ABSTRACT


In the two studies comprising this dissertation research, the French and Raven (1959) and Raven (1965, 1992, 1993) social power rubric was applied to study school psychological consultation. The first study addressed how likely consultants would be to use the social power bases, while the second study addressed the acceptability of a subset of these social power bases. In each study, 1,000 Nationally Certified School Psychologists (NCSPs) were mailed corresponding forms of a modified Interpersonal Power Inventory (IPI) In Study 1, the IPI was modified to measure the likelihood of use in a psychological consultant/teacher dyad, and in Study 2, the IPI was modified to measure the acceptability of the power bases in a psychological consultant/teacher dyad. Results from Study 1 indicated that Raven’s (1992) social power bases can be divided into soft and harsh categories. Results further indicated that psychologists are more likely to use soft power bases than harsh power bases. In Study 2, the acceptability of the following six social power bases was addressed: direct informational, positive expert, positive referent, personal reward, legitimate position, and legitimate dependence power. Results indicated that psychological consultants view these power bases as differentially acceptable. Psychologists rated positive referent power as more acceptable than legitimate dependence, legitimate position, positive expert, and direct informational power. Psychologists also rated direct information as more acceptable than legitimate dependence, legitimate position, and positive expert power. Finally, psychologists rated legitimate dependence power as more acceptable than positive expert and personal reward power.
power. Taken in their entirety, these dissertation studies reinforce the relevance and applicability of social power to the study of psychological consultation. Consultants are not only more likely to use soft power bases, but also report they find positive referent and direct information more acceptable within the psychologist/teacher dyad. These findings also support the notion that consultation is a complex interaction in which a consultant is able to select certain influence strategies over others based upon their likelihood of use and acceptability.
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Introduction

A primary function of school psychologists is to provide psychological services to both educators and students (Fagan & Wise, 1994), but exactly how school psychologists should provide these services is debatable. For example, Bradley-Johnson, Johnson, and Jacob-Timm (1995) suggested that school psychologists should focus attention on improving student-centered services as a way to better serve the student population. However, Conoley and Gutkin (1995) suggested that school psychologists should take a broader, ecological perspective in order to better serve the student population. These authors argued that, from this perspective, school psychologists’ ability to influence other adults is of primary importance, as this will enable them to positively affect the educational lives of many more students (Conoley & Gutkin, 1995).

Offering, and actively engaging in, consultation services is but one way for school psychologists to achieve this broadened perspective. At its core, consultation falls under the indirect service paradigm, which allows the school psychologist to help more students. Although the focus of consultation may be on a particular client or student case, consultation is an intervention that is preventative in nature because the consultant can empower the consultee to recognize and effectively address similar student situations in the future.

In addition to being a preventatively oriented intervention, consultation is commonly practiced within the school setting (Costenbader, Swartz, & Petrix, 1992), is a service that many school psychologists prefer to engage in (Costenbader et al., 1992), has been found to be an effective means to address and ameliorate a wide range of educational concerns (Sheridan, Welch, & Orme, 1996), and is commonly viewed as an exercise in interpersonal
influence (O’Keefe & Medway, 1997). Given the importance of consultation (e.g., it is effective and a preferred function), it is necessary for trainers, students, and practitioners to have a more complete understanding of the processes behind successful consultation experiences.

One such way to gain a more complete understanding of consultation is to examine the interpersonal influence processes that underlie consultation. French and Raven (1959) and Raven (1965, 1992, 1993) have provided a means to explore these processes with the explication of social power bases and introduction of the Power/Interaction Model of Interpersonal Influence. These constructs were first applied in social, organizational, and business psychology, but they have been found to be equally relevant to the field of school psychology and to consultation in particular (e.g., Erchul & Raven, 1997; Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001; Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001; Erchul, Raven, & Wilson, 2004; Martin, 1978).

The research that relates most directly to social power and school psychological consultation has focused on the perceived effectiveness of the various social power bases (Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001; Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001; Erchul et al., 2004). This research has advanced three major conclusions. The first, and most general, is that school psychologist consultants view soft power bases as more effective in bringing about compliance than harsh power bases. The soft power bases include positive expert, positive referent, direct information, legitimate dependence, and personal reward, while the harsh bases include legitimate equity, legitimate position, legitimate reciprocity, impersonal reward, impersonal coercion, personal correction. Researchers have viewed soft power bases
as being subtle and harsh bases as being overt or heavy-handed (Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001). The second finding suggests that school psychologist consultants view direct informational, positive expert, and positive referent power as effective in leading to teacher compliance. The final finding relates to gender differences, and suggests that female consultants view soft power bases as being more effective in leading to teacher compliance.

As previously mentioned, much of the available social power and school consultation research has focused solely on the construct of perceived effectiveness. Despite this singular focus, there are other constructs that appear equally important to furthering the understanding of social power’s role within consultation. Two of these are “likelihood of use” and “acceptability.” Because previous intervention research has indicated there are hypothesized links between effectiveness, likelihood of use, and acceptability (e.g., Kratochwill & Stoiber, 2000; Von Brock & Elliott, 1987), it seems logical to proceed to address practitioner perceptions of likelihood of use and acceptability of social power bases within school consultation.

The purpose of this dissertation research was to examine two constructs new to the social power literature. More specifically, the two studies to be described focused on the variables of likelihood of use and acceptability of considerations drawn from Raven’s (1992, 1993) social power bases as applied to school consultation. In addition to the social power bases, the two constructs (i.e., likelihood of use and acceptability) were related to aspects of Raven’s (1992, 1993) Power/Interaction Model of Interpersonal Influence. Particular attention was paid to the soft and harsh power base groupings as well as the individual social power bases.
Following the presentation of relevant literature, the research is described and results are analyzed and discussed. It is hoped that the results of this dissertation research will contribute to the extant social power/school consultation literature. Up to this point, the entirety of the empirical research and theoretical writing in this area has focused solely on issues of effectiveness. By extending research into the areas of likelihood of use and acceptability, school psychology students, trainers, and practitioners will gain a more complete understanding of how social power can influence and inform the practice of school consultation.
Review of the Literature

This literature review will address several topics related to the practice of school psychology, ranging from consultation to social power to social validity. The first section of the literature review defines the three types of consultation models typically found within the school system. The second section examines the interpersonal influence process and how the construct of social power (Raven 1992, 1993) can be used to further the understanding of interpersonal influence. The third section provides a description of the Interpersonal Power Inventory (IPI), a critical-incident instrument designed to assess perceptions of social power. This section discusses several empirical studies that all serve to validate the IPI as a useful and reliable instrument in industrial-organizational psychology and school psychology contexts. The fourth section addresses how one’s gender can impact perceptions of social power and use of language. The fifth section presents the construct of social validity and how it relates to the variables of treatment acceptability, treatment implementation/use, treatment integrity, and treatment effectiveness. The sixth and final section of literature review discusses Witt and Elliott’s (1985) model of treatment acceptability and how it relates to social validity and the variables of treatment acceptability, treatment implementation/use, treatment integrity, and treatment effectiveness. The entire literature review provides the rationale for this dissertation research and its focus on the likelihood of use and acceptability of Raven’s (1992, 1993) social power bases within school consultation.
According to Gutkin and Conoley (1990), the role of school psychologists must evolve in order for the field to meet the many and changing needs of today’s school-aged children. Although the field of school psychology has enormous potential, many practitioners are required only to assess and assign diagnostic labels to children. In Gutkin and Conoley’s (1990) view, this is an inefficient model of practice. In order for the field to positively impact the lives of children, school psychologists must not only recognize but embrace the relevance of the “paradox of school psychology” (Gutkin & Conoley, 1990). This paradox states that in order for school psychologists to better assist school-aged children, they must maximize their ability to work well with other adults.

The “paradox of school psychology” provides an alternative means to conceptualize the difference between direct and indirect services that school psychologists are able to offer. Direct services are those in which the practitioner works with clients in a one-to-one relationship or on a group basis (Gutkin & Conoley, 1990; Gutkin & Curtis, 1999). Two common examples of this type of service are the refer-test-place paradigm and individual psychotherapy. In contrast, indirect services require that school psychologists interact with other adults/caregivers and ultimately, it is these individuals who work directly with the client. This situation places the school psychologist in a consultative and empowerment role rather than a strictly diagnostic role. Within the indirect service model, the school psychologist’s main function is to enable other adults/caregivers to care effectively for students, thus allowing them to assist more students in a time-efficient manner (Gutkin & Conoley, 1990; Gutkin & Curtis, 1999). This potential exists because the consultees, be they
teachers, parents, or school administrators, can take the knowledge gained from meetings with the school psychologist and apply it to different situations involving other students.

In large part, the effectiveness of indirect services hinges upon the quality of interaction between the school psychologist and the other adult/caregiver (Conoley & Gutkin, 1986). Because indirect services take place between two or more adults, such services essentially become an exercise in interpersonal influence (Conoley & Gutkin, 1986). The ability of the school psychologist to successfully influence the behavior of another adult becomes paramount, and this will be discussed in further detail later in the literature review.

Consultation

Generally speaking, consultation is an indirect service in which all school psychologists are trained and one that school psychologists prefer (Costenbader, Swartz, & Petrix, 1992). A generic definition of consultation could be a process that occurs between two professionals where the ultimate goal is to help a third party (i.e., the client) (Caplan, 1970). However, consultation is too complex a topic to be reduced to such a simplistic definition, and Medway’s (1979) definition is more informative. He defined consultation as a “collaborative problem solving process between a mental health specialist (the consultant) and one or more persons (the consultees) who are responsible for providing some form of psychological assistance to another (the client)” (p. 279). In consultation, the consultant is often viewed as an expert in a particular area while the consultee is often viewed as an individual who sees his or her work-related difficulty as falling within the realm of the consultant’s expertise (Caplan, 1970; Erchul & Martens, 2002). The consultative relationship is also triadic, work-related, and voluntary (Kurpius & Fuqua, 1993). Typically in school
consultation, the consultant is the school psychologist and the consultee is a teacher, but school administrators and parents may also be consultees. Invariably in school consultation, the client is a student or a group of students.

Implicit in each of these definitions are the two primary goals of consultation. The first goal is to remediate the presenting problem, and the second is to help the consultee function more effectively in the future (Gutkin & Curtis, 1999). In order to achieve these dual goals of consultation, the consultant and consultee meet on multiple occasions, and it is during these meetings that the consultant helps guide the consultee through the problem-solving process (Erchul & Martens, 2002). Therefore, the ultimate purpose of consultation is to address the presenting problem while at the same time providing the consultee with the skills to function independently in the future. Having presented the general purpose and goals of consultation, it is necessary to define the three major models of consultation commonly practiced within the school setting: mental health consultation, organizational consultation, and behavioral consultation (Reschly, 1976).

*Mental health consultation.* The first model of consultation is mental health consultation (MHC), a model closely associated with the writings of Gerald Caplan (Caplan, Caplan, & Erchul, 1994). In his early writings, Caplan (1970) defined MHC as occurring between two professionals. One professional, the consultee, seeks assistance from a consultant in solving a work-related problem. The work-related difficulty invariably involves a third party (i.e., the client), and the consultee views the difficulty as falling in the consultant’s area of expertise (Caplan, 1970). In addition to these major defining characteristics, there are several secondary defining characteristics. For example, in MHC,
the consultee is not obligated to accept the consultant’s advice and the consultant is not to be
held responsible for client outcomes. On a final note, Caplan (1970) emphasized the
preventative nature of MHC as well as the inherent differences in MHC and other
interpersonal relationships (e.g., supervision, psychotherapy).

Caplan (1970) subdivided MHC into four separate categories according to the various
goals a consultant could potentially address: (a) client-centered case consultation, (b)
consultee-centered case consultation, (c) program-centered administrative consultation, and
(d) consultee-centered administrative consultation. One way to distinguish between these
four categories is to determine the level of the problem. A problem can exist at the level of a
particular case or client or at the level of an entire program. A second way to differentiate is
by determining whether the solution focuses on providing specific suggestions or improving
general problem-solving skills.

In client-centered case consultation, the focus of the problem centers on the
consultee’s difficulties in effectively addressing a particular case involving the client. The
consultant’s primary goal is to assist the consultee in finding the most effective treatment for
the given client. However, in consultee-centered case consultation, the consultant focuses
more on the consultee and not the individual client. By focusing on the consultee, there is an
increased opportunity for the preventative aspects of MHC to take hold. Specifically, the
consultant aids the consultee in recognizing distortions that can interfere with his/her ability
to effectively work with any client. Caplan (1970) posited that there are four possible
explanations for a consultee’s inability to work well with a client: lack of understanding or
knowledge about the presenting problem, general lack of skill in effectively addressing the
concern, lack of self-confidence in one’s ability to effectively address the issue, and lack of professional objectivity.

Program-centered administrative consultation centers on difficulties in effectively administering or offering a specific mental health program to a specific population. The problem may be specific to any aspect of the program itself, and so this could include program planning or training of workers. The final category of MHC is consultee-centered administrative consultation. Here the consultant attempts to help consultees improve upon their ability to solve and anticipate difficulties when planning and developing assistance programs.

Organizational consultation. The second model of consultation relevant to the practice of school psychology is organizational consultation. Although organizational consultation has a larger scope, its ultimate aim is still to aid students (Gutkin & Curtis, 1999; Zins & Erchul, 1995). In organizational consultation, problems may stem from several areas of the organization, but often there is a lack or mismatch of technology (Gallessich, 1982). This could be as simple as a lack of communication between teacher and upper-level administrators, or as complicated as poor morale due to overly restrictive and repetitive bureaucratic requirements. Given these two scenarios, the general goal of consultation would be to increase productivity and morale, and this could be accomplished in several ways. If the situation resulted from poor communication, the consultant could try to improve the communication network within the school by developing faculty and administrator group meetings. On the other hand, if poor productivity were due to low morale stemming from
questionable bureaucratic requirements, the consultant could overhaul the present reporting procedures.

The methods by which an organizational consultant could enact change fall into three categories (Gallessich, 1982). First, the consultant could help initiate a change in the organization and ensure that the change is accepted, understood, and works well. Second, the consultant could train others on how to use the new technology. Finally, the consultant could provide assistance or support when requested to do so.

In organizational consultation, there are several domains on which the consultant may focus (Gallessich, 1982). The consultant can focus on the staff members or workers within the organization (e.g., increasing knowledge through training), the programs offered by the organization (e.g., designing or modifying them), or the functioning of the organization in general (e.g., increasing communication among staff members). An example of this type of consultation could be a consultant disseminating new information regarding interventions for students with reading difficulties to all teachers in an in-service education program.

**Behavioral consultation.** The third model of consultation commonly found in schools is behavioral consultation (Costenbader et al., 1992). In behavioral consultation, the consultant typically views the problem as arising from some sort of dysfunctional or inappropriate behavior. An example is a child who always interrupts the teacher during instructional time. In this case, the goal of consultation would be to reduce the number of times the student interrupts, and to increase the number of times the student raises his/her hand to answer or ask a question during instructional time. In order to make a positive change in the client’s behavior, the consultant and consultee first must define the problem
behavior before agreeing to address it. Typically, the two parties come to a shared agreement on how to address the problem and the consultant helps the consultee by describing how to correctly implement the mutually agreed upon intervention (Erchul & Martens, 2002).

Behavioral consultation, by its nature, is quite specific because it is a byproduct of behavior modification and applied behavior analysis techniques (Martens, 1993). Here, the consultant follows a systematic approach comprised of four steps (Kratochwill & Bergan, 1990). In the first step, problem identification, the consultant helps the consultee, typically a teacher, identify and define the presenting problem, gather estimates of behavior frequency, and begin baseline data collection. In the second step, problem analysis, the two parties use data that were collected to establish treatment goals. The consultant and consultee both hypothesize about antecedents and consequences that potentially could be working to maintain the target behavior. The two also design a plan to intervene. In the third stage, treatment implementation, the consultee carries out the intervention, while the consultant periodically checks in to ensure that the plan is being implemented with integrity. In the final stage, treatment evaluation, the two parties examine the effectiveness of the intervention program by comparing baseline data to the data that have been collected throughout intervention implementation (Kratochwill & Bergan, 1990).

Summary. Consultation is a common activity in which school psychologists participate. There are three major models of consultation practiced in the school setting (Reschly, 1976). A school psychologist engaged in any one of the three models has the potential to impact more children than would be possible if the psychologist were engaged in direct service activities. Because consultation has the potential to be a powerful
method of intervention, it is imperative to understand the processes that lead to effective consultation outcomes. Examining available influence tactics drawn from social power bases, their likelihood of use, and their acceptability is one way to accomplish this goal.

*The Influence Process and Social Power*

According to Erchul (1999), consultation is an exercise in interpersonal influence. Examining interpersonal influence is a difficult task at best, and Raven’s (1992, 1993) Power/Interaction Model of Interpersonal Influence offers an accepted lens through which to examine this complex process. This model has been used to study a wide array of interpersonal interactions ranging from salesmen and customers to children attempting to influence other children (Raven, 1992).

Before delving into the details of Raven’s (1992, 1993) model, it is necessary to differentiate between the constructs of social power and social influence. *Social power* is the potential for influence, whereas *social influence* is the actual change in the beliefs, attitudes, and/or behavior of another. Generally speaking, in social power base research, one is attempting to determine what basis of influence an individual may draw from (i.e., has the potential to use), rather than how s/he actually attempted to influence another.

*Social Power*

In the following sections, the definitions of the individual social power bases will be provided along with a discussion of the development of the Power/Interaction Model of Interpersonal Influence (Raven, 1992, 1993). Particular attention will be paid to the section of Raven’s model in which he discusses how an individual assesses the availability of the
social power bases. It is here that a consideration of variables such as likelihood of use and acceptability of the power bases is particularly relevant.

As noted, social power is defined as the potential of an agent to exert influence over a target, and social influence is the successful implementation of this potential (French & Raven, 1959). In the case of social power, the agent is the individual engaged in an attempt to influence, and the target is the individual whom the agent is attempting to influence. For an agent to be successful (i.e., influential), the target must accept the agent’s attempts at influence. It is important to note that perceptions of social power, and not just the agent’s overt attempts at drawing from a particular power base, are both important to social power research.

Definitions of the original five power bases. The French and Raven bases of social power have undergone three major revisions (i.e., French & Raven, 1959; Raven, 1965, 1992). In their original paper, French and Raven (1959) defined five social power bases from which an agent could draw. These five power bases are: expert, referent, coercive, reward, and legitimate power. In expert power, the target attributes superior knowledge or ability to the agent in a particular field, and complies with the agent because s/he is perceived to know more than the target. In referent power, the target follows the lead of the agent because the target sees the agent in a desirable, positive light and/or feels a need to be similar to the agent. In this instance, the target complies because s/he identifies with the agent in some significant way. If an agent attempts to utilize coercive power, s/he needs to make the target believe that s/he has the ability to somehow punish the target for noncompliance. Reward power is the exact opposite of coercive power. Here the target complies because s/he feels
that the agent will be able to provide a reward or positive experience contingent upon compliance. The final power base specified by French & Raven (1959) is *legitimate* power. When a target attributes legitimate power to an agent, s/he complies with a request because the agent occupies a position of authority over him/her, and therefore has a legitimate reason to request compliance.

*First expansion of social power bases.* Six years after the publication of the French and Raven (1959) social power definitions, Raven (1965) differentiated *informational* power from *expert* power. In the original typology, informational power was considered a subtype of expert power. Although the two bases are related, they are different enough to warrant the delineation. When a target decides to comply with an agent based on informational power, s/he comes to this decision by listening to the logical argument presented within the agent’s message. However, when a target complies due to the agent’s expert power, s/he is complying not because of the agent’s argument, but simply because the agent is viewed as an expert.

*Later expansion of the social power bases.* In the most recent revision, Raven (1992) expanded the typology by further differentiating the power bases. First, expert and referent power bases were divided into positive and negative forms. Reward and coercive power bases were divided into distinct impersonal and personal forms. Informational power was also split into direct and indirect forms. Legitimate power received the most attention and was further subdivided into four separate forms: formal legitimate, legitimate reciprocity, legitimate equity, and legitimate dependence. These 14 power bases are defined in Table 1.
Table 1


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Power Base</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Expert</td>
<td>Target complies because the agent is an expert in the field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Expert</td>
<td>Target does not comply because s/he assumes that the agent is thinking of his/her own best interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Referent</td>
<td>Target complies because s/he wants to be associated with or be viewed as similar to the agent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Referent</td>
<td>Target does not comply because s/he does not want to be associated with or be similar to the agent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal Reward</td>
<td>Target complies because s/he perceives that the agent can provide a tangible reward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Reward</td>
<td>Target complies because s/he believes the agent will approve or like him/her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal Coercion</td>
<td>Target complies because s/he perceives that the agent has the power to punish him/her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Coercion</td>
<td>Target complies because s/he believes that the agent will disapprove or dislike him/her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Informational</td>
<td>Target complies because the information provided by the agent makes logical sense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Informational</td>
<td>The target complies because s/he hears from another source how well a particular course of action worked in a similar situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate Position</td>
<td>Target complies because the agent holds a position of authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimacy of Reciprocity</td>
<td>The target complies after the agent has done something positive for the target. The target feels a need to reciprocate this prior good deed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimacy of Equity</td>
<td>The target complies as a way to compensate for prior hard work or suffering on the part of the agent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimacy of Dependence</td>
<td>Target complies because the agent is unable to do it himself or herself.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Power/interaction model of interpersonal influence. Raven’s (1992, 1993) comprehensive model of social power and interpersonal influence encompasses several aspects in addition to the 14 social power bases. This model follows, from the agent’s perspective, the entirety of an influence attempt. This model can been seen in Figure 1. First, the agent has to be motivated to influence another individual. Individual motivation can vary from an intrapersonal desire to benefit to the desire to satisfy internal self-esteem needs. Second, the agent assesses which of the social power bases are available to him/her. Third, the agent must logically and rationally assess the positives and negatives associated with each power base. Naturally, just because a power base is potentially available to an agent does not mean that it would be an appropriate means of influence. The fourth step involves the preparations that any agent must pass through before attempting an actual influence attempt. Two examples are preparing the target for the attempt and explicitly emphasizing specific aspects of one’s own power. The fifth step occurs once the agent has selected a power base or bases, and has made an overt attempt to influence the target. The sixth, and final step, in Raven’s (1992, 1993) model involves the evaluation of the influence attempt. Was the attempt successful, was the attempt unsuccessful, was the attempt only partially successful? Depending upon the evaluation, the agent may elect to recycle back through some of the previous steps in the process.

Although the variables of perceived effectiveness, acceptability, and likelihood of use are not explicitly mentioned in Raven’s (1992, 1993) model, they conceivably could be placed in the third step of the process. During the cost/benefit analysis, the consideration of variables such as effectiveness, acceptability, and likelihood of use is logical. Perceived

**Assessment of Available Power Bases**
1. Reward resources.
2. Coercive resources.
3. Legitimacy.
4. Expertise.
5. Reference (identification).
6. Information
7. Manipulation possibilities
8. Indirect influence possibilities

**Preparing for Influence Attempts**
1. Setting stage or scene.
2. Enhancing/Emphasizing power bases.
3. “Softening up” target.
4. Others.

**Motivation to Influence**
1. Attain extrinsic goals.
2. Satisfy internal needs-power, status, security, self-esteem.
3. Role requirements, higher authority.
4. Motivation of the influence-desire to benefit or harm.
5. Desired status in the eyes of self, target, third parties.

**Choice of Power Bases,**

**Influence Attempt: Choice of Mode**

**Assessment of Available Bases in Relation to Target, Power, Preference, and Inhibitions**
1. Costs and effects.
2. Secondary gains and losses.
3. Norms and values.
5. Time perspective.

**Effects**
1. Positive/negative effects.
2. Public/private effects on other power bases
3. Side effects
   a. changes in perception and evaluation of agent and target.
   b. attempts to repair damage.
effectiveness is a common-sense consideration, as a savvy agent is not going to want to draw from an ineffectual power base. In the case of likelihood of use, the agent may make the decision to try and draw from a power base that s/he has used in the past and found to be successful. When considering the acceptability of various power bases, the agent may determine that some power bases, if used, might be successful but might also result in negative outcomes. For example, using personal or impersonal coercive power might be effective, in that the target complies; however, the target might also lose respect for the agent and possibly become resistant to future influence attempts. These final two variables, likelihood of use and acceptability, are particularly relevant as they comprise the two primary dependent variables and are the focus of this dissertation research.

*Measuring Social Power Bases: The Interpersonal Power Inventory*

In an effort to research social power and the Power/Interaction Model of Interpersonal Influence, the Interpersonal Power Inventory (IPI; Raven, Schwarzwald, & Koslowsky, 1998) was developed. It is an instrument that was originally designed to measure Raven’s (1992) bases of social power in a supervisor/subordinate dyad. Of Raven’s 14 power bases, the IPI measures only 11. Indirect information, negative expert, and negative referent are not included because their indirect nature makes them inherently difficult to measure. Accordingly, the 11 power bases measured by the IPI are: reward power (personal and impersonal), coercive power (personal and impersonal), legitimate power (position, reciprocity, equity, and dependence), positive expert power, positive referent power, and direct informational power.
The IPI, a critical-incident instrument, is composed of either 33 or 44 individual items (i.e., three or four items for each of the 11 power bases). An individual is asked to respond using a seven point Likert scale about how likely s/he is to comply to supervisor requests. A response of one indicates that this item is not a likely reason for compliance, while a response of seven indicates that this item is a likely reason for compliance. A modified version of the IPI (to be discussed later) appears in Appendix A.

In the following section, two series of research studies that used the IPI will be discussed in an effort to show the relevance and utility of this instrument to social power research. Both research series highlight the use of the IPI in fields other than school psychology, namely social psychology and organizational psychology. The first series was primarily concerned with validating a new social power instrument and addressing questions related to which social power bases the participants perceived as being effective in different situations (i.e., work and academic settings). The first study in this series (Raven, et al., 1998) describes the construction of the IPI and showcases its ability to measure the perceived effectiveness of the social power bases in both analog and naturalistic organizational settings. The second study (Elias, Riedel, & Mace, 1999) describes the use of the IPI to measure social power within the college professor and college student relationship.

The second series of research (Koslowsky, Schwarzwald, & Ashuri, 2001; Schwarzwald, Koslowsky, & Agassi, 2001a, b) includes studies designed to empirically assess various aspects of Raven’s (1992, 1993) Power/Interaction Model of Interpersonal Influence. Koslowsky, et al., (2001) examined the relationships between an employees’ compliance to the social power bases and their attitudes towards the organization.
Schwarzwald et al. (2001a) examined the relationship between police officers’ compliance to the social power bases and the leadership style their police captain exhibits. The third study in the series (Schwarzwald et al., 2001b), examined the relationship between police officers’ compliance to the social power bases, the leadership style of the police captain, and the captain’s level of stress.

Presentation of a third series of studies that used the IPI to examine social power within school consultation will be highlighted in a subsequent section on the application of social power to school consultation. Ultimately, these three sections will demonstrate the development of the IPI as a reliable and valid instrument, as it is applied across different situations and different cultural contexts.

*Raven, Schwarzwald, and Koslowsky (1998).* The IPI was specifically developed for the two studies undertaken by Raven et al. (1998), and as a result, this is the first mention of the IPI in the scientific literature. The overall purpose of these two studies was to develop a new and more psychometrically sound instrument to measure Raven’s (1992) social power bases. A secondary purpose was to operationally define the 11 power bases and to ensure that each power base represented distinct factors and not a mixture of several interrelated factors. To accomplish these two goals, these authors used the newly developed IPI to assess the supervisor/subordinate dyad in two different populations.

In their first study, 317 U.S. university students were randomly assigned to one of two groups and asked to respond to one of two forms of the IPI. Those in the “supervisor” group were asked to respond to the supervisor form of the IPI, while those in the “subordinate” group were asked to respond to the subordinate form of the IPI (a parallel form
of the supervisor IPI). The supervisor IPI asked the respondent to think of a work situation where s/he was the supervisor, and to rate the likelihood of every IPI item as a reason why the subordinate would have complied. An example of expert power is: “S/he probably feels I know the best way to handle the situation.” In the subordinate form of the IPI, the respondent rated the degree to which each of the IPI items was a possible reason for compliance. An example of expert power is: “My supervisor probably knew the best way to do the job.” The participants were given a specific scenario, depending on their assigned role (i.e., supervisor or subordinate), and asked to respond to a situation where an initially reluctant subordinate eventually complied with what the supervisor originally asked. Specifically, the participants were asked to rate a given reason on a scale from one to seven about how likely the given reason would be in leading the subordinate to comply with a request. By looking at the question from two different points of view, the authors hoped to gain insight into how social power operates in the work arena from the perspectives of a supervisor and a subordinate.

Internal consistency ratings (.72 to .90) indicated the IPI to be a reliable measure of social power. Before any further analyses were run on the data, Raven et al. (1998) ran a series of intercorrelations on each of the four items theorized to belong to each of the 11 different power bases. The authors dropped one item from each of the 11 power bases that reduced the reliability for each base. What resulted was a 33 item IPI (three items for each of the 11 power bases) and, using these data, the rest of the analyses were performed.

Factor analysis results showed that the power bases could be broken down into two distinct factors, one measuring “soft” power bases and another measuring “harsh” power
bases. Soft bases included positive expert, positive referent, direct informational, legitimate dependence, and personal reward power, while the harsh bases included legitimate reciprocity, impersonal coercive, legitimate equity, impersonal reward, personal coercive, and legitimate position power. This breakdown of power into “soft” and “harsh” categories is important because it serves to emphasize that social power is not necessarily overt and heavy-handed. Secondary discriminant analysis across position (i.e., supervisor and subordinate) showed that there were significant differences across groups with regard to the expert, informational, and referent power bases. For these bases, supervisors’ means were significantly higher than subordinates’ ratings, indicating that the supervisor thought that use of these three power bases would lead to a greater degree of compliance than did the subordinates.

In the second Raven et al. (1998) study, the IPI was translated into Hebrew for use with Israeli hospital workers. Consequently, all respondents were subordinates in this study. The purpose of this study was to follow up on the previous study in an actual working environment in order to examine issues related to cultural generalizability and to determine if responses on the IPI could distinguish between workers with high and low job satisfaction. A group of 101 hospital workers completed the subordinate form of the IPI, and the short form of the Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquits, 1967). Analysis of results with respect to the IPI showed that the “soft” and “harsh” breakdown was again present, although it was slightly different than the breakdown found using the earlier U.S. sample. In the Israeli sample, legitimate position power loaded higher
on the soft rather than the harsh factor. It is also interesting to note that in the U.S. data, legitimate position power loaded almost equally on both factors and only slightly higher on the harsh factor (which is why the authors included it under the harsh factor). In addition to these larger factor results, there were interesting findings pertaining to the individual power bases. For instance, the Israeli sample’s top five power bases were all soft bases, with direct informational power perceived as most likely to result in compliance, followed by legitimate position, positive expert power, legitimate dependence, and positive referent power. Data analyses comparing responses from the Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire and the IPI showed the soft/harsh power breakdown was able to differentiate workers with high and low job satisfaction. More specifically workers with high levels of job satisfaction indicated greater compliance to the soft power bases while workers with low levels of job satisfaction indicated greater compliance to the harsh power bases.

In summary, the results from Raven et al. (1998) show that participants in the two cultures indicate soft power bases (e.g., informational and expert power) are perceived as more likely to make supervisees comply with supervisors’ requests. Results also showed that the IPI may be considered a reliable and valid instrument for measuring social power bases. For example, evidence of the IPI’s construct validity is shown by the replication of the soft/harsh breakdown and the similar conceptualization of the soft/harsh breakdown across two cultures.

Elias, Riedel, and Mace (1999). Elias, Riedel, and Mace (1999) used a modified version of the IPI to study undergraduate students’ perceptions of the effectiveness of the various social power bases in complying with university faculty (i.e., professors’) requests.
Elias et al. (1999) advanced two hypotheses. One was that first and second year students would be more compliant than third and fourth year students, and the second was that there would be significant differences in the perceived effectiveness among the various power bases. A modified version of the IPI questionnaire was administered to 326 university students and each respondent was asked to provide demographic information such as gender, ethnicity, age, and university classification. University classification was used to divide the sample into first and second year students (freshman and sophomores) and third and fourth year students categories (juniors and seniors).

Results showed that first and second year students indeed indicated greater levels of compliance than third and fourth year students. However, this was not the case across all power bases. First and second year students indicated that they perceived the social power bases of positive expert, positive referent, legitimate position, legitimate equity, and direct informational power as more likely to result in their compliance than the remaining social power bases. Additional analyses, based on the entire sample of students, showed that the students perceived the most effective power bases to be direct informational, positive expert, impersonal reward, and legitimate position power. A final finding, consistent with previous research (Raven et al., 1998) was the emergence of the two-factor (soft, hard) structure of the social power base model.

Elias et al. (1999) also analyzed the data to determine if there were any gender or racial differences. Female students, regardless of class distinction, indicated that they
perceived personal reward power as more effective than did their male counterparts. Additionally, African American students indicated that they perceived expert power to be more effective than did Caucasian students. Additional results from Elias et al. (1999) support those from previous research (Raven et al., 1998), namely that the IPI is a valid and reliable instrument.

Koslowsky, Schwarzwald, and Ashuri (2001). This study examined how the social power bases and their perceived effectiveness might vary with several personal variables and with levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The personal variables of interest were objective and subjective professional distance. Objective professional distance was operationally defined as the actual difference between a supervisor and a subordinate in education and experience, while subjective professional distance was operationally defined as the gap between ability and knowledge between a supervisor and a subordinate. The authors advanced three hypotheses regarding objective and subjective distance, and one hypothesis related to level of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The three hypotheses related to professional distance were: (a) there will be a positive relationship between professional distance and likelihood of compliance, with there being a higher likelihood of compliance when professional distance is large; (b) there will be a negative relationship between professional distance and likelihood of compliance for the harsh power bases, with likelihood of compliance being higher when professional distance is small; and (c) there will be a positive relationship between professional distance and supervisors when supervisors are promoted from within the department. Finally, compliance to the harsh power
bases will be associated with lower levels of both job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Koslowsky et al. (2001) administered the 33 item IPI, the Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), the Power Sources Scale (PSS), an organizational commitment measure, and an objective/subjective rating of professional distance to 232 female nurse subordinates and 32 female nurse supervisors in Israel. Generally, the results suggested that the power bases measured by the IPI may be divided into two factors (i.e., soft and harsh), and both subordinates and supervisors indicated that direct informational power would result in the highest levels of compliance (i.e., direct informational power was perceived to be the most effective in bringing about compliance). The results also suggested that the soft power bases are closely associated with job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and both aspects of professional distance.

More specifically, for the variable of objective professional distance, MANOVAs showed that the subordinates reported higher levels of compliance for both the soft and harsh power bases. However, in the case of subjective professional distance, the data indicated that the subordinates reported higher levels of compliance for only the soft power bases. To explore the hypothesis related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment, the authors divided the subordinates into high/low categories for each variable (based on a median split procedure). Job satisfaction was positively related to the soft power bases and negatively related to the harsh power bases, meaning that high levels of job satisfaction were associated with compliance to the soft power bases, and low levels of job satisfaction were associated with compliance to the harsh bases. However, organizational commitment was positively
related to both the soft and harsh power bases, meaning that compliance to either factor resulted in higher levels of organizational commitment.

The major findings from Koslowsky et al. (2001) generally suggest that Raven’s (1992, 1993) Power/Interaction Model of Interpersonal Influence is a useful rubric when attempting to explain outcomes in organizations. More specifically, the findings suggest that the IPI is a reliable and valid instrument for measuring perceptions of social power, and that employees’ ratings of job satisfaction are positively related to compliance with the soft power bases and negatively with the harsh power bases. Additionally, employees’ ratings of their own job commitment were positively related to both the soft and the harsh power bases.

Schwarzwald, Koslowsky, and Agassi (2001a). The specific purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between supervisor leadership style and subordinate compliance to supervisor requests in Israeli police departments. The authors advanced two hypotheses: (a) subordinates would be more likely to comply with transformational leaders as opposed to transactional leaders regardless of power base, and (b) low level subordinates would be more likely to comply with the harsh power bases and less likely to comply with the soft power bases. Transformational leaders are those who inspire workers, are empowering, and innovative, while transactional leaders are those who do not inspire workers, are less empowering, and more corrective in their leadership (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & van Engen, 2003).

To answer these questions, the authors administered the 33 item IPI, the Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), and form 5X-Self to 40 police captains (i.e., supervisors)
and 240 police officers (i.e., subordinates). Generally, the data indicated that the social power bases could again be separated into soft and harsh factors. Results from hierarchical multiple regressions showed that police officers who worked for transformational leaders reported higher levels of compliance to both soft and harsh power bases. To answer the second research hypothesis regarding low versus high levels of performance, the authors conducted a second multiple regression; these results were not significant, thus indicating that compliance to either the soft or harsh power bases is not related to police officers’ performance levels.

_Schwarzwald, Koslowsky, and Agassi (2001b)._ This study examined Israeli police officers’ compliance as it related to their police captains’ leadership styles and levels of work stress. The police captains were classified as either transformational or transactional leaders based on responses to the MLQ. The authors used a median split procedure on the Work Stress Questionnaire (WSQ) to classify the police captains as either high or low stress.

The authors administered the 33 item IPI and the WSQ to 40 police captains (i.e., supervisors) and 240 police officers (i.e., subordinates). Initial analyses showed that IPI scores could be reduced into two distinct soft and harsh factors. More specific analyses revealed that subordinates reported higher levels of compliance to the soft power bases as opposed to the harsh power bases. Subordinates also reported higher levels of compliance to high transformational captains for both soft and harsh power bases than they did to low transformational captains. When the relationship between captain stress level and police officer compliance was examined, the data showed that higher levels of police officer compliance were reported for captains who were categorized as having low stress. This
relationship held regardless of power base type, meaning that police officers were more likely to comply with low stress captains in general.

Summary. The results of these five empirical studies confirm the status of the IPI as a reliable and valid instrument for measuring social power. All studies replicated the soft/harsh social power breakdown; perhaps more significant than this is the fact that this breakdown occurred across cultural lines and across different organizational contexts (i.e., medical, law enforcement, university/academic). The initial study (Raven et al., 1998) showed that Raven’s power bases can be reliably and validly measured, that the power bases can be divided into two distinct factors, and that soft power bases such as direct informational and positive expert power are perceived as more likely to result in compliance. The second study (Elias et al., 1999) replicated the two factor structure and the finding that the soft power bases, such as direct informational and positive expert, are viewed as more effective in leading to compliance. The final three studies (Koslowsky et al., 2001; Schwarzwald et al., 2001a, b) examined Raven’s (1992) Power/Interaction Model of Interpersonal Influence, and specifically how interpersonal variables may affect perceptions of social power. The first of these studies showed that job satisfaction and level of organizational commitment on the part of the subordinate may affect compliance, while the final two studies showed that compliance to supervisor requests may be affected by the supervisor’s leadership style and level of supervisor stress.

Relevance of the French and Raven Social Power Bases to School Consultation

Before moving away from the studies that used the IPI to investigate social power from an organizational psychology perspective, it is necessary to draw attention to reasons
why this model is also relevant to the practice of school psychology and to the study of school consultation. Consultation, as an indirect service implicitly requires the school psychologist to work effectively with other adults (Conoley & Gutkin, 1986). As previously, noted Gutkin and Conoley (1990) have termed this focus on adults, the “paradox of school psychology.” Raven’s (1992, 1993) Power/Interaction Model of Interpersonal Influence allows practitioners and researchers to examine the underlying processes behind successful and unsuccessful consultation experiences. Additionally, Raven’s model and the social power bases have been cited for their relevance to school consultation (e.g., Erchul & Raven, 1997; Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001; Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2002; Erchul, Raven, & Wilson, 2004; Martin, 1978; Martin & Curtis, 1980). Because past research has used this typology, it is worthwhile to continue and expand upon these prior research agendas. Ultimately, this framework can aid practitioners’ understanding of consultation as a process and possibly lead to the development of more effective school psychological consultants (Erchul & Martens, 2002).

After summarizing selected social power research, the following section will focus on the published literature that addresses social power and its relevance to school psychology and consultation. The first two publications are more theoretical or conceptual in nature, but they provide the basis for the three empirical studies that follow.

Publications Relating to School Consultation and Social Power

Martin (1978). Martin (1978) was the first to highlight the relevance of the French and Raven (1959) social power bases to school consultation. In his paper, Martin hypothesized that, of the five French and Raven social power bases, only two are relevant to
the practice of school consultation (Note. Martin only considered the five original social power bases postulated by French and Raven, 1959). Martin proposed that a school consultant can only expect to draw on expert and referent power when consulting with teachers. The remaining three power bases, reward, coercive, and legitimate power, were deemed inaccessible to the consultant because the consultant does not occupy a position of line authority over the consultee. Martin argued that because consultants do not have legitimate authority over consultees, it is unreasonable for consultees to expect that consultants can punish, reward, or in some other way use their position to force another to comply.

Martin (1978) also provided some advice to practicing school consultants: he hypothesized that the best and most effective consultants develop a balance between expert and referent power. According to Martin, it is wise to develop expertise in only a few areas, because if consultants market themselves as experts in many areas, they will likely be seen as too different and difficult to relate to, thereby lessening their referent power. Additionally, consultants should maintain some degree of camaraderie with consultees (i.e., develop referent power), but drawing too much on referent power could also backfire because consultees then may not attribute them much expert power.

Erchul and Raven (1997). A more recent look at the relevance of French and Raven’s social power bases to school consultation challenges Martin’s contention that only expert and referent power are applicable to the practice of consultation (Erchul & Raven, 1997). Erchul and Raven argued that expert and referent power are indeed available for use by consultants, but given the recent revisions of the original power bases (Raven, 1992), forms of all six...
bases of social power are potentially available for use by the school psychologist (Erchul & Raven, 1997). For example, relative to specific individual bases, it may be premature to dismiss the impersonal forms of both coercive and reward power. The impersonal forms of coercion and reward power require that the agent be capable of delivering tangible punishments and rewards. It is not completely out of the realm of possibility to suggest that consultants might shape the behavior of the consultee by using punishment (coercion) or positive reinforcement (reward) (Tharp & Wetzel, 1969). Additionally, the personal forms of coercive and reward power are available to the school psychologist in that personal disapproval and/or personal approval of the consultant may lead to action on the part of the consultee (Erchul & Raven, 1997).

Although the applicability of positive expert, positive referent, and direct informational power are readily apparent, the applicability of the negative and indirect forms is less clear. The negative forms of expert and referent power are relevant in the sense that the consultant should be aware of the potential negative impact these forms of power can produce. For example, in the case of negative expert power, the consultee could see the consultant as using his/her expertise for personal gain and not to help the consultee with the problem at hand. This situation is not much different when one considers the potential negative consequences that could stem from use of negative referent power. In this case, the consultee could see him/herself as so different from the consultant as to do the exact opposite of what the consultant suggests. Finally, the use of indirect informational power is obscure. Although the information presented indirectly has the potential to be useful, exactly how a
The final power base hypothesized to be available to the school psychologist is legitimate power. Martin (1978) dismissed this base as irrelevant because he saw the school psychologist as lacking formal line authority over the teacher; however, given the further differentiation of legitimate power, Erchul and Raven (1997) have indicated Martin’s dismissal may have been premature. According to Raven’s (1992) revision, there are four subforms, and Erchul and Raven hypothesized that all four forms are potentially available.

With regard to legitimate position power, one would not expect the consultant to overtly draw from this power base, but it is not unreasonable to think that a consultee may feel obliged to follow a consultant’s lead because the consultant’s job is to help the consultee.

Use of the other three forms of legitimate power may be just as plausible. For example, it is not unreasonable for a consultee to agree to implement a classroom intervention because the consultant spent several hours or days coming up with a plan (legitimate equity). A consultant could appeal to the consultee’s sense of fair play by calling the consultee’s attention to the fact that he or she might not have collected any baseline data thus having made it more difficult to design an intervention. If this were the case, then a consultant might draw on the legitimate power of equity by insisting that it is only fair that the consultee immediately start to collect baseline data in an effort to rectify the situation. Consultants can potentially draw on the power of legitimate reciprocity by highlighting that s/he had spent time meeting with the teacher and also spent time observing the child in the classroom. In this instance, the consultee could feel obligated to reciprocate the effort of the
school psychologist by collecting data or implementing an agreed upon intervention plan. The final form of legitimate power is the power of dependency. In order to draw from this power base, a consultant could explain to the consultee that he or she was relying on the consultee to collect the data, because s/he, as the consultant, did not have the time or the means (Erchul & Raven, 1997).

The next section will present the results of three studies that used the IPI to examine social power within a school consultation context. Each of these studies empirically investigated several of the research questions posed by Erchul and Raven (1997).

*Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001)*. Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001) applied a social power perspective to school psychological consultation by using the IPI to assess school psychologists’ perceptions of social power within problem-solving consultation with classroom teachers. Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001) hypothesized that, given a choice of harsh and soft power bases, school psychological consultants would indicate that soft bases would result in greater consultee compliance to consultant requests.

Modified versions of the IPI (altered to reflect the psychologist/teacher dyad; see Appendix A) were mailed to 317 non-student members of a state-level school psychology association, and the 101 respondents who returned completed IPIs comprised the participant pool. The respondents were asked to think of an instance when they were interacting with a teacher who was initially reluctant to follow through with a request made of them in consultation. An example of an item measuring direct information power is: “Once I point it
out, s/he can see why the change is necessary.” The psychologist participants were asked to respond to the 44 items on the IPI to help the researchers understand what psychologists thought would make teachers more likely to comply with what the psychologist requested.

Consistent with Raven et al.’s (1998) methodology, a series of intercorrelations between the four items theorized to belong to each of the 11 power bases were analyzed, and the one item with the lowest correlation in relation to the others was dropped from further analyses. Two principal components analyses (PCAs) were then run on the 33 item IPI. The first PCA assessed the overall structure, while the second analysis was designed to specifically examine a two-factor solution. The first PCA revealed a four-factor solution. The four factors were: (a) position power, (b) impersonal sanctions, (c) personal power, and (d) credibility. The first factor, position power, was comprised of three harsh power bases: legitimate equity, legitimate position, and personal coercion. The second factor, impersonal sanctions, was comprised of the impersonal forms of the reward and coercion power bases. The third factor, personal power, was comprised of three soft power bases and one harsh power base. These four bases were: personal reward, positive referent, legitimate dependence, and legitimate reciprocity (the lone harsh base). The final factor, credibility, was comprised of the final two soft power bases: direct informational and positive expert power. The second PCA, a forced two-factor solution, corresponded to the previously mentioned soft/harsh power base breakdown. Additionally, and perhaps more interesting, is the finding that out of the six top-rated power bases, five fell into the soft power base category. These top six power bases were: direct informational, positive expert, impersonal reward (a hard base), positive referent, legitimate dependence, and personal reward. Another finding was
that when the power bases were divided into soft and harsh categories, psychologists rated soft bases over harsh bases as more likely to result in teacher compliance to their requests.

The implications of these findings are particularly relevant to the ongoing collaboration debate (Erchul, 1999; Gutkin, 1999). These results show that when consultants are asked to consider the consultative process using social power theory, they do not perceive the more “heavy-handed” power bases as necessarily a successful means of influence. In fact, consultants perceived soft power bases (e.g., informational, expert, and referent) as being more successful means of influence, while harsh bases (e.g., impersonal coercion, impersonal reward, legitimate equity, personal coercion, and legitimate reciprocity) were viewed as rarely entering into consultation. Given these findings, it makes logical sense to explore how school psychologist consultants view the acceptability and usage of soft and harsh power bases (i.e., do findings from the effectiveness literature generalize to the constructs of acceptability and likelihood of use?).

Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001). The next study (Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001) may be considered an expansion of the Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001) study. In this study, Erchul and colleagues examined social power issues from both teacher and school psychologist perspectives. The overarching purpose of this study was to determine how similarly a national sample of teachers and school psychologists view social power during consultation. The authors put forth three major research questions: (a) how do teachers view the relative effectiveness of the power bases used by psychologists?, (b) how similarly do psychologists and teachers perceive the relative effectiveness of the power bases used by psychologists?, and (c) do teachers view psychologists’ potentially use of soft power bases as
more likely to increase the likelihood of compliance than harsh bases? The authors hypothesized that the two groups would view soft power bases as being more effective than harsh power bases, but the authors were not sure precisely how the two groups would view the role of specific social power bases in school consultation.

Even though Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001) is essentially an expansion of Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001), there are some methodological differences that warrant discussion. A goal of this second study was to determine how both parties in consultation perceive the utility of Raven’s (1992) power bases by using the IPI (Raven et al., 1998). However, the IPI used in previous research addressed the power bases from only one perspective, that of the consultant. Because Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001) wanted to examine the question from both perspectives, it was necessary for them to develop a parallel form of the IPI to measure consultees’ perceptions. This parallel form was created and termed the IPI Form CE (see Appendix B).

IPIs were mailed to a random sample of 500 nationally certified school psychologists (NCSPs) and 500 more IPIs were mailed to a random sample of elementary school teacher members of the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC). However, due to a combination of low teacher response rate and the fact that approximately 20% of the NAEYC sample reported having no contact with a school psychologist in a consulting relationship, the College Marketing Group Direct (CMG; now MSGi Direct) was contacted and asked to provide the names and addresses of teachers with the same characteristics of the NAEYC sample. From this listing, IPI Form CEs were sent to an additional 400 teachers. Ultimately, 134 school psychologists and 118 teachers who taught
grades K-5 comprised the participant pool. Unlike the Raven et al. (1998) and Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001) studies, the full 44 item IPI was used in the data analyses. The full IPI was used because the intercorrelations for the four items measuring each of the 11 power bases were roughly similar (i.e., no one item correlated too poorly with the other three, so therefore none of the items were dropped).

Data analyses, addressing the first research question, indicated that teachers view the power bases available to the psychologist as differentially likely to increase the likelihood of compliance to requests in consultation. The teachers ranked direct information, positive expert, legitimate dependence, and positive referent power as more effective than the other available bases in leading to compliance. Three findings address how similarly psychologists and teachers view the perceived effectiveness of the power bases available to the psychologist. With respect to rank ordering based on mean ratings of the power bases, both groups viewed direct information and positive expert power as the two bases most likely to lead to compliance to consultant requests. Both groups also rated soft power bases as being significantly more likely to result in compliance than harsh bases. Finally, the rank ordering of the 11 power bases by the consultants and the consultees were significantly correlated, $r_s (9) = .73, p < .05$. Taken together, these three findings suggest that both groups view the power bases in consultation similarly.

Despite these similarities, there were some differences in how the two groups viewed the relative perceived effectiveness of the social power bases available to psychologists. For instance, teachers indicated that they would be more influenced by legitimate position power, legitimate dependence power, and direct informational power than the psychologists thought
they would. On the flip side, the psychologists thought that the impersonal and personal forms of reward power would be more effective in bringing about compliance than did teachers. Finally, when the mean ratings of the power bases of each group were compared, there were significant differences for 7 of the 11 power bases.

The data that answer the final question advanced by Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001) indicate that both teachers and psychologists view soft power bases as being more likely to increase the likelihood of compliance to requests in consultation than harsh bases. In conclusion, the authors advanced the tentative statement that both teachers and psychologists perceive that soft power bases as more effective, but the two groups disagree on the relative rankings for the individual social power bases.

*Erchul, Raven, and Wilson (2004).* This third study, using the psychologist data reported originally in Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001), focused on gender differences in school psychologist perceptions of social power. Given that the method has already been discussed, only the specific hypothesis, research question, and results will be presented here. The research question dealt with the broader issue of how both male and female school psychological consultants view the effectiveness of Raven’s (1992, 1993) social power bases. The sole directional hypothesis was that female school psychological consultants would perceive the soft power bases as being more effective in bringing about compliance in reluctant teachers.

A MANOVA was used to analyze the data garnered from the IPI to address both the general research question and the specific directional hypothesis. The results of an initial MANOVA were not statistically significant, and suggested that male and female school
psychological consultants hold similar perceptions about the effectiveness of the individual social power bases. A second MANOVA addressed whether there were gender differences with regard to perceptions of the soft (i.e., positive expert, positive referent, direct information, legitimate dependence, and personal reward) and harsh power bases (i.e., personal coercion, impersonal coercion, impersonal reward, legitimate position, legitimate equity, and legitimate reciprocity). This MANOVA was statistically significant, and follow up Scheffe’s tests revealed that there were significant effects for both harsh \( F = (2, 129) = 5.75, p = .01 \) and soft power bases \( F = (2, 129) = 7.60, p < .006 \). These findings indicate that female school psychological consultants rated both harsh and soft power bases as more likely to result in consultee compliance during teacher consultation. In an effort to explore this finding further, and to determine if it had practical significance, an effect size analysis (Cohen, 1988) was performed. A criterion of .5 was established a priori as the determinant of whether a practical difference was present. Results showed that the effect size for soft power bases was .50, and the effect size for harsh power bases was .42. Given their effect size criterion, the authors concluded that female consultants perceive the soft power bases as more effective than do male consultants.

**Summary.** In conclusion, Erchul and Raven (1997) have disagreed with Martin’s (1978) conclusion that only expert and referent power are available to the school consultant. Given the revisions of the original French and Raven (1959) social power bases (Raven, 1965, 1992), Erchul and Raven (1997) have argued that forms of all six power bases are potentially available to the consultant. The utility of positive expert, positive referent, and direct informational power bases is readily apparent (Erchul & Raven, 1997). However, the
utility of the negative and indirect forms of these power bases is less apparent. Additionally, both the impersonal and personal forms of reward and coercion are available to the school psychologist, but it is important for the consultant to show tact when drawing on these power bases (Erchul & Raven, 1997). Finally, even though Martin (1978) dismissed the legitimate power base as unavailable to the school psychologist, Erchul and Raven (1997) have argued that despite the school psychologist not occupying a position of line authority over the consultee, s/he might still draw from all four variations of this power base.

In addition to this theoretical speculation (Erchul & Raven, 1997; Martin, 1978), empirical research (Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001; Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001; Erchul, Raven, & Wilson, 2004) has shown that the social power rubric is a valid way to examine the consultative relationship. Research has indicated that both teachers and school psychologists view soft power bases as a more effective means of influence than harsh power bases. Additionally, school psychologists and teachers both rated direct information and positive expert power as the most likely to lead to teacher compliance. Finally, gender differences were discovered: female school psychologist consultants perceive both soft and harsh power bases as more effective in bringing about compliance in an initially reluctant teacher consultee than do male consultants. However, a more conservative effect size analysis found that for only soft power bases was this difference clinically significant. This research has also shown the modified IPI to be a reliable and valid instrument in a consultative context.

The previous section summarized both the theoretical/conceptual and empirical publications in the school psychology literature that dealt with social power. Although this next section generally retains the focus on the construct of social power, the emphasis shifts
to how social power and gender interact. School psychology is increasingly becoming a female-dominated profession (Curtis, Grier, Abshier, Sutton, & Hunley, 2002). Given that female practitioners make up 70% of the school psychologist population, it is logical to ask how gender may affect perceptions of social power within school psychology, in general, and school psychological consultation, in particular.

**Gender and Social Power**

The following section will summarize selected empirical studies that address gender differences and how these differences relate to nonverbal behavior and language use. The first section will address gender differences with regard to perceived access to the social power bases, and how this can affect women’s ability to function effectively in the workplace. The second section will address gender differences in language.

**Gender, Nonverbal Behavior, and Power Perceptions**

Carli (1999) reviewed the literature that addressed gender and interpersonal power issues, and she asserted that gender differences in social power have real consequences for women in the workplace. For example, women advance slowly up the corporate ladder and are provided with fewer benefits than are men. Ely (1995, cited in Carli, 1999) has linked promotions and access to benefits to the effective use of power, with the implication being that women do not advance or receive benefits because they are less powerful.

Carli (1999) cited Johnson’s (1976) research in which men were found to have greater access to social power than women. With regard to positive expert power, research has shown that men are stereotyped as being more competent than are women (Broverman,
Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz, 1972), and this leads to the conclusion that
men are attributed more expert power than are women (Johnson, 1976). The opposite is true
for positive referent power. Here, research shows women to be more concerned about other
people’s feelings and more empathetic than men (Broverman et al., 1972). These attributions
appear to provide women with more referent power than men.

Two research studies using undergraduate students conducted by Aguinis and
colleagues have addressed social power attributions in the workplace. These studies (Aguinis
& Henle, 2001; Aguinis, Simonsen, & Pierce, 1998) assessed the effects of nonverbal
behavior on power base perceptions and how these perceptions differed when gender was a
variable. The two studies had the same design, so in the interest of space, the similar aspects
will be described first. Both studies used a sample of non-traditional (i.e., older) U.S. college
students to determine the impact of various nonverbal behaviors had on power base
perceptions. The power bases assessed were the original five defined in French and Raven
(1959) and an additional power base, termed credibility, operationally defined as the
truthfulness, follow-through, and accuracy of a power source. The three categories of
nonverbal behaviors investigated were eye contact (direct vs. indirect), seating posture
(relaxed vs. on edge), and facial expression (relaxed vs. normal). The participants were
randomly assigned to one of eight research groups and were asked to read a vignette
describing the interaction between a bank manager and an employee. The eight research
groups were based on combinations of the three categories of nonverbal behavior (e.g., direct
eye contact, relaxed body posture, and relaxed facial expression). The only differences
between the two studies were the number of participants and the gender of the bank manager.
In the first study (Aguinis et al., 1998), the bank managers were all male, but in the second study (Aguinis & Henle, 2001), the bank managers were all female.

_Aguinis, Simonsen, and Pierce (1998)._ In Aguinis et al. (1998), results showed that some nonverbal behaviors significantly affected an individual’s perceptions of the power bases. Specifically, facial expression (relaxed vs. nervous) significantly affected ratings of referent, expert, legitimate, and credibility. Eye contact only affected the credibility power base, while body posture was insignificant. These results show that nonverbal behaviors have a significant impact on social power base perceptions.

_Aguinis and Henle (2001)._ In the second study (Aguinis & Henle, 2001), all the bank managers in the vignettes were female and, as one would expect, the results were much different. The purpose of having a male employee and a female bank manager interact was to determine if there were any gender differences with regard to non-verbal behavior on perceptions of power. The results from this study showed that effective female managers (defined as being direct and assertive) were rated highly on coercive power. However, when the female managers conformed to gender stereotypes (less direct and less assertive), they were rated as having little social power. The implications for these results are extremely important because they place a female manager or, for that matter, any female in a power position, in a potential no-win situation. Either she can act like a quality manager, but be seen as coercive and heavy-handed, or she can act according to stereotype and be labeled a manager with little power.

**Summary.** The Aguinis studies (Aguinis & Henle, 2001; Aguinis, et al., 1998) show that virtually identical behavior (i.e., direct eye contact and relaxed facial expression) can
result in different attributions of power depending on gender. Men were given higher ratings for referent, reward, legitimate, expert, and credibility power bases when they were depicted as having a relaxed face, but women were rated lower on the exact same power bases. Women engaging in the same behavior as men were rated significantly differently than were men. Also, Carli’s (1999) and Johnson’s (1976) writings present findings that suggest there are gender differences with regard to social power. Both authors assert that men are found to have greater access to social power than are women. In the workplace, this often puts women in a no-win situation.

Gender, Language, and Social Power Perceptions

Moving away from nonverbal behaviors, there is an established line of research on gender differences with regard to language. After a brief discussion of how women use praise in the workplace, the focus will shift to other power bases such as reward and informational power. The second section will focus on how men are perceived to speak more powerfully than women, and how several researchers have tested the assertion that some power bases are more associated with one gender than they are with another.

Sociolinguist Deborah Tannen has published several books discussing the communication stylistic differences between men and women (e.g., Tannen, 1990, 1994). Although Tannen does not suggest that one communication style is better than the other, she does state that these stylistic differences may cause problems (i.e., miscommunication) in interaction (Tannen, 1994). Some of Tannen’s findings may be directly applied to the work of French and Raven (1959) and Raven (1993). Specifically, Tannen (1994) found that in the workplace, women use praise more frequently than do men when interacting with fellow
colleagues. This tendency of women to use praise may translate into women being more likely to use, or to find acceptable, the available forms of reward power.

Lending support to this assertion are similar findings from a recent meta-analysis on leadership styles (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & van Engen, 2003.) The authors found that females’ leadership style is most often characterized as “transformational” as opposed to “transactional.” A transformational leader is one who has gained the trust and confidence of subordinates and who is established as a role model. These leaders are often seen as innovative and empowering mentors (Eagly et al., 2003). Alternatively, a transactional leader is one who engages in more “give and take” with subordinates. This means that s/he is often seen as one who delineates subordinates’ responsibilities (Eagly et al., 2003). Eagly et al. suggested that both types of leaders can be effective and that any one leader can exhibit characteristics consistent with both leadership styles.

In this meta-analysis (Eagly et al., 2003), female leaders were found to be more “transformational” and to offer more contingent praise and reward (also consistent with the “transactional” style of leadership) to supervisees than were male leaders. This second finding lends support to the assertion that females tend to offer reward and praise to others more often than males (Tannen, 1994). In addition, Harper and Hirokawa’s (1988) research suggests that female managers prefer rational influence tactics, which are direct and reward-based. These bases all directly correspond to the French and Raven (1959) and Raven (1993) social power bases. Specifically, the tendency of women to use rational influence techniques may be compared directly to Raven’s (1965) informational power, while the reward and coercion-based tactics are clearly most similar to the both forms of reward and coercive
power bases. These findings all suggest that, in the work arena, females tend to use praise- and reward-based tactics more often than males.

With regard to general language use, research suggests that men speak more powerfully than women (Timmerman, 2002). Timmerman (2002), in a meta-analysis of 30 gender and language studies, concluded that men’s use of language is not only considered more powerful but also more credible than women’s use of language. In addition to using more powerful language, other research (Gruber & White, 1986; Schwarzwald & Koslowsky, 1999) suggests that males have a larger number of social power bases (i.e., influence tactics) available.

Gruber and White (1986) tested Johnson’s assertion that certain power bases are associated with one gender more than another (Johnson, 1976), and found that males reported significantly greater use of both “male” and “female” type power bases than did females. They also found that males did not report using the “male” typed power bases significantly more often than the “female” typed power bases. Additionally, females reported that they relied on the “female” typed power bases significantly more often than “male” typed power bases (Gruber & White, 1986). A more recent study (Schwarzwald & Koslowsky, 1999) on the use of social power tactics and adolescent self-esteem provided corroboration for Gruber and White’s (1986) findings. These authors also found that male adolescents reported using the various strategies (e.g., rationality, coercion, and reciprocity) more often than did female adolescents (Schwarzwald & Koslowsky, 1999).

Another area of research suggests that women tend to use indirect and collaborative tactics (Barry & Watson, 1996; Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz,
1972; Offermann & Schrier, 1985), whereas men tend to use more direct and reward- and coercive-based influence tactics. These indirect and collaborative tactics may be directly comparable to Raven’s conceptualization of referent power. This assertion is supported by Carli’s (1999) finding that women are attributed higher levels of referent power than are men.

Summary. The research that focuses on gender differences in behavior, as well as language use and social power and influence, have consistently agreed that gender differences are present; however, the direction these gender differences take is inconsistent and inconclusive. The Aguinis studies (Aguinis & Henle, 2001; Aguinis, et al., 1998) show that identical behavior by male and female managers can result in polar opposite power attributions. In the area of power and influence, Offermann and Schrier (1985) and Barry and Watson (1996) found that women prefer to use more indirect and collaborative influence tactics, whereas men prefer to use more reward-based tactics. This finding conflicts with the results from Eagly et al.’s (2003) meta-analytic results that, in addition to being viewed as more transformational than transactional, female leaders were found to offer more contingent reward and praise than were male leaders. Eagly et al.’s (2003) findings and Harper and Hirokawa’s (1988) finding that female managers prefer rational influence tactics, which are often reward based, and Carli’s (1999) finding that women are attributed higher levels of referent power suggest that women are viewed as preferring soft power bases. Support for this assertion is partially found in Erchul, et al. (2004) using a somewhat less conservative statistical standard. As previously noted, these authors found that, compared to males, female
school psychologist consultants perceive both soft and harsh social power bases as being more effective in bringing about compliance in initially reluctant teacher consultees.

The next section will transition from gender and social power issues to the construct of social validity and interventions. Social validity is relevant to the practice of school psychology because school psychologists are often asked to consult with teachers, and consultation is a type of intervention. When developing interventions during consultation, social validity is extremely relevant because it potentially has a strong bearing on whether or not interventions are actually implemented. The larger concept of social validity is also relevant because it introduces several variables of interest. For example, the two variables acceptability and likelihood of use are relevant to the concept of social power. These variables are defined and their relevance to this dissertation research is highlighted in the next section.

Social Validity

Social validity is a multifaceted concept comprised of several individual variables (e.g., effectiveness, acceptability, side-effects, practicality/feasibility) that both social scientists and consumers use to judge interventions. Social validity is relevant to school psychology in general and to the practice of consultation in particular because invariably the school psychologist is asking other adults to behave in a different manner. If these changes in behavior are not seen as socially valid or appropriate, it is possible that interventions may not be implemented and behavioral changes may not have the opportunity to occur. Treatment acceptability, treatment effectiveness, treatment implementation, and treatment integrity are all intimately related to each other and to the larger concept of social validity. The following
section of this literature review will define and discuss the importance of the social validity construct, along with the previously mentioned variables.

Social validity, as originally defined by Wolf (1978), involves a three-part subjective judgment. First, would the average person deem the intervention and its goals as important? In other words, are the specific goals of a treatment desired by society? Second, do those involved with the dissemination of an intervention (i.e., the client and the caregiver) consider the treatment procedures acceptable and appropriate? Finally, are the consumers satisfied with the results of the treatment? Social validity is a central concept in the field of applied psychology (Kazdin, 1980; Wolf, 1978). As applied scientists in the business of developing and disseminating treatments through consultation, it is incumbent upon school psychologists to ensure that their treatments are a socially valid means of addressing the concerns of their clients. As mentioned previously, social validity is a multifaceted concept comprised of several related variables such as treatment acceptability, treatment implementation, treatment integrity, and treatment effectiveness. These terms will be defined in the following section before undertaking a closer examination of their interrelationships.

**Treatment Acceptability**

A basic definition of *treatment acceptability* includes judgments concerning the appropriateness of the treatment procedures and their effectiveness. More specifically, Kazdin (1980) has stated that acceptability refers to judgments by professionals and nonprofessionals about the intervention procedures, and has suggested that acceptable treatments are those with procedures that are deemed fair, reasonable, and non-intrusive. Lennox and Miltenberger (1990) provided another practical definition of treatment
acceptability that recognizes these judgments are based upon several factors. These authors proposed that efficacy, the presence of secondary effects, legal and ethical considerations, and practical considerations all impact judgments of treatment acceptability (Lennox & Miltenberger, 1990). With regard to efficacy considerations, Lennox and Miltenberger stated the interventions that are the most efficacious are those that are related to the root cause of the behavioral difficulty. Secondary effects include any unforeseen side effects and the like that might affect the client. Several other authors (e.g., Kazdin, 1980; Wolf, 1978) have also highlighted the importance of legal and ethical considerations in judgments of treatment acceptability. Practical considerations, the final variable posited by Lennox and Miltenberger, include determining whether a particular treatment and the steps involved are feasible. This can range from judgments concerning the complexity of the steps involved in the treatment to the number of individuals involved in treatment delivery.

**Treatment Implementation/Use**

Treatment implementation/use concerns whether or not the treatment was actually delivered (Noell & Witt, 1999). Ensuring treatment implementation is a task that is considered almost, if not more difficult, than the process of treatment design (Noell, Witt, LaFleur, Mortenson, Ranier, & LaVelle, 2000). The implementation of treatments are of paramount importance to applied scientists because if an intervention is not delivered, it is difficult to expect positive behavioral changes.

**Treatment Integrity**

Closely related to treatment implementation/use is the concept of treatment integrity. Treatment integrity refers to the degree to which the independent variable (i.e., the treatment)
is implemented as it was originally intended and designed (Gresham, Gansle, & Noell, 1993). The two concepts of treatment implementation/use and treatment integrity are relevant for indirect services in general and to consultation in particular because failure to actually implement a treatment and/or a failure to implement a treatment with integrity can result in the absence of positive outcomes. In fact, Sterling-Turner, Watson, Wildmon, Watkins, and Little (2001) stated that moderate to high levels of treatment integrity are necessary in order for a treatment plan to have the potential to be effective. Other research has shown that initial levels of treatment integrity often start out high, but that they gradually decrease over time (Witt, Noell, LaFleur, & Mortenson, 1997). A recently published article also supports the finding that teachers often fail to implement an intervention with integrity because of a lack of support from the consultant (DiGennaro, Martens, & MacIntyre, 2005).

Additional research has shown that training can improve levels of treatment integrity (Noell, Witt, Gilbertson, Ranier, & Freeland, 1997). In this study, the authors followed three regular education elementary school teachers and a student with academic problems. The purpose was to examine the effect of performance feedback on treatment integrity using a multiple baseline design. In the first phase of the experiment, the school psychologist consultant explained how to correctly implement the intervention, provided data sheets, and explained that data would be collected at the end of every day. After this initial meeting, the teacher was then responsible for independently implementing/using the treatment with integrity. In the second phase of this experiment, the performance feedback phase, the school psychologist consultant and the teacher met for approximately five minutes each morning. During this meeting, the consultant presented the teacher with data on the student’s academic
performance as well as data on the level of the teacher’s treatment integrity. The consultant then made sure to show the teacher which specific intervention steps she did not implement, and why it was important that these steps be included. In the third phase, the maintenance phase, the school psychologist consultant and the teacher no longer met, but data collection continued as it had in the earlier stages. The results showed that, although all three teachers initially showed high levels of treatment integrity during the first few days of the intervention, these levels dropped off. However, when the school psychologist consultant provided feedback on the teachers’ performance, the teachers all showed corresponding increases in levels of treatment integrity.

A more recent examination of treatment integrity has corroborated Noell et al.’s (1997) finding that training can lead to increases in treatment integrity. Sterling-Turner, Watson, and Moore (2002) used a multiple baseline design to examine the effects of direct and indirect methods of consultee training on levels of treatment integrity and treatment outcomes in special education classrooms. The two methods of instruction were didactic training and rehearsal/feedback training. During didactic training, the consultees were exposed to verbal training and discussion of the treatment steps and procedures. The consultant, acting as trainer, answered all consultee questions, but did not engage in any direct demonstration of the treatment steps and procedures. During the rehearsal/feedback training session, the consultant provided verbal training in the treatment steps and procedures. The consultant and consultee then modeled the delivery of the entire treatment regimen. Results showed that the indirect method of training resulted in lower levels of treatment integrity, while the more direct method of training resulted in higher levels of
treatment integrity. Additionally, the authors found that treatments implemented with high levels of treatment integrity led to more successful outcomes. Improving levels of treatment integrity will ultimately benefit students, and finding ways to ensure that teachers understand the importance of treatment integrity is one possible way to improve treatment integrity.

Wickstrom and Witt (1993) proposed other ways to improve treatment integrity. They stated that people naturally resist change and that it is this resistance to change that can lead to poor levels of treatment integrity. These authors then recommended several techniques to school psychologist consultants to react to consultee resistance. One technique is to emphasize referent power during the initial stages of consultation. Being cooperative, empathetic, and genuine during the consultative process are just a few of the available options for promoting referent power. A second technique is to strengthen consultee knowledge and skill concerning the particular intervention. If a consultant is able to draw on direct informational power to help a consultee feel more empowered, there is a potential to reduce resistance particularly if the resistance is rooted in perceptions of an inability to correctly implement a treatment.

*Treatment Effectiveness*

The final variable under discussion is treatment effectiveness. To proceed, however, the two related terms, *effectiveness* and *efficacy*, must be differentiated. These two terms appear together when, for example, discussing the dichotomy of *effectiveness studies* and *efficacy studies* (Seligman, 1995). The major similarity between these two types of studies is that they both are concerned with the outcomes of interventions. However, the method by which this information is uncovered is vastly different. In efficacy studies, a premium is
placed on internal validity issues and maintaining a high degree of experimenter control (Seligman, 1995). A typical efficacy study will have random assignment, strict inclusion criteria, “blinded” treatments, multiple control groups, and manualized treatments. This strict control allows efficacy researchers to demonstrate statistically significant differences between an intervention and a control. This is not to say that effectiveness studies are unconcerned with internal validity issues, but they just focus more on how the intervention is actually delivered in a real-world (i.e., out of the laboratory) setting. By switching the focus to external validity issues, effectiveness researchers are demonstrating the effect that an intervention has when it is delivered under real-world conditions (e.g., individuals with multiple diagnoses, varying length of treatment implementation) (Seligman, 1995). Given that school psychologists and teachers are working within the school system, the construct of effectiveness often may seem more relevant to the practice of school psychological consultation than does efficacy.

The assessment of treatment effectiveness concerns client outcomes following treatment implementation. One hopes that client outcomes are positive, side-effects are minimal, and the treatment is deemed successful and therefore effective (Goldberg & Shapiro, 1995). When discussing issues of effectiveness, the relationship between treatment integrity and treatment effectiveness deserves mention (Sterling-Turner et al., 2002). If a treatment, implemented with poor integrity, is unsuccessful in changing client behavior, one cannot assume that it was the treatment that was unsuccessful. Gresham and Kendell (1987) further asserted that treatment integrity must be assessed in order to determine if it was the given treatment that resulted in the behavior change. Even when treatment outcomes are
positive, and a treatment is considered effective, one cannot be sure if it was the treatment that actually led to the improvement or if it was another extraneous variable. There is empirical support for the assertion that higher levels of treatment integrity lead to more successful outcomes. For instance, Sterling-Turner et al. (2002) found that direct training versus indirect training led to higher levels of treatment integrity and better student outcomes.

Summary

The previous section began with a definition of the social validity construct and then introduced four additional variables. These four variables: (a) treatment acceptability, (b) treatment implementation/use, (c) treatment integrity, and (d) treatment effectiveness were also defined and research was cited to support their relevance to school psychology and consultation. In the following section, a model of treatment acceptability will be presented. This model is particularly important because it highlights how each of these four variables can affect the others. Additional empirical research will be cited to show these inter-relationships.

A Model of Treatment Acceptability

Witt and Elliott’s (1985) model of treatment acceptability (see Figure 2) fits well with Wolf’s (1978) and Kazdin’s (1980) conceptualization of social validity. Witt and Elliott (1985) proposed a comprehensive four-part model of treatment acceptability that describes the interactions that occur between and among (a) treatment acceptability, (b) treatment implementation/use, (c) treatment effectiveness, and (d) treatment integrity. The relationships between each of these parts is sequential and reciprocal (Witt & Elliott, 1985). For instance,
Figure 2

Witt and Elliott’s (1985) Model of the Relationship between Treatment Acceptability, Use, Integrity, and Effectiveness
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treatment acceptability is often considered during treatment selection, and once an acceptable treatment is selected, the likelihood of an individual actually implementing/using that treatment increases relative to other treatments. Once a treatment has been deemed acceptable and is being implemented/used, the effectiveness of that treatment is affected by treatment integrity. Finally, if there is a high degree of treatment integrity, the probability of effecting positive behavior change increases, and there is an increased possibility that the treatment will be judged to be even more acceptable.

The following sections explore a selection of studies that address the empirical relationships between the subcomponents of Witt and Elliott’s (1985) model of treatment acceptability. Specifically, five relationships are explored: (a) treatment effectiveness and treatment acceptability, (b) treatment acceptability and treatment implementation/use, (c) treatment acceptability and treatment integrity, (d) treatment integrity and treatment effectiveness, and (e) treatment implementation/use and treatment effectiveness. In each of the five sections, multiple empirical studies that address the relationship between the variables are reviewed and important findings are highlighted.

Treatment Effectiveness and Treatment Acceptability

*Von Brock and Elliott (1987).* These authors investigated the relationship between treatment effectiveness and treatment acceptability. They were primarily interested in determining how information concerning treatment effectiveness influenced teachers’ ratings of pretreatment acceptability. A secondary purpose was to develop the Behavior Intervention Rating Scale (BIRS), an instrument designed to measure perceptions of treatment
effectiveness and treatment acceptability. The BIRS measures three factors related to
treatment effectiveness and treatment acceptability. The acceptability factor is comprised of
the embedded 15-item Intervention Rating Profile (IRP—15), the effectiveness factor is
comprised of seven items, and the time to effectiveness factor is comprised of two items. The
three factor BIRS accounted for 73.3% of the variance in perceptions of acceptability and
effectiveness, and the scale has a coefficient alpha of .98 (Von Brock & Elliott, 1987).

Von Brock and Elliott (1987) provided teachers with written case descriptions and
then asked them to complete the BIRS. The written cases contained information about the
presenting behavior problem, the intervention, and the effectiveness of the intervention. The
interventions used were a time-out procedure, a token economy system, and a response cost
system. Each of these interventions contained one of three descriptions about effectiveness
(i.e., no information, user satisfaction information, or research-based outcome information).
Results showed that the constructs of effectiveness and acceptability were highly correlated
\((r = .79)\). Results also showed that teachers rated the time-out intervention as the least
acceptable of the three interventions. Von Brock and Elliott found that when teachers view
an intervention as less acceptable, they also view it as less effective.

Reimers and Wacker (1988). In this study, parental pre-and post-intervention
acceptability ratings were assessed in an outpatient clinic. Specifically, Reimers and Wacker
(1988) provided parents with treatment recommendations along with a step-by-step
description about how to accurately administer the behavioral intervention. The investigators
then provided a rationale for the behavioral interventions. Pre-intervention ratings were
obtained after the treatment recommendations and treatment descriptions were provided, and post-intervention ratings were obtained one week and one month after the parents implemented the treatment. Both pre-and post-intervention ratings of acceptability were measured using the Treatment Acceptability Rating Form (TARF). The results showed that treatment effectiveness and treatment acceptability were significantly correlated at one month post-intervention ($r = .90$).

Reimers, Wacker, Cooper, and De Raad (1992). The purpose of this investigation was to measure parental ratings of acceptability in both analog and natural settings (i.e., actual treatment recommendations for the behavior problems of their children). In the analog setting, parents were asked to read a description of a behavior problem (mild or severe) and the accompanying treatment description (either positive reinforcement, time-out, or medication), and then they were asked to complete the TARF. After completing the analog portion of the study, the parents progressed to the naturalistic portion of the study. Here, the parents worked with a multidisciplinary team to evaluate their child’s behavior and then come up with an intervention. Once an intervention was decided upon, the multidisciplinary team verbally described and demonstrated the selected intervention for the parents. The parents were then asked to demonstrate the correct implementation procedures in front of the multidisciplinary team. After training, the parents implemented the intervention at home and completed the TARF at one, three, and six-month intervals.

Results for the analog portion of the study showed that type of intervention had a significant impact on treatment acceptability ratings ($F[2,37] = 31.38, p < .01$). Post-hoc tests revealed that intervention type (i.e., positive reinforcement, time-out, or medication) had a
significant impact on ratings of treatment acceptability, with positive reinforcement and time-out being rated as more acceptable than medication. There was also an interaction between treatment type and the severity of the behavior problem on treatment acceptability ratings ($F_{[2,37]} = 4.77, p < .05$). Additional post-hoc tests indicated that positive reinforcement and time-out were rated as more acceptable for low severity problems, while medication was rated as more acceptable for high severity problems. Findings from the second portion of the study indicated that there were statistically significant positive correlations between treatment acceptability and treatment effectiveness across all time points: at pre-intervention ($r = .75$), one month ($r = .82$), three months ($r = .77$), and six-months ($r = .85$).

**Summary.** These three studies all examined the relationship between treatment acceptability and treatment effectiveness. Each study provided evidence of a positive relationship between the constructs of treatment acceptability and treatment effectiveness. An important aspect of these consistent findings is their generalizability. For instance, the relationship between treatment acceptability and treatment effectiveness was demonstrated in both analog and naturalistic settings and with different participant pools (i.e., undergraduate students and parents).

**Treatment Acceptability and Treatment Implementation/Use**

Intervention acceptability and implementation of treatments is an important issue, especially when there are multiple options available (Kazdin, French, & Sherick, 1981). It stands to reason that when there are several interventions available to address the same problem, the treatment that is deemed the most acceptable will be the one that is eventually implemented (Kazdin et al., 1981). However, legal and ethical issues can affect intervention
acceptability and implementation (Kazdin, 1980; Wolf, 1978). For example, some treatments, like corporal punishment, have been deemed unacceptable because they impinge on the rights of the individual. In this particular example, corporal punishment has been judged unacceptable and is therefore less likely to be used or implemented by many.

*Kazdin, French, and Sherick (1981).* In a study on the acceptability of alternative treatments, Kazdin et al. (1981) found that providing information on a intervention’s acceptability and more information about the intervention itself can impact how a consumer views that particular treatment. This, in turn can impact the likelihood that the consumer will implement/use the treatment. This makes logical sense; if a teacher finds an intervention unacceptable, it is likely that the teacher will chose not to implement the intervention (Reimers, et al., 1987; Witt & Martens, 1983). Witt and Elliott (1985) posited that an individual’s willingness to use an intervention may impact his/her judgments of acceptability, because it can be assumed that any unwillingness to implement an intervention is based on perceptions of unacceptability.

*Reimers, Wacker, and Koeppel (1987).* In this review on the acceptability of behavioral interventions, the authors stated that consultee understanding of an intervention can affect acceptability judgments (Reimers et al., 1987). For instance, if a consultee fails to implement an intervention, an underlying assumption is that the consultee possibly found the intervention unacceptable and therefore did not see fit to implement/use that available treatment option. The authors stated that one way to improve the likelihood of a consultee implementing/using a treatment is to ensure that s/he has a full understanding of the
treatment’s steps, procedures, and goals. One logical way to improve understanding would be for the school psychologist consultant to provide the consultee with enough direct information about the treatment and all its intricacies. If this information is provided, Reimers et al. (1987) have argued that the consultee will be more likely to understand the treatment, more likely to implement the treatment, and more likely to view the treatment as acceptable.

Allinder and Oats (1997). Allinder and Oats (1997) examined the relationship between treatment acceptability, treatment implementation/use, and treatment fidelity (i.e., treatment integrity) on teacher acceptability ratings of a curriculum-based measurement (CBM) program for math development. Treatment integrity/treatment fidelity was measured using permanent product data from student performance graphs, and teacher self report on several variables (i.e., number of probes administered, final goals for the student, the number of times these goals were adjusted, number of instructional changes, and the correctness of timing changes). For data analysis purposes, the teachers were split into two categories: (a) high acceptability and (b) low acceptability. Results showed that the teachers in the high acceptability group administered more CBM probes, set more difficult goals for their students, and their students showed greater gains in math performance than teachers in the low acceptability group.

Summary. Treatment acceptability and treatment implementation/use are important considerations for school psychologists and consultees. Logically, unacceptable treatments are unlikely to be implemented/used (Reimers et al., 1987). Research has shown that providing evidence of a treatment’s acceptability (Kazdin et al., 1981) and enough
information to ensure consultee understanding of a treatment (Reimers et al., 1987) can increase a treatment’s likelihood of being used and viewed as acceptable. These are important considerations for the school psychologist because a treatment that is not implemented has no chance of being effective. If consultants can provide information about treatments and ensure that consultees have an understanding of the rationale behind a given treatment, they increase the probability that their treatment is implemented/used and has the opportunity to be effective.

*Treatment Acceptability and Treatment Integrity*

If a treatment is acceptable, is it more likely to implemented with integrity? Reimers et al. (1987) have argued that acceptability plays an important role in treatment integrity. They posited that consultees who find a given treatment acceptable are more likely to carefully implement the treatment with a high degree of treatment integrity. Reimers et al. (1987) are not the only authors who believe treatment acceptability is a prerequisite for treatment integrity (e.g., Lentz, Allen, & Erhardt, 1996). The Allinder and Oats (1997) research discussed in the previous section is also relevant to this discussion. For instance, teachers in the high acceptability group had higher levels of treatment fidelity/integrity than did teachers in the low acceptability group (Allinder & Oats, 1997). Teachers in the high acceptability group administered more CBM probes and set more challenging goals for their students (these were both viewed as types of treatment integrity).

Sterling-Turner and Watson (2002). The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between treatment acceptability and treatment integrity, because despite there being a solid literature base to suggest that these two variables are related, there are few
empirical studies that address this relationship. In order to investigate the extent and direction of this relationship, 64 undergraduates were trained to implement an intervention for tics (the person with the facial tic was a confederate) and were then asked to rate treatment acceptability of the intervention using the IRP—15 (Martens, Witt, Elliott, & Darveaux, 1985). Levels of treatment integrity were then assessed using a specially designed checklist and videotape of the intervention session. Results showed that there were no significant Spearman rank order correlations between pre-treatment acceptability ratings and treatment integrity, and post-treatment and treatment integrity data \( r_s = .001 \) and \( r_s = .13 \) respectively, thus suggesting that there is no empirical relationship between the two variables.

**Treatment Integrity and Treatment Effectiveness**

Treatment integrity is often considered a necessary link to treatment effectiveness (Gresham, Gansle, Noell, Cohen, & Rosenblum, 1993). Treatment integrity is an important component in intervention research because in order to state that a treatment caused behavioral changes, one has to demonstrate that the independent variable (i.e., the treatment implemented with integrity) led to changes in the behavior (i.e., the dependent variable) (Gresham et al., 1993). One way to demonstrate this is to measure levels of treatment integrity along with treatment outcomes. If the treatment integrity of an intervention is monitored (and found to be high) and behavioral change is observed, then it is easier to claim that the intervention led to the change in behavior. Conversely, if treatment integrity is low and behavioral change is not observed, it is difficult to determine whether the treatment itself was ineffective or if the treatment was effective but not implemented correctly and thus rendered ineffective.
Research has addressed the link between treatment integrity and treatment effectiveness. Some aspects of this research have been addressed in an earlier section (see Treatment Integrity), but it will be briefly summarized here. Noell et al.’s (1997) research on enhancing treatment integrity through performance feedback found that level of treatment integrity increased when teachers were provided with feedback on their performance. More importantly, there were corresponding increases in student performance for two out of three students, thus suggesting that increased levels of integrity lead to improved performance. A second study, Sterling-Turner and Watson (2002), also examined how training could improve levels of treatment integrity. The authors found that direct training, as opposed to indirect training, resulted in higher levels of treatment integrity. An additional finding supported the link between high levels of treatment integrity and levels of treatment effectiveness. Specifically, in three out of the four consultation cases, high levels of treatment integrity were associated with successful student outcomes. Again, this suggests that increased levels of integrity result in successful client outcomes.

This fifth and final section focuses on the relationship between treatment implementation/use and treatment effectiveness. Two recent studies by Fuchs and Fuchs highlight the effectiveness of peer assisted learning strategies (PALS) intervention programs implemented with a high degree of integrity.

*Treatment Implementation/Use and Treatment Effectiveness*

It makes logical sense to assume a connection between using a treatment and obtaining treatment effectiveness. In other words, if one does not use an intervention, then one cannot expect there to be a positive effect.
Fuchs, Fuchs, and Karns (2001). This study addressed the empirical relationship between treatment implementation, treatment effectiveness, and teacher perceptions of treatment feasibility. Fuchs, Fuchs, and Karns (2001) implemented peer assisted learning strategies (PALS) in 20 kindergarten classrooms (ten experimental, ten control) to help with math skill development. Results showed that: (a) the ten teachers who implemented the PALS program did so with varying degrees of integrity (an average of 90% accuracy), (b) the PALS program promoted math development, and (c) teachers rated the PALS program as feasible within the classroom setting. This suggests that if teachers view a treatment as practical, they are likely to implement/use said treatment with a high degree of integrity. Perhaps just as important as perceptions of practicality and the degree of integrity is the positive impact practical treatment implemented/used with integrity can have on students.

Fuchs, Fuchs, Yazdin, and Powell (2002). Fuchs, Fuchs, Yazdin, and Powell (2002) also studied PALS and math skill development, but with a first grade sample. They found that when treatment (i.e., the PALS intervention) was used in conjunction with high levels of treatment integrity, the treatments were rated as highly effective. It is also important to note that, not only did the teachers use the PALS intervention, but that the first grade children all benefited from the intervention (i.e., showed improvements in math performance).

These results suggest that when teachers implement/use a treatment with a high degree of integrity, not only are treatments rated as effective, but also students reap positive benefits.

Summary. Both studies support the link between treatment implementation and treatment effectiveness. However, there is one important caveat: there must also be high
levels of treatment integrity in order for the treatments to be effective. In addition to the two Fuchs studies (Fuchs et al., 2001; Fuchs et al., 2002) other studies cited earlier in the literature review support the link between treatment effectiveness and treatment implementation (e.g., Noell et al., 1997).

Conclusion

The preceding literature review has served to build the rationale for this dissertation research to be described. Consultation is a means of service delivery that school psychologists can use to benefit students. According to Erchul (1999), consultation is an exercise in interpersonal influence. The construct and process of interpersonal influence can be examined through Raven’s (1992, 1993) Power/Interaction Model of Interpersonal Influence. This model has previously been applied to examine the process of school consultation (e.g., Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001; Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001; Erchul, et al., 2004).

The construct of social power has also been used to examine the presence of gender differences with regard language use and leadership styles. This research has consistently found that individuals differentially attribute social power to men and women (Carli, 1999). The Aguinis studies (Aguinis & Henle, 2001; Aguinis, et al., 1998) have also shown that identical behavior can result in different attributions. Other gender and social power research preliminarily indicates that women perceive soft power bases to be more effective in bringing about compliance (Erchul, et al., 2004).

Finally, the construct of social validity is relevant to the practice of school psychology in general and school consultation in particular. When one considers consultation
as an intervention, the relevance of social validity becomes readily apparent. For example, if a school psychologist asks a parent or a teacher to implement an intervention that s/he does not see as valid or acceptable, it is not unreasonable to expect some form of resistance in implementation. Witt and Elliott (1985) proposed a model of treatment acceptability that logically integrates several aspects of social validity to explain how these various aspects can affect the delivery and impact of an intervention.
Statement of the Problem

Consultation is an indirect form of service delivery in which school psychologists interact with other adults (e.g., teachers, parents, and administrators) in an effort to ameliorate a difficulty experienced by a student. The consultation process has become both a preferred and a primary function of today’s school psychology practitioner (Zins & Erchul, 2002). Given the importance of the consultation enterprise, it is incumbent on both researchers and practitioners to have a better understanding of the processes that underlie consultation.

One way to develop a better understanding of the relational process of consultation is to apply Raven’s (1992, 1993) Power/Interaction Model of Interpersonal Influence. This model allows researchers to explore how variables such as effectiveness, likelihood of use, and acceptability affect social power perceptions.

Previous research (Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001; Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001; Erchul, et al., 2004) has explored the perceived effectiveness of Raven’s (1992) social power bases within school consultation. These three studies have found that psychologists, as a whole, perceive soft power bases as being more effective in bringing about compliance in initially reluctant teacher consultees. More specifically, the Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001) and Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001) studies found that school psychologist consultants view direct informational, positive expert, and positive referent power as being effective in bringing about compliance in teacher consultees. Additionally, Erchul, et al. (2004) found that female school psychologist consultants view soft social power bases as being more
effective in leading to compliance in teacher consultees than did male school psychologist consultants.

All current research that has addressed the intersection of social power and school psychological consultation has focused on issues of perceived effectiveness. The purpose of this two-part dissertation research was to address two of the areas suggested by Erchul and Raven (1997) in their seminal article on social power and school consultation. More specifically, the constructs of likelihood of use and acceptability were examined in relation to the social power bases and Raven’s (1992, 1993) Power/Interaction Model of Interpersonal Influence. In the first part of this dissertation, psychologists were asked to rate the likelihood of use of 11 of Raven’s (1992) social power bases. In the second part, psychologists were asked to rate the acceptability of the six soft social power bases (i.e., direct information, positive expert, positive referent, personal reward, legitimate position, and legitimate dependence). Gender differences were also explored in both studies.
Hypotheses and Rationales

At the conclusion of Erchul and Raven’s (1997) article, the authors proposed questions for future research in the area of social power and school psychological consultation. Some of these questions have been addressed in the ongoing social power research agenda conducted by Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001), Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001), and Erchul et al. (2004). However, several important questions and issues remain unaddressed. Accordingly, the following two groups of hypotheses stem from Erchul and Raven’s (1997) research agenda and the existing social power research base.

Study One: Likelihood of Use

Hypothesis One (H1): School psychologist consultants will report that they are likely to use soft power bases significantly more often than harsh power bases.

Rationale. Previous social power research in the area of school consultation has examined the issue of perceived effectiveness (Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001; Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001; Erchul, et al., 2004). The next logical step in the social power research agenda is to examine likelihood of use. Social power studies (e.g., Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001; Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001; Raven, Schwarzwald, & Koslowsky, 1998) have consistently found empirical support for the division of the power bases into two distinct factors, namely the soft and harsh factors. Of these two factors, soft power bases have been perceived as the most effective in leading to compliance (Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001; Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001).
Hypothesis Two (H 2): School psychologist consultants will report that they are likely to use direct informational, positive expert, and positive referent power significantly more often than the remaining eight power bases.

Rationale. The rationale behind the second hypothesis is also based on previous speculations and research in the area of social power. Martin (1978) first highlighted the relevance of positive expert power and positive referent power to the practice of school consultation. Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001) then found empirical support for this supposition, noting that school consultants rated positive expert and positive referent as two of the most effective power bases in bringing about compliance in consultees. Additionally, Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001) found that the two power bases rated as most likely to result in teacher compliance were the soft bases of direct informational and positive expert power. These researchers performed a principal components analysis and found that these two bases could be grouped together as a separate construct. Also relevant to this rationale is the connection between the constructs of effectiveness and use. Logically, if an intervention or treatment is perceived as effective, it follows that this intervention or treatment will be used or implemented (Fuchs et al., 2002). However, it is important to note that this might not always be true. For instance, for school psychology practitioners, ethical and legal considerations should take precedence over effectiveness issues.

Hypothesis Three (H 3): Female school psychologist consultants will report that they are likely to use soft power bases significantly more often than are male school psychologist consultants.
Rationale. This hypothesis is partially based on the findings of Erchul, et al. (2004). These authors reported that female school psychologist consultants rate soft power bases as more effective than do male school psychologist consultants. Also relevant is Fuchs et al., (2002) assertion that issues of effectiveness and use are linked.

Study Two: Acceptability

Hypothesis One (H1): School psychologist consultants will report that direct informational, positive expert, and positive referent power are more acceptable than the remaining three soft social power bases (i.e., legitimate position, legitimate dependence and personal reward).

Hypothesis Two (H2): Female school psychologist consultants, more than male consultants, will report that influence strategies drawn from direct informational, positive expert, and positive referent are more acceptable than the three remaining soft power bases (i.e., legitimate position, legitimate dependence and personal reward).

Rationale. The rationale for these hypotheses are based on findings from Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001), Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001), and Erchul, et al. (2004). Specifically, in Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001), a sample of school consultants viewed soft power bases as more effective than harsh power bases, and direct informational and positive expert power were the top-rated power bases. Similarly, Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001) found that school psychologists rated direct informational, positive expert, and positive referent as the most effective bases overall. Finally, Erchul, et al. (2004), based on a conservative effect size analysis, reported that female school psychologists rated soft power bases as more likely to be effective than did male school psychologists. Additionally, Von Brock and Elliott (1987) proposed a relationship between the constructs of effectiveness and
acceptability. Specifically, they posited that effective treatments are viewed as more acceptable and ineffective treatments are viewed as less acceptable.
Method

Although the methods presented in the following two sections are similar, it is necessary to treat them separately because they address two distinct lines of inquiry. The first study addresses the likelihood of use of both soft and harsh social power bases, while the second study addresses the acceptability of a subset of these social power bases (i.e., positive expert, positive referent, direct informational, legitimate dependence, personal reward, and legitimate position power).

Study One: Likelihood of Use

Participants

The National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) provided a random listing of names and addresses of 1000 Nationally Certified School Psychologists (NCSPs). All these NCSPs were contacted to participate in Study One.

Instrumentation

The Interpersonal Power Inventory (IPI) was originally developed and first used by Raven et al. (1998). The IPI is a critical-incident questionnaire designed to measure 11 of the 14 social power bases previously defined by Raven (1992). For each of these 11 power bases, there are four items that assess each particular power base, thus leading to an instrument that has 44 total items. To each of the 44 items along a seven point Likert scale, individuals were asked to respond about how likely it was that the particular reason would result in compliance to a request from a supervisor.

Before completing their final analyses, Raven et al. (1998) examined the intercorrelations among each of the four items that assessed the individual power bases. They
decided to drop the one item that did not “hang” well with the others. Dropping these 11 items resulted in a 33 item questionnaire (i.e., 3 items per social power base).

Although the original IPI was designed to assess the relationship between supervisors and subordinates (Raven et al., 1998), it has been subsequently modified to examine the relationship between teachers and students (Elias et al., 1999) and the relationship between consultants and consultees (Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001; Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001). For the present research, the IPI has been further modified to assess “likelihood of use” of the social power bases within school consultation (see Appendix C). Following the methodology presented in the Raven et al. (1998) study, this instrument (IPI-Form CT-U) also has been reduced to 33 items. The same procedure was followed and, by examining the intercorrelations between the four items that assessed an individual social power base, the one item that did not “hang” well with the others was dropped. The data that supported these decisions came from the combined school psychologist consultant databases reported by Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001) and Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001). These two data bases were combined for two reasons. First, combining the two samples led to a more representative sample than either sample alone, and secondly, it was deemed more appropriate to eliminate items based on as large a sample as possible. As a result, the decision to eliminate one item per power base was based on the responses of 235 school psychologist consultants (101 from the Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001, study and 134 from the Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001, study). Five of the items that were eliminated from the new instrument matched those dropped by Raven et al. (1998), and four items that were
dropped from the new instrument corresponded to those eliminated by Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001).

For this dissertation research, the instruments given to respondents were modified to assess likelihood of use of the power bases. Specifically, the school psychologist respondent was asked to estimate how likely s/he would be to *use* a particular consideration when attempting to influence a teacher. The rating scale was also changed to assess use as opposed to likelihood of compliance (i.e., effectiveness).

Prior to implementation, this instrument was reviewed by practicing school psychologists from the Wake County Public Schools in Raleigh, NC. These volunteer school psychologists checked the instrument for readability (i.e., do the instructions make sense?), understanding (i.e., is the task clear?), and amount of respondent burden (i.e., is the instrument too long?). The instrument was also reviewed by four members of a graduate-level research team for information on the same three questions. Slight modifications were made following receipt of feedback.

Although the IPI is a relatively new instrument, it has been shown to be reliable. For example, the study that used the original IPI (Raven et al., 1998) examined reliability issues across two cultures using coefficient alphas as measures of internal consistency. In the U.S. sample, coefficient alphas for the individual factors ranged from .67 to .86 and accounted for approximately 60% of the variance in a two-factor solution (the soft/harsh dichotomy). Alphas in the Israeli sample were very similar, ranging from .63 to .88 and accounting for 59% of the variance in a two-factor solution. The IPI was altered by Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001) to examine school psychologists’ perceptions of social power in the context of school
consultation (IPI-Form CT; see Appendix A). On the IPI-Form CT, the alphas for the two-factor solution were .80 and .86, and these two factors accounted for approximately 47% of the variance in IPI-Form CT scores. Similar results were also obtained for the IPI-Form CT in Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001). Here, the alphas ranged from .79 to .83 with a mean of .81.

The IPI is also a valid instrument. That the replication of the soft/harsh breakdown occurs across several studies (Elias et al., 1999; Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001; Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001; Raven et al., 1998) and across cultures (Raven et al., 1998) indicates a great deal of construct validity. Additional evidence of construct validity is found in the general consistency of the power bases that fall within the soft/harsh dichotomy. Finally, in the Raven et al. (1998) study, the concurrent validity of the IPI was demonstrated by showing that the soft power bases were associated with job satisfaction. More specifically, data analyses that compared IPI responses to Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSJQ) responses showed that the harsh/soft power breakdown was able to differentiate workers with high and low job satisfaction. In other words, higher ratings of job satisfaction (as measured by the MSJQ) were correlated with higher scores for the soft power bases on the IPI.

Procedure

Copies of IPI-Form CT-U were mailed at the end of August 2004 to the 1,000 NCSPs along with a cover letter (see Appendix E) that described the intent of the study. These participants were asked to complete the inventory and return it in the enclosed postage-paid envelope. Reminder postcards were mailed to those participants who had not responded by
the end of September 2004. Once completed IPI-CT-Us were returned, the responses were transferred to an opscan sheets by two undergraduate students for statistical analysis. These students were supervised by a graduate-level school psychology student, and they earned independent research study credit for their work.

*Study Two: Acceptability*

*Participants*

The National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) provided a random listing of names and addresses of 1000 Nationally Certified School Psychologists (NCSPs). All these NCSPs were contacted to participate in Study Two.

*Instrumentation*

In this section, the development of the IPI Form CT-A (i.e., acceptability) is described. Because the IPI Form CT-A is based on both the intervention acceptability literature and social power bases literature, each is presented in turn.

The Intervention Rating Profile (IRP) was originally designed to assess teacher judgments of intervention acceptability using a six-point Likert scale (Witt, Elliott, & Martens, 1984; Witt & Martens, 1983). The IRP contains 20 items and has been found to have five separate factors (Witt et al., 1984; Witt & Martens, 1983). These five factors accounted for 72% of the variance in one study (Witt & Martens, 1983) and 98% of the variance in another (Witt et al., 1984). The IRP was also found to have adequate reliability (coefficient alpha of .91; Witt & Martens, 1983).
In the first study, Witt and Martens (1983) administered the IRP to 180 preservice and student teachers. The participants were asked to rate the acceptability of an intervention (i.e., praise, home-based reinforcement, response cost system, token economy, time out, or ignoring) designed to reduce a specific behavior problem (i.e., daydreaming, using obscene language, or destroying other people’s property) exhibited by a fifth-grade boy.

Results of a principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation revealed five factors. Although the authors did not name these five factors, they suggested that the first (i.e., primary) factor reflected perceptions of general acceptability, while the other four secondary factors reflected perceptions of amount of risk, teacher time, effects on other students, and amount of teacher skill, respectively. Cumulatively, these unnamed five factors accounted for 72% of the variance (factor one, 41%; factor two, 9%; factor three, 9%; factor four, 7%; and factor five, 7%).

In a follow-up study, Witt et al. (1984) administered the IRP to 180 preservice and student teachers. In this study, participants were also asked to rate the acceptability of six interventions (i.e., praise, home-based reinforcement, response cost system, token economy, time out, or ignoring) designed to improve a specific behavior problem. The specific behavior problem, not explicitly defined, varied along three criteria: (a) severity of the behavior problem (low, moderate, severe), (b) teacher time needed to implement (low, moderate, high), and (c) intervention type (positive or negative).

Witt et al. (1984) identified five factors using principal component analysis with varimax rotation. These five factors were interpretable and were named to reflect the content of the individual items that composed each factor. The first factor, the “General
Acceptability” factor, was composed of seven items and accounted for 61% of the variance in teacher responses. An example item is: “Most teachers would find the intervention suitable for the behavior problem described.” The second factor, “Risk,” was composed of four items and assessed the perception of whether the intervention would pose a risk to the student. This factor accounted for 12% of the variance; an example item is: “This intervention would not result in risk to the child.” The third factor, “Time,” assessed perceptions of the amount of teacher time required to deliver the intervention. There are four items on this factor and responses accounted for 11% of variance in teacher responses. An example of an item from this factor is: “This intervention is practical in the amount of time required for record keeping.” The fourth factor, “Other Children,” assessed perceptions of an intervention’s effect on other children in the classroom. Three items made up this factor and responses accounted for seven percent of the variance. An example of an item from this factor is: “This intervention would not be difficult to implement in a classroom with 30 other students.” The final factor, “Skill,” was composed of two items. These two items assessed the amount of teacher skill necessary to correctly implement the intervention and responses accounted for seven percent of the variance. An example item from this factor is: “Teachers are likely to use this intervention because it requires little technical skill.”

The similarities between the factor structures across the two studies (Witt & Martens, 1983; Witt et al., 1984) suggest that the IRP is a valid measure of perceptions of acceptability. The relatively high coefficient alpha (.91) also suggests that the IRP is a reliable instrument (Witt & Martens, 1983).
For this dissertation research, the seven items from the “General Acceptability” scale of the IRP (Witt et al., 1984) were used to assess school psychologists’ perceptions of the acceptability of five soft social power bases plus legitimate position power (see IPI Form-CT-A [Acceptability] in Appendix D). The seven item “General Acceptability” factor and not the entire IRP was used in an effort to reduce respondent burden. Therefore, this new instrument has 42 items (seven items x the six power bases). The six social power bases were integrated into the instrument in six separate scenarios. Each scenario asked the respondent to rate the acceptability of a consultative approach based upon that particular power base. For example, the scenario for positive expert power is as follows: “She regards you as “the expert.” She acknowledges that you probably know more about this particular situation than she does and therefore you know the best way to address Billy’s (i.e., the student’s) problem.”

The instructions, item order, and physical layout were modified from the original IPI-Form CT (see Appendix A) in order to clearly indicate how the school psychologist should respond. Additionally, in order to ensure that respondents would have a shared understanding of consultation, a brief paragraph describing consultation was added. This modification was modeled after a similar definition provided by Gonzalez, Nelson, Gutkin, and Shwery (2004) in their study of teacher resistance to school-based consultation. A second section that described a case between a school psychologist and an elementary school teacher was added to the instrument to provide a common basis for responding to the acceptability of the six social power bases. The overall purpose for including these two general descriptions was to
ensure that all participants would respond to the same critical incident and not to a compilation of their own experiences.

Prior to actual use, the IPI Form CT-A was reviewed by practicing school psychologists in the Wake County Public Schools in Raleigh, NC. As was the case for Study One, these volunteer school psychologists checked this instrument for readability (i.e., do the instructions make sense?), understanding (i.e., is the task clear?), and amount of respondent burden (i.e., is the instrument too long?). The instrument was also reviewed by four members of a graduate-level research team for preliminary information on the same three questions. Minor modifications were made following receipt of feedback.

Procedure

Copies of the IPI Form CT-A were mailed in late August 2004 to 1,000 NCSP school psychologists along with a cover letter (see Appendix F). Participants were asked to complete and return the inventory in the enclosed postage-paid envelope. Reminder postcards were mailed to all participants who had not replied by the end of September 2004. Once completed IPI Form-CT-As were returned, responses were transferred to opscan sheets by two undergraduate students for statistical analysis. These students were supervised by a graduate-level school psychology student, and they earned independent research study credit for their work.
Results

The results of this dissertation research will be presented in two sections that correspond to the two individual studies. Therefore, the first section will discuss the findings of the first study, which addressed the likelihood of use of Raven’s (1993) social power bases, and the second section will discuss the findings of the second study, which focused on the acceptability of six social power bases (i.e., expert, positive referent, direct informational, personal reward, legitimate dependence, and legitimate position).

Study One: Likelihood of Use of Power Bases

The results section for Study One will be organized in three sections. The first section will present a description of the participant pool, including the means and standard deviations of the individual power bases and the soft/harsh power base dichotomy along with a gender breakdown. The second section will present results of two principal component analyses. The principal component analysis is exploratory in nature, and the second principal component analysis is a forced two-factor solution (i.e., the soft/harsh dichotomy). The final section will present the results of the inferential statistics that address the three directional hypotheses.

Descriptive statistics. In this study, 372 of 1,000 individuals returned the IPI-CT-U, for an overall response rate of 37.2%. Of these 372 IPI-CT-U’s, 352 were used in analyses, thus resulting in a usable response rate of 35.2%. A survey was considered unusable if a respondent failed to answer 4 or more of the 33 survey questions. Of the 352 participants who returned usable surveys, 71.4% were female and 28.6% were male (with two missing data points; .56% missing). The sample was primarily Caucasian (95.1%); the remainder of
the sample was 2.0% Hispanic, 1.4% African-American, 0.9% Multiethnic, 0.3% Native American, and 0.3% Asian (with six missing data points; 1.7% missing). The majority of the participants reported that they had received formal training in school psychological consultation (65.8%), while 34.2% reported that they had no formal training in consultation (two missing data points; .56% missing) With regard to level of education, 37.2% of respondents had specialist degrees in school psychology, 34.7% had master’s degrees (MA/MS/MEd), 26.4% had doctoral degrees, and 1.7% reported that they had bachelor’s degrees (BA/BS) (four missing data points; 1.1% missing). The respondents had a mean age of 51.3 years ($R = 25$ to 83; $SD = 9.6$) and a mean of 20.2 years experience ($R = 1$ to 38; $SD = 8.6$). Finally, the sample was geographically diverse, with respondents representing 46 states.

As for the teachers whom the school psychologist respondents had in mind when they were completing the critical-incident IPI-CT-U, 94.9% were female and 4.8% were male (with two missing data points; .56% missing). These teachers were 90.8% Caucasian, 4.3% African American, 2.6% Hispanic, 1.7% Multiethnic, 0.3% Asian, and 0.3% Native American (three missing data points; .85% missing). With regard to grade level, 42.4% of these teachers taught in grades 1 through 3; 19.9%, 4 and 5; 13.1%, 6 through 8; 12.5%, pre-kindergarten or kindergarten; 9.4%, 9 through 12; and the remaining 2.3%, “other” grades (two missing data points; .56% missing). The teachers had a mean age of 40.2 ($SD = 9.5$) years ($R = 23$ to 65) and 13.8 ($SD = 8.2$) years of teaching experience ($R = 1$ to 35).

The means and standard deviations of the 11 social power bases and the soft/harsh dichotomy are presented in Table 2. This table also breaks down this information according
Table 2


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power Base</th>
<th>Total (N = 352)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Males (n = 100)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Females (n = 250)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Informational</td>
<td>5.54 c</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Expert</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Referent</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Reward</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal Reward</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Coercion</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal Coercion</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legit. Position</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legit. Equity</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legit. Reciprocity</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legit. Dependence</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft a</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harsh b</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a This factor is composed of positive expert, positive referent, legitimate dependence, direct informational, and legitimate position power.  
b This factor is composed of impersonal reward, impersonal coercion, personal coercion, legitimate equity, legitimate reciprocity, and personal reward power.  
c The scaling on the Interpersonal Power Inventory-Usage (IPI-CT-U) runs from 1 to 7, with 1 reflecting a very low likelihood of use and 7 reflecting a very high likelihood of use.
to consultant gender. A “top six” rank ordering based on ratings of the power bases for all consultants with respect to \textit{likelihood of use} was direct informational, positive expert, legitimate dependence, positive referent, legitimate position, and personal reward power.

\textit{Overall factor structure}. Two principal component analyses (PCAs) with varimax rotation were conducted on consultant responses to the IPI-CT-U. The first PCA was exploratory in nature and the second principal component analysis was a forced two-factor solution; however, the results for these analyses were identical and thus will be discussed together. As presented in Table 3, two factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.0 emerged. Together these two factors accounted for 61.03% of the variance. The two labeled factors, presented in order of variance accounted for, were: (a) \textit{harsh power} (consisting of impersonal reward, impersonal coercion, personal coercion, legitimate equity, legitimate reciprocity, and personal reward power); and (b) \textit{soft power} (consisting of positive expert, positive referent, legitimate dependence, direct informational, and legitimate position power). The harsh factor accounted for 45.47 \% of the variance in consultant responses on the IPI-CT-U and the soft factor accounted for 15.56 \% of the variance. Coefficient alphas for these two factors were moderately high (.89 for both harsh and soft).

\textit{Inferential statistics}. Repeated measures ANOVAs were used to perform planned contrasts to address the three directional hypotheses. The first hypothesis, that school psychologist consultants would report that they are significantly more \textit{likely to use} the soft power bases, was supported. Using a traditional alpha level of .05, there was a significant effect, $F (1, 351) = 3340.97, p < .0001$. An effect size analysis (Cohen, 1988) was also performed on these data in order to determine if this statistically significant difference was
Table 3

*Factor Loadings and Coefficient Alphas for the Likelihood of Use of the Individual Power Bases*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Power Base Content</th>
<th>Factor 1 Loadings</th>
<th>Factor 2 Loadings</th>
<th>Coefficient Alphas for Primary Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harsh</td>
<td>Impersonal Reward</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impersonal Coercion</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Coercion</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legitimate Equity</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legitimate Reciprocity</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Reward</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft</td>
<td>Positive Expert</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Referent</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legitimate Dependence</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct informational</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legitimate Position</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
also practically or clinically significant. The effect size ($ES$) was calculated by subtracting the mean of the harsh factor from the mean of the soft factor and then dividing this difference by the pooled standard deviation. According to Cohen (1988), $.50$ acts as the lower limit of a medium effect, and this a priori criterion was easily met ($ES = 2.85$), thus providing additional support for the finding that school psychological consultants are more likely to use soft bases than harsh bases.

The second hypothesis, that school psychological consultants would report that they are significantly more likely to use direct informational, positive expert, and positive referent power than the remaining eight power bases, was largely supported. As a prelude to this analysis, it was discovered that the repeated measures ANOVA used to perform planned contrasts indicated that the sphericity assumption was violated (Hatcher & Stepanski, 1994). More specifically, the Greenhouse-Geisser Epsilon and the Huynh-Feldt Epsilon measures were both less than $.75$, thus suggesting the need to conduct a repeated measures MANOVA instead of a univariate approach (Hatcher & Stepanski, 1994). Therefore, using a repeated measures MANOVA with a traditional alpha level of $.05$, there was a significant overall effect, $F (10, 342) = 543.92, p < .0001$. For the planned contrasts, however, a more conservative alpha level of $.0016$ (as determined by a Bonferroni adjustment) was used to correct for the number of planned contrasts used in addressing this hypothesis. The alpha level of $.0016$ was derived by taking the traditional alpha level of $.05$ and dividing by the number of comparisons (i.e., $30$). Because these were one-tailed tests however, $.0032$ became the alpha level used to determine statistical significance.
The next three paragraphs describe the specific results pertaining to the three sets of planned contrasts. First, when direct informational power was contrasted with the other eight power bases (i.e., impersonal reward, personal reward, impersonal coercion, personal coercion, legitimate position, legitimate dependence, legitimate equity, and legitimate reciprocity), consultants reported that they were significantly more likely to use direct informational power than they were the remaining power bases. Table 4 presents the relevant $F$ values for these individual planned contrasts.

Second, when positive expert power was contrasted with the other eight power bases (i.e., impersonal reward, personal reward, impersonal coercion, personal coercion, legitimate position, legitimate dependence, legitimate equity, and legitimate reciprocity), consultants reported that they were significantly more likely to use positive expert power than they were the remaining power bases. See Table 4 for the relevant $F$ values for these individual planned contrasts.

Third, when positive referent power was contrasted with the other eight power bases (i.e., impersonal reward, personal reward, impersonal coercion, personal coercion, legitimate position, legitimate dependence, legitimate equity, and legitimate reciprocity) consultants reported that they were significantly more likely to use positive referent power than they were the remaining power bases. The lone exception was the comparison between positive referent power and legitimate dependence power. Here, consultants did not report that they were more likely to use positive referent power. Again, see Table 4 for the relevant $F$ values for these individual planned contrasts.
Table 4

*F* Values for the Individual Planned Contrasts for Direct Informational, Positive Expert, and Positive Referent Power (Usage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bases</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Direct Informational</th>
<th>Positive Expert</th>
<th>Positive Referent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal Reward</td>
<td>1, 351</td>
<td>4240.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal Coercion</td>
<td>1, 351</td>
<td>5324.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Coercion</td>
<td>1, 351</td>
<td>3057.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legit. Equity</td>
<td>1, 351</td>
<td>3488.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legit. Reciprocity</td>
<td>1, 351</td>
<td>2354.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Reward</td>
<td>1, 351</td>
<td>1250.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legit. Dependence</td>
<td>1, 351</td>
<td>548.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legit. Position</td>
<td>1, 351</td>
<td>1698.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal Reward</td>
<td>1, 351</td>
<td>1628.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal Coercion</td>
<td>1, 351</td>
<td>2001.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Coercion</td>
<td>1, 351</td>
<td>1356.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legit. Equity</td>
<td>1, 351</td>
<td>1456.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legit. Reciprocity</td>
<td>1, 351</td>
<td>860.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Reward</td>
<td>1, 351</td>
<td>374.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legit. Dependence</td>
<td>1, 351</td>
<td>12.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legit. Position</td>
<td>1, 351</td>
<td>563.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal Reward</td>
<td>1, 351</td>
<td>1351.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal Coercion</td>
<td>1, 351</td>
<td>1608.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Coercion</td>
<td>1, 351</td>
<td>1114.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legit. Equity</td>
<td>1, 351</td>
<td>1207.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legit. Reciprocity</td>
<td>1, 351</td>
<td>772.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Reward</td>
<td>1, 351</td>
<td>330.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legit. Dependence</td>
<td>1, 351</td>
<td>4.38*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legit. Position</td>
<td>1, 351</td>
<td>303.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Not statistically significant at a .0016 alpha level.
Several *ad hoc* analyses not specifically related to the second hypothesis were also performed. These analyses compared *direct informational power*, *positive expert power*, and *positive referent power* to each other in an effort to determine their *likelihood of use* relative to each other. These results showed that consultants reported that they were more *likely to use* direct informational power than they were positive expert $[F(1, 351) = 387.37, p < .0001]$ and positive referent power $[F(1, 351) = 644.73, p < .0001]$. Consultants also reported that they were more *likely to use* positive expert power than they were positive referent power $[F(1, 351) = 37.84, p < .0001]$.

Corresponding effect size analyses were also performed (Cohen, 1988), and again using an *a priori* criterion of .50 to indicate a medium effect size, there were several clinically significant findings. When direct informational and positive expert power were compared, the results indicated that there is a clinically significant difference in how school psychological consultants view these two power bases, with consultants reporting that they are more *likely to use* direct informational power ($ES = 1.03$). However, when positive expert and positive referent power were compared, the results did not suggest that there is a clinically significant difference in how consultants view these two power bases ($ES = .31$). When positive expert and personal reward were compared, the results indicated that there is a clinically significant difference in how consultants view these two power bases, with consultants being more *likely to use* positive expert power ($ES = 1.18$). Finally, when positive referent and personal reward were compared, the results indicate that consultants are more *likely to use* positive referent power ($ES = .89$).
Summary. The second hypothesis in Study One received strong but not complete support. Consultants reported that they were more likely to use (a) direct informational power than the remaining ten power bases, and (b) use positive expert more than the remaining nine power bases. However, in the case of positive referent power, there was no statistically significant difference in how consultants viewed their likelihood to use legitimate dependence relative to positive referent power. In other words, consultants’ rank ordering of the power bases based on ratings was: (1) direct informational, (2) positive expert, and (3) legitimate dependence and positive referent power. Effect size analyses also revealed that several of these statistically significant differences were practically significant. These three main findings are that consultants are more likely to use (a) direct informational power than positive expert power, and (b) positive expert than positive referent power, and (c) positive referent than personal reward.

The third hypothesis, that female school psychological consultants would report that they are significantly more likely to use soft power bases than are male consultants, was not supported. Using a traditional alpha level of .05, there was a significant main effect \[ F (1, 348) = 183.08, p < .0001 \], with both male and female consultants reporting that they were more likely to use the soft power bases. However, there was not a significant interaction between gender of consultant and power base, \[ F (1, 348) = 1.43, p = .23 \].

Study Two: Acceptability of Power Bases

The results section for the second study will also be organized in three sections. The first section will present a description of the participant pool, including the means and standard deviations of the six individual power bases considered. The second section will
present the results of a principal components analysis. The final section will present the results of the inferential statistics that address the two directional hypotheses.

**Descriptive statistics.** In this study, 300 of 1,000 individuals returned IPI-CT-As, for an overall response rate of 30%. Of the 300 returned surveys, 283 were used in the analyses, resulting in a usable response rate of 28.3%. A survey was considered unusable if the respondent failed to answer 4 or more of the 42 survey questions. Of the 283 participants who returned usable surveys, 71.9% were female and 28.1% were male (with 16 missing data points; 5.6% missing). Again, the sample was primarily Caucasian (96.1%). The remainder of the sample was 2.4% African-American, 0.8% Asian, 0.4% Hispanic, and 0.4% Multiethnic (with 28 missing data points; 9.9% missing). The majority of the participants reported that they had received formal training in school psychological consultation (62.8%), while 37.8% had not (with 20 missing data points; 7.1% missing). With regard to level of education, 47.7% of respondents had specialist degrees in school psychology, 27.3% had doctoral degrees, 24.2% had master’s degrees (MA/MS/MEd), and 0.8% reported that they had bachelor’s degrees (BA/BS). The respondents had a mean age of 50.7 ($SD = 12.3$) years ($R = 24$ to $57$) and a mean of 20.0 ($SD = 7.7$) years experience ($R = 1$ to $40$). Finally, the participant sample was geographically diverse, with respondents representing 46 states.

The means and standard deviations of the acceptability ratings for six social power bases assessed by the IPI-CT-A are presented in Table 5. This table also breaks down the descriptive information by consultant gender. The rank ordering of the acceptability of these social power bases (based on ratings) for all consultants was: positive referent, direct
Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations for the Acceptability of Six Social Power Bases Overall and by Consultant Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power Base</th>
<th>Total ($N = 283$)</th>
<th>Males ($n = 75$)</th>
<th>Females ($n = 192$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Informational</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Expert</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Referent</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Reward</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legit. Dependence</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legit. Position</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credible Person$^a$</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate Power$^b$</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ This factor is composed of positive expert, positive referent, direct informational, and personal reward power. $^b$ This factor is composed of legitimate dependence and legitimate position power. $^c$ The scaling on the Interpersonal Power Inventory-Acceptability (IPI-CT-A) runs from 1 to 6, with 1 reflecting a very unacceptable strategy and 6 reflecting a very acceptable strategy.
Table 6

Factor Loadings and Coefficient Alphas for the Acceptability of the Individual Power Bases and the Two Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Power Base Content</th>
<th>Factor 1 Loadings</th>
<th>Factor 2 Loadings</th>
<th>Coefficient Alphas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person Power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Expert</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Referent</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct informational</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Reward</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate Dependence</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate Position</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

informational, personal reward, legitimate dependence, legitimate position, and positive expert power.

Overall factor structure. Two principal component analyses (PCAs) with varimax rotation were conducted on consultant responses to the IPI-CT-A. The first PCA was exploratory in nature and the second was a forced two-factor solution. As was the case in Study One, the results of these analyses were identical and thus will be discussed together. As presented in Table 6, two factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.0 emerged. Together
these two factors accounted for 55.49% of the variance in IPI-CT-A scores. The two labeled factors, in order of the variance accounted for, were: (a) *person power* (consisting of positive expert, positive referent, direct informational, and personal reward power); and (b) *legitimate power* (consisting of legitimate dependence and legitimate position power). The *person power* factor accounted for 38.31% of the variance in IPI-CT-A scores, and the *legitimate power* factor accounted for 17.18% of the variance.

Alpha coefficients were also calculated as a means of determining the reliability of the newly designed IPI-CT-A. Coefficient alphas for the six “scales” were all moderately high (ranging from .75 to .81). The alphas for the individual power bases and the two factors (i.e., Person Power and Legitimate Power) are also presented in Table 6. The coefficient alphas show that despite being a new instrument, the individual scales comprising the IPI-CT-A have good reliability.

*Inferential statistics.* Two repeated measures ANOVAs were used to perform planned contrasts to address the two directional hypotheses. The first hypothesis, that school psychological consultants would report that positive referent, direct informational, and positive expert power are more *acceptable* than the remaining three power bases (i.e., legitimate dependence, personal reward, and legitimate position power), was partially supported. What follows is the supporting evidence for this conclusion.

Using a traditional alpha level of .05, there was a significant overall effect, \( F(5, 278) = 90.00, p < .0001 \). For the planned contrasts, however, a more conservative alpha level of .003 (as determined by a Bonferroni adjustment) was used to correct for the number of planned contrasts used in addressing this hypothesis. The alpha level of .003 was derived by
taking the traditional alpha level of .05 and dividing it by the number of total comparisons (i.e., 15). However, because these were one-tailed tests, .006 became the tabled alpha level to determine statistical significance.

Using this adjusted alpha level of .006, the following results were obtained. First, when positive referent power was contrasted with legitimate dependence, personal reward, and legitimate position power, consultants reported that they found positive referent power to be more acceptable than legitimate dependence and legitimate position power. However, there was not a statistically significant difference between positive referent power and personal reward power. See Table 7 for the relevant individual contrasts and the corresponding $F$ values.

Second, when direct informational power was contrasted with legitimate dependence, personal reward, and legitimate position power, consultants reported that they found direct informational to be more acceptable than legitimate dependence and legitimate position power. However, when direct informational was contrasted with personal reward power there, was not a significant difference. See Table 7 for the relevant individual contrasts and the corresponding $F$ values.

Third, when positive expert power was contrasted with legitimate dependence, personal reward, and legitimate position power, consultants reported that there was not a significant difference between positive expert and legitimate position power. However, consultants reported that they found both legitimate dependence and personal reward power to be more acceptable than positive expert power. Again, see Table 7 for the relevant individual contrasts and the corresponding $F$ values.
Table 7

_F Values for the Individual Planned Contrasts for Positive Referent, Direct Informational, and Positive Expert Power (Acceptability)_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bases</th>
<th>Positive Referent</th>
<th>Direct Informational</th>
<th>Positive Expert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52.88^a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legit. Dependence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Reward</td>
<td>8.40^e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legit. Position</td>
<td>257.84^a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legit Dependence</td>
<td>17.71^b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Reward</td>
<td>0.48^e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legit. Position</td>
<td>169.68^b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legit. Dependence</td>
<td></td>
<td>60.87^c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Reward</td>
<td></td>
<td>163.71^d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legit. Position</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.28^e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a Consultants reported that positive referent power is more acceptable.  
^b Consultants reported that direct informational power is more acceptable.  
^c Consultants reported that legitimate dependence is more acceptable.  
^d Consultants reported that personal reward is more acceptable.  
^e Difference is not statistically significant at _p_ < .006.
Multiple ad hoc analyses not specifically related to the second hypothesis were also performed. These analyses compared direct informational power, positive expert power, and positive referent power to each other in an effort to determine acceptability relative to each other. These results showed that consultants found positive referent power more acceptable than both positive expert power \(F (1, 282) = 332.09, p < .0001\) and direct informational power \(F (1, 282) = 17.57, p < .0001\). Additionally, consultants rated direct informational power as more acceptable than positive expert power, \(F (1, 282) = 191.83, p < .0001\).

Corresponding effect size analyses (Cohen, 1988) were also performed as a way to examine the practical significance of these findings. When positive referent and direct informational power were compared, the results did not indicate a practical difference in how consultants viewed the acceptability of these two power bases (\(ES = .20\)). However, when (a) positive referent and positive expert and (b) direct informational and positive expert were compared, the results indicated practical differences in how consultants viewed the acceptability of these power bases. The effect size for the comparison between positive referent and positive expert (\(ES = 1.22\)) revealed that consultants find positive referent power to be more acceptable than positive expert power. Finally, the effect size for the comparison between direct informational and positive expert power (\(ES = .96\)) indicated that consultants find direct informational to be more acceptable than positive expert power.

Summary. The results for the first hypothesis in Study Two suggest that the acceptability of the six power bases relative to each other is more complicated than originally hypothesized. Positive referent power was rated as more acceptable relative to legitimate dependence, legitimate position, positive expert, and direct informational power. However,
there was not a statistically significant difference in the acceptability of positive referent power and personal reward power. Direct informational power was rated as more acceptable than legitimate dependence, legitimate position, and positive expert power. There also was not a statistically significant difference in the acceptability of direct informational power and personal reward power. Finally, legitimate dependence power was rated as more acceptable than both positive expert and legitimate position power. Effect size analyses indicated that there are some practical differences in how consultants rated the relative acceptability of these six power bases. Using effect size analyses, both positive referent power and direct informational power were rated as more acceptable than positive expert power.

The second hypothesis, that female school psychologist consultants more than male consultants would report that influence strategies drawn from positive expert, positive referent, and direction information are more acceptable than the remaining power bases, was not supported. Using a traditional alpha level of .05, the repeated measures ANOVA used to perform planned contrasts did not reveal a significant main effect, $F(5, 1325) = 1.13, p = .33$; however, there was a significant interaction between gender of consultant and power base acceptability [$F(5, 1325) = 3.78, p = .0028$]. Using a Bonferroni adjusted alpha level of .006, the following planned contrasts results were obtained. First, when positive expert power was contrasted with legitimate dependence, personal reward, and legitimate position power there were no significant gender interactions (see Table 8 for the individual contrasts and the corresponding $F$ values). Second, when positive referent power was contrasted with legitimate dependence and personal reward power, there were not any
Table 8

*F* Values for the Gender Interactions on the Individual Planned Contrasts Involving the Acceptability of Positive Expert, Positive Referent, and Direct Informational Power

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bases</th>
<th>Positive Expert</th>
<th>Positive Referent</th>
<th>Direct Informational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legit. Dependence</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Reward</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legit. Position</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legit. Dependence</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Reward</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legit. Position</td>
<td>9.28&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legit. Dependence</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Reward</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legit. Position</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Significant gender interaction, with male consultants reporting legitimate position power as more acceptable than female consultants, using a *p* < .006.
significant gender interactions. However, when *positive referent power* was contrasted with legitimate position power, there was a significant gender interaction, with male consultants reporting that they found legitimate position power to be more *acceptable* than did the female consultants, $F(1, 265) = 9.28, p = .0025$ (see Table 8 for the individual contrasts and the related $F$ values).

Third, when *direct informational power* was contrasted with legitimate dependence, personal reward, and legitimate position power, there were not any significant gender interactions (Again, see Table 8 for the individual contrasts and the corresponding $F$ values). These three sets of results are also graphically represented in Figure 3. When the bar extends above the $x$-axis, this indicates that male consultants found that particular power base to be more *acceptable* than did female consultants (i.e., positive expert, legitimate dependence, legitimate position power). Conversely, when the bar extends below the $x$-axis, this indicates that female consultants found that particular power base to be more *acceptable* than did male consultants (i.e., positive referent, personal reward power).

Cohen’s (1988) effect size analysis was also used to further examine the one significant finding that male consultants found legitimate position power to be more *acceptable* than did female consultants. Using an *a priori* criterion of .50, this difference was not clinically significant ($ES = .33$).

**Summary.** The second hypothesis in Study Two was not supported, as the only significant gender interaction did not involve the predicted power bases. The sole significant finding was the interaction between positive referent power and legitimate position power. Here, male consultants reported that they found the legitimate position power more
Figure 3

Differences in Acceptability Ratings for Social Power Bases by Male and Female Consultants
acceptable than did female consultants. However, effect size analysis did not support this interpretation.

Discussion

This dissertation research presents the first two empirical studies to examine the likelihood of use and acceptability of Raven’s (1993) social power bases within a school psychological consultation context. The results will be discussed in three sections. The first section will present a commentary on the findings of the principal components analyses (PCAs) for both the likelihood of use study and the acceptability study. The second section will discuss the individual directional hypotheses from both studies according to general findings (i.e., all consultants) and then separately by gender. The concluding section of the Discussion will center on the relevance of the likelihood of use and acceptability findings to the practice of school psychological consultation. Limitations of this research and possible directions for future research will also be presented.

Principal Component Analyses

Study One. The results of the PCA on the likelihood of use data suggest that the soft/harsh dichotomy originally reported by Raven et al. (1998) in the social/organizational psychology literature and by Erchul and colleagues (Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001; Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001) in the school psychology literature is still relevant and should continue to guide research efforts. In these three original studies, the construct under examination was the perceived effectiveness of the social power bases believed to result in supervisee and consultee compliance; however, in the present study, the constructs under examination were school psychologists’ perceptions of the likelihood of use of the social
power bases (Study One) and the acceptability of a specific subset of these power bases (Study Two).

Despite these subtle differences in respondent task, the structure of the soft/harsh dichotomy found here is identical to that originally reported in Raven et al.’s (1998) second study. In both studies, the harsh factor was composed of impersonal reward, impersonal coercion, personal coercion, legitimate equity, legitimate reciprocity, and personal reward power. Similarly, the soft factor was composed of positive expert, positive referent, direct informational, legitimate position, and legitimate dependence. This structure differs slightly from what was reported in the Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001) study, where the harsh factor was composed of impersonal coercion, impersonal reward, legitimate equity, personal coercion, legitimate reciprocity, and legitimate position, while the soft factor was composed of legitimate dependence, direct informational, positive expert, positive referent, and personal reward power.

These discrepancies in factor structure could be due to the judgments the participants were asked to make. In the original Raven et al. (1998) and Erchul studies (Erchul, Raven, & Ray; Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001), respondents were asked to make judgments concerning the likely effectiveness of a particular power base in leading to supervisee or teacher compliance. However, in this dissertation research, respondents were asked to make judgments concerning how likely they would be to use a particular power base when trying to influence a teacher. An additional variable that may have led to the differences in factor structure across these studies might be the nature of the dyad under examination. In Raven et al. (1998), participants made judgments about the nature of the supervisor/supervisee dyad;
however, in the Erchul studies (Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001; Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001), participants made judgments about the nature of the psychologist/teacher dyad. In the former relationship, supervisors have the ability to demand that supervisees do their job differently. However, in the latter relationship, (i.e., psychologist/teacher dyad), this is decidedly not the case, because in the psychologist and teacher dyad, the two individuals are essentially on equal footing (Erchul & Raven, 1997).

Study Two. The six power bases under examination in the second study were the five soft power bases (Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001) and legitimate position power. According to earlier research conducted by Erchul and colleagues, legitimate position power is alternatively a harsh power base (Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001) and a soft power base (Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001). This power base was included in Study Two because it loaded highly on both soft and the harsh factors, making its orientation variable. The results of the PCA on the acceptability data suggest that legitimate dependence and legitimate position power are more similar to each other than to the remaining four power bases (i.e., positive referent, positive expert, direct informational, and personal reward). This finding was expected, because legitimate dependence and legitimate position power are derivatives of the original French and Raven (1959) legitimate power base. Also expected was the clustering of positive expert and direct informational power along with positive referent and personal reward power. Specifically, Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001) conducted a PCA and found a four-factor solution. One factor, named credibility, was composed of positive expert and direct informational; a second factor, named personal power, included positive referent and personal reward power. These findings are logical because in the original French and Raven
(1959) social power taxonomy, informational power was viewed as a type of expert power. Furthermore, in his writings on the relationship between French and Raven’s (1959) social power bases and school psychological consultation, Martin (1978) suggested a close and reciprocal relationship between expert and referent power. He theorized that if one attempted to draw upon expert power, then his/her ability to draw upon referent power would be diminished and vice-versa.

**Summary.** The first PCA suggests that the soft/harsh factor distinction as reported by Raven et al. (1998) and Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001) is still relevant. However, there are two important changes to the factor structure when the respondent’s task changes from making judgments of effectiveness to likelihood of use. First, legitimate position power switched from a harsh power base (Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001) to a soft power base. This movement from harsh to soft power is similar to one factor structure reported by Raven et al. (1998). Second, personal reward power switched from a soft power base (Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001) to a harsh power base. Again, this is similar to the factor structure results in Raven et al.’s (1998) second study. The second PCA from Study Two suggests that the two legitimate power bases (i.e., legitimate dependence and legitimate position power) are more similar to each other than to the remaining four power bases under examination (i.e., positive expert, positive referent, direct informational, personal reward).

**Individual Hypotheses**

*All consultants.* The first hypothesis from Study One was supported: school psychological consultants reported that they are more likely to use soft power bases than
harsh power bases. However, it is important to remember that, in this dissertation study, the soft power base factor was composed of slightly different power bases than previously reported in the literature. As has been mentioned already, the soft factor consisted of direct informational, positive expert, positive referent, legitimate dependence, and legitimate position power; the harsh factor consisted of legitimate equity, legitimate reciprocity, impersonal coercion, personal coercion, impersonal reward, and personal reward. This finding can be related to the existing school psychology/school consultation literature. More specifically, Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001) found that school psychological consultants indicated that soft power bases would result in greater consultee compliance to consultant requests. That is, consultants perceived that soft bases would be more effective in leading to compliance than harsh bases. Additionally, Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001) reported that both consultants and teacher/consultees indicated that soft bases are significantly more likely to result in consultee compliance than are harsh bases. Given that consultants (Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001) and consultees (Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001) both view soft power bases as more effective in leading to compliance, it follows that consultants would be more likely to use soft power bases when attempting to influence consultees.

Other explanations for why psychologists report they are more likely to use the soft power bases are based on the desire to maintain a positive working relationship, ethics, feasibility, and personal variables such as leadership style and job satisfaction. In the interest of maintaining a functional and positive working relationship with a teacher, it is understandable that a psychologist would not want to come across as heavy-handed and overly demanding during consultation. If a consultant is not considerate of a teacher’s time or
asks for drastic changes, the teacher may resist making changes, complain to other teachers, or become resentful (Erchul & Raven, 1997). In turn, this could hurt the psychologist’s ability to work with other teachers. Ethically, it is also questionable to use coercive influence tactics in an attempt to change behavior. Threats are not only undesirable but also have the potential to damage the working relationship between the consultant and the teacher. Especially in the consultative relationship, the consultant wants the consultee to make a change because s/he wants to, not because s/he is being forced to. Finally, Martin (1978) suggested that it is not feasible for the school psychologist consultant to demand change in an overt manner, because s/he does not have that type of authority over a teacher.

Research by Schwarzwald, Koslowsky, and Agassi (2001a) supports the assertion that dyadic interaction styles can moderate perceptions of social power. In their study, Israeli police captains were divided into transformational and transactional leaders. A transformational leader was characterized as empowering, inspiring, and innovative. Alternatively, a transactional leader was characterized as corrective and coercive. Results suggest that police officers responded better to transformational police captains. Police officers who worked under transformational leaders reported higher levels of compliance to both soft and harsh power bases than did police officers who worked under transactional leaders. It follows that a school psychological consultant would prefer to fall under the category of a transformational leader rather than transactional leader because the purpose behind indirect services within school psychology (of which consultation is an integral part) is to empower adults to work with children. When a psychological consultant is characterized as transformational his/her ability to work with adults is enhanced. Consultants report that
they are more likely to use soft power bases is easily related to a transformational style of leadership.

Additional research by Koslowsky, Schwarzwald, and Ashuri (2001) supports the assertion that the maintenance of a positive working relationship is another important moderating variable as it relates to job satisfaction and to social power bases. In their study, Israeli nurses and nurse supervisors reported that direct informational power was the most effective power base in leading to compliance. The authors further reported that job satisfaction (as rated by the Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire) was positively related to soft power bases and negatively related to harsh power bases. This suggests that psychological consultants who use soft power bases might expect to see an increase in the level of consultee satisfaction during and after the consultation process. Although this relationship was not specifically addressed, one could argue that satisfied consultees are more likely to follow through with consultant requests.

The second hypothesis from Study One stated that school psychological consultants would report that they are more likely to use direct informational, positive expert, and positive referent power than the remaining eight power bases. This hypothesis was largely supported: consultants indicated that they are more likely to use direct informational power more than the remaining ten power bases, and also reported that they are more likely to use positive expert power than the remaining nine bases. There was not a statistically significant difference in the likelihood of use between positive referent and legitimate dependence power. However, consultants were more likely to use positive referent power and legitimate dependence power than the remaining social power bases (i.e., legitimate equity, legitimate
reciprocity, legitimate position, impersonal reward, personal reward, impersonal coercion, and personal coercion).

As noted, consultants were more likely to use direct informational power and positive expert power than the remaining power bases. This is not surprising, given that Martin (1978) hypothesized that positive expert power is highly relevant to the practice of school psychological consultation. [Parenthetically, it is important to recall that Martin (1978) did not consider direct informational power in his analysis, because he was apparently unaware that Raven (1965) divided expert power into informational power and expert power.]

Additionally, empirical research has underscored the importance of positive expert and direct informational power in consultation. Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001) found that school psychological consultants rated direct informational and positive expert power as two of the most effective bases in bringing about compliance in consultees. Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001) confirmed this finding with a larger, national sample.

Slightly unexpected was how consultants viewed the potential use of positive referent and legitimate dependence power. In this dissertation research, there was not a statistically significant difference between these two power bases. However, consultants did report that they were significantly more likely to use positive referent and legitimate dependence power than the remaining power bases. Partially why this finding was somewhat unexpected centers on the importance Martin (1978) attached to positive referent power. Martin (1978) speculated that positive referent power is highly relevant to the practice of school consultation. Additionally, Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001) and Erchul, Raven, and
Whichard (2001) have documented that consultants perceive positive referent power as effective in leading to consultee compliance.

Although previous research had not dismissed the importance of legitimate dependence power in the context of school consultation, positive referent power was reported as being more effective in leading to consultee compliance. It is interesting to note that the teacher-consultees in the Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001) study rated legitimate dependence power as the third most effective power base in leading to compliance, followed by positive referent power. Perhaps consultants are realizing that consultees can view them (i.e., consultants) as needing help and that this dependence does not signify incompetence or powerlessness. In this sense, consultees understand that consultants cannot implement the intervention themselves and that is why their (i.e., consultees) job is so vital to the success of a given intervention or treatment.

Switching from the construct of likelihood of use to acceptability, the first hypothesis from Study Two stated that school psychological consultants would find positive referent, direct informational, and positive expert power to be more acceptable than the remaining three power bases (i.e., personal reward, legitimate dependence, and legitimate position). This hypothesis was partially supported: positive referent power was more acceptable than the remaining power bases, with the exception of personal reward power. Direct informational was more acceptable than the remaining power bases, with the exception of personal reward power. However, legitimate dependence and personal reward power were both viewed as more acceptable than positive expert power. Finally, there was not a significant difference in the acceptability of positive expert and legitimate position power. It
is important to note that the partial support for Hypothesis Two does not indicate that the remaining power bases (i.e., personal reward, legitimate dependence, and legitimate position) are unacceptable. In other words it can only be concluded that the three power bases (i.e., positive expert, direct informational, and positive referent) are relatively more acceptable than the three remaining power bases (i.e., personal reward, legitimate dependence, and legitimate position).

Again, that school psychological consultants rated positive referent and direct informational power as acceptable during consultation is not surprising given previous theoretical writings and empirical research. As stated earlier, Martin (1978) was the first to highlight the importance of positive referent power to school psychological consultation, and Erchul’s two studies (Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001; Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001) also show that psychologist-consultants and teacher-consultees view positive referent and direct informational power as not only relevant to school psychological consultation, but also as effective in leading to teacher-consultee compliance.

Given Martin’s (1978) writings and the findings from Erchul’s two empirical studies, it is interesting to note how school psychological consultants rated the acceptability of positive expert power as compared to the other remaining power bases (i.e., positive referent, direct informational, legitimate dependence, personal reward, and legitimate position power). What Martin (1978) viewed as a cornerstone necessary for effective consultation and what consultants had rated as effective in leading to teacher-consultee compliance, was rated as one of the least acceptable power bases. Perhaps the acceptability of positive expert power depends on how the psychological consultant attempts to draw on that particular influence
strategy. If the consultant attempts to use positive expert power to “set the stage” for an influence attempt, this might be positively received, but alternatively, if the consultant overtly states that s/he is an expert in the field, this might be negatively received (see Erchul & Raven, 1997).

That both school psychologists and teacher-consultees consider soft power bases more likely to be effective in leading to consultee compliance (Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001) and the finding here that school psychological consultants report that they are more likely to use these soft power bases is both consistent and expected. The finding that consultants are more likely to use direct informational, positive expert, positive referent, and legitimate dependence power, coupled with the finding that consultants report that direct informational, positive referent, and legitimate dependence power are more acceptable can be related back to two constructs that are relevant to the practice of consultation and to the practice of school psychology. Namely, these two constructs are social validity (Wolf, 1978) and Wittant Elliott’s (1985) model of treatment acceptability.

Wolf (1978) originally defined social validity as a three-part judgment based (a) on the goals of the intervention, (b) how those involved with the intervention view its appropriateness, and finally, (c) overall satisfaction. The construct of social validity, as defined by Wolf, consists of the global interpretation concerning the interrelationships between treatment implementation-treatment use, treatment effectiveness, treatment acceptability, and treatment integrity. Social validity is used by clinicians and lay people to judge various interventions and treatments. This construct is particularly related to school consultation, because if consultees do not view consultant requests as valid or relevant to the
identified problem, then they are not likely to follow through with the intervention, and therefore it is likely to be implemented with poor integrity.

Witt and Elliott’s (1985) model of treatment acceptability attempts to highlight how these four variables interact with each other, and the following sections will focus on the research that addresses these various relationships (i.e., treatment acceptability and treatment effectiveness; treatment implementation/use and treatment acceptability; treatment effectiveness and treatment implementation/use; treatment acceptability and treatment implementation/use). First, results reported by Reimers, Wacker, Cooper, and De Raad (1992), Reimers and Wacker (1988), and Von Brock and Elliott (1987) provide evidence of a positive relationship between treatment acceptability and treatment effectiveness. In other words, when a treatment is judged effective, it is also deemed acceptable.

The results of this dissertation research, coupled with earlier research by Erchul and his colleagues (Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001; Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001), suggest this positive relationship also exists when one considers the effectiveness and acceptability of the power bases. Erchul and colleagues found that the soft power bases consultants perceive as being effective in leading to compliance were also be seen as acceptable means of influence within the context of school psychological consultation. Consultants rated the perceived effectiveness of direct informational and positive referent power highly (Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001; Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001), and findings here indicate that consultants also rated positive referent and direct informational power as acceptable influence strategies in consultation. However, this relationship is not perfect because consultants perceived positive expert power as being highly effective in leading to consultee compliance, but they
did not rate the *acceptability* of this power base as highly. Perhaps the *acceptability* of positive expert power is perceived less positively, because consultants feel that direct informational is a more subtle and potentially more powerful means of influencing others. When Raven (1965) revised his conception of expert power to differentiate between expert power and direct informational power, he brought up the concepts of socially dependent and socially independent change. More specifically, Raven (1965) suggested that informational power was a more desirable and powerful mode of influence because once a rationale was explained and accepted, the consultant would not have to monitor the consultee to ensure follow through. Stated another way, consultee change resulting from informational power is independent of the consultant.

The results of this dissertation also support the presence of a positive relationship between the perceived effectiveness of the social power bases and consultant ratings of *likelihood of use*. Witt and Elliott’s (1985) model of treatment acceptability suggests that if a treatment is viewed as effective, it is more likely to be used. In broad terms, Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001) and Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001) found that school psychological consultants perceived soft power bases to be more effective in leading to consultee compliance than harsh power bases. More specifically, Erchul and colleagues’ findings suggest that consultants view positive expert, direct informational, positive referent, and legitimate dependence power as likely being effective means in leading to consultee compliance during school psychological consultation. When these results are related to the findings here that consultants report that they are more *likely to use* (a) soft power bases than
harsh power bases and, more specifically, (b) direct informational, positive expert, legitimate
dependence, and positive referent power, there is evidence to suggest that the relationship
between the effectiveness of an influence strategy and the likelihood of an individual using
that influence strategy is indeed positive.

Witt and Elliott’s (1985) treatment acceptability model also proposes a relationship
between treatment implementation/use and treatment acceptability. Along these lines,
Allinder and Oats (1997), Kazdin, French, and Sherick (1981), and Reimers, Wacker, and
Koeppel (1987) found that the acceptability of an intervention or treatment can increase the
actual implementation of that same intervention or treatment. In this dissertation research,
consultants reported that they were more likely to use soft power bases than harsh power
bases. More specifically, consultants reported that they were more likely to use direct
informational power than the remaining power bases. Consultants also rated direct
informational power as an acceptable power base to draw on during consultation.
Additionally, consultants reported that they were more likely to use positive referent power
and, again, consultants rated positive referent power as another acceptable power base. The
likelihood of consultants using direct informational and positive referent power and the high
acceptability ratings for these two power bases suggest that when consultants report they are
likely to use a particular power base, they will also rate that power base as being relatively
more acceptable. It is important to remember that the interaction between likelihood of use
and acceptability and effectiveness was not directly addressed, and the previous discussion is
extrapolated from the findings of several separate but related studies. Any speculation as to
the nature of these relationships is not directly based on research and is certainly correlational rather than causal.

Summary of consultant findings. To review, school psychological consultants reported that they are more likely to use soft power bases than harsh power bases. These consultants also reported that they are more likely to use direct informational, positive expert, positive referent, and legitimate dependence power more than they are the remaining power bases (i.e., legitimate equity, legitimate reciprocity, legitimate position, impersonal coercion, personal coercion, impersonal reward, and impersonal reward). Finally, consultants reported that positive referent, direct informational, and legitimate dependence power are more acceptable means of influence relative to personal reward, positive expert, and legitimate position power.

When these results and the findings from Erchul and colleagues (Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001; Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001) are viewed in the context of Witt and Elliott’s (1985) model of treatment acceptability, there are some intriguing conclusions. The power bases that psychologists regard as seemingly effective in leading to teacher-consultee compliance are essentially the same bases that they report are more likely to be used and that they find more acceptable as means of influence. More specifically, consultants indicate that direct informational, positive expert, positive referent, and legitimate dependence power are effective in leading to compliance (Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001; Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001), and they report that they are also more likely to use these same power bases when consulting. Finally, the power bases that consultants find acceptable are the same ones they are find effective and report that they are likely to use.
Gender findings. The third hypothesis from Study One stated that female school psychological consultants would report they are more likely to use soft power bases than are male consultants. This hypothesis was not supported. This hypothesis was based on findings from Erchul, et al.’s (2004) study of gender differences in school psychological consultation, which found that female consultants perceived soft power bases as more effective in leading to consultee compliance. Failure to find support for this hypothesis was unexpected, given Witt and Elliott’s (1985) model of treatment acceptability, which suggests there is a relationship between effectiveness and usage. Overall, there was a positive relationship between the perceived effectiveness of the Raven (1993) social power bases and consultant reports of how likely they would be use the soft power bases, but the absence of a gender interaction was unexpected given the perceived effectiveness findings from Erchul et al. (2004). Perhaps the lack of significant findings can be related to a generalized personality or temperament similarity shared by female and male school psychologists. Alternatively, perhaps the shift from perceived effectiveness to likelihood of use makes the question more relevant to actual clinical practice, and therefore female and male school psychological consultants answered similarly. Several authors have researched gender differences in nonverbal behavior and in language (Aguinis & Henle, 2001; Carli, 1999; Eagly et al., 2003; Johnson, 1976; Tannen, 1990, 1994), and seemingly the only consensus is that the direction gender differences take is inconsistent. Perhaps this null finding supports the notion that gender differences are often subtle and difficult to pinpoint.

The second hypothesis from Study Two stated that female school psychological consultants would find positive referent, direct informational, and positive expert power
more acceptable than would male school psychological consultants. This hypothesis also was not supported. In fact, the only significant finding suggested that male consultants found legitimate position power to be more acceptable than did female consultants. One possible explanation for this significant finding could be that male consultants feel more comfortable in a position of authority, and therefore find legitimate position power more acceptable. Additionally, female consultants may find legitimate position power less acceptable because they may prefer positive referent power more because their interaction style is more collegial than directive. Again, the absence of significant gender findings in the predicted direction is surprising given the previous findings reported by Erchul et al. (2004). However, it is important to remember that there were only six power bases under examination in the acceptability study, and perhaps the ability to uncover statistically significant differences was limited by the self imposed restriction of only examining this particular subset of social power bases.

Summary of gender findings. There were no significant differences in how male and female school psychological consultants reported how likely they would be to use soft and harsh power bases. Additionally, male and female school psychological consultants essentially agreed on the acceptability of six power bases (i.e., positive expert, positive referent, legitimate dependence, legitimate position, direct informational, and personal reward power). The one significant result obtained was not in the predicted direction and it did not involve the specified social power bases (i.e., males rated legitimate position as more acceptable than did females). Although there was not much to report by way of gender
findings, it is important to note that gender differences within the social power base literature have been difficult to predict.

Conclusions

Relevance of findings to the field of school psychology. The results of this dissertation support the notion that social power is relevant to the practice of school psychological consultation. Not only are soft social power bases perceived to be effective in leading to consultee compliance (Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001; Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001) but consultants also report that they are more likely to use these soft social power bases when engaged in consultation with teachers. Additionally, consultants report that direct informational and positive referent power are more acceptable power bases to draw on during consultation with a teacher (relative to positive expert, legitimate dependence, legitimate position, and personal reward power). This new information further supports Erchul and colleagues’ assertion that social power is relevant to consultation.

These findings also support Erchul’s (1999) contention that consultation is not an overt and heavy-handed process where the consultant rules the interaction with an iron fist. Instead, consultation is better conceptualized as an active process where consultants are able to select various influence strategies while choosing to ignore other influence strategies when working with consultees. The current dissertation research, and past work by Erchul and colleagues (Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001; Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001) indicate that consultants potentially rely more on Raven’s (1993) soft bases than harsh bases. These findings (i.e., soft bases are more effective, consultants are more likely to use the soft bases, and consultants endorse positive referent and direct informational power as acceptable),
taken as a whole seem to lend support to Erchul’s (1999) assertion that consultants have a choice of which influence strategies to rely on when engaged in consultation, all the while maintaining a collegial and positive working relationship with the consultee. Additionally, consultants should try to be transformational in their consultation style rather than transactional. Schwarzwald, Koslowsky, and Agassi (2001a) found that police officers working under transformational (empowering, innovative, and inspiring) police captains reported higher compliance to both soft and harsh power bases. It seems that being characterized as transformational might improve one’s power to influence.

School psychologist consultants should have a metacognitive understanding of the complex relationships between the effectiveness, likelihood of use, and acceptability of Raven’s (1993) soft social power bases. For example, consultants should understand that although positive expert power is viewed as an effective power base, and although one might be likely to use strategies drawn from this particular power base, it was not rated as very acceptable. This suggests that what is seen as effective and what is likely to be used, might not always be acceptable. In this case, however, it is interesting to note that positive expert power might be viewed as more acceptable if it were used to “set the stage” for consultation. Alternatively, consultants should understand that what might be effective, may not be feasible or ethical if actually implemented.

By understanding the complexity of these relationships, consultants put themselves in a position to better understand the entire influence process. An increased understanding of this process can only lead to increased self awareness and ultimately, increased consultee satisfaction, and to improved child/client outcomes. Stated another way, if a consultant is
aware and is able to critically evaluate each consultation experience, s/he will gain a better understanding of what works well and what does not work well within consultation. By using an iterative approach, and modifying his/her influence strategies and techniques, a consultant will become more influential and effective. Ultimately, an influential consultant is an effective consultant, because an effective consultant helps the consultee understand how to positively effect client behavior.

_Treatment integrity._ Another way to improve child and treatment outcomes is to focus on treatment integrity. Treatment integrity refers to the degree that the independent variable (i.e., instruction) is implemented as it was originally intended (Gresham, Gansle, & Noell, 1993). Treatment integrity is of utmost importance in consultation because if an intervention is not implemented with integrity, there can be a failure to see positive results. In the case where there is poor treatment integrity, the consultant and consultee cannot, with confidence, report that the failure was in fact due to a poorly designed treatment. It is equally likely that the failure could be due to the poor implementation of the treatment (i.e., poor treatment integrity). As mentioned earlier, Sterling-Turner et al. (2001) reported that moderate to high levels of treatment integrity are necessary in order for a treatment to be effective.

Consultation is beneficial to students, but in order for students and teachers to realize these benefits, teacher-consultees must implement interventions correctly and with integrity (Noell & Witt, 1999). According to recent research in the field of consultation and treatment integrity, teachers often fail to implement treatments with integrity due to a perceived lack of consultative support (DiGennaro, Martens, & MacIntyre, 2005). Because a lack of treatment integrity is a major obstacle in positive child/client outcomes, perhaps results from this
dissertation research can provide some insight for psychologist practitioners into the means for increasing treatment integrity. For example, Wickstrom and Witt (1993) recommended that a consultant should attempt to emphasize positive referent power during the initial stages of consultation as a means to increase treatment integrity. Results from this research suggest that consultants rank positive referent power as a base that they are indeed likely to use. Additionally, consultants rated positive referent power as the most acceptable power base (relative to the six under examination).

The acceptability of positive referent power could, in a sense set the stage for other influence strategies such as legitimate dependence and legitimate reciprocity power. For example, it is common for people to do “favors” for others whom they see as similar to themselves and for people to repay favors in kind. Here a consultee could feel a need to correctly implement an intervention because the consultant came to his/her school just to help. Alternatively, a consultee could implement an intervention simply because s/he likes the consultant and wants to be liked in return.

Wickstrom and Witt (1993) also suggested that consultant attempts to either strengthen or increase consultee knowledge and skill are means to increase treatment integrity. This dissertation research provides conceptual support for this supposition. For instance, consultants ranked direct informational power as a power base that they would be likely to use. In this example, when the consultant uses direct informational power as a means to influence a consultee and as a catalyst for change, the client and the consultee both benefit. Consultees benefit because they have now internalized why a change is necessary, and thus have minimized the need for consultants to assist in future cases and have maximized the
likelihood for a high degree of treatment integrity. Additionally, consultees have a more complete understanding of what exactly is being requested. Finally, clients reap benefits because teachers are doing their jobs differently, and their behaviors (or misbehaviors) are being addressed in a more appropriate and effective manner.

The use of direct informational power during consultation is also closely tied to DiGennaro et al.’s (2005) suggestion that negative reinforcement is a way to increase consultee compliance, and therefore treatment integrity. DiGennaro et al. found that decreasing the number of consultant/consultee follow-up meetings led to increases in treatment integrity. However, there was an important caveat: in order to cancel the follow-up meetings, it was necessary for the teacher/consultee to implement the intervention correctly. Here, consultees received daily written feedback concerning their treatment integrity, and if it was less than 100%, they had to meet with the consultant to directly rehearse the missed or incorrectly implemented steps. During the initial stages of consultation, direct informational power can be an ideal way to increase consultee knowledge base and intervention implementation skills. If consultees have a more complete understanding of the steps required in a given intervention and know why it is critical to implement interventions correctly, one could argue that they would be more likely to implement the intervention with integrity. When considering the possibility of the follow-up meetings, the consultant could potentially rely on more “negative” and harsh power bases. For example, the consultant could rely on both the personal and impersonal forms of coercive power. Having to continually meet with the consultant to review treatment integrity data could be viewed in a negative light. Consultees could feel that they rarely have time to plan for lessons, and that
they could spend their time more effectively if they did not have to meet with the consultant. During the discussion of the steps involved in treatment implementation, the consultant could emphasize the possibility of follow-up meetings if there was poor treatment integrity. The consultant could also emphasize that these follow-up meetings would take time away from planning periods, and that the best way to avoid these subsequent meetings would be to implement interventions with integrity from the start.

Although the previous example focused on *impersonal coercion*, *personal coercion* is also possible. For instance, consultants may also want to avoid the possibility of follow-up meetings with consultees. Consultants could make it known that they would be annoyed or aggravated at having to continually meet with consultees. Consultees could feel that consultants will not like them if they (i.e., consultants) are required to return for additional meetings.

A final and natural impediment to treatment integrity is consultee resistance to change. Completing a task in the same manner as before is comforting because of the mere fact that the behavior pattern is familiar. Often times it takes more than simply suggesting that someone do their job differently in order for change to occur. It is possible that using soft social power bases could help decrease teacher/consultee resistance. For instance, consultees could be reminded that students sometimes rely on adults to help them overcome difficulties (i.e., legitimate dependence power), and that it is the job of the consultee to help all students, especially those that are struggling (i.e., legitimate position power).

*Limitations.* This dissertation research attempted to address some of the limitations from the previous research in this area. Decreasing the length of the critical-incident IPI
instruments was an important first step; however, several important limitations still remain. The first, and perhaps most obvious limitation centers on the design of both studies. Namely, both studies employed a survey methodology, and both IPI instruments (i.e., IPI-CT-U and IPI-CT-A) still ask respondents to rate how they think they behaved during one particular point in the past. These judgments are subjective and potentially prone to contamination from other experiences. For example, it is possible that consultants are thinking of a typical consultation experience, but it is equally likely that they are thinking of a best case or even a worst case scenario when responding to the various IPI prompts. Given these complexities, it will become increasingly important to explore ways to directly assess how consultants and consultees actually behave during consultation by focusing on what happens during actual consultation sessions.

This is also the first time the IPI-CT-A was used in research, as it was adapted from the Intervention Rating Profile (IRP; Witt et al., 1984). The original IRP consisted of several factors, one of which was a seven-item factor designed to assess the general acceptability of a treatment or intervention. This seven-item scale was adapted into the IPI-CT-A, and results showed that the IPI-CT-A is a valid instrument. The seven items accounted for 55% of the variance in consultant responses and the coefficient alphas were moderately high (ranging from .79 to .81). Although these preliminary statistics bode well, it will be necessary to continue with instrument development.

A third limitation relates to the two instruments used in this study. Although participants were asked to respond to a shorter instrument, the distinctions that they were asked to make were quite complex. Although the response rates were relatively high
compared to those in the Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001) study (26% for psychologists) and the Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001) study (31%), the response rates in Study Two were lower than those in Study One. The complexity of these judgments could have contributed to the lower response rate found in the acceptability study. The fact that only 75 males returned usable surveys in the second study also could have diminished the statistical power to find gender differences. It also would have been beneficial had the same group of respondents addressed both likelihood of use and acceptability.

A final limitation relates to how the IPI-CT-A (i.e., Study Two) was distributed to potential participants. While compiling the cover letter, postcards, envelopes, and the actual instrument itself, the researcher failed to include the seven concluding demographic questions in the survey packets. Fortunately, this error was discovered before the instruments were mailed, and demographic questions were then added to approximately 950 (out of 1,000) survey packets. Despite this effort to complete the survey packet, it is possible that some participants decided not to complete the survey because it was incomplete. This could have produced a biased respondent pool.

Directions for future research. This dissertation research is but a piece in an ongoing investigative agenda that concerns the relationship between aspects of school psychological consultation and Raven’s (1993) social power bases. This research is unique because it addresses dimensions of consultation other than effectiveness. Namely, this research focuses on the acceptability of various influence strategies and how likely consultants are to use various influence strategies. In order to further our understanding of consultation and the role social power and influence play in this process, it will be necessary to further explore the
acceptability of various influence strategies as well as their likelihood of use. In addition to addressing these issues, it will become important to do so in the context of actual consultation sessions. By exploring these issues more directly and during actual consultation sessions, researchers will gain a better and more complete understanding of what actually occurs and not what people think happens.

One direction for future research would be to consider limiting the scope of Raven’s (1993) social power bases as they relate to the practice of school psychological consultation. Specifically, consultants reported that they find the soft power bases to be more effective in leading to consultee compliance (Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001; Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001), and this dissertation research suggests consultants are more likely to use these soft power bases. This empirical research seems to support the idea that soft power bases are more relevant to the consultation enterprise than are harsh power bases. Perhaps it is time to focus solely on these softer influence strategies.

This research studied only the consultants’ perspective of social power base acceptability and likelihood of use. Future researchers might also consider exploring the dual constructs of acceptability and likelihood of use from the perspective of consultees. Understanding how both parties in the consultation dyad perceive these variables can only further our understanding of the complex interactions that occur during consultation.

Given the theoretical links between the constructs of treatment effectiveness, treatment acceptability, and treatment use or treatment implementation proposed by Witt and Elliott’s (1985) model of treatment acceptability, it will become necessary to empirically investigate the nature of the relationship between these variables and Raven’s (1993) social
power bases. Special attention should be paid to directly examining the relationship between and among social power base effectiveness, acceptability, and likelihood of use. Directly addressing these various relationships will further the social power/school psychological consultation research agenda. The current research had to extrapolate findings from various studies, and in the future it will be important to directly examine these links in an effort to strengthen any conclusions regarding these complicated and multi-layered relationships.

Perhaps one way to address this issue would be to ask school consultants to make a three part judgment: (a) how effective is a particular soft power base in leading to consultee compliance? (b) how likely would they be to use the same soft power base? and (c) how acceptable do they find that particular power base?

Another possible direction for future research would be to further examine the presence of gender differences in consultant perspectives of social power. For example, would a female consultant working with a female teacher rate her likelihood of use differently than a male consultant working with a female teacher? This question could also be addressed by looking at dyads where the teacher is male, although logistically this might be difficult. A related study could also address how years of experience affect which power bases a consultant endorses as either acceptable or rate as being likely to use.

A final area of research could focus on linking the consultation process to consultation outcome. This question could also be asked from both the perspective of both the consultant and the consultee (e.g., do consultants and consultees agree that using certain power bases lead to more effective consultation?, and how does acceptability of power bases affect consultation outcomes?). One way to address this overall process-outcome question
would be to correlate responses to various versions of the IPI instruments to another instrument addressing effectiveness.

In conclusion, the social power research agenda has addressed multiple lines of inquiry, with the ultimate goal of developing a better understanding of the complex dyadic interaction that is school psychological consultation. Erchul and Raven (1997) initiated research in this area by applying Raven’s (1993) revised social power bases from the realm of social psychology to the field of school psychology. Soon afterward, Erchul and colleagues initiated investigations concerning the effectiveness of Raven’s (1992) social power bases within consultation (Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001; Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001; Erchul, et al., 2004). The current line of research has expanded this focus by addressing the acceptability and likelihood of use of these social power bases within school psychological consultation. Taken as a whole, the research that addresses effectiveness, acceptability, and likelihood of use of social power bases by consultants increases our understanding of the dynamic process of psychological consultation within the schools.
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Appendix A
Interpersonal Inventory Form CT

INSTRUCTIONS: School psychologists, as consultants, may ask teachers to do their jobs somewhat differently, and teachers may be initially reluctant to change. In such cases, teachers tend either to resist making the changes or to do as requested. We are interested in understanding when teachers are more likely or less likely to do what the consultant asks.

Think about a time when you were consulting with a teacher about a particular classroom situation and the teacher was initially reluctant to follow your suggestions or comply with your requests. Asking a teacher to collect baseline data or to start an intervention plan on a particular day are two examples of these types of situations.

On the following pages, there are a number of considerations that might have influenced the teacher’s decision to do or not to do as you requested. Read each statement carefully, and decide how likely it would be that for each of these considerations the teacher would tend to comply or not comply. Use the following scale (found on the enclosed opscan sheet) in estimating how you believe the teacher would react:

A. Much more likely to comply.
B. More likely to comply.
C. A bit more likely to comply.
D. Would not affect their tendency to comply.
E. A bit less likely to comply.
F. Less likely to comply.
G. Much less likely to comply.

Remember that you are indicating the likelihood that the teacher would or would not tend to comply given these specific circumstances.

Thank you for your cooperation.

REMINDER: You have asked a teacher to do his/her job somewhat differently and he/she is initially reluctant to change. Using letters from the following scale, indicate the likelihood that the teacher would comply for each of the following items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A)</th>
<th>(B)</th>
<th>(C)</th>
<th>(D)</th>
<th>(E)</th>
<th>(F)</th>
<th>(G)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much more likely to comply</td>
<td>More likely to comply</td>
<td>A bit more likely to comply</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>A bit less likely to comply</td>
<td>Less likely to comply</td>
<td>Much less likely to comply</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please indicate the degree to which the following considerations would have made the teacher more or less likely to comply. Using the enclosed opscan sheet, for each item please fill in the circle that corresponds to the letter of your rating. Disregard options H, I, and J on the opscan sheet.

*The teacher has realized that:*

1. A good evaluation from me could lead to an increase in pay or other benefits.
2. After all, I am the consultant, and the teacher should feel some obligation to go along.
3. He/she probably feels I know the best way to handle the situation.
4. Once I point it out, he/she can see why the change is necessary.
5. He/she admires or respects me and does not wish to disagree.
6. I can give the teacher undesirable job assignments.
7. I have done some nice things for teachers in the past and so he/she does this in return.
8. He/she likes me and my approval is important to him/her.
9. It is clear that I really depend on the teacher to do this for me.
10. He/she does not want me to dislike him/her.
11. By doing so, he/she can make up for some difficulties he/she may have caused in the past.
12. For past considerations he/she has received, he/she feels obliged to comply.
13. I can make things unpleasant for teachers.
14. It makes the teacher feel better to know I like him/her.
15. He/she sees me as someone he/she can identify with.
16. He/she knows that unless he/she does so, my job will be more difficult.
17. I have carefully explained the basis for this request.
18. It would be disturbing for the teacher to know that I disapprove of him/her.
19. He/she feels I probably know more about this particular situation.
20. It is my job to tell him/her how to handle this situation.
21. Complying helps make up for things he/she has not done so well previously.
22. I can help the teacher receive special benefits.
23. I may be cold and distant if he/she does not do as requested.
24. I gave the teacher good reasons for changing how he/she handled the situation.
25. He/she understood that I really needed his/her cooperation on this.
26. He/she trusts me to give him/her the best direction.
27. We are both part of the same work group and should see eye to eye on things.
28. I have the right to request that he/she handle the situation in a particular way.
29. I make the teacher feel more valued when he/she does as requested.
30. He/she has made some mistakes and therefore feels that he/she owes this to me.
31. I can make it more difficult for him/her to get a promotion.
32. I can help him/her get a promotion.
33. I have previously done some good things that he/she has requested.
34. It makes the teacher feel personally accepted when he/she does as asked.
35. As a teacher, he/she has an obligation to do as I say.
36. He/she looks up to me and generally models his/her behavior accordingly.
37. He/she has not always done what I have asked so this time feels he/she should.
38. He/she feels that I probably have more knowledge about this than he/she does.
39. I can make it more difficult for him/her to get a pay increase.
40. He/she realizes that a consultant needs assistance and cooperation from teachers.
41. He/she expects some favorable consideration from me for going along on this.

42. He/she now understands why the recommended change is for the better.

43. I have let the teacher have his/her way earlier so he/she feels obliged to comply now.

44. He/she would be upset knowing that he/she was on the bad side of me.

Thank you for completing the Interpersonal Inventory. To help us understand your responses more completely, we ask that you provide us with some additional information.

45. What is your sex? (Please fill in appropriate circle under “Sex” on opscan sheet.)

46. What is your birthdate? (Please fill in appropriate circles under “Birthdate” on the sheet.)

47. Please briefly describe for us the type of consultation situation that you were thinking of in responding to this questionnaire:

48. What is the gender of the teacher you thought about in completing the questionnaire?
   ______ Male ______ Female

49. To which ethnic group does he/she belong? ____________________

50. What is his/her approximate age? ____________________

51. What is your highest earned degree? ____________________

52. To what ethnic group do you belong? ____________________

53. As part of your graduate training, did you take any formal courses in consultation?
   ______ Yes ______ No

   If yes, please specify:

54. How many years have you been a school psychologist? ________ years

55. Do you have previous experience as a school consultant? ______ Yes ______ No

   If yes, for how long? ______ years; ______ months
If yes, in approximately how many consultation cases have you served as a consultant?

- ______ 1-5 (minimally experienced)
- ______ 6-15 (moderately experienced)
- ______ More than 15 (extremely experienced)
Appendix B

Interpersonal Inventory Form CE

INSTRUCTIONS: When consulting, school psychologists may ask teachers to do their jobs somewhat differently, and teachers may be initially reluctant to change. In such cases, teachers tend either to resist making the changes or to do as requested. We are interested in understanding when teachers are more likely or less likely to do what the school psychologist asks in consultation.

Think about a time when a school psychologist was consulting with you about a particular classroom situation and you were initially reluctant to follow his/her suggestions or comply with his/her requests. Asking you to collect baseline data or to start an intervention plan on a particular day are two examples of these types of situations.

On the following pages, there are a number of considerations that might have influenced your decision to do or not to do as you were requested. Read each statement carefully, and decide how likely it would be that for each of these considerations you would tend to comply or not comply. Use the following scale (found on the enclosed opscan sheet) in estimating how you believe you would react:

A. Much more likely to comply.
B. More likely to comply.
C. A bit more likely to comply.
D. Would not affect your tendency to comply.
E. A bit less likely to comply.
F. Less likely to comply.
G. Much less likely to comply.

Remember that you are indicating the likelihood that you would or would not tend to comply given these specific circumstances.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Note: If you never have worked with a school psychologist in a consultative situation, please place a check here: _____

We ask, then, that you do not complete this questionnaire but instead return all materials in the postpaid envelope. Thank you.
REMINDER: The consultant has asked you to do your job somewhat differently and you are initially reluctant to change. Using letters from the following scale, indicate the likelihood that you would comply for each of the following items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A)</th>
<th>(B)</th>
<th>(C)</th>
<th>(D)</th>
<th>(E)</th>
<th>(F)</th>
<th>(G)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much more likely to comply</td>
<td>More likely to comply</td>
<td>A bit more likely to comply</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>A bit less likely to comply</td>
<td>Less likely to comply</td>
<td>Much less likely to comply</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate the degree to which the following considerations would have made you more or less likely to comply. Using the enclosed opscan sheet, for each item please fill in the circle that corresponds to the letter of your rating. Disregard options H, I, and J on the opscan sheet.

You have realized that:

1. A good evaluation from the consultant could lead to an increase in pay or other benefits.
2. After all, he/she is the consultant, and I should feel some obligation to go along.
3. The consultant probably knows the best way to handle the situation.
4. Once the consultant points it out, I can see why the change is necessary.
5. I admire or respect the consultant and do not wish to disagree.
6. The consultant can give me undesirable job assignments.
7. The consultant has done some nice things for teachers in the past and so I do this in return.
8. I like the consultant and his/her approval is important to me.
9. The consultant really depends on me to do this for him/her.
10. I do not want him/her to dislike me.
11. By doing so, I can make up for some difficulties I may have caused in the past.
12. For past considerations I have received, I feel obliged to comply.
13. He/she can make things unpleasant for teachers.
14. It makes me feel better to know he/she likes me.
15. I see the consultant as someone I can identify with.
16. I know that unless I do so, the consultant’s job will be more difficult.
17. The consultant has carefully explained the basis for this request.
18. It would be disturbing for me to know that the consultant disapproves of me.
19. The consultant probably knows more about this particular situation than I do.
20. It is the consultant’s job to tell me how to handle this situation.
21. Complying helps make up for things I have not done so well previously.
22. The consultant can help me receive special benefits.
23. The consultant may be cold and distant if I do not do as requested.
24. The consultant gave me good reasons for changing how I handled the situation.
25. I understand that the consultant really needed my cooperation on this.
26. I trust the consultant to give me the best direction on this.
27. We are both part of the same work group and should see eye to eye on things.
28. The consultant has the right to request that I handle the situation in a particular way.
29. The consultant makes me feel more valued when I do as requested.
30. I have made some mistakes and therefore feel that I owe this to the consultant.
31. The consultant can make it more difficult for me to get a promotion.
32. The consultant can help me get a promotion.
33. The consultant has previously done some good things that I have requested.
34. It makes me feel personally accepted when I do as the consultant asks.
35. As a teacher, I have an obligation to do as the consultant says.
36. I look up to the consultant and generally model my behavior accordingly.
37. I have not always done what I have been asked to do, so this time I feel I should.
38. I feel that the consultant probably has more technical knowledge about this than I do.
39. The consultant can make it more difficult for me to get a pay increase.
40. I realize that a consultant needs assistance and cooperation from teachers.
41. I expect to get some favorable consideration from him/her for going along on this.
42. I now understand why the recommended change is for the better.
43. The consultant has let me have my way earlier so I feel obliged to comply now.
44. I would be upset knowing that I was on the bad side of the consultant.

Thank you for completing the Interpersonal Inventory. To help us understand your responses more completely, we ask that you provide us with some additional information.

45. What is your sex? (Please fill in appropriate circle under “Sex” on opscan sheet.)
46. What grade do you currently teach? (Please fill in appropriate circle under “Grade” on the sheet, using “0” to indicate a preschool or kindergarten assignment.)
47. What is your birthdate? (Please fill in appropriate circles under “Birthdate” on the sheet.)
48. Please briefly describe the type of consultation situation with a school psychologist that you were thinking of in responding to this questionnaire:

49. To what ethnic group do you belong? ____________________
50. What is your highest earned degree? ____________________
51. How many years of teaching experience do you have? ______________
52. What is the gender of the school psychologist-consultant you thought about in completing items 1-44?

      _____ Male ______ Female

53. To which ethnic group does he/she belong? ______________________

54. What is his/her approximate age? ______________________

Thank you again for your cooperation.
Appendix C

Interpersonal Inventory

Form CT-U

INSTRUCTIONS: School psychologists, as consultants, may ask teachers to do their jobs somewhat differently and teachers may be initially reluctant to change. In such cases, teachers tend either to resist making the changes or to do as requested. We are interested in understanding the factors that a school psychologist considers when working with an initially resistant teacher.

Think about a specific instance when you were consulting with a particular teacher about a classroom problem and the teacher was initially reluctant to follow your suggestions or comply with your requests. Asking this teacher to collect baseline data on a student’s behavior or to start an intervention plan on a particular day are two examples of these types of situations.

On the pages that follow, please indicate how likely you would be to use the factor described in each of the 33 items when deciding how you might try to influence this teacher. Use this scale for items 1-33:

1. Extremely likely to use
2. Very likely to use
3. Somewhat likely to use
4. Neither likely nor unlikely to use
5. Somewhat unlikely to use
6. Very unlikely to use
7. Extremely unlikely to use

After you have completed these items, there will be 12 more items that ask you to evaluate how you worked with this particular teacher. Use this scale for items 34-45:

1. Very strongly disagree
2. Strongly disagree
3. Disagree
4. Neither disagree nor agree
5. Agree
6. Strongly agree
7. Very strongly agree

To increase readability, this questionnaire assumes that the teacher is female. Of course, the specific teacher you are recalling could be either male or female.

Thank you for your cooperation.
REMINDER: You have asked a teacher to do her job somewhat differently and she is initially reluctant to change. Using the following scale, indicate how likely you would be to use this factor in trying to influence this teacher during consultation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely likely to use</th>
<th>Very likely to use</th>
<th>Somewhat likely to use</th>
<th>Neither likely nor unlikely to use</th>
<th>Somewhat unlikely to use</th>
<th>Very unlikely to use</th>
<th>Extremely unlikely to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please circle the appropriate number to the right of each item.

1. A good evaluation from me could lead to an increase in her pay or other benefits.  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

2. She feels I know the best way to handle the situation.  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

3. I can give her undesirable job assignments.  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

4. She does not want me to dislike her.  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

5. By complying, she can make up for some difficulties she may have caused me in the past.  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

6. She feels obliged to comply because of past favors she has received from me.  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

7. It makes her feel better to know that I like her.  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

8. She sees me as someone she can identify with.  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

9. She knows my job will be more difficult if she does not comply.  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

10. She knows I have a strong basis for this request.  
    1  2  3  4  5  6  7

11. It is disturbing for her to know that I may disapprove of her.  
    1  2  3  4  5  6  7
REMINDER: You have asked a teacher to do her job somewhat differently and she is initially reluctant to change. Using the following scale, indicate how likely you would be to use this factor in trying to influence this teacher during consultation.

Please circle the appropriate number to the right of each item.

12. She feels I know more about this particular situation.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13. She understands it is my job to tell her how to handle this situation.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. By complying, she can make up for things she has not done so well previously.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. I can help her receive special benefits.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16. I can give her good reasons for changing how she handles the situation.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17. She understands that I really need her cooperation on this.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

18. We are both part of the same work group and should see eye-to-eye on things.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

19. I have the right to request that she handle the situation in a particular way.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

20. I make her feel more valued if she does as I request.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

21. She has made some mistakes and therefore feels that she owes this to me.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

22. I can make it more difficult for her to get a promotion.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
REMINDER: You have asked a teacher to do her job somewhat differently and she is initially reluctant to change. Using the following scale, indicate how likely you would be to use this factor in trying to influence this teacher during consultation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely likely to use</th>
<th>Very likely to use</th>
<th>Somewhat likely to use</th>
<th>Neither likely nor unlikely to use</th>
<th>Somewhat unlikely to use</th>
<th>Very unlikely to use</th>
<th>Extremely unlikely to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please circle the appropriate number to the right of each item.

23. I can help her get a promotion.  
   
24. I have done some nice things she requested in the past.  
   
25. It makes her feel personally accepted if she does as I ask.  
   
26. As a teacher, she has an obligation to do as I say.  
   
27. She looks up to me and generally models her behavior accordingly.  
   
28. She feels that I have more knowledge about this than she does.  
   
29. I can make it more difficult for her to get a pay increase.  
   
30. I need assistance and cooperation from her.  
   
31. She now understands why the recommended change is for the better.  
   
32. Because I let her have her way earlier, she now feels obliged to comply.  
   
33. She would be upset knowing that she was on my bad side.
In this next section, we ask that you continue to think about the consultation with this teacher. Specifically, for items 34-45, please recall your impressions immediately after your consultation with this teacher ended. Using the following scale, indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither disagree nor agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Very strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please circle the appropriate number to the right of each item.

34. I was generally helpful. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
35. I offered useful information to her. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
36. My ideas as to the primary goals of schools were similar to hers. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
37. I helped her to find alternative solutions to problems. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
38. I was a good listener. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
39. I helped her to identify useful resources. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
40. I fit well into the school’s environment. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
41. I encouraged her to consider a number of points of view. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
42. I viewed my role as a collaborator rather than an expert. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
43. I helped her to find ways to apply the content of our discussions to specific situations. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
44. I was able to offer assistance without completely “taking over” the management of problems. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
45. I think this teacher would request services from me again, assuming that other consultants would be available. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Thank you for completing the Interpersonal Inventory. To understand your responses more completely, we please ask that you provide us with some additional information.

46. What is your gender?      _____ Female _____ Male

47. What is your birthdate?    _____ Day _____ Month _____ Year

48. Please briefly describe the type of consultation situation that you were thinking about while completing this questionnaire:

49. What is the gender of the teacher you thought about while completing this questionnaire?
   _____ Female _____ Male

50. To which ethnic group does s/he belong? ____________________

51. At the time of this consultation, what grade level did s/he teach? __________

52. What was her/his approximate age? ____________________

53. Approximately how many years of experience did s/he have as a teacher? _____

54. What is your highest earned degree? ____________________

55. To what ethnic group do you belong? ____________________

56. As part of your graduate training, did you take any formal courses in consultation?
   _____ Yes _____ No

   If yes, please specify: ______________________________________________________

57. How many years have you been a school psychologist? ________ years

Thank you again for your cooperation.

6/9/04
Appendix D

Interpersonal Inventory – Acceptability of Consultative Approaches

Form CT-A

The purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain information that will aid school psychologists when consulting with teachers.

In consultation, a teacher and school psychologist work together, contributing their respective professional expertise to assist children with learning and adjustment difficulties. Although consultation can occur across different settings, it typically involves identifying a child’s behavior that is of concern; assessing where, when, why, and under what conditions the behavior occurs; and jointly developing one or more interventions that address the identified behavior. The school psychologist and teacher actively continue this process until an acceptable intervention plan is developed. Afterwards, the plan is put into action by those who are identified in the plan as responsible for one or more parts of the intervention.

Please read the following case study:

Assume that you are consulting with Mrs. Smith, a third grade teacher. She has initiated this consultation because she is experiencing difficulty with Billy, a student who defies classroom rules by constantly interrupting and occasionally bullying other students. Mrs. Smith has ten years of teaching experience and, in the past, she has dealt with classroom disruptions by removing student privileges. However, this strategy has not worked with Billy and therefore she has contacted you. Mrs. Smith knows that you have successfully consulted with her and other teachers before, and she hopes that you can help her develop a plan to reduce Billy’s misbehavior.

You meet with Mrs. Smith to discuss Billy’s behavior. She agrees to collect baseline data on target behaviors for several days, and to meet with you to discuss potential interventions the following week. In the follow-up meeting, you discuss the baseline data she collected and then jointly develop an intervention plan. You request that she start this plan the very next day and she agrees to do so. However, a week passes without Mrs. Smith implementing the agreed-upon plan. It is critical that this plan be put in place.

On the following pages you will find six possible approaches to influence Mrs. Smith to implement the intervention plan. You are asked to rate the acceptability of these six approaches using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your cooperation.
**Scenario A**

From previous experience working with Mrs. Smith, you know the following to be true:

*She regards you as “the expert.” She acknowledges that you probably know more about this particular situation than she does and therefore you know the best way to address Billy’s problem. You make use of this attribution by reminding her that the intervention plan has been shown to be effective in several published research studies.*

Using only this specific information, how would you view the **acceptability** of this approach to influence Mrs. Smith to implement the intervention plan?

Please circle the number to the right of each item that best describes your agreement or disagreement with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Taking this approach would be acceptable in changing the teacher’s behavior.  
   
2. Taking this approach would be effective in changing the teacher’s behavior.  
   
3. The teacher’s reluctance to change is severe enough to warrant use of this particular approach.  
   
4. Overall, taking this approach would be beneficial.  
   
5. Most school psychologists would find this approach suitable for the described situation.  
   
6. Most school psychologists would find this approach appropriate.  
   
7. I would be willing to use this particular approach in my own work with teachers.
Scenario B

From previous experience in working with Mrs. Smith, you know the following to be true:

*She identifies with you, looks up to you, and generally models her professional behavior after yours. She also realizes that you and she are both part of the same work group and thus should see eye-to-eye on things. You make use of this attribution by pointing out the similarities between her professional views and yours, including the shared goal of wanting Billy to succeed in the classroom.*

Using only this specific information, how would you view the acceptability of this approach to influence Mrs. Smith to implement the intervention plan?

Please circle the number to the right of each item that best describes your agreement or disagreement with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Taking this approach would be acceptable in changing the teacher's behavior.

9. Taking this approach would be effective in changing the teacher's behavior.

10. The teacher’s reluctance to change is severe enough to warrant use of this particular approach.

11. Overall, taking this approach would be beneficial.

12. Most school psychologists would find this approach suitable for the described situation.

13. Most school psychologists would find this approach appropriate.

14. I would be willing to use this particular approach in my own work with teachers.
Scenario C

From previous experience in working with Mrs. Smith, you know the following to be true:

*She is a rational person who is capable of seeing why changing her professional behavior is necessary once you have explained the logical basis for your request. You make use of this attribution by providing her with the many reasons why it “makes sense” to start the intervention plan immediately.*

Using only this specific information, how would you view the **acceptability** of this approach to influence Mrs. Smith to implement the intervention plan?

Please circle the number to the right of each item that best describes your agreement or disagreement with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Taking this approach would be acceptable in changing the teacher’s behavior.
16. Taking this approach would be effective in changing the teacher’s behavior.
17. The teacher’s reluctance to change is severe enough to warrant use of this particular approach.
18. Overall, taking this approach would be beneficial.
19. Most school psychologists would find this approach suitable for the described situation.
20. Most school psychologists would find this approach appropriate.
21. I would be willing to use this particular approach in my own work with teachers.
Scenario D

From previous experience in working with Mrs. Smith, you know the following to be true:

*She realizes that a school psychologist needs assistance and cooperation from teachers, and you are really depending on her help to address Billy’s problem. You make use of this attribution by making it clear that Billy can be helped only if she follows through with the intervention plan.*

Using only this specific information, how would you view the **acceptability** of this approach to influence Mrs. Smith to implement the intervention plan?

Please circle the number to the right of each item that best describes your agreement or disagreement with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Taking this approach would be acceptable in changing the teacher’s behavior.

23. Taking this approach would be effective in changing the teacher’s behavior.

24. The teacher’s reluctance to change is severe enough to warrant use of this particular approach.

25. Overall, taking this approach would be beneficial.

26. Most school psychologists would find this approach suitable for the described situation.

27. Most school psychologists would find this approach appropriate.

28. I would be willing to use this particular approach in my own work with teachers.
**Scenario E**

From previous experience in working with Mrs. Smith, you know the following to be true:

*She values your approval and feels more personally accepted when she follows through with requests that you make of her. You make use of this attribution by offering her compliments and praise for her active involvement in consultation.*

Using only this specific information, how would you view the **acceptability** of this approach to influence Mrs. Smith to implement the intervention plan?

Please circle the number to the right of each item that best describes your agreement or disagreement with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. Taking this approach would be acceptable in changing the teacher’s behavior.  
30. Taking this approach would be effective in changing the teacher’s behavior.  
31. The teacher’s reluctance to change is severe enough to warrant use of this particular approach.  
32. Overall, taking this approach would be beneficial.  
33. Most school psychologists would find this approach suitable for the described situation.  
34. Most school psychologists would find this approach appropriate.  
35. I would be willing to use this particular approach in my own work with teachers.
Scenario F

From previous experience in working with Mrs. Smith, you know the following to be true:

*She sees you as “the consultant”—someone who has a right to ask teachers to go about their jobs differently in order to solve classroom problems. You make use of this attribution by reminding her that part of the school psychologist’s role is to advise teachers in these situations.*

Using only this specific information, how would you view the **acceptability** of this approach to influence Mrs. Smith to implement the intervention plan?

Please circle the number to the right of each item that best describes your agreement or disagreement with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. Taking this approach would be acceptable in changing the teacher’s behavior.

37. Taking this approach would be effective in changing the teacher’s behavior.

38. The teacher’s reluctance to change is severe enough to warrant use of this particular approach.

39. Overall, taking this approach would be beneficial.

40. Most school psychologists would find this approach suitable for the described situation.

41. Most school psychologists would find this approach appropriate.

42. I would be willing to use this particular approach in my own work with teachers.

(Over, please…)
Thank you for completing the Interpersonal Inventory. To understand your responses more completely, we please ask that you provide us with some additional information.

43. What is your gender? _____ Female _____ Male

44. What is your birthdate? _____ Day _____ Month _____ Year

45. What is your highest earned degree? _____________________

46. To what ethnic group do you belong? ____________________

47. As part of your graduate training, did you take any formal courses in consultation?
   _____ Yes _____ No
   If yes, please specify: ________________________________________________

48. How many years have you been a school psychologist? _____ years

Thank you again for your cooperation.

Identification number: _________

8/19/04
Appendix E

Cover Letter: Likelihood of Use Study

Dear NCSP Colleague:

We are inviting you to participate in a study focusing on how school psychologists view their consulting relationship with teachers. This study is an attempt to extend prior research in the area of the psychologist/teacher relationship and the processes that underlie consultation. This research is part of a dissertation project that has been approved by a graduate faculty committee and NC State’s Institutional Review Board on Research Involving Human Subjects.

Your participation consists of completing the enclosed Interpersonal Inventory, which should take approximately 20 minutes. The Interpersonal Inventory asks you to indicate how likely each of the items would be a consideration you would use when attempting to influence a teacher to comply with a request you made of him/her during consultation. After you have answered the items on the Interpersonal Inventory, you are asked to mail it back to us by October 1. A postage-paid envelope has been provided for this purpose.

Your participation is strictly voluntary and will remain completely confidential. An identification number will be used solely to facilitate follow-up mailings. This information will be filed separately, and only the principal investigators will have access to these files. You are free to withdraw your consent to participate any time.

Your responses are important to us in order to have complete and useful data. If you have questions or concerns, please feel free to contact either one of us. Thank you in advance for your time and effort!

Sincerely,

William P. Erchul, Ph.D., NCSP
Professor of Psychology

Kristen E. Wilson, M.A.
School Psychology Student
Appendix F

Cover Letter: Acceptability Study

Dear NCSP Colleague:

We are inviting you to participate in a study focusing on how school psychologists view their consulting relationship with teachers. This study is an attempt to extend prior research in the area of the psychologist/teacher relationship and the processes that underlie consultation. This research is part of a dissertation project that has been approved by a graduate faculty committee by NC State’s Institutional Review Board on Research Involving Human Subjects.

Your participation consists of completing the enclosed Interpersonal Inventory, which should take approximately 20 minutes. The Interpersonal Inventory will ask you to read five scenarios each depicting a different approach a consultant could take when trying to influence a teacher during consultation. After reading these brief scenarios you will be asked to answer several questions that address your perceptions of the acceptability of these five approaches to consultation. After you have answered the items on the Interpersonal Inventory, you are asked to mail it back to us by October 1. A postage-paid envelope has been provided for this purpose.

Your participation is strictly voluntary and will remain completely confidential. An identification number will be used solely to facilitate follow-up mailings. This information will be filed separately, and only the principal investigators will have access to these files. You are free to withdraw your consent to participate any time.

Your responses are important to us in order to have complete and useful data. If you have questions or concerns, please feel free to contact either one of us. Thank you in advance for your time and effort!

Sincerely,

William P. Erchul, Ph.D., NCSP
Professor of Psychology

Kristen E. Wilson, M.A.
School Psychology Student