

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Testing an Integrated Model of Advice Giving in Supportive Interactions

Bo Feng

Department of Communication, University of California, Davis, CA 95616

Viewing supportive communication as a multistage process, the present study proposed and tested an integrated model of advice giving, which specifies three sequential moves in supportive interactions involving advice: emotional support, problem inquiry and analysis, and advice. Seven hundred and fifty-two participants read and responded to a hypothetical scenario in which they received advice from a friend. Results of the study showed that advice that was offered following the moves of emotional support and problem inquiry and analysis was judged to be higher in quality than advice that did not follow this sequential pattern.

doi:10.1111/j.1468-2958.2008.01340.x

Advice-giving behaviors are ubiquitous in supportive interactions, often outnumbering other kinds of supportive communication behaviors (e.g., Cutrona & Suhr, 1994; Goldsmith & Dun, 1997). However, like other forms of communication, advice giving requires skill, and it can elicit widely varied responses from recipients (e.g., Goldsmith & Fitch, 1997; MacGeorge, Graves, Feng, Gillihan, & Burleson, 2004). As research on advice grows, researchers are beginning to understand what causes different advice messages to be evaluated more or less positively, and how judgments informed by the application of these criteria influence outcomes of advice episodes. Overall, the extant research on advice suggests that “good” advice is determined by *who* says it (e.g., Feng & MacGeorge, 2006), *how* it is said (e.g., Goldsmith & MacGeorge, 2000; MacGeorge, Lichtman, & Pressey, 2002), and *what* is said (Feng & Burleson, 2007; MacGeorge, Feng, Butler, & Budarz, 2004). Although this research is valuable in providing a model of effective advice giving in supportive context, it exhibits two noteworthy limitations. First, while this research has looked at the source, stylistic, and content features of advice, it has not paid much attention to the issue of effective timing of advice in supportive interactions. It is possible that the impact of even “good advice” (as defined by underlying message properties) may vary as a function of *when* that advice is given during the course of a supportive

Corresponding author: Bo Feng; e-mail: bfeng@ucdavis.edu

The research reported in this article was based in part on the author’s doctoral dissertation, which was directed by Drs. Brant Burleson and Erina MacGeorge from Purdue University.

interaction. There are suggestions in the literature that even good advice may be rejected and evaluated negatively if it is not given at an “appropriate” time (see Dunkel-Schetter, Blasband, Feinstein, & Herbert, 1992; Goldsmith, 2000). Therefore, it is necessary to examine the effective *timing* of advice in supportive interactions.

Second, with few exceptions (e.g., Goldsmith, 2000; Pearlin & McCall, 1990), advice has typically been studied as an independent form of support that functions on its own. When researchers did examine advice in relation to other forms of social support, such as emotional support, they have typically examined various forms of support in a *competitive* rather than a *complementary* framework. For instance, a large body of research has compared the effects of different types of social support (e.g., emotional support, informational support, tangible support) reported by recipients of that support or individuals’ preference for certain types of support in difficult situations (e.g., Barbee, Derlega, Sherburne, & Grimshaw, 1998; Clark & Stephens, 1996). However, little work has examined the connectedness and complementarity of various forms of support in the supportive communication process (e.g., Caplan, 1981). It is important to recognize that different supportive behaviors are not mutually exclusive: Choosing to talk about a distressed other’s immediate emotional stress does not mean that the support provider cannot (or should not) also address the nature of the problem and/or discuss possible solutions to the problem. It is possible that different forms of support can be meaningfully integrated to achieve maximum supportive effect. What can thread these different acts or topical foci together is timing: Various supportive behaviors are not simply isolated acts but acts that are perhaps appropriate at different stages of the supportive process and can thus be effectively implemented together to achieve maximum effect (Jacobson, 1986).

In this article, I propose that, instead of treating advice as an isolated form of support, we study advice as it occurs in the broader supportive communication context. There are both theoretical and empirical grounds for reasoning that advice should be more effective when integrated with other forms of support. Drawing from theory and research on counseling, therapy, and supportive communication, this article proposes an integrated model of advice giving in supportive interactions, which suggests that advice in supportive context should be maximally effective when the helper has (a) provided emotional support to the target and (b) assessed the relevance of advice giving and analyzed the problematic situation with the target. In their study of occupational stress and marital support, Pearlin and McCall (1990) have made similar predictions by arguing that an ideal sequence of supportive acts would “begin with listening, followed by an expression of affection, after which there would be an exchange organized around questions that were in the service of gathering relevant information, and last, the offering of advice” (p. 57). To date, however, those ideas have remained largely speculative. In the following sections, I first lay out the rationale underlying the proposed model of advice giving. I then report an empirical study that tests the major hypotheses derived from the model, followed by a discussion of the study’s findings and their implications for future practice and research of advice giving.

The provision of emotional support as an initial response to distress

To date, substantial research evidence has shown that sensitive emotional support can contribute to the physical and psychological well-being of individuals and can facilitate the maintenance and development of personal relationships (for a review, see Burleson & MacGeorge, 2002). However, little research has examined whether and how emotional support can facilitate the provision of other forms of support such as advice giving. Theory and research on supportive communication (e.g., Burleson & Goldsmith, 1998) and counseling (e.g., Greenberg & Paivio, 1997) combine to suggest that advice givers would be most effective if they also aim to improve a distressed person's emotional state by offering the person some emotional support *before* trying to help the individual cope with his or her problem. The conversationally induced reappraisals (CIR) model proposed by Burleson and Goldsmith, for instance, provides some theoretical basis for proposing that emotional support should be an *initial* response to an individual's distress. Based on the view that people's emotional reactions are a product of the appraisals they make of external events in the context of their currently relevant life goals (see Lazarus, 1991), the CIR model proposes that conversation is "a medium in which a distressed person can express, elaborate, and clarify relevant thoughts and feelings" (Burleson & Goldsmith, 1998, p. 260) and is thus a way to facilitate the target's cognitive reappraisals of an upsetting event. Although the CIR model does not directly address the issue of how a helper can facilitate the target's problem-focused coping, it suggests that advice may be maximally effective if the target has the opportunity to work through his or her feelings about the problematic situation (Burleson, 2003).

Existing research on response modes in the context of counseling or therapy also supports the proposition that the provision of emotional support can create a supportive context for advice giving. Advice giving has been a central focus in studies of counseling interactions because advice is often seen as a central task of the counselor (e.g., Kinnell & Maynard, 1996). Although everyday supportive interactions are different in important aspects from professional counseling or therapy, research on more and less effective counseling or therapist response modes provides us with some useful insights into how a support provider can effectively orient to the target's situation. Studies of effective therapist response modes suggest that creating a conversational context that is ripe for advice giving is an important and helpful step to take before the actual delivery of advice (Heritage & Sefi, 1992; Vehviläinen, 2001). Theory and research on therapy has long recognized the importance of the therapist's empathic attunement to the client's emotional experience. The Emotionally Focused Therapy (Greenberg & Paivio, 1997), for example, suggests that the first step in the therapeutic process should involve "forming a supportive relationship by acknowledging, understanding, and validating the client's emotional struggles" (Greenberg & Paivio, 1997, p. 104).

In sum, theory and research on effective forms of support and counseling suggest that *initial* responses to a distressed other should be directed at helping the target to overcome emotional upsets such as sadness, anxiety, fear, or anger. Distressed

individuals may not be ready to investigate the specific problem they are facing or to take advice until they have had the chance to work through their current emotional state (see Jacobson, 1986).

Problem inquiry and analysis before advice giving

The advice-giving process is typically triggered by the helper's perception that the recipient is experiencing a problem and is in need of advice. However, acting simply on the assumption that a problem exists and the target needs advice may be problematic because this assumption can be wrong. As research has shown, unwanted, irrelevant, or redundant advice is counterproductive in the sense that it tends to meet resistance from the recipient (e.g., Feng & MacGeorge, 2006; Goldsmith, 2000). As Maynard's Perspective Display Sequence in conversation (Maynard, 1991) suggests, conversation partners should adapt their personal opinion to the listener's frame of reference by first soliciting the listener's opinion and then producing one's own opinion in a way that takes the other's opinion into account. Based on these views, the integrated model of advice giving proposes that, following emotional support, the next general move for the advisor to take is to conduct an inquiry that is focused on assessing relevance of advice and an analysis of the target's problem. Inquiry into the target's situation can enable the helper to determine whether the state of affairs described by the target embodies a problem that is solvable and whether advice is a relevant and appropriate response. Focused analysis of the target's problem can enable the helper to tailor his or her advice to the target's situation.

Previous theory and research on advice, helping, and counseling has provided some support for the importance of problem inquiry and analysis before advice giving (Elliott, 1985; Vehviläinen, 2001). For instance, stepwise entry—a sequential conversational structure specifically designed for advice giving—has been studied in health care and counseling settings. Stepwise entry involves a professional laying the groundwork for advice through a step-by-step, question–answer sequence in which the helper elicits the recipient's perspective before offering advice (e.g., Heritage & Sefi, 1992). There is evidence from studies on advice in health care and other institutional settings that using the stepwise entry into advice giving not only allows the advisor to assess the relevance of advice but also enables the advisor to fit the advice to the knowledge, views, reported actions, and attitudes of the advisee (Heritage & Sefi, 1992; Vehviläinen, 2001). A noteworthy methodological limitation with extant research on stepwise entry into advice, however, is that this research has focused on describing and analyzing limited instances of various advice-giving behaviors, and it has relied on the observed or speculated consequences of those instances through conversational analysis (e.g., Kinnell & Maynard, 1996; Vehviläinen, 2001). Little or no research has systematically investigated the effectiveness of stepwise entry into advice or other response modes by experimentally manipulating the variables of interest in a study and assessing advice recipients' evaluations of advice.

Testing the integrated model of advice giving

Various theoretical models of support and the counseling process combine to suggest two major tasks that helpers should accomplish before giving advice. Specifically, helpers should (a) provide emotional support (e.g., through expressions of sympathy, concern, and understanding) and (b) assess the relevance of advice and, if relevant, undertake an analysis of the problem with the recipient before arriving at a plausible solution to the problem. Hence, the integrated model of advice giving in supportive interactions consists of three “moves”: emotional support (E), problem inquiry and analysis (P), and advice giving (A).

A study was conducted to test the hypotheses implicit in the proposed model of advice giving. Specifically, the study was designed to examine how the sequential placement of advice in a supportive interaction influences recipients' evaluations of it. Testing the model would involve three primary tasks: (a) assessing the effectiveness (in terms of evaluation of advice quality) of including emotional support or problem inquiry and analysis in the model and (b) assessing the effectiveness of particular sequential orders of the three steps in the model.¹ Accordingly, the following hypotheses were derived from the model:

H1: Advice-giving models in which emotional support is offered *before* advice will be evaluated more positively than advice-giving models in which emotional support is *not* offered or is offered *after* advice.

H2: Advice-giving models in which problem inquiry and analysis is conducted *before* advice will be evaluated more positively than advice-giving models in which problem inquiry and analysis is *not* conducted or is conducted *after* advice.

Although the integrated model of advice-giving proposes that both emotional support and problem inquiry and analysis should be offered before advice giving, the model also posits that emotional support should be the helper's *first* response to the distressed target. In other words, advice should be more effective if emotional support is offered first and problem inquiry and analysis second. Hence, the following hypothesis was proposed:

H3: Advice in the EPA model will be evaluated more positively than advice in the PEA model.

Method

Participants

Study participants were 752 college students recruited from communication classes at a large university in the Midwestern United States and a large university on the U.S. West Coast. The majority of the participants were European Americans ($n = 507$), but the sample also included Asian Americans ($n = 137$), African Americans ($n = 30$), and Hispanic Americans ($n = 28$). Fifty participants belonged to other ethnic groups. The participants ranged in age from 18 to 36 years and averaged 20.7 years old (505 females, 247 males).²

Experimental design and procedure

A message perception paradigm was used to isolate and control the variables of interest (i.e., the presence or absence of emotional support and problem inquiry and analysis and their sequential placement in a supportive interaction in relation to advice). Participants were randomly assigned to read a transcript of a conversation putatively taking place between the participant and a friend. There were altogether 33 versions of the conversation, defined by crossing factors of advice-giving model (11 levels: EPA, EAP, PAE, PEA, AEP, APE, EA, AE, PA, AP, A) and type of problem that the participant was portrayed as undergoing (three levels: failing an important exam, having a conflict with parents over choice of future career, and being underpaid at a part-time job). The three different problem types were included solely to enhance generality of the results.

Because the primary purpose of this study was to test the proposed advice-giving model, each conversation included the “advice” component. The “advice move” in the conversations was created to reflect “good” advice, as defined by findings of past research (e.g., Feng & Burleson, 2007; Goldsmith, 1994); the other two moves in the experimental conversations were also designed to exhibit high-quality support, as defined by relevant research (e.g., Burleson, 2003; Elliott, 1985). Participants were encouraged to imagine that the scenario happened between themselves and a real friend and to respond to the scenario as if they were responding to that friend. After reading the conversation, participants were instructed to evaluate the quality of the advice offered by the helper.

Manipulation of supportive moves

Advice was operationalized through (a) statements that employ facework to show concern of the target’s positive and negative face needs (Brown & Levinson, 1987) and (b) statements articulating the response efficacy, feasibility, and absence of limitations of the advised action (see Feng & Burleson, 2007).

Emotional support was operationalized through (a) statements reflecting “person-centered” comforting messages that explicitly acknowledge and legitimate the feelings and perspectives of the distressed target and (b) statements that aim to foster a positive outlook on the issue (see Burleson, 2003).

The move of problem inquiry and analysis was operationalized through (a) statements soliciting the target’s perspective on the problem and (b) statements helping the target to identify possible causes of the problem (see Heritage & Sefi, 1992). An example of a conversation that contains all the three moves is provided in the Appendix.

Measurement of variables

Advice quality

Five items on 7-point Likert style scales (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*) were used to assess participants’ evaluation of the overall quality of the advice message.

This measure was used in several previous studies of advice (e.g., Feng & MacGeorge, 2006; Goldsmith & MacGeorge, 2000). The five items exhibited good internal consistency ($\alpha = .88$) and were averaged to form an index of message quality.

Scenario realism

Because this study employed hypothetical conversations created by the researcher, it was desirable to assess how participants perceived the realism of the conversation they read. It is possible that the realism of the conversation influences participants' responses to the messages; for instance, participants may evaluate advice that is offered prior to problem inquiry and analysis negatively because they perceive the scenario as unlikely in the real world. The perceived realism of the hypothetical scenarios was measured with five Likert-style items on 5-point scales (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*). Examples of the items include: "The scenario was believable," "My friend's responses in the scenario are likely in real life," "It's possible that I will encounter the situation in the scenario in real life." The five items constituted a reliable scale ($\alpha = .86$). The average rated scenario realism across all the 33 scenarios was 3.91 on a 5-point scale, suggesting that participants perceived the hypothetical scenarios as generally realistic. A two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with type of advice model (11 levels) and problem type (3 levels) as fixed factors detected a significant main effect for problem type, $F(2, 719) = 7.72, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .02$. Posthoc Tukey tests showed that, on average, participants perceived the scenarios involving the problem of being underpaid at a part-time job as more realistic ($M = 4.14, SD = 0.72$) than the scenarios involving the problem of failing an exam in a research method course ($M = 3.83, SD = 0.77$) or having a conflict with parents over choice of future career ($M = 3.92, SD = 0.79$). No significant main effect was detected for type of advice model, $F(10, 719) = 1.2, ns$, and no significant interaction was found between the two factors, $F(20, 719) = 0.90, ns$.³

Results

H1 predicted that advice-giving models in which emotional support was offered before advice would be evaluated more positively than advice-giving models in which emotional support was not offered or was offered after advice. Similarly, H2 predicted that advice-giving models in which problem inquiry and analysis was conducted before advice would be evaluated more positively than advice-giving models in which problem inquiry and analysis was not conducted or was conducted after advice. These two hypotheses were assessed through a $3 \times 3 \times 3$ analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) with scenario realism as the covariate. The between-group factors included manipulation of emotional support (absent, present before advice, and present after advice), manipulation of problem inquiry and analysis (absent, present before advice, and present after advice), and problem type (fail exam, conflict with parents over career choice, and being underpaid at a part-time job). Scenario realism was a significant covariate, $F(1, 724) = 285.37, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .28$. The

ANCOVA results revealed that, when controlling for scenario realism, manipulation of emotional support had a significant main effect on evaluation of advice quality, $F(2, 724) = 5.54, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .02$. Follow-up pairwise comparisons showed that advice offered following emotional support (adjusted $M = 5.87$) was evaluated more positively than advice offered either before emotional support (adjusted $M = 5.70$), $p < .05$, or without emotional support (adjusted $M = 5.56$), $p < .001$. Therefore, H1 was supported. There was no significant difference between the latter two conditions.

The ANCOVA analyses also revealed a significant main effect of manipulation of problem inquiry and analysis, $F(2, 724) = 2.94, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .01$. Follow-up pairwise comparisons revealed that advice offered following the move of problem inquiry and analysis (adjusted $M = 5.82$) was evaluated more positively than advice offered before the move of problem inquiry and analysis (adjusted $M = 5.61$), $p < .05$, but it did not differ significantly from advice offered without the move of problem inquiry and analysis (adjusted $M = 5.70$), *ns*. Therefore, H2 was partially supported. There was no significant difference between the latter two conditions.

The ANCOVA results revealed no significant main effect of problem type, $F(2, 724) = 0.11, ns$. None of the two-way or three-way interactions was significant.

H3 predicted that the EPA model would be more effective than the PEA model. A 2×3 ANCOVA was performed to test this hypothesis (including only cases in those two models). The between-group factors included model type (EPA vs. PEA) and problem type. Scenario realism was a significant covariate, $F(1, 143) = 85.36, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .37$. The ANCOVA results revealed that, when controlling for scenario realism, advice in the EPA model (adjusted $M = 6.16$) was evaluated more positively than advice in the PEA model (adjusted $M = 5.79$), $p < .01$. Therefore, H3 was supported. The main effect of problem type was not significant, neither was the interaction between problem type and model type.

Discussion

Drawing on theory and research on counseling, therapy, and supportive communication, this study proposed and tested an integrated model of advice giving, which specifies three sequential moves in supportive interactions involving advice: emotional support, problem inquiry and analysis, and advice. The following sections summarize the major findings of the study, discuss the theoretical and pragmatic implications of the findings, and detail the limitations of the current study and directions for future research.

Findings of the present study suggest that, compared to advice that is offered without emotional support or before emotional support, advice functions better when it is offered following emotional support. These findings provide empirical evidence supporting the proposition that emotional support should be an *initial* response to the target's distress. Interestingly, the present study did not detect a significant difference in evaluation of advice quality between advice offered without emotional support and advice offered before emotional support. This finding seems

to suggest that when emotional support is offered after the delivery of advice, it is unlikely to contribute to the recipient's judgment of advice. However, given the well-documented salutary effects of sensitive emotional support on individuals' well-being and relationship development (for a review, see Burleson & MacGeorge, 2002), it is reasonable to expect that even when emotional support is offered at the last stage of a supportive interaction, it will still promote the recipient's perceptions of other aspects of supportive interactions such as his or her overall satisfaction with the helper's supportive attempt and the recipient's relationship with the helper. Therefore, future research should assess this possibility by including measures of those types of dependent variables.

Consistent with previous research in counseling and therapy (e.g., Kinnell & Maynard, 1996; Vehviläinen, 2001), findings of this study showed that advice was evaluated more positively when it was offered following the move of problem inquiry and analysis than when it was offered before the move of problem inquiry and analysis. This finding suggests that the move of problem inquiry and analysis is only appropriate when it is conducted before advice is offered. Surprisingly, however, findings of the present study did not support the prediction that advice offered following problem inquiry and analysis should be more effective than advice offered in the absence of problem inquiry and analysis. Failure to support this hypothesis may be, in part, due to two features of this study's design. First, during the opening dialogue between the helper and the target, which was held constant across the 11 advice-giving models, the target disclosed that he/she was experiencing a problematic situation (e.g., telling the friend that he/she has failed an exam and felt frustrated and upset). As previous research suggests, disclosure of a problem can be heard as a way of asking for advice (Goldsmith, 2000). This possibility was also evidenced in findings obtained in the follow-up study in which participants from the same group of students used in the main study reported a moderate level of advice solicitation across the conditions. Second, the advice messages employed in the current study were held constant across the 11 advice-giving models and were designed to reflect "high-quality" advice that attended to the recipient's face needs, proposed an action that was relevant to the target's situation, and explained the feasibility, efficacy, and lack of limitations with carrying out the advised action (Feng & Burleson, 2007; MacGeorge, Feng et al., 2004). Consistent with previous research, results of this study indicated that participants' responses to these advice messages were generally positive, with a mean rating of above 5 (i.e., *somewhat agree*) on a 7-point scale. A follow-up topic for future research is to examine if advice offered following the move of problem inquiry and analysis will be *qualitatively* better than advice that is offered without problem inquiry and analysis.

Comparison of the EPA model and PEA model showed that participants viewed advice offered in the EPA model as higher in quality than advice offered in the PEA model. This finding further supports the proposition that emotional support should be a helper's initial response to a distressed individual's problem. It is not only important to engage in both comforting and problem inquiry before attempting

to give advice, the order in which each of those two supportive acts is performed also matters.

Pragmatic implications

Although the integrated model proposes a three-step, sequential model of advice giving in supportive interactions, it should be understood that this specification does *not* assume that the three tasks of providing emotional support, inquiring and analyzing the target's problem, and offering advice should be sequentially accomplished during the course of one single episode of interaction. In real-life practice, supportive process can span over multiple episodes of interactions and over a period of days, weeks, or even longer. Therefore, it is important for a helper to apply this advice-giving model holistically and to monitor and adjust to the target's responses while using this model as a general guideline. For instance, although this study identified and examined emotional support as a distinct move in the supportive process, it is important to understand that the provision of emotional support can also be an ongoing process. A distressed individual may show need for comforting and sympathizing at various points of the supportive interaction. Also, building trust and rapport with the target is an ongoing process and requires the continuous, sustained emotional caring of the target. This continuous and sustained caring does not necessarily have to be shown through explicit, verbal expressions of understanding of the target's feelings and emotions; rather, it can be delivered in a more subtle and implicit manner. The use of politeness strategies (Brown & Levinson, 1987), for example, may be necessary and helpful for maintaining a harmonious and supportive atmosphere when inquiring and analyzing the problem with the target or offering the advice (e.g., MacGeorge, Feng et al., 2004), as may be the use of "immediate" non-verbal behaviors (Jones & Guerrero, 2001).

Meanwhile, it is important to note that good quality social support is not simply defined by the form and structure of the support being offered but also, and perhaps more importantly, the quality of support content. Supportive actions are effective to the extent that the helper's behaviors and expressions are responsive to the needs and messages of the person with whom he or she is interacting (Burlinson, 2003; Reis & Shaver, 1988). Further, the proposed model's focus on advice by no means advocates that advice should *always* be offered in response to an individual's distress or problem. Sometimes the crucial question for a support provider to answer is: "To give or not to give advice?" As the integrated model suggests, a key function of problem inquiry before attempting to give advice is to assess the relevance of advice. In cases where the target indicates little interest in or need for advice, the support provider may be better off focusing on other forms of support such as comforting.

Limitations and directions for future research

Two limitations of this study need to be acknowledged. The first limitation pertains to the study's lack of assessment of potential mediating factors that link variations in the structure of supportive interaction involving advice with variations in

individuals' evaluation of advice quality. It thus remains an empirical question as to what underlying cognitive and psychological processes would explain the primacy of the EPA model over alternative models. To identify the explanatory mechanism, future research will need to incorporate additional measures such as rationality of the helper's responses to the target's situation and perceived appropriateness and sensitivity of the entire supportive interaction. The second limitation of this study is its use of hypothetical scenarios. Participants' imaged responses to hypothetical supportive messages may differ from their responses to those messages in real-life supportive interactions. Accordingly, future research should obtain in situ assessments of advice-giving behaviors and message evaluations. Such research could focus on observing either naturally occurring advice giving and receiving behaviors or those that occur in controlled lab settings. Although ethical and practical considerations may create limits for investigations of supportive interactions in laboratory or real-life settings (Burleson, 2003), there have been successful examples of such studies in recent years (e.g., Jones & Guerrero, 2001), suggesting that this type of research is feasible, albeit challenging in many ways.

Notes

- 1 This design is similar to the component control designs used in psychotherapy research, in which the effectiveness of components in treatment protocols is examined by using a portion of the treatment as comparison conditions and observing the difference in effectiveness between conditions including the components and conditions excluding them (see Haaga & Stiles, 2000).
- 2 The cell sizes of male participants across the 11 advice model conditions ranged from 16 to 29, and the cell sizes of female participants ranged from 39 to 62. The proportion of male participants across the three manipulation conditions for emotional support and the three manipulation conditions for problem inquiry and analyses was relatively consistent, ranging from 30 to 36%. Follow-up $3 \times 3 \times 2$ ANOVA with manipulation of emotional support, manipulation of problem inquiry and analysis, and participant sex as the between-subjects factors and advice quality as the dependent variable did not detect any significant interaction effects involving participant sex.
- 3 A follow-up pilot study was administered to a sample of 216 college students to assess the influence of two additional potential confounding factors on evaluation of advice quality across the 11 advice models: Perceived conversational coherence and the extent to which advice was perceived to be solicited from the helper. Three items on 7-point Likert-style scales (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*) were used to measure perceived conversational coherence (e.g., "The conversation between Person A and Person B was coherent," "Person A's responses to what Person B said were sensible"). The three items constituted a reliable scale ($\alpha = .87$). The average rating of conversational coherence across the 11 models was 5.75. A 3×3 ANOVA with manipulation of emotional support (absent, present before advice, and present after advice) and manipulation of problem inquiry and analysis (absent, present before advice, and present after advice) as the between-group factors was conducted to assess variation

in perceived conversational coherence across different conditions. The main effect of manipulation of emotional support was not significant, $F(2, 207) = 1.08$, *ns*. The main effect of manipulation of problem inquiry and analysis was significant, $F(2, 207) = 4.24$, $p < .05$, $\eta_p^2 = .04$. Posthoc Tukey tests showed that conversations in which advice was offered without problem inquiry and analysis ($M = 5.47$, $SD = 1.07$) were seen as less coherent than conversations in which advice was offered following problem inquiry and analysis ($M = 5.97$, $SD = 0.92$). No significant difference was detected in other comparisons, and there was no significant interaction between the two manipulation factors, $F(4, 207) = 0.69$, *ns*. Goldsmith's (2000) 5-item advice solicitation scale was used to measure the perceived solicitation of advice from the helper (e.g., "It's obvious that Person B hoped to get Person's A's advice," "Person B was asking for advice from Person A"). The five items constituted a reliable scale ($\alpha = .83$). The average perceived solicitation rating across the 11 conditions was 4.59 on a 7-point scale. A 3×3 ANOVA with manipulation of emotional support (absent, present before advice, and present after advice) and manipulation of problem inquiry and analysis (absent, present before advice, and present after advice) as the between-group factors was conducted to assess variation in perceived advice solicitation across different conditions. Neither the main effect of manipulation of emotional support, $F(2, 207) = 0.32$, *ns*, nor the main effect of manipulation of problem inquiry and analysis, $F(2, 207) = 2.06$, *ns*, was significant. However, there was a significant interaction between the two manipulation factors, $F(4, 207) = 3.15$, $p < .05$, $\eta_p^2 = .06$. Decomposition of the interaction showed that manipulation of emotional support had a significant effect on perceived advice solicitation only when advice was offered without problem inquiry and analysis, $F(2, 67) = 7.41$, $p < .001$. More specifically, perceived advice solicitation was higher in the EA model ($M = 4.90$, $SD = 1.06$) than it was in the AE model ($M = 4.06$, $SD = 0.95$). No significant difference was detected in other comparisons.

References

- Barbee, A. P., Derlega, V. J., Sherburne, S. P., & Grimshaw, A. (1998). Helpful and unhelpful forms of social support for HIV-positive individuals. In V. J. Derlega & A. P. Barbee (Eds.), *HIV and social interaction* (pp. 83–105). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Burleson, B. R. (2003). Emotional support skills. In J. O. Greene & B. R. Burleson (Eds.), *Handbook of communication and social interaction skills* (pp. 551–594). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Burleson, B. R., & Goldsmith, D. J. (1998). How the comforting process works: Alleviating emotional distress through conversationally induced reappraisals. In P. A. Anderson & 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.
- Caplan, G. (1981). Mastery of stress: Psychosocial aspects. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *138*, 413–420.

- Clark, S. L., & Stephens, M. A. P. (1996). Stroke patients' well-being as a function of caregiving spouses' helpful and unhelpful actions. *Personal Relationships*, *3*, 171–184.
- Cutrona, C. E., & Suhr, J. A. (1994). Social support communication in the context of marriage: An analysis of couples' supportive interactions. In B. R. Burleson, T. L. Albrecht, & I. G. Sarason (Eds.), *Communication of social support* (pp. 113–135). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dunkel-Schetter, C., Blasband, D., Feinstein, L., & Herbert, T. (1992). Elements of supportive interactions: When are attempts to help effective? In S. Spacapan & S. Oskamp (Eds.), *Helping and being helped: Naturalistic studies* (pp. 83–114). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Elliott, R. (1985). Helpful and nonhelpful events in brief counseling interviews: An empirical taxonomy. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *32*, 307–322.
- Feng, B., & Burleson, B. R. (2007, May). *The effects of argument articulation on responses to advice in supportive interactions*. Paper presented at the International Communication Association annual convention, San Francisco.
- Feng, B., & MacGeorge, E. L. (2006). Predicting receptiveness to advice: Characteristics of the problem, the advice-giver, and the recipient. *Southern Communication Journal*, *71*, 67–85.
- 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. (2000). Soliciting advice: The role of sequential placement in mitigating face threat. *Communication Monographs*, *67*, 1–19.
- Goldsmith, D. J., & Dun, S. A. (1997). Sex differences and similarities in the communication of social support. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *14*, 317–337.
- Goldsmith, D. J., & Fitch, K. (1997). The normative context of advice as social support. *Human Communication Research*, *23*, 454–476.
- 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.
- Greenberg, L., & Paivio, S. (1997). *Working with emotion in psychotherapy*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Haaga, D. A. F., & Stiles, W. B. (2000). Randomized clinical trials in psychotherapy research: Methodology, design, and evaluation. In C. R. Snyder & R. E. Ingram (Eds.), *Handbook of psychological change: Psychotherapy processes and practices for the 21st century* (pp. 14–39). New York: Wiley.
- Heritage, J., & Sefi, S. (1992). Dilemmas of advice. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings* (pp. 359–417). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Jacobson, D. E. (1986). Types and timing of social support. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, *27*, 250–264.
- Jones, S. M., & Guerrero, L. A. (2001). The effects of nonverbal immediacy and verbal person centeredness in the emotional support process. *Human Communication Research*, *27*, 567–596.
- Kinnell, A. M., & Maynard, D. (1996). The delivery and receipt of safer sex advice in pretest counseling sessions for HIV and AIDS. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, *24*, 405–437.

- Lazarus, R. S. (1991). *Emotion and adaptation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- 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.
- MacGeorge, E. L., Graves, A. R., Feng, B., Gillihan, S. J., & Burleson, B. R. (2004). The myth of gender cultures: Similarities outweigh differences in men's and women's provision of and responses to supportive communication. *Sex Roles, 50*, 143–175.
- 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.
- Maynard, D. W. (1991). The perspective-display series and the delivery and receipt of diagnostic news. In D. Boden & D. H. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Talk and social structure: Studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis* (pp. 164–194). Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Pearlin, L. I., & McCall, M. E. (1990). Occupational stress and marital support: A description of microprocesses. In J. Eckenrode & S. Gore (Eds.), *Stress between work and family* (pp. 39–60). New York: Plenum.
- Reis, H. T., & Shaver, P. (1988). Intimacy as an interpersonal process. In S. Duck (Ed.), *Handbook of personal relationships* (pp. 367–389). Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Vehviläinen, S. (2001). Evaluative advice in educational counseling: The use of disagreement in the “stepwise entry” to advice. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 34*, 371–398.

Appendix: An Example of Conversations Exhibiting the EPA Sequence

Your friend: Hi there! How are you doing?

You: Oh, hi. OK. Well, maybe not so OK. You know, I took the first exam for COM304 last week?

Your friend: Yeah?

You: Well, I just got it back. I got a D! I thought I understood that stuff. I'm really bummed out.

Your friend: Well, sure. That's understandable. You've got every right to feel that way. I mean, I've blown an exam before and I know how lousy I felt. But blowing one exam doesn't mean you're not smart or anything. Everybody has a bad day sometimes. Plus, I've heard that is a really tough course; I bet not too many people did very well on it. Remember, though, your whole grade doesn't depend on just one test. You've still got other chances to pull your grade up.

You: Yeah, I guess you're right, although I still feel kind of bad about it.

Your friend: Do you feel you can do better on the next exam?

You: That's what worries me the most; I don't know what I should do in order to do well on the next exam.

Your friend: Well, maybe a good place to start is to think about why you didn't do well on this exam. Was it because you didn't have enough time to prepare or you didn't understand some of the materials, or other reasons?

You: I spent a whole week studying for that exam so time should not be a problem. The thing is ... it turned out that several of the big questions just hit one of the parts that I didn't quite understand and that kind of ruined the whole thing. I don't know why that happened.

Your friend: Well, I know you usually study by yourself, but maybe you can try studying with other people in your class before the exam next time. You know you get different perspectives when preparing for exams with others and you might have missed something during class in the notes that other people may have. Studying with other classmates will help you gain a better understanding of the materials. You mentioned before that there are a few good students in your class that you really like and get along with well. You can study with them next time. Of course, when studying with others, you might have to spend a lot of time on things that you already understand but you can understand better when you've explained it to others.

You: Those are some good ideas; I just wish I had done better on this exam.

Un test d'un modèle intégré des conseils lors d'interactions de soutien

Bo Feng

University of California, Davis

Résumé

Voyant la communication de soutien comme un processus à plusieurs étapes, la présente étude propose et teste un modèle intégré du conseil, qui spécifie trois mouvements séquentiels des interactions de soutien impliquant des conseils : le soutien émotif, le questionnement et l'analyse du problème, puis les conseils. 752 participants ont lu et réagi à un scénario hypothétique dans lequel ils recevaient les conseils d'un ami. Les résultats de l'étude démontrent que les conseils offerts à la suite du soutien émotif et du questionnement et de l'analyse du problème furent considérés de meilleure qualité que les conseils qui ne suivaient pas ce modèle séquentiel.

Untersuchung eines integrativen Modells des Ratschlag-Gebens in unterstützenden Interaktionen

Vorliegende Studie betrachtet unterstützende Kommunikation als einen mehrstufigen Prozess und testet ein integratives Modell des Ratschlag-Gebens bei unterstützenden Interaktionen, welches durch drei aufeinander folgende Schritte spezifiziert wird: emotionale Unterstützung – Problemerörterung und -analyse – Ratschlag. 752 Teilnehmer lasen und reagierten auf ein hypothetisches Szenario, in welchem sie einen Ratschlag von einem Freund erhielten. Die Ergebnisse der Studie zeigten, dass ein Ratschlag, der dem Ablauf emotionale Unterstützung, Problemerörterung und -analyse folgte als qualitativ höher eingeschätzt wurde als ein Ratschlag, der diese Abfolge nicht einhielt.

Poniendo a Prueba un Modelo Integrado del Dar Consejos durante Interacciones de Apoyo

Bo Feng
University of California, Davis

Resumen

Viendo a la comunicación de apoyo como un proceso de múltiples pasos, el presente estudio propuso y puso a prueba un modelo integrado del dar consejos, que especifica tres movimientos secuenciales en las interacciones de apoyo que involucran dar consejos: apoyo emocional—preguntar sobre el problema y el análisis—el consejo. 752 participantes leyeron y respondieron a un escenario hipotético en el cual recibieron el consejo de un amigo. Los resultados de este estudio mostraron que el consejo que fue ofrecido siguiendo los estados de apoyo emocional y las preguntas sobre el problema y análisis fue juzgado como de mayor calidad que el consejo que no siguió la secuencia de la pauta.

检验支持性互动中提供建议的整合模式

Bo Feng

加州大学戴维斯分校

将支持性传播看作是一种多阶段过程，本研究提出并测试了一个提供建议之整合模式。这个模式界定了涉及建议的支持性互动中三种有序性的行为：即情感支持—问题询问和分析—建议。752名参与者阅读并应答了一个接受朋友建议的假设性的场景。研究结果显示：在情感支持和问题询问及分析之后提出的建议，比之于没有遵循这个过程而提出的建议，其质量被认为是更高。

지지적인 상호작용내에서의 통합적인 충고-기부모델에 관한 연구

Bo Fend

University of California, Davis

요약

지지적인 커뮤니케이션을 여러단계과정으로 간주한 가운데, 본 연구는충고를 하는데 있어서의 통합적 모델을 제시하고 연구한 것으로, 이는충고에 있어 연루되는 지지적인 항호작용들; 감정적인 지원, 문제파악과 분석, 그리고 충고로 이어지는 3단계의 연속적인 움직임을 특정화한 연구이다. 752명의 참여자들이 그들이 친구로부터 충고를 받게되는 가정적인 시나리오를 읽고 반응하게 하였다. 본 연구의 결과는 감정적 지원과 문제파악과 지원등의 연속적인 움직임으로 제공되는 충고가 이러한 형태를 수반하지 못하는 충고보다 질적으로 더욱 우수한 것으로 나타났다.