

## **Critical Thinkers or Political Pawns?: Educating the Next Generation of Designers**

**By Teal Triggs**

### **Introduction**

This paper will present a British perspective on a universal theme. In 1987, Frith and Horne argued that British art schools taught the value of the arbitrary gesture over any notion of vocational training (1987: 36). Since then progressive UK governments have sought to push the art and design colleges in the UK toward more conventional vocational education and training. In 2001, then culture minister, the Rt. Honourable Chris Smith, claimed that that the creative industries were ‘at the cutting edge’, ‘a fundamental building block of the knowledge economy’ and ‘the new economy of the twenty-first century’. The remit of the newly formed Department of Culture, Media and Sport was to ‘make money’ for the UK economy. And, they had the figures to prove it: an increase in revenue generation from the creative industries £60 billion in 1998 to £112 billion in 2001. In total they said that 1.3 million were employed in pop music, fashion, design, film, computer software and advertising (DCMS 2001: Annex 1.12). Yet, as one government critic remarked:

‘In all the excitement over the economic case for the arts, the case for artistic excellence takes a back seat. At the risk of being unkind, the one other thing that marks out this culture secretary is his enduringly middlebrow taste in music and literature. Little matter when there is money to be made’ (Heartfield 2001).

What are the implications of this shift for graphic design education? Under new Quality Assurance Agency guidelines, university lecturers have to embed key skills (literacy, numeracy and IT skills) into their undergraduate curriculum and demonstrate how they are measured against learning outcomes and assessment criteria. It may be argued that many of the required key and transferable skills are already inherent in graphic design practice including communication, problem solving processes, and working with others. But where does this leave the ‘arbitrary gesture’? This paper will explore the tensions between the idea of artistic creativity and the needs of the marketplace as graphic design students are educated for the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

### **Artistic Practice versus the Marketplace: A Brief History**

*‘The taproot of all this mischief is in the endeavour to produce some ability in the student to make money by designing for manufacture. No student who makes that his primary object will ever be*

*able to design at all; and the very words 'School of Design' involve the profoundest of Art fallacies'* (Ruskin 1904, quoted in Bell: 1963: 263).

British design education has gone full circle from the early days of government initiatives, which saw the founding of the new Schools of Design (1837) to more recent arts and cultural policies promoting the creative economy (2001). Despite the distance travelled of nearly two hundred years, the agenda of the British government has remained essentially the same. That is, to foster economic growth by capitalizing on the fact that 'good design is good business'. In 1836 Parliament's Select Committee's final report proposed not only 'normal schools' to train teachers, but also the creation of Schools of Design in order to supply the country with manufacturing artists. Here the emphasis was to be on the vocational or technical aspects of training rather than the fine art principles and classical aesthetics espoused previously by the painters at the Royal Academy. The report recommended:

'...the direct practical application of the Arts to Manufacturers ought to be deemed an essential element. In this respect, local schools, where the arts reside as it were with the manufacture to which they are devoted appear to possess many practical advantages...the inventive power of the artist ought equally to be brought to bear on the special manufacture which he is destined hereafter to pursue (Bell 1963: 59).

The programme included one year of general instruction in art before the student applied what had been learnt to a specialist trade for a two-year period. The government stressed, however, that these schools were not to be seen as schools of fine art stating that 'a school which allowed a proportion of its students to become painters or sculptors might well be accused of wasting public money' (Bell 1963: 68).

This gave rise to heated debates between government and its critics as to what might constitute an appropriate programme of training in order to effectively meet the needs of industry. For example, debates took place around the relevance of drawing the human figure or even learning to draw from antique statuary, as had been indicative of the pedagogical practices of the European academies. It was clear that the intent of the Schools of Design<sup>1</sup> was to foster training that was essentially focussed on fostering the UK's growing industrial base. Even William Dyce (1806-1864), a painter and also Superintendent for the Council of the School of Design, argued in a report (1840) on the state of education that the training of the Bavarian system, based upon the

---

<sup>1</sup> The most well known School of Design in London was renamed the Royal College of Art in 1896. Bell indicates that the Schools of Design numbered 90 by 1849 with 12,000 students with trained teachers whose remit was to reach into schools for the poor and educating 70,000 children (Bell 1963: 256).

model of the engineering workshops, was better. Learning to draw in this case was “strictly for ‘the purpose of ornament’ (Frayling 1987: 19).<sup>2</sup> Whilst the Schools of Design established the foundations from which ‘good design’ would be recognized as an economic benefit, the importance of creativity in its curricula was seen as ‘an irrelevant diversion’ (Frith and Horne 1987: 31). In David Thistlewood’s treatise on art education titled ‘The New Creativity in British Art Education 1955-1965’, the principles that had belonged to an earlier era of art education ‘was a system devoted to conformity, a misconceived sense of belonging to a classical tradition, to a belief that art was essentially a technical skill’ (Thistlewood 1981: 4).

Drawing continued to feature in the debates as to the place of art within industry even as it moved from Britain to the US in the late 1800s. The British Aesthetic movement was introduced to America by noted literary figures and artists such as Oscar Wilde and Walter Crane but also through the ideas conveyed in the work displayed at the Philadelphia Centennial Exposition (1876). The noted design historian Ellen Mazur Thomson comments ‘the Exposition was seen by many as proof that English industrial arts education had dramatically raised the standards of commercial products’ (Thomson 1997: 108). However, British Romanticism and Aestheticism and enlightened practitioners such as John Ruskin and William Morris challenged the division promoted between fine art (which Ruskin equated with design) and industry.<sup>3</sup> John Ruskin in particular, ‘emphasised appreciation over skill’ and according to Thomson, ‘[the] implications for design education were...significant’ (Thomson 1997: 109). Evidence of the impact on the art curriculum in the US and in the establishment of public design schools in the 1870s may be found in the programmes at Harvard, Yale and Syracuse universities where professional schools were founded in fine and industrial arts (Thomson 1997: 112). In Chicago, The Frank Holme School of Illustration located in the Anthaeaeum Building in Chicago (1898) benefited from their affiliation with typographers and designers such as William Addison Dwiggins, Oswald Cooper and Frederic Goudy.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> The syllabus for the School of Design included ‘outline drawing, shading from plaster, modelling and colouring’; the study of design for ‘special branches of industry’; and lectures in the ‘history of taste and theoretical knowledge of style’ (Bell 1963: 73).

<sup>3</sup> Frith and Horne comment that the first art school directly influenced by William Morris and his ideas was in Birmingham (1890) who trained jewellers and silversmiths (Frith and Horne 1987: 34).

<sup>4</sup> For further details see Thomson’s excellent study on *The Origins of Graphic Design in America 1870-1920*.

In London, the Saint Bride Foundation Institute Printing School opened in 1894 (the forerunner of the London College of Communication)<sup>5</sup> in response to the City of London Parochial Charities Act (1891). Its remit was to provide training for apprentices in the printing trade and by 1912 the School boasted 250 registered apprentices. Then principal J.R. Riddell, who had been a pioneer in technical-based education, sought to abolish the traditional method of text book teaching for a more hands on ‘practical’ approach which replicated the commercial environment of the printing industry (Riddell 1939: 2). This philosophy continued to permeate the curriculum of its courses, which was highlighted by A.L. Butler in the School’s monthly magazine *The L.S.P Record* (October 1923, No.1). He argued for ‘the research worker’ as ‘the man whose scientific skill can take the problems that perplex the worker and find their solution; or who can create new methods and construct new processes so that some branch of industry is improved by their use’ (Butler 1923: n.p.). Despite the introduction of discrete Graphic Design and Typographic Design courses in the late 1940s, the emphasis continue to be placed on the ‘practical approach to design by close contact with all technical departments (LSPGA 1953: 52). It wasn’t until the 1950s with the formation of the Design Department that tutors such as Tom Eckersley who joined in 1954 and designer F.H.K. Henrion, would seek to bridge the gap between fine art, design and typographic practices.

The Central School of Art and Design was founded (1896) as a product of the nineteenth-century debate and whose original aim was to encourage the ‘industrial application of decorative design’ (London County Council 1896: 3). William Lethaby and others promoted the traditions of craft-based training combined with the traditions of technically based engineering approaches. Reconciling industry needs with craft-based training continued during the interwar period only to be fuelled by the emigration of Bauhaus artists and designers from Germany and the inevitable rise of consumerism. For a brief period in 1939 American industrial designer Raymond Loewy opened up a studio in London, managed by British designer and educator Douglas Scott. This influenced Scott’s pedagogical position within the Central Schools’ Industrial Design curriculum as he adapted American stylistic trends and business practices into the existing curriculum.

---

<sup>5</sup> In 1922 Saint Bride Foundation Printing School was renamed the London School of Printing and Kindred Trades and moved from Saint Bride Lane to 61 Stamford Street passing into London County Council Control. By 1949 the School experienced another name change to the London School of Printing and Graphic Arts and in 1962 again, to the London College of Printing taking up new premises at the Elephant and Castle building. In 2004 it was renamed the London College of Communication, University of the Arts London.

The introduction of a core programme of ‘basic design’ in the 1940s complemented the teachings of Lethaby and the principles upon which Central School was first founded. The Graphic Design Department was founded by Jesse Collins in 1945 who, three years later, was joined by Anthony Froshaug, Edward Wright and Herbert Spencer all of whom would take forward modernist ideas of ‘functional typography’ (Sego 1995: 152). The approach had developed out of two reports – one commissioned by the Council of Design and Industries Association (DIA, 1943) which promoted courses that would ‘explore and explain the principles of design, the qualities of craftsmanship including the qualities to be sought in machine crafts’; and the other from the Society of Industrial Artists (SIA, 1944) which advocated the introduction of a Basic Course approach to meet the requirements of post-war industrial design. Such a course would focus on amongst other things, ‘the creative approach to design; the necessity for invention’ (SIA 1944: 4).

Similarly, tutors at Camberwell School of Arts and Crafts also applied basic design approaches to courses taught in the commercial art and industrial design areas. William Johnstone, who taught at Camberwell and the Central School, encouraged the implementation of fine art guidance as an important component in the training for commercial and industrial designers. Johnstone satisfied this aim by hiring Victor Pasmore at Camberwell and later at Central School (1950-1954) to teach drawing and painting. Pasmore advocated a framework, which afforded students the opportunity to work in various media in order to advance experimentation. As if to legitimize such practices the published report from Sir William Coldstream in 1961 proposed to rationalise the role and remit of British art schools by introducing a more ‘broadly based qualification, equivalent in status to a university degree, with specialized areas of fine art, graphic design, textile and fashion design and three-dimensional design’ (Frith and Horne 1987: 40). The *Coldstream Report* fostered ‘basic design’ studies in an attempt to reintroduce experimentation into the curriculum (Sego 1995: 14). Equally notable was the compulsory courses to be undertaken in General Studies replacing the training focus of the vocational courses.

#### The Working Party on Typographic Teaching

If we might turn briefly to typography, it is worth noting that in the teaching of this subject, educators similarly had to reconcile the relationship between art (as a creative practice) and industry (as applied to commercial printing).<sup>6</sup> In 1966, the Working Party on Typographic

---

<sup>6</sup> The British Typographical Association complained in the second half of the nineteenth century that apprentices were not ‘the whole “art and mystery” of printing’ and that with increased specialisation

Teaching (findings published in 1969) was set up by the Society of Industrial Artists and Designers (London) in response to ‘repeated criticism from assessors, teachers, and spokesmen from industry that much graphic design work in colleges of art and design was let down by an immature approach to typography’ (Working Party on Typographic Teaching 1969: 97). The Working Party was Chaired by Professor Michael Twyman<sup>7</sup> and set out to identify the place typography should have in graphic design education. The final report emerged out of a series of meetings and national study conferences and read more like a series of observations rather than drawing any significant conclusions. However, the group deduced that ‘on economic grounds alone, this country cannot afford to tolerate bad design education any longer’ (Ibid: 95).

The role typography had in visual communication systems was considered ‘central to the machinery of government, industry, trade, transport, education and scholarship’. Harking back to earlier debates in design education, the Working Party findings indicated that the profession and industry were not best served by design education that promoted ‘personal expression’ (Ibid: 95). This approach, they argued, ‘may be perfectly legitimate in painting and sculpture, but is a distortion of typographic designing and, for that matter, any other designing’ (Ibid: 94). Instead they advocated a return to training for typographers and designers where ‘functional, technical and economic factors’ were privileged over technical expertise and which emphasised ‘typography as a form of applied arts’. While the report did not draw any detailed conclusions it did encourage forging stronger links with industry through work placement, re-training of existing staff and hiring new staff with industrial experience. Justine G. Beament, a recent graduate of the London College of Printing and attendee of the first meeting (1966) writes, ‘the development of skills and the acquisition of first-hand industrial experience with printers, publishers and design groups were considered to be important stages in the education of the aspiring designer’ (Beament 1998 in Jury 2001: 235).

---

student’s education was limited in the opportunity to acquire ‘that complete knowledge of the trade which is essential to a good printer’ (Musson 1954:187). Increased mechanisation fostered an increase in further specialisation.

<sup>7</sup> There were 48 members of The Working Party on Typographic Teaching including with their then institutional affiliations: Harold Bartram (LCP), Peter Burnhill (Stafford College of Art and Design), Clive Chizlett (Brighton College of Art), Brian Grimbley (RCA), Ernst Hoch (ICOGRADA) Jock Kinneir (LCP), Leslie McCombie (LCP), Ian McLaren (Ravensbourne College of Art and Design), James Mosley (St Brides Printing Library), Cal Swann (Manchester College of Art and Design), Peter Werner (Ravensbourne College of Art and Design), and Edward Wright (Chelsea School of Art); (Twyman in Jury 2001: 237-240).

The report also recommended a curriculum for typography and design, which stressed the ‘importance of stimulating the student’s imagination as well as training his analytical powers’ and recognized that ‘the typographer must produce creative and compelling solutions to the problems that are put to him...’ (Ibid: 101). This was one of the first indicators that ‘creativity’ was acknowledged as a part of the design process rather than for its overall economic viability. Twyman reflecting recently on the achievements of the Working Party’s report felt that it had a definite ‘impact’ if for no other reason that it provided support and ‘ammunition for those who wanted to develop serious courses in typography and graphic design’ (Twyman 2004). Some issues still remain unresolved despite the general acceptance in ‘understanding that there are different kinds of “creativity”, not just that of the artist.’ Twyman writes ‘I get the impression that there is a failure to recognize that vocational studies (and others too, of course) should stress enquiry, experimentation, and a broad understanding of the subject being pursued’ (Twyman 2004).

The Working Party readily acknowledged the ‘conflict’ between art and design in their Report and argued that design problems were different from the practice of art and craft and as a result required different forms of training. By the 1980s, however, Frith and Horne observed that the ‘old art vs commerce arguments are now structured within the education system – even on fashion courses there is disagreement as to “whether design students should be trained as creative individuals who produce art, or as craftworkers whose main relationship should be to the mass-production industry’ (1987: 37). Creativity as part of a fine art leaning experience had, according to Frith and Horne, formed the backbone of art school curricula since the 1950s where the term ‘creative’ was defined by being inventive or imaginative through experimentation or play.

### **Reconciling Creative Practices and Industry Needs**

*Graphic design students have a reputation for being more solid, more phlegmatic characters than fine art students, who relish and live out the idiosyncrasies of bohemian mythology* (Frith and Horne 1987: 38).

British art school traditions emerged from the cross-fertilisation of Romantic idealism and 1960s popular and consumer cultures (Frith and Horne 1987: 65). As we have seen up to this point, students had received vocational training in the practical skills of their profession as well as in the specialist areas as artisans and craftsmen. By 1959, such practical hands-on education came together with the emergence of a new wave of British export industries based in the areas of

fashion, textile, product and graphic design to produce new professional career pathways for its British graduates. As the producer of a recent BBC arts programme reflected:

‘In this way, the Sixties art scene in London was the seedbed of innumerable creative trends, and was one of the most exciting and varied hotbeds of talent that the art world has ever seen’ (Engle 2004).

London-based art schools in the 1950s and 1960s established the educational foundation for a group of now internationally recognized artists and graphic designers. David Hockney, RB Kitaj, Peter Phillips, Allen Jones, Derek Boshier and Patrick Caulfield were graduates of the Royal College of Art and Gilbert and George, John Latham and Anthony Caro had studied at St Martins School of Art. Graphic designers and illustrators including Alan Fletcher, Raymond Hawkey, Len Deighton attended the Royal College of Art while Peter Wildbur, Derek Birdsall, Colin Forbes, Ken Garland, and Gordon Moore all graduated from the Central School in the 1950s.

Fine art education traditionally has been considered as ‘free practice’ and something that is ‘not taught but learned through personal discovery’. Design practice, on the other hand, had as a discipline been traditionally viewed as a ‘response to external demand’ (Frith and Horne 1987: 30) where designers ‘learn by doing’ or in some cases, learn by ‘undoing’ (Pulos 1970: 169). The Schools of Design may have once produced, what Quentin Bell identified as the ‘ornamentalists’ or surface painters of the late nineteenth century, rather than practitioners of ‘High Art’, but designers were gradually coming to terms with functionality, utility and consumer culture. While design courses developed structured curricula to mimic the professional demands of the industry, they also redefined ‘creativity’ as an integral part of the problem solving processes and those which are identified as ‘external to artistic practice’ (Frith and Horne 1987: 37).

So what are the implications for Graphic Design education as we move firmly into the 21<sup>st</sup> century? It is interesting to note that the UK Quality Assurance Agency does not separate out art and design education or the criteria by which quality is measured. Under the defining principles of the art and design subject benchmarking statements the second point includes the creative process suggesting that,

‘The role of imagination in the creative process is essential in developing the capacities to observe and visualize, in the identifying and solving of problems, and in the making of critical and reflective judgments. Whilst convergent forms of thinking, which involve rational and analytical skills, are developed in art and design, they are not the only conceptual skills within the repertoire employed by artists and designers. More divergent forms of thinking, which involve

generating alternatives, and in which the notion of being ‘correct’ gives way to broader issues of value, are characteristic of the creative process’ (QAA 2002).

Stuart Laing (2002) examines the terminology in ‘Creativity, Professionalism and Culture – Beyond Benchmarking’, by taking the benchmarking statements from the three main subject areas of Art and Design; History of Art, Architecture and Design; and Communication, Media, Film and Cultural Studies and presents a comparative analysis of the references to phrases such as ‘creative expression’, ‘expressive practice’ and ‘creative industries and ‘cultural industries’ within the three documents and compares them to each of the other subject benchmarking statements. He draws the conclusion that

‘The concepts of the ‘creative industries’ and the ‘cultural industries’ could perhaps be terms that the subject benchmarks advance as matters for interrogation within the curriculum rather than as the political and economic rationale upon which the contemporary survival of the subject depends’ (Laing 2002: 111).

Graphic Design graduates are certainly well placed if higher education institutions have managed to deliver and assess the required skill bases of the QAA processes. Self-management, critical awareness, interpersonal and social skills, skills in communication and presentation as well as information skills all have had a role to play in ‘rounding out’ the student learning experience. Are we in danger of going through the motions and ticking off boxes from a list of required skills and in its wake, producing graduates who are highly skilled but lack the ability to engage and utilise the ‘arbitrary gesture’?

The ‘arbitrary gesture’ has historically found its place within fine art practice and indeed is a product of the British art school tradition. Yet, I would argue that over the last decade such practice does suggest a closer alliance between Graphic Design and ‘artistic’ practice. The rise of directions such as ‘graphic authorship’ has legitimized the use of the ‘arbitrary gesture’ within graphic design practice. Rick Poynor observes ‘ideas of personal authorship within a commercial medium and greater collaborative involvement in the process of message-making that are now taken for granted in Graphic Design, were in Britain, first proposed and applied twenty or more years ago by illustrators at the Royal College of Art’ (Poynor 1998: 11). The designer’s objectivity as a mediator of the client’s messages has shifted to that which fosters the graphic language of the ‘self’ (or graphic author). The design writer and educator Gerard Mermoz, takes this into Graphic Design education where he suggests the ‘new agendas should be set for graphic

design and designers, beyond the commercial needs and concerns of industry' (Mermoz 2000: 152). However, what if any, implications emerged out of this for Graphic Design curricula?

### **Conclusion: What of the Future of Graphic Design for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century?**

Despite the longevity of the debate between art and commerce there has been little or no resolution and the tension remains intact and firmly in evidence today. In March 2001, the Rt. Honourable Chris Smith announced in his Green Paper, *Culture and Creativity: The Next Ten Years*, that 'creativity is central to the country's future (DCMS 2001). The paper recognizes the value of 'creative industries' to the UK economy and refers directly to 'those industries which have their origin in individual creativity, skill and talent and which have a potential for wealth and job creation through the generation and exploitation of intellectual property' (DCMS 2001: Annex 1.1.2). As the context for industrial production and its technological base has shifted, so too has the way in which economic prosperity is achieved. Today it is dependent upon the successful development of a knowledge-based economy rather than the artisan factories and workshops of yesteryear.

The Green Paper outlined Smith's objectives. These were: to maintain and encourage excellence; to provide widening access to 'cultural quality'; and recognition that creative enterprises provide 'added value' to the economy. But what is perhaps key to us here is the fourth objective in which Smith proposes 'to ensure, both in the formal school system and also through life, that artistic creativity forms a central part of what is offered as the learning experience'. These objectives would be achieved through a number of key initiatives including 'creative partnerships' by linking children and teachers with creative professionals; funding support for individual artists; and 'free access to national museums and galleries' (DCMS 2001).

While this is all well and good, such strategic developments have been confined to primary and secondary education. The Green Paper fails to explicitly take into account the role higher education has to play in this equation. Linda Ball, a tutor at Brighton University acknowledges the importance of 'nurturing young talent' but also indicates that 'higher education will need to understand the nature of creative enterprises to help students and graduates to learn about the industry and how to access training and development opportunities (Ball 2002: 11). She speculates that 'providing a bridge between the 'real world' and programmes in higher education, we will be able to achieve the government's stated objectives. One way forward is to ensure that

graduates have the relevant management skills (e.g. networking), research skills and professional development for establishing their ‘creative businesses’ or for successfully entering the workplace (Ball 2002: 14).<sup>8</sup>

Still, I approach all of this with some scepticism. Design educators should be wary of the government’s attempts of supporting development in the creative industries. There is no doubt that various models of curricula have successfully supported student’s studying Graphic Design at the undergraduate level. It may also be evidenced that many students do benefit greatly by being exposed to ‘real world’ situations in project competition briefs such as those schemes sponsored by British professional bodies such as the Design & Art Directors (D&AD) and the International Society of Typographic Designers (ISTD). The development of transferable key skills is essential to this idea, where such factors as time management, working in teams, etc., readily prepare students for the workplace. In addition, internships and work placement schemes which have been for some years firmly integral to BA (Hons) programmes like that found at the London College of Communication, provide students with opportunities to take a year out to work in a design studio or related workplace.

Developing a curriculum for Graphic Design today should emerge out of an understanding that we need to meet the demands of the profession but equally we have a pedagogical duty to deliver the content through appropriate teaching and learning methods. These may be through teaching in small groups, one to one tutorials, or in large group lectures; using strategies such as self- and peer assessment to help students understand the criteria of evaluating projects; working collaboratively in small groups or role playing; creating effective forums for feedback including the use of Blackboard or other technology-based learning tools.

We must also educate students to think critically. By this I mean that students should be able to position themselves within the context of the profession’s history. This suggests an understanding of graphic design history but also in terms of contemporary developments of design in relationship to society at large. For example, the *First Things First Manifesto* first introduced by Ken Garland in 1964 and its later reincarnation by *Adbusters* (2000) is a case in point where through vigorous debates, designers have become more aware of roles and responsibilities.

---

<sup>8</sup> Such rhetoric of the Green Paper is reminiscent of early 1980s Thatcherite moves to encourage independent entrepreneurs.

Equally however, students should be able to articulate, if not demonstrate how to apply directly, a range of key theories and methodologies commonly used by designers as tools for engaging with and developing solutions for commercial and personal projects. How many students understand the basic concepts behind modernism and postmodernism and how this relates to the visual language of graphic design? Are they able to understand the way in which semiotic analysis can inform their approach to mediating client's messages to a target audience?

I would also argue that students should be able to employ as appropriate the techniques of experimentation or 'arbitrary gesture' as a strategy which 'frees up' an approach to problem solving and allows for 'testing' of ideas, methods or materials as an integral and effective part of the design process. Are they able to extend the design solution beyond a standard result or, for that matter extend the boundaries as to what it means to be a graphic designer? Are students able to reflect critically upon this in their work and apply what they have learned to the next design challenge?

Finally, Graphic Design practice should be seen in relationship to appropriateness. That is the selecting, developing and drawing conclusions from sources and practices that are relevant to the process of problem solving. This is part of a creative process – to think around problems, to look beyond the obvious and move ideas and methods forward. Graphic Design must link up with industry in order to achieve this, but at the same time should have the skills and ability to shape and inform the way industry itself functions and operates. We should not lose sight of these key traits as we educate the next generation of designers.

## **Bibliography**

Butler, A.L. (1923) 'The Research Worker', *The L.S.P. Record*, No. 1, October, London: London School of Printing and Kindred Trades, p. 6.

British Broadcasting Association (BBC) (2004) *Timeshift: Art School in the 1950s and 1960s*. London: BBC4

Ball, Linda (2002) 'Preparing Graduates in Art and Design to Meet the Challenges of Working in the Creative Industries: A New Model for Work'. *Art, Design & Communication*. Vol 1 No 2, pp. 10-24.

Beament, Justin G. (1998) 'A Time of Change: An Introduction to the Working Party for Typographic Teaching' reprinted in David Jury (ed) (2001) *TypoGraphic Writing*: Stoud: ISTD, pp. 234-236.

Bell, Quentin (1963) *The Schools of Design*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Council of Design and Industries Association (1943). 'Art School Education' reprinted in Herbert Read (1934, re. 1944) *Art and Industry*. London: Faber and Faber.

DCMS (2001) *Culture and Creativity: The Next Ten Years*. London: Department of Culture, Media and Sport.

Engle, Vanessa (2004) 'Summer in the Sixties: Snapshot of the Era – Art' [http://www.bbc.co.uk/pressoffice/pressreleases/stories/2004/05\\_may/13/sixties\\_art.shtml](http://www.bbc.co.uk/pressoffice/pressreleases/stories/2004/05_may/13/sixties_art.shtml) (accessed 4th August 2004).

Frayling, Christopher (1987) *The Royal College of Art: One Hundred & Fifty Years of Art & Design*. London: Barrie & Jenkins.

Frith, Simon and Howard Horne (1987) *Art into Pop*. New York: Methuen.

Heartfield, James (2001) 'Culture Vultures', reprinted in *Spiked Culture* <http://www.spiked-online.com/Articles/00000000551F.htm> (accessed 30th June 2004).

Laing, Stuart (2002) 'Creativity, Professionalism and Culture - Beyond Benchmarking', *Art, Design & Communication* Vol 1 No 2, pp. 108-114.

LSPGA (1953) *London School of Printing & Graphic Arts Prospectus 1952/53*. London: LSP

Mermoz, Gerard (2000) 'Towards More Ambitious Agendas' in Esther Dudley and Stuart Mealing (eds) *Becoming Designers: Education and Influence*. Exeter: Intellect.

Musson, A.E. (1954) *The Typographical Association: Origins and History Up to 1949*. London: Oxford University Press.

Poynor, Rick (1998) *Design Without Boundaries: Visual Communication in Transition*. London: Booth-Clibborn Editions.

QAA (2002) *Benchmarking Statement for Art and Design*. Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education.

Sego, Alex (1995) *Burning the Box of Beautiful Things: The Development of a Postmodern Sensibility*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Society of Industrial Artists (1944) *The Training of Designers for Industry: Proposal for Improving the Education and Status of the Artist-Designer*. London: Society of Industrial Artists.

The Working Party on Typographic Teaching (1969) 'Typographic Education', *Journal of Typographic Research*. Vol 3 No 1 January, pp. 91-102.

Thistlewood, David (1995) *A Continuous Process: The New Creativity in British Art Education 1955-65*. London: ICA

Thomson, Ellen Mazur (1997) *The Origins of Graphic Design in America 1870-1920*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Twyman, Michael (1968) 'The Working Party on Typographic Teaching: Interim Report, October 1968' reprinted in David Jury (ed) (2001) *TypoGraphic Writing*. Stoud: ISTD. pp.237-244.

Twyman, Michael (2004) Email to author. Saturday 21st August.