

Final Report
to the
Department of Education and Science
and the
Association For All Speech Impaired Children

Dissemination Service Research Project
relating to the
Diploma in Remedial Language Studies
University of Reading

September 1985

1 General background

1.0. Language handicap

The past twenty years have seen a sharply increased awareness of the existence of language handicap in young children, and of the problems these children face, growing up in a society where ability to communicate is a prerequisite for success. There are two main reasons for this, which are reflected in the phrase 'language handicap'. First, unprecedented public attention has been drawn to the importance of language in early learning, and of the need to develop abilities and maintain standards, through the educational linguistic studies of the 1970s, and in particular the publication of the Bullock Report (1975). Secondly, public concern over the nature of handicap has reached unprecedented levels, as is evident from the frequent coverage of the topic in its various forms on radio and television, and most notably through the publication of the Quirk Report (1972) and the Warnock Report (1978). While terminology is by no means consistent, and the associated symptomatology only partly understood, the existence of an entity variously referred to by such phrases as 'language disorder', 'language delay', 'aphasia' or 'specific language needs' is now well recognised in clinical and educational practice.

No detailed survey of the condition has been undertaken in the United Kingdom, and estimates vary greatly, depending on whether we adopt a narrow or broad view of the nature of the language problem. If we adopt a narrow view, recognising only the severest forms of language handicap, and using a criterion such as 'requires the services of a speech therapist' (the criterion of the Quirk Report), then 2-3% of the child population are implicated. If we adopt a broader view, recognising any abnormal pattern

of learning in which language difficulties play a part, the figure will approach 10%. 'Language', in these contexts, includes listening comprehension, speaking, reading and writing, along with the use of any alternative modes of communication, such as signing. Of particular importance, in this respect, is to draw attention to the many children whose language problems have not been recognised, but whose special needs have been defined with reference to some other factor (such as mental deficit or disturbed behaviour).

1.1. Complexity of the condition

Before any discussion of the nature of educational and clinical provision can take place, the uniquely complex nature of the phenomenon of linguistic handicap must be appreciated. If we begin with the well-established clinical axiom that 'anything that can go wrong, does', then we have to take into account the following facts. Any spoken dialect of English contains a system of sounds, grammatical constructions and vocabulary: the approximately 40 consonants and vowels are used in over 200 ways to make up the words of the language; there are over 1000 distinguishable grammatical forms and constructions; and in standard English, the vocabulary available to be learned exceeds half a million words. A normal five-year-old has mastered most of the sound system, all of the basic grammatical structures, and has a vocabulary in excess of 5000 words. In addition, any account of his abilities has to recognise the way he 'speaks' the language, through his control of intonation, stress, rhythm and tone of voice; and also the way he uses the language, to different kinds of people in different social situations. A similar account can be given of the written language: the 26 letters, in their many graphic forms, are used in several hundred combinations, along with such conventions as punctuation and layout, to

produce the visual patterns whose decoding and encoding is taught through the skills of reading and writing. To define the nature of a child's language handicap precisely, all of these variables need to be taken into account.

Precise techniques for the analysis and description of language have been available for half a century, but it is only in the last 20 years that they have come to be used routinely in relation to normal child language acquisition, or in the definition of language handicap. Now that they have, the remarkable intricacy of the task of language learning has begun to be uncovered; the acquisition of small and apparently straightforward areas of language - such as pronouns, or the definite article - turns out to be a highly complicated process, taking several years, and involving the use of a variety of learning strategies. Tentative stages in the acquisition of sounds, grammar, vocabulary and language use have been proposed, and the main findings have already come to be applied in educational and clinical settings. But the field of language acquisition is still in its early days, with most features of language learning imperfectly understood, or yet to be investigated. And as a consequence, the application of acquisitional findings to the field of language handicap has to be carried out with caution, by people who know the strengths and limitations of the available research, and who are capable of evaluating its relevance to remedial work.

1.2. Professional roles

The linguistic welfare of the language handicapped child is primarily in the hands of three categories of professional: the speech therapist, the educational psychologist, and the teacher. Ideally, these three groups

collaborate in developing the child's linguistic skills: the psychologist focusses on the cognitive and social foundations prerequisite for language development; the speech therapist on the child's ability to learn and use the linguistic structures required for adequate everyday conversation; and the teacher on the child's ability to use his language in order to cope with the demands made upon it by the school curriculum. Naturally, these roles must not be viewed as discrete compartments: the teacher who is developing a child's concept of number may have to work on some of the language structures upon which mathematical reasoning relies (such as spatial prepositions, or the comparative construction); similarly, a psychologist or speech therapist may find it useful to relate their intervention to curricular activities. But the focus of the work of each professional is quite different, and is clearly reflected in the syllabuses of training programmes. No speech therapy training course, for example, systematically investigates the way language permeates the curriculum, or provides training in the use of materials relating to mathematics, reading, science, and so on. Or again, no teacher training course provides a thorough training in the techniques of phonetic analysis.

During the 1970s, discussion of these matters brought to light an anomaly, which was striking at the basis of the collaborative ideal. While speech therapists and educational psychologists had lengthy training courses, specially-orientated to their professional roles, there was no training available for those teachers who had special responsibility for the linguistic needs of the language handicapped child, once he arrived in school. Teacher training courses, whether in general or in special education, contained no component in which the nature of language handicap

was systematically investigated, and the skills of remedial language teaching inculcated. After the Bullock Report, a few training courses introduced syllabuses which focussed on the normal development of language skills; but the remedial domain remained unaffected. Until the recent developments reviewed in 1.3, we had never met a teacher in special education who had received any training in the assessment and remediation of language handicapped children. Teachers in mainstream education, of course, fared no better. The inadequacy of this situation was beginning to be recognised in the mid-1970s, but it was the Warnock Report recommendations, and the 1981 Education Act, which introduced an element of urgency. Increasingly, teachers were being asked to take charge of groups of language handicapped children in a special unit, or to allow such a child into a normal classroom, but they had received no training in the kind of problems which they would encounter. The cutbacks in speech therapy services meant that there was only a remote chance of most teachers receiving help from that quarter; and even when a speech therapist was available, most teachers found themselves unable to understand the implications of the language assessments used. The kind of collaboration between speech therapist and teacher which exists in the residential language schools provides a welcome exception to this generalization, but these cater for only a tiny part of the language handicapped population.

1.3. The Diploma in Remedial Language Studies

It was in order to rectify a small part of the above anomaly that the Diploma in Remedial Language Studies (DRLS) was planned in 1978. The initiative came from the Association for All Speech-Impaired Children (AFASIC), whose regular contacts with parents and teachers had early on led

them to recognise the need for teacher training. The Department of Linguistic Science at the University of Reading welcomed the proposal. It had developed considerable experience in post-experience language courses, especially in the fields of foreign language teaching and speech therapy, and it seemed a natural extension to develop a syllabus in the field of mother tongue teaching, with a focus on handicap. The Department contained several people with experience in clinical linguistic research and who had been involved in providing in-service courses on language handicap for teachers; it also housed a speech therapy training course, and a speech therapy clinic. As a consequence, the course was first advertised in 1978, and the first year of students was admitted in 1979. At the time of writing, it seems likely that the final year of this course will run from 1985-6, hence the use of the past tense below.

The DRLS was a nine-month, full-time, post-experience course, running from October to June. The aim was to provide teachers of language-handicapped children with special training in the nature of linguistic handicap, and in the theory and techniques of linguistic assessment and intervention, with particular reference to the role of language in educational development. All categories of linguistic handicap were covered by the course, as were children of all ages and types of school background. However, the course was primarily intended for teachers in special units and schools for children with specific language problems, or for teachers with special responsibility for language problems in other educational settings. Applicants were expected to be qualified teachers, with at least two years' experience of working with language-handicapped children.

The course provided a thorough coverage of the following themes: the theoretical foundations of language; the description of English; the acquisition and development of language in children; the nature of linguistic handicap; the nature and techniques of linguistic assessment; the theory and practice of remedial language teaching; language in educational development; professional roles in remedial language work; the nature and practice of remedial language research; and the use of remedial language materials. In all of this, the term 'remedial' was being used in the broadest sense, synonymous with 'intervention', and was not intended to imply a particular category of child or educational philosophy.

Between 1979 and 1984, the course was directed by Professor D. Crystal, and the course tutor was Miss M. Davison; from 1984 to 1986, following Professor Crystal's departure from the University of Reading, the course was directed by Miss Davison. Several other members of the University's Departments of Linguistics and Psychology were involved in the teaching, as were staff from the local speech therapy, educational psychology, medical, and special needs services.

The following details of the courses taught and methods of assessment should give a clear picture of the nature of the DRLS. It should be borne in mind that between 1979 and 1985 the course content and assessment procedures altered in several ways, in the light of the staff's developing experience of students' needs and potential. The details below are based on the course structure as it had evolved by 1984.

Autumn Term

Introduction to linguistics; Describing the structure of English; Child language acquisition; Introduction to speech and language disorders;

Cognitive prerequisites for language development; LARSP theory and practice; Principles of remedial language work; Practical phonetic skills; Language tests and materials. There were weekly back-up seminars in all areas, individual tutorials at regular intervals, and weekly visits to the University speech therapy clinic.

Lent Term

Structure of English; Practical phonetic skills; Linguistics; Child language acquisition; Language tests and materials; Language in education; Professional roles in remedial language work; Remedial techniques; Sociolinguistic issues. The programme of tutorials and clinic visits continued. One day a week was spent in supervised project work, involving assessment and remedial teaching, at a language unit or school.

Summer Term

The available time during this term was largely devoted to external visits to schools and units specialising in remedial language work. There was a programme of workshops on special topics related to the students' own interests, and (in recent years) talks on dissemination techniques.

Assessment

The assessment was carried out on the basis of both project work and examinations. Two projects of approx 10,000 words each had to be written: one on normal child development; the other on a linguistically-handicapped child. Essays were written relating to the courses in linguistics, psychology, and child language acquisition; and practical examinations were held in several areas of linguistics. Two formal examinations in Language Assessment and Remediation were held in the Summer Term. A separate test established competence in the use of the Reynell Developmental Language Scales.

It is not the concern of the present report to enter into an evaluation of the form and content of the DRLS course, or to comment on the reasons for its impending demise. However, the record would be incomplete if at least the following comments were not made:

(1) The original intention to take 10-12 students a year was never achieved. Although there were usually enough applications, the number taking up the offer of a place in any one year fell well below this target, and on three occasions there were as few as 3 students (see Appendix D). Ironically, it is only in the current, final year, that this target has been achieved. Only three applicants were formally rejected during the six years. In all cases the failure to attend was due to lack of finance - primarily, the shortage of secondments.

(2) The full-time nature of the course made it inappropriate for teachers with a family, especially if they lived far from Reading. There were nonetheless several such students who travelled long distances to attend the course (notably, from Newcastle and Shrewsbury).

1.4 The need for follow-up

During the very first year of the DRLS, it became apparent that we were facing a mammoth pedagogical task. We were committed to training as wide a range of teachers as possible, and for this reason we did not set a formal criterion of entry other than the teacher's initial qualification and at least two years' experience in working with language handicapped children. This meant that most students arrived with little or no previous experience of academic coursework, and a considerable amount of the course tutor's time had to be devoted to training the basic skills of independent study, techniques for writing essays and reports, and so on. As a result, the rate of progress was generally slow, so that by the end of the course little more than a basic training had been achieved. A regular comment

made by students in their third term was that they were at last becoming able to see how the various components of the course came together, and that they wished there was a further term to consolidate their new skills. This suggested the need for some kind of follow-up activity.

A second factor arose out of the nature of the DRLS training - a point on which we focussed in the course on professional roles. It was evident that we were training a new kind of teacher - a 'remedial language teacher' - and it was by no means clear how this category of professional would integrate with other professionals involved with language handicap. We tried to anticipate the problems by having representatives of the main professions hold sessions with the students, but it was plain that the real issues would emerge only when students returned to their individual settings. At this point, we reasoned, they would need to keep in touch, both with us and with each other. This supported the notion of follow-up activities.

A third factor arose from the size of the course. The numbers we were training were tiny, compared with the large number of teachers who were becoming involved with language-handicapped children, few of whom had received any training for this work. We were anxious that the kind of knowledge which diplomates (and the teaching staff) had accumulated through the DRLS should reach as wide a professional audience as possible. At the same time, we recognised that diplomates would be put under considerable pressure if asked to take on extra duties by way of dissemination. This problem required further discussion, and provided a further motivation for follow-up work.

The need for further activities was reinforced by a fourth, external factor. The initial funding for the DRLS had been for a period of three years, and it was unclear how the course might run subsequently. It had to be self-financing, in the economic climate of the time, but it was unlikely that the costs of the course would be met by student fees alone. The DES were unable to fund the course directly. Some other source of funding therefore needed to be found, and it was thought possible that the operation of some kind of dissemination service would be one way of proceeding, whereby those associated with the DRLS would provide 'information' that would be packaged in various ways and sold to interested bodies, such as libraries and LEAs, to help support the cost of running the course.

After preliminary discussion, a formal proposal was made by AFASIC to the DES to support a research project which would determine the viability of dissemination work in this field. This proposal was accepted, and a grant of £30,000 was made available, over a 3-year period, to cover the cost of appointing a half-time project officer, a part-time secretary, and various administrative costs of travelling, duplicating, etc. The terms of reference of the Dissemination Service Research Project (DSRP) were twofold: (i) to assist in the setting up and initial operation of a dissemination service, supplementary to the Diploma course;

(ii) to assist teachers who have taken the course to act as a resource for their own local authorities, as a source of reference and advice to local education authority advisers and other teachers, and to assist with local in-service training courses.

In the event, the anticipated organisation and financial basis of the DSRP proved less than satisfactory, for two reasons (presented in detail in the Interim Report):

(i) The same person (Miss Davison) was appointed to act as half-time DSRP officer as well as half-time DRLS course tutor. This proved to be an impossible work-load, especially when the student numbers increased in 1983 and 1984.

(ii) The national salary awards took up more of the DES grant than had been anticipated, and secretarial hours needed to be increased, to cope with the work-load. There was consequently less money available for other activities than had been expected.

Also, in 1984, there were personnel changes in the Department of Linguistic Science at Reading University, which resulted in a change of administrative direction. Professor Crystal was given part-time leave-of-absence during the 1984-5 session, and Miss Davison took over the running of the DRLS. She thus had to cease acting as dissemination officer. In the interests of preserving continuity until the end of the project period, Professor Crystal offered to devote one day a week of his research leave to act as dissemination officer, and this was accepted. As a consequence of these events, there were several modifications in the range of activities undertaken, as will be summarised below.

2 The Dissemination Service Research Project

2.0 Scope

The purpose of this section is to recapitulate the early history of the DSRP, as presented in the Interim Report, and to give an account of the activities which occupied the Project subsequent to that Report.

2.1 April-December 1982

As we were new to Dissemination work, we spent some time at the outset discovering from colleagues at the DES and in Schools of Education just what was involved. We were presented with a somewhat discouraging picture, for failed projects it seems far outnumber those which have succeeded. The most valuable piece of advice we were given was to 'think small' - in our case, to concentrate on the nucleus of diplomates and work closely with them, to establish what their needs were and how practicable it was to meet them. It was emphasised that a great deal of spade work was involved, not all of which would have positive results. We were told not to expect results too quickly, - and warned (quite correctly, as it turned out) that we would receive criticism for not producing results straight away. One team told us that if we could produce a single viable 'product' at the end of the project, we could consider it a success. We have more than satisfied this criterion, in that we have generated two major projects which will be self-financing (2.4, 2.9). On the other hand, it quickly became apparent, as DRLS estimates were prepared, that there was no way in which the the various products we envisaged could provide a guaranteed income anywhere near what would be required to maintain a full-time academic course, especially given the cut-backs on local authority spending.

The initial discussions took up the first part of the project. We also arranged a one-day conference with diplomats, to inform them of the project's existence, and to obtain initial feedback on the areas we should focus upon. Subsequent correspondence and discussion enabled us to select four main areas as priorities, as follows:

(a) Short-term problems. Diplomats were anxious to have the opportunity to discuss difficulties as soon as they returned to their localities. Some kind of 'immediate feedback' arrangement had to be introduced, and we commenced this directly (see 2.2).

(b) Fact-finding. From the conference and subsequent correspondence, it emerged that no simple generalisation could be made about the needs of diplomats, because of the variety of settings in which they worked. An early priority was therefore a person-by-person study of the nature of each diplomat's setting to establish their needs and the help that might be offered. This fact-finding study was planned towards the end of 1982, and was scheduled to last for a year (see 2.3).

(c) Information. There seemed to be an urgent need for regular information about research and developments in the field of remedial language teaching, which would enable diplomats to be kept up-to-date and to feel in contact with each other. Several proposals were made, and we followed up all suggestions. In the end, we selected three proposals for feasibility studies:

(i) No academic journal existed on the specific area of remedial language teaching theory and practice. It was felt that a special journal devoted to this field would be an ideal forum for discussion, and a means of disseminating information (see 2.4).

(ii) Annual workshops, which would be attended by diplomates and colleagues from their own locality, were felt to be an important early goal (see 2.5).

(iii) The provision of a Newsletter, it was felt, would enable diplomates to raise smaller-scale matters, and generally keep in touch with each other (see 2.6).

(d) Materials. Two kinds of materials were envisaged: items which would enable the diplomate to fulfil the function of a local 'resource' (see 2.7); and items which would assist in the task of teaching (see 2.8). Our early discussions led us to believe that this last goal was very long-term, and not likely to be feasible within a 3-year project.

January 1983-January 1984

The guiding principle during this stage of the project was to keep as many irons in the fire as possible, within the limits of time and resources. We were fortunately able to operate a 'flexitime' arrangement for Miss Davison, so that she could timetable her teaching to fit in with visits to local authority officials and schools. Such visits are never possible to arrange in a straightforward way, and it would have been impossible to make any progress without the cooperation of the members of the Department of Linguistic Science, for which we are most grateful.

2.2 Short-term problems

In the July 1982 conference, we made it clear that both Professor Crystal and Miss Davison would be available for individual consultations as required, over and above the initiatives we were proposing ourselves to introduce. We were pleased with the alacrity with which this offer was taken up. There were a large number of contacts made, by letter, phone,

and visit, and they involved varying amounts of time. Most queries were small-scale, but one diplomate went so far as to produce an entire language teaching scheme. The topics covered a wide range, such as problems of assessment or teaching, advice about planning talks or arranging in-service meetings, and discussing various kinds of personal project. Over the course of the DSRP, we have had over 100 contacts of this kind. More formally, both Professor Crystal and Miss Davison have been involved with in-service discussions and lectures at the request of diplomates: over 20 such meetings, ranging from evening lectures to whole-day conferences, took place in various parts of the country between Easter 1982 and Easter 1985.

2.3 Fact-finding

Late in 1982, we wrote to all diplomates asking them for a list of officials in their localities with whom they are professionally involved (education and health offices, schools, etc.). When these lists were received, we wrote to everyone, informing them of the diplomate's background, and of the research project. We proposed a meeting to discuss how the diplomate's training might best be put to use in that area. Not all areas responded with enthusiasm, but most expressed interest, and we were able to begin a programme of visits in February 1983, which continued until February 1984. Details of each visit are included in Appendix A. We began with Oxfordshire, because we had most diplomates there, and followed this up with Berkshire, West Sussex, the Isle of Wight, and Meath School. An account of these discussions is provided in Section 3.

We called a halt to the programme of visits in early 1984, for three reasons: (i) to give us time to concentrate on the other aspects of the DSRP; (ii) the points being raised were beginning to duplicate; and (iii)

the visits brought to light an unexpectedly depressing picture, which called into question the whole concept of the dissemination service, as originally conceived. It emerged that diplomates were facing major problems which would disallow their involvement in dissemination work on the scale first envisaged. Moreover, the problems they were encountering raised basic questions to do with the recognition of language handicap, and the nature of the provision for dealing with it. The DSRP had no brief to address these questions fully, but as the implementation of any dissemination service is totally dependent on diplomates being given an opportunity to use their skills in relation to the available provision, we have no alternative but to refer to factors which, in our view, militate against this taking place, in the current climate. These are reviewed in Section 3.

2.4 Journal

One of the most commonly-cited 'products' which diplomates asked for was the provision of some regular means of keeping up-to-date with developments in their field. Proposals for both a Newsletter (2.6) and a Journal were made. Our first step was to investigate the nature of the need - to determine, in short, whether our diplomates' views were representative of the wider population. To this end, a questionnaire was devised and circulated to a large number of teachers and other specialists in this country. We are grateful to AFASIC for the opportunity to use their mailing list, which proved to be an extremely fruitful way of obtaining feedback on the proposal. The response was enthusiastic, and several valuable suggestions were made. As a consequence, we drafted a journal proposal, and attempted to interest a publisher. An initial approach to one

publisher produced a negative response. A second publisher showed interest, but withdrew after six months of discussion. Fortunately, our third approach met with success, and a contract with Edward Arnold Ltd was signed in February 1984. The new journal, Child Language Teaching and Therapy, appeared for the first time in 1985, with Professor Crystal as Editor, and Miss Davison as Executive Editor. The DES grant and the role of AFASIC were acknowledged in the first issue. An editorial board was appointed involving scholars from many parts of the world, and an advisory panel of teachers and therapists was appointed to provide feedback about level. The journal's editorial policy is printed as Appendix B.

We should like to record our thanks to Edward Arnold Ltd. for their support and interest in this proposal, and not least for their willingness to make this aspect of the dissemination work genuinely self-financing. A single sum of £5000 was made available to cover the expenses involved in planning and launching the journal during 1984 and 1985. Subsequent journal costs will be borne by Edward Arnold Ltd. Professor Crystal will continue to edit the journal after the DSRP is over; but at the time of writing it is not clear whether Miss Davison will be able to continue as executive editor, in view of the general uncertainties surrounding the DRLS course.

2.5 Workshops

A one-day conference for diplomates was held in July 1983, the main aim of which was to continue discussion of the DSRP, and to obtain agreement about the most urgent needs. A major outcome of this was to hold a workshop at the earliest available opportunity. The first DRLS 'Easter School' was held 16-18 April 1984 at Castle Priory College, Wallingford, on the general

theme of language intervention, and was attended by over 30 diplomates and working colleagues. The occasion was felt to be a success, so a second workshop was organised 10-12 April 1985 at Bulmershe College, Reading, attended by 25 participants, on the theme of language handicap and the curriculum. A copy of the conference programme is in Appendix C.

The annual one-day conferences for diplomates continued to be held throughout the DSRP period, the last of these (November 1984) providing an important occasion for fresh thinking (see 2.9).

2.6 Newsletter

We were somewhat wary of the proposal for a Newsletter, as the success of this kind of enterprise is totally dependent on the opportunity of the readership to send in material, and we knew that the diplomates were extremely hard pressed for time. Nonetheless, in view of the interest in the idea, we went ahead with a first issue at the end of 1983, a second issue in February 1984, and a third in May 1984. However, the response was not good; we found it necessary to force material out of people; and the idea was therefore dropped (though it is replaced by the correspondence column of Child Language Teaching and Therapy, and by the proposal to include a Newsletter as part of NATLIC, 2.9).

2.7 Resource materials

The intention here was to provide audio and video resource materials to assist diplomates (and others) who are preparing talks and other kinds of 'awareness' activity. We were able to do this from time to time upon request, in an ad hoc way, using material collected in the University clinic; but it was plain that a more systematically collected body of data was needed. An MRC grant to Professor Crystal (January 1984-July 1985)

provided equipment and a research assistant to transcribe and analyse samples from several of the departmental tapes, and this has now been completed. However, the proposal to use Miss Davison to collaborate with the research assistant in order to select and organise material for a resource library has not been carried out, due to her full-time involvement as Director of the DRLS. Professor Crystal has been able to do some general library planning and initial cataloguing of the material, in the final year of the DSRP, and he hopes to be able to develop these ideas in further work, either through NATLIC or the DHSS.

2.8 Teaching material

Insufficient proposals for teaching activities have been sent in to make a systematic statement possible. Authors of ideas in this area have been recommended to submit their work to Child Language Teaching and Therapy.

2.9 NATLIC

Our synthesis of comments and reactions to the diplomates' questionnaires and visits left us in no doubt that the major problems facing diplomates, reviewed in Section 3, could not be solved on an individual basis. Broader initiatives were required. Also, by the middle of the DSRP it was becoming clear that dissemination work after the project ended in 1985 would require resources over and above those originally envisaged, and a permanent organisation to promote awareness and activities. It was no longer possible to think of this being centred at Reading, if the DRLS was no longer there, and the most involved staff had left. An alternative model was therefore required.

Professor Crystal's first task as project officer in the final year of the DSRP was to organise a one-day conference of diplomates at which the

proposal to form a National Association of Teachers of Language Impaired Children (NATLIC) was introduced and discussed. There was unanimous support for such an Association, and as a result a questionnaire was devised and circulated to all diplomates, and to all schools and units on the ICAA list. The response to the questionnaire was extremely good, and the idea was strongly supported. Professor Crystal therefore approached various people who had expressed interest in being members of a founding committee. The initial meeting of this committee took place in Reading in June 1985, under the chairmanship of Mr J. Lea, Headteacher of Moor House School, and subsequent meetings have been held. The formal launching of NATLIC is scheduled for 1 January 1986.

The aims of the Association, as they are currently formulated, are:

- (a) To promote professional awareness of the needs of the language impaired child.
- (b) To encourage relevant and effective teaching skills.
- (c) To provide an opportunity for interprofessional cooperation.
- (d) To set up channels of communication at local and national level.
- (e) To represent the interests of its members.

Further details of policy and procedure will be publicised later in 1985.

In many respects, NATLIC is an ideal solution to the problems of long-term dissemination. It is proposed to run an annual conference (which we hope will maintain the impetus of the Easter Schools), a newsletter, and to initiate local groups. Child Language Teaching and Therapy will become formally associated with NATLIC. Through the Association, it would be possible to run in-service courses, and to launch special ventures (such as a tape library). Above all, NATLIC can provide a public voice to address the problems raised by diplomates. It is therefore our view that this organisation will provide the most important memorial to the ideals and aspirations of the DSRP.

3 The diplomates' situation

3.0 Background

As already indicated, an initial step in the project was to visit those who might wish to use a dissemination service, to discuss with them whether such a service was needed, and if so what it should provide and how it could be most effective. The model which the DES had asked us to investigate was one in which teachers, having been seconded by their Authorities to do a specialised DRLS, would be used on their return as resources for the in-service training of other teachers in their area. The first people to be visited, therefore, were teachers who had completed the DRLS. They were employed in the following range of educational settings:

- (i) Special Schools for children with severe language disorders.
- (ii) Language units attached to normal schools.
- (iii) Assessment classes in schools for children with learning difficulties.
- (iv) Advisory posts (providing support for teachers in normal schools).

Where relevant, discussions were also held with the headteachers to whom the diplomates were responsible, and with their speech therapy colleagues. There was general agreement that a dissemination service could be very valuable, but that for a variety of reasons it might be difficult to establish (see below). Further meetings were then held with Special Education Advisers, District Speech Therapists, and Educational Psychologists in the areas where the diplomates were working. Although there was initial antagonism to the idea of a dissemination service from some of them, it was almost entirely concerned with the source of the

dissemination, the nature of the information being disseminated, and in particular whether teachers should be responsible for dissemination at a local level. There was general enthusiasm and support for the establishment of some form of dissemination service.

3.1 Diplomates' work-load

The main problem relating to most teachers employed by LEAs was the fact that dissemination was not part of their official job description. This meant that anything which they undertook to do would have to be done in their own free time. Without exception, they were prepared to do this, and in some cases had already taken part in arranging and speaking at local training sessions. However, as we talked it became apparent that their involvement in their jobs was such that they were already working extremely long hours. In fact, one of the points most frequently made by their colleagues was that the teachers should be protected from any additional demands on their time. This was a particular concern of the headteachers, who were very much aware of the pressure on diplomates. However, the same point was made by several district speech therapists, one of whom expressed her worry that dissemination would be yet another burden imposed on the teacher: 'the teachers would appear to be fully stretched'.

3.2 More teachers

There seem to be several reasons for this heavy work-load. Perhaps the most obvious one is the financial constraints which make it difficult to employ the additional staff required to fulfil the children's needs adequately. One teacher in charge of a language unit showed us her work schedule: it involved a 50-hour week, and working through half of every school holiday, in order to cover the basic classroom requirements. She

was desperate for more staff in the classroom, so that she would have time to run the unit more effectively. Another teacher in a language unit, commenting that she would very much like to be involved in dissemination, then said that she already had more work than she could cope with, and 'given the present staffing levels, we cannot do any more'. An advisory teacher reported to her Advisory and Management Committee: 'at a very conservative estimate, the cost in terms of time is totally beyond the capacity of three people'. She gave a detailed breakdown of the numbers of children involved and the time per child, concluding that '1 hour 45 minutes per week per child for 44 children is a total of 77 hours per week (for each teacher). The teaching/monitoring time alone constitutes 33 hours weekly - eight hours in excess of the school day'.

3.3 More speech therapists

The need is not only for more trained teachers and care staff, but for more speech therapy provision. This is a particular problem in the schools for children with learning difficulties, where a typical pattern seems to be that a speech therapist visits the school once or twice a week. In the schools visited, numbers ranged from 130-260 children. The diplomates were in charge of 'assessment classes' for up to 10-11 children, which in fact were functioning very much as language units - that is, many of the children placed in them had severe language and communication problems. However, unlike an established language unit, there was no consistent speech therapy provision. This meant that the diplomate had to rely on her own training to assess and plan the remedial language programmes for the children in her class, without the professional expertise and regular support and advice of a speech therapist. In addition, many of the

children in the rest of the school also had considerable language and communication problems; the diplomates felt that they should be advising the teachers in the rest of the school, in addition to their normal work-load, but could not do so because there was no alternative cover for the children in their own class. (Since the initial visits, one of these diplomates has been given a post of special responsibility for language development within the school.) There was also a tendency for the speech therapist, in the face of overwhelming numbers, to spend her time in the school with those children who were not receiving specialist teaching from the diplomate. As a result, the diplomate's opportunity to discuss problems with the speech therapist was lessened, and her feeling of isolation increased. Even in the language units, where a speech therapist is seen as an essential member of the staff, there are considerable problems with speech therapy provision.

The point was made by several district speech therapists that, although language units were needed, they posed additional strains on the speech therapy service, since AHAs would not provide extra money to fund them. As a result, employing a speech therapist in a language unit effectively meant the loss of a post elsewhere in the district, and cutting back on other speech therapy provision. One headteacher commented on the inadequacy of present provision in the language unit in his own school, saying that, although on paper there was full-time speech therapy, in fact this consisted of several part-time therapists who were unable to give the children the continuity of treatment which they needed. He also remarked on the number of sessions missed by the therapists because of in-service training days and requests to give outside lectures. Points such as these

led to the frequently expressed opinion that there should be some arrangement whereby speech therapists were employed by Education, or by some joint LEA/AHA funding. This would have a clear advantage for the headteachers, in that they would then have some control over the hours worked by the therapists. (It is perhaps relevant to note here that speech therapists in the Special Language Schools are employed as part of the school staff: see 3.7.) It was, however, uniformly rejected by the therapists, who were anxious to retain their autonomy. In addition to the political aspects, they feared that if they were employed by Education they would lose contacts with their colleagues in the Health Service, and would also lose access to AHA resources, such as routine referral procedures. (Several of these points repeated the arguments considered by the Quirk Report, 1972.) One diplomate, working as an advisory teacher, was concerned that, because of lack of speech therapy resources, therapists in her area had been withdrawn from work within schools, and were entirely clinic-based. She herself hoped to maintain close links with the therapists, but was worried not only that classroom teachers would have less opportunity to discuss the children's problems with the speech therapist, but that there would be less opportunity for informal observation by the therapist of children who were causing concern to the teacher, but who did not appear to be sufficiently handicapped for referral.

3.4 More educational psychologists

Comments were also made about the rarity of educational psychologists; but whereas the need for more speech therapy was seen as a pressing concern, it seemed to be accepted that there were not, and never will be, enough psychologists. One teacher commented that due to job changes in her area

there was no psychologist in post (April, 1983) and that the post could not be filled until September 1983. Some of the schools in her area 'have not seen a psychologist for more than a year'. Another teacher said that the 1981 Education Act had produced so much work for the psychologists that 'all assessment conferences in my class were cancelled', and eventually she had to 'insist that an educational psychologist visit my class to review children so that they could be moved to other placements'.

3.5 New role of diplomates

It thus seems clear that inadequate staffing is one of the main reasons for the teachers' heavy work-load. It also seems likely, however, that this is exacerbated by the teachers' knowledge of how much more could be done for the children. Having studied language development and language handicap in some depth, diplomates are aware of the extent of the children's linguistic needs and how they could help them. They are also aware of many other children who could benefit from intervention but who are not receiving any specialist help. Often, however, they do not have enough time to implement their training fully with the children in their own class, let alone any others. This suggests that while the diplomates have learned new skills, those necessary for a teacher of children with language difficulties, the authorities employing them have not fully recognised the implications of this in terms of staffing levels and facilities. As one teacher wrote, 'many of those at senior levels, in both psychology and education, have so very little real idea of the implications of language difficulty, and they still see the "remediation" required as a more intensive speech therapy'.

This leads to a frequently expressed sense of frustration on the part of the diplomates that their skills are not understood or being fully used. Talking to those not directly involved with diplomates on a day-to-day basis, it was clear that this was true. Many of those to whom we spoke, although professionally closely concerned with diplomates, did not know the content of the DRLS. One of the most useful parts of our discussion was often an explanation of the nature of the training, and consequently a clearer awareness on the part of all concerned of ways in which diplomates could not only disseminate information about teaching children with language handicap, but work more closely with their colleagues in other professions. It might be argued that this should have been done by the diplomates themselves, and in some cases this had happened. There are, however, at least two possible difficulties: the first concerns the status and role of the diplomate (3.6-7); the second, relationships between different professional groups (3.8).

3.6 Status of diplomates

As with the above discussion, the question of status relates primarily to teachers employed by LEAs. Diplomates employed in special schools were in a rather different position, and they will be discussed separately in 3.7. In general, there appeared to be no plans at an administrative level for a career structure for diplomates, apart from in the field of special education as a whole. This means that there is at present no recognition for diplomates in terms of status or career prospects. The effects of this on their work were frequently mentioned by those to whom we spoke. One diplomate commented on the low prestige, in terms of salary scales, attached to specialist remedial language teachers: 'they are treated as

advisers, but paid as junior teachers'. This creates problems when they have to deal with other teachers, in particular headteachers, who are unsure of the diplomate's status, and consequently of their authority. Another teacher wrote that she was thought to be 'out for personal gain and/or status', when she was actually campaigning for better provision for the children. 'I felt quite hopeless in the face of anxious parents, for I have no status (I'm a Scale I teacher)., nor any authority at all'. When applying for jobs in new language units which were being established, several diplomates made comments such as the following: 'I will not agree to run it unless my job is properly described and salaried'. Over and over again, the implication was not that they wanted recognition for their own sake, but that without it they could not do their job properly.

An adviser for special education acknowledged that the diplomate in his area was 'under-employed', in that she was not in a position to use her skills; but he stressed that a high-level administrative decision was needed about the development of services for language-handicapped children. Several headteachers said that they thought diplomates should be used much more in an advisory capacity, but that in order to do this effectively they would have to be employed at a senior level. The general consensus was that as long as diplomates were employed as classroom teachers they would have neither the time, nor the authority, to use their skills adequately. This was resisted by many diplomates who felt that it should be possible to combine, at least to some extent, the role of a classroom teacher and a specialist language adviser, although the ways in which they suggested this should be done depended on their individual situations. Given their status as classroom teachers, most diplomates felt inhibited

about approaching senior members of other professions to discuss how they could work more closely together, and thought that it would not be appropriate for them to do so.

3.7 Diplomates in special schools

Teachers in special schools for children with language disorders were in a slightly different position as far as the above points were concerned. In general, their special skills as diplomates are recognised and used, and they were expected to organise in-service training for the teachers in the school in collaboration with the speech therapists. Although the work-load was heavy, as it is for any senior teacher in a residential school, there was a general feeling of confidence that the children were receiving the necessary help. There seemed to be adequate speech therapy provision, and easy access to other professionals for assessment and advice. The problems as far as these diplomates were concerned related more to the lack of an established set of formal contacts with other teachers and therapists working in the same geographical area. Thus, for example, it was possible for discussions to take place concerning the establishment of a language unit by the LEA, without any reference to the special school in the same area. Although presumably there is wide variation in the extent to which contacts exist between non-maintained schools and LEAs and AHAs, it seems unfortunate that the expertise of the special school should not always be recognised, and shared more widely. One diplomate experienced considerable antagonism when she suggested inviting local teachers to the in-service training already provided in the school, or putting on a course at a local teacher centre. Reasons for reactions such as this are complex, but suggest the difficulty that diplomates in this situation might have if they wished to disseminate information outside the confines of the school.

3.8 Relationships between different professions

Relationships between different professional groups working with the same children, and having overlapping roles, are inevitably a sensitive area. Problems rarely appeared to arise at the personal level, where teachers and therapists, or teachers and psychologists, were working closely together. However, varying degrees of antagonism and resentment towards diplomates were expressed by those in more senior posts, responsible for the overall support and development of their own profession.

There were several reasons for this, but the two most important seemed to be: misunderstanding of the nature of the diplomate's training and role; and anxiety about possible areas of conflict where the roles of different professions overlapped. As stated above, few of those to whom we spoke knew what the DRLS involved, and some district speech therapists were very concerned that teachers who 'know very little about language structure or language development' should be involved in dissemination. One senior speech therapist queried the competence of diplomates to plan a child's language remediation, or to advise other teachers, and said she preferred working with teachers who were prepared to follow her suggestions without querying them. Another criticised a diplomate who 'thought she knew about language' and who 'took it upon herself' to visit the child's parents. Comments such as these reflect a stereotyped view of a teacher as knowing little about normal language development or language handicap, which may not easily be dispelled until senior speech therapists have seen diplomates and therapists working together effectively. As mentioned above, this is less of a problem at an individual level, where teachers and therapists working together quickly discover the strengths of each other's training, and ways in which they complement and support each other.

At another level, anxiety stems from the fact that the economic situation is causing AHAs, if not to cut back, at least not to increase speech therapy provision. In the face of this, the suspicion that remedial language teachers might be used to replace therapists in some situations is perhaps inevitable. Although there is no way in which teachers would be qualified, or would wish, to take over the role of the speech therapist, this was clearly seen as an underlying threat. One district therapist expressed a fear that the AHA might say that there was less need for speech therapists if there were well-trained remedial language teachers in the schools. She also reported that she had heard it said that if there were a diplomate in a language unit a full-time therapist would not be essential. A similar opinion was reported to have been given by an adviser for special education. One diplomate in an assessment class reported that she had heard that speech therapy provision for her class was not being increased, partly because it was officially an assessment unit rather than a language unit, but also because it was known that she was a diplomate. Although not substantiated, the fact that such views are expressed at all indicates the underlying unease about the situation. Until it is recognised that the roles of the two professions are in fact quite different, and that neither can replace the other, this is likely to be a continuing problem.

Several senior therapists argued that, rather than training teachers in remedial language teaching, it would be better to encourage more speech therapists to gain an additional teaching qualification. They themselves usually added, however, that someone who had chosen to be a speech therapist would probably not want to be a classroom teacher. One speech therapy adviser, who is herself dually-qualified as a teacher and

therapist, commented on how difficult she had found it to reconcile the two roles when she worked in a language unit. This is interesting in the light of one Education Authority's decision to employ on a permanent basis in their language units only teachers who are also qualified as speech therapists. One of their teachers, having been seconded by them to do the DRLS, wrote: 'I am excluded from applying (for a post in a language unit) because of county policy, which is only to employ dually-qualified teacher/speech therapists in their units. There are teachers working in the units, without any specialist qualifications, but they are not on permanent contracts'. This suggestion from the therapists, however, reflects the points already discussed. There is concern about the adequacy of the DRLS as a sufficient training for teaching children with language and communication problems, or for disseminating information about the nature and remediation of those problems. There is also a suspicion that the role of the therapist may not be sufficiently valued and recognised, and that given economic cutbacks there might be an attempt to replace them by teachers with a special qualification.

At an immediate and practical level, many speech therapists feel that dissemination should be their role, and that in fact they are already doing it. For example, speech therapists routinely talk to parents and other groups, and provide in-service training for teachers, health visitors, and others involved with children with language problems. Several district speech therapists categorically stated that speech therapists should organise workshops for teachers and parents. As one of them said: 'Any dissemination should be undertaken by speech therapists, not by teachers. Speech therapists see it as their role to advise teachers on the nature of

language handicap and to suggest remedial teaching strategies. They should also advise parents, set up local courses and workshops, and recommend suitable language teaching materials'. Another expressed the concern that by developing a dissemination service for teachers, speech therapists might tend to be ignored, and teachers would start to set up workshops and so forth without consulting a speech therapist. One diplomate who (with her speech therapist colleague) was trying to arrange in-service training for teachers at a local teachers' centre, was told by the district therapist that she, as a teacher, should not do this, and that teachers should not give talks on the subject of language handicap. (An interesting reflection of these attitudes came from an adviser for special education who, when asked if a dissemination service might impinge on the work of other professions, said he thought there would be no conflict, but then added that some speech therapists might be upset if they (i.e. teachers) were suggesting strategies for language development, as opposed to giving general educational advice'.) A less extreme position is represented by another district therapist who said that she thought very careful liaison was essential between teachers and therapists to avoid conflict. She would be unhappy if a teacher were to arrange talks and training without consulting her, but said that given good communication between the two professions there should be no problem. She fully supported the idea of workshops jointly organised and run by teachers and therapists.

Given the overlap between the roles of teachers and speech therapists, collaboration between the two based on real understanding and mutual respect would seem to be essential both in their work with the children and in providing information to others. The teachers were quite clear

that their role extended beyond the classroom, at least to the children's families. Several headteachers and diplomates regretted that they could not spend more time with the families. As one headteacher said, 'It is the families who are most likely to benefit from the support and expertise of the diplomates, and would then pass on the benefit to the children'. It was generally agreed that the closer the contacts between home and school, the more effective would be the remedial teaching. Similarly, it would seem obvious that diplomates would be the most appropriate people to advise other teachers on the educational implications of language handicap. Given this widely accepted approach to education, it seemed strange to hear a district therapist maintaining that the teacher's role was restricted to work within the school building. The anxiety presumably stems from concern that teachers will give inappropriate advice on language development, but it would seem essential that problems such as these be resolved. Many people stressed the importance of good personal relationships between the individuals concerned. One medical officer commented on the difficulty which different professions often have in working together because of their different training, aims and professional ethos, and pointed out that even in multi-disciplinary teams there is a tendency to work in parallel, rather than together. She suggested that it was important to acknowledge the difficulties and discuss them openly. Indeed, the lack of any real communication between the different groups involved with the same children was often striking. This was recognised by many of those to whom we spoke. The most frequently suggested way in which these antagonisms and misunderstandings could be overcome was through joint training schemes, and one of the main requests was that a dissemination service should provide opportunities for this by setting up multidisciplinary workshops (see 2.5).

3.9 Dissemination service activities

Most of the suggestions for the output of a dissemination service involved some form of further training for those who would be doing the disseminating at a local level. Thus there were requests for updating on recent research, on new forms of assessment, techniques of language remediation, and teaching materials. Many diplomates commented on the difficulty which they experienced in gaining access to new materials and books, and asked if a lending library could be established through the dissemination service, so that they could borrow them and decide whether they were relevant to their needs before buying them. Diplomates suggested many ways in which they would like to disseminate information themselves: the main support which they requested was access to a catalogued library of audio and video tapes which they could use to illustrate talks, and as the basis of workshop discussions. This idea was also strongly supported by the speech therapists, for their own use. A further request was that a dissemination service should provide a list of speakers who could be invited to talk to local groups. In general, there was a need for a 'clearing house' of information, to which they could turn for advice and support. This involved both advice on specific topics, such as which books and materials to include in a local resource centre, and help in establishing links with professionals with similar needs. For example, at least three diplomates asked for advice and comments on a language curriculum which they had been asked to develop in their schools. Rather than doing this separately, it seemed sensible that they should share their ideas and work together. Some formal means of keeping diplomates in touch with each other and with others doing similar work seems to be important.

At a slightly different level, several district therapists suggested that a valuable role for a dissemination service would be to help establish communications between the diplomates and speech therapists. One made the point that she had not known there was a diplomate in her area until she received the preliminary letter from Professor Crystal outlining the dissemination project. Nor did she know exactly what a diplomate was, until she had had the opportunity to talk to Miss Davison. Once she had this information, however, she proposed several ways in which the speech therapists and diplomate in her area could work together. The request was made several times that when a teacher was seconded to do the DRLS the University should inform the local district speech therapist, if possible before the teacher started the course. It would be much easier for the University to make this approach than for the individual teacher to do so, and would help to avoid many misunderstandings and potential areas of conflict. The teacher would then be seen as a colleague, rather than as a potential threat.

It was suggested at the beginning of this section that, while there was general support for the idea of a dissemination service, some doubts were expressed about the nature of the information to be disseminated, and the source of that information. Although some of the comments were based on misunderstanding of the DRLS, they illustrate the sensitivity of the whole area. One educational psychologist expressed concern that a dissemination service should not just spread 'the Reading approach to language disorder', and on another occasion, 'there is more to language disorder than LARSP'. Any real knowledge of the DRLS syllabus - or for that matter the Reading approach - would show that such remarks are

ill-founded; but the fact that they can be made at all requires appropriate consideration. One diplomate said that she had experienced some difficulty in talking to the local remedial advisory team because they were antagonistic to analytical, structured methods of language remediation, and had identified her with that approach. Presumably problems such as this could eventually be overcome at a local level, as people become more informed about the nature of a diplomate's training. However, that raises the more general issue of who should be responsible for providing a dissemination service. If it is to consist mainly of an updating and resource centre for diplomates, then presumably there would be no controversy. If, however, it is to be available to a wider group of professionals, there might be some disagreement as to the most appropriate source of dissemination.

3.10 The need for provision

Finally, over and over in our discussions the point was made that educational provision for language-handicapped children is grossly inadequate. Teachers, speech therapists, education advisers, and medical advisers were unanimous about this. Not only is there inadequate language unit provision, but where it exists it often seems to be the result of isolated initiatives, rather than as part of a systematic policy. Thus, for example, there may be a class for children aged 5-9 years, but nothing for younger or older children. Diplomates in language units frequently discussed the problems of placement for children reaching the top age for the language unit, but who were still not capable of integrating in a normal class. If they were kept on in the unit, waiting lists would become even longer, and younger children would be deprived of the special help they

needed. If they were sent back to the local comprehensive, they would be unlikely to cope without a great deal of individual help, which the teachers knew they would not receive. One teacher wrote: 'It's so easy, as it is now, for them to be ignored and just pushed into any old schools ... I have had to question over and over again the value of starting intervention and remediation if I wasn't going to be allowed to finish'. In some cases, this lack of secondary provision reflected official policy. One adviser for special education said that no provision was planned because it was felt that, as a result of specialist teaching and therapy at nursery and primary age levels, children would no longer be in need of additional help by the time they reached secondary school. This point of view was not supported by anyone else to whom we spoke, and the evidence from the well-established primary language units definitely seems to be that some children still need special educational provision after the age of 11 years. One other dissenting view was expressed by a medical officer, who argued that there is no point in increasing special educational provision until it has been shown to be effective. However, the general consensus was that more provision was urgently needed, although there was little optimism that it would be provided. As one adviser for special education said: 'it is most unlikely that any new provision will be made in the next three years, because of the political and economic climate'.

Given these limitations, the clear message we received was that the most immediate need of those working with language-handicapped children was for improved educational and speech therapy provision. One adviser for special education summarised the feelings of many when he concluded that: 'The best service which could be provided by this dissemination project would be to convince the Government that remedial language teaching is a necessity, and that more adequate provision is needed for children with a language handicap'.

4 Conclusions

Notwithstanding the expectations of some of our academic colleagues referred to in 2.1, the DSRP has produced two major self-financing 'products': an international journal, and a national association. We expect these initiatives to exercise a major influence on the development of professional awareness among teachers of language-impaired children, and to provide, in the short term, a means of addressing several of the specific needs raised by our diplomates and their colleagues. We regret that we have not been able to produce other forms of product, given the limitations of time and money, but in several areas we expect our initiatives to be taken further by other interested parties - by NATLIC, in particular.

At the same time, we are under no illusions about the complexity of the task involved in the long-term development of the responsibilities of those working in this field, and we hope that this report will stimulate discussion of the problem. The DRLS course, and our subsequent investigations, have identified several issues which urgently need to be addressed:

- (i) There is a major gap in teacher training which needs to be filled if provision for children with special linguistic needs is to be satisfactorily implemented.
- (ii) The complexity of language handicap is such that, to provide a reasonable training for specialist teachers, a course of comparable scope and depth to the DRLS is required. This does not exclude the possibility of shorter courses, on specific topics, but these cannot provide the solid foundation in all major aspects of the subject that is currently required.

Alternative models to the 9-month full-time course (such as various forms of distance learning) should be investigated.

(iii) However, specialised training programmes of whatever kind have a point only if the people involved are appropriately rewarded by positions of special responsibility, and if they are given the opportunity to apply their newfound expertise to the children in their care. The DSRP has identified major problems in this respect, which need to be resolved before further training programmes are introduced.

(iv) Likewise, the effect of training programmes is likely to be impeded if proper attention is not paid to the interests of other professional bodies, especially speech therapists, who need to be made more aware of the nature and responsibilities of specialised remedial language teachers.

Finally, we should draw attention to the fact that a great deal of experience, both theoretical and practical, has been accumulated through planning and teaching the DRLS and following up its students. We hope that in due course there will be an opportunity to share this experience with others, especially if new initiatives develop for training courses.

David Crystal

Margaret Davison

30 September 1985

Appendix A

Visits to diplomate areas carried out between 1983 and 1984

- 23.2.83 Berkshire: Diplomate.
- 16.3.83 Language Unit, Queensway School, Banbury: Headteacher, Diplomate.
- 18.3.83 Language Unit, Rosehill School, Oxford: Headteacher, two Diplomates, Speech Therapist.
- 27.4.83 Special Needs Resource Unit, Oxfordshire: Diplomate.
- 9.5.83 Brookfields School (ESN), Reading: Headteacher, Diplomate.
- 12.5.83 Newick House School (ESN), Burgess Hill, W. Sussex: Headteacher, Diplomate.
- 18.5.83 Berkshire meeting: teachers, speech therapists, educational psychologists, Adviser for Special Education.
- 2.6.83 Reading: Adviser for Special Education.
- 2.6.83 Reading: Diplomates.
- 14.6.83 Meath School, Ottershaw, Surrey: Diplomate.
- 30.6.83 Chichester: Adviser for Special Education, W. Sussex.
- 8.7.83 Oxford: Senior Adviser for Special Education, Oxfordshire.
- 4.8.83 Reading: Director, Centre for the Teaching of Reading.
- 30.9.83 St. Catherine's School, Ventnor: Headteacher, Diplomate, Speech Therapist.
- 3.10.83 Newport, Isle of Wight: Assistant County Education Officer for Primary and Special Schools, District Speech Therapist.
- 10.10.83 Reading: Principal Educational Psychologist, Educational Psychologist with responsibility for hearing-impaired and language-disordered children in Berkshire, Educational Psychologist.
- 24.10.83 Banbury: Senior Medical Officer, Speech Therapist, Health Visitor.
- 4.11.83 Reading: Senior Clinical Medical Officer, W. Berkshire.
- 7.11.83 Banbury: District Speech Therapist, Oxfordshire.
- 17.11.83 Meath School, Ottershaw: Headteacher.
- 25.11.83 Crawley, Sussex: District Speech Therapist.
- 13.12.83 Oxford: Consultant Paediatrician, Oxfordshire.
- 1.2.84 Meath School, Ottershaw: Headteacher, ICAA Secretary for Schools.

Appendix B

Child Language Teaching and Therapy Editorial Policy

CLTT exists to help those who have to teach children handicapped by an inadequate command of spoken or written language, for any reason, of any age, in any setting. The range of handicap primarily relates to children who have been labelled speech or language-disordered, aphasic, dyslexic, with special (language) needs, or with language learning disabilities, but we include also children whose communication problems arise from deafness, emotional difficulty, or from any form of mental or physical handicap. We recognise the relevance of the language problems encountered in multilingual education, foreign or second language teaching, the teaching of normal oracy and literacy skills, and remedial education in a broad sense.

The primary focus of CLTT is the principles and practice of teaching language-handicapped children, especially in relation to the demands made upon them by the way language is used in the curriculum. Papers may raise questions of diagnosis, screening, assessment, or any other recognised area of concern, as long as the issues are related to learning, teaching, therapy, or management, and as long as the primary subject-matter is language. Topics such as alternative communication systems, signing, technical aids, specific assessment techniques, or remedial programmes are included, as are topics to do with professional roles, educational provision, or government policies, in relation to the needs of these children. Case studies, especially written by members of a team, are welcome.

Because this is an interdisciplinary field which is rapidly growing, and because levels of training in special language skills vary enormously, we welcome expository critical accounts of important theoretical, methodological, or technical developments in fields relevant to remedial language teaching. We ask contributors to be aware at all times of the mixed nature of the readership of this journal, and not to assume familiarity with (for example) the specialised terminology of linguistics, medical nomenclature, or statistical rationales: in such cases, a degree of exposition would be welcomed.

Appendix C

Programme of the DRLS Easter School, 1985

- 10 April, p.m. Language across the curriculum. (D. Crystal)
Working on comprehension. (J. Knox)
Curriculum discussion
- 11 April, a.m. Language and mathematics. (E. Grauberg)
p.m. Current trends in the teaching of reading. (B. Root)
Aspects of integration in mainstream education. (S.
Newitt, C. Gregory)
Dissemination Service plans. (D. Crystal)
- 12 April, a.m. Pragmatic disorders. (D. Crystal)
General discussion.

Appendix D

DRLS student summary, 1979-1985

	No. of applications	No. of students	Passes	Distinctions	Failures	Withdrawals
1979-80	11	8	7	1	0	0
1980-81	9	3	2	1	0	0
1981-82	10	3	2	1	0	0
1982-83	9	4	3	0	0	1
1983-84	19	8	5	3	0	0
1984-85	10	5	3	1	1	0
1985-86	15	10				