

20 de junio

Querido Sr. Ferrater,

Siento mucho que no podía asistir a la cena con Señora Sarofin, pero tenía un montón de cosas que empaquetar antes de irme a California. Micky me dijo que fue una cena muy divertida, pero ya había sospechado eso.

Le mando este "clipping" del periódico para convencerle que no importa tanto que las estudiantes no discutan en su clase. En mi opinión, hablar en la clase no indica necesariamente interés en el curso, ni tampoco conocimiento del sujeto. Por ejemplo, como le dije una vez, una estudiante puede hablar porque quiere ganar el favor del profesor para sacar buenas notas. Seguramente no tengo toda razón, pero claro es que las estudiantes que demuestran la mayor conocimiento e interés por medio de sus papeles y exámenes, no son siempre las que hablan en la clase. Así, usted no debe preocuparse más con la idea de que a las muchachas de su clase de IOI no les interese el curso--
idea formada a
a base de su participación. ^{¡¡VOLTA!} Conosco varias muchachas de la clase del semestre pasado que les fascinó el curso, y sobre todo, su presentación. Encontraron muy gracioso su manera de decir mucho mientras parece que no dice nada. Es muchísimo mejor que algunos profesores que hacen lo contrario. (Parecer decir mucho pero no decir nada.)

Espero que su viaje a Europa sea lo mas agradable. Muchos saludos a senora de Ferrater y a Jaime.

Sinceramente,

Lila Foster

27-VII-62

STUDENT'S BOOK ROOM

The Quiet Ones Win Out at UC

Still Waters DO Run Deep

By JACK SHEEHAN

A unique University of California experiment in group behavior may hold some lessons for the Nation on the values of different kinds of leadership—and on the fact that ability to “speak out” is not the only quality needed in a good leader.

Setting of the experiment was a graduate course in the UC School of Public Health in which “quiet” students were pitted against and surpassed “vocal” students.

The results were startling to both groups. Dr. Andie Knutson, lecturer in public health and director of the school's Behavioral Science

Project, said yesterday.

Doctor Knutson emphasizes the tests make a good case for finding new ways to draw out latent talents of quiet students.

Also, it shows up the inadequacy of non-examination courses in which students are graded only on class participation.

During the first few weeks of the course which started last spring, the students were ranked according to the number of times they participated in class discussions.

The students were totally unaware the experiment had begun. But after the first few weeks they had been divided into four groups: “Very vo-

cal,” “vocal,” “quiet,” and “very quiet.”

Adding to the value of the experiment the groups were evenly matched in intelligence. And, as it turned out, they also were similar in grade averages at the course's end.

Each of the classified groups was assigned a similar task—to test and evaluate a pamphlet on public health and to come up with recommendations on ways it could be improved.

As each group met separately to begin its task, observers said striking differences became immediately apparent. Among them were:

Those in the “very quiet”

group were astounded to find themselves without a vocal leader. Not a voice was heard for the first 15 minutes. And when one of the group finally made a remark he was immediately viewed as the leader by the others. But he was reluctant to accept the role.

With the “very vocal” group things were different, Doctor Knutson said.

In its case there was immediate and vigorous competition for the group's leadership. Competition was so keen, said Doctor Knutson's report, that the group scarcely bothered to read the assignment, let alone plot a careful course of action.

With completion of the

assignment, a detailed questionnaire was given to members of all groups.

Members of the “vocal” groups were delighted with the assignment, thought their groups were best (one student said his group was “the cream of the crop”), and were completely satisfied with the studies they had produced.

Conversely, “quiet” group members were negative in their answers. Among other things they said they would have preferred to be in another group and were critical of their own efforts.

The pamphlet studies of all four groups were judged by expert consultants from the California Department of

Public Health in Berkeley.

Their findings:

The work of the two “quiet” groups was unanimously ranked first.

To Doctor Knutson it appeared the “vocal” students had been unable to work well as a team and, in the case of the “very vocal” group, it was found that not a single member had bothered to read the entire pamphlet before it was submitted for judging.

Doctor Knutson sums up the study this way:

“The fast-speaking members of the vocal groups needed a leader who could

hold them back until sound decisions were reached, help them to evaluate progress and make necessary changes in plans, coordinate ideas and findings and make sure that an integrated product resulted.”

Doctor Knutson made one final observation:

“During the remainder of the course it was noticed that several members of the quiet groups assumed active leadership roles and that, for a while at least, the somewhat crestfallen “vocal” students were less active verbal participants in class discussions.