 2022).

Additionally, one of obstacles that children with ASD may face is having vision problems, which considered as an example of sensory integration problems that are frequently there in this group.Thus, they may have difficulties interpreting objects visually such as images, sequences, and puzzles. In such a case, the therapist focuses on visual performance exercises such as match-related tasks that help children improve their abilities in the field of scanning and locating similarities/ differences, leverage different trainings that address a variety of skills, and give them an opportunity to improve their visual performance abilities, which affects the environmental and social awareness of this group. Therefore, these skills serve as an important starting point for other functional and organizational skills, including counting money, dressing, and completing worksheets at school. (Chung & Son, 2020).

From an interesting perspective, sensory abnormalities and social vulnerability in people with ASD are related. The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders 5's ASD diagnostic criteria (DSM-5, TR) involved "excessive or deficient interaction with sensory input or exceptional interest in environmental sensory features". For instance, we may notice that infants precede their atypical sensory development with social communication symptoms, and lack of sensory response predicts minimum degree of linguistic development and general attention, and variable visual perception with ASD, Social impairment in ASD can also directly caused by sensory impairment, or the two may coexist (APA, 2022).

Vision is the most significant sensory modality to process gaze since it accounts for approximately 80% of the knowledge that the individuals brain receives from the outside world. It is also a necessary condition of mutual interest, or tradition that is strongly associated with empathy. Children at risk of ASD, who were diagnosed with ASD, considerably display typical social interactions (such as taking care of the face) until the age of 12 months. However, they start to exhibit abnormal social behaviors after their first year of life, followed by atypical visual behaviors. This finding implies that poor visual processing may be a factor in social impairment. Children with ASD who have unusual visual perception may have difficulty understanding social cues offered visually, which may eventually cause them to feel isolated due to social information overload (Chung & Son, 2020).

Accordingly, our study aims to identify the level of language social use among children with ASD in Jordan and its relationship to some selected variables, and the following questions are derived:

- What is the level of language social use among children with ASD in Jordan?

- According to the gender variable and the severity of ASD, are there statistically significant differences in the level of language social usage among children with ASD in Jordan?

Disability Rights Advocates Autism Spectrum Speakers: Individuals with ASD, defined by issues with social interaction, recurrent patterns of activities, spoken language skills, and language usage issues, may also exhibit may also exhibit recurrent patterns of activities (American Psychiatric Association, 2013).

The Social Use of Language refers to social interaction or pragmatism and reflects the ability of Individuals with ASD to utilize language in social situations, and also includes the capability to use language for various purposes such as: welcome, request, command, etc (Hage, et al, 2021). In our study, it procedurally considered as the result obtained by the examinee on the test of language social use built by the researcher to achieving the objectives of the study.

2. Theoretical background

American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASLHA, 2021, B) showed that Social interaction, social cognition, pragmatism, and language processing are all parts of social communication, which is the utilize of language in social circumstances. Social communication also involves social interaction abilities and the capacity to modify the way of speech, adopt the perspective of others, and understand the rules of both communication (verbal and nonverbal) appropriately. In addition, Social communication considered as the application of linguistic structures (including vocabulary, syntax, and phonology) to these objectives. The ability to utilize language systematically, such as vocabulary and grammar, may also be factors in pragmatic capacity, which can range from non-verbal to above-average levels in school-age children with autism. People with autism are sometimes described as having pragmatic deficiencies. Growing evidence suggests that some of the pragmatic language inadequacies seen in autistic children are caused by problems with their structural language, even if this hasn't been fully confirmed. Children with ASD have obstacles understanding metaphor, where their knowledge of grammar, vocabulary, and language structure foretells these obstacles (Roquetas & Katsosb, 2020).

Having trouble communicating socially through both verbal and nonverbal means is a symptom of social

communication disorder, where the three main challenges are pragmatism, social cognition, and social interaction. Individuals display specific deficiencies in their capacity to follow conversational and storytelling rules, modify communication to the audience's requirements or the situation, communicate for social goals in methods appropriate to the specific social context, comprehend unwritten or obscure language, and comprehend what is not specifically declared (ASHA, 2021. C).

Individual differences in language development are related to the timing of the emergence of some talents as well as the rhythm of development and features of language. Language development is directly related to the linguistic and environmental surroundings. These variables have to do with a person's aptitudes and are greatly influenced by contextual conditions, as language acquisition relies on a variety of non-linguistic techniques. Additionally, more proficient children typically have access to greater linguistic resources. As a result of this ongoing contact, language skills are developed and put to use in many situations. These language and communication development milestones don't always go as planned because some kids skip a lot of developmental milestones. In addition as language is a predictive factor in ASD, language acquisition is a crucial part of a child's development in infancy and fosters social cognitive growth. Since about half of autistic children do not utilize language functionally and have persistent communication difficulties, the precise extent of language impairment in the autism group is yet unknown due to variations in symptoms. However, other children exhibit language development that is comparable to that of typical kids along with practical issues such trouble adapting communication styles to other contexts or dimensions or trouble grasping rhetorical devices like metaphors or sarcasm (Fernanda, Fernandes, & Daniela. 2012).

Given that social communication abilities are crucial for linguistic expression and understanding in both spoken and written forms, the link between spoken language, written language, and social communication is complicated. Effective communication is made possible by spoken and written language abilities in a range of

social settings and for a variety of objectives. There are a vast range of recognized standards within and across individuals, families, and cultures, and these norms affect social communication activities e.g. eye contact, facial expressions, and body language (ASHA, 2021. A).

Pragmatism is defined by (ASLHA, 2021) as guidelines for language use in conversation and other social contexts. We note that while some definitions of pragmatic language place more emphasis on social communication elements that involve the utilize of language in social contexts, others place more emphasis on inference and non-literal meaning through the utilize of linguistic context, with intense connection to the structural elements of language. Both pragmatism and social communication skills have distinct differences, but there is also clear overlap, and they are commonly utilized together in the same sentence (Miller et al., 2015)

According to Several studies, in order to completely comprehend and interpret linguistic structural elements (such as vocabulary, syntax, and phonology) and to be successful communicators, children must be able to understand and interpret verbal and nonverbal cues that provide crucial information about the speaker's intentions. They, for instance, need to comprehend the setting of a discussion; non-verbal clues, such as alterations in tone and facial expressions; and pragmatic language, which essentially connects all facets of expressive and receptive language (Such as phonemes, diacritics, syntax and semantics) (Lavi and Mainess, 2019).

Knowing and following these guidelines makes it simpler to interact with others. These guidelines include when and how to talk to people, how to change the subject, and how to show our emotions through facial expressions and gestures. Three key competencies comprise social communication: utilizing language for diverse goals (e.g., greeting and saying "hello" or "goodbye"), altering the language or attitude of the listener (e.g., addressing children differently than adults), and adhering to conversational and storytelling conventions, (such as letting others know the topic when you start talking) (ASHA, 2021. B).

Pragmatic language obstacles are intricate in an education context and constitute a significant impediment to successful learning, so it is critical to promptly identify practical language deficiencies and provide students having the resources needed to support their education. Research supports the assumption that pragmatic communication challenges are regularly present in children with autism, and current data suggests that students with SLI frequently also have pragmatic language disorders (Lavi&Mainess, 2019).

Language is typically a child's first experience with socialization, mediated by the parents during routine activities. Language development originates from the need to communicate with others. Communication impairments impact a child's capacity to sustain relationships and demonstrate interest in a variety of topics when their language is not functional and problems with social integration, as in ASDs. Furthermore, a child should be assessed to see whether they have a developmental language disorder (DLD) if they are experiencing substantial difficulty with verbal expression and receptive language without any intellectual deficiencies being noticed (Hage et al., 2021).

Language is defined by (ASLHA, 2021, a) as behavior guided by rules, including comprehension or utilize of speaking (hearing and speaking), writing (reading and writing), or any other system of communication symbols. (i.e. American Sign Language). Both expressive (speaking and writing) and appreciating (listening and reading) components make up spoken and written language. Language is a synergistic system made up of several language domains (such as phonology, diacritics, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics) that come together to produce a dynamic, integrative whole. Spoken language, written language, and their related components (i.e., assimilative and expressive) are all part of this system.

The problem of our study, according to the theoretical background related to ASD, is to show the extent of the apparent deficit in language social use. The studies showed that people with ASD suffer from a clear deficiency in communication skills, and this in turn contributes to the emergence of a number of negative

behaviors that are difficult to control and greatly affect communication with them. In light of this, social vulnerability receives more attention than the atypical sensory behaviors that children with autism frequently exhibit through a variety of sensory modalities (such as apathy toward pain, aversion to specific sounds or chemicals, excessive item smelling or touching, an obsession with lights or motion, and aberrant sensory perception). Recently, sensory problems have been seen in roughly 95% of children with autism, and a growing number of researchers now view them as a key symptom (Chung & Son, 2020).

The number of new cases of social communication disorder that are discovered during a specific time frame considered as the incidence, and the number of Individuals who have social communication disorder over that same time period is known as the prevalence. Estimating the prevalence and incidence of social communication disorders has been challenging as result of numerous studies use various populations and conflicting or ambiguous definitions of the condition. Prior to determining the prevalence of this disease, it will be required to study and evaluate the validity of the criteria for it given the relatively recent expansion to incorporate the new diagnostic category of social (pragmatic) communication disorder. According to a community sample-based population estimate of more than 1,300 preschoolers, pragmatic language weakness affects boys 2.6:1 more frequently than girls and affects 7.5% of kids overall. People with language difficulties and a number of other disorders have higher prevalence (23% - 33%), and more information may be available on the incidence and prevalence of people with particular symptoms and traits (ASHA, 2021. C).

3. **Methodology**:

Our study relied on the descriptive survey method to answer the study questions and achieve its objective. The study sample included (120) persons (males n=92, females n=28), aged (10-20 years), and diagnosed with ASD**.**

Study Tool:

The study utilized a Scale of Social Language Use, where the scale was built to identify the ability of people with ASD to utilize language in various social contexts, by

referring to related literature in order to form the paragraphs of the scale, where the following references were used (ASHA, 2021 2021; Lavi, et al, 2019; Kid, 2020). The scale may consist of (32) items distributed on three variables. The first variable was "the ability to use language for different reasons" (e.g. welcome, inform people about things, request, and command). The second variable is "the ability to adapt language to meet the listener's needs and the situation" (e.g. conversing differently with children than adults, and speaking loudly in noisy environments Recognize the knowledge of the listener and provide more or less information as necessary). Third variable is "unspoken rules of conversation and storytelling" (e.g. switching between discussions, paying attention to the speaker, maintaining a comfortable distance, and expressing yourself with gestures and facial expressions). The answer of the scale paragraphs is from a quadruple gradation, which is (very good, good, poor, not at all).

The correlation coefficients between the paragraph and the question's variable mean: the extent to which all paragraphs of the questionnaire are consistent with the variable to which they belong; In other words, the statement only measures the things it was intended to measure. As a result, the Pearson correlation coefficient between the scores of each statement on the scale and the corresponding variable and the scale's overall score was calculated**.**

Table (1) Correlation coefficients between the scale's variables and each paragraph's score on the scale

Item	correlation to variable	Overall Score	Item	correlation to variable	Overall Score
1	.780**	.737**	17	.856**	.891**
2	.814**	.718**	18	.841**	.891**
3	.498**	.384*	19	.839**	.833**
4	.612**	.462*	20	.843**	.839**
5	.600**	.561**	21	.502**	.592**
6	.655**	.601**	22	.788**	.820**
7	.867**	.897**	23	.877**	.879**

8	.853**	.818**	24	.803**	.848**
9	.785**	.767**	25	.831**	.852**
10	.848**	.803**	26	.891**	.903**
11	.900**	.864**	27	.816**	.859**
12	.873**	.890**	28	.688**	.704**
13	.885**	.837**	29	.706**	.714**
14	.818**	.792**	30	.600**	.634**
15	.943**	.900**	31	.626**	.676**
16	.819**	.771**	32	.708**	.747**

***Statistically significant at the level (0.05).**

****** Statistically significant at the level (0.01).**

Table (1) showed that all correlation coefficients for the scale's individual paragraphs and its overall degree are statistically significant at the level of (0.05 =). The correlations between the paragraphs and the associated variable ranged from (0.498 to 0.943), whereas the correlations between the paragraphs and the scale's overall degree ranged from (0.348 and 0.900). The scale had a final length of (32) paragraphs since all of these values were statistically significant, demonstrating the consistency of the scale's internal structure**.**

Stability:

The Cronbach alpha coefficient and estimator stability were determined to guarantee the stability of the language social use scale, and the findings are in table (2).

Table (2) Cronbach's alpha coefficient stability coefficient

Variable	Stability of estimators	Cronbach's alpha stability
Language use for different reasons	.82	0.90
Adapting language to meet the listener's needs and the situation	.93	0.96
Following the rules of conversations and storytelling	.92	0.95
Total	**.99**	**0.98**

Table (2) showed that the Cronbach alpha coefficient of the total scale reached (0.98), while the stability of estimators reached (0.99). The Cronbach alpha coefficient of the Variable "Language use for different reasons" reached (0.90), while the stability of estimators reached (0.82). Moreover, The Cronbach alpha coefficient of the Variable "Adapting language to meet the listener's needs and the situation" reached (0.96), while the stability of estimators reached (0.93). Finally, the Cronbach alpha coefficient of the Variable "Following the rules of conversations and storytelling" reached (0.95), while the stability of estimators reached (0.92). These values indicate that the scale of language social use has a high degree of stability, which, in accordance with the (Nani scale), was accepted as a minimum of (0.70) for stability and may be depended upon in the field application.

4. Results and Discussion

The results are presented in this chapter, which seeks to identify the evaluation of the language social use among the study sample and its relationship to some variables discussed in Jordan. After the data were collected, based on the statistical processing of the study data, the following results were reached:

First: The outcomes in relation to responding to the first question:

What is the level of language social use among a sample of children with ASD in Jordan?

To answer this question, the arithmetic means and standard deviations (SD) of the responses of the study sample were calculated on the scale of language social use, as shown in the following table.

Table (3) Mean and SD related to the Language Social Use Scale in Descending Order

Variables	SD	Arithmetic mean
The language use for different reasons	0.80	1.90
Following the rules of conversations and storytelling	0.83	1.52
Adapting language to meet the listener's needs and the situation	0.82	1.47
Total score of the scale	**0.75**	**1.63**

Table (3) showed that the total arithmetic mean of language social use reached (1.63), at a moderate level of appropriation. The results showed that the variable "The language use for various reasons" was at first rank, with arithmetic mean reached (1.90) at a moderate level of appropriation. The second rank was for the variable "Following the rules of conversations and storytelling", with arithmetic mean reached (1.52) at a moderate level of appropriation. The third rank was for the variable "Adapting language to meet the listener's needs and the situation", with arithmetic mean reached (1.47) at a moderate level of appropriation.The following is a breakdown of the Arithmetic means of the scale paragraphs according to the variables.

Variable of the language use for different reasons:

Table (4): Mean and SD related to Language Use for different Reasons in Descending Order

Rank	Level	SD	Mean
1	High	0.86	2.30
2	High	0.87	2.24
3	High	0.93	2.13
4	High	0.97	2.08
5	High	0.83	2.04
6	Moderate	0.86	2.00
7	Moderate	1.01	1.73
8	Moderate	1.05	1.66
9	Moderate	1.04	1.43
10	Moderate	0.94	1.38
Total	**Moderate**	**0.80**	**1.90**

Table (4) showed that the total mean of the variable "Language Use for different Reasons" was at moderate level, with an arithmetic mean reached (1.90), while the arithmetic means of the paragraphs ranged between (1.38 and 2.30).The paragraph that states "The student can express his needs, for example; (ordering food, ordering drink, asking to enter the bathroom...)" was at

first rank with an arithmetic mean reached (2.30) at a high level.The second rank was forthe paragraph that states "He asks for a spade for example; (book, pen, bag...)" with an arithmetic mean reached (2.24) at a high level. The paragraph that states "The student exchanges ideas with others" ranked ninth and penultimate with an arithmetic mean reached (1.43) at a moderate level, and the paragraph that states "The student uses appropriate words to make friends with others" was in the tenth and last rank, with mean reached (1.38) at a moderate level.

Variable of Adapting language to meet the listener's needs and the situation.

Table (5): Mean and SD related to adapting language to meet the listener's needs and the situation in descending order

Rank	Arithmetic mean	SD	Level
1	1.59	0.99	Moderate
2	1.57	0.86	Moderate
3	1.55	0.92	Moderate
4	1.49	0.93	Moderate
5	1.43	0.91	Moderate
6	1.36	0.89	Moderate
7	1.27	0.95	Moderate
Total	1.47	0.82	**Moderate**

Table (5) showed that the total arithmetic mean of the variable “Adapting language to meet the listener's needs and the situation” was at moderate level, with an arithmetic mean reached (1.47), while the arithmetic means of the paragraphs ranged between (1.27 and 1.59). The paragraph that states "The student speaks loudly when there is a lot of noise” was at first rank with an arithmetic mean reached (1.59) at a moderate level.The second rank was forthe paragraph that states "The student approaches the speaker and realizes the limits of the personal distance between them" with an arithmetic mean reached (1.57) at a moderate level.The paragraph that states "the student skips some details when the person talking to him is already aware of the subject" ranked sixth and penultimate with an arithmetic

mean reached (1.36) at a moderate level. Moreover, the paragraph that states "The student understands and respects the point of view of others" came in the last rank with mean (1.27) at a moderate level

Variable of "Following the rules of conversations and storytelling":

Table (6): Mean and SD related tofollowing the rules of conversations and storytelling in descending order

Rank	Arithmetic mean	SD	**Level**
1	1.89	0.99	Moderate
2	1.87	1.00	Moderate
3	1.83	0.98	Moderate
4	1.72	0.96	Moderate
5	1.68	0.96	Moderate
6	1.47	0.88	Moderate
7	1.44	1.07	Moderate
8	1.43	0.95	Moderate
9	1.41	0.89	Moderate
10	1.38	0.93	Moderate
11	1.38	0.98	Moderate
12	1.30	0.91	Moderate
13	1.27	0.93	Moderate
14	1.21	0.89	Moderate
Total	1.52	0.83	**Moderate**

Table (6) showed that showed that the total arithmetic mean of the variable “Following the rules of conversations and storytelling” was at moderate level, with an arithmetic mean reached (1.52), while the arithmetic means of the paragraphs ranged between (1.21 and 1.89).The paragraph that states "The student can look at the speaker while talking to him” was at first rank with an arithmetic mean reached (1.89) at a moderate level. The second rank was fourth paragraph that states "The student stands from the speaker at an

appropriate distance" with an arithmetic mean reached (1.87) at a moderate level. The paragraph that states "The student clarifies what is meant from his words when others do not understand him" ranked thirteenth and penultimate with arithmetic mean reached (1.27) at a moderate level. Moreover, the paragraph that states "The student takes the role in conversation when he has the opportunity" came in the last rank with an arithmetic mean (1.21) at a moderate level.

Second: The outcomes in relation to responding to the second question:

"According to the gender variable and the severity of ASD, are there statistically significant differences in the level of language social usage among children with ASD in Jordan?"

To determine the significance of the differences, the t-test was employed to calculate the means and SD of the sample's responses on the social use of language scale by gender, as shown in the accompanying table.

Table (7): "T-Test"

Variable	Gender	N	Mean	Sd	T	Freedom degrees	Sig.
Language use for reasons	Male	92	1.88	0.79	-0.272	118	0.786
	female	28	1.93	0.86			
Adapt the language to meet the needs of the listener and the situation	male	92	1.49	0.86	0.611	118	0.543
	female	28	1.38	0.65			
Follow the rules of conversations and storytelling	Male	92	1.53	0.82	0.283	118	0.778
	female	28	1.48	0.87			
Total	male	92	1.64	0.75	**0.198**	**118**	**0.843**
	female	28	1.60	0.76			

*Statistical significance at the level (a=0.05)

Table (7) showed that there are no statistically significant differences at the level of (a=0.05) in the total score and all variables of language social use scale according to the gender variable.

Most people with disabilities have a large and noticeable deficit in language, and their learning of the communication language is essential as they are trained to develop language acquisition by forming a stock for their communication function. Many Research has paid great attention to teaching people with disabilities the communication, and training techniques have become routinely available with educational plans for people with disabilities of different ages and levels of disability (Hage et al, 2021).

Third: The outcomes in relation to responding to the third question:

"Are there statistically significant differences at the level of significance (a=0.05) in the level of language social use among a sample of children with ASD in Jordan according to the severity of disability?"

In order to respond to this query, the mathematical means and standard deviations of the responses from the study sample were computed using a scale of language social usage based on the degree of the handicap. As shown in the accompanying tables, the significance of differences in the scale's total score was determined using the analysis of single variance (One Way ANOVA), and the significance of differences in the scale's variables was determined using the analysis of multiple variances (MANOVA).

Table (8): Means and SD related to Language Social Use Scale according to the Severity of Disability

Category	SD	AM	N
Simple	0.64	1.96	61
Average	0.67	1.51	40
Severe	0.51	0.82	19
Total	0.75	1.63	120

Table (8) showed that there are clear differences between the arithmetic means of the study sample responses on the scale of language social use according to the severity of disability. The results of the analysis of single variance (One Way ANOVA) used to determine if the variance differences are statistically significant at the level of (a=0.05) are shown in Table. (9).

Table (9) (One Way ANOVA)

Source of contrast	Sum of squares	Average of squares	Freedom degrees	**F**	**Statistical significance**
Between groups	19.461	9.730	2	24.123	.000*
Within groups	47.193	.403	117		
Total	66.653		119		

*** Statistical significance at the level (a=0.05)**

Table (9) showed that there are statistically significant differences at the level of (a=0.05) between the means of the sample members in the total score of the scale of language social use according to the severity of disability, where the value of (F) (24.123) and the level of significance (0.00). To find out the reason of the differences, Scheffe test for variable al comparisons was conducted and Table (10) shows the results.

Table No. (10): Scheffe test for variable al comparisons of language social use scale according to the severity of disability

Sig.	**Difference between averages (I-J)**	**Severity of disability**	
		J	**I**
0.004	.4445*	average	simple
0.000	1.1344*	severe	simple
0.001	.6898*	severe	average

* Statistical significance at the level (a=0.05)

Table (10), where the arithmetic mean of the mild disability category was greater than the arithmetic means of the moderate and severe disability categories, demonstrated significant differences in the level of language social use between the mild disability category and the moderate and severe disability categories at the level of (= 0.05).

There were also significant differences at the level of (α = 0.05) in the level of language social use between the moderate disability group and the severe disability category, and the mean for the moderate disability group was greater than the mean for the severe disability category. The means and SD of the samples' responses

on the variables of the "language social use" scale were calculated according to the severity of the handicap, as shown below, to determine the significance of the variations in the variable s of the scale.

Table (11): Arithmetic means and Standard Deviations related to"Language Social Use" Scale according to the Severity of Disability

Variable	SD	AM	Number	category
Language use for reasons	0.65	2.21	61	simple
	0.83	1.80	40	average
	0.58	1.10	19	severe
Adapt the language to meet the needs of the listener and the situation	0.79	1.82	61	simple
	0.68	1.29	40	average
	0.50	0.70	19	severe
Follow the rules of conversations and storytelling	0.74	1.84	61	simple
	0.74	1.42	40	average
	0.63	0.68	19	severe

Table (11) showed that there are clear differences between the means of the samples' responses in the variables of "language social use" scale according to the severity of disability. Multiple variance analysis (MANOVA) was used to assess if the differences between the means are statistically significant at the level of (= 0.05), as indicated in Table (12).

Table (12): (MANOVA)

Source of contrast	Field	Sum of squares	Freedom degrees	Average of squares	F	Sig.
Severity of disability Wilks' Lambda 0.696 Sig. 0.000	Language use for reasons	18.370	2	9.185	18.465	0.000*
	Adapt the language to meet the needs of the listener and the situation	20.049	2	10.025	19.732	0.000*
	Follow the rules of conversations and storytelling	20.103	2	10.052	19.191	0.000*
	Language use for reasons	58.200	117	0.497		

fault	Adapt the language to meet the needs of the listener and the situation	59.440	117	0.508		
	Follow the rules of conversations and storytelling	61.279	117	0.524		
Total	**Language use for reasons**	76.570	119			
	Adapt the language to meet the needs of the listener and the situation	79.490	119			
	Follow the rules of conversations and storytelling	81.383	119			

*Statistical significance at the level of (0.05)

Table (12) demonstrated that there are statistically significant differences between the arithmetic means of the study sample members in the variables of "language social use" scale, where the value of Woolex Lambda (0.696) and the level of significance. (0.000). Scheffeh test for variable al comparisons was carried out to determine the cause of the discrepancies, as indicated in Table. (13).

Table No. (13) Schiffe's test for variable comparisons of "language social use" scale according to the severity of disability

Variable	I	J	**Difference between averages (I-J)**	Sig.
The language use for different reasons	simple	average	.4104*	0.019
	simple	severe	1.1082*	0.000
	average	severe	.6978*	0.003
Adapting language to meet the listener's needs and the situation	simple	average	.5304*	0.002
	simple	severe	1.1204*	0.000
	average	severe	.5900*	0.014
Following the rules of conversations and storytelling	simple	average	.4264*	0.017
	simple	severe	1.1601*	0.000
	average	severe	.7336*	0.002

* Statistical significance at the level of (0.05 = ()

Table (13) showed significant differences at the level of (α = 0.05) in all variables of "language social use" scale between the mild disability category and the classifications of moderate and severe disability, where the arithmetic mean of the mild disability category was more than the arithmetic mean of the classifications of moderate and severe disability.

There were also significant differences at the level of (α = 0.05) in all variables of "language social use" scale between the moderate disability category and the severe disability category, where the arithmetic mean of the moderate disability category was more than the arithmetic mean of the severe disability category.

The researcher explains this result to the need to teach, train and develop language acquisition and increase the linguistic stock of their communicative function. Language is the focus of learning and the primary tool through which teachers can access students to the entire curriculum, and learning acquisition is a major concern for students with moderate disabilities more than students with severe disabilities.

5. Recommendations:

According to the study results, we recommended the following:

1. Conducting further studies on the topic of social employment among children with special needs.
2. Conducting descriptive research and studies on the language social use and linking it to other variables.

References:

Almehmadi, W. Tenbrink, T &Sanoudaki, E. (2020). "Pragmatic and Conversational Features of Arabic-Speaking Adolescents With Autism Spectrum Disorder: Examining Performance and Caregivers' Perceptions". Journal of Speech ،Language ،and Hearing.63(7):2308-2321.

Al-Zariqat, Ibrahim. (2020). Effective interventions with autism spectrum disorder therapeutic practices based on scientific research. (I1).

American Psychiatric Association (APA). (2013). "Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders, fifth edition (DSM-5)". Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.

American Psychiatric Association (APA). (2022). "Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders, fifth edition (DSM-5- TR)". Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.

ASHA. (2021). “Language In Brief”. American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA).https://www.asha.org/practice-portal/clinical-topics/spoken-language-disorders/language-in-brief/

ASHA. (2021). “Social Communication Disorder”. American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA). https://www.asha.org/practice-portal/clinical-topics/social-communication-disorder/

ASHA. (2021). “Social Communication”. American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA). https://www.asha.org/public/speech/development/social-communication/

Baixauli-Fortea, I. Miranda Casas, A. Berenguer-Forner, C. Colomer-Diago, C &Roselló-Miranda, B. (2019). “Pragmatic competence of children with autism spectrum disorder. Impact of theory of mind, verbal working memory”. ADHD symptoms, and structural language. Applied Neuropsychology: Child. 8: 101 - 112.

Bruyneela, E. DemurieaInge, E. Zink, P. Warreyn, P. &Herbertr, O. (2019). “Exploring receptive and expressive language components at the age of 36 months in siblings at risk for autism spectrum disorder”. Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders. 66 (10).

Cardillo, R. Mammarella, I. Demurie, E. Giofrè, D &Roeyers, H. (2021). “Pragmatic Language in Children and Adolescents With Autism Spectrum Disorder: Do Theory of Mind and Executive Functions Have a Mediating Role?”.Autism Research (INSAR). 14(5): 932-945.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). (2022).”Autism spectrum disorder (ASD): Data &Statistics. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention". USA. https://www.hhs.go

Chung, S & Son, J. (2020). “Visual Perception in Autism Spectrum Disorder: A Review of Neuroimaging Studies”. SoaChongsonyonChongsinUihak. 31(3): 105–120.

Colle, L. Cohen, S. Wheelwright, S & Lely, H. (2007). “Narrative Discourse in Adults with High-Functioning Autism or Asperger Syndrome”. Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders. 38: 28–40.

Dar Al Fikr. Jordan. Zriqat, Ibrahim. (2018). Speech and language disorders diagnosis and treatment. Dar Al Fikr. Jordan.

Dar Al Fikr. Jordan. Zriqat, Ibrahim. (2019). Life skills for people with disabilities: basic considerations and intervention procedures. (I1).

Fernanda, D. Fernandes, C & Daniela, R. (2011). “Language Assessment in Autism”.

Hage, S. Sawasaki, L. Hyter, Y &Fernandes, F. (2021). “Social Communication and pragmatic skills of children with Autism

Spectrum Disorder and Developmental Language Disorder". CODAS, 34 (2): 17.

Kid, Sense. (2020). "Social Communication (Pragmatics)". Kid Sense Child Development Corporation Pty Ltd.

Kodak, T & Clements, A. (2009). "Acquisition OfMands And Tacts With Concurrent Echoic Training". Journal Of Applied Behavior Analysis, 42(4): 839–843

Lavi, A &Mainess, K. (2019). "A Comparative Analysis of Social (Pragmatic) Communication Skills in Students with High-Functioning Autism and Pragmatic Language Impairment Using Video-Based Assessments". Autism Open Access,. 9(2): 239

Makinen, L. Loukusa, S. Leinonen, E. Moilanen, I. Ebeling, H &Kunnari ,S. (2014). "Characteristics of narrative language in autism spectrum disorder: Evidence from the Finnish". Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders. 8: 987–996.

Miller, M. Young, G. Hutman, T. Johnson, S. Schwichtenberg, A &Ozonoff, S. (2015). "Early pragmatic language difficulties in siblings of children with autism: Implications for DSM-5 Social Communication Disorder?".J Child Psychol Psychiatry. 56(7): 774–781 .

Norbury, C. T. Rhea & P Frazier, C. (2014). "Pragmatics abilities in narrative production: a cross-disorder comparison". Journal of Child Language , 41(3): 485-510.

ODonnell, E. (2019). "The Roles of Semantic Relatedness and Narrative Structure in Narrative Comprehension in ASD". Theses Undergraduate Theses.The University of Vermont

Rivard, M & Forget, J. (2012). "Verbal Behavior in Young Children with Autism Spectrum Disorders at the Onset of an Early Behavioral Intervention Program". The Psychological Record, 62: 165–186.

Roquetaa, C &Katsosb, N. (2020). "A Distinction Between Linguistic and Social Pragmatics Helps the Precise Characterization of Pragmatic Challenges in Children With Autism Spectrum Disorders and Developmental Language Disorder". Ournal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research. 63: 1494–1508.

Simmons, E &Volkmara, F. (2014). "Assessing Pragmatic Language in Autism Spectrum Disorder: The Yale in vivo Pragmatic Protocol". Journal of speech, language, and hearing research: JSLHR.

Volden, J & Phillips, L. (2010). "Measuring Pragmatic Language in Speakers With Autism Spectrum Disorders: Comparing the Children's Communication Checklist—2 and the Test of Pragmatic Language". American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology. 19: 204–212.