

The open area classroom tends toward inducement of a group or 'village' perception of the world. Independent study, in an extreme version, tends to develop individuality, opinionion, or 'point of view'. The benefits and dangers of each extreme situation are analyzed to try to make clear the nature of the educational process in any open plan or independent study situation.

S. D. NEILL*

The Open Area School and Independent Study

INTRODUCTION

The open area concept and independent study are recent innovations in a growing number of schools. Like most innovations, there is little theory backing their acceptance. A good, brief overview of the thinking behind the open concept school, as interpreted in this paper, is provided in *A Day in the Life: Case Studies of Pupils in Open Plan Schools*.¹ The words 'open plan' seem to have a number of interpretations in the literature — from free schools to outdoor education. My concern is with that 'openness' which is based on a large, wall-less space within the school building. Similarly, there are many articles on 'independent study' in *Education Index*; most, however, are about audio-visual, library, and programmed instruction activities, and are not concerned with an independent study environment as developed here. Much of this literature speaks of the concern over group conformity and the need to 'individualize' some aspects of the school program. These programs are concerned with subject content and the training of the student's research techniques. These are useful articles for gaining ideas for setting up programs, but my purpose is to take these theories of learning — that large open areas aid the learning process, and that learning is promoted in an independent study situation — and develop them strictly from the viewpoint of the effects of the two different environments on the learning process.

The open area learning milieu as a group experience

In the open classroom, housing from 90 to 120 children, and a team of three, four, or more teachers, the perception of 'mass' is always present.

*Associate Professor, School of Library and Information Science, University of Western Ontario.

¹Research Office, Division of Research and Development. Aurora, Ontario: York County Board of Education, 1970.

The student is an individual in a group, conducted by a group, in a larger, more environmental group. He works with a cluster of students which need not consist of the same individuals every week. His measured skills vary from 'subject' to subject and from time to time; so one week he will be in a less able group in arithmetic, and a more able group in art. The next week he could advance to a middle group in arithmetic and a heterogeneous group in language arts. Neither his classmates nor the content of his concentration are stable in time. Nor is he stable in space; for he moves from table to table around a large room, or from 'centre' to 'centre' (named: music, art, arithmetic, science, composition) throughout the day. Periodically he is given free time — or he is given free time when he asks for it — in order to read or type or look at audio-visuals or be alone. The organization of his spaces and his times is analogous to the heterogeneity of time and space in contemporary physics. He is not learning that there is a place for everything and that everything must be in its place, and a time 'one time' to think science and another time to think social studies. Although he is organized and even manipulated by the teachers, he does not feel it or sense it, and therefore cannot react against it, as in the standard box classroom with rows of desks (each of which 'belongs' to an individual) and where bells and clocks change the subject. His primary experience is one of interaction with other people.²

This is reinforced by the team teaching system in which, for example, three teachers work together with ninety children, arranging each child's group changes by regular tests of the various required skills. One teacher does not dominate. The three of them move, individually, from group to group, teaching, it is true, but in a more casual, informal way, sitting with the children, than if *one* were to stand up and conduct a standard lesson for twenty or thirty minutes. (I am using the term 'standard' to identify the classroom and teaching method we knew in most of our schools until recently — teacher dominated and time regimented.) The teacher of the group is a reflection of and a model for the child. The teaching team is consultative, not authoritarian, within their own group and within the group of pupils. The team teaches, by example, conference, cooperation, togetherness, and communal spirit. This is what the child experiences. No teacher's point of view is forced on him, either by edict or behaviour. He does not see one person leading. He perceives corporate decision-making, and experiences interpersonal action as the generality of his school day.

The environment he lives in is an environment of motion. There are no walls to break his awareness of distant bodies, and no aisles to regu-

²Donald N. Michael, professor of psychology and Program Director, Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge (University of Michigan), speaks of the increasing need for people skilled in interpersonal relationships for personal support and guidance in a disrupted society. [*The unprepared society*. (New York: Basic Books, 1968), p. 44.].

late the flow of bodies around him. He is no island desk. Although he may be absorbed in a book, in the words of a fellow student, or in some activity; his sense of smell, sight, and hearing resonate to the constant and changing noises and movements stretching to the far corners of his world. The walls are too distant and there are too many people in between to make of them more than a secondary impingement on his sensory apparatus. The standard classroom makes one aware of position and stability — desks, front of room, door, windows on one side, chalkboard — not movement and not sounds. However, it must be emphasised, that in the open classroom the child does not perceive other people only as individuals, but the structure of their behaviour as well.

The child in this environment of change, changes his physical space often. His mental activity ranges through different levels and on different topics at irregular times. His surroundings are in motion and the sounds of voices and activities envelope him. He is, in effect, in acoustic space.³ He is at the centre and so is each of his classmates.

In such a situation he can be individualistic but he cannot have a point of view. That is, he does not take an ideological stance in opposition to or different from the other members of the group. The communal 'culture' does not develop individual viewpoints on issues. If it is old enough, it has traditions to guide it. In the group we are discussing, the members are still young enough to be relatively free of individual biases, and issues are met by the interaction of the pupils in discussion. We get a consensus — a corporate decision or conclusion. However, judgments are not made for pronouncement, but merely as temporary guidelines.

It seems paradoxical that it is in this group situation that the self-centered student develops; yet it can be argued that anyone who is constantly engaged in interpersonal dialogue, or immersed in the processing of other 'dialogues', would tend to be highly aware of personal relations and personal characteristics of speech, dress, and behaviour. It would seem logical for him to become interested in his own personal appearance and actions and, inside the group, establish his own egocentric (eccentric?) being.⁴ This is not to say that he is interested in his appearance in order to be outstanding — apart from the group. He does not differentiate himself physically from the corporate body of which he is a living part. His aim is to conform to the appearance of the others.

³I must acknowledge a debt to Marshall McLuhan for indicating important ways of looking at or perceiving environments. Perhaps the most useful of his works is the National Association of Educational Broadcaster's *Report on Understanding New Media*, 1960, in which McLuhan defines many of his terms more clearly than in any of the books that are generally available. Acoustic space receives particular attention in his *Counterblast*, (McLelland and Stewart, 1969).

⁴Jean Piaget. *The Construction of reality in the child*. (New York: Basic Books, 1954), p. XII.

He dresses identically in his desire to 'belong' — to show he is 'in'. Within a general style of dress and manner, great variety of ornament is permissible and admired.

The opposite is the independent, objective individualism of the organizer of ideological parties — parties as different from groups. Parties follow a party line imposed as a code, or a set of rules to be followed. There is a conscious conforming to a single way of seeing the world. Groups or teams operate on a consultative basis, leaderless, except as specific temporary situations call for a certain talent, prepared to shift positions in a highly adaptable manner (excluding any adaptation which would fragment the group; for the group is held together by uncodified regulations). They are, as McLuhan says of the mass audience, "involved in one another and involved in the creative process of the art or educational system that is presented to them."⁵ The individual in the group does not develop his own, separate, 'system'.

CONTENT

The content of the 'subjects', while mostly being the skills of reading, writing, and arithmetic, also consists of the variety of social studies. Within all these areas, humanistic, scientific, and expressive, however, there is great freedom of choice, and questions raised by the children are answered, even if it means designing a work pattern of several days' duration. Knowledge is not a given, static, rigidly assigned course which is 'covered' regardless of the needs or desires of the pupils. *Full* freedom of choice is not allowed, but enough consideration is shown to make 'knowledge' a flexible, rambling, unstructured field of inquiry and to cause a real difference in the child's view of the nature of knowledge in comparison with the compartmental, textbook-orientation of the standard school.

Such a view of knowledge is, perhaps, closer to the true nature of knowledge which we are coming to realize is molar rather than fragmentary. And such an approach to 'constructing' the curriculum is probably closer to the pattern of the thinking process, which Agnes Arber compares to a reticulum of many dimensions,⁶ and which is less like the focussing of the sun's rays by a magnifying glass, and more like the flight of a cabbage butterfly on a hot afternoon.

DISCUSSION

Before closing this description of what happens in the open concept school, a description which is a conglomerate of observations made in

⁵Marshall McLuhan. 'The relation of environment to anti-environment', in *The human dialogue*, ed. by F. W. Matson and Ashley Montagu. (New York: Free Press, 1967), p. 45.

⁶Agnes Arber. *The mind and the eye: a study of the biologist's standpoint*. (Cambridge University Press, 1954), p. 45.

several of these schools, it is necessary to comment on the discussion aspect of the teacher's method. Although the child does work on his own, he has far more occasion to work with a team than in the standard system. He talks often. Dialogue is frequent, and, even when he himself is silent, he hears others talking. If we learn the grammar of the written word by writing, and comparing our product to the writing of others, then it seems we can conclude that children engaged in dialogue are going to learn, by practice, comparison, and experience, the grammar of speech. We begin to do so when we learn to speak, but, in the textbook school, attention is soon turned to expression in writing. Learning the grammar or structure of speech, even by intuition (as a result of experience), is necessary in acoustic space if one is to keep one's sanity. There are serious conflicts in trying to cope with any environment if one perceives it through the structured matrix of some other environment. One need only listen to professionals from different disciplines to realize that the words they use to label their concepts do not have the same basis in perception as the identical words used by someone in another discipline. Their environments (their laboratories, or the 'things' they work with) are different. They then see the world through a conceptual or cognitive structure based on their perceptions. The shadows cast by the different structures do not match and no light comes through the lattice. Interdisciplinary discussion entails much redefining or 'feeling around'.

When the teacher sits down with a group of children and allows them to express their opinions — about a topic, or about the teacher, or the system of education, or about themselves — they are not only getting ideas. They are also being taught that one person is as worthy as another in a dialogue. Each learns that when he speaks, he is central. All listen. And when another speaks, that person is central. They are taught that the system is not rigid, nor is the structure of knowledge.

Discussion in a small group has a social as well as a professional value. The sheer physical effort of speaking (which is difficult for many) helps to break down the barriers certain individuals construct around themselves. Contact and interaction with others tends to erode inhibitions so that a student who would have built up a store of frustration and enmity toward those 'leaving him out', is softened. He gets a sense of belonging to a group with whom he is on speaking terms, with whom he is in touch. The psychological warmth of human contact increases the willingness to enter into discussion. Those who are at first reluctant, and hang back, gain confidence, and the potentially hostile child can be helped into friendly relations, at least with some of his fellows. The teacher, of course, must be aware of these possibilities and use his knowledge to involve each child in the corporate activity of the group, so that none are inadvertently or deliberately left out.

This intellectual fluidity reinforces the physical fluidity of the open room. We again have an analogy to the concept of the universe described in relativity and quantum physics. We might even compare it to the swift-moving, ever-changing world of information the child lives in outside the school. Large quantities of factual information, emotional displays, and many different opinions flow over him, much of it incomprehensible, it is true, but the significant fact is that he perceives the multiplicity of kinds of information, the speed at which information changes, and the variety of forms that carry that information to all his senses. The open area school would seem to be well suited to educate citizens to live in such a world.

INDEPENDENT STUDY AS DETACHMENT

Independent study takes many forms in our schools. It is not my intention to describe accurately any one system or even a conglomerate. My aim is to examine independent study as a complement to group discussion as exemplified in the open area school. The small group seminar in a small room (or an ordinary classroom) is not the contrast I intend. I see independent study as a possible antidote or balance to the open concept plan. This does not mean that I am registering disapproval of the open system. My point is that *both* are necessary and that one should come after the other. In order to make the contrast as clear as possible, my postulated independent study program will be an ideal. To emphasise the advantages of independent study, *vis a vis* the open concept, I will use the disadvantages of the open concept plan in the development of the argument. In the process, certain aspects of the open plan not touched on above will be noted. This procedure should bring out the complementarity of the two programs.

Simply stated, a student on independent study works alone with some guidance from a teacher. He attends class for some subjects, but the majority of his time, let us say sixty percent, is spent in the study of some field of knowledge in which he is interested. We have looked at the open classroom in isolation from the rest of the child's career in school. Now we will attempt to see him in the independent study situation and examine its effect on him.

The group as blind

Let us suppose we push the group environment of the open school to its extreme, in order to extract from it its very real values. In doing so, we also push to the extreme the tendency to corporateness and uncritical acceptance of group decisions. The 'group' environment has some parallel to elements of tribal society as can be seen in these lines from the chapter on education in Jomo Kenyatta's *Facing Mount Kenya*.

"An individualist is looked upon with suspicion and is given a nickname of mwebongia, one who works only for himself and is likely to end up as a wizard. He may lack assistance when he needs it. He cannot expect that everything he

does will prosper, for the weight of opinion makes him feel his crime against society. Religious sanction works against him too, for Gikuyu religion is always on the side of solidarity."

"In the Gikuyu community there is no really individual affair, for everything has a moral and social reference. The habit of corporate effort is but the other side of corporate ownership; and corporate responsibility is illustrated in corporate work no less than in corporate sacrifice and prayer."⁷

The child is aware of himself as a member of the group. Inasmuch as he is a worthwhile member, he sees himself as a valuable individual — but he is not aware of himself as a possible entity outside the group. He is group-centred because he cannot see the group as an object to be perceived (like a fish in water), and he is self-centred because he does not know himself as an independent object apart from his role in the group.

Put another way, once he becomes the centre of attention for himself (self-perception), he no longer feels the need to be the centre of attention of others. The group is no longer important. Once he is able to objectify himself, he discovers himself. The ability to study (criticize) himself is also the ability to study the group, which, because he no longer needs it, becomes detached. He is ready to be the artist (his training in acoustic space giving him balance), building the mirrors in which society can see its image. He is also ready to become the scientist, examining the society or group as an object, tinkering with new arrangements (inventions), and promulgating utopian or dystopian theories. The group does not invent, it discusses, holding in suspension any particular idea until it has been thoroughly assimilated into the traditions. Such a mode of making changes is very slow, and the change itself, therefore, almost unnoticeable. The radical elements are compromised out to accommodate the interests of the members, and of history. Shirley Jackson's story 'The Lottery' is a chilling example of the slowness of cultural change in a small community,⁸ and Josephine Klein finds evidence for group solidarity and solidity even in such social groups as committees and clubs. She says: "Insofar as ideas are shared with those with whom one is in frequent contact, they will remain unexamined and unverified."⁹

The independent study program

Any independent study program should take as its logic the creation of an environment in which the student can develop his self-perception, self-confidence, detachment, objectivity, and critical abilities. One can question, of course the need for having critical abilities. They could lead, on the one hand, to the making of changes supposedly for the benefit of society. Change, as a means of improving our material con-

⁷Jomo Kenyatta. *Facing Mount Kenya* (Mercury, 1938), pp. 98-129.

⁸In *Adventures in American Literature*, ed. by E. Fuller and Jo Kinnick (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1961).

⁹*Working With Groups* (London: Hutchinson. University Library, 1961), p. 120.

dition, can itself be questioned. Michael's *The Unprepared Society* lists the difficulties and dangers in making decisions for change, and Braybrooke and Lindblom's realistic, decision-making strategy of "disjointed incrementalism" is a concession to these difficulties and dangers.¹⁰ On the other hand, such critical observation could lead to a decision to stop changes — drastic changes, at least. There is some evidence for this as the disenchantment with science shows. Even among scientists themselves a new social consciousness is rising.¹¹ We may yet change our minds about the value of *progress*.

A cogent reason for critical self-awareness is indirectly but importantly useful to society. This is the need to see the person as a good which 'exists for itself' — the idea that society is for man. Also that man is a 'whole' who is, in a way, above society; although he benefits from communication with others. Michael notes this in speaking of the necessity of concern for the social implications of technology. Without this concern "we are very likely to suffer social disruption and individual diminution".¹² Jacques Maritain has written *The Person and the Common Good* on this very matter. Without perspective one cannot see that, as Maritain says, even good societies tend to "enslave and diminish the person in the measure the society considers the person as a part and as a mere material individual."¹³ A man who does not see himself as above society in this way can become a Marxist or a Maoist — neither 'group' particularly fond of criticism.

Marshall McLuhan, in his metaphoric style, remarks on the reverse side of this coin: "We are all robots when uncritically involved with our technologies."¹⁴

One factor in the process of the development of these abilities is the requirement that the student work on his own for a long period of time (two or three months at the secondary level, for instance), his only contact with the school system's personnel being a teacher to act as guide and as critic. The student must feel that his work time-table and the pace at which he works is *his* to decide. The topic should also be his choice. In this way he is forced to face the fact that it takes inner drive and sustained will-power to make a decision and carry it out to completion. In coming to that knowledge, no matter how long it takes, or how many independent study 'sessions', he will get to know something about himself as an individual. He will see himself as weak or strong, able or mediocre. Care must be taken that he produce something that

¹⁰D. Braybrooke, and C. E. Lindblom. *A Strategy of Decision* (New York: Macmillan, 1963).

¹¹Doris Grumback, "Out of the grooves of academe", *Commonweal* (Jan. 30, 1970), pp. 468-70.

¹²*Op. Cit.*, p. 19.

¹³Jacques Maritain. *The Person and the Common Good* (Scribner's, 1964), p. 67.

¹⁴Marshall McLuhan. *War and Peace in the Global Village* (Bantam, 1968), p. 18.

will evidence for him his ability to take a stand. Such a confrontation with one's self to act on one's own is a first step in self-awareness.

This solitary environment will be heightened if the student is given a place to work that is his — a carrel in the library, for instance, where he can be alone and quiet. It is in such privacy that he can contemplate the personal trial of pushing himself into action. He needs time for this kind of reflection, plenty of it, but he also needs a place where he can be assured that he will not be disturbed.¹⁵ Such stability of place will contrast with the space shifts that take place in the open classroom and the ordinary classroom operated on the 'centres' system, and even those of the standard school. A space labelled with his name is itself a 'lesson' in selfhood. Private ownership counteracts the corporateness of the group.

The standard classroom also has a private space — the desk — but it is one among many. It is possible for the student to 'go along with the group' in a classful of students. His point of view is essentially the same as his fellows. The classroom format does emphasize, however, the idea of individual point of view, with the teacher on one side and the class on the other. The pattern is 'you there', 'me here', whereas in the group discussion, it is 'we-more-or-less-together'. A 'standard' experience should, perhaps, be used as part of the independent study system, to provide another element of conflict that is necessary in cutting the individual out of the group-think milieu. (One might question whether forty per cent is the proper length of time to be spent in the standard class.) Comfort does not come easily in the growth of independence. Clark Moustakas says that, in the end, "genuine learning is often an aching, struggling, solitary process."¹⁶

Getting the student to develop a point of view should be built into the independent study program. By point of view I mean that he develops a position, with respect to the material he is studying, which is theoretical. He should not be concerned, at this time, with action, with doing something, with a useful end. The practical considerations of his topic should be of no importance to him. Relevance is out. Such considerations would necessitate involvement in the effects of his 'theory' on people. As soon as he takes others into account, he begins to compromise. Later in his school career (or in some other part of the program) he can be brought to practical inquiry and application, but the independent study program should be as pure in its objectivity and impartiality (toward theory) as is possible. The theory then becomes *his* theory,

¹⁵For two eloquent arguments for the library as a place where one can be alone to satisfy the need of the human soul for mystery and privacy, see: Mason W. Gross, 'Facts, values, and libraries', in *Student use of Libraries* (American Library Association, 1964), and Jesse H. Shera, 'The quiet stir of thought', *Library Journal*, 94:15 (Sept. 1, 1969), pp. 2875-28880.

¹⁶Clark Moustakas. *Individuality and encounter*. (Cambridge, Massachusetts. Howard A. Doyle, 1968), p. 4.

and, as such, his point of view on the matter in hand. The content of the study he makes is not important in this context; although he should not be allowed inaccuracies. It is the formation of the ability to take a personal position, and to know that it has been taken, that we want.

Further to this is A. C. MacIntyre's dictum: "only in concrete examples worked out in depth can criticism flourish."¹⁷ Such concentration necessitates the choosing of only one topic at a time. It provides a counter to the multitude of topics possible in the discussion milieu of the child-centred, open school. We can well apply Alfred North Whitehead's two educational commandments: "'do not teach too many subjects', and again, 'What you teach, teach thoroughly'."¹⁸

One of the problems in the group situation, where content is discussed (but no conclusions are accepted as final), and learning takes place by 'doing' (followed by discussion), is the lack of conceptualization of what has been learned. The teacher sees enthusiastic involvement in a team project, or a student-conducted lesson, but the students are never told what they have learned. The kind of summary of knowledge which is in text books is not part of the 'involvement' theory of education. Yet not to know what it is that one knows is to be left planless, if not weaponless. Knowledge can be present as a tool without conscious advance awareness of it. But such use is only at the point of impact. It is knowledge for the present, which comes only at the moment it is needed. It is not fitted into a structure of which one is aware, and which one can use in the analysis of future actions.

The opening paragraph of a novel by an African writer, and about tribal Africa, illustrates this:

"A village which has remained virtually unchanged throughout the reigns of thirty-four consecutive Kabakas can hardly be expected to show any fundamental difference in the short space of two years, and so, on this, our second visit to Kalasanda, we are not terribly surprised to find that the only thoroughfare, that narrow, murram track sidling discreetly off the main Hoima Road, and sneaking through Kalasanda to the adjoining village of Gumbi, is, if anything, even rougher and more anti-motorist than it was before. Anyone would think that Kalasandans had never heard of 'Bulungi Wansi', for in vain does Ggombolola Chief Musisi appeal to their civic pride when it is a question of keeping the village's only link with a trunk road reasonably passable. 'You'll never get anywhere at this rate', he constantly reminds them, and their usual reply, issued with infuriating complacency, is: 'Well, where is it that we are supposed to be going?'"¹⁹

The danger of adopting a single, extremely stubborn point of view, of course, is that one cannot see anything outside particular lines of perspective. Anything that tends to disturb such a world-view is 'wrong', or, in communication language, 'noise'. (The flexibility of viewing

¹⁷A. C. MacIntyre, 'Against Utilitarianism', in *Aims in Education*, T. H. B. Hollins, editor (Manchester University Press, 1964), p. 20.

¹⁸Alfred North Whitehead. *The Aims of Education* (Mentor, 1948), p. 14.

¹⁹Barbara Kimenye. *Kalasanda Revisited* (Oxford, 1966), p. 9.

knowledge, or the things of the world, as fluid, hopefully developed in the open area school group, allows the potentially good things in the 'noise' to be discovered.) Such a firmly held position is characteristic of what we have labelled the standard classroom, with authoritative teacher and textbook. In the independent study program proposed, the teacher-advisor-critic provides a foil which not only helps the student develop his own point of view or theory, but to realize that other points of view can be held.

One other factor must be considered, and that is the form of communication most conducive to the development of critical ability. Those media are best suited that are themselves objects to be studied, that is, that provide a great deal of information, clearly and definitely. They provide a package of knowledge whose very form and 'grammar' teaches 'position', point of view, and detachment. Any process of communication that allows a give and take of opinions, or that has few clear facts or well-supported opinions, so that any message can be read into it (poetry, especially of a highly metaphoric nature, or non-objective art), must be avoided. Such learning experiences can be provided at other times.

In this vein, the advisor, should not be too friendly, but, rather, firm, articulate, and very well prepared with facts to back the point of view opposing the student's. This does not mean he has to be hostile, but he should be definite — helpful in method but not in the development of the student's theory.

In other words, the media used by the student, both in getting information and in producing his own, must be those which are well-defined in their own forms. Print, rather than handwriting, which is not as highly defined in its letter formation, suggests the use of a typewriter for the production of his results. Films, with their photographic, brightly-lit details, lectures, and printed books, rather than seminars, private conversations, or manuscript comments, should be used as the sources of information.

Thus the 'input' of the learning process, which would ordinarily be in as many forms as possible, would be limited to print (the visual focus necessitates a physical 'point' of view); the auditory being reduced to a minimum.²⁰ Processing the information should take place in writing and solitary thinking, and, when it is necessary, in a formal interview, but should not include discussion with others, especially those who might be sympathetic to developing the theme in an open, free-wheeling, informal manner. Preliminary production would be criticized by the advisor, but crystallization and the final decision on the finished 'theory' would be by the student himself.

²⁰McLuhan says: ". . . the individual 'discovers himself' in the act of reading and writing." [*Report on Understanding the New Media*. (N.A.E.B., 1960), p. 45.] A. C. MacIntyre writes: "But all culture which fosters critical ability must accept the standards of literacy." (*Op. cit.*, p. 20.)

It might be worth considering having the student give a lecture. It would force him to organize his material clearly, concisely, and for a definite time period, and to prepare himself psychologically to present his point of view while he himself stands as the focal point of the audience's view.

CONCLUSION

This analysis of two methods of education has deliberately isolated extreme positions to explore the values of each as clearly as possible. The question is, are not the extreme positions the only valuable ones, since the lesson of each is closely connected to its environment and its format. Indeed, to include in one any elements of the other would be trying to get the best of both when the best is only in the pure, uncompromised version of each.

It is for this reason that I would suggest a pairing of the two methods, preferably in a close time relationship. It might even be worth considering a planned sequence of alternating group and independent study years with some time in standard classrooms interlaced.

In any event, let me say again, it is not my purpose to encourage the elimination or the adoption of any *one* method. A man may be an individual; indeed, a quite singular individual, but yet his dancing is bafflingly complex.