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**Abstract**

Theory on advice currently gives insufficient attention to relational context, the interaction, and the advisor’s perspective. We conceptualize advice interactions as dyadic processes within relationships, and examine how relationship assessments influence perceptions of advice and the interaction. Friends reported on their relationships (152 dyads, *N* = 304), had conversations that included advice, and then rated advice quality and conversational satisfaction. An actor-partner interdependence model supported a “mutual influence model”: both advisors and recipients were influenced by their own and their partners’ assessments. For advisors and recipients, higher ratings of partners’ past support increased their own advice quality ratings and conversation satisfaction, and higher advice quality increased conversation satisfaction. Relationship reports from the partner’s perspective impacted individuals’ outcomes in unexpected ways.
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Dyadic Perspectives on Advice between Friends:

Relational Influence, Advice Quality, and Conversation Satisfaction

 Advice—recommendations for what to say, think, or do about a problem—is a frequent and influential form of social support in myriad relationships (MacGeorge, Feng, & Guntzviller, 2016). Advice interactions can garner salutary outcomes, such as helping individuals emotionally cope with a problem, determine solutions for a problem, and enact productive problem-solving behaviors (MacGeorge, Feng et al., 2016). However, advice can also demean or criticize recipients, encourage inadequate or imprudent solutions, and damage advisor-recipient relationships (Goldsmith, 2004; Goldsmith & Fitch, 1997). These variable outcomes of advising interactions, together with the ubiquity of advice in interpersonal relationships, spurred the creation of Advice Response Theory (ART; Feng & MacGeorge, 2010; MacGeorge, Guntzviller, Hanasono, & Feng, 2016). ART posits that individuals receiving advice evaluate its implications for their identity (i.e., politeness) and evaluate the advice content, along with characteristics of the advisor and the problem—and that these evaluations, in turn, influence relevant perceptions and outcomes, including advice quality, coping capacity, and intention to implement the advised action (MacGeorge, Guntzviller, Hanasono et al., 2016).

With established support for the basic theoretical premises of ART, scholarly attention has begun shifting to expansion of its theoretical scope (Guntzviller, Ratcliff, Dorsch, & Osai, 2016; MacGeorge, Smith, Caldes, & Hackman, 2016). Scholars call for ART extensions beyond its message- and recipient-focus so that it can further explain how advice functions within ongoing relationships and in supportive interactions (MacGeorge, Feng et al., 2016). Indeed, recent research stresses the unique role and perspective of the advisor (Guntzviller & MacGeorge, 2013; Shi, 2013) and the multiplicity of relational factors that affect advice outcomes for both advisors and recipients (Feng & Magen, 2016; Guntzviller et al., 2016). Moreover, supportive communication theorists increasingly emphasize the interactional nature of social support, observing how processes and outcomes for recipients and providers are dependent on both parties’ behaviors and evaluations (High & Solomon, 2014; Jones & Bodie, 2014). Expanding advice theorizing to incorporate these elements allows for a more holistic understanding of advice processes and outcomes.

Accordingly, we merge ART propositions with those derived from theories of relationships and supportive communication to test: (a) how multiple dimensions of relationships (partner characteristics, interdependence, closeness, and past received support) impact perceptions of advice quality, (b) how perceived advice quality influences holistic satisfaction with the conversation, and (c) how this process unfolds dyadically (incorporating both advisor and recipient perspectives). We test our hypotheses with data obtained before and immediately after interactions between college student friends discussing a current stressor. The present study thus advances ART toward a more relational, interactive, and dyadic position on advice, and provides practical insight for advisors and recipients, especially regarding how relationships may influence advice outcomes for both advisors and recipients.

**Relational Assessments and Advice Quality**

ART contends that recipients’ perceptions of advice messages are influenced by their perceptions of the advisor. Specifically, perceiving advisors as more likeable, similar, or trustworthy makes advice messages more supportive and persuasive to recipients (Bonaccio & Dalal, 2006; MacGeorge, Guntzviller, Hanasono et al., 2016). Within the ART framework, these advisor qualities have been conceptualized and examined as a group and termed *advisor characteristics*. Recipient perceptions of advisor characteristics affect advice quality ratings directly and indirectly, through their influence on message evaluations (Feng & Feng, 2013; Feng & MacGeorge, 2010; MacGeorge et al., 2004). Specifically, more positive recipient perceptions of advisor characteristics (i.e., liking, similarity, and trust) produce more positive evaluations of advice content and politeness (MacGeorge, Guntzviller, Hanasono et al., 2016). Recently, several studies have suggested that ART’s proposition about advisor characteristics should be extended to incorporate a broader range of *relational assessments* (Carlson, 2016; Guntzviller et al., 2016). Indeed, supportive communication theory and research indicate that discrete supportive behaviors such as advice, comforting, or tangible support are routinely interpreted in the broader context of advisor-recipient interactions and relationships (Goldsmith, 2004; High & Solomon, 2014; Priem, Solomon, & Steuber, 2009).

In addition to advisor characteristics, three relational assessments—closeness, interdependence, and past support—seem especially likely to influence how advice is evaluated. *Interdependence*—the degree to which partners influence each other’s routine, engage in mutual behaviors and activities, and help facilitate partner goals (Knobloch & Solomon, 2003; Solomon & Knobloch, 2001)—may positively impact perceptions of advice. Advisors who are more interdependent may have greater knowledge about actions that are relevant and feasible for the recipient, allowing the advisor to produce objectively higher-quality advice, which is recognized as such by recipients. Even if the advice is not objectively higher quality, the relational closeness of interdependent partners (Berscheid, 1983) may positively bias recipients’ quality perceptions (Guntzviller et al., 2016). Greater relational *closeness* is associated with more positive perceptions of comforting behavior (Young, 2004) and with greater receptivity to advice (Feng & MacGeorge, 2006). *Past support* may also influence advice evaluations. As relationships develop over time, they typically offer recurring opportunities for giving and receiving support (Thoits, 2011), including advice and informational support along with emotional support, esteem support, and network support (Xu & Burleson, 2001). In relationships that have a more extensive history of prior support, advice is expected, which should improve its evaluation (Feng & Magen, 2016). Further, advisors who have given more support to a particular recipient over time may have ways of tailoring their advice to be more beneficial and appealing to that individual. Overall, we anticipated that relational assessments influence recipients’ perceptions of advice quality in a particular interaction. With this argument in mind, the first hypothesis is presented:

**H1:** Higher recipient relational assessments (i.e., advisor characteristics, interdependence, closeness, and past received support from the advisor) will be associated with higher recipient advice quality ratings.

**Advice Quality and Conversational Satisfaction**

Research testing ART has typically focused on three advice-centric outcomes: advice quality, which is a global judgment about the behavior; coping facilitation, which focuses on whether advice supports recipients’ emotion- and problem-management; and implementation intention, which addresses the persuasive impact of advice (MacGeorge, Feng et al., 2016). However, ART has had little to say about how advice influences the evaluation of the interaction in which it is given. When advice messages are embedded in supportive interactions, they are typically accompanied by a variety of other advisor and recipient behaviors (e.g., offers, planning; MacGeorge et al., 2015). Although all conversation behaviors presumably affect advice recipients’ global satisfaction with supportive conversations, the quality of advice is likely to directly impact perceptions of supportive interactions given its implications for problem-solving behavior, identity, and the relationship with the advisor (MacGeorge, Feng et al., 2016). Therefore, the second hypothesis is presented:

**H2:** Recipient advice quality ratings will be positively associated with recipient overall conversational satisfaction.

Anticipating effects of relational assessments on advice quality, it is reasonable to assume that advice quality mediates at least some of the influence of relational assessments on conversational satisfaction—that is, people are ultimately more satisfied with a supportive conversation when evaluations of the relationship boost perceived advice quality. Yet, support recipients could be satisfied with the conversation due to relational history even if they regarded the advice they received as low quality (see Lakey & Orehek, 2011). Thus:

**H3:** Recipient relational assessments will be directly and indirectly (through advice quality ratings) associated with their conversational satisfaction.

Finally, because of the discrepancy between recipient and advisor roles (one has the problem, the other has the advice), coping facilitation and implementation intention are outcomes principally relevant to recipients. (For advisors, one might ask about supportive or persuasive intentions.). However, satisfaction is an outcome relevant to both recipients and advisors (e.g., MacGeorge et al., 2015; Spitzmuller & Van Dyne, 2013), and one that is plausibly connected to the future of supportive exchanges between them. Although ART has not previously addressed advisor-reported variables, we argue that the advisor’s perspective is a vital component for advice interaction models.

**Incorporating the Advisor’s Perspective**

Support interactions are influenced by communication behaviors, perceptions, and evaluations of both parties (Goldsmith, 2004). Relationships themselves “look different” from each individual party’s perspective, and support providers’ and recipients’ perceptions of enacted support may differ, sometimes quite substantially (Bodie, Jones, Vickery, Hatcher, & Cannava, 2015; Priem et al., 2009). Likewise, advice evaluations differ depending on whether the evaluator enacts the role of advisor or recipient (Barkan, Danziger, & Shani, 2016; Danziger, Montal, & Barkan, 2012). In its original form, ART focused solely on the advice recipient’s perspective, but advisors are also influenced by advice messages (Wilson et al., 1998). Thus, we incorporate advisor evaluations of relational assessments, advice quality, and conversation satisfaction into ART, along with recipient evaluations of these elements.

We propose three testable models—differentiated by patterns of actor- and partner-effects—on the conjoint influence of recipient-reported and advisor-reported variables. Actor-effects describe the association between variables reported by the same person (e.g., associations between recipient relational assessments and recipient advice quality ratings; Kenny, Cook, & Kashy, 2006). Across all three models, we anticipate the previously-hypothesized *actor-effects* for recipients. Correspondingly, advisors may experience similar actor-effects between these variables (*the* *independent perspectives model*). However, because advice interactions focus on the recipients’ problems, advisors’ evaluation of their own advice and satisfaction with the conversation might depend on how recipients respond (*the recipient-dominant model*). Advisor outcomes may therefore be influenced by recipient *partner-effects*—when one person’s ratings influence the partner’s outcome (Kenny et al., 2006). Finally, advisors’ and recipients’ perceptions may mutually influence each other, with both advisors and recipients experiencing actor- and partner-effects (*the mutual influence model*). Figure 1 models the hypotheses about recipient actor-effects (i.e., H1 - H3) and the three perspectives representing advisor outcomes. We discuss each model below.

 **Independent perspectives model: Parallel actor-effects.** Advisors’ evaluative processes might parallel those of recipients. In other words, the relationships between relational assessments, advice quality, and conversational satisfaction may occur for advisors in the same manner as for recipients. Individuals satisfied with their relationships report they provide higher quality support (Priem et al., 2009), and advisors who perceive their advice as higher quality likely will also be more satisfied with the conversation. Although associations between relationships, advice quality, and conversation satisfaction may be parallel between advisors and recipients, advisor and recipient variables may not influence each other. From construal-level theory, Danziger and colleagues (2012) argue that advisors conceptualize advice more abstractly than recipients, who are more focused on the need to transform advice into concrete action. Further, support providers and recipients do not necessarily align in their assessments of supportive interactions (Priem & Solomon, 2015). Consequently, associations between the variables in the model may be largely role-dependent such that only actor-effects are present for either advisor or recipient. Thus, for the *independent perspectives model*, we propose that advisor perceptions of the relationship will be positively associated with advisor advice quality ratings, and these ratings will be positively associated with advisor conversational satisfaction (see Figure 1). Advisor relational perceptions may also directly influence advisor conversational satisfaction, corresponding with H3.

**Recipient-dominant model: Recipient perspectives matter most.** Although advisors conceptualize the advice interaction differently than recipients, advisors might nonetheless be attuned to, and influenced by, recipient perceptions. Supportive communication is typically motivated by the intention of helping or assisting the recipient (MacGeorge, Feng, & Burleson, 2011), making it relevant for support providers to monitor their behavior’s immediate influence. Further, it is not unusual for advice recipients to verbally indicate advice is problematic—through direct statements, pointing out drawbacks, or implicit resistance—or for advisors to display frustration when their advice is resisted (MacGeorge et al., 2015). Such behaviors indicate that advisors’ perceptions of supportive interactions are influenced by recipient responses. Correspondingly, advisors’ evaluations of advice quality and their satisfaction with the conversation could be driven by recipient perceptions (as expressed through the advice interaction) rather than their own. This reasoning suggests that advisors will be more satisfied with a supportive conversation when recipients view the advice as high quality and respond as such during the conversation. Based on this prioritization of the recipient perspective, the *recipient-dominant model* proposes that although the recipient evaluations will be driven by actor-effects, advisor advice quality and conversational satisfaction will be influenced by partner-effects (see Figure 1).

**Mutual influence model: Advisors and recipients influence each other.** Finally, a model with all actor- and partner-effects could best represent relationships between relational assessments, advice quality, and conversational satisfaction for advisors and recipients. Communication scholars often conceptualize interaction as a dynamic process between conversational partners, with both partners responding to messages, adjusting goals, and making inferences about partner intention (Caughlin, 2010; Goldsmith, 2004). Thus, although recipient perspectives may matter to advisors because recipients “own” the problems and are responsible for taking problem-solving actions, recipients may also be responsive to the advisor point of view. For example, prior research indicates that advice recipients are more likely to implement advice when the advisor expresses confidence in it (Bonaccio & Dalal, 2006), indicating that advisor perspectives may also be associated with recipient outcomes (i.e., partner-effects for recipients). Thus, the *mutual influence model* incorporates the recipient actor-effects (i.e., H1-H3), advisor actor-effects (*independent perspectives model*), and advisor partner-effects (*recipient-dominant model*), and adds recipient partner-effects (see Figure 1). Because all three models are plausible given prior research, we pose a research question:

**RQ1:** Does the independent perspectives model, the recipient-dominant model, or the mutual influence model better represent the interrelationships of advisor and recipient perceptions of relational assessments, advice quality, and conversational satisfaction?

**Method**

**Participants**

 The data for this study were obtained from a larger study of supportive interactions (*N* = 359). The subset of cases used for the current study were interactions in which both members of the dyad independently agreed that advice was given or received during the interaction (*N* = 152 dyads). Participants were college students from a large Midwestern university and received either extra credit or $10 for study participation. The average participant age was 19.7 (*SD* = 1.60) years old and 60.5% of participants were freshmen or sophomores. Fewer than one third (27.5%) were communication majors. Most participants were female in both advisor and recipient roles (64.4% and 67.1% respectively). Approximately 74% of the dyads were same-sex (*n* = 33 male-male dyads; *n* = 80 female-female dyads), with 22 male advisor-female recipient dyads and 18 female advisor-male recipient dyads. Participants described their relationship with their conversation partner in an open-ended question: 36.3% described the relationship as best friends, 27.8% as close or good friends, 24.8% as friends, 3.9% as roommates, 6.5% as a romantic relationship, and .7% said “it’s complicated”.

**Procedures**

Recruited subjects brought a friend with them to the study to participate as a dyad. Both participants were asked to individually list three to five problems, stresses, or hassles they were currently experiencing. Participants rated each problem on seriousness, distress caused by the problem, and whether they had previously talked to their partner about the problem. A research assistant reviewed the pool of both participants’ problems and identified the single most serious problem among those that had not been previously discussed between the dyad. If multiple problems met these criteria, the most distressing problem was chosen. The participant whose problem was selected was assigned the role of advice recipient and the other participant was assigned the role of advice giver: these labels were not communicated to participants, but determined subsequent procedures. Participants were separated and completed the relational assessment measures (i.e., partner characteristics, interdependence, closeness, past support). Participants were then reunited to discuss the selected recipient problem for up to 15 minutes. The dyad was again separated to complete questionnaires about the advice quality and conversational satisfaction. Only advisors and recipients who both reported advice was given during the interaction were included in this study.

**Measures**

Confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) were conducted for all measures, and each measure was assessed for invariance between advisors and recipients and for adequate model fit (see Table 1; Kenny et al., 2006; Kline, 2011).

 **Partner characteristics.** Partner characteristics (labeled “advisor characteristics” in publications focused on the recipient’s perspective) was modeled as a second-order construct with first-order ratings of liking, similarity, and trust of the partner. Five items were taken from Rubin’s (1970) Liking Scale (e.g., I think that my friend is one of those people who quickly wins respect”) and were measured on a 5-point scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*; Cronbach’s alpha [henceforth *α*] = .79, .82 [hereafter respectively listed as advisor and recipient). Four items from the Perceived Homophily Scale (McCroskey, Richmond, & Daly, 1975) assessed partner similarity to self (e.g., 1 = *doesn’t think like me*, 7 = *thinks like me*; *α* = .84, .83). Six items from the Individualized Trust Scale (Wheeless & Grotz, 1977) measured trust on a semantic differential scale (e.g., 1 = *is untrustworthy*, 7 = *is trustworthy*; *α* = .76, .73).

 **Interdependence.** Interdependence between the advisor and recipient was assessed with five items slightly modified from Knobloch and Solomon (2003; e.g., “My friend affects how I schedule my activities”) measured on a 5-point scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*; *α* = .81, .87).

 **Closeness.** Participants rated their relational closeness on six items from the Depth subscale of the Quality of Relationships Inventory (Pierce, 1994; e.g., “How significant is this relationship in your life?”) on a 4-point scale (1 = *not at all*, 4 = *very much*; *α* = .87, .90).

 **Past** **support.** Participant perceptions of past received support from their partner were assessed with 14 items from Xu and Burleson’s (2001) experienced support scale. The scale includes four types of support, which were used to represent a second-order construct: emotional support (conveying care and sympathy), informational support (giving advice and information), esteem support (bolstering self-worth and expressing liking), and network support (providing connections to others and a sense of belonging). All items started with the stem “Please use the scale below to indicate how much of each behavior you currently receive from your friend…” and were measured on a 5-point scale (1 = *don’t receive at all*, 5 = *receive a great deal*). Items measured emotional (four items, e.g., “Providing you with hope or confidence”; *α* = .70, .75), informational (three items, e.g., “Analyzing a situation with you and telling you about available choices and options”; *α* = .75, .82), esteem (four items, e.g., “Assuring you that you are a worthwhile person”; *α* = .87, .90), and network support (three items, e.g., “Connecting you with people whom you may turn to for help”; *α* = .85, .86).

 **Advice quality.** Following MacGeorge et al. (2004), participants rated advice quality based on its helpfulness, supportiveness, and effectiveness on a 5-point scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*; *α* = .81, .86).

 **Conversation satisfaction.** Advisors and recipients reported on their conversational satisfaction with eight items (e.g., “I would like to have another conversation like this one”) from the Interpersonal Communication Satisfaction Inventory (Hecht, 1978) measured on a 5-point scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*; *α* = .89, .85).

**Plan of Analysis**

The primary analyses were conducted with structural equation models in MPlus 7.3 using maximum likelihood estimation (Muthén & Muthén, 2012). Participants’ sex and age were included as predictors of advice quality and conversation satisfaction. All models allowed exogenous variables to freely covary and included error covariances between analogous endogenous variables (i.e., between advisor and recipient advice quality, and between advisor and recipient conversation satisfaction). All variables were represented as observed variables per APIM recommendations (Kenny et al., 2006). All observed variables (i.e., exogenous and endogenous variables) were standardized prior to model entry. To create observed variables for the second-order latent factors, scales were standardized and then used as indicators of a first-order factor (i.e., liking, similarity, and trust were the three standardized indicators of the partner characteristics latent variable, and emotional, informational, esteem, and network support were the four standardized indicators of the past support latent variable). The factor scores of these two latent variables were downloaded and used as observed variables (Muthén & Muthén, 2012). Results did not significantly vary when using the second-order factor scores as observed variables compared to the latent representations. We report unstandardized path coefficients from the model output, which are interpreted as standardized (Kline, 2011). Indirect effects are reported with 95% bias corrected bootstrapped confidence intervals based on 5,000 resamples.

**Results**

The negligible missing data (0.003%) were handled with mean replacement. Data were examined for univariate, bivariate, and multivariate normality. Three dyads were not analyzed because they were multivariate outliers (i.e., Mahalanobis Distance > 3 *SD* above the mean). Treatment of dyads as independent was both theoretically warranted (based on role assignment) and empirically indicated by better fit of an unconstrained effects model (*X213*Δ*=*35.40, *p <* .001). Descriptive statistics and correlations for all variables are reported in Table 2.

**Model Selection**

 To address RQ1, we first compared structural equation models representing the three advisor models. The independent perspectives model included all actor-effects and no partner-effects, the recipient-dominant model included recipient actor-effects and recipient to advisor partner-effects, and the mutual influence model included all actor- and partner-effects (see Figure 1). For each model, two SEMs were examined: one with direct actor effects between relational assessments and conversation satisfaction, and one without direct effects (i.e., indirect effects only, based on H3). Thus, six models in total were considered (see Table 1 for goodness of fit statistics). The mutual influence model with direct effects displayed the best fit statistics when compared to other models (e.g., direct effects recipient-dominant model *X24*Δ*=*24.41, *p* < .001, and no direct effects mutual influence model *X28*Δ*=*25.54, *p* = .001; Kline, 2011). Residuals of the final model were all below .20. Because the relationship between advice quality and conversation satisfaction was based on theory and not truly predictive, we reran the best fitting model with these two variables switched (i.e., with conversation satisfaction predicting advice quality) to demonstrate the theoretically-driven model was superior.

 As recommended by Ledermann, Macho, and Kenny (2011), after we determined the mutual influence model with direct effects was the best-fitting model, we tested individual paths for indistinguishability. If constraining paths between advisors and recipients did not worsen model fit by a chi-square difference test, the paths were constrained to be equal. This allowed us to simplify the model in theoretically appropriate and meaningful ways (Ledermann et al., 2011). Many paths were indistinguishable (discussed in detail below) and the final model with these indistinguishable paths constrained displayed good fit (see Table 1). We use this final constrained model to report our results. Path coefficients are reported in Table 3, although only statistically significant paths are modeled (see Figure 2) and discussed in-text. Overall, the final model explained 10.1% of advisor advice quality variance, 17.2% of recipient advice quality variance, 26% of advisor conversational satisfaction variance, and 30.7% of recipient conversational satisfaction variance. Advisor and recipient advice quality were not correlated in the model (*r* = .09, *p* = .19), although advisor and recipient ratings of conversation satisfaction were positively related (*r* = .17, *p* = .001).
**Actor-Effects**

H1 proposed recipient relational assessments (partner characteristics, interdependence, closeness, and past support) would impact recipient advice quality. These actor-effects were indistinguishable between advisors and recipients, thus actor-effects between relational assessment variables and advice quality were constrained between advisors and recipients. Actor ratings of partner characteristics, interdependence, and closeness did not influence that person’s advice quality ratings. Individuals’ ratings of partner past support positively predicted their advice quality ratings (β = .41, *p <* .001). H1 was partially supported for advisors and recipients.

 H2 proposed recipient advice quality would be positive associated with recipient conversation satisfaction: this path was indistinguishable between advisors and recipients and was constrained. Participant advice quality ratings were positively associated with their conversation satisfaction (β = .36, *p <* .001). H2 was supported for advisors and recipients.

 H3 proposed recipient relational assessments would impact recipient conversation satisfaction directly and indirectly through recipient advice quality ratings. Three direct effects on conversation satisfaction were indistinguishable between advisors and recipients: partner characteristics, interdependence, and past support. Only past support significantly predicted conversation satisfaction, with greater reports of past support predicting greater conversation satisfaction (β = .26, *p =* .01). The direct actor effect between closeness and conversation satisfaction varied based on role: recipients’ closeness ratings did not directly predict their conversation satisfaction, but increased advisor closeness ratings marginally predicted lowered conversation satisfaction (β = -.17, *p =* .07). Both advisors and recipients had one significant indirect actor-effect: greater actor past support ratings lead to greater actor conversation satisfaction through the positive impact on actor advice quality ratings (B = .15, 95% CI = [.06, .27]). H3 was partially supported.

**Partner Effects**

 The best fitting model included partner-effects for both advisors and recipients. Three of the partner relational assessment to actor advice quality effects were indistinguishable between advisors and recipients for partner characteristics, closeness, and past support. Only one of these three effects was statistically significant: as the partner’s rating of actor characteristics increased, actor advice quality ratings decreased (β = -.30, *p =* .01). The partner-effect of interdependence on advice quality varied by role: higher advisor interdependence ratings led to lower recipient advice quality ratings (β = -.23, *p =* .01), but recipient interdependence ratings did not significantly influence advisor advice quality.

 The effect of partner advice quality ratings on actor conversation satisfaction varied by role. As advisors rated advice quality as higher, recipients reported lower conversation satisfaction (β = -.13, *p =* .05). As recipients rated advice quality as higher, advisors reported higher conversation satisfaction (β = .13, *p =* .07), although this was marginally significant.

 Some indirect partner effects from relational assessment to conversation satisfaction were statistically significant through advice quality. Because indirect effects were mediated through two variables (advisor and recipient advice quality), specific mediation paths were statistically significant when the total indirect effect was not. Only cases in which total indirect effects were statistically significant are reported. For both advisors and recipients, partner ratings of actor characteristics had a negative indirect impact on actor conversation satisfaction through actor advice quality (B = -.11, 95% CI = [-.19, -.04]). The distinguishable negative effect of advisor interdependence on recipient advice quality caused a negative, indirect effect on recipient conversation satisfaction (B = -.08, 95% CI = [-.16, -.03]), and on advisor conversation satisfaction (B = -.03, 95% CI = [-.09, .00]).

RQ1, which inquired about advisor actor-effects and advisor and recipient partner-effects, was answered: most advisor actor-effects were indistinguishable from recipient actor-effects, and partner-effects were present for both advisor and recipients between (a) relational assessments and advice quality, (b) advice quality and conversation satisfaction, and (c) indirectly between relational assessments and conversation satisfaction.

**Discussion**

To date, theorizing about advice has been constrained by insufficient focus on advice interactions, advising relationships, and the perspective of the advisor. In this paper, we began to extend Advice Response Theory (ART), addressing these limitations by examining how relational assessments influence advice quality and satisfaction with the supportive conversation for both advisor and recipient. An actor-partner interdependence model demonstrated support for the *mutual influence model*. This model proposed that relational assessments, advice quality, and conversation satisfaction are related through an individual’s own assessment of these elements, but that both individuals are also impacted by their partner’s assessments. Many of these effects were statistically indistinguishable by role (i.e., were the same for advisors and recipients). Actor-effects (the impact of one participant’s ratings of relational assessments on advice quality, and advice quality on conversation satisfaction) were indistinguishable by role and behaved as predicted. Participants who thought their partners gave more support during past interactions rated advice quality in the current interaction as higher, and higher rating of both elements corresponded with greater satisfaction with the conversation. The mutual influence model was supported by the presence of partner-effects for advisors and recipients, but the direction of these effects was unexpected. Specifically, one individual’s positive assessment of the relationship negatively impacted the other’s ratings of advice quality, especially for advice recipients.

Theoretically, our findings support modifying current ART propositions about advisor characteristics to encompass broader relational assessments. At the same time, they suggest that ART needs to provide a more nuanced treatment of how diverse relational assessments affect outcomes, and to recognize differences in relational influence on recipients versus advisors. These findings have practical implications for advisors and advice recipients. We first discuss the impact of advice quality on conversation satisfaction, and then describe the impact of relational assessments on both these variables.

**Influence of Advice on Satisfaction with Supportive Interaction**

Although it might be assumed that advice quality influences satisfaction with a supportive interaction (MacGeorge, Feng et al., 2016), prior ART research had not directly tested this claim. Instead, ART research has focused on post-interaction, recipient-focused outcomes such as coping facilitation and implementation intention. Satisfaction with a supportive conversation is especially relevant in relational contexts where it is likely to affect willingness to engage in future support-seeking or support provision. The current findings provide evidence that advice quality is associated with conversational satisfaction for both recipients and advisors. Advisors and recipients both reported more satisfaction with the conversation when they perceived the advice was of higher quality: this effect did not differ by participant role. These findings are broadly consistent with supportive communication theory, insofar as receiving higher quality support improves a wide range of outcomes for recipients (MacGeorge, Feng, & Burleson, 2011) and providing higher quality support generates greater satisfaction for support providers (Spitzmuller & Van Dyne, 2013).

 Although actor-effects of advice quality on conversation satisfaction were identical between roles, advisor and recipient outcomes differed based on their partner’s advice quality ratings. Advisors were more satisfied with the conversation when recipients rated the advice as higher in quality, supporting the contention that advisors orient to recipient perceptions of advice. Advisors likely recognize when recipients are displeased by advice (see MacGeorge, Guntzviller, Branch et al., 2016) and accordingly are pleased when recipients value their suggestions. However, unlike advisors, recipients reported *lower* conversation satisfaction when advisors rated their advice as higher quality. Advisors may overestimate the utility of their advice, strongly advocating for their “good” solutions, especially if recipients initially reject the advice as inefficacious or unfeasible (MacGeorge, Guntzviller, Branch et al., 2016). Advisors who perceive a solution to be beneficial to the recipient may inadvertently threaten the recipient’s face in their attempt to articulate the advice quality (Goldsmith & Fitch, 1997). Alternatively, advisors may judge their proposed solutions harshly, but recipients may be relatively satisfied with the supportive interaction because their friends demonstrated support, even if the advised action itself is not an ideal solution.

**Influence of Relational Assessments on Advice and Conversation**

Expanding from ART’s assertion that certain advisor characteristics influence advice evaluation, we examined the predictive role of partner characteristics and three additional relational assessments on advice quality and conversation satisfaction ratings. Importantly, we assessed these relational variables prior to the advice interactions to eliminate bias from retrospective recall. Although we hypothesized that relational assessments would have a uniformly positive impact on advice and conversation perceptions, this was not the case. Instead, each relational variable behaved uniquely and sometimes counter to predictions.

**Partner characteristics.** Consistent with past research on advisor characteristics (e.g., MacGeorge, Guntzviller, Hanasono et al., 2016), advisors and recipients reported on the extent to which they liked, trusted, and were similar to their friends. Advisors and recipients did not differ in how partner characteristics ratings impacted the advice and conversation outcomes. No actor-effects were statistically significant: ratings of a friend’s liking, trust, and similarly did not impact that person’s advice quality or conversation satisfaction. This finding was surprising and counter to predictions, as prior research indicates that recipient ratings of advisor characteristics positively impact recipient evaluations of advice features (e.g., Feng & MacGeorge, 2010; Van Swol, 2011). Previous studies have used retrospective recall, which may cause recipient-rated advisor characteristics to be more strongly associated with advice quality ratings than in immediate assessments of advice interactions (MacGeorge, Guntzviller, Hanasono et al., 2016). Moreover, ART posits that recipient assessments of advisor characteristics impact advice quality ratings predominantly through recipient evaluations of specific message features. The current study did not include those mediating variables. Additionally, past studies *only* examined partner characteristics, as they were not focused on relational assessments. Given that advice is a form of social support, past supportive behavior between advisor and recipient may overshadow effects of individual characteristic perceptions on advice and conversation ratings.

Higher ratings of a friend’s characteristics did influence partner advice quality, but in the opposite direction than expected. Rating a friend as more likeable, similar, and trustworthy was associated with the friend rating advice quality as worse, regardless of participant role (i.e., advisor or recipient). Moreover, this negative effect also decreased that person’s conversation satisfaction indirectly, because it lowered their advice quality ratings. One explanation connects with the observation that “weak ties” are sometimes more useful than “strong ties” (Fingerman, 2009). Friends with high levels of similarity are likely to have overlapping knowledge and resources, and consequently advice within these relationships may be insufficiently novel to be useful. Moreover, Wright and Miller (2010) suggest weak-tie relationships can be superior for support than strong-tie relationships as the type of similarity between provider and recipient may be based on the situation (rather than demographic or interpersonal similarity) and the reduced emotional attachment of a weak-tie support provider allows for greater objectivity. A second explanation is that individuals who like, trust, and feel more similar to their partners may feel entitled to give advice with less facework (such as unsolicited advice; Feng & Magen, 2016) or to respond negatively when advice is not deemed useful (MacGeorge, Guntzviller, Branch et al., 2016). Although relational closeness does tend to reduce perceptions of face threat (e.g., Zhang & Stafford, 2008), both advisors and recipients may overestimate the extent to which their relationship grants them latitude to threaten face. Further research is needed to determine if this partner-effect is a consequence of objectively worse advice solutions or communication styles that negatively impact partner’s perceptions.

**Closeness.** Closeness was the only relational assessment that did not have any statistically significant effects on the outcome variables. One effect was marginally significant: greater advisor closeness ratings predicted lower advisor conversation satisfaction. Interactions in close relationships can be sources of frustration (Bradbury, Fincham, & Beach, 2000). Advisors in close relationships may advise more frequently (Feng & Magen, 2016), and are probably more aware of recipients’ problems and the limitations of the support they can offer, contributing to a greater sense that supportive conversation is effortful or even ineffective. Close advisors could also be less satisfied with advice interactions because, over time, they are able to ascertain that the recipient typically disregards the advice (Cheuk & Rosen, 1992).

 **Interdependence.** Although closeness and interdependence are closely related, the effect of interdependence was distinctive in this study. When advisors rated their relationship as more interdependent, recipients rated advice quality as lower. Moreover, this negative relationship between advisor interdependence and recipient advice quality facilitated negative indirect effects on both advisor conversation satisfaction and recipient conversation satisfaction. When advisors’ and recipients’ lives are closely intertwined, advisors may feel particularly motivated to not only solve recipient problems, but to encourage particular solutions, as recipient problems and outcomes may directly impact the advisor’s life. For example, with academic problems (a frequent problem in the current dataset), advising a friend to “study more in the evenings” may not only address the recipient’s problem (“I’m not doing well in my classes”) but may also be self-serving for the advisor: the advisor can also study more if the recipient is not encouraging the advisor to socialize. Thus, advisors who rate the advisor-recipient relationship as interdependent may feel more entitled to give advice, advocate strongly for a particular solution, or repeat advice previously given, even if recipients did not seek advice or displayed resistance (Feng & Magen, 2015; MacGeorge Guntzviller, Branch et al., 2016). Regardless of whether advisor motives are self-focused or more altruistic, these behaviors likely cause the recipient to rate the advice as lower in quality (see Guntzviller & MacGeorge, 2013; MacGeorge, Guntzviller, Branch et al., 2016).

**Past support.** Of the relational assessments examined in this study, past support best aligned with predictions for both advisors and recipients. All past support effects were indistinguishable between roles, were actor-effects, and had a positive impact on the outcomes. Participants who said their partners gave them more support in the past rated the current advice as higher quality and were more satisfied with the conversation. Past support increased conversational satisfaction directly and indirectly through advice quality. These findings indicate past received support facilitates positive feelings about subsequent advice and supportive conversation, regardless of whether the individual is the support provider or recipient. These findings align with our extensions of ART predictions that favorable relational assessments facilitate more favorable ratings of advice and the conversation (MacGeorge, Guntzviller, Hanasono et al., 2016).

**Theoretical Implications and Directions**

These findings support extensions to ART, and more generally, urge scholars toward a more interactional and relational mode of thinking about advice and supportive interactions (see also Goldsmith, 2004; Priem & Solomon, 2015). Prior focus on advisor characteristics (Bonaccio & Dalal, 2006; MacGeorge et al., 2016) now appears too narrow for understanding how advisors and recipients interact, since a broader range of relational assessments contribute to the prediction of advice quality and conversational satisfaction for both recipients and advisors. Expanded tests on relational qualities could include uncertainty and turbulence (Solomon, Knobloch, Theiss, & McLaren, 2016), satisfaction (Bradbury et al., 2000), and power discrepancy (Knudson-Martin, 2013). Identifying past support as a particularly strong influence on the evaluation of present supportive behavior emphasizes that advice interactions between partners in intimate relationships cannot be divorced from the longer history of those relationships (see Goldsmith, 2004). Future research could encompass how advisors’ and recipients’ behavior during an interaction and across time influence their outcomes, including contributing to perceptions of the advisor-recipient relationship. Advice conversations likely impact subsequent assessments of received support quality and the advisor-recipient relationship (Afifi, Shahnazi, Coveleski, Davis, & Merrill, 2017). Moreover, stressors are often discussed multiple times in close relationships, and advice and support related to an ongoing stressor can extend over multiple conversations (Afifi et al., 2017; MacGeorge, Feng et al., 2016). Previous advice conversations about a stressor likely contextualize future advice quality ratings and conversation satisfaction. Longitudinal research capturing support interactions is needed to document how advice unfolds over multiple interactions and the causal impact of advice conversations on relationships over time.

Further, our findings emphasize that subsequent theorizing must account for ways in which advisor perceptions align and differ from those of recipients. Prior research indicates that advisors construe problems differently than advice recipients (Danziger et al., 2012), and that supportive behavior is influenced by providers’ appraisals and attributions about the recipient’s problem (Holmstrom, Russell, & Clare, 2013; MacGeorge, 2001) and by goals for the interaction (Guntzviller & MacGeorge, 2013; Shi, 2013). Our work extends these observations, suggesting that actor-effects may remain consistent regardless of role, but that relational intimacy and interdependence put advisors at greater risk for producing advice that will be less-positively received. Examining conversation messages could reveal how these effects manifest. For example, do advisors who rate their relationship as higher in independence feel they experience the same stressors and verbally ruminate during the advice interaction, shifting the focus from the advice recipient and causing less positive perceptions of advice (see Afifi et al., 2017)? Moreover, although recipient perceptions of advisor characteristics link to positive recipient outcomes in previous studies, they negatively impacted advisor advice ratings in the current study. These partner-effects reveal theoretically important insights when models of dyadic interaction are fully specified. To further theory on advisor-recipient discrepancy, its consequences, and possible interventions, future research could examine how advisors and recipients evaluate the problem (e.g., problem severity; MacGeorge, Guntzviller, Hanasono et al., 2016) and how problem assessment influences advice messages and evaluations (e.g., MacGeorge, 2001).

**Limitations**

The current results should be interpreted while considering the limitations of the sample and study design. Study participants were predominantly White, college-aged students, and thus are subject to the generalizability limitations inherent in utilizing a fairly well-educated, White, and young adult sample. Our study procedures prioritized selection of serious stressors not previously discussed by the dyad, because past discussions or advice interactions likely influence subsequent discussions of the same topic. Thus, role assignment was not random within the dyad, but based on problem characteristics.

Relational characteristics were assessed prior to advice conversations, but advice quality ratings and conversational satisfaction were assessed after the conclusion of the conversation. Thus, although causal claims can be made about relational assessments on advice and conversational ratings, the data cannot fully support causal claims between advice quality and conversational satisfaction. However, a model with these two variables switched produced worse fit.

Perceptions of advice were likely influenced by partner response during the interaction. The current study examines advisor and recipient cognitions, with the assumption that these views will be communicated to partners during the interaction. We did not measure the process during the interaction by which advisors and recipients came to their evaluations of the advice or the conversation, or the specific conversational behaviors and sequences that influenced these ratings (see MacGeorge et al., 2015; MacGeorge, Guntzviller, Branch et al., 2016). Future research could examine specific communication behaviors in which evaluations of the advice are discussed or communicated. Although modeling involving behaviors and perceptions from both dyadic members is especially complex, incorporating cognitive and behavioral elements is likely necessary for a comprehensive explanation about how advice is exchanged in ways that benefit or harm individuals and relationships. Compared with hypothetical scenarios and evaluations of researcher-designed messages, assessments of naturalistic interactions have advantages, yet the presence of the recording equipment, or the requirement to discuss a specific problem may have interfered with normal interaction behavior in unknown ways. We encourage continued innovation in methods for studying advice and supportive interaction.

**Advice for Advising Dyads**

Practically, the current findings indicate that support providers should anticipate their advice influences the recipient’s holistic view of their support and that support perceptions matter for future advice interaction ratings. More specifically, advisors need to recognize that what they view as good advice may associate with lower conversational satisfaction for the recipient, and that having an intimate relationship or being interdependent do not guarantee that advice will be well received—it may even work against it. To enhance the likelihood of giving good advice from the recipient’s perspective and leaving recipients satisfied with the supportive conversation, advisors likely need to focus on recommending useful actions, being friendly and respectful, and not pushing their own perspectives, especially when they differ markedly from those of recipients (MacGeorge, Guntzviller, Branch et al., 2016). At the same time, for the good of close relationships, advice recipients could acknowledge their partners’ efforts to provide support (even when those are less-than-ideal), recognize that close others do not always have the perspective to recommend useful actions, and to help their partners by indicating the kind of support they are seeking. Engaging in advice interactions with people who have provided good support in the past can be satisfying for both advisors and recipients, and can lead to overall higher advice quality ratings.
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Table 1

Goodness of Fit Statistics

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | *Χ2* | *df* | *p* | RMSEA | RMSEA CI90 | CFI | TLI |
| **CFAs** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Partner Characteristics |  | 161.13 | 87 | .00 | .053 | .040, .066 | .93 | .92 |
| Interdependence |  | 17.89 | 5 | .00 | .090 | .049, .141 | .98 | .95 |
| Closeness |  | 59.59 | 53 | .25 | .029 | .000, .061 | .99 | .99 |
| Past Support |  | 93.34 | 59 | .00 | .044 | .026, .061 | .98 | .98 |
| Advice Quality |  | 14.95 | 8 | .06 | .076 | .000, .136 | .98 | .96 |
| Conversation Satisfaction |  | 33.02 | 19 | .02 | .050 | .018, .078 | .98 | .97 |
| **APIM** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Independent Perspectives  | Direct | 41.27 | 20 | .00 | .084 | .047, .121 | .83 | .55 |
|  | No direct | 57.53 | 26 | .00 | .090 | .059, .122 | .75 | .48 |
| Recipient-Dominant | Direct | 38.52 | 16 | .00 | .097 | .058, .137 | .96 | .75 |
|  | No direct | 61.42 | 24 | .00 | .102 | .071, .134 | .93 | .73 |
| Mutual Influence | Direct | 14.11 | 12 | .29 | .034 | .000, .094 | .98 | .93 |
|  | No direct | 30.81 | 18 | .03 | .069 | .021, .110 | .90 | .70 |
| Direct, AQ and CS switched | 32.12 | 12 | .001 | .106 | .063, .151 | .84 | .29 |
| **Constrained Final Model** | **22.38** | **23** | **.50** | **.000** | **.000, .065** | **1.00** | **1.00** |

*Note.* Each model was tested with (i.e., Direct) and without (i.e., No direct) actor-effects between relational assessments and conversation satisfaction. The direct Mutual Influence model was selected as the best-fitting model. In this model, individual paths were tested for distinguishability between advisors and recipients, and constrained in the “Constrained Final Model” if indistinguishable.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics and Bivariate Correlations

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | M (SD) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| 1. ASex | ---- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. AAge | 19.77 (1.63) | .07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. APartnerChar | 0.00 (.76) | .20\* | .01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. AIntdpd | 3.24 (.87) | .03 | -.05 | .28\*\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. ACloseness | 2.95 (.66) | .20\* | -.05 | .44\*\*\* | .59\*\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. ASupport | 0.00 (.83) | .39\*\*\* | -.08 | .50\*\*\* | .42\*\*\* | .70\*\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. AAdvQual | 4.09 (.59) | .04 | -.03 | .15† | .03 | .11 | .21\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. AConvSat | 4.29 (.59) | .10 | -.15† | .16† | -.08 | .00 | .24\*\*\* | .37\*\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. RSex | ---- | .41\*\*\* | .04 | .16† | -.08 | .13 | .30\*\*\* | .09 | .27\*\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. RAge | 19.73 (1.60) | .06 | .60\*\*\* | .15† | .07 | .12 | -.02 | -.05 | -.22\*\* | -.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11. RPartnerChar | 0.00 (.62) | .18\* | -.01 | .52\*\*\* | .30\*\*\* | .47\*\*\* | .48\*\*\* | .07 | .13 | .14† | .03 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12. RIntdpd | 3.29 (.91) | -.01 | -.08 | .12 | .53\*\*\* | .47\*\*\* | .33\*\*\* | .13 | .00 | -.10 | -.03 | .38\*\*\* |  |  |  |  |
| 13. RCloseness | 2.94 (.72) | .05 | -.12 | .25\*\*\* | .54\*\*\* | .59\*\*\* | .50\*\*\* | .14† | .06 | .02 | -.01 | .63\*\*\* | .69\*\*\* |  |  |  |
| 14. RSupport | 0.00 (.88) | .23\* | -.11 | .44\*\*\* | .42\*\*\* | .62\*\*\* | .70\*\*\* | .14† | .21\* | .25\*\*\* | -.02 | .74\*\*\* | .50\*\*\* | .71\*\*\* |  |  |
| 15. RAdvQual | 4.19 (.63) | .13 | -.05 | -.15† | -.18\* | -.04 | .02 | .08 | .19\* | .03 | -.15† | .09 | -.02 | .07 | .19\* |  |
| 16. RConvSat | 4.21 (.52) | .20\* | -.04 | .05 | -.05 | .12 | .23\*\* | -.07 | .31\*\*\* | .19\* | -.20\* | .25\*\* | .03 | .20\* | .32\*\*\* | .48\*\*\* |

 *Notes.* “A” prefix. = Advisor’s Rating. “R” prefix = Advice Receiver’s Rating. For sex, 0 = *male*, 1 = *female*. PartnerChar = Partner Characteristics. Intdpd = Interdependence. Support = Past Support Received. AdvQual = Advice Quality. ConvSat = Conversation Satisfaction. PartnerChar and Support variables are downloaded latent factor scores (with the indicators respectively being the standardized scales of liking, similarity, and trustworthiness; and emotional, information, network, and esteem support).

†*p* < .10, *\*p* < .05, \*\**p* < .01, \*\*\**p* < .001.

Table 3

APIM Standardized Path Estimates

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Endogenous Variables |
|  |  | AAdvQual | RAdvQual |  | AConvSat | RConvSat |
| *Relational Characteristics* |  |  |  |  |
|  | APartnerChar | .15(.11) | -.30\*\*(.11) |   | .12(.09) | --- |
|  | AIntdpd | -.11(.08) | **-.23\*(.09)** |   | -.10(.07) |   |
|  | ACloseness | -.04(.09) | .08(.09) |   | **-.17†(.09)** |   |
|  | ASupport | .41\*\*\*(.11) | -.09(.11) |   | .26\*\*(.10) | --- |
|  | RPartnerChar | -.30\*\*(.11) | .15(.11) |  | --- | .12(.09) |
|  | RIntdpd | **.13(.10)** | -.11(.08) |  | --- | -.10(.07) |
|  | RCloseness | .08(.09) | -.04(.09) |  | --- | **.05(.09)** |
|  | RSupport  | -.09(.11) | .41\*\*\*(.11) |  |  | .26\*\*(.10) |
| *Advice Quality* |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | AAdvQual | --- | --- |   | .36\*\*\*(.05) | **-.13\*(.07)** |
|  | RAdvQual | --- | --- |  | **.13†(.07)** | .36\*\*\*(.05) |
| *Control Variables* |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Advisor Sex | -.07(.09) | .15†(.08) |   | -.01(.07) | --- |
|  | Advisor Age | .03(.10) | .07(.09) |   | -.15\*(.07) | --- |
|  | Recipient Sex | .05(.09) | -.13(.08) |  | --- | .06(.07) |
|  | Recipient Age | -.05(.10) | -.17†(.10) |  | --- | -.13†(.07) |

*Notes.* See Table 1 for abbreviations. Most predicted paths were indistinguishable: bolded coefficients indicate distinguishability between advisors and recipients. Coefficients are interpreted as standardized as all variables were standardized prior to entry. Standard errors are reported in parentheses.

†*p* < .10, *\*p* < .05, \*\**p* < .01, \*\*\**p* < .001.

Figure 1

Hypothesized APIM

*Note.* H1-H3 and correlations are included in all models. IP = Independent Perspectives model. RD = Recipient-Dominant model. MI= Mutual Influence model.

Figure 2

****Statistically Significant Paths of the Final APIM

*Note.* Standardized path coefficients reported. R-squared predicted variance displayed in upper right corner of endogenous variables. Exogenous covariances not pictured for parsimony. Dashed lines represent marginally significant paths (i.e., *p* < .10). Black lines represent paths constrained across role; gray lines are not constrained.

**+***p* < .10, *\*p* < .05, \*\**p* < .01, \*\*\**p* < .001.