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A. B.
INTRODUCTION

The principal objective of the study was to apply and test the major theoretical constructs and research findings related to the diffusion of innovation, to decisions by members of occupationally related associations to participate in educational programs designed to increase occupational competence.

Professional associations occupy an important role in increasing the professional competence of their members through the dissemination of new information. Journals and other publications reporting new research findings and methods for more efficient organization and management of work is one way in which persons connected with occupational associations attempt to increase the competence of their members. Annual meetings that provide opportunities for research reporting, policy making, and informal interaction among geographically separated individuals is another. Still a third which has taken on importance more recently is the society sponsored conference, seminar or short course. These short term residential meetings concerned with a single issue or area of study are often co-sponsored by the university.

In recent years many universities have established centers for adult conference programs, one of the best known of which is the Nebraska Center for Continuing Education. Each year statewide and national professional societies conduct programs designed to increase the competence of their members. Persons engaged in continuing higher education at the University, as well as their counterparts in professional societies, have been concerned with more effectively reaching members in need of acquiring new information in order to increase professional competence. Increasingly, members of the labor force must adapt to the rapidly growing amount of information occurring in relation to their fields.

This research represents an approach to further understanding of how association members learn about a program designed to increase their competence and how factors related to the ways in which they learn about the program influence their decision to participate. The concept of the diffusion of innovation is a useful framework in which to examine this problem. Further defined, it is the acceptance (intention to participate), over time, of a practice (program designed to increase occupational competence), by individuals (for whom it is intended), linked to specific channels of communication, to a social structure (a professional society), and to a given system of values.

That which is being diffused and adopted, in the members' decisions to attend a program, represents a major departure from
prior diffusion studies for several reasons.* First, participants tend to be more homogeneous for any given program than the groups studied in other diffusion research (e.g., farmers who adopt a new practice, or persons who learn canasta). Second, the amount of time during which diffusion may occur is limited to the period between the first announcement and the start of the educational program. Third, the emphasis is primarily on increasing occupational competence (i.e., knowledge or skill) whereas most diffusion studies have been concerned with adoption of practices in which changed competence is a secondary concern. Fourth, the educational program designed to increase competence defines status through the achievement qualifications necessary to become a member (admission) and the increased status which may accrue to an individual as a result of achievement within the organization (grades, diplomas, etc.). Both status-defining capacities are related to achievement within the organization, whereas the status in most other products and processes studied is not directly related to the achievement but is related to activities and objectives which lie outside the organization concerned with promoting diffusion. Fifth, the status relationship in an educational program tends to be one in which the participant has a lower status than the instructor. If status is, in part, the ability to invoke responses in others, the instructor's acts of evoking systematic responses to facilitate learning maintain the subordinate status of the 'student.' In the case of purchasing a product the status relationship is not consistent. Either buyer or seller may have the higher status and the relationship is usually not implicit in the relationship. Sixth, the function of an educational program designed to increase occupational competence has primarily an instrumental function in that the students undertake activities to increase their performance in another domain (their occupation) at some future time. Student-instructor interchanges, of course, introduce the expressive function but this is usually secondary. The instrumental-expressive function in most diffusion studies is not as consistent as it is with education.²

The social structure of concern here, the professional society, also represents several unique departures from previous diffusion studies. First, most diffusion studies have undertaken a community, state or nation-wide analysis rather than focus on a smaller more homogeneous organization. Few have considered organizations, such as corporations, voluntary associations, or government organizations.³ Second, most community analysis has been limited to the smaller community and may not reflect diffusion patterns in urban areas. Consequently, there is need for research that can contribute

*Items in prior diffusion studies include farm machinery, agricultural practices, fallout shelters, washing machines, fabrics, fashions, drugs, canasta, old age insurance, contraceptives, boiling water, canning, polio vaccine, tuberculosis tests, fluoridation and television sets.

²
to the theory of diffusion within the context of formal organizations in a culture having a high division of labor.

From the foregoing, it becomes evident that not only does the application of diffusion theory to the spread and adoption of an educational program in a professional society extend existing thought, but in addition, it provides the educational program planner with information on ways he might influence the process of diffusion in order to increase participation in programs designed to increase occupational competence.

The study had the following three objectives:

1. To examine the diffusion process when the diffused item consists of participation in a formal organization.

2. To construct a detailed account of the spread and adoption of an educational program in a professional society through the application and testing of diffusion theory.

   Particular attention was given to:

   a. assessing the relative extent and impact of face-to-face interaction and mass communicated messages in the decisions of society members to attend or not attend an educational program;

   b. identifying the function of face-to-face interaction in decisions to attend or not attend an educational program;

   c. describing the relationship between the influential and the person influenced with respect to participation in an adult education program as well as the characteristics differentiating the two; and

   d. describing the flow of influence and information over time that is operative in the social system with respect to decisions to participate.

3. From the above to derive a set of postulates, and subsequently recommendations, regarding the promotion of educational programs that would serve to guide the program administrator regarding ways he can or cannot effectively influence the process of innovation in order to increase participation.
METHOD

Data were obtained by mailed questionnaires sent to the members of six occupationally related voluntary associations that are co-sponsoring educational programs at the Nebraska Center for Continuing Education. The association sponsored conferences that were selected met the following conditions:

1. The selected conferences are primarily designed to increase occupational competence;
2. Participation is limited to association members;
3. Participation by members is optional;
4. The population (total membership) from which conference participants come is contained in Nebraska and bordering states;
5. The promotional plan for the conference is that, except for the planning committee members, all members of the population receive information about the conference at about the same point in time;
6. The leaders of the association are sympathetic to having members interviewed; and
7. The time between the date the conference is held and the date information and registration forms are received by potential participants should not exceed four months or be less than one month.

It was not always possible to obtain associations that limited conference participation to association members. One group sent a special invitation to members of comparable groups in surrounding states to attend. Those that attended were excluded from our analysis. The membership in the six associations ranged from 60 to 396 members. Participation in these one- and two-day conferences ranged from 18 to 209 members. The names of the associations and the conferences they sponsored follows.

Nebraska Elementary School Principals Association, Department of Elementary School Principals Annual Conference
Nebraska Conservation Contractors Association, Conservation Contractors Workshop
Professional Surveyors Association of Nebraska, Nebraska Land Surveyors Conference
Nebraska Association of School Administrators, Joint Conference of the Nebraska Association of School Administrators and the Department of Educational Administration, Teachers College, University of Nebraska
Omaha-Lincoln Section of the American Society for Quality Control, Fourth Annual Quality Control Conference
Nebraska Architects Association, 1965 Seminar, "The Dramatics of Lighting"
These associations have been assigned code numbers for purposes of this report. The groups tend to be homogeneous. The original plan was to select three associations that had not previously sponsored conferences; however, this was not possible. All of the associations had previously sponsored conferences. It was also hoped that associations could be selected such that their formal objectives would represent a range of orientation to tradition. Although other measures of the orientation to tradition revealed systematic differences between associations, the objectives of the six associations were nearly identical.

Questionnaires were sent to all of the following people:

1. Conference coordinators who were employed at the Conference Center and worked with the association in planning and arranging the conference;
2. Association members who were on the conference planning committee and worked with the coordinator (whether or not they registered and/or attended);
3. Association members who registered and/or attended the conference (exclusive of planning committee members); and
4. Association members who did not register or attend the conference (exclusive of planning committee members).

A follow-up letter and a copy of the questionnaire were sent to those who did not respond to our initial inquiry. The rate of return ranged from 22 to 94 per cent. The rate of return appeared to vary directly with the level of education of the respondents. In two out of the six conferences the number of responses from members who did not participate in the conference exceeded the number of those from people who did participate. In the remaining four, participants responded to a greater extent than non-respondents. In all, 204 non-participants returned completed questionnaires, while 406 participants did so.

The six associations were divided into two sets of three. The members of one set were sent questionnaires in the period immediately following the conference. Members of the remaining three associations were sent questionnaires immediately following the receipt of their registration for the conference. Members who did not register or attend were sent a questionnaire immediately following the conference. The three associations whose members were sent questionnaires after the conference served as control groups. This procedure provided evidence regarding the effects of replying to the questionnaire during the registration period on the diffusion process.

As it turned out, there was virtually no difference between the two sets of associations that could be accounted for by the time at which they received the questionnaire. However, the fact that registration in all cases reached a peak just before the conference meant that a number of participants did not get an
opportunity to complete the questionnaire until after the conference. As we did not ask respondents to indicate when they completed the questionnaire, we could not control for this possible source of bias as much as we would have liked.

The scales and other measures used are described in detail in connection with the specific tests of each hypothesis.
RESULTS

This section examines the following components of the diffusion process: time of adoption; the diffused item; unit of adoption; channels of communication; the social structure; and values of the system. The derivation of each hypothesis is stated; the way in which it was tested is described and any conclusions that may emerge are also expressed.

Time of Adoption

The systematic accounting of time is a crucial element in that (1) it is a way of identifying the characteristics of early or late adopting individuals; (2) it can establish the direction of the flow of influence over time; and (3) it makes possible a mathematical description of diffusion according to whether the item spread is influenced more by the extent of previous adoptions or by the nature of the contacts with previous adopters.

Research on the difference between earlier and later adopters is vast. Many studies suggest five categories of adopters according to the relative amount of time intervening between the introduction of the item into the system and adoption of the item by the individual. These categories are opinion leaders (or innovators), early adopters, early majority, late majority and laggards. The categories have been validated to the extent that in one study the self-image of 76% of the subjects corresponded to these categories. Research suggests that as one moves from opinion leader to laggard: age increases; the level of education decreases; orientation to tradition increases; the total number of sources decreases; and integration into the social system generally decreases. It was hypothesized that:

the characteristics of early and late adopters of educational programs, although less pronounced, are the same as those indicated by studies of other diffused items.

The time of adoption was calculated for each individual by keeping a record of the day each conference registration was received. The period from the time the first registration was received and the first day of the conference ranged from ten days to more than six weeks. Individuals whose registrations were among the first 33 per cent to be received were early adopters, the middle third were termed middle adopters and the last third became late adopters. In cases where more registrations were received on a particular day than were needed to fill an adopter category, registration forms were randomly assigned to adopter categories until the requisite number was achieved. This procedure could not be in the case of one conference where, in spite of the fact
preregistration was requested, 93 per cent of the participants registered on the first day of the conference. Because of this unique situation, this conference was omitted from the early-late adopter analysis. The characteristics differentiating early and late adopters found in earlier studies do not seem to appear as clearly among populations eligible to participate in occupationally related conferences. To increase the probability of obtaining a difference, middle adopters were omitted from the analysis.

**Age.** It was predicted that older persons would adopt later. The data, although supportive, did not support a unidirectional prediction (Table 1). Young conference participants also tended to adopt later. Participants in the modal age category (35-44 years of age) tended to adopt earlier, while participants that were younger and older than they tended to adopt later.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Adoption and Age of the Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age of Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Adopters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Adopters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intellectual Ability and Formal Education.** The level of education and time of adoption of the participants seem to vary with each other. In one conference group the modal level of formal education was high school graduation, while in another it was graduate work beyond a Master's degree. There was little difference between early and late adopters in conference groups having a lower modal level of education. However, in groups having a modal level of four years of college or more, early adopters tended to have a higher level of education than late adopters (Table 2). A Fisher Exact Probability Test of the observed distribution indicated that it would occur 8 per cent of the time by chance alone, not significant by the usual standard but provocatively close. The fact that such distributions were not observed in conference groups where the modal level of education was less than a Bachelor's degree is not clearly understood.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education and Time of Adoption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Adopter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate work beyond a Master's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A comparison of the mental ability of early and late adopters revealed that early adopters tend to have slightly higher intellectual (particularly verbal) ability. The difference between the mean of the early adopters 15.5 and the late adopters 14.1 yielded a "t" score indicating that such a difference would occur by chance less than one per cent of the time.

Individual Orientation to Tradition. It was also proposed that late adopters are more traditionally oriented than early adopters. An individual's orientation to tradition has been defined such that it includes the following. A traditionally oriented individual:

1. looks toward local colleagues rather than the people from the top institutions for assistance in learning more about their field;
2. has many extensive ties (e.g., financial, kinship, friendship, cultural, etc.) to a particular community such that severing them would be very disruptive;
3. has limited contact with occupational peers outside the state in which he is employed, but rather he knows many residing in the same area as himself;
4. waits until innovations and new practices are utilized on a widespread rather than a limited basis before adopting them; and
5. views primary relations in expressive rather than instrumental terms such that membership in professional associations would be viewed as enhancing his opportunity to form new friendships and maintain old ones.

Let us examine each of these orientation dimensions to tradition in turn. Fifty per cent of those nominating local colleagues as opposed to persons from the top institutions for occupational leadership and assistance were early adopters. However, 61 per cent of those who nominated persons from the top institutions tended to be early adopters. It should be noted, however, that 17 per cent of all adopters were unable to nominate either as being useful or insisted that both were equally useful. In this case the early adopters tended to be less oriented to tradition.

A six-item cosmopolitan scale adapted from the Academic Administrator and University Goal study of Gross and Grambusch was modified for use in this study. The items were designed to reveal the extent of an individual's ties to the local community. Scores ran from a theoretical of six (least cosmopolitan) to a high of 30. The mean for all conference participants was 17.9. The mean for the early adopters was 16.9, while the late adopters' mean score was 17.1. A "t" test revealed that the difference between the early and late adopters was not statistically significant.
The number of colleagues residing outside of the state nominated by early and late adopters was not ostensibly different. Only a relatively small proportion (28%) of the adopters nominated such colleagues. Forty-one per cent of those identifying such contacts were early adopters. A Kolmogorov-Smirnov one-sample test of this indicated that the distribution was not statistically significant. Also, the number of colleagues with whom the respondent had frequent contact who resided in the geographic area of the member was nearly the same for both early and late adopters. Our contention that more tradition oriented individuals are late adopters is not supported insofar as being traditionally oriented is coterminous with having local rather than cosmopolitan colleagues.

The fourth dimension of orientation to tradition is the propensity to be among the first to adopt new ideas or practices. The tradition oriented person is apt to adopt an idea about the same time as everyone else or be among the last to adopt. Forty-six per cent of those who felt that they were generally among the first to adopt an idea were also among the first to register for the conference. However, the distribution is not statistically significant.

Somewhat contrary to our expectation, those persons who view the association as greatly enhancing their opportunity to form new friendships and maintain old ones tend to adopt earlier (57% were early adopters) than those who do view social gains as a major benefit (45% were early adopters). The difference, though, does not conform to the conventional level of significance, occurring 20 per cent of the time by chance according to a chi square calculation. However, the tendency is worth noting.

On the whole, none of the dimensions of an orientation to tradition conformed to our expectation in terms of predicting early and late adoption. It would seem that either the time of adoption distinction is not appropriate to apply to educational conferences or that the concept orientation to tradition needs to be reexamined.

Information Sources. The number of personal and mass communicated sources of information were also thought to systematically vary with time of adoption. Although the mean number of face-to-face contacts reported in connection with the decision to register for the conference ranged from 2.9 persons for early adopters to 2.5 persons for late adopters, an analysis of variance did not yield a sufficiently high F value to accept the hypothesis. The mean number of news items, brochures and other mass communicated sources ranged from 2.8 for early adopters to 3.3 for late adopters. Analysis of variance was used to test the variability accounted for by the number of mass communicated messages. The
value of F yielded by this computation indicated that the observed distribution would occur more than five per cent of the time by chance.

Integration into the Association. The extent to which an individual was integrated into the association sponsoring the conference was also thought to differentiate early adopters from late adopters. System integration refers to the extent to which an individual has contact with other members of the association regarding organizational affairs. The measure of system integration used was a sociometric device where respondents were asked to name the three association members with whom they discussed organizational business. From the nominations made by all the respondents a sociometric score was calculated for each member. An individual's score was based first of all, on the number of nominations he received and second, on the number of times members who named the individual were nominated. A person receiving one or two nominations from persons who themselves were nominated several times would score as high as a person who was nominated five or six times by persons who were themselves not nominated by anyone.8 Those less integrated would adopt later as they would have less obligation to conform to a norm established early by those who view the program as an important organizational activity. The data conform to our hypothesis (Table 3). Only 44 per cent of those less integrated into the association sponsoring the conference were early adopters, while 67 per cent of those highly integrated into the organization were early adopters. A chi square calculated on the observed distribution indicated that the finding would occur by chance 10 per cent of the time.

Table 3

Member Integration and Time of Adoption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Integration</th>
<th>Low Integration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Adopters</td>
<td>67% (14)</td>
<td>44% (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Adopters</td>
<td>33% ( 7)</td>
<td>56% (42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% (21)</td>
<td>100% (75)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, then, it appears that our hypothesis was confirmed in part. There were a number of systematic differences observed between early and late adopters, but many less than early research led us to predict. Essentially, two factors--intellectual ability (as reflected in level of formal education and intelligence) and integration into the social system--predict time of adoption. Those with greater intellectual ability and those more highly integrated into the association tend to adopt early. One interpretation is that the relevance of an educational program may become apparent more quickly to someone with greater intellectual skill. Also, those more integrated into the system have more
opportunity to learn about the conference and the consequences of participation to a greater extent (and therefore earlier) by virtue of their vast interpersonal network.

Closely linked to the time of adoption is the "contagion" quality of the educational programs. Contagion refers to whether a program's spread is a "function of the extent of previous adoptions." One geographer demonstrated that the most probable adopter of a new farm practice was a farmer living in the vicinity of someone who has just adopted it.9 This study advanced a similar hypothesis that is:

holding other sources of information constant, an individual is more likely to adopt an educational program when someone he interacts with has adopted the program.

The proportion of participants who reported talking with one or more persons who had already decided to attend the conference was compared with the proportion of non-participants who reported doing so before registering for the conference (Table 4).

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation and Face-to-Face Contact with Persons Who Have Already Decided to Attend</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Non-Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact with Adopter</td>
<td>48% (193)</td>
<td>35% (72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Contact with Adopter</td>
<td>52% (213)</td>
<td>65% (132)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100% (406)</td>
<td>100% (204)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forty-eight per cent of the participants reported contact with someone who already decided to attend before registering for the conference, while only 35 per cent of the non-participants reported such contact before registering. The finding was subjected to a chi square test which revealed that the observed distribution would occur one per cent of the time if chance alone were operating. It is reasonable to conclude, therefore, that the adoption of adult education does seem to possess a quality of contagion to it. However, contagion may be more descriptive of the interpersonal relationships rather than anything intrinsic to "contagion" itself. This point will be elaborated further in subsequent pages.

The Diffused Item

The third element in the definition of diffusion is the diffused item, or of interest here, the educational program designed to increase competence. The broad question is, what qualities of
an educational program are most influential on its diffusion pattern? The following are thought to be relevant: (1) the educational program's tangibleness; (2) the status conferring aspects of the program; (3) the function the program has for the student; (4) the continuous emphasis on increasing competence; (5) the program's subject matter content; and (6) the departure the program represents from previous modes of acting.

Communication Ability. The low objective content (tangibleness) and the delayed gratification often inherent in educational programs suggest that such programs are not easy to communicate to others and that their utility is often difficult to demonstrate. This would suggest that the ability to handle and apply abstract ideas and proficiency in receiving and directing communication would be relevant to the diffusion of an educational program. It was hypothesized that:

the flow of information is from those who have higher intelligence and educational achievement to those who have somewhat lower intelligence and educational achievement.

To test this hypothesis we examined the characteristics of those forming face-to-face contacts in connection with their decision to register. The 610 respondents to our questionnaire reported face-to-face contact with 1,427 different persons. Many of these face-to-face contacts were with other association members. Although the mail questionnaire prevented us from obtaining information on both persons in each diad, we were able to examine 387 diads. Respondents in each conversation diad were asked to nominate the person who first brought up the conference as a topic. The person who initiated the conference topic was treated as an information source and the member of the diad who did not initiate the conversation was an information receiver. This assumption may or may not be warranted. An individual may initiate a conversation in order to obtain or impart information about a conference. One fact is certain. The initiator needed to possess some information about the conference in order to initiate a conversation about it and therefore is more likely to be the person who imparts information about the program.

Information sources or initiators appear to have a higher level of education than the information receivers. Forty-five per cent of the initiators possessed more formal education than the receiver, 45 per cent the same level and only 10 per cent had attained less formal education than the receiver. A Kolmogorov-Smirnov one-sample test was used to test the observed distribution. Such a distribution would occur only five per cent of the time by chance. The variable of educational achievement conforms to our
hypothesis that information flows from those having higher educational achievement to those who have somewhat lower academic attainment.

Again, our estimate of intelligence is based on an abbreviated verbal ability test. Scores were not available for 31 per cent of the diads, thus less confidence may be placed in the findings. Forty-four per cent of the initiators in the diads for which we have complete information possessed higher verbal ability than the information receivers, seven per cent obtained the same score and 49 per cent scored higher than the initiator. The high number of diads lacking verbal ability scores mitigates against using a statistical test. Therefore, our hypothesis is confirmed only insofar as formal educational achievement is concerned.

It was further hypothesized that:

the flow of information is from those who have higher verbal ability and frequency of verbal interaction to those who have lower communicative ability.

The verbal ability test, in addition to its use as an estimator of overall intelligence, may be used as a measure of verbal ability. Our hypothesis that information about the educational program flows from those with high ability to those with low ability, according to the data already reported, is not confirmed. The hypothesis that the information flows more often from those whose verbal interaction about the program is greater than from those who communicate less often about the program is given some confirmation. Fourteen per cent of those who initiated interaction discussed the conference more often than their receiver, while only 10 per cent of the initiators talked about the program less often than their receivers. The bulk of the initiators tended to discuss the conference about as often as did their conversation partners. A Kolmogorov-Smirnov one-sample test calculated on the observed distribution indicated that it would occur five per cent of the time by chance.

Another hypothesis was advanced in connection with the member's ability to communicate with others about the program.

Non-adopters have lower intellectual and communicative ability.

The hypothesis that non-adopters have lower intellectual ability and communicate less often about the program is given partial confirmation. The mean scores of the two groups on the verbal ability test did not significantly differ, but the two groups did differ on the extent to which they discussed the
conference with association members and others. Only 76 per cent of the non-participants reported such conversations, while 90 per cent of the participants did so. The chi square test revealed that this distribution would occur 30 per cent of the time if chance alone were operating.

We may conclude then that there is some evidence that the tangibleness of educational programs and the attending difficulty in communicating such things as the program's objectives, the activities while the program is in session, and the consequences of participation, have implications for the flow of information regarding the program. Those with higher academic achievements and who discuss the program more frequently (and presumably possess greater ability to verbally communicate) have more ability to communicate information regarding the program than those possessing these qualities to a lesser extent. The data lend support to these notions, although not at the conventional level of significance.

**Status-Conferring Aspects of the Conference.** The status-conferring aspects of an educational program and the status relationship between the student and the instructor would have implications for diffusion. Status is defined as having one or more of the following referents:

1. ethnic background;
2. ownership of property (material goods) and the right to dispose of it;
3. control over the occupational and social mobility of other individuals;
4. specialized knowledge, skill or ability; and
5. freedom in initiating and maintaining goal-directed activities and organizational structure.

If participation in an educational program implies a conferring of status on the participant, then concepts dealing with changes in status congruence, reference groups, initiating structure, goal-directed activity and relative status in occupational groups become important. An individual will not attempt to enhance his status when:

1. there is high probability of increased status incongruence;
2. changing reference group identification is difficult;
3. the individual is insecure in initiating structure and goal-directed activities; and
4. the status of others in the occupational reference group is lower than his own.
When participation implies conferring of status, it is hypothesized that:

the flow of information is from those who want to enhance their status to those who do not.

Conference participants were asked to rank a variety of objectives according to the extent to which they influenced their decision to register for the conference. One of those that members were asked to rank was, "to aid in securing higher professional status and prestige at work or among my colleagues." The diads were examined to determine if the information passed from those who ranked the objective higher to those who ranked it lower. In 44 per cent of the diads this was the case. However, in 40 per cent of the cases the information flow was reversed. Therefore, we cannot accept the hypothesis that the flow of information about the conference is from those who want to enhance their status to those who do not want to do so.

The status relationship the student enters into with regard to the instructor often involves an extended subordinate relationship. The amount of experience with status subordinate relationships may be one factor which differentiates those who enter into such relationships from those who do not. Those with more recent experience with status subordination relationships (e.g., employees who have only moderate supervisory responsibilities in complex organizations) are more likely to pass on, or reinforce information, or to adopt, than those with less recent experience (e.g., managers, department heads and officers of complex organizations). The hypothesis was that:

non-adopters and those who do not receive, pass on, or reinforce information would tend to be those with less experience with status subordinate relationships.

A substantial difference exists between participants (adopters) and non-participants (non-adopters) with respect to the number of positions during their occupational history in which they regularly reported to someone regarding their work responsibility. Each such position was counted as one status subordinate relationship. The mean number of status subordinate relationships was calculated for participants and non-participants. Eleven such positions was the mean for participants, while the non-participants reported six. An analysis of variance yielded an F value indicating that the variability in adoption accounted for by status subordinate experience could only occur by chance less than one per cent of the time.

Association members who discussed the educational conference with other members would have opportunities to receive, pass on, or reinforce information regarding the conference, while those who
did not discuss the program would not have an opportunity to do so. The mean member of status subordinate positions held by those who reported discussing the conference with association members and by those who did report such discussions was calculated. A mean of nine positions was found among those who discussed the conference (prior to registration) with members, while a mean of seven was observed among those who did not report conversations involving the conference as a topic. An analysis of variance yielded an F value indicating that the variability in passing on, reinforcing and receiving information about the conference could occur by chance less than one per cent of the time. Because the positions involving number status subordinate relationships could be a function of age, the means were calculated for each age category; however, the finding persisted.

In summary, whether or not individuals want to enhance their status has little to do with the flow of information about educational conferences. However, whether or not an association member has had extensive experience with the status subordinate relationships that characterize educational sessions appears to predict adoption as well as the extent to which an individual will relay information about the conference.

Function of the Conference. The function of professionally related educational programs has a number of implications for diffusion. The intent of the program is clearly instrumentally oriented in that the students undertake activities to increase their performance in a domain outside of the educational program, at some future date. Certainly some expressive or social-emotional functions are intended in student-instructor interchanges, but this is usually secondary to the instrumental function. However, the function the program has for the student may vary considerably from the intended function. The program may serve such instrumental but unintended function as increasing the status of the student or changing performance in domains other than occupation. Or the expressive or socio-emotional function may be uppermost. It was hypothesized that:

persons for whom the function of an educational program deviates from the intended functions are involved in diffusion patterns different from those for whom the function is the same as the intended function.

The amount of consensus between the planners of the six conferences was extensive regarding those educational objectives that were of highest priority. The following objectives or functions emerged as having high priority in all conferences: to provide the participant with an opportunity to engage in the discussion of ideas; to acquire knowledge that will increase his occupational competence; to become introduced to new ideas; to
acquire added knowledge or skill reflecting the most recent developments in the field; to exchange ideas and information with other members; and to learn something that they can apply when they return to their work.

By and large the participants rated similar objectives as having greatly influenced their decision to register for the conference. However, there were three objectives, differing greatly from the intended functions of the conference, that were endorsed by substantial numbers of participants as influencing their decision to register. These were:

1. to aid in securing higher professional status and prestige at work or among my colleagues;
2. to get together with friends and associates; and
3. to experience a change from the job or day-to-day routine.

Those who endorsed these objectives were compared with those who assigned them a low rating on the following aspects of diffusion: (1) time of adoption; (2) extent of exposure to mass communicated messages regarding the program; (3) number of face-to-face contacts regarding the program; (4) extent of interaction with other association members regarding the program.

The three deviant objectives rated as important factors influencing the decision to register for the conference systematically influenced only some aspects of diffusion. Number of face-to-face contacts and mass communicated messages reported were nearly identical for those who rated these deviant reasons high and those who rated them low. However, those who gave getting together with friends and associates and securing career advancements high ratings tended to differ with respect to time of adoption from their counterparts who did not rate this objective highly. Those rating the social objective high tended to adopt later (90 per cent in contrast to 79 per cent for those assigning a low rating). The distribution would occur by chance one per cent of the time. Those interested in securing career advances, on the other hand, tended to adopt early (22 per cent in contrast to 14 per cent). A chi square calculated on this distribution indicates that this would occur ten per cent of the time by chance.

Persons rating social reasons high also differed from those who felt these reasons had a minimum influence on their decision with respect to the extent they were nominated as persons with whom the subject of conference participation was discussed. Those who rated social reasons high were nominated more often than those assigning or rating them low. Nineteen per cent of the high raters were nominated one or more times and 11 per cent of those who did not report being influenced to attend for social reasons
were nominated one or more times. Such a distribution would only occur five times in 100. Those who gave high ratings to (1) achieving status and (2) achieving career advancement tended to be nominated less often than those assigning a low rating to these factors. Five per cent and nine per cent of the former were nominated one or more times, while 17 per cent of the latter two groups were so nominated. These findings would only occur by chance five per cent of the time. In summary, persons for whom the intended functions of a conference differ from their own objectives tend to be involved in distinctive diffusion patterns.

**Emphasis on Increasing Competence.** One of the central characteristics of an educational program is its emphasis, for the entire duration of the program, on changing (primarily increasing) the participant's level of performance. This is more characteristic in education than in any other domain of life. Among those for whom an educational program has the instrumental function of increasing occupational competence, a high degree of educational efficacy would seem to be an important prerequisite. Educational efficacy is defined as the degree of influence (control) one feels he has over the types of skills, amount of knowledge and/or types of attitudes he has. It is often gauged by the individual as his probability for success in a new situation and is partially dependent upon his past experience of success or failure in similar situations. It is hypothesized that:

those with a high degree of educational efficacy, perceiving education toward increased occupational competence as highly important, would be more likely to attempt to convince others of its importance.

Educational efficacy is reflected in such activities as keeping up with new developments in the field, reading and studying professional journals, and other materials not directly connected with specific work matters and receiving professional journals on a regular basis. A person with high efficacy would probably not view keeping up with new developments as a major or heavy burden, but as one of many activities necessary to perform effectively. Of course, the most substantial evidence for a high feeling of control over the amount of knowledge one has is participation in adult education programs. All of these factors were examined in connection with the hypothesis that persons possessing a high degree of educational efficacy attempt to convince others of its importance more often than those with low educational efficacy.

To assess the extent to which members actually keep up with new developments in the field, respondents were asked to indicate on a five-point scale their position between the extremes of (1) "keep up with nearly everything relevant to my work" and (2) "pretty
rusty on keeping up." A mean score was calculated for those having less than three conversations with others regarding the program and for the group having three or more face-to-face contacts. The mean for both groups was 3.3; therefore, our proposition that those who do a good job of keeping up with new developments try to convince others of the importance of the program is not supported.

The extent to which an individual reads journals and other materials appears to be related to the extent an individual talks with others about the programs. Forty-seven per cent of those reading less than ten hours per week talked with three or more persons about the conference, while 58 per cent of those who read ten or more hours per week did so. The chi square test indicates the observed distribution would occur by chance only five per cent of the time.

Forty-seven per cent of those who received fewer than five professional journals on a regular basis reported three or more conversations where the conference was a topic, while 56 per cent of those who received five or more journals reported that number of face-to-face contacts. A chi square reveals that such a distribution would be obtained by chance one per cent of the time. Thus, the hypothesis, insofar as number of professional journals received on a regular basis is a measure of educational efficacy, is supported.

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they thought keeping up with new developments in the field was (1) a major burden, (2) a heavy burden, (3) one among many, or (4) not much of a burden. Twenty-eight per cent of the members felt that keeping up was a major or heavy burden. There was no significant difference between the members' responses to this item and the number of face-to-face contacts regarding the conference. However, when participants and non-participants are analyzed separately, interesting differences emerged. Sixty-one per cent of those participants who believed this to be the case discussed the conference with three or more persons, while only 53 per cent of those who felt keeping up was one burden among many or not much of a burden reported talking with that many persons about the conference. This distribution is contrary to our initial proposal, and would occur 20 per cent of the time by chance alone. In contrast only 28 per cent of the non-participants who believed keeping up presented a major or heavy burden talked to three or more persons, while 40 per cent of those who felt keeping up was not such a heavy burden had such face-to-face contacts. A chi square test calculated on the distribution revealed that it would occur 20 per cent of the time by chance alone. The non-participants conform to our hypothesis, while the participants do not. One interpretation is that the participants may view the conference as a way of alleviating the problem of keeping up,
while the non-participants may not view the conference as accomplishing such an objective.

Finally, the difference between those who have a history of participation in adult education and those who did not report such experience conform to our hypothesis. Only 38 per cent of those who had a limited amount of experience participating in adult education programs talked with three or more persons regarding the conference, while 55 per cent of those who had more extensive experience did so (Table 5). The distribution is significant beyond the .01 level.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation in Adult Education Programs and Extent of Face-to-Face Contacts Regarding the Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited Experience in Adult Education Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-Face Contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% (226)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, our hypothesis is confirmed insofar as the amount of professionally related reading an individual does, the number of journals he receives regularly, and the extent of his history of participation in adult education are indications of the amount of control one has. Those possessing a high degree of educational efficacy tend to talk to others about upcoming educational programs and probably attempt to convince others of its importance.

Program Content. The question of the amount of variance in diffusion patterns which is related to the content (information to be disseminated) of the conference introduces another source of variance in the program's diffusion. The content of the programs designed for a single professional society often varies from conference to conference. A state dental association may one year hold a conference to increase the competence of members to promote dental health programs in their own community, while in another year hold a conference designed to increase the dentist's competence in managing his office. The question was, to what extent do different occupationally related topics attract different association members? The extreme positions on this question are:

1. Conferences on different topics attract a group having the same characteristics but consisting of different individuals. This would support the hypothesis that:

   program content influences diffusion patterns.
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2. Conferences on different topics attract a group consisting of the same individuals. This would support the hypothesis that:

program content does not influence diffusion patterns.

Eighty-eight per cent of the participants and 58 per cent of the non-participants indicated that they would be interested in attending a conference next year on a related or different topic. The participants nominated some 187 different topics one or more times while the non-participants named 64 topics. The topics of the conferences studied were compared with the suggested topics. If the participants named topics that were closely related to the present conference, that is, merely broader or narrower aspects of subjects covered, it would support the notion that program content influences diffusion patterns. This was not the case, however, as 62 per cent of the participants named topics that were different from those covered during the conference. A Kolmogorov-Smirnov one-sample test revealed that such a frequency would only occur five per cent of the time by chance. Thus, the hypothesis that program content does not appreciably influence diffusion patterns is supported. However, such a notion is an oversimplification. Conferences are often designed to attract as wide an audience as possible. A wide variety of topics are included to increase the likelihood of widespread appeal. Also, the interests of an entire association membership are diverse rather than monolithic—reflecting the high degree of specialization occurring in most fields. Consequently, the influence of content on participation is more complex than our initial hypothesis suggested. A more detailed study of content is needed which exceeds the scope of the present study.

The Conference as a Departure from the Norm. The final dimension of the diffused item, to be considered here, is "the extent to which an innovation is a major departure from some previous mode of acting." In other terms, the extent of consistency between the innovation and existing values and the past experience of the potential adopter, influences diffusion patterns. Of course, if the item is not a departure from some previous mode of acting, it is not an innovation. It was hypothesized that:

when potential adopters perceive a conference as a radical departure from previous modes of behavior, (a) the proportion of the total group which adopts is small, (b) early adopters are perceived as deviants, (c) early adopters will have internalized the values of the professional society to a limited extent, and (d) the flow of information is from those less integrated into the system to those who are more integrated into the system.
All conference participants were asked whether the conference represented a considerable departure from the types of activities in which the association has usually engaged. Those who thought that it did represent such a departure or were uncertain as to whether it represented a departure or not were treated as persons who thought the conference was a departure from existing norms. However, we were not able to compare the proportion of the respondents who felt the conference was a departure from the norm with the proportion of the total membership that attended because there was little correspondence between the ratio of participants to non-participants in our sample and in the membership of the associations. However, one important difference between participants and non-participants did emerge with respect to the idea that the conference represents a departure from previous modes of behaving (Table 6).

Table 6
Participation and the Conference as a Departure from the Norm*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference seen as departure from previous association activities</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Non-Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28% (105)</td>
<td>56% (93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference not seen as departure from previous association activities</td>
<td>72% (264)</td>
<td>44% (72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% (369)</td>
<td>100% (165)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thirty-seven participants (9%) and 39 non-participants (19%) did not answer the question.

Fifty-six per cent of the non-participants who answered the question reported that the conference represented a departure from the usual activities of the association, while only 28 per cent of the participants who answered the question did so. A chi square revealed that such a distribution would only occur one per cent of the time by chance.

There are several possible interpretations of this phenomenon. A number of members may not attend because they do feel that it is a departure from the norm—something the association should not do. Or it may merely be a reaction to a situation that does not permit them to attend anyway—"sour grapes" is a more colloquial way of expressing it. Other members who feel the conference is a departure from the norm but attend may participate because it represents an important activity in which the association should engage, or they may be engaging in the program because they have to even though they believe it is "not right," e.g., their superior may request them to attend.
There was considerable consensus among both those who believed the conference to represent a departure from the norm and those who did not that the conference represents an important activity that the association should continue in the future. Therefore, we may discount the proposition that members choose not to attend because they feel the conference is something the organization should not be doing. The idea of the conference causing the member who attends inconvenience appears to be more tenable. Fifty-eight per cent of non-participants who reported that attending conferences caused them major inconvenience tended to view the conference as a departure from the norm, while only 44 per cent of those who indicated attending conferences caused them little or no inconvenience did so. Such a distribution would occur 20 per cent of the time by chance. This adds credence to the "sour grapes" interpretation. No such distribution was observed among the participants.

The question is, for whom does an educational program represent a departure? It is suggested that educational programs represent more of a departure from a previous mode of acting for those who have not participated in adult education programs since completing formal training. Thus, it was hypothesized that:

the characteristics of those having previously participated in adult education varies systematically from those who have not participated.

The extent of an individual's experience in adult education seems to differentiate association members in some ways but not in others. It is important to note that some experience in adult education programs is very widespread among members of the associations studied. Only one per cent of the participants and one per cent of the non-participants reported no previous experience. The modal number of such programs for both groups was five. Those reporting more than five programs were treated as members having extensive participation experience, while those reporting five programs or less were treated as having less extensive experience. Extent of participation did not differentiate those who adopted the conference early from those who registered later. Nor did prior participation differentiate between members who viewed themselves as being among the first to adopt a new idea and members who adopted an idea about the same time as everyone else. Extent of participation seemed to have little bearing on: (1) the length of time the member had been in his present occupation; (2) the degree to which he was satisfied with his career up to the present time; and (3) his occupational mobility as reflected in whether his present occupation had more, less or the same status as that of his father when he was approximately the same age as the respondent. Although there was a tendency for older respondents and those with a
higher level of formal education to report more extensive histories, the data were not statistically significant.

On the other hand, those who scored high on a four-item opinion leadership scale tended to report more extensive experience in adult education. Only 53 per cent of those taking a less active role while "talking shop" reported an extensive history of adult education participation, while 70 per cent of those who were active opinion leaders with respect to occupational matters reported major involvement in adult education programs. A chi square calculated on the distribution revealed that the difference would occur by chance only one time in one hundred.

Opinion leaders, of course, have to keep up with new developments in their field. One of the ways to do this is to participate in adult education programs where such information is apt to be available. Persons who participate in many adult education programs also report keeping up with new developments, while those who participate less report being "pretty rusty" on new developments in the field. This distribution would occur by chance only two times out of one hundred. Extent of participation in adult education also appears to differentiate between those who have substantial contact with other members of the association and those whose contact with other members is limited. Fifty-six per cent of those having more extensive contacts with other members of the association report an extensive history of enrollment in adult education programs, while only 44 per cent of those with less contact with other members of the association report such experience. A chi square test indicates that this finding is at the .05 level of confidence. Not only does the person reporting more participation in adult education report more contact with other association members, he also reports spending more hours per month on the association and being a member for a greater number of years. Sixty per cent of those spending little or no time on association matters reported extensive participation in adult education, while 73 per cent of those spending some time on the association each month reported extensive participation. With respect to the number of years the respondent was a member of the association, 56 per cent of those whose tenure was less than five years reported extensive adult education program participation, while 69 per cent of those belonging five years or more reported such participation. Both findings were at the .01 level of confidence.

Finally, the diffusion pattern, insofar as it is reflected in the amount of face-to-face contact reported in connection with the decision to register for the conference, was systematically related to member participation in adult education. Those with more experience reported contact with three or more persons more often than those with less experience. Fifty-five per cent of those reporting heavy participation did so, while only 38 per cent of those reporting limited participation in
adult education did so. A chi square calculation revealed that this distribution would occur less than one per cent of the time by chance alone.

In summary, our hypothesis that the characteristics of those having previously participated in adult education varies systematically from those who have not participated is confirmed. It appears that the systematic difference revolves around what may be loosely termed social participation. Those actively involved in one way are most apt to be active in organizations of the same gender. In this case, those who make efforts to keep up with new developments in their field also take a more active part in their professional associations (whose function is, in part, to facilitate keeping up), talk shop with others in the same field, participate in formal educational programs, etc. There appears to be a syndrome of participation related to increasing or maintaining one's occupational competence.

Unit of Adoption

The third element of the diffusion definition is the unit of adoption. The adoption of an item may be classified with regard to the unit of adoption for which they are intended. Some are intended only for adoption by a group, some by an individual, still others may involve elements of both. For example, an item may require a collective adoption but permit any given individual to adopt or not, such as establishment of telephone service in a community. Or a group may adopt as a unit leaving no room for individual options. Fluoridation or a raise in the mill levy would be examples. In some cases the culture may require a collective decision. Most educational programs are collectively adopted by the professional association. The association establishes the policy regarding whether the individual member has an option to attend. In nearly all cases the individual member may adopt or not.

The unit of adoption becomes an important influence on diffusion patterns when there is likelihood of directing an appeal or information regarding an educational program to the wrong adopting unit. When this occurs, the adoption is less likely to be widespread. An appeal made to association members as members from a given community or business could yield a weak response when the social system of the professional association emphasizes allegiance and the instigation of goal-directed activities towards state or national headquarters or where individual autonomy is part of the value system of the association. The appeals made by the associations in the study were very comparable --describing in detail the topics to be presented and giving brief reference to the benefits to be gained from participating--namely increasing occupational competence. This coincidence of appeals precluded examination of the effect of appeals to diverse units of adoption.
Channels of Communication

Another definitional element is the channels of communications. The fact that the concern here is with the diffusion of information and/or influence within a well-defined social system facilitates an examination of the channels through which it is diffused. All members are known and they all initially receive essentially the same information regarding an educational program at the same point in time. This was accomplished by a mailed brochure sent to all members at the same time. The assumption was made that many people talk to others about the program and this interaction influences the diffusion process. A large body of research and theory, beginning with the monumental work by Katz and Lazarsfeld entitled Personal Influence supports the assumption that many people solicit and receive the interpretations, opinions, and ideas of others before reaching a decision to participate in an activity.18 There are, no doubt, people who receive a brochure, and come to some decision about participating without discussing it with anyone else. However, this is most likely to occur when the individual is socially or geographically isolated from other association members. Thus it was hypothesized that:

members socially and/or geographically isolated from other members are less likely to discuss a decision to adopt an educational program or not.

Several measures of social isolation were used, while only one geographical isolation measure was used. The sociometric device described previously was used as one measure of social isolation. The second measure of member isolation consisted of the number of people having the same occupation as the respondent with whom he had contact at least once every two months or more often. For the third and final measure each respondent was asked to think of the three friends he sees most often and then indicate the number having the same occupation as himself. The single measure of geographic isolation employed was the size of the community in which the respondent worked. A small community would have fewer persons in any given occupation than a large urban area; therefore, a person working in a small community would be more geographically isolated from his professional peers than someone in a larger community.

The sociometric measure of social isolation yielded data that conformed to our hypothesis. Only 45 per cent of those having a low sociometric score had face-to-face contact with three or more persons in connection with their decision to register for the conference, while 67 per cent of those with high scores did so. The observed distribution, according to the value yielded by chi square, would occur less than one per cent of the time by chance.
Respondents who reported contacts once every two months or more often with more than ten people in the field tended to talk with more people about the conference than those who reported ten or fewer colleagues. Fifty-eight per cent of the former group reported three or more face-to-face contacts, while only 50 per cent of the latter group did so. The distribution would only occur 20 times out of a hundred by chance alone.

Persons who reported that one or more of the three friends they see most often have the same occupation as themselves tended to report more face-to-face contacts than persons whose friends did not include someone in the same field. Fifty-two per cent of the former group reported contact with three or more persons, while only 45 per cent of the latter group did so. This finding would only occur 10 per cent of the time by chance.

There is a tendency for those living in smaller communities to report fewer face-to-face contacts in connection with the decision to register with one important exception—those association members residing in the one population area containing 250,000 persons or more. Forty-four per cent of those living in communities under 10,000 population reported three or more face-to-face contacts, 57 per cent of those living in communities having a population of 10,000 to less than 250,000 population reported such contact, while only 34 per cent of the respondents from the largest community in the state reported as many face-to-face contacts. This distribution would occur two per cent of the time by chance alone. Unless some form of alienation is operating, which is not immediately apparent from the data, the finding is difficult to explain. The social and geographic isolation hypothesis, with one exception, is supported at somewhat more than the conventional level of significance.

Social Structure

One of the central concerns of this study is with the relay functions of interpersonal networks insofar as they are concerned with social structure, the next element of the diffusion definition. Social structure refers to the classification of individuals according to their relationships with other people. The central question is how does differential placement (location) in the social structure relate to differential access to, acceptance of, passing on, or reinforcement of, information and influence concerning the educational program. This includes both the way information makes its way into the social structure from "outside" and the way it diffuses through the interpersonal network "inside."

The overarching social structure is that of the professionally related voluntary association. Two umbrella dimensions may be used in analyzing the relation of differential locations to differential
patterns in the flow of influence and information. The first is the frequency and character of interaction and the second is the "right to influence or relay information to others."

**Frequency of Interaction.** Frequency of interaction implies that the flow of information is dependent upon the accessibility of individuals in the system to other individuals. In general, it is hypothesized that:

1. persons having a higher frequency of interaction with other members of the association will have more access to information about the diffused item, will adopt the item more frequently, and will pass on and reinforce information more frequently; and be early adopters; and that

2. the information will flow from those with higher interaction frequency to those with a lower interaction frequency.

Both hypotheses were tested and supported earlier under the rubric of ability to verbally communicate.

Frequency of interaction has been viewed by some students of diffusion as a measure of the extent of integration (or isolation) in the system. A study of the diffusion of a drug among doctors indicated that those who were more integrated adopted earlier. Also, the rate of adoption accelerated (like a "chain-reaction" process) in highly integrated groups. After a given period (4 months) the networks of high interaction became independent of the adoption process. The author suggested that this occurred because the uncertainty about the use of the drug was greatly reduced. This would suggest the hypothesis that:

the amount of information transferred regarding the innovation is directly related to the extent of uncertainty about it.

The null hypothesis was that: participants who reported feelings of uncertainty about the conference do not report more exposure to media messages and face-to-face contacts regarding the conference than do persons not reporting such feelings. Participants were asked to indicate whether they felt uncertain as to (1) what their objectives were in registering for the conference, and (2) what consequences participation would have for them. Eight per cent of the participants indicated they were uncertain as to what their objectives were in registering for the conference and 32 per cent reported uncertainty as to the consequences the
conference would have for the participants. There was no difference between persons who expressed uncertainty about the program and those who did not do so with respect to the extent of their exposure to professional publication ads and articles, news items appearing in the newspaper or on TV and radio, and brochures and announcements. However, the groups did differ with respect to the number of face-to-face contacts reported. Persons who reported being uncertain about their objectives as well as the consequences of the conference tended to visit with fewer people about the conference before registering. This finding is contrary to our hypothesis. The observed distribution may, however, be a function of the extent of integration of the participant. The more integrated the individual, the more opportunity to discuss his uncertainty with peers. When the extent of the individual's integration is controlled, our hypothesis is more credulous. Those who have greater interpersonal resources in the association do indeed discuss their impending decision when they are uncertain about the consequences of their decision. Sixty-nine per cent of those reporting uncertainty about outcomes talked with three or more persons about their decision, while 65 per cent of those who did not report feelings of uncertainty visited with three or more persons. The difference between these groups would occur 25 per cent of the time if chance alone were operating. There were insufficient cases to test the hypothesis with respect to uncertainty about one's objectives in registering for the conference. Although support for our contention is weak, it is in the predicted direction.

So far the discussion has been centered on how integration into the social system pertains to the way information is diffused through the interpersonal network inside the system. The way information from a change agent makes its way into the system from outside may also influence the diffusion patterns. The change agent in this case is the University conference coordinator that is helping to plan and conduct the educational program. His ability to secure and maintain linkages with his client system (representatives of the association) would vary with his integration into the social system. If he has had training or experience in the profession represented by the association, he will be more highly integrated into the system than if he has not. Thus, it was hypothesized that:

the amount of information originating from the change agent that is accepted, passed on, or reinforced, will vary directly with the extent of his integration into the system.

Four conference coordinators employed by the University helped to plan and conduct the conferences in the study. In four out of the six cases these coordinators indicated that their past high school education was largely unrelated to the subjects that the conference participants studied as part of their formal training.
In both exceptions the coordinators reported that a major portion of their studies consisted of subjects often part of the conference's curriculum. The coordinators also reported in connection with five out of the six conferences that their occupational histories were largely unrelated to the histories of persons attending the conference. In the one instance the coordinator's occupational history included at least one job that was the same as many of those association members who attended the conference. The coordinator in this case was a member of the organization sponsoring the conference.

In no instance was a coordinator's name mentioned in connection with a decision to register for a conference. It is clear that any role they have in this area of decision-making is nominal. In the area of conference planning we would expect the University coordinators to have a more active part. In relation to each conference, the coordinator was asked: (1) About how many contacts did you have with members of the planning committee either as a group or individually in regard to plans for the Conference? (2) In how many of these contacts did you offer advice or information that was eventually incorporated into conference plans? (3) Relative to other conferences you have coordinated, how would you rate the extent to which you were involved in planning all aspects of the conference: Would you say you had (1) a substantial part in the planning, (2) a moderate part, or (3) little or no part in the planning? The proportion of contacts in which the coordinator offered advice that was used and the extent of his role in conference planning was compared with the extent of his linkages to the association.

Table 7 shows the relative impact of the coordinators on the conference and the amount of overlap between the academic and occupational background of the coordinator and the typical conference participant.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent to Which Extent of Coordinator's</th>
<th>Extent of Over-</th>
<th>Extent of Over-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asso. Coordinator's Advice was In-</td>
<td>Coordination's Part</td>
<td>Academic Back-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Incorporated Into</td>
<td>in Conference Planning</td>
<td>ground of Coordinator and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conferees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>substantial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is very little relation between extent of the coordinator's integration into the system and the amount of information or advice emanating from the change agent that is incorporated into the association. The absence of a relationship, however, is not conclusive as the size of our sample is small. A larger sample of conferences could very well provide information in support of the hypothesis.

The above hypothesis suggests that another way of classifying interaction is according to whether the information sources within the system have more or less contact with the outside world. Contact with the outside world refers to the frequency of interaction an individual member of the system has with (1) members in other cities and (2) persons not in the association but having the same profession who reside in other cities. Those with more contact may be termed "cosmopolitan," and those with less contact, "local." Studies of diffusion suggest the hypothesis that:

information and influence will flow from individuals with relatively more contact with the outside world to those who have less contact.21

Again, the method of noting the status of the initiator of the interaction diad and comparing it with that of the receiver was used to test the hypothesis. Two variables were used: the Gross-Grambusch cosmopolitan scale, and the proportion of colleagues residing outside of the state with whom the respondent had contact at least once every two months. The hypothesis would be considered to be supported if initiators had a higher cosmopolitan score than the receivers and if the initiators reported more out-of-state colleagues than the receivers more often than the reverse conditions. The hypothesis was supported only in part. Initiators had higher cosmopolitan scores nearly as often as they had lower scores than the receivers. However, the initiators reported more than or the same number of out-of-state colleagues as their conversation partners 87 per cent of the time. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov one-sample test reveals that such a distribution could only occur five times out of one hundred. Therefore, we may conclude influence flows from those who have the same amount or more contact with the outside world to those who have less contact.

A final method for classifying interaction is according to whether the information sources are personal or impersonal. Personal sources refer to those based on informal face-to-face interaction, while impersonal sources refer to formal face-to-face interaction and all media sources. Rural sociologists who have divided the individual adoption process into stages find that different types of sources are used at different stages. The four stages are: (1) awareness, (2) interest, (3) evaluation or trial, and
It has been found that impersonal sources are most frequently used in the awareness and interest stages, while personal sources are most important at the trial stage. The use of personal sources drops at the adoption stage. There is nothing directly comparable to the trial stage in the diffusion of an educational program (except for a series of meetings such as classes). Perhaps "a heightened predisposition to adopt" is comparable to the trial stage. It was hypothesized that:

persons having a heightened predisposition to adopt tend to accept, pass on, and reinforce information from personal sources more than impersonal sources.

It was further hypothesized that:

persons having less predisposition to adopt, tend to accept, pass on, and reinforce information from both personal and impersonal sources.

A number of factors were thought to comprise an individual's predisposition to participate in an educational program. The variables comprising the predisposition to participate include (1) past participation in association sponsored conferences; (2) interest in participating in the subsequent year; (3) possessing a feeling of certainty as to one's objectives in participating and the nature of the benefits to be gained from participation; and (4) knowing that one's expenses will be covered. In other words the individual who (1) has taken part in previous conferences, (2) is generally interested in participating in future conferences, (3) feels confident of the consequences of his engagement, and (4) knows that participation will not necessitate any out-of-pocket expenses is predisposed. On the other hand the individual who (1) has participated in few or no conferences, (2) is not particularly interested in future conferences, (3) feels uncertain as to why he should enroll or what would happen if he did, and (4) knows that he would have to pay his own expenses if he should choose to take part is not predisposed to do so. The latter individual, it is hypothesized, would expose himself to few mass communicated messages (receive information) regarding an upcoming conference and engage in discussion (reinforce and pass on information) about the program to a very limited extent. Our hypotheses are nominally supported. In all variables, with the exception of cost reimbursement, predisposed members tend to have more face-to-face contacts in connection with decisions to register. With the exception of confidence in the consequences of participation and having one's expenses covered, media exposure tends to be less in connection with decisions to register. However, none of the differences are
It was concluded that the notion of a predisposition to adopt is not particularly useful in predicting media exposure and interpersonal contacts with regard to decision to participate in professionally related educational conferences.

The Right to Influence Others. The second umbrella dimension of social structure relating differential patterns of diffusion is the right to influence or relay information to others and refers to a number of related concepts; that is, status, prestige, leadership, etc. The right to influence or relay information includes the individual's access to information and his obligation to accept, pass on, or reinforce information. The proposition was advanced that greater access and obligation is directly related to one or more of the following:

1. a heightened predisposition to adopt, or actual adoption;
2. ownership of property and the right to dispose of it;
3. control over the occupational and social mobility of others;
4. specialized knowledge, skill, or ability;
5. freedom to initiate and maintain goal-directed activities and organizational structure;
6. personal security in initiating structure- and goal-directed activities; and
7. obligation and right to sanction deviant behavior.

It was hypothesized that:

information and influence flow from persons with a higher right to influence or relay information (as measured by one or more of the above components) to those with a lower right to do so.

A right to influence and relay information is a complex variable having four dimensions. Among them is the individual's prior experience in occupationally related adult education programs (as manifested in the extent of past participation in such programs, number of professional journals read on a regular basis, and keeping up with new developments in the field). The second dimension of the right to influence persons is the linkages that the individual has with other members of associations sponsoring the conference (as manifested in such variables as the extent to which the individual is an opinion leader regarding organization policy and business, whether or not he possesses formal leadership responsibilities in the association, and the extent of his ties with other voluntary associations).

A third dimension is the individual's performance in his profession. One variable is the individual's perception of his career progress to date, his occupational mobility relative to
his father, his occupational status relative to his peers, whether or not he is an opinion leader when it comes to "talking shop" with others having the same occupation, and number of hours spent working in a typical week. The fourth and final dimension consists of situational factors, such as age and ethnicity.

An individual has a right to influence others when he has prior experience in the area for which he is influential. Such experience legitimizes his position as an influential. Also, the prior experience gives him the knowledge he needs in order to be influential. The second dimension provides him with the interpersonal ties that make it possible for him to act as an influential. That is, he is in contact with people he can influence and with others who can provide him with information that will be useful in imparting advice and influence at a later time. The third dimension--his professional status--provides him with important ancillary qualities of leadership. Someone having high occupational status may be viewed as someone who, by virtue of the accomplishments the status signifies, has a claim to exercise influence in domain quite unrelated to occupational performance. The situational factors operate in a similar way. A .05 level of confidence was selected and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov one-sample formula was used to determine the probability of each observed distribution occurring by chance.

The variables studied in connection with the individual's claim to his influential position tended to support our prediction that information flowed from those with more of a right to relay information to those with less of a right to do so. Seventy per cent of the initiators had more extensive occupationally-related adult education experience than the receivers. This distribution would occur only less than five per cent of the time by chance. However, the number of journals received on a regular basis did not discriminate in the predicted direction--rather the flow emanated from those who received fewer journals about as often as it did from those who received more journals. Finally, information flowed from those who keep up to a greater extent or the same extent rather than from those who keep up with new developments to a lower extent. This distribution would occur 20 per cent of the time by chance.

Like the prior participation dimension, the individual's link to the system as a predictor of information flow was confirmed only in part. Those who scored higher as opinion leaders with respect to organizational policy and business tended to initiate the diads. This accounted for 47 per cent of the cases, and would occur less than five per cent of the time by chance. Overall, only ten per cent of the diads involved formal leaders of the association. In those diads 91 per cent of the discussions regarding the conference were initiated by persons holding office
or having other official duties in the association. It appears that information does flow from those who hold formal leadership positions as well as those who hold informal opinion leadership positions. When number of voluntary associations is considered as part of the right to relay information our hypothesis is no longer supported. Rather, information tends to flow between persons belonging to the same number of associations. Apparently one's position in the association sponsoring the conference is much more crucial than affiliation with voluntary associations in general. This finding would only occur less than five per cent of the time by chance.

The ancillary dimension--occupational performance--does not predict information flow as well as the above two dimensions. The dominant mode of each of the variables, with the exception of occupational opinion leadership, and career progress, is for the information to flow between individuals of comparable status. That is, the person who initiated the interaction had the same occupational mobility (70%), responsibility and income (77%), and worked the same number of hours per week (41%) as the receiver of the information. Each of these distributions were significant at the .05 level or beyond. In forty-eight per cent of the diads, information flowed from persons who had a better feeling about progress in their career to those who had a worse feeling about their career. This finding would occur less than five per cent of the time by chance. Also, 50 per cent of the initiators scored higher on occupational opinion leadership scale than the recipients of the interaction. Such a distribution could only occur less than five per cent of the time by chance. The variables of opinion leadership and feelings about career progress appear to predict information flow better than other ancillary qualities. The type of behavior required for opinion leadership in one area (association business) would be very comparable to the behavior required for opinion leadership in another area, thus such a finding is not contrary to our expectations.

Age and ethnic background did not predict information flow as expected, rather the initiator tended to have the same age and background as the receiver.

In summary, then, the flow of information does tend to be from those with more right to influence others regarding the conference to those with less right. The variables included in the assessment of this right are: extent of prior participation in occupationally related adult education, extent of keeping up with new developments in the field, opinion leadership with respect to association business and other professional matters, extent of formal leadership in the association, and extent that one feels he has made progress in his career. Those not included are: the number of journal subscriptions, the number of voluntary association
A related hypothesis is that:

those with a greater access and obligation will be early adopters while those with low access and obligation will be late or non-adopters.

Only those factors that predicted the flow of information in connection with the right to relay information about the conference were used to test this hypothesis. Early adopters and participants in the conference tended to report enrollment in four or more job-related adult education programs more often than late adopters or conference non-participants. Fifty-six per cent of the early adopters reported such participation, while only 44 per cent of the late adopters did so. This finding would occur 20 per cent of the time by chance. Fifty-four per cent of the participants reported heavy participation, while only 33 per cent of the non-participants did so. The distribution is significant at the .001 level. Although the early adopters tended to keep up with new developments in the field to a slightly greater extent than late adopters, there was virtually no difference between participants and non-participants. However, the difference between the early and late adopters would occur 50 per cent of the time by chance; therefore, there is virtually no support for our hypothesis. There was no significant difference between early and late adopters or between participants and non-participants with respect to opinion leadership scores either with respect to association business or professional matters.

Those reporting good progress in their career tended to be early adopters, while those reporting something less tended to be late adopters. However, the data did not conform to the conventional level of significance. Thus, support for our hypothesis is very limited. Virtually no difference appeared between participants and non-participants. In general, their is only weak support for the notion that those with a greater right to relay information about the conference were early adopters and participants.

The terms opinion leader, innovator, influential, etc., which appear throughout the literature are usually seen as being among the earliest adopters. In the theoretical scheme presented above they are the people from whom the information flows; i.e., those integrated into professionally oriented informal networks who have more contact with the outside world, who use impersonal sources of information, have high access to information and influence, and a high obligation to accept, pass on, and reinforce
information and influence. The often raised question of whether they are deviants or not is not germane. They are deviants by definition, since, with regard to the innovation they are among the first to adopt and depart from the most frequent pattern of overt behavior of the social system.

Finally, the flow of information throughout the entire system varies according to the specialization of the social system; therefore, it was hypothesized that:

where the roles of the members are fairly similar with regard to the system's functioning, the flow is uniform; and where there are factions, cleavages, and a high division of labor, the flow is less uniform.

As it turns out, the associations studied are fairly homogeneous groups. Within any given association the range in occupational status or level of education is nominal. Furthermore, there is fairly uniform perception among the membership as to the leadership structure, the extent to which cliques tend to dominate leadership positions, and the extent to which differences of opinion among members interfere with important activities of the association. In general, all six associations tended to be perceived as having a somewhat autocratic leadership structure. Among those who felt they knew enough to judge, nearly two-thirds (63%) indicated that the executive officers make decisions after minimum contact with members rather than after extensive consultation with members.

There was a good deal of agreement that the top leadership positions in the association were passed around a good deal. Fifty-three per cent indicated that this was the case. The one exception to this trend was an association that had only been in existence for a year in which 69 per cent of the members indicated they didn't know whether the leadership was passed around or not. The brevity of its history would explain the response. Presumably it was "too early to tell." This was also the only association in which the modal response was that leadership consults extensively with the rank and file on policy decisions. Finally, the bulk of the members (84%) indicated that differences of opinion interfered very little with activities of the association.

The sociometric technique described in some detail earlier contained a feature where one could identify cliques, which are groups of four or more members, each of whom either has (a) three reciprocal relationships with the others, or has (b) two reciprocal relationships, both of which are with members who have three. In view of the homogeneity found earlier it is not
surprising that each association had only one clique plus a number of members who did not belong. Unfortunately, for purposes of our study, the members were homogeneous and the number of factions and cleavages in the associations were nominal. Therefore, comparison of these factors with such things as time of adoption, number of face-to-face contacts, number of mass communicated messages and extent of integration into the social system promoting the conference would be without reward.

Values of the System

The last element of the definition of diffusion, the values of the system, concerns the compatibility between the values of the group, and elements of a proposed innovation. Numerous diffusion studies have studied adoption in terms of orientations such as sacred-secular, scientific-traditional, cosmopolitan-local, etc. Drawing on concepts from several of these orientations a cursory description of the distinction could be made as follows. A professionally related voluntary association could be classified as less traditional when:

1. members have a higher level of education;
2. members are oriented to learning more about their field by paying attention to people from the top institutions rather than through daily contact with local colleagues;
3. members and officers tend to be among the first to adopt new ideas related to the field;
4. members have contact with people in the same occupation as themselves who reside in other parts of the country;
5. members are more cosmopolitan than local; and
6. members view the association as having major obligations with respect to the socio-emotional life of the members.

It was hypothesized that:

to the extent that a program represents a departure from previous modes of acting, the rate and extent of adoption varies inversely with how traditionally oriented the conference is.

When the program represents a significant departure from previous modes of acting, it was hypothesized that:

the rate and extent of adoption is higher in less traditional associations than in more traditional associations.
The six associations were ranked from one to six on each of seven variables that reflected the above dimensions of orientation to tradition. The ranks were assigned on the basis of the proportion of the respondents in each association who fell into the high orientation category. The higher the proportion, the higher the rank. The ranks for each association were then summed. The sum of the ranks ranged from 14.5 to 35.5 (most traditional association). There was a natural division into two sets of three associations. The mean per cent of the membership that registered for the two groups differed in such a way as to conform to our hypothesis. A mean of 57 per cent was obtained for the less traditional associations, while a mean of 37 per cent was derived for the more traditional groups. The distribution would occur only 10 per cent of the time by chance. The one association in the more traditional group whose extent of adoption exceeded that of the more traditional associations was recently formed. Unlike older groups, the membership consisted of those who joined recently, and therefore consisted of a minimum of people who were interested at one time but had since lost interest. This explanation would then appear to account for the high rate of adoption and the only exception to the adoption pattern of more traditional associations.

The proportion of the respondents also felt the conference represented a departure from the types of activities in which the association was usually engaged. This proportion was calculated and compared with the orientation to tradition ranking of the association. There was no relation between associations judging the conference to be a deviation and the adoption rate. Therefore, we may reject the hypothesis. However, the individual's integration into the association must be considered. The less integrated (the less interaction with its members) the more he could deviate from the norms of the association. Thus it was hypothesized that:

among persons less traditionally oriented than the association to which they belong, who are less integrated into the system, the extent and rate of adoption will be higher.

The data did not support the hypothesis. The respondents were compared with the mode of the association on each of the variables. They were then divided according to whether they had the same orientation to tradition as the association or were more or less traditionally oriented. These groupings were then subdivided according to whether they had a high or low score on the sociometric score with respect to discussing association policy and business. The rate of adoption among the less traditionally oriented relatively unintegrated did not significantly differ from the more traditionally oriented who were not well integrated into the group. Integration into the association
seems to be the best predictor of participation. A person who is well integrated into the association is apt to participate in the conference regardless of whether he is more or less tradition oriented than most other association members.

Although no hypotheses were advanced in connection with the objective of assessing the relative impact of face-to-face contact, one of our objectives was to examine this question. Respondents were asked to indicate the one way that they learned something about the conference that was most influential on their decision. Thirty per cent of the conference participants nominated face-to-face contact, 48 per cent mentioned brochures and fliers as being most influential, 7 per cent reported trade journal articles, while only two per cent mentioned newspaper articles or radio/television programs. Some 13 per cent of the respondents could not nominate a "most" influential source of information. This would suggest that although personal influence was an important factor in participation, mass communicated messages provide most of the information needed to reach a decision to participate.
DISCUSSION

A number of factors emerge from the results of this study. With respect to time of adoption, the characteristics differentiating early and late adopters found in earlier studies do not appear as clearly among educational conference participants. Early adopters did report more exposure to mass communicated messages about the conference and were more highly integrated into the association sponsoring the conference. Regardless of when they adopt, they are more likely to do so when someone they interact with has adopted the program.

It was found that the conference itself had some implication for the way in which it was adopted. Communication about the program tended to flow from those having higher educational achievement, but not necessarily higher intelligence, to those with less achievement. Conversations about the conference were usually generated by those who reported frequent discussion regarding the program. Such data suggest that persons who are better equipped to convey information about the program's objectives and consequences initiate face-to-face contact more often than those who are not so equipped. Also, an association member is more apt to adopt earlier and discuss the program with others when his occupational history includes positions where he is in a status subordinate relationship to a superior (rather than self-employed). This finding is interpreted as meaning that persons who have rich experience with such positions find it easier to adjust to the comparable situation often found in educational situations. Also, members who are actively involved in the diffusion process through face-to-face interaction are those who feel that they have control over their level of knowledge and that they can continue to change or alter their intellectual competence.

In general, those who are actively involved in one type of educative activity are the most apt to participate in educational conferences and to discuss their involvement in such programs with other members. Members who make efforts to keep up with new developments in their field also take a more active part in their professional association (whose function is to facilitate keeping up), "talk shop" with others in their field and participate in formal educational programs. The phenomena would lead us to conclude that there is a syndrome of participation related to increasing or maintaining one's occupational competence. Further evidence for this hypothesis is that persons who are socially or geographically (as measured by community size) isolated from others in the same occupation are apt to participate in or discuss educational conferences less often than those who are less isolated. This syndrome of participating in educative activities also includes such things as extent of contact with
peers in other states, but excludes such things as number of professional journal subscriptions, occupational mobility and status and number of hours per week devoted to one's work.

Participants who attended for reasons other than those intended by the conference planners adopted later and were nominated as sources of information about the program less often, with one exception. Those who attended to get together with friends and association members were mentioned by fellow members as persons who relayed information about the conference. Some members of the association (particularly those who did not participate in the conference) viewed the conference as a departure from the types of activities in which the association had previously engaged. Apparently this did occur not because they felt the conference was worthwhile, but because attending the conference would cause them considerable inconvenience.

The professional change agent, that is, the conference coordinator who specializes in planning and conducting conferences, appears to have little to do with member decisions to participate in the conference. Rather, his influence seems to be in the area of conference planning. His effectiveness in this role has little to do with the extent to which he is integrated into the association, either by virtue of membership in the association or academic and occupational experience similar to that of association members.

The extent of participation appears to be related to the extent to which the association itself is oriented to tradition. Members of more traditionally oriented associations participate less often in conferences than do members of less traditionally oriented groups.

It appears that some elements of diffusion theory are more useful than others for predicting the way in which association members become involved in conferences designed to increase occupational competence. The time of adoption, contrary to our expectation, was not useful in predicting the characteristics of adopters or describing the flow of influence over time. The characteristics of the conference itself, that is (1) the tangibility of its objectives and the consequences of participation and (2) the status subordinate relationship inherent in educational situations, predict both flow of influence and the characteristics of both those who decide to adopt and those who do not. An examination of the channels of communication and the social structure of the association revealed that a syndrome of participation in educative activities may be operative in predicting the characteristics of those who adopt as well as the way in which information regarding the conference flows through the association. Finally, the values of the social system, as manifested in the extent to which each association is traditionally
oriented, emerged as important in predicting differences in adoption rates in entire social systems. In short, diffusion theory has proved to be useful in examining conference participation, but also imposes serious limitations in both scope and depth.
CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

What implications for the conference coordinator do the conclusions that can be drawn from this study suggest? Let us examine the major conclusions in turn.

The finding that early adopters report more media exposure and that media exposure was reported as being most influential in many cases would suggest that early adopters are more predisposed to read brochures, announcements, journal articles, and ads. The value of extensive additional mailings and advertising is open to some question. It would seem that those who adopt early should be induced by the conference planners to talk with others (those that are least likely to participate) about the conference; particularly since the person most apt to enroll is one who has talked with someone who has already decided to attend.

If efforts are made to encourage members to discuss the program with others, the planner should encourage those having the most formal education, as they are best equipped to convey information about the program. Also, more success would be encountered by encouraging those in middle management positions rather than those who are self-employed.

The association member who has many contacts with other members is well equipped to promote conferences because he has the necessary interpersonal network to do so. Finally, individuals who engaged in one type of educative activity are the most likely candidates for participation, as well as informal promotion of the program. The person who keeps up with new developments, actively "talks shop," and is an active member of the association has already internalized the activities and values associated with increasing occupational competence.

In conclusion, the traditional qualities of the association itself provide cues important to the program promoter. The amount of promotional energy needed to receive "x" registrations in a highly traditional association will be much greater than that which is required to obtain the same number in a less traditional association. Although there may be strong supporters of conferences in traditional associations, it is important to ascertain the extent to which they are integrated into the association before relying on them to promote educational programs. Persons not well integrated would be very ineffective, and promotional resources would be inefficiently used. Perhaps, one of the most crucial factors in promoting association-sponsored conferences designed to increase occupational competence is to identify members who are going to be effective in promoting the conference on an informal basis.
SUMMARY

The principal objective of the proposed study was to extend and further test major theoretical constructs and research findings related to the diffusion of innovation, to decisions made by members of occupationally related associations to participate in educational programs sponsored by the professional association. The study extended prior work in two major ways. First, the diffused item consisted of participation in a formal organization; and second, diffusion was examined as it occurred within a closed social system in which all members are known. The detailed account of the spread and adoption of an educational program provided information on (a) the relative extent and impact of face-to-face interaction on decisions to attend an educational program, (b) the function of face-to-face interaction in decisions to attend, (c) the relationship between the influential and the person influenced as well as the characteristics differentiating them, and (d) the flow of information over time.

Mailed questionnaires were sent to members of six associations sponsoring educational programs. The promotion and registration process connected with such conferences provided a unique opportunity to obtain important information from members soon after a decision is made to attend the program. Since the membership was limited, it was possible to trace the flow of information and influence through the entire social system. The questionnaire included sociometric items, an intelligence scale, demographic data, as well as items obtaining information on the source and relative importance of messages pertaining to the program. Fifty-one per cent of the members (604) returned completed questionnaires.

Diffusion theory has emerged as a useful conceptual framework for predicting participation in association-sponsored educational conferences, as well as the flow of conference information from member to member. Both mass communicated messages and face-to-face contacts emerge as effective recruiting devices. Some members emerge as being more instrumental in the flow of information about the conference than others by virtue of having certain intellectual abilities, an extensive interpersonal network made up of association members, and a history of participation in educative activities. The properties of participation in educative activities were examined.
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APPENDIXES

"Participation in Association Sponsored Conferences," Participant Questionnaire

Contact with the Conference Insert--those who registered but did not attend

Additional Schedule for Conference Planners

"Participation in Association Sponsored Conferences," Non-Participant Questionnaire
PARTICIPATION IN ASSOCIATION SPONSORED CONFERENCES

A Study by the
Office of Adult Education Research
University of Nebraska

This questionnaire is being given to a carefully selected sample of association members who register for and another sample who do not register for sponsored by the _____________________________.

The results of this study will be of value to you and to your association in the planning of future conferences. The success of such a study depends completely on the kindness and generosity of each respondent.

The research is supported by the OFFICE OF EDUCATION, U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE.

This questionnaire is completely confidential. No one will see it except the professional members of our research staff. Nevertheless, for purposes of control of returns, we need your name to serve as a double-check on the accuracy of our number control system. We can then check it off our sample list so that we know who has been heard from. Please write your name on the line below.

 NAME ____________________________________________

ALL QUESTIONS REFERRING TO "THE CONFERENCE" PERTAIN TO THE ____________________________

ALL QUESTIONS REFERRING TO "THE ASSOCIATION" PERTAIN TO THE ____________________________

P. C.  1    2    K. P.  Response Control No.
1. CONTACT WITH THE CONFERENCE

1.1 Think back to the time just before you first learned about the Conference (seminar/workshop) and when you actually registered. What events or circumstances prompted you to start thinking about attending the Conference (workshop/seminar)?

1.2 Circle the number of separate times that you received information about the Conference in each of the following ways:

- professional journal articles or ads (include newsletters and trade papers) 0 1 2 3 4 5
- news items on radio, television, or in the newspaper 0 1 2 3 4 5
- brochures, fliers, announcements, or registration forms 0 1 2 3 4 5

1.3 Circle the number of times you visited with anyone or that anyone visited with you about the Conference before you registered, (This may include phone calls, personal correspondence, and informal discussions with co-workers, wife, friends, etc.)

0 1 2 3 4 5

1.4 Think of the articles, news items, brochures, and/or persons with whom you visited as a string of events. List these events in the order you experienced them on the lines at the top of the next page. List them using the terms brochure, trade journal article, news items on TV, person, etc. If person is an association member, write in his name.

SAMPLE

For example, if a person first (1) brochure, then talked with (2) person his spouse about attending the Conference, then a colleague (3) A. J. Smith who was a member of the Association asked him if he was planning to attend and then he saw an ad in one of the trade journals before deciding to register, his list would appear (6) as follows:
1.41 Below is a list of topics (A-G) that are sometimes contained in articles and brochures about conferences and that come up in the conversations of people who are planning to attend conferences. Circle the letters to the right of each item on your list to indicate all of the topics mentioned by each.

A. Dates Conference to be held.
B. Conference speakers or faculty.
C. Where Conference was to be held (facility or city).
D. Specific topics, issues or problems to be dealt with during the Conference.
E. Identity of other Association members who plan to attend.
F. Consequences of participation for the participant (i.e. rewards that might accrue to you, skills or knowledge you might obtain).
G. Information as to the organization business that was to be conducted during the Conference.

IF YOU DID NOT TALK WITH ANYONE ABOUT THE CONFERENCE, SKIP TO QUESTION 1.7.

1.5 In order to get a complete and accurate picture of how people like yourself decide to take part in conferences, (seminars/workshops) we need to know something about the people with whom you visited where the Conference was a topic of conversation. Place the initials of each person with whom you talked on the lines below, from left to right in the order you talked with them. Check (√) those brackets under each person's name and opposite the statements that best describe the individual. If you are uncertain, place a question mark (?) in the bracket. If you talked with more than three persons before you decided to register, just report the three most recent conversations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person 1</th>
<th>Person 2</th>
<th>Person 3</th>
<th>CARD THREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- member of about the same number of organizations and clubs as yourself
- member of more organizations than yourself
- a man
- a relative of yours
- a member of your immediate family
- someone who works in the same firm as you
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship Description</th>
<th>Person 1</th>
<th>Person 2</th>
<th>Person 3</th>
<th>Do Not Write</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>someone with very nearly the same amount of formal education as yourself</td>
<td>( )35</td>
<td>( )36</td>
<td>( )37</td>
<td>( )38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>someone with more formal education than yourself</td>
<td>( )39</td>
<td>( )40</td>
<td>( )41</td>
<td>( )42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a person in whom you can confide</td>
<td>( )43</td>
<td>( )44</td>
<td>( )45</td>
<td>( )46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a person with whom you visit nearly every day</td>
<td>( )47</td>
<td>( )48</td>
<td>( )49</td>
<td>( )50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a person with whom you visit several times a month</td>
<td>( )51</td>
<td>( )52</td>
<td>( )53</td>
<td>( )54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a person with whom you visit several times a year</td>
<td>( )55</td>
<td>( )56</td>
<td>( )57</td>
<td>( )58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>someone with whom you had little or no contact before</td>
<td>( )59</td>
<td>( )60</td>
<td>( )61</td>
<td>( )62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about the same age as yourself</td>
<td>( )63</td>
<td>( )64</td>
<td>( )65</td>
<td>( )66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>older than you</td>
<td>( )67</td>
<td>( )68</td>
<td>( )69</td>
<td>( )70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>someone with a job with more responsibility and income than yourself</td>
<td>( )71</td>
<td>( )72</td>
<td>( )73</td>
<td>( )74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>someone who started talking to you about the Conference before you mentioned it</td>
<td>( )11</td>
<td>( )12</td>
<td>( )13</td>
<td>( )14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>someone who had already decided to attend the Conference</td>
<td>( )15</td>
<td>( )16</td>
<td>( )17</td>
<td>( )18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an officer or committee chairman of the Association</td>
<td>( )19</td>
<td>( )20</td>
<td>( )21</td>
<td>( )22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the person who was the most influential on my decision to attend (check one only)</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.6 With what one topic (A-G or any other) were most of these conversations concerned?

Person 1
_____________________________________________

Person 2
_____________________________________________

Person 3
_____________________________________________

( )24

( )25

( )26

1.7 In what other ways did you learn about the Conference before you decided to attend?

( )27

( )28

( )29

1.8 Check the one way that you learned something about the Conference that was most influential on your decision to register.

person........................................................................1( )
trade paper or journal article.................................2( )
newspaper article, radio or television program........3( )
brochure or flier.....................................................4( )
don't know............................................................5( )
1.9 Did you actually decide to attend the Conference before, after, or at about the same time as you registered for the conference?

before........................................1( )
after............................................2( )
at about the same time.............3( )

1.91 (IF BEFORE OR AFTER) About how long before/after you registered did you decide to attend?

one to two days...............................1( )
more than two days, but
less than a week.............................2( )
one to two weeks............................3( )
more than two weeks......................4( )
don't know.................................5( )
(specify)………………………………………( )

2. THE CONFERENCE

2.1 Do you think that you would be interested in attending a conference next year on a related or different topic?

yes..............................1( )
no.................................2( )
don't know.........................3( )

2.11 (IF YES) What topic?


2.2 Check whether you mainly agree, are uncertain, or disagree with respect to each of the following statements.

The Conference represents an important activity that the Association should continue in the future. agree........1( )
uncertain........2( )
disagree........3( )

The Conference represents a considerable departure from the types of activities in which the Association has usually engaged. agree........1( )
uncertain........2( )
disagree........3( )

The Conference represents something in which only a few members of the Association are really interested. agree........1( )
uncertain........2( )
disagree........3( )

2.3 People attend conferences for many reasons. Please rank the reasons listed below according to the extent to which they influenced your decision to register for the Conference. Place a "1" in the bracket next to the reason that was most important to your decision, a "2" in the bracket next to the reason that was second in importance, a "3" next to the reason that was third in importance, and so on. If a reason was irrelevant to your decision, place a "7" in the bracket next to the objective.

To learn something that I can apply when I return to work.........................( )
To aid in securing higher professional status and prestige at work or among my colleagues............................................( )
To get together with friends and associates.............................................( )
To experience the stimulation of being introduced to new ideas, discussing ideas with others, and earning new information.............................................( )
To experience a change from the job or day to day routine........................( )
To increase my occupational competence in order to secure career advancements.................................................................( )
2.4 Please write below any additional reason that you had for registering for the Conference and assign it a number from "1" to "6" depending on its importance to your decision.

2.5 Please check whether you mostly agree or disagree with the following two statements.

I am somewhat uncertain as to what my objectives were in registering for the Conference.

agree........1( )
disagree....2( )

I was (am) somewhat uncertain as to the outcome or consequences that participation in the Conference would have for me.

agree........1( )
disagree....2( )

2.6 Would you say that being away from your job for periods of several days to attend conferences generally causes you

major inconvenience...........1( )
some inconvenience...........2( )
slight, if any, inconvenience.....3( )

2.61 (IF SOME OR MAJOR INCONVENIENCE) What is the nature of this inconvenience?

2.7 Were (are) your expenses for the Conference covered by your employer or some other agency?

yes...................1( )
no..................2( )
don't know yet........3( )

3. PARTICIPATION IN ASSOCIATION

3.1 About how often does the Association sponsoring the Conference usually have meetings that are open to all regular members?

doesn't have regular meetings........1( )
weekly...........................2( )
twice a month....................3( )
monthly.........................4( )
several times a year............5( )
yearly............................6( )

3.11 (IF ASSOCIATION HAS REGULAR MEETINGS) About how often do you attend?

almost never...................1( )
1-25% of the time.............2( )
26-50% of the time..........3( )
51-75% of the time..........4( )
76-100% of the time........5( )

3.2 About how many hours do you spend on this group in a typical month?

none....................1( )
3 hours or less.............2( )
4-6 hours....................3( )
7-12 hours...................4( )
13 or more hours...........5( )
3.3 Check whether you have ever served as an officer, committee chairman, or committee member of the Association? (CHECK ALL APPROPRIATE BRACKETS)

- officer
- committee chairman
- committee member
- other
- (specify)

3.4 How long ago did you join the Association?

- less than 2 years
- 2-4 years
- 5-8 years
- 9-12 years
- 13-16 years
- 17 or more

3.5 (IF YOU WERE NOT A MEMBER 3 YEARS AGO, SKIP TO NEXT QUESTION)

In the past 3 years had the amount of time you spent on the Association increased, stayed about the same, or lessened?

- increased
- same
- lessened

4. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ASSOCIATION

4.1 Check the one statement that comes closest to describing the satisfaction you obtain from participating in the Association.

- I take part in the Association's activities just for the sake of participating and I really enjoy doing things with this group
- The Association's activities may or may not be fun in themselves, but I get much satisfaction from knowing that, in the long run, worthwhile results are accomplished

4.2 Check the statement that comes closest to describing the activities of the Association.

- Most of the important activities of the Association are for the benefit of the members and are not concerned with changing or helping other people who are not members
- Many of the important activities of the Association are directed toward modifying, changing or helping in some way other people who are not members

4.3 On the line below check the space that represents the extent to which differences of opinion among members interferes with important activities of the Association.

Interferes a great deal
Interferes very little

Do Not Write
4.4 With regard to each of the following, are the members of the Association much better off, somewhat better off, or no better off than they would be if they did not belong?

4.51 Their income or financial position
- much better off
- somewhat better off
- no better off
- not relevant to organization
- don't know

4.52 Their status or prestige in the organization in which they work
- much better off
- somewhat better off
- no better off
- not relevant to organization
- don't know

4.53 Their opportunity to have their ideas or points of view advanced
- much better off
- somewhat better off
- no better off
- not relevant to organization
- don't know

4.54 Their social life, that is, their opportunity to form new friendships and maintain old ones
- much better off
- somewhat better off
- no better off
- not relevant to organization
- don't know

4.55 Their ability to perform their job effectively
- much better off
- somewhat better off
- no better off
- not relevant to organization
- don't know

4.6 Which one of the following statements best describes the top leadership structure of the Association? Do the executive officers make decisions
- only after extensive consultation with members, or
- after minimum contact with members
- don't know

4.7 Are the leadership positions in the Association passed around a good deal or do they tend to remain among certain members?
- a good deal
- among certain members
- don't know

4.8 Do you feel that your attendance at Association business meetings counts
- a great deal
- somewhat
- very little
- association doesn't hold business meetings
- I don't attend business meetings

5. ADOPTION OF NEW IDEAS

After a new practice or idea is made available to the public, people vary greatly as to how soon they use it in their work. Some people adopt practices as soon as the practice has been tested on a preliminary basis. Others wait until the ideas have been tested and proven, while still others seem to wait until nearly everyone else has put the idea to use.
5.1 Would you say that the active members of the Association

- are among the first to adopt a new idea: 1()
- adopt an idea at about the same time as everyone else: 2()
- are among the last to adopt a new idea: 3()
- don't know: 4()

5.2 Are most of the officers of the Association

- among the first to adopt a new idea: 1()
- among those who adopt an idea at about the same time as everyone else: 2()
- or among the last to adopt a new idea: 3()
- don't know: 4()

5.3 Would you say that you

- are among the first to adopt a new idea: 1()
- adopt an idea at about the same time as everyone else: 2()
- or are among the last to adopt a new idea: 3()

5.4 Are the people who attend(ed) the Conference

- among the first to adopt a new idea: 1()
- among those who adopt an idea at about the same time as everyone else: 2()
- or are among the last to adopt a new idea: 3()
- don't know: 4()

6. ASSOCIATION BUSINESS OPINION LEADERSHIP

6.1 In the past two years have you had an occasion to have conversations with Association members about the policies, goals, organization, or activities of the Association?

(IF NOT, SKIP TO QUESTION 6.7)

- yes: 1()
- no: 2()

6.2 What are the names of the three Association members you most frequently talk with regarding organization policy and business?

1. 
2. 
3. 

6.3 Which of the following seems to happen more often as far as factual information about Association policy and business is concerned?

- you inform your associates: 1()
- they inform you: 2()
- it is a mutual information exchange: 3()

6.4 When you and your associates discuss Association policy and business, do you

- mainly listen: 1()
- do most of the talking: 2()
- listen and talk about equally: 3()

6.5 Thinking back to your last discussion about organizational policy and business

- were you mainly asked for your opinion: 1()
- did you mainly ask someone else, or: 2()
- was it a mutual exchange of opinion: 3()
6.6 Compared with the associates you see most often, are you more or less likely than any of them to be asked for information or advice about organizational policy and business?

more likely........1( )
less likely........2( )

6.7 What are the names of the three Association members that you meet most frequently on social occasions?

1. ____________________________
2. ____________________________
3. ____________________________

6.8 About how many of the people who have the same occupation as yourself do you visit with or correspond with at least once every two months or more often?.....

6.81 What per cent of them live in or near the city in which you work?.... %

6.82 What per cent of them live outside the state?......................... %

7. ACTIVITIES OUTSIDE WORKING HOURS

7.1 Think of the three friends whom you see most often socially; how many of them have the same occupation as yourself?

none............1( )
one............2( )
two............3( )
all three........4( )
don't know........5( )

7.2 About what percentage of your free time do you spend in the company of others who have the same occupation as yourself?......................... %

7.3 Other than the Association, how many organizations similar to the ones listed below do you belong to? Indicate the number of memberships held in each type in the brackets on the right.

Church related group, such as: Board of Standing Committee, Men's or Women's Group, Voluntary Service.................................( )

Job related association, such as: Farmers' Organization, Business or Professional Association, Labor Union..........................( )

Recreational group, such as: Bowling League, Women's Garden, Card Club...............................................................( )

Fraternal - Service Organization, such as: Masons, Eastern Star, Service Club, Hospital Auxiliary............................................................( )

Civic - Political group, such as: P. T. A., Home and School, Permanent Community Planning Council, Political Party Club.................( )

Other Adult Leader or Youth Program, such as: 4-H, YMCA, YWCA; Scouts, Veterans Organizations, Board Member of Community Agency, Coop...........( )

IF NONE, SKIP TO QUESTION 8.

7.4 About how many hours do you spend on all of these groups combined in a typical month? Please include meeting time in your estimate.

3 hours or less........1( )
4 to 6 hours............2( )
7 to 12 hours...........3( )
13 to 19 hours........4( )
19 to 24 hours........5( )
25 or more.............6( )
7.5 In how many of these organizations have you ever been an officer, committee member or official?

8. EDUCATION

8.1 Check the highest level of formal education you happened to have achieved.

- 12 years (high school grad) or less
- Technical school, G.I. training, etc.
- 1 to 3 years college
- College graduate (4 years)
- Graduate work (no masters)
- MS, MA, MBA, etc.
- Graduate work beyond Masters (No Ph.D.)
- Ph.D., Ed.D., N.D., etc.
- Post Doctoral Study

8.2 IF NO DEGREE SKIP TO QUESTION 8.3.

Please indicate the degrees you have received, the year in which you obtained them, and your major field of study below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Major Field of Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(                      )11</td>
<td>)12</td>
<td>( )13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( )14</td>
<td>)15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( )16</td>
<td>)17</td>
<td>( )18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( )19</td>
<td>)20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( )21</td>
<td>)22</td>
<td>( )23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( )24</td>
<td>)25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( )26</td>
<td>)27</td>
<td>( )28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( )29</td>
<td>)30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3 Indicate the number of conferences, workshops, or seminars you have attended that were sponsored by the Association.

- None
- 1-2
- 3-4
- 5-8
- 9-16
- More than 16

8.4 In the brackets to the right of each topic below write the number of educational programs dealing with that topic you have taken part in during the past two years other than the formal training and the conferences mentioned above. If none, enter an "0" in the bracket.

Regular School Subjects: Examples: History, Mathematics, Foreign Languages, English, Geography

Business and Professional Subjects: Examples: Management, Cost Accounting, Refresher and Updating courses

Public Affairs and Citizenship: Examples: International Problems, Community Government, Citizenship, Tax Workshops

Home Improvement and Family Living: Examples: Home Repairs or Furnishings, Gardening, Baby or Child Care

Hobbies and Recreation: Examples: Photography, Bridge, Dancing, Swimming or Golf, Music or Art

Personal Development: Examples: Religious Studies, Personality Development, Public Speaking, Physical Fitness

Do Not Write
( )68
( )69
8.5 Turning to the problem of keeping up with new developments in your field generally—

8.51 From your point of view, does keeping up present a major burden, a heavy burden, just one burden among many, or not much of a burden at all?

- major burden...1( )
- heavy burden...2( )
- one among many...3( )
- not much of a burden...4( )
- don't know...5( )

8.52 There is nearly always a certain lag between the availability of new knowledge and when it is actually put to use. In your opinion does this lag affect practices in your field seriously, just somewhat, or not at all?

- seriously...1( )
- just somewhat...2( )
- not at all...3( )
- don't know...4( )

8.53 Place a check in the space below that indicates the extent that you actually manage to keep up with new developments in your field.

keep up with nearly every- [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]  pretty rusty on thing relevant to my work [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]  ( )

8.54 In a typical week, how many hours do you devote to your occupation? ( )

8.55 In a typical week, about how many hours do you spend reading and studying professional journals and other materials not directly connected with specific work matters? ( )

8.56 How many different professional journals do you now receive on a regular basis? (This includes subscriptions in addition to ones you borrow regularly from colleagues, etc.) ( )

8.57 Which of the following is most helpful in learning more about your field, daily contact with local colleagues or paying attention to people from the top institutions?

- local colleagues...1( )
- people from top institutions...2( )

8.58 Do not write
9. WORD FAMILIARITY

One of the problems that continually faces program planners is constructing statements that are both effective and readable. To provide some guidance in the choice of words, we would like to know how familiar you are with a sample of words. Here is a list of 20 words, some familiar and some unfamiliar. For each word, check the word in the list of four following it that means the same as the first word. If you don't know, GUESS. Most people will only be sure of some. Work quickly and answer all twenty.

trick loot...1( )11 abyss rule...1( )12 taper lser...1( )13
send...2( ) duet...2( ) wick...2( )
joye...3( ) urge...3( ) worm...3( )
ruse...4( ) gulf...4( ) bind...4( )
small mean...1( )14 facet pain...1( )15 usurp grab...1( )16
pint...2( ) side...2( ) slop...2( )
meek...3( ) turn...3( ) glut...3( )
safe...4( ) easy...4( ) sate...4( )
feign sway...1( )17 allot lend...1( )18 crown hair...1( )19
sham...2( ) meta...2( ) brag...2( )
rule...3( ) weal...3( ) hail...3( )
glad...4( ) much...4( ) pate...4( )
lock tame...1( )17 allot lend...1( )18 crown hair...1( )19
joke...3( ) turn...3( ) glut...3( )
safe...4( ) easy...4( ) sate...4( )

10. OCCUPATIONAL HISTORY

We would like to learn about the types of positions that you have had in your professional career. We are not concerned with summer or part time work, only with full time jobs that you have held for 9 months or longer. For each position you have had we would like to know the type of firm or organization in which you worked, your job title, duties, the number of people directly responsible to you and the years you were in each position. Start with your present position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of industry, firm or institution</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year Ended</th>
<th>Title and Major Duties</th>
<th>No. of persons directly responsible for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T-734 T-T.39
7735 T-T40
7136 T-T41
( )37 ( )42
T-744 T-T49
T-T45 T-T50
T-146 (751
( )47 ( )52
10.2 Check the number of positions listed on the preceding page in which you regularly reported to someone above you regarding your work responsibilities. (A person not in such a position might be 'freelancing,' owner-manager of a business, or a professional such as a doctor, lawyer or dentist.)

1. ..................1( )
2. ..................2( )
3. ..................3( )
4. ..................4( )
more than 4......5( )

10.3 Check the one statement below that best describes your feelings about your career up to the present time.

Good progress thus far, and the future looks good.................................1( )

Good progress thus far, but I'm not at all sure about the future..................2( )

Good progress and I feel reasonably satisfied with where I am. I doubt that anything much better will turn up.................................3( )

My career has had so many ups and downs that I'm not at all sure just what my next move will be or ought to be..................4( )

I am blocked where I am and will have to move out to get ahead.............5( )

The future does not look good at all and I do not have any good hope for the long-range future.................................................................6( )

10.4 What are the names of the three Association members with whom you most frequently "talk shop"?
1. ........................................................................
2. ........................................................................
3. ........................................................................

10.41 When you "talk shop" with others in your field, which seems to happen more often as far as factual information about your field is concerned?

you inform your associates.................................1( )
they inform you..................................................2( )
it is a mutual information exchange...............................3( )

10.42 When you and your associates "talk shop," do you

mainly listen..................................................1( )
do considerable talking..................................2( )
or listen and talk about equally.......................3( )

10.43 Thinking back to the last time you "talked shop"

were you mainly asked for your opinion.................................1( )
did you mainly ask someone else..................................2( )
or was it a mutual exchange of opinion.......................3( )

10.44 Compared with the associates you see most often, are you more or less likely than any of them to be asked for information or advice in connection with some aspect of your field?

more likely..................................................1( )
less likely..................................................2( )
10.5 Suppose you had a very attractive position available to you that was comparable to one you now have in all major respects, and which would enable you to pursue your professional interests better than you could here. However, suppose the position was located a considerable distance away. How much would the factors on this list weigh in your thinking; that is, would they weigh a great deal, quite a lot, some, hardly any or not at all?

10.51 Having to leave the climate and geographic setting here

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Great Deal</th>
<th>Quite a Lot</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Hardly Any</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1( )</td>
<td>2( )</td>
<td>3( )</td>
<td>4( )</td>
<td>5( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.52 Having to give up my ties and contacts with people in the community here whose interests are the same to my own

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Great Deal</th>
<th>Quite a Lot</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Hardly Any</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1( )</td>
<td>2( )</td>
<td>3( )</td>
<td>4( )</td>
<td>5( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.53 Having to give up my friends here

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Great Deal</th>
<th>Quite a Lot</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Hardly Any</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1( )</td>
<td>2( )</td>
<td>3( )</td>
<td>4( )</td>
<td>5( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.54 Having to give up the recreational and cultural opportunities of the local community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Great Deal</th>
<th>Quite a Lot</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Hardly Any</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1( )</td>
<td>2( )</td>
<td>3( )</td>
<td>4( )</td>
<td>5( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.55 Having to close out my financial investments in the area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Great Deal</th>
<th>Quite a Lot</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Hardly Any</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1( )</td>
<td>2( )</td>
<td>3( )</td>
<td>4( )</td>
<td>5( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.56 Having to move the family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Great Deal</th>
<th>Quite a Lot</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Hardly Any</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1( )</td>
<td>2( )</td>
<td>3( )</td>
<td>4( )</td>
<td>5( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.57 Would you consider such a position under any circumstances you can envision at the present time?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1( )</td>
<td>2( )</td>
<td>3( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. CLASSIFICATION INFORMATION

11.1 Check the age category that includes your age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>Under 25</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55-64</th>
<th>65 and Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1( )</td>
<td>2( )</td>
<td>3( )</td>
<td>4( )</td>
<td>5( )</td>
<td>6( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11.2 Check the statement that best describes your marital and family status.

- single...........................................1( )
- married, no children......................2( )
- married, predominately young children...3( )
- married, predominately grown children...4( )
- divorced or separated.......................5( )
- widowed.........................................6( )

11.3 What was your father's occupation when he was about your age? (GIVE SPECIFIC DETAILS AS TO TYPE OF INDUSTRY, JOB TITLE AND SPECIFIC DUTIES)

- [ ]

11.4 In what country was your father born?

- [ ]

11.5 How many years of formal education did your father happen to complete?

- less than high school graduate..........................1( )
- high school graduate.........................................2( )
- some college..................................................3( )
- college graduate..............................................4( )
- graduate work..................................................5( )

11.6 What was the population of the community in which you spent the greater part of your life up to age 17?

- farm.....................................................1( )
- 2,499 or less...............................................2( )
- 2,500 - 9,999...............................................3( )
- 10,000 - 49,999.............................................4( )
- 50,000 - 249,999...........................................5( )
- 250,000 and over............................................6( )

11.7 Check the approximate size of the community in which you work.

- rural farm.............................................1( )
- 2,499 or less...............................................2( )
- 2,500 - 9,999...............................................3( )
- 10,000 - 49,999.............................................4( )
- 50,000 - 249,999...........................................5( )
- 250,000 and over............................................6( )

11.8 For about how many years have you been in your present type of work?

- less than 2 years..............................1( )
- 2 - 5 years.................................2( )
- 6 - 10 years.............................3( )
- 11 years or more..........................4( )

11.9 Sex

- Male....................................................1( )
- Female...................................................2( )

Race

- White...................................................1( )
- Negro.....................................................2( )
- Other.....................................................3( )
- (specify)

PLEASE USE THE ENCLOSED, SELF ADDRESSED, REPLY ENVELOPE TO RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE.
Our records show that you registered for the Conference but did not attend. It is as important for us to know how people decide not to attend as well as to attend.

Would you indicate, so far as you can, the events and circumstances that led to your decision not to attend the conference.

_____________________________________________________

(If more than one reason why you did not attend)

Of the several factors that contributed to your decision not to attend, which one had the most influence on that decision?

_____________________________________________________

Do Not Write

( )72
( )73
( )74
( )75
( )76

( )77
( )78
Conference planners have many objectives. As a conference planner I would like you to rank each of these objectives according to their priority in the Conference. Mark each goal in the bracket to the right of the goal. Place a four in the bracket if the goal is not relevant, a three if it is a low priority objective, a two if it is of moderate priority, and a one if it is of high priority. Please rank the objective as you see them in your role as a conference planner and not as a potential participant nor as you believe other planners would rank them.

1. Goal has high priority
2. Goal has moderate priority
3. Goal is low priority objective
4. Goal not relevant

The objective of the conference was (is) to provide the participant with an opportunity To engage in the discussion of ideas.................................................................( )48
To get away from the day to day routine......................................................( )49
To enhance the likelihood of achieving a higher income or financial position........( )50
To acquire knowledge that will increase his occupational competence..............( )51
To get together with individuals who have a similar interest as a change from isolated work.( )52
To contribute to the betterment of others....................................................( )53
To prepare for career advancement..............................................................( )54
To obtain status and prestige in the firms for which they work.......................( )55
To enjoy the satisfaction that comes from learning........................................( )56
To become introduced to new ideas.............................................................( )57
To increase his effectiveness in social relations............................................( )58
To master a body of subject matter.............................................................( )59
To acquire certain specialized manual skills.................................................( )60
To acquire new information and knowledge................................................( )61
To be active in his field...............................................................................( )62
To participate in new activities....................................................................( )63
To meet new people in the field....................................................................( )64
To acquire added knowledge or skill reflecting the most recent development in the field.( )65
To increase his understanding of life............................................................( )66
To exchange ideas and information with each other......................................( )67
To learn something that they can apply when they return to their work............( )68
To recruit new employees...........................................................................( )69
To become more familiar with the broader aspects of man's knowledge...........( )70
Please write any additional objective below and indicate its priority in the numbered bracket .................................................................( )71
PARTICIPATION IN ASSOCIATION SPONSORED CONFERENCES
A Study by the
Office of Adult Education Research
University of Nebraska

This questionnaire is being given to a carefully selected sample of association members who register for and another sample who do not register for sponsored by the __________________________.

The results of this study will be of value to you and to your association in the planning of future conferences. The success of such a study depends completely on the kindness and generosity of each respondent.

The research is supported by the OFFICE OF EDUCATION, U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE.

This questionnaire is completely confidential. No one will see it except the professional members of our research staff. Nevertheless, for purposes of control of returns, we need your name to serve as a double-check on the accuracy of our number control system. We can then check it off our sample list so that we know who has been heard from. Please write your name on the line below.

NAME __________________________

ALL QUESTIONS REFERRING TO "THE CONFERENCE" PERTAIN TO THE __________________________

ALL QUESTIONS REFERRING TO "THE ASSOCIATION" PERTAIN TO THE __________________________

P. C. 1 2 K. P. * Response Control No.
1. CONTACT WITH THE CONFERENCE

1.1 Think back to the time just before you first learned about the Conference (seminar/workshop) and when the Conference actually took place. During this period did you ever consider attending the Conference?

yes................1( )
no..................2( )

IF YOU NEVER CONSIDERED ATTENDING, SKIP TO QUESTION 1.22.

1.11 (IF YES) What events or circumstances promoted you to start thinking about attending the Conference (workshop/seminar)?

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

1.2 What considerations led you to decide against attending the Conference (workshop/seminar)?

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

1.21 (IF MORE THAN ONE REASON YOU DECIDED NOT TO ATTEND) Of the several factors you listed above, which one was most influential on your decision not to attend?

_________________________________________________________________

1.22 (IF YOU NEVER CONSIDERED ATTENDING) Why was attending the Conference definitely out of the question?

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

1.3 Circle the number of separate times that you received information about the Conference in each of the following ways:

- professional journal articles or ads (include newsletters and trade papers) 1 2 3 4 5
- news items on radio, television, or in the newspaper 1 2 3 4 5
- brochures, fliers, announcements, or registration forms 1 2 3 4 5

14 15 16
1.4 Circle the number of times you visited with anyone or that anyone visited with you about the Conference before it took place. (This may include phone calls, personal correspondence, and informal discussions with co-workers, wife, friends, etc.)

0 1 2 3 4 5

1.5 Think of the articles, news items, brochures, and/or persons with whom you visited as a string of events. List these events in the order you experienced them on the lines below. List them using the terms brochure, trade journal article, news items on TV, person, etc. If the person is an Association member, write in his name.

SAMPLE

For example, if a person first received a brochure about the Conference, then talked with his spouse about attending the Conference, then a colleague who was a member of the Association asked him if he was planning to attend and then he saw an ad in one of the trade journals before it took place, his list would appear as follows:

(1) brochure A B C D E F G
(2) person A B C D E F G
(3) A. J. Smith A B C D E F G
(4) journal ad A B C D E F G
(5) A B C D E F G
(6) A B C D E F G

1.51 Below is a list of topics (A-G) that are sometimes contained in articles and brochures about conferences and that come up in the conversations of people who talk about forthcoming conferences. Circle the letters to the right of each item on your list to indicate all of the topics mentioned by each.

TOPICS

A. Dates Conference to be held.
B. Conference speakers or faculty.
C. Where Conference was to be held (facility or city).
D. Specific topics, issues or problems to be dealt with during the Conference.
E. Identity of other Association members who plan to attend.
F. Consequences of participation for the participant (i.e. rewards that might accrue to you, skills or knowledge you might obtain).
G. Information as to the organization business that was to be conducted during the Conference.
In order to get a complete and accurate picture of the contact people like yourself have with conferences, seminars/workshops we need to know something about the people with whom you visited where the Conference was a topic of conversation. Place the initials of each person with whom you talked on the lines below, from left to right in the order you talked with them. Check (✓) those brackets under each person's name and opposite the statements that best describe the individual. If you are uncertain, place a question mark (?) in the bracket. If you talked with more than three persons before the Conference, just report the three most recent conversations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member of about the same number of organizations and clubs as yourself</th>
<th>Person 1</th>
<th>Person 2</th>
<th>Person 3</th>
<th>Person 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member of more organizations than yourself</th>
<th>Person 1</th>
<th>Person 2</th>
<th>Person 3</th>
<th>Person 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A man</th>
<th>Person 1</th>
<th>Person 2</th>
<th>Person 3</th>
<th>Person 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A relative of yours</th>
<th>Person 1</th>
<th>Person 2</th>
<th>Person 3</th>
<th>Person 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A member of your immediate family</th>
<th>Person 1</th>
<th>Person 2</th>
<th>Person 3</th>
<th>Person 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Someone who works in the same firm as you</th>
<th>Person 1</th>
<th>Person 2</th>
<th>Person 3</th>
<th>Person 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Someone with very nearly the same amount of formal education as yourself</th>
<th>Person 1</th>
<th>Person 2</th>
<th>Person 3</th>
<th>Person 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Someone with more formal education than yourself</th>
<th>Person 1</th>
<th>Person 2</th>
<th>Person 3</th>
<th>Person 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A person in whom you can confide</th>
<th>Person 1</th>
<th>Person 2</th>
<th>Person 3</th>
<th>Person 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A person with whom you visit nearly every day</th>
<th>Person 1</th>
<th>Person 2</th>
<th>Person 3</th>
<th>Person 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A person with whom you visit several times a month</th>
<th>Person 1</th>
<th>Person 2</th>
<th>Person 3</th>
<th>Person 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A person with whom you visit several times a year</th>
<th>Person 1</th>
<th>Person 2</th>
<th>Person 3</th>
<th>Person 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Someone with whom you had little or no contact before</th>
<th>Person 1</th>
<th>Person 2</th>
<th>Person 3</th>
<th>Person 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>About the same age as yourself</th>
<th>Person 1</th>
<th>Person 2</th>
<th>Person 3</th>
<th>Person 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Older than you</th>
<th>Person 1</th>
<th>Person 2</th>
<th>Person 3</th>
<th>Person 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Someone with a job with more responsibility and income than yourself</th>
<th>Person 1</th>
<th>Person 2</th>
<th>Person 3</th>
<th>Person 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Someone who started talking to you about the Conference before you mentioned it</th>
<th>Person 1</th>
<th>Person 2</th>
<th>Person 3</th>
<th>Person 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Someone who had already decided to attend the Conference</th>
<th>Person 1</th>
<th>Person 2</th>
<th>Person 3</th>
<th>Person 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>An office or committee chairman of the Association</th>
<th>Person 1</th>
<th>Person 2</th>
<th>Person 3</th>
<th>Person 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.7 With what one tonic (A-G or any other) were most of these conversations concerned?

Person 1
Person 2
Person 3

1.8 In what other ways did you learn about the Conference?

2. THE CONFERENCE

2.1 Do you think that you would be interested in attending a conference next year on a related or different topic?

yes

no

don't know

2.11 (IF YES) What topic?

2.2 Check whether you mainly agree, are uncertain, or disagree with respect to each of the following statements.

The Conference represents an important activity that the Association should continue in the future.

agree

uncertain

disagree

The Conference represents a considerable departure from the types of activities in which the Association has usually engaged.

agree

uncertain

disagree

The Conference represents something in which only a few members of the Association are really interested.

agree

uncertain

disagree

2.3 Would you say that being away from your job for periods of several days to attend conferences generally causes you

major inconvenience

some inconvenience

slight, if any, inconvenience

2.31 (IF SOME OR MAJOR INCONVENIENCE) What is the nature of this inconvenience?

3. PARTICIPATION IN ASSOCIATION

3.1 About how often does the Association sponsoring the Conference usually have meetings that are open to all regular members?

doesn't have regular meetings

weekly

twice a month

monthly

several times a year

yearly

Do Not Write
3.1 (IF ASSOCIATION HAS REGULAR METING) About how often do you attend?

- almost never
- 1-25% of the time
- 26-50% of the time
- 51-75% of the time
- 76-100% of the time

3.2 About how many hours do you spend on this group in a typical month?

- none
- 3 hours or less
- 4-6 hours
- 7-12 hours
- 13 or more hours

3.3 Check whether you have ever served as an officer, committee chairman, or committee member of the Association? (CHECK ALL APPROPRIATE BRACKETS)

- officer
- committee chairman
- committee member
- other

(specify)

3.4 How long ago did you join the Association?

- less than 2 years
- 2-4 years
- 5-8 years
- 9-12 years
- 13-16 years
- 17 or more

3. (IF YOU WERE NOT A MEMBER 3 YEARS AGO, SKIP TO NEXT QUESTION)

In the past 3 years has the amount of time you spent on the Association increased, stayed about the same, or lessened?

- increased
- same
- lessened

3.1 Check the one statement that comes closest to describing the satisfaction you obtain from participating in the Association.

I take part in the Association's activities just for the sake of participating and I really enjoy doing things with this group.

The Association's activities may or may not be fun in themselves, but I get much satisfaction from knowing that, in the long run, worthwhile results are accomplished.

3.2 Check the statement that comes closest to describing the activities of the Association.

Most of the important activities of the Association are for the benefit of the members and are not concerned with changing or helping other people who are not members.

Many of the important activities of the Association are directed toward modifying, changing or helping in some way other people who are not members.

3.3 On the line below check the space that represents the extent to which differences of opinion among members interfere with important activities of the Association.

Interferes a great deal

Interferes very little

(specify)
4.4 With regard to each of the following, are the members of the Association much better off, somewhat better off, or no better off than they would be if they did not belong?

4.51 Their income or financial position

- much better off
- somewhat better off
- no better off
- not relevant to organization
- don't know

4.52 Their status or prestige in the organization in which they work

- much better off
- somewhat better off
- no better off
- not relevant to organization
- don't know

4.53 Their opportunity to have their ideas or points of view advanced

- much better off
- somewhat better off
- no better off
- not relevant to organization
- don't know

4.54 Their social life, that is, their opportunity to form new friendships and maintain old ones

- much better off
- somewhat better off
- no better off
- not relevant to organization
- don't know

4.55 Their ability to perform their job effectively

- much better off
- somewhat better off
- no better off
- not relevant to organization
- don't know

4.6 Which one of the following statements best describes the top leadership structure of the Association? Do the executive officers make decisions

- only after extensive consultation with members
- after minimum contact with members
- don't know

4.7 Are the leadership positions in the Association passed around a good deal or do they tend to remain among certain members?

- passed around a good deal
- remain among certain members
- don't know

4.8 Do you feel that your attendance at Association business meetings counts

- a great deal
- somewhat
- very little
- association doesn't hold business meetings
- I don't attend business meetings

5. ADOPTION OF NEW IDEAS

After a new practice or idea is made available to the public, people vary greatly as to how soon they use it in their work. Some people adopt practices as soon as the practice has been tested on a preliminary basis. Others wait until the ideas have been tested and proven, while still others seem to wait until nearly everyone else has put the idea to use.
5.1 Would you say that the active members of the Association

are among the first to adopt a new idea.................................1( )
adopt an idea at about the same time as everyone else................2( )
are among the last to adopt a new idea.................................3( )
don't know.............................................................................4( )

5.2 Are most of the officers of the Association

among the first to adopt a new idea......................................1( )
among those who adopt an idea at about the same time as everyone else.................................2( )
or among the last to adopt a new idea.................................3( )
don't know.............................................................................4( )

5.3 Would you say that you

are among the first to adopt a new idea................................1( )
adopt an idea at about the same time as everyone else..............2( )
or are among the last to adopt a new idea.............................3( )

5.4 Are the people who attend(ed) the Conference

among the first to adopt a new idea......................................1( )
among those who adopt an idea at about the same time as everyone else.................................2( )
or are among the last to adopt a new idea.............................3( )
don't know.............................................................................4( )

6. ASSOCIATION BUSINESS OPINION LEADERSHIP

6.1 In the past two years have you had an occasion to have conversations with Association members about the policies, goals, organization, or activities of the Association?

(IF NOT, SKIP TO QUESTION 6.7)
yes.................................................................1( )
no.................................................................2( )

6.2 What are the names of the three Association members you most frequently talk with regarding organization policy and business?

1.

2.

3.

6.3 Which of the following seems to happen more often as far as factual information about Association policy and business is concerned?
you inform your associates.................................1( )
they inform you.........................................................2( )
it is a mutual information exchange.................................3( )

6.4 When you and your associates discuss Association policy and business, do you

mainly listen.................................................................1( )
do most of the talking.................................................2( )
listen and talk about equally.......................................3( )

6.5 Thinking back to your last discussion about organizational policy and business

were you mainly asked for your opinion.................................1( )
did you mainly ask someone else, or.................................2( )
was it a mutual exchange of opinion.................................3( )
6.6. Compared with the associates you see most often, are you more or less likely than any of them to be asked for information or advice about organizational policy and business?

- more likely .......... 1( )
- less likely .......... 2( )

6.7 What are the names of the three Association members that you meet most frequently on social occasions?

1. ____________________________________________
2. ____________________________________________
3. ____________________________________________

6.8 About how many of the people who have the same occupation as yourself do you visit with or correspond with at least once every two months or more often?

6.81 What per cent of them live in or near the city in which you work? ...........................................

6.82 What per cent of them live outside the state? ...........................................................................

7. ACTIVITIES OUTSIDE WORKING HOURS

7.1 Think of the three friends whom you see most often socially; how many of them have the same occupation as yourself?

- none ............... 1( )
- one ............... 2( )
- two ............... 3( )
- all three ....... 4( )
- don’t know .... 5( )

7.2 About what percentage of your free time do you spend in the company of others who have the same occupation as yourself? .................................................. %

7.3 Other than the Association, how many organizations similar to the ones listed below do you belong to? Indicate the number of memberships held in each type in the brackets on the right.

- Church related group, such as: Board of Standing Committee, Men’s or Women’s Group, Voluntary Service .............................................. ( )
- Job related association, such as: Farmers’ Organization, Business or Professional Association, Labor Union .................................................. ( )
- Recreational group, such as: Bowling League, Women’s Garden, Card Club ............................................................ ( )
- Fraternal - Service Organization, such as: Masons, Eastern Star, Service Club, Hospital Auxiliary .................................................. ( )
- Civic - Political group, such as: P. T. A., Home and School, Permanent Community Planning Council, Political Party Club .................................. ( )
- Other Adult Leader or Youth Program, such as: 4-H, YMCA, YUCA, Scouts, Veterans Organizations, Board Member of Community Agency, Coop ........ ( )

IF NONE, SKIP TO QUESTION 8.

7.4 About how many hours do you spend on all of these groups combined in a typical month? Please include meeting time in your estimate.

- 3 hours or less .... 1( )
- 4 to 6 hours .... 2( )
- 7 to 12 hours .... 3( )
- 13 to 18 hours .... 4( )
- 19 to 24 hours .... 5( )
- 25 or more .... 6( )
7.5 In how many of these organizations have you ever been an officer, committee member or official?

8. EDUCATION

8.1 Check the highest level of formal education you happened to have achieved.

- 12 years (high school grad) or less
- Technical school, G.I. training, etc.
- 1 to 3 years college
- College graduate (4 years)
- Graduate work (no masters)
- MS, MA, MBA, etc.
- Graduate work beyond Masters (No Ph.D.)
- Ph.D., Ed.D., M.D., etc.
- Post Doctoral Study

8.2 IF NO DEGREE SKIP TO QUESTION 8.3.

Please indicate the degrees you have received, the year in which you obtained them, and your major field of study below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Major Field of Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3 Indicate the number of conferences, workshops, or seminars you have attended that were sponsored by the Association.

- None
- 1-2
- 3-4
- 5-8
- 9-16
- More than 16

8.4 In the brackets to the right of each topic below write the number of educational programs dealing with that topic you have taken part in during the past two years other than the formal training and the conferences mentioned above. If none, enter an "0" in the bracket.

- Regular School Subjects: Examples: History, Mathematics, Foreign Languages, English, Geography
- Business and Professional Subjects: Examples: Management, Cost Accounting, Refresher and Updating courses
- Public Affairs and Citizenship: Examples: International Problems, Community Government, Citizenship, Tax Workshops
- Home Improvement and Family Living: Examples: Home Repairs or Furnishings, Gardening, Baby or Child Care
- Hobbies and Recreation: Examples: Photography, Bridge, Dancing, Swimming or Golf, Music or Art
- Personal Development: Examples: Religious Studies, Personality Development, Public Speaking, Physical Fitness
Community Development: Examples: School Improvement, Attracting Industry.................................................( ) 38
Youth Leadership Work: Examples: Scout Leader Training.................................................................( ) 39
Other: (Any educational activity not covered by these categories) Examples: Driving lessons, Speed reading, Specify: .................................................................( ) 40

8.5 Turning to the problem of keeping up with new developments in your field generally--

8.51 From your point of view, does keeping up present a major burden, a heavy burden, just one burden among many, or not much of a burden at all?

major burden..............1( ) 42
heavy burden..............2( )
one among many............3( )
not much of a burden.....4( )
don't know..................5( )

8.52 There is nearly always a certain lag between the availability of new knowledge and when it is actually put to use. In your opinion does this lag affect practices in your field seriously, just somewhat, or not at all?

seriously....................1( ) 43
just somewhat...............2( )
not at all.....................3( )
don't know....................4( )

8.53 Place a check in the space below that indicates the extent that you actually manage to keep up with new developments in your field.

keep up with nearly every-thing relevant to my work [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] pretty rusty on keeping up ( ) 44

8.54 In a typical week, how many hours do you devote to your occupation? ( ) 45

8.55 In a typical week, about how many hours do you spend reading and studying professional journals and other materials not directly connected with specific work matters?.........................................................( ) 46

8.56 How many different professional journals do you now receive on a regular basis? (This includes subscriptions in addition to ones you borrow regularly from colleagues, etc.)..............................................( ) 47

8.57 Which of the following is most helpful in learning more about your field, daily contact with local colleagues or paying attention to people from the top institutions?

local colleagues..............1( ) 51
people from top institutions..2( )
9. WORD FAMILIARITY

One of the problems that continually faces program planners is constructing statements that are both effective and readable. To provide some guidance in the choice of words, we would like to know how familiar you are with a sample of words.

Here is a list of 20 words, some familiar and some unfamiliar. For each word, check the word in the list of four following it that means the same as the first word. If you don't know, GUESS. Most people will only be sure of some. Work quickly and answer all twenty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>GUESS</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>GUESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>trick</td>
<td>loft...11</td>
<td>abyss</td>
<td>rule...12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>send...2</td>
<td>duet...2</td>
<td>wick...2</td>
<td>urge...3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>joke...3</td>
<td>meek...3</td>
<td>facet</td>
<td>pain...15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pint...2</td>
<td>safe...4</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>mean...14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ruse...4</td>
<td>glad...4</td>
<td>frown</td>
<td>sway...17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean...14</td>
<td>facet</td>
<td>pain...15</td>
<td>usurp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pint...2</td>
<td>safe...4</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>mean...14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ruse...4</td>
<td>glad...4</td>
<td>frown</td>
<td>sway...17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean...14</td>
<td>facet</td>
<td>pain...15</td>
<td>usurp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pint...2</td>
<td>safe...4</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>mean...14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ruse...4</td>
<td>glad...4</td>
<td>frown</td>
<td>sway...17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean...14</td>
<td>facet</td>
<td>pain...15</td>
<td>usurp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pint...2</td>
<td>safe...4</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>mean...14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ruse...4</td>
<td>glad...4</td>
<td>frown</td>
<td>sway...17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. OCCUPATIONAL HISTORY

10.1 We would like to learn about the types of positions that you have had in your professional career. We are not concerned with summer or part time work, only with full time jobs that you have held for 9 months or longer. For each position you have had we would like to know the type of firm or organization in which you worked, your job title, duties, the number of people directly responsible to you and the years you were in each position. Start with your present position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of industry, Firm or Institution</th>
<th>Year Started or Present</th>
<th>Year Ended</th>
<th>Title and Major Duties</th>
<th>No. of persons responsible for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARD SIX

Do Not Write
10.2 Check the number of positions listed on the preceding page in which you regularly reported to someone above you regarding your work responsibilities. (A person not in such a position might be "freelancing," owner-manager of a business, or a professional such as a doctor, lawyer or dentist.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Positions</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.3 Check the one statement below that best describes your feelings about your career up to the present time.

- Good progress thus far, and the future looks good..........................1( )
- Good progress thus far, but I'm not at all sure about the future........2( )
- Good progress and I feel reasonably satisfied with where I am. I doubt that anything much better will turn up.................................3( )
- My career has had so many ups and downs that I'm not at all sure just what my next move will be or ought to be.................................4( )
- I am blocked where I am and will have to move out to get ahead............5( )
- The future does not look good at all and I do not have any good hope for the long-range future.............................................6( )

10.4 What are the names of the three Association members with whom you most frequently "talk shop"?

1. 
2. 
3. 

10.41 When you "talk shop" with others in your field, which seems to happen more often as far as factual information about your field is concerned?

- You inform your associates........................................1( )
- They inform you.....................................................2( )
- It is a mutual information exchange..................................3( )

10.42 When you and your associates "talk shop," do you

- Mainly listen.........................................................1( )
- Do considerable talking............................................2( )
- Or listen and talk about equally....................................3( )

10.43 Thinking back to the last time you "talked shop"

- Were you mainly asked for your opinion.............................1( )
- Did you mainly ask someone else....................................2( )
- Or was it a mutual exchange of opinion...............................3( )

10.44 Compared with the associates you see most often, are you more or less likely than any of them to be asked for information or advice in connection with some aspect of your field?

- More likely.........................................................1( )
- Less likely..........................................................2( )
10.5 Suppose you had a very attractive position available to you that was comparable to one you now have in all major respects, and which would enable you to pursue your professional interests better than you could here. However, suppose the position was located a considerable distance away. How much would the factors on this list weigh in your thinking; that is, would they weigh a great deal, quite a lot, some, hardly any or not at all?

10.51 Having to leave the climate and geographic setting here

- a great deal...1(  )
- quite a lot....2(  )
- some........3(  )
- hardly any....4(  )
- not at all.....5(  )

10.52 Having to give up my ties and contacts with people in the community here whose interests are the same to my own

- a great deal.....1(  )
- quite a lot.....2(  )
- some.........3(  )
- hardly any.....4(  )
- not at all.....5(  )

10.53 Having to give up my friends here

- a great deal.....1(  )
- quite a lot.....2(  )
- some.........3(  )
- hardly any.....4(  )
- not at all.....5(  )

10.54 Having to give up the recreational and cultural opportunities of the local community

- a great deal.....1(  )
- quite a lot.....2(  )
- some.........3(  )
- hardly any.....4(  )
- not at all.....5(  )

10.55 Having to close out my financial investments in the area

- a great deal.....1(  )
- quite a lot.....2(  )
- some.........3(  )
- hardly any.....4(  )
- not at all.....5(  )

10.56 Having to move the family

- a great deal.....1(  )
- quite a lot.....2(  )
- some.........3(  )
- hardly any.....4(  )
- not at all.....5(  )

10.57 Would you consider such a position under any circumstances you can envision at the present time?

- yes.............1(  )
- no..............2(  )
- don't know.....3(  )

11. CLASSIFICATION INFORMATION

11.1 Check the age category that includes your age.

- under 25.........1(  )
- 25-34............2(  )
- 35-44............3(  )
- 45-54............4(  )
- 55-64............5(  )
- 65 and over.....6(  )
11.2 Check the statement that best describes your marital and family status.

- single ........................................ 1( )
- married, no children ........................ 2( )
- married, predominately young children .... 3( )
- married, predominately grown children .... 4( )
- divorced or separated ........................ 5( )
- widowed ....................................... 6( )

11.3 What was your father's occupation when he was about your age? (GIVE SPECIFIC DETAILS AS TO TYPE OF INDUSTRY, JOB TITLE AND SPECIFIC DUTIES)

11.4 In what country was your father born?

11.5 How many years of formal education did your father happen to complete?

- less than high school graduate .......... 1( )
- high school graduate ..................... 2( )
- some college ................................ 3( )
- college graduate ............................ 4( )
- graduate work ................................ 5( )

11.6 What was the population of the community in which you spent the greater part of your life up to age 17?

- farm ........................................... 1( )
- 2,499 or less ................................. 2( )
- 2,500 - 9,999 ................................. 3( )
- 10,000 - 49,999 ............................. 4( )
- 50,000 - 249,999 ............................ 5( )
- 250,000 and over ............................ 6( )

11.7 Check the approximate size of the community in which you work.

- rural farm ..................................... 1( )
- 2,499 or less ................................. 2( )
- 2,500 - 9,999 ................................. 3( )
- 10,000 - 49,999 ............................. 4( )
- 50,000 - 249,999 ............................ 5( )
- 250,000 and over ............................ 6( )

11.8 For about how many years have you been in your present type of work?

- less than 2 years ............................ 1( )
- 2 - 5 years .................................. 2( )
- 6 - 10 years ................................. 3( )
- 11 years or more ............................ 4( )

11.9 Sex

- Male .......................................... 1( )
- Female ........................................ 2( )

11.10 Race

- White ........................................ 1( )
- Negro ......................................... 2( )
- other ......................................... 3( )

(Please specify)

PLEASE USE THE ENCLOSED, SELF ADDRESSED, REPLY ENVELOPE TO RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE.