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Supplemental Tables

Supplemental Table 1

Model Fit when Comparing Partner-Effects and Direct-Effects Models

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Model Fit |  | Difference Test |  | Explained Variance |
|  |  | *Χ2* | *df* | *p* | *RMSEA**(90% CI)* | *CFI* | *TLI* | *SRMR* |  | *Χ2Δ* | *df Δ* | *p* |  | *RAQ* | *AAQ* |
| Measurement Model |  | 1107.28 | 846 | .00 | .05 (.04, .06) | .92 | .91 | .08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | H5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Independent Perspectives  | Direct | 103.04 | 66 | .00 | .07 (.04, .09) | .93 | .84 | .08 |  | 67.13 | 30 | .001 |  | .58 | .49 |
|  | No direct | 115.30 | 70 | .00 | .07 (.05, .09) | .91 | .82 | .08 |  | 70.96 | 34 | .001 |  | .55 | .47 |
| Recipient-Dominant | Direct | 79.40 | 51 | .01 | .07 (.04, .09) | .95 | .84 | .07 |  | 30.30 | 15 | .01 |  | .58 | .53 |
|  | No direct | 93.37 | 55 | .00 | .07 (.05, .10) | .93 | .80 | .07 |  | 75.48 | 19 | .001 |  | .55 | .50 |
| All Partner-Effects | Direct | 49.39 | 36 | .07 | .05 (.00, .09) | .98 | .89 | .05 |  | *Comparison Model* |  |  .60 |  .52 |  |
|  | No direct | 63.75 | 40 | .01 | .07 (.03, .10) | .96 | .83 | .06 |  | 14.11 | 4 | .007 |  | .58 | .50 |
| **Final Model, constrained** | 80.45 | 68 | .14 | .04 (.00, .07) | .98 | .95 | .07 |  | ---- | --- | ---- |  | .57 | .53 |

*Note.* Δ = difference (e.g., *Χ2Δ* = Chi-Squared difference between the All Partner-Effects Model with Direct Effects and the model to which it is being compared). Chi-Square coefficients are Satorra-Bentler and the difference test Chi-Squared are scaled. Model fit is statistically different when the Chi-Square test *p* < .05.

Supplemental Table 2

Comparison of Message Evaluation to Advice Quality Actor-Effects

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | *B(SE)* | *p value* |
|  *Invariant Effects* |  |  |
| Eff - PosFac | -.01(.08) | .93 |
| Eff - NegFac | **.17(.07)** | **.02** |
| Eff - Feas | **.29(.07)** | **.00** |
| PosFac - NegFac | -.02(.06) | .80 |
| PosFac - Feas | **.29(.09)** | **.00** |
| NegFac - Feas | .11(.08) | .13 |
|  *Recipient Effects* |  |  |
| REff - RAbs | **.19(.07)** | **.01** |
| RPosFac - RAbs | **.20(.08)** | **.01** |
| RNegFac - RAbs | .02(.07) | .79 |
| RFeas - RAbs | **-.29(.09)** | **.00** |
|  *Advisor Effects* |  |  |
| AEff - AAbs | .00(.08) | .95 |
| APosFac - AAbs | .00(.09) | .98 |
| ANegFac - AAbs | **-.18(.08)** | **.02** |
| AFeas - AAbs | **-.29(.09)** | **.00** |

*Note*. Comparisons conducted in *MPlus* with model constraint command. Statistically significant *p* values indicate the two effects differ and are bolded. Therefore, for the second row, the invariant actor-effects between advice quality with efficacy and negative facework (i.e., the efficacy effect minus the negative facework effect) statistically differ. See manuscript Table 1 for abbreviations.

Supplemental Table 3

Direct and Indirect Effects from Advisor Characteristics to Advice Quality

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Unstandardized | AAQ |  | RAQ |
|  | *Total Indirect* | *Direct* | *Significant Mediators* |  | *Total Indirect* | *Direct* | *Significant Mediators* |
| AExpert | **.14[.07,.22]** | .06[-.01,.12] | AEff, AAbs, APosFac |  | .05[-.01,.11] | ---- | RPosFac |
| ARelSat | **.09[.01,.16]** | **.08[.01,.15]** | AAbs |  | .03[-.03,.08] | ---- | RPosFac |
| RExpert | .00[-.07,.06] | ---- |  |  | **.13[.08,.20]** | .06[-.01,.12] | REff, RPosFac |
| RRelSat | .01[-.05,.08] | ---- | RAbs (-), APos (+) |  | **.15[.08,.22]** | **.08[.01,.15]** | REff, RPosFac |
| Standardized | AAQ |  | RAQ |
|  | *Total Indirect* | *Direct* | *Significant Mediators* |  | *Total Indirect* | *Direct* | *Significant Mediators* |
| AExpert | **.22[.12,.33]** | .09[-.01,.19] | AEff, AAbs, APosFac |  | .08[-.01,.16] | ---- | RPosFac |
| ARelSat | **.13[.02,.24]** | **.12[.03,.22]** | AAbs |  | .04[-.03,.12] | ---- | RPosFac |
| RExpert | .00[-.11,.09] | ---- |  |  | **.20[.13,.30]** | .08[-.01,.18] | REff, RPosFac |
| RRelSat | .02[-.07,.13] | ---- | RAbs (-), APosFac (+) |  | **.23[.13,.34]** | .**13[.03,.25]** | REff, RPosFac |

*Note.* Numbers in the brackets are the 95% bias-corrected bootstrapped confidence intervals based on 5,000 samples. Bolded entries are statistically significant (i.e., zero is not included in the confidence interval). “Significant mediators” represent the specific indirect effects from the predictor to advice quality that were statistically significant. All significant mediators had positive indirect effects unless otherwise noted.