

THESIS TITLES

FULL TITLE: Isolating Opinion Leaders in the Group - The Validity  
of the Self-Designating Method.

SHORT TITLE: Self-Designation and the Detection of Opinion Leaders.

AUTHOR: M. Richard Gelfand.

DEPARTMENT: Department of Sociology and Anthropology, McGill University.

DEGREE: Master of Arts.

DATE: April, 1967.

ISOLATING OPINION LEADERS IN THE GROUP -  
THE VALIDITY OF THE SELF-DESIGNATING METHOD

A Thesis prepared in partial fulfillment  
of the Master of Arts degree in the  
Department of Sociology and Anthropology,  
McGill University

M. Richard Gelfand

April, 1967

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My interest in the field of communications and intrigue with the opinion leader concept was stimulated by Professor Frederick Elkin, formerly of McGill University and presently at York University. His guidance in the initial stages of this project was invaluable.

To Professors Howard E. Roseborough and Maurice Pinard, whose critical comments relating to the draft version led me to view the findings from a more meaningful perspective than originally, I am also deeply indebted.

I also wish to acknowledge the assistance and moral support provided by my wife, Pearl Sures Gelfand. Without her aid in recruiting appropriate groups, her assistance in supervising the conduct of the interviews, and moral encouragement throughout the extended period of study and research, this work might well have been abandoned.

Finally, gratitude is also expressed to my close acquaintances, Dr. and Mrs. M. Shapiro. Their critical views, expressed in discussions carried out at various stages of the research, resulted in significant modifications in my methodological approach. I am also grateful to them for the impetus provided by their encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	iv
LIST OF TABLES .....	vii
INTRODUCTION .....	i
SECTION I. THE OPINION LEADER CONCEPT AND OPINION LEADER RESEARCH	
Chapter	
I. THE OPINION LEADER CONCEPT - WHAT IS AN OPINION LEADER? .....	5
II. OPINION LEADER RESEARCH - THE PROBLEM OF IS- OLATING OPINION LEADERS IN THE GROUP .....	14
SECTION II. THE PURPOSE AND METHOD OF THE RESEARCH	
III. THE PURPOSE AND METHOD OF THE RESEARCH .....	25
A. Purpose of the Research .....	25
B. Research Method .....	25
1) The Sample	
2) Interviewing Method	
3) Timing	
SECTION III. THE FINDINGS OF THE RESEARCH	
IV. SELF-DESIGNATED LEADERSHIP AND SOCIOMETRIC CHOICES ....	33
A. The Self-Designated Leaders .....	33
B. The Sociometric Stars .....	36

Table of Contents (Continued)

Chapter	Page
V. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SELF-DESIGNATED LEADERSHIP AND 'ACTUAL' LEADERSHIP AS INDICATED BY SOCIOMETRIC CHOICES .....	41
VI. THE DEVIANT CASES .....	49
A. Deviance in Relation to the Sociometric Roles Explored .....	49
B. Deviance in Relation to Official Status in the Group .....	52
C. Deviance in Relation to Gregariousness .....	58
D. Deviation in Relation to Sundry Variables .....	60
VII. SUMMARY .....	61
APPENDIX I. TABLES OF FINDINGS .....	66
APPENDIX II. QUESTIONNAIRE USED FOR THE RESEARCH .....	77
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	90

- vii -  
LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
4-1. Proportion of Self-Designated Leaders in Each of the Two Test Groups .....	34
4-2. Self-Designated Leadership in Household Mark- eting in Relation to Self-Designated Lead- ership in Fashions .....	35
4-3. Household Marketing Sociometric Choices in Relation to Fashion Sociometric Choices .....	37
4-4. Spearman's Coefficient of Rank Correlation Between Sociometric Choices in the House- hold Marketing and Fashion Areas .....	38
4-5. Spearman's Coefficient of Rank Correlation Between the Various Sociometric Choices Within each Area .....	39
5-1. The Relationship Between Sociometric Choices and Self-Designated Leadership .....	42
5-2. Spearman's Coefficient of Rank Correlation Between Rankings on Sociometric Choices and Self-Designation in Regard to House- hold Marketing and Fashions for the Two Groups .....	44
5-3. Average Rank Based on Number of Sociometric Choices Obtained by Self-Designated Leaders, 'Semi-Leaders,' and Followers - Household Marketing and Fashion Data Combined .....	46
6-1. Proportions of Deviant and Non-Deviant Cases Encountered in Each of the Three Sociometric Choice Areas .....	50
6-2. Proportions of Present and Former Executives Versus Rank and File Who Received Sociometric Choices .....	52

List of Tables (Continued)

Table	Page
6-3. Proportions of Present and Former Executives Versus Rank and File Who Were the Objects of Sociometric Choice - Shown for Self-Designated Leaders and Followers .....	54
6-4. The Relationship Between Gregariousness and Deviance .....	59

## INTRODUCTION

It has long been recognized that individuals do not exist in groups as totally separate and unaffected entities. Individual opinions, attitudes and behavior are in large measure molded by the groups of which the individual comprises a part. It is also important to recognize, however, that there is a reciprocal relationship between the individual and society - just as he is molded by his society, so does he in turn mold that society. The role of the individual in wielding influence and contributing to change has only quite recently come under close scrutiny.

The process of change and the dynamics whereby change is instituted has been an area of enquiry that has long been of interest to many social scientists. In the modern era attention has been focused on the media of mass communication as one of the more important means whereby change is brought about. In the world of marketing today the omnipotence of the mass media is generally acknowledged. Indeed, it is presently the subject of a serious controversy between the consumer and the marketer with the former maintaining that he is being manipulated by the bombardment of advertising directed his way.

In recent years, however, social research has provided some indication that the mass media of communication are perhaps not as all powerful as the marketing man believes them to be. The role of personal influence has emerged as a significant intervening variable. Similarly,

the concept of the 'opinion leader' as one who disproportionately affects the behavior of others has captured the imagination of many.

That opinion leaders exist and by definition wield great influence in society is generally acknowledged. To the extent that our efforts are directed toward understanding and predicting social behavior we cannot afford to ignore the process of opinion leadership. It will also be acknowledged that recognition of the opinion leader concept and acceptance of the functions usually attributed to it have significant implications for the conduct of survey research. Similarly, in the marketing world it is probable that acknowledgment and understanding of the dynamics of these phenomena will result in new strategies for the conduct of consumer research and the formulation of marketing programmes.

In 1955 Elihu Katz and Paul F. Lazarsfeld carried out an extensive project which was essentially concerned with evaluating the roles of various forms of influence and with examining the correlates of opinion leadership.<sup>1</sup> A technique was developed for isolating opinion leaders in the group. While an attempt was made to validate the technique, the process was not completed. The only conclusion possible on the basis of this preliminary work was that the technique (referred to as 'the self-designating' method) appeared to be a reasonably accurate indicator of opinion leadership in the group.

The purpose of the present work is to provide some further indication of the validity of the Katz and Lazarsfeld method - a method which has been

---

<sup>1</sup> Elihu Katz and Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Personal Influence (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955).

adopted by others in subsequent research without its validity being at all questioned.

It should be recognized that the research carried out in this work cannot be regarded as an absolute test of the validity of the method. The sample size and composition preclude the possibility of generalizing to the population at large. In this regard two points should be noted: (1) The work is based on formed groups. Accordingly, the results cannot necessarily be generalized to any aggregate. (2) The work is concerned with internal rather than external validity. That is, it is concerned with determining whether two methods of isolating opinion leaders yield similar or different results. It does not establish whether either method is closely related to actual behavior. Despite these limitations it is hoped that the research may provide some insight into the problems to be faced and guidance for further work which may follow.

The work is organized into three major sections. The first section is concerned with providing a definition of the opinion leader concept and in highlighting the particular problem with which the research deals. The second section outlines the specific objectives of the research and describes the methods employed. The final section presents the findings of the research.

SECTION 1

THE OPINION LEADER CONCEPT

AND

OPINION LEADER RESEARCH

## CHAPTER I

### THE OPINION LEADER CONCEPT - WHAT IS AN OPINION LEADER?

The term 'opinion leader' has been subject to various interpretations and, in general, has been loosely used. In this first chapter we shall review the historical findings which led to the development of the concept. We shall also examine some of the definitions of the concept that have been and are being used. Finally, we shall submit the definition which we feel is functionally significant and which will provide the reader with the frame of reference from which opinion leadership is viewed in this work.

For some time now, an increasing number of social studies have served to focus attention on the individual and primary groups and to highlight the significance of personal influence in the processes of opinion formation and social behavior. Triggered by the Roethlisberger and Dickson study,<sup>1</sup> the primary group was 'rediscovered' and has since become a major subject of investigation.

These studies have served to highlight the fact that the individual's behavior is importantly affected by the persons with whom he is in close and frequent contact. In other words, individual attitudes, opinions and behavior are molded by others through the process of personal influence.

---

1

F.J. Roethlisberger and W.J. Dickson, Management and the Worker (Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1939).

Hartley <sup>1</sup> states that:

"Individual opinion is a group matter. As a psychologist, concerned with the functioning of the individual, I must maintain that social attitudes and opinions are in largest measure reflections in the individual of his group affiliations and can only be fully understood if we explore the relation of the individual to the group represented by the opinion which he maintains."

Bogardus <sup>2</sup> takes a similar position in regard to occupational attitudes.

"Each occupation tends to develop its own culture heritages, slogans, beliefs or even superstitions. These are sooner or later caught up by the individual and with modifications become a part of his thought life, creating for him an occupational attitude."

Katz and Lazarsfeld maintain that conformance to group opinions and attitudes functions in two important ways for the individual.<sup>3</sup> First, to the extent that the individual desires acceptance as a member of the group, he will be motivated - whether he is aware of it or not - to accept that group's outlook. They refer to this as the instrumental function. The second is providing a social reality for the individual, that is "the group as a provider of meanings for situations which do not explain themselves."

There are a host of examples of the instrumental function, only a few of which we shall attempt to cite here. The whole concept of reference group

---

<sup>1</sup> Eugene L. Hartley "The Social Psychology of Opinion Formation," Public Opinion Quarterly (Winter, 1950-51), Vol. 14, p. 670.

<sup>2</sup> Emory S. Bogardus, "The Occupational Attitude," Journal of Applied Sociology, Vol. 8 (January-February, 1924), p. 175.

<sup>3</sup> Elihu Katz and Paul Lazarsfeld, op. cit., pp. 50-53.

theory hinges on the fact that individual opinions are held with particular groups in mind.<sup>1</sup> In a study of an election campaign<sup>2</sup> it was found that family members normally share attitudes on politics, religion and other similar topics. Stouffer et al<sup>3</sup> reported that "green" soldiers (those with no combat experience), soon after being sent as replacements to join veteran groups, differed greatly in attitudes to combat from comparable "green" soldiers in groups composed entirely of their own kind. Newcombe expresses it as:

"In a membership group in which certain attitudes are approved (i.e., held by majorities, and conspicuously so by leaders), individuals acquire the approved attitudes to the extent that the membership group (particularly as symbolized by leaders and dominant sub-groups) serves as a positive point of reference."<sup>4</sup>

The function of providing a social reality for the individual can be exemplified by the following experiment carried out by Sherif.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Robert K. Merton and Alice Kitt, "Contributions to the Theory of Reference Group Behavior," Merton and Lazarsfeld, eds., Continuities in Social Research (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1950).

<sup>2</sup> Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Bernard Berelson and Hazel Gaudet, The People's Choice (New York: Columbia University Press, 1948).

<sup>3</sup> Samuel A. Stouffer et al, The American Soldier: Studies in Social Psychology in World War II (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1949), Vol. II, p. 244.

<sup>4</sup> Theodore M. Newcomb, "Attitude Development as a Function of Reference Groups: The Bennington Study," Swanson, Newcomb, Hartley et al, eds., Readings in Social Psychology (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1952), p. 420.

<sup>5</sup> Muzafer Sherif, "Group Influences Upon the Formation of Norms and Attitudes," Swanson, Newcomb Hartley et al, eds., op. cit., pp. 249-62.

This consisted of an autokinetic effect experiment relating to the illusion of movement created by an actually stationary pinpoint of light when it was flashed in a totally darkened room. The study demonstrated that the judgments of others greatly affected private judgments. Significant variations in initial judgments converged to a shared norm as a result of this process. A similar experiment was carried out by Asch.<sup>1</sup> In this instance the subjects were required to match the length of a given line with one of three unequal lines. Each member of the group was required to announce his judgments publicly. Because of complicity between certain members of the group and the experimenter, individuals would find themselves contradicted by the entire group. It was found that there was a tendency for the individual to yield to group pressure.

This latter function has been well described by the Lewinian school, "What exists as 'reality' for the individual is to a high degree determined by what is socially accepted as reality."<sup>2</sup>

Katz and Lazarsfeld summarize the process as follows:

"When individuals interact with each other relative to a problem they have in common, they begin to 'see' things in the same way and consequently create a social norm."<sup>3</sup>

The concept of opinion leadership became somewhat crystallized as a result of a study by Lazarsfeld et al.<sup>4</sup> In this study it was suggested

---

<sup>1</sup> S.E. Asch, "Effects of Group Pressure Upon the Modification and Distortion of Judgments," Swanson, Newcomb, Hartley et al, eds., op. cit., pp. 2-11.

<sup>2</sup> Kurt Lewin and Paul Grabbe, "Conduct, Knowledge and Acceptance of New Values," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 1, No. 3, pp. 53-64, reported in Katz and Lazarsfeld, op. cit., p. 57.

<sup>3</sup> Elihu Katz and Paul F. Lazarsfeld, op. cit., p. 57.

<sup>4</sup> Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Bernard Berelson and Hazel Gaudet, op. cit.

that there is a "two-step flow of communication" which emanates from the mass media, sifts through the 'opinion leaders' in the community, and is disseminated from these leaders to the public at large. This was further documented by Berelson et al.<sup>1</sup> Of central importance in these works is the concept of the individual as a purveyor of opinions, and the dichotomization of the population into 'opinion leaders' and 'followers'. Katz<sup>2</sup> refers to:

"The networks of inter-connected individuals through which mass communications are channeled as opposed to the traditional view of the audience as a mass of disconnected individuals, hooked up to the media but not to each other."

Merton,<sup>3</sup> pursuing similar lines, refers to 'local influentials' who function as opinion leaders in the primary groups and 'cosmopolitan influentials' who are the link between the community and the outside world.

This frame of reference is similar to the one adopted in an article by Shils.<sup>4</sup> He cites a variety of studies, all of which conclude that the group's formal leaders must mediate between their associates and communications from above if these communications are to be at all effective.

---

<sup>1</sup> Bernard Berelson, Paul F. Lazarsfeld and William M. McPhee, Voting (Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1954).

<sup>2</sup> Elihu Katz, "The Two Step Flow of Communication," Public Opinion Quarterly, VOL. XXI, 1957, No. 1, p. 61.

<sup>3</sup> Robert K. Merton, "Patterns of Influence," in Lazarsfeld and Stanton, eds., Communications Research, 1948-49 (New York: Harper and Bros. 1949), pp. 180-219.

<sup>4</sup> Edward A. Shils, "Primary Groups in the American Army," Lerner and Lasswell, eds., The Policy Sciences (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1951).

Also to be noted is Lewin's concept of the "gatekeeper," which is similar to that of the opinion leader.<sup>1</sup>

Perhaps an important distinction between the work of Katz and Lazarsfeld and that of the investigators of the more conventional type of 'leader' is the fact that the latter group, by and large, tend to focus their attention on leadership traits. The former concentrate on leadership roles.

Conventional leadership research tends to suggest that leadership traits will vary from one situation to the next. Sanford states:

"We can conclude with reasonable certainty that: (a) there are either no general leadership traits, or if they do exist they are not to be described in any of our familiar psychological or common sense terms; (b) In a specific situation leaders do have traits which set them apart from followers, but what traits set what leaders apart from what followers will vary from situation to situation."<sup>2</sup>

Apparently identifying leaders by titles does not serve us well. Titles designate leadership roles; they do not tell us how individuals behave in those roles. Is it the role of clergyman that makes Mr. Brown a community leader? Or is it the nature and activities and personal magnetism of Mr. Brown who happens to be a clergyman, but who would lead whatever his calling? Particular research has demonstrated that "authority" figures may have less influence over opinions than congenial groups have.

---

<sup>1</sup> Kurt Lewin "Group Decision and Social Change," Swanson, Newcomb, Hartley et al, eds., op. cit., pp. 459-73.

<sup>2</sup> Fillimore H. Sanford, "The Psychology of Military Leadership," Wayne Denis ed., Psychology in the World Emergency (Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1952), cited in Katz and Lazarsfeld, op. cit., p. 100.

A study by Berenda<sup>1</sup> indicated that classmates are more influential among their peers than are their teachers.

As a corollary to this, Lipsky<sup>2</sup> suggests that:

"The leaders that are followed are not always men who have first hand information on the subjects on which they issue opinions, but those who are credited with special ability in choosing the real thinkers and experts . . . men who have won distinction as inventors, chemists or automobile manufacturers pronounce verdicts on problems of education, biology, economics and religion. They are listened to respectfully because they are supposed to know better than the average man on which side the truth is likely to be found. They are the trusted secondary authorities."

Foster<sup>3</sup> expressed this as follows:

"Gifted or unusual people who may or may not occupy formal positions of leadership in a community often play decisive roles in bringing about changes. If they are looked to by their associates for any reason, and if their actions are apt to be imitated by others, they may be thought of as leaders, regardless of their status in their social group."

---

<sup>1</sup> Ruth W. Berenda, The Influence of the Group on the Judgments of Children (New York: Columbia University Press, 1950), cited in Katz and Lazarsfeld, op. cit., pp. 69-70.

<sup>2</sup> Abram Lipsky, Man the Puppet (New York: Frank Maurice Inc., 1925), pp. 48-49

<sup>3</sup> George M. Foster, Traditional Cultures and the Impact of Technological Change (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1962), p. 112.

In certain quarters, particularly in the world of marketing, there has been a tendency to equate the terms 'opinion leader' and 'innovator.' To many in this field it is felt that to identify opinion leaders one merely has to trace the pattern of adoption of a new concept or product. Those who can be classified as 'early adopters' are considered to be the opinion or thought leaders.

Willingness to adopt a new idea or product, in and of itself, is not the salient criterion whereby the opinion leaders can be separated from the followers. One can be an innovator whose innovative patterns are not followed by others. Some innovators may merely be seeking to set the fashion for others without ever actually doing so. Others may use innovation as an expression of non-conformity which may or may not affect the behavior of others. However, we must admit that by definition, the opinion leaders -- those individuals who consciously or unconsciously set the model for others -- finally adopt or reject a new idea or product prior to the time that the followers do, and that the leaders' attitudes and opinions regarding the new idea or product will influence the attitudes of the followers. As such, innovation should be included in the opinion leader concept, but cannot be equated with it.

Rogers<sup>1</sup> points out one of the pitfalls to be avoided in dealing with innovation as an element of opinion leadership. He suggests that the opinion leader group includes rejectors as well as adopters.

---

<sup>1</sup> Everett M. Rogers, Diffusion of Innovations (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1962), p. 209.

"Active rejectors may also be opinion leaders. They oppose adoption of the innovation and seek to influence others not to adopt . . . practically no research attention has been paid to the possible influence of opinion leaders in discouraging change."

Opinion leadership, as the term is used by Katz and Lazarsfeld (and the sense in which it is used in this paper), is concerned with leadership in informal rather than formal groups, and in face-to-face rather than more extensive groups. It is concerned with the sometimes subtle and unbeknown guiding of opinion that occurs in the informal group in contrast to the overt efforts that take place in more formal surroundings.

"What we shall call opinion leadership, if we may call it leadership at all, is leadership at its simplest: it is casually exercised, sometimes unwitting and unbeknown, within the smallest grouping of friends, family members and neighbors. It is not leadership on the high level of a Churchill, nor of a local politico, nor even of a local social elite. It is quite at the opposite extreme: it is the almost invisible, certainly inconspicuous, form of leadership at the person-to-person level of ordinary, intimate, informal, everyday contact."

---

<sup>1</sup> Elihu Katz and Paul F. Lazarsfeld, op. cit., p. 138.

## CHAPTER II

### OPINION LEADER RESEARCH - THE PROBLEM OF ISOLATING OPINION

#### LEADERS IN THE GROUP

We may now turn our attention to research that has been carried out specifically in the area of opinion leadership. Our purpose is to examine and evaluate the various criteria that have been utilized and to detect opinion leadership, and to isolate problems that appear to exist. We note that although particular methods of detection appear to hold much promise, there have been no real attempts to validate the appropriateness of these methods. In the process we provide the background to the research problem to be dealt with in this work.

The problem of isolating opinion leaders has been approached in a variety of ways. Kurt W. Back reports on research that indicates that group pressures on opinions and attitudes should be most strongly felt by those who are most attached to the group.<sup>1</sup> Carrying this one step further,<sup>2</sup> Francis S. Bourne suggests that individuals with lesser status in their group and less feeling of security are more likely to observe the norms of the group than others, even if they privately disagree with its specific

---

1

Kurt B. Back, "Influence Through Social Communication," Swanson, Newcomb, Hartley et al, eds., op. cit., pp. 445-459.

2

Francis S. Bourne, "Group Influence in Marketing and Public Relations," Rensli Likert and Samuel P. Hayes, Jr., eds., Some Applications of Behavioral Research (Paris, France: UNESCO, 1957), p. 215.

position, since they require acceptance from the group for their own security. Generalizing from this one might conclude that those with the greatest need to conform are likely to consist of followers while those with the least such need are likely to be the leaders. But it is not all that simple. Dittes and Kelley have provided some validation for the foregoing hypothesis. However, they also show that individuals with high status and security feel the greatest freedom to express non-conformity.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, even if this were not so, the problem of isolating relevant reference groups presents a rather serious obstacle.

An attempt to deal with innovation as a central concept of opinion leadership is represented by a study carried out by the Opinion Research Corporation. Their thesis was:

"The most reliable predictors of change in a mobile society are the people who are themselves mobile. Using the concept of a Mobile Society, we suggest that America's leaders are those individuals who, more than their fellow Americans, display this central characteristic of mobility."<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> J.E. Dittes and H.H. Kelley, "Effects of Different Conditions of Acceptance Upon Conformity to Group Norms," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology Vol. 53, 1956, pp. 100-107.

<sup>2</sup> Opinion Research Corporation, America's Tastemakers -- A new Strategy for Predicting Change in Consumer Behavior (Princeton, New Jersey: Opinion Research Corporation, The Public Opinion Index for Industry, Project 463-B, April, 1959).

They defined mobility in rather broad terms taking into account seven major criteria; intellectual mobility, occupational mobility, kinship mobility, economic mobility, social mobility, educational mobility, and geographic mobility.<sup>1</sup> The families studied were classified as high, medium or low mobiles and relationships were established between degree of mobility and early adoption of particular products and brands. They also devised an "Early Adoption Index" which took into account the year of adoption of 75 different items ruling out the influence of income by controlling it in their analysis.<sup>2</sup>

They conclude that there is a significant positive relationship between mobility and early adoption. They found, for example, that among households that scored high on mobility, 53% scored high on the Early Adoption Index, while among those that scored low on mobility, only 24% scored high on the Early Adoption Index.

However, there are two basic weaknesses in the theory and its application to the conduct of large scale studies among 'opinion leaders,' 'influentials,' or 'tastemakers.'

Both the mobility and early adoption scales involve an ex facto classification of respondents arbitrarily into high, medium and low mobiles and early and late adopters. Both concepts are not absolute measures. They imply relativity and at best, for example, can be used

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid, p. 49.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid, p. 63.

only to classify some individuals as more or less mobile than others. Furthermore, any enquiry using the method must initially start out with a time consuming and costly step of determining who the high mobiles are and subsequent to a post hoc classification, deal with the specific problem at hand.

A more serious criticism pertains to the method of validation employed. The theory is that the mobiles are the tastemakers. The method of validation was to establish the relationship between mobility and innovation or early adoption. What, in effect, they show is that individuals who generally have a pioneering or innovating orientation are likely to be pioneers or innovators. Reduced to this tautology, the theory appears to have little substance.

Menzel and Katz,<sup>1</sup> applied a similar, but more fruitful approach. Working among a sample of medical practitioners, they attempted to isolate influentials in the group by means of sociometrics. The sociometric "stars" (those who interacted frequently with others and whose ideas about drug therapy were valued) were selected as were the "isolates" (not at all chosen in respect to the items noted above) and the "neutrals" (those who were relatively infrequently chosen.)

---

<sup>1</sup> Menzel and Katz, The Epidemiology of a New Drug (New York: Columbia University Press, Publication A190 of the Bureau of Applied Social Research, 1956), cited in the Marketing Bulletin (Toronto, Canada: Modern Medicine of Canada, July-August, 1963), also cited in Likert and Hayes, op. cit.

The sociometric data were then related to the chronological history of the adoption of a new drug. The doctors were placed in four different categories based on the point in time at which they adopted the new drug. The first adopters are referred to as "innovators." Their action in adopting the new drug did not result in any rush by the others to follow suit. These individuals tended to be among the "isolates." Those who followed next are referred to as the "influentials" who tended to be the "stars" and whose behavior resulted shortly afterward in similar behavior on the part of the large group of "followers." The "followers" tended to be in contact with the "stars," but in contrast to the latter, tended to be the recipients rather than the donors of advice. The fourth group consisted of the "diehards" who adopted the new drug only after a considerable time lapse. These "diehards" tended to be older doctors and "isolates."

These data tend to support the hypothesis that innovation, in and of itself, is not an indication of influence. The sociometric approach, however, appeared to bear some fruit.

Katz and Lazarsfeld in their study of personal influence attempted to deal with the problem in two ways.<sup>1</sup> The first approach was one which assumed that influentials could be located through the testimony of those they had influenced. With this method respondents were required to name the individuals who had influenced them in a given situation (or whom they had influenced in that same situation), and an attempt was made to obtain

---

<sup>1</sup> Elihu Katz and Paul F. Lazarsfeld, op. cit.

substantiation from the individuals so named. The second method involved the use of a self-designating technique. That is, respondents were required to indicate whether or not they had recently been influenced by others and also, whether they considered that they would be more or less likely than others to influence those with whom they interact.

The first method proved to be impractical. Only a small proportion of the individuals named as influentials or influences could be contacted and interviewed. However, the data that were obtained in the 'follow-up' interviews that were carried out, when compared with the 'self-designating' results, suggested that the latter method appeared to function as a valid method for isolating opinion leaders in the group.<sup>1</sup>

The Katz and Lazarsfeld research involved an interview and re-interview two months later. In their use of the self-designating method they asked the following question in the initial interview: "Have you ever been asked your advice about . . .?"<sup>2</sup> The question was asked in regard to four different spheres: household marketing, fashions, public affairs and movies. The question was repeated when the respondents were asked in the second interview (in relation to each of the four areas noted) "Compared with other women belonging in your circle of friends, are you more or less likely than any of them to be asked your advice on . . .?"

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid, P. 160.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid, p. 147.

Based on responses to these questions, an index was constructed designed to separate out the opinion leaders in each of the spheres investigated. A respondent was considered to be an opinion leader,<sup>1</sup> if: a) she reported in both interviews that she had recently been asked for advice in regard to a specific area, or b) she reported in one interview that she had recently been asked for advice in regard to a specific area and also stated that she was more likely than her friends to be asked for advice in regard to that area.

In examining the correlates of opinion leadership the authors came up with two observations which are of considerable significance in the field of sociological investigation. Supporting the findings they encountered in their study of the 1940 American presidential campaign,<sup>2</sup> they set to rest the conventional view of the flow of influence in society. It was formerly believed that opinions formed by the elite of the community sifted down from one social stratum to the next so that the pattern was established by those at the apex of the structure. The recent studies indicate that opinion leaders exist at each level and that there is a significant horizontal flow of influence.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid, pp. 374-77 .

<sup>2</sup> Bernard Berelson, Paul Lazarsfeld and William M. McPhee, op. cit.

They also provided evidence that indicated there is little likelihood of the existence of a "generalized opinion leader." The data suggest that opinion leaders may be influential in particular fields, but not in others. Thus, reference is made to the opinion leaders in public affairs, household marketing, fashions, and so on.

In a recent attempt to validate some of the hypotheses developed by Katz and Lazarsfeld, Carter and Clark,<sup>1</sup> in a study of educational television viewers, not only accepted the validity of the self-designating method for opinion leader detection, but went one step further by adapting the method to a single interview situation. Individuals were asked, "Has anyone you know asked you for your advice or opinion recently about some public issue in the news?" and, "Compared with most people you know, would you guess you are more likely to be asked to give opinions about public issues in the news?"<sup>2</sup> Respondents who answered "Yes" to both questions were classified as opinion leaders.

Among the sample of 259 respondents, 40% were classified as opinion leaders in this way. This proportion is considerably higher than the

---

<sup>1</sup> Roy E. Carter, Jr., and Peter Clark, "Public Affairs Leadership Among Educational Television Viewers," American Sociological Review, Vol. XXVII, No. 6, (December, 1962), pp. 792-99.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid, pp. 793-94.

approximately 12% public affairs opinion leaders encountered by Katz and Lazarsfeld with their sample of 800 respondents.<sup>1</sup>

Admittedly, the universe of educational television viewers may contain a higher proportion of public affairs opinion leaders than did the cross section of housewives interviewed in the Decatur study. However, the discrepancy may also result from the different methods employed.<sup>2</sup>

The self-designating method appears to have considerable merit and the Carter and Clark adaptation using it in a single interview situation could make the task of carrying out studies among opinion leaders relatively simple. The concept of opinion leadership would seem to be meaningful and has significant implications for social studies attempting to understand and predict social behavior. However, it would appear to be premature at this time to attempt to validate hypotheses that have been developed regarding the correlates of opinion leadership.

Before we can proceed on these lines there is a need to establish a valid technique for isolating opinion leaders -- preferably one which can be easily administered as a prelude to the investigation which follows, and which by virtue of its brevity, permits the treatment of further topics in a single interview.

---

<sup>1</sup> Elihu Katz and Paul F. Lazarsfeld, op. cit., p. 376.

<sup>2</sup> It is quite likely that a contributing factor was the actual framing of the second question. Katz and Lazarsfeld asked, "Are you more or less likely to be asked your advice," while Carter and Clark begged an affirmative response by merely asking, "Are you more likely . . . ?"

The pilot research that has been carried out and which is the subject of this paper is centrally concerned with exploring more fully the value of the self-designating method.

## SECTION II

### THE PURPOSE AND METHOD OF THE RESEARCH

### CHAPTER III

#### THE PURPOSE AND METHOD OF THE RESEARCH

##### A. PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH

The central purpose of this pilot research was to obtain some indication of the validity of the self-designating technique as a means of isolating opinion leaders in the group.

More specifically, the research has sought: 1) to determine opinion leadership structure in specific groups as measured by a sociometric approach; 2) to determine leadership structure in the same groups by means of the self-designating method; 3) to correlate the results obtained from the two approaches just noted.

##### B. RESEARCH METHOD

###### 1) The sample

The sample consisted of two women's auxiliary groups associated with Protestant Churches in the city. The first consisted of 46 women (for the most part middle-aged housewives) associated with St. Matthew Anglican Church in St. Laurent. The second group comprised 40 women (largely middle-aged working women, about half of whom were married and the remainder single or widowed) associated with the Wesley United Church of Notre Dame de Grace.

A third group was also interviewed (a gymnastic class associated with Neighbourhood House in St. Laurent). However, the interviews were

discarded when it was revealed that the women had no contact with each other outside of the weekly sessions, and that the group had been in existence for only a few months. The group obviously was not suited for our purposes since most of the women were incapable of making any sociometric choices within the group due to their unfamiliarity with each other.

The St. Matthew group in total comprises approximately seventy women. Within the group there is a hard core of about 50 women who regularly attend all meetings which are held twice a week. This hard core comprises for the most part women who have been active in the Auxiliary for at least fifteen years. The forty-six women interviewed (consisting of those who were in attendance on the evening on which the interviewing was carried out) were, in large measure, part of this hard core. All members of the group reside in the same general area and contacts outside the Church are fairly frequent.

The primary endeavor of the group for the past few years has been the preparation of supplies for the Red Cross. At a typical meeting the women gather in the Church hall seated at large tables, each of which accommodates some ten women. They busy themselves with cutting, folding and rolling bandages while at the same time engaging each other in conversation. Late in the evening coffee and biscuits are distributed and, following their consumption, the women return home.

The Wesley group is a larger one consisting of about one hundred women. However, attendance on the part of many of these tends to be sporadic.

Regular attenders at the weekly meeting number about thirty-five. The remaining number (usually an additional forty) comprise less frequent attenders.

As was true for the first group, the respondents interviewed (40 in all) consisted largely of the hard core of faithful attenders. The major portion of the remainder who were not in attendance on the evening of the interview, although officially listed as members of the group, essentially were 'fringe members.'

The second group is primarily concerned with raising funds for the Mission. The weekly meetings are usually devoted to dealing with specific business at hand and is followed by an address by an invited speaker. The evening closes with the serving of tea, coffee, sandwiches and cakes.

## 2) Interviewing Method

In both instances the interview was administered at coffee time. Arrangements for interviewing the groups were made with the church minister. He was told of the purpose of the research in very general terms. It was also explained that the survey results were being used for the preparation of a graduate thesis in Sociology at McGill University. In each instance too, a nominal cash donation was made to the group as a token of appreciation for its cooperation.

The interview was carried out by self-administered questionnaires in a group situation (see Appendix for a copy of the instrument used).

Prior to the completion of the questionnaires, the women were addressed by the writer. The main purposes of this brief talk were to provide the women with a general idea of why the research was being done; to explain exactly what they were required to do, and to set their minds at ease about revealing how they felt about other women in their group by assuring them of anonymity.

The research concerned itself with two general areas - - household marketing and fashions. In regard to household marketing, three specific product categories were dealt with - - instant coffee, cake mixes, and frozen dinners. These particular product categories were selected because in the first two instances it is generally recognized that a considerable amount of brand switching has occurred in the recent past and still is going on today. Frozen dinners represent a relatively new product category which is only really beginning to meet with mass acceptance. It was felt that by dealing with these particular categories in referring to possible brand switching, the situation would be more realistic than if we were to include categories such as flour, for which brand loyalty is very high.

In the area of fashions, the research concerned itself with length of skirt and style of shoes worn (shape of the toe and height of the heel). Styles in regard to these items had recently undergone drastic changes (a trend toward shorter skirts, squarer toed shoes, and lower heels).

Three sociometric questions were included relating to household marketing, in general, and fashions. These sociometric questions attempted

to deal with three different forms of influence which may have been operative within the group. In the first instance we attempted to isolate those individuals who are perceived as 'experts' in the particular area. In the second we attempted to isolate those individuals to whom the others might consult for advice in regard to the particular area (the 'consultants'). Finally, we sought to single out those women who were seen as the 'trend setters,' whether by virtue of their knowledgeability in the area, the kinds of relationships they had built up with others, their status in the group, or any other factors which might have contributed to this particular type of image having been built up around them.

The household marketing questions used follow below (the framework was identical for the fashion questions).

1.) Thinking about products consumed in the home such as instant coffee, cake mixes, frozen dinners and so on, which woman or women in your group do you consider to be particularly knowledgeable in this regard? In other words, which woman or women do you think would be particularly good at judging whether such products or brands are good or poor? (List the names and provide first names or initials as well as surnames. List as many or as few women as you feel are appropriate).

2.) Let's suppose for a moment that you had just decided to change brands of some product consumed in the home, such as the ones we've been talking about. Let's also suppose that you weren't sure of what new brand to use. To which woman or women in your group would you be

most likely to go for advice about what brand to buy? (List the names and provide first names or initials as well as surnames. List as many or as few names as you feel are appropriate).

3. When women get together in a group such as this one, what some women do is more likely to be copied than what others do. Thinking of the women in this group, which one or which ones do you think would be most likely to be copied in regard to their use of the products that are consumed in the home? (List the names of women you think would be most likely to be copied. Please print the names and provide first names or initials as well as surnames. List as many or as few names as you feel are appropriate).

These were the sociometric soundings which were designed to determine which women in the group actually wield influence, consciously or unconsciously.

The women were also required to answer two questions in regard to each of household marketing and fashions which would serve to classify them as self-designated opinion leaders or self-designated followers.<sup>1</sup> The first question asked whether or not they had recently been asked for advice by any of the women in the group in regard to the particular area

---

<sup>1</sup> The framework of the questions is that used by Katz and Lazarsfeld (op. cit.). It will be noted that the second question duplicates the Katz and Lazarsfeld approach rather than that of Carter and Clarke (loc. cit.). Thus, respondents are asked if they are "more or less likely" rather than merely asked if they are "more likely" and thereby biasing the response toward an affirmative answer.

under discussion. The second required the respondent to indicate whether she felt she would be more or less likely than others in her group to be asked for advice in regard to the particular area. The household marketing questions are again cited, however, as before, they duplicate the structure used in the area of fashions.

- 1.) Have you recently been asked for advice by any members of this group concerning the use of products for the home such as instant coffee, cake mixes, or frozen dinners?
- 2.) Compared with the other women in this group, are you more or less likely to be asked for advice about the use of products for the home such as instant coffee, cake mixes and frozen dinners?

In line with the previous works, respondents who answered affirmatively to the first question and also said they were more likely to be asked for advice were classified as self-designated opinion leaders.

Various other questions were included in a 'general section.' Anticipating the incidence of deviant cases (individuals who appeared to wield influence, but who did not designate themselves as leaders, or individuals who did not seem to be influential, but who did designate themselves as leaders), other questions were included dealing with variables which it was thought might provide some insight into why such deviance was noted.

### 3) Timing

The interviewing was carried out during the month of March, 1966, and was personally supervised by the author and three assistants.

### SECTION III

#### THE FINDINGS OF THE RESEARCH

## CHAPTER IV

### SELF-DESIGNATED LEADERSHIP AND SOCIOMETRIC CHOICES

In this chapter we turn our attention first to the results obtained to the questions designed to isolate those individuals who designated themselves as opinion leaders. We then go on to examine the data pertaining to the sociometric choices made.

#### A. THE SELF-DESIGNATED LEADERS

For the sake of convenience and also to preserve the anonymity of respondents, the women in the sample will be referred to by number. The St. Matthew group, comprising 46 women, will be referred to as group one. The Wesley group, comprising 40 women, will be referred to as group two.

It will be recalled that self-designated leaders were to be isolated on the basis of responses to two questions asked in regard to each of household marketing and fashions. Self-designated leaders are those who stated that they had recently been asked for advice in one of the particular areas and also stated that they felt that they were more likely than the other women in their group to be asked for advice in that same area.

As will be noted in the table which follows, only a very small minority in each group could be classified as leaders. A somewhat larger proportion stated they would be more likely than others to be

asked for advice, but did not report actually being asked for advice.

The great majority responded negatively to both questions.

TABLE 4-1

PROPORTION OF SELF-DESIGNATED LEADERS IN EACH OF THE TWO TEST GROUPS			
	Group 1	Group 2	Groups 1 and 2 combined
Number of respondents	46	40	86
<u>Household Marketing:</u>	%	%	%
Leaders (responded affirmatively to both questions)	7	5	6
'Semi-leaders' (responded affirmatively to only one of the questions)	15	15	15
Followers (responded negatively to both questions)	78	80	79
<u>Fashions:</u>			
Leaders	4	3	4
'Semi-leaders'	9	15	12
Followers	87	83	85

With only one exception, respondents who fit our leader criteria on one count only, maintained that they would be more likely than others to be asked for advice. Included in the 'semi-leader' group is one respondent in group one who stated that she had been asked for advice regarding household marketing, but considered herself less likely than others to be asked for advice in that area.

These findings are consistent with earlier research, that is, that only a very small proportion of individuals in a group can be classified as self-designated leaders.

When we examine the relationship between self-designated leadership in one area with that of the other, we obtain the following:

TABLE 4-2

<u>SELF-DESIGNATED LEADERSHIP IN HOUSEHOLD MARKETING</u> <u>IN RELATION TO SELF-DESIGNATED LEADERSHIP</u> <u>IN FASHIONS</u>						
	HOUSEHOLD MARKETING CLASSIFICATION					
	Group 1		Group 2		Groups 1 and 2 combined	
	Leader	Follower	Leader	Follower	Leader	Follower
Number of respondents	10	36	8	32	18	68
	%	%	%	%	%	%
<u>Fashion Classification:</u>						
Leader	40	6	75	3	56	4
Follower	60	94	25	97	44	96

We may note that although some relationship appears to exist, the bond is not very strong. This tends to support the findings of Katz and Lazarsfeld who, as we noted earlier, discounted the concept of a "generalized leader." If one is a leader in a particular area, it does not necessarily follow that one is also a leader in another area.

Worthy of mention is the observation that if an individual designates himself as a follower in one area, there is a fairly strong likelihood that he will so designate himself in another area. However, if an individual

designates himself as a leader in one area, he is equally likely to designate himself as either a leader or a follower in another area. This pattern of response will be encountered in regard to a number of other situations which we shall come upon later. The implications of this, as we shall note in a later chapter, have an important bearing on the central problem with which the research is concerned.

#### B. THE SOCIOMETRIC STARS

It will be recalled that the sociometric choices were made on the basis of three questions asked in regard to each of household marketing and fashions: 1) women chosen as 'experts,' 2) women selected as individuals who would be consulted for advice and, 3) women regarded as 'trend setters' in the group.

When we examine these data (shown in Appendix Tables A and B), we note that, as in the case of self-designated leadership, the stars were relatively few in number. In each of the two areas among both groups we find there is one star who obtains a far greater number of choices than does anyone else. There are several 'minor stars' who obtain a greater number of choices than the average, but fewer than the star, and a still greater number of lesser lights (neutrals) who receive one or two choices. The majority, however, are isolates.

A summary of the data presenting sociometric choices in one area related to those in other follows in Table 4-3 below.

TABLE 4-3

<u>HOUSEHOLD MARKETING SOCIOMETRIC CHOICES IN RELATION</u> <u>TO FASHION SOCIOMETRIC CHOICES</u>							
FASHION SOCIOMETRIC CHOICES							
		Group 1		Group 2		Groups 1 and 2 combined	
		Chosen	Not Chosen	Chosen	Not Chosen	Chosen	Not Chosen
Number of respondents		25 %	21 %	17 %	23 %	42 %	44 %
<u>Household Marketing</u> <u>Sociometric Choices:</u>							
Chosen		56	14	65	17	60	16
Not Chosen		44	86	35	83	40	84

It will be noted that the findings present a pattern similar to that obtained when we examined the relationship between the two areas in regard to self-designated leadership. It appears that while some relationship exists between choices in the two areas, it is not by any means a strong one. Similarly, we note that an individual who is not chosen in one area is very likely not to be chosen in the second. However, being chosen in one area does not provide any real indication of whether or not one will also be chosen in the second area.

Another indication of the relatively weak bond that exists between choices in the two areas is obtained when the choices for each are rank ordered (see Appendix Tables C and D) and Spearman's Coefficient of Rank Correlation obtained.

TABLE 4-4

<u>SPEARMAN'S COEFFICIENT OF RANK CORRELATION BETWEEN</u> <u>SOCIOMETRIC CHOICES IN THE</u> <u>HOUSEHOLD MARKETING AND FASHION AREAS</u>		
	Group 1	Group 2
Coefficient of Rank correlation between selections in the Household Marketing and Fashion areas.	.591	.690

Although the correlation coefficient was somewhat higher for group two than for group one, it was not particularly impressive in either case.

Thus far we have been examining the total number of sociometric choices an individual received without regard for whether she was chosen as an 'expert,' 'consultant,' or 'trend setter.' It might be in order at this point to examine the relationship that exists between these three measures.

As a first step toward this end the sociometric choices in regard to each role were rank ordered (see Appendix Tables C and D). On this basis Spearman's Coefficient of Rank Correlation was calculated and the following results obtained:

TABLE 4-5

SPEARMAN'S COEFFICIENT OF RANK CORRELATION BETWEEN THE VARIOUS SOCIOMETRIC CHOICES WITHIN EACH AREA						
	GROUP 1			GROUP 2		
	House Mark.	Fash.	H.Mark. & Fash. Comb- ined	House Mark.	Fash.	H.Mark. & Fash. Comb- ined
	.... Coefficient of Rank Correlation ....					
Relationship between selected as:						
'Expert' and 'Consultant'	.789	.786	.730	.736	.780	.753
'Consultant' and 'Trend Setter'	.688	.945	.753	.817	.837	.813
'Expert' and 'Trend Setter'	.682	.837	.825	.730	.780	.749

We may note that, in general, the relationship definitely exists between all the various areas. The 'consultant' and 'trend setter' relationship is very striking in regard to fashions. No definite trends in this regard were noted in reference to household marketing.

We may conclude that if an individual is selected in a particular area as an 'expert,' for example, there is a very strong likelihood that she will also be selected as a 'consultant' and/or 'trend setter.' In other words, once selected or not selected in any one of these respects, one is very likely to be similarly treated in regard to the two other roles.

It may also be observed that the coefficients of correlation between component areas within sociometric choices are higher than those obtained in Table 4-4 where we sought to establish the relationship between the two different areas. We again can provide support for the Katz and Lazarsfeld

conclusion that there is decidedly not a one-to-one relationship between leadership in one area and leadership in another.

To summarize briefly the major points made in this chapter, we noted that whether measured by self-designation or by sociometric choices, the proportion of leaders in the group tends to be small. We also found that regardless of which measure was used, the data suggested that leadership in one area is only loosely related to leadership in another and pointed out that this finding was consistent with those of earlier research which was skeptical of the concept of a "generalized opinion leader."

In examining the manner in which the relationship between self-designated and sociometric leadership seemed to break down, we found that among the 'actual' followers, the relationship was strong. However, 'actual' leaders were equally likely to designate themselves as followers or leaders. It was suggested that this pattern had an important bearing on our problem and that we would discuss it further at a later point.

Finally, we noted that a fairly strong relationship existed in a given role area within sociometric choices with other roles dealt with in these choices.

In the chapter which follows we shall turn our attention to the relationship between self-designated leadership and sociometric choices.

CHAPTER V

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SELF-DESIGNATED OPINION LEADERSHIP AND 'ACTUAL'  
LEADERSHIP AS INDICATED BY SOCIOMETRIC CHOICES

The major purpose of the research was to obtain some basis for evaluating the validity of the self-designating technique as a method for isolating opinion leaders. Our method was to obtain an independent measure of opinion leadership - sociometric choices in the groups. In this chapter we shall seek to determine what relationship, if any, exists between the two measures.

In Table 5-1 below (based on the tabulations to be found in Appendix Tables A and B), we show the proportions of respondents who received one or more sociometric choices in the particular area in terms of whether or not they responded affirmatively to either one of the self-designating questions in regard to that same area. We class those who provided at least one affirmative response as self-designated leaders, and those who responded negatively to both questions as followers.

TABLE 5-1

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIOMETRIC CHOICES AND						
SELF-DESIGNATED LEADERSHIP						
	Group 1		Group 2		Groups 1 and 2 combined	
	Not		Not		Not	
	Chosen	Chosen	Chosen	Chosen	Chosen	Chosen
<u>MARKETING:</u> N=	25	21	17	23	42	44
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Self-designated:						
Leaders	32	10	41	4	36	7
Followers	68	90	59	96	64	93
	$\chi^2=2.197^*$ $p=>.10$		$\chi^2=6.144^*$ $p=<.02$		$\chi^2=9.122^*$ $p=<.01$	
<u>FASHIONS:</u> N=	17	29	15	25	32	54
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Self-designated:						
Leaders	24	7	40	4	31	6
Followers	71	93	60	96	69	94
	$\chi^2=2.655^*$ $p=>.10$		$\chi^2=6.107^*$ $p=<.02$		$\chi^2=8.331^*$ $p=<.01$	
* Yates' Correction Applied.						

The note that for group two and for the two groups combined we obtain highly significant differences between the chosen and not chosen groups. The results for group one approach significance.

We also note that among the two deviant groups in each instance - the sociometrically chosen who did not designate themselves as leaders, and the unchosen who did so designate themselves - it is the former who contribute to a much greater extent than the latter to the amount of deviance encountered. It would appear that an 'actual' leader<sup>1</sup> is more likely to designate himself as a follower rather than as a leader. An 'actual' follower, on the other hand, is very likely to designate himself as a follower. Thus, we again note the pattern we commented on earlier - the followers fitting in much as we would expect them to, but the leaders showing inconsistency in regard to self-designation. We merely wish to highlight the finding at this time - we shall return to it when we examine the deviant cases more closely.

The data contained in Appendix Tables A and B were tabulated so that respondents were rank ordered in terms of the number of times they were selected sociometrically and also on the basis of their responses to the self-designating questions (presented in Appendix Tables E and F). On the basis of these tabulations Spearman's coefficient of rank correlation was calculated with the following results:

---

<sup>1</sup> 'Actual' as operationally defined in this research. That is, one whose leadership is manifest by the sociometric choices she receives.

TABLE 5-2

<u>Spearman's Coefficient of Rank Correlation Between</u> <u>Rankings on Sociometric Choices and Self Designation</u> <u>In Regard to Household Marketing and Fashions for the Two Groups</u>			
	<u>Household</u> <u>Marketing</u>	<u>Fashions</u>	<u>Household Marketing</u> <u>&amp; Fashions Combined.</u>
	Coefficients of correlation between .....Sociometric and self-designation ranks.....		
Group 1	.505	.612	.519
Group 2	.703	.739	.637

For both groups (particularly group two) there is further confirmation that there is indeed a relationship between the two measures. Among both groups too, the relationship was somewhat more marked in regard to fashions than in reference to household marketing.

Let us now examine these data from another perspective. We shall separate our respondents in accordance with how they designated themselves as leaders and look at the average rank obtained by each

group on the basis of sociometric choices. That is, we shall separate the leader group into two categories - the 'leaders' (those who responded affirmatively to both of the self-designating questions), and the 'semi-leaders' (those who responded affirmatively to only one of the two self-designating questions).

If the relationship between the two independent measures holds true, then we would expect that the leaders would obtain the highest average ranking based on sociometric choices; the 'semi-leaders' to obtain the next highest ranking; and the followers to obtain the lowest ranking.

TABLE 5-3

<p><u>AVERAGE RANK BASED ON NUMBER OF SOCIOMETRIC CHOICES OBTAINED</u>  <u>BY SELF-DESIGNATED LEADERS, SELF-DESIGNATED 'SEMI-LEADERS',</u>  <u>AND SELF-DESIGNATED FOLLOWERS</u>                      (Household Marketing and Fashion Data Combined)</p>					
	Group 1		Group 2		Groups 1 and 2 combined
	N	Av. Soc 'met. Rank	N	Av. Soc 'met. Rank	N      Av. Soc 'met. Rank
A. Self-designated leaders in household marketing and fashions (self-designating score of 4)	(1)	3.0	(1)	1.0	(2)      2.0
B. Self-designated leaders in one area and self-designated 'semi-leader' in the second area (self designating score of 3)	(2)	5.5	(0)	-	(2)      5.5
C. Self-designated leader in one of the areas and self-designated follower in the second, or self-designated 'semi-leader' in both areas (self-designating score of 2)	(1)	19.5	(6)	11.5	(7)      12.6
D. Self-designated 'semi-leader' in one area and self-designated follower in the second (self-designating score of 1)	(8)	20.4	(2)	6.3	(10)      17.6
E. Self-designated follower in both areas (self-designating score of 0)	(34)	38.5	(31)	23.8	(65)      33.0

With only one exception (in group two), there is the clear indication that as one's self-designated score increases, so does the likelihood that one will be the object of sociometric choice.

On the basis of the data we have seen thus far, it may be suggested that if an individual designates himself as an opinion leader by means of the Katz and Lazarsfeld technique, there is a very strong likelihood that he indeed significantly influences others. However, if an individual so designates himself as a follower, it does not necessarily follow that he in fact is a non-leader.

It is recognized that the present research, by virtue of the limited sample size, the unrepresentativeness of the sample and the nature of the methods employed, cannot serve as a final basis upon which to judge the validity of the self-designating method. A more definitive test would involve a larger and more representative sample and perhaps too, would include a measure of actual behavior, in addition to, or perhaps instead of the sociometric approach, to sort out the 'actual' influentials. However, the findings do provide further support for the technique and further verify the results obtained by Katz and Lazarsfeld when they attempted to validate the method.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Elihu Katz and Paul F. Lazarsfeld, op. cit., pp. 149-161. In 77% of the confirmed cases (a total of 442 of a potential 1,549), individuals named as influentials or influencees acknowledged the role reported played by them. Although a small proportion of designates were confirmed, the proportion of those who acknowledged their role is high.

In the following chapter we shall devote our attention to the deviant cases in an attempt to determine what factors may have contributed to the incidence of deviance, and perhaps to provide some insight into how the self-designating technique may be appropriately modified so as to function as a more accurate indicator of opinion leadership in the group.

## CHAPTER VI

### THE DEVIANT CASES

As we noted earlier, our aim in this chapter is to take a closer look at the deviant cases in an attempt to gain some insight into the factors which contributed to deviance. Various aspects of deviance will be examined in sub-sections of the chapter.

#### A. DEVIANCE IN RELATION TO THE SOCIOMETRIC ROLES EXPLORED

We earlier noted that the sociometric choices involving the roles of 'expert,' 'consultant,' and 'trend setter' were quite closely related to each other. However, it is possible that one of the three may bear a closer relationship to self-designated leadership than do the others. If this is indeed so, we would expect that the incidence of deviance would be lower for the particular role involved. With this in mind, we present in Appendix Table G the proportions of respondents selected and not selected in each of the three areas, separating those who designated themselves as leaders and those who classified themselves as followers. Table 7 - 1 below summarizes the findings encountered by showing the proportion of deviant (self-designated leaders who were not chosen, and self-designated followers who were chosen) and non-deviant cases in each of the three sociometric choice areas. The data shown represent the results from groups one and two combined.

TABLE 6-1

<u>PROPORTIONS OF DEVIANT AND NON-DEVIANT CASES</u> <u>ENCOUNTERED IN EACH OF THE THREE SOCIOMETRIC</u> <u>CHOICE AREAS</u>				
	Expert	Consultant	Trend Setter	Average of Expert, Consultant, & Trend Setter
N =	----- 86 -----			
<u>HOUSEHOLD MARKETING:</u>	%	%	%	%
Deviant cases	31	27	33	30
Non-deviant cases	69	73	67	70
<u>FASHIONS:</u>				
Deviant cases	26	14	16	29
Non-deviant cases	74	86	84	71
Average proportion of deviant cases (mean of the marketing and fashions deviant cases)	29%	20%	25%	29%

We find that the 'consultant' choices bear a closer relationship to self-designated leadership than either of the other two sociometric measures. That this finding is encountered is not altogether without reason. If we recognize that the self-designating questions are oriented toward the consulting function (has anyone recently asked you for advice, and are you more or less likely to be asked for advice....?), then it is not surprising that the 'consultant' choices

come closer to isolating the self-designated leaders than do the 'expert' and 'trend setter' choices.

Two questions arise from these data. 1) Are the 'expert,' 'consultant,' and 'trend setter' functions an integral part of the situation in which personal influence is operative? 2) Would the incidence of deviant cases drop significantly if the self-designating leadership questions were modified to include the 'expert' and 'trend setter' functions as well as that of 'consultant?'

The answer to both questions would seem to be in the affirmative. In the first instance, it seems reasonable to assume that individuals who function in one or more of the roles noted would be likely to influence the behavior patterns of others. In the second instance the evidence would seem to provide some support for the hypothesis that a closer relationship between the measurements of self-designated leadership and 'actual' leadership (as measured in the present research) could be achieved through broadening the scope of the self-designating questions. Clearly, however, further research would be required to provide a definitive answer.

For the moment, based on the evidence at hand, it would appear that one of the factors which inhibits the efficacy of the self-designating technique in isolating all the opinion leaders in the group is the fact that it is oriented toward selecting only one of various types of leaders which may exist -- the individual who is actively sought out for advice -- and not others who may lead, perhaps unknowingly, by virtue of the examples they set.

B. DEVIANCE IN RELATION TO OFFICIAL STATUS IN THE GROUP

One of the factors which may have contributed to the incidence of deviant cases may relate to the individual's official position in the group. It can be hypothesized that individuals who presently or formerly occupied an executive position would be more likely to be included in the sociometric choices than the rank and file because of a 'halo' effect tracing back to their elevated status in the group.

To test this hypothesis the information concerning present and former executive positions held in the group was tabulated in reference to whether or not the individual was the object of sociometric choice (see Appendix Table H). The results obtained for groups one and two combined follow in Table 6 - 2 below.

TABLE 6-2

<u>PROPORTIONS OF PRESENT AND FORMER EXECUTIVES VERSUS</u>		
<u>RANK AND FILE WHO RECEIVED SOCIOMETRIC CHOICES</u>		
	Present and Former Executives	Rank and File
N =	41	45
<u>HOUSEHOLD MARKETING:</u>	%	%
Chosen	68	31
Not chosen	32	69
<u>FASHIONS:</u>		
Chosen	54	22
Not chosen	46	78

The data provide support for the hypothesis put forward. They clearly indicate that the odds favor a present or former executive being made the object of a sociometric choice, while the odds are against a member of the rank and file being so selected.

While the foregoing suggests that official status may have had some bearing on the incidence of deviant cases, it does not pinpoint this situation, nor does it provide any insight into the dynamics which might underlie such a situation. Accordingly, let us re-examine the data contained in Appendix Table H. In this instance we shall study the extent to which self-designated leaders and followers within each of the executive and rank and file groups were the objects of sociometric choice.

TABLE 6-3

<u>PROPORTIONS OF PRESENT AND FORMER EXECUTIVES VERSUS RANK AND FILE</u> <u>WHO WERE THE OBJECTS OF SOCIOMETRIC CHOICE - SHOWN FOR</u> <u>SELF-DESIGNATED LEADERS AND FOLLOWERS</u> (Groups one and two combined)		
	Present and former Executives	Rank and File
N=	41 %	45 %
<u>HOUSEHOLD MARKETING:</u>		
<u>NON-DEVIANT CASES:</u>		
Self-Designated Leaders-Chosen	27	9
Self-Designated Followers-Not Chosen	24	69
<u>DEVIANT CASES</u>		
Self-Designated Leaders-Not Chosen	7	-
Self-Designated Followers-Chosen	42	22
<u>FASHIONS:</u>		
<u>NON-DEVIANT CASES:</u>		
Self-Designated Leaders-Chosen	22	2
Self-Designated Followers-Not Chosen	42	76
<u>DEVIANT CASES:</u>		
Self-Designated Leaders-Not Chosen	5	2
Self-Designated Followers-Chosen	32	20

We note that, on the average, we encounter almost twice as many deviant cases in the executive group (43%) as we do among the rank and file (22%).

The data contained in Table 6-3 permit us to generate some hypotheses in regard to how official status may affect self-designated roles and sociometric choices. These data indicate that a higher proportion of self-designated leaders among the executive group were not the objects of sociometric choice than was true of the rank and file (an average of 6% among the former as compared with an average of 1% among the latter). On this basis it might be assumed that the individual who designated herself as a leader, but did not emerge as such on the basis of sociometric choices, is one who has an inflated opinion of herself in regard to her role as influencer, perhaps because of her elevated status in the organization.

Turning our attention to the other deviant group -- the individuals who designated themselves as followers, but who were the objects of sociometric choice -- we find we encounter an average of 37% of such deviance among the executive group and an average of 21% among the rank and file. That an individual who designates himself as a follower, but who emerges as an 'actual' leader on the basis of sociometric choice is more likely to be among the present or former executive group than among the rank and file suggests two further conclusions. 1) An individual who is not actively or consciously an opinion leader, may be thought of as one by her peers by virtue of the image of leadership that has been built up around her as a result of her tenure in an official position with the organization. 2) The individual who has received official recognition of elevated status in the group by having been appointed to office, will have a lesser need to indicate to others that she is an influential than an individual who has not received such recognition. In such circumstances the former may, falsely or in modesty, indicate that she is less influential than she indeed is.

Some support for the latter position was obtained when an attempt was made to obtain some understanding of what happened in one glaringly deviant case. In group one, case number 24 is a striking example of a very obvious sociometric star who classified herself as a follower. When this fact became obvious in the tabulation of the data, number 24 was contacted by telephone and an unstructured interview was carried out.

Number 24 is presently Vice-President of the group, was President last year, was formerly second Vice-President, and also formerly was in charge of several committees. To a greater extent than the others, she appears to have had a place in the official structure of the organization. While this might well account for the very high regard in which many of the other women obviously hold her, it does not explain why she should regard herself as a follower.

In the telephone interview it was pointed out to her that many women reported seeking her advice and many also regarded her as particularly knowledgeable in the fields of household marketing and fashions. When asked why she did not report being asked for advice or expressing the opinion that her advice would be more sought after than others she replied, "I didn't think it was too important. I thought that if other women valued my advice they would tell you about it themselves." It seems reasonably clear that subject 24, had she answered the self-designating questions honestly, would have classified herself as an opinion leader. It would appear that a sense of modesty inhibited her from doing so.

On the basis of the foregoing it would appear that the self-designation method, in and of itself, is not a sensitive enough indicator of opinion leadership in the group. We have seen that individuals with a sense of modesty (perhaps related too to strong feelings of security in the group) may tend to deflate their status with the self-designating procedure.

We have also seen that there are other individuals who have an inflated view of the amount of influence they wield. This would suggest that the self-designating method might be improved if used in conjunction with measures of modesty and security. In other words, it would appear that a further avenue of fruitful endeavor would be to develop appropriate scales of modesty and security and to determine whether or not appropriate modification of self-designated ratings in accordance with how the individual can be classified in terms of such scales leads to greater accuracy in pinpointing opinion leaders. For example, we would speculate that an individual who designates himself as a leader and also scores low on a scale of modesty is perhaps not an actual leader. Similarly, an individual who designates himself as a follower and who rates high on a scale of modesty may in fact be a leader.

#### C. DEVIANCE IN RELATION TO GREGARIOUSNESS

It was thought that gregariousness might represent yet another factor which could provide some insight into the incidence of deviance. It was hypothesized that the deviant self-designated follower (an individual who designated herself as a follower, but was the object of sociometric choice) was an individual who was more often in contact with people than the non-deviants. Our reasoning was that frequent social contacts may function to enhance an individual's perceived status in the eyes of others, and because of this she might, unknown to herself, be one whose behavior was often imitated. Similarly, it was thought that frequent interaction with others might, in and of itself, make her more influential than she thought herself to be.

Each respondent was classified in terms of gregariousness using the method adopted by Katz and Lazarsfeld.<sup>1</sup> Table 6-4 below presents the distribution of those who were classed as high and low in terms of gregariousness among the particular deviant and non-deviant segments of the sample.

TABLE 6-4

<u>THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GREGARIOUSNESS</u> <u>AND DEVIANCE</u> (Presented for Groups 1 and 2 Combined)		
N=	Gregariousness Rating	
	Low	High
<u>HOUSEHOLD MARKETING:</u>	57 %	29 %
<u>NON-DEVIANT CASES:</u>		
Self-designated leaders - chosen	12	24
Self-designated followers - not chosen	54	38
<u>DEVIANT CASES:</u>		
Self-designated leaders - not chosen	4	3
Self-designated followers - chosen	30	34
<u>FASHIONS:</u>		
<u>NON-DEVIANT CASES:</u>		
Self-designated leaders - chosen	12	10
Self-designated followers - not chosen	61	55
<u>DEVIANT CASES:</u>		
Self-designated leaders - not chosen	2	7
Self-designated followers - chosen	25	28

<sup>1</sup> Katz and Lazarsfeld, Op.cit. pp.226-228. The average number of people

The data do not lend any support for the hypothesis put forward. Although there are somewhat higher proportions of deviant followers to be found in the high gregariousness group than in the low group, the differences are too slight to be of significance.

#### D. DEVIANCE IN RELATION TO SUNDRY VARIABLES

Various other hypotheses concerning deviance were developed which led to further cross analyses of the data. For example, it was thought that frequency of attendance at meetings of the club might be related to deviance. Such, however, was not the case. We noted earlier that the respondents constituting both groups comprised the hard core of regular attenders. The range in regard to frequency of attendance was very small and virtually precluded the possibility of discovering the relationship that was sought.

Interaction with club members apart from group activity was also examined. In this instance too our efforts went unrewarded.

Similar negative results were obtained in regard to level of education attained and socio-economic status. In both instances each group was relatively homogeneous and there was virtually no opportunity for significant differences to emerge.

---

with whom the respondents are in contact (outside of family and neighbors) and the average number of organizations to which they belong serve as the basis for classification in terms of gregariousness. Those falling above the average in both respects score high; those who fall below the average in both respects score low, while the remainder are "medium." To provide for greater stability of the bases used, we have combined the "medium" with "high" to yield two groups, low gregariousness and high gregariousness.

## CHAPTER VII

### SUMMARY

In this final chapter we shall present the major findings which emerged in the study and examine their implications. In this regard it should again be pointed out that for a variety of reasons the research cannot be regarded as an absolute test of the validity of the self-designating method. 1) The research was carried out with formed groups. Accordingly, the results cannot necessarily be generalized to any aggregate. 2) The research was essentially concerned with internal rather than external validity. In other words, it sought to determine whether two methods of isolating opinion leaders yielded similar or different results. It could not definitely establish whether either method was successful in isolating those who in actual practice function as opinion leaders. However, the research does give rise to some legitimate doubt concerning the efficacy of the self-designating method and should provide guidance for further exploration of the problem.

A considerable amount of evidence was amassed to indicate that a relationship exists between the self-designating and sociometric methods for isolating opinion leaders. The data showed that the self-designating method was successful in sorting out (perhaps somewhat crudely) the sociometric stars from the neutrals and isolates. Approximately 30% of the cases, however, fell into a deviant category.

The great majority of individuals who designated themselves as leaders appeared, in fact, to be leaders. The incidence of deviance among the self-designated leaders was quite low. The major problem stemmed from the fairly high proportion of individuals who designated themselves as followers who actually appeared to be leaders.

Based on these findings we concluded that if an individual is classed as a leader through the use of the self-designating technique, there is a very strong likelihood that he indeed significantly influences others. However, if by the same method an individual is classed as a non-leader, it does not necessarily follow that he in fact is a non-leader.

In examining the deviant cases we reported on two major factors which seemed to contribute to deviance and which appeared to offer some guidance for reformulating the self-designating method so as to make it a more accurate tool.

The first of these raised some doubts about the appropriateness of the frame of reference used for the self-designating questions. When we scrutinized the relationship between self-designation and each of the three component roles which were included in our sociometric soundings ('expert,' 'consultant,' and 'trend setter'), we noted that self-designated leadership was more closely related to 'consultant' stars than to the remaining two.

This led us to examine more closely the frame of reference of the self-designating questions and in so doing, concluded that they were decidedly oriented toward the consulting function of opinion leadership. We suggested that opinion leadership (as it was defined at the end of Chapter I) was a broader concept than consulting. The 'experts' and 'trend setters' need not be consulted or sought after for advice in order for them to influence the behavior of others -- it is very likely that because they are so regarded, their behavior is imitated without the behavior pattern ever having been a topic of conversation between the imitator and the imitated.

We accordingly suggested that the self-designating questions devised by Katz and Lazarsfeld were too limiting and that perhaps it was necessary to expand the scope of the questions to include the 'expert' and 'trend setter' functions, and any others which might be properly thought to be operational in personal influence.

The second factor related to the individual's official status in the group. We hypothesized that individuals who presently or in the past occupied an executive position in the group would be more likely to be included in sociometric choices than the rank and file because of a 'halo' effect tracing back to their elevated status in the group. And this, of course, highlighted one of the problems to be dealt with in a situation in which internal rather than external validity was being tested. Did the sociometric choices indeed indicate who the actual opinion leaders were ?

Evidence was proffered to support the hypothesis presented.

That such was the case makes it clear that further research into the problem, if it is to be meaningful, must concern itself with external validity by making use of some measure of actual opinion leadership.

Finally, examination of the deviant cases encountered among the executive and rank and file groups led to some conclusions in regard to how official status might affect self-designated roles and sociometric choices.

We noted that a higher proportion of self-designated leaders among the executive group were not the objects of sociometric choice than was true of the rank and file. It was suggested that some individuals may have an inflated opinion of themselves as influencers because of their elevated official status.

We also found that individuals who designated themselves as followers, but who were the objects of sociometric choice, were also more often to be found in the executive group than in the rank and file. This suggested two kinds of situations. 1) An individual who is not actively or consciously an opinion leader may be thought of as one by her peers by virtue of the image of leadership that has been built up around her as a result of her tenure of an official leadership position. Again, this argues for the use of an actual measure of leadership as opposed to sociometric choices.

2) The individual who has received official recognition of elevated status by having been appointed to office may have a lesser need to indicate overtly to others that she is an influential than is an individual who has not received such recognition. Just such a situation was encountered in a personal follow-up interview carried out with one of the deviant cases.

This latter situation suggested that the self-designating technique, whether used in the restricted 'consulting' framework adopted by Katz and Lazarsfeld, or in the broader sense that was earlier suggested, is not likely to be a sensitive enough tool, in and of itself. Some measure of the esteem in which the individual holds himself and perhaps also an indication of the extent to which he feels secure, might serve as correcting factors to increase the efficacy of the method.

APPENDIX I

TABLES OF FINDINGS

TABLE A

## SOCIOMETRIC CHOICES OF GROUP 1

Number of times selected as:	Household Marketing				Fashions				Household Marketing and Fashions Combined			
	Expert	Con- sultant	Trend Setter	Total Times Selected	Expert	Con- sultant	Trend Setter	Total Times Selected	Expert	Con- sultant	Trend Setter	Total Times Selected
Respondent No.: $\phi$												
1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
3	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	2
4+	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
6+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	4	2	1	7	0	0	0	0	4	2	1	7
8++	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
9	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
12+	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
14	1	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3
15	1	0	1	2	1	0	0	1	2	0	1	3
17	2	0	2	4	1	0	0	1	3	0	2	5
19	1	2	0	3	2	1	2	5	2	3	2	8
20+	3	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	4
21	1	1	2	4	2	0	2	4	3	1	4	8
22	0	1	1	2	8	2	4	14	8	3	5	16
23+	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
24	6	2	5	13	21	14	18	53	27	16	23	66
25	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	2
27+	1	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3
29	1	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3
30+	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
34++++	3	1	2	6	6	3	2	11	9	4	4	17
35 +	0	0	1	1	3	3	2	8	3	3	3	9
36	1	0	1	2	1	0	0	1	2	0	1	3
37	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
38	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	2
40	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
41+++	2	1	2	5	1	0	0	1	3	1	2	6
46+++	2	2	1	5	10	3	4	17	12	5	5	22

++ Self-designated leader in household marketing	+ Self-designated "semi-leader" in household marketing
## Self-designated leader in fashions	# Self-designated "semi-leader" in fashions

Ø Respondents who have been omitted consist of those individuals who were both sociometric isolates and self-designated followers in both areas.

TABLE B

## SOCIOMETRIC CHOICES OF GROUP 2

Number of times selected as: Respondent No.: $\phi$	Household Marketing				Fashions				Household Marketing and Fashions Combined			
	Expert	Con- sultant	Trend Setter	Total Times Selected	Expert	Con- sultant	Trend Setter	Total Times Selected	Expert	Con- sultant	Trend Setter	Total Times Selected
3	4	2	1	7	0	1	1	2	4	3	2	9
4 <sup>++</sup>	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
8	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	2
9 <sup>+</sup> ‡	3	1	0	4	0	1	0	1	3	2	0	5
14	2	1	0	3	3	0	1	4	5	1	1	7
17	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
18	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	1	0	2
19	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	1	1	2
21	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3	3	0	0	3
24	1	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4
25 <sup>+</sup> ‡	1	2	2	5	3	2	2	7	4	4	4	12
26 <sup>+</sup> ‡	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
27	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
28	2	0	0	2	1	1	0	2	3	1	0	4
29	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
32	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
35 <sup>+</sup>	2	1	3	6	1	0	1	2	3	1	4	8
37 <sup>++</sup> ‡‡	11	4	4	19	9	4	4	17	20	8	8	36
38 <sup>+</sup> ‡	1	1	2	4	4	3	1	8	5	4	3	12
39 <sup>+</sup> ‡	3	1	2	6	3	3	2	8	6	4	4	14
40 ‡	1	1	0	2	3	2	2	7	4	3	2	9

++ Self-designated leader in household marketing

+ Self-designated "semi-leader" in household marketing

‡‡ Self-designated leader in fashions

‡ Self-designated "semi-leader" in fashions

$\phi$  Respondents who have been omitted consist of those individuals who were both sociometric isolates and self-designated followers in both areas.

TABLE C

RANK ORDERING OF SOCIOMETRIC CHOICES OF GROUP 1												
Number of times selected as:	Household Marketing				Fashions				Household Marketing and Fashions Combined			
	Expert	Con- sultant	Trend Setter	Total Times Selected	Expert	Con- sultant	Trend Setter	Total Times Selected	Expert	Con- sultant	Trend Setter	Total Times Selected
Respondent No.:												
1	34.5	31	31	36	12	27	27	12.5	21.5	32	31.5	25.5
3	15	31	31	22	12	27	27	12.5	13	32	31.5	19.5
4 <sup>+</sup>	34.5	31	31	36	31.5	6.5	27	12.5	37	12.5	31.5	24.5
6 <sup>+</sup>	34.5	31	31	36	31.5	27	27	32	37	32	31.5	37.5
7	2	2.5	10.5	2	31.5	27	27	32	5	7	13	8
8 <sup>++</sup>	15	10	31	15.5	31.5	27	27	32	21.5	12.5	31.5	19.5
9	15	10	31	15.5	31.5	27	27	32	21.5	12.5	31.5	19.5
12 <sup>+</sup>	15	31	31	22	31.5	27	27	32	21.5	32	31.5	25.5
14	15	10	10.5	10.5	31.5	27	27	32	21.5	12.5	13	14
15	15	31	10.5	15.5	12	27	27	12.5	13	32	13	14
17	6	31	3.5	7	12	27	27	12.5	8	32	8	10
19	15	2.5	31	10.5	6.5	6.5	5.5	6	13	5	8	6.5
20 <sup>+</sup>	3.5	10	31	7	31.5	27	27	32	8	12.5	31.5	11
21	15	10	3.5	7	6.5	27	5.5	7	8	12.5	4.5	6.5
22	34.5	10	10.5	15.5	3	5	2.5	3	4	5	2.5	4
23 <sup>+</sup>	15	10	31	15.5	31.5	27	27	32	21.5	12.5	31.5	19.5
24	1	2.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
25	34.5	31	10.5	22	12	27	27	12.5	21.5	32	13	18.5
27 <sup>+</sup>	15	10	10.5	10.5	31.5	27	27	32	21.5	12.5	13	14
29	15	10	10.5	10.5	31.5	27	27	32	21.5	12.5	13	14
30 <sup>+</sup>	15	31	31	22	31.5	27	27	32	21.5	32	31.5	25.5
34 <sup>+++</sup>	3.5	10	3.5	3	4	3	5.5	4	3	3	4.5	3
35 <sup>+</sup>	34.5	31	10.5	22	5	3	5.5	5	8	5	6	5
36	15	31	10.5	15.5	12	27	27	12.5	13	32	13	14
37	34.5	31	31	36	12	27	27	12.5	21.5	32	31.5	25.5
38	15	31	31	22	12	27	27	12.5	13	32	31.5	19.5
40	15	31	31	22	31.5	27	27	32	21.5	32	31.5	25.5
41 <sup>+++</sup>	6	10	3.5	4.5	12	27	27	12.5	8	12.5	8	9
46 <sup>+++</sup>	6	2.5	10.5	4.5	2	3	2.5	2	2	2	2.5	2

Each of: 2,5,10,11,13,16 18,26,28,31,32 33,39,42,43,44, 45.	34.5	31	31	36	31.5	27	27	32	37	32	31.5	37.5
---	------	----	----	----	------	----	----	----	----	----	------	------

++ Self-designated leader in household marketing

+ Self-designated "semi-leader" in household marketing

## Self-designated leader in fashions

+ Self-designated "semi-leader" in fashions

TABLE D

RANK ORDERING OF SOCIOMETRIC CHOICES OF GROUP 2												
Number of times selected as:  Respondent No.:	Household Marketing				Fashions				Household Marketing and Fashions Combined			
	Expert	Con- sultant	Trend Setter	Total Times Selected	Expert	Con- sultant	Trend Setter	Total Times Selected	Expert	Con- sultant	Trend Setter	Total Times Selected
3	2	3	7.5	2	26	8	7.5	10	6	5.5	6.5	5.5
4 <sup>++</sup>	12.0	28	25	16	26	25.5	25.5	28	15.5	28	27	20.5
5	28	8.5	25	16	26	25.5	25.5	28	29.5	12	27	20.5
8	12	28	25	16	26	25.5	7.5	14	15.5	28	10.5	15.5
9 <sup>+</sup>	3.5	8.5	25	7	26	8	25.5	14	9.5	7.5	27	9
14	6.5	8.5	25	9	5	25.5	7.5	6	3.5	12	10.5	8
17	6.5	28	25	12	26	25.5	25.5	28	12	28	27	15.5
18	28	28	25	29	9.5	8	25.5	10	15.5	12	27	15.5
19	28	28	25	29	26	8	7.5	10	29.5	12	10.5	15.5
21	28	28	25	29	5	25.5	25.5	7	9.5	28	27	12
24	12	3	7.5	7	26	25.5	25.5	28	15.5	7.5	10.5	10.5
25 <sup>++</sup>	12	3	4	5	5	4.5	3	4.5	6	3	3	3.5
26 <sup>++</sup>	28	28	25	29	26	25.5	25.5	28	29.5	28	27	31
27	12	28	7.5	12	26	25.5	25.5	28	15.5	28	10.5	15.5
28	6.5	28	25	12	9.5	8	25.5	10	9.5	12	27	10.5
29	28	28	25	29	9.5	25.5	25.5	14	15.5	28	27	20.5
32	28	8.5	7.5	12	26	25.5	25.5	28	29.5	12	10.5	15.5
35 <sup>+</sup>	6.5	8.5	2	3.5	9.5	25.5	7.5	10	9.5	12	3	7
37 <sup>+++</sup>	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
38 <sup>++</sup>	12	8.5	4	7	2	2.5	7.5	2.5	3.5	3	5	3.5
39 <sup>+</sup>	3.5	8.5	4	3.5	5	2.5	3	2.5	2	3	3	2
40 <sup>+</sup>	12	8.5	25	12	5	4.5	3	4.5	6	5.5	6.5	5.5
Each of: 1,2,6,7,10,11, 12,13,15,16, 20,22,23,30, 31,33,34,36	28	28	25	29	26	25.5	25.5	28	29.5	28	27	31

++ Self-designated leader in household marketing	+ Self-designated "semi-leader" in household marketing
## Self-designated leader in fashions	# Self-designated "semi-leader" in fashions

TABLE E

## SCORES\* AND RANKS BASED ON SELF-DESIGNATED LEADERSHIP AND SOCIOMETRIC CHOICES GROUP 1

Respondent No.:	Household Marketing				Fashions				Household Marketing and Fashions Combined			
	Sociometric Choices		Self-Designation		Sociometric Choices		Self-Designation		Sociometric Choices		Self-Designation	
	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank
24	13	1	0	28.5	53	1	0	26.5	66	1	0	29.5
7	7	2	0	28.5	0	32	0	26.5	7	8	0	29.5
34	6	3	2	1.5	11	4	2	1.5	17	3	4	1
41	5	4.5	2	1.5	1	12.5	1	4.5	6	9	3	2.5
46	5	4.5	1	6.5	17	2	2	1.5	22	2	3	2.5
21	4	7	0	28.5	4	7	0	26.5	8	6.5	0	29.5
20	4	7	1	6.5	0	32	0	26.5	4	11	1	8.5
17	4	7	0	28.5	1	12.5	0	26.5	5	10	0	29.5
29	3	10.5	0	28.5	0	32	0	26.5	3	14	0	29.5
27	3	10.5	0	28.5	0	32	1	4.5	3	14	1	8.5
19	3	10.5	0	28.5	5	6	0	26.5	8	6.5	0	29.5
14	3	10.5	0	28.5	0	32	0	26.5	3	14	0	29.5
36	2	15.5	0	28.5	1	12.5	0	26.5	3	14	0	29.5
23	2	15.5	1	6.5	0	32	0	26.5	2	19.5	1	18.5
22	2	15.5	0	28.5	14	3	0	26.5	16	4	0	29.5
15	2	15.5	0	28.5	1	12.5	0	26.5	3	14	0	29.5
8	2	15.5	1	6.5	0	32	1	4.5	2	19.5	2	4
9	2	15.5	0	28.5	0	32	0	26.5	2	19.5	0	29.5
40	1	22	0	28.5	0	32	0	26.5	1	25.5	0	29.5
38	1	22	0	28.5	1	12.5	0	26.5	2	19.5	0	29.5
35	1	22	0	28.5	8	5	1	4.5	9	5	1	8.5
30	1	22	1	6.5	0	32	0	26.5	1	25.5	1	8.5
25	1	22	0	28.5	1	12.5	0	26.5	2	19.5	0	29.5
12	1	22	1	6.5	0	32	0	26.5	1	25.5	1	8.5
3	1	22	0	28.5	1	12.5	0	26.5	2	19.5	0	29.5
37	0	36	0	28.5	1	12.5	0	26.5	1	25.5	0	29.5
6	0	36	1	6.5	0	32	0	26.5	0	37.5	1	8.5
4	0	36	1	6.5	1	12.5	0	26.5	1	25.5	1	8.5
1	0	36	0	28.5	1	12.5	0	26.5	1	25.5	0	29.5

Each of: 2,5,10,11,13,16,18, 26,28,31,32,33,39, 42,43,44,45.	0 36	0 28.5	0 32	0 26.5	0 37.5	0 29.5
---	------	--------	------	--------	--------	--------

\* Scores for sociometric choices represent the total number of times the individual was selected. Self-designation scores were derived by assigning 1 point to each individual who claimed she had been recently consulted and another point if she felt she was more likely than others in the group to be asked for advice.

Table F. (Continued)

TABLE F

SCORES* AND RANKS BASED ON SELF-DESIGNATED LEADERSHIP AND SOCIOMETRIC CHOICES GROUP 2												
Respondent No.:	Household Marketing				Fashions				Household Marketing and Fashions Combined			
	Sociometric Choices		Self-Designation		Sociometric Choices		Self-Designation		Sociometric Choices		Self-Designation	
	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank
37	19	1	2	1.5	17	1	2	1	36	1	4	1
3	7	2	0	24.5	2	10	0	24	9	5.5	0	25
35	6	3.5	1	5.5	2	10	0	24	8	7	1	8.5
39	6	3.5	1	5.5	8	2.5	1	4.5	14	2	2	4.5
25	5	5	1	5.5	7	4.5	1	4.5	12	3.5	2	4.5
9	4	7	1	5.5	1	14	1	4.5	5	9	2	4.5
24	4	7	0	24.5	0	28	0	24	4	10.5	0	25
38	4	7	1	5.5	8	2.5	1	4.5	12	3.5	2	4.5
14	3	9	0	24.5	4	6	0	24	7	8	0	25
17	2	12	0	24.5	0	28	0	24	2	15.5	0	25
27	2	12	0	24.5	0	28	0	24	2	15.5	0	25
28	2	12	0	24.5	2	10	0	24	4	10.5	0	25
32	2	12	0	24.5	0	28	0	24	2	15.5	0	25
40	2	12	0	24.5	7	4.5	1	4.5	9	5.5	1	8.5
5	1	16	0	24.5	0	28	0	24	1	20	0	25
8	1	16	0	24.5	1	14	0	24	2	15.5	0	25
4	1	16	2	1.5	0	28	0	24	1	20	2	4.5
18	0	29	0	24.5	2	10	0	24	2	15.5	0	25
19	0	29	0	24.5	2	10	0	24	2	15.5	0	25
21	0	29	0	24.5	3	7	0	24	3	12	0	25
26	0	29	1	5.5	0	28	1	4.5	0	31	2	4.5
29	0	29	0	24.5	1	14	0	24	1	20	0	25
Each of: 1,2,6,7,10,11,12,13,15, 16,20,22,23,30,31,33,34,36.	0	29	0	24.5	0	28	0	24	0	31	0	25

\* Scores for sociometric choices represent the total number of times the individual was selected. Self-designation scores were derived by assigning 1 point to each individual who claimed she had been recently consulted and another point if she felt she was more likely than others in the group to be asked for advice.

TABLE G

PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS SELECTED AS 'EXPERTS', 'CONSULTANTS', AND 'TREND SETTERS' SHOWN FOR SELF- DESIGNATED LEADERS AND FOLLOWERS						
	Household Marketing					
	Expert		Consultant		Trend Setter	
	Chosen	Not Chosen	Chosen	Not Chosen	Chosen	Not Chosen
Group 1: N=	..... 46 .....					
Self-designated:	%	%	%	%	%	%
Leader	17.4	4.3	13.0	8.7	6.5	15.2
Follower	30.4	47.9	19.6	58.7	26.1	52.2
Group 2: N=	..... 40 .....					
Self-designated:	%	%	%	%	%	%
Leader	15.0	5.0	12.5	7.5	10.0	10.0
Follower	22.5	57.5	17.5	62.5	12.5	67.5
Groups 1 and 2 combined: N=	..... 86 .....					
Self-designated:	%	%	%	%	%	%
Leader	16.3	4.7	12.8	8.1	8.1	12.8
Follower	26.7	52.3	18.6	60.5	19.8	59.3
	Fashions					
	Expert		Consultant		Trend Setter	
	Chosen	Not Chosen	Chosen	Not Chosen	Chosen	Not Chosen
Group 1: N=	..... 46 .....					
Self-designated:	%	%	%	%	%	%
Leader	8.7	4.3	6.5	6.5	6.5	6.5
Follower	26.1	60.9	8.7	78.3	8.7	78.3
Group 2: N=	..... 40 .....					
Self-designated:	%	%	%	%	%	%
Leader	12.5	5.0	15.0	2.5	12.5	5.0
Follower	15.0	67.5	10.0	72.5	12.5	70.0
Groups 1 and 2 combined: N=	..... 86 .....					
Self-designated:	%	%	%	%	%	%
Leader	10.5	4.7	10.5	4.7	9.3	5.8
Follower	20.9	63.9	9.3	75.5	10.5	74.4

TABLE H

PROPORTIONS OF PRESENT AND FORMER EXECUTIVES VERSUS RANK AND FILE WHO RECEIVED SOCIOMETRIC CHOICES (shown for self-designated leaders and followers)								
	Household Marketing				Fashions			
	Executives		Rank & File		Executives		Rank & File	
	Not Chosen	Chosen	Not Chosen	Chosen	Not Chosen	Chosen	Not Chosen	Chosen
Group 1: N=	.....21.....		.....25.....		.....21.....		.....25.....	
Self-designated:	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Leaders	24	10	12	0	14	5	4	4
Followers	48	19	28	60	43	38	16	76
Group 2: N=	.....20.....		.....20.....		.....20.....		.....20.....	
Self-designated:	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Leaders	30	5	5	0	30	5	0	0
Followers	35	30	15	80	20	45	25	75
Groups 1 and 2 Combined: N=	.....41.....		.....45.....		.....41.....		.....45.....	
Self-designated:	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Leaders	27	7	9	0	22	5	2	2
Followers	42	24	22	69	32	42	20	76

TABLE I

TOTAL NUMBER AND RANK ORDERING OF SOCIOMETRIC CHOICES AND RESPONDENTS' OFFICIAL STATUS IN THE GROUP - GROUP I					
Respondent No.:	Present or Former Executives		Respondent No.:	Rank and File	
	Total times chosen	Socio- metric rank		Total times chosen	Socio- metric rank
24	66	1	34 <sup>++</sup> ##	17	3
7	7	8	21	8	6.5
41 <sup>++</sup> +	7	9	29	3	14
46 <sup>+</sup> ##	22	2	14	3	14
20+	5	11	23	2	19.5
17	5	10	8 <sup>+</sup> +	2	19.5
27 #	3	14	9	2	19.5
19	8	6.5	40	1	25.5
36	3	14	38	2	19.5
22	16	4	25	2	19.5
15	3	14	44	0	37.5
35 #	9	5	43	0	37.5
30+	1	25.5	42	0	37.5
12+	1	25.5	39	0	37.5
3	2	19.5	33	0	37.5
45	0	37.5	32	0	37.5
37	1	25.5	28	0	37.5
31	0	37.5	18	0	37.5
13	0	37.5	16	0	37.5
6+	0	37.5	11	0	37.5
4+	1	25.5	10	0	37.5
			5	0	37.5
			2	0	37.5
			1	1	25.5
			26	0	37.5

++ Self-designated leader in household marketing

## Self-designated leader in fashions

+ Self-designated "semi-leader" in household marketing

# Self-designated "semi-leader" in fashions

TABLE J

TOTAL NUMBER AND RANK ORDERING OF SOCIOMETRIC CHOICES AND RESPONDENTS' OFFICIAL STATUS IN THE GROUP - GROUP 2					
Respondent No.:	Present or Former Executives		Respondent No.:	Rank and File	
	Total times Chosen	Socio- metric rank		Total times chosen	Socio- metric rank
37 <sup>++</sup> ##	36	1	17	2	15.5
3	9	5.5	28	4	10.5
35+	8	7	8	2	15.5
39 <sup>+</sup> #	14	2	4	1	20
25 <sup>+</sup> #	12	3.5	2	0	31
9 <sup>+</sup> #	5	9	6	0	31
24	4	10.5	7	0	31
38 <sup>+</sup> #	12	3.5	11	0	31
14	7	8	12	0	31
27	2	15.5	15	0	31
32	2	15.5	16	0	31
40 #	9	15.5	18	2	15.5
5	1	20	19	2	15.5
1	0	31	22	0	31
10	0	31	23	0	31
13	0	31	29	1	20
20	0	31	31	0	31
21	3	12	33	0	31
26 <sup>+</sup> #	0	31	34	0	31
30	0	31	36	0	31

++ Self-designated leader in household marketing

## Self-designated leader in fashions

+ Self-designated "semi-leader" in household marketing

++ Self-designated "semi-leader" in fashions

APPENDIX II

QUESTIONNAIRE USED FOR THE RESEARCH

## QUESTIONNAIRE

### Instructions

1. Use a ball point pen or pencil.
2. Please write carefully and legibly.
3. Please do not discuss the questions or your answers with anyone.

### Purpose of the Study

A study of buying patterns regarding household goods, and of public opinion.

### Sponsor of the Research

The research is being carried out under the direction of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology of McGill University.

### How the Information collected is handled

After the questionnaires are completed they will be collected and the material will be transferred to I.B.M. punch cards for tabulation. None of the members of your group will see your questionnaire. It will be given a number and from that point on you will remain anonymous and any information you provide will be treated confidentially.

### Further General Instructions

1. Please give us your frank answers -- remember, nobody in your group will ever see your questionnaire. There is no need for you to provide distorted answers because you feel you might be hurting anyone's feelings.
2. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers. Answer each question so that your answer reflects your actual opinion.
3. IF THERE IS ANYTHING YOU DO NOT UNDERSTAND AS YOU COMPLETE THE QUESTIONNAIRE, PLEASE HOLD UP YOUR HAND AND SAY THAT YOU WANT TO HAVE SOMETHING CLARIFIED. THE RESEARCH SUPERVISOR WILL COME TO YOU AND WILL ANSWER YOUR QUESTION. DO NOT ASK THE QUESTION SO THAT IT WILL BE HEARD BY THE OTHERS IN THE ROOM WITH YOU.

SECTION I

This section deals with certain items which are purchased for household consumption.

INSTANT COFFEE

1. (a) Do you happen to use instant coffee in your home? (TICK OFF APPROPRIATE ANSWER BELOW)

☐ No (SKIP TO Q.2)

☐ Yes →

← ANSWER THE FOLLOWING IF YOU USE INSTANT COFFEE IN YOUR HOME

- (b) Approximately how long is it now that you've been using instant coffee in your home?

\_\_\_\_\_ years

\_\_\_\_\_ months

- (c) Approximately how many cups of instant coffee would you serve in your home during an average day?

\_\_\_\_\_ cups

- (d) What brands of instant coffee do you use at home?

\_\_\_\_\_

ANSWER "e" IF YOU MENTIONED MORE THAN ONE BRAND ABOVE

- (e) Which brand of instant coffee is used most often in your home?

\_\_\_\_\_

- (f) Approximately how long is it now that you have been using the brand of instant coffee that is used most often in your home?

\_\_\_\_\_ weeks/months/years

CAKE MIXES

2. (a) TO BE ANSWERED BY EVERYONE

Do you happen to use cake mixes in your home?

( ) No (SKIP TO Q.3)

( ) Yes 

 ANSWER THE FOLLOWING IF YOU USE CAKE MIXES IN YOUR HOME

- (b) Approximately how long is it now that you've been using cake mixes in your home?

\_\_\_\_\_ years

\_\_\_\_\_ months

- (c) Approximately how many single cakes would you make in your home during an average month using packaged cake mixes?  
(COUNT LAYER CAKES AS 2 SINGLE CAKES)

\_\_\_\_\_ cakes made from cake mix during an average month

- (d) What brand or brands of cake mix do you use at home?

\_\_\_\_\_

ANSWER "e" IF YOU MENTIONED MORE THAN ONE BRAND ABOVE

- (e) What brand of cake mix do you use most often in your home?

\_\_\_\_\_

- (f) Approximately how long is it now that you have been using the brand of cake mix that is used most often in your home?

\_\_\_\_\_ years

\_\_\_\_\_ months

FROZEN DINNERS

3.

(a)

TO BE ANSWERED BY EVERYONE

Do you happen to use frozen dinners in your home?

( ) No (SKIP TO Q.4)

( ) Yes

ANSWER THE FOLLOWING IF YOU USE FROZEN DINNERS IN YOUR HOME

- (b) Approximately how long is it now that you've been using frozen dinners in your home?

\_\_\_\_\_ years

\_\_\_\_\_ months

- (c) Approximately how many packages of frozen dinner would you use in your home during an average month?

\_\_\_\_\_ packages

- (d) What brand or brands of frozen dinners do you use at home?

\_\_\_\_\_

ANSWER "e" IF YOU MENTIONED MORE THAN ONE BRAND ABOVE

- (e) What brand of frozen dinner do you use most often in your home?

\_\_\_\_\_

- (f) Approximately how long is it now that you have been using the brand of frozen dinners that is used most often in your home?

\_\_\_\_\_ years

\_\_\_\_\_ months

GENERAL QUESTIONS ABOUT PRODUCTS CONSUMED IN THE HOME

4.

TO BE ANSWERED BY EVERYONE

Thinking about products consumed in the home such as instant coffee, cake mixes, frozen dinners and so on; which woman or women in your group do you consider to be particularly knowledgeable in this regard? In other words, which woman or women do you think would be particularly good at judging whether such products or brands are good or poor? (LIST THE NAMES AND PROVIDE FIRST NAMES OR INITIALS AS WELL AS SURNAMES. LIST AS MANY OR AS FEW WOMEN AS YOU FEEL ARE APPROPRIATE)

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

5.

TO BE ANSWERED BY EVERYONE

Let's suppose for a moment that you had just decided to change brands of some product consumed in the home, such as the ones we've been talking about. Let's also suppose that you weren't sure of what new brand to use. Which woman or women in your group would you be most likely to go for advice about what brand to buy? (LIST THE NAMES OF WOMEN YOU WOULD BE LIKELY TO GO TO BELOW. PLEASE PRINT THE NAMES AND PROVIDE FIRST NAMES OR INITIALS AS WELL AS SURNAMES. LIST AS MANY OR AS FEW NAMES AS YOU FEEL ARE APPROPRIATE)

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

6.

TO BE ANSWERED BY EVERYONE

When women get together in a group, such as this one, what some women do is more likely to be copied than what others do. Thinking of the women in this group, which one or which ones do you think would be most likely to be copied in regard to their use of products that are consumed in the home? (LIST THE NAMES OF WOMEN YOU THINK WOULD BE MOST LIKELY TO BE COPIED. PLEASE PRINT THE NAMES AND PROVIDE FIRST NAMES OR INITIALS AS WELL AS SURNAMES. LIST AS MANY OR AS FEW NAMES AS YOU FEEL ARE APPROPRIATE)

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

7.

TO BE ANSWERED BY EVERYONE

Have you recently been asked for advice by any members of this group concerning the use of products for the home such as instant coffee, cake mixes or frozen dinners? (TICK OFF APPROPRIATE ANSWER BELOW)

( ) YES

( ) NO

8.

TO BE ANSWERED BY EVERYONE

Compared with the other women in this group, are you more or less likely to be asked for advice about the use of products for the home such as instant coffee, cake mixes or frozen dinners? (TICK OFF APPROPRIATE ANSWER BELOW)

( ) I am more likely than the others to be asked for advice about products for the home

( ) I am less likely than the others to be asked for advice about products for the home

SECTION 2

This section deals with questions about women's fashions .

FASHIONS

1. (a) TO BE ANSWERED BY EVERYONE

Would you please check off below the answer that best describes the length that you presently wear your skirts or dresses?  
(Do not consider cocktail dresses or evening gowns)

- ☐ above the knee  
☐ just covering the knee  
☐ below the knee

- (b) TO BE ANSWERED BY EVERYONE

Exactly how long is it now that you have been wearing your skirts or dresses at that length?  
\_\_\_\_\_

2. (a) TO BE ANSWERED BY EVERYONE

As you probably know, there are several toe styles available in women's shoes today. Which of the styles below do you now wear for going out?

- ☐ pointed toes  
☐ round toes  
☐ square toes

- (b) TO BE ANSWERED BY EVERYONE

For how long is it now that you have been wearing this toe style for going out?  
\_\_\_\_\_

3. (a) TO BE ANSWERED BY EVERYONE

Which of the categories below best describes the size of the heel on the shoes you use most often for going out?

- ☐ high (about 2½ inches)  
☐ medium (about 1½ inches)  
☐ low (about ¾ inch to 1 inch)  
☐ flat

- (b) TO BE ANSWERED BY EVERYONE

For how long is it now that you have been wearing this size of heel for going out?  
\_\_\_\_\_

4. **TO BE ANSWERED BY EVERYONE**

Let's talk about women's fashions in general now. Thinking only of the women who belong to this group with you, which woman or women do you think are most knowledgeable about current women's fashions? (PLEASE PRINT THE NAMES AND PROVIDE FIRST NAMES OR INITIALS AS WELL AS SURNAMES. LIST AS MANY OR AS FEW NAMES AS YOU FEEL ARE APPROPRIATE)

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

5. **TO BE ANSWERED BY EVERYONE**

If you wanted some advice about women's fashions, to which woman or women in your group would you be most likely to go? (PLEASE PRINT NAMES AND PROVIDE FIRST NAMES OR INITIALS AS WELL AS SURNAMES. LIST AS MANY OR AS FEW NAMES AS YOU FEEL ARE APPROPRIATE)

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

6. **TO BE ANSWERED BY EVERYONE**

In a group such as this, some women are more likely to set the trends in women's fashions than are others. Which woman or women in this group do you think would be more likely to set the fashion trends for the other women in the group? (PLEASE PRINT THE NAMES AND PROVIDE FIRST NAMES OR INITIALS AS WELL AS SURNAMES. LIST AS MANY OR AS FEW NAMES AS YOU FEEL ARE APPROPRIATE)

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

7. **TO BE ANSWERED BY EVERYONE**

Have you recently been asked for advice by any members of this group regarding women's fashions?

☐ YES

☐ NO

8. **TO BE ANSWERED BY EVERYONE**

Compared with the other women in this group, are you more or less likely to be asked for advice regarding women's fashions?

☐ I am more likely than others to be asked for advice about women's fashions

☐ I am less likely than others to be asked for advice about women's fashions

SECTION 3  
GENERAL QUESTIONS

1. Name \_\_\_\_\_ Christian name(s) \_\_\_\_\_  
(PLEASE PRINT)

2. Address \_\_\_\_\_ City \_\_\_\_\_ Prov \_\_\_\_\_  
(PLEASE PRINT)

3. How long have you been living at this address? \_\_\_\_\_ years

4. Marital status:                      ☐ Single  
   ☒ Married  
   ☐ Widowed  
   ☐ Divorced or separated

5. (IF MARRIED) For how long have you been married? \_\_\_\_\_ years

6. If you are not single, would you list below the ages of each of your children, if you have any?  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

7. Into which of the following age groups do you fit?

☐ Under 25  
☐ 25 - 34  
☐ 35 - 45  
☐ 46 or over

8. What was the last grade of school you attended?

☐ Some elementary school  
☐ Completed elementary school  
☐ Some high school  
☐ Completed high school  
☐ Some university  
☐ Completed university

(INDICATE DEGREE OBTAINED) \_\_\_\_\_

9. Your occupation \_\_\_\_\_

10. Occupation of the major wage earner in your household -- if not yourself  
\_\_\_\_\_

11. a) Is your home rented or do you own it?

☐ Rented

☐ Owned

→ SKIP TO Q.12

IF RENTED

b) Do you rent it furnished or unfurnished?

☐ Furnished

☐ Unfurnished

12. If you own your own home, please tick off the category below which indicates the current market value of your home.

☐ Under \$12,000  
☐ \$12,000 - \$19,999  
☐ \$20,000 - \$29,999  
☐ \$30,000 or over

13. If your home is rented, please tick off the category below that corresponds with the monthly rent you pay.

☐ \$59.00 or less  
☐ \$60.00 - \$74.99  
☐ \$75.00 - \$89.99  
☐ \$90.00 - \$104.99  
☐ \$105.00 - \$119.99  
☐ \$120.00 - \$134.99  
☐ \$135.00 - \$149.99  
☐ \$150.00 or more

14. (a) Do you presently hold any official position in this club ?

☐ NO

☐ YES

(b) (IF POSITION HELD) What official position do you now hold?

\_\_\_\_\_

(c) (IF POSITION NOW HELD) For how long have you held this position?

From \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_

15. (a) Did you ever in the past hold any official position in this club?

☐ NO

☐ YES

SKIP TO Q. 16

(b) (IF POSITION FORMERLY HELD; LIST EACH BELOW AND SUPPLY THE RELEVANT INFORMATION)

Positions formerly held

From (date)

To (date)

_____	_____ 19 _____	_____ 19 _____
_____	_____ 19 _____	_____ 19 _____
_____	_____ 19 _____	_____ 19 _____
_____	_____ 19 _____	_____ 19 _____

16. How long is it now since you became a member of this group?

\_\_\_\_\_

17. What organizations, clubs or discussion groups do you belong to -- where current issues are discussed, books read, speakers heard, or where people just get together to talk, play cards, etc.? (LIST NAMES BELOW)

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

18. Not counting relatives, in-laws, present neighbours, or former neighbours, how many friends do you have with whom you talk fairly often?

\_\_\_\_\_ (NUMBER OF FRIENDS WITH WHOM TALK FAIRLY  
OFTEN NOT INCLUDING RELATIVES; PRESENT  
OR FORMER NEIGHBOURS)

19. How many meetings and social functions of this group would you guess you've attended during the past year?

\_\_\_\_\_

20. (a) Do you ever see any of the women who belong to this group anywhere outside the group itself, or do you ever talk to any of them on the telephone?

( ) YES

( ) NO

- (b) (IF YOU SEE OR SPEAK TO SOME OF THE MEMBERS OUTSIDE OF THE GROUP GATHERINGS) Would you please list the names of members of the group whom you see outside or speak to on the telephone (PLEASE PRINT NAMES BELOW)

- (c) For each member of the group that you see or speak to outside, would you please guess the average number of hours you might spend with each during an average week, apart from group activities?  
(PLEASE INCLUDE TIME SPENT ON THE TELEPHONE AS WELL)

Members seen (spoken to) from the  
group  
(PLEASE PRINT NAMES)

Average number of hours per week spent  
with each in person or on telephone  
(NOT INCLUDING GROUP ACTIVITIES)

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_, 1967.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Asch, S.E., "Effects on Group Pressure Upon the Modification and Distortion of Judgments," Swanson, Newcomb, Hartley et al, eds., Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1952, pp. 2-11.
- Back, Kurt W., "Influence Through Social Communication," Swanson, Newcomb, Hartley et al, eds., Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1952, pp. 445-59.
- Berelson, Bernard, Lazarsfeld, Paul F., and McPhee, William M., Voting. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1950.
- Berenda, Ruth W., The Influence of the Group on the Judgments of Children. New York: Columbia University Press, 1950.
- Bogardus, Emory S., "The Occupational Attitude," Journal of Applied Sociology, Vol. VIII (January-February, 1924), p. 175.
- Bourne, Francis S., "Group Influence in Marketing and Public Relations," Likert and Hayes, eds., Some Applications of Behavioral Research. Paris, France: UNESCO, 1957, pp. 207-257.
- Carter, Roy E., Jr., and Clarke, Peter, "Public Affairs Leadership Among Educational Television Viewers," American Sociological Review, Vol. XXVII, No. 6 (December, 1962), pp. 792-99.
- Cooley, C.H., Social Organization. New York: Charles Scribners Sons, 1909.
- Dittes, J.E., and Kelley, H.H., "Effects of Different Conditions of Acceptance Upon Conformity to Group Norms," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. LIII (1956), pp. 100-107.
- Foster, George M., Traditional Cultures and the Impact of Technological Change. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962.
- Hartley, Eugene L., "The Social Psychology of Opinion Formation," Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. XIV (Winter, 1950-51), pp. 668-74.

Bibliography (Continued)

Katz, Elihu, and Lazarsfeld, Paul F., Personal Influence. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955.

Katz, Elihu, "The Two Step Flow of Communication," Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. XXI, No. 1 (1957), pp. 60-65.

Lazarsfeld, Paul F., Berelson, Bernard, and Gaudet, Hazel, The People's Choice. New York: Columbia University Press, 1948.

Lewin, Kurt, and Grabbe, Paul, "Conduct, Knowledge and Acceptance of New Values," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 1 No. 3, pp. 53-64.

Lewin, Kurt, "Group Decision and Social Change," Swanson, Newcomb, Hartley et al, eds., Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1952, pp. 459-73.

Lipsky, Abram, Man the Puppet. New York: Frank Maurice Inc., 1925.

Menzel and Katz, The Epidemiology of a New Drug. New York: Publication A190 of the Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University Press, 1956.

Merton, Robert K., and Pitt, Alice, "Contributions to the Theory of Reference Group Behavior," Merton and Lazarsfeld, eds., Continuities in Social Research. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955.

Merton, Robert K., "Patterns of Influence," Lazarsfeld and Stanton, eds., Communications Research - 1948-49. New York: Harper and Bros., 1949, pp. 180-219.

Newcomb, Theodore M., "Attitude Development as a Function of Reference Groups: The Benington Study," Swanson, Newcomb, Hartley et al, eds., Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1952, pp. 420-30.

Opinion Research Corporation, America's Tastemakers. Princeton, New Jersey: Project 463-B, The Public Opinion Index for Industry, April, 1959.

Bibliography (Continued)

- Roethlisberger, F.J., and Dickson, W.J., Management and the Worker. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1952.
- Rogers, Everett M., Diffusion of Innovations. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1962.
- Sanford, Fillmore H., "The Psychology of Military Leadership," Denis Wayne, ed., Psychology in the World Emergency. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1952.
- Sherif, Mazafer, "Group Influences Upon the Formation of Norms and Attitudes," Swanson, Newcomb, Hartley et al, eds., Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1952, pp.249-262.
- Shils, Edward A., "Primary Groups in the American Army," Lerner and Laswell, eds., The Policy Sciences. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1951.
- Stouffer, Samuel A., et al, The American Soldier: Studies in Social Psychology in World War II. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1949.