

Editorial

Six months ago the first issue of *Studies in Design Education and Craft* appeared. In style and content it was considerably more ambitious than the *Studies in Education and Craft* it replaced. In view of the well known hazards of journal publishing the editorial board was well aware that it was upon a risky and uncertain venture. Since that time our fears have rapidly diminished in the face of the enthusiastic response to the first issue. Readers from all areas of work in design education have been warm in their encouragement and prompt in their subscriptions. Advertisers are using the journal in increasing numbers and the flow of contributions has been impressive. The break-even point in the journal's finances now looks nearer than once seemed possible. It is the policy of the journal to achieve further development and the increased content and illustration of this issue are a first indication of this. In addition it is hoped to be able to contain increasing costs – including postage – and to stabilise the subscription at present rates for at least several years.

This issue focusses on one of the most important contemporary developments in design education – the integrated design department. This is a form of reorganisation taking place in many schools – and under consideration in many more. At its simplest it is an attempt to break down the traditional but often unnecessary separation between work in art, craft, wood, metal, home economics and the other design subjects. It is not an attempt to break down the identity of these areas, rather to strengthen them by allowing the student to see both their similarities and their differences in materials, techniques and standards. An integrated department will have opportunities for students to sample all areas of work with materials, to have access to all specialist teachers and to undertake work which juxtaposes their contributions. In this way his approach to problem solving and creative work can be based on an informal and rational rather than an arbitrary choice between the specialisms.

Such an arrangement, however attractive in theory, presents formidable administrative problems. In this issue teachers from Oldham, Leicestershire and Hertfordshire report on their solutions to some of these problems and their plans for continued development of integrated approaches. All three present a picture of increasing opportunity for pupils and staff. Indeed one of the immediate consequences of the early planning stage in all the schools appears to be the way in which the discussions lead teachers to take a new and perceptive view of their own roles. It is a process that may be matched by staff and students in colleges of education as Lancaster shows in his account of the development of integrated studies at St. Mary's College, Cheltenham.

The articles make it clear that a further problem in the development of integrated approaches is the teacher's understandable worry about his specialist status. In this connection the article by Hanson on the history of professional associations of art teachers is particularly relevant. The article, printed as part of the journal's continuing policy of presenting relevant research papers, demonstrates the long drawn out battle to overcome status insecurity by the art specialist and the complex paths taken in the

attempt to achieve it. A short contribution by Harper gives a contemporary turn to the discussion in its examination of the implications, for the schools, of the two forms of training envisaged by the Coldstream report.

The review section is, again, comprehensive and reflects the growing range and quality of books that can contribute to design education. Two contrasting series are given attention. One is the extensive Batsford introductory series which is well on the way to establishing an important basic library of design education. The other, vastly different, is the impressive Praeger series of reprints of historical texts of trade and craft interest. Here as elsewhere in the review section an attempt is made to alert design education specialists to books that have important but not immediately apparent relevance to their work – from Pearce's *Thomas Telford* to Barnaby's *Paper Aircraft*. In the literature, as in the design department, the boundaries spring from the practitioner – not his subject.

S. John Eggleston