

ABSTRACT

GETTY, KIMBERLY CHAPMAN. Gender and Professional Experience as Predictors of Consultants' Likelihood of Use of Social Power Bases. (Under the direction of William P. Erchul, Ph.D.).

The social power typology originally identified by French and Raven (1959) and later modified by Raven (1965, 1992) was used to examine factors related to school psychological consultation. Specifically, this dissertation investigated whether the gender and amount of relevant professional experience of psychologists (i.e., consultants) and teachers (i.e., consultees) influenced how likely psychologists were to use soft power bases when consulting with teachers. In addition, this study examined whether consultants' use of soft power bases was related to their self-evaluations of effectiveness during consultation. Two instruments were employed: the Interpersonal Power Inventory (IPI), which was modified to examine school consultants' likelihood of use of social power bases when consulting with teachers; and the Consultant Evaluation Form (CEF), which was modified to assess psychologists' self-evaluations of effectiveness during teacher consultation. The IPI and CEF were mailed together to 1,000 Nationally Certified School Psychologists, and a total of 352 usable protocols were returned. Results indicated that when consulting with female teachers, female consultants were *not* more likely to use positive referent power than the other four soft power bases combined; however, male psychologists *were* more likely to use positive expert power than the other four soft power bases combined. Additional results indicated that consultants' likelihood of use of soft power bases was not related to their years of professional experience, although results of a secondary set of analyses using a slightly different constellation of soft power bases did yield a significant relationship between the two variables. Findings also revealed a significant relationship between

consultees' years of experience and consultants' use of soft power bases, in that school consultants were less likely to use soft power with more experienced teachers. Finally, results indicated a significant, positive relationship between consultants' likelihood of use of soft power bases and their self-evaluations of effectiveness during consultation. Findings of this study suggest that the experience level of teachers plays a significant role in determining the influence strategies used by psychologists during consultation. Results also imply that consultants' use of soft power is related to perceptions of more effective school consultation.

GENDER AND PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE AS PREDICTORS OF CONSULTANTS'
LIKELIHOOD OF USE OF SOCIAL POWER BASES

by
Kimberly Chapman Getty

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
North Carolina State University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

PSYCHOLOGY

Raleigh

2006

APPROVED BY:

Helen Lupton-Smith, Ph.D.

Ann Schulte, Ph.D.

Mary Haskett, Ph.D.

William P. Erchul, Ph.D.

Chair of Advisory Committee

BIOGRAPHY

Kimberly Chapman Getty was born on August 8, 1977 in Syracuse, New York. Her younger brother Peter and her parents, George and Victoria, have their roots in Fayetteville, New York, where Kimberly graduated from Fayetteville-Manlius High School in 1995. She then attended the University of Richmond in Richmond, Virginia, where she double majored in Psychology and Sociology. After receiving her Bachelor of Arts degree in 1999, Kimberly enrolled in the doctoral program in School Psychology at North Carolina State University. She earned a Master of Science degree in December 2003 and is currently completing her pre-doctoral internship within the Wake County Public School System.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Had it not been for the unwavering support of many individuals, this dissertation may never have come to fruition. First, I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. William Erchul, who has provided outstanding guidance throughout this process. I am also grateful for the statistical and editorial contributions made by my committee members, Dr. Mary Haskett, Dr. Helen Lupton-Smith, and Dr. Ann Schulte.

This dissertation would not have been possible without Dr. Kristen Wilson, with whom I collaborated to collect data, as well as the assistance of two undergraduate research assistants, Karen Chaney and Hilary Metz. For their statistical savvy, I must also thank Dr. Jason Allaire, Hugh Crews, and Caryn Ward.

Words alone cannot express my gratitude toward my parents, whose words of encouragement and steadfast optimism gave me strength to see the light at the end of the tunnel. Immense thanks also go to my good friends, who have provided a bottomless source of emotional support over the years.

And last but certainly not least, I must thank my soul mate and partner for life, David Sherrill, whose love and endless support made this work possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	vii
INTRODUCTION	1
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	5
Consultation and School Psychology.....	5
Definition of consultation	6
Consultation models.....	9
Mental health consultation	9
Behavioral consultation	10
Organizational consultation.....	11
Efficacy and Effectiveness of Consultation within the Schools	12
Social Influence and Social Power	14
Definitions of the social power bases	15
Definitions of the original five social power bases.....	15
Addition of the sixth power base	16
Expansion of the six power bases	17
Power/interaction model of interpersonal influence	18
Relevance of social influence and social power to school consultation	21
Application of Raven's (1992) model to school consultation	23
Development of the Interpersonal Power Inventory (IPI)	26
Rationale for the development of the IPI.....	26
Raven et al. (1998) - Study one	28
Raven et al. (1998) - Study two	32
Additional Studies Measuring the Social Power Bases Using the IPI.....	35
Elias, Riedel, and Mace (1999).....	35
Koslowsky, Schwarzwald, and Ashuri (2001).....	36
Schwarzwald, Koslowsky, and Agassi (2001).....	40
Schwarzwald, Koslowsky, and Ochana-Levin (2004).....	43
Literature Examining Social Power within School Consultation	46
Application of social power to school consultation.....	46
Martin (1978).....	46
Erchul and Raven (1997)	51
Empirical studies examining social power within school consultation	54
Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001).....	54
Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001)	58
Erchul, Raven, and Wilson (2004).....	62
Gender and Social Power.....	67
Gender, communication style, and perceptions of social power	68
Gender and verbal communication style.....	70
Johnson (1976).....	71
Offerman and Schrier (1985)	72
Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, and van Engen (2003).....	74
Erchul et al. (2004)	74

Gender, nonverbal communication style, and social power	75
Gender dyads and social power	78
Hogg (1985)	79
Mulac (1989)	80
Relevant Professional Experience and Social Power	82
Professional experience, social power/influence, and consultation outcomes	84
Martin and Curtis (1980)	84
Short, Moore, and Williams (1991)	85
Professional experience and consultation outcomes	88
Weissenburger, Fine, and Poggio (1982)	88
Gutkin and Bossard (1984)	89
Likelihood of Use as a Variable	91
Linking Consultation Process to Consultation Outcome	93
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	95
METHOD	99
Participants	99
Instrumentation	99
Interpersonal Power Inventory – Consultant Form – Usage	99
Consultant Evaluation Form	102
Procedure	103
RESULTS	105
Demographic Information	105
Descriptive Statistics for Independent and Dependent Variables	106
Principal Components Factor Analysis	111
Hypothesis 1 and 2	113
Primary Analyses	115
Secondary Analyses	116
Research Questions 1 and 2	116
Primary Analyses	116
Research Question 1	117
Research Question 2	118
Secondary Analyses	120
Research Question 1	120
Research Question 2	121
Additional Analyses Pertaining to Research Questions 1 and 2	122
Research Question 3	123
Primary Analyses	123
Secondary Analyses	124
DISCUSSION	125
Principal Components Factor Analysis	125
Consultant Gender and Likelihood of Use of Soft Power Bases	127

Relationship between Professional Experience and Likelihood of Use of Soft Power Bases	129
Consultant Experience and Likelihood of Use	129
Consultee Experience and Likelihood of Use.....	132
The Link between Likelihood of Use of Soft Power Bases and Consultant Effectiveness	136
Implications, Limitations, and Future Research Directions.....	139
Implications.....	139
Study Limitations.....	140
Future Research Directions.....	142
Conclusion	144
REFERENCES	146
APPENDIX A.....	157
Interpersonal Inventory Form CT-U	
APPENDIX B	164
Table A: Full Multiple Regression Analysis with Consultant Years of Relevant Professional Experience, Consultant Gender, and the Interaction Between Consultant Experience and Consultant Gender and Their Relationship to Consultant Likelihood of Use of Soft Power Bases	
Table B: Full Multiple Regression Analysis with Consultee Years of Relevant	166
Professional Experience and the Interaction between Consultee Experience and Consultant Gender and Their Relationship to Consultant Likelihood of Use of Soft Power Bases	
APPENDIX C	167
Table C: Full Multiple Regression Analysis with Consultant Years of Relevant Professional Experience, Consultant Gender, and the Interaction Between Consultant Experience and Consultant Gender and Their Relationship to Consultant Likelihood of Use of Soft Power Bases	
Table D: Full Multiple Regression Analysis with Consultee Years of Relevant	169
Professional Experience and the Interaction between Consultee Experience and Consultant Gender and Their Relationship to Consultant Likelihood of Use of Soft Power Bases	

List of Tables

Table 1: Differentiation of Raven's (1992) Social Power Bases	19
Table 2: 11 Power Bases Differentiated into Harsh and Soft Bases as Identified by Raven et al. (1998)	31
Table 3: Summary of Studies Measuring Raven's (1992) Social Power Bases Using the IPI	47
Table 4: Summary of Published Empirical Studies Examining Social Power Bases within School Consultation	66
Table 5: Descriptive Statistics on Consultants' Ratings of Likelihood of Use of Soft Power Bases, Years of Relevant Professional Experience, and Mean Item Score on Consultant Evaluation Form (CEF)	107
Table 6: Intercorrelations among Independent and Dependent Variables	109
Table 7: Factor Loadings for Consultant Responses on the IPI Form CT-U	112
Table 8: Items Pertaining to the Soft Power Bases on the IPI Form CT-U	114

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

School psychologists engage in a variety of activities as part of their role in helping to ensure the educational and psychological well-being of children. Approximately two thirds of these activities involve special education classification and placement, primarily the administration of individual assessments to children. However, practicing school psychologists have indicated a preference for spending more time in other activities, including indirect services such as problem-solving consultation (Reschly & Ysseldyke, 2002). Indeed, with each passing year, consultation is becoming increasingly more important within the field of school psychology (Gutkin & Curtis, 1999), as evidenced by its demonstrated efficacy (Sheridan, Welch, & Orme, 1996) and the belief of both psychologists and teachers that consultation is an effective and important form of service delivery (Ysseldyke & Geenen, 1996). Considering the heightening reputation of consultation within the schools, there is a growing need to expand research in this area to better understand the factors and processes that contribute to its delivery.

By definition, school consultation is an indirect service because school consultants do not provide “hands-on” assistance to students. Rather, consultation involves a working relationship between a consultant and a teacher-consultee, the goal being for the consultant to enhance the consultee’s skills in handling a specific student problem such that the consultee will be able to handle similar situations in the future without the assistance of the consultant. School consultation thus is widely considered to be an interpersonal influence process, as its success is largely contingent on a consultant’s ability to influence a consultee to use more effective methods and follow through with plans discussed during consultation (Hughes, 1992).

In attempting to better understand the interpersonal processes that operate within school consultation, some recent thematic research has focused on the application of Raven's (1992, 1993) power/interaction model of interpersonal influence to consultation within the schools. In general, this model posits that an individual has the potential to use a variety of forms of power (social power bases) in attempting to influence another individual, and must go through several stages to determine which social power bases are most effective and appropriate for use in achieving successful interpersonal influence. Investigations applying Raven's (1992, 1993) model to school consultation primarily have concentrated on psychologists' and teachers' perceptions regarding which social power bases are most effective in influencing teachers to follow through with plans made during consultation. These studies generally indicate that both psychologists and teachers perceive the soft power bases (i.e., relational forms of power) to be more effective than the harsh power bases (i.e., direct forms of power) (Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001; Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001; Erchul, Raven, & Wilson, 2004).

In order to develop a more comprehensive understanding of the interpersonal processes that take place within consultation, however, it is necessary to move beyond an examination of the perceived effectiveness of social power bases. One way to accomplish this is to investigate which social power bases school psychologists are likely to actually *use* in influencing teachers, as it is possible that psychologists may perceive a social power base to be an effective means of influence but would not actually implement it. Clearly, an examination of school psychologists' likelihood of use of social power bases will add to a greater understanding of how social influence processes are manifested within school consultation.

To enhance this understanding even further, it also is necessary to consider the impact other factors may have on school psychologists' likelihood of use of social power bases. Gender

is one such factor, as the literature repeatedly has indicated that there are significant differences in the communication styles and power strategies demonstrated by men and women (Eagly, 1987; Payne, Fuqua, & Cangemi, 2001). Erchul et al. (2004) initiated an examination of this variable by investigating the relationship between gender and school psychologists' perceived effectiveness of social power bases, results of which were significant and will be discussed in greater detail in the literature review. Currently, however, research in school consultation has not considered the relationship between gender and school consultants' likelihood of use of power bases, and, more specifically, whether certain gender dyads (e.g., female consultant-female consultee vs. male consultant-female consultee) will result in differences regarding consultants' likelihood of use of power bases.

Another variable that may influence school psychologists' likelihood of use of social power bases is the professional experience of psychologists and teachers. Although this variable has not received much recent attention in the school consultation literature, past research suggests that professional experience may indeed influence psychologists' use of social power. For instance, some investigators have found that teachers with more experience are less likely to prefer consultation (Gutkin & Bossard, 1984), which suggests that psychologists may need to employ different power bases depending on the teacher's amount of experience. Clearly, an examination of how professional experience is related to consultants' likelihood of use of social power bases is warranted.

Lastly, in consideration of the need to incorporate outcome assessment into routine practices such as school consultation (Zins, 1990, as cited in Bramlett & Murphy, 1998), it is important not to overlook the link between consultation process and outcome. Specifically, an exploratory investigation of how consultants' likelihood of use of social power bases is related to

outcomes in school consultation (such as consultants' self perceptions of their effectiveness) will not only expand the literature in this area, but also will help determine which consultation practices contribute to more positive outcomes and, ultimately, lead to the most successful delivery of school consultation.

It is clear that there are a variety of factors related to the practice of school consultation that require further research attention. Having provided a brief overview of these factors, next is a discussion of relevant literature addressing these topics in greater detail, followed by a presentation of this dissertation research.

CHAPTER TWO

Review of the Literature

The following literature review will describe several key topics pertinent to the process of consultation within the schools. An overview of school consultation will be provided first, including its definition, the primary models from which it stems, and its demonstrated efficacy/effectiveness within the schools. Next will be a discussion of social influence and social power, followed by its relevance to school consultation. Several key studies that have demonstrated the application of a social power framework within organizations as well as school consultation will be reviewed next. A discussion of gender in relation to social power also will be presented, followed by a discussion of how the perception and potential use of social power may be affected by individuals' years of relevant professional experience. Next will be an overview of the variable *likelihood of use* in relation to social power, as likelihood of use of social power in consideration of gender and years of experience is the focal point of this dissertation research. Finally, the literature review will highlight the importance of linking consultation process to outcome, which is the last aim of the investigation.

Consultation and School Psychology

The primary role of school psychologists is to work with educators, parents, and other professionals to help ensure that all children learn in a safe, healthy, and supportive environment (Silva, 2003). The responsibilities that come with this position include, but are not limited to, assessment, development of interventions and prevention programs, provision of consultation services, research, and educational planning. Despite the multiple functions school psychologists are trained to perform, assessment of learning disabilities and other disorders for the purpose of placing children in special education classrooms is still a dominant function of many, if not most,

school psychologists. However, psychologists' growing dissatisfaction with this "refer-test-place" model has contributed to the rise of consultation within the field of school psychology (Bramlett & Murphy, 1998). In fact, it has been suggested that the role of consultation within school psychology has been and continues to grow increasingly more important with each passing year (Gutkin & Curtis, 1999).

Gutkin and Curtis (1999) have posited that the ability of school psychologists to serve children is mediated to a large extent by their ability to work successfully as consultants. This position is based on the notion of the "Paradox of School Psychology" (Gutkin & Conoley, 1990), which suggests that "to serve children effectively school psychologists must, first and foremost, concentrate their attention and professional expertise on adults" (p. 212). In other words, although school psychologists often provide services such as diagnostic testing or one-on-one counseling directly to children, much of the assistance provided to children by school psychologists comes directly from *other* adults in the child's environment, such as teachers or parents. Consultation is thus considered an indirect form of service delivery because it requires the school psychologist to interact with other adult professionals and caregivers, who then work directly with children (Gutkin & Curtis, 1999). In fact, consultation is considered the primary indirect service delivered by school psychologists and other school-based professionals (Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001). Next is a general definition of consultation as well as a specific definition and description of the process of consultation within school psychology.

Definition of Consultation

In its broadest sense, consultation in the human services is focused on assisting a person, group, organization, or larger system in activating internal or external resources to deal with problem confrontations and change efforts (Lippitt & Lippitt, 1986). The major premise behind

consultation is that by assisting an individual or system with a specific problem, the individual/system will be able to handle similar difficulties in the future without requiring the consultant's assistance. In this way, individuals or people within groups/systems gain a sense of empowerment in their ability to successfully handle future problematic situations. In other words, consultation is an indirect helping process that empowers the consultee (Brown, Pryzwansky, & Schulte, 2001).

Context is an important aspect of consultation (Zins & Erchul, 2002), and so the specific way in which consultation is defined often depends on the situation in which consultation takes place. Within the schools, consultation is a process whereby a school psychologist assists a teacher in handling a specific student problem, primarily through the development and implementation of specific research-based interventions that address the student's presenting problem. The goal of this interaction is not only to remediate the student's problem, but also to improve the teachers' ability to handle similar situations in the future without the assistance of the school psychologist. In this way, consultation as an indirect service delivery has the potential to serve a significant number of children without necessarily requiring a large amount of the psychologist's time. Erchul and Martens (1997) have defined school consultation specifically as:

a process for providing psychological and educational services in which a specialist (consultant) works cooperatively with a staff member (consultee) to improve the learning and adjustment of a student (client) or group of students. During face-to-face interactions, the consultant helps the consultee through systematic problem solving, social influence, and professional support. In turn, the consultee helps the client(s) through selecting and implementing effective school-based interventions. In all cases, school consultation serves a remedial function and has the potential to serve a preventive function (p. 12).

Due to its indirect nature, the success of school consultation is largely contingent on whether the consultee is willing and able to follow through with plans developed during the consultation process, as it is generally the consultee's responsibility to perform the functions

associated with the plan and ultimately provide services to the student (e.g., collecting baseline data, implementing an intervention, keeping records of progress/change in a student's functioning). Meanwhile, it is the consultant's responsibility to be available to the consultee if any concerns arise, as well as ensure that plans are being implemented accurately while maintaining a non-evaluative relationship with the consultee (Zins & Erchul, 2002). In some instances, there may be a need for the consultant to make additional requests of the consultee, particularly in situations where an intervention plan is not producing positive results and modifications need to be made. Such requests may be minor (e.g., increasing the frequency of rewards in a behavior modification plan) or substantial (e.g., beginning an entirely new intervention, including collecting new baseline data). In addition, there may be times when a consultee is resistant or reluctant to comply with a consultant's suggestions, thus inhibiting the successful delivery of services to a student. For example, a consultee may not agree with the appropriateness of a plan, may not understand how to implement the plan, or simply may be resistant to carrying it out (Brown et al., 2001).

Because the success of consultation depends initially on the interactions between a consultant and a consultee (i.e., during the development of an intervention plan) and ultimately on the consultee's successful delivery of services, it is important for a consultant to develop a good working relationship with a consultee. This is particularly important in situations where additional requests need to be made, as poor working relationships may contribute to consultee resistance (Wickstrom & Witt, 1993). Indeed, it has been suggested that the nature of the consultative relationship and its impact on the consultee are what determine whether such services are actually rendered (O'Keefe & Medway, 1997). In conceptualizing this relationship, Zins and Erchul (2002) have indicated that it is optimal for consultants and consultees to have a

“cooperative partnership,” wherein openness, trust, and a sharing of responsibilities and expertise are incorporated. This relationship has been called a “cooperative partnership” for two reasons. First, the relationship is cooperative because consultants and consultees should work together on as equal a level as possible, each having different contributions to make and specific responsibilities to uphold that are necessary for effective consultation to take place. Second, the relationship is considered to be a partnership because consultant and consultee responsibilities should be clearly defined and agreed-upon to enhance progress toward mutual goals. Within this reciprocal relationship, the consultant uses interpersonal skills and techniques to guide and structure the actual consultation process, whereas the consultee provides much of the content of the discussion (Zins & Erchul, 2002).

The aforementioned definition of school consultation stems largely from the models of consultation from which it borrows. Next is a brief overview of three consultation models that have influenced the process of consultation within the schools.

Consultation Models

The ways in which the consultation process takes place are varied, despite the common goal of providing indirect services to a client. Of all the consultation models used within the schools, aspects of the mental health, behavioral, and organizational consultation models have been the most frequently utilized (Zins & Erchul, 2002). What follows is a brief description of these models.

Mental health consultation. Psychodynamic theory provides the primary theoretical foundation of mental health consultation, emphasizing the importance of social support systems within a community in the prevention of psychological disorders (Brown et al., 2001). Specifically, Caplan (1970) posited that the unresolved conflicts and personal needs of a

professional caregiver (e.g., teacher) may interfere with his/her professional functioning, and so mental health consultation is one way to manage and address those personal issues in a professional setting.

Mental health consultation has been defined as a process of interaction between two professionals (a consultant and a consultee) wherein the consultee requests the assistance of the consultant in a work-related issue that is considered to be within an area of the consultant's expertise (Caplan & Caplan, 1993). The purpose of this interaction is to improve the functioning of a third party (the client) with whom the consultee works. It should be noted that within this model, the consultative relationship is voluntary and nonhierarchical, and is initiated by the consultee (Caplan, 1970). Although the consultant may provide professional advice or treatment suggestions to the consultee, the consultant does not carry an authoritative or coercive role within the consultation interaction, and it is up to the consultee to decide whether to implement any suggestions given by the consultant (Caplan & Caplan, 1993). Similarly, the consultant is not responsible for implementing remedial action for the client, but rather it is the consultee's responsibility to do so. In this way, the goal of consultation is twofold: to improve the consultee's functioning with a client, and to increase the consultee's professional skills in handling similar problematic situations in the future (Caplan & Caplan, 1993).

Behavioral consultation. Similar to mental health consultation, the process of behavioral consultation also involves a consultant working with a consultee to provide services to a third party, the client. However, the behavioral consultation model emphasizes greater use of data in a problem-solving process to define, analyze, and remedy problem situations. Bergan and Kratochwill (1990) have characterized behavioral consultation as an indirect, problem-solving service involving a positive working relationship between the consultant and consultee in which

the consultant gathers and communicates information relevant to the consultee's problem as well as the psychological principles that will assist the consultee in utilizing the information. When utilizing a behavioral approach to consultation, there are four steps a consultant must follow: (a) identify the problem, (b) analyze the problem, (c) implement a plan, and (d) evaluate the plan (Bergan, 1977).

An important distinction between behavioral and mental health consultation is the manner in which the consultant functions during the consultative interaction. Whereas a mental health consultation model advocates the development of a nonhierarchical relationship between the consultant and consultee wherein consultees are free to accept or reject the ideas that are presented, a main tenet of a behavioral model is that consultants should interact with consultees in a manner that will maximize the consultees' likelihood of accepting the consultants' recommendations. In other words, it is fully expected that consultees will implement the ideas that are discussed during consultative sessions, and that consultants operating within a behavioral framework should use communication techniques such as questioning and systematic reinforcement to enhance consultees' compliance with consultants (Bergan, 1977).

Organizational consultation. Because of the importance of context within school consultation, it has been proposed that school consultation also rely on a systems, or organizational, approach to consultation in addition to its mental health and behavioral slants (Zins & Erchul, 2002). In fact, Gutkin (1993) has suggested that a preferred model of school consultation be a culmination of behavioral and ecological/systems theories. Specifically, Gutkin (1993) has posited that school consultation draws from a behavioral paradigm with its data-driven, problem-solving approach to problem resolution, while at the same time it borrows from an ecological framework with its focus on the contribution of environmental variables to

problem situations. School consultation clearly is multi-faceted in nature, and its success depends largely on the contribution of several different consultation approaches.

Considering that consultation has become a primary job function of many school psychologists (Reschly & Wilson, 1995), it has become increasingly important for researchers to document the efficacy or effectiveness of consultation within the schools. Next is a brief overview of several reviews that have demonstrated that school consultation is indeed an efficacious form of service delivery, and also is considered by school psychologists and teachers to be an important method of service delivery.

Efficacy and Effectiveness of Consultation within the Schools

Before discussing the efficacy and effectiveness of school consultation, it is necessary to distinguish between the two forms of measurement. *Efficacy* studies are empirical in nature and involve the traditional components of an experimental study (e.g., control groups, random assignment). They are conducted to determine whether a certain treatment results in better outcomes when compared to a control group. *Effectiveness* studies, on the other hand, are based on participants' perceptions and judgments about a particular treatment. Such studies provide information about how well a treatment is perceived to work (i.e., the treatment's judged effectiveness) in an actual setting (Seligman, 1995). The discussion will now focus briefly on several studies demonstrating the efficacy of school consultation, followed by research indicating consultation is judged to be an effective form of service delivery.

In their critique of consultation outcome literature, Sheridan et al. (1996) conducted an extensive review of 46 school consultation outcome studies published between 1985 and 1995, including articles in refereed journals and dissertations located in *Dissertation Abstracts International*. Twenty-one of the studies used a behavioral consultation model, five studies

followed a mental health consultation framework, and the remaining 20 studies used a different consultation model or did not specify a model. Most targets of consultation outcomes were based on behavioral and academic concerns of clients (33% and 22%, respectively), and skill building in the consultee (15%). Rating scales and direct observation were the primary measures used to assess these outcomes, and outcomes were coded as either positive, negative, or neutral.

Results of Sheridan et al.'s (1996) review indicated that consultation is largely efficacious, as it led to at least some positive results in 76% of the studies considered. Studies that followed a behavioral model of consultation generated the most positive results, with 95% reporting at least one positive outcome, and of the five mental health consultation studies, three (60%) reported at least one positive finding. Sheridan et al. noted that their results were very similar to findings of previous consultation outcome investigations. Specifically, Mannino and Shore (1975, as cited in Berkovitz, 2001) found that out of their review of 35 consultation outcome studies (17 of which were in the schools), consultation produced positive results in 78% of the studies they reviewed, and Medway (1979, as cited in Sheridan et al., 1996) indicated that school consultation produced positive results in 76% of the studies they reviewed. In addition, results of a meta-analysis by Medway and Updyke (1985) indicated that consultees demonstrated improvements greater than 71% and clients showed improvements greater than 66% as compared to a control group. Finally, results from a study examining the effects of training in behavioral consultation by Kratochwill, Elliott, and Busse (1995) indicated that consultation was an efficacious method of service delivery, as demonstrated by an effect size of .95 in favor of consultation over appropriate controls. These relatively consistent results lend strong support to the use of consultation within the schools, particularly when a behavioral model of consultation is utilized.

Not only has research demonstrated that consultation is an efficacious means of providing indirect services within the schools, but also it has documented that psychologists as well as teachers perceive consultation to be an important and effective form of service delivery. For instance, Ysseldyke and Geenen (1996) indicated that school psychologists consider expertise in consultation to be their most important contribution to making sure that the practice of school psychology leads to successful outcomes for children in need of services. Regarding teachers' perceptions of consultation, Gutkin (1980) found that teachers place a high priority on working with school consultants and react positively to consultation services overall. In addition, Ford and Migles (1979), who examined teachers' preferences for various job functions performed by school psychologists, found that teachers judged all job functions, including consultation, to be at least "moderately important." (It should be noted, however, that teachers preferred direct and remedial services over indirect and preventive services such as consultation.)

The documented efficacy of consultation within the schools combined with school psychologists' and teachers' perceptions that consultation is an important and effective service delivery justifies the need for a comprehensive understanding of the consultation process. Because school consultation, by nature, involves a working relationship between the school consultant and the consultee, the social interactions and exchanges that take place between these individuals are a critical aspect of consultation that requires attention. One way to better understand these important interactions is to examine the concepts of social influence and social power. Next is an introduction to these concepts, followed by their application to the face-to-face interactions that take place within school consultation.

Social Influence and Social Power

The following section will provide an overview of social influence and social power,

followed by the definitions of French and Raven's (1959) original social power bases and additional expansions of these bases (Raven, 1965; Raven, 1992). Finally, a detailed discussion of Raven's (1992, 1993) power/interaction model of interpersonal influence will be provided, followed by the application of this model to school consultation.

The most renowned and established model for studying social power is the typology of social power bases originally created by French and Raven (1959) and later modified by Raven (1965, 1992) (Mintzberg, 1983). Within this typology, *social influence* is defined as a change in the belief, attitude, or behavior of a *target* of influence, which results from the action or presence of an influencing *agent*. *Social power*, in turn, is the potential for social influence to occur (Raven, 1992, 1993). The discussion will now focus on the social power bases, the mode of influence within French and Raven's (1959) typology.

Definitions of the Social Power Bases

Definitions of the original five social power bases. The original model outlined by French and Raven (1959) posed five power bases, or sources of influence, which individuals may use to attempt to influence others: reward, coercive, legitimate, expert, and referent power. Following is an overview of these five power bases.

The premise behind *reward power* is that a target of influence may change his/her behavior if he/she perceives that the influencing agent is capable of and willing to provide tangible rewards for such a change. A second form of power, *coercive power*, is based on a target of influence's perception that an influencing agent may punish him/her in some way if he/she does not comply. *Legitimate power*, a third form of social power, is based on a target of influence's sense of an obligation to comply with an influencing agent, often due to the agent's status or organizational position. A fourth form of social power, *expert power*, is based on a

target's perception that an influencing agent is knowledgeable or has expertise in a specific area. Finally, *referent power*, the fifth original power base, is rooted in a target of influence's sense of similarity and/or identification with the influencing agent (or the desire to identify with the agent) (French & Raven, 1959).

It is important to note that all five of these social power bases are socially *dependent* in nature, in that their success is dependent on the interactions that take place between the influencing agent and target of influence (Erchul & Raven, 1997). In addition, reward and coercive power also require surveillance by the influencing agent in order to be successful. In other words, the target of influence must *perceive* that the influencing agent will be able to observe whether or not he/she has complied (French & Raven, 1959). In this way, reward and coercive power are successful if the target of influence believes that the influencing agent has the ability to observe his/her behavior and provide a reward or punishment as a result of such behavior, regardless of whether or not the agent actually rewards or punishes.

Addition of the sixth social power base. Shortly after the initial five power bases were specified, a sixth power base, informational power, was added (Raven, 1965). The premise behind informational power is that a target of influence may comply with an influencing agent because he/she perceives the information contained within the agent's message to be relevant to the situation at hand. Although it appears at first to be the same as expert power, informational power is different in that it is the target's judged relevance of the agent's message, not the agent's expertise, that influences the target (Erchul & Raven, 1997). For example, a target of influence may comply with an influencing agent because he or she believes the information provided by the agent is relevant and helpful in addressing a particular problematic situation, not because he or she simply views the agent as an expert.

An important distinction between informational power and the original five social power bases is that unlike the original bases, informational power is not socially dependent (Erchul & Raven, 1997; French & Raven, 1959). As was mentioned earlier, the success of the original five social power bases relies on the interactions that take place between the influencing agent and the target of influence. However, because the success of informational power depends on the target of influence's judged relevance of the influencing agent's message content and not the actual interaction with the agent, informational power is socially *independent*. In other words, an agent's use of informational power can be considered successful if a target is able to apply the information presented to him/her even after interactions with the agent have been terminated.

Since their inception, the original six power bases identified by French and Raven (1959) and Raven (1965) have been used to help understand social interactions in a variety of settings, including within the family, among children, between teachers and students, and among supervisors/supervisees in organizational settings (Raven, 1992). Over the years, the wide application of these original six power bases has led to substantial modification and revision of the social power typology model. The most recent adaptation of this social power model has expanded to include 14 power bases and has been rephrased as a power/interaction model of interpersonal influence (Raven, 1992, 1993). A brief overview of the 14 power bases is next, followed by a discussion of the power/interaction model of interpersonal influence.

Expansion of the six power bases. The expanded set of 14 power bases is the result of several differentiations of the original 6 social power bases (Raven, 1992). First, reward and coercive power each have been differentiated into personal and impersonal forms. In addition, expert and referent power each have positive and negative forms. Informational power has been divided into direct and indirect forms, and finally, legitimate power has been divided into four

forms: formal legitimate, legitimacy of reciprocity, legitimacy of equity, and legitimacy of dependence (Raven, 1992). Table 1 provides a concise summary of the 14 expanded social power bases.

When Raven (1992) expanded the social power bases, he also developed the power/interaction model of interpersonal influence. The discussion will now turn to an examination of this model.

Power/interaction model of interpersonal influence. In this comprehensive model, Raven (1992) described the process an influencing agent goes through in selecting, implementing, and evaluating the use of a social power base. The model will be described here from the perspective of the influencing agent, although it also may be examined from the perspective of the target of influence. There are six main stages within the model: (a) The Motivation to Influence, (b) Assessment of Available Power Bases, (c) Assessment of the Costs of Differing Influence Strategies, (d) Preparing for the Influence Attempt, (e) Choice of Mode of Influence, and (f) Assessing the Effects of Influence. Following is a description of these six stages.

The first stage of the model addresses the influencing agent's initial decision to use social power bases as a means of influence (Raven, 1992). It is here that the agent must assess his/her reasons, or motivators, for using social power. For instance, the agent may want to obtain extrinsic goals or may wish to satisfy internal needs such as an increase in self-esteem or status. According to Raven (1992), the agent's motivation for using influence is what helps the agent determine which social power bases are available for use, which leads to the second stage of the model, Assessment of Available Power Bases. During this phase, the influencing agent must determine which social power bases are available for use and then determine which of those will be most effective in obtaining his/her goals. As such, the variable *likelihood of use*, which is a

Table 1

Differentiation of Raven's (1992) Social Power Bases

Social Power Base	Definition
Positive Expert	Person A does what Person B says because Person B is perceived to be an expert in a particular area.
Negative Expert	Person A does the opposite of what Person B says because he/she believes that Person B is thinking of his/her own best interests.
Positive Referent	Person A does what Person B wants because he/she wants to be similar to or associated with Person B.
Negative Referent	Person A does the opposite of what Person B says because he/she does not want to be similar to or associated with Person B.
Impersonal Reward	Person A complies with Person B because he/she perceives that Person B can give some form of tangible reward for complying.
Personal Reward	Person A complies with Person B because he/she believes Person B will like or approve of him/her for complying.
Impersonal Coercion	Person A complies with Person B because he/she perceives that Person B has the ability to tangibly punish him/her for noncompliance.
Personal Coercion	Person A complies with Person B because he/she believes that Person B will dislike or disapprove of him/her for noncompliance.
Direct Information	Person A complies with Person B because the information provided by Person B makes logical sense.
Indirect Information	Person A complies with Person B because he/she overhears from a third party that a certain course of action worked well in a similar situation.
Formal Legitimate/Position	Person A feels obligated to comply with Person B because Person B occupies a position of status or authority.
Legitimacy of Reciprocity	Person A feels obligated to comply with Person B because Person B has done something positive for him/her in the past.
Legitimacy of Equity	Person A feels obligated to comply with Person B as a way of compensating for Person B's previous hard work.
Legitimacy of Dependence	Person A feels obligated to comply with Person B because Person B is unable to accomplish a certain action without his/her help.

* *Note.* Adapted from Table 1 in Erchul, Raven, and Wilson (2004)

focal point of this study's research, is most relevant during this phase of the model.

The third stage of the model involves the influencing agent's assessment of the potential costs and benefits of using particular social power bases. For instance, the agent may have decided that coercive power would be one effective way to achieve his/her goals, but when assessing this power base in relation to the target of influence, he/she may decide that this form of power could result in a feeling of fear or dislike from the target of influence (Raven, 1992). It is during this third phase that an influencing agent must decide which social power bases will be most effective and appropriate for use in consideration of the situation at hand.

Once the influencing agent has determined which social power base to use, he/she must prepare the situation for an influence attempt. It is during this stage that the agent must prepare, or "set up" the situation for the use of the selected social power base (Raven, 1992). Examples of preparing the situation include setting the stage (e.g., displaying diplomas, wearing professional clothing), enhancing the power base to be used (e.g., emphasizing one's advanced knowledge in preparation for using expert power, or pointing out similarities in the agent's and target's backgrounds in preparation for using referent power), and minimizing the target and/or minimizing opposing influence agents. For instance, an agent may put down the target of influence to increase his/her use of expert power, or may reduce the expertise of another individual who supports the target of influence's current behavior, thus increasing the effect of the agent's own use of power (Raven, 1992).

During the fifth stage of Raven's (1992) model, an influencing agent must determine in what manner and tone he/she will implement the social power base. For example, the agent may decide that because he/she is going to use expert power, he/she will be present him/herself in a very authoritative, superior manner, such that the target of influence is more apt to be influenced

by the use of expert power. However, if an agent has chosen to use referent power, he/she may try to be very empathetic toward the influencing agent, such that a basis of similarity/identification is formed and the effect of using referent power is increased.

Finally, once the agent has implemented the social power base, he/she must assess how effective it was, which is the last stage in Raven's (1992) model. For instance, was the agent's influence attempt successful? Did the target of influence change his/her attitude, behavior, or belief? Has the target of influence changed his/her feelings toward the agent? All of these questions are important in determining whether an agent's use of a particular social power base was effective and worthwhile. It is likely that if an agent deemed the influence attempt with a certain social power base to be successful, he/she would use that base again in the future. Conversely, if an agent were not successful in using a particular social power base, he/she may try using a different social power base during his/her next influence attempt.

Having described the concepts of social influence and social power, defined the various social power bases, and reviewed the framework behind Raven's (1992) model, the literature review will now turn to a discussion of the relevance of social influence and social power to school consultation, followed by an application of social power/influence and Raven's (1992) model to the process of consultation within the schools.

Relevance of Social Influence and Social Power to School Consultation

As was mentioned earlier, a school consultant must utilize a variety of interpersonal skills and techniques while guiding a consultee through the consultation process. Due to the indirect nature of consultation, these interactions are particularly important because the consultant will not be able to provide assistance to the client without the cooperation of the consultee (Gutkin & Curtis, 1999). More specifically, a school consultant is successful only to the degree that he or

she can *influence* a teacher to adopt a more effective approach (Hughes, 1992). One way a school consultant may invoke such cooperation is to rely on techniques of social influence and social power, which are considered two basic components of all human interaction (Leary, 1957; Strong & Hills, 1986; as cited in Erchul & Raven, 1997). Indeed, social influence processes are considered to be a significant feature within successful consultation relationships (O’Keefe & Medway, 1997), and both social influence and social power are considered necessary in ensuring the successful delivery of indirect services like consultation (Conoley & Gutkin, 1986).

It should be pointed out that there have been disparate views regarding the relevance of the concepts of social power and influence within the process of school consultation; this discussion has been regarded as the “collaboration debate” (Erchul, 1999; Gutkin, 1999a, 1999b; Schulte & Osborne, 2003). This debate largely stems from the differing perceptions regarding the operational definition and application of collaboration within school consultation, as some may perceive a behavior as being collaborative in nature while others may view that same behavior as being noncollaborative (Schulte & Osborne, 2003). For instance, it has been the argument of some (e.g., Gutkin, 1999a, 1999b) that the school consultant does not utilize social power or social influence during consultation with a teacher, because the consultation relationship is collaborative in nature, not directive. In other words, the school consultant does not influence a teacher (as a consultee) to implement a plan, but rather the teacher comes to an agreement with the consultant and thus follows through with a plan of his or her own accord. However, it is the contention of others (e.g., Erchul, 1999) that school consultation does in fact involve concepts of social power and influence, in that it is the school consultant’s role in consultation to guide or direct (i.e., influence) the consultee toward implementing a mutually agreed-upon plan. Indeed, of all the primary professional activities school psychologists engage

in, consultation has been viewed most often as an interpersonal influence process (O'Keefe & Medway, 1997), a contention that has been around for many years (Lambert, 1973). Combined with the assertions mentioned earlier, there appears to be clear support for the relevance of social power and influence to the process of school consultation.

Application of Raven's (1992) Model to School Consultation

Raven's (1992) power/interaction model of interpersonal influence is an excellent model to use in demonstrating how social influence and social power apply not only to organizational settings but also to the process of consultation within the schools. The section that follows will first provide a brief explanation of how social influence and social power relate to school consultation, and then will describe how a school consultant may approach each of the six stages of Raven's (1992) model in attempting to utilize social power to influence a consultee.

Recall that social influence, the successful application of social power, involves a change in the belief, attitude, or behavior of a target of influence, which results from the action or presence of an influencing agent (Raven, 1992). As considered here, within the context of school consultation, the influencing agent is the school psychologist consultant and the target of influence is usually a teacher consultee (or other educational professional). As such, it is typically the school consultant who uses social power in an attempt to influence the consultee; however, it is also possible for these roles to be reversed, in that a teacher consultee could serve as an influencing agent, and the school consultant would then be the target of influence.

The discussion will now focus on the application of Raven's (1992) model to school consultation. To facilitate this discussion, an example will be used involving a female, African American school consultant who is consulting with a male, Caucasian teacher consultee regarding a student who acts out in class (For ease of explanation, rather than using the expanded

set of 14 social power bases, only the 5 original power bases and informational power will be used in the example.)

As described earlier, it is during the first stage of Raven's (1992) model when an influencing agent determines his/her reasons for using social power as a means of influence. In the aforementioned example, the consultant's goal may be for the consultee to implement a particular intervention aimed at reducing the student's acting out behavior. Having determined why she wishes to use social power, the consultant would then assess which social power bases are available for use—the second stage of Raven's (1992) model. In assessing these power bases, the consultant may decide that coercive power is too harsh a means of influence and so would eliminate this power base from her repertoire of possible power bases. She may also eliminate referent power, because she knows that her ethnicity and gender likely make it difficult for the consultee to identify with her. Consequently, the consultant's remaining available power bases would be legitimate power, informational power, reward power, and expert power.

During the third stage of Raven's (1992) model, the consultant would determine the potential costs and benefits of using each available power base with the consultee, ultimately choosing which power base she will implement. After weighing the advantages and disadvantages of each power base, the consultant may decide that informational power would be the most effective form of social power to use with the consultee. For instance, regarding the use of expert power, the consultant may believe that portraying herself as an expert may increase the professional "distance" between herself and the consultee and thus would not be an appropriate form of social power to implement. She may also decide that despite the likely effectiveness of legitimate power and reward power, they may not be received as well as informational power by the consultee.

Now that the consultant has determined she will use informational power with the consultee, she must prepare the situation for the influence attempt. This corresponds to the fourth stage in Raven's (1992) model. Knowing that she is basing her attempt at influence on the consultee's judged relevance and usefulness of the information she provides him, the consultant may research the proposed intervention and gather recent empirical studies that demonstrate its efficacy to give to the consultee, because she knows he values research-based interventions. She may also speak with another teacher who used the intervention to get positive feedback regarding its effectiveness and then share this feedback with the consultee, because she believes the consultee will be more likely to "buy into" an intervention if his fellow teachers have found it to be successful.

Having prepared the situation for the use of informational power, the consultant would then enter the fifth stage of Raven's (1992) model. Here, the consultant must decide in what manner she will implement informational power. Due to the selected intervention's evidence-based nature as well as the consultee's preference for educational methods that are backed by research, the consultant may decide to present the information (i.e., implement informational power) in a straightforward manner, using facts, research, and past experience to convey confidence in the intervention's effectiveness.

Finally, after having implemented informational power, in the sixth stage of the model, the consultant must assess how effective her use of informational power was in influencing the consultee. She may ask herself questions like, "did the consultee find the information helpful?" and "did the consultee actually implement the intervention?" The consultant's decision to use informational power in the future will be aided by her answers to these and other questions.

As was mentioned earlier, the original six power bases identified by French and Raven (1959) and Raven (1965) have been applied to a wide variety of social interactions, including those that take place among family members and in professional settings (Raven, 1992). To investigate how the power/interaction model of interpersonal influence (Raven, 1992) applies within workplace settings, the *Interpersonal Power Inventory* (Raven, Schwarzwald, & Koslowsky, 1998) was created. Next is a discussion of the development of this instrument, followed by key studies examining its applicability within workplace settings and, later, school consultation.

Development of the Interpersonal Power Inventory (IPI)

The section that follows presents the rationale behind the development of the Interpersonal Power Inventory (IPI), followed by a review of six studies that shed light on the psychometric properties associated with the IPI in measuring the social power bases in workplace settings. Of these studies, Raven et al.'s (1998) two initial studies implementing the IPI will be discussed first, followed by four additional studies that have provided further support for the IPI as a valid and reliable instrument for measuring the social power bases.

Rationale for the Development of the IPI

Over the years, the heightening reputation and widespread application of the original five social power bases outlined by French and Raven (1959) led to the development of several instruments to measure these bases. Three of the most widely used early measures include those by Bachman, Smith, and Slesinger (1966, as cited in Podsakoff & Schriesheim, 1985), Student (1968, as cited in Podsakoff & Schriesheim, 1985), and Thamhain and Gemmill (1974, as cited in Podsakoff & Schriesheim, 1985). However, in a comprehensive analysis of field studies that used these and other instruments to examine the social power bases in organizational and other

settings, it was determined that the psychometric properties of these early measures were considerably lacking (Podsakoff & Schriesheim, 1985). One significant flaw with many of these instruments was that they provided inaccurate, incomplete, or overly vague conceptualizations of French and Raven's (1959) social power bases, which would allow for different interpretations by different respondents and thus reduce content validity (Hinkin & Schriesheim, 1989; Podsakoff & Schriesheim, 1985). In addition, many instruments used only one item to represent a social power base, which is problematic because the use of one-item scales typically assumes that: (a) the single item is the best representation of the construct, (b) the construct is not comprised of multiple factors, and (c) all respondents will interpret the item in the same manner (Podsakoff & Schriesheim, 1985). Other faults found within these early measures include their failure to address the effect of social desirability on respondents' replies as well as their ranked response format, which does not allow an independent examination of a power base and may force some power bases to be related to certain criterion variables simply because of their rank among the other social power bases (Podsakoff & Schriesheim, 1985).

In an attempt to address the psychometric limitations of existing measures examining social power bases, as well as to create an instrument to operationally define and measure the expanded social power base model outlined by Raven (1992), Raven et al. (1998) developed the *Interpersonal Power Inventory*. Building from previously developed scales (e.g., Hinkin & Schriesheim, 1989) and specific definitions of the power bases provided in Raven's (1992) model, Raven et al. (1998) developed items for 11 of the 14 power bases. Because negative expert power, negative referent power, and indirect informational power are more difficult to conceptualize concretely and thus more difficult to measure, these three social power bases were excluded from the development of the IPI. Items were piloted using open-ended interviews,

during which respondents were asked to complete trial questionnaires. Four items were eventually constructed for each of the 11 power bases, resulting in a total of 44 items on the IPI.

Next is a discussion of two studies conducted by Raven et al. (1998) to examine the operationalization and underlying factor structure of the items on the IPI, as well as to determine the IPI's validity in an alternative culture and work setting.

Raven et al. (1998) - Study One

In this first study, Raven et al. (1998) administered the IPI to 317 college students (102 males) from various universities in California. Participants were asked to respond to one of two forms of the IPI: the subordinate form or the supervisor form. The instructions for the subordinate form are as follows:

Often supervisors ask subordinates to do their job somewhat differently. Sometimes subordinates resist doing so or do not follow the supervisor's directions exactly. Other times, they will do exactly as their supervisor requests. We are interested in those situations which lead subordinates to follow the requests of their supervisor.

Think about a time when you were being supervised in doing some task. Suppose your supervisor asked you to do your job somewhat differently and, though you were initially reluctant, you did exactly as you were asked. On the following pages, there are a number of reasons why you might do so. Read each descriptive statement carefully, thinking of the situation in which you were supervised. Decide how likely it would be that this would be the reason you would comply.

Respondents rated the likelihood that each item would lead to compliance on a scale of 1 to 7, with a 1 indicating the item was "definitely not a reason" and a 7 indicating the item was "definitely a reason" for complying. An example of an item addressing positive expert power on the subordinate form is, "my supervisor probably knew the best way to do the job" (Raven et al., 1998).

Instructions on the supervisor form asked participants to think of a similar work situation in which the participant was the supervisor. On this form, participants were asked to indicate

how likely each item was a reason why the subordinate would have complied, using the same 7-point scale described above.

To test the construct validity of the social power typology model, Raven et al. (1998) calculated the intercorrelations among the 4 items that were hypothesized to represent each of the 11 power bases, or factors. Results of this analysis indicated that some of the items within each factor did not “hang together,” or correlate well with the other items. As such, for each factor, one item that had the greatest effect on reducing the reliability of the factor was eliminated, resulting in a total of 33 items (i.e., 3 items for each of the 11 power bases). After this elimination, the individual alphas for each item ranged from .67 to .86, indicating moderate to good internal consistency.

Next, Raven et al. (1998) conducted a principal components factor analysis with the remaining 33 items, which resulted in seven factors with eigenvalues greater than 1. These seven factors were labeled impersonal sanctions (combining impersonal reward and impersonal coercive power), credibility (expert and information power), legitimate equity (legitimate equity and legitimate reciprocity), reference, personal sanctions (personal reward and personal coercive power), legitimate position, and legitimate dependence. Coefficient alphas for each of the seven factors ranged from .72 to .90, which is indicative of good reliability. Interestingly, this analysis indicated that some of the factors hypothesized by Raven (1992) as distinctive were actually part of the same factor (i.e., personal reward and personal coercion, legitimate equity and legitimate reciprocity, and informational and expert power). Although this result does not necessarily diminish the individuality of the 11 power bases within the IPI, it does suggest that certain power bases are more similar in nature than others.

The mean scores of the 11 power bases were then factor analyzed to determine whether there were underlying structures or source factors (Raven et al., 1998). A two-factor solution emerged, with factor I explaining 34.6% of the variance and including soft or weak bases (i.e., credibility, reference, and legitimate dependence) and factor II explaining 24.7% of the variance and including harsh or strong bases (i.e., legitimate equity, impersonal sanctions, personal sanctions, and legitimate position). This two-factor solution is of particular interest as it is similar to results of previous studies (e.g., Bass, 1981, as cited in Raven et al., 1998; Yukl & Falbe, 1991) and has been demonstrated in much recent research, which will be described later in this literature review. Table 2 presents the differentiation of the 11 power bases into harsh (also considered hard) or soft categories as was found by Raven et al. (1998).

Before continuing, a brief explanation of the conceptual difference between the harsh and soft power bases will be presented. The harsh power bases represent means of influence that are more heavy-handed and assertive in tone, and tend to emphasize the advantage of the influencing agent over the target (e.g., providing tangible rewards for compliance or punishing for noncompliance) (Schwarzwalder, Koslowsky, & Ochana-Levin, 2004). Soft power bases, on the other hand, are characterized by influence tactics that are more relational and personal in nature. This form of social power tends to rely on the influencing agent's personal assets and expresses a more equal approach to exerting influence, because the influencing agent does not exert outside pressure (e.g., punishment for noncompliance) and the decision to comply is left to the target (Schwarzwalder et al., 2004).

Finally, Raven et al. (1998) conducted discriminant analyses for gender and position perspective (i.e., subordinate or supervisor) to determine whether the seven factors were

Table 2

11 Power Bases Differentiated into Harsh and Soft Bases as identified by Raven et al. (1998)

Harsh (Hard) Power Bases	Soft Power Bases
Legitimate power of reciprocity	Expert power
Impersonal coercive power	Referent power
Legitimate power of equity	Informational power
Impersonal reward power	Legitimate power of dependence
Personal coercive power	Personal reward power
Legitimate power of position	

consistent across subgroups. Although results indicated that men and women did not differ in their responses, it was determined that position perspective did influence responses.

Specifically, participants responding with the perspective of either a subordinate or supervisor differed on expert power, informational power, and referent power. This difference emerged only among the soft power bases, where supervisor mean compliance was greater than subordinate compliance for expert, informational, and referent power (Raven et al., 1998).

Raven et al. (1998) – Study Two

Because the first study by Raven et al. (1998) involved American college students who had little or no work experience, the purpose of their second study was threefold: (a) to examine the generalizability, or consistency, of the social power structure across cultures; (b) to assess the similarity in the degree of compliance to power bases; and (c) to investigate the relationship between compliance and job satisfaction, which is a variable that has been used often as a measure of organizational outcome and has shown positive relationships in the power literature (Podsakoff & Schriesheim, 1985). Participants included 101 hospital workers (e.g., laboratory assistants) from several departments in an Israeli hospital. Thirty-eight participants were male, and the average age was 36.8 years (Raven et al., 1998).

Two instruments were used. First, the 33-item IPI subordinate form employed with the American sample in the first study was translated into Hebrew for use in this study. Second, the short version of the *Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire* (MSQ) was used, which contains 20 statements that ask respondents to indicate their degree of satisfaction with their job on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating “very dissatisfied” and 5 indicating “very satisfied.” An example of an item from the MSQ is, “The freedom to use my own judgment.” The coefficient alpha for the instrument is .87, indicating good reliability (Arvey, Bouchard, Siegal, & Abraham, 1989, as

cited in Raven et al., 1998). These two instruments were administered to participants in a counterbalanced order.

With respect to the results, Raven et al. (1998) first assessed the internal consistency of the 33 items on the Hebrew version of the IPI subordinate form. Coefficient alphas for each scale ranged from .63 (for legitimate dependence) to .88 (for impersonal reward and coercion), and results indicated a similar relationship among items among the Hebrew version of the IPI as was found with the American version. Although a factor analysis on the individual items was not conducted due to the small sample size, Raven et al. (1998) did conduct a factor analysis on the 11 power bases, which yielded a two-factor solution similar to that found in the first study. Specifically, the first factor explained 39.8% of the variance and was comprised of the harsh bases, while the second factor explained 20.3% of the variance and consisted of the soft bases. In both studies, the power bases fell into the same harsh/soft categories except for two power bases: legitimate position, which was included among the soft bases, and personal reward, which was included as a harsh base. However, further examination of the factor analysis results from the first study indicated that the factor loading of legitimate position power was actually quite similar for both the harsh and soft factors (.35 and .34, respectively), which suggests that legitimate position power could have been interpreted as either a soft or harsh base. As such, the factor analysis results from the second study provide strong support for the consistency of the two-factor solution across samples.

Results pertaining to the perceived degree of compliance as a result of the specific power bases were very similar to results of the first study. The rank order correlation between the two samples was .93, indicating a very high correspondence in how the American and Israeli samples ranked the power bases as a reason for their compliance. Both samples indicated that certain

bases, like information, legitimate position, and expert power, were more likely to be the reason for compliance than other bases, including legitimate reciprocity, equity, and impersonal coercive power (Raven et al., 1998).

Lastly, Raven et al. (1998) conducted separate discriminant analyses using the 11 power bases and the harsh and soft categories as predictors of job satisfaction. Participants' score on the MSQ, split at the median, was the grouping variable. Results regarding the individual power bases were significant, indicating that the compliance profile (i.e., the likelihood that specific power bases were a reason for compliance) distinguished between workers with high and low job satisfaction. Overall results of the discriminant analysis using only two predictors (means for the harsh and soft bases) with the general MSQ score as the grouping variable were also significant, and a follow-up univariate analysis indicated that only the soft power bases were significant. In other words, greater compliance as a result of the use of soft power bases was related to higher degrees of job satisfaction, but compliance as a result of the use of harsh power bases did not relate to job satisfaction (Raven et al., 1998).

In sum, the two studies conducted by Raven et al. (1998) demonstrated that the IPI is a valid and reliable instrument that may be used to assess how Raven's (1992) social power bases are attributed to supervisors in influencing subordinates. Results of both studies not only showed good internal consistency for the items comprising each of the 11 power bases, but also indicated a robust harsh/soft power structure among the 11 power bases. In addition, the IPI demonstrated construct validity because individuals across cultures (i.e., American and Israeli), positions (i.e., subordinate and supervisor), and gender had similar conceptualizations of the social power bases within the harsh/soft categories. Moreover, the IPI displayed concurrent validity due to the fact that the soft power bases were shown to correlate and distinguish among high and low job

satisfaction, an outcome measure demonstrated to positively relate to power bases (Podsakoff & Schriesheim, 1985).

After Raven et al. (1998), in their initial set of studies, demonstrated the reliability and validity of the IPI as an instrument for measuring the social power bases, several other researchers set out to demonstrate the applicability of the IPI to measure the social power bases in alternate organizational settings and with different participants. This research interest likely was enhanced by literature indicating that managerial advancement and success are dependent on the effective use of influence (and thus social power bases) (Bass, 1990). Following is a review of several noteworthy studies in this area.

Additional Studies Measuring the Social Power Bases Using the IPI

The section that follows presents an overview of four empirical investigations examining social power using the IPI. The first study is based in a university setting and involves college students' perceptions of social power bases; the remaining three studies are set in an organizational context and examine the relationship between individuals' perceptions of social power and related characteristics associated with their work environment.

Elias, Riedel, and Mace (1999)

Recall that in their first study, Raven et al. (1998) had college students respond to the IPI as though they were subordinates or supervisors in a work setting. Elias, Riedel, and Mace (1999) also used college students as participants to examine Raven's (1992) social power model; however, their study was more contextually relevant for the participants in that the university students responded within the context of a university setting, not a work setting. Specifically, a modified version of the IPI was administered to 326 university students to obtain their perceptions of the effectiveness of various social power bases when used by university faculty to

gain compliance. It was hypothesized that (a) first and second year students would be more compliant than third and fourth year students, and (b) there would be significant differences in the perceived effectiveness of the various power bases (Elias et al., 1999).

Using students' university classification, the sample was divided into two categories: first and second year students, and third and fourth year students. As predicted, results indicated that first and second students indicated greater levels of compliance than third and fourth year students; however, this finding held only for expert, referent, legitimate position, legitimate equity, and informational power bases. In an additional analysis using the entire student sample, it was determined that informational, expert, impersonal reward, and legitimate position power bases were perceived to be the most effective in gaining compliance. Data were also analyzed to determine if there were any differences based on gender or ethnicity. Results indicated that regardless of university classification, female students reported personal reward power as more effective than male students, and African American students perceived expert power to be more effective than Caucasian students (Elias et al., 1999).

Finally, Elias et al. (1999) replicated results found by Raven et al. (1998), in that a two-factor (i.e., harsh/soft) structure of the social power model was identified. This finding, in conjunction with additional analyses, provides further support for the IPI as a valid and reliable instrument for use in measuring the social power bases in various contexts.

Koslowsky, Schwarzwald, and Ashuri (2001)

Similar to the set of studies conducted by Raven et al. (1998), Koslowsky, Schwarzwald, and Ashuri (2001) examined subordinates' reasons for compliance in situations where they were in conflict with their supervisors and their supervisors were trying to get their way. A key differentiating feature of this study, however, is that actual supervisors and supervisees were

selected as participants rather than having participants respond as though they were in supervisory or subordinate positions. Specifically, the authors examined whether reasons for compliance to power bases were related to job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and professional distance.

A total of 264 female nurses participated in the study, 32 of whom were supervisors and 232 of whom were nurse subordinates. Participants were selected from 16 different clinical departments in two municipal hospitals in the Tel Aviv metropolitan area (Koslowsky et al., 2001).

Five instruments were used in this study, two of which were used to determine how likely subordinates were to rate power bases as a reason for compliance: the 33-item IPI (described earlier) and the *Power Sources Scale* (PSS) (Schriesheim, Hinkin, & Podsakoff, 1991). The PSS is very similar to the IPI, except that it only examines five power sources (i.e., reward power, referent power, coercive power, legitimate power, and expert power) because it was developed prior to Raven's (1992) expanded model. The PSS consists of 25 items, 5 items for each of the 5 power bases. Respondents rated each statement on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating they "strongly disagree" with the item and 5 indicating they "strongly agree" with the item as a reason for compliance. Nurse supervisors and nurse subordinates responded to the supervisor and subordinate forms of the IPI and PSS, respectively (subordinates were to respond as themselves, but supervisors were asked to focus on subordinates when they responded).

The third instrument was the shortened version of the *Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire* (Arvey, Bouchard, Segal, & Abraham, 1989, as cited in Koslowsky et al., 2001). The instrument consists of 20 items pertaining to satisfaction with one's job (e.g., "the work is secure and there is no concern about being laid off"), and nurse subordinates were to indicate the

extent to which they were satisfied with the content of each item on a scale ranging from 1 to 5, with 1 indicating they were “very dissatisfied” and 5 indicating they were “very satisfied.” The job satisfaction score is computed by totaling the responses to all 20 items. The scale has good internal consistency, as evidenced by a coefficient alpha of .81.

The shortened version (Cook, Hepworth, Wall, & Warr, 1981, as cited in Koslowsky et al., 2001) of the Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian (1974, as cited in Koslowsky et al., 2001) questionnaire was the fourth instrument. This measure of organizational commitment consists of nine items reflecting commitment to one’s job, such as “I am proud to tell others that I work in this organization.” For each item, nurse subordinates were asked to indicate the degree to which each item was true for them on a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 indicating the item was “very untrue” and 7 indicating the item was “very true.” The mean score across the nine items was used for each participant. The measure has good internal consistency, with a coefficient alpha of .85.

Finally, two scores were calculated to measure objective and subjective professional distance between supervisors and subordinates. To measure objective distance, the gap in professional level between supervisor and subordinate was calculated, resulting in two categories (nurses and supervisors with an equal professional level and supervisors with a higher professional level than that of nurses). To measure subjective difference, six items were developed (e.g., “I rely on my supervisor’s professional judgment”). Nurse subordinates indicated the degree to which each item was true for them on a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 indicating the item was “very untrue” and 7 indicating the item was “very true.” The total score across the items was computed and resulted in a coefficient alpha of .85, indicating good reliability. Using a median split, two categories were created: small subjective professional distance and large subjective professional distance (Koslowsky et al., 2001).

Results of two repeated measures ANOVAs followed by post-hoc comparisons indicated that for both nurse subordinates and supervisors, informational power yielded the highest compliance and was significantly different from all other power bases, and impersonal coercive power and legitimacy of equity power yielded the lowest compliance for both subordinates and supervisors (Koslowsky et al., 2001). Furthermore, there was a high rank order correlation ($\rho = .89, p < .01$) between subordinates and supervisors, indicating both groups rated their likelihood of compliance to various power bases very similarly.

Similar to the results found by Raven et al. (1998), a principal components factor analysis of nurses' responses on the IPI yielded a two-factor solution. The first factor, labeled "harsh power sources," explained 41.9% of the variance and included seven power bases (personal reward, impersonal reward, personal coercive, impersonal coercive, legitimacy of position, legitimacy of equity, and legitimacy of reciprocity). The second factor, which explained 15.5% of the variance and was labeled "soft power tactics," included four power bases: expert power, informational power, referent power, and legitimacy of dependence (Koslowsky et al., 2001).

In addition, two scores were calculated for each participant: the mean compliance to harsh sources ($\alpha = .85$) and mean compliance to soft sources ($\alpha = .72$). These scores were then compared to responses on measures of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and subjective and objective professional distance. It was determined that, generally, the soft factor was more highly related to these variables (Koslowsky et al., 2001). Additional results indicated that when professional distance was large, participants reported greater compliance to harsh and soft sources, and high job satisfaction was associated with greater compliance to soft power sources whereas low job satisfaction was associated with greater compliance to harsh power sources (Koslowsky et al., 2001).

Overall, results of Koslowsky et al. (2001) provide additional support for the IPI as a valid and reliable instrument for assessing reported compliance to social power bases. Moreover, the identification of a two-factor solution among the 11 power bases, categorized as either harsh or soft, provides further evidence for the harsh/soft power base distinction. It is important to note, however, that the harsh/soft power base distinction found by Koslowsky et al. (2001) was somewhat different from that identified by Raven et al. (1998). Specifically, Koslowsky et al. (2001) included personal reward power as a harsh base, whereas Raven et al. (1998) included it as a soft base. In general, it is somewhat expected that the harsh/soft power base distinction may vary subtly across studies because of differences in the samples used for each study, resulting in different responses and thus affecting results of factor analyses.

In another study using the IPI, Schwarzwald, Koslowsky, and Agassi (2001) investigated responsiveness to supervisor requests (i.e., compliance to social power bases) in relation to leadership type, a variable not examined by Koslowsky et al. (2001). Following is a discussion of this study.

Schwarzwald, Koslowsky, and Agassi (2001)

Similar to previous research, Schwarzwald et al. (2001) also examined the use of social power by supervisors in gaining compliance from subordinates in conflict situations; however, the study by Schwarzwald et al. (2001) is unique in that they examined the potential interaction between the use of social power and leadership style. Specifically, two types of leadership were examined: transactional leadership, which is associated with coerced compliance, and transformational leadership, which is based on the use of rewards for good performance and the use of punishment, or coercion, only when necessary (Bass, 1985). It was hypothesized that regardless of which power bases were used, subordinates would be more willing to comply with

transformational leaders as opposed to transactional leaders, and that compared to high-level subordinates, low-level subordinates would be more likely to comply with harsh power bases and less likely to comply with soft bases (Schwarzwald et al., 2001).

Participants included 40 police captains and 240 police officers and noncommissioned officers in the Israeli police department. Captains were randomly selected from three districts in the Central region of Israel, and police officers were selected based on captains' evaluations, such that six police officers were identified for each of the 40 captains (two officers with the highest evaluations, two officers with the lowest evaluations, and two officers with average evaluations).

Participants completed two instruments. First, police officers completed the Hebrew version of the IPI (described earlier). It should be noted that the directions and items were modified slightly such that they referred to captains and police officers instead of supervisors and subordinates, respectively. Second, captains completed the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, form 5X-Self (MLQ; Bass & Avolio, 1991, as cited in Schwarzwald et al., 2001). The MLQ (translated into Hebrew for this study) is used to discriminate between transactional and transformational leadership styles and consists of seven subscales, four of which evaluate transformational leadership types (Attributed Charisma, Inspirational Leadership, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individual Consideration) and three of which evaluate transactional leadership types [Contingent Reward, Management-by-Exception (Active) and Management-by-Exception (Passive)]. An item from the Attributed Charisma subscale is "I instill pride in those I lead in being associated with me" and an item from the Contingent Reward subscale is "I give those I lead what they want in exchange for their support." Captains were to judge how frequently they displayed the described behavior from each subscale on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating

“frequently, if not always” and 5 indicating “not at all.” For each captain, two scores were calculated, one for transformational leadership and one for transactional leadership.

Using mean scores for each of the 11 power bases on the IPI, results of a principal components factor analysis indicated a two-factor solution. The first factor represented “harsh” power bases (impersonal coercive, impersonal reward, legitimacy of reciprocity, personal reward, legitimacy of equity, and personal coercive) and accounted for 46.8% of the variance, and the second factor represented “soft” power bases (expert, informational, referent, legitimacy of position, and legitimacy of dependence) and accounted for 15.3% of the variance (Schwarzwalde et al., 2001). This two-factor solution is similar to that found by Raven et al. (1998) with the exception of personal reward power (included here as a harsh base) and legitimacy of position power (included here as a soft base), which provides further evidence for the validity of the two-factor distinction.

Next, after omitting outliers, hierarchical multiple regressions were conducted separately for harsh and soft power bases, using police officers’ level of performance (high, average, or low) and captains’ leadership style (transactional or transformational) as independent variables. Results indicated that for both regressions, an increase in the use of the transformational type of leadership was accompanied by greater compliance to either harsh or soft power bases (Schwarzwalde et al., 2001). Separate follow-up ANOVAs were then conducted for both soft and harsh factor scores (dependent variables), using high and low transactional and transformational leadership scores as well as performance evaluation (high, average, and low) as independent variables. Results for the harsh factor indicated that police officers were more likely to comply with high transformational leaders than with low transformational leaders, regardless of whether captains had a high or low transactional leadership level. Results for the soft factor indicated

that for high transactional leaders, police officers' compliance was moderate regardless of whether captains' level of transformational leadership was high or low; however, for low transactional leaders, compliance was low for low transformational types and compliance was high for high transformational types (Schwarzwalde et al., 2001).

In sum, results of the study by Schwarzwalde et al. (2001) provide additional evidence for the validity of the harsh/soft power base distinction, and indicate that individuals with a transformational leadership style are more likely to obtain compliance when using harsh power bases and, in certain circumstances, soft power bases as well. Such findings have implications for the use of social power in other professional settings, such as school consultation, in that compliance to power bases may be determined at least in part by the manner in which an influencing agent interacts professionally with a target of influence.

Schwarzwalde et al. (2004)

In the most recent study to date examining social power within organizational settings, Schwarzwalde et al. (2004) investigated whether situational determinants (i.e., settings where either complex or routine tasks dominate) would have an effect on social power usage. This study was based on Raven's (1992) power/interaction model of interpersonal influence, which assumes that the acceptability and effectiveness of influencing tactics are largely determined by cultural or situational variables. It was hypothesized that as compared to the complex work environment, organizations where routine tasks dominate would show greater usage of and greater compliance to harsh power tactics rather than soft tactics.

Before discussing the study in detail, it is important to emphasize that Schwarzwalde et al. (2004) were the first researchers to examine *usage* of social power bases within organizational settings, as previous research in this area has focused only on perceived effectiveness of social

power bases in gaining compliance. Schwarzwald et al.'s (2004) focus on the usage of social power bases not only has contributed to the social power literature within organizational settings, but also has lent support for the examination of social power usage within alternative settings, such as school consultation, which is a primary focus of the proposed investigation.

Participants included 194 workers and 97 supervisors selected from 4 different organizations: department store, manufacturing facility, hospital setting, and high technology firm. Both males and females were represented in all organizations except the manufacturing facility, where only males participated. Average ages for the workers and supervisors in the four organizations ranged from 30.0 years to 49.3 years (Schwarzwald et al., 2004).

Participants completed at least one of three adapted versions of the IPI, each of which included the original 33 items on the IPI but had slightly re-worded directions and items. First, the IPI Usage Scale-Worker's Format asked respondents to indicate how often their supervisor uses the social power base described in each item to gain compliance using a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating "very rarely" and 5 indicating "very often." Next, the IPI Usage Scale-Supervisor's Format asked respondents to indicate on a scale of 1 to 5 how often he/she uses the social power base described in each item, with 1 indicating "very often" and 5 indicating "very rarely." Finally, the IPI Compliance Scale-Worker's Format asked respondents to indicate how they react when their supervisor applies the social power base described in each item using a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating they "refuse to comply" and 5 indicating they "perform much beyond what was requested of me" (Schwarzwald et al., 2004). Although not specifically stated in the study, it is assumed that the workers completed the two worker formats of the IPI, and the supervisors completed the one supervisor format of the IPI.

Schwarzwald et al. (2004) conducted separate confirmatory factor analyses using data from the three IPI instruments to determine whether the underlying two-factor solution (i.e., harsh and soft) found in previous studies could be replicated. Indeed, out of four different confirmatory factor analytic models, the two-factor model yielded the best values for data from each of the three IPI instruments, thus providing even more support for this distinction.

Additional results indicated that workers and supervisors agreed on the relative usage prevalence of each social power base (rank order correlation = .83) (Schwarzwald et al., 2004), and both workers and supervisors reported informational power to be the most frequently used social power base and impersonal reward to be the least frequently used. Also, social power bases that were classified as soft received higher mean usage scores than harsh power bases. Results also indicated that participants reported greater usage of harsh tactics (i.e., social power bases) in organizational settings where job tasks were less complex; soft power bases, on the other hand, were not related to organizational setting (Schwarzwald et al., 2004).

Overall, results of Schwarzwald et al. (2004) once again demonstrated the reliability and validity of the IPI, as well as the harsh/soft power distinction among Raven's (1992) 11 social power bases measured by the IPI. Findings also indicated that both workers and supervisors perceived the supervisor's use of harsh and soft power bases similarly. Such results have implications for other organizational and professional settings (e.g., school consultation) because they suggest that regardless of professional position (e.g., supervisor versus subordinate) and regardless of organizational type (e.g., department store versus hospital), individuals have similar views regarding the use of harsh and soft power bases.

Thus far, the discussion has focused on studies that have demonstrated the applicability of the IPI in examining compliance to power bases primarily in organizational settings. (Table 3

presents a summary of these studies.) However, as was discussed earlier, the concepts of social influence and social power are also relevant to the field of school psychology. Specifically, Conoley and Gutkin (1986) have posited that social influence and social power are necessary in ensuring the successful delivery of school consultation. Consequently, there has been a recent surge of research applying Raven's (1992) social power typology to the field of school consultation in an effort to obtain a more comprehensive understanding of the consultation process. Next is a detailed examination of this literature.

Literature Examining Social Power within School Consultation

The following section will begin with a review of two articles that have discussed the application of social power to school consultation. Next, three empirical studies will be discussed that have examined school psychologists' and teachers' perceptions of social power bases within consultation. The limitations and future research directions of each empirical study will be discussed, including ways in which the proposed investigation will address some of these issues.

Application of Social Power to School Consultation

Martin (1978). Martin (1978) was the first school psychologist to apply the original five power bases outlined in French and Raven's (1959) model to school consultation. In his paper, Martin (1978) acknowledged that researchers had been reluctant to apply the notion of power and influence to school psychology, because such concepts had been associated primarily with political authority (Lambert, 1973) and also because school psychologists had often been trained in a humanistic fashion, which emphasizes that individuals change their behavior of their own accord and not because of someone else's influence. However, Martin (1978) indicated that, as

Table 3

Summary of Studies Measuring Raven's (1992) Social Power Bases using the IPI

Study	Participants	Purpose(s)	Key Results
Raven et al. (1998), Study One	317 college students	Examine operationalization of 11 of Raven's (1992) 14 expanded social power bases and their underlying factor structure; examine subordinate and supervisor perceptions of compliance to social power bases	Two-factor solution indicating a distinction between harsh and soft power bases; supervisor mean compliance was greater than subordinate mean compliance for soft power bases (i.e., expert, informational, and referent power)
Raven et al. (1998), Study Two	101 hospital workers	Examine consistency of social power structure across cultures; assess degree of compliance to social power bases; investigate relationship between job satisfaction and compliance to social power bases	Two-factor solution indicating a harsh/soft power base distinction; compliance greater for soft rather than harsh bases; greater compliance as a result of the use of soft power bases related to higher job satisfaction
Elias et al. (1999)	326 college students	Examine college students' perceived effectiveness of social power bases when used by professors to gain compliance	Two-factor solution indicating a harsh/soft power base distinction; younger students indicated higher level of compliance than older students for certain soft power bases; female students perceived personal reward power to be more effective than male students
Koslowsky et al. (2001)	32 nurse supervisors and 232 nurse subordinates	Examine relationship between reasons for compliance to social power bases and job characteristics (i.e., satisfaction, commitment, and professional distance)	Two-factor solution indicating a harsh/soft power base distinction; informational power yielded highest compliance and impersonal coercive power and legitimacy of equity power yielded lowest compliance for both supervisors and subordinates;

Table 3 Continued

Summary of Studies Measuring Raven's (1992) Social Power Bases using the IPI

Study	Participants	Purpose(s)	Key Results
			job satisfaction, commitment, and professional distance more highly associated with compliance to soft power bases
Schwarzwalld et al. (2001)	40 police captains and 240 police officers and non-commissioned officers	Examine potential interaction between leadership style and compliance to social power bases	Two-factor solution indicating a harsh/soft power base distinction; transformational leadership style associated with greater compliance to both harsh and soft power bases
Schwarzwalld et al.	194 workers and 97 supervisors	Examine potential relationship between organizational setting and use of and compliance to social power bases	Two-factor solution indicating a harsh/soft power base distinction; supervisors and workers reported greater mean usage for soft power bases than harsh bases; greater usage of harsh power bases was reported in less complex work settings

part of their professional role, school psychologists spend much of their time consulting with other individuals (consultees) with the goal of persuading consultees to comply with psychologists' suggestions. As such, he emphasized the importance of power and influence in this process and posited that these concepts provided an important conceptual framework for enhancing the consultative skills of school psychologists (Martin, 1978).

In applying French and Raven's (1959) original five social power bases, Martin (1978) reasoned that because coercive and reward power result from an influencing agent's ability to control resources desired by a target of influence, access to these forms of power were reserved only for those possessing line positions, or positions of authority, within an organization. He further posited that legitimate power is only accessible to those in positions of authority, the rationale being that an influencing agent can access this form of power only when a target of influence believes the agent has a right to control or dictate his/her behavior. Consequently, because school psychologists occupy staff rather than line positions and as such do not have the ability to control resources or the right to dictate behavior, Martin (1978) concluded that school psychologists did not have access to reward, coercive, or legitimate power.

Martin (1978) did, however, propose that school psychologists, as consultants, have access to the remaining two original social power bases: expert and referent power. This contention was made because these forms of power do not originate in an influencing agent's position of authority but rather stem from the target's perception of an agent's skill or a sense of identification with the agent. For instance, within the context of school consultation, expert power may occur when a teacher consultee perceives the school consultant to have superior knowledge in an area in which the consultee is having difficulty (e.g., the use of behavior management strategies to reduce students' acting out behavior) and thus complies with the

consultant's suggestions because he/she believes the consultant must know the right thing to do in that situation. Referent power may result when a teacher consultee feels a sense of similarity to or identification with the school consultant (e.g., both females with some teaching experience), and so complies with the consultant due to this feeling of similarity. As such, a school consultant may attempt to utilize expert or referent power.

At the same time, Martin (1978) was careful to note that school consultants are apt to be more successful in using either expert or referent power only in certain circumstances. For instance, an individual is generally considered to have expertise in a limited number of content areas (French & Raven, 1959); as such, it is best for consultants to demonstrate expertise in select areas, because if they attempt to be extremely knowledgeable in a wide range of areas they may actually reduce their expert power. Likewise, attempts at using referent power are limited to the consultant's reference group, or the group of individuals with whom they share similar characteristics. For instance, young, female consultees are more likely to attribute referent power to young, female consultants, but are less likely to attribute referent power to older, male consultants. Finally, Martin (1978) indicated that school consultants must balance their use of expert and referent power, as it has been hypothesized that when individuals are perceived as experts in a certain area, other people find them so different from themselves that it becomes difficult to develop a sense of identification or similarity (Aronson, Willerman, & Floyd, 1966, as cited in Martin, 1978). In other words, the more expert power is attributed to a consultant, the less referent power will be attributed, and vice versa.

In sum, Martin (1978) presented a new perspective regarding the use of social power in school consultation and helped to set the stage for future research in this area. As French and Raven's (1959) model has developed and expanded over time, however, so too has the

conceptualization regarding which power bases are available to school psychologists. In their review of the original social power bases (French & Raven, 1959; Raven, 1965) and Raven's (1992) power/interaction model of interpersonal influence and the expanded set of social power bases, Erchul and Raven (1997) presented an updated application of such concepts to the process of consultation within school psychology. Next is a discussion of Erchul and Raven's (1997) assessment of school psychologists' available power bases.

Erchul and Raven (1997). Unlike Martin (1978), who posited that school psychologists had access to only expert and referent power, Erchul and Raven (1997) concluded that school psychologists have the potential to access all forms of social power. Their position is the result of an examination of Raven's (1992) expanded set of social power bases and the power/interaction model of interpersonal influence. Specifically, Erchul and Raven (1997) emphasized that the power model is meant to be applicable to all social situations in which social influence and power, or potential influence, are involved. Because school consultation is widely considered to be an interpersonal influence process (as was documented earlier), school psychologists thus potentially have access to all forms of social power. Next is an overview of Erchul and Raven's (1997) interpretation of the expanded set of social power bases in relation to their use by school psychologists.

Recall that in Raven's (1992) updated social power model, both coercive and reward power were categorized into personal and impersonal forms. Erchul and Raven (1997) suggested that the personal forms of these social power bases have the potential to be quite effective when used by school psychologists, citing literature indicating that approval or disapproval from someone an individual likes can be quite rewarding or disappointing, respectively (Raven & Kruglanski, 1970). For example, within school consultation, a teacher consultee may be more

likely to follow through with plans made during consultation if he/she favors the school consultant and wants the consultant's approval (and does not want his/her disapproval). Erchul and Raven (1997) also indicated that school psychologists may have access to the impersonal forms of coercive and reward power, although use of such power bases may be unlikely and, perhaps, inadvertent. For instance, impersonal coercive power may take place if a teacher fears that failing to follow through with plans made during consultation (and thus failing to help the student) will negatively affect his/her relationships with other individuals within the school, possibly even preventing professional advancement. Conversely, impersonal reward power may result if that same teacher follows through with plans made during consultation, believing that doing so will increase his/her chances for professional advancement.

Erchul and Raven (1997) also posited that the four forms of legitimate power (i.e., position, reciprocity, equity, and dependence) have the potential to be used by school consultants. For instance, legitimate power of position may occur if a consultee follows through with a consultant's suggestions simply because he/she has requested the services of the consultant and feels obliged to follow through. However, Erchul and Raven (1997) pointed out that it would be rare for a school consultant to explicitly implement legitimate power of position by conveying his/her position of authority, as that may result in a consultee's resentment of the consultant. A psychologist's use of the remaining three forms of legitimate power is apt to be less direct and stems from social norms involving obligations to comply (Erchul & Raven, 1997). In using legitimate power of reciprocity, a school consultant may imply that a consultee has an obligation to comply because he/she has spent several hours helping the consultee develop a plan, and as such the consultee should implement it. Similarly, with legitimate power of equity, a school consultant may convey to a consultee that he/she should implement a plan to

compensate for the amount of time the consultant spent developing the plan. Finally, legitimate power of dependence draws from the notion that we have an obligation to help those who cannot help themselves (Berkowitz & Daniels, 1963). For instance, a school consultant may imply that because he/she cannot remove a challenging child from the consultee's classroom, the consultee should follow through with plans made during consultation to assist the child.

Although Martin (1978) posited that only the positive forms of expert and referent power are available to school psychologists, Erchul and Raven (1997) have suggested that the negative forms of each are also available. This stance is based on the notion of the "boomerang effect," which occurs when individuals do the exact opposite of what an influencing agent does or wants them to do (Hovland, Janis, & Kelley, 1963). For example, negative expert power may result if a consultee recognizes a consultant's superior knowledge but believes the consultant is using that knowledge for his/her personal best interests, and as such distrusts the consultant and does not comply. On the other hand, negative referent power may occur if a consultee does not like a consultant and chooses not to identify with him/her, thus acting/thinking differently than the consultant.

Finally, both the direct and indirect forms of informational power are considered to be available to school consultants (Erchul & Raven, 1997). This is largely because this form of social power is based not on characteristics of the consultant, but on the message of the consultant. In this way, direct informational power occurs when a consultee perceives the content of the consultant's message to be important and helpful to the situation at hand and thus complies with the consultant. Sometimes, however, it is more effective for the consultant to present information indirectly, particularly if a consultee feels patronized or feels his/her integrity is threatened by a consultant's message presentation. In this situation, indirect

informational power would occur when a consultant provides information in a circuitous fashion, such as referencing an intervention he/she heard about that was found to be effective in helping a student with a similar issue.

At the conclusion of their review, Erchul and Raven (1997) presented several questions in an effort to spur future research regarding the application of the social power typology to the process of consultation within school psychology. Since then, several investigators have addressed some of these research areas, including which power bases are viewed by school consultants and teachers as more effective in gaining compliance as well as the relationship between consultants' gender and power usage. A review of these studies will be presented next.

Empirical Studies Examining Social Power within School Consultation

Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001). In the first empirical study applying Raven's (1992) social power framework to school psychology, Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001) examined school psychologists' perceptions of social power within consultation. Drawing from previous research that used the IPI to examine social power bases in organizational hierarchical relationships, these investigators were interested in determining whether the IPI also would be useful in helping understand social power in relation to the process of school consultation. Two research questions were posed: (a) which power bases do school psychologists perceive as most likely to be used in helping an initially reluctant teacher follow a consultant's specific request?; and (b) how similar are the social power rankings within the school consultant-consultee relationship to the rankings among hierarchical, organizational relationships demonstrated in previous research?

Participants included 101 members of a school psychology association located in the southeastern United States. Participants ranged in age from 24 to 68 years, with a mean age of

42.9 years. Females comprised 78% of the sample, and 69% of participants reported themselves to be “extremely experienced” as consultants.

Participants completed a modified version of the original, 44-item IPI (Raven et al., 1998), which was termed the IPI-Form CT. Alterations included changes to individual items as well as to the overall directions for completion such that the wording was appropriate for school psychologists rather than individuals in an organizational, subordinate/supervisor setting.

Revised directions are as follows:

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.

Each of the 44 items (4 items for each of the 11 power bases) asks respondents to rate a specific reason in terms of how likely it might be to influence a teacher to comply with a request made of him or her during consultation. For instance, an item measuring referent power states, “we are both part of the same work group and should see eye to eye on things.” For each item, participants were asked to rate their responses on a 7-point scale, with 1 indicating “much more likely to comply” and 7 indicating “much less likely to comply” (Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001).

After examining the intercorrelations among the four items hypothesized as belonging to each of the 11 power bases, the item with the lowest correlation within each power base was dropped to ensure that all items clearly represented their corresponding power base, as was done by Raven et al. (1998). This left a total of 33 items in the IPI-Form CT, which improved the internal consistency of the instrument (coefficient alphas for each factor ranged from .75 to .89) (Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001).

To address their first research question, Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001) examined participants' mean rankings of the 11 power bases. Results indicated that five of the six highest ranked power bases in terms of perceived effectiveness were soft power bases. Specifically, direct informational power and expert power were the two highest ranked power bases, and referent power, legitimate dependence power, and personal reward power were the fourth, fifth, and sixth highest rated power bases, respectively. Interestingly, the third highest ranked power base was impersonal reward power, which is a hard power base. This result is surprising because out of the six highest ranked social power bases, it was the only hard power base; furthermore, the five lowest ranked power bases were all hard bases. In explaining this result, the authors suggested that some of the items used to measure impersonal reward power may not have clearly represented the concept of impersonal reward (e.g., the word "consideration" may have been vague in the item, "He/she expects some favorable consideration from me for going along on this"), which may have resulted in a higher ranking. Regardless of this exception, a paired-difference *t* test indicated that psychologists believed soft, rather than hard, power bases would result in greater teacher compliance. Such findings indicate that school psychologist consultants clearly find soft power bases to result in more effective influence (Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001).

In addition, a principal components factor analysis identified a two-factor solution among the 33 items within the IPI-Form CT, which corresponded highly to the harsh/soft power base distinction identified by Raven et al. (1998). The only exception was that legitimate position power, a harsh power base, loaded slightly higher on the soft base factor (.39) than the harsh base factor (.35); however, Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001) pointed out that according to Comrey and Lee (1992, as cited in Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001), a construct with a loading of .32 may be considered as "belonging" to a factor, and so a case could be made that legitimate position power

could indeed be considered a harsh power base in their study. Nevertheless, despite this exception, the harsh factor accounted for 23.5% of the variance (alpha coefficient = .86) and the factor comprised mostly of soft bases accounted for 22.9% of the variance (alpha coefficient = .80), which indicates that the harsh/soft power base distinction is meaningful within the field of school consultation (Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001).

Overall, results of Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001) support the contentions of other researchers and are relatively consistent with findings of previous empirical studies. Not only is the high ranking of expert and referent power consistent with Martin's (1978) position that school psychologists have access to expert and referent power in consultation, but also the high rankings of informational power, legitimate dependence power, and personal reward power lend support to Erchul and Raven's (1997) contention that school psychologists have the potential to access all social power bases. Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001) also noted that the low ranking of legitimate position power (which received the lowest ranking out of all 11 bases measured) was in line with Erchul and Raven's (1997) suggestion that school psychologists are not very likely to use this form of social power due to the possibility of causing resentment among consultees. Finally, the identification of a two-factor solution indicating a harsh/soft power base distinction is consistent with previous research in organizational settings, the results of which were discussed earlier (e.g., Elias et al., 1999; Koslowsky et al., 2001; Raven et al., 1998; Schwarzwald et al., 2001; Schwarzwald et al., 2004). Such consistency indicates that the harsh/soft power base distinction is meaningful within school consultation as well as within organizational settings.

Despite the significance of their findings, Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001) were careful to point out some limitations of their study as well as suggestions for future research. For instance,

participants were selected from only one state, which limited the generalizability of results. In addition, because the data were based on self-report and not observed interactions, it is possible that their findings may not be representative of actual practice within school consultation. Among their suggestions for future research were to use a national sample of school consultants, as well as to link social power base ratings to actual consultation outcomes.

It is also important to note that although Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001) examined school consultants' perceptions of which power bases would be likely to result in compliance from teachers, they did not investigate which power bases consultants would be likely to actually *use* in gaining compliance. An examination of this variable will provide a more comprehensive understanding of the actual practice of consultation within school psychology, and as such the present study investigated consultants' likelihood of use of social power bases in gaining compliance from initially reluctant teachers. [This research direction was also noted by Erchul, Raven, and Wilson (2004) and will be discussed in more detail during a review of their study.] The present investigation also used a national sample of school psychologists and linked consultation process to consultation outcome in an attempt to address some of Erchul, Raven, and Ray's (2001) limitations and future research directions.

In the second empirical study investigating social power bases in relation to school consultation, Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001) addressed an additional future research aim posed by Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001), which was to examine teachers' perceptions of social power bases in addition to the perceptions held by school consultants. A discussion of this study is presented next.

Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001). Similar to the study by Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001), Erchul, Raven and Whichard (2001) used a modified form of the IPI to examine school

consultants' perceptions of the effectiveness of social power bases when used to gain compliance from initially reluctant teachers. However, it has been suggested that obtaining information from both members of a particular dyad (e.g., school consultant-teacher consultee) is helpful in developing a more comprehensive understanding of the relationship (Erchul, Hughes, Meyers, Hickman, & Braden, 1992). As such, Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001) expanded on the study by Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001) by also examining teacher consultees' perceptions regarding the effectiveness of consultants' use of social power bases in gaining compliance. Three research questions were advanced regarding instances when psychologists consult with teachers who are initially reluctant to comply with requests: (a) How do teachers perceive the relative effectiveness of power bases used by school psychologists?; (b) How similarly do psychologists and teachers perceive the relative effectiveness of power bases used by psychologists?; and (c) Do teachers perceive psychologists' use of soft bases as more effective than harsh bases?

Participants included 134 school psychologists (63.9% female) from 41 states who held the Nationally Certified School Psychologist credential, and 118 teachers (95.8% female) from 35 states who taught grades K-5. Psychologists had a mean age of 47.4 years and reported an average of 15.5 years of experience in the field. The mean age of teachers was 44.8 years, and they reported an average of 16.9 years of teaching experience.

Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001) administered a modified version of the IPI-Form CT (Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001) using a survey-by-mail methodology. Recall that in developing the IPI-Form CT, the lowest correlated item for each of the 11 power bases was dropped, leaving a total of 33 items. However, Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001) did not eliminate the lowest correlated item for each power base because 97% of the bivariate correlations resulting from the

intercorrelation matrices conducted with data from their sample were statistically significant, thus indicating that the four items within each power base were clearly related. As such, all 44 items on the IPI-Form CT were used (Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001). For each item, participants were asked to rate their responses on a 7-point scale, with 1 indicating “much more likely to comply” and 7 indicating “much less likely to comply”

In addition to the aforementioned modification, the IPI-Form CT was edited to create an additional instrument, termed the IPI-Form CE (Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001). The IPI-Form CE is essentially identical to the IPI-Form CT, except that the directions and items are worded to allow assessment of teachers’ (rather than psychologists’) perceptions of the effectiveness of psychologists’ use of social power bases in consultation. The directions for the IPI-Form CE are as follows:

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.

An example of an item reflecting direct informational power is, “Once the consultant points it out, I can see why the change is necessary.” Teachers rated each item using the same 7-point Likert scale described for the IPI-Form CT. Internal consistency estimates based on the teacher sample were strong (coefficient alphas derived from principal components analysis ranged from .82 to .92) (Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001).

Regarding their first research question pertaining to teachers’ perceptions of social power bases, results indicated that teachers rated direct informational, positive expert, legitimate

dependence, and positive referent power—all soft power bases—as the top four bases that would be most effective for school psychologists to use in increasing teacher compliance.

Psychologists rated direct informational, positive expert, positive referent, and personal reward power—also all soft power bases—as the top four power bases most likely to be effective in gaining teacher compliance. Interestingly, both teachers and psychologists rated direct informational and positive expert power as the two power bases most likely to result in teacher compliance, and the overall rank order of power bases provided by psychologists and teachers was significantly correlated, $r_s(9) = .73, p < .05$. These results suggest that in general, teachers and psychologists share similar views regarding school consultants' use of social power bases in gaining compliance, which addressed Erchul, Raven, and Whichard's (2001) second research question.

At the same time, however, it should be noted that results of Cohen's (1988) effect size analyses indicated that there were some differences in the way teachers and psychologists view the effectiveness of psychologists' use of certain power bases. More specifically, psychologists gave higher effectiveness ratings for impersonal ($ES = 0.54$) and personal reward power ($ES = 0.78$) than did teachers, whereas teachers gave higher effectiveness ratings than did psychologists for legitimate position ($ES = 1.03$), direct informational ($ES = 0.61$), and legitimate dependence power ($ES = 0.56$). Such findings have implications for psychologists who are attempting to use social power to influence teachers, suggesting that despite a general agreement regarding the overall effectiveness of social power bases in gaining compliance, teachers and psychologists hold slightly dissimilar views in terms of the effectiveness of specific power bases.

Additional results indicated that both teachers and psychologists rated soft power bases as significantly more effective than harsh power bases in increasing teacher compliance, which

addressed Erchul, Raven, and Whichard's (2001) third research question. Not only are these results consistent with those of Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001), who also found that psychologists believed soft power bases rather than harsh power bases would result in greater teacher compliance, but they also indicate that teachers themselves perceive soft power bases as more likely to be effective than harsh bases in gaining their compliance to psychologists' requests.

Overall, the study by Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001) helped to develop a more comprehensive understanding regarding the application of social power bases to school consultation by examining the perceived effectiveness of social power bases among teachers and school psychologists. At the same time, however, the authors noted that there were limitations to their study, including the use of self-report instruments in obtaining their data and their relatively limited sample of teachers. Areas for future research were also suggested, including how individuals' perceptions of social power are associated with age, gender, and specific gender dyads (e.g., female school psychologist-female teacher); this third research direction was a major focal point of the present study and will be discussed later in the literature review.

In the third empirical study examining the perceived effectiveness of social power within school consultation, Erchul, Raven, and Wilson (2004) delved more deeply into the Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001) dataset by examining how the variable of gender is related to school consultants' perceptions of social power. A discussion of this study is presented next.

Erchul, Raven, and Wilson (2004). Drawing from the future research directions advanced by Erchul and Raven (1997) and Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001), Erchul, Raven, and Wilson (2004) examined how similarly male and female school psychologists perceived the effectiveness of social power when consulting with teachers described as being initially reluctant

to comply with psychologists' requests. Based on research examining gender and the use of language and power strategies, which indicates that women tend to be more indirect and collaborative in nature while men tend to be more direct and use more powerful language (e.g., Offermann & Schrier, 1985), Erchul et al. (2004) hypothesized that female school psychologists would perceive soft power bases as more effective in consulting with teachers than would male school psychologists. An additional research question was how male and female school psychologists would compare with respect to their perceptions of the effectiveness of individual social power bases when consulting with teachers.

Erchul et al. (2004) drew from the sample and methodology used by Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001). As such, participants included 134 nationally certified school psychologists, 63.9% of whom were female. The participants had a mean age of 47.4 years and reported an average of 15.5 years of professional experience. For their analyses, Erchul et al. (2004) used participants' responses on the IPI-Form CT (see Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001, for a detailed description of this instrument).

Erchul et al. (2004) conducted a MANOVA to compare the effectiveness ratings of the hard and soft power bases by gender of respondent, which addressed their hypothesis. Results of the overall MANOVA were significant, with follow-up analyses indicating that female school psychologists rated both harsh and soft power bases as more likely to result in teacher compliance during consultation than male school psychologists. In addition, an effect size analysis was conducted to determine if such results had clinical significance, with an a priori criterion of .50 established to indicate "real-world" significance. The effect size for soft power bases was .50, and the effect size for harsh power bases was .42. Based on these effect sizes, Erchul et al. (2004) concluded that female school psychologists regard only the soft power bases

as more effective than male school psychologists (i.e., the effect size of .42 for the harsh bases did not meet the a priori criterion of .50).

Finally, the effectiveness ratings of the 11 individual power bases were compared by participants' gender, which addressed Erchul et al.'s (2004) research question. The overall MANOVA was not significant, suggesting that male and female school psychologists do not have significantly different perceptions regarding the effectiveness of the individual power bases.

Results of Erchul et al. (2004) are important in several ways. First, their findings add to the literature base examining the application of social power bases to school consultation, and provide additional support indicating that the soft/harsh power base distinction is meaningful within school consultation. In addition, their findings regarding gender differences in perceptions of social power bases have implications for the practice of consultation within the schools. As stated earlier, results of the study by Erchul et al. (2004) indicated that female school psychologists perceived soft power bases as more effective in consulting with initially reluctant teachers than did male school psychologists. Such findings suggest that, when compared to male school psychologists, female school psychologists may employ different methods and techniques, including their implementation of social power, when consulting with teachers.

Considering that Erchul et al. (2004) were the first researchers to examine gender in relation to social power within school consultation, however, their results may be regarded as preliminary in nature and thus warrant additional research. One research direction suggested by Erchul et al. (2004) as well as by Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001) is to examine specific gender dyads with regard to school psychologists' perceptions of social power bases. For instance, would a female school psychologist have differing perceptions of social power bases

depending on whether she is consulting with an initially resistant female vs. male teacher?

Addressing this question will provide additional information regarding how psychologists go about the consultation process, and as such was a focus of the current investigation.

Erchul et al. (2004) also suggested that future research in this area should maintain a focus on the soft power bases within school consultation. This suggestion was based on the results of their study as well as those of previous studies (i.e., Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001; Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001), which have consistently demonstrated that school psychologists perceive the soft power bases, rather than harsh bases, as more effective when consulting with teachers. As such, the current investigation focused on only soft power bases.

An additional research direction advanced by Erchul et al. (2004) involves an examination of the variable *likelihood of use* in relation to psychologists' use of social power bases within school consultation. Recall that the published research in this area has demonstrated that school psychologists generally perceive soft power bases as more effective than harsh power bases when consulting with initially reluctant teachers. However, if school psychologists perceive specific social power bases to be more effective than others, does that mean they will actually *use* those social power bases when consulting with teachers? Answering this question will provide greater insight into the process of consultation within the schools, and thus was the major focus of this investigation.

In sum, there has been an increasing awareness of and research interest in the relevance of social power bases within school consultation, with a major emphasis on school psychologists' perceived effectiveness of social power bases when used in school consultation (i.e., Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001; Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001; Erchul et al., 2004). Table 4 provides a summary of these studies. In an effort to expand this important area of research, the

Table 4

Summary of Published Empirical Studies Examining Social Power Bases within School Consultation

Study	Participants	Purpose	Key Results
Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001)	101 school psychologists	Determine if the IPI is useful in examining social power bases in school consultation; determine which power bases psychologists perceive as most likely to be effective in gaining teacher compliance; examine similarity in social power rankings between those in organizational relationships and in psychologist-teacher relationships	Psychologists ranked direct informational power and expert power as the two social power bases most likely to gain teacher compliance; five of the six highest ranked social power bases were soft bases; two-factor solution identified a harsh/soft power base distinction; social power rankings consistent with previous research in organizational settings
Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001)	134 school psychologists and 118 teachers	Determine teachers' perceptions of effectiveness of social power bases when used by school psychologists; examine how similarly teachers and school psychologists perceive effectiveness of social power bases; determine if teachers view soft power bases as more effective than harsh bases	The top four power bases rated by teachers and psychologists as most effective in gaining teacher compliance were soft bases, and this rank order was significantly correlated; both teachers and psychologists perceived soft power bases as more effective than harsh bases
Erchul, Raven, and Wilson (2004)	134 school psychologists	Examine the relationship between gender and perceived effectiveness of social power bases	Female school psychologists perceived soft power bases as more effective than male psychologists; no differences between male and female psychologists regarding effectiveness of individual power bases

present investigation examined several areas that have not yet been addressed within this published literature, as were discussed previously. Two additional areas were also examined in the present investigation: (a) the relationship between consultants' and consultees' years of professional experience and consultants' likelihood of use of social power bases, and (b) the relationship between consultants' likelihood of use of social power bases and their ratings of their personal effectiveness during consultation. These two research areas will be discussed later in the literature review.

The literature review to this point has provided an overview of the concept of social power, including its definition, its relevance to organizational settings, and ultimately demonstrating its application within the process of school consultation. However, considering that during the 1999-2000 school year approximately 70% of all school psychologists were female (Curtis, Grier, Abshier, Sutton, & Hunley, 2002), a thorough understanding of the role of social power within school consultation would be incomplete without also considering gender. As such, the literature review will now turn to a discussion of gender and its relation to social power, which was a major focal point of this investigation.

Gender and Social Power

The section that follows will review the concept of gender, communication, and social power in several contexts. First, an overview of the general communication styles of men and women will be discussed, including hypothesized reasons for why such differences exist. Second, a review of differences in men and women's verbal communication behaviors (i.e., language) will be presented, followed by several studies demonstrating differences in perceptions regarding the use of social power by men and women. Next, a discussion of men and women's nonverbal communication behaviors in relation to social power will be presented, and finally, the

section will consider how specific gender dyads may influence the communication styles of men and women, thus affecting social power perceptions.

Gender, Communication Style, and Perceptions of Social Power

Differences in the communication styles of men and women are well documented in the social science literature. Generally, research has found that during social interactions, women have a tendency to exhibit a more social-emotional or relational orientation, whereas men are more likely to demonstrate an unemotional, independent disposition (Eagly, 1987). Such gender differences are thought to be the result of traditional gender role socialization, which involves teaching children to behave in stereotypically male or female ways. For example, young girls are often taught to be passive and polite, whereas young boys are often encouraged to be aggressive and dominant. It is posited that the behaviors learned in early childhood are carried out into adulthood, thus leading to differences in how men and women interact in their relationships (Gayle & Preiss, 2002).

Furthermore, it is likely that the communication differences between males and females contribute to differences in men and women's perceptions regarding the use of power. For example, Payne et al. (2001) have stated that many women have negative feelings about power, indicating they feel uncomfortable when they think about using it. This notion may stem from the way in which young girls are taught to be passive, not aggressive. Conversely, men tend to be more comfortable with the idea of using power, as they often assume that others expect them to wield authority (Payne et al., 2001). It is likely that male perceptions regarding power result from how they are taught to be assertive and dominant when they are children. Payne et al. (2001) also have suggested that when men and women do utilize power, they do so in different ways. These strategies are in line with the aforementioned behaviors men and women often

assume during interpersonal interactions. For instance, men tend to use power strategies that are assertive and direct in nature, whereas women try to gain power by being less assertive and more relational (Payne et al., 2001).

It is important, however, to be mindful of cultural implications when interpreting the gender literature, as a focus on gender without also considering culture may lead to inappropriate universalistic assumptions (Rabin, 2005). It is likely that characteristics demonstrated to differ as a function of gender, such as styles of interpersonal interaction, are influenced not only by societal expectations and social norms but also by the broader cultural context. In other words, it is probable that differences in culture lead to differences in social behavior (Morris, Podolny, & Ariel, 2001). For instance, in America, it may be argued that individuals are not as likely to commit to attitudes and behaviors prompted through social influence when compared to other culture groups (Iyengar & Brockner, 2001), and it has been demonstrated that Western countries such as the United States are much more individualistic compared to the majority of other countries in the world (Morris et al., 2001). This means that results of research regarding social behavior (including communication differences between men and women) that uses American samples may not hold true in other societies. As such, an awareness of the impact of culture will be important in interpreting research pertaining to gender differences in communication style and power preferences.

Thus far, the discussion has been very general, focusing on basic differences in the communication styles of men and women and how those differences relate to perceptions of power. However, the term *communication style* can be characterized in many ways (e.g., actual words spoken, tone of voice used, displayed body language). For the purposes of the current investigation, *communication style* will be divided into two forms of communication: verbal and

nonverbal. The discussion will now turn to a more specific review of research demonstrating gender differences in verbal and nonverbal communication style and how such differences may be related to social power.

Gender and verbal communication style. Research has demonstrated that the verbal communication, or spoken language, that takes place among men and women is quite different. This difference may be explained in part by research indicating that the purpose of language is different for men and women. For instance, women tend to use speaking as an opportunity to include others and establish and maintain relationships (Payne et al., 2001). In fact, Tannen (1994) has posited that talk is at the center of women's relationships. Termed "troubles talk," women use language to equalize status through the matching of experiences, as well as to support one another. Men, on the other hand, tend to use language as a way to establish and maintain their own individual status (Wood, 1994, as cited in Payne et al., 2001). Rather than using language to listen or match experiences with those of others, men tend to use language simply as a means to an end, such as for solving problems (Tannen, 1994). In sum, the verbal communication of women may be characterized as supportive and relational, but for men such communication tends to be assertive, straightforward, and to the point.

Such differences in verbal communication are evidenced in the actual words men and women speak. For instance, women's use of tag questions (e.g., "you started to collect the data, right?"), intensifiers and adverbs (e.g., "this is *so* important"), and hedges (e.g., "I would *kind of* like you to begin the intervention this week") while speaking conveys a less powerful form of speech (Carli, 1990). Conversely, men have a tendency to use "certain" language (i.e., speaking without hedges, tag questions, or intensifiers/adverbs), which has been found to contribute to a more assertive, less polite, and ultimately more powerful form of verbal communication

(Timmerman, 2002). Furthermore, the manner in which men and women speak may emphasize these language differences. For example, Addington (1968, as cited in Payne et al., 2001) suggested that women's speech is traditionally soft and "breathy," which conveys beauty and femininity but not much intelligence or depth, whereas masculine voices tend to be rated higher in intelligence and maturity. Such differences may be due to men's tendency to speak more loudly, more emphatically, and with a lower pitch than women, ultimately contributing to a more assertive form of speech for men (Payne, 1996, as cited in Payne et al., 2001).

It is likely that differences in men and women's verbal communication also contribute to differences relating to social power, as power and influence may be considered a part of everyday social interactions (Johnson, 1976). What follows is a discussion of several selected studies demonstrating differences in the perceptions and use of social power among men and women.

Johnson (1976). In an effort to identify which of the original six power bases (French & Raven, 1959; Raven, 1965) would be perceived as being used by men and women, Johnson (1976) assigned one of two questionnaires to 60 undergraduate students. The first questionnaire (Q1) presented a situation in which student X wanted to get student Y to change his opinion on a legal case, and the second questionnaire (Q2) portrayed a scenario where student X wanted to get student Y to do something he/she would not normally do. There were 15 items on each questionnaire; each item depicted student X using a different form of power to reach his/her goal. For Q1, participants were to rate how likely they thought that student X was a male or female. For Q2, participants were to rate how much they thought each item was masculine or feminine.

Results indicated that for Q1, participants rated coercive, legitimate, expert, and informational power as more likely to be used by males, but the use of reward power was not

found to differ between the genders. Findings related to Q2 indicated that coercive, expert, direct informational, and legitimate power were viewed as more masculine than feminine. Reward power was the only one of the original power bases (French & Raven, 1959; Raven, 1965) to be considered more feminine than masculine (Johnson, 1976).

Based on the literature regarding men and women's verbal communication styles (i.e., men tend to be more assertive while women tend to be more relational), it is not surprising that reward power was the only power base perceived to be used more by females and to be more feminine in nature, as Johnson (1976) suggested that reward power may be demonstrated indirectly and/or in a personal manner (e.g., offering friendship to induce compliance, or being friendly to someone and then making a request). Interestingly, Johnson (1976) concluded that women's access to power is limited by societal expectations that women should maintain a relational, nonassertive demeanor; men, on the other hand, have greater freedom when wielding power because society expects men to be assertive and dominant.

Johnson's (1976) study was an important first step in understanding how the original social power typology (French & Raven, 1959; Raven, 1965) is perceived to apply to men and women. In another study examining gender differences with regard to the use of power in organizational settings, Offermann and Schrier (1985) found similar results. This study is presented next.

Offermann and Schrier (1985). These researchers examined the influence strategies men and women would consider using to get their own way when they were in a disagreement at work. A total of 173 undergraduate students (78 male) participated in the study, half of whom were told they were employees of a company and that they disagreed with their supervisor, and the other half were told that they were supervisors of the company and that they were in

disagreement with an employee. Participants were asked to rate on a 9-point scale how likely they would be to take each of 40 actions in order to get their own way, with higher ratings indicating they would be more likely to take the action. In addition, participants responded to 15 items tapping their level of apprehension or discomfort with having and using power (e.g., “I would enjoy being a powerful person”).

Results pertaining to gender indicated that women reported a greater likelihood of using Personal/Dependent and Negotiation strategies (Offermann & Schrier, 1985). An example of a Personal/Dependent strategy is to “tell him or her you really need help/support,” and an example of a Negotiation strategy is to “compromise.” With regard to French and Raven’s (1992) social power bases, these findings suggest women may be more likely to use soft power bases, particularly the legitimate power of dependence. Results also indicated that men reported a greater likelihood of using Indirect and Reward/Coercion strategies. For instance, an Indirect strategy would be to “try to manipulate him or her,” and a Reward/Coercion strategy would be to “offer rewards for cooperation.” Pertaining to Raven’s (1992) social power bases, such results suggest men may be more likely to use personal coercive power or impersonal reward power, which are both hard bases.

Interestingly, results also indicated that women reported more negative attitudes toward having power than men, and men reported more negative attitudes towards others’ power than women (Offermann & Schrier, 1985). These findings suggest that women are particularly uncomfortable with having their own power, whereas men are particularly uncomfortable with people *other than themselves* having power. Such results are in line with research by Payne et al. (2001), who indicated that women tend to feel uneasy when they think about using power, while men tend to feel more comfortable with the idea. Perhaps because men feel they are expected to

wield power, the male participants in Offermann and Schrier (1985) felt threatened at the thought of other people—and not themselves—having power.

Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, and van Engen (2003). The authors of this study reviewed 45 studies (including published articles, book chapters, doctoral dissertations, and unpublished documents) for their meta-analysis examining gender differences in leadership style. Leadership style was examined in terms of whether it was transactional, transformational, or *laissez-faire* in nature. Transactional leadership is characterized by the use of rewards and punishment; transformational leadership is characterized by empowerment and encouragement of followers in an effort to achieve future goals; and *laissez-faire* leadership is a general failure to take responsibility for managing (Eagly et al., 2003).

Overall, results of Eagly et al.'s (2003) meta-analysis indicated that female leaders are more transformational than male leaders. In other words, women tend to use more interpersonal strategies with their followers, such as using motivation and encouragement and establishing trust. Although this meta-analysis did not examine social power *per se*, these findings provide additional support for the documented gender differences regarding communication style and perceptions regarding the use of social power.

Erchul et al. (2004). Recall that Erchul et al. (2004) were the first researchers to investigate the relationship between gender and perceptions of social power bases within the field of school consultation. Because this study was discussed earlier, a detailed review will not be provided here. However, it is important to reiterate one of their findings, which was that of the two types of social power bases (harsh or soft), female school psychologists regarded only soft power bases as more effective than male school psychologists. In other words, female school psychologists favored power bases that are more relational and personal in nature (e.g.,

referent power), rather than power bases that involve aggressive or assertive tactics (e.g., coercive power). Moreover, male school psychologists did *not* perceive the soft power bases as more effective than harsh bases. Results of Erchul et al. (2004) are thus consistent with literature discussed to this point, which repeatedly suggests that women are perceived to demonstrate—and prefer to use—softer, more relational forms of power.

The aforementioned section discussed the differences in men and women's verbal communication styles, and presented several investigations demonstrating that there are differences in perceptions regarding the use of social power by men and women that are likely to be related to differing verbal communication styles. In the discussion that follows, two studies will be presented that demonstrate that nonverbal communication behavior also is associated with perceptions of men and women's use of social power.

Gender, nonverbal communication style, and social power. Nonverbal behaviors, such as facial expressions, bodily movements and gestures, posture, and eye gaze, have been linked to social influence and perceptions of power (Aguinis, Simonsen, & Pierce, 1998). In a study examining French and Raven's (1959) original social power typology in relation to a male employee's nonverbal behavior, Aguinis et al. (1998) had 170 undergraduate students read one of eight vignettes depicting an interaction between two men, "John" and "Greg." In each of the eight vignettes, John was described as combining three types of nonverbal behavior: facial expression (nervous or relaxed), eye contact (direct or nondirect), and body posture (sitting on edge of chair or leaning back in chair with legs crossed). After reading the vignettes, participants were asked to evaluate John's power using a modified version of Hinkin and Schriesheim's (1989) power scales as adapted by Nesler, Aguinis, Quigley, and Tedeschi (1993, as cited in Aguinis et al., 1998). The scale includes 25 items (4 items for each of the 5 power bases, plus 5

items measuring a form of power labeled credibility), with each item being a statement reflecting a particular form of social power (e.g., an item reflecting reward power is “John can increase Greg’s pay level”). Participants rated each item on a 9-point Likert scale, with higher ratings indicating they agreed with the statement.

Results indicated that of the three nonverbal behaviors examined, facial expression was the nonverbal behavior most related to evaluations of social power. Specifically, when John’s facial expression was relaxed, he was evaluated as having higher referent, reward, legitimate, expert, and credibility power (coercive power was not related to facial expression). Eye contact was found to be associated only with credibility, with direct eye contact leading to higher evaluations of credibility. No significant results were found between body posture and evaluations of social power.

Overall, the findings by Aguinis et al. (1998) highlight the impact a male’s facial expression can have on the social power he is perceived to have. However, this study did not examine the perceptions of power attributed to a *female*. Consequently, Aguinis and Henle (2001) extended the study by Aguinis et al. (1998) by examining participants’ perceptions of social power attributed to a female employee. Aguinis and Henle (2001) used the same methodology employed by Aguinis et al. (1998); the only exception was that instead of portraying two male employees, the eight vignettes depicted an interaction between a woman, “Mary,” and a man, “John.”

Findings of Aguinis and Henle (2001) were similar to those of Aguinis et al. (1998), in that facial expression was the nonverbal behavior most associated with power perceptions, whereas eye contact and body posture were less related to perceptions of social power. Specifically, when Mary was portrayed as having a relaxed facial expression, she was perceived

to have less reward, coercive, legitimate, referent, and expert power, as well as less credibility. With regard to the other nonverbal behaviors, results indicated that when Mary had direct eye contact, she was perceived as having more coercive power, and when she had a relaxed posture, she was perceived as having more referent power (Aguinis & Henle, 2001).

Interestingly, results of Aguinis and Henle (2001) pertaining to the relationship between facial expression and social power were nearly opposite of those found by Aguinis et al. (1998). Specifically, Aguinis et al. (1998) found that when John had a relaxed facial expression, he was perceived as having *more* social power (except coercive power), whereas Aguinis and Henle (2001) found that when Mary had a relaxed facial expression, she was perceived as having *less* social power. Considering that the vignettes used in each study were identical except for the gender of the employee whose power was being evaluated, such results are suggestive of distinct differences with regard to how power is attributed to men and women. Such gender differences are further supported by findings regarding eye contact. Specifically, when Mary made direct eye contact, she was perceived to demonstrate more coercive power (Aguinis & Henle, 2001), yet when John made direct eye contact, he was perceived to demonstrate more credibility (Aguinis et al., 1998). Taken together, findings of Aguinis et al. (1998) and Aguinis and Henle (2001) imply that women may be at a disadvantage in the workplace when it comes to perceptions of social power: women who attempt to use assertive nonverbal tactics like direct eye contact may be perceived as being coercive, yet when they try to be less assertive by maintaining a relaxed posture, they are perceived to be relatively powerless.

It should be noted, however, that Aguinis and Henle (2001) did not examine a female-female dyad. Their failure to examine this particular relationship is surprising considering that in the previous study by Aguinis et al. (1998), care was taken to examine a same-sex dyad because

research by Burgoon, Buller, Hale, and deTurck (1984, as cited in Aguinis et al., 1998) indicated that individuals' gender may have an impact on reactions to their nonverbal behaviors. This finding suggests that if Mary had been interacting with another female employee rather than a male employee, participants may have changed the social power they attributed to her. Clearly, a consideration of specific gender dyads is critical in obtaining a more complete understanding of the relationship between gender and power.

Recall that in their study regarding the influence of gender and perceptions of social power within school consultation, Erchul et al. (2004) also pointed out the importance of examining specific gender dyads, as it is possible that perceptions of social power attributed to an individual may be affected by the gender of the person with whom that person is interacting. In other words, specific gender dyads, such as female-female or female-male, may contribute to differing forms of communication and thus may alter perceptions of social power. Considering the importance of examining specific gender dyads in relation to social power, the following section will highlight literature indicating that communication styles and power are, indeed, affected by specific gender dyads. General hypothesized reasons for communication differences in same- and mixed-sex dyads will be discussed first, followed by a review of two empirical studies demonstrating such differences.

Gender Dyads and Social Power

As discussed earlier, men and women learn at an early age that it is considered appropriate for women to be relational and passive, whereas it is somewhat expected for men to be assertive and aggressive. These traditional gender roles translate into accepted ways of behaving (i.e., norms) that operate during social interactions, and it has been suggested that the norms that function in same-sex interactions are different than those that operate in mixed-sex

interactions (Carli, 1990). In other words, the normative expectations for women to be relational and for men to be dominant lead to patterns of behavior that are “most social” in groups of women and are “least social” in groups of men.

Furthermore, gender has been considered a “diffuse status characteristic,” which is a characteristic used by others to assess an individual’s competence or ability, particularly in situations where there is no other information by which to evaluate the person (Berger & Fisek, 1974; Carli, 1990). This means that in mixed-sex interactions, gender would serve as a diffuse status characteristic because it would provide a way to evaluate the individual in comparison to others in the group. For example, in a group of professional men and women, a man may use the fact that a woman is female to make judgments about her professional competence in comparison to other men. However, in same-sex interactions, gender would *not* act as a diffuse status characteristic because it would not convey unique information about an individual. For instance, in a group composed only of professional females, it is likely that a woman would use factors other than gender to judge another woman’s competence, such as professional experience or age, because the use of gender would not provide a unique way to compare the ability level of two women. As such, it is possible that gender differences in communication will take place primarily among interactions involving both men and women, but will be less prevalent during same-sex interactions (Carli, 1990).

Next is a review of selected research studies demonstrating the influence of specific gender dyads on communication styles and perceptions of power.

Hogg (1985). In a study examining gender differences in speech style, Hogg (1985) compared the speech styles of men and women when speaking in same sex dyads as opposed to mixed sex groups. Participants included 9 male and 15 female undergraduate students.

Participants listened to 42 different speech extracts from a stimulus tape. Each extract was brief in length (20-30 seconds) and came from conversations between two males or two females (single sex dyads) or two males versus two females (mixed sex groups); each extract featured only one speaker from the dyad or group. Participants were asked to rate each speaker on 10 different speech characteristics on a scale of 0 to 10, with higher ratings indicating a greater demonstration of the characteristic. Five of the characteristics reflected stereotypical male speech styles (e.g., blunt and aggressive speech, use of slang), and the other five were suggestive of stereotypical female speech styles (e.g., gentle and emotional speech, high pitch).

Results indicated there were general differences in speech patterns with regard to gender. Specifically, male speakers were perceived to use more masculine speech (i.e., more authoritarian and aggressive) than females, and females were rated as using more feminine speech (i.e., more gentle and emotional) than males. These gender differences persisted in dyads, where males were perceived to use more slang than females, and females were perceived to use more feminine speech than males. Interestingly, speakers within group situations were perceived as using more masculine speech and less feminine speech, regardless of gender (Hogg, 1985). This finding suggests that when in situations with men, women changed their speaking style to be less feminine and more masculine; however, when women were with other women, they maintained a more feminine and less masculine speech style. These results also are consistent with Carli's (1990) position that gender differences will be more pronounced in mixed-sex settings, and suggest that women's communication styles may change as a function of whether they are interacting with females or males.

Mulac (1989). Similar to the study by Hogg (1985), Mulac (1989) examined gender differences in speech style as a function of whether individuals were in same- or mixed-sex

dyads, but he also investigated whether such differences were related to power. Mulac (1989) based his study on research by Henley and LaFrance (1984, as cited in Mulac, 1989), who indicated that nonverbal behavior (e.g., use of touch, eye gaze) is one way to demonstrate power, and gender differences in nonverbal behavior often represent inequalities in power between men and women. Because power involves influence and speaking is a primary way to influence others, Mulac (1989) posited that “Talk behavior,” which includes behaviors such as the amount of talk, the length of utterances, and the rate of speech, would be a form of nonverbal behavior that may be associated with power. In general, people who talk more, speak longer utterances, and have a higher rate of speech are attributed more power. As such, Mulac (1989) first examined whether men and women’s nonverbal talk behaviors would differ as a function of whether they were interacting in a same- or mixed-sex dyad, and then examined whether such differences would be related to differences in power.

A total of 108 undergraduate students participated in the study. The students took turns solving “problems” (e.g., what are the best ways to spend a vacation?) in each of four different dyads: male-male, female-female, male-female, and female-male, so that all participants spent 10 minutes in each dyad. Conversations were recorded for later analysis.

Results indicated that the individuals who talked the most were males in mixed-gender dyads. Males and females in same-gender dyads spoke in moderation, and females in the mixed-gender dyads produced the least amount of talk (Mulac, 1989). In addition, males spoke in longer utterances than women, regardless of whether they were in same- or mixed-sex dyads; however, no significant differences were found regarding gender and rate of talk (Mulac, 1989). Interpreting these results in relation to power, Mulac (1989) concluded that because men spoke more and in longer utterances when compared to women, they thus demonstrated greater power.

Such findings also are consistent with research indicating that men tend to be more dominant and assertive while communicating, whereas females tend to be more passive (Carli, 1990; Timmerman, 2002).

Taken together, the aforementioned research by Carli (1990) and the results of Hogg (1985) and Mulac (1989) suggest that the way in which men and women communicate depends on whether or not they are interacting with members of their own gender. Such research has implications for the use of social power within school consultation, as it is possible that school consultants may implement different forms of social power depending on the gender of the consultee with whom they are consulting.

Overall, the literature examining the issues of gender and, more specifically, gender dyads in relation to social power clearly indicates that such variables influence perceptions of social power, and it is logical that such perceptions will affect consultants' likely use of social power bases within school consultation. The impact of variables other than gender on individuals' perceptions of social power is less evident in the extant literature, however. An example of one such variable is professional experience. The literature review will now focus on a discussion of professional experience and its potential impact on the use of social power within school consultation.

Relevant Professional Experience and Social Power

There is a lack of research that specifically examines the association among consultants' and consultees' professional experience and social power within school consultation. In general, the majority of published studies in this area are relatively dated, having focused on the relationship between various characteristics of school consultants and consultees (i.e., teachers) and teachers' perceptions of consultation processes and outcomes. Although consultees'

teaching experience has been included frequently as a characteristic that may be related to consultation outcomes, fewer studies also consider *school consultants'* years of consulting experience. Furthermore, the majority of this research does not investigate how consultant and consultee characteristics and consultee perceptions may be related to the social power bases; only two studies were located that focus on social power and influence and both unfortunately address the issue indirectly. In spite of all this, however, the findings of this early research have implications for the use of social power within school consultation, and as such, some of this research will be presented here.

Following is a review of four selected studies examining professional experience in relation to school consultation. Two of the four investigations considered social power and influence in some form in relation to professional experience and school consultation. The remaining two studies concentrated largely on the relationship between consultees' teaching experience, other consultant and consultee characteristics, and consultees' perceptions of consultation. Taken together, the results of these four investigations indicate that there is a strong relationship between experience and consultation outcomes, with a general trend indicating that greater amounts of teaching experience are associated with less positive consultation outcomes. Implications of each study with regard to consultants' use of social power bases within school consultation will be discussed, and the section will conclude with ways in which the current investigation expanded this literature base to more specifically investigate social power in relation to relevant professional experience within school consultation.

Before continuing, it is important to note that "professional experience" as a variable may be operationalized a number of ways, such as an individual's highest educational degree

obtained, an individual's credentials, or the amount of time an individual has worked in a specific area. Although the studies to be discussed used varying definitions of experience, the current investigation operationalized this variable as the total number of years an individual has worked in his/her current profession, and will be termed *relevant professional experience*.

Professional Experience, Social Power/ Influence, and Consultation Outcomes

Martin and Curtis (1980). Stemming from the influential paper by Martin (1978), which discussed school psychologists' potential use of the positive forms of expert and referent power in school consultation, Martin and Curtis (1980) examined the effects of consultants' and consultees' age and experience on consultation outcomes. Although expert and referent power were not cited explicitly, the authors implied that consultees may perceive consultants with more experience than themselves as having expert power, and consultees may perceive consultants who are similar in age as themselves as demonstrating referent power.

To determine the relationship of age (i.e., referent power) and experience (i.e., expert power) to school consultation outcomes, Martin and Curtis (1980) administered questionnaires to 164 school psychologists. The questionnaires asked participants to think about their most and least successful consultation experiences with a teacher, and then respond to questions about both of those experiences. Participants were asked to indicate their age and years of experience as a school psychologist at the time of each consultation session, and also were asked to estimate the age and years of experience of the teacher with whom they consulted during each session.

Results indicated that the teacher consultees associated with the least successful consultation sessions were older and more experienced than the consultants (Martin & Curtis, 1980). These findings suggest that both age and amount of experience of consultees are significantly related to the success of consultation outcomes; however, the results did not

indicate whether it was simply the absolute age and experience of teachers or the relative difference between consultants' and consultees' age and experience that contributed significantly to consultation outcomes. As such, additional analyses were conducted to determine the effects of the relative age and experience of consultees and consultants (i.e., difference between consultees' and consultants' age and years of experience) on consultation outcomes. Results of these additional analyses were significant, indicating that in the most successful consultation experiences, consultants and consultees tended to be very similar in age and shared similar amounts of experience; however, in the least successful consultation sessions, teacher consultees tended to be older and more experienced than psychologists (Martin & Curtis, 1980).

Not only do these findings indicate that the relative age and experience of consultants and consultees is significantly related to consultation outcomes, but also they lend support for the use of expert and referent power within school consultation. First, the finding that the most successful consultation sessions were associated with a similarity in consultants' and consultees' age and experience levels makes a strong case for the use of referent power in school consultation. The second finding that consultation sessions were least successful when teacher consultees had more experience and were older than consultants has implications for the use of expert power, in that consultants may have more success using expert power when they are older and more experienced than consultees. The finding also suggests that consultants who are younger and/or less experienced than consultees may benefit from choosing a form of social power other than expert power, because expert power relies heavily on consultees' perceptions of consultants' experience and expertise.

Short, Moore, and Williams (1991). In another study based on Martin (1978), Short, Moore, and Williams (1991) considered the importance of social influence in the process of

school consultation. The authors cited research by Cooper and Croyle (1984), which indicated that credibility (comprised of expertness and trustworthiness) and social attractiveness are two important characteristics associated with effective communicators. Short et al. (1991) thus inferred that within school consultation, school consultants (as influencing agents) who are perceived by consultees to demonstrate credibility and social attractiveness would be more likely to experience successful influence attempts with those consultees. To examine this hypothesis, Short et al. (1991) operationalized the variables of credibility and social attractiveness in terms of social influence and power, using school psychologists' credentials and consulting experience (i.e., expert power) as a measure of credibility, and using psychologists' past teaching experience (i.e., referent power) as a measure of social attractiveness.

Participants included 153 teachers (115 female) in a rural American school system. Teachers had a mean age of 38.4 years, and their mean teaching experience was 12.4 years. Participants received a verbal description of a male school psychologist consultant that varied on three characteristics: (a) his degree (doctoral vs. master's); (b) his experience as a school psychologist (high vs. low); and (c) his teaching experience (present vs. absent). Next, the participants viewed a videotape portraying an initial consultation session between the school psychologist consultant and a female teacher who was approximately the same age as the consultant. After viewing the tape, participants rated the consultant's social influence on the Counselor Rating Form (CRF; Barak & LaCrosse, 1975, as cited in Short et al., 1991). The CRF consists of 36 items measuring three dimensions (perceived expertness, trustworthiness, and social attractiveness), such that there are 12 items measuring each dimension. Participants rate each item on a 7-point scale, resulting in a score range of 12-84 for each dimension. The CRF has been validated extensively and used widely to measure social and interpersonal influence

(Dorn, 1984, as cited in Short et al., 1991).

MANOVA results indicated that the consultant's degree and amount of experience as a psychologist significantly influenced teachers' perceptions of the consultant's social influence. Specifically, the consultant was rated higher on the expertness dimension when he was described as having a doctoral degree, and he was rated higher on the both the expertness and trustworthiness dimensions when he was described as having several years of experience as a school psychologist. The consultant's amount of teaching experience, however, was not related to teachers' perceptions of social influence (Short et al., 1991).

Such results have implications for the use of expert power within school consultation. For instance, the finding that consultants with greater professional experience were perceived as being more credible suggests that consultants with significant experience may be more successful than consultants with less experience when attempting to use expert power with consultees. This attempt may be even more successful when consultees have less experience than consultants, as was evidenced by Martin and Curtis (1980).

Short et al.'s (1991) finding that the teaching experience of consultants, whether it was substantial or minimal, did not influence teachers' perceptions of the consultants' social attractiveness also has implications for the use of referent power within school consultation. Specifically, this finding may be interpreted to suggest that teacher consultees do not necessarily identify with or feel similar to consultants just because the consultants have experience in teaching. In other words, teaching experience may not be a good indicator of referent power. In choosing to use this form of social power, school consultants may wish to consider other characteristics with which they are similar to consultees, such as gender or age.

Professional Experience and Consultation Outcomes

Weissenburger, Fine, and Poggio (1982). In an effort to identify associations among specific consultant and consultee characteristics and school consultation outcomes, Weissenburger, Fine, and Poggio (1982) examined a variety of variables in association with consultation outcomes. Questionnaires containing five sections were administered to 149 experienced classroom teachers. The first two sections contained self-report measurements examining four areas: (a) teachers' life position (based on Transactional Analysis theory); (b) teacher dogmatism; (c) teachers' perceptions of consultant facilitativeness; and (d) teachers' perceptions of consultation success, which was measured by teacher satisfaction, teacher strength (i.e., teachers' feelings of competence regarding teaching), and problem resolution. The next two sections of the questionnaire examined teachers' attitudes concerning a specific, self-selected consultation experience during which they were the consultees, and the last section asked teachers to indicate their number of years of teaching experience and the number of consultations they engaged in per year.

Weissenburger et al. (1982) conducted multiple regression analyses to analyze responses on the 107 usable questionnaires. Results pertaining to experience and perceptions of consultation outcome indicated that there was a negative significant relationship ($r = -.20$) between years of teaching experience and teacher strength. In other words, the more teaching experience teachers had, the less likely they were to report feeling stronger or more competent because of the consultation session. The authors interpreted this finding to suggest that teachers with greater amounts of experience already feel relatively competent regarding intervention skills, and as such are not as receptive to learning new skills from consultation and thus do not "buy into" it. These findings are in line with those of Martin and Curtis (1980), which indicated

that consultation sessions were perceived by consultants to be less successful when the consultees were more experienced than the consultants.

In terms of consultants' use of social power, Weissenburger et al.'s (1982) major finding implies that school consultants may benefit from implementing different forms of social power depending on whether they are consulting with teachers who have substantial or little experience. For instance, consultees with minimal teaching experience may feel they have much to learn and as such view consultants as experts, and so consultants may be successful implementing expert power as a means of influence with less experienced consultees. On the other hand, consultants' use of expert power with experienced consultees may be less successful due to the potential view of these consultees that they have nothing new to learn from consultants and thus nothing to gain from consultation. In these situations, consultants may be wise to select a form of social power other than expert power as a means of influence.

Gutkin and Bossard (1984). Shortly after the study by Weissenburger et al. (1982), Gutkin and Bossard (1984) also examined various consultant and consultee characteristics in an effort to understand factors that influence consultees' perceptions of consultation. Specifically, Gutkin and Bossard investigated the relationship among consultants' skill, consultees' total years of teaching experience, consultees' number of years teaching at their current school, and the schools' organizational structure in relation to consultees' perception of consultation.

Participants included 146 teachers in 9 different elementary schools in an urban area of the midwestern United States. In addition, each of the schools was assigned a school psychology graduate student trained in consultation. The graduate students spent 2 half-days per week for 14 weeks in their respective schools, during which time they functioned in a consultant role, working together with school personnel who voluntarily approached them for assistance (Gutkin

& Bossard, 1984).

Assessment of variables took place during the final week of the 14-week period. First, consultant skill was assessed by trained expert consultants who viewed a 15-minute videotape of each graduate student consultant in a consultation session with a teacher and then rated his/her performance using the Consultant Observational Assessment Form (Curtis & Anderson, 1975, as cited in Gutkin & Bossard, 1984). To assess organizational variables, teachers completed two instruments measuring organizational climate and the principal's leadership behavior. In addition, teachers completed a questionnaire assessing their attitudes toward consultation services. Finally, teachers' total years of teaching experience and the number of years they had taught at their current school were included as independent variables (Gutkin & Bossard, 1984).

Results pertaining to consultees' teaching experience indicated that the more teaching experience consultees had, the less they preferred to use consultation services. Interestingly, however, the more years teachers taught at their current school, the more they preferred consultation (Gutkin & Bossard, 1984).

Several implications regarding consultants' use of social power bases may be gleaned from Gutkin and Bossard's (1984) results. First, the finding that greater teaching experience is related to reduced preferences for consultation may be interpreted to suggest that experienced teachers believe they will not benefit from consultation because they have already learned everything, as was mentioned earlier when discussing Weissenburger et al. (1982). As such, school consultants may not be successful utilizing expert power in these situations, as experienced consultees may not view consultants as experts. At the same time, however, school consultants may be successful using other forms of social power with experienced consultees, especially considering Gutkin and Bossard's second finding that consultees who have been

teaching in the same school for many years are more apt to prefer consultation. For example, school consultants may be successful using informational power with experienced consultees, because consultees would be able to decide for themselves whether they judge the information to be helpful. Another option would be for consultants to use referent power, building on the shared experiences they have with consultees as a means of influence.

Taken together, the literature examining professional experience in relation to school consultation is limited. As was stated earlier, much of this research has focused primarily on teachers' teaching experience and less on consultants' consulting experience, and empirical studies within school consultation that explicitly examine experience in relation to social power are rare. The limitations of these studies are compounded by the fact that the majority of this research was conducted in the 1980s and early 1990s; as such, any studies that addressed social power and influence did not incorporate Raven's (1992) expanded social power typology. Clearly, there is a need to expand this literature base to address directly the relevant professional experience of both consultees and consultants, as well as to incorporate Raven's (1992) current social power typology model. The current investigation addressed both of these issues by examining consultants' likelihood of use of the social power bases in relation to consultants' and consultees' relevant professional experience. In addition to their experience, the current research also considered the gender of both consultants and consultees, as it is possible that this variable may further influence consultants' likelihood of use of the social power bases.

Likelihood of Use as a Variable

Throughout this literature review, repeated reference has been made to the current investigation's examination of school consultants' *likelihood of use* of social power bases. The purpose of this brief section is to provide a more detailed rationale for examining this variable.

As was indicated during the review of social power research within school consultation, all three published studies to date have focused exclusively on consultants' and consultees' *perceived effectiveness* of social power bases, but have not considered consultants' *likelihood of use* of social power bases. It is crucial to address this gap in the research, as Raven's (1992) power/interaction model of interpersonal influence indicates that both of these concepts are essential to the decision-making process agents engage in to select and implement social power bases.

Recall that it is during the second stage of Raven's (1992) model that consultants must determine which power bases will be effective in influencing a target, but it is during the third stage in which consultants must weigh the costs and benefits of actually *using* those power bases. Here, consultants not only must consider the logistics of using a power base (e.g., would it work?), but also must contemplate the potential relational, situational, and/or ethical ramifications of using a particular power base. For example, a consultant may determine that impersonal coercive power would be effective in influencing a teacher consultee, but may decide not to use that power base because it could result in the consultee having feelings of hostility toward the consultant. Furthermore, the use of impersonal coercion may be deemed a violation of professional ethics. Consultants' use of social power bases is thus dependent not only on their judged effectiveness of the social power bases, but also on the context of the situation in which those power bases may be used and whether the use of those power bases are ethical; as such, an examination of consultants' likelihood of use of social power bases (and the factors that may influence such use) is crucial in obtaining a more comprehensive understanding of social power within school consultation.

Linking Consultation Process to Consultation Outcome

A final aspect of the current investigation was an examination of the connection between consultants' likelihood of use of social power bases and consultants' self-perceptions of effectiveness. A brief rationale for this research consideration is presented next.

Nearly 20 years ago, Gresham and Kendell (1987) published an article critiquing empirical studies within school consultation, citing several inadequacies regarding both process and outcome research, such as the limited range of topics and the use of unsophisticated statistical analyses. Since then, research examining the process of school consultation has shown moderate improvement, expanding to include better operational definitions, incorporate well-validated instruments, and use more powerful statistical analyses to address various factors related to the school consultation process. The use of meta-analytic strategies to statistically examine large groups of studies in combination also has enabled researchers to obtain a much more comprehensive understanding of outcome research within school consultation. Despite these advancements, however, one area within school consultation research that has remained relatively overlooked is the link between consultation process and outcome, particularly concerning the association between social power and influence and outcomes of consultation.

Earlier in the literature review, several studies were examined that demonstrated how certain social power bases, namely the soft power bases, are perceived as more effective by both school consultants and consultees (e.g., Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001; Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001; Erchul et al., 2004). However, none of these studies investigated whether the perceptions of such social power bases are related to consultation outcomes. An examination of this link not only would extend the literature base pertaining to social power within school consultation, but also would address the lack of research connecting school consultation process

and outcome.

Consequently, one aspect of the current investigation was to study in an exploratory manner whether there is a relationship between school consultants' likelihood of use of social power bases (a process variable) and their self-perceptions of effectiveness (an outcome variable). It was anticipated that examining this relationship will begin to develop a more comprehensive understanding of how social power plays a role within school consultation, ultimately leading to more effective consultation practices. Furthermore, fostering an understanding of this relationship will address issues of teacher follow through and treatment integrity, because it is teachers, not consultants, who implement plans made during consultation and truly determine the success of the consultation process. Gaining an understanding of which social power bases are related to more effective consultation will assist consultants in selecting influence strategies that are most likely to result in treatment implementation.

CHAPTER THREE

Statement of the Problem, Hypotheses, and Research Questions

It has been demonstrated that the social power base typology outlined by Raven (1992) is a useful tool in understanding power/influence processes that take place within the workplace, including the field of school psychological consultation. Research also has shown that school psychologist consultants perceive the soft, rather than harsh, power bases to be more effective methods of influence when consulting with teachers. Indeed, consultants' preference for the soft power bases has been repeated with such consistency in school consultation research that continuing to include harsh power bases in future school consultation research likely would be futile; as such, the proposed investigation will only consider the soft power bases. At the same time, however, investigations examining social power bases within school psychology are limited. Although studies have focused on the perceived *effectiveness* of social power bases, investigators have yet to examine additional questions related to school psychologists' perceptions of social power. Of particular interest is whether school consultants are more likely to actually *use* certain power bases more than others, an area for future research suggested by Erchul et al. (2004).

An additional research aim that demands further attention is the relation between gender and social power bases in school consultation. Research has clearly demonstrated that there are differences in how men and women communicate, with the general theme being that women are more emotional and relational when interacting with others, whereas men tend to have more assertive and firm communication patterns. In turn, it has been shown that such gender differences in communication manifest themselves in the way in which men and women utilize power and influence. More specifically, the literature has illustrated that the tendencies of men

to be dominant and assertive in communicating with others lead them to display more dominant and assertive influence strategies; women, on the other hand, have been shown to maintain their relational communication style when selecting influence strategies. With regard to the social power typology model outlined by Raven (1992), Erchul et al. (2004) demonstrated that there are gender differences with regard to the perceived effectiveness of social power bases. Specifically, results of their study indicated that female school psychologists endorse soft power bases to a greater degree than do male school psychologists.

Despite these important findings, much remains to be understood regarding gender and its relation to power bases in school consultation. In particular, research in school consultation has not investigated the likelihood of use of social power bases with regard to specific gender dyads. For instance, do female school consultants working with female consultees perceive power bases differently than *male* school consultants working with female consultees? The importance of this research question is supported further by research indicating that the gender composition of groups may influence communication methods (Payne et al., 2001).

Published research, albeit limited, also has indicated that years of experience may play a role in how social power is wielded within school psychological consultation. For instance, it has been demonstrated that school psychologists tend to be less successful when consulting with teachers who have greater experience than themselves (Martin & Curtis, 1980). Other research has suggested that teachers who have high levels of teaching experience tend have more negative attitudes toward consultation (e.g., Gutkin & Bossard, 1984). Although such findings have implications for the way in which social power may be utilized by school consultants—namely that consultees' as well as consultants' years of professional experience may influence consultants' likelihood of use of social power bases—this early research is dated, having been

conducted prior to Raven's (1992) expansion of the social power base model. Consequently, a more in-depth, current examination of the relationship between relevant years of professional experience and consultants' likelihood of use of social power bases is warranted.

Finally, considering that consultation has become one of the primary job functions of many school psychologists (Reschly & Wilson, 1995), it is critical to link consultation process to consultation outcome in order to enhance the current practice of school consultation and, ultimately, increase treatment integrity. As such, it is important not only to understand how gender and years of experience factor into consultation process, but also to examine how such factors relate to consultation outcomes. This is particularly important considering that social power research in the field of school consultation has yet to explore the link between consultation process and outcomes.

With such research questions, limitations, and demands in mind, the current investigation expanded the literature base in the area of school consultation by examining consultants' likelihood of use of soft power bases in relation to gender, relevant years of professional experience, and self-perceptions of consultant effectiveness. By determining whether gender and experience influence consultants' choices regarding use of soft power bases, as well as whether particular soft power bases are related to more favorable perceptions of consultant effectiveness, school psychologists will gain an increased understanding of what influence strategies are associated with more successful consultation outcomes.

Based on the established research findings regarding soft power bases and gender discussed earlier, the following two hypotheses were proposed:

1. In consultation dyads with a *female* consultant and a female consultee, the mean rating for referent power will be higher than the mean rating of the other four power bases combined.
2. In consultation dyads with a *male* consultant and a female consultee, the mean rating for expert power will be higher than the mean rating of the other four soft power bases combined.

In addition, due to the limited research examining the relationship between likelihood of use and years of experience and self-perceptions of consultant effectiveness, three research questions were proposed:

1. What is the relationship between *consultant* years of relevant professional experience and consultant likelihood of use of soft power bases? Is this relationship moderated by gender of consultant?
2. What is the relationship between *consultee* years of relevant professional experience and consultant likelihood of use of soft power bases? Is this relationship moderated by gender of consultant?
3. What is the relationship between consultants' likelihood of use of soft power bases and their self evaluation of effectiveness during consultation sessions?

CHAPTER FOUR

Method

Before presenting the Method for this study, it should be noted that another dissertation (Wilson, 2005) drew from the same data set. Results from that study will be presented in the Discussion section where appropriate.

Participants

Participants were 352 Nationally Certified School Psychologists (NCSPs) from a list of 1,000 NCSPs randomly selected by the National Association of School Psychologists. Demographic information concerning the participants is presented in the Results chapter.

Instrumentation

Two instruments were used: (a) the Interpersonal Power Inventory - Consultant Form - Usage (IPI CT-U); and (b) an adapted form of the Consultant Evaluation Form (CEF; Erchul, 1987). A review of the development and validation of the IPI CT-U is next, followed by a description of the CEF.

Interpersonal Power Inventory - Consultant Form - Usage

The IPI CT-U is based on the original Interpersonal Power Inventory (IPI) developed by Raven et al. (1998). Designed to measure 11 of the 14 social power bases outlined by Raven (1992), the IPI is a critical-incident instrument consisting of 44 items (4 items for each of the 11 power bases). Negative expert power, negative referent power, and indirect informational power are not included in the instrument because they are more difficult to conceptualize concretely and thus more difficult to measure. Each of the 44 items represents a reason for compliance that corresponds with a particular power base, and instructions ask respondents to indicate how likely each item would be a reason for compliance to a supervisor's request. Respondents rate each

item using a seven-point Likert scale, with responses of 1 indicating the item was “definitely not a reason” for compliance and responses of 7 indicating the item was “definitely a reason” for compliance.

In testing the intercorrelations among the 44 items hypothesized as representing each of the 11 power bases, Raven et al. (1998) found that for each power base, there was one item that did not correlate as highly as the other three items representing that power base. As such, the item with the lowest correlation for each of the 11 power bases was eliminated, leaving a total of 33 items (3 items for each of the 11 power bases).

The IPI was originally designed for use in organizational settings to assess the relationship between supervisors and subordinates (Raven et al., 1998). Over time, however, the instrument has undergone substantial modification so that it could be used to examine other relationships in alternate settings, such as the relationship between students and professors in college classrooms (Elias et al., 1999), and between school consultants and consultees within school consultation (Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001; Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001). For the present study, the IPI was further modified to assess school consultants’ likelihood of use of the social power bases, and has been termed the IPI-Form CT-U (Appendix A).

To obtain a representative sample of school consultants and to have as large a sample as possible on which to base analytical decisions regarding the modification of the IPI for the proposed investigation, the databases used in studies by Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001) and Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001) were combined, resulting in a sample of 235 school consultants. (Recall that both of these studies used the IPI-Form CT.) Just as was done by Raven et al. (1998), the intercorrelations among the 4 items hypothesized as representing each of the 11 power bases were examined, and the item with the lowest correlation within each of the

11 power bases was eliminated, leaving a total of 33 items (3 items for each of the 11 power bases). Many of the items that were deleted corresponded with those eliminated from the IPI in previous studies. Specifically, 5 of the 11 deleted items matched those dropped by Raven et al. (1998), and 4 of the deleted items matched those dropped by Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001).

In addition, this instrument was further modified for use in the investigation by changing the wording of the directions and the rating scale. Recall that the original IPI developed by Raven et al. (1998) asked respondents to indicate how likely each item would be a reason for compliance to a supervisor, and the IPI-Form CT used by Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001) and Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001) asked school consultants to indicate how likely each item would be to influence an initially reluctant consultee. For this investigation, the directions were changed to ask school consultants to rate how likely they would be to actually *use* each item when attempting to influence a teacher. Furthermore, (a) the rating scale was changed to assess likelihood of use rather than likelihood of compliance; and (b) the anchors for the scale were reversed from previous studies in school consultation, such that higher ratings logically indicate a greater likelihood of use. A pilot version of the IPI-Form CT-U was reviewed by graduate students and volunteer school psychologists to assess the readability of the instrument, the clarity of the instructions, and how long it took to complete.

Several investigations have demonstrated the internal consistency/reliability of both the original IPI and subsequent modifications of the instrument. First, in Raven et al.'s (1998) original two studies examining the IPI, internal consistency was assessed using data from an American sample and a Israeli sample. Coefficient alphas for the individual factors ranged from .67 to .86 in the American sample and from .63 to .88 in the Israeli sample, indicating moderate to very good internal consistency. Furthermore, the factors in the American sample accounted

for 59.3% of the variance in a two-factor solution (the harsh/soft dichotomy), and accounted for 60.1% of the variance in a two-factor solution in the Israeli sample. When Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001) modified the IPI for use in their study, they reassessed the reliability. Results indicated that the modified instrument (termed the IPI-Form CT) also demonstrated very good reliability, with coefficient alphas for the individual factors ranging from .79 to .89, and accounting for 46.4% of the variance in a two-factor solution. Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001) found similar results when they examined the IPI-Form CT, with coefficient alphas for the individual factors ranging from .79 to .83.

Evidence for the validity of the IPI is moderately strong. For instance, the replication of the harsh/soft distinction among the power bases across studies (e.g., Elias et al., 1999; Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001; Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001; Erchul et al., 2004; Raven et al., 1998), as well as across cultures (e.g., Raven et al., 1998) is indicative of good construct validity. In all these studies, the similarity regarding which power bases were categorized as harsh or soft is further evidence of construct validity. The correlation between the soft power bases and job satisfaction found by Raven et al. (1998) also demonstrates that the IPI has construct validity.

Consultant Evaluation Form

The Consultant Evaluation Form (CEF; Erchul, 1987) is a 12-item instrument originally designed to assess consultees' perceptions of consultants' effectiveness or helpfulness. A sample item is "The consultant was generally helpful." Each of the 12 items is rated on a 7-point Likert scale, with responses of 1 indicating strong disagreement (i.e., consultees did not find the consultant to be helpful) and responses of 7 indicating strong agreement (i.e., consultees did find the consultant to be helpful). Total scores on the CEF can range from 12 to 84, and mean scores can range from 1 to 7. Mean scores are reported in the current investigation.

The CEF has been used by a number of researchers examining consultation outcomes within school psychology (e.g., Erchul, 1987; Erchul & Chewning, 1990; Erchul, Covington, Hughes, & Meyers, 1995; Kratochwill, Sheridan, Carrington-Rotto, & Salmon, 1991; Sheridan, Erchul, Brown, Dowd, Warnes, Marti, Schemm, & Eagle, 2004), and has been demonstrated to have strong internal consistency. Specifically, Erchul (1987) indicated a coefficient alpha of .94 based on a sample of 29 consultant-consultee dyads, and Erchul and Chewning (1990) indicated a coefficient alpha of .95 based on a sample of 85 consultants. Based on a larger sample of 129 consultees, Erchul et al. (1995) also found the CEF to have strong internal consistency (coefficient alpha = .94). Information regarding the validity of the CEF is not available.

For this investigation, the directions and individual items were reworded such that consultants rated themselves regarding how effective they thought they were during a specific consultation session with a consultee. For example, the first item on the original CEF states, “the consultant was generally helpful.” On the modified version, the item was changed to state, “I was generally helpful.” Just as with the original CEF, consultants rate each item on a scale of 1 to 7, with a response of 1 indicating strong disagreement with the item, and a response of 7 indicating strong agreement with the item (Appendix A, items 34-45).

Procedure

The IPI-Form CT-U, with the embedded CEF, was mailed to 1,000 NCSPs along with a postage paid envelope and a cover letter describing the intent of the study and requesting their participation. Four weeks after the original mailing, reminder postcards were sent to individuals who had not yet returned the completed IPI-Form CT-U and CEF.

Once completed instruments were returned, responses were transferred to Opscan sheets by two undergraduate psychology students under the supervision of the investigator and the

investigator's advisor. The OpSCAN sheets were then scanned electronically to form an initial data file, after which a graduate student transferred the data on the computer printout to an Excel spreadsheet, which was double-checked for accuracy prior to analyses.

CHAPTER FIVE

Results

The following chapter presents the data analysis procedures and results for the two hypotheses and three research questions presented earlier. All statistical procedures were conducted using the SAS statistical program (version 8.2) published by the SAS Institute. Descriptive statistics for the sample and independent and dependent variables are presented first, followed by the results corresponding to the hypotheses and research questions. Additional analyses are reported when appropriate.

Demographic Information

Of the 1,000 IPI-Form CT-Us that were sent to randomly selected Nationally Certified School Psychologists (NCSPs), 352 were returned from 46 states, resulting in a response rate of 35.2%. One hundred respondents identified themselves as male (28.4%) and 250 identified themselves as female (71.0%); two respondents (0.6%) did not indicate their gender.

Consultants had an average age of 51.3 years ($SD = 9.6$, $R = 25$ to 76). The majority of the sample was White/Caucasian (93.8%), with 2.0% identifying themselves as Hispanic/Latino, 1.4% identifying themselves as Black/African-American, and 1.4% identifying themselves as either Asian/Pacific Islander, Native American/Alaskan, or Multiethnic; 1.4% did not report their ethnicity. Respondents had an average of 20.2 years of experience ($SD = 8.6$, $R = 1$ to 38).

Regarding level of education, 36.9% of respondents had a specialist degree in school psychology, while 34.4% reported they had a master's degree (MA/MS/MEd), 26.1% reported they had a doctoral degree, and 1.7% indicated they had a bachelor's degree (BA/BS); three respondents (0.9%) did not report their educational background.

Regarding the teacher consultees the school psychologist respondents had in mind when responding to the IPI-Form CT-U, 333 teachers (94.9%) were reported to be female and 17 (4.8%) were reported to be male; two respondents (0.6%) did not indicate the teacher's gender. Respondents reported the teachers had a mean of 13.8 years of experience ($SD = 8.2$, $R = 0$ to 35), and had an average age of 40.2 years ($SD = 9.5$, $R = 23$ to 65). Just under 91% (90.8%) of teachers were reported to be Caucasian/White, while 4.3% were reported to be African-American/Black, 2.6% Hispanic/Latino, and 2.3% as either Asian/Pacific Islander, Native American/Alaskan, or Multiethnic.

Descriptive Statistics for Independent and Dependent Variables

The means and standard deviations were computed for the soft power bases (both individually and in combination), consultants' mean item score on the CEF, and consultant and consultee years of relevant professional experience, and are presented in Table 5. These descriptive statistics are reported by male and female consultants as well as for the total sample. A correlation matrix also was computed for independent and dependent variables that were used in analyses for the hypotheses and research questions. Results of this correlation matrix are presented in Table 6.

In addition, a preliminary one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine whether consultants' years of relevant professional experience differed as a function of their gender. Results indicated a significant difference between male and female consultants with respect to their years of professional experience, $F(1, 345) = 7.31$, $p = .007$, with males having significantly more experience than females.

Finally, both instruments demonstrated good reliability (IPI-CT-U, coefficient alpha = .92; CEF, coefficient alpha = .88).

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics on Consultants' Ratings of Likelihood of Use of Soft Power Bases, Years of Relevant Professional Experience, and Mean Item Score on Consultant Evaluation Form (CEF)

Variable	Male Consultants			Female Consultants			Total Sample		
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Range	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Range	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Range
Expert Power ^{ab}	4.34	1.41	1.00 – 7.00	4.31	1.25	1.00 – 6.67	4.32	1.29	1.00 – 7.00
Informational Power ^{ab}	5.31	1.17	1.00 – 7.00	5.64	0.94	1.00 – 7.00	5.54	1.02	1.00 – 7.00
Legitimate Dependence Power ^{ab}	3.92	1.26	1.00 – 6.00	4.09	1.14	1.00 – 5.67	4.04	1.18	1.00 – 6.67
Legitimate Power of Position ^b	2.58	1.26	1.00 – 6.00	2.73	1.23	1.00 – 5.67	2.69	1.24	1.00 – 6.00
Personal Reward Power ^a	2.58	1.42	1.00 – 5.67	2.74	1.39	1.00 – 6.33	2.69	1.39	1.00 – 6.33
Referent Power ^{ab}	3.68	1.35	1.00 – 6.00	3.98	1.25	1.00 – 6.67	3.89	1.29	1.00 – 6.67
Expert, Informational, Legitimate Dependence, and Legitimate Position Power Combined	4.05	0.96	1.00 – 7.00	4.18	0.85	1.00 – 7.00	4.15	0.88	1.00 – 7.00
Referent, Informational, Legitimate Dependence, and Legitimate Position Power Combined	3.89	0.96	1.00 – 7.00	4.10	0.86	1.00 – 7.00	4.04	0.89	1.00 – 7.00
Expert, Informational, Legitimate Dependence, and Personal Reward Power Combined	4.05	0.98	1.00 – 7.00	4.18	0.85	1.00 – 7.00	4.14	0.89	1.00 – 7.00

Table 5 (continued)

Descriptive Statistics on Consultants' Ratings of Likelihood of Use of Soft Power Bases, Years of Relevant Professional Experience, and Mean Item Score on Consultant Evaluation Form (CEF)

Variable	Male Consultants			Female Consultants			Total Sample		
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Range	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Range	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Range
Referent, Informational, Legitimate Dependence, and Personal Reward Power Combined	3.89	1.02	1.00 – 7.00	4.10	0.89	1.00 – 7.00	4.04	0.93	1.00 – 7.00
Five Soft Power Bases Combined ^c	3.96	0.98	1.00 – 5.80	4.15	0.87	1.13 – 6.20	4.10	0.90	1.00 – 6.20
Five Soft Power Bases Combined ^d	3.97	0.95	1.00 – 5.53	4.15	0.86	1.13 – 6.00	4.10	0.89	1.00 – 6.00
Consultant Years of Experience	22.18	7.76	2.00 – 35.00	19.45	8.79	1.00 – 38.00	20.23	8.50	1.00 – 38.00
Consultee Years of Experience	13.04	7.96	3.00 – 35.00	14.01	8.31	0.00 – 35.00	13.76	8.20	0.00 – 35.00
CEF Mean Item Score	5.74	0.52	4.42 – 6.83	5.65	0.62	3.83 – 7.00	5.68	0.60	3.83 – 7.00

^aIdentified as a soft power base in previous empirical findings

^bIdentified as a soft power base in the PCA conducted with the current data set

^cGrouping of five soft power bases as identified in previous empirical findings

^dGrouping of five soft power bases as identified in the PCA conducted with the current data set

Table 6

Intercorrelations among Independent and Dependent Variables

	Expert Power	Informational Power	Legitimate Dependence Power	Referent Power	Legitimate Position Power	Personal Reward Power	Consultant Experience	Consultee Experience	Consultant Gender	Likelihood of Use of Soft Power Bases Combined ^a	Likelihood of Use of Soft Power Bases Combined ^b	CEF Mean Item Score
Expert Power	1.00	.526**	.239**	.479**	.482**	.316**	.037	-.161**	-.013	.750**	.701**	.128*
Informational Power		1.00	.405**	.456**	.335**	.254**	-.020	-.098	.131*	.721**	.693**	.226**
Legitimate Dependence Power			1.00	.439**	.409**	.475**	.029	-.016	.058	.670**	.692**	.081
Referent Power				1.00	.478**	.574**	.154**	-.185**	.097	.786**	.818**	.184**
Legitimate Position Power					1.00	.495**	.060	-.106	.046	.745**	.609**	-.009
Personal Reward Power						1.00	.114*	-.082	.045	.584**	.745**	-.063
Consultant Experience							1.00	-.052	-.151**	.075	.093	.162**
Consultee Experience								1.00	.063	-.159**	-.151**	-.118*

Table 6 (Continued)

Intercorrelations among Independent and Dependent Variables

	Expert Power	Informational Power	Legitimate Dependence Power	Referent Power	Legitimate Position Power	Personal Reward Power	Consultant Experience	Consultee Experience	Consultant Gender	Likelihood of Use of Soft Power Bases Combined ^a	Likelihood of Use of Soft Power Bases Combined ^b	CEF Mean Item Score
Consultant Gender									1.00	.084	.082	-.081
Likelihood of Use of Soft Power Bases Combined ^a										1.00	.956**	.161**
Likelihood of Use of Soft Power Bases Combined ^b											1.00	.142**
CEF Mean Item Score												1.00

^aGrouping of five soft power bases as identified in the PCA conducted with the current data set^bGrouping of five soft power bases as identified in previous empirical findings* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Principal Components Factor Analysis

Before conducting any analyses related to the hypotheses and research questions, a principal components factor analysis (PCA) with varimax rotation was conducted using consultant responses on the IPI Form CT-U. Results of the PCA identified a two-factor solution, with each factor having an eigenvalue greater than 1.0. Together, the two factors accounted for 61.03% of the variance. Table 7 presents the two factors, labeled *soft power* (including positive expert, positive referent, legitimate dependence, direct informational, and legitimate position power); and *harsh power* (consisting of impersonal reward, impersonal coercion, personal coercion, legitimate equity, legitimate reciprocity, and personal reward power).

Results of the initial PCA are important, as they identified a set of soft power bases that is very similar, but not identical, to the soft power bases documented in previous research (e.g., Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001). Specifically, legitimate position power emerged as a soft power base and took the place of personal reward power, which was identified as a harsh power base; the remaining four soft power bases did not change. To this point, research using versions of the IPI (e.g., IPI-Form CT) to examine the harsh/soft social power base distinction within the field of school consultation has been empirically driven, in that individual power bases have been labeled as either harsh or soft from results of principal components and/or factor analyses. As such, the primary statistical analyses for the present investigation were conducted using the new constellation of soft power bases as specified in the PCA just described. However, because the hypotheses and research questions for the current research were based on the original set of soft power bases identified in previous studies, parallel analyses also were conducted using the soft power bases as they were originally specified. These secondary analyses will be presented briefly when appropriate.

Table 7

Factor Loadings for Consultant Responses on the IPI-Form CT-U

Factor	Power Base	Factor 1 Loadings	Factor 2 Loadings	Coefficient Alphas for Primary Factor
Harsh				.89
	Impersonal Reward	.79	.02	.91
	Impersonal Coercion	.77	-.09	.91
	Personal Coercion	.76	.35	.90
	Legitimate Equity	.78	.31	.90
	Legitimate Reciprocity	.69	.42	.90
	Personal Reward	.60	.53	.90
Soft				.89
	Positive Expert	.07	.73	.91
	Positive Referent	.28	.74	.90
	Legitimate Dependence	.26	.61	.90
	Direct Informational	-.11	.78	.91
	Legitimate Position	.38	.64	.90

Relatedly, only responses pertaining to the five soft power bases were used to address the hypotheses and research questions because previous research examining social power in relation to school consultation has consistently demonstrated that both consultants and consultees perceive soft bases to be more effective than harsh bases (e.g., Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001; Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001; Erchul et al., 2004). Table 8 lists items on the IPI Form CT-U that pertain to the five soft power bases identified in the principal components factor analysis, again, which are positive expert, direct informational, legitimate dependence, positive referent, and legitimate position power. These five soft power bases were used in conducting the primary analyses. In addition, Table 8 includes a sixth power base, personal reward power, which prior school consultation research has identified as a soft power base instead of legitimate position power. Consequently, personal reward power was used in the place of legitimate position power when conducting the secondary analyses.

For the purposes of the following analyses, respondent likelihood of use of a specific soft power base corresponds to the mean of the 3 items that correspond to that power base, while respondent likelihood of use of the soft power bases *combined* corresponds to the mean of the 15 items that comprise the soft power bases as a group. Following are the results pertaining to the hypotheses and research questions.

Hypotheses 1 and 2

Recall that Hypotheses 1 and 2 were very similar: Hypothesis 1 stated that in consultation dyads with a *female* consultant and a female consultee, consultants will rate they are likely to use referent power more than the other four soft power bases (i.e., expert, informational, legitimate dependence, and legitimate position power); Hypothesis 2 stated that in consultation dyads with

Table 8

Items Pertaining to the Soft Power Bases on the IPI Form CT-U

Power Base	Item
Expert power ^{ab}	<p>2 – She feels I know the best way to handle the situation.</p> <p>12 – She feels I know more about this particular situation.</p> <p>28 – She feels that I have more knowledge about this than she does.</p>
Informational power ^{ab}	<p>10 – She knows I have a strong basis for this request.</p> <p>16 – I can give her good reasons for changing how she handles the situation.</p> <p>31 – She now understands why the recommended change is for the better.</p>
Legitimate power of dependence ^{ab}	<p>9 – She knows my job will be more difficult if she does not comply.</p> <p>17 – She understands that I really need her cooperation on this.</p> <p>30 – I need assistance and cooperation from her.</p>
Referent power ^{ab}	<p>8 – She sees me as someone she can identify with.</p> <p>18 – We are both part of the same work group and should see eye to eye on things.</p> <p>27 – She looks up to me and generally models her behavior accordingly.</p>
Legitimate power of position ^a	<p>13 – She understands it is my job to tell her how to handle the situation.</p> <p>19 – I have the right to request that she handle the situation in a particular way.</p> <p>26 – As a teacher, she has an obligation to do as I say.</p>
Personal reward power ^b	<p>7 – It makes her feel better to know that I like her.</p> <p>20 – I make her feel more valued if she does as I request.</p> <p>25 – It makes her feel personally accepted if she does as I ask.</p>

^aDenotes soft power base used in primary analyses

^bDenotes soft power base used in secondary analyses

a *male* consultant and a female consultee, consultants will rate they are likely to use expert power more than the other four soft power bases (i.e., informational, legitimate dependence, legitimate position, and referent power). To explore these hypotheses, a repeated measures ANOVA was conducted across the five soft power bases for female consultants (Hypothesis 1) and for male consultants (Hypothesis 2). Because both hypotheses involved dyads with female consultees, only consultants' responses pertaining to consultation sessions with female consultees were used for these analyses, resulting in 240 female consultant-female consultee dyads and 92 male consultant-female consultee dyads. (Note that responses from 20 consultants were not used because the responses of 18 consultants pertained to sessions with male consultees, and 2 respondents did not indicate consultee gender). As was reported earlier, results of a preliminary one-way ANOVA indicated a significant difference between male and female consultants with respect to their years of experience, so consultant years of experience was included as a covariate for both repeated measures ANOVAs.

Primary Analyses

The repeated measures ANOVA for Hypothesis 1 was significant, $F(4, 1183) = 189.55, p < .0001$. However, the results were significant in the *opposite* direction of what was predicted, indicating that when consulting with female consultees, female consultants are significantly more likely to use the other four soft power bases combined than referent power alone ($t = -2.43, p = .015$). As such, Hypothesis 1 was not supported.

For Hypothesis 2, results of the repeated measures ANOVA were significant in the direction that was predicted, $F(4, 443) = 54.36, p < .0001$, thereby supporting the hypothesis that male consultants would be likely to use expert power more than the other four soft power bases combined.

Secondary Analyses

Results pertaining to the secondary analyses for Hypotheses 1 and 2 were consistent with findings obtained in the primary analyses, and thus will not be presented here.

Research Questions 1 and 2

Research Question 1 asked what the relationship is between consultant years of relevant professional experience and consultant likelihood of use of soft power bases, and whether this relationship is moderated by consultation dyad type (i.e., female consultant-female consultee and male consultant-female consultee). Research Question 2 was the same, except it focused on *consultee* years of relevant professional experience rather than consultant experience. Note that because both questions involved consultation dyads with female consultees, only consultants' responses pertaining to consultation sessions with female consultees were used in analyzing Research Questions 1 and 2, resulting in 240 female-female dyads and 92 male-female dyads. The use of the variable consultant gender (dummy coded) allowed for the examination of specific gender dyads (i.e., when consultant gender was female, the female consultant-female consultee dyad was examined; when consultant gender was male, the male consultant-female consultee dyad was examined). Presented next are the results of the primary analyses for Research Questions 1 and 2, followed by a brief presentation of the findings for the secondary analyses.

Primary Analyses

An underlying assumption of multiple regression is that there is some degree of association among independent and dependent variables. Consequently, a bivariate intercorrelation matrix was initially computed and included the variables consultant gender, consultant years of relevant professional experience, consultee years of relevant professional

experience, and consultant likelihood of use of soft power bases combined (i.e., expert, informational, legitimate dependence, referent, and legitimate position power) (refer to Table 6, presented earlier). Of the six unique pairings, two correlations were significant and negative. First, consultant years of relevant professional experience was negatively correlated with consultant gender [$r(328) = -.14, p = .014$], indicating that males had more experience than females. Second, consultee years of relevant professional experience was negatively correlated with consultant likelihood of use of soft power bases [$r(322) = -.18, p = .001$], signifying that the more experience consultees had, the less likely consultants were to use the soft power bases.

Taken together, the bivariate intercorrelation matrix demonstrated that, in general, the four variables were minimally correlated with one another. More specifically, the three variables that were to be used as independent variables in the regression analyses (i.e., consultant experience, consultee experience, and consultant gender) were not highly correlated with one another, thereby reducing the possibility of multicollinearity. Furthermore, consultee experience was significantly correlated with the dependent variable likelihood of use; although the strength of this correlation was minimal, the significant relationship between the two variables suggested that within a multiple regression, consultee experience would be a strong variable in predicting likelihood of use. Consequently, the use of a multiple regression procedure to examine the relationship among these independent and dependent variables was considered appropriate.

Next, a series of multiple regression analyses were conducted. Findings pertaining to Research Question 1 will be presented first, followed by results for Research Question 2.

Research Question 1. Recall that Research Question 1 asked about the relationship between consultant experience and likelihood of use of soft power bases, and whether this relationship was moderated by consultant gender. As such, Research Question 1 was answered

in several steps. First, a simple regression analysis was conducted with consultant experience as the independent variable and consultant likelihood of use as the dependent variable. Results of this analysis were not significant, $F(1, 326) = 2.90, p = .09, R^2 = .0088$, indicating that consultant experience did not explain a significant proportion of the variance in consultant likelihood of use.

However, because results of a one-way ANOVA with consultant gender as the independent variable and consultant experience as the dependent variable were significant (discussed earlier), it was necessary to control for consultant gender in answering the first part of Research Question 1. As such, a multiple regression analysis was conducted with consultant experience as an independent variable, consultant gender as a control variable, and consultant likelihood of use as the dependent variable. Results of this analysis approached significance, $F(2, 325) = 2.98, p = .052, R^2 = .0180$.

To answer the second part of Research Question 1, which asked whether the relationship between consultant experience and likelihood of use was moderated by consultant gender, an additional multiple regression analysis was conducted with consultant gender, consultant experience, and the interaction between consultant gender and consultant experience as independent variables, and likelihood of use as the dependent variable. Results of this analysis were not significant, $F(3, 324) = 2.31, p = .076, R^2 = .0210$, indicating that the relationship between consultant experience and likelihood of use did not vary by consultant gender. In other words, consultant gender did not moderate the relationship between consultant experience and likelihood of use. Table A in Appendix B is the source table for these results.

Research Question 2. Recall that Research Question 2 was the same as Research Question 1, with the exception that it examined *consultee* years of professional experience as

opposed to consultant years of experience. As such, the procedure used to answer the second research question was nearly identical to the one used for the first; the only difference was that it was not necessary to control for consultant gender, as there was not a suspected relationship between consultant gender and consultee experience.

First, a simple regression analysis was conducted with consultee years of experience as the independent variable and consultant likelihood of use of soft power bases as the dependent variable. Results of this analysis were significant, $F(1, 318) = 10.62, p = .001, R^2 = .0323$, indicating that consultee experience accounted for 3.2% of the variance in consultant likelihood of use of soft power bases. It is interesting to note that the regression coefficient for consultee experience was negative ($b = -.0192$) and significant [$t(319) = -3.26, p = .0012$], revealing an interesting relationship between consultant likelihood of use and consultee experience: the more experience teacher consultees are reported to have, the less likely consultants are to use soft power bases.

Next, to determine whether the relationship between consultee experience and consultant likelihood of use was moderated by consultant gender, a multiple regression analysis was conducted with consultee experience and the interaction between consultee experience and consultant gender as independent variables, and consultant likelihood of use as the dependent variable. Results of this model were also significant, $F(2, 317) = 6.03, p = .003, R^2 = .0367$, indicating that consultee experience and the interaction between consultee experience and consultant gender together accounted for 3.7% of the variance in consultant likelihood of use of soft power bases. An examination of regression coefficients revealed that consultee experience was significant [$t(319) = -3.24, p = .0013$], indicating that consultee experience not only contributed to the total variance in consultant likelihood of use of soft power bases, but it also

made a unique contribution to consultant likelihood of use of soft power bases. Again, this coefficient was negative ($b = -.0254$), indicating that the more experience consultees have, the less likely consultants are to use soft power bases. The interaction between consultee experience and consultant gender was not significant [$t(319) = 1.19, p = .23$], indicating that the relationship between consultee experience and consultant likelihood of use did not vary by consultant gender (i.e., the relationship was not moderated by gender). Table B in Appendix B is the source table for these results.

Secondary Analyses

Research Question 1. The substitution of personal reward power for legitimate position power in the secondary analyses led to some variation in the results pertaining to Research Question 1. First, in addition to the two significant correlations reported in the primary analyses, a third significant correlation was found between consultant years of relevant professional experience and consultant likelihood of use of soft power bases [$r(330) = .11, p = .014$]. This correlation was positive, indicating that the more experience consultants have, the more likely they are to use soft power bases.

Next, using a procedure that paralleled the primary analyses, a simple regression analysis was conducted with consultant experience as the independent variable and consultant likelihood of use of soft power bases as the dependent variable. Results of this analysis were significant, $F(1, 326) = 4.12, p = .043, R^2 = .0125$, indicating that consultant experience accounted for 1.3% of the variance in consultant likelihood of use of soft power bases. However, because this model did not control for consultant gender, an additional regression analysis was conducted with consultant gender as a control variable, consultant experience as an independent variable, and consultant likelihood of use as the dependent variable. Results of this second analysis were also

significant, $F(2, 325) = 3.71, p = .025, R^2 = .0223$, revealing that consultant gender and consultant experience together accounted for 2.2% of the variance in likelihood of use. An examination of regression coefficients indicates that consultant experience again was significant [$t(327) = 2.26, p = .0243$], revealing that consultant experience made a significant unique contribution to consultant likelihood of use even after controlling for consultant gender. The positive direction of this relationship indicates that the more experience consultants have, the more likely they are to use the soft power bases.

To test whether the relationship between consultant experience and likelihood of use was moderated by consultant gender, an additional multiple regression model was conducted with consultant gender, consultant experience, and the interaction between consultant gender and consultant experience as independent variables, and likelihood of use as the dependent variable. This model also was significant, $F(3, 324) = 2.85, p = .038, R^2 = .0257$, revealing that the three independent variables contributed a significant amount of variance (2.6%) to likelihood of use. The regression coefficient for consultant experience was significant [$t(327) = 2.02, p = .0439$], indicating that it made a unique contribution to the variance in likelihood of use after accounting for the variance contributed by consultant gender and the interaction term. It should be noted that the regression coefficient for the interaction term was not significant [$t(327) = -1.05, p = .2922$], revealing that the relationship between consultant experience and likelihood of use did not vary by gender. Table C in Appendix B is the source table for these results.

Research Question 2. Results pertaining to the secondary analyses for Research Question 2 were consistent with those obtained in the primary analyses, and so they will not be presented here. However, Table D in Appendix C is the source table for these results.

Additional Analyses Pertaining to Research Questions 1 and 2

To further explore the relationship between professional experience and consultant likelihood of use of soft power bases, a simple ANOVA was conducted with consultant likelihood of use of soft power bases as the dependent variable and the relative experience of consultants and consultees as the independent variable. The variable *relative experience* consisted of three levels: (a) dyads in which consultants had more experience than consultees ($n = 207$); (b) dyads in which consultees had more experience than consultants ($n = 63$), and (c) dyads in which consultants and consultees had similar levels of experience ($n = 68$). (Note that 14 dyads were not included due to missing data.) Consultants and consultees were considered to have approximately the same amount of experience if the difference between their years of professional experience was less than or equal to three years (e.g., a dyad consisting of a consultant with 10 years of experience and a consultee with 8 years of experience fell in this category).

Results of the ANOVA were significant, $F(2, 336) = 4.54, p = .01$, indicating that consultants' likelihood of use of soft power bases differed depending on the relative experience of consultants and consultees. Scheffe *post-hoc* analyses revealed that consultants were more likely to use the soft power bases when they consulted with consultees who had less experience than themselves as opposed to consultees who had similar amounts of experience (mean difference = .3165, $p = .039$). No other significant differences were found regarding likelihood of use of soft power bases and relative experience. It should be noted that such findings were consistent using both the primary and secondary constellations of soft power bases.

Research Question 3

Primary Analyses

Research Question 3 asked about the relationship between consultant likelihood of use of soft power bases and consultants' self-evaluations of effectiveness during consultation sessions. To answer this question, a single bivariate correlation was conducted between consultants' mean ratings of likelihood of use of the five soft power bases combined (i.e., expert, informational, referent, legitimate dependence, and legitimate position power) and consultants' mean item score on the CEF. Results were significant, $r(343) = .16, p = .003$, indicating that consultant likelihood of use of soft power bases was positively related to their self-evaluations of effectiveness during consultation sessions. In other words, as consultants rate they are more likely to use soft power bases, their self-evaluations of effectiveness increase. It should be noted that despite the statistical significance of the analysis, the magnitude of the correlation was small.

To further examine the relationship between consultant likelihood of use of soft power bases and self-evaluations of effectiveness during consultation sessions, several additional bivariate correlation analyses were conducted examining relationships between specific soft power bases and CEF self-evaluations of effectiveness. Results of these analyses indicated that three of the five soft power bases were significantly correlated with consultants' CEF self-evaluations. Specifically, expert, [$r(343) = .13, p = .02$], informational [$r(344) = .23, p < .0001$], and referent power [$r(344) = .18, p = .001$] were each positively correlated with consultants' CEF self-evaluations. Legitimate dependence [$r(344) = .08, p = .13$] and legitimate position power [$r(343) = -.01, p = .87$] were not significantly correlated with CEF evaluations of effectiveness.

Secondary Analyses

Results of the secondary analyses for Research Question 3 were consistent with those obtained in the primary analyses, in that replacing legitimate position power with personal reward power did not affect the significant relationship between consultant likelihood of use of soft power bases and their self-evaluations of effectiveness, $r(343) = .14, p = .008$. In addition, the correlation between likelihood of use of personal reward power and consultants' CEF scores was not significant, $r(344) = -.06, p = .24$.

CHAPTER SIX

Discussion

The purpose of this study was twofold: to investigate relational aspects of the consultation process, and to initiate an examination of the link between the consultation process and consultation outcome. Consultation process was addressed by considering the gender of consultants and the professional experience of both consultants and consultees and the relationship of these variables to consultants' likelihood of use of social power bases. To shed light on the link between consultation process and outcome, the relationship between consultants' likelihood of use of social power bases and consultants' self-evaluations of effectiveness during consultation sessions was examined. Two hypotheses and three research questions were advanced to facilitate a better understanding of these relationships. Repeated measures ANOVAs, multiple regression analyses, and bivariate correlational analyses were conducted to address how these variables are related.

What follows is a discussion of the results of this study. Findings pertaining to the Principal Components Factor Analysis will be considered first. Next, Hypothesis 1 and 2 will be addressed together, followed by a discussion of each of the Research Questions. Implications for consultation within school psychology will be presented, and the chapter will conclude with a consideration of study limitations and future research directions. Unless noted otherwise, references to the five soft power bases will be those that were used in the primary analyses.

Principal Components Factor Analysis

Results of a PCA using responses on the IPI-CT-U resulted in a soft/harsh power base dichotomy that is very similar—and in some cases identical—to results of social power research in relation to organizational settings (Raven et al., 1998; Schwarzwald et al., 2001) and school

consultation (Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001; Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001). The relative consistency in this social power structure across studies indicates that the soft/harsh power base distinction is meaningful and should continue to guide future research in this area.

Specifically, the present study identified positive expert, positive referent, legitimate dependence, direct informational, and legitimate position power as soft bases. This same grouping of soft power bases was identified in the second study by Raven et al. (1998) as well as by Schwarzwald et al. (2001). Research by Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001) and Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001) resulted in a nearly identical soft power base arrangement; the only exception being that personal reward power was classified as an additional soft power base rather than a harsh base.

Interestingly, this soft/harsh power base distinction has persisted despite the way in which social power has been examined. For instance, earlier studies in school consultation investigated consultants' and consultees' perceived effectiveness of social power bases when used to influence teacher consultees (Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001; Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001), and past research in organizational settings examined supervisors' and supervisees' perceived effectiveness of social power bases when used to influence supervisees (Raven et al., 1998; Schwarzwald et al., 2001). The present study, however, considered consultant *likelihood of use* of social power when consulting with teachers. It is likely that the changing focus of the IPI (perceived effectiveness versus likelihood of use), combined with the varying setting (school consultation versus organizational setting) and the type of respondent (consultants, consultees, supervisors, or supervisees) led to slightly different view regarding social power, resulting in the subtle changes in the constellation of the soft/harsh bases. Ultimately, however, the relative consistency of the power base structure across disciplines and respondents is an indication of the

robust nature of the soft/harsh power base dichotomy.

Consultant Gender and Likelihood of Use of Soft Power Bases

Two hypotheses were advanced that predicted which of the five soft power bases male and female consultants would be most likely to use when consulting with female consultees. Results did not support Hypothesis 1, which predicted that female consultants would be more likely to use referent power than the other four soft power bases. However, findings pertaining to Hypothesis 2 indicated that, as predicted, male consultants were likely to use expert power more than the other four soft power bases combined. Studies examining gender in relation to communication style and perceptions of social power are helpful in interpreting these results.

Recall that differences in the communication styles of men and women are well-established in the literature. A plethora of studies have demonstrated that males tend to hold an assertive and unemotional disposition when interacting with both men and women (e.g., Eagly, 1987). This communication style has been linked to the use of “certain” language (speaking without the use of hedges or tag questions), and has been found to contribute to a more direct and powerful form of communication (Timmerman, 2002). Indeed, research comparing how power is attributed to gender has revealed that both males and females associate power more with men more than women (Haines, 2000). Females, on the other hand, are often more relational in nature, and are inclined to communicate in a gentler, less assertive manner (Carli, 1990; Timmerman, 2002). As was indicated in the literature review, these variations in the communication styles of men and women are likely to contribute to gender differences relating to social power, because power and influence may be considered an aspect of everyday social interactions (Johnson, 1976).

Such research provides solid support for the finding that men are likely to use expert

power more than the other four soft power bases. Recall that the goal of expert power is to portray oneself as a skilled and proficient professional in order to exert influence (Raven, 1992). Although a number of techniques may be used to convey this image, one way is to use a dominant form of communication, which is often attributed to males and is characterized by directness, assertiveness, and self-confidence (Payne et al., 2001). In fact, it may even be argued that of the five soft power bases, expert power involves influence tactics that are the most dominant and assertive in nature. Consequently, male consultants who prefer to communicate using more direct styles may find expert power to be the most agreeable form of soft power to use when trying to influence a consultee.

Furthermore, studies have indicated that expert power is often attributed more to males than females. For instance, in Johnson's (1976) study, which examined gender in relation to the original six power bases (French & Raven, 1959; Raven, 1965), participants rated expert power as one of the power bases more likely to be used by males, and also indicated that expert power is one of the power bases viewed as more masculine than feminine. In a similar study involving undergraduate students who read written descriptions of counselors and then rated how expert they viewed the counselors, low-disclosing counselors were rated significantly more expert than high-disclosing counselors (Merluzzi, Banikiotes, & Missbach, 1978). In other words, counselors who were less personal and more direct during counseling sessions were viewed as more expert than counselors whose styles were more relational in nature. Although gender *per se* was not considered, such findings clearly support the notion that an assertive communication style often adhered to by men is associated with expert power.

Considering the substantial literature base indicating that women are more apt to use gentle, relational forms of communication, it is more difficult to understand the null finding that

female consultants were not more likely to use referent power with female consultees than the other four soft power bases. A possible reason for this failure to find significance for referent power is that female consultants may interact differently with female consultees as opposed to male consultees. For instance, in a study examining the tentativeness of speech (i.e., nonassertive communication style) among men and women in same- and mixed-sex groups, the use of tentative speech enhanced a woman's ability to influence a man, but reduced her ability to influence a woman (Carli, 1990). It is possible that the female consultants in the present investigation were hesitant to use referent power as a strategy to influence female teachers, perhaps believing it would not be forceful or persuasive enough to lead to a change in the consultees' behavior.

Relationship between Professional Experience and Likelihood of Use of Soft Power Bases

Two research questions were posed regarding the association among relevant professional experience, gender, and likelihood of use of soft power bases. First, Research Question 1 asked about the relationship between the experience of consultants and their likelihood of use of soft power bases, and then asked whether this relationship is moderated by gender. Research Question 2 was the same, except it considered the professional experience of *consultees*. To facilitate the following discussion, results pertaining to Research Question 1 will be discussed first, followed by findings pertaining to Research Question 2.

Consultant Experience and Likelihood of Use

Results regarding the relationship between the professional experience of consultants and their likelihood of use of soft power bases are intriguing, as there was some variation in the findings. First, results of the primary analyses revealed that consultant experience did not predict likelihood of use of soft power bases with female consultees. In other words, the amount of

experience consultants had did not influence how likely they were to use soft power. A possible explanation for this nonsignificant finding is that consultants are likely to use the soft power bases when consulting with female consultees *regardless* of their own experience level. Recent studies examining social power in relation to school consultation provide support for this interpretation. First, results of Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001) and Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001) revealed that consultants perceive soft power bases to be more effective than harsh bases when used during consultation with teachers. Furthermore, dissertation research by Wilson (2005), which shared the same data set as the present study, indicated that consultants also are more likely to *use* soft, rather than harsh, power bases during consultation with teachers. As such, a reasonable conclusion is that consultants in the present investigation were likely to use the soft power bases regardless of their level of experience, thus failing to reveal a significant relationship between experience and likelihood of use.

It should be noted that issues with measurement and data collection may also have contributed to the lack of significant findings in the primary analyses. For instance, information was not gathered regarding other factors that may influence the relationship between consultant experience and likelihood of use of soft power bases, such as personality characteristics or the ethnicity of consultants and consultees. As such, it is important to be cognizant of these and other variables that may have affected the findings but that were not able to be accounted for during statistical analyses.

Results of the secondary analyses, however, which included personal reward power rather than legitimate position power as the fifth soft power base, *did* yield a significant relationship between consultant experience and likelihood of use. Stated another way, the more professional experience the consultants had, the more likely they were to use the soft power

bases with female consultees. This finding is curious, as it indicates that replacing legitimate position power with personal reward power provoked a relationship between consultant experience and likelihood of use.

A possible explanation for this result is that consultants perceived the use of personal reward power as similar to the use of impersonal reward power, and as such felt they must have more authority—and thus more experience—to use it. Recall that impersonal reward power occurs when a consultee complies with a consultant because the consultee perceives the consultant will provide a tangible reward for compliance (Raven, 1992). This form of power is considered harsh because it is a somewhat heavy-handed means of achieving influence, and it may be associated with authority because a person who uses this form of power must be in a position to provide tangible rewards. Personal reward power is similar, except that it involves the provision of an *intangible* reward for compliance, such as praise or approval, and as such is considered a soft form of power (Raven, 1992). Perhaps the consultants in this study associated the provision of praise or approval with having more experience. For instance, consultants with little experience may have felt uncomfortable rewarding consultees with praise, believing that they were not experienced enough themselves to be in a position to praise someone else's efforts. However, consultants with substantial time in the field may have felt that they were more qualified to give praise or approval, because they had been consulting long enough to be in a position to do so.

Finally, it should be noted that regardless of which constellation of soft power bases was examined, the interaction between consultant experience and consultant gender was not significant. This null result suggests that gender does not significantly strengthen the relationship between consultant experience and their likelihood of using soft power bases with

female consultees. Similar null findings were revealed in a study by Rice, Instone, and Adams (1984), which indicated that the gender of leaders does not moderate the relationship between leadership style (i.e., use of social power strategies) and leadership success.

Next is a discussion of the results pertaining to Research Question 2, which examined the relationship between the professional experience of consultees, likelihood of use of soft power bases, and gender.

Consultee Experience and Likelihood of Use

Unlike the varied findings regarding likelihood of soft power base use and consultant experience, *consultee* experience was significantly related to likelihood of use regardless of which constellation of soft power bases was used. Specifically, the more experience female consultees had, the less likely consultants were to use soft bases. Not only are these findings consistent with research presented earlier in the literature review, but they also provide new insight regarding the use of soft power bases within school consultation.

The negative relationship between consultee experience and consultant likelihood of use of soft power bases suggests that the experience level of teachers is a significant factor considered by school consultants as they contemplate the use of social power. Although this study did not examine *why* consultants were less likely to use soft power bases with more experienced consultees, one reasonable explanation is that the consultants perceive experienced consultees to be somewhat disinterested in consultation, and thus do not view the soft power bases as likely to be influential with them. For instance, an item on the IPI-CT-U representing referent power states, “She looks up to me and generally models her behavior accordingly,” and an item reflecting expert power asserts, “She feels that I have more knowledge about this than she does.” Both of these items assume that teacher consultees would be willing to change their

behavior because of the consultants' social status or expertise. Perhaps consultants believed that consultees who had been teaching for many years were so experienced that they were not likely to change their behavior due to, for example, someone *else's* expertise.

Several studies have demonstrated that experienced teachers are less invested in consultation. Recall that Gutkin and Bossard (1984) found that teachers with greater levels of experience do not prefer to use consultation services, and research by Weissenburger et al. (1982) demonstrated that more experienced teachers are less likely to report feeling more competent as a result of consultation. In another study investigating variables that distinguish elementary teachers who participate in consultation from those who do not, it was found that the less professional experience teachers had, the more likely they were to participate in consultation (Stenger, Tollefson, & Fine, 1992). Relating this past research to the present investigation, it is possible that consultants regarded female consultees with greater experience to be "set in their ways" and thus less likely to be agreeable to suggestions made during consultation. Martin and Curtis (1980) made this same assertion, suggesting that older, more experienced teachers are more rigid in their professional perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors, thus making it difficult to establish a positive consultative relationship with more experienced teachers.

In interpreting the negative relationship between consultee experience and consultant likelihood of soft power base use, it is also important to remember that only consultation sessions involving female consultees were examined. Considering research indicating that social interactions with females often involve indirect and nonassertive communication strategies, one may have predicted that consultants would be likely to use soft power bases when consulting with female consultees, regardless of how experienced the consultees were. Interestingly, however, consultants were *less* likely to use soft power bases with more experienced consultees,

despite the fact that the consultees were female. In this situation, it is possible that the experience level of the consultees overpowered any effect their gender may have had on consultants' likelihood of using the soft power bases.

To understand this finding, it is also helpful to consider research by Berger and Fisek (1974), who posited that in American culture, *diffuse status characteristics*, which include gender and experience, among others, are used to assess individuals' competence or ability, particularly in situations where no other specific information about an individual is available. This means that in consultation sessions where gender is the only characteristic known about a consultee, consultants may be likely to select social power strategies based on gender (e.g., use a soft power base to influence a female consultee). However, if the consultant in this situation had known that the consultee was female but also knew she had substantial teaching experience, the consultant may have selected an alternative influence strategy based on the consultee's experience. In this way, the experience of the consultee was more important in the consultant's decision making regarding social power than was the consultee's gender. This may have been the case in the current investigation, in that when consultees had greater experience, consultants were less likely to use soft power in favor of an alternative strategy, despite the fact the consultees were also female.

Of course, other variables also may have been at play that discouraged consultants from using soft power bases when consulting with experienced female teachers, including cultural and socioeconomic factors. Ultimately, it is impossible to know with certainty why the consultants in this study were less likely to use the soft power bases with more experienced female consultees, but there is evidence that teachers' level of experience plays a significant role in consultants' decision making. Future research examining other variables that may influence

consultants' use of soft power bases, such as ethnicity, individual personality factors, or the focus of consultation (e.g., academic or behavior issue) is likely to provide additional insight in this area.

In attempting to understand why consultants were less likely to use soft power when interacting with experienced consultees, the following question must also be considered: what methods *do* consultants use when working with experienced teachers? For example, do consultants resort to the use of harsh power bases, perhaps believing that a more assertive form of power would be more influential with experienced consultees? Although this seems unlikely in light of past research indicating that school consultants perceive soft power bases to be more effective than harsh bases (Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001; Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001) and are more likely to *use* the soft power bases (Wilson, 2005), it is possible that consultants may use a harsh power strategy in a relational, or "soft," manner. For instance, a consultant may politely use impersonal coercive power by nicely indicating that if a consultee does not comply with plans made during consultation, the consultant may need to inform the school administration, which may result in negative ramifications for the consultee (e.g., reprimand from the principal). Again, future research examining other variables that may influence consultants' likelihood of use of soft power (e.g., personality characteristics such as introversion/extraversion), as well as research investigating which social power bases consultants *would* use when working with experienced consultees would help to answer this question.

Lastly, the interaction between consultant gender and consultee experience was not significant, indicating that consultant gender did not strengthen the relationship between consultee experience and consultant likelihood of use of soft power bases. This phenomenon also was observed when examining the relationship between *consultant* experience and

likelihood of use. That the interaction was not significant indicates that consultee experience is a strong predictor of its own accord. In other words, the professional experience of consultees is a variable that influences consultant likelihood of use of soft bases independently of consultant gender.

Next is a discussion of results pertaining to Research Question 3, which examined the relationship between consultants' likelihood of use of soft bases and their self-perceptions of effectiveness.

The Link between Likelihood of Use of Soft Bases and Consultant Effectiveness

Results of a bivariate correlation revealed that the more likely consultants are to use the soft power bases, the higher they rate themselves as being effective consultants. This significant finding is an encouraging advancement in the application of social power to the field of school consultation, as it not only provides additional support for the use of soft power in consultation but it also is another important step in linking consultation process to consultation outcome.

In discussing this finding, the application of Raven's (1992) power/interaction model of interpersonal influence to school consultation will be revisited. Recall that the six stages in this model describe the process an individual goes through in selecting, implementing, and assessing the use of social power as an influence strategy. To this point, research applying social power to school consultation has focused primarily on stages two and three of the model, which address some of the processes associated with using social power bases. Specifically, studies by Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001) and Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001) both examined consultants' perceived effectiveness of available social power bases (stage three); the present investigation, as well as research by Wilson (2005), investigated how likely consultants were to use specific power bases, which addressed stage two of Raven's (1992) model. Results of these studies

consistently demonstrate that consultants perceive soft power bases to be more effective than harsh bases, and that consultants are more likely to actually *use* the soft bases.

Despite the considerable contribution these studies have made to the literature base in this area, each has maintained a relatively one-sided examination of the application of social power to school consultation by focusing either on aspects of consultation process or outcome, but not tying the two concepts together. Recall that the last step in Raven's (1992) model comes after the consultant has implemented social power, and involves the consultant's examination of whether the use of social power was effective. This step is important, as it helps the influencing agent determine whether the use of specific power bases contributed to successful influence. Accordingly, to obtain a more comprehensive understanding of the application of social power to school consultation process, it is also important to investigate how aspects of consultation process are related to consultation outcomes. The finding that consultants who were more likely to use the soft power bases rated themselves as more effective in consultation indicates that indeed, the intent to use soft power is positively associated with one index of effective consultation.

That soft power is associated with positive outcomes in school consultation is not surprising. Using soft power bases is an interpersonal enterprise, wherein the consultant shares information and often develops a trusting relationship with the consultee. As opposed to using heavy-handed, punitive methods to exert influence (i.e., harsh power bases), the soft power bases convey a more equal approach in working with the consultee (Schwarzwald, Koslowsky, & Ochana-Levin, 2004). As was discussed in the literature review, consultation appears to work best—and be most successful—when there is a “cooperative partnership” between consultants and consultees, which incorporates openness, trust, and a sharing of responsibilities and expertise

(Zins & Erchul, 2002). Findings of the present investigation suggest it is likely that the soft power bases contribute to the development of characteristics associated with a positive working relationship between consultants and consultees, thus leading to positive perceptions of consultant effectiveness.

Although the likelihood of using soft bases in general was positively related to consultants' perceptions of effectiveness, additional findings revealed that three of the five soft bases may be particularly likely to contribute to positive consultation outcomes. Specifically, expert, referent, and informational power each were positively and significantly related to consultants' self-perceptions of effectiveness. Considering that consultants in the present investigation rated informational and expert as the two power bases most likely to be used (refer to Table 5), and that consultants in a previous study rated those same two power bases as most likely to lead to teacher compliance (Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001), it makes sense that both were significantly correlated with consultants' perceptions of effectiveness. Interestingly, however, referent power was rated as only fourth likely to be used, yet it demonstrated the second highest correlation with consultant perceptions of effectiveness (informational power was correlated highest). It is possible that the higher correlation between likelihood of use of referent power and perceived effectiveness occurred because of the somewhat greater variability among consultants' likelihood of use ratings for referent power.

With regard to expert power, similar findings were noted in an examination of therapists' use of social power and clients' perceptions of therapy outcomes. Specifically, McCarthy (1998) revealed a positive relationship between therapists who had reputations as being experts and clients' perceptions of the quality of their therapy. Such findings provide further support for the present investigation, implying that consultants who portray themselves as experts (i.e., use

expert power) may be more likely to experience positive consultation outcomes.

It is important to interpret the results of the present investigation cautiously, however, as the low correlations between consultant self-ratings of effectiveness and informational, expert, and referent power, respectively, do not account for much variance in perceived effectiveness. Furthermore, these ratings are based on consultant self-report and do not reflect consultee impressions or client behavioral changes. Future research using data from observed consultation sessions and/or behavioral outcomes would provide a truer picture of the relationship between likelihood of use of soft power and consultant effectiveness. Additionally, it would be interesting to know whether consultees also viewed consultants as more effective after they (consultants) had used the soft power bases.

Implications, Limitations, and Future Research Directions

The current study has revealed some logical—and in some cases, intriguing—relationships among professional experience, likelihood of use of soft power bases, and consultant effectiveness. Several implications pertaining to consultation within the schools may be gleaned from these findings. Study limitations and areas for future research are also apparent. The following section begins with a discussion of implications, followed by a brief presentation of study limitations and future research directions.

Implications

The present study alludes to the impact of consultee experience on consultants' selection and implementation of social power strategies. That the experience level of consultees was negatively associated with consultants' likelihood of using the soft power bases indicates that consultee experience plays a significant role in shaping the consultation process. This finding has implications regarding consultee resistance and treatment integrity. Resistance has been

defined as anything that obstructs problem solving or plan implementation and, ultimately, problem resolution (Wickstrom & Witt, 1993). As was discussed earlier, experienced teachers may be resistant to consultation due to their own accumulated knowledge and/or perceptions regarding their ability to benefit from consultation. As a result, treatment integrity may be jeopardized because consultees who do not “buy into” consultation are less apt to carry through with the plans made during consultation. Results from the present investigation suggest that consultants are less likely to use the soft power bases with more experienced consultees. Clearly, additional strategies must be enlisted in working with these teachers.

Despite results pertaining to the use of soft power with experienced consultees, study findings do have clear implications for the use of soft power in school consultation, as the more likely consultants were to use the soft bases, the more highly they rated themselves as having been effective. It appears that the use of these forms of power is related to more positive perceptions of consultation outcomes. Consultants are thus encouraged to understand the various soft power bases and consider how their implementation not only can enhance communication while working with consultees but also can ultimately increase the overall effectiveness of the consultation process.

Study Limitations

Results of the present investigation provided new insight regarding the application of social power bases to school consultation; however, it is important to consider the limitations of this research. First, the two instruments used to obtain data for the present study (IPI CT-U and CEF) are both self-report in nature. As such, caution must be used when interpreting the findings, as it is possible that consultants may not have provided accurate reports of their consultation experiences. For instance, respondents were to think of one consultation session

with a particular teacher in formulating their responses; however, the respondents may have used a compilation of their best (or worst) experiences during consultation and used those to complete the instruments. Or, it is possible that consultants may have had faulty recollections of their consultation experiences, thus affecting the accuracy of responses.

A related limitation is that ratings of consultant effectiveness on the CEF were based solely on the perspective of consultants (i.e., consultee perceptions were not considered). It is possible that consultants may have portrayed themselves in a positive light by rating themselves as highly effective, when consultees, in fact, did not find them to be as effective. Unfortunately, without the perspective of consultees, it is impossible to know with certainty whether consultants provided accurate assessments of their own effectiveness.

A major focus of this study was to examine how *likely* consultants are to use the soft power bases. However, a resulting limitation is that consultants' *actual* use of soft power bases was not investigated. This is important, as consultants may believe they are likely to use a particular power base but may not actually implement it in practice.

An additional limitation of this investigation is that it was not possible to examine relationships between male or female consultants and male teachers. Although the sample was representative of the gender make-up of both psychologists and teachers in this country, with both groups at least 70% female (Curtis, Grier, Abshier, Sutton, & Hunley, 2002; National Education Association, 2003), it would have been helpful to have a comparison of consultants' likelihood of use of soft power bases with female consultees versus male consultees.

Finally, because this investigation relied on correlational analyses rather than experimental procedures, an additional limitation is that it is not possible to claim causal relationships among the variables that were examined. For instance, it may be concluded that

there is a positive relationship between consultant likelihood of use of soft power bases and ratings of effectiveness; however, it would be erroneous to assert that consultants who are likely to use soft power bases *result in* higher ratings of effectiveness. Although this limitation does not undermine the current findings, it does limit the conclusions that can be made regarding the variables that were examined.

Future Research Directions

Results of the present investigation have advanced our knowledge of social power in relation to school consultation. At the same time, however, the findings have prompted several new questions to answer and topics to consider as we continue this line of research. Following are suggested research directions that may help address these areas.

As was mentioned earlier, research to this point has been based on consultant self-report, which may not reflect what actually happens during consultation. For instance, consultants may indicate they are likely to use informational power, but in reality they may use a different power base. Admittedly, collecting data from actual consultation sessions is more time-consuming and less cost effective; however, it is the best way to secure accurate and representative information about the consultation process. Using observational data also will assist in gathering objective assessments regarding consultant effectiveness, and ultimately will help further our understanding of the relationship between consultation process and outcome.

Similarly, gathering teacher feedback pertaining to consultant effectiveness should be a central focus in future studies. Considering it is consultees—not consultants—who ultimately determine whether plans made during consultation are actually implemented (O’Keefe & Medway, 1997), obtaining teacher feedback is particularly critical. For example, it is possible that consultants perceive themselves to be effective during consultation, whereas consultees may

have substantially different perspectives. Collecting teacher feedback will be an important step in developing a more comprehensive understanding of the link between consultation process and outcome.

Much emphasis has been placed on the importance of direct observation and teacher feedback in obtaining more representative data regarding social power and the process and effectiveness of consultation. However, considering that a major purpose behind consultation is to help teachers develop interventions to address the needs of students, gathering data pertaining to client outcomes is also critical in understanding how the use of social power bases contributes to the effectiveness of consultation. For instance, will consultants' use of soft power bases during consultation lead to positive changes in students' behavior and/or academic performance? Future research incorporating client outcomes will contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of the relationship between social power and the effectiveness of school consultation.

Due to the low number of consultants who used consultation sessions with male teachers as the basis for their ratings, this study only examined consultants' likelihood of use of soft power bases in relation to sessions with female teachers. As such, conducting future research with both male and female consultees will be necessary to determine whether consultants are likely to use certain soft power bases as a function of consultee gender.

Considering that consultants were less likely to use soft power bases when consulting with more experienced teachers, researchers should continue to explore the impact of consultee experience on consultants' perceptions and use of the social power bases. Future research may help to reveal the different influence strategies consultants may employ when working with experienced teachers.

In addition, it would be interesting to determine whether consultation outcomes differ when psychologists consult with more versus less experienced teachers. For instance, is consultation more successful with less experienced teachers? The identification of any differences would inform the process of school consultation and may help consultants tailor their influence strategies to result in effective consultation regardless of the amount of experience teachers have.

On a more general level, researchers should continue to pursue an examination of the link between consultation process and consultation outcome. The present study provided some preliminary findings regarding this link, but future research incorporating more sophisticated measurement techniques (e.g., the use of actual consultation sessions as opposed to self-report ratings) would result in a more comprehensive understanding of how process and outcome are related in school consultation.

Finally, as has been suggested by other researchers (e.g., Erchul et al., 2004), an exploration of ethnicity in relation to social power within school consultation would be helpful in expanding our knowledge in this area.

Conclusion

In sum, findings from the present investigation have enhanced our understanding of the application of social power to school consultation, demonstrating that consultants' likelihood of use of soft power bases is related to variables such as consultant gender and consultee experience. Results also indicated that there is a significant association between likelihood of use of soft power bases and consultant self-perceptions of effectiveness, thus providing an initial step in what will hopefully be a continuing examination of the link between social power bases and consultation outcomes. It is further hoped that information from the present study will encourage

the development of successful interpersonal influence strategies and, ultimately, yield more effective consultation within the schools.

References

- Aguinis, H., Simonsen, M. M., & Pierce, C. A. (1998). Effects of nonverbal behavior on perceptions of power bases. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 138*, 455-469.
- Aguinis, H., & Henle, C. A. (2001). Effects of nonverbal behavior on perceptions of a female employee's power bases. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 141*, 537-549.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: The Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics, 18*, 19-31.
- Bergan, J. R. (1977). *Behavioral consultation*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.
- Bergan, J. R., & Kratochwill, T. R. (1990). *Behavioral consultation and therapy*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Berger, J. & Fisek, M. H. (1974). A generalization of the theory of status characteristics and expectation states. In J. Berger, T. L. Conner & M. H. Fisek (Eds.), *Expectation states theory: A theoretical research program* (163-205). Cambridge, MA: Winthrop Publishers.
- Berkowitz, L., & Daniels, L. R. (1963). Responsibility and dependency. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 66*, 429-436.
- Bramlett, R. K., & Murphy, J. J. (1998). School psychology perspectives on consultation: Key contributions to the field. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 9*, 29-55.
- Brink-Muinen, A. V. D., Dulmen, S. V., Messerli-Rohrbach, V., & Bensing, J. (2002). Do

- gender-dyads have different communication patterns? A comparative study in Western-European general practices. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 48, 253-264.
- Caplan, G. (1970). *The theory and practice of mental health consultation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Caplan, G., & Caplan, R. B. (1993). A definition of mental health consultation. Chapter in *Mental health consultation and collaboration* (pp.11-23). San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.
- Carli, L. L. (1990). Gender, language, and influence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 941-951.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Conoley, J. C., & Gutkin, T. B. (1986). School psychology: A reconceptualization of service delivery realities. In S. N. Elliott & J. C. Witt (Eds.), *The delivery of psychological services in schools: Concepts, processes, and issues* (pp. 393-424). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Curtis, M. J., Grier, J. E. C., Abshier, D. W., Sutton, N. T., & Hunley, S. (2002, June). School psychology: Turning the corner into the twenty-first century. *NASP Communique*, 30, pp. 1, 5-7.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & van Engen, M. L. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-fair leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women

- and men. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129, 569-591.
- Elias, S. M., Riedel, R. G., & Mace, B. L. (1999). Effectiveness of social power usage by university faculty members. Unpublished manuscript, Auburn University.
- Erchul, W. P. (1987). A relational communication analysis of control in school consultation. *Professional School Psychology*, 2, 113-124.
- Erchul, W. P. (1999). Two steps forward, one step back: Collaboration in school-based consultation. *Journal of School Psychology*, 37, 191-203.
- Erchul, W. P., & Chewning, T. G. (1990). Behavioral consultation from a request-centered relational communication perspective. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 5, 1-20.
- Erchul, W. P., Covington, C. G., Hughes, J.N., & Meyers, J. (1995). Further explorations of request-centered relational communication within school consultation. *School Psychology Review*, 24, 621-632.
- Erchul, W. P., Hughes, J. N., Meyers, J., Hickman, J. A., & Braden, J. P. (1992). Dyadic agreement concerning the consultation process and its relationship to outcome. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 3, 119-132.
- Erchul, W. P., & Martens, B. K. (1997). *School consultation: Conceptual and empirical bases of practice*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Erchul, W. P., & Raven, B. H. (1997). Social power in school consultation: A contemporary view of French and Raven's bases of power model. *Journal of School Psychology*, 35, 137-171.
- Erchul, W. P., Raven, B. H., & Ray, A. G. (2001). School psychologists' perceptions of social power bases in teacher consultation. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 12, 1-23.

- Erchul, W. P., Raven, B. H., & Whichard, S. M. (2001). School psychologists and teacher perceptions of social power bases in school consultation. *Journal of School Psychology, 39*, 483-497.
- Erchul, W. P., Raven, B. H., & Wilson, K. E. (2004). The relationship between gender of consultant and social power perceptions within school consultation. *School Psychology Review, 33*, 582-590.
- French, J. R. P., & Raven, B. H. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power* (pp. 150-167). Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research.
- Gayle, B. M., & Preiss, R. W. (2002). An overview of dyadic processes in interpersonal communication. In M. Allen & R. W. Preiss (Eds.) *Interpersonal communication research: Advances through meta-analysis: LEA's communication series* (pp. 111-123). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gresham, F. M., & Kendell, G. K. (1987). School consultation research: Methodological critique and future research directions. *School Psychology Review, 16*, 306-316.
- Gutkin, T.B. (1993). Moving from behavioral to ecobehavioral consultation: What's in a name? *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 4*, 95-99.
- Gutkin, T. B. (1999a). The collaboration debate: Finding our way through the maze: Moving toward the future: A response to Erchul (1999). *Journal of School Psychology, 37*, 229-241.
- Gutkin, T. B. (1999b). Collaborative versus directive/prescriptive/expert school-based consultation: Reviewing and resolving a false dichotomy. *Journal of School Psychology, 37*, 161-190.

- Gutkin, T. B., & Conoley, J. C. (1990). Reconceptualizing school psychology from a service delivery perspective: Implications for practice, training, and research. *Journal of School Psychology, 28*, 203-223.
- Gutkin, T. B., & Curtis, M. J. (1999). School-based consultation theory and practice: The art and science of indirect service delivery. In C. R. Reynolds & T. B. Gutkin (Eds.) *The handbook of school psychology (3rd ed.)*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Gutkin, T. B., & Bossard,, M. D. (1984). The impact of consultant, consultee, and organizational variables on teacher attitudes toward consultation services. *Journal of School Psychology, 22*, 251-258.
- Haines, E. L. (2000). Elements of a social power schema: Gender standpoint, self-concept, and experience. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The City University of New York.
- Hinkin, T. R., & Schriesheim, C. A. (1989). Development and application of new scales to measure the French and Raven (1959) Bases of Social Power. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*, 561-567.
- Hogg, M. A. (1985). Masculine and feminine speech in dyads and groups: A study of speech style and gender salience. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 4*, 99-112.
- Hovland, C. I., Janis, I. L., & Kelley, H. H. (1963). *Communication and persuasion: Psychological studies of opinion change*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Hughes, J. N. (1992). Social psychology foundations of consultation. In F. J. Medway & T. P. Cafferty (Eds.), *School psychology: A social psychological perspective*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Iyengar, S. S. & Brockner, J. (2001). Cultural differences in self and the impact of personal

- and social influences. In W. Wosinska, R. B. Cialdini, D. W. Barrett & J. Reykowski (Eds.), *The practice of social influence in multiple cultures* (pp. 13-32). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Johnson, P. (1976). Women and power: Toward a theory of effectiveness. *Journal of Social Issues*, 32, 99-110.
- Koslowsky, M., Schwarzwald, J., & Ashuri, S. (2001). On the relationship between subordinates' compliance to power sources and organizational attitudes. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 50, 455-476.
- Kratochwill, T. R., Elliott, S. N., & Busse, R. T. (1995). Behavior consultation: A five-year evaluation of consultant and client outcomes. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 10, 87-117.
- Kratochwill, T. R., Sheridan, S. M., Carrington-Rotto, P., & Salmon, D. (1991). Preparation of school psychologists to serve as consultants for teachers of emotionally disturbed children. *School Psychology Review*, 20, 530-550.
- Martin, R. (1978). Expert and referent power: A framework for understanding and maximizing consultation effectiveness. *Journal of School Psychology*, 16, 49-55.
- Martin, R. P., & Curtis, M. (1980). Effects of age and experience of consultant and consultee on consultation outcome. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 8, 733-736.
- McCarthy, W. C. (1998). An examination of the relationship between therapist use of social power, therapist burnout, and clients' perceptions of outcomes. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Pittsburgh.
- Medway, F. J., & Updyke, J. F. (1985). Meta-analysis of consultation outcome studies. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13, 489-505.

- Merluzzi, T. V., Banikiotes, P. G. & Missbach, J. W. (1978). Perceptions of counselor characteristics: Contributions of counselor sex, experience, and disclosure level. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 25, 479-482.
- Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Power in and around organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Morris, M. W., Podolny, J. M., & Ariel, S. (2001). Culture, norms, and obligations: Cross-national differences in patterns of interpersonal norms and felt obligations toward coworkers. In W. Wosinska, R. B. Cialdini, D. W. Barrett & J. Reyskowski (Eds.), *The practice of social influence in multiple cultures* (pp. 97-123). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Mulac, A. (1989). Men's and women's talk in same-gender and mixed-gender dyads: Power or polemic? *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 8, 249-270.
- National Education Association (2003). *Status of the American Public School Teacher 2000-2001: Highlights*.
- Offermann, L. R., & Schrier, P. E. (1985). Social influence strategies: The impact of sex, role, and attitudes toward power. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 11, 286-300.
- Payne, K., Fuqua, H. E., & Cangemi, J. (2001). Gender and power. In K. E. Payne (Ed.), *Different but equal: Communication between the sexes* (pp. 115-129). Westpoint, CT: Praeger.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & Schriesheim, C. A. (1985). Field studies of French and Raven's bases of power: Critique, reanalysis, and suggestions for future research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 97, 387-411.

- Protulipac, S. W. (2004). A descriptive analysis of the relationship between years of experience and the frequency and style of consultation employed by school counselors with teachers, administrators, parents, and counselors in community agencies. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Duquesne University.
- Rabin, C. L. (2005). Gender and culture in the helping process: A professional journey. In C. L. Rabin (Ed.), *Understanding gender and culture in the helping process: Practitioners' narratives from global perspectives* (pp. 9-30). Australia: Wadsworth.
- Raven, B. H. (1965). Social influence and power. In I. D. Steiner & M. Fishbein (Eds.), *Current studies in social psychology* (pp. 371-382). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Raven, B. H. (1992). A power/interaction model of interpersonal influence: French and Raven thirty years later. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 7, 217-244.
- Raven, B. H. (1993). The bases of power: Origins and recent developments. *Journal of Social Issues*, 49, 227-251.
- Raven, B. H., & Kruglanski, A. W. (1970). Conflict and power. In P. G. Swingle (Ed.), *The structure of conflict* (pp. 69-109). New York: Academic Press.
- Raven, B. H., Schwarzwald, J., & Koslowsky, M. (1998). Conceptualizing and measuring a power/interaction model of interpersonal influence. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28, 307-332.
- Reschly, D. J., & Wilson, M. S. (1995). School psychology practitioners and faculty: 1986 to 1991-1992: Trends in demographics, roles, satisfaction, and system reform. *School Psychology Review*, 24, 62-80.
- Reschly, D. J., & Ysseldyke, J. E. (2002). Paradigm shift: The past is not the future. In A.

- Thomas and J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology IV* (pp. 3-20).
Bethesda, MD: The National Association of School Psychologists.
- Rice, R. W., Instone, D. & Adams, J. (1984). Leader sex, leader success, and leadership process: Two field studies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 12-31.
- Schulte, A. C., & Osborne, S. S. (2003). When assumptive worlds collide: A review of definitions of collaboration in consultation. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 14, 109-138.
- Schriesheim, C. A., Hinkin, T. R., & Podsakoff, P. M. (1991). Can ipsative and single-item measures produce erroneous results in field studies of French and Raven's (1965) five bases of power? An empirical investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 106-114.
- Schwarzwald, J., Koslowsky, M., & Agassi, V. (2001). Captain's leadership type and police officers' compliance to power bases. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 10, 273-290.
- Schwarzwald, J., Koslowsky, M., & Ochana-Levin, T. (2004). Usage of and compliance with power tactics in routine versus nonroutine work settings. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 18, 385-402.
- Seligman, M. E. P. (1995). The effectiveness of psychotherapy: The *Consumer Reports* study. *American Psychologist*, 50, 965-974.
- Sheridan, S. M., Erchul, W. P., Brown, M. S., Dowd, S. E., Warnes, E. D., Marti, D. C., Schemm, A. V., & Eagle, J. W. (2004). Perceptions of helpfulness in conjoint behavioral consultation: Congruence and agreement between teachers and parents. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 19, 121-140.

- Short, R. J., Moore, S. C., & Williams, C. (1991). Social influence in consultation: Effect of degree and experience on consultees' perceptions. *Psychological Reports*, 68, 131-137.
- Silva, A. (2003). *What is a school psychologist?* Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Stenger, M. K., Tollefson, N. & Fine, M. J. (1992). Variables that distinguish elementary teachers who participate in school-based consultation from those who do not. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 7, 271-284.
- Tannen, D. (1994). *Talking 9 to 5: How women's and men's conversational styles affect who gets heard, who gets credit, and what gets done at work*. New York: William Morrow.
- Thimm, C., Koch, S. C. & Schey, S. (2003). Communicating gendered professional identity: Competence, cooperation, and conflict in the workplace. In J. Holmes & M. Meyerhoff (Eds.) *The handbook of language and gender* (pp.528-549). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Timmerman, L. M. (2002). Comparing the production of power in language on the basis of sex. In M. Allen & R. W. Preiss (Eds.), *Interpersonal communication research: Advances through meta-analysis*. LEA's communication series (pp. 111-123). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Weissenburger, J. W., Fine, M. J., & Poggio, J. P. (1982). The relationship of selected consultant/teacher characteristics to consultation outcomes. *Journal of School Psychology*, 20, 263-270.
- Wickstrom, K. F., & Witt, J. C. (1993). Resistance within school-based consultation. In J.

- E. Zins, T. R. Kratochwill, & S. N. Elliott, *Handbook of consultation services for children* (pp. 159-178). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wilson, K. E. (2002). Age and gender effects on school psychologist and teacher perceptions of social power in school consultation. Unpublished thesis equivalency project. North Carolina State University.
- Wilson, K. E. (2005). The likelihood of use and acceptability of social power bases in school consultation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. North Carolina State University.
- Yukl, G., & Falbe, C. M. (1991). Importance of different power sources in downward and lateral relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 416-423.
- Zins, J. E., & Erchul, W. P. (2002). Best practices in school consultation. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology IV* (pp. 625-643). Bethesda, MD: The National Association of School Psychologists.

Appendix A

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

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

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 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.

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

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.

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

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

- | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 23. I can help her get a promotion. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 24. I have done some nice things she requested in the past. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 25. It makes her feel personally accepted if she does as I ask. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 26. As a teacher, she has an obligation to do as I say. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 27. She looks up to me and generally models her behavior accordingly. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 28. She feels that I have more knowledge about this than she does. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 29. I can make it more difficult for her to get a pay increase. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 30. I need assistance and cooperation from her. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 31. She now understands why the recommended change is for the better. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 32. Because I let her have her way earlier, she now feels obliged to comply. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 33. She would be upset knowing that she was on my bad side. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

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.

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

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.

Identification number: _____

6/8/04

Appendix B

Table A

Full Multiple Regression Analysis with Consultant Years of Relevant Professional Experience, Consultant Gender, and the Interaction between Consultant Experience and Consultant Gender and Their Relationship to Consultant Likelihood of Use of Soft Power Bases

Independent variable	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>R</i> ²	<i>b</i> ¹	<i>StdB</i> ²	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Full Model (all variables)	3, 324	2.31	.0760	.0210					
Individual Variables									
Consultant Experience					.0208	.2053	1	1.80	.0728
Consultant Gender					.4682	.2386	1	1.55	.1224
Interaction					-0.0131	-0.167	1	-0.99	.3248

¹Regression coefficient

²Standardized regression coefficient

Table B

Full Multiple Regression Analysis with Consultee Years of Relevant Professional Experience and the Interaction between Consultee Experience and Consultant Gender and Their Relationship to Consultant Likelihood of Use of Soft Power Bases

Independent variable	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>R</i> ²	<i>b</i>	<i>StdB</i> ²	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Full Model (all variables)	2, 317	6.03	.0027*	.0367					
Individual Variables									
Consultee Experience					-0.0254	-.2377	1	-3.24	.0013*
Interaction between Consultee Experience and Consultant Gender					.0081	.0877	1	1.19	.2333

* $p < .01$

¹Regression coefficient

²Standardized regression coefficient

Appendix C

Table C

Full Multiple Regression Analysis with Consultant Years of Relevant Professional Experience, Consultant Gender, and the Interaction between Consultant Experience and Consultant Gender and Their Relationship to Consultant Likelihood of Use of Soft Power Bases

Independent variable	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>R</i> ²	<i>b</i> ¹	<i>StdB</i> ²	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Full Model (all variables)	3, 324	2.85	.0376*	.0257					
Individual Variables									
Consultant Experience					.0236	.2301	1	2.02	.0439*
Consultant Gender					.4985	.2516	1	1.64	.1026
Interaction					-0.0141	-0.1814	1	-1.05	.2922

* $p < .05$

¹Regression coefficient

²Standardized regression coefficient

Table D

Full Multiple Regression Analysis with Consultee Years of Relevant Professional Experience and the Interaction between Consultee Experience and Consultant Gender and their Relationship to Consultant Likelihood of Use of Soft Power Bases

Independent variable	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>R</i> ²	<i>b</i> ¹	<i>StdB</i> ²	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Full Model (all variables)	2, 317	5.96	.0029	.0362					
Individual Variables									
Consultee Experience					-0.0264	-.2431	1	-3.31	.0010*
Interaction between Consultee Experience and Consultant Gender					.0100	.1067	1	1.45	.1473

* $p = .001$

¹Regression coefficient

²Standardized regression coefficient