Advice: Expanding the Communication Paradigm

Erina L. MacGeorge

Pennsylvania State University

Bo Feng

University of California, Davis

Lisa M. Guntzviller

University of Illinois

Manuscript accepted for *Communication Yearbook, 40*

.

Contact information:

Erina MacGeorge
elm26@psu.edu
Associate Professor
Pennsylvania State University
Communication Arts and Sciences
221 Sparks Building
University Park, PA 16802
(765) 430-7896

Bo Feng
bfeng@ucdavis.edu
Associate Professor
University of California, Davis
361 Kerr Hall
Davis, CA 95616
(530) 204-8321

Lisa Guntzviller
lguntzviller@gmail.com
Assistant Professor, Department of Communication
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
3001 Lincoln Hall
702 S. Wright St. Urbana, IL 61801
(217) 265-0764

Abstract

Advice is a ubiquitous form of support and influence, exchanged in diverse contexts. Communication scholars have examined how advice recipients evaluate advice, but have done less to explore the breadth of effects it can have. We contrast the "message paradigm" for advice research with three alternative paradigms, each developed primarily by scholars from other disciplines. We then spotlight five directions for future research, integrating elements of the alternative paradigms with communication questions, perspectives, and methods of inquiry. By acquainting our discipline with existing theory and research on advice, we encourage bolder exploration of this consequential interpersonal phenomenon.

Advice: Expanding the Communication Paradigm

…it would be best by far

for all people by nature to have complete knowledge,

but if not, since that is not how things lean,

then it is well that they learn from good advice

Sophocles, *Antigone*[1]

People have problems. Many of those problems are more easily addressed with advice from others. Consequently, advice is a ubiquitous form of interpersonal communication[2], exchanged in both personal and professional contexts (Lomi, Lusher, Pattison, & Robins, 2013; MacGeorge & Hall, 2014), in a wide range of relationship configurations (B. Feng & Magen, 2015; Koenig, 2011), in face-to-face and mediated interactions (Blank, Schmidt, Vangsness, Monteiro, & Santagata, 2010), and in diverse cultures (Chentsova-Dutton & Vaughn, 2011; B. Feng, 2014b). Indeed, the impact of advice on recipients, advisors, relationships, groups, and organizations is evident in multiple life domains. To offer just a few examples: Grandmothers advise on infant feeding (Reid, Schmied, & Beale, 2010), young women advise one another on HPV vaccination (Miller-Ott & Durham, 2011), financial advisors recommend investment strategies (Marsden, Zick, & Mayer, 2011), and managers consult with other managers (S.-S. Wong & Boh, 2014),

Communication scholars have emphasized that advice is both social support and social influence (MacGeorge, Feng, Butler, & Budarz, 2004; Wilson & Kunkel, 2000). In other words, advice has the capacity to reduce recipients' distress and improve their coping in tandem with persuading them to take particular problem-solving actions (MacGeorge, Guntzviller, Hanasono,

& Feng, 2013). These positive consequences of advice are counter-balanced by its potential to threaten face or identity, increase distress, and generate resistance to the advised action (Goldsmith & Fitch, 1997). Indeed, most communication research on advice has focused on explaining how features of advice messages affect supportive and persuasive outcomes for recipients (for a review, see MacGeorge, Feng, & Burleson, 2011). This research agenda has produced valuable insight into the relationship between the design of advice messages and immediate effects on their intended targets. Yet it has also underestimated the complexity and the consequentiality of advice because of its relative inattention to other predictors and outcomes, reliance on a narrow range of methods and theoretical perspectives, and insufficient attention to the wide range of relationships and contexts in which advice is exchanged.

This chapter was written to encourage communication scholars to move beyond seeing advice as a social support or social influence “message,” and explore the influence of person-to-person advising in interactions, relationships, organizations, cultures, and online. To open these directions for future research, we begin by reviewing and critiquing the central paradigm for communication research on advice—what we call the message paradigm of research on advice (see also MacGeorge et al., 2004). We then discuss three alternative paradigms of advice research conducted primarily (though not exclusively) by scholars from other disciplines, highlighting their strengths and limitations. In the final section, we recommend five future directions for research on advice. These directions reflect integrations of the existing paradigms, but also encourage a broader domain of topical focus and practical application, together with more diversity of theoretical perspective and research methods. Overall, we have two goals: acquainting communication scholars with the broad territory of existing theory and research on advice, and encouraging bolder exploration of this consequential interpersonal phenomenon.

The Message Paradigm

At present, the message paradigm for research on advice has two defining characteristics: (a) positioning advice as a type of message provided in supportive encounters, usually in personal relationships, and (b) focusing on the relationship between qualities of these advice messages and their effects on recipients (Goldsmith & MacGeorge, 2000). Indeed, most of this work fits within the broader tradition of studying social support from a “communication perspective” (MacGeorge et al., 2011), where advice is typically categorized as a form of informational or instrumental support and has been explicitly defined as messages that make recommendations about what to do, think, or feel in response to a problematic situation (MacGeorge, Feng, & Thompson, 2008). Researchers whose work contributes to the message paradigm principally come from departments of communication (but see Dalal & Bonaccio, 2010), but affiliation with a communication department is not a defining characteristic, as several ‘COM’ scholars have done work that makes important contributions to other paradigms and will be reviewed in later sections (e.g., Goldsmith, 2004).

In many respects, the message paradigm emerged from work by Goldsmith (1992, 1994), who encouraged focused interest in advice by arguing (based on politeness theory, Brown & Levinson, 1987), that variation in advice outcomes is a function of the threat it poses to recipients’ face. Advice has the potential to threaten “negative face” when recipients perceive advice as “butting in” and constraining autonomy, and “positive face” when recipients perceive advice as implying a lack of knowledge or competence (Goldsmith, 1999; Goldsmith & Fitch, 1997). Multiple studies built on this theoretical foundation demonstrate that advice can threaten recipients’ face (Wilson, Aleman, & Leatham, 1998; Wilson & Kunkel, 2000) and that perceptions of face threat or politeness influence message evaluations and interaction outcomes. Advice perceived by recipients as attending to their face needs (i.e., polite) is generally seen as more sensitive, appropriate, and effective than advice that is presented bluntly or explicitly threatens face (B. Feng & Feng, 2013; Goldsmith, 2000; MacGeorge et al., 2004; MacGeorge et al., 2013). Face concerns become particularly salient when advice is unsolicited (Goldsmith, 2000; Goldsmith & Fitch, 1997), which predicts poorer evaluations (Carlson, in press; B. Feng & MacGeorge, 2006). Advice recipients respond more positively to highly polite or "mitigated" advice than to either blunt or impolite ("aggravated") advice (Caplan & Samter, 1999; MacGeorge, Lichtman, & Pressey, 2002), though the effects of more subtle linguistic strategies are difficult to track (Goldsmith & MacGeorge, 2000).

Subsequent research extended beyond the framework of face and politeness to address the content features of advice. Recognizing that advice functions as both social support and social influence (Wilson & Kunkel, 2000), MacGeorge, Feng, and colleagues drew on theories of argumentation and persuasion (e.g., Social Judgment Theory; Sherif & Hovland, 1961) to identify several features of advice content that should influence recipients' responses to advice messages (MacGeorge et al., 2004; MacGeorge et al., 2008). Their series of studies has demonstrated that recipients' evaluations of an advised action's efficacy, feasibility, and lack of limitations, and the extent to which advice confirms previously-intended behavior, are positively associated with perceptions of advice quality, coping facilitation, and intention to implement the advised action (B. Feng, 2014b; B. Feng & Burleson, 2008; MacGeorge et al., 2013). In addition, advice messages containing explicit arguments about the advised action's efficacy, feasibility, and lack of limitations are evaluated more positively than advice messages without these arguments (B. Feng & Burleson, 2008).

Based on the expanding research, Feng and MacGeorge (2010) proposed a synthesis and extension of existing theory, which they termed advice response theory (ART). This theory drew together the preexisting emphases on advice message content and politeness, but also began to integrate research examining the influence of advisor, recipient, and situational factors on advice outcomes (MacGeorge et al., 2013; see also later sections on psychological and network paradigms). In its current form, the theory proposes that message features (including both content and stylistic features such as politeness) are stronger influences on advice outcomes than are source characteristics such as expertise and trustworthiness, and predicts that the influence of source characteristics is mediated through their effects on perceptions of message features. In addition, drawing on dual-process models of persuasion and supportive communication (Bodie & Burleson, 2008), ART proposes that message features have a stronger influence on advice outcomes when recipients “process” or think about advice messages more carefully (e.g., when recipients perceive problems as very serious), and source characteristics become more influential when advice messages are thought about less carefully (e.g., when recipients perceive problems to be less serious). Initial testing of the theory largely supported these propositions (B. Feng & MacGeorge, 2010). Subsequent studies testing ART indicate that recipient characteristics such as culture and gender act as moderators on the effects of message features and advisor characteristics, and that the persuasive outcome of intention to implement is most strongly affected by message content, whereas the supportive outcome of facilitation of coping is more strongly affected by message politeness (B. Feng & Feng, 2013; MacGeorge et al., 2013).

Feng’s integrated model of advice (IMA; B. Feng, 2009) steps beyond ART’s current focus to theorize how advice functions in the broader context of supportive interactions. Drawing from the conversational appraisal theory of supportive communication (Burleson & Goldsmith, 1997), IMA emphasizes the role of emotional support and problem analysis in preparing a distressed person to consider advice. Feng’s (2009, 2014b) experimental studies demonstrate that the impact of even high quality advice messages varies as a function of interaction sequence: advice offered following emotional support and problem analysis messages are perceived as higher in quality, more facilitative of the recipient's coping, and leading to stronger implementation intention than advice that does not follow this sequential pattern. Feng has also expanded ART's focus to consider the influence of national culture on advice, demonstrating similarities in Chinese and American patterns of advice evaluation and response, with relatively small effects explained by individualism and collectivism (B. Feng, 2014a; B. Feng & Feng, 2013).

Research in the message paradigm has principally employed one of two methodologies used by supportive communication scholars (Burleson & MacGeorge, 2002). The message perception method involves presenting participants with sets of messages designed to instantiate features of theoretical interest. The messages are typically embedded in researcher-constructed scenarios (e.g., MacGeorge et al., 2002). The foremost strength of this paradigm is its capacity to isolate effects from specific message features. Other research has employed a more naturalistic method that involves retrospective self-reports about supportive interactions that involved advice (e.g., MacGeorge et al., 2004). A major strength of this method is ecological validity; instances of naturally occurring advice giving and receiving are examined in the context of real and oftentimes substantial stressors.

In sum, research in the message paradigm has provided insight into features or characteristics of advice messages that affect how recipients evaluate and respond to advice, with some more recent attention to the interplay between features of advice messages, perceived characteristics of advisors and situations (MacGeorge et al., 2013), other types of messages that accompany advice in supportive interactions (B. Feng, 2009), and culture (B. Feng, 2014a). This work permits detailed "advice to the advisor" about constructing advice messages that support and persuade. However, we contend that this paradigm, as developed to date, is also remarkably and unnecessarily limited in ways that have obscured the importance and interest value of advice for communication scholars, perhaps especially for those whose research interests lie outside of interpersonal communication, social support, or close relationships. Researchers in the message paradigm have tended to concentrate on advice in close, peer relationships (often involving young, college adults), and given much less attention to advice in workplace or professional contexts, to relationships where partners differ in power or status, or to non-intimate relationships. Correspondingly, they have usually examined advice with regard to personal problems, as opposed to those that are professional or task-related, and to problems that evoke relatively high degrees of emotional distress (B. Feng & MacGeorge, 2010). The message paradigm has also concentrated on immediate outcomes for advice recipients, and done relatively little to address broader impacts, such as making health-related decisions, developing a relationship with an advisor, being productive in a working group, or sustaining an organizational culture—yet interpersonal advice can exert these influences and more.

Alternative Paradigms for the Study of Advice

Prior to or concurrent with the development of the message paradigm by communication scholars, other scholarly disciplines have also regarded advice as an important phenomenon, and contributed to three other research paradigms. The strengths and limitations of the message paradigm are thrown into sharper relief by comparison with these paradigms, helping to identify how communication scholars can expand "our" traditional questions and theories about advice to connect with a broader range of interactional, relational, organizational, cultural, and technological issues. Thus, in the following section, we review what we have termed the discourse, psychological, and network paradigms, introducing the distinctive theories and methods that characterize these paradigms and highlighting key findings.[3] A summary of all four paradigms is provided in Table 1.

The Discourse Paradigm

The discourse paradigm for research on advice is characterized by a focus on naturally-occurring advising interactions, often in institutional contexts. Qualitative analyses highlight the behavior—discourse—used to accomplish advising in these interactions, how this behavior is associated with roles, relationships, and culture, and the "meanings" or interpretive frames employed by ordinary actors. Researchers who work in in this domain typically come from linguistics, socio-linguistics, sociology or English, and applied professions such as education, social work, and medicine, but some work by communication scholars aligns more closely with this paradigm than with the message paradigm (e.g., Goldsmith, 2004; Pudlinski, 2012). In this tradition, researchers often reference the definition of advice put forward by DeCapua & Dunham (1993): "opinions or counsel given by people who perceive themselves as knowledgeable…" (p. 519). However, discourse analytic researchers are especially attuned to the variability of forms that "opinions and counsel" can take, including interrogative, declarative, and imperative structures (Locher & Limberg, 2012), and still more indirect or "off-record" forms, such as when advisors describe their own prior experiences and actions (Goldsmith, 2004). Much discourse analytic research has an applied dimension, with extensions to improving academic, counseling, and medical interactions (Locher & Limberg, 2012).

Most work in the discourse paradigm is conversation analytic. Conversation analysis (CA) is arguably both a method and a set of theoretical commitments (Clayman & Gill, 2012; Heritage, 2009). Starting from the assumption that social structures are created and maintained through ordinary conversations, analysts record naturally-occurring interactions and create exceptionally detailed transcriptions. Conversation analysts largely eschew “talk-extrinsic” data, and instead attempt to ground their conclusions in behavior that is “visible, hearable, displayed, and responded to, by actors in real-time interaction” (Ford, 2012). Nonetheless, many conversation analyses of advice are informed by the same theories of identity, face, and politeness that have stimulated work in the message paradigm (e.g., Brown & Levinson, 1987), and increasingly, by Heritage and colleagues’ analysis of epistemic status (Heritage, 2009, 2012). Heritage’s conceptual framework guides conversation analysts to consider how advisors and recipients make claims (usually implicit) to epistemic status, or “access and rights to specific domains of knowledge and information” (Heritage, 2012, p. 7)—and resist each other’s claims. Some conversation analyses of advice also reference social constructionist theory (see Gubrium & Holstein, 2008) relevant to the domain of interaction (e.g., theories of learning for analyses of peer tutoring; Park, 2014).

Other discourse paradigm scholars share conversation analysts’ focus on real-world enactment of advice but adopt diverse interpretive approaches to examining the meaning(s) assigned to advice in different types of interactions, relationships, and cultures. The breadth of topical focus inhibits brief summary (for a sampling, see Limberg & Locher, 2012), and methods include participant-observation, interview, and even survey (Chentsova-Dutton & Vaughn, 2011), along with diverse ways of analyzing transcripts and other texts. Scholars both invoke and contribute to social constructionist theories (Gubrium & Holstein, 2008) relevant to their context of study. For example, Goldsmith, a communication scholar whose contributions to the message paradigm were previously noted, has articulated an interpretive or rhetorical theory of supportive interaction (Goldsmith, 2004), emphasizing that both interpretation and enactment of support (including advice) are contextualized by the particularities of the relationships and cultures in which they occur (see also Goldsmith, Lindholm, & Bute, 2006).

An essential contribution of the entire discourse paradigm is highly detailed description of behavior in advising interactions. Early CA work described the adjacency pair and preference structure of advice (for reviews, see: Heritage, 2009; Park, 2014). An adjacency pair is a conversational sequence in which behavior by one person makes certain behaviors by another person immediately relevant. Giving advice is the first part of an adjacency pair that makes relevant the acceptance of or resistance to that advice, such that any response not interpretable as accepting or resisting will interrupt the flow of interaction and require explanation. For example, if a colleague says “You should really read that chapter by Scholar A,” this first pair part makes relevant replies like “You’re right!” or “Umm…In Volume X? I already did.” Acceptance is described as a “preferred” response and resistance as a “dispreferred” response, because resistance is more often marked by hesitations and qualifications (e.g., “Umm…In Volume X?), whereas acceptance is typically offered in an immediate, unhesitating form (You’re right!). From these descriptions, CA studies have gone on to display diverse ways of offering advice (Heritage & Lindstrom, 2012; Riccioni, Bongelli, & Zuckzkowski, 2014; Waring, 2007b), such as “advice-implicative interrogatives” that inquire about the relevance of a possible future action rather than directly recommending it (Butler, Potter, Danby, Emmison, & Hepburn, 2010),

A second contribution of the discourse paradigm, closely related to the descriptive contribution, is demonstrating how certain behaviors are designed to manage issues that recur across advising interactions. For example, some work describes diverse strategies recipients can use to resist advice (Waring, 2005, 2007a) and advisors’ attempts to forestall resistance (e.g., packaging the advice as a tag question that invites agreement; Hepburn & Potter, 2011). Recent work focuses on advisors' means of negotiating resistance when it occurs (e.g., expressing concern about the problem, asking questions, defending the advised action, giving alternative advice or information, and repeating or reformulating the advice (Hepburn & Potter, 2011; Heritage & Lindstrom, 2012; Pudlinski, 2012; Waring, 2007b). Goldsmith and colleagues (Goldsmith, 2004; Goldsmith et al., 2006) discuss how spouses' efforts to advise and direct may be framed as less intrusive actions, such as inquiring about one's day or initiating shared activity.

A third contribution of the discourse paradigm work is showing how advising behavior is shaped by and (re)produces roles, relationships, institutions, and cultures. For example, Heritage and colleagues' conversation analyses (e.g., Heritage & Lindstrom, 2012) connect health visitors' varied and persistent strategies for advising to their institutional mandate to ensure infant well-being. Other CA work explores how advising strategies employed by peer tutors and helpline counselors reflect institutional philosophies and training that underscore help-seekers' autonomy and self-direction (Butler et al., 2010; Park, 2012). Relying on ethnographic methods, Goldsmith and colleagues have described relational norms for giving and interpreting supportive behavior, emphasizing their dialectical character: for (some) white, middle-class, Americans advice is a way of expressing care and support, but also an intrusive boundary violation (Goldsmith & Fitch, 1997; see also Goldsmith et al., 2006). Other work explores the advice norms associated with national and ethnic cultures, such as the value Russians place on unsolicited advice motivated by mutual responsibility (Chentsova-Dutton, 2012; Chentsova-Dutton & Vaughn, 2011).

The Psychological Paradigm

In theoretical and methodological counterpoint to the discourse paradigm, the psychological paradigm focuses on cognitive and emotional processes that affect the use of advice, especially when making decisions. Researchers within this paradigm typically affiliate with psychology, business or management, or finance, and the methods are almost exclusively quantitative. Advice is usually conceptualized as "input" from an advisor to someone who needs to make a decision and operationalized as a recommendation in favor of a specific action (Bonaccio & Dalal, 2006; Dalal & Bonaccio, 2010). Psychological research is especially focused on developing theory, but practical application also informs some of this work (e.g., improving the outcomes of financial advising; Kadous, Leiby, & Peecher, 2013). Two distinctive sub-paradigms are discussed in turn: one focused on recipients' use of advice in their decisions (advice utilization research; Yaniv, 2004) and the other addressing the selection of an advisor (advisor selection research; Cross & Sproull, 2004).

Theorizing about advice utilization has drawn from the persuasion and attitude change literature (Sherif & Hovland, 1961), small group research (Kerr & Tindale, 2004), and cost-benefit analysis (Schrah, Dalal, & Sniezek, 2006). A central theoretical debate concerns the underutilization of advice, which has been explained as resulting from anchoring (attachment to one's own opinion), egocentric bias (belief in the superiority of one's own perspective) and differential information (for a review, see Yaniv, 2004). Research evidence favors the differential information account, which claims that recipients favor their own opinions because they understand their own knowledge and reasoning better than their advisors'. More recently, researchers in this paradigm have tested theory addressing how emotion valence and agency (self-focused versus other-focused) affect advice utilization (de Hooge, Verlegh, & Tzioti, 2013; Gino & Schweitzer, 2008).

Studies that examine advice utilization typically employ the judge-advisor system (JAS), an experimental protocol that places participants in the role of judge or decision maker (henceforth called the recipient for consistency). Recipients are presented with a decision task, given a recommendation by an “advisor,” and record a final decision; frequently they make an initial decision before receiving advice, so the initial and final decision can be compared (Yaniv & Kleinberger, 2000). The operationalization of the advisor varies; most frequently, researcher-created advice is credited to a fictitious advisor and communicated to the recipient in written form (Gino & Schweitzer, 2008), but confederate and participant advisors may be employed instead (Van Swol, 2011). Decision tasks are usually intellective (there is a correct answer), such as a multiple choice exam on the dates of historic events, and advice is given in the form of recommended answers (e.g., “choose answer ‘A’,” Gino, 2008). Some recent work has expanded to include judgmental choices (i.e., matters of preference without a correct answer), such as which movie to watch (Van Swol, 2011).

As previously noted, advice underutilization is a central research focus for this paradigm (Harvey & Fischer, 1997). Recipients often do not give advice enough weight to benefit from receiving it, especially when recipients have greater knowledge or experience (Yaniv, 2004), and when tasks are easier (Gino & Moore, 2007). Utilization rises when recipients invest in their advice (i.e., pay for it; Gino, 2008), and when they are induced to take the perspective of another person (Yaniv & Choshen-Hillel, 2012). Researchers in the psychological paradigm have also focused on the influence of advisor characteristics as perceived by recipients. Multiple studies show that advisors’ expertise and trustworthiness are positive influences on utilization (Bonaccio & Dalal, 2006; Van Swol, 2011); indeed these may predict advice utilization more strongly and reliably than other advisor characteristics (e.g., advisor confidence, availability of other advisors; Bonaccio & Dalal, 2010).

A third research question driving advice utilization research is how recipient emotions and feelings affect the use of advice. This research indicates that emotions such as gratitude, anger, and anxiety impact advice utilization and decision accuracy even when those emotions are unrelated to the decision (Gino, Brooks, & Schweitzer, 2012; Gino & Schweitzer, 2008). Power is often negatively related to advice utilization because powerful recipients are more confident, and higher confidence leads to lower advice utilization (See, Morrison, Rothman, & Soll, 2011). Recently, de Hooge et al. (2013) synthesized advice and emotion research into a theoretical framework, proposing that positive self-focused and negative other-focused emotions decrease advice utilization, whereas negative self-focused and positive other-focused emotions increase it.

Within the psychological paradigm, the principal focus on advice utilization is complemented by a sub-paradigm focused on advisor selection. This work draws from theories of network generation (Nebus, 2006), network ties (Granovetter, 1983), and social capital (Burt, 2000), along with organization theories (Heyden, Van Doorn, Reimer, Van Den Bosch, & Volberda, 2013). Advisor selection research often utilizes egocentric sampling methods, in which participants describe their network members' qualities and behaviors, but network members' data are not obtained (Cross & Sproull, 2004; Vargas & Schafer, 2013). (As discussed later, scholars in the network paradigm also study advisor selection but with sociocentric rather than egocentric sampling.) Other studies utilize experimental methods (Bonaccio & Dalal, 2010), including some that are akin to the JAS (Gino, Shang, & Croson, 2009; Van Swol, 2011).

Findings from advisor selection research identify characteristics of advisors, tasks, and contexts that influence advisor selection. Consistent with network generation theory (Nebus, 2006), people who have few sources of advice about an issue tend to use advisors they can access easily, such as friends and family members rather than professionals (Reid et al., 2010), and those viewed as having the disposition to help (White, 2005). More generally, recipients tend to select advisors they perceive to have relevant expertise (Zagenczyk & Murrell, 2009). Similarity to the recipient (McDonald & Westphal, 2003; Van Swol, 2011) and higher status relative to the recipient (Cross & Sproull, 2004) can influence advisor selection, as does the type of problem (Heyden et al., 2013) and the cost of seeking advice (Nebus, 2006).

The Network Paradigm

A third paradigm of research on advice is characterized by its focus on networks of advising relationships, typically between members of teams or organizations, and the corresponding use of social network analysis, especially sociometric sampling methods, to examine these relationships. Researchers in this domain typically affiliate with sociology, management, or industrial-organizational psychology. Consistent with the broader paradigm of social network research (Carpenter, Li, & Jiang, 2012), an advice network is defined as a "pattern of relationships…in which one member asks advice from one or more members" (Wang, Tjosvold, Chen, & Luo, 2014, p. 836). Advice per se is typically left undefined, except operationally. Studies typically ask participants to identify all the individuals within some organization or context from whom they seek advice, advice in a particular domain, or advice in combination with other assistance (e.g., "help and advice," Lomi et al., 2013). Thus, the ties in advice networks are probably best understood as constructed from advice and a range of allied discourse, such as information, opinion, and assistance.

Research on advice networks addresses two related issues: the development and structure of advice networks (who has an advice relationship with whom, and why), and the influence of network structures on individuals and groups within the network. Both types of research are grounded in social capital theory (Burt, 2000), so advice networks are regarded as "main social conduits through which resource[s], knowledge, and information flow…" (Lomi et al., 2013, p. 440). Scholars working in this domain have drawn from a variety of other theories, including theories of social exchange (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005), social status and stratification (Ravlin & Thomas, 2005), and social identity and self-categorization (Hogg & Terry, 2000), as well as theories of cooperation, leadership, and personality (Battistoni & Colladon, 2014; Wang et al., 2014; Z. Zhang & Peterson, 2011). Currently, an important theoretical question is whether advice networks are better understood as resulting from individuals' desire to improve their social status (relative social position), or from desire to access social capital (resources available through others). In a study testing hypotheses derived from the *social status perspective* and the *social capital perspective*, Agneessens and Wittek (2012) found some support for both mechanisms, but asserted a stronger case for social capital, because social status did not generally inhibit advice seeking, except by individuals who are among the most-sought (highest-status) advisors in the network.

The network paradigm utilizes methods of social network research, especially sociocentric sampling. This method focuses on modeling the entire network of advising relationships among individuals connected within some boundary, such as a group or organization. Sociocentric methods require specialized analytic techniques to address common issues of structural autocorrelation (nonindependence of observations over time and space), endogenity (predictors correlated with error terms), and sample selection bias (from nonrandom samples; Carpenter et al., 2012).

Research on advice network generation typically examines predictors of advice centrality, where centrality refers to the frequency with which members of a network are sought by others for advice. Research on structural factors affecting centrality indicates that advice seeking is more likely between those who share an in-group, such as a work group or professional role, than between those who do not (Creswick & Westbrook, 2010; Keith, Demirkan, & Goul, 2010). Advising relationships are also more likely when network members are "structurally equivalent," meaning that they have other advice relations in common (Copeland, Reynolds, & Burton, 2008). A variety of individual factors also affect who becomes a central advisor. Having task-relevant expertise predicts greater advisor centrality (Keith et al., 2010), as does being prototypical of one's work group (Copeland et al., 2008), and possessing certain personality traits (e.g., high in conscientiousness, Battistoni & Colladon, 2014) or behavioral characteristics (e.g., altruistic citizenship behavior and job involvement; M. Zhang, Zheng, & Wei, 2009).

Aside from centrality, other aspects of network development are beginning to receive more attention. There is evidence for a negative relationship between being sought as an advisor (centrality) and seeking advisors for oneself (Lazega, Sapulete, & Mounier, 2011), though Agneessens and Wittek (2012) suggest that this effect is limited to the most central advisors in a network. Advice-seeking behavior is also affected by individual factors, such as organizational identification. In top management teams, managers who identify more with the organization at large seek advice across corporate divisions, whereas those who identify more with their own division seek advice within that division (Lomi et al., 2013). Some research has examined the development of larger network structures. For example, Battistoni and Colladon (2014) found that people who are more conscientious and agreeable and less neurotic are more likely to inhabit larger and more connected clusters of advising relationships.

The second principal question addressed by research on advice networks is network effects, or how network structures affect outcomes for members of the network. A key construct in this research is network density, referring to the number of advice ties within a network. In general, density is positively associated with group or team effectiveness (Wang et al., 2014; S.-S. Wong, 2008), which is operationalized in a variety of ways (e.g., innovation, Moolenaar, Daly, & Sleegers, 2011). Several studies have identified mechanisms, such as knowledge sharing (S.-S. Wong, 2008) and shared decision-making (Moolenaar et al., 2011) by which greater network density creates positive outcomes. Network effects researchers also examine centrality, but as a characteristic of networks rather than individuals. Greater centrality in networks, indicating that advice is sought from a smaller number of individuals in that network, dampens the positive effects of density (Wang et al., 2014). Thus, for networks to benefit from the density of advice relations in the network, those relations may need to be decentralized (many people connected to many others) rather than centralized (many people connected to a few others). This conclusion is further supported by evidence that advice network outcomes improve as the number of ties to out-of-network members increases (S.-S. Wong, 2008).

Comparing the Paradigms

As made evident throughout this section (and in Table 1), the message, discourse, psychological, and network paradigms provide different types of insight about the characteristics, functions, and outcomes of advice. At present, the message paradigm is distinctive for its focus on qualities of advice messages and the effort to predict supportive (and to a lesser extent, persuasive) outcomes for individual recipients, especially between peers, but has had much less to say about advising interactions and relationships, cognitive and emotional processes affecting advice evaluation, or organizational networks formed from the exchange of advice. The discourse paradigm provides unique insight into the structure and interpretation of advice in interactions. However, this interpretive work has focused on a limited range of advising contexts, and provides a weak basis for generalization about advising processes outside those contexts. The psychological paradigm illuminates cognitive and emotional processes that predict the use of advice in decision making, but focuses almost exclusively on persuasive outcomes and offers relatively little insight on interactions or relationships. The network paradigm highlights the utility of advice, especially in organizational contexts, but focuses on connections and global outcomes created through the exchange of advice with little attention to the interactions that create these links. The comparison between paradigms could be elaborated in ways that further highlight the value of the message paradigm. Indeed, the message paradigm accomplishes something that many scholars of interpersonal communication, social support, and social influence have prized: identifying and explaining strategies or tactics for communication behavior that show evidence of general utility (see MacGeorge et al., 2011).

However, our purpose here is not congratulatory, but motivational. We assert that the nature and influence of advice is both more complex than currently envisioned by communication scholars operating within the message paradigm (or other paradigms), and broader-reaching, such that advice is worthy of attention from scholars whose research interests range from interpersonal interactions and relationships to organizations, cultures, and computer-mediated communication. Correspondingly, we contend that the communication of advice is fruitfully examined from a greater diversity of theoretical perspectives and methods.

Toward a “Communication Paradigm”

In the following sections, we elaborate a broader vision for communication research with advice as a central focus, working toward a more useful and inclusive “communication paradigm.” In part, we pull together the strengths of the discourse, psychological, and network paradigms to address the limitations of the message paradigm; these cross-paradigm comparisons indicate relevant directions while providing theoretical and methodological foundations. However, our effort to open new or little-used trails also emphasizes domains that are not well addressed by any existing paradigm, and application to important practical issues. By necessity, our recommendations are selective, but we chose them to illustrate the relevance of advice in communication contexts from the interpersonal and relational to the organizational, cultural, and computer-mediated. In the process, we encourage more research on advice that employs not only post-positivistic but interpretive and critical approaches, and we engage with theories in those domains.

Interactions and Advisors

For interpersonal communication and social support scholars, there are immediate and valuable extensions of theory and method that arise from incorporating aspects of the discourse and psychological paradigms to improve understanding of advice in interaction. By demonstrating the intricate interplay of advising interactions, the discourse paradigm highlights the message paradigm's overreliance on evaluations of researcher-constructed or recollected advice (B. Feng & Burleson, 2008; B. Feng & MacGeorge, 2010), and hints at potentially generalizable relationships between the structure of advice interactions and their outcomes for recipients. Feng's integrated model of advice (IMA; B. Feng, 2009, 2014a) represents an important bridge between the message and discourse paradigms, underscoring the role of emotional support and problem analysis in preparing a distressed person to consider and utilize advice (see also Burleson & Goldsmith, 1997). Recently, MacGeorge and colleagues have presented analyses of naturalistic interactions recorded in a laboratory context. This method makes advising behavior available for detailed analysis (in transcripts and video), while also permitting immediate assessment of recipients' (and advisors') advice outcomes. Initial papers from this data examine how advisor and recipient behaviors interact to influence outcomes, underscoring the role of advisor emotional support and recipient planning in determining whether advice is supportive and persuasive (MacGeorge et al., 2015; MacGeorge, Guntzviller, Branch, & Yakova, in press-a), and describing trajectories of interaction that characterize and may contribute to less satisfying advice interactions (MacGeorge, Guntzviller, Branch, & Yakova, in press-b)

The psychological paradigm highlights the value to be gained if communication scholars integrate a more explicit focus on cognition and emotion into studying advice interactions and advisors. For example, researchers in the message paradigm have spent considerable effort to describing face threat, facework, and their effects (for a review, see Goldsmith, 2004), but have not directly examined affective responses when situated identities are threatened by advice (e.g., (e.g., embarrassment, anger). Moreover, people who are more anxious, guilty, or ashamed are more likely to seek and utilize advice (de Hooge et al., 2013), making it logical to assess the role of advice in reducing these negative emotions (versus indirect measures such as "coping facilitation," e.g, MacGeorge et al., 2013). Research in the psychological paradigm also highlights the discrepancy between advisors' and recipients' perceptions of advice (Danziger, Montal, & Barkan, 2012), encouraging communication scholars to pay more attention to *advisors'* perspectives, motivations, and sources of knowledge as influences on behavior and outcomes (Benjamin & Budescu, 2015; Harnish, Bridges, & Krajci, 2012). To date, a handful of communication scholars have documented variation in advisors' goals and plans for advising (Guntzviller & MacGeorge, 2013; Shi, 2013). Indeed, theories of message production (Dillard & Wilson, 2014) suggest that advisors will be more supportive and persuasive to the extent that they can address multiple goals simultaneously (e.g., problem-solving and identity management; see Wilson et al., 1998) and shift goals readily, responding to the behavior of the recipient (B. Feng, 2009; Samp, 2013).

A focus on the details of interaction and an effort to contribute to theories of message production or dyadic interaction need not preclude engagement with real-world advice about significant problems. Indeed, we strongly encourage "interpersonal communication" scholars (broadly defined) to continue undertaking advice research with an applied focus. One recent example of such work is research examining the details of doctors' argumentation strategies in support of their treatment advice. This work (B. Feng, Bell, Jerant, & Kravitz, 2011; Labrie & Schulz, 2014a, 2014b) combines a focus on naturally-occurring argument in consultations with patients (informed by the discourse paradigm; Koenig, 2011) with the goal of connecting argumentative strategies to patient outcomes (message paradigm). It is easy to imagine this work as a model for examining doctors' advice to patients about societally-relevant health concerns (e.g., antibiotic stewardship, Smith, M'ikanatha, & Read, 2014). Outside of the medical context, people often seek support from friends and family to deal with experiences of social injustice and crime, including workplace bullying (Lutgen-Sandvik & Tracy, 2012) and racial discrimination (Hanasono, Chen, & Wilson, 2014), but little work has focused directly on advice about these issues. Examining advice in interactions around significant social issues creates potential for a symbiotic relationship between traditionally post-positivistic research on advice, and a critical-activist agenda to change advice-giving practices that can harm individuals and sustain unjust conditions. For example, research on workplace bullying indicates that victims are sometimes advised to take actions that are likely to perpetuate and even worsen the situation (e.g., "just stand up to the bully," Lutgen-Sandvik & Tracy, 2012). Research focused directly on the motivations for and consequences of such advice might help to reduce its occurrence.

Advising (in) Relationships

With a few exceptions (see B. Feng & Magen, 2015), research in the message and psychological paradigms has typically reduced the relationship between the advisor and recipient to the recipient's perception of certain advisor qualities (e.g., liking, similarity; MacGeorge et al., 2013). This reduction of the association between advice and relationships is patently inadequate. Research in the discourse paradigm highlights relational and institutional norms for advising (Goldsmith, 2004), but leaves several valuable directions largely unexplored. One of these is simply to focus more attention on the use, evaluation, and outcomes of advice in relationships where advice is especially prevalent and consequential. Carlson (2014, in press) illustrates a multi-method approach to studying advice in the relationship between parents and emerging adult children, using interview data to explicate how emerging adults interpret advice in the context of parental knowledge and authority, and their own desire for autonomy (Carlson, 2014), and quantitative data to show how qualities of the message and relationship affect implementation (Carlson, in press). Personal relationships aside, advice is recognized as a central component of developmental relationships, such as mentoring and coaching (Allen & Eby, 2007; Passmore, Peterson, & Freire, 2013), and is integral to other professional relationships (educational, legal, financial, medical), but advice has not typically been the central focus of research attention for scholars or practitioners of these relationships.

A focus on advice meanings and consequences in relationships can be complemented by a more detailed focus on advice as a contributor to relationship development and maintenance over time. In the existing research paradigms, this type of question is addressed at a birds-eye level by the network paradigm, but links in the socio-grams largely hide the communicative work involved in generating and sustaining those connections. A scaled-up version of advice response theory (MacGeorge et al., 2013) suggests that advice will be sought most frequently over time from advisors whose advice is high quality (e.g., consistently evaluated as more efficacious and face-protective). Such evaluations should contribute in turn to positive advisor perceptions (e.g., expertise, trustworthiness, Bonaccio & Dalal, 2010), which in conjunction with access and other contstraints (Nebus, 2006), could predict returning to the same advisor (and a probable positive bias toward the advice they offer). Over time, such processes could connect single advising interactions with the development of stable advising relationships. This reasoning is consistent with network evolution models (Lazega et al., 2011), in which network members with high status (due to experience) become even more central (sought for advice) over time.

Arguably, the rationale for studying advice in specific types of relationships becomes still stronger when relationships studied intersect with prevalent health and social issues. A recent model for this type of engaged scholarship on advice in relationships is provided by Wilson and colleagues (Wilson, Gettings, Hall, & Pastor, 2015), whose interpretive work identifies advising dilemmas faced by partners of military service members when they want the service members to seek mental health assistance. Correspondingly, though examples are scarce, we see value in the application of a critical perspective on advising in relationships, asking “Who benefits?” To illustrate, in the marriages and long-term partnerships described by both Wilson (2014) and Goldsmith (2006), men are more typically the ones with the problems (mental health, heart condition), and women more typically face the dilemmas or challenges of advising. Scholarship based in feminist theory (see reviews by Ashcraft, 2014; Griffin, 2009) might target the gendered nature of expectations (and material conditions) that require women to wrestle with dilemmas or challenges of advising in their relationships, while men are allowed to stubbornly resist behavioral change despite the impact on their partners and families (see Loscocco & Walzer, 2013).

Organizing Advice / Advice in Organizations

Both the discourse and network paradigms do a better job of recognizing the contribution of advice in professional roles, workplaces, and other organizations than the message paradigm. However, in the gap between micro-level conversation analyses and macro-level network models of who advises whom, two large questions remain relatively unaddressed: how does advice participate in constituting organizations ("organizing"), and how can positive outcomes of advice exchange be enhanced? The first of these questions aligns with theorizing about the relationship between organizational "discourse" and "Discourse" (Fairhurst & Putnam, 2004). For example, the Montréal School theorizes organizations as "networks of practices and conversations" that are translated into collective experience, texts, and ultimately organizational representations that act as agents—which in turn affect practices and conversations (Brummans, Cooren, Robichaud, & Taylor, 2014; McPhee, Poole, & Iverson, 2014). Clearly, there are social constructionist connections between this perspective and the discourse paradigm of advice research. Yet, the Montréal School contends that advice, along with other communicative acts in organizations, does not simply facilitate decision-making or constitute an advising relationship. It is part of organizing—creating the organization through communication. Lacking examples of organizational advice studied from this perspective, we speculate that the organizing capacity of advice might be most detectable in certain communication "flows" or constitutive processes (McPhee et al., 2014), such as membership negotiation (socializing and assimilating new members; Kramer & Miller, 2014). For researchers, advice to new members about behavior within the organization might be especially transparent in training and mentoring interactions, and therefore more traceable than other types of discourse as it becomes translated into collective experience. In addition, organizational members tasked with socializing roles (e.g., trainers, coworkers) may be especially likely to 'ventriloquize' advice from the organization (Cooren, 2012), providing a window on the translation from organizational representation back to practices and conversations. Advice between members of organizations should also contribute to "organizing" across multiple aspects of organizational life, as when members advise one another on work-life issues (Kirby & Buzzanell, 2014) or on responding to organizational change (Lewis, 2014).

Organizational communication scholars with more post-positivist orientation may find value in studying how advice can be conveyed for more positive outcomes in organizations and through networks. Network paradigm studies already demonstrate that advising interactions can facilitate knowledge-sharing, decision-making, and group effectiveness (e.g., innovation, Moolenaar et al., 2011), but the dynamics of the advice exchange that support these outcomes remain largely unstudied in organizational contexts. Organizational scholars might draw on interpersonal-level analyses of advice (e.g., MacGeorge et al., 2013) as a foundation for examining the successes and failures of advice in organizational contexts. However, researchers should also think beyond the dyad to consider factors that affect whether advice that is relevant to multiple recipients actually spreads through a network. Based on diffusion of innovation theory, Dearing (2009) has argued that health interventions are more successfully disseminated to the extent that such interventions are supported by opinion leaders, who are defined as people routinely sought for advice (i.e., central in an advice network). Thus, mapping the pre-existing relational structure in an organization or population is essential for identifying opinion leaders, and recruiting them to support health interventions. Yet, Dearing also argues that opinion leaders will not be effective if asked to "advocate, persuade, promote, or educate in ways they normally would not" (2009, p. 12). This work provides fertile theoretical ground for scholars interested in connecting advice, other elements of social influence, outcomes for individuals and groups, and real-world issues (see also Kim & Dearing, 2015).

Advice and Culture

As previously reviewed, research in the message and discourse paradigms has attended to cultural influences on advice. Research in the message and psychological paradigms has focused on identifying salient characteristics of culture(s) and examined these cultural variables as predictors of cultural variation in advice giving and evaluation (B. Feng, 2014b; B. Feng & Feng, 2013; Mercier, Yama, Kawasaki, Adachi, & Van der Henst, 2014), typically contrasting European Americans or Western Europeans with people from Eastern cultures (especially, China). This work draws heavily on Hofstede's (1991) framework of cultural value orientations, especially individualism-collectivism. Consequently, explanations for cultural variation (especially at the national level) in advice seeking, provision, and evaluation have been largely restricted to these broad dimensions of cultural variation.

Scholars contributing to the message paradigm increasingly recognize that dimensions such as individualism and collectivism explain relatively small percentages of culture-related variance in advice communication (B. Feng, 2014b; B. Feng & Feng, 2013). Thus, for post-positivist scholars, alternative theoretical frameworks may be better guides for further inquiry. For example, drawing on the theory of reasoned action (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975), research by H. Feng (2013) indicates that task-specific beliefs can explain cultural similarities and differences in support provision, including advice. Another alternative is suggested by past research on culturally-based tendencies in stress appraisal. Philosophical and religious traditions such as Buddhism and Taoism in Eastern cultures teach the virtue of enduring and accepting adverse fate (Chen, 2006); indeed individuals from many Asian cultures tend to endorse an external locus of control for stressors (Chun, Moos, & Cronkite, 2006). From this perspective, the coping strategy of actively attacking the problem may seem superfluous (P. T. P. Wong, Wong, & Scott, 2006), affecting how advice is given and evaluated.

From interpretive and critical perspectives, the effort to make generalizable comparisons across cultures misses essential insights about culture and communication (Halualani & Nakayama, 2010) . Research in the discourse paradigm provides some “thick” accounts of advice in particular cultural communities (e.g., Wilson et al., 2015), but this type of work remains scant, especially with regard to national or ethnic cultures (see Chentsova-Dutton & Vaughn, 2011; Fitch, 1998). One guide for future interpretive and critical study of advice and culture is the culture-centered approach (Dutta, 2008). This perspective, developed in response to the dominant paradigm in health communication, challenges Western approaches that suggest universal conceptualizations of health. Dutta and colleagues emphasize the meaningfulness of contextualized human experience, and advocate the importance of understanding participants’ voices and agency (Dutta & Jamil, 2013). The culture-centered approach places special priority on hearing the voices of marginalized or “subaltern” peoples, recommending that researchers look beyond “mainstream” (e.g., Western, middle-class, young, well-educated) experiences in advice seeking, provision, and evaluation. For example, Dutta and Jamil’s (2013) work with Bangladeshi immigrants suggests that doctors’ advice will be understood quite differently in the context of immigration, precarious employment, no health insurance, and heavy familial obligation. The culture-centered approach also promotes a focus on advice as it participates in shaping both individual and societal responses to significant disputes and injustices. Thus, it might be used to shed light on advice about confrontations with law enforcement in urban, under-privileged, African-American communities, or Latino/Hispanic responses to legal or informal advice on immigration issues. As diverse people seek to live together harmoniously and remedy social injustice, investigating cultural influences on advising is of both theoretical and practical importance.

Advice Online

Finally, we observe that the online exchange of advice is both substantial and largely unaddressed by the existing research paradigms. The Internet has created multiple new pathways to access (and provide) information and support for virtually any problem, in a huge array of formats (e.g., traditional websites, support groups, blogs, online forums, social networking sites). In addition, most major online retailers now solicit and utilize electronic word of mouth (eWOM) that consumers then consult (often within the retail website) as a form of advice for purchasing decisions (King, Racherla, & Bush, 2014). Given space constraints, we offer brief suggestions for research on advice in the context of social networking sites (e.g., Facebook) and online forums (e.g., YahooAnswers). These sites promote a conjunction of interpersonal, group, and mass communication, termed *masspersonal* communication (O'Sullivan, 2005). In these contexts, not only can single advice-seekers interact with multiple advisors, but advisors can interact with and influence each other, as can recipients. Such online environments allow exchanges between advisors and advisees to influence a mass audience of “lurkers” who view, but do not interact.

Various forms of social support are sought and provided in masspersonal contexts, but advice and other forms of informational support often predominate (Blank et al., 2010; Sillence, 2013). Thus, these environments provide a “natural laboratory” for examining how advice seeking, giving, evaluating, and responding change as advising interactions take on characteristics of group and mass communication. For example, the phenomenon of masspersonal advice puts a spotlight on the question of multiple advisors—and interaction between multiple advisors—as influences on advice recipients. Research in the psychological tradition has examined the impact of multiple advice sources on advice judgment and utilization (Harries, Yaniv, & Harvey, 2004; Yaniv & Milyavsky, 2007), suggesting that recipients are most likely to follow the advice closest to their original perspectives. However, in these studies, advice sources are only implied in the different pieces of advice that participants are given (Yaniv & Milyavsky, 2007), leaving the impact of interaction (and cross-advisor argument) unexamined.

More broadly, masspersonal contexts for advice interactions recommend attention to the transmission of advice from an original source, target, and context, to alternative targets and contexts (see Cappella, Kim, & Albarracín, 2014). Online environments make it easy for advisors to pass along recommendations from organizations, groups, or individuals, to use recommendations and information from those sources in support of more personalized advice, or to share information from such sources as a less direct effort to influence a recipient's actions. The prevalence, motivation, and impact of these tactics deserve attention. Given recent attention to the negative impact of misinformation in the mass media (Southwell & Thorson, 2015), one specific focus might be misinformation as the basis for giving problematic advice (e.g., anti-vaccination advice), and interpersonal advising in the face of media misinformation (see Bode & Vraga, 2015).

Research to examine how advice is sought, evaluated, utilized, and transmitted in masspersonal environments will likely require the integration of theories across traditional intra-disciplinary boundaries (dyads, groups, and mass audiences). Correspondingly, such research will generate practical knowledge for improving people's competence in advice communication and facilitate development of effective online support interventions (Barak, Boniel-Nissim, & Suler, 2008; Raghavendra, Newman, Grace, & Wood, 2013)

Advice for Communication Scholars

As this chapter indicates, advice is a significant form of interpersonal interaction, with implications for most domains of human life. We began by describing the message paradigm for research on advice, and continued by describing three alternatives: the discourse, psychological, and network paradigms. From cross-paradigm comparison, both the strengths and weaknesses of the message paradigm become more apparent. Subsequently, we sketched five areas for future research, drawing from the alternative paradigms, but also extending to domains insufficiently addressed by any prior research on advice. We sought to represent theoretically and practically relevant questions in communication contexts ranging from the dyadic to the masspersonal, and to encourage inquiry from post-positivistic, interpretive, and critical perspectives. Indeed, our review highlights how research on advice can contribute to theories of message production and dyadic interaction, relationship development and maintenance, organizing and communication in organizations, cultural influence, and computer-mediated communication—and how research on advice might be harnessed to address issues of health and social justice. Research in the four existing paradigms underscores the consequentiality of advice, but there are a wide range of questions left to be answered, with the potential to enhance communication theory and contribute to application in the varied domains where advice is given and received. We invite scholars across our discipline to focus attention on the way that advice moves and connects us.

References

Agneessens, F., & Wittek, R. (2012). Where do intra-organizational advice relations come from? The role of informal status and social capital in social exchange. *Social Networks, 34*, 333-345. doi: 10.1016/j.socnet.2011.04.002

Allen, T. D., & Eby, L. T. (Eds.). (2007). *The Blackwell handbook of mentoring: A multiple perspectives approach*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Ashcraft, K. L. (2014). Feminist theory. In L. L. Putnam & D. K. Mumby (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational communication: Advances in theory, research, and methods* (3rd ed., pp. 127-150). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Barak, A., Boniel-Nissim, M., & Suler, J. (2008). Fostering empowerment in online support groups. *Computers in Human Behavior, 24*(5), 1867-1883.

Battistoni, E., & Colladon, A. F. (2014). Personality correlates of key roles in informal advice networks. *Learning and Individual Differences, 34*, 63-69.

Benjamin, D., & Budescu, D. V. (2015). Advice from experience: Communicating incomplete information incompletely. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making, 28*(1), 36-49.

Blank, T. O., Schmidt, S. D., Vangsness, S. A., Monteiro, A. K., & Santagata, P. V. (2010). Differences among breast and prostate cancer online support groups. *Computers in Human Behavior, 26*(6), 1400-1404. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2010.04.016

Bode, L., & Vraga, E. K. (2015). In related news, that was wrong: The correction of misinformation through related stories functionality in social media. *Journal of Communication, 65*, 619-638.

Bodie, G. D., & Burleson, B. R. (2008). Explaining variations in the effects of supportive messages: A dual-process framework. In C. Beck (Ed.), *Communication yearbook 32* (pp. 354-398). New York: Routledge.

Bonaccio, S., & Dalal, R. S. (2006). Advice taking and decision-making: An integrative review of the literature. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 101*, 127-151. doi: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2006.07.001

Bonaccio, S., & Dalal, R. S. (2010). Evaluating advisors: A policy-capturing study under conditions of complete and missing information. *Journal of Behavioral Decision-Making, 23*, 227-249. doi: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2009.11.007

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Brummans, B. H. J. M., Cooren, F., Robichaud, D., & Taylor, J. R. (2014). Approaches to the communicative constitution of organizations. In L. L. Putnam & D. K. Mumby (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational communication: Advances in theory, research, and methods* (pp. 173-194). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Burleson, B. R., & Goldsmith, D. J. (1997). How the comforting process works: Alleviating emotional distress through conversationally induced reappraisals. In P. A. Andersen & L. K. Guerrero (Eds.), *Handbook of communication and emotion: Research, theory, applications, and contexts* (pp. 245-280). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Burleson, B. R., & MacGeorge, E. L. (2002). Supportive communication. In M. L. Knapp & J. A. Daly (Eds.), *Handbook of interpersonal communication* (3rd ed., pp. 374-424). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Burt, R. S. (2000). The network structure of social capital. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 22*, 345-423.

Butler, C. W., Potter, J., Danby, S., Emmison, M., & Hepburn, A. (2010). Advice-implicative interrogatives. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 73*(3), 265-287. doi: 10.1177/0190272510379838

Caplan, S. E., & Samter, W. (1999). The role of facework in younger and older adults' evaluations of social support messages. *Communication Quarterly, 47*, 245-264.

Cappella, J. N., Kim, H. S., & Albarracín, D. (2014). Selection and transmission processes for information in the emerging media environment: Psychological motives and message characteristics. *Media Psychology*, advance online publication.

Carlson, C. L. (2014). Seeking self-sufficiency: Why emerging adult college students receive and implement parental advice. *Emerging Adulthood, 2*(4), 257-269. doi: 10.1177/2167696814551785

Carlson, C. L. (in press). Predicting emerging adult college students' implementation of parental advice: Source, situation, relationship, and message characteristics. *Western Journal of Communication*.

Carpenter, M. A., Li, M., & Jiang, H. (2012). Social network research in organizational contexts A systematic review of methodological issues and choices. *Journal of Management, 38*(4), 1328-1361. doi: 10.1177/0149206312440119

Chen, Y.-H. (2006). Coping with suffering: The Buddhist perspective. In P. T. P. Wong & L. C. J. Wong (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural perspectives on stress and coping* (pp. 73-89). New York: Springer.

Chentsova-Dutton, Y. E. (2012). Butting in vs. being a friend: Cultural differences and similarities in the evaluation of imposed social support. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 152*(4), 493-509. doi: 10.1080/00224545.2011.642025

Chentsova-Dutton, Y. E., & Vaughn, A. (2011). Let me tell you what to do: Cultural differences in advice-giving. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 43*, 687-703. doi: 10.1177/0022022111402343

Chun, C.-A., Moos, R. H., & Cronkite, R. C. (2006). Culture: A fundamental context for the stress and coping paradigm. In P. T. P. Wong & L. C. J. Wong (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural perspectives on stress and coping* (pp. 29-53). New York: Springer.

Clayman, S. E., & Gill, V. T. (2012). Conversation analysis. In J. P. Gee & M. Handford (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 120-134). Oxon, UK: Routledge.

Cooren, F. (2012). Communication theory at the center: Ventriloquism and the communicative constitution of reality. *Journal of Communication, 62*(1), 1-20. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2011.01622.x

Copeland, M. P., Reynolds, K. J., & Burton, J. B. (2008). Social identity, status characteristics and social networks: Predictors of advice seeking in a manufacturing facility. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 11*, 75-87.

Creswick, N., & Westbrook, J. I. (2010). Social network analysis of medication advice-seeking interactions among staff in an Australian hospital. *International Journal of Medical Informatics, 79*(6), e116-e125. doi: 10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2008.08.005

Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management, 31*(6), 874-900.

Cross, R., & Sproull, L. (2004). More than an answer: Information relationships for actionable knowledge. *Organization Science, 15*(4), 446-462.

Dalal, R. S., & Bonaccio, S. (2010). What types of advice do decision-makers prefer? *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 112*(1), 11-23. doi: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2009.11.007

Danziger, S., Montal, R., & Barkan, R. (2012). Idealistic advice and pragmatic choice: A psychological distance account. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 102*(6), 1105-1117. doi: 10.1037/a0027013

de Hooge, I. E., Verlegh, P. W. J., & Tzioti, S. C. (2013). Emotions in advice taking: The roles of agency and valence. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*. doi: 10.1002/bdm.1801

DeCapua, A., & Dunham, J. F. (1993). Strategies in the discourse of advice. *Journal of Pragmatics, 20*(6), 519-531.

Dillard, J., & Wilson, S. R. (2014). Interpersonal influence. In C. R. Berger (Ed.), *Interpersonal communication*. Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.

Dutta, M. J. (2008). *Communicating health: A culture-centered approach*: Polity.

Dutta, M. J., & Jamil, R. (2013). Health at the margins of migration: Culture-centered co-constructions among Bangladeshi immigrants. *Health Communication, 28*(2), 170-182. doi: 10.1080/10410236.2012.666956

Fairhurst, G. T. (2007). *Discursive leadership: In conversation with leadership psychology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fairhurst, G. T., & Putnam, L. (2004). Organizations as discursive constructions. *Communication Theory, 14*(1), 5-26. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2885.2004.tb00301.x

Feng, B. (2009). Testing an integrated model of advice-giving in supportive interactions. *Human Communication Research, 35*, 115-129. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2958.2008.01340.x

Feng, B. (2014a). When should advice be given? Assessing the role of sequential placement of advice in supportive interactions in two cultures. *Communication Research, 41*(7), 913-934. doi: 10.1177/0093650212456203

Feng, B. (2014b). When should advice be given?: Assessing the role of sequential placement of advice in supportive interactions in two cultures. *Communication Research, 41*, 913-934. doi: 10.1177/0093650212456203

Feng, B., Bell, R. A., Jerant, A. F., & Kravitz, R. L. (2011). What do doctors say when prescribing medications?: An examination of medical recommendations from a communication perspective. *Health Communication, 26*(3), 286-296. doi: 10.1080/10410236.2010.550020

Feng, B., & Burleson, B. R. (2008). The effects of argument explicitness on responses to advice in supportive interactions. *Communication Research, 35*, 849-874. doi: 10.1177/0093650208324274

Feng, B., & Feng, H. (2013). Examining cultural similarities and differences in responses to advice: A comparison of American and Chinese college students. *Communication Research, 40*, 623-644. doi: doi: 10.1177/0093650211433826

Feng, B., & MacGeorge, E. L. (2006). Predicting receptiveness to advice: Characteristics of the problem, the advice-giver, and the recipient. *Southern Communication Journal*, *71*(1), 67-85. doi: 10.1080/10417940500503548

Feng, B., & MacGeorge, E. L. (2010). The influences of message and source factors on advice outcomes. *Communication Research, 37*, 576-598. doi: 10.1177/0093650210368258

Feng, B., & Magen, E. (2015). Relationship closeness predicts unsolicited advice giving in supportive interactions. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, advance online publication. doi: 10.1177/0265407515592262

Feng, H. (2013). Understanding cultural variations in giving advice among Americans and Chinese. *Communication Research*. doi: 10.1177/0093650213486668

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Fitch, K. L. (1998). *Speaking relationally: Culture, communication, and interpersonal connection*. New York: Guilford Press.

Ford, C. E. (2012). Clarity in applied and interdisciplinary conversation analysis. *Discourse Studies*, *14*(4), 507-513. doi: 10.1177/1461445612450375

Gino, F. (2008). Do we listen to advice just because we paid for it? The impact of advice cost on its use. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 107*, 234-245. doi: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2008.03.001

Gino, F., Brooks, A. W., & Schweitzer, M. E. (2012). Anxiety, advice, and the ability to discern: Feeling anxious motivates individuals to seek and use advice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 102*, 497-512. doi: 10.1037/a0026413

Gino, F., & Moore, D. A. (2007). Effects of task difficulty on use of advice. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, *20*(1), 21-35. doi: 10.1002/bdm.539

Gino, F., & Schweitzer, M. E. (2008). Blinded by anger or feeling the love: How emotions influence advice taking. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93,* 1165-1173. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.93.5.1165

Gino, F., Shang, J., & Croson, R. (2009). The impact of information from similar or different advisors on judgment. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *108*(2), 287-302.

Goldsmith, D. J. (1992). Managing conflicting goals in supportive interaction: An integrative theoretical framework. *Communication Research*, *19*, 264-286.

Goldsmith, D. J. (1994). The role of facework in supportive communication. In B. R. Burleson, T. L. Albrecht, & I. G. Sarason (Eds.), *Communication of social support: Messages, interactions, relationships, and community* (pp. 29-49). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Goldsmith, D. J. (1999). Content-based resources for giving face-sensitive advice in troubles talk episodes. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 32*, 303-336.

Goldsmith, D. J. (2000). Soliciting advice: The role of sequential placement in mitigating face threat. *Communication Monographs, 67*, 1-19. doi: 10.1080/03637750009376492

Goldsmith, D. J. (2004). *Communicating social support*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Goldsmith, D. J., & Fitch, K. (1997). The normative context of advice as social support. *Human Communication Research*, *23*, 454-476. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2958.1997.tb00406.x

Goldsmith, D. J., Lindholm, K. A., & Bute, J. J. (2006). Dilemmas of talking about lifestyle changes among couples coping with a cardiac event. *Social Science & Medicine*, *63*(8), 2079-2090.

Goldsmith, D. J., & MacGeorge, E. L. (2000). The impact of politeness and relationship on perceived quality of advice about a problem. *Human Communication Research, 26*, 234-263. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2958.2000.tb00757.x

Granovetter, M. (1983). The strength of weak ties: A network theory revisited. *Sociological theory, 1*(1), 201-233.

Griffin, C. L. (2009). Feminist communication theories. In S. W. Littlejohn & K. A. Foss (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of communication theory* (Vol. 1, pp. 390-394). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gubrium, J. F., & Holstein, H. A. (2008). The constructionist mosaic. In J. A. Holstein & J. F. Gubrium (Eds.), *Handbook of constructionist research* (pp. 3-10). New York: Guilford.

Guntzviller, L. M., & MacGeorge, E. L. (2013). Modeling interactional influence in advice exchanges: Advice giver goals and recipient evaluations. *Communication Monographs, 80*, 83-100. doi: 10.1080/03637751.2012.739707

Halualani, R. T., & Nakayama, T. K. (2010). Critical intercultural communication studies: At a crossroads. In T. K. Nakayama & R. T. Halualani (Eds.), *The handbook of critical intercultural communication* (pp. 1-16). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Hanasono, L. K., Chen, L., & Wilson, S. R. (2014). Identifying communities in need: Examining the impact of acculturation on perceived discrimination, social support, and coping amongst racial minority members in the United States. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication, 7*(3), 216-237.

Harnish, R. J., Bridges, K. R., & Krajci, M. D. (2012). Evaluating advice: Self-presentational biases between high and low self-monitors. *Psychology and Marketing*, *29*(4), 270-278. doi: 10.1002/mar.20520

Harries, C., Yaniv, I., & Harvey, N. (2004). Combining advice: The weight of a dissenting opinion in the consensus. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making, 17,* 333-348.

Harvey, N., & Fischer, I. (1997). Taking advice: Accepting help, improving judgment, and sharing responsibility. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 70*, 117-133.

Hepburn, A., & Potter, J. (2011). Designing the recipient: Managing advice resistance in institutional settings. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *74*(2), 216-241.

Heritage, J. (2009). Conversation analysis as social theory. In B. S. Turner (Ed.), *The new Blackwell companion to social theory* (pp. 300-320). West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Heritage, J. (2012). Epistemics in action: Action formation and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language & Social Interaction, 45*(1), 1-29.

Heritage, J., & Lindstrom, A. (2012). Advice giving - terminable and interminable: The case of British health visitors. In H. Limberg & M. A. Locher (Eds.), *Advice in Discourse* (pp. 169-193). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Heyden, M. L., Van Doorn, S., Reimer, M., Van Den Bosch, F. A., & Volberda, H. W. (2013). Perceived environmental dynamism, relative competitive performance, and top management team heterogeneity: examining correlates of upper echelons' advice-seeking. *Organization Studies*, *34*(9), 1327-1356.

Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. London: McGraw-Hill.

Hogg, M. A., & Terry, D. I. (2000). Social identity and self-categorization processes in organizational contexts. *Academy of Management Review*, *25*(1), 121-140.

Kadous, K., Leiby, J., & Peecher, M. E. (2013). How do auditors weight informal contrary advice? The joint influence of advisor social bond and advice justifiability. *The Accounting Review, 88*, 2061-2087. doi: 10.2308/accr-50529

Keith, M., Demirkan, H., & Goul, M. (2010). The influence of collaborative technology knowledge on advice network structures. *Decision Support Systems, 50*(1), 140-151.

Kerr, N. L., & Tindale, R. S. (2004). Group performance and decision making. *Annual Review of Psychology, 55*, 623-655.

Kim, D. K., & Dearing, J. W. (2015). The use of informal opinion leader-based strategy for the diffusion of public health services among international workers in South Korea. *Health Communication, 12*, 115-148.

King, R. A., Racherla, P., & Bush, V. D. (2014). What we know and don't know about online word-of-mouth: A review and synthesis of the literature. *Journal of Interactive Marketing, 28*(3), 167-183.

Kirby, E. L., & Buzzanell, P. M. (2014). Communicating work-life issues. In L. L. Putnam & D. K. Mumby (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational communication: Advances in theory, research, and methods* (pp. 351-374). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Koenig, C. J. (2011). Patient resistance as agency in treatment decisions. *Social Science & Medicine, 72*(7), 1105-1114.

Kramer, M. W., & Miller, V. D. (2014). Socialization and assimilation. In L. L. Putnam & D. K. Mumby (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational communication* (pp. 525-547). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Labrie, N., & Schulz, P. J. (2014a). The effects of general practitioners' use of argumentation to support their treatment advice: Results of an experimental study using video-vignettes. *Health Communication*, advance online publication. doi: 10.1080/10410236.2014.909276

Labrie, N., & Schulz, P. J. (2014b). Quantifying doctors' argumentation in general practice consultation through content analysis: Measurement development and preliminary results. *Argumentation*, advance online publication. doi: DOI 10.1007/s10503-014-9331-5

Lazega, E., Sapulete, S., & Mounier, L. (2011). Structural stability regardless of membership turnover? The added value of blockmodelling in the analysis of network evolution. *Quality & Quantity, 45*, 129-144.

Lewis, L. K. (2014). Organizational change and innovation. In L. L. Putnam & D. K. Mumby (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational communication: Advances in theory, research, and methods* (3rd ed., pp. 503-524). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Limberg, H., & Locher, M. A. (Eds.). (2012). *Advice in discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Locher, M. A., & Limberg, H. (2012). Introduction to advice in discourse. In H. Limberg & M. Locher (Eds.), *Advice in Discourse* (pp. 1-28). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lomi, A., Lusher, D., Pattison, P. E., & Robins, G. (2013). The focused organization of advice relations: A study in boundary crossing. *Organization Science*, *25,* 438-457.

Loscocco, K., & Walzer, S. (2013). Gender and the culture of heterosexual marriage in the United States. *Journal of Family Theory & Review, 5*(1), 1-14.

Lutgen-Sandvik, P., & Tracy, S. J. (2012). Answering five key questions about workplace bullying how communication scholarship provides thought leadership for transforming abuse at work. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *26*(1), 3-47.

MacGeorge, E. L., Feng, B., & Burleson, B. R. (2011). Supportive communication. In M. L. Knapp & J. A. Daly (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of interpersonal communication* (4th ed., pp. 317-354). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

MacGeorge, E. L., Feng, B., Butler, G. L., & Budarz, S. K. (2004). Understanding advice in supportive interactions: Beyond the facework and message evaluation paradigm. *Human Communication Research, 30*, 42-70. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2958.2004.tb00724.x

MacGeorge, E. L., Feng, B., & Thompson, E. R. (2008). "Good" and "bad" advice: How to advise more effectively. In M. T. Motley (Ed.), *Studies in Applied Interpersonal Communication* (pp. 145-164). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

MacGeorge, E. L., Guntzviller, L. M., Bailey, L., Brisini, K., Salmon, S., Severen, K., . . . Cummings, R. (2015). *The influence of emotional support quality on advice evaluation and outcomes*. Paper presented at the annual convention of the International Communication Association, San Juan, Puerto Rico.

MacGeorge, E. L., Guntzviller, L. M., Branch, S., & Yakova, L. (in press-a). Advice in interaction: Quantity and placement of problem-solving behaviors. *Communication Research*.

MacGeorge, E. L., Guntzviller, L. M., Branch, S., & Yakova, L. (in press-b). Mediocre counsel: An interpretive analysis of trajectories associated with less satisfying advice interactions. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*.

MacGeorge, E. L., Guntzviller, L. M., Hanasono, L. K., & Feng, B. (2013). Testing advice response theory in interactions with friends. *Communication Research*, advance online publication. doi: 10.1177/0093650213510938

MacGeorge, E. L., & Hall, E. D. (2014). Relationship advice. In C. Agnew (Ed.), *Social influences on close relationships: Beyond the dyad* (pp. 188-208). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

MacGeorge, E. L., Lichtman, R. M., & Pressey, L. C. (2002). The evaluation of advice in supportive interactions: Facework and contextual factors. *Human Communication Research, 28,* 451-463. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2958.2002.tb00815.x

Marsden, M., Zick, C., & Mayer, R. (2011). The value of seeking financial advice. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues, 32*(4), 625-643. doi: 10.1007/s10834-011-9258-z

McDonald, M. L., & Westphal, J. D. (2003). Getting by with the advice of their friends: CEOs' advice networks and firms' strategic responses to poor performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 48*(1), 1-32.

McPhee, R. D., Poole, M. S., & Iverson, J. (2014). Structuration theory. In L. L. Putnam & D. K. Mumby (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational communication* (pp. 75-99). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mercier, H., Yama, H., Kawasaki, Y., Adachi, K., & Van der Henst, J.-B. (2014). Is the use of averaging in advice taking modulated by culture? *Journal of Cognition and Culture*, advance online publication.

Moolenaar, N. M., Daly, A. J., & Sleegers, P. J. (2011). Ties with potential: Social network structure and innovative climate in Dutch schools. *Teachers College Record, 113*(9), 1983-2017.

Nebus, J. (2006). Building collegial information networks: A theory of advice network generation. *The Academy of Management Review, 31*(3), 615-637. doi: 10.2307/20159232

O'Sullivan, P. B. (2005). *Masspersonal communication: Rethinking the mass interpersonal divide*. Paper presented at the 55th annual convention of the International Communication Association, New York, NY.

Park, I. (2012). Seeking advice: Epistemic asymmetry and learner autonomy in writing conferences. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *44*(14), 2004-2021.

Park, I. (2014). Stepwise advice negotiation in writing center peer tutoring. *Language and Education, advance online publication*. doi: 10.1080/09500782.2013.873805

Passmore, J., Peterson, D. B., & Freire, T. (Eds.). (2013). *The Wiley-Blackwell handbook of the psychology of coaching and mentoring*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Pudlinski, C. (2012). The pursuit of advice on US peer telephone helplines: Sequential and functional aspects. In H. Limberg & M. A. Locher (Eds.), *Advice in Discourse* (pp. 233-252). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Raghavendra, P., Newman, L., Grace, E., & Wood, D. (2013). 'I could never do that before': effectiveness of a tailored Internet support intervention to increase the social participation of youth with disabilities. *Child: Care, Health and Development, 39*(4), 552-561.

Ravlin, E. C., & Thomas, D. C. (2005). Status and stratification processes in organizational life. *Journal of Management*, *31*(6), 966-987.

Reid, J., Schmied, V., & Beale, B. (2010). 'I only give advice if I am asked': Examining the grandmother's potential to influence infant feeding decisions and parenting practices of new mothers. *Women and Birth, 23*(2), 74-80. doi: 10.1016/j.wombi.2009.12.001

Riccioni, I., Bongelli, R., & Zuckzkowski, A. (2014). Mitigation and epistemic positions in troubles talk: The giving advice activity in close interpersonal relationships. Some examples from Italian. *Language and Communication, 39*, 51-72. doi: 10.1016/j.langcom.2014.08.001

Samp, J. A. (2013). Goal variability and message content during relational discussions. *Communication Studies*, *64*(1), 86-105.

Schrah, G. E., Dalal, R. S., & Sniezek, J. A. (2006). No decision-maker is an island: Integrating expert advice with information acquisition. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making, 19*, 43-60.

See, K. E., Morrison, E. W., Rothman, N. B., & Soll, J. B. (2011). The detrimental effects of power on confidence, advice taking, and accuracy. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 116*, 272-285. doi: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2011.07.006

Sherif, M., & Hovland, C. I. (1961). *Social judgment: Assimilation and contrast effects in communication and attitude change*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Shi, X. (2013). Cognitive responses in advice planning: An examination of thought content and its impact on message features under high versus low effortful thinking modes. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *32*, 311-334. doi: 10.1177/0261927X12470112

Sillence, E. (2013). Giving and receiving peer advice in an online breast cancer support group. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, *16*(6), 480-485.

Smith, R. A., M'ikanatha, N. M., & Read, A. F. (2014). Antibiotic resistance: A primer and call to action. *Health Communication, 30*, 309-314.

Van Swol, L. M. (2011). Forecasting another’s enjoyment versus giving the right answer: Trust, shared values, task effects, and confidence in improving the acceptance of advice. *International Journal of Forecasting, 27*, 103-120. doi: 10.1016/j.ijforecast.2010.03.002

Vargas, N., & Schafer, M. H. (2013). Diversity in action: Interpersonal networks and the distribution of advice. *Social science research*, *42*(1), 46-58.

Wang, Z., Tjosvold, D., Chen, Y.-f. N., & Luo, Z. (2014). Cooperative goals and team performance: Examining the effects of advice network. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 31*(3), 835-852.

Waring, H. Z. (2005). Peer tutoring in a graduate writing centre: Identity, expertise, and advice resisting. *Applied Linguistics*(26), 141-168. doi: 10.1093/applin/amh041

Waring, H. Z. (2007a). Complex advice acceptance as a resource for managing asymmetries. *Text & Talk, 27*(1), 107-137. doi: 10.1515/TEXT.2007.005

Waring, H. Z. (2007b). The multi-functionality of accounts in advice giving. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 11*, 367-391.

White, T. B. (2005). Consumer trust and advice acceptance: The moderating roles of benevolence, expertise, and negative emotions. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 15*, 141-148.

Wilson, S. R., Aleman, C. G., & Leatham, G. B. (1998). Identity implications of influence goals: A revised analysis of face-threatening acts and application to seeking compliance with same-sex friends. *Human Communication Research, 25*, 64-96.

Wilson, S. R., Gettings, P. E., Hall, E. D., & Pastor, R. G. (2015). Dilemmas families face in talking with returning US military service members about seeking professional help for mental health issues. *Health Communication, 30*(8), 772-783.

Wilson, S. R., & Kunkel, A. W. (2000). Identity implications of influence goals: Similarities in perceived face threats and facework across sex and close relationships. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 19*, 195-221. doi: 10.1177/0261927X00019002002

Wong, P. T. P., Wong, L. C. J., & Scott, C. (2006). Beyond stress and coping: The positive psychology of transformation. In P. T. P. Wong & L. C. J. Wong (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural perspectives on stress and coping* (pp. 1-26). New York: Springer.

Wong, S.-S. (2008). Task knowledge overlap and knowledge variety: the role of advice network structures and impact on group effectiveness. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 29*(5), 591-614.

Wong, S.-S., & Boh, W. F. (2014). The contingent effects of social network sparseness and centrality on managerial innovativeness. *Journal of Management Studies, 51*(7), 1180-1203. doi: 10.1111/joms.12086

Yaniv, I. (2004). Receiving other people's advice: Influence and benefit. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 93*, 1-13. doi: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2003.08.002

Yaniv, I., & Choshen-Hillel, S. (2012). When guessing what another person would say is better than giving your own opinion: Using perspective-taking to improve advice-taking. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48*(5), 1022-1028.

Yaniv, I., & Kleinberger, E. (2000). Advice taking in decision making: Egocentric discounting and reputation formation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 84*, 260-281. doi: 10.1006/obhd.2000.2909

Yaniv, I., & Milyavsky, M. (2007). Using advice from multiple sources to revise and improve judgments. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *103*, 104-120. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2006.05.006

Zagenczyk, T., & Murrell, A. (2009). It is better to receive than to give: Advice network effects on job and work-unit attachment. *Journal of Business & Psychology*, *24*(2), 139-152. doi: 10.1007/s10869-009-9095-3

Zhang, M., Zheng, W., & Wei, J. (2009). Sources of social capital: Effects of altruistic citizenship behavior and job involvement on advice network centrality. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *20*(2), 195-217.

Zhang, Z., & Peterson, S. J. (2011). Advice networks in teams: The role of transformational leadership and members' core self-evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *96*(5), 1004-1017.

Table 1

Comparison of paradigms

	Message Paradigm	**Psychological Paradigm**	**Discourse Paradigm**	**Network Paradigm**
Focus	Advice as message within supportive interactions, usually in personal relationships	Advice as input to individual decision making	Behavior in naturally-occurring advising interactions, often with advisors in professional or para-professional roles	Networks of advising relationships, typically between members of teams or organizations
Advice Definition	Messages that make recommendations about what to do, think, or feel, in response to a problematic situation	A recommendation about an intellective choice (i.e., one that has a correct answer)	Opinions or counsel, which can take diverse linguistic forms	Left to participants to define / defined operationally
Core Research Questions	How do advice message characteristics influence recipient evaluation and response to advice?	When do advisees utilize (or not utilize) advice? On what basis do recipients select an advisor?	What are advisor and advisee behaviors during interactions? How do they negotiate challenges, and sustain conversational goals and norms associated with roles and institutions?	Who develops an advising relationship with whom and why (i.e., network development)? How do network structures (e.g., density) affect outcomes for members of the network?
Typical disciplinary homes of scholars	Communication	Psychology, business or management	Linguistics, socio-linguistics, sociology, English, communication, education, social work, and medicine	Sociology, business or management, labor and industrial relations, industrial or organizational

				psychology, or engineering
Data Collection and Analysis	Experiments with message manipulations, questionnaires about past advice interactions	Lab experiments with advice provided for a decision made by participants	Conversation analysis, interviews, participant-observation	Social network analysis with , sociometric sampling
Sampling of issues raised by paradigm not addressed by message paradigm		Cognitive and emotional processes, multiple advisors	Behavior in interaction, advising norms, roles and relationships	Multiple advisors, competing advice

About the Contributors

Bo Feng (Ph.D., Purdue University) is an Associate Professor in the Department of Communication at the University of California, Davis. Her research program centers on supportive communication, investigating the processes through which people conceptualize, seek, provide, and respond to various forms of support, such as comforting and advice, and how these processes are similar and different for people of different cultures, genders, and across contexts. In addition to examining supportive communication in traditional face-to-face and close relationship contexts, Dr. Feng studies technologically-mediated supportive communication that occurs in virtual environments.

Lisa Guntzviller (Ph.D., Purdue University) is an assistant professor in the Department of Communication at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Her research focuses on interpersonal communication in health and family contexts, specifically examining the link between communication quality and individual and dyadic perceptions of complex interactions. She has focused on language brokering interactions, in which a bilingual child culturally and linguistically mediates between a primarily Spanish-speaking parent and an English speaker, and advice-giving interactions, such as parent-to-child advice on exercise and physical activity.

Erina MacGeorge (Ph.D., University of Illinois) is an Associate Professor in the Department of Communication at the Pennsylvania State University. Her primary research program examines the intersection of social support and social influence, in the form of interpersonal advice. She studies advice in both personal and professional contexts, with a current focus on how advice recipients evaluate the content and style of advice messages, and how those evaluations are influenced by other behaviors in supportive interactions, such as planning. In related work, Dr.

MacGeorge examines supportive and persuasive communication, especially about matters of health, including miscarriage, bipolar disorder, breast cancer, and antibiotic resistance.

Notes

[1] This translation from the Greek text was provided by Dr. Michele Kennerly, historian of rhetoric in the Department of Communication Arts and Sciences at Pennsylvania State University. Dr. Kennerly also provided the following context: In this play by Sophocles, Creon, the King of Thebes, intends to put Antigone to death for violating his decree forbidding the burial of enemy combatants. (She had attempted twice to bury her brother.) Being engaged to Antigone and attuned to the objections of Thebes' citizens to Creon's severity in this matter, Haemon petitions his father to grant clemency to Antigone. Creon does not heed his advice, with tragic results.

[2] We recognize that people may obtain “advice” from media sources, books, or educational materials, but focus herein on recommendations by one person to another.

[3] Our selected labels for these paradigms may cue for some readers broader theoretical or methodological approaches than are currently represented in research focused on advice (e.g., the discourse paradigm in organizational communication is more diverse both theoretically and methodologically; see Fairhurst, 2007). Our intention is not to diminish these larger traditions, but to use terms that adequately describe the type of work we are reviewing—and that are used by scholars who do research on advice (e.g., see *Advice in Discourse*, Limberg & Locher, 2012).