

Teacher Perceptions of School Consultant Social Influence Strategies:

Replication and Expansion

Julie Sarno Owens<sup>1</sup>, Madeleine E. Schwartz<sup>1</sup> William P. Erchul<sup>2</sup>, Lina Himawan<sup>1</sup>, Steven W.

Evans<sup>1</sup>, Erika K. Coles<sup>3</sup>, Ann C. Schulte<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Ohio University

<sup>2</sup>University of California, Riverside

<sup>3</sup>Florida International University

<sup>4</sup>Arizona State University

<sup>1</sup>Ohio University, Porter Hall 200, Athens, OH, 45701 USA; [owensj@ohio.edu](mailto:owensj@ohio.edu); [ms711613@ohio.edu](mailto:ms711613@ohio.edu); [himawan@ohio.edu](mailto:himawan@ohio.edu); [evanss3@ohio.edu](mailto:evanss3@ohio.edu);

<sup>2</sup>University of California, Riverside, [erchul@asu.edu](mailto:erchul@asu.edu)

<sup>3</sup>Florida International University, 11200 SW 8th St., Miami, FL 33199, USA  
[ecoles@fiu.edu](mailto:ecoles@fiu.edu)

<sup>4</sup>Arizona State University, [Ann.Schulte@asu.edu](mailto:Ann.Schulte@asu.edu)

Corresponding Author: Julie S. Owens, Ph.D., Department of Psychology, Ohio University  
Porter Hall 200, Athens, OH 45701, PH: 740-593-1074, Fax: 740-593-0579

Published on-line, Feb, 3, 2017 in *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*,  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10474412.2016.1275649>

### Acknowledgements

The research reported here was supported by the Institute of Education Sciences, U.S.

Department of Education, through Grant # R324A120272. The opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not represent views of the Institute or the U.S. Department of Education.

### Abstract

The goals were to (a) replicate the findings of Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001) with regard to the Consultee/Teacher Version of the Interpersonal Power Inventory (IPI; Raven, Schwarzwald, & Koslowsky, 1998), and (b) advance the literature by examining IPI scores about a current consultation relationship. Sample 1 included 99 elementary school teachers (44.4% Hispanic) who completed the IPI. Results replicated Erchul et al. Sample 2 ( $N=37$ ; 45.9% Hispanic) represented a subset of Sample 1 who participated in a consultation project and completed the IPI about influence in their current consultation relationship. The results advance the literature by offering evidence for convergent and predictive validity of the IPI soft power bases. Importantly, teachers who reported being influenced by soft power strategies experienced greater change in their behaviors and their students' behaviors than those who reported being not influenced by such strategies. Implications for research and practice in school consultation are discussed.

Keywords: Social Influence; Interpersonal Power Inventory; School Consultation; Teachers; Integrity

Teacher Perceptions of School Consultant Social Power Influence Strategies:  
Replication and Expansion

School consultation can improve the integrity (adherence and competence) with which teachers implement classroom management practices (Becker, Bradshaw, Domitrovich, & Ialongo, 2013; Bradshaw, Pas, Goldweber, Rosenberg, & Leaf, 2012; Coddling, Feinberg, Dunn, & Pace, 2005; Noell & Gansle, 2014; reference masked for review), with some evidence that improved integrity is related to improved student outcomes (Coles, Owens, Serrano, Slavec, & Evans, 2015; Sanetti, Collier-Meek, Long, Kim, & Kratochwill, 2014). Consultation is an indirect method of service delivery in which a triadic relationship is formed between the consultant and the consultee (e.g., a teacher) who provides direct intervention to the student (Erchul & Martens, 2010). In the school psychology literature, this process has been identified as paradoxical (Gutkin & Conoley, 1990) because, although the ultimate goal is to improve student behavior, the primary mechanism for improving student behavior is change in adult behavior (e.g., applying a new strategy, improving the integrity with which the strategy is applied). Thus, the success of school consultation may depend largely on the consultant's ability to influence the behavior of adults (i.e., teachers) (Conoley & Gutkin, 1986).

School psychologists have the potential to influence teacher behavior; however, many do not exercise this influence and/or are not aware of the most influential strategies for achieving behavior change in teachers (i.e., Second Paradox of School Psychology; Erchul, Grissom, & Getty, 2008). Although there is strong evidence from the organizational psychology literature that various influence strategies are associated with specific outcomes (e.g., Pierro, Cicero, & Raven, 2008; Schwarzwald, Koslowsky, & Bernstein, 2013), the study of this relationship in the context of school consultation is more limited. Indeed, there are very few studies that highlight

how teachers view such influence (Cienki, 1982; Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001); yet, both consultant and teacher perceptions of influence could serve as barriers to effective consultation, which, in turn, may affect intervention integrity (i.e., adherence to recommended procedures and quality implementation of those procedure) and student outcomes. Given this context, it is important to better understand the nature of interpersonal influence in school consultation. In this study, we examine teachers' perceptions of social influence, describe the psychometric properties of a measure assessing teacher perceptions of influence in school consultation, and conduct a preliminary examination of the convergent and predictive validity of the measure.

### **Social Influence: Bases of Power Model**

Social influence refers to demonstrated change in the beliefs, attitudes, and/or behaviors by a target of influence, which results from the action or presence of an influencing agent (French & Raven, 1959). Social power is the *potential* for such influence to occur and is the basis for one of the most well-known frameworks for examining social influence, namely that of Raven and colleagues (French & Raven, 1959; Raven, 1965, 1992, 1993).

French and Raven's (1959) original framework presents five bases of power that the influencing agent can use to change the beliefs, attitudes, and/or behaviors of a target of influence. The original five power bases, as well as a sixth base (i.e., informational power) added by Raven (1965), are listed below, along with an example relevant to the teacher-school consultant relationship (for efficiency, the pronoun *she* is used for both consultant and teacher):

1. *Coercive power* is based on the teacher's perception that the consultant can punish her for noncompliance. The strength of coercive power depends on how aversive the punishment is to the teacher, as well as the teacher's perception that she can avoid the punishment by following the recommendation made by the consultant.

2. *Reward power* is based on the teacher's view that the consultant is ready and able to reward her if she follows the recommendation/s made.
3. *Legitimate power* is based on the teacher's perception that she is obligated to accept the consultant's influence attempt because the consultant has a legitimate right to influence her because of the consultant's professional role, status, or position.
4. *Expert power* is based on the teacher's perception that the consultant has knowledge or expertise relevant to her situation.
5. *Referent power* is the consultant's potential to influence the teacher based on the teacher's identification with the consultant and/or the desire for such identification.
6. *Informational power* is the consultant's potential to influence the teacher because of the judged relevance of the information contained in the consultant's message (e.g., logical explanations for child behavior or new information that might produce change).

The framework was later updated (Raven, 1992, 1993) to include 14 power bases, each of which is derived from the original six. Namely, reward and coercive power are differentiated into personal and impersonal forms, and expert and referent power have positive and negative forms. Informational power is divided into direct and indirect forms, and legitimate power has four forms: formal legitimate, legitimate reciprocity, legitimate equity, and legitimate dependence. This terminology refers to the power bases; however, when one is *enacting* a power base, it is referred to as a power *strategy* (B. H. Raven, personal communication, February 18, 2004). These bases of power have been categorized into two groups (soft and harsh): soft bases are more subtle, indirect, and non-coercive in nature, whereas harsh bases are more coercive, overt, restricting of autonomy, and/or use hierarchical forms of power.

The utility of this model has been demonstrated convincingly within the field of

organizational psychology. For example, a comprehensive review of studies based on the original French and Raven model (Podsakoff & Schriesheim, 1985) concluded that superiors' use of expert and referent power correlate positively with subordinates' satisfaction with supervision and related outcomes, whereas reward, coercive, and legitimate power generally correlate negatively with these outcomes. Although we acknowledge there are other viable frameworks to study social influence (e.g., Cialdini, 2008; Yukl, Chavez, & Seifert, 2005), the French and Raven model is (a) the best known framework for examining social power (Mintzberg, 1983), (b) has been applied to explain processes and outcomes of school consultation for many years (cf. Martin, 1978), and (c) has considerable empirical evidence backing its use (Erchul, Grissom, Getty, & Bennett, 2014). Thus, it is a logical choice to use it here. More recently, Raven's (1992, 1993) revised model has been applied to school consultation (e.g., Getty & Erchul, 2009), but until the current study, its application to actual, ongoing consultation cases has been limited.

### **Social Influence in School Consultation**

School consultation offers a rich context in which to study social influence for several reasons (Erchul, Grissom, Getty, & Bennett, 2014). First, although school consultants are typically not in a supervisory or hierarchical role over teachers, a consultant is someone who draws upon an area of unique expertise to offer recommendations for addressing an identified problem. Thus, school consultants are in a position of influence when called upon to assist with a situation (Lambert, 1973). Second, in the wake of school districts implementation of multi-tiered systems of supports and response-to-intervention programming, there is increased attention to mandates to implement evidence-based interventions. This context further legitimizes the importance of the recommendations offered by consultants and gives consultants an additional

means of influencing teachers' adoption and implementation of classroom interventions (Erchul, 2013). By understanding how social influence can be used in a manner that is acceptable to both the consultant and consultee, and in a manner that produces positive outcomes (e.g., high quality intervention implementation and improved student behavior), training on social influence strategies could be incorporated into graduate programs and/or professional development trainings of school consultants as means of enhancing the quality of consultation and achieving desired student outcomes.

A few studies provide preliminary evidence that successful application of influence may be linked to positive consultation outcomes (e.g., Bergan & Tombari, 1975; Erchul et al., 2009; Erchul et al., 2008). For example, early behavioral consultation research demonstrates that various types of verbal communication (i.e., how a consultant provides or elicits information) demonstrated by a consultant during a problem identification interview with a teacher are associated with important outcomes such as successful problem identification and problem resolution, as assessed by an objective observer (Bergan & Tombari, 1975). Similarly, using a relational communication coding system, Erchul and colleagues (2009) found that a consultant's successful influence over the teacher (i.e., defined as consultant attempts at influence that are accepted by the teacher) during a problem analysis interview was positively related ( $r = .59$ ) to subsequent consultant observations of teacher's intervention implementation integrity. These findings suggest that it may also be important to assess the teacher's perceptions of the consultant's influence and examine the relationship between such perceptions and subsequent change in teacher behavior. Given the importance of social influence in a school consultation, as well as these findings linking social influence to positive consultation outcomes, additional study is warranted to guide recommendations for consultation training and practice. Raven's model

and related assessment tools provide a viable means for doing so.

### **Measurement of Social Influence in School Consultation**

To measure Raven's (1992, 1993) expanded set of power bases, Raven, Schwarzwald, and Koslowsky (1998) created the Interpersonal Power Inventory (IPI). Building on previous scales and definitions of the power bases offered in Raven's (1992, 1993) model, Raven and colleagues (1998) developed items for 11 of the 14 bases. Because negative expert power, negative referent power, and indirect informational power are more difficult to operationally define, these three bases were excluded from the IPI. Four subscale items were eventually constructed for each of the 11 power bases measured by the IPI (Raven et al., 1998), creating a 44-item measure. See Table 1 for the 11 power bases as they relate to school consultation.

Raven et al. (1998) conducted two studies to examine the IPI's psychometric properties and underlying factor structure. First, they administered the IPI to 317 college students in the United States. Their assessment of inter-item correlations for the original 44-items resulted in the discarding of one item per scale (that with the lowest correlations); resulting coefficient alphas for the 11 bases (with 3 items each) ranged from .67 to .86, indicating moderate to good internal consistency. The 33 items were subjected to a principal components analysis (PCA) which resulted in 7 factors having eigenvalues greater than 1. Of these 7 factors, 5 combined 2 subscales while 2 others were as hypothesized. Importantly, PCA findings revealed all items hypothesized as belonging to a given subscale remained on the same subscale/factor rather than "drifting" to a different subscale/factor. The authors then subjected the 11 subscale mean scores to a second PCA that resulted in a two-factor solution. Factor I explained 34.6% of the variance and included *soft* bases. Factor II explained 24.7% of the variance and included *harsh* bases (see Table 1 for Raven et al.'s designated soft and harsh bases).



In Raven et al.'s second study (1998), 101 workers in an Israeli hospital each completed a Hebrew language version of the 33-item IPI. Similar to the first study, coefficient alphas for each scale ranged from .63 to .88. They conducted a PCA on the subscale scores (but not individual items) and generally replicated the two-factor solution (i.e., soft and harsh). With the exception of personal reward (which loaded as a harsh base rather than a soft base), the pattern of findings was consistent with that found in the first sample and offered support for construct validity within another culture.

To date, five studies in the school consultation literature (see Table 14.3 in Erchul et al., 2014) have used a modified version of Raven et al.'s (1998) IPI to assess teachers' and consultants' perceptions of social influence in consultation. Consultants' perceptions of social influence (IPI-Consultant Version) were assessed in all five studies and teacher perceptions of influence (IPI-Consultee/Teacher Version) were assessed in one study (Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001). Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001) obtained data on the original 44-item Consultee/Teacher Version from 118 teachers across 35 states through a mailed survey. Inter-item correlations suggested that all 44 items were related in the expected manner; thus, all items were retained in the analyses. Internal consistency estimates for the Teacher Version were moderately high, with coefficient alphas derived from PCA ranging from .82 - .92. Teachers rated direct informational, positive expert, legitimate dependence, and positive referent power — all soft bases — as the top four bases that would be the most effective strategies of influence for consultants to use in teacher consultation. Interestingly, both teacher and consultant rankings of power basis influence revealed that direct informational and positive expert were rated the highest, and the overall rank ordering of power bases provided by the two groups was significantly correlated ( $r_s = .73, p < .05$ ). These findings suggest that teachers and

psychologists within the United States may share similar views regarding the effectiveness of specific social power bases in influencing teachers in consultation. Lastly, both teachers and consultants rated soft bases as significantly more effective than harsh bases, a result consistent with prior research (Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001).

Given that there is the only one study of the psychometric properties of the IPI-Consultee/Teacher Version, replication of the subscales' internal consistency with expansion of the assessment of other psychometric properties (e.g., convergent and predictive validity) is warranted. For example, to date the IPI-Consultee/Teacher Version has only been used to assess teachers' perceptions of influence in a past or hypothetical consulting relationship. Namely, teachers have been instructed to *think about a time when a school psychologist was consulting with you about a particular classroom situation*. Although it is likely that a teacher's preferences or responsiveness to a specific type of influence in a past or hypothetical relationship is related to his/her preferences in a current relationship, it is important to examine this empirically. Further, to date no study has examined the extent to which teachers' perceptions of influence in a current consultation relationship are related to his/her receptivity to consultation, as defined as change in teachers' consultation-related behaviors (e.g., adherence to recommended procedures).

### **Current Study**

The first aim of the current study was to replicate the findings of the teacher sample in Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001) with regard to an examination of descriptive statistics, internal consistency, and rankings of power bases/strategies using the IPI-Consultee/Teacher Version. We hypothesized that the subscales, particularly those representing soft bases, would have adequate reliability and that the subscales representing soft bases would have higher mean scores than the subscales representing harsh bases. The second aim was to examine the relation

between scores on the original IPI-Consultee/Teacher Version (that assess teachers' perceptions of influence in a past or hypothetical consulting relationship) and scores on a modified version of the measure that assesses perceptions of influence in a current consultation relationship (i.e., convergent validity). We hypothesized that teachers' preferences for specific types of influence (e.g., soft bases) in a past or hypothetical relationship would be significantly related to preferences for influence in a current, actual relationship. The third aim of the study was to examine the relationship between scores assessing influence in a current relationship and change in consultation-related teacher behaviors (i.e., implementation of classroom management strategies recommended by the consultant), among a sample of teachers with low baseline classroom management competencies (i.e., a group with maximum opportunity for growth). We hypothesized that teachers who reported being highly influenced by soft bases would show greater growth in classroom management skills recommended in consultation than teachers who reported not being influenced by soft bases, as soft bases (particularly direct informational, positive expert, and legitimate dependent) are well represented in the consultation package used in this study. The data were collected in the context of a grant-funded project (Owens & Coles, 2012) assessing the feasibility and effectiveness of a multi-component behavioral consultation package designed to address barriers to the integrity with which teachers implement classroom management strategies.

## **Method**

### **Participants**

Participants for Aim 1 (Sample 1) were 99 general education teachers from five elementary schools in a small city in Ohio ( $n = 52$ ) and four elementary schools in an urban city in Florida ( $n = 47$ ) who attended an in-service training prior to the start of the 2014-2015 school

year. Participants for Aims 2 and 3 (Sample 2) were a subset ( $n = 37$ ; 18 from Ohio; 19 from Florida) of the total sample who participated in the year-long consultation project, had participated in at least 4 bi-weekly consultation sessions, and had complete IPI data from the mid-year assessment time point<sup>1</sup> (i.e. see Table 2 for teacher characteristics). The demographic characteristics of teachers in this study is representative of teaching staff in the schools from which they were recruited. Consultants were post-doctoral fellows ( $n = 2$ ), master's level clinicians ( $n = 2$ ), or graduate students in a master's or doctoral program in psychology ( $n = 5$ ) who were employed by the investigators; eight identified as Caucasian and one identified as Hispanic.

## Procedures

*Aim 1.* All procedures were approved by the University Institutional Review Boards at both universities and the participating school districts in Ohio and Florida. Given that this study was designed to examine the extent to which the psychometric properties reported in Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001) could be replicated, below we outline how our methods are similar to or differ from the previous study. In contrast to prior studies on the IPI in which data were obtained via mailed surveys, the current data were collected in a group format in a public school using the research electronic data capture (REDCap) system (Harris et al., 2009) following a teacher in-service conducted by the investigators. The investigators initially contacted school administrators to describe the opportunity for their buildings to participate in the year-long grant-funded project examining the utility of a multi-component consultation packet on the integrity with which teachers implement classroom management strategies and a daily report card intervention for a child with or at risk for ADHD (Coles, Owens, Serano, Slavac, & Evans,

---

<sup>1</sup> There were 58 total teachers who participate in the year-long consultation process. The 37 included the current sample did not differ significantly from the remaining 21 on years of teaching experience or IPI soft subscale scores.

2015). Although only 6 teacher-student dyads per building were needed for the consultation project, the entire staff at each participating building was invited to a 3-hour in-service training in August 2014 that focused on attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), best practices in general classroom management strategies (i.e., labeled praise, use of rules and routines, and effective response to classroom rule violations) and the implementation of daily report card (DRC) intervention.<sup>2</sup> Teachers were asked to complete a battery of rating scales following the in-services. Teachers received a \$60 stipend for attending the in-service and a \$25 stipend for completing the battery of rating scales. The overall response rate across all building for attendance at the in-service and completion of the measures was 51% of all teachers in the building.

***Aims 2 and 3.*** To participate in the year-long consultation process, teachers had to refer a student with inattentive and/or disruptive behavior and academic impairment to the program, and the student had to meet eligibility requirements.<sup>3</sup> Once a target child was identified and the teacher consented to the consultation process, a minimum of two classroom observations were conducted to obtain a baseline assessment of each teacher's skills and competency in classroom management (see description of observation system below).

Consultation focused on general classroom management strategies (i.e., labeled praise, effective instructions, and appropriate response to rule violations) with all students and the use of a DRC intervention with the target student. Teachers participated in (a) an initial interview

---

<sup>2</sup> The DRC is a well-established school intervention for children with or at risk for ADHD (Evans, Owens, & Bunford, 2015; Vannest, Davis, Davis, Mason, & Burke, 2010). The DRC can be tailored to each student via individualized target behaviors, use at various times of day, frequency of feedback, types of rewards, use of pictorial cues, and degree of student involvement in tracking behaviors.

<sup>3</sup> Investigators conducted an assessment to determine that the student had IQ estimate score of 80 or above within the 95% confidence interval; was in the general education classroom at least 50% of the day; was demonstrating classroom impairment and symptoms of inattention and/or hyperactivity/impulsivity; and had no prior diagnosis of an Autism Spectrum Disorder, Bipolar Disorder, or Cognitive or Developmental Disability per parent report.

during which the facilitator learned about the teacher's approach to classroom management, (b) a target behavior interview to assess the target child's strengths and weaknesses and identify individualized DRC target behaviors, (c) baseline tracking of target behaviors for five school days, and (d) a DRC development meeting to review baseline data and finalize target behaviors and goal criteria.

Following the DRC development meeting, the DRC was launched, teachers were observed weekly (observations lasted 15 to 45 minutes) and received biweekly (every other week) performance feedback. Performance feedback procedures included (a) review of the teacher's use of general classroom management strategies as observed over the last two observations, (b) review of graphs depicting the target child's progress on DRC target behaviors, (c) praise for correct implementation of general classroom management strategies and DRC procedures, and (d) corrective feedback about implementation as dictated by the data ("areas for growth"). Although there were some exceptions, most sessions ranged from approximately 30 minutes to 1 hour ( $M = 30.04$ ;  $SD = 20.12$ ), and were scheduled during school (i.e., during a break period or using a floating substitute teacher paid by the program to cover the classroom), or before or after school (per the teacher's preference).

Mid-way through the consultation process (i.e., after 4 bi-weekly sessions), teachers were asked to complete a battery of questionnaires (that included the IPI-modified to assess influence in the active consultation relationship), using the REDCap system. Teachers were emailed a link to the on-line surveys, were asked to complete them on their own time within a 2-week window, and were compensated with \$30 for completing the battery of measures.

## Measures

**Interpersonal Power Inventory (IPI)-Consultee/Teacher Version.** In August, teachers

in Sample 1 completed the original 44-item IPI-Consultee/Teacher Version developed by Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001), which assesses 11 power bases (as conceptualized by Raven et al., 1998). This measure includes four items per power basis, each of which is scored on a 7-point scale. As described previously, the IPI-Consultee/Teacher Version has demonstrated acceptable internal reliability in one study. With permission from Erchul, the items were reverse scored so that higher scores indicate a greater likelihood that the teacher would be responsive to that influence, and we replaced “comply” with “follow recommendations” for all anchors (1 = *much less likely to follow recommendations*; 2 = *less likely*; 3 = *a bit less likely*; 4 = *would not affect your tendency to follow recommendations*; 5 = *a bit more likely*; 6 = *more likely*; 7 = *much more likely to follow recommendations*).

The 11 subscale scores are derived by averaging the responses for the four items on each subscale. Consistent with previous studies, subscale means are used to reflect the rank order of the participants’ likelihood of responsiveness to that influence. To retain the highest number of cases with acceptable data, we applied the following majority rule: Subscale mean scores were computed if the teacher completed 3 of the 4 items for that subscale, and cases were retained if at least 6 of 11 subscales were computed. Applying these criteria, 97% of cases had at least 8 of 11 subscales. The subscales that primarily accounted for the missing data were impersonal coercion, impersonal reward, and legitimate equity.

After completing their 4th consultation session, teachers in Sample 2 completed a modified version of the IPI. The items and response format were identical to that described above. However, on this version, the instructions directed teachers to think about *the consultant who is working with you on the Classroom Behavior Support project* as they answered each item.

**Student Behavior-Teacher Response Observation Rating System (SBTR).** The SBTR

(Pelham, Greiner, & Gnagy, 2008) is a systematic class-wide observation system that captures student rule violations and teacher classroom management behaviors in preschool and elementary classrooms (e.g., Fabiano et al., 2010; Fabiano et al., 2013; Vujnovic et al., 2014). In previous studies (Fabiano et al., 2013; Fabiano & Vujnovic, 2013) inter-rater reliability has been indexed by the correlations between observers; they were significant and of large magnitude ( $r$  for total challenging behaviors  $\geq .88$ ; effective instructions  $\geq .80$ ; praise  $\geq .88$ ), although appropriate response to rule violations was lower ( $r = .57$ ). As evidence of convergent validity, the frequency of student rule violations and teachers' appropriate responses to these behaviors was correlated in the expected direction with other measures of classroom climate ( $r$ s range from .20 to .45; Massetti et al., 2007; Vujnovic et al., 2014). Lastly, scores on the SBTR have demonstrated sensitivity to change as a function of intervention (Fabiano et al., 2010). Using a modified version of this system (i.e., modified to capture behaviors of and toward a target student), observers obtained (a) frequency counts of specific rule violations by the target student, (b) frequency counts of total rule violations by all other students in the classroom collectively, (c) frequency counts of how the teacher responded to each of those types of rule violations (d) frequency counts of the teacher's use of social reinforcement (labeled and unlabeled praise); and (e) frequency counts of the teacher's use of instructions (effective and ineffective). The observation manual includes definitions, and inclusion and exclusion examples for coding violations of seven rules (i.e., be respectful, obey adults, work quietly, use materials appropriately, remain in seat, raise hand to speak, stay on task), the teacher's response to each rule violation (i.e., coded as appropriate<sup>4</sup>, inappropriate, or no response), teacher labeled and

---

<sup>4</sup>An appropriate response is defined as any verbal or nonverbal action that follows a rule violation to provide a response to the behavior. Appropriate responses contain appropriate content, are delivered with appropriate affect with a neutral tone of voice of normal pitch and intensity, and without including any behavior included in Inappropriate Response (i.e., verbal or nonverbal behavior that is antagonistic,



unlabeled praise, and effective and ineffective instructions. Following each observation, observers also rated the teacher's global competency classroom management on a 10-point scale (ranging from *(1) inconsistent with* to *(10) entirely consistent with best practices in classroom management*). Global competency ratings were averaged across each teacher's baseline observations. Teachers with an average baseline score below a score of 6 were categorized into the low baseline group; teachers with an average baseline score of 6 or higher were categorized into the high baseline group.

In the grant-funded project, consultants and research assistants were trained to reliability on the SBTR. Inter-observer assessments were conducted for 24% of all observations in the grant project. To assess interrater reliability, we computed Intraclass Correlations (ICC) of type 1 for average of k raters (that is ICC(1,k) as outlined in Shrout and Fleiss (1979) or ICC(k) for Case 1 as outlined in McGraw and Wong, (1996); for simplicity we use the notation of ICC(1,k) henceforth) because we did not have a set of consistent raters across all ratees and we would like to observe the reliability across a set of raters rather than one rater only. Across all frequency count variables, the ICC(1,k) ranged from 0.79 to 0.98 with an average of 0.91. More specifically, the ICC(1,k) for the target child rule violations ranged from 0.79 to 0.98 with an average of 0.89. The ICC(1,k) for teacher appropriate response to target child rule violations was 0.88 and to other child rule violations was 0.94. The ICC(1,k) for all teacher's praise variables ranged from 0.88 to 0.95 with an average of 0.93. For the global competency classroom management variable, the ICC(1,k) was 0.68.

To prepare the data for analysis, the following calculations were conducted first for the target student and then for all other students in the classroom. First, each frequency count

---

accompanied by excessive or inappropriate gestures, or delivered with inappropriate affect or an inappropriate tone of voice.).

variable (e.g., total rule violations, total labeled praise) was summed for a given observation and divided by the total duration of the observation in minutes. This number was multiplied by 60 to produce a rate per hour. These rates were averaged across all observations for the case. Second, the total number of appropriate teacher responses to target child rule violations for a given observation was divided by the total number of rule violations by the target child for that observation period. This produced the percent of appropriate response to rule violations per observation. These percentages were averaged across all observations. This was also repeated for appropriate response to rule violations by all other children.

## Results

### **Aim 1: Replication of Psychometric and Descriptive Properties**

Descriptive data for the IPI-Teacher Version for Sample 1 are provided in Table 3. The subscales are listed in the order in which the means from the total sample were ranked. Consistent with Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001), the top ranked power bases were direct informational, positive expert, legitimate dependence, and positive referent, all of which are considered soft bases and have strong internal reliability estimates (alphas  $>.80$ ). Consistent with that found by Raven et al. (1998), Cronbach's alpha for the subscales ranged from .54 to .89, with 6 of 11 subscales having an internal consistency estimate above .80; impersonal and personal coercion and formal legitimacy represented the least reliable subscales (see Table 3). It is also noteworthy that the vast majority ( $> 80\%$ ) of responses fell between scores of 4 (*would not affect tendency to follow recommendations*) and 7 (*much more likely to follow recommendations*); very few teachers used responses on the lower end of the scale.

Because our sample was nearly 50% Caucasian and 50% Hispanic, we examined the means and rank orders of the subscale for these two groups. Direct information and positive

expert were ranked first by both groups, and the order of the remaining subscales were identical with two minor exceptions: Caucasian teachers ranked legitimate dependence 3rd and positive referent 4th (this order was reversed for the Hispanic teachers), and Caucasian teachers ranked personal reward 6th and legitimate reciprocity 7th (this order was reversed for Hispanic teachers). Given these similarities, the remaining analyses were conducted on the total sample.

### **Aim 2: Relations between IPI Ratings About Past Versus Current Consultation**

To examine the extent to which IPI scores about a past or hypothetical consultation relationship are related to IPI scores about a current consultation relationship, we first examined descriptive data from the IPI scales completed at mid-point about the current consultation relationship (see Table 3, Sample 2). Direct informational, positive expert, legitimate dependence, and positive referent (all soft bases) remained the top-ranked power bases, and internal consistency reliabilities for these four subscales remained above .80.

Next, with Sample 2, we examined bivariate correlations between teachers' IPI subscale ratings about a past or hypothetical consultation relationship and IPI ratings about the active consultation relationship. The data in Table 4 offer evidence of convergent validity for the soft bases. Namely, for most subscales representing the soft bases, each subscale was (a) more highly correlated with itself across time than with other subscales across time, or (b) more highly correlated with other subscales representing soft bases across time than with subscales representing harsh bases across time. This pattern offers evidence for the convergent and divergent validity of the subscale scores representing soft bases. The evidence for convergent and divergent validity was not as strong for the subscales representing harsh bases (e.g., see the pattern for legitimate equity and personal coercion in Table 4).

Lastly, we calculated the average of the six subscales representing soft power bases and

the four subscales representing harsh bases (we did not include personal reward in either average because it has been found to load on both bases) at both time points. Soft basis scores at Time 1 were significantly correlated with soft basis scores at Time 2 ( $r = .66, p < .001$ ). Harsh bases at Time 1 were significantly correlated with harsh bases at Time 2 ( $r = .47, p < .001$ ). The cross-construct correlations over time were of smaller magnitude offering some evidence of divergent validity (Time 1 soft bases and Time 2 harsh bases:  $r = .38, p < .05$ ; Time 1 harsh bases and Time 2 soft bases:  $r = .29, p > .05$ ).

### **Aim 3: Relations between IPI Scores and Change in Teacher Behaviors**

The third aim of the study was to examine the relationship between scores assessing influence in a current relationship and change in consultation-related teacher behaviors (i.e., implementation of classroom management strategies recommended by the consultant).

**Data preparation.** To determine change in teacher behavior as a function of consultation, the observation data for the total sample were first analyzed using hierarchical linear modeling (HLM). The key variables of interest were the following: rate of target child rule violations, rate of other child rule violations, appropriate response to target child and other child rule violations, and rate of labeled praise. Each of these variables was derived by obtaining the average for the variable across observations in a given biweekly time period. Time (i.e., biweekly period) was treated as continuous and centered at the last data point.

Several growth curves (i.e., linear, log and quadratic) were fitted, and Akaike information criteria (AIC) and Bayesian information criteria (BIC) were used to determine the best fit. In all five models, the effect of time was significant (all  $ps < .01$ ), indicating significant improvement in all student and teacher behaviors. A log growth curve fit four variables: rate of target child rule violations, rate of other child rule violations, percent appropriate response to target child rule

violations, and percent appropriate response to other child rule violations, indicating that there were greater improvements in these behaviors during the first half of consultation process, with rates of improvement plateauing toward the latter half of consultation. A quadratic growth curve fit rate of labeled praise.

Next, we derived an indicator of change over time (i.e., slope) for each of the five variables. The log growth curve for four variables showed that change happened in the same direction over all time points. Thus, a linear regression was fit to the baseline and the means for each of the possible eight biweekly periods of each teacher to obtain an estimate of each teacher slope for these variables: rate of target child rule violations, rate of other child rule violations, percent appropriate response to target child, and percent appropriate response to other child rule violations. For rate of labeled praise, one slope could not represent the patterns of change over time because the quadratic growth curve showed that there was improvement over the first few time points, and the trajectory changed direction over the latter time points. Because we were most interested in initial response to the consultation, we used the HLM model to obtain the optimum biweekly observation point (that is before the curve changed its direction) and fitted a linear regression line to the baseline and the means of the biweekly observations before the optimum point was reached for each teacher.

To maximize our ability to detect the relationship between scores assessing influence in a current relationship and change in consultation-related teacher behaviors, we categorized teachers into one of two groups (High or Low Baseline) using baseline classroom management competencies scores. Teachers who fell above a score of 6 (on the 10-point scale) were categorized as higher in competence and, as such, may have had limited room for change in classroom management practices as a function of consultation. Teachers who fell below a score

of 6 on the 10-point scale were categorized as lower in competence and, as such, represented the group with maximum opportunity for growth. From this point forward, we focus attention on the low baseline group because they represent the group of teachers with maximal opportunity for growth and thus the greatest opportunity to detect the relationship of interest.

**Predictive validity.** To examine the relationship between scores assessing influence in a current relationship and change in consultation-related teacher behaviors, we grouped low baseline teachers by scores on the soft power bases. Those with an average score of 6 or 7 represent teachers who reported being *highly influenced* by soft strategies. Those with an average score of 4 or 5 represent teachers who reported being *not or minimally influenced* by soft strategies. Data in Table 5 document that for 4 of the 5 variables of interest (rate of child rule violations and other child rule violations and percent appropriate response to target child and other child rule violations), those who reported being highly influenced by soft power strategies demonstrated greater change in student and teacher behaviors (in expected direction) than those who reported being not or minimally influenced by such strategies. Due to small sample sizes, it was not appropriate to conduct significance tests on these differences; thus, we report effect sizes in Table 5. However, the magnitude of the slopes offers a guide to the clinical meaningfulness of the differences. For example, on average, among the low baseline teachers, the *highly influenced* group appropriately responded to 4% more of the rule violations with each consultation session and experienced a decline of approximately 11 classroom rule violations per hour with each consultation session. Over 8 bi-weekly sessions, this amounts to appropriately responding to an additional 32% of the rule violations and a decline in 88 rule violations per hour. In contrast, the *not or minimally influenced* group of low baseline teachers experienced half of this benefit: appropriately responded to only an additional 1% of the rule violations and had a decline of

approximately 5 rule violations per hour with each consultation session. Over 8 bi-weekly sessions, this amounts to teachers appropriately responding to an additional 8% of the rule violations and a decline in 40 rule violations per hour.

### **Discussion**

The goals of this study were to replicate the findings of Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001) with regard to the psychometric properties of the Consultee/Teacher Version of the IPI, and extend the literature by examining the concurrent and predictive validity of score interpretations of the IPI in the context of a current consultation relationship. We found evidence in support of all three hypotheses for the soft bases. First, we replicated the findings of Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001). Consistent with our hypotheses, the internal reliability estimates for the subscales representing the soft power bases were strong (i.e.,  $>.80$ ). Further, teachers' (both Caucasian and Hispanic) four top-rated bases were direct information, positive expert, positive referent, and legitimate dependence. Replications such as this offer an important contribution (Brandt et al., 2014) by providing further evidence for use of the IPI-Teacher Version, particularly for assessing and studying soft bases. Second, we found evidence that teachers' perceptions of influence in a past or hypothetical consultation relationship are significantly related to perceptions of influence in a current relationship, particularly for soft bases. Third, the results provide preliminary evidence that teachers in need of classroom management consultation (i.e., those with low baseline competencies in global classroom management) and who reported being influenced by soft bases, showed greater growth in their skills and greater reductions in student rule violations than teachers in need of classroom management consultation who reported not being influenced by soft bases. We interpret our findings in the context of the consultation literature and offer directions for future research.

### **Reliability Considerations**

In this study and the previous study (Erchul, Raven, & Whichard, 2001), the internal consistency reliability estimates for the subscales representing soft power bases are strong (alphas  $>.80$ ). With this replication, researchers can have confidence in the use of these subscales in research with teacher participants. However, given that the majority of item responses fell within the 4 to 7 range on the response scale, researchers should consider whether the lower end of the scale (0 to 3 range) is needed at all, as it may create some confusion among respondents. Interestingly, in both samples, the subscales representing harsh bases had weaker psychometric properties. This replicated finding raises questions about whether the harsh bases have any value in the study of consultation relationships with teachers. Researchers may wish to consider the question posed by Erchul et al. (2008): “Are harsh power bases essentially irrelevant to the practice of school consultation?” (p. 305) and redouble efforts to study soft strategies instead. Alternatively, before giving up on the harsh bases completely, researchers could work collaboratively with teachers to develop items that represent the harsh bases within a school consultation model and subsequently test the reliability and validity of newly developed items.

Overall, teacher ratings and rankings of power bases are generally consistent with those found by Erchul, Raven, and Whichard (2001). Namely, strategies that aligned with direct informational, positive expert, legitimate dependent, and positive referent power bases were ranked as the top four most influential strategies, respectively, that consultants could use when working with teachers. As described by both consultants and teachers in previous studies, soft bases (those that are subtle, positive, and non-coercive) are viewed as more effective in school consultation than harsh bases. Although not assessed in the current study, possible reasons for why teachers endorse soft bases are that consultant influence strategies drawn from soft bases



may give teachers a sense of autonomy by presenting teachers with information about effective classroom management approaches rather than authoritatively telling them to use the approaches. These strategies may offer teachers a greater sense of social responsibility. Of course, *why* teachers prefer soft power strategies requires further investigation, and once documented, educators of future consultants may be more confident when incorporating social influence constructs into consultation training.

### **Validity Considerations**

This is the first study to examine IPI scores in the context of a current consultation relationship. The correlations in Table 4 provide evidence that teacher perceptions about social influence in a past or hypothetical consultation relationship are significantly related to teacher perceptions about social influence in a current consultation relationship. These findings lend further credibility to previous studies that used the IPI-CE as, to date, the IPI has only measured social influences in past relationships. Further, the pattern of correlations offers preliminary evidence of convergent and divergent validity for the soft bases' subscale scores. Scores that measure similar constructs (e.g., two subscales representing soft bases; or a single subscale measured over time) are more highly correlated than scores that measure dissimilar constructs (one subscale measuring a soft base and one subscale measuring a harsh base). The lack of this clear pattern for the harsh bases, again, suggests that these bases may not be relevant to the school consultation context.

This is also the first study to examine the relationship between a teacher's report of influence and actual change in classroom management skills as a function of consultation. We found that, among teachers with lower baseline competencies in classroom management skills, those who reported being more receptive to soft power influence demonstrated more

improvements than those who were less receptive. They also observed greater reductions in student rule violations. Although the work is preliminary (i.e., small cell size), the patterns in Table 5 suggest that the magnitude of this effect is medium to large and involves meaningful and easily observable differences in teacher and student behavior. If this pattern is replicated, it may allow researchers and consultants to identify, a priori, teachers who are most likely to be receptive to and thus experience benefits from consultation. In addition, these findings present a potential avenue for research examining tailoring of consultation strategies to teachers based on the bases of power by which they report being influenced. This could involve creating alternative consultation strategies for teachers who are not as influenced by the soft bases of power.

### **Limitations**

This study's findings should be interpreted in the context of its limitations. Namely, teachers in Sample 1 completed the IPI after an in-service training which provided teachers with information about effective classroom management strategies for children with ADHD. We cannot know the impact of this training on their IPI scores. Second, the sample size was reduced to 37 for the Aim 2 analyses and reduced even further ( $n = 12$ ) for the Aim 3 analyses. Thus, replication with larger samples is warranted. However, given that this is the first study to examine IPI scores in relation to actual change in teacher and student behavior, the findings remain noteworthy. Third, the inter-rater reliability of the global competency classroom management variable was lower than desired which limits the strength of the conclusions drawn. Fourth, this study was part of a large, federally grant-funded project that had considerable supports in place to provide benefits to both the consultant and the teacher, such as consultant and teacher training and financial incentives for participating in the training and the study. As such, the influence of said support should be taken into account before generalizing the obtained

results to everyday practice where such benefits are likely not available. Lastly, we obtained the findings in the context of a behavioral consultation model. It is possible that relationship between social influence and teacher behavior may differ in the context of other types of consultation models (e.g., mental health consultation). Thus, additional research with other models is needed before such generalizations can be made.

## **Conclusions**

The information presented in this study provides several points to consider when conducting classroom management consultation with teachers. In general, consultants should be more cognizant of the role that social influence plays in their attempts to help teachers implement interventions. Namely, this and other studies (e.g., Yukl et al., 2005) suggest that specific influence strategies, particularly those derived from soft bases (e.g., direct informational, positive expert, positive referent, legitimate dependent), may prove to be especially effective when asking teachers to follow recommendations. Using such strategies over others has the potential to increase intervention implementation efforts and improve student outcomes, especially when teachers report being influenced by such strategies. Additional studies may examine the extent to which consultants should individualize their consultation programs based on each teacher's reports of effective influence strategies in order to obtain optimum results. Future research focusing on teachers who do not report being influenced by these soft strategies could also provide important information for program individualization. In addition, this is one of few studies to use the IPI with teachers in a school-based context. The relationship between consultant and teacher is somewhat unique in that it is more of a partnership than a hierarchy. Thus, future IPI users should consider whether or not harsh bases should be eliminated.

This study is the first to provide empirical evidence to support the hypothesis that using

soft influence strategies over others has the potential to increase intervention implementation efforts and improve student outcomes. This is an important finding and one we hope will stimulate additional research in this area. Our data provide further evidence that researchers can have confidence in their use of the IPI-Teacher Version for assessing and studying soft bases; however, modification to items assessing harsh bases are warranted in the teacher consultation context.

### References

- Becker, K. D., Bradshaw, C. P., Domitrovich, C., & Ialongo, N. S. (2013). Coaching teachers to improve implementation of the good behavior game. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research, 40*, 482-493.
- Bergan, J. R., & Tombari, M. L. (1975). The analysis of verbal interactions occurring during consultation. *Journal of School Psychology, 13*, 209-226.
- Bradshaw, C. P., Pas, E. T., Goldweber, A., Rosenberg, M., & Leaf, P. J. (2012). Integrating school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports with tier 2 coaching to student support teams: The PBISplus model. *Advances in School Mental Health Promotion, 5*, 177-193.
- Brandt, M. J., IJzerman, H., Dijksterhuis, A., Farach, F. J., Geller, J., Giner-Sorolla, R., ... Van't Veer, A. (2014). The replication recipe: What makes for a convincing replication? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 50*, 217-224.
- Cialdini, R. B. (2008). *Influence: Science and practice* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Cienki, J. A. (1982). Teachers' perception of consultation as a function of consultants' use of expert and referent power. Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1982. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 43*(3-A), 725.
- Codding, R. S., Feinberg, A. B., Dunn, E. K., & Pace, G. M. (2005). Effects of immediate performance feedback on implementation of behavior support plans. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 38*, 205-219.
- Coles, E. K., Owens, J. S., Serrano, V., Slavec, J., & Evans, S. W. (2015). From consultation to student outcomes: The role of teacher knowledge, skills, and beliefs in increasing integrity in classroom behavior management. *School Mental Health, 7*, 34-48.

- 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.
- Erchul, W. P. (2013). Treatment integrity enhancement conceptualized as an exercise in social influence. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 23, 300-306.
- Erchul, W. P., DuPaul, G. J., Bennett, M. S., Grissom, P. F., Jitendra, A. K., Tresco, K. E., Volpe, R. J., Vile Junod, R. E., Flammer-Rivera, L. M., & Mannella, M. C. (2009). A follow-up study of relational processes and consultation outcomes for students with ADHD. *School Psychology Review*, 38, 28-37.
- Erchul, W. P., Grissom, P. F., & Getty, K. C. (2008). Studying interpersonal influence within school consultation: Social power base and relational communication perspectives. In W. P. Erchul & S. M. Sheridan (Eds.), *Handbook of research in school consultation* (pp. 293-322). New York, NY: Erlbaum/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Erchul, W. P., Grissom, P. F., Getty, K. C., & Bennett, M. S. (2014). Researching interpersonal influence within school consultation: Social power base and relational communication perspectives. In W. P. Erchul & S. M. Sheridan (Eds.), *Handbook of research in school consultation* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.; pp. 349-385). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Erchul, W. P., & Martens, B. K. (2010). *School consultation: Conceptual and empirical bases of practice* (3rd ed.). New York: Springer.
- 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 psychologist and teacher perceptions of social power bases in school consultation. *Journal of School Psychology, 39*, 483-497.
- Evans, S. W., Owens, J. S., & Bunford, N. (2014). Evidence-based psychosocial treatments for children and adolescents with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology, 43*(4), 527-551.
- Fabiano, G. A., Vujnovic, R., Pelham, W. E., Waschbusch, D. A., Massetti, G. M., Yu, J., . . . Volker, M. (2010). Enhancing the effectiveness of special education programming for children with ADHD using a daily report card. *School Psychology Review, 39*, 219–239.
- Fabiano, G. A., Vujnovic, R. K., Waschbusch, D. A., Yu, J. Mashtare, T. Pariseau, M. E. . . . Smalls, K. J. (2013). A comparison of workshop training versus intensive, experiential training for improving behavior support skills in early educators, *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 28*(2), 450-460.
- 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, MI: Institute for Social Research.
- Getty, K. C., & Erchul, W. P. (2009). The influence of gender on the likelihood of using soft social power strategies in school consultation. *Psychology in the Schools, 46*, 447-458.
- 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.

- Harris, P.A., Taylor, R., Thielke, R., Payne, J, Gonzalez, N. & Conde, J.G. (2009) Research electronic data capture (REDCap) – a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. *Journal of Biomedical Information*, 42, 377-381.
- Lambert, N. M. (1973). The school psychologist as a source of power and influence. *Journal of School Psychology*, 11, 245-250.
- Martin, R. (1978). Expert and referent power: A framework for understanding and maximizing consultation effectiveness. *Journal of School Psychology*, 16, 49-55.
- McGraw, K.O. & Wong, S.P. (1996). Forming Inferences About Some Intraclass Correlation Coefficients. *Psychological Methods*, 1(1), 30-46
- Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Power in and around organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Noell, G. H., & Gansle, K. A. (2014). Research examining the relationships between consultation procedures, treatment integrity, and outcomes. In W. P Erchul & S. M. Sheridan (Eds.) *Handbook of research in school consultation* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.; pp. 386-408). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Owens, J. S., & Coles, E. K. (2012). *Development of Strategies to Increase Teacher Integrity in a Daily Report Card Intervention for Children with ADHD*. R324A120272. Grant funded by the Institute of Education Sciences.
- Pelham, W. E., Greiner, A. R., & Gnagy, E. M. (2008). *Student behavior teacher response observation code manual*. Unpublished manual.
- Pierro, A., Cicero, L., & Raven, B. H. (2008). Motivated compliance with bases of social power. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 38(7), 1921-1944.
- 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(3), 387-411.
- Raven, B. H. (1965). Social influence and power. In I. D. Steiner and M. Fishbein (Eds.), *Current studies in social psychology* (pp. 371–381). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & 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., Schwarzwald, J., & Koslowsky, M. (1998). Conceptualizing and measuring a power/interaction model of interpersonal influence. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28, 307–332.
- Sanetti, L. M. H., Collier-Meek, M. A., Long, A. C. J., Kim, J., & Kratochwill, T. R. (2014). Using implementation planning to increase teachers' adherence and quality behavior support plans. *Psychology in the Schools*, 51, 879-895.
- Schwarzwald, J., Koslowsky, M., & Bernstein, J. (2013). Power tactic usage by gender at work and home: past, present, and future. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 24(3), 307-324.
- Shrout, P.E. & Fleiss, J.L. (1979). Intraclass Correlations: Uses in Assessing Rater Reliability. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86(2), 420-428.
- Vannest, K. J., Davis, J. L., Davis, C. R., Mason, B. A., & Burke, M. D. (2010). Effective intervention for behavior with a daily behavior report card: A meta-analysis. *School Psychology Review*, 39(4), 654

- Vujnovic, R. K., Fabiano, G. A., Waschbusch, D. A., Pelham, W. E., Greiner, A., Gera, S., ... & Buck, M. (2014). Preliminary psychometric properties of an observation system to assess teachers' use of effective behavior support strategies in preschool classrooms. *Education and Treatment of Children, 37*(2), 323-346.
- Yukl, G., Chavez, C., & Seifert, C. F. (2005). Assessing the construct validity and utility of two new influence tactics. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26*(6), 705-725.

### **Acknowledgements**

The research reported here was supported by the Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education, through Grant # (R324A120272). The opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not represent views of the Institute or the U.S. Department of Education.

Table 1

*Social Power Bases (Raven, 1992, 1993) and School Consultation Examples*<sup>a, b</sup>

Power Base (factor)	Description	IPI Sample Item
Positive Expert (soft)	Person B's <sup>c</sup> perception that Person A has knowledge or expertise in a specific content area of interest to B. <b>Example:</b> Teacher views consultant as knowledgeable because of her PhD in school psychology and extensive work experience.	<i>The consultant probably knows the best way to handle the situation.</i>
Positive Referent (soft)	A's potential to influence B based on B's identification with A and/or wish for such identification. <b>Example:</b> Teacher is likely to follow consultant's direction during consultation because she aspires to consult with teachers in a similar way in the future.	<i>We are both part of the school community and should see eye to eye on things.</i>
Impersonal Reward (harsh)	B's perception that A is able to deliver tangible rewards. <b>Example:</b> Consultant, very pleased with how much teacher has participated in consultation thus far, brings in extra classroom supplies for her use. (The supplies of course are rewarding by themselves but the potential to influence through reward power comes from teacher's expectation that consultant will provide additional supplies if consultant's direction is accepted again.)	<i>I expect to get some favorable consideration from him/her [the consultant] for going along on this.</i>
Personal Reward <sup>d</sup>	A's liking and personal approval of B is important to B, and B believes that approval is more likely if B follows A's recommendations. <b>Example:</b> Consultant compliments teacher for collecting baseline data for one week, as was recommended. Teacher feels good about these compliments and hopes and expects further approval for similar follow through in the future.	<i>The consultant makes me feel more valued when I do as asked.</i>
Impersonal Coercion (harsh)	B's perception that A is capable of delivering tangible punishments. <b>Example:</b> Either implicitly or explicitly, the consultant communicates the expectation that a failure to follow recommendations could lead to a negative report or poor evaluation.	<i>The consultant can give me undesirable tasks to do.</i>
Personal Coercion (harsh)	B is very concerned about A not liking/disapproving of B, and expects that failing to follow her direction will result in such disapproval. <b>Example:</b> Consultant expresses disapproval when teacher has not implemented the classroom intervention as agreed upon. Teacher finds this mild rejection disconcerting, and expects even greater	<i>I would be upset knowing that I was on the bad side of the consultant.</i>

disapproval if she does not follow subsequent recommendations from consultant.

Power Base	Description	IPI Sample Item
Direct Informational (soft)	A's potential to influence B because of the judged relevance of the information contained in A's message. <b>Example:</b> Teacher perceives the intervention endorsed by the consultant as likely to succeed – not because of consultant's expertise – but because teacher was convinced long ago that boys with ADHD always benefit from a Daily Report Card as advocated by consultant.	<i>Once the consultant points it out, I can see why the change is necessary.</i>
Formal Legitimate (soft)	B's perception that A has a right to influence based on A's professional role, status, or organizational position. <b>Example:</b> Teacher sees consultant's role as having the authority to offer recommendations that the teacher should feel obligated to follow.	<i>The consultant has the right to request that I handle the situation in a particular way.</i>
Legitimate Reciprocity (harsh)	B's perception that he/she is obligated to respond in-kind for what A has done already to benefit B. <b>Example:</b> Consultant has spent considerable time with teacher developing an appropriate intervention plan, so now teacher feels an obligation to implement this plan to the best of her ability.	<i>The consultant has done some nice things for teachers at my school in the past and so I do this in return.</i>
Legitimate Equity (harsh)	B's perception that he/she is obligated to follow A's recommendation due to a mismatch of expended effort as well as possible inconvenience experienced previously by A. <b>Example:</b> Consultant has spent considerable time working with teacher developing an intervention plan but teacher has failed to begin implementation, causing consultant to return to the classroom unnecessarily, thus delaying what would have been an initial evaluation of the plan. Teacher, feeling uneasy, begins implementation immediately.	<i>Following the consultant's recommendations helps make up for things I have not done so well previously.</i>
Legitimate Dependence (soft)	B's perception that there is an obligation to assist those like A who cannot help themselves and who are dependent upon others. <b>Example:</b> Consultant requests teacher's help in assisting a student via consultation services because the student's test scores do not warrant a pull-out special education placement.	<i>The consultant really depends on me to do this for him/her.</i>

<sup>a</sup> Based on information from Erchul and Raven (1997) and Erchul and Martens (2010).

<sup>b</sup> Absent from this table are negative expert, negative referent, and indirect informational power, three power bases discussed by Raven (1992, 1993) but not measured by the Interpersonal Power Inventory (Raven et al., 1998).

<sup>c</sup> Person A is the influencing agent (i.e., consultant) in these examples. Person B is the target of influence (i.e., teacher) in these examples.

<sup>d</sup> Identified by Raven et al. (1998) as a soft base in the first study and as a harsh base in the second study.

Table 2

*Demographic Characteristics of Participants*

Characteristic	Aim1 Sample 1 <sup>a</sup>	Aim 2 & 3 Sample 2 <sup>b</sup>
	<i>N</i> (%)	<i>N</i> (%)
Sex (% Female)	94 (94.9%)	35 (94.6%)
Ethnicity		
Caucasian	51 (51.5%)	19 (51.4%)
Hispanic	44 (44.4%)	17 (45.9%)
African American	2 (2.0%)	1 (2.7%)
Highest Level of Education		
BA/BS degree	29 (29.3%)	13 (35.1%)
MA/MS degree	58 (58.6%)	18 (48.6%)
Ed.S/Ed.M/Ed.D. degree	10 (10.1%)	6 (16.2%)
Current Grade Level		
Kindergarten	17 (17.2%)	9 (24.3%)
1 <sup>st</sup> grade	13 (13.1%)	5 (13.5%)
2 <sup>nd</sup> grade	14 (14.1%)	9 (24.3%)
3 <sup>rd</sup> grade	22 (22.2%)	8 (21.6%)
4 <sup>th</sup> grade	15 (15.2%)	5 (13.5%)
3 <sup>rd</sup> and 4 <sup>th</sup> grade combined	3 (3.0%)	NA
5 <sup>th</sup> grade	15 (15.2%)	1 (2.7%)
Years Teaching ( <i>M, SD</i> )	14.37 (7.89)	14.33 (8.15)
Years in Current Grade ( <i>M, SD</i> )	8.71 (6.82)	8.77 (7.91)

Note: <sup>a</sup>*N* = 99. <sup>b</sup>*N* = 37. Percentages that fail to sum to 100 indicate missing data.

Table 3

*Descriptive Data for the IPI-Consultee/Teacher Version by Sample*

Subscale	Sample 1 <sup>a</sup> Based on Past or Hypothetical Consultation			Sample 2 <sup>b</sup> Based on Current Consultation		
	Cronbach's Alpha	<i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	Rank	Cronbach's Alpha	<i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	Rank
Direct Informational (S)	.89	6.18 (.95)	1	.91	6.14 (1.00)	1
Positive Expert (S)	.81	5.73 (.93)	2	.94	5.66 (1.15)	2
Legitimate Dependent (S)	.84	5.40 (.94)	3	.87	5.48 (.94)	3
Positive Referent (S)	.82	5.34 (.99)	4	.83	5.38 (.97)	4
Formal Legitimate (S)	.67	5.11 (.77)	5	.87	5.01 (.97)	5
Personal Reward (S/H)	.85	4.94 (.93)	6	.84	5.00 (.96)	6
Legitimate Reciprocity (S)	.73	4.91 (.83)	7	.77	4.75 (.75)	7
Impersonal Reward (H)	.74	4.71 (.80)	8	.62	4.42 (.66)	9
Legitimate Equity (H)	.83	4.60 (.83)	9	.57	4.46 (.62)	8
Personal Coercion (H)	.69	4.33 (.67)	10	.83	4.40 (.73)	10
Impersonal Coercion (H)	.54	4.21 (.83)	11	.71	4.01 (.81)	11

Note. <sup>a</sup>*N* ranges from 84 to 99 depending on the subscale; <sup>b</sup>*N* ranges from 35 to 37 depending on the subscale. Range of ratings was 1 to 7; 1 = *much less likely to follow recommendations*; 2 = *less likely*; 3 = *a bit less likely*; 4 = *would not affect your tendency to follow recommendations*; 5 = *a bit more likely*; 6 = *more likely*; 7 = *much more likely to follow recommendations*; S = soft base per Raven et al. (1998); H = harsh base per Raven et al. (1998).

Table 4

*Correlations between IPI Scores about a Past or Hypothetical Consultant and IPI Scores about a Current Consultant*

IPI for Current Consultant	IPI for Past or Hypothetical Consultant										
	DI	PE	LD	PR	FL	PerR	LR	IR	LE	PC	IC
Direct Informational (DI) <sup>a</sup>	<b>.79**</b>	.75**	.48**	.64**	.44**	.28	.26	.25	.08	.23	.10
Positive Expert (PE) <sup>a</sup>	.68**	<b>.70**</b>	.46**	.63**	.45**	.30	.25	.42*	.24	.30	.19
Legit. Dependent (LD) <sup>a</sup>	.34*	.49**	<b>.55**</b>	.51**	.35*	.36*	.32	.39*	.20	.10	-.08
Positive Referent (PR) <sup>a</sup>	.50**	.55**	.54**	<b>.62**</b>	.42**	.35*	.33*	.44**	.24	.30	.16
Formal Legit. (FL) <sup>a</sup>	.46**	.55**	.52**	.60**	<b>.62**</b>	.44**	.47**	.53*	.28	.30	.19
Personal Reward (PerR) <sup>ab</sup>	.42*	.45**	.57**	.54**	.34*	<b>.49**</b>	.34*	.36*	.24	.35*	-.21
Legit. Reciprocity (LR) <sup>a</sup>	.20	.24	.43**	.43*	.15	.51**	<b>.56**</b>	.46**	.27	.46**	.02
Impersonal Reward (IR) <sup>b</sup>	.17	.18	.11	.22	.16	.23	.17	<b>.40*</b>	.17	.38*	.18
Legit. Equity (LE) <sup>b</sup>	.36*	.50**	.66**	.57**	.41*	.64**	.59**	.57**	<b>.28</b>	.45**	.09
Personal Coercion (PC) <sup>b</sup>	.18	.28	.26	.32	.38*	.42**	.40*	.46**	.19	<b>.39*</b>	.12
Impersonal Coercion (IC) <sup>b</sup>	.11	.02	-.02	.08	-.03	.22	.02	-.01	.16	.20	<b>.54**</b>

Note. <sup>a</sup>Represents a soft base; <sup>b</sup>Represents a harsh base. *Ns* range from 34 to 37 depending on the subscale.

Table 5

*Slopes representing Change in Student and Teacher Behavior Among Low Baseline Teachers<sup>1</sup> as a Function of Social Influence Groups*

Variable	Slopes for Teachers Not or Minimally Influenced by Soft Bases <sup>2</sup> <i>M, SD</i>	Slopes for Teachers Highly Influenced by Soft Bases <sup>3</sup> <i>M, SD</i>	Effect Size <sup>4</sup>
Rate/Hour Labeled Praise	2.65 (2.89)	2.40 (4.06)	-0.07
Rate/Hour Target Child Rule Violations	-.76 (1.34)	-1.23 (2.90)	0.21
Rate/Hour Other Child Rule Violations	-4.53 (7.63)	-11.12 (7.00)	0.90
% Responded Appropriately–Target Child	.01 (.06)	.04 (.04)	0.59
% Responded Appropriately–Other Child	.01 (.03)	.04 (.06)	0.63

Note. For teacher behaviors, positive slopes indicate an increases or improvement in the teacher behavior and negative slopes indicate a decrease or decline in this teacher behavior. For student rule violations, positive slopes indicate an increase in rule violations per hour and negative slopes indicate a decrease in rule violations per hour.

<sup>1</sup> Low baseline teachers represents teachers with average global classroom management competency scores below a 6 on the 10-point scale. We focused on this group because they represent the group of teachers with maximal opportunity for growth in skills.

<sup>2</sup>*n*=9

<sup>3</sup>*n*=3.

<sup>4</sup>Cohen's *d* effect size calculation.