

# Local education authorities' approaches to provision for children with specific speech and language difficulties in England and Wales

Geoff Lindsay<sup>a\*</sup>, Julie E. Dockrell<sup>b</sup>, Clare Mackie<sup>a</sup> & Becky Letchford<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>University of Warwick, UK; <sup>b</sup>Institute of Education University of London, UK

Children with specific speech and language difficulties (SSLD) pose a challenge to the education system as a result of their language needs and associated educational and social-behavioural difficulties. Local education authorities (LEAs) in England and Wales have developed language units to meet their needs but previous research has indicated this provision was inadequate. The development of inclusion raises questions regarding this type of provision, compared with full inclusion into mainstream schools. The present study reports on a national survey of LEAs in England and Wales (97 respondents, 49.5% response rate) and interviews with 37 LEA special educational needs managers. Provision varied by age group with designated specialist provision more prevalent at key stages 1 and 2 (age 5–11 years), and relatively little at key stages 3 and 4 (11–16). LEAs' decision-making regarding provision varied, influenced by the lack of common criteria, which was highlighted by the difficulties in distinguishing children with SSLD from those with autistic spectrum disorder. There were also difficulties translating policies into practice, including the shortage of speech and language therapists. The implications of the study are discussed with reference to inclusion.

AQ1 Keywords:

## Introduction

Children with specific speech and language difficulties (SSLD) have a primary language problem. That is, the problem is not attributable to intellectual impairment,

---

\*Corresponding author. Centre for Educational Development, Appraisal and Research (CEDAR), University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, UK. Email: [geoff.Lindsay@warwick.ac.uk](mailto:geoff.Lindsay@warwick.ac.uk)

severe or profound hearing loss or lack of linguistic opportunity (Leonard, 1997). The more common term in the research and clinical literature is specific language impairment (SLI), which is synonymous with the term specific speech and language difficulties (SSLD) often used in the UK, particularly by educationists.<sup>1</sup> Prevalence studies suggest that the numbers of children concerned are substantial, at about 5–7%. (Tomblin *et al.*, 1997). Their core deficits with language place them at risk of associated literacy difficulties (Botting *et al.*, 1998; Dockrell & Lindsay, 2004); poor academic attainments (Snowling *et al.*, 2001) and social-emotional problems (Beitchman *et al.*, 1996; Lindsay & Dockrell, 2000). Thus, while the children present with core deficits in the area of language, associated problems increase risk of academic difficulties and therefore have implications for support provided by LEAs and health trusts.

A common approach to meeting the children's educational needs has been the provision of language units within or associated with mainstream schools, with children experiencing more serious difficulties attending specialist (often residential) special schools. As early as 1987, Hutt and Donlan (1987) expressed concern that there were about half as many units for junior-age children, aged 8 to 11 years, at key stage 2 (KS2) as opposed to infants aged 5 to 7 (KS1) (349:654 children respectively) in their sample of 108 of the 200 units, and only 39 pupils in secondary units. Criteria for admission, the nature and extent of integration, the use of manual signing, and staffing ratios all showed considerable variation. Furthermore, the teachers had no consistent pattern of specialized training.

Since that time, there have been major changes in the education system in England and Wales following legislation (Education Reform Act 1988; Special Educational Needs and Disability Act (SENDA) 2001); various initiatives of the Labour Government (DfEE, 1997; DfES, 2001a); reorganization of local educational authorities (LEAs) and the National Health Service (NHS); developments in professional and administrative practice by LEAs and health trusts; and the implications arising from legal interventions, including judicial reviews. Moreover, it has been recognized that not all children with SSLD will be found in language units or specialist provision, although there has been little systematic empirical evidence to substantiate this view.

A number of factors are likely to influence the educational provision for children with SSLD. Variation in LEA practice results in different patterns of placement across a range of provision. This may be planned, or a result of inadequate identification and assessment, or a lack of appropriate facilities. Dockrell and Lindsay (1998) report that about two-thirds of the children with significant degrees of language impairment, and hence high levels of need, in their study were in mainstream provision rather than special units or schools. Also, LEAs may use provision for children with SSLD designed for a broad range of children with SEN or those with, for example, specific literacy difficulties.

Consideration of educational provision for children with any special educational needs (SEN) must take account of the development of moves towards a more inclusive system of education embedded in legislation, the most recent of which is the SENDA 2001, supported by the government's SEN Strategy (DfES, 2004) and the

enhanced involvement of parents in partnership with professionals (DfES, 2001b). Although there is general support for the principle of inclusion, there is also concern about the implementation of a policy which may lead to provision which is 'inclusive' but not meeting the children's needs (Ofsted, 2004). Recent legislation and indeed much practice has been driven by concerns for the rights of children with SEN to be included, rather than by evidence of the more effective forms of education for different children (Lindsay, 2003). There is also concern about the ability of teachers to implement effective programmes. For example, Dockrell and Lindsay (2001) found that the teachers supporting children with SSLD in mainstream schools felt unprepared, as a result of lack of training, and generally unsupported, so raising questions about the efficacy of the inclusion being experienced by the children. Botting *et al.* (1998) report that after transfer from KS1 language units, almost half the children were being educated in provision their teachers did not consider 'ideal'.

Determining educational provision for children with SSLD must address the issue of definition. This problem is not unique to SSLD but is evident in relation to provision for both children with moderate learning difficulties (MLD) or social, emotional and behaviour difficulties (SEBD). Despite the heterogeneous nature of the population with language impairments (Rapin & Allen, 1983; Conti-Ramsden *et al.*, 1997), there is a common set of clinical criteria used to identify the population of children with SLI (see DSM IV: American Psychiatric Association, 1994) or ICD-I0 (World Health Organization, 1992). As noted above, in the UK the term specific speech and language difficulties (SSLD) has become a synonym for SLI and is preferred by many educationists. Substantial variation in needs can occur in an educational context partly resulting from the children's associated difficulties (Botting *et al.*, 1998; Dockrell & Lindsay, 2000). In addition, children with SSLD typically have needs that require input from both health, especially speech and language therapy, and education services.

The purpose of the present study was to address the current provision made by LEAs in England and Wales for children considered to have SSLD, including designated special provision in mainstream schools in the form of units or integrated resources; special schools, both those specifically for children with SSLD and others, especially for children with moderate learning difficulties (MLD); and provision in individual mainstream schools without designated special provision.

In the UK, LEAs are regional authorities ranging in size from small cities to large areas comprising towns and rural areas that have responsibilities for the delivery of education services. In particular, LEAs have responsibilities under the Education Act 1996 for the assessment of and making provision for children with special educational needs.

Historically provision for children with *specific* language difficulties (SLI/SSLD) has excluded children with autism. However, the prevalence of pragmatic difficulties among this population has become more evident and the concept of autistic spectrum disorders has developed, bringing a substantially larger group of children into consideration. Advisers to the research in its inception phase indicated that LEAs were now changing the remit of specialist language provision to include children with ASD. This change in policy had also been influenced by the reportedly substantial increase in the

numbers of children diagnosed with ASD (Charman & Baird, 2002). Consequently, the interrelationship between these two categories and the impact on provision needed to be explored. It was necessary to consider: (a) the variation in identification and assessment practices, both between and within LEAs, and (b) to examine overall planning and organizational processes for the determination of provision for individual children with SSLD (and ASD). For example, children may be determined to have SSLD but, in the absence of optimal provision, alternative support may be made. A systems analysis also required investigation of collaboration between health and education, and the practices of speech and language therapists (SLTs).

### Method

The study was carried out in England and Wales and built upon earlier research funded by the Department for Education and Employment, Department of Health and the Welsh Assembly, which investigated collaboration between education and health services in providing for children with speech and language needs of all types (Law *et al.*, 2000). A survey of local education authorities (LEAs) and speech and language therapy services carried out as part of that project provided information on provision, but not on that specifically for children with SSLD (Lindsay *et al.*, 2002).

### Samples

LEAs. The three samples investigated were LEAs, speech and language therapy services, and schools. There was a two-stage process, with national questionnaires to all LEAs and SLT services, followed by interviews with a sample of each. Finally, interviews were held with a sample of schools that provided for children with SSLD. The present paper reports the findings from LEAs.

A questionnaire<sup>2</sup> was sent to all LEAs in England and Wales ( $N = 196$ ). Ninety-seven responded, a response rate of 49.5%; 40 of the LEA respondents were selected for the second stage, comprising an interview with the LEA representative—16 LEAs were selected as coterminous with the health trusts, the remaining 24 were selected at random. There were 37 completed interviews; three respondents were unavailable. Normally the interview was conducted with the same person who completed the questionnaire; however, on five occasions this person had left the position, or did not feel that they were the most appropriate interviewee. In these cases, another relevant senior officer was interviewed as advised by the LEA. The respondents were predominantly education officers with responsibility for SEN, but also included senior educational psychologists and advisory teachers.

### Measures

The questionnaire was piloted on a small number of appropriate professionals including an adviser for special educational needs; education officer for I CAN, the voluntary body in the UK for all children with speech and language difficulties; and

an LEA education officer with responsibility for special educational needs. One assumption was that there would be variation in conceptualization of 'specific speech and language difficulties', and that this would have implications for provision. This posed a methodological problem, however, as it was necessary for the questionnaire to have sufficient clarity regarding the target population of children to enable successful completion while still allowing respondents the opportunity to specify the term they used. The main issue arising from the piloting phase was the potential overlap between SSLD and autistic spectrum disorder (ASD). The following guidance for completion of the questionnaire was provided: 'The purpose of this questionnaire is to identify provision for children with *specific speech and language difficulties* (SSLD)—i.e. those with a *primary* language problem, not attributable to severe/profound hearing loss, physical disability, autistic spectrum disorder (ASD) or severe/profound learning difficulties.'

The issue of ASD was addressed by questions specifically targeting the question of SSLD/ASD overlap, namely: 'Is provision for children with SSLD also used for children with ASD?', and 'How do you see the relationship between your provision for children with SSLD and those with ASD developing?'. In each case, respondents could also add comments.

The questionnaire mainly comprised forced-choice questions (e.g. Yes/No) or required specific information. After the initial questions on SSLD/ASD overlap, the questionnaire comprised five sections for pre-school; reception and key stage 1 (age 5–7 years); key stage 2 (8–11 years); key stage 3/4 (11–16 years); and post-16 (16+ years). In each case, respondents were asked to specify: 'Educational provision for children with specific speech and language difficulties (SSLD) at the pre-school stage (or alternative as relevant) (please specify separately that made by the LEA itself, alone or in partnership with others; please record separately where the LEA funds places in provision made by others)?' Respondents were also invited to specify, where appropriate, the number of schools and number of child places for each provision made.

The interview schedule was semi-structured. It was designed to produce comparable data on the main questions, but also to allow an exploration of respondents' views in detail. An initial open-ended question was followed by prompts used where the informant did not provide the required information, or follow-on questions to elicit further information. The interview explored the interviewees' opinions regarding policy, including written policy statements on children with SSLD; practice and deviations from policy; liaison with other LEAs/voluntary bodies; provision for children with ASD; the LEA's overall approach to service delivery in educational settings; policy for parental involvement specifically for SSLD; and examples of good practice (see Appendix 1). Interviews were conducted by phone and typically lasted about 30 minutes.

## Results

### Educational provision

Data reported in this section regarding the provision made by the LEAs were derived from the questionnaire study (Figure 1).




Figure 1. Educational provision for children with SSLD (% LEAs)

**Mainstream.** The majority of LEAs made provision in mainstream for children with SSLD, with the highest proportions at reception/key stage 1 (98%) and key stage 2 (99%). However, fewer than half of LEAs made provision in mainstream post-16 (46.7%).

#### *Special provision*

**Pre-school.** Relatively few LEAs made provision through designated nursery schools either alone (8%) or in collaboration with the voluntary sector (1%). Of these, most (four) LEAs provided one nursery, one provided two nurseries and one provided three. Generally, these nurseries had part-time places only, from 12 to 40. Units/integrated resources for children with SSLD were more common, with 23% of LEAs funding these alone and a further 10% making provision jointly funded by either social services or the voluntary/private sector.

**Key Stage 1 to post-16.** Fewer than 10% of respondents provided special schools designated for children with SSLD, and these commonly had one school per age group. However, most responding LEAs provided language units: 91% at reception/KS1 and 84% at KS2, although only 29% made this provision at KS3/4 and only one authority (1%) provided it for pupils post-16. The modal number of units at each stage was one, with minorities of LEAs providing up to three at reception/KS1 (one: 47%, two: 22%, three: 12%) and KS2 (one: 53%, two: 16%, three: 7%). A minority of LEAs provided between five and 10 at these two stages (8% and 7% respectively). The most common size was 10–20 pupils. Consequently, very few children were educated in specialist language provision in any LEA.

LEAs also used other special units/resources not designed specifically for children with SSLD, particularly for younger children: 22% of LEAs at reception/KS1 and

21% at KS2, approximately double the percentage reporting this for KS3/4 (11%) and post-16 (9%). The mode was one per LEA, but the range was substantial (up to 20 at reception/KS1 and at KS2).

Nearly two-thirds of respondents reported making provision for children with SSLD in special schools for pupils with moderate learning difficulties (MLD) for all age groups to the end of KS4: 60% reception/KS1; 61% KS2; and 66% KS3/4, but only 27% reported using MLD schools for post-16. The mode was one MLD school (32–40% of LEAs between reception and KS4), but again, the range was large (one to 15 up to KS2). About half of LEAs also reported using other special schools (53% reception/KS1; 52% KS2; 52% KS3/4; and 34% post-16). Use of provision made by the voluntary sector or other LEAs was also reported: 40% at reception/KS1; 47% KS2, increasing substantially at KS3/4 (70%) and also common at post-16 (40% of LEAs).

#### *Policy into action*

*Policies.* Data from the interviews ( $N = 37$ ) are presented in the following sections to provide elaboration of the rationales underlying the implementation of the LEAs' policies. A quarter of the interviewees (nine) stated that they had specific documentation regarding children with SSLD:

We have a specific policy for children with SSLD, this has recently become official at the LEA level; it's a joint document with health, outlining specific criteria and levels of support.

However, not all could give details:

Yes, there is a written policy, however it is rather short.

Almost half (17) reported that there was a written policy but it was included within the overall SEN policy document. A further nine LEAs reported only a working understanding with other professionals regarding support and criteria, with two stating that they did not know if the LEA had a specific written policy for this group of children.

Two-thirds (25) of respondents stated that they had a relevant development plan, most (15) stating that the plan was directly related to children with SSLD and with a further 10 stating it was part of a general SEN plan. Of those with specific plans for SSLD, eight involved either extending or identifying new provision for children with SSLD and six addressed improving collaboration with health or increasing SLT provision. The majority specified developments at secondary or nursery level—'extend provision for SSLD at key stage 3 and 4', or 'we have a bid to I CAN for a nursery scheme'. Other issues included greater collaboration with health colleagues, particularly to integrate therapy and education at school level, and joint training of teachers and SLTs.

Although all interviewees stated their policy was for inclusion wherever possible, further probing revealed that while 26 attributed inclusion a medium/high priority, 10

336 G. Lindsay et al.

gave it a low priority. The main focus of comments by the former was to argue for more mainstream services rather than special schools:

Definitely more inclusion. We want to develop resources for schools not more special schools.

Language units/integrated resources were often seen as examples of inclusive practice:

We use the term inclusion, though the children are mainly in language units not mainstream.

This provision was part of many LEAs' development plans:

We have an inclusion plan and this involves increasing the number of speech and language units.

*Criteria for provision.* Excluding the two interviewees who did not know whether the LEA had a written policy, the 35 remaining respondents provided a diverse picture regarding criteria for provision for children with SSLD (Table 1). Over one-third (13) stated that there were no criteria at LEA level:

Only the needs of the child and the right environment for the child are important: there are no performance criteria.

Five reported criteria based upon severity of language difficulty. Only five provided specific criteria including assessment of different aspects of language and the notion of discrepancy between language and nonverbal cognitive ability:

The child has to be average or above—i.e. only with speech and language difficulties, which means a delay in acceptance until they are sure.

These criteria could be elaborate:

The level of need is assessed through a ranking system, the assessment of different aspects receptive, expressive, semantic and pragmatic and through to educational ability, and how they relate to peers and adults. There is a negative scoring system operating, so that a low score has mainstream and support, then a statement with specific dedicated teaching hours, dedicated provision, and the highest score out of authority.

Table 1. Criteria for placements

	LEAs
Specific criteria given	5
Severity of language difficulty	5
Statutory assessments	7
No criteria	13
Other	2
Don't know	5

*N* = 35.



Seven stated that provision was determined through the statutory assessment process:

The entry criterion comes from the statementing process, which is in conjunction with a panel of professionals, specialist teachers, SLT and parents.

One respondent focused on the environment of the language unit rather than the ability of the child:

A resource for work on social communication rather than focus on the medical model of language special school as criteria.

*Practice.* Two-thirds of LEAs (24) stated that they had difficulties translating policy into practice. Ten interviewees referred to difficulties caused by the lack of integration across the LEA, owing to geographical variations, or communication difficulties with schools or health colleagues:

The most difficulty is with health. The NHS (National Health Service) is bureaucratic and it is difficult to come to agreements with health regarding provision, they do not want to follow government guidelines.

Four blamed the overall lack of funding resulting in lack of provision, which could inhibit practice, but so also could the need for training and difficulties with differential assessment of children, each mentioned by two interviewees. Shortage of SLTs, and parental wishes regarding provision, were each mentioned by three interviewees as affecting the translation of policy into practice:

Parental preference is always an issue, a total lack of SLT will make parents want different provision; though we're trying to develop skills in teachers, the parents will always want direct help from the therapist and may choose a school where therapists are on staff.

Just under half (16) of the interviewees liaised with other LEAs for the allocation of provision, with arrangements often described as informal, but 19 reported little or no such liaison. A number of these stated that this was because they had enough provision for SSLD in their own LEA. Fifteen liaised with voluntary bodies for the allocation of provision, especially I CAN, the charity for all children with speech and language difficulties in the UK which funds independent schools and joint provision with LEAs, and Afasic, the charity that supports parents of children with speech and language difficulties.

Most (29) interviewees stated that children with SSLD had access to out-of-authority provision including I CAN or independent schools. However, some were not happy with making this provision, partly As a result of their inclusion policy or cost, and were not encouraging its continuation:

Children do go out of authority. We wouldn't restrict them from doing so if it is in their best interests, but it knocks a big dent in the SEN budget.

*Autistic spectrum disorders (ASD).* A smaller proportion of interviewees than respondents to the questionnaire (22% versus 45%) reported joint provision was made for

338 G. Lindsay et al.

children with SSLD and ASD, with the majority reporting separate provision. Many (13) interviewees were unable to provide a specific reason for their policy, whether for separate or joint provision. Where reasons were given for separate provision, a quarter of interviewees (nine) stated that children with SSLD and ASD had different needs and aetiologies, even if differential diagnosis was difficult:

We try to keep them separate as they have qualitatively different needs; however, they are very difficult to separate at an early age.

Reference was also made to children with ASD being better able to access a mainstream curriculum than children with SSLD.

Most of those making joint provision argued that both ASD and SSLD were seen as part of the 'language and communication' category by the LEA:

We have joint provision for ASD and SSLD as language and communication is part of both.

However, one interviewee noted:

It is difficult to draw a line between ASD and SSLD, we have specialist teachers for both at our unit provision

while others noted the lack of overall provision and geographical difficulties of large counties.

Most interviewees considered that numbers of children with SSLD, and especially ASD, were increasing (21 and 34 interviewees respectively: see Table 2). With respect to ASD, three-quarters of interviewees considered that the pattern of diagnosis had changed (Table 3). In some cases, they referred to earlier or better diagnosis, a result of improved practice. However, four respondents suggested that the increase was due to over-labelling as opposed to under-labelling, which had occurred in the past'. There were also six respondents who did not necessarily impute 'over-diagnosis', but implied changes in policies and practices by professionals rather than an absolute increase in the numbers of children:

It's not a real increase just a change in labelling.

*Service delivery.* Traditionally, speech and language therapists (SLTs) treated children in clinics either in hospital or the community, requiring children to take time

Table 2. Changes in numbers of children with SSLD and ASD

	SSLD	ASD
Increasing	21	34
Decreasing	2	0
Staying the same	5	0
Don't know	4	3
Missing	5	

*N* = 37.

away from school and limiting contact between SLTs and teachers. Most interviewees expressed a preference for delivery of speech and language therapy within schools rather than clinics. Half (19) reported that children with SSLD are seen by the SLT in mainstream schools, although they varied in the degree to which they reported work in schools as part of a definite plan, or a development whose details were not clear to them, or which was inconsistent—'It depends on the SLT'. Work in clinics was often related to limited resources or SLT preference rather than LEA policy:

There are different health areas and, where possible, children are seen in schools, though due to low numbers of SLT, more are seen in clinics as it is practical.

This practice was not always welcomed:

Children with statements are seen in clinics. There is not enough partnership within education and work with schools.

Where there was work in a variety of settings, this was typically related to the child's needs, or a decision on optimal service delivery:

The therapists see the children in a mixture of settings based on severity of need.

About one-third of LEAs (12) employed their own SLTs, while some were working towards this. Those employing or seeking to employ SLTs wished to improve service delivery:

We have SLTs employed by the LEA working in the same office as us, which leads to greater collaboration and understanding

or to overcome existing shortages:

In areas of our LEA there is a non-existing service, we are trying to fund our own therapists.

*Parent involvement.* All LEAs referred to parent partnership schemes. In addition, about half (19) had working groups involving parents in decision-making. These were considered to be positive developments. Parental involvement in policy development could also be facilitated by engagement with voluntary bodies:

Table 3. Reasons for the increase in numbers of children with ASD

	n
<i>Diagnosis</i>	26
Early diagnosis	4
Over diagnosis	4
Better diagnosis	12
Overall increase in diagnosis	6
<i>Environmental</i>	2
<i>Don't know</i>	6

N = 37.

340 G. Lindsay et al.

We work with Afasic. There are two parent reps who sit on a panel and we discuss issues surrounding provision. We also have a parent forum in January, which we use to present and listen to a wide range of issues: they are very much involved.

Twelve LEAs had experienced appeals to the SEN tribunal owing to lack of speech and language therapy, pressure for children to attend special schools or out of LEA schools, and lack of school provision:

There has been a complaint about a child who has complex needs where we were unable to produce a complete package. There were two or three schools that were good enough but there weren't enough places.

### Discussion

The present study indicates that the educational needs of children with SSLD are met in a number of different types of provision ranging from individual inclusion in mainstream schools to special schools. This pattern supports that previously found in a national survey of provision for children with all kinds of language needs (Lindsay *et al.*, 2002). However, comparison with the survey by Hutt and Donlan (1987) raises questions regarding service development. One possibly positive development has been the increase in numbers of special language units/integrated resources within mainstream schools at junior (KS2) level for children aged 8–11 years. However, the lack of such provision at the secondary stage (KS3/4) for age 11–16 years continues, and is a cause of concern to LEAs, one reason being that SLT input is aimed primarily at this provision rather than to children individually included in mainstream schools.

Variation in the nature and use of criteria also continues. Hutt and Donlan focused on criteria for admission to language units but the present study has broadened this to include the definition of SSLD and criteria for provision. The most common response was that LEAs had no specific criteria and instead used the statutory assessment procedure. This may be characterized as a 'needs-led' approach, compared with the 'diagnostic' approach favoured by SLTs (Lindsay *et al.*, submitted). It recognizes the difficulties inherent in diagnosis of many developmental psycho-educational difficulties, such as SSLD, and may therefore be helpfully flexible. However, there is also the danger that it is not strategic, leading to unacceptable variation in provision for similar children assessed in different LEAs, or even within the same LEA. The increased number of children with ASD has also led to a focusing of discussion on criteria regarding the appropriate provision for each, whether together or separate. Concern about the lack of appropriate training of teachers continues, supplemented now by the training needs of teaching assistants. Such training is essential if the needs of exceptional children are to be assessed and met successfully, in whatever provision.

An overriding theme to emerge from the present study is the impact of the inclusion policy. The practice of this policy in special needs education is to increase inclusion into mainstream with a reduction of numbers in special schools. However, the place of designated special provision in mainstream schools (language units in the Hutt & Donlan (1987) study) is unclear. Are they examples of inclusion, being in mainstream or of segregation, given the varying degrees of separation of children for periods of

time? The present study has shown that while over 90% of responding LEAs reported making provision to support children with SSLD in ordinary mainstream schools, the use of units/integrated resources was also popular, especially for ages 5–11 years, and were seen as inclusion, for example:

We have an inclusion action plan, and this involves increasing the number of speech and language units.

The relative lack of provision post-KS2 was a cause for concern and many LEA plans included developing designated special provision for this age group. There are very few special language schools, but almost two-thirds of LEAs made use of schools for children with moderate learning difficulties, an interesting finding as the standard definition of SSLD specifies normal levels of non-verbal cognitive ability. In our separate, longitudinal study, we have found a substantial minority of children attending mainstream transferring to MLD provision at KS3 (Dockrell *et al.*, 2004). This suggests provision being made on the basis of a failure of that originally made and subsequent provision being expedient rather than designed to meet children's needs.

Discussion of inclusion must address not only special schools, but also given their prevalence, the specific issue of units/integrated resources traditionally provided for children with SSLD in mainstream schools. Underlying this issue is the tension between inclusion as a right compared with effective practice (Lindsay, 2003). Most LEAs wished to develop inclusion, but many had doubts about whether inclusion in mainstream was as effective compared with specialist language provision at meeting the needs of the children. The case for inclusion based on children's rights has often been argued as if inclusion were the only right. However, inclusion is only one of several, competing values that might be held: Mithaug (1998), writing from a US perspective, offers freedom and equality as others. Furthermore, there are different foundations for holding an inclusive view, for example, the individual's capabilities, and freedom from obstacles and facility to self-determine. If children are seen as essentially equal, inclusion requires opportunities for individuals to participate in society. If, however, we consider that children have unequal abilities, then inclusion requires a degree of protection of some individuals.

Overviews, reviews and meta-analyses have failed to provide clear evidence for the benefit of inclusion (Madden & Slavin, 1983; Baker *et al.*, 1994; Hegarty, 1997). For example, the review of meta-analyses by Baker *et al.* (1994) found a positive but small effect size, mainly with academic achievement, but this was primarily in one of the three analyses. The evidence on effectiveness is not easy to gather, as 'inclusion' is not a simple intervention, subject to experimental manipulation. Most of the evidence gathered over the years has been on children with general learning difficulties. It is necessary to examine the specific aspects of inclusion for children with SSLD. Clearly many of the LEAs in the present study considered there was a need to continue with units/integrated resources, a policy that has some support from a study by Mills *et al.* (1998). However, there is a lack of evidence of the differential effectiveness of provision for children with SSLD.

A careful consideration of models of SEN and provision currently in use is required. For example, children with severe and profound intellectual, sensory or physical impairment are typically identified at birth or soon afterwards and provision to meet their SEN is made at that time. Children with MLD, by contrast, are typically not identified until after school entry as a result of difficulties in responding to curriculum demands. Children with SSLD are typically identified around the age of 3–5 years with intervention provided during the pre-school period and at KS1/2. While provision to meet the SEN of the other children specified here typically continues throughout their schooling, that for children with language difficulties typically reduces after KS2, as indicated in the present research for children with SSLD and by Lindsay *et al.* (2002) for the full range of children with language difficulties.

A key factor for developing inclusion for children with SSLD concerns the collaboration between health and education systems. At the level of senior managers and politicians is the need to develop joint policies that facilitate the work of practitioners. Some LEAs' development plans included joint plans with health to provide more therapy for mainstream schools. Parental involvement at this level allows their voices to influence policy, but this was far from universal, either here or in an earlier study (Band *et al.*, 2002). At the level of practitioners, speech and language therapists, teachers and SLT or teaching assistants, there is a need for agreed understanding of practice, as well as collaboration and coordination of service delivery. Several models are available but SLTs have recently been moving to an increased use of the consultation model, as identified here also (Law *et al.*, 2002). This can be a concern to teachers and parents who see it as a reduction in skilled, hands-on work with the children by SLTs unless the practice is agreed and the teachers and assistants are skilled in its use. In the present study, some LEAs reported teachers feeling out of their depth. The importance attached to training by the LEAs reflects these concerns and many of their examples of effective practice focused on the training of mainstream teachers, or models of teachers and therapists collaboratively enabling the schools to provide therapy.

Collaboration also requires common understandings and criteria for assessing and making provision for children with SSLD, but the present findings suggest variation between LEAs, compounded by different models found also from the reports of SLT managers (Lindsay *et al.*, submitted). This lack of consistency was identified as a barrier to practice by interviewees. Collaboration is also important between LEAs and schools in order to develop a coherent, integrated system of provision. One key issue to address this need is the provision of training, including joint training (I CAN, 2001). Another concerns funding. Inclusive education requires new partnerships and patterns of work. Designated special provision in mainstream schools can provide a more cost-effective approach by focusing expertise, which also allows training opportunities, but savings may be offset by transport costs. The use of consultation models of practice by SLTs may have cost benefits for that service, also important given the shortage of therapists, but it puts more reliance on teachers and teaching assistants, and is currently of unproven effectiveness. However, bringing SLTs into schools rather than treating children in clinics provides more opportunities for effective practice, improving mutual understanding and training.

Children with SSLD pose a particular challenge to the education system as a result of the need to address both oral language and access to the curriculum. Their difficulties often persist at least into adolescence where the latter problems predominate (Stothard *et al.*, 1998). In many respects, the present study suggests developments since 1987 have been limited, but LEAs now develop practice and provision firmly within a policy of inclusion. This requires careful consideration of the relative benefits of specialist designated provision in mainstream schools, as well as individual inclusion of children.

### Acknowledgements

This project was funded by the Nuffield Foundation. We are grateful for the support of the LEAs, health trusts and steering group.

### Notes

1. There are several terms referring to this condition including specific language impairment; our preference is for specific speech and language difficulties. This is one of the issues on which we report in this study.
2. Available from the first author


### References

- American Psychiatric Association (1994) *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders: DSM IV* (Washington, DC, APA).
- Band, S., Lindsay, G., Law, J., Soloff, N., Peacey, N., Gascoigne, M. & Radford, J. (2002) Are Health and Education talking to each other? Perceptions of parents of children with speech and language needs, *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 17, 211–227.
- Baker, E. T., Wang, M. C. & Walberg, H. J. (1994) The effects of inclusion on learning, *Educational Leadership*, 52, 33–5.
- Beitchman, J. H., Wilson, B., Brownlie, E. B., Inglis, A. & Lancee, W. (1996) Long-term consistency in speech/language profiles, II: behavioural, emotional and social outcomes, *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 35, 815–825.
- Botting, N., Crutchley, A. & Conti-Ramsden, G. (1998) Educational transitions of 7-year-old children with SLI in language units: a longitudinal study, *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*, 33, 177–197.
- Charman, T. & Baird, G. (2002) Practitioner review: diagnosis of autistic spectrum disorder in 2- and 3-year-old children, *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 43, 289–305.
- Conti-Ramsden, G., Crutchley, A. & Botting, N. (1997) The extent to which psychometric tests differentiate subgroups of children with SLI, *Journal of Speech Language and Hearing Research*, 40, 765–777.
- Department for Education and Employment (1997) *Excellence for all children* (London, Stationery Office).
- Department for Education and Skills (2001a) *Inclusive schooling* (Nottingham, DfES).
- Department for Education and Skills (2001b) *The SEN code of practice* (London, DfES).
- Department for Education and Skills (2004) *Removing barriers to achievement: the government's strategy for SEN* (Nottingham, DfES).
- Dockrell, J. E. & Lindsay, G. (1998) The ways in which speech and language difficulties impact on children's access to the curriculum, *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*, 14, 117–133.

344 G. Lindsay et al.



- Dockrell, J. E. & Lindsay, G. (2000) Meeting the needs of children with specific speech and language difficulties, *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 15, 24–41.
- Dockrell, J. E. & Lindsay, G. (2004) Specific speech and language difficulties and literacy, in: T. Nunes & P. Bryant (Eds) *Handbook of children's literacy* (London, Kluwer Academic Publishers), 403–435.
- Dockrell, J. E., Lindsay, G. & Mackie, C. (2004) Transferring to secondary school with a specific speech and language difficulty. Paper presented at *European Association of Early Intervention Conference*, Thessaloniki, Greece, November.
- Hegarty, S. (1993) Reviewing the literature on integration, *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 8, 194–200.
- Hutt, E. & Donlan, C. (1987) *Adequate provision? A survey of language units* (London, I CAN).
- I CAN (2001) *Joint professional development framework* (London, I CAN).
- Law, J., Lindsay, G., Peacey, N., Gascoigne, M., Soloff, N., Radford, J. & Band, S. with Fitzgerald, L. (2000) *Provision for children with speech and language needs in England and Wales: facilitating communication between education and health services* (London, DfEE).
- Law, J., Lindsay, G., Peacey, N., Gascoigne, M., Soloff, N., Radford, J. & Band, S. (2002) Consultation as a model for providing speech and language therapy in schools: a panacea or one step too far? *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*, 18, 145–163.
- Leonard, L. (1997) *Children with specific language impairment* (Cambridge, MA, MIT Press).
- Lindsay, G. (2003) Inclusive education: a critical perspective, *British Journal of Special Education*, 30, 3–12.
- Lindsay, G. & Dockrell, J. E. (2000) The behaviour and self-esteem of children with specific speech and language difficulties, *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 70(4), 583–601.
- Lindsay, G., Dockrell, J. E., Letchford, B. & Mackie, C. (submitted) Educational provision for children with specific speech and language difficulties: perspectives of speech and language therapy managers.
- Lindsay, G., Soloff, N., Law, J., Band, S., Peacey, N., Gascoigne, M. & Radford, J. (2002) Speech and language therapy services to education in England and Wales, *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*, 37, 273–288.
- Madden, N. A. & Slavin, R. E. (1983) Mainstreaming students with mild handicaps: academic and social outcomes, *Review of Educational Research*, 53, 519–569.
- Mills, P. E., Cole, K. N., Jenkins, J. R. & Dale, P. S. (1998) Effects of differing levels of inclusion on preschoolers with disabilities, *Exceptional Children*, 65, 79–90.
- Mithaug, D. E. (1998) The alternative to ideological inclusion, in: S. J. Vitello & D. E. Mithaug (Eds) *Inclusive schooling: national and international perspectives* (Mahwah, NJ, and London, Lawrence Erlbaum).
- Ofsted (2004) *Special educational needs and disability: towards inclusive schools* (London, Ofsted).
- Rapin, I. & Allen, D. A. (1983) Developmental language disorders: nosological considerations, in: U. Kirk (Ed.) *Neuropsychology of language, reading, and spelling* (New York, Academic Press).
- Snowling, M. J., Adams, J. W., Bishop, D. V. M. & Stothard, S. E. (2001) Educational attainments of school-leavers with a pre-school history of speech–language impairments, *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*, 36, 173–183.
- Stothard, S. E., Snowling, M. J., Bishop, D. V. M., Chipchase, B. B. & Kaplan, C. A. (1998) Language impaired pre-schoolers: a follow-up into adolescence, *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research*, 41, 407–418.
- Tomblin J. B., Records, N., Buckwalter, P., Zhang, X., Smith, E. & O'Brien, M. (1997) Prevalence of specific language impairment in kindergarten children, *Journal of Speech Language and Hearing Research*, 40(6), 1245–1260.
- World Health Organization (1992) *The ICD-10 classification of mental and behavioural disorders* (Geneva, WHO).





**Appendix 1: The questionnaire**

1. What is your LEA's policy for children with SSLD?
  - Do you have a written policy?
2. What is the practice?
  - Are there deviations in practice from stated policy?
3. What liaison is there with other LEAs/voluntary bodies for provision for children with SSLD?
4. How does your LEA make provision for children with ASD?
5. What is the LEA's overall approach to service delivery for children with SSLD in educational settings?
6. What is the LEA's policy for parental involvement specifically for children with SSLD?
7. Please provide examples of any good practice you have in meeting the needs of children with SSLD.



# Author Query Sheet

Manuscript Information	
Journal Acronym	EJSN
Volume and issue	20—3
Author name	G Lindsay et al.
Manuscript No. (if applicable)	

**AUTHOR:** The following queries have arisen during the editing of your manuscript. Please answer the queries by marking necessary corrections **at the appropriate positions on the PROOFS. Do not answer the queries on the query sheet itself. Please also return a copy of the query sheet with your corrected proofs.**

QUERY NO.	QUERY DETAILS
1	<b>Keywords — please supply up to six keywords for abstracting purposes.</b>
2	<b>Dockrell &amp; Lindsay (2001) — not listed in References.</b>
3	<b>Hegarty (1997) — not listed in References.</b>



## PROOF CORRECTION MARKS

Instruction	Mark in text	Mark in margin
Leave unchanged	<u>text</u>	( <i>stet</i> )
Extraneous marks or damaged letter	encircle	x
Delete	/ or  —	∩
Insert or replace text	λ	/text to be added
Add (λ) or substitute (/): full stop	λ /	⊙
decimal point	λ /	⊙
comma	λ /	∩
semi-colon	λ /	∩
colon	λ /	⊙
apostrophe or quotation mark	λ /	∩ ∩
superscript	λ /	2
subscript	λ /	2
hyphen	λ /	/-
short or long rule	λ /	/ <sup>en</sup> / or / <sup>em</sup> /
oblique	λ /	⊙
Wrong typeface or size	encircle	wf
Change to: roman (upright)	encircle	(rom)
italic	<u>underline</u>	(ital)
capital letters	<u>underline three times</u>	(caps)
small capitals	<u>underline twice</u>	(s.c)
bold type	<u>wavy underline</u>	(bold)
lower case letters	encircle	(l.c)
Greek letters	encircle	(gk) adding Greek letter
Delete and close up	copy	∩
Reduce space	in / copy	less #
Close up space	in copy	∩
Insert space	in copy	#
Make space in line equal	λ	eq #
Insert space between lines	) _____ (	
Reduce space between lines	( _____ )	
New paragraph	[	(para)
Run on, no new paragraph	2	(run on)
Transpose letters or words	┌ ┐	┌ ┐
Transpose lines	_____	_____
Take character to next line	∩	(take over)
Take character to previous line	∩	(take back)
Raise text on page	┌ _____ ┐	(raise)
Lower text on page	└ _____ ┘	(lower)
Check vertical alignment		
Check horizontal alignment	=====	=====



**AN AGREEMENT FOR THE TRANSFER OF COPYRIGHT**

**IN RELATION TO THE CONTRIBUTION OF YOUR ARTICLE ('THE ARTICLE') ENTITLED:**

.....  
**BY:**.....

**WHICH WILL BE PUBLISHED IN R-EJS**

.....  
In order to ensure both the widest dissemination and protection of material published in our Journal, we ask authors to assign the rights of copyright in the articles they contribute. This enables Taylor & Francis Ltd ('us' or 'we') to ensure protection against infringement. In consideration of the publication of your Article, you agree to the following:

1. You assign to us with full title guarantee all rights of copyright and related rights in your Article. So that there is no doubt, this assignment includes the assignment of the right to publish the Article in all forms, including electronic and digital forms, for the full legal term of the copyright and any extension or renewals. Electronic form shall include, but not be limited to, microfiche, CD-ROM and in a form accessible via on-line electronic networks. You shall retain the right to use the substance of the above work in future works, including lectures, press releases and reviews, provided that you acknowledge its prior publication in the journal.
2. We shall prepare and publish your Article in the Journal. We reserve the right to make such editorial changes as may be necessary to make the Article suitable for publication, or as we reasonably consider necessary to avoid infringing third party rights or law; and we reserve the right not to proceed with publication for whatever reason.
3. You hereby assert your moral rights to be identified as the author of the Article according to the UK Copyright Designs & Patents Act 1988.
4. You warrant that you have at your expense secured the necessary written permission from the appropriate copyright owner or authorities for the reproduction in the Article and the Journal of any text, illustration, or other material. You warrant that, apart from any such third party copyright material included in the Article, the Article is your original work, and does not infringe the intellectual property rights of any other person or entity and cannot be construed as plagiarising any other published work. You further warrant that the Article has not been previously assigned or licensed by you to any third party and you will undertake that it will not be published elsewhere without our written consent.
5. In addition you warrant that the Article contains no statement that is abusive, defamatory, libelous, obscene, fraudulent, nor in any way infringes the rights of others, nor is in any other way unlawful or in violation of applicable laws.
6. You warrant that wherever possible and appropriate, any patient, client or participant in any research or clinical experiment or study who is mentioned in the Article has given consent to the inclusion of material pertaining to themselves, and that they acknowledge that they cannot be identified via the Article and that you will not identify them in any way.
7. You warrant that you shall include in the text of the Article appropriate warnings concerning any particular hazards that may be involved in carrying out experiments or procedures described in the Article or involved in instructions, materials, or formulae in the Article, and shall mention explicitly relevant safety precautions, and give, if an accepted code of practice is relevant, a reference to the relevant standard or code.
8. You shall keep us and our affiliates indemnified in full against all loss, damages, injury, costs and expenses (including legal and other professional fees and expenses) awarded against or incurred or paid by us as a result of your breach of the warranties given in this agreement.

9. You undertake that you will include in the text of the Article an appropriate statement should you have a financial interest or benefit arising from the direct applications of your research.
10. If the Article was prepared jointly with other authors, you warrant that you have been authorised by all co-authors to sign this Agreement on their behalf, and to agree on their behalf the order of names in the publication of the Article. You shall notify us in writing of the names of any such co-owners.
11. This agreement (and any dispute, proceeding, claim or controversy in relation to it) is subject to English law and the jurisdiction of the Courts of England and Wales. It may only be amended by a document signed by both of us.

Signed \_\_\_\_\_

Print name \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_