DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 098 141 SO 007 941

AUTHOR Hahn, Carole L.
TITLE Perceptions of New Social Studies Projects and Their Adoption in Four States.
PUB DATE Nov 74
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, College and University Faculty Association (Chicago, Illinois, November 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Adoption (Ideas); *Changing Attitudes; Curriculum Development; *Diffusion; *Educational Innovation; Educational Research; High School Curriculum; Innovation; Prediction; Questionnaires; *Social Studies; Statistical Analysis; Use Studies

ABSTRACT

The problem of this study was to assess the characteristics of innovations that were perceived by two samples of potential adopters of social studies innovations. The purpose was to determine if those perceptions were related to the potential adopters' attitudes toward the innovations and to adoption of innovations, and if relative advantage, compatability, trialability, observability, and complexity are useful concepts to help predict the degree to which social studies innovations will be adopted. Principals of 250 high schools in Indiana, Ohio, Florida, and Georgia received a New Social Studies Materials List and a Materials Information Questionnaire. Statistical analyses performed on the data from the completed questionnaires indicated that potential adopters tended to come from more urban and suburban communities, that there is correlation between perceptions and attitudes, but that little correlation exists between perceptions and adoption and between attitudes and adoption. Attitudes were shown to be influenced by observability and compatability. The New Social Studies Materials List, Materials Information Questionnaire, and tables of data are included. (Author/KSM)

ED 098141

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

PERCEPTIONS OF NEW SOCIAL STUDIES PROJECTS AND THEIR ADOPTION IN FOUR STATES

Carole L. Hahn
Division of Educational Studies
Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia

SO 007 941

Presented at the 1974 annual meeting of the College and University Faculty Association of the National Council for the Social Studies, Chicago, November 28.

Background for the Study

Much development activity had occurred in social studies education in the 1960's, but little was known about the extent to which the ideas, practices, and products called "the new social studies" had diffused to classrooms across the country.

Several scholars had synthesized knowledge about diffusion of innovations from anthropology, agriculture, business and education which suggested implications for studying the diffusion of social studies innovations.[1] In particular, Rogers and Shoemaker[2] emphasized that an important variable was the potential adopter's perceptions of the innovation. One of the least researched areas of diffusion was the role of innovation attributes,[3] but the few studies which had been done in the area indicated that perceptions of innovations explained a large percent of the variance in rate of adoption of innovations.[4]

In addition to contributing to the knowledge base in diffusion, a study of the relationships between adopters' perceptions of social studies innovations and adoption might suggest practical implications for developers and change agents. Discovering how adoption is related to adopters' perceptions of innovations might yield implications for the packaging of innovations and for strategies to diffuse innovations.

The Problem

Rogers and Shoemaker suggested that the five concepts of relative advantage, compatibility, trialability, observability, and complexity were useful in categorizing potential adopters' perceptions of innovations. They emphasized that it was "the attributes of a new product, not as seen by experts but as perceived by the potential adopters that really matters."[5]

The problem of this study was to assess the characteristics of innovations that were perceived by two samples of potential adopters of social studies innovations, and to determine if those perceptions were related to the potential adopters' attitudes toward the innovations and to adoption of the innovations. The purpose of the study was to seek answers to the following questions:

1. Are potential adopters' perceptions of social studies innovations related to their attitudes toward those innovations?

2. Are potential adopters' perceptions of social studies innovations related to adoption of those innovations?

3. Do potential adopters' attitudes toward innovations correlate with adoption of those innovations in their schools?

4. What perceptions of innovations have the strongest and weakest correlations with positive and negative attitudes toward social studies innovations?

5. What perceptions of innovations have the strongest and weakest correlations with actual adoption of innovations?

6. Are relative advantage, compatibility, trialability, observability, and complexity useful concepts to help predict the degree to which social studies innovations will be adopted?

The Concepts

"Relative advantage is the degree to which an innovation is perceived as being better than the idea it supercedes," said Rogers and Shoemaker.[6] Further, they said,

> relative advantage, in one sense, indicates the intensity of the reward or punishment resulting from adoption of an innovation. There are undoubtedly a number of subdimensions of relative advantage: the degree of economic profitability, low initial cost, lower perceived risk, a decrease in discomfort, a savings in time and efforts, and the immediacy of the reward. This latter factor perhaps explains why preventive innovations have an especially low rate of adoption. Such ideas as buying insurance, using auto seat belts, getting innoculation against disease, adopting birth control methods,... are examples.[7]

Studies on the diffusion of innovations indicated that perceptions of initial cost, continuing cost, risk, and profit affected adopters' willingness to try innovations.

Compatibility is the degree to which an innovation is perceived as consistent with the salient existing values, past experiences, and needs of the receivers.[8]

Trialability is the degree to which an innovation may be tried on a limited basis.[9] Perceived divisibility, or the ability to try an innovation on a small scale or pilot basis was found to be important in several studies of the adoption of innovations.

Observability is the degree to which the results of an innovation are visible to others.[10] Several studies concluded that being able to observe the results of using innovations had contributed to their adoption.

Complexity is the degree to which an innovation is perceived as relatively difficult to understand and use.[11] Difficulty for teachers and for students may be barriers to the diffusion of social studies materials.

The Materials Information Questionnaire (see Appendix) was developed to measure subdimnesions of perceptions suggested by the literature. The questionnaire was field tested to establish its reliability and to identify items for revision.

Hypotheses

It was hypothesized that (1.1) potential adopters' perceptions of social studies innovations as having relative advantage correlate positively with their having positive attitudes toward those innovations. Subhypotheses 1.1.1 - 1.1.6 were that perceptions of low initial cost, low continuing cost,

low risk, savings in time and effort, increased student interest, and increased student learning would have positive correlations with potential adopters' attitudes toward the innovations.

It was hypothesized that (1.2) potential adopters' perceptions of social studies innovations as being compatible (1.2.1 - 1.2.3, compatible with felt need, with previous experience, and with values)would correlate positively with their having positive attitudes toward them.

It was hypothesized that perceptions of trialability (1.3) and observability (1.4) would correlate positively with potential adopters attitudes toward the innovations.

It was hypothesized that (1.5) perceived complexity (1.5.1 - 1.5.4, difficult for teachers to understand, difficult for teachers to use, difficult for students to understand and use, and dependence on teachers having particular skills) would have a negative correlation with potential adopters' attitudes toward the innovation.

Further, it was hypothesized that perceptions of relative advantage (2.1.1 - 2.1.6 as related to initial cost, continuing cost, low risk, little time and effort needed, increased student interest and increased student learning) would have a positive correlation with adoption of the innovations in potential adopters' schools.

It was hypothesized that potential adopters' perceptions of compatibility (2.2.1 - 2.2.3, with felt need, previous experience, and values), trialability (2.3), and observability (2.4) would have positive correlations with adoption of the innovations in their schools. Perceived complexity (2.5.1 - 2.5.4) was hypothesized to have a negative correlation with adoption.

It was also hypothesized (3.0) that there is a positive correlation between potential adopters' favorable attitudes toward social studies innovations and adoption of those innovations in their schools.

Procedures

From the schools listed in the Indiana, Ohio, Florida and Georgia school directories as having grades 9, 10, 11, or 12, 250 schools were identified in each state using a table of random numbers. Letters were sent to the principals of the 1000 schools explaining the study and asking each principal to name the person or persons who had the most influence in the selection of social studies materials for his or her school. An accompanying questionnaire asked for some demographic data on the school.

Of the 1000 principals, 225 (90 percent) of the Indiana principals, 185 (74 percent) of the Ohio principals, 193 (77 percent) of the Florida principals, and 201 (80 percent) of the Georgia principals returned questionnaires for use. In a few cases, more than one principal named the same person as being influential in selecting social studies materials for their schools. In other cases, a principal named several people. A few principals did not name anyone.

In total, 216 individuals were named by Indiana principals, 257 were named by Ohio principals, 216 were named by Florida principals, and 222 were named by Georgia principals. Letters, directions, and questionnaires were sent to the 473 people identified by Indiana and Ohio principals in the spring of 1973 and to the 438 individuals named by Florida and Georgia principals in the spring of 1974. The potential adopters of secondary social studies materials were asked to identify materials on The New Social Studies Materials List (Appendix A) with which they were familiar. They were then to fill out up to three Materials Information Questionnaires in terms of materials with which they were familiar. Fifty-four percent of the Indiana people, 38 percent of the Ohio people, 66 percent of the Florida people and 64 percent of the Georgia people returned questionnaires. The resulting sample of potential adopters in Indiana and Ohio in the spring of 1973 contained 209 individuals. And the Southern sample contained 286 potential adopters from Georgia and Florida in the spring of 1974.

Several different kinds of statistical analyses were performed on the data obtained from the principals' and potential adopters' questionnaires.

Responses to the 28 items on the Materials Information Questionnaire were factor analyzed using a varimax rotation method. The factor analysis was performed to determine if the concepts of relative advantage, compatibility, observability, trialability, and complexity did in fact represent distinct categories of perceptions that contained the various subdimensions suggested by the literature.

Kendall rank correlations (τ) were used to test the hypotheses relating perceptions to attitudes and to adoption, and relating attitudes toward an innovation to the adoption of that innovation.

χ^2 values were computed for the differences in demographic variables between respondents who said they were not familiar with any of the titles on the New Social Studies Materials List and those who were familiar enough with some of the materials to complete a Materials Information Questionnaire for at least one title on the list.

Who is Familiar with the New Social Studies Projects?

Eighty-three respondents or 40 percent of the respondents in the midwestern sample and 138 respondents or 49 percent of the respondents in the southern sample said they were not familiar with any of the materials on the New Social Studies Materials List and, therefore, they could not fill out any Materials Information Questionnaires. A total of 231 usable questionnaires were returned from 126 different potential adopters in Indiana and Ohio, and 304 usable questionnaires were returned from 286 different potential adopters in Florida and Georgia.

A χ^2 analysis of the differences between potential adopters who were familiar with new social studies materials and the respondents who were not familiar with the materials indicated that there were no differences in community and occupational levels, in school enrollment and organization, or in per pupil expenditures between the two groups. It was found that potential adopters

who were familiar with the materials tended to come from more urban and suburban communities and from schools with larger graduating classes than did respondents who were not familiar with the materials, as can be seen in Table 1.

TABLE 1. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SCHOOLS OF RESPONDENTS WHO WERE NOT FAMILIAR WITH NEW SOCIAL STUDIES MATERIALS AND SCHOOLS OF POTENTIAL ADOPTERS WHO WERE FAMILIAR WITH THE MATERIALS

	Indiana-Ohio		Georgia-Florida	
Community type	Familiar %*	Not familiar %*	Familiar %*	Not familiar %*
1. Urban	31	16	22	20
2. Suburban	31	13	38	20
3. Urban/Suburban	2	0	3	0
4. Small town	12	26	15	24
5. Rural	19	34	18	28
6. Small town/Rural	5	6	5	7
	100, n=121	100, n=82	101, n=146	99, n=137
	χ^2 = 18.263 (5df)**		χ^2 = 18.905 (5df)**	
Community Educational Level				
1. College graduate	7	1	9	5
2. Attended college	7	5	13	6
3. High school graduates	64	72	53	47
4. Mixed H.S. grads/attended H.S.	10	5	7	7
5. Did not graduate from H.S.	12	8	18	35
	100, n=112	99, n=73	100, n=129	100, n=121
	χ^2 = 6.183 (4df)		χ^2 = 11.677 (4df)***	
Community Occupational Level				
1. Professional or technical, self-employed business managers & officials	21	16	35	19
2. Clerical & sales, skilled workers, farmers	46	45	38	45
3. Laborers, service workers	33	40	28	36
	99, n=37	101, n=58	101, n=104	100, n=94
	χ^2 = 1.7287 (2df)		χ^2 = 6.021 (2df)***	

	Indiana-Ohio		Georgia-Florida	
	Familiar %*	Not familiar %*	Familiar %*	Not familiar %*
Number of students in graduating class				
1. More than 500	15	11	20	12
2. 251-500	34	22	35	22
3. 100-250	31	33	33	39
4. Fewer than 100	20	35	12	27
	100, n=123	101, n=33	100, n=137	100, n=119
	χ^2 = 8.0403 (3df)***		χ^2 = 15.396 (3df)**	
Expenditure per pupil				
1. More than $1000	3	2	9	5
2. $900 - $999	7	4	17	8
3. $800 - $899	14	22	8	11
4. $700 - $799	33	22	21	26
5. $600 - $699	22	36	16	21
6. $500 - $599	11	15	19	21
7. Less than $500	5	0	10	8
	100, n=36	101, n=55	100, n=77	100, n=62
	χ^2 = 11.3097 (6df)		χ^2 = 4.544 (6df)	

* Rounded to nearest whole percent
** Significant at .01 level
*** Significant at .05 level, but not .01 level.

How Useful Are the Concepts for Categorizing Perceptions of Social Studies Materials?

Responses to the Materials Information Questionnaire were factor analyzed to determine if the concepts previously used in the diffusion literature were appropriate in classifying potential adopters' perceptions of social studies innovations. Items loaded on four distinct factors. Table 2 contains the factor loadings for the items which occurred together in the first factor for the Indiana and Ohio data. Table 3 contains the factor loadings for the items which occurred together in the first factor for the Georgia-Florida data.

TABLE 2. FACTOR LOADINGS FOR FACTOR I - INDIANA AND OHIO

Questionnaire Item Number	Item	Factor Loading	Original Concept
1.	Student interest increased	.7609	Relative advantage
2.	Package needed	.5511	Compatibility
3.	Results observable to other teachers and administrators	.4099	Observability
6.	Approach or methods needed	.7019	Compatibility
8.	Results observable to parents	.5174	Observability
14.	Student learning greater	.7796	Relative advantage
17.	Risky - lessons fail	.5399	Relative advantage
18.	Better than previous material	.8090	Relative advantage
19.	Content needed	.6834	Compatibility
25.	Teaches valued things	.6141	Compatibility
28.	Learning observable to teacher	.7063	Observability

TABLE 3. FACTOR LOADINGS FOR FACTOR I - FLORIDA AND GEORGIA

Questionnaire Item Number	Item	Factor Loading	Original Concept
1.	Student interest increased	.7316	Relative advantage
2.	Package needed	.4973	Compatibility
3.	Results observable to other teachers and administrators	.3352	Observability
6.	Approach or methods needed	.4761	Compatibility
8.	Results observable to parents	.3731	Observability
14.	Student learning greater	.6958	Relative advantage
18.	Better than previous material	.7641	Relative advantage
19.	Content needed	.6513	Compatibility
23.	Fits a course	.4971	Compatibility
25.	Teaches valued things	.5704	Compatibility
28.	Learning observable to teacher	.7063	Observability

Factor I seemed to indicate several criteria that potential adopters of social studies innovations used to determine if an innovation was better than what it superceded. If new material was perceived as generating increased student interest and increased student learning, it may have been seen as better than previously used material. Increased student interest and increased student learning may have functioned for educators as profit did for farmers in other studies. They are valued outcomes.

However, Factor I was broader than the original concept of relative advantage. It contained perceptions that the innovation would meet the adopters' needs in packaging, content, approach and methods, and that it was compatible with their values. An innovation's being compatible with one's needs and values was a valued outcome of adopting something new.

To determine if an innovation would produce valued outcomes, potential adopters probably noted the observable results of using it. It was not surprising then that the three items designed to measure observability were associated together and with the items related to valued outcomes.

As a whole, Factor I seemed to represent concern with whether the material met the potential adopters' objectives and with whether those valued outcomes could be observed. It contained the subdimensions which potential adopters used to determine if an innovation was better than what it superceded, but since those subdimensions were different from the ones of profitability and efficiency previously associated with relative advantage, it seemed important to see it as a new factor.

Factor II in this study looked very much like Rogers' original concept of complexity as can be seen in Tables 4 and 5.

The six items designed to measure Rogers' category of complexity all loaded on the second factor. In addition, Factor II contained the two items from relative advantage which measured whether one perceived that using new material would require more time and effort initially, and with continued use. Materials that were difficult for adopters to understand and use probably did require more teacher preparation time and effort. Factor II, with the added subdimension of time and effort demands, was called complexity.

The items related to cost and to trialability loaded together on a third factor. Items related to risk also loaded on the third factor in data from the southern sample, but they had not loaded there on the earlier sample from the midwestern respondents, as can be seen in Tables 6 and 7.

Concerns about the cost and risk involved in adopting an innovation and whether or not it can be tried on a small scale first all have to do with whether it would be wise to try it, regardless of its merit. It combines feasibility and risk elements.

Factor IV contained the two items designed to measure compatibility with previous experience (Tables 8 and 9).

TABLE 4. FACTOR LOADINGS FOR FACTOR II - Indiana and Ohio

Questionnaire Item Number	Item	Factor Loading	Original Concept
4.	Special skills needed	.6094	Complexity
7.	Difficult for teachers to use	.7171	Complexity
9.	Reading level difficult	.6207	Complexity
11.	Time and effort--at first	.4679	Relative advantage
16.	Time and effort--continued	.5478	Relative advantage
21.	Tasks difficult for students	.7196	Complexity
24.	Content difficult for students	.7502	Complexity
27.	Easy for teachers to understand	.6063	Complexity

TABLE 5. FACTOR LOADINGS FOR FACTOR II - Florida and Georgia

Questionnaire Item Number	Item	Factor Loading	Original Concept
4.	Special skills needed	.5571	Complexity
7.	Difficult for teachers to use	.7171	Complexity
9.	Reading level difficult	.7731	Complexity
11.	Time and effort--at first	.6044	Relative advantage
16.	Time and effort--continued	.5817	Relative advantage
21.	Tasks difficult for students	.7418	Complexity
24.	Content difficult for students.	.7993	Complexity
27.	Easy for teachers to understand	.4094	Complexity

TABLE 6. FACTOR LOADINGS FOR FACTOR III - Indiana and Ohio

Questionnaire Item Number	Item	Factor Loading	Original Concept
10.	Continuing cost	.5123	Relative advantage
12.	Limited experiment possible	.7059	Trialability
22.	Initial cost	.5543	Relative advantage
23.	Fits a course	.6767	Compatibility
26.	Can be tried on small scale	.6493	Trialability

TABLE 7. FACTOR LOADING FOR FACTOR III - Florida and Georgia

Questionnaire Item Number	Item	Factor Loading	Original Concept
5.	Risk in community	.3857	Relative advantage
10.	Continuing cost	.3389	Relative advantage
12.	Limited experiment possible	.3678	Trialability
15.	Risk on standardized tests	.3357	Relative advantage
17.	Risk lessons fail	.5807	Relative advantage
26.	Can be tried on small scale	.4574	Trialability

TABLE 8. FACTOR LOADINGS FOR FACTOR IV - INDIANA AND OHIO

Questionnaire Item Number	Item	Factor Loading	Original Concept
13.	Content used before	.7727	Compatibility
20.	Approach used before	.7947	Compatibility

TABLE 9. FACTOR LOADINGS FOR FACTOR IV - FLORIDA AND GEORGIA

Questionnaire Item Number	Item	Factor Loading	Original Concept
13.	Content used before	.6292	Compatibility
20.	Approach used before	.7632	Compatibility

The factor analysis in this study indicated that perceived similarity with things used in the past did not occur with perceptions of meeting one's needs and values as Rogers had suggested in grouping the three subdimensions together in the concept of compatibility. The distinct factor IV was, therefore, re-labeled "similarity."

The factor analysis indicated that perceptions empirically did not occur together in the categories of relative advantage, compatibility, observability, trialability, and complexity. Rather perceptions fell into four distinct perceptions of observability of valued outcomes, feasibility, similarity, and a slightly changed category of complexity.

What Subdimensions of Perceptions are Related to Attitudes Toward the Materials?

Correlations between subdimensions of perceptions and potential adopters' willingness to try the new materials were computed (Table 10). Correlations between subdimensions as measured by items 1 - 28 on the questionnaire, and attitudes as measured by item 29 were used to test the hypotheses relating perceptions to attitude.

There were strong positive correlations between perceptions that the material was better than previous material, that student interest would be greater, that student learning would be greater, that the package, content, and approach or methods were needed, that it teaches valued things and that learning would be observable to the teacher with the potential adopters' willingness to adopt an innovation, as had been hypothesized.

TABLE 10. CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SUBDIMENSIONS OF POTENTIAL ADOPTERS' PERCEPTIONS OF NEW SOCIAL STUDIES MATERIALS AND THEIR ATTITUDES TOWARD THOSE MATERIALS

Hypothesis	Item on Materials Information Questionnaire		Correlation with Attitude - Indiana and Ohio (n)[a]	Correlation with Attitude - Florida and Georgia (n)[a]
1.1	18	Better than previous material	.6341[c] (221)[a]	.6276[c] (286)[a]
1.1.1	22	Initial cost low	.1614[c] (223)	.0755[d] (286)
1.1.2	10	Continuing cost low[b]	.1494[c] (223)	.1436[c] (289)
1.1.3	5	Low risk in community[b]	.1268[d] (227)	.0473 (290)
	15	Low risk on standardized tests[b]	.1860[c] (223)	.3217[c] (285)
	17	Low risk of lessons failing[b]	.3205[c] (225)	.3557[c] (288)
1.1.4	11	Teacher time & effort--at first	-.1372[d] (228)	-.0050 (294)
	16	Teacher time & effort--continued	-.0273 (226)	.1390[c] (292)
1.1.5	1	Student interest greater	.5656[c] (221)	.6439[c] (290)
1.1.6	14	Student learning greater	.5513[c] (223)	.5534[c] (284)
1.2.1	2	Package needed	.4138[c] (224)	.4371[c] (294)
	6	Approach or methods needed	.4814[c] (226)	.2594[c] (296)
	19	Content needed	.5318[c] (224)	.5099[c] (291)
	23	Fits a course	.2994[c] (226)	.4458[c] (293)
1.2.2	13	Content similar	-.1823[c] (227)	.0091 (293)
	20	Approach similar	.0312 (228)	.0950[c] (292)
1.2.3	25	Teaches valued things	.5260[c] (227)	.5240[c] (296)
1.3	12	Limited experiment possible	.0947 (228)	.1695[c] (289)
	26	Trial on small scale possible[b]	.1083[c] (226)	.2617[c] (295)
1.4	3	Observable to other teachers	.2837[c] (227)	-.2573[c] (280)
	8	Results observable to parents	.3543[c] (224)	.2489[c] (279)
	23	Learning observable to teacher	.5665[c] (222)	.6310[c] (284)
1.5.1	27	Not easy for teacher to understand	-.1985[c] (225)	.2418[c] (295)
1.5.2	7	Difficult for teachers to use	-.1628[c] (226)	-.1939[c] (295)
1.5.3	9	Reading level difficult	-.1116[d] (226)	-.1330[c] (296)
	21	Tasks difficult for students	-.1209[d] (224)	-.1517[c] (292)
	24	Content difficult for students	-.1310[d] (226)	-.2069[c] (293)
1.5.4	4	Teacher needs special skills	.0644 (224)	-.1000[c] (294)

[a] Questionnaires with missing data for either of the two variables in a correlation were not included in computing that correlation so not all cases were used for any particular correlation.

[b] The direction of responses were reversed so that correlations derived from negatively stated items would correspond with positively stated hypotheses or so that positively stated items would correspond with negatively stated hypotheses.

[c] Significant at the .01 level.

[d] Significant at the .05 level, but not at the .01 level.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

There were positive correlations between perceptions of low cost, low risk, ability to try the innovation on a small scale and observability to parents, with potential adopters' attitudes, as hypothesized, but the correlations were not very strong.

Overall there were negative correlations between subdimensions of complexity and attitude as hypothesized. But the correlations were weak and in one case (Georgia/Florida - item 27) the relationship was positive.

There were little or no correlations between perceived similarity with previous experience and one's willingness to try an innovation. Apparently potential adopters make their decisions in ways that are not related to whether it is something they have used before.

The relationships between perceived time and effort needed and attitude were mixed and the correlations were very weak.

The various subdimensions of perceptions were also examined for their relationship to adoption. Correlations between subdimensions, as measured by items 1 - 26 on the questionnaire, and adoption as measured by item 32 were used to test the appropriate hypotheses (Table 11).

None of the hypotheses relating subdimensions of perceptions to actual adoption of the new social studies materials were adopted. All correlations between perceptions and adoption were extremely weak, and in many cases were in opposite (positive and negative) directions for the two studies.

Correlations between potential adopters' attitudes toward new social studies materials and adoption of those materials by their schools were obtained (Table 12).

TABLE 12. CORRELATIONS BETWEEN POTENTIAL ADOPTERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD NEW SOCIAL STUDIES MATERIALS AND ADOPTION OF THOSE MATERIALS BY THE POTENTIAL ADOPTERS' SCHOOLS

Sample	Correlation between Attitude and Adoption
Indiana (n = 120)	.2535
Ohio (n = 111)	.3453
Florida (n = 132)	-.1461
Georgia (n = 116)	-.0662

There were weak correlations between attitude and adoption in the two midwestern states and little or no relationship between attitude and adoption in the two southern states. The strongest positive correlation between attitude and adoption was obtained in Ohio, the only one of the four states without a state textbook adoption policy. Several respondents in Indiana, Georgia and Florida

TABLE 11. CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SUBDIMENSIONS OF POTENTIAL ADOPTERS' PERCEPTIONS OF NEW SOCIAL STUDIES MATERIALS AND ADOPTION OF THOSE MATERIALS BY THEIR SCHOOLS.

Hypothesis	Item on Materials Information Questionnaire		Correlation with Adoption - Indiana and Ohio (n)[a]	Correlation with Adoption - Florida and Georgia (n)[a]
2.1	18	Better than previous material	.1111[d] (224)	-.1045[c] (291)
2.1.1	22	Initial cost low	.2017[c] (226)	-.1512[c] (290)
2.1.2	10	Continuing cost low[b]	.1612[c] (226)	-.1301[c] (293)
2.1.3	5	Low risk in community[b]	.0207 (230)	-.0870[c] (295)
	15	Low risk on standardized tests[b]	-.1040 (226)	-.0029 (290)
	17	Low risk of lessons failing[b]	.0153 (226)	.1346[c] (293)
2.1.4	11	Teacher time and effort - at first	.0088 (231)	-.0536 (299)
	16	Teacher time and effort - continued	.0215 (229)	-.0162 (297)
2.1.5	1	Student interest greater	.1540[c] (224)	-.0949[c] (293)
2.1.6	14	Student learning greater	.1541[c] (226)	-.1246[c] (289)
2.2.1	2	Package needed	.1500[c] (227)	-.1201[c] (297)
	6	Approach or methods needed	.1073[d] (229)	-.2190[c] (300)
	19	Content needed	.1129 (227)	-.1433[c] (296)
	23	Fits a course	.2497[c] (229)	-.1241[c] (297)
2.2.2	13	Content similar	-.1113[d] (230)	-.0247 (298)
	20	Approach similar	-.0831 (231)	-.0556 (297)
2.2.3	25	Teaches valued things	.1688[c] (230)	-.0988[c] (301)
2.3	12	Limited experiment possible	.1399[c] (230)	-.1024[c] (293)
	26	Trial on small scale possible[b]	.2403[c] (229)	-.1058[c] (300)
2.4	3	Observable to other teachers[b]	.0444 (222)	.1240[c] (284)
	8	Results observable to parents	.0893 (227)	-.1225[c] (283)
	28	Learning observable to teacher	.1405[d] (224)	-.1446[c] (287)
2.5.1	27	Not easy for teachers to understand[b]	-.0573 (226)	-.0409 (300)
2.5.2	7	Difficult for teachers to use	-.0304 (229)	.0328 (300)
2.5.3	9	Reading level difficult	-.0895 (229)	.0684[d] (301)
	21	Tasks difficult for students	-.0003 (227)	-.0123 (297)
	24	Content difficult for students	-.0393 (229)	.0678[d] (297)
2.5.4	4	Teacher needs special skills	.0731 (227)	-.0493 (298)

[a] Questionnaires with missing data for items measuring perceptions were not included in the computation of the correlation using that item, resulting in different numbers of cases being used for correlations.

[b] The direction of responses was reversed so that correlations derived from negatively stated items would correspond with positively stated hypotheses or so that correlations derived from positively stated items would correspond with negatively stated hypotheses.

[c] Significant at the .01 level.

[d] Significant at the .05 level, but not the .01 level.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

said they were not using the material, although they would like to, because it was not on the state adopted list. In all three states, it is possible to use supplemental funds to obtain materials not on the list, but it is rarely done, either because potential adopters do not perceive they have the necessary funds for purchase, or because they believe they can purchase only from the state list. Some of the Ohio respondents were similarly affected by county adoption policies, which may explain why the correlation between attitude and adoption was not stronger than it was in a state without a statewide adoption policy.

Overall, the weak correlations between attitude and adoption may be because materials are used for several years, until they "wear out," whether or not they are currently the most desirable, so there is a lag between attitude toward innovations and whether or not they can be adopted or replaced. That idea was supported by responses to the open ended item 31 on the questionnaire.

Implications and Recommendations

Social studies change agents should note the large number of potential adopters who are not yet aware of "the new social studies" projects of the 1960's. The problem seems to be acute particularly in rural areas and small towns where schools have small graduating classes. Since it is not profitable for commerical publishers to send representatives to small schools great distances from one another, the task of informing those potential adopters of new developments will fall to government agencies and professional organizations.

Because potential adopters' attitudes toward innovations are influenced by whether there are observable increases in student interest and student learning and whether the innovation meets their needs and is compatible with their values, developers and change agents should make objectives and evaluation data available to potential adopters. Change agents and developers should demonstrate to potential adopters how they can minimize costs, risks, and the complexity of using innovations if they want potential adopters to develop favorable attitudes toward the innovation.

Further studies are needed to determine if the findings of this study are applicable to other kinds of educational innovations. It would be particularly interesting to determine if the four factors occur in regard to other innovations.

Although there were correlations between perceptions and attitudes, there were little or no correlations between perceptions and adoption, and the correlations between attitude and adoption were weak. This indicates that further study is needed to determine what are the most important factors in determining adoption of educational innovations. In a study of programs for the gifted in Illinois, House concluded that situational constraints in the local schools prevented teachers from adopting innovations which they liked.[12] Further studies are needed to determine why potential adopters of social studies innovations continue to use materials they do not like, and do not use materials which they do like.

REFERENCES

1. Havelock, Ronald G., Planning for Innovation through Dissemination and Utilization of Knowledge, Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, January, 1971.

   Miles, Matthew B., editor, Innovation in Education, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1964.

   Rogers, Everett M., with Shoemaker, F. Floyd, Communication of Innovations: A Cross-Cultural Approach, The Free Press, New York, 1971.

2. Rogers and Shoemaker, op. cit.

3. Elliot, John Gerrard, Farmers' Perceptions of Innovations as Related to Self-Concept and Adoption, Unpublished doctor's thesis, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1969, micro., p. 12.

4. Rogers and Shoemaker, op. cit., p. 157.

5. Ibid., p. 137.

6. Ibid., p. 138.

7. Ibid., p. 139.

8. Ibid., p. 145.

9. Ibid., p. 155.

10. Ibid.

11. Ibid., p. 154.

12. House, E. R., Steele, J. M., and Kerin, T., Development of Educational Programs: Advocacy in a Non-Rational System, University of Illinois, Urbana, 1970.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NEW SOCIAL STUDIES MATERIALS LIST

1. New Dimensions in American History series published by D.C. Heath, Amherst College, The Committee on the Study of History Units in American History, Richard Brown and Van Halsey, eds.

2. Patterns in Human History multimedia kits published by The MacMillan Company, Anthropology Curriculum Study Project, Malcolm Collier, University of Chicago.

3. Asian Studies Inquiry Program published by Field Educational Publications, University of California at Berkeley, John Michaelis and Robin McKeown.

4. Social Studies Unit Books (Political Parties, Our Polluted World, Anthropology in Today's World, Black in America, etc.), American Education Publishers, Xerox.

5. World Studies Inquiry Series, Field Educational Publications, University of California at Berkeley, Robin McKeown.

6. Voices for Justice and Conflict, Politics and Freedom, published by Ginn and Co., University of California, Los Angeles, Charles Quigley and Richard Longaker.

7. The Americans: A History of the U.S. and Living in Urban America, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Carnegie Mellon University, Slow Learner Project, Edwin Fenton.

8. Comparative Political Systems, Comparative Economic Systems, The Shaping Of Western Society and Tradition and Change in Four Societies, A New History of the U.S., The Humanities in Three Cities, and Introduction to the Behavioral Sciences, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Carnegie Mellon University, Edwin Fenton.

9. The People Make A Nation, Allyn and Bacon, Inc., Marvin W. Sandler, Edwin C. Rodwenc, Edward C. Martin.

10. From Subject to Citizen, Denoyer-Geppert Co., Education Development Center, Franklin Patterson, Arleigh Richardson and Nona Plessner Lyons.

11. Units for grades 9-12, Anthropology Curriculum Project, University of Georgia, Marion Rice and Wilfred D. Bailey.

12. Public Issues Series Harvard Social Studies Project, American Education Publishers, Fred Newmann and Donald Oliver.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

13. Geography in an Urban Age, High School Geography Project, Nicholas Helburn, Macmillan.

14. American Political Behavior, Ginn and Company, Indiana University High School Curriculum Center in Government, Howard Mehlinger and John Patrick.

15. Inquiry into Crucial American Problems Series, Prentice Hall, Series Editor, Jack Fraenkel.

16. Justice in Urban America, Houghton-Mifflin, Law in American Society Foundation, Robert Ratcliffe.

17. Manpower and Economic Education: Opportunities in American Life, Ohio University, Robert Darcy and Phillip Powell.

18. Economics in Society, Addison Wesley, Suzanne Wiggins Helburn, and John Sperling.

19. World History through Inquiry Series, Rand McNally, Byron Massialas and Jack Zevin.

20. Sociological Resources for the Social Studies, Allyn and Bacon, University of Michigan, Robert Angell-Episodes, Inquiries in Sociology, Readings in Sociology Series.

21. High School Social Studies Program, Lincoln Filene Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs, Tufts University, John S. Gibson--38 Case Studies.

22. Analysis of Public Issues, Utah State University, James Shaver and Guy Larkins.

MATERIALS INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

For: _____

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	Student interest will be greater if ___ is used than it was (is) with the text or material used previously (now). (1)	___	___	___	___
2.	___ is packaged in a format (hard or soft cover, units, semester or year length) that we need. (2)	___	___	___	___
3.	The results of using ___ are not observable to other teachers and administrators. (3)	___	___	___	___
4.	To use ___, teachers need special skills. (4)	___	___	___	___
5.	In our community, it is more risky to use ___ than to use what was used previously or is now used. (5)	___	___	___	___
6.	For the class in which ___ is, or could be used, we need material with the type of approach or methods it uses. (6)	___	___	___	___
7.	___ is relatively difficult for teachers to use. (7)	___	___	___	___
8.	Parents can observe the results of using ___. (8)	___	___	___	___
9.	The reading level of ___ is difficult for many students. (9)	___	___	___	___
10.	___ costs more on a continuing basis than did (does) what was (is) used previously (now). (10)	___	___	___	___
11.	Teachers would spend more time and effort preparing lessons when they first use ___ than they did (do) previously (now). (11)	___	___	___	___
12.	___ may be experimented with on a limited basis. (12)	___	___	___	___
13.	The content of ___ is like something I (we) used before. (13)	___	___	___	___
14.	Student learning would be greater with ___ than it was (is) with the materials used previously (now). (14)	___	___	___	___
15.	There is a greater chance that students who have had ___ will do poorly on standardized tests than if they had used the previously used (currently used) material. (15)	___	___	___	___
16.	Use of ___ will continue to require more teacher time and effort than did (does) what was previously (is now) used. (16)	___	___	___	___

(Please turn the page over and continue)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Title Used on Reverse Side

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
17.	There is a greater chance that lessons will not succeed if ___ is used than there was with the material previously (now) used. (17)				
18.	___ is better than the material previously (now) used. (18)				
19.	The content in ___ is needed for the class in which that material is or could be used. (19)				
20.	The approach in ___ is like something I (we) used before. (20)				
21.	___ requires students to do tasks that are difficult for them. (21)				
22.	___ costs less to purchase initially than the material previously (now) used. (22)				
23.	___ easily fits into a course we previously (now) taught (teach). (23)				
24.	The content of ___ is difficult for many students. (24)				
25.	___ teaches things I think should be taught in social studies. (25)				
26.	___ cannot be tried on a limited basis or small scale before one decides whether or not to adopt it. (26)				
27.	___ is easy for teachers to understand (27)				
28.	The teacher can observe increased student learning when ___ is used. (28)				
29.	If I was given the choice, I would like to adopt ___. (29)				
30.	I have much influence in deciding which social studies materials are selected to be used in our school. (30)				

31. ___ We are not using the above material.
___ We are using the above material on an experimental basis.
___ We are using the material on a regular supplementary basis.
___ We are using this as the basic material for a course.

32. What was the major reason for your school using, or not using, this material?

Thank you for your help. Please return this in the enclosed, stamped envelope as soon as possible.