DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 228 696 EA 015 542

AUTHOR Gottschalk, Rand; Schmitt, Neal
TITLE Innovation Adoption Decisions in Organizations: An Empirical Investigation.
SPONS AGENCY National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 82
GRANT ISI-7920576-01
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association (90th, Washington, DC, August 23-27, 1982).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adoption (Ideas); *Demonstration Programs; Educational Innovation; Elementary Secondary Education; Financial Support; *Influences; *Innovation; *Institutional Characteristics; National Surveys; Participative Decision Making; Program Implementation; Social Support Groups; Staff Role; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS *Criminal Justice; Department of Justice; *National Diffusion Network Programs; Role Shift

ABSTRACT

Research on educational and criminal justice programs sought to clarify the relationship between organizational characteristics and innovation adoption. It focused on the reasons why organizations adopt innovations and the differences in clientele, staff, and decision-making participation between organizations adopting or unaware of an innovative program. Four programs each were chosen from the Education Department's National Diffusion Network (NDN) and the Justice Department's Exemplary Projects Program (EPP). A telephone survey was conducted on a national sample of 187 schools and 131 courts, police departments, and prisons. Variables covered included organizational resources, age, location, size, contact with NDN or EPP, and extent of decision-making participation, as well as four categories of adoption reasons, involving program expense and financial support, changes in roles and role relationships, expected smoothness of implementation, and support from organizational actors. Among the findings yielded by statistical analysis were that adoption reasons varied significantly by program, programs with higher costs had greater organizational participation in the adoption decision, adopters and nonadopters did not differ in staffing or client patterns, and criminal justice organizations were more likely to cite smoothness of implementation as a reason than were educational organizations. (RW)

Innovation Adoption Decisions in Organizations: An Empirical Investigation

Rand Gottschalk
Neal Schmitt
Michigan State University

Paper presented at the 90th annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C., 1982. This work was completed under a grant from the National Science Foundation #ISI-7920576-01.

Innovation Adoption Decisions in Organizations: An Empirical Investigation

Innovation adoption, implementation, and routinization are areas of great importance both practically and theoretically. The practical importance comes into play if new practice is perceived to be better than existing practice. It is then imperative for the sake of both organizational efficiency and survival that this process be carried out quickly. The theoretical interest in this area is very much linked to practicality. Since an innovation is usually defined as any practice or product that is new to the organization (Rogers & Shoemaker, 1971), the only way that organizations change is through the innovation process. This may account for both the multi-disciplinary nature of the study of innovation and the large numbers of studies dealing with this topic (Rogers & Eveland, 1975).

Past Research

Much of the past research has dealt with the adoption of innovations by individuals (Rogers & Shoemaker, 1971). In the rural sociology tradition, various characteristics of individuals were correlated with early and late adoption of innovations. Examples of the innovations studied would be a new kind of seed or method of planting. The unit of analysis in many of these cases was the individual farmer.

In a compelling analysis, Pincus (1974) pointed out some

reasons why the findings concerning individual innovativeness and organizational innovativeness would differ. He compared and contrasted public schools and public utilities. Both types of organizations are non-market oriented and have a captive client population. In addition, schools have an unclear technology and there exists little agreement concerning the aims of schooling. Given this situation, schools were seen as having incentives to adopt innovations that do not have observable effects. Farmers, on the other hand, would want to see the effects of any adoption. Organizational innovation is a complex phenomena involving multiple actors embedded in a context of formal and informal authority structures, personal relationships, as well as organizational relationships to clients and the environment. This context may serve to constrain the individual organizational actor or group (Hage & Dewar, 1973) thus attenuating the relationship among individual variables and organizational innovation adoption.

Research on organizational characterisitics related to the adoption of innovations has provided at best a mixed bag. Hage and Aiken (1967) and Aiken and Hage (1971) have pointed out the association among variables indicating a more organic form of organization (high complexity, low formalization, less centralization) and the number of new practices started in a five year period. Tornatzky et. al. (1980) demonstrated the impact of an organizational atmosphere favoring change (organizational climate) on the adoption of an innovation. Siegel and Kaemmerer (1978) demonstrated the existence of differential amounts of

these climate dimensions in traditional and alternative schools. In these latter two studies, the question of what caused this "innovative" type of climate was not addressed. With the exception of the work of Tornatzky et. al., most studies in this area relate macro-organizational properties to macro-definitions of innovation. Questions remain concerning the relationship of these macro-properties to the adoption of specific innovations or practices.

Methodological Criticisms

In response to the lack of consistent findings concerning both organizational properties and innovation attributes from one study to another, Downs and Mohr (1976) cited four sources of instability among studies. First, there could be variation in the primary attributes of innovations or organizations from one study to another. A primary attribute is an attribute upon which either an innovation or an organization can be classified without respect to the other. To the extent that primary attributes exist, there is a neccesity for a different theory of innovation for each level of the primary attribute. A second source of instability concerned the lack of accounting for statistical interactions. Third, the innovation variable may be at a different level of aggregation than the variables used to predict it. If this is true, then researchers are committing the "ecological fallacy" of cross level inference when they generalize the findings of a study using an aggregated measure of innovation to the adoption of a specific innovation. Fourth, Downs and Mohr (1976)

identified three different operationalizations of innovativeness. These definitions concern clearly different phenomena.

Downs and Mohr (1976) advocate the use of the Innovation Decison Design in order to avoid the above problems. Using this design, if one is considering 10 innovations and 100 organizations, the effective sample size is 1000. That is, each innovation is considered in relation to each organization.

A further explanation of instability in this literature is offered by Bigoness and Perreault (1981) who suggest that the generalizability of a given study's findings concerning innovation are limited by the representativeness of the content and reference domains of the innovation and organization. The content domain refers to the type of innovations sampled. The reference domain refers to the comparison sample of the organizations being considered. That is, innovating organizations should be compared to organizations which did not adopt a specific innovation with respect to a variety of organizational and member characteristics.

Rationale of the Present Study and Research Questions

As a resolution to the inconsistency of the literature concerning organizational innovation, it is suggested that the perceived reasons for the adoption decision across many different innovations may provide a mediating variable between organizational characteristics and innovation adoption.

Much research in this area has been conducted in educational organizations and thus, this was the first policy area chosen for

inclusion in the present study. A second social policy area was chosen in an attempt to make the findings of the present research more generalizable. The additional area chosen was criminal justice. Specifically, the present research addresses the following questions:

(1) Why do organizations adopt innovations? Do these reasons differ either as a function of the social policy area or of the innovation?

(2) Do organizations that ultimately adopt a program differ from organizations that have never heard of the program in terms of changes in the numbers of clients, administrative staff, or front-line service providing staff? Are there differences on these variables as a function of either the social policy area or the innovation under consideration?

(3) Do organizations which ultimately adopt a program have different patterns of participation in decision making than organizations which have never heard of the program? If so, are these differences a function of either the social policy area or the innovation?

Method

Innovations. Innovations were selected for study from the many programs offered by the National Diffusion Network (NDN) of the Department of Education and from the Exemplary Projects Program of the Department of Justice. Programs were selected that met the following criteria: programs had to be validated in some manner, each program had to have a reasonable assurance of having

20-30 replications, each program had to be at least two years old, and each innovation had to be organization-wide. The last criteria was included to increase the likelihood that there would be an organizational rather than an individual decision to adopt the program. Four programs were chosen from the educational area and four programs were chosen from the criminal justice area. Table 1 describes the eight programs chosen for study.

Unit of Analysis. The study of organizational innovation requires an appropriate definition of the adopting "organization". In education, the school was defined as the adopting organization. The rationale for this decision was as follows. School districts can decide to adopt and implement a program. However, the implementation of the innovation takes place at the school level. The organization was defined as the unit that implements the program. In criminal justice, the same decision rules were used. During the course of the research, decisions on what to call various units within the criminal justice field were made with an eye to insuring compatibility with the decision to treat the school as the adopting organization.

Sampling of Organizations within Innovations. In the educational area, a 3% random sample of all schools in the continental United States was generated from a source tape provided by the National Center for Educational Statistics and Market Data Retrieval. In the criminal justice area, a 3% random sample from all the appropriate organizational units was generated for each of the following types of organizations: circuit and district

courts, juvenile courts, police departments, and prisons. This sample was generated from a tape of organizations purchased the United States Department of the Census.

It was attempted to generate the entire sample of organizations (both those organizations unaware of a given innovation and those organizations that had adopted a given innovation) from the above random sample. However, the first 120 calls produced only three adopters across all eight programs. Due to time and resource constraints, adopters were therefore located through lists obtained from program developers. Identification of unaware non-adopting organizations proceeded using the randomly generated list of organizations. Table 2 shows the number of adopters and unaware non-adopters by program.

Interviewers. Interviewers were Michigan State University graduate and undergraduate students who participated in the research for payment, course credit, or some combination of the two. Interviewers were trained using role-plays.

Respondents. Most respondents in adopting organizations were either adminsistrators in the organization (n=71, 44%) or front-line service providing staff (n=37, 23%). The same pattern held true for respondents in unaware non-adopting organizations. Administrators in the organization constituted 58% of the sample (n=90), and front-line service providing staff constituted 25% of the sample (n=38).

Measures

Adoption Decision Questionnaire. This instrument was desig-

ned to obtain perceptions of informed organizational personnel concerning the important reasons for the adoption decision. The Adoption Decision Questionnaire (ADQ) was based on variables from the literature on the determinants of innovation and included variables in the following categories: perceived innovation characteristics, characteristics of innovation champions and change agents, support or antagonism from relevant groups or actors inside or outside of the organization, amount and type of role change required by the innovation, availability of organizational and extra-organizational resources for the innovation, incentives for adoption within the organization, quality of the management of the adoption decision process, and environmental factors aiding or hindering the adoption of the innovation.

Organization Profile. This instrument was designed to obtain information concerning organizational resources, age, location, size, and extent of contact with NDN or the LEAA Exemplary Projects Program. In addition, information concerning the level and number of actors involved in both the adoption decision and involved in decision-making in general was collected for adopters. Only the latter piece of information was collected for non-adopters.

Procedure

Interview Administration. The interviews were conducted by telephone. Interviewers frequently had to go through a complex tracking process to locate the appropriate respondent. Respondents in adopting organizations were interviewed concerning both

the reasons for adoption (Adoption Decision Questionnaire) and organizational demographics (Organization Profile). Respondents in unaware non-adopting organizations were interviewed only concerning organizational demographics.

In all cases the interviewer attempted to locate and interview the person in the organization most knowledgeable about the adoption decision even if this person was no longer employed by the specific organization. This procedure insured questioning a respondent who was actually involved in the adoption decision.

After introducing him or herself and the purposes of the research, the interviewer asked about some of the reasons that influenced the adoption decision. The interviewers were instructed to obtain as many reasons as possible from the respondents. After obtaining an exhaustive list of reasons from the respondents, interviewers asked a series of "probes" to obtain additional reasons. These probes were the ADQ variable categories discussed above prefaced by "Was there anything about [variable category e.g., the availability of resources] which had an impact in your decision making?" Interviewers then verbally summarized the respondent's reasons for adoption and asked for clarification or amplification if neccesary. Following this, interviewers asked the more structured Organization Profile questions.

Reliability and Validity. Inter-coder reliability was assessed through having a second interviewer listen in on the interview and independently code the interview. Reliability was taken to be the percentage of exact agreement between inter-

viewers on the information obtained during the interview.

A major concern of the research was that the reasons for adoption be actual considerations taken into account during organizational decision making rather than the idiosyncratic reaction of single individual to the program in question. To assess this, in a sample of cases, a second respondent was contacted in the organization and interviewed. This procedure can be loosely termed a check on the validity of the interview. Validity was taken to be the percentage of exact agreement between respondents on the information obtained during two independent interviews.

Results

Reliability and Validity. Reliability on the Adoption Decision Questionnaire ranged from .863 to .966 with a mean of .921. Reliability or inter-coder agreement on the Organization Profile (OP) ranged from .676 to .946 with a mean of .950. Inter-respondent agreement on the ADQ ranged from .774 to .945 with a mean of .890. Validity on the OP ranged from .627 to .900 with a mean of .692. Reliability and validity of these measures was taken to be adequate.

Number of Reasons. The mean number of reasons for adoption for each program ranged from a high of 17.84 on HOSTS to a low of 13.50 on MCPRC. An analysis of variance of the number of reasons coded by program failed to reveal any significant differences among programs in terms of the number of reasons coded ($F(7,152) = 1.90$, $p > .05$).

Scaling of the Reasons for Adoption. The reasons for adop-

tion were scaled using rational and empirical methods (Jackson, 1971). Items were eliminated if they had less than a 10% endorsement frequency. Zero-order correlations were then computed for all items. Based on item content, coding protocol, and negative correlations, some items addressing very specific aspects of the same general construct were combined into one item. For example, combining of items took place on two items referring to the perceived expense of the program. One item referred to the program being inexpensive due to grant support brought in by the program while the other item referred to the program being inexpensive without any referent. Clearly, both these items are getting at the perceived expense of the program to the organization. There was a negative correlation between these two items. For the purposes of building reliable scales, in instances such as the above, items were added together and the mean of the two items was taken to represent the construct.

Figure 1 shows the scale names and item composition of each of the four scales that resulted from the process outlined above. The four scales were labelled: Expense and Financial Support, Changes in Roles and Role Relationships, Expected Smooth Implementation, and Support (from various organizational actors). Table 3 shows the correlations among the scales and the internal consistency (alpha) of each of the scales. All the internal consistency estimates computed were .50 or above. Three of the six possible correlations among the scales were significantly different from zero.

Differences among Programs on the Scales. Due to the significant correlations among the scales a multivariate analysis of variance was calculated. This revealed significant differences among the scales as a function of the program (Wilk's F approximation=17.26, $p<.00001$). On this basis, univariate analyses of variance were performed.

Table 4 shows the results of the univariate analyses of variance. All the scales differed significantly as a function of the program. In order to determine whether these differences occurred as a function of whether the program was in education or in criminal justice, planned contrast analyses of variance were performed. No signinficant differences were found between areas on the Expense and Financial Support scale ($T(152)=.82$, $p>.05$), the Changes in Roles and Role Relationships scale ($T(152)=.75$, $p>.05$), and the Support scale ($T(152)=1.09$, $p>.05$). However, on the Expected Smooth Implementation scale, education and criminal justice were significantly different from one another ($T(152)=3.34$, $p<.001$) with criminal justice organizations more frequently citing expected smooth implementation as a reason for adoption than educational organizations. In other words, criminal justice organizations were significantly higher on this scale.

Post-hoc Scheffe pairwise comparisons among programs were calculated for all scales. There were no significant pairwise differences among programs on either the Expense and Financial Support scale or the Changes in Roles and Role Relationships scale. Significant differences were found on the Expected Smooth

Implementation scale. HOSTS, ODOT, and CAP were significantly higher on this scale than the EBCE program ($p<.05$). A significant pairwise difference was also found on the Support scale. EBCE program adopters were significantly higher on this scale than HOSTS program adopters ($p<.05$).

Organizational Demographics and Environments. The Organization Profile asked respondents (both adopters and unaware non-adopters) about the number of clients (people processed by the organization), number of administrative staff, and number of front-line service providing staff in both the organization and the super-ordinate organization. In addition, respondents were asked for each of the above whether these client or staffing numbers had been increasing, decreasing, or stable at the time of the adoption decision. Only analyses for the increasing, decreasing, and stable information are presented here. It is clear that the absolute sizes of the variables will differ as a function of the organization and program since schools, courts, juvenile service agencies, police departments, and prisons will differ as far as staffing patterns.

Analyses of variance were conducted in order to ascertain whether adopting organizations were different from unaware non-adopting organizations. For these analyses, increasing was coded 1, stable coded 0, and decreasing coded -1. Program was treated as one independent variable and adoption status (adopter or unaware non-adopter) was treated as the second independent variable.

Table 5 shows the analyses of variance on these three variables. In all three analyses, these variables differed as a function of program and did not differ as a function of adoption status. In all three analyses there was no interaction between program and adoption status. In other words, adopters did not differ from unaware non-adopters as far as increasing, decreasing, or stable numbers of clients, administrative or front-line staff.

Planned contrast analyses of variance comparing education to criminal justice were conducted for all three variables. All three contrasts were significant: the number of clients is significantly more likely to be stable or decreasing in education compared to criminal justice ($T(151)=5.01$, $p<.0001$); educational organizations are more likely to exhibit decreasing or stable numbers of administrative staff than criminal justice organizations ($T(151)=1.81$, $p<.07$); and educational organizations are more likely to show stable or decreasing patterns of the number of front-line staff compared to criminal justice organizations ($T(151)=3.41$, $p<.001$). The Scheffe post-hoc pairwise comparison procedure failed to reveal any significant pairwise differences among programs on any of the three variables ($p>.05$).

Participation in Decision Making. The number of different levels of organizational and extra-organizational actors participating both in the adoption decision (adopters) and decision making in general (adopters and unaware non-adopters) were analyzed to see if program or adoption status differences existed. A third variable was computed by subtracting the number of levels

involved in decision making in general from the number of levels involved in the adoption decision for adopting organizations. This variable indicates the extent to which the adoption decision was a typical one.

Table 6 shows the analysis of variance for the number of levels involved in decision making in general by both the program and adoption status. Again, there is a main effect for program, no main effect for adoption status, and no interaction between adoption status and program. In terms of the number of levels involved in the adoption decision, there was a significant main effect for program ($F(7,152)=3.31$, $p<.01$). On the variable computed by subtacting the former variable from the latter variable, there were no significant differences as a function of program for adopters ($F(7,152)=1.75$, $p>.05$).

Planned contrast analyses of variance revealed that educational adopters have significantly more levels involved in both decision making in general ($T(152)=4.67$, $p<.0001$) and in the adoption decision ($T(152)=3.92$, $p<.0001$) than criminal justice adopters. The Scheffe post-hoc comparison procedure revealed no significant pairwise differences among programs ($p>.05$).

Correlations between the scales and the demographic variables, participation in decision making, and the length of time the program had been in use in the organization are presented in Table 7. There were no significant correlations with any of the demographic variables. It would appear from these analyses that the ability of the demographic variables to explain program dif-

ferences on the scales is limited. However, there were several significant correlations between the scales and the length of time the program had been used in the organization and participation in decision making.

Additional analyses were undertaken to explicate the reasons for program differences on the scales. Two additional variables, age of the program and job position of the respondent were explored. Table 8 shows the analyses of variance for each scale as a function of age and program. There were no main effects for age or interaction of age with program on any of the scales. The scales also did not differ as a function of the job position of the respondent (Wilk's F approximation(4,147)=1.70).

Discussion

Some of the most striking findings of this research concerned differences between social policy areas. For example, criminal justice adopters were more likely to cite the expected smoothness of the implementation as a reason to adopt than education adopters. There are a number of possible explanations for this finding. Given the current high status value placed on innovation, educational adopters could be trying to make themselves look very change oriented by not citing implementation ease as a reason to adopt. Alternatively, change could be a more difficult process in criminal justice organizations than in education organizations thus necessitating the consideration of implementation issues prior to the change.

Several program differences concerning the reasons for adop-

tion were also of interest. For example, Program differences on the Expected Smooth Implementation scale can be explained by reference to the content of the program. The EBCE program requires that students spend significant periods of time outside of the school. This would seem to be a bigger change from usual operating procedure than the changes required by the HOSTS, DNOT, and CAP programs. This explanation should be treated cautiously since no attempt was made to systematically measure the the degree of change necessitated by the content of the program.

With regard to contrasting adopters and non-adopters, there were no differences between adopting organizations and unaware non-adopters in terms of increasing, decreasing, or stable staffing and client patterns. For adopters, education organizations seem to be facing a more uncertain future than criminal justice organization in terms of the number of clients and staff. This is probably due to the decline in the number of students attending schools in these post "baby boom" times. Criminal justice organizations, on the other hand, would seem to face a rosier future in terms of these variables due to the increases in crime rate, litigation, and inmate population. It is surprising that these variables did not correlate with any of the scales. Because of the differences between education and criminal justice in terms of expectations for the future, one would expect these variables to correlate with the reasons why programs were adopted.

The correlations between the scaled reasons for adoption and

participation in decision making and the length of time that the program had been used in the organization are interesting to consider. The larger the difference in terms of the number of organizational levels participating in the adoption decision and the number of organizational levels participating in decision making in general, the more expense and the availability of financial support is considered. This could indicate that decisions with costs (either high or low) necessitate the involvement of a certain number of levels. In addition, the larger this difference is, the more ease of implementation issues are considered. It could be that higher levels of the organization are primarily concerned with ease of impelementation and costs of the program. When these levels are involved, these issues are considered.

The length of time that the program had been in use in the organization also correlated significantly with two of the scaled reasons for adoption. The negative correlation of length of time the program had been in use at the organization and the Changes in Roles and Role Relationships can be explained through memory effects. The longer the time the program had been in use in the organization the less likely it was that changes in roles would be cited as a reason to adopt. It could be that desired role change is a factor initially in the decision but that over time as the role change becomes part of the organization, this is not remembered as a factor. The positive correlation between the length of time the organization had been using the program and the Support scale suggests that over time support comes to be

considered a major factor in the adoption decision.

This study both partially supports and partially refutes the ideas of Downs and Mohr (1976). The fact that the reasons for adoption were significantly different depending on the program would suggest that the reasons for adoption are not primary characteristics of innovations. The lack of significant interactions between the program as an independent variable and the length of time the program has been in use in terms of the reasons for adoption is disappointing given the fairly large number of respondents involved in this study. With a sample of organizations numbering 160, the power to detect interactions was higher in this study than in many past studies.

An interesting question not answered fully by this study is why the reasons for adoption vary as a function of program. It is possible that there are primary characteristics of programs that are differentially salient to organizations depending on the situation, problem, and people involved.

In looking at this study and the results, one might be tempted to say "So what? Different organizations adopt different programs for different reasons." Given the lack of consistient findings in the literature, this would hardly seem to be a so what conclusion. It would have been difficult to say what the factors involved in the adoption decision are on the basis of the inconsistient findings of past research. This study has rationally and empirically derived what the different reasons are for different programs.

The usefulness of the concept of reasons for adoption still remains to be demonstrated. The reasons for adoption could be important in explaining how close the replication resembles the original model program. The reasons for adoption could provide a measure of the adopting site's initial motivation to replicate the programs. Perhaps adopters with certain reasons for adoption might be more likely to implement and run a program that closely resembles the original program. To the extent that this is found to be true, and to the extent that program developers want adopters to be true to the original model, such empirically derived "reasons for adoption" could be important both practically and theoretically.

References

Aiken, M., & Hage, J. The organic organization and innovation. Sociology, 1971, 5, 63-82.

Bigoness, W.J., & Perreault, W.D., Jr. A conceptual paradigm and approach for the study of innovators. Academy of Management Journal, 1981, 24, 68-82.

Downs, G.W., & Mohr, L.B. Conceptual issues in the study of innovation. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1976, 21, 700-714.

Hage, J., & Aiken, M. Program change and organizational properties: A comparative analysis. American Journal of Sociology, 1967, 72, 503-519.

Hage, J., & Dewar, R. Elite values versus organizational structure in predicting innovation. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1973, 18, 279-290.

Jackson, D.N. A sequential strategy for personality scale development. In C. Spielberger (Ed.), Issues in clinical and community psychology. New York: Academic, 1971.

Pincus, J. Incentives for innovation in the public schools. Review of Educational Research, 1974, 44, 113-144.

Rogers, E.M., & Eveland, J.D. Diffusion: Communication and innovation in organizations. In P. Kelly and M. Kranzbert (Eds.): Aspects of technological innovation. Atlanta: Advanced Technology and Science Studies Group, Georgia Institute of Technology, 1975.

Rogers, E.M., & Shoemaker, F.F. Communication of innovations: A cross-cultural approach. New York: The Free Press, 1971.

Siegel, S.M., & Kaemmerer, W.F. Measuring the perceived support for innovation in organizations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1978, 63, 553-562.

Tornatzky, L.G., Fergus, E.O., Avellar, J.W., Fairweather, G.W., & Fleischer, M. Innovation and social process: A national experiment in implementing social technology. New York: Pergamon Policy Studies, 1980.

Table 1

Innovations Selected in the Present Study

Education

Help One Student to Succeed (HOSTS)--A diagnostic, prescriptive, tutorial reading program for children in grades 2-6. Tutors are community volunteers and high school students. The program includes "pulling out" students from their regular classes at least one-half hour per day.

ECOS Training Institute (ECOS)--A training program to help principals and teachers infuse new content areas into existing curricula or add new content areas. A major part is the formation of a committee composed of administrators, teachers, and students. Deals with all grade levels.

Experience Based Career Education (EBCE)--This program provides experience outside of school at volunteer field sites for the student. Systematic career and interest exploration on the part of the student is also encouraged. The development of an individualized learning plan for each student is carried out. Program concerns high school students.

Focus Dissemination Project (FOCUS)--A "school within a school" for disaffected junior and senior high school students. All students are required to participate in a group of 8-10 students and one leader (called Family). Students take at least one class in the Focus program. Classes in the Focus program involve individualized, self-paced instruction.

Criminal Justice

One Day/One Trial (ODOT)--A jury management system that calls in a certain number of potential jurors per day. Potential jurors come in for that day and if not selected to serve in a trial have completed their obligation.

Community Arbitration Project (CAP)--Juvenile offenders are sent to a formal arbitration hearing run by the court intake division, rather than to courts. Juveniles have the specific consequences of their actions explained to them. Youths are then given a number of hours of informal supervision usually involving work in the community.

Community Crime Prevention (SCCPP)--This program is a three phase attack at residential burglary. This involves the setting up of a neighborhood block watch, property marking and inventory, and home security inspections.

Pre-Release Center (MCPRC)--Involves the setting up of a residential facility separate from the prison. This facility should be in the community from which most of the inmates are drawn. Inmates are encouraged to work so that they will have a job when they are released. Counseling and social awareness instruction is also part of this program.

Table 2

Number of Adopters and Unaware Non-adopters by Program

		Adopters	Unaware Non-adopters
Education	HOSTS	32	18
	ECOS	24	20
	EBCE	28	20
	FOCUS	25	20
Criminal Justice	ODOT	16	20
	CAP	9	20
	SCCPP	18	20
	MCPRC	8	20
	Total	160	158

Table 3

Scale Correlations of the Reasons for Adoption

	Expense and Financial Support	Changes in Roles and Role Relationships	Expected Smooth Implementation	Support
Expense and Financial Support	(.54)*			
Changes in Roles and Role Relationships	.23***	(.54)		
Expected Smooth Implementation	.20***	.17***	(.51)	
Support	.07	.10	-.09	**

*Diagonals are coefficient alphas

**Rational Scale (no α computed)

***p < .05

Table 4

Results of Univariate Analysis of Variance on Expense and Financial Support Scale, Changes in Roles and Role Relationships Scale, Expected Smooth Implementation Scale, and Support Scale by Program

		Expense and Financial Support			Changes in Roles and Role Relationships			Expected Smooth Implementation			Support		
Source	df	MS	F	ω^2	MS	F	ω^2	MS	F	ω^2	MS	F	ω^2
Among Programs	7	.22	3.12*	.09	.43	3.79*	.11	.57	6.09*	.24	.30	2.92*	.08
Error	152	.07			.11			.09			.103		

*p < .01

Table 5

Results of Analysis of Variance on Numbers of Clients, Administrative Staff, and Front-Line Staff (increasing, decreasing, or stable[+]) by Program and Adoption Status

		Number of Clients			Number of Administrative Staff			Number of Front-Line Staff		
Source	df	MS	F	ω^2	MS	F	ω^2	MS	F	ω^2
Program	7	6.26	10.47*	.18	.66	2.81*	.04	2.91	6.01*	.11
Adoption Status	1	1.71	2.86		.04	.15		1.55	3.23	
Program by Adoption Status	7	.25	.42		.24	1.00		.06	.12	
Error	294	.60			.24			.49		

*$p < .01$

[+]Increase coded 1, decreasing coding -1, stable coded 0.

Table 6

Results of Analysis of Variance of Collapsed Number of Levels Involved in Decision Making in General by Program and Adoption Status for both Adopters and Non-adopters

Source	df	SS	MS	F	ω^2
Program	7	32.20	4.60	9.92*	.16
Adoption Status	1	.36	.36	.78	
Program by Adoption Status	7	2.77	.40	.85	
Error	302	140.10	.46	2.34	
Total	317	175.43			

*p < .01

Table 7

Correlations Among Four Scales, Number of Levels Participating in Both the Adoption Decision and Decisions in General (Collapsed), Number of Levels in Adoption Decision -- Number of Levels in General (Collapsed), Length of Time Program Has Been in Use in the Organization, and Demographic Variables for Adopters

	Expense and Financial Support	Changes in Roles and Role Relationships	Expected Smooth Implementation	Support
Length of Time Program Used In Organization	-.10	-.16**	-.11	.18**
Number of Levels Involved In Adoption Decision	.15	.08	.09	.24**
Number of Levels Involved In Decisions in General	-.14	.01	-.11	.15
(Number of Levels In Adoption Decision -- Number of Levels In General)	.26**	.06	.19**	.08
Number of Clients*	-.06	-.13	.09	-.11
Number of Administrative Staff*	.03	.02	.05	.02
Number of Front-Line Staff*	.02	.01	-.003	-.04

*Increasing coded 1, stable coded 0, decreasing coded -1.

**$p < .05$

Table 8

Results of Analysis of Variance on Expense and Financial Support Scale, Changes in Roles and Role Relationships Scale, Expected Smooth Implementation Scale, and Support Scale by Program and Age

		Expense and Financial Support			Changes in Roles and Role Relationships			Expected Smooth Implementation			Support		
Source	df	MS	F	ω^2	MS	F	ω^2	MS	F	ω^2	MS	F	ω^2
Program	7	.22	3.21*	.09	.43	3.64*	.11	.57	6.13*	.19	.30	2.63*	.07
Age	1	.00	.00		.04	.33		.01	.11		.11	1.00	
Program by Age	7	.12	1.72		.03	.25		.12	1.27		.06	.59	
Error	144	.07			.12			.09			.11		

*$p < .01$

Figure 1

Items in Scales and Scale Names

ADQ Item #*	Scale Name	Item
	Expense and Financial Support	
67		Program would be relatively inexpensive for the organization.
68		Program would be relatively inexpensive for the organization due to grant support brought in by the program.
115		Federal financial support was available.
119		State financial support was available.
123		Local financial support was available.
	Changes in Roles and Role Relationships	
52		Program would involve large change in the organization's client roles or role behaviors.
54		Program would require a large change in the organization's member roles or role behaviors.
55		Program would involve a large change in the role relationships (interaction) between any organization actors.
59		Program would improve the interpersonal relationships in the organization.

*The following items were combined due to coding procedures for scaling purposes (see text): 67 and 68; 115, 119 and 123; 52 and 54.

Figure 1 (cont.)

Items in Scales and Scale Names

ADQ Item #*	Scale Name	Item
	Expected Smooth Implementation	
43		Program would increase the efficiency of the organization (broadly interpreted).
45		Program would not take a lot of staff time to execute.
39		Program would be likely to function smoothly in the organization (WORKABLE; organization member-organization, i.e., administrative).
41		Program would be likely to function smoothly in the organization (WORKABLE; organization member-client, i.e., services process).
107		Appropriate materials for the program were available before adoption.
111		Appropriate facilities were available for the program before adoption.
	Support	
70		Members of the policy super-ordinate organization were supportive of the program.
72		Members of the administrative super-ordinate organization were supportive of the program.
74		Administrators in the organization were supportive of the program.
76		Specialized super-ordinate organization staff were supportive of the program.
78		Specialized organizational staff directly involved with the program's implementation were supportive of the program.
80		Front-line staff (potentially) directly involved with the program's implementation were supportive of the program.

*The following items were combined due to coding procedures for scaling purposes (see text): 39 and 41; 107 and 111.