Politeness Strategies Performed by Teachers: A Case of Assisting Elicitation in Children with Autism

Huma Batool*
Tehmina Farrukh**
Sadia Irshad***

Abstract

The current research explores politeness strategies employed by the teachers for successful elicitation of language from children with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD). Data of the study is collected from classroom interaction of 13 verbally autistic children having bilingual background. After building the corpus, data is transcribed and analyzed on the basis of the theoretical framework proposed by Brown and Levinson (1978). The results of the study suggest that mental ability and autistic condition of children play a determining role in the selection of politeness strategy/strategies by teachers for linguistic elicitation. The findings also suggest that non-verbal acts performed by the teacher aid in getting attention from children with autism.

Keywords: Politeness Strategies, children with autism, Brown and Levinson

*   Assistant Professor, Department of English, Air University, Islamabad
    humabatool2019@gmail.com
** MPhil Scholar (Linguistics), Department of English, Air University, Islamabad
    tehmina.farrukh@uettaxila.edu.pk
*** Assistant Professor, Department of English, Air University, Islamabad.
    sadiyairshad@gmail.com

Introduction

Autism is a complex neurodevelopmental disorder which hampers an individual's socialization and communication abilities (DSM V, 2013). Assisting and managing such children require teachers' competence in language exploitation to carry out successful communication and interaction with people with autism (Sugini, Djatmika, & Maryadi, 2016). Besides inability at reciprocal interaction, receptive language impairment and expressive language difficulties (Hudry, et al., 2010), structural language difficulties with respect to any event or situation (Manolitsi & Botting, 2011) and non-literal and pragmatic language development difficulties (Whyte & Nelson, 2015) also characterize children with autism. Moreover, lack of copying and imitating others in words and/or actions, another valuable social adaptation, also causes communication difficulties in people with autism (Hopkins, Yuill, & Branigan, 2021).

Teacher-student relation plays an important role in academic communicative interactions. Empirical study conducted by Cornelius-Whilte (2007) shows that "positive teacher-student relationship is closely associated with positive child outcomes, such as the development of children's social skills." In the domain of autism, student teacher relationships are important for the academic and social development of children with autism (Feldman, et al., 2019). Hence, the study is an endeavor to see the role of politeness strategies used by teachers for successful interaction with autistic children in a bilingual context. Unlike previous studies (Sugini, Djatmika, & Maryadi, 2016; Yoga, Ketut, & Hery, 2018), this study reports the findings from a bilingual context of Urdu and English.

Literature Review

Lakoff (1973) concentrated on the supportive features of politeness and stated that *"politeness is for reaffirming and strengthening relationships"*. Sagae, Lavie, and MacWhinney (2005) and Lu (2009) reported the use of statistical parser to automate sophisticated measures of syntactic development, by looking at the performance comparable to those obtained by manual annotation. Emily T., Roark, Black, and Santen (2011), identified speech markers in children with Autism Spectrum Disorder following computational methodologies. Their research integrated features from automatic morpho-syntactic and syntactic annotation which is helpful in identifying common errors in language produced by children

with autism. The results of their research reported to be utilized in detecting and correcting common ESL errors.

Conversational style of an adult diagnosed with autism was analyzed by Dobbinson, Perkins, and Boucher (1998). Using Conversational Analysis as an analytical tool to explore the differences between conversational features of an autistic individual and a normal person, the author reports the differences as *"cognitively motivated"*. Following the same tradition, many studies have been conducted to look into the conversational patterns of autistic subjects following Conversational Analysis as an analytical tool to investigate following a corpus-based approach as methodology to yield significant results. As autistic children are slow learners, it is not unusual that they encounter a variety of challenges in their academic life. In this regard, Shi (2018) corpus based study to explore the effects of visuals in teaching reports the significance of using visuals and images as pedagogical tools to enhance the learning ability of children with autism.

Teaching children with autism requires special strategies combining verbal and non-verbal aspects of language for communication. Teacher's role and behavior plays an important role and greatly influences children with autism. Significance of non-verbal behavior as part of multimodal interaction in order to transfer knowledge and assist children with autism was investigated by a group of researchers. According to Djatmika, Wibowo, and Sugini 2018, the use of full language and stimuli including written words in order to engage children can lead to a better understanding and comprehension of complex language and literacy skills performed by children with autism.

Politeness theory as Analytical framework

Politeness Principle implies that people should minimize the expression of impolite beliefs and maximize the expression of polite beliefs (Leech, 2014). The classification of *Politeness* strategy proposed by Brown and Levinson (1978) are "bald-on record", which show the highest degree of directness; further realized in speech acts via *positive politeness* and *negative politeness;* and *off-record* expressed the degree of indirectness. Moreover, Brown and Levinson suggested further fifteen (15) super strategies for positive face, ten (10) for negative face and fourteen (14) for off record politeness.

Brown and Levinson's approach to Politeness, to date, has proven to be extremely significant in its generation of research. Because of its completeness and universality in nature, many empirical studies are

conducted adopting Brown and Levinson's model of Politeness as a reference point. One of the contributing factors in current research is that although a limited number of similar studies have been conducted in the same domain of children with autism. However, in the bilingual context, in the case of Urdu and English language, to my knowledge there is very little work that has been reported or done.

Data Collection and Methodology

Thirteen children (7 B; 4 G) with autism, between 6 and 13 years were the participants of the study. The linguistic data (that was in English and Urdu) of interactive classroom sessions with all 13 verbal children with autism was transcribed and tagged according to the theoretical framework of politeness (Brown & Levinson, 1978). Code BOR represents Bald on Record, PPS for positive politeness strategies, NPS for negative politeness strategies and ORP for off-record politeness strategies. For the purpose of this study, we have coded the data based on the strategies of the politeness framework selected. The next step involves the analysis of the coded data by listing the reasons for every utterance and categorizing these utterances according to the preferred politeness strategies.

The methodology followed in this study has combined corpus linguistics (CL) techniques within the framework of Politeness Theory. Corpus Linguistics (CL) has guided the collection, annotation and analysis of data from the corpus by means of quantitative computer-assisted methodology. The data then has been annotated and tagged manually with labels for *politeness acts* by the researcher following the theoretical framework offered by theory of Politeness proposed by Brown and Levinson (1978). Linguistic annotation is a highly intricate interpretive process, especially in case of pragmatic annotation. The complexity inherent in this task is partly due to the fact that it takes into account levels above the individual words and may even need to refer to contextual information beyond those textual units that are commonly referred to as a "sentence" or "utterance". To serve the purpose, POS (parts-of-speech) or semantic tagging or annotation is not considered, because the data is code switched in nature.

Analysis, Results and Discussion

In each of the interactions carried out for elicitation, each teacher performs differently in terms of number of turns, the number and type of act of

politeness strategies including non-verbal aspects of behavior. The turn and the type of act for each student are considerably related to the autism condition each child possesses. Only initials are written for keeping the identity of the students confidential. Table 1 shows the performance of the teachers against children with autism in general. Turns taken only by the teacher for elicitation are identified and tagged and analyzed. It is noteworthy to see that the condition of the children can play a major role in determining the number of acts the teacher produced in the interaction. The more mild-moderate the condition is, the more acts the teacher has produced in accommodating elicitation.

Table 1
Politeness Strategies Performed by Teachers

Name of student	Gender	Autism Condition	Number of turns	Politeness strategies				
				Bald-on	Positive	Negative	Off-Record	Non-verbal
AhAz	Boy	Severe	83	0	44	15	23	2
AhNm	Boy	Mild-moderate	68	0	22	22	27	1
Aw	Boy	Mild-moderate	110	0	35	33	32	19
Az	Girl	Severe	74	0	32	22	26	1
Hm	Boy	Severe	61	0	11	13	25	13
Ib	Boy	Mild-moderate	71	0	39	18	18	6
Is	Boy	Severe	94	0	27	25	22	7
Mm	Girl	Mild-moderate	64	0	30	20	13	2
Ms-A	Boy	Mild-moderate	41	0	23	8	8	2
Ms-B	Boy	Mild-moderate	86	0	45	12	31	3
Rn	Boy	Mild-moderate	88	0	39	18	22	18
Wn	Girl	Severe	99	0	52	22	25	4
Zn	Girl	Mild-moderate	61	0	37	32	18	0
					436	*260*	*290*	

Another important feature is that no bald-on act was identified with any of the students. Bald-on record refers to a high degree of directness. Although the teacher motivates the students to take part in the conversation, in such a context where children with specific needs, i.e., autistic children, commanding the students directly may threaten student's faces. So, no bald-on record utterance is identified in the data. However, most of the utterances used to command or give imperatives were used with such a selection of words that it softens the effect and thus making it part of negative politeness. The teacher seems to be dominant in making use of politeness strategies; however, the teacher did not use commanding tone, which is otherwise common in such a context.

Corroborating with the findings of Sugini, Djatmika, & Maryadi, (2016), the findings of the research suggest that only a fewer number of strategies from the politeness theory (Brown & Levinson, 1978) are identified. Number of politeness strategies performed by the students is not explored in the research. However, the dominance of teachers in producing the language and having maximum number of turns is mainly because they have to interact and make students with autism interact with them. The autistic children are observed as mostly passive in the classroom discourse. The teacher has to motivate and use contextual clues, hints and associations frequently to get reply from the children. The detail of strategies used is as following:

Results of Positive-politeness strategy
The positive politeness strategies are utilized to satisfy the positive face of the listener. Positive politeness indicates a similar want between the interlocutors. In this data of elicitation, based on the classification of Brown and Levinson (1978), politeness strategies employed by the teacher are identified in Table 2:

Table 2
Teachers' Positive-Politeness Strategies

Sr No	Positive-Politeness Strategies	Data Coding	Teacher
1.	Notice, attend to Hearer	PPS 1	88
2.	Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with Hearer)	PPS 2	9
3.	Intensify interest to Hearer	PPS 3	42
4.	Use in-group identity markers	PPS 4	106
5.	Seek agreement	PPS 5	42
6.	Avoid disagreement	PPS 6	53
7.	Presuppose, raise, assert common ground	PPS 7	-
8.	Joke	PPS 8	-
9.	Assert or presuppose Speaker's knowledge of and concern for Hearer's wants	PPS 9	5
10.	Offer, promise	PPS 10	5
11.	Be optimistic	PPS 11	-
12.	Include both Speaker and Hearer in the activity	PPS 12	22
13.	Give or ask for reasons	PPS 13	4
14.	Assume or assert reciprocity	PPS 14	11
15.	Give gifts to listener (goods, sympathy, and understanding, cooperation)	PPS 15	49
			436

Whenever a teacher wanted to open her conversation with any autistic child, she employed positive politeness strategy *PPS 1* i.e., *strategy 1: Notice or attend to the hearer*, by using greeting phrases like *"Assalam-o alaikom,"* or *"How are you?"*. It is the second most employed strategy in positive politeness strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson. It is assumed that the teacher makes use of a questioning strategy to engage the students in the conversation. Teacher considers it effective in initiating the interaction with autistic children. Other such examples of the teacher employing strategy 1 can be seen through the concordance line: *"Teacher: acha is waqt kahan aye hoy ho ap?" (PPS 1)*

By asking this question, the teacher is trying to attend to the child (hearer's) interest. This is perhaps a very good way to extend conversation with children with autism by asking such questions, who usually have limited associations. Moreover, to initiate a conversation and to maintain

cooperative interaction with children with autism, besides prior reputation, trust building with people with autism is crucial (Maurera, Chambon, Bourgeois-Gironde, Leboyer, & Zalla, 2018). Hence, the teacher employed *strategy 2: Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with Hearer)* to talk and ask more about student's interest and upon more inquiry immediately got other associative response as well:

> *"Teacher: hmmm? Work time hota hai. Phir work time kay baad Wn kahaan jatee ha?*
> *Student: Peshawar jaatee hy*
> *Teacher: Acha? Peshawar? Peshawar kon rehta hy?... (PPS 2)*
> *Teacher: or dadoo bhi*
> *Student: nano bhee"*

For autistic children it is very important to maintain their interest. They can easily lose attention and can stray in terms of imagination. So, to keep on track, and for successful elicitation the teacher employed *Strategy 3: Intensify interest to hearer*. This strategy is used to make connections as well.

> *"Child: <an activity book> ((uttered suddenly as if recalled)) >an answer book<*
> *Teacher: answer book. Okay= (PPS 3)*
> *Child: sound book*
> *Teacher: sound book ok (PPS 3)"*

The teacher employed *strategy 4 (Use in-group identity marker, PPS 4)* for encouraging the students to identify themselves as a part of the group. The analysis identifies the use of utterances like:*"Teacher: Ad kia karta hy school mein? Ad to the poem ati hy?"*. The use of such phrases help to face threatening acts. Moreover, the teacher does not nominate a student directly for a task. In fact, the nomination is for the sake of grabbing attention. Therefore, this positive-politeness strategy remained most frequent in the data. For successful elicitation, the teacher sometimes seeks approval by applying *strategy 5: seek agreement POS 5*. This is a good way of getting a favorable response.

> *"Teacher: aaj aap park nahee gain aa aaj park day thaa*
> *Student: silent*
> *Teacher: park day thaa naa? Hoon?... (PPS 5)*
> *Student: nahee gai thay"*

Teacher employed *strategy 6 Avoid disagreement PPS 6*, in order to guide and bring students in the right direction for successful elicitation. If

students' reply is not according to what the teacher is asking for then instead of directly refusing or saying no, by developing association or by giving reference the process of interaction is carried out. Since children with autism lack effective receptive skills (Hudry, et al., 2010), this strategy also facilitates effective comprehension for children with autism.

> *"Teacher: nahee soaiy tau nahee thay. Us kay baad kiya kiyaa thaa? (PPS 6)*
> *Child: us kay baad kaam kiya thaa*
> *Teacher: kon saa kaam kiya?*
> *Child: ABC (wala)*
> *Teacher: ABC tau nahee kiya tha! Wo tau shuroo main kiya thaa (PPS 6)"*

According to Brown and Levinson (1978) disputes and clashes of opinion are considered as positive-face threatening acts. In this way the speaker conveys to the recipient that they are wrong in their perceptions or may be misguided or at times unreasonable on a particular matter. To reduce such threat, they proposed *positive-politeness "Avoid disagreement"*. An example from the data shows that instead of telling directly that a student is not at home the teacher gives justification for the associations available at home.

> *"Student: ghar main*
> *Teacher: ghar main tau mama hotee hain. Yusra hotee hai! (PPS 6)"*

Strategy 9 Assert or presuppose Speaker's knowledge of and concern for Hearer's wants PPS 9, is somewhat similar with strategy 1. However, the difference is related to the hearer's pre-existing knowledge in this positive-politeness strategy. The teacher exhibits her concerns towards the student by applying this strategy. Although the child did not utter any word or ask for anything, the teacher by her guess came to know what the child wanted at that time. This shortened the distances as well.

> *"Teacher: idhar haath do. Sardee lag rehee hai? Main haath garam ker daitee hoon.". (POS 9)*

The analysis reveals that the teacher makes attempts to encourage the positive face of the students. The teacher made use of strategy *10* as the teacher offered help and also promised to facilitate students. Such an utterance is commonly found immediately before an offer or promise. When a teacher makes a promise, it motivates the autistic children as they understand that they would be rewarded if a desired act would be performed. Attending the child's interest in this way is a kind of positive

politeness strategy that follows willingness to speak by the child (Sugini, Djatmika, & Maryadi, 2016). So, this strategy helped teachers in encouraging autistic children to take part in conversation.

> *"Teacher: story book? Story book chaheeay Mm ko?*
> *Student: ((seemed satisfied upon the idea that her requirement is being recognized))*
> *Teacher: Mm pehlay mujhay reply karay gee phir main Mm ko story book doon gee. Phir hum story book perhain gay! (PPS 10)*
> *Student: ((sat silently on the chair))"*

For successful elicitation and interaction with children with autism it is very important to involve them practically into the action with the teacher. The teacher employed *strategy 12 to include the Speaker and Hearer in the activity PPS 12,* through the use of *"hum".* The use of the inclusive pronoun "we" encourages the autistic children to assume an environment of cooperation, thus helping the teacher to remove the face-threatening acts (FTAs).

> *"Teacher: acha Ma nay yeh kiya likha hai? (PPS 12)*
> *Child: ((made some sound again – this time unintelligible))*
> *Teacher: Ma mujhay perh kay batai gaa (PPS 12)"*
> *"Teacher: abi hum poem parhay gy" (PPS 12)*

Differences can be observed while interacting. Especially in cases where students are autistic, who have relatively limited knowledge about language, nouns and things around them. They get easily disturbed if routine schedules are not followed. Discussion about out-of-the-routine schedules becomes out-of-the-context linguistic interaction and it becomes difficult for children with autism to interpret the received information (Saalasti, et al., 2008). So, redress this Brown and Levinson (1978) has proposed *strategy 13 give or ask for reason PPS 13*. In case of autistic children by applying this positive politeness strategy the teacher redresses the FTA by justifying and giving reasons.

> *"Teacher: acha aj weather kesa hy?*
> *Student: rain*
> *Teacher: rain. Aaj aap park main kiyoon nahee gai? (PPS 13)*
> *Student: silent*
> *Teacher: aaj aap park nahee gain naa aaj park day thaa. aj hum park kiun nahi gay? Kiun k barish thi (PPS 13)"*

Research shows that autistic children tend to forget things easily since they have difficulty orienting and shifting attention (Macoun, Schneider, Bedir,

Sheehan, & Sung, 2021). Their attentional pattern is linked to motivation and reinforcement provided (Alloway & Lepere, 2019). Positive-politeness *strategy 14 Assume or assert reciprocity PPS 14* employed by the teacher in order to maintain routine and scheduled tasks of singing and reading poems with children. The limitation of linguistic ability of the students has also contributed to this choice of strategy by the teacher.

> *"Student: °twinkle°*
> *Teacher: twinkle. Sunao 'twinkle twinkle' (PPS 14)*
> *Student: little star*
> *Teacher: very good 'little star'*
> *Student: how I wonder*
> *Teacher: how I wonder (PPS 14)*
> *Student: °what you are°*
> *Teacher: what you are (PPS 14)"*

In any context, praises and compliments play a vital role in encouraging interpersonal relationships between teachers and students. Same is true for individuals with developmental disabilities (Hood, Olsen, Luczynski, & Francesca A. Randle, 2020). For successful interaction and elicitation, the goal of the teacher is to help students and believe that they have the skills to succeed. The way teachers compliment students has an impact on how successful students perceive themselves. By employing *strategy 15 give gifts to listeners i.e. goods, sympathy, and understanding, cooperation: PPS 15* the teacher appreciates and thus motivates her students. This is perhaps the most needed action by children with autism. They are required to be motivated a lot in order to have successful interactions and learn new things. Remarks like *"very good", "good job", "well done", "high ten"* and *"wow"* are common in this regard. In addition, because of the limitation of utterance to express something, it was possible to express politeness non verbally. Non-verbal politeness is also shown by the teacher by taking students in her hand and by showing friendly facial expressions.

Result of negative politeness strategies
Being indirect is one of the major characteristics of negative politeness. According to the findings, the teachers attempted to be indirect to redress the face threatening of the hearer, therefore negative politeness strategy is used as can be seen in Table 4. As the purpose of the conversation is elicitation and interaction with autistic children, hedging seems to be the most important linguistic feature identified in the data. As children with autism can get easily offended and their behavior can get out of control so by posing direct questions teachers can threaten their face. Moreover,

unlike normal children, autistic children in order to remain focused and in order to get required answers are usually asked a single question multiple times in order to get the desired answer for successful elicitation.

Table 3
Details of Negative Politeness Strategies

Sr. No	Negative-Politeness Strategies defined by Brown and Levinson (1978)	Data Coding	Teacher
1.	Be conventionally indirect	NPS 1	56
2.	Questions, hedge	NPS 2	193
3.	Be Pessimistic	NPS 3	-
4.	Minimize the imposition	NPS 4	1
5.	Give deference	NPS 5	-
6.	Apologies	NPS 6	-
7.	Impersonalize speaker and Hearer	NPS 7	-
8.	State the Face Threatening Act as a general rule	NPS 8	-
9.	Nominalize	NPS 9	10
10.	Go on record as incurring debt, or as not indebting Listener	NPS 10	-
			260

Therefore, to avoid this issue and redress negative faces, the teacher remained indirect, used hedges and then the teacher applied a questioning strategy. Research studies provide evidence that children with autism, as compared to developing children, typically exhibit significant limitation in quality and quantity of verbal and non-verbal response to elicitation or questions posed by the teacher (Saalasti, et al., 2008) (Manolitsi & Botting, 2011). So, the teachers have to repeat the questions unconventionally or in an indirect manner to remove the negative face threatening acts.

　"Teacher: Music teacher atay hain na?" (NPS 1)
　Student: silent
　Teacher: Music teacher atay hain na? hain?" (NPS 1)
　"Teacher: Phir IB ghar chala jata hy na?" (NPS 1)
　"Teacher: Play time kay baad snack kartay ha na" (NPS 1)

Social initiation is a core deficit in children with autism. Hedges are an important part of polite conversation. Hedges make whatever is said or asked less direct. Asking direct questions can prompt autistic children to behave abnormally.

> *"Teacher: acha phir*
> *Teacher: Phir homework kay baad kia karaya teacher nay?" (NPS 2)*
> *"Teacher: isko bhi hum dekhay gy, pehly bataey ap ye bataey ap is*
> *mein color kar saktay hain?" (NPS 2)*

Negative face threatening act of minimizing imposition works in compliance with non-verbal act of teacher. Only one such evidence was identified from the text. By her non-verbal act, she has tried to redress this face threatening act: *"Teacher: Idher hath do. Sardee lag rahi ha?" (NPS 4).* It is very important to use honorific words with children with autism to motivate them and to make them feel associated with their mentor. *Strategy 5, NPS 5* is related to giving deference. Although the text has plenty of examples where the teacher is interacting respectfully with autistic children, these are tagged under positive politeness strategy categories.

Strategy 9 Nominalization (NPS 9) is applied by the teacher to diminish the speaker's active participation. As the purpose of utterances was successful elicitation and interaction with autistic children, so this strategy was used sometimes to lessen the teacher's reference of active participation in the activity: *"Teacher: sab say pehly aap kia kartay ho school main aa kay? Sab sa pehlay ap konsa kam kar ka detay ha mujhy?" (NPS 9)*

Result of Off-record politeness strategies

It is the most favored form of politeness strategy employed by the teacher for interaction. Autistic children tend to remember things with associations, and they need to remind and repeat again and again. Off record politeness strategies are also observed to great extent in interactive sessions for elicitation.

Table 4
Details of Off-Record Politeness Strategy

Sr No	Off-record Politeness Strategies defined by Brown and Levinson (1978)	Data Coding	Teacher
1.	Give Hints	ORP1	59
2.	Give association clues	ORP 2	197
3.	Presuppose	ORP 3	-
4.	Understate	ORP 4	-
5.	Overstate	ORP 5	-
6.	Use tautologies	ORP 6	-
7.	Use contradiction	ORP 7	-
8.	Be ironic	ORP 8	-
9.	Use metaphors	ORP 9	-
10.	Use rhetorical questions	ORP 10	-
11.	Be ambiguous/ be vague	ORP 11	-
12.	Over-generalize	ORP 12	-
13.	Displace Hearer	ORP 13	-
14.	Be incomplete, use ellipsis	ORP 14	34
			290

Hints and Associations as a subcategory of this strategy are the most frequently used and the most preferred strategies applied by the teacher. Table 4 presents the results of off-record politeness strategy. These strategies are usually common in classroom context. Specially in the case of elicitation in the classroom context of children with ASD. Autistic children tend to forget things easily. In order to retain associations, repetition and reinforcement and hinting play an important role. Whenever the teacher wanted to get a favorable response, she usually applied *off-record politeness strategy 1 give hints (ORP 1).* As seen from the text, the teacher at times gives hints in order to put students on the right path and to achieve social pragmatic function.

    "Teacher: in ko daikhain ((pointed at the teacher aid)) (NON-VERBAL) (ORP 1)
    Student: ((looked at the teacher aid; uttered something unintelligible-made a sound as if trying to repeat what the adult said))
    Teacher: teacher
    Student: teacher ((repeated meaninglessly in high pitch))
    Teacher: teacher? A ((gave a hint)) (ORP 1) ….
    Student: (anila) ((in unusual shrill voice))"

Language appears to be represented in the human mind in multiple ways, in terms of sensory, functional, hierarchical, and associational parameters. Autistic children tend to exhibit great difficulty in acquiring and recalling semantic knowledge of language. So, *giving association clues (OFF 2)* plays a vital role in this regard. For successful elicitation the teacher usually uses connectives and pointers strategy.

> *"Teacher: Acha, sab say pehlay aap kiya kertay ho school main aa kay. (ORP 2) Sab say pehlay kon saa kaam kertay ho? (ORP 2)*
> *Student: English ((uttered that with muffled plosive sound))*
> *Teacher: English ka?Acah sab say pehlay aap kaa work time hota hai tau English kaa kaam kertay ho? (ORP 2)*
> *Student: ((gave her second hand to the adult))*
> *Teacher: English ka kiya perhtay ho? (ORP 2)*
> *Student: (3 secs) ((trying to enunciate the word))*
> *Teacher: English ka kiya kertay ho?= (ORP 2)*
> *Student: Child:= ABCD"*

However, always giving hints and providing students with association clues may hamper actual interaction and elicitation ability of children with ASD. So, teachers tend to utilize *strategy 14, be incomplete and use ellipsis (ORP 14).* Elliptical phrases also act as hints and clues but comparatively they are larger units of language.

> *"Teacher: Aur exercise main kiya kertee hai Wn?*
> *Student: (2 secs) °°Wn exer°°*
> *Teacher: exercise kon see?*
> *Student: (3 secs) °°( )°° ((mumbled something to herself))*
> *Teacher: ((gave the hint)) tred... (ORP 14)*
> *Student: tre ((repeated after the adult))*
> *Teacher: batao kiya kiya kertee ho aap?*
> *Student: tred. tredfootball ((raised the voice at the end))*
> *Teacher: football? Treadmill (ORP 14)*
> *Student: °°treadmill°° ((uttered with uncertainity unlike the previous turns where she caught the hints immediately- as if it was not there in the memory))"*

Non-verbal strategies performed by the teacher
No one can deny the importance of non-verbal aspects of language in order to maintain successful communication. It involves gesture, body language, paralinguistic features and kinesics. Non-verbal strategies have been reported to facilitate the production of verbal expressions in autism (Djatmika, Wibowo, & Sugini, 2019). Although looking at non-verbal

aspect of interaction is not the primary objective of this study, this aspect is an integral part of teacher-student interaction, especially in the case of verbally autistic children. As can be seen through data that teachers at times have to go beyond what is known as just simple words forming questions, or hints providing assistance. Non-verbal acts like going beyond proximity and taking the hand of students in her own hand in order to have attention, at times tapping on fingers or hands also serve the same purpose. Similarly putting the items in the visual field to have attention and make the child responsive is also another example. Other instances are when the teacher in order to take an introduction from the child holding his arms and pointing at him to aid elicitation, making the child lift his face to prevent him from resting on the table are some of the highlights in terms of non-verbal acts used by the teacher. These acts are employed mostly to gain attention.

Conclusion

The research reports the findings of politeness strategies used by the teacher with the student in the context of a classroom of bilingual verbal autistic children. The findings of the analysis show that positive politeness strategies were the most preferred strategies and in terms of successful elicitation, for negative politeness, and in off-record politeness strategies, indirect questions, hunting and suggestions play a major role in getting responses from children with Autism. As for non-verbal aspect, teachers sometimes have to go beyond words and have to get themselves physically involved with students in order to control them in terms of their behavior and responses. Moreover, as such children at times get hyper over certain questions, so in order to maintain the decorum and keep them calm sometimes teachers have to act non-verbally. For future implication a detailed study can be conducted on non-verbal strategies used by teachers in order to attain successful elicitation. Comparative studies on how and why certain students respond differently to certain questions can be conducted by just looking at the responses from the perspective of cognitive linguistics.

References

Alloway, T., & Lepere, A. (2021). Sustained Attention and Working Memory in Children with Autism Spectrum Disorder. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 68(1), 1-9.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1978). *Politeness Some Universals in Language Usage.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cornelius-Whilte, J. (2007). Learner-Centered Teacher-Student Relationships Are Effective: A Meta-Analysis. *The Review of Educational Research, 77*(1), 113-143.

Djatmika, D., Wibowo, A.H, & Sugini, S. (2018). Teacher Non-Verbal Behaviour as Part of Multimodal Interaction to Children with Autism. *4th PRASASTI International Conference on Recent Linguistics Research (PRASARTI 2018)* (pp. 75-79). Atlantis: Atlantis Press.

Djatmika, D., Wibowo, A. H., & Sugini. S. (2019). Do Teachers' Non-Verbal Behaviors Support the Verbal Production of Children with Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD)? *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, 338*, 118-123.

Dobbinson, S., Perkins, M. R., & Boucher, J. (1998). Structural patterns in conversations with a woman who has autism. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, *31*(2), 113-134.

Emily T., P., Roark, B., Black, L., & Santen, J. (2011). Classification of atypical language in autism. *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Cognitive Modeling and Computational Linguistics* (pp. 88-96). Oregon: Center for Spoken Language Understanding, Oregon Health & Science University.

Hood, S. A., Olsen, A. E., Luczynski, K. C., & Francesca A. Randle. (2020). Improving accepting and giving compliments with individuals with developmental disabilities. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis,* 53(2), 1013–1028.

Hopkins, Z. L., Yuill, N., & Branigan, H. P. (2021). Autistic children's language imitation shows reduced sensitivity to ostracism. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 1-13.

Hudry, K., Leadbitter, K., Temple, K., Slonims, V., McConachie, H., Aldred, C., & Pact Consortium. (2010). Preschoolers with autism show greater impairment in receptive compared with expressive language abilities. *International journal of language & communication disorders*, *45*(6), 681-690.

Leech, G. N. (2014). *The pragmatics of politeness*. Oxford Studies in Sociolinguis.

Lu, X. (2009). Automatic measurement of syntactic complexity in child language acquisition. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, *14*(1), 3-28.

Macoun, S. J., Schneider, I., Bedir, B., Sheehan, J., & Sung, ·. A. (2021). Pilot Study of an Attention and Executive Function Cognitive Intervention in Children with Autism Spectrum Disorders. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders, 51*, 2600–2610.

Manolitsi, M., & Botting, N. (2011). Language abilities in children with autism and language impairment: using narrative as an additional source of clinical information. *Child Language Teaching and Therapy, 27*(1), 39-55.

Maurera, C., Chambon, V., Bourgeois-Gironde, S., Leboyer, M., & Zalla, T. (2018). The influence of prior reputation and reciprocity on dynamic trust-building in adults with and without autism spectrum disorder. *Cognition, 172*, 1-10.

Saalasti, S., Lepistö, T., Toppila, E., Kujala, T., Laakso, M., Nieminen-von Wendt, T., & Jansson-Verkasalo, E. (2008). Language abilities of children with Asperger syndrome. *Journal of autism and developmental disorders*, *38*(8), 1574-1580.

Sagae, k., Lavie, A., & MacWhinney, B. (2005). Automatic measurement of syntactic development in child language. *43rd Annual Meeting on Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)5*, (pp. 197-204). Ann arbor, Michigan.

Shi, J. (2018). Pedagogical Application of Corpus on EFL of Children with Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD): The Function of Visualization on Attention Deficit Problem. *Journal of Educational and Developmental Psychology*, *8*(2), 120-120.

Sugini, Djatmika, & Maryadi. (2016). Politeness Strategies performed by teachers to effectively assist children with autism in their learning process. *Humaniora, 28*(1), 28-36.

Whyte, E. M., & Nelson, K. E. (2015). Trajectories of pragmatic and nonliteral language development in children with autism spectrum disorders. *Journal of Communication Disorders, 54*, 2-14.

Yoga, W. I. G. N. B., Ketut, S., & Hery, S. M. (2018). The implications of politeness strategies among teachers and students in the classroom. In *SHS Web of Conferences* (Vol. 42, p. 00067). EDP Sciences.