

**Social Capital and the Diffusion of Innovations within Organizations:
Application to the Implementation of Computer Technology in Schools**

Kenneth A. Frank
Yong Zhao
Michigan State University
Kathryn Borman
University of South Florida

Running Head: **Social Capital and the Diffusion within Organizations**

Approximate Word Count: 10,400

Accepted to *Sociology of Education*, April 2004.

title footnote:

This work was supported primarily by a grant from the Spencer Foundation/National Academy of Education. A pilot study, extra research costs and compensation for schools was funded by a grant from the Social Capital Initiative at Michigan State University. Schools were also compensated with funds from the College of Education at Michigan State University. Travel to two sites was supported by the National Science Foundation (9874246). Thanks to Andrew Topper for helping develop and pilot the instrument. The ideas presented here have benefitted greatly from discussions at meetings of the social capital initiative at Michigan State University, and presentations at interdisciplinary colloquia at Stanford University, the University of Wisconsin in Madison, the University of Groningen, and the University of Washington. We thank Joe Byers and Nicole Ellefson for specific comments on this manuscript. Special thanks to Aaron Pallas, Karl Alexander and the Sociology of Education Reviewers for their thoughtful comments. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, Washington DC., 2000.

Direct correspondence to :
Ken Frank
Room 460 Erickson Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48824-1034

E-mail: kenfrank@msu.edu. Phone: 517-355-9567. Fax: 517-353-6393

ABSTRACT

Although the educational community has learned much about better educational practices, less is known about processes for implementing new practices. The standard model of diffusion suggests that people change perceptions about the value of an innovation through communication, and these perceptions then drive implementation. But implementation can be affected by more instrumental forces. In particular, members of a school share the common fate of the organization and affiliate with the common social system of the organization. Thus they are more able to informally access each others' expertise and more likely to respond to social pressure to implement an innovation, regardless of their own perceptions of the value of the innovation. Here we characterize informal access to expertise and responses to social pressure as manifestations of social capital. Using longitudinal and network data in a study of the implementation of computer technology in six schools, we find the effects of perceived social pressure and access to expertise through help and talk were at least as important as the effects of traditional constructs. By implication, change agents should attend to local social capital processes related to the implementation of educational innovations or reforms.

keywords: diffusion of innovation, implementation of innovation, computer technology, social capital within organizations

Although we are learning about better educational practices, we know little about how to implement those practices (Bryk and Schneider 2002). Lost in our focus on producing new curricula and training teachers is that schools are fundamentally social organizations. As such, schools implement reform and innovations through localized social processes (Cuban 1990; Cohen 1995; Fullan 1991). This manuscript is about how social processes within schools affect the implementation of innovation, in particular the implementation of computer technology.

Educational researchers have identified an array of factors that potentially affect educational outcomes, ranging from constructivist teaching (Cohen McLaughlin and Talbert 1993; Lave and Wenger 1991; Prawat 1989) to directed teaching (Delpit 1988; Slavin and Madden 2001), from the inequities of tracking (Alexander and Pallas 1985; Oakes 1985) to the market potential of schools of choice (Chubb and Moe 1990; Friedman and Friedman 1980; Greene 2001). For each new understanding there is a corresponding new reform or policy. Teachers should be retrained, schools should be reorganized, students should be able to choose which schools they attend.

As complex social organizations, schools typically draw on informal processes to implement innovations or reforms. Thus, implementation of these reforms potentially places competing demands on the social structure of the school. But little is known about the relative importance of the social structure or the specific mechanisms through which social structure affects implementation.

In order to quantify and understand how social structure within schools affects diffusion we apply the theory of social capital, operationalized as the potential to access resources through social relations. Thus the basic research question addressed in this manuscript is “To what extent does a teacher’s implementation of an innovation depend on the teacher’s access and response to social capital?”

If teachers do draw on social capital to implement innovations then reformers and innovators must consider the distribution of social capital in any school in which they seek to implement change. Is there enough social capital to implement the innovation? How does the distribution of social capital in a given school differ from exemplar or pilot schools? What other

reforms are on the horizon that will draw on the same stores of social capital? This turns existing tendencies to ask questions about the distribution of financial capital (is there enough money ...?) or physical capital (do we have the materials and space ...?) or human capital (are our teachers trained ...?) to comparable questions about social capital.

As we develop our theory, we note that schools are representative of well-bounded social systems in which social processes are critical to functioning (Bidwell 2000; Singh, House and Tucker 1986; Wilkins and Ouchi 1983). Not surprisingly, many organizational theories have been applied to schools (see Bidwell and Kasarda 1987; Bolman and Heller 1995, and Perrow 1986, for reviews) from control theory (Callahan 1962) to contingency theory (e.g., Greenfield 1975) and new institutionalism (Meyer and Rowan 1977; Rowan 1995). Thus findings from our study of schools should have implications for other organizations.

We will focus on computer innovations (e.g., internet, educational software, digital camera, etc) because there is currently a strong press on schools to implement such innovations (Budin 1999; Cuban 1999; Loveless 1996; President's Committee of Advisors on Science and Technology 1997). This makes computer technology a valuable innovation for schools to implement, either because it enhances productivity or because of strong institutionalized legitimacy (Rowan 1995).

Previous research on the diffusion of computers in schools has traditionally focused on the effects of three sets of factors on the adoption of computers. First, access to functional and reliable hardware and software and technical support was critical to implementation (Collins 1996; Cuban 1999; Loveless 1996; Zhao, Pugh, Sheldon, and Byers 2002). Second, institutional factors such as scheduling and types of school leadership affect teachers' use of computers (Collins 1996; Cuban 2001; Hodas 1993; Loveless 1996; Sandholtz and Ringstaff 1996; Zhao et al. 2002). Third and perhaps most frequently cited were characteristics of the individual teacher, including willingness and ability to use technology as well as pedagogical styles (Becker 2000; Burns 2002; Gilmore

1995; Hadley and Sheingold 1993; Harris and Grangenett 1999; US Congress Office of Technology Assessment 1995).

A few studies have highlighted the importance of social contexts, social processes, and social support in teachers' uses of computers (Becker 2000; Sandholtz and Ringstaff 1996; Schofield 1995; Zhao and Frank 2004), but there is little theory or empirical research regarding the social processes that affect the implementation of computers within a school. Thus in the next Section we integrate social capital into a theoretical model of diffusion within organizations. We then use longitudinal, social network data to empirically assess social capital effects on the implementation of computer technology in schools. In the discussion we review the findings as examples of technology and organizations, draw implications for change agents, explore the theoretical emergence of social capital, and identify limitations.

DIFFUSION WITHIN ORGANIZATIONS

Rogers (1995, page 5) defines diffusion as “the process by which an innovation is *communicated* through certain channels over time among members of a social system” (emphasis added). This definition features communication and reflects an individual level innovation-decision process. In particular, Rogers' process consists of an independent individual's knowledge or awareness of an innovation, formation of an attitude toward the innovation, decision to adopt or reject, implementation of the decision, and confirmation of the decision process (see also Prochaska et al 1992).

The question then is how to elaborate the model to apply to diffusion within organizations such as schools. Rogers (chapter 10) provides a brief history of the study of diffusion within organizations. Initially, researchers simply applied the model of the individual to the organization. Then researchers included uniquely defined organization attributes (e.g., size, centralization,

complexity, etc.,) which affect innovation. This moved to a focus on implementation and an “explosion” (page 390) of studies in the 1980's and 1990's and generated a new model of the processes through which an organization implements an innovation. For example, Rogers’ intra-organizational model (page 392) includes agenda setting, matching an innovation to the agenda, redefining/restructuring, and clarifying and routinizing. But note that action is specified essentially at the organizational level – the organization (i.e., the members acting as a collective) sets an agenda, matches, etc. Like other such models (e.g., Leonard-Barton 1988), Rogers’ model has a managerial focus in which the organization decides to adopt an innovation and then must go through a roughly linear process to implement.

While the process described by Rogers may apply to manufacturing organizations with simple hierarchical decision-making structures (such as the Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing company studied by Van De Ven 1986), it may not apply to organizations such as schools in which decision-making is complex (Etzioni 1961; Hage 1999). In these organizations it is not a simple matter of making a collective decision to adopt and then implement. Instead the process is more one of diffusion of innovation within the organization, as each actor has some autonomy to make her own decision partly in response to the ideas, information and other social forces to which she is exposed¹.

To understand the diffusion process within organizations, we must revisit Rogers’ (1995) individual level model of diffusion and modify it to include the unique social processes that apply to members of a common organization. First, members of an organization derive important benefits from the organization, including social and psychological rewards, access to resources, information, status, etc. Thus members of an organization can exert social pressure on each other by sanctioning failure to conform through mild detachment (i.e., being “out of the loop”) to complete ostracism (Ajzen and Fishbein 1980; Ibarra 1993). Note that actors may apply social pressure to other members of their organization to coordinate effort, protect internal political

positions or direct organizational resources to support the innovation. Thus social pressure within an organization goes beyond the mere interdependence of action that can apply, for example, to members of system who adopt communication innovations (see Valente 1995, 21-22).

Second, members of an organization share the fate of the organization (see Portes and Sensenbrenner's 1993, discussion of bounded solidarity). Therefore they are more likely to help other members implement an innovation that improves the common fate. Of course, the formal organizational chart may designate a centralized department responsible for supporting technological innovations (Attewell 1992), but much help still comes through the informal organization (Aiken Bacharach and French 1980; Ibarra 1993; Kanter 1983). This help is critical for implementation of complex innovations such as new software or other computer technologies which are context specific (Eveland and Tornatzky 1990).

Informal help and social pressure can be combined under the general theoretical framework of social capital, which we define as the potential to access resources through social relations (Bourdieu 1986; Coleman 1988; see Lin 2001, Portes 1998, or Woolcock 1998, for recent reviews)². An actor who receives help that is not formally mandated draws on social capital by obtaining information or resources through a social relationship or obligation. An actor who exerts pressure also draws on social capital by using the threat of detachment or ostracization to direct another's behavior.

The effects of social capital can be understood relative to a full model of intra-organizational diffusion as depicted in figure 1. First, begin by noting that for complex innovations individuals do not simply implement or not. As complex innovations have a variety of applications and uses (Bayer and Melone 1989; Yetton, Sharma and Southon 1999), implementation should be defined on a continuum. In the figure, different baseline levels of implementation are depicted by the active, expert, computer user on the left versus the hunt and peck novice on the right. Then the other factors are understood to affect change in use along the continuum.

Insert Figure 1 here

While the focus here is on social capital and other network processes, it is important to include effects already identified in the literature (Bayer and Melone 1989; Yetton, et al. 1999; Wolfe 1994). To begin, organizations affect members through job conditions, including location in the division of labor. For example, in high schools, members of English departments may be more inclined to implement new word processing programs than others, or in businesses members of sales departments may be most inclined to implement new pricing software. Job conditions are represented by the boxes of alternating dashes and dots around each actor.

Implementation may also be affected by changes in job conditions, defined as job stress. Stress increases uncertainty and therefore demands on resources, accentuating immediate barriers to implementation. Thus actors experiencing considerable job stress may be less inclined to implement innovations. Job stress is depicted via the jagged lines connecting the organization to each actor's job conditions.

The engineering approach to implementation emphasizes technical characteristics of the innovation (e.g., Ramamurthy and Premkumar 1995) or the interaction of technology and task (e.g., Cooper and Zmud 1990). This is depicted in terms of the dotted lines pointing from "Technology Resources" to the computers used by the expert and novice.

In the extant diffusion literature (Rogers 1995; Tornatzky and Fleischer 1990; Yetton et al. 1999; Wolfe 1994), the critical human factor affecting implementation is the individual's perceptions of the technology, in particular the perceived potential of the technology (this is consistent with effects of willingness to use and apply technology and pedagogical style on implementation found in the educational literature cited in the introduction). Traditional diffusion is then depicted in figure 1 via the dashed line from the mouth of the expert to the perceived potential (within the thought bubble) of the novice. Thus though traditional diffusion is conveyed

through communication, its effects on computer use are mediated by actors' perceptions of the value of technology.

Perceived potential can also be influenced by exogenous institutions (Meyer and Rowan 1977) regarding technology (e.g., societal tendencies to adopt certain platforms, or to attribute more value to some uses than others). The effect of institutions is depicted in the upper corners of figure 1 via waves that permeate the organizational boundary and then approach the actors' thought bubbles. Furthermore, effects of institutions can be indirect, as an organizational member who responds to an institution can then influence the potential of technology perceived by another. Thus, though institutions can affect each individual independently, institutions can be transmitted and filtered by the intra-organizational networks of traditional diffusion.

Social capital processes are also manifest through interactions. In particular, the expert user on the left may provide information and help to the novice on the right as well as apply social pressure. For example, in commenting on how she would respond to a non-computer user in her school, one of the teachers in the study reported on below indicated she was inclined to apply social pressure "...you *need* to try and start experimenting..." as well as support "...let them know they're not alone" Critically, note that the effects of social pressure and access to others' expertise do not depend on changes in perceptions regarding the value of computers. Thus the solid arrow in figure 1 representing social capital effects points directly to the novice's behavior.

Though information, help, and social pressure are most likely to flow from those with greater expertise to those with less expertise, the flow of social capital is reciprocal, as indicated by the gray shaded arrows in figure 1. When resources flow, in the form of help, it is from those with greater expertise to those with lesser expertise³. On the other hand, the actor who implements an innovation in response to social pressure provides a resource, in the form of conformity, to other members of the organization who have already implemented at higher levels.

The reciprocal flows of social capital within the organization are integral to the transition

from individual, micro-level action, to the macro behavior of the organization. Each actor is a potential “other” for the rest of the organization. The language is often telling, as obligations of latent social capital are often attributed to an unspecified *they*: “*They* need so much help”; “*They’re* pressuring me to use technology more.” As another teacher in our study described her response to computer technology:

Very frightened to use it [technology], but you know, some of the people in the building are very much *pushing us and the peer pressure*, in a way, to try new things and it's sort of like I'll try it if you support me in this so we try more things until we get hooked ourselves on this. And then we try to hook more teachers into it.

As this teacher was subject to and then a conduit for social pressure, she was affected by, and then became part of, the organizational culture.

Overall, figure 1 locates multiple levels of constructs affecting implementation of an innovation relative to the organizational boundary. Institutions and technology (other than that produced by in-house research and development) originate from outside the organization. The organization directly and structurally affects its members through job conditions and job stress. Most importantly, interactions within organizations, including those of traditional diffusion as well as social capital, are key processes that contribute to informal organizational culture, and thus to the organization as a social entity.

Plan of Analysis

In the next Section we present a study of the implementation of computer technology in schools to evaluate many aspects of our model. The focal action in Figure 1 is the implementation of computers, representing the general implementation of innovation. Thus we identify use of

computers as our outcome. Our theory then applies to how other characteristics, such as job conditions, social capital, etc., affect the implementation of innovations. Correspondingly, we treat measures of these other characteristics as predictors in our analyses.

Because our theory integrates previous theories and introduces the construct of social capital in the diffusion of innovation, part of our empirical analyses are exploratory. Thus we obtain multiple measures for each theoretical predictor and describe the relationship between each measure and computer use with correlations (partialled for school membership to account for unique school characteristics). We then partial for *expertise*, allowing us to assess effects on *new* computer use. Finally, we use regression to simultaneously estimate and account for multiple effects on computer use, ultimately reporting a parsimonious model with high explanatory power that represents each theoretical construct.

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY IN SCHOOLS

Sample and Design

We conducted our study in six schools in three states. The schools were chosen because they were believed, through other research, to be attempting to implement computer related innovations⁴. Innovations ranged from providing laptop computers to all students and infrared access in all classrooms to software for facilitating open communication to use of the internet as the exclusive source for technology (e.g., software, data, graphics).

Two of the states were in the northern midwest, and the third was in the southwest. Two of the schools served kindergarten through fifth grade, one served second and third grades only, one served kindergarten through eighth grade, one served sixth through eighth grade, and one was a high school (for which only two strands, or schools within a school, were sampled). Faculty sizes

ranged from fifteen to eighty. The student composition ranged from one school that was upper middle class (ten percent free lunch) to one that was mostly lower class (ninety-five percent free lunch), and the racial compositions included a school that was ninety-five percent Caucasian (white), two that were ninety five percent Latino (hispanic) and one that was ninety-five percent African American (black).

From January to May of 2000 we interviewed at least six teachers in each school as well as each principal. From November 2000 to May 2001 we conducted at least six more interviews per school, about half of which were reinterviews of original informants. Both times a simple protocol was used (“How do you use computers?”; “How do you make decisions about what to use?”; “What is the social context in which you make those decisions?”). These interviews provided basic phenomenological data regarding computer use as well as informed the development of a questionnaire to assess teachers’ use of computers, perception of the potential of computers, background information, etc.⁵ The questionnaire also included sociometric questions regarding professional discussions, closest colleagues, providers of help to use computers, and with whom teachers talked about computers. Thus each respondent indicated others who were close colleagues, helpful, etc. Respondents also indicated frequency categories for talk and help.

After conducting the first round of exploratory interviews, school teachers⁶ in eight schools were surveyed in the Spring of 2000 (March to May) , defined as time 1. The original sample size was 230. We returned for a second survey in the Spring of 2001 (March to May) to six of the schools, defined as time 2. (One of the schools in the first wave was not formally recruited but voluntarily completed surveys without compensation and chose not to volunteer at time 2. The principal of a second school indicated she felt too much external pressure to ask her teachers to participate in the survey a second time.) To achieve high response rates, schools were offered \$400-\$500 compensation for an 85% response rate or greater⁷. The survey was administered at staff meetings on most occasions with repeated follow-ups with principals or contact teachers to

identify and solicit those teachers who had not yet responded. This was especially necessary to obtain information from teachers who were less socially engaged in their schools and therefore less likely to participate in a school-based survey. For each wave, response rates were greater than 70% in each school except one (which was at 50% at time 1 and 35% at time 2). Ultimately we conducted analyses on 143 teachers for whom we had data at time 2 and could obtain a measure of expertise.

Measures

Implementation of Computer Technology

We adapted the primary measure of innovation implementation from the diffusion of innovation literature (e.g., Rogers 1995; Tornatzky and Fleischer 1990; Wolfe 1994) to apply to teachers' computer use. In particular, we measured use not in terms of gross percentages of time teachers and students used computers but in terms of the number of occasions on which teachers used computers for each of five primarily educational goals and activities. Thus use was defined by the sum of teachers' responses to a set of items measured at time 2 beginning with the stem "I use computers to help me ...," completed by: "teach the required curriculum"; "introduce new material into the curriculum"; "model an idea or activity;" "connect the curriculum to real world tasks"; "motivate students." The responses were on a five point scale (recoded to represent number of days/year: daily=180; weekly=40; monthly=9; yearly=1; never=0). Means ranged from 27 to 58 with standard deviations ranging from 47 to 71 ($\alpha = .91$, items listed in order of correlation with the total from highest to lowest). Although based on teacher reports, these items at least measure teacher behaviors, which ultimately must be the link between any innovation and educational

outcomes. Furthermore, the teachers may well be reliable informants of their own behaviors (cf. Bidwell Frank and Quiroz 1997).

Our dependent variable, computer use, is a count of a number of occurrences. Not surprisingly, the distribution had a large positive skew, with a few teachers reporting extreme amounts of use. Correspondingly, we include the natural log of computer use in the descriptive statistics (as well as the original metric), and use the log version in reporting correlations and regression models⁸.

Access to Expertise through Help and Talk

The manifestation of social capital depends on the extent and quality of the resource provided. Regarding computer technology, the quality of the resource depended on the expertise of the teacher who provided help or with whom others talked about computers. Of course, expertise can be partly defined by knowledge of an innovation, but, recognizing the complexity of teaching as a task and of computers as an innovation, expertise must also consist of understanding how to apply computers to teaching. Thus our measure of expertise began with the amount teachers used computers for their own purposes (e.g., teach the required curriculum) and student purposes (e.g., to help students communicate) at time 1. The scale for these measures ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree⁹.

We then augmented the measure of expertise with information from time 2, including the total number of applications with which the teacher was familiar and the extent to which the teacher reported being able to operate computers and how confident the teacher felt with computers. An overall composite was made by taking the average of standardized versions of each variable ($\alpha=.76$). Using the time 2 data increased reliability and provided information for teachers who did not respond to the time 1 survey (n=57). The supplemental items generally referred to the

expertise of the teacher but did not directly include measures of the extent to which the teacher used computers at time 2 (thus avoiding problems of circularity, or endogeneity, and also avoiding problems of estimation – Marsden and Friedkin 1994).

Social capital is observably *manifest* when one actor allocates resources to another through interaction that is not formally mandated. Correspondingly, we measured two types of interactions through which resources could be conveyed. First, each teacher listed the others who had provided help to use computers. Since this type of help is rarely mandated in schools, occurrences of it are evidence of social capital. Second, each teacher indicated with whom she talked about computers. Admittedly, engaging in talk is less demanding of a provider than is providing help. But teachers convey information through talk, and information is a resource of social capital (Arrow 1979; Sandefur and Laumann 1998).

To obtain a social capital measure of expertise accessed through help we multiplied the frequency (daily=180; weekly=40; monthly=9; yearly=1) with which a teacher i obtained help from another, i' , by the expertise of i' . We then summed across all others:

$$\textit{Access to expertise through help}_i = \sum_{\substack{i'=1, \\ i' \neq i}}^{n-1} (\textit{help}_{ii'}) \times (\textit{provider's expertise}_{i'}) \quad , \quad (1)$$

where $\textit{help}_{ii'}$ is the extent to which teacher i reported (at time 2) receiving help with computers from teacher i' . Thus the right hand side defines an independent variable representing a network effect (Marsden and Friedkin 1994). Moreover, the right hand side draws on the comprehensive network data to include the two components of social capital: a resource (expertise) and an interaction (help) through which the resource is provided.

We then note that the measure as defined by (1) is limited because it does not account for the provider's ability to convey expertise. Just as good teachers must have knowledge of pedagogy

as well as subject matter, so good helpers must know how to convey their expertise to others. Though we did not directly measure the ability of each teacher to convey expertise, we use as a proxy the amount that others received help from a given teacher (i') at time 1 and time 2. Our reasoning is that those who were frequently listed by others as providing help must be reasonably good at doing so. Thus our new measure is

Access to expertise through help $_i =$

$$\sum_{\substack{i'=1, \\ i' \neq i}}^{n-1} (\text{help}_{i'}) \times (\text{provider's expertise}_i) \times (\text{amount of help provided to others}_{i'}) \quad . \quad (2)$$

Thus the extent of expertise accessed through help depends on the provider's ability to convey help.

Next we generated a comparable measure based on talk as interaction. That is,

Access to expertise through talk $_i =$

$$\sum_{\substack{i'=1, \\ i' \neq i}}^{n-1} (\text{talk}_{i'}) \times (\text{provider's expertise}_i) \times (\text{amount of help provided to others}_{i'}) \quad , \quad (3)$$

where $\text{talk}_{i'}$ is the extent to which teacher i reported (at time 2) talking to teacher i' about computers.

The measures of expertise accessed through help and talk were highly correlated, at .87. Therefore we combined the values into a single measure of expertise accessed, either through help or talk:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Access to expertise through help and talk}_i = \\
& z[(\text{Access to expertise through help})_i] + \quad (4) \\
& z[\text{Access to expertise through talk}]_i ,
\end{aligned}$$

where z indicates the variable was standardized with mean zero and variance one¹¹. We then reduced positive skew by adding .95 to make all values positive and taking the natural log. Ultimately the coefficient for this measure represents the flow of social capital from expert to novice in figure 1.

Social Pressure to Use Computers

It was not feasible to directly ask teachers about others who exerted social pressure. Teachers, like members of most organizations, were reluctant to identify specific others who had exerted pressure, with its negative connotation. Therefore we asked, more generally, the extent to which teachers agreed with four statements at time 2 (others in this school expect me to use computers; others in this school encourage me to use computers; knowing about computers increases opportunities for collaboration at XX; using computers helps a teacher become integrated into XX). All variables were measured on a 4 point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree ($\alpha=.66$, items in the previous sentence are listed in order of their correlation with the total, from highest to lowest). The four statements measure perceived social pressure, including direct pressure (e.g., expectation) as well as encouragement and opportunities that can serve as

indirect pressure. Ultimately the coefficient for this measure represents the flow of social capital from novice to others.

Own Expertise

Following the logic of human capital (see Bourdieu 1986 for a comparison of human and social capital), a teacher can access her own expertise to implement computers. Furthermore, because a teacher's own expertise is essentially a baseline measure, controlling for a teacher's own expertise allows us to more confidently make causal inferences from the estimated coefficients for other factors. For example, as postulated here, actors who have access to others' expertise are more likely to implement innovations, but this may be obscured by the fact that those with the most inclination to implement may already have expertise and thus not require help from others. Therefore by controlling for own expertise we can identify the unique effect of access to others' expertise. The same variables used to measure provider's expertise were used to measure own expertise. Of course for own expertise the values were taken from the same survey as the dependent variable¹².

Perceived Potential of Computers

The traditional diffusion model operates through actors' perceptions of technology, as indicated by the thought bubbles in figure 1. Drawing on what Wolfe (1994) referred to as relative advantage, one of the most important factors found by Tornatzky and Klein (1982), we developed two measures of perceived potential of computers based on responses at time 2. For the first, the items matched those of our dependent variable, use of computers, but began with the stem "Computers can help me ..." and were completed by: "introduce new material into the curriculum";

“connect the curriculum to real world tasks”; “teach the required curriculum”; “motivate students”; “model an idea or activity.” Responses were on a four point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (4). The means ranged from 3.15 to 3.38 and standard deviations ranged from .56 to .65 ($\alpha=.90$, items listed in order of correlation with the total, from highest to lowest). Because the original variable had a negative skew, the measure used in the correlations and regression analyses was based on the $-\log(5-\text{original value})$.

For the second measure of perceived potential, we recognized that teachers may perceive the potential of technology more for their students than themselves (Cuban 1999). Thus we developed a measure of perceived potential of computers for student use. These items began with the stem “Computers can help students ...” and were completed by: “communicate”; “engage new material”; “explore alternative ways of thinking”; “collaborate”; “engage in higher order thinking”; “think critically.” Responses were on a four point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The means ranged from 3.23 to 3.40 and standard deviations ranged from .54 to .62 ($\alpha=.94$, items listed in order of correlation with the total, from highest to lowest).

Resources for Computing

Of course, the resources define the technology to which one has access, as shown by the types of computers used in figure 1. We measured the adequacy of technical resources in terms of percent of times a teacher reported encountering significant technical difficulties with computers that limited use (less than 25%=1; 26%-50%=2; 51%-75%=3; more than 75%=4). We also created a composite of the perceived adequacy of physical resources from the following statements: The computer resources in my room are adequate; I would like access to more hardware (reverse coded); I would like access to more software (reverse coded). Each response was obtained at time 2 and was

based on a four point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree ($\alpha=.71$). For the regression analyses we took the natural log because the original variable had a positive skew.

We also measured perceived adequacy of organizational support for computers, based on the mean of responses to three items: I have adequate support to use computers in my classroom; It is easy to introduce new software at XX; I have adequate support for new things I am asked to implement. Each response was obtained at time 2 and was based on a four point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree ($\alpha= .72$).

Job Conditions

Job conditions define unique contexts that affect the true and perceived value of the technology and unique obstacles to implementing the technology. These are represented by the box of alternating dashes and dots around each user in figure 1. Measures of job conditions included class size, grades taught (including separate indicators for teachers of multiple or unknown grades), and years in school. We used the log of years in school in the correlation and regression analyses because the original measure was positively skewed.

Job Stress

Job stress can demand immediate resources, distract attention, and induce burnout, all of which may affect an individual's capacity and intent to implement innovations. Job stress is shown by the jagged line (i.e., shaking the users) in figure 1. Measures of job stress included perceived work load (minimal=1, engaged=2, busy=3, or overwhelmed=4), whether the grades or subjects were new¹³, and perceived changes in emphasis on standardized tests (the latter responses were on a five point scale ranging from "much less" to "much more" than last year). Items were treated separately as no combination had internal consistency α above .7.

Background

Of course, people of different backgrounds may have different propensities to use computers. We included fixed effects (i.e., dummy variables) a for teacher's gender and race/ethnicity.

School

Teachers were nested within schools, thus constituting nested or multilevel data (Bryk and Raudenbush 1992). The schools differed in terms of the populations they served, their configurations, their architecture, their leadership, their institutional histories and relationships to their districts. These all undoubtedly affect the diffusion of any innovation. But estimation of school effects is beyond the range of this study. Because our theory focuses on intra-organizational processes, and because we had only six schools in our final sample, we controlled for school effects using a set of dummy variables (that is, we treated schools as fixed, not random, effects as in multilevel models). Thus any characteristic associated with the school, from student composition to general availability of hardware was captured in the unique effect for each school. To conserve degrees of freedom we used two dummy variables delineating schools that differed substantially from the others¹⁴.

Institutions

As described in our introduction, all of the schools in the study below were exposed to common, general societal level institutions to implement technology. Thus, there is little variation in exposure to societal institutions. Furthermore, we controlled for unique state or district institutions through the dummy variables designating each school described above. Finally,

following the new institutionalism, our model postulates that institutions have their effect by altering actors' perceptions, which are included in our model. Nonetheless, the direct effects of institutions essentially go untested as we attend to intra-organizational diffusion.

Results

The means for each of the variables described above are given in the second column of table 1. On average, teachers reported applying computers to 196 purposes per year (although any given use could have more than one purpose). Regarding social capital measures, access to expertise through talk and help had a mean of -1.43 and standard deviation of 1.67, although the metric is difficult to interpret because the variable is defined by the multiplication of three components. Teachers tended to agree with statements regarding perceived pressure to use computers (mean=2.96).

Teachers' mean responses to statements regarding perceived potential for teacher use was slightly greater than agree (mean=3.25) and similarly for student use (mean=3.30), indicating teachers placed high value on the potential of computers. Regarding technology resources, on average, teachers reported significant technical problems between 25% and 50% of the time (mean=1.54), suggesting a serious limitation even in these schools selected partly for their intentions to use computers. Teachers were inclined to disagree with statements regarding resources available for computers (mean=1.82) indicating teachers perceived their resources to be limited, although they were almost neutral on rating their organizational support (mean=2.59).

Insert Table 1 Here

Regarding job conditions, the average class sizes was about 22. The mean grade level was between fourth and fifth, and about half the teachers indicated teaching multiple grades, either via shared classrooms or special assignments. The average teacher had been in his or her school for slightly less than seven and a half years, with considerable variation.

Regarding job stress, teachers tended to describe their workloads as busy (mean=3.13), with 16% teaching new grades, and 11% new subjects. The average teacher indicated that there was more emphasis on standardized tests in 2000-2001 than in 1999-2000 (mean=3.86). Thus there was already increasing emphasis on standardized tests, at least in this small sample, prior to the “No Child Left Behind” policy. Finally, regarding background, 27% of the teachers were males, and 43% were white (this may be an unusually low percentage of white teachers, but there were many minority teachers in the schools that served primarily Hispanic students and the one school that served primarily African American students).

The correlation of each variable with reported use of computers at time 2, partialling out school, is given in the fourth column of table 1. The social capital partial coefficients were moderate, .28 for access to expertise through help and talk and .36 for perceived social pressure to use computers. The traditional diffusion measure of perceived potential for teacher use had a coefficient of .34, while perceived potential for student use had a coefficient of .19. The difference is not surprising, as perceived potential of teacher use most aligns with teacher use of computers.

Perceived adequacy of resources and perceived organizational support both had moderate coefficients (.14 and .16 respectively). Of the remaining factors, class size had a coefficient of -.25, and perceived changes in emphasis on standardized tests had a coefficient of -.15. No other coefficients were greater than .10.

Many of the coefficients partialled only for school are consistent with relationships reported in the literature (e.g., Rogers 1995; Tornatzky and Fleischer 1990; Wolfe 1994). But importantly, other studies typically have not controlled for an individual’s own expertise, and any relationship

with computer use may be spurious, attributable to expertise. Thus in the last column of table 1, we report the correlation of each variable with reported use of computers at time 2, partialling out school *and* expertise. Many of the largest correlations are reduced (access to expertise through talk and help, perceived pressure to use computers, perceived potential of computers for teacher use, perceived potential of computers for student use, perceived adequacy of organizational support, class size, and perceived increased emphasis on standardized tests). Thus some of explanatory power of each of these measures should more rightly be attributed to a teacher's expertise. For example, though those who perceive organizational support to be adequate use computers more, this may be attributed to their expertise. The only correlation that increased once partialling for expertise was perceived adequacy of physical resources, reflecting a suppression effect. Those with greater expertise actually perceive resources to be less adequate (perhaps because they are more demanding). Thus, within levels of expertise, the adequacy of physical resources has a larger effect on computer use than when examined across the whole sample.

Partialling for school and expertise, the job conditions coefficient with the largest magnitude was class size (-.21). None of the other measures for job conditions (grade, teaching multiple grades, years in school), job stress (workload, teaching a new grade, teaching a new subject) or background (gender, race) had partial correlations with computer use above magnitude of .10. Thus although there were general theoretical reasons to believe that job conditions, job stress, and background could be related to use of computers, the specific measures were neither statistically significant nor substantively meaningful in correlations partialled for school and expertise or the final model.

After exploring multiple models with various measures listed in table 1, results from the final regression for computer use are shown in table 2¹⁵. This model was chosen for its explanatory power (R^2 of .42), parsimony and representation of theoretical constructs¹⁶. The single most important predictor, not surprisingly, was own expertise, with a standardized coefficient of .32.

Access to expertise through help and talk was statistically significant at $p \leq .01$, and perceived social pressure to use computers was statistically significant at $p \leq .05$. Moreover, the standardized coefficients for the social capital measures (.21 and .16 respectively) were comparable to those of perceived potential of computers (.18) and perceived adequacy of resources (.19). In fact, the change in R^2 above a baseline model (controlling only for own expertise and schools) for the social capital measures was .10 whereas for the traditional diffusion measures it was .08. Thus the two social capital measures explained slightly more variation in use of computers than did measures of traditional constructs of perceived resource adequacy and perceived potential of computers¹⁷.

Finally teachers with large classes (job conditions) and who perceived an increased emphasis on standardized tests (job stress) were less likely to use computers. Both effects were small, but statistically significant ($p \leq .05$). Thus teachers' implementation of computers can be affected by incidental conditions locating them within their organizational context.

Insert Table 2 Here

Regarding the effect of expertise accessed through help, one teacher explained (emphasis added):

A person helped us and answered questions we had about how to use the computer and how to, how to use clip art and how to just do things that we wanted to do, that we didn't feel comfortable doing. So this person was very instrumental in getting, getting me to feel more comfortable with my computer.

Consistent with the theory presented in the previous section this quote indicates how the effects of social capital can bypass standard effects of diffusion, in particular those of resources and perceived

potential; the teacher's emphasis is on comfort with the computer, not perceived value of the computer.

It is possible that the standard diffusion and social capital mechanisms are redundant (suggesting negative interactions). For example, when teachers perceive high value in using computers social pressure may be unnecessary . Similarly, when resources are adequate, access to others' expertise may have less value. Consistent with this conjecture, interactions between standard diffusion and social capital measures were negative, although only the interaction of social pressure and perceived potential approached statistical significance.

DISCUSSION

We have included social capital in a theory of the diffusion of innovations within organizations. Members of an organization are likely to help and talk to one another because they share a common fate, and members of an organization can exert social pressure on one another because they affiliate with a common social system. Help, talk and social pressure are not merely disjoint processes. Each plays off the other as organizational members generate, and draw on, social capital. Empirically, the effects of access to expertise through help and talk (measured with network data) and perceived social pressure to use computers were comparable to traditional diffusion effects associated with perceived value of technology and adequacy of resources.

We recognize that the social capital effects are moderate. But social capital need not have dominating effects to be an important force for the implementation of innovations because social capital leverages expertise and social relations already in a system. Thus social capital is readily available relative to the purchase of physical resources or attempts to change the potential value actors perceive for technology, which can be expensive and time consuming. Furthermore, because social capital leverages existing expertise, it can theoretically apply to the implementation of any

innovation for which there is already some expertise and favorable predisposition in the system. In fact, perhaps social capital effects are easily overlooked in any given situation because they are ubiquitous (Burt 2000; Coleman 1988; Granovetter 1985; Portes 1998).

The function of social capital in intra-organizational diffusion helps us understand the transitions between the macro-level social entity of the organization and the micro-level action of independent individuals. Theoretical explanations of the link between organizational culture and organizational level implementation have not elucidated the underlying mechanisms and processes at the individual level (e.g., Amburgey et al 1990; Cook and Yanow 1995; Kotter and Heskett 1992; Siehl and Martin 1990). But we argue that the organization establishes the context for resource sharing and social pressure targeted towards implementation. This is in contrast to persuasion through individual based communication targeted towards changes in perceived potential as in the traditional diffusion model (Rogers 1995). Thus our theory of social capital addresses how individuals draw on membership in a common organization to access expertise and exact conformity to influence each others' implementation. Organizational culture is not neglected in the least (Bryk et al. 1998). Rather the effects of organizational culture are realized when social capital is manifest.

Implications for Change Agents

One direct implication of our findings is that change agents may be able to draw on social capital to facilitate the implementation of innovations. For example, change agents could designate professional development time for organizational members to interact and share existing expertise. Or change agents could strategically cultivate new expertise by supporting ambivalent actors to explore innovations and then share their knowledge. Using graphical representations of social structure (e.g., Frank 1996; Frank and Zhao 2004; McDonald 2002), change agents could

strategically cultivate new relations through which innovations could diffuse more evenly. This might be accomplished by relocating actors, encouraging interaction across departments, etc.

Because social capital theory applies to the micro-macro transition, our findings also have implications for organizational level action. In particular, if social capital is like others forms of capital, it is a fixed resource (Bourdieu 1986; Robison Siles and Schmidt 2002). For example, teachers may not have the time to help one another develop a new math curriculum *and* implement a new after school program. As a result, attempts to implement multiple innovations simultaneously may pit proponents against each other. Thus, though empirically we track diffusion within schools, our theory is consistent with those who call for implementation to be conceptualized at the school, instead of the teacher, level (e.g., Bryk and Schneider 2002; Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin 1995; Frank and Fahrback 1999).

Because social capital is local, an innovation effectively implemented in one organization may not be effectively implemented in another organization. For example, a school with computer expertise distributed evenly among teachers may effectively move from lab to classroom based computing because most of the teachers have a source of social capital on which to draw for help. On the other hand, a school where computer expertise is held by a few socially marginal teachers may be more effective by formalizing support in a lab setting. This is just one example of how innovations cannot simply be scaled up and out because implementation depends on the distribution of social capital.

Change agents should also attend to job conditions and job stress of those they hope will implement innovations. Regarding job conditions, our results suggest that the advantages of small classes, established experimentally (Finn and Achilles 1990), may be partly attributed to easing implementation of an innovation. In particular, the demands of classroom management and unreliable technology (Cuban 1999) are greater in large classes, thus inhibiting opportunity to experiment and innovate “on the fly.” Conversely, our findings suggest that recent legislation

emphasizing standardized tests (e.g., Elementary and Secondary Education Act/“No Child Left Behind Act of 2001”) may impede the implementation of technological innovation by increasing job stress. Perhaps the tests require teachers to focus on forms of knowledge not easily supported by computers, or perhaps the high stakes associated with the tests make teachers averse to risks of innovation. Generally, aspects of job conditions and job stress should be considered as constructs that affect implementation.

The Emergence of Social Capital

If change agents are to draw on social capital, then the next obvious question is “Where does social capital come from?” Frank (2001) found that teachers were more likely to help those identified as close colleagues. Thus the flow of social capital was guided by social exchange. But Frank also found that those who identified with members of their schools as a collective were more likely to help others regardless of close collegial relationships, thus facilitating the even distribution of resources throughout schools. This is consistent with findings linking overall sense of community to the efficient flow of resources within organizations and organizational effectiveness (e.g., Bryk et al 1998). Thus social capital emerges from direct social relationships and perceived links to a collective.

The mechanisms Frank identified as generating social capital are almost inaccessible to change agents. It is difficult to generate new collegial ties or identification with a collective in the abstract. Then what is the role of the change agent? Perhaps instead, recognizing that social capital accumulates through cyclical processes (Bryk and Schneider 2002; Putnam 2000), we should ask “What are we currently doing to facilitate or inhibit the cultivation of social capital?” To be sure, governmental policies can impede the cultivation of social capital by restricting and controlling behavior (Shedd and Bacharach 1991). Even well-meaning policies may limit social capital by

formalizing exchange and therefore inhibiting opportunities for establishing trust (Molm, Takahashi and Peterson 2000). Most importantly, each demand placed on a school potentially drains the stores of social capital. Therefore schools should be circumspect in the changes they attempt to implement, and change agents should be aware of other innovations schools are implementing that may compete with their own and thus overdraw the stores of social capital.

Limitations and Extensions

Our findings are based on a small sample of schools. Though the students attending the schools vary considerably demographically, there are many types of schools and students not represented in our sample. For example, our sample consists mostly of elementary schools and thus we cannot explore the extent to which effects of social capital vary by level of school. Furthermore, we simply do not have enough degrees of freedom to estimate the extent to which our effects vary by average socioeconomic status, racial composition, etc.

Acknowledging concerns regarding the representativeness of our sample, we use a new index (Frank and Duke 2003; Frank, under review), to calculate the robustness of our inference to potential alterations of the sample. In particular, we consider replacing half the sample with a hypothetical sample with different partial correlation between predictor and outcome (but with the same means and variances for all variables as for the observed cases). This index shows that the partial correlation between access to expertise through help and talk and use of computers would have to be less than .120 in a replacement sample to alter our inference (.120 is about one standard error below the observed partial correlation of .216). In contrast, the hypothetical partial correlation between perceived social pressure and use of computers in a replacement sample would only have to be less than .165, relative to an observed partial correlation of .170, to alter the inference. Thus the inference regarding access to expertise through help and talk is moderately

robust with respect to concerns about the representativeness of the sample, while the inference regarding the effect of social pressure could easily be altered in a more representative sample.

Clearly, it would be valuable to extend our study to a sample that is representative of a larger population and through which one could meaningfully explore variation in social capital effects by school characteristics, drawing on a multilevel framework (Bryk and Raudenbush 1992; Frank 1998). But our design features longitudinal data, sociometric items and high percentages of the teachers in the targeted schools. To obtain such data requires a more focused effort than standard large scale, representative, surveys which may be anonymous and may not place such high burdens on individual schools. Thus, in line with Charles Bidwell's (2000, 2001) recent calls to attend to the micro social processes within schools, we have emphasized in-depth understanding of within school social processes over national representativeness. Ultimately, of course, the two are not mutually exclusive, and we call upon the education research community to focus more attention on gathering large scale data that includes the micro-social processes of schools.

The study could also be extended by delving deeper into each school as a case. For example, Frank and Zhao (2004) described how collegial subgroups structured the diffusion process in schools. But what is needed is a deeper understanding of the interplay between the distribution of social capital and the roles social capital plays in the diffusion process. This could particularly apply to how institutions permeate organizational boundaries and then are transmitted throughout organizations (omitted in our empirical analysis). For such analyses one could draw more heavily on qualitative data to incorporate aspects of organizational history, decision making, politics, etc.

Our operationalization of social capital, as the potential to access resources through social relations, was intentionally narrow. As such, it may appear little different than social exchange (e.g., Blau 1967). But we specified the mechanisms of help and social pressure as social capital because, unlike social exchange, social capital emerges out of the larger social context. In particular, teachers respond to social pressure and are inclined to help one another because they are

members of a common social organization, the school. Nonetheless, it would be important to link our conceptualization of social capital to other conceptualizations of social capital, such as an adaptation of Putnam's "civic participation," in the school setting.

In what other organizations and for what other innovations does our model of intra-organizational diffusion apply? We expect the model applies in organizations where decision-making is complex and not the function of a centralized actor or set of actors. In such organizations, each member contributes to the pattern of diffusion, best understood through a model that includes the effects of interaction on individual action. Furthermore, we suspect that informal help and social pressure are more important when the technology is complex, as is the case for new software or computer technology. When technology is simple, implementation may be influenced by standardized, decontextualized, sources.

In spite of these limitations, attending to social capital effects in intra-organizational diffusion generates important theoretical insights that were supported by our data. Social capital processes help us understand how organizations coordinate action without relying on formal authority or traditional influence processes, which have limited durability and/or immediacy. Thus evidence of social capital has implications for those hoping to facilitate the diffusion of innovations within organizations. Finally, the language of the *social* as *capital* helps us to consider how informal help, talk and pressure can accumulate, but are fixed commodities at any given time. This has critical implications for organizational change agents, who should not overtax social capital as they use it to leverage change.

Notes

¹ Fichman and Kemerer (1993) refer to diffusion within organizations as “assimilation” and Zmud and Apple (1992) refer to it as the “infusion” process, characterized by the integration of an innovation into the routines of the formal organization. In this manuscript we will use diffusion to refer to the process through which innovation spreads, whereas implementation refers to the act of using an innovation.

² We are aware that social capital has been defined in multiple ways, from Coleman’s (1990) “definition by function” (page 303), to Putnam’s (2000) link to “civic virtue” (page 19). The result is that social capital has become one of the most ambiguous terms in the social sciences (Portes 1998), and may lose any distinctive meaning (Hirsh and Levin 1999). Our definition is consistent with the emerging consensus among sociologists, as typified by definitions offered by Portes’ (1998, page 7) and Lin (1999, pages 30-31). This narrower definition facilitates theory and operationalization, although in discussing limitations we relate our definition to broader definitions and other sociological concepts.

³ We acknowledge that those with greater expertise may choose not to help others, or may discourage others from use, preserving control over resources. But when actors engage in such competitive action they undermine the goals of the common organization, to the extent that implementation of an innovation is beneficial to the organization (although actors may compete regarding some matters in some organizations – Burt 2000). Since our theory is of intra-organizational diffusion, we emphasize the direction of effects generated by membership in a common organization.

⁴ In four of the schools the third author and colleagues evaluated the Urban Systemic Initiative sponsored by the National Science Foundation. This initiative emphasized constructivist teaching practices but included a technological component.

⁵ We also initially conducted a pilot study (with colleague Andrew Topper) establishing the reliability of several of the measures regarding computers (see Frank, Topper and Zhao 2000).

⁶ The sample included administrators and support staff, but most respondents were teachers and computers are implemented primarily in the classroom, so for the remainder we refer to the set of respondents as teachers.

⁷ Due to accounting constraints schools were pre-paid in June 2000 for their participation in 2000-2001.

⁸ We also verified our results by applying Poisson regression to use of computers in its original metric to account for heterogeneous variances for a count variable, such as purposes for which computers are used (the variance for a measure of count, such as use of computers, depends on the mean). We also corrected for overdispersion (the variance was approximately four and a half times the mean), with scale parameter of 1.34 estimated by the ratio of the deviance to the degrees of freedom (McCullagh and Nelder 1989). Using this correction improves significance tests.

⁹ The scale was changed from time 1 to time 2 because there were strong response sets across items with many teachers choosing a single value for all items at time 1. This did not occur in our pilot data. The frequency scale at time 2 evoked more variation in responses.

¹⁰ Use of computers at time 1 was correlated about .6 with the total measure for those on whom we measured all components of expertise.

¹¹ Those 41 respondents who indicated neither talking to nor receiving help from anyone were assigned the score marking the bottom 1 percent, assuming their access to social capital was extremely low.

¹² Because the original scale of use of computers was different between time 1 and time 2 (see note 9), and because expertise was augmented with variables from time 2, we could not construct and analyze difference scores (Allison 1990).

¹³ Approximately 40% of the teachers did not indicate whether they were teaching a new subject, possibly because, as elementary teachers, they teach all subjects every year. It was assumed these teachers were not teaching a new subject.

¹⁴ One dummy variable was associated with a predominantly Hispanic middle school which was lower than all others and the other was associated with a predominantly Hispanic high school that was higher than all others.

¹⁵ The results from the OLS estimates were confirmed by those for a Poisson model. Each of the effects reported in table 2 was statistically significant at $p \leq .05$ except for perceived changes in emphasis on standardized tests and class size.

¹⁶ Though perceived changes in emphasis on standardized tests had only a partial correlation of -.06, it did enter our final model, while teaching multiple grades, teaching new grades, and teaching new subjects, each with partial correlation of .10, did not enter our final model because their regression coefficients were reduced when other factors, in particular, xx xx were controlled for.

¹⁷ One reviewer argued that traditional diffusion might be better measured by the *perceptions* of others with whom one interacts. We claim that perceptions of others should have their effect by altering ones' own perceptions, and that interactions should have their effect by conveying resources, and therefore standard diffusion processes are represented in our model. Nonetheless, we calculated a measure of exposure to others' perceptions using methods similar to those described for "access to expertise through help and talk," replacing *expertise* with the other's average of perceptions of the value of technology from time 1 and time 2. We explored versions of exposure to others' perceptions including and excluding "amount of help provided to others" (interpreting it as a proxy for charisma). Consistent with the reviewer's suggestion, exposure to expertise was correlated with log of computer use at .20 ($p \leq .05$) controlling for own expertise and schools, as in Table 1. But none of the versions of exposure to others' perceptions were significant when added to the final model, with the magnitudes of standardized coefficients each less than .03. The coefficient for exposure to others' perceptions was most dramatically reduced once "access to expertise through help and talk" was included in the model, consistent with our argument that it is access to the resource, others's expertise, that affects behavior more than exposure to others' perceptions.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics for Factors Related to Computers Use

Factor	Mean	Standard Deviation	Correlation with Log of Computer Use at Time 2, partialling for school	Correlation with Log of Computer Use at Time 2, partialling for school and own expertise
Occurrences of computer use (as reported by teacher)	196	251		
Log of occurrences of computer use (as reported by teacher)	4.26	1.81		
<i>Social Capital</i>				
Access to expertise through help and talk	-1.43	1.67	.28	.26
Perceived social pressure to use computers	2.96	.49	.36	.28
<i>Perceived Potential</i>				
Perceived potential of computers for teacher use	3.25	.51	.34	.26
Perceived potential of computers for student use	3.30	.51	.19	.08
<i>Technology Resources</i>				
% of time teacher had significant technical problems using computers	1.54	.80	.00	.07
Perceived adequacy of physical resources	1.82	.65	.14	.22
Perceived adequacy of organizational support	2.59	.68	.16	.07
<i>Job Conditions</i>				
Class size	21.66	6.44	-.25	-.21
Grade ^a	4.71	2.55	.00	-.06
Teaching multiple grades	.54	.50	.10	.10
Years in School	7.35	6.46	.03	.07
<i>Job Stress</i>				
Workload	3.13	.58	-.10	-.07
Teaching a new grade	.16	.37	.02	.10
Teaching a new subject	.11	.32	.04	.10
Perceived changes in emphasis on standardized tests	3.86	.86	-.15	-.06
<i>Background</i>				
Male	.27	.45	-.04	-.03
White	.43	.50	.08	.00

^an=60, only those reporting single grade.

Table 2
Model for Log of Occurrences of Computers Use at Time 2

Independent Variable	OLS Coefficient (Standard Error)	Standardized Coefficient
Access to expertise through help and talk (<i>social capital</i>)	.23** (.09)	.21
Perceived social pressure to use computers (<i>social capital</i>)	.56* (.28)	.16
Perceived potential of computers for teacher use (<i>Perceived potential – traditional diffusion</i>)	1.02* (.44)	.18
Perceived adequacy of physical resources (<i>Technology resources – traditional diffusion</i>)	.90** (.33)	.19
Class size (<i>job conditions</i>)	-.04* (.02)	-.12
Perceived changes in emphasis on standardized tests (<i>job stress</i>)	-.34* (.17)	-.16
Own Expertise	.71*** (.17)	.32
Intercept	5.24 (1.32)	
R ²	.42	
adjusted R ²	.38	

* p ≤ .05; ** p ≤ .01; *** p ≤ .001.

n=143

REFERENCES

- Aiken, M, S. B. Bacharach, and J. L. French. 1980. "Organizational Structure, Work Process, and Proposal Making in Administrative Bureaucracies." *Academy of Management Journal* 23:631-52.
- Ajzen, I. And M. Fishbein. 1980. Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Alexander, Karl. L., and Aaron M. Pallas. 1985. School sector and cognitive performance: When is a little a little? *Sociology of Education*, 58(2), 115-128.
- Allison, Paul D. 1990. Change Scores as Dependent Variables in Regression Analysis. *Sociological Methodology* 20:93-114.
- Amburgey, T.L., D. Kelly, D., and W. P. Barnett. 1990. "Resetting the clock: the dynamics of organizational change and failure." *Academy of Management best papers proceedings*, pp. 160-164.
- Arrow, Kenneth. 1979. The Economics of Information. In the Computer Age: A Twenty-Year View. Michael Dertouzos and Joel Moses, es. Pp. 306-320. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Attewell, P. 1992. "Technology Diffusion and Organizational Learning." *Organization Science* 3(1):1-19.
- Bayer, J., and N. Melone. 1989. A Critique of Diffusion-Theory as a Managerial Framework for Understanding Adoption of Software Engineering Innovations, 9(2):161-166.
- Becker, H. J. 2000. Findings from the Teaching, Learning, and Computing Survey: Is Larry Cuban Right? *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 8(51), 2-32.
- Bidwell, Charles E. 2000. School as Context and Construction: A Social Psychological Approach to the Study of Schooling. Maureen T. Hallinan, Ed. Pp. 15-36. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Bidwell, Charles. E. 2001. "Analyzing Schools as Organizations: Long Term Permanence and Short Term Change." *Sociology of Education, Extra Issue*, 100-114.
- Bidwell, Charles E., Kenneth A. Frank, and Pamela Quiroz. 1997. Teacher Types, Workplace Controls, and the Organization of Schools. *Sociology of Education*, October.
- Bidwell, Charles E. and Jack. Kasarda. 1987. Structuring in organizations: Ecosystem theory evaluated. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press Inc.

Blau, Peter.M. 1967. Exchange and Power in Social Life. New York: Wiley.

- Bolman, L. G., and R. Heller. 1995. School administrators as leaders. In S. Bacharach and B. Mundell (Eds.), *Images of schools* (pp. 315-358). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1986. "The Forms of Capital." Pp. 241-58 in Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education, edited by J.G. Richardson. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Bryk, Anthony S., and Stephen W. Raudenbush. 1992. *Hierarchical Linear Models for Social and Behavioral Research: Applications and Data Analysis Methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Bryk, Anthony.S., Pennie B. Sebring, David D. Kerbow, Sharon S. Rollow, and John Q. Easton. 1998. *Charting Chicago School Reform: Democratic Localism as a Lever for Change*. Colorado: Westview Press.
- Bryk, Anthony S. and Barbara Schneider. 2002. *Trust in Schools*. New York: Sage.
- Budin, H. 1999. The Computer Enters the Classroom. Teachers College Record, 100(3), 656-669.
- Burns, M. 2002. From Compliance to Commitment: Technology as a Catalyst For Communities of Learning. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 84(4), 295-302.
- Burt, Ronald. 2000. The Network Structure of Social Capital. Robert I. Sutton and Barry M. Staw, ed. Elsevier Science.
- Callahan, R. 1962. *Education and the cult of efficiency*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Chubb, John E., and Terry Moe. 1990. *Politics, markets, and America's schools* Washington, D.C. : Brookings Institution.
- Cohen, M.D. and L.S. Sproul. 1995. *Organizational learning*. Organization Science, Sage Publications.
- Cohen, David K., Milbrey W. McLaughlin, and Joan E. Talbert. 1993. *Teaching for Understanding: Challenges for Policy and Practice*. San Francisco, Jossey Bass.
- Coleman, James S. 1988. "Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital." *American Journal of Sociology* 94:95-120.
- _____. 1990. *Foundations of Social Theory*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Collins, A. 1996. Whither Technology and Schools? Collected Thoughts on the Last and Next Quarter Centuries. In C. Fisher and D. C. Dwyer and K. Yocam (Eds.), *Education and Technology: Reflections on Computing in Classrooms* (pp. 51-66). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cook, Scott D.N. and D. Yanow. 1995. "Culture and Organizational learning" in *organizational Learning*, edited by M. Cohen. London: Sage.

- Cooper, R.B. and R.W. Zmud. 1990. Information Technology Implementation Research - A Technological Diffusion. *Management Science* 36(2):123-139.
- Cuban, Larry 1990. "Reforming again and again and again." *Educational Researcher*, 19(1), pp3-13.
- _____. 1999. The Technology Puzzle: Why Is Greater Access Not Translating Into Better Classroom Use? *Education Week*, pp. 68, 47.
- _____. 2001. *Oversold and Underused: Computers in Schools 1980-2000*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Darling-Hammond, Linda. and Milbrey W. McLaughlin. 1995. "Policies That Support Professional Development in an Era of Reform." *Phi Delta Kappan*.
- Delpit, Lisa. D. 1988. The silence dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. *Harvard Educational Review*, 58(3).
- Etzioni, Amiti. 1961. *Complex organizations: A sociological reader*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Fichman, R.G and C.F. Kemerer. 1993. Adoption of software engineering process innovations: The case of object orientation. *Sloan Management Review*, 34(2): 7-22.
- Finn, Jeremy.D., and Charles M. Achilles. 1990. Answers About Questions About Class Size: A Statewide Experiment. *American Educational Research Journal* 27:557-577.
- Frank, Kenneth A. 1996. "Mapping interactions within and between cohesive subgroups." *Social Networks* 18: 93-119.
- _____. 1998. "The Social Context of Schooling: Quantitative Methods" *Review of Research in Education*, 23, chapter 5: 171-216.
- _____. 2001. "Identification with the collective as a quasi-tie." Based on "The Dynamics of Social Capital," presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Social Networks Association, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Frank, Kenneth, and Fahrback, K. 1999. Organization Culture as a Complex System: Balance and Information in Models of Influence and Selection. *Organization Science*, 10(3), 253-277.
- Frank, Kenneth .A., Andrew Topper and Yong Zhao. 2000. Diffusion of Innovations, Social capital, and Sense of Community. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, Washington DC.
- Frank, Kenneth A., and Yong Zhao. 2004. "Subgroups as a Meso-Level Entity in the Social Organization of Schools." Book honoring Charles Bidwell's retirement, edited by Larry Hedges and Barbara Schneider. New York: Sage publications.

- Frank, Kenneth A., and Nell K. Duke. 2003. "The Value of Large Scale Data Bases Versus Randomized Experiments for Educational Research." Paper presented at the American Educational Researcher Association. Chicago Il.
- Frank, Kenneth A. Under review. "Inferences for the Effects of Catholic Schools and School Vouchers on Achievement: Application of Indices of the Robustness of Statistical Inferences."
- Friedman, Milton and Friedman, Rose. 1980. *Free to Choose: a Personal Statement*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Fullan, M. G. 1991. *The New Meaning of Educational Change*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gilmore, A. M. 1995. Turning teachers on to computers: Evaluation of a teacher development program. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education*, 27(3), 251-269.
- Granovetter, Mark. 1985. "Economic Action and Social Structure: The Problem of Embeddedness." *American Journal of Sociology* 91(3):481-510.
- Greene, Jay. 2001. "The Looming Shadow." *Education Next*, Winter 2001.
- Greenfield, T. 1975. Theory about organization: A new perspective and its implications for schools. In R. Campbell and R. Gregg (Eds.), *Administrative behavior in education*. London: Athlone.
- Hadley, M, and K. Sheingold. 1993. Commonalities and distinctive patterns in teachers' integration of computers. *American Journal of Education*, 101 (May), pp. 261-315.
- Hage, J.T. 1999. Organizational Innovation and Organizational Change. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* 25:597-622.
- Harris, J. B., and Grangenett. 1999. Correlates with Use of Telecomputing Tools: K-12 Teachers' Beliefs and Demographics. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education*, 31(4), 327-340.
- Hirsh, Paul M. and Daniel Z. Levin. 1999. "Umbrella Advocates Versus Validity Police: A Life-Cycle Model." *Organization Science* 10:199-212.
- Hodas, S. 1993. Technology refusal and the organizational culture of schools. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, 1(10).
- Ibarra, Herminia. 1993. "Network Centrality, Power, and Innovation Involvement." *Academy of Management Journal* 36(3):471-501.
- Kanter, R. M. 1983. *The Change Masters*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Kotter, J.P. and J.L. Heskett. 1992. *Corporate Culture and Performance*. New York: Free Press.

- Lave, J., and E. Wenger. 1991. *Situated learning* Legitimate peripheral participation. Cambridge [England]; New York Cambridge University Press.
- Leonard-Barton, Dorothy. 1988. "Implementation as Mutual Adaptation of Technology and Organization." *Research Policy* 17:251-267.
- Lewis, Laurie K. and David R. Seibold. 1993. "Innovation Modification During Intraorganizational Adoption." *Academy of Management Review* 18(No. 2):322-54.
- Lin, Nan. 1999. "Sunbelt Keynote Address." *Connections* 22(1):28_51.
- _____. 2001. *Social Capital: A Theory of Social Structure and Action*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Loveless, Thomas. 1996. Why aren't computers used more in schools? *Educational Policy*, 10(4), 448-467.
- Marsden, Peter, and Noah E. Friedkin. 1994. Network studies of social influence. *Sociological Methods and Research*, 22(1), 127-151.
- McCullagh, Peter. and J.A. Nelder. 1989. *Generalized Linear Models*. New York: Chapman and Hall.
- Mc Donald, Mary B. 2002. "Social Capital in a Community Collaborative Network". Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University.
- Meyer, John. and Brian Rowan. 1977. "Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony." *American Journal of Sociology* 30:431-50.
- Molm, L., N. Takahashi, and G. Peterson. 2000. "Risk and Trust in Social Exchange: An Experimental Test of a Classical Proposition." *American Journal of Sociology* 105(5):1396-1427.
- Oakes, Jeannie. 1985. *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Perrow, Charles. 1986. *Complex organizations: A critical essay*. New York: Random House.
- Portes, Alejandro. 1998. Social Capital. Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24: 1-24.
- Portes, Alejandro and Julia Sensenbrenner. 1993. "Embeddedness and Immigration: Notes on the Social Determinants of Economic Action." *American Journal of Sociology* 98(6):1320-50.
- Prawat, Richard S. 1989. "Teaching for Understanding" *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 5: 315-328.
- President's committee of advisors on science and technology (Panel on Educational Technology). 1997. Report to the President on the Use of Technology to Strengthen K-12 Education in the United States. Washington, DC: president's Committee of advisors on science and technology.

- Prochaska, James O., Carlo C. DiClemente, and John C. Norcross. 1992. "In Search of How People Change." *American Psychologist* 47(9):1102-14.
- Putnam, Robert D. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Ramamurthy, K. and G. Premkumar. 1995. Determinants and Outcomes of Electronic Data Interchange Diffusion. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, 42(4):332-351.
- Robison, Lindon J., and Alan A. Schmidt and Marcelo E. Siles. 2002. Is Social Capital Really Capital? *Review of Spcial Economy* Vol 60(1) pp. 1-21.
- Rogers, Everett. 1995. *Diffusion of Innovations*. New York: The Free press.
- Rowan, Brian. 1995. "The Organizational Design of Schools." Pp. 11-42 in *Images of Schools*, edited by S.B. Bacharach and B. Mundell. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.
- Sandefur, Rebecca L. and Edward O. Laumann. 1998. A Paradigm for Social Capital. *Rationality and Society* 10(4): 481-501.
- Sandholtz, J. H., and C. Ringstaff. 1996. Teacher Change in Technology-rich Classrooms. In C. Fisher and D. C. Dwyer and K. Yocam (Eds.), *Education and Technology: Reflections on Computing in Classrooms* (pp. 281-299). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schofield, J. W. 1995. *Computers and Classroom Culture*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Shedd, Joseph B. and Samuel S. Bacharach. 1991. Tangled hierarchies : teachers as professionals and the management of schools. Publisher San Francisco: Josey-Bass Publishers.
- Siehl, C. and J. Martin. 1990. "Organizational Culture: A Key to Financial Performance?" Pp. 241-81 in *Organizational Climate and Culture*, edited by B. Schneier. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Singh, J.V., R.J. House, and D.J. Tucker. 1986. Organizational Change and Organizational Mortality. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 31, 587-611.
- Tornatzky, Louis G. and Mitchell Fleischer. 1990. *The Process of Technological Innovation*. Lexington Books.
- Tornatzky, Louis.G. and K.J. Klein. 1982. Innovation characteristics and innovation adoption – implementation: a meta-analysis of findings. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, 29, 28-45.
- US Congress Office of Technology Assessment. 1995. *Teachers and Technology: Making the Connection* (OTA-EHR-616). Washington DC: Office of Technology Assessment.

- Valente, Thomas W. 1995. *Network Models of the Diffusion of Innovations*. New Jersey: Hampton Press, Inc.
- Van De Ven, Andrew H. 1986. "Central Problems in the Management of Innovation." *Management Science* 32(No. 5):590-607.
- Wilkins, A.L. and W.G. Ouchi. 1983. Efficient cultures: Exploring the relationship between culture and organizational performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28, 468-481.
- Wilson, Suzanne M., and Deborah L. Ball. 1991. Changing Visions and Changing Practices: Patchworks in Learning to Teach Mathematics for Understanding. Research Report 91-2. Michigan State University: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning.
- Wolfe, R.A. 1994. Organizational Innovation: Review, Critique and Suggested Research Directions. *Journal of Management Studies*, 31(3): 405-431.
- Woolcock, Michael. 1998. "Social Capital and Economic Development." *Theory and Society* 27(2):151-208.
- Yetton, P.; Sharma, R.; Southon, G. 1999. Successful IS Innovation: the contingent contributions of innovation characteristics and implementation process. *Journal of Information Technology*, 14: 53-68.
- Zhao, Yong and Frank, Kenneth. A.. 2004. "An Ecological Analysis of Factors Affecting Technology Use in Schools." *the American Educational Research Journal*.
- Zhao, Yong, Kevin Pugh, Stephen Sheldon, and Joseph Byers 2002. Conditions for Classroom Technology Innovations. *Teachers College Record*, 104(3), 484-515.
- Zmud, R.W., Apple, L.E. 1992. Measuring Technology Incorporation/Infusion. *J. Prod. Innov. Management*, 9: 148-155.