Which Communication Style Best Explains Happiness in Social Relationships among Young People?

Gençlerde Sosyal İlişkilerden Mutluluğu Hangi İletişim Tarzı Açıklar?

Ali Murat ALPARSLAN[1] iD , **Merve Betül BAYKUR**[2] iD , **Kamuran KOCAİLİK**[3] iD

[1] Prof. Dr. Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi, İletişim Fakültesi, Isparta, Türkiye
[2] Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi, Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi, Isparta, Türkiye
[3] Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi, Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi, Isparta, Türkiye

Abstract: This study is a field research aimed at examining the communication styles that enhance happiness in social relationships among young individuals. One of the key concepts of the research, communication styles, refers to how individuals interact with others, while social well-being refers to the satisfaction individuals experience in their relationships with others. This research was conducted to understand which communication styles are more effective in supporting happiness in social relationships among young people. Data was collected through online and face-to-face surveys from 454 university students aged 18-24 from eight different universities in Turkey. Communication styles were measured using the Communication Styles Inventory (CSI), and social well-being was assessed through the Social Well-Being Scale, based on the PERMA model of positive psychology. The findings of correlation and regression analyses indicate that expressive communication style is positively associated with social well-being, while emotional and manipulative communication styles do not have a significant effect on social well-being. These results suggest that fostering expressive communication styles can increase happiness and satisfaction in social interactions among young people. In conclusion, the study highlights the positive impact of expressive communication styles on social well-being, suggesting that developing this style has the potential to enhance social integration and overall quality of life.

Keywords: Social Well-Being, Expressive Communication Style, Manipulative Communication Style, Emotional Communication Style

Özet: Bu çalışma, genç bireylerin sosyal ilişkilerindeki mutluluğu artıran iletişim tarzlarını incelemeyi amaçlayan bir saha araştırmasıdır. Araştırmanın temel kavramlarından biri olan iletişim tarzları, bireylerin başkalarıyla nasıl etkileşim kurduğunu, sosyal iyi oluş ise bireylerin diğerleri ile olan ilişkilerindeki memnuniyeti ifade eder. Bu araştırma, genç bireylerin sosyal ilişkilerindeki mutluluğun hangi iletişim tarzlarıyla daha fazla desteklendiğini anlamak amacıyla yapılmıştır. Türkiye'deki sekiz farklı üniversiteden 18-24 yaş arası 454 üniversite öğrencisinden çevrimiçi ve yüz yüze anketlerle veri toplanmıştır. İletişim tarzları, İletişim Tarzları Envanteri (İTE) ile; sosyal iyi oluş ise pozitif psikolojinin PERMA modeline dayanan Sosyal İyi Oluş Ölçeği ile ölçülmüştür. Korelasyon ve regresyon analizlerinin bulguları, dışavurumcu iletişim tarzının sosyal iyi oluş ile pozitif ilişkili olduğunu, duygusal ve manipülatif iletişim tarzlarının ise sosyal iyi oluş üzerinde anlamlı bir etkisinin olmadığını göstermektedir. Bu sonuçlar, genç bireylerin sosyal etkileşimlerinde dışavurumcu iletişim tarzlarını geliştirmenin mutluluk ve doyumu artırabileceğini öne sürmektedir. Sonuç olarak, çalışmada dışavurumcu iletişim tarzlarının sosyal iyi oluş üzerindeki olumlu etkisi vurgulanmakta olup, bu tarzın geliştirilmesinin bireylerin sosyal uyumunu ve genel yaşam kalitesini artırma potansiyeline sahip olduğu belirtilmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sosyal İyi Oluş, Dışavurumcu İletişim Tarzı, Manipülatif İletişim Tarzı, Duygusal İletişim Tarzı

1. Introduction

Social well-being is crucial for young people, encompassing both individual and social-contextual factors. Research has indicated that positive social relationships significantly contribute to the well-being of youth, especially those experiencing homelessness (Stewart, 2000). Moreover, a sense of community and empowerment play a vital role in enhancing social well-being among young individuals, fostering feelings of integration, value, trust, and societal progress (Cicognani et al., 2014). Welfare policies and interventions aimed at promoting social and emotional well-being are essential for vulnerable children and young people, highlighting the necessity for comprehensive support systems (Coverdale, 2017). Additionally, social capital, sense of community and adaptive responding mechanisms have been associated with positive health outcomes and reduced depressive symptoms among marginalized youth (Littman, 2021). Overall, understanding and addressing the multifaceted needs of young individuals through recognition, advocacy, and social justice are fundamental components in promoting their social well-being (Almqvist & Lassinantti, 2018;

Höjer & Sjöblom, 2010; Boylan & Dalrymple, 2011).

Interpersonal communication styles, such as manipulativeness, emotionality and expressiveness, can significantly influence social well-being among young people. Research suggests that positive communication styles, characterized by empathy and effective expression of emotions, are associated with higher levels of social well-being (Moore & Leung, 2002). Additionally, the ability to navigate social interactions and form meaningful relationships plays a crucial role in enhancing well-being among adolescents (Spence et al., 2015). Furthermore, the impact of communication styles on social capital and social connectedness highlights the importance of effective interpersonal communication in promoting the overall well-being of young individuals (Addae, 2020). Therefore, fostering healthy communication patterns and emotional intelligence can contribute to the social well-being of young people, emphasizing the significance of interpersonal skills in enhancing their overall quality of life.

Interpersonal communication styles play a significant role in influencing social well-being among young people. Positive communication styles, such as empathy and effective expression of emotions, have been associated with higher levels of social well-being (Stewart & Townley, 2020). Research has shown that the ability to navigate social interactions and form meaningful relationships is crucial for enhancing well-being among adolescents (Peleg et al., 2021). Furthermore, the impact of communication styles on social capital and social connectedness underscores the importance of effective interpersonal communication in promoting the overall well-being of young individuals (García et al., 2019). Therefore, fostering healthy communication patterns and emotional intelligence can contribute to the social well-being of young people, highlighting the significance of interpersonal skills in enhancing their quality of life.

In the literature, there may be a gap regarding the influence of interpersonal communication on social well-being at the individual level. Understanding how individual communication styles, such as manipulativeness, emotionality, and expressiveness, impact social well-being could provide valuable insights into enhancing the overall well-being of young individuals. By exploring the nuances of these communication styles and their effects on social interactions and relationships, researchers can contribute to filling this potential gap in the literature and further elucidate the intricate relationship between interpersonal communication and social well-being at the individual level.

The study conducted by Diotaiuti, Valente, Mancone, and Grambone (2020) aimed to assess the psychometric properties and conduct a preliminary validation of the Italian Brief Version of the Communication Styles Inventory (CSI-B/I). Given the scarcity of instruments in the Italian psychometric landscape for evaluating communication styles, the research focused on translating and validating the Italian short version of the Communication Styles Inventory. Through methods such as structural equation modeling, concurrent validity and confirmatory factor analysis, the study sought to provide a reliable and valid tool for assessing communication styles in the Italian context. By establishing the psychometric properties and validating the Italian version of the inventory, the research aimed to contribute to the understanding of how individual communication styles impact social well-being, emphasizing the importance of effective communication in fostering positive social interactions and relationships (Stewart & Townley, 2020).

2. Individual Communication Styles

Communication styles are defined by the ways in which individuals express their thoughts, feelings and needs, characterized by specific features. Various studies on communication styles help us understand how these styles impact individuals' social interactions, relationships, and personal development. Classifications made by different researchers allow for a deeper examination of the various aspects of communication styles and their effects on individuals. In this context, the approaches of researchers such as Bourne (1995), Bennet (1998), Merrill and Reid (1999), Alessandra and Hunsaker (1993), and Murphy (2015) contribute to a comprehensive understanding of the subject.

Bourne (1995) classifies communication styles as passive, aggressive, passive-aggressive, manipulative, and assertive. In the passive communication style, individuals believe their own opinions and desires are insignificant, acting reserved and yielding to others' wishes. This style is characterized by a lack of self-confidence and a tendency to please others. In contrast, the aggressive communication style involves individuals prioritizing their own needs without hesitating to harm others. This style is marked by a lack of empathy and a blaming language. The passive-aggressive communication style is where individuals express their feelings indirectly through negative behaviors. The manipulative communication style includes tendencies to influence and use others for personal gain. The assertive communication style enables individuals to express their rights clearly and openly while respecting others.

Bennet (1998) categorizes communication styles into linear-circular, direct-indirect, attached-detached, formal-informal, abstract-concrete, thought-oriented-relationship-oriented, and low-context-high-context. In the linear communication style, information is presented sequentially and logically, whereas in the circular style, messages are conveyed in a repetitive and circular manner. Direct communication involves clear and explicit expression, while indirect communication is characterized by implicit and suggestive messaging. The attached communication style heavily incorporates emotional expressions, while the detached style adopts a more ob-

jective and analytical approach. Formal communication represents structured and formal interactions, while informal communication is more casual and intimate. Abstract communication deals with general concepts and theoretical approaches, whereas concrete communication is conducted through specific objects and events. Thought-oriented communication adopts a logical and analytical approach, while relationship-oriented communication emphasizes interpersonal relationships and emotional bonds. Low-context communication involves the direct transmission of messages, while high-context communication relies on the context and situation to convey the message.

Merrill and Reid (1999) classify communication styles as analytical, directive, expressive, and amiable. The analytical communication style involves a logical and systematic approach, emphasizing details and data. The directive communication style adopts a straightforward and results-oriented approach. The expressive communication style includes an energetic and social approach, while the amiable communication style embodies an empathetic and supportive approach.

Alessandra and Hunsaker (1993) categorize communication styles into direct-indirect, supportive-controlling, relators, socializers, thinkers and directors. In the direct communication style, individuals express their thoughts openly, while in the indirect style, communication is conducted implicitly. The supportive communication style involves an empathetic and understanding approach, while the controlling style focuses on direction and decision-making. Relators prioritize relationships and collaboration; socializers adopt an energetic and social approach. Thinkers adopt an analytical and logical approach, while directors focus on leadership and direction.

Murphy (2015) classifies communication styles as analytical, personal, intuitive, and functional. The analytical communication style adopts a logical and data-focused approach. The personal communication style is based on empathy and emotional bonds. The intuitive communication style focuses on general concepts and seeing the bigger picture. The functional communication style includes a structured and systematic approach.

In addition to these classifications, Diotaiuti et al. (2020) conducted a study on the Italian Brief Version of the Communication Styles Inventory (CSI-B/I), aiming to validate its psychometric properties. The study involved a factor analysis to ensure the inventory's reliability and validity in measuring communication styles. The CSI-B/I includes dimensions such as expressiveness, assertiveness, and flexibility, offering a concise yet comprehensive tool for assessing communication behaviors. This model contributes significantly to the field by providing a validated instrument that can be used in both research and practical settings to better understand and improve individual communication styles.

In conclusion, communication styles play a significant role in individuals' social interactions and personal relationships. The classifications made by various researchers provide guides that help individuals improve their communication skills and establish more effective communication. This diversity also reveals how communication styles are shaped by individual differences and cultural contexts. Therefore, understanding communication styles contributes to building healthier and more productive relationships in both personal and professional lives.

3. Social Well-Being

Positive psychology, as pioneered by Martin Seligman, focuses on the study and promotion of positive aspects of human life, such as happiness, well-being, and flourishing. Seligman (2011) introduced the PERMA model, which stands for Positive Emotions, Engagement, Relationships, Meaning, and Accomplishment. Each element of this model contributes to an individual's overall well-being. Within this framework, "R" represents Relationships, emphasizing the critical role that positive and supportive relationships play in enhancing well-being.

Social well-being, introduced by Kristen Neff (2003) and often referred to as self-compassion, self-understanding, self-sensitivity, and self-mercy in the Turkish literature (Ozdemir, 2023), is integral to this model. It highlights an individual's ability to show understanding and compassion towards themselves in the face of challenges and setbacks, viewing their weaknesses and failures as part of the common human experience. This aspect of well-being has become essential for overall mental and emotional health.

Social well-being, is a broad term that encompasses efforts to improve the welfare, happiness, and health of individuals and communities. It is as crucial as physical health, including social, emotional, and mental well-being. Key components of social well-being include social bonds, community participation, emotional health, empathy helping and equality and justice. Positive relationships, such as friendships, family ties, and community connections, are vital for meeting emotional needs and coping with stress. Active participation in social activities and contributing to social issues help individuals feel valued and strengthen their sense of community belonging. Managing emotions, positive thinking, and coping with stress are integral to emotional health, enhancing self-confidence and improving quality of life. Empathy fosters closer relationships and creates a more supportive community environment, while equality and justice ensure that everyone can realize their potential and live fulfilling lives.

Research has found that the level of self-understanding predicts psychological well-being by 23% (Ozdemir, 2023). Childhood parental attitudes and experiences of emotional or physical violence significantly affect social workers' self-understanding and psychological well-be-

ing levels. Additionally, participants with democratic parental attitudes in childhood have higher self-understanding levels, and those with democratic parental attitudes exhibit higher psychological well-being than those with accusatory and inconsistent parental attitudes. Self-understanding and psychological well-being levels do not significantly differ by gender, age group, marital status, or field of work (Ozdemir, 2023).

Studies on well-being are conducted from two perspectives: subjective well-being and psychological well-being (Ryan & Deci, 2001). Subjective well-being evaluates overall feelings and quality of life, while psychological well-being examines perceptions related to self-fulfillment, such as pursuing meaningful goals, personal growth, and forming quality relationships. Ryff (1989) developed a multidimensional framework to explore individuals' psychological functioning, including autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life, and self-acceptance. This framework indicates how individuals evaluate themselves and their quality of life.

The concept of well-being, first introduced by Bradburn (1964) and related to Aristotelian eudaimonia (happiness), suggests that an individual's psychological well-being is high when positive emotions outweigh negative ones and low when negative emotions dominate. Well-being is seen as a dynamic process where individuals realize their potential, enjoy personal existence, live life meaningfully, and contribute to social life.

Positive psychology interventions aim to enhance well-being by focusing on subjective experiences like life satisfaction, optimism and flow; individual aspects like forgiveness, authenticity, and spirituality; and group aspects like altruism, responsibility, and tolerance (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). Promoting social well-being helps societies become more resilient, cohesive, and prosperous.

4. Method

Our study was conducted on young individuals, specifically targeting university students aged between 18-24. The reason for selecting the research population and sample from young individuals in this age group is that it represents a period in which social interactions are most intense and they are most affected by these interactions. The sample comprised a total of 520 undergraduate and graduate students. However, the analysis was performed on the data from 454 participants who completed the survey accurately and thoroughly. Participants who attempted manipulative data entries were excluded from the analysis.

The data for the study were collected from eight different universities. Participants were reached through surveys administered both online (via SurveyMonkey) and face-to-face in university libraries. To enhance the reliability of the research, 65% of the participants were surveyed face-to-face. The data collection took place over a one-month period in February 2024. A convenience sampling method was used.

Of the participants, 56% were female. To ensure the generalizability of the study results, efforts were made to reach students from all fields of study. While an effort was made to include students from various academic levels, 50% of the participants were first- and second-year students. Students from diverse fields such as education, social sciences, natural sciences, and health sciences were included. Additionally, the questionnaire included questions about the participants' childhood environments, as these were considered factors that could influence their communication styles and social relationships.

The fundamental hypothesis of this research is that:

The interpersonal communication styles that young people use affect their social well-being in different ways.

4.1. Scales
4.2. Communication Styles Inventory (CSI)

The Communication Styles Inventory (CSI) developed by De Vries et al. (2013) comprises 96 items across 6 scales. These dimensions include Expressiveness, Precision, Verbal Aggressiveness, Critical Spirit, Emotionality, and Impression Manipulation. Each scale consists of four sub-scales, with each sub-scale containing four items. The items are rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Diotaiuti et al. (2020) have created a short form of this inventory, which includes 18 items across 3 main dimensions: Expressiveness, Emotionality, and Impression Manipulativeness.

An example item for the Emotionality dimension is: "When talking about my memories, I sometimes become visibly emotional." For the Expressiveness dimension, an example item is: "I often take the lead in conversations." An example item for the Impression Manipulativeness dimension is: "Sometimes I speak in a very persuasive tone when I want something."

In the study by Diotaiuti et al. (2020), the validity analysis of the scale yielded the following results: $\chi^2/df = 1.251$, RMSEA = 0.027, RMSEA 90% CI = 0.008–0.040, GFI = 0.958, AGFI = 0.937, CFI = 0.983 and NFI = 0.922. The CSI-B/I allows measurement of three main dimensions of communication style. The reliability coefficients for these dimensions range from 0.80 to 0.74.

In the context of this research, the reliability coefficients obtained are as follows: Emotionality = 0.736, Expressiveness = 0.674, and Impression Manipulativeness = 0.630. The validity analysis of the scale yielded the following results: $\chi^2/df = 490/116$, RMSEA = 0.058, CFI = 0.87 and TLI = 0.85. Furthermore, the concurrent validity was confirmed through significant correlations with the Multidimensional Personality Profile, further valida-

ting the scale's utility in assessing communication styles in relation to personality traits (Diotaiuti et al., 2020).

4.3. Social Well-Being Scale

The Social Well-Being Scale, developed by Martin Seligman, is designed to assess individuals' satisfaction with their social relationships and overall quality of life. Created within the framework of positive psychology, this scale is a significant tool for determining individuals' interactions with their social environments and their levels of social well-being. The Social Well-Being Scale is based on Seligman's PERMA model and measures experiences in areas such as positive emotions, meaningful relationships, deep engagement, the meaning of life, and personal achievement.

The validity and reliability of the scale have been demonstrated in various studies. The scale has been found to be highly reliable through measures such as internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) and test-retest reliability. It has been adapted in different cultural contexts and shown to be universally applicable. For example, in Keyes' (1998) study, internal consistency coefficients for the subscales ranged from 0.70 to 0.85 and test-retest reliability coefficients ranged from 0.70 to 0.78. In Van Dierendonck's (2004) study, internal consistency coefficients ranged from 0.74 to 0.89, and test-retest reliability coefficients ranged from 0.72 to 0.80. In this study, the reliability coefficient is 0.72. In the confirmatory factor analysis, the standart error of each item are above 0.5 and the factor loading values are at the level of significance.

In this study, the Social Well-Being Scale was administered using a 10-point Likert scale and consists of three items. An example item is, "How satisfied are you with your personal relationships?" This scale is used in fields such as positive psychology, health psychology, clinical psychology, education, and school psychology to evaluate individuals' quality of social life and levels of social support.

4.4. Demographic Findings

The study was conducted with a total of 452 students from eight different universities in Türkiye (Dicle University, İnönü University, Süleyman Demirel University, Isparta University of Applied Sciences, Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Mersin University, Erciyes University, Akdeniz University). Data from 431 participants were deemed valid and included in the analyses. Of the participants, 56.8% were male (n=245) and 43.2% were female (n=186), with ages ranging from 18 to 25. This diversity indicates a balanced representation of gender distribution and a broad examination of the young adult population.

Table 1. Demographic Findings

Variables	%	(n)
Gender		
Male	56.8 %	245
Female	43.2 %	186
Education Area		
Social Sciences	20.7 %	87
Natural Sciences	8.6 %	36
Education Sciences	11.9 %	50
Health Sciences	15.5 %	62
Academic Year		
1	30.6 %	124
2	20.0 %	81
3	18.3 %	74
4	13.8 %	56
5	2.7 %	11
Postgraduate degree	6.2 %	25
Graduate	8.1 %	25
Where You Spent Your Childhood		
Big City	27.6 %	119
Village/Town	21.3 %	92
District	23.9 %	103
City	27.1 %	117

The distribution of participants by fields of study is as follows: social sciences (20.7%), natural sciences (8.6%), educational sciences (11.9%), and health sciences (15.5%). This distribution enables the nvestigation of communication styles among students from various academic disciplines. In the analysis by academic level, first-year students comprised the largest group at 30.6% (n=124), followed by second-year students at 20% (n=81), third-year students at 18.3% (n=74), fourth-year students at 13.8% (n=56), fifth-year students at 2.7% (n=11), graduate students at 6.2% (n=25), and alumni at 8.1% (n=25). These data indicate that while the majority of participants are undergraduate students, the study also includes those pursuing advanced education.

Regarding the participants' childhood environments, 27.6% (n=119) grew up in large cities, 21.3% (n=92) in villages/towns, 23.9% (n=103) in districts, and 27.1% (n=117) in cities. This diversity suggests that the participants come from varied socio-cultural backgrounds, providing an opportunity to evaluate the potential impacts of these differences on communication styles.

The demographic data demonstrate that the study encompasses a broad student population, offering a comprehensive dataset to examine the effects of different genders, academic disciplines, class levels, and socio-cultural backgrounds on communication styles.

4.5. Correlation Analysis Findings

The correlation analysis conducted on the data examines the relationships between the communication styles used by young people and their social well-being. According to the results of the analysis, various relationships were identified between the variables of emotional communication (M=3.03, SD=0.736), expressive communication (M=3.37, SD=0.662), manipulative communication (M=2.76, SD=0.794), and social well-being (M=3.37, SD=0.662).

Table 2. Correlation Analysis Findings

Variable		M	(SD)	Emotionality	Social Well-Being	Expressiveness	Impression Manipulativeness
Emotionality	r	3.03	0.736	-			
	p			-			
Social Well-Being	r			-0.050	-		
	p			0.311	-		
Expressiveness	r	3.37	0.662	0.144**	0.189**	-	
	p			0.004	<.001	-	
Impression Manipulativeness	r	2.76	0.794	0.274***	0.044	0.411***	-
	p			<.001	0.370	<.001	-

Note. * p <.05, **p <.01, *** p <.001

A significant and positive relationship was found between expressive communication and manipulative communication (r=0.411, p<0.001). This finding indicates that young people who adopt an expressive communication style may also use a manipulative communication style. Similarly, a significant and positive relationship was identified between manipulative communication and emotional communication (r=0.274, p<0.001), suggesting that young people who adopt a manipulative communication style may also tend to use an emotional communication style.

There is a positive and significant relationship between expressive communication and social well-being (r=0.189, p<0.001), indicating that young people who adopt an expressive communication style may be more satisfied with their social relationships. However, no significant relationship was found between manipulative and emotional communication styles and social well-being (p>0.05). It appears that the happiness of young people in their social relationships is significantly and positively related only to the expressive (self-expressive) communication style.

These findings provide important insights into unders-tanding the effects of communication styles on the social well-being of young people. Specifically, it is observed that the expressive communication style has a positive impact on social well-being, which is associated with greater satisfaction and happiness in social relationships. In this context, it may be important to encourage young people to adopt expressive communication styles to be more successful and happier in their social relationships.

4.6. Regression Analysis Findings

In line with the research objective, a regression model was assumed where social well-being was the dependent variable and the dimensions of communication styles were the independent variables. Before establishing this model, the assumptions of normal distribution for the variables were examined.

To investigate the effects of communication styles used by young people on social well-being, a regression model was designed. Upon evaluating the overall fit measures of the model, it was found to be significant (R = 0.205, R^2 = 0.0419, F(3, 450) = 5.69, p < .001). This result indicates that communication styles explain 4.19% of the variance in social well-being.

Table 3. Model Fit Statistics

Model	R	R^2	F	df1		P
1	0.205	0.0419	5.69	3		<.001
Predictor	Estimate	SE	t		p	Stand. Estimate
Intercept	5.8617	0.594	9.862		<.001	
Emotionality	-0.1696	0.135	-1.260		0.209	-0.0649
Impression Manipulativeness	-0.0509	0.135	-0.377		0.706	-0.0210
Expressiveness	0.6020	0.156	3.861		<.001	0.2091

*Dependent Variable= Social Well-Being

When examining the effect of each independent variable in the model on social well-being, it was found that

the emotional communication style did not have a significant impact on social well-being (β = -0.1696, SE = 0.135, t = -1.260, p = 0.209). This indicates that the emotional communication style does not lead to a significant change in the social well-being levels of young people. Similarly, the manipulative communication style was also found to have no significant effect on social well-being (β = -0.0509, SE = 0.135, t = -0.377, p = 0.706).

On the other hand, the expressive communication style was found to have a positive and significant impact on social well-being (β = 0.6020, SE = 0.156, t = 3.861, p < .001). This finding suggests that young people who adopt an expressive communication style are happier and more satisfied in their social relationships. Thus, it is demonstrated that satisfaction and happiness in social relationships are directly related to the expressive communication style and that this style significantly affects social well-being. These results indicate that the expressive communication style plays an important role in enhancing satisfaction and happiness in the social relationships of young people.

The hypothesis is accepted in relation to the expressive communication style. However, it is important to note that no significant relationship was found for emotional and manipulative communication styles. Thus, the hypothesis is confirmed in part, particularly for the positive influence of the expressive communication style on young people's social well-being.

5. Conclusion

Today, young people make up a significant portion of the population and are emerging as a dynamic and critical part of society. Given their place and impact in social life, it is understood that their communication styles significantly affect every moment of their lives. Therefore, studies on young people are becoming increasingly important. Peer relationships play an important role in developing young people's social skills, and the challenges they face with peers negatively affect their emotional bonding processes (Doğan, 2016). Research to understand the complexity of young people's social relationships reveals that they connect with a wide social network

through social media platforms due to the influence of technology and feel good in these environments (Doğan & Karakaş, 2016). Studies on the importance of satisfaction and happiness derived from interpersonal communication indicate that generational differences bring tensions, causing young people to generally communicate less positively with family members and prefer to communicate more with their peers (Kılıç, 2018). Considering that these communications occur mostly through social media, it is observed that they face difficulties in face-to-face communication and bonding (Gökbulut, 2024; Ceylan & Emir, 2022). However, such relationships can be insufficient in depth and quality, and young people may struggle to form genuine bonds. Despite feeling good in large

social groups, feeling lonely at the end of the day stems from factors such as superficiality in social relationships and a lack of genuine connections (Karakuş, 2023). These situations can negatively affect their social well-being. In this context, the importance of one-on-one interpersonal communication is increasing. Additionally, identifying which type of communication enhances the social well-being of young people has become a crucial research topic.

This study also aimed to examine communication styles that enhance happiness in the social relationships of young individuals, demonstrating that expressive communication plays a critical role in improving their social well-being. The Communication Styles Inventory (CSI) was used to categorize communication behaviors and the Social Well-Being Scale from Martin Seligman's PERMA model was applied to measure the overall quality of social relationships and life satisfaction. Correlation and regression analysis results revealed that expressive communication style is positively related to social well-being. In contrast, emotional and perception-driven (manipulative) communication styles did not significantly impact social well-being.

Findings show that expressive communication style involves individuals clearly expressing their thoughts and feelings, engaging in active and proactive communication, assuming leadership roles in social relationships. Expressive communication style is a form of communication based on openly expressing one's emotions, thoughts and desires. This style enables people to communicate by expressing their emotional and cognitive value worlds and can increase mutual understanding. An accepting and factual evaluative communication style with a non-protective, somewhat exploratory attitude enhances satisfaction in social relationships. Supported by related literature, the findings indicate that young people who adopt an expressive communication style generally feel more satisfied and fulfilled in their social relationships (Bakker-Pieper & De Vries, 2011).

On the other hand, emotional and manipulative communication styles were found to have no significant impact on social well-being. Emotional communication style involves expressing one's emotional states and sensitivities, partly expecting privilege through emotions. In contrast, manipulative communication style is defined as a form of communication where individuals try to influence others according to their interests. The absence of a significant positive or negative impact of these styles on social well-being shows that these communication styles are insufficient in determining the level of happiness and satisfaction in social relationships.

In this context, encouraging expressive communication behaviors in the social interactions of young individuals can improve their social integration and overall quality of life. The limited impact of emotional and manipulative communication styles on social well-being suggests

that promoting expressive communication skills rather than developing these styles would be more beneficial. This style allows individuals to express themselves comfortably and confidently, contributing to more satisfaction and happiness in social relationships. Strengthening social bonds, increasing self-confidence, and achieving emotional balance are the main positive outcomes of this style.

Türkiye is considered a high-context society. In such societies, communication is indirect, implicit, and context-based. Personal relationships and social networks are of great importance in daily life and business. People prefer to convey what they think indirectly rather than directly. Group loyalty, respect for family, and social hierarchy are important values. Traditions and cultural norms shape individuals' behaviors and decisions. This high-context communication style reflects Türkiye's cultural richness and the strength of its social bonds. However, it has been observed that the younger generations in Türkiye have increasingly adopted the expressive communication style in recent years. Expressive communication style is characterized by direct, clear, and explicit expressions. Young people have tended to express their thoughts and feelings more directly. With the influence of decreasing power distance and the liberating space of social media, the opportunity for self-expression has increased. The younger generation interacts more with global culture, affecting their communication styles. While expressive communication style allows individuals to express themselves more freely, it can create a conflict with the traditional high-context communication style. This transformation has the potential to reshape communication dynamics and social relationships in Türkiye. The widespread adoption of the expressive communication style among young people in Türkiye indicates that society may be transitioning from a high-context communication style to a low-context communication style. This change can have significant effects on communication dynamics and social relationships.

Based on the findings of this study, the following research topics are suggested to more comprehensively examine the effects of different communication styles on social well-being. Understanding the adoption and effectiveness of expressive communication styles across different cultural backgrounds is an important area of research. In this context, examining the interactions of high-context and low-context communication styles in different cultural environments can help us better understand the role of cultural influences on communication. Investigating the impact of social media and digital communication platforms on the development and use of expressive communication styles is essential to understanding the role of modern communication tools in social interactions. Additionally, examining the potential of digital tools to create more meaningful social interactions and relationships can help evaluate the positive contributions of technology in communication. Exploring the psychological structures that explain why expressive communication is more effective in enhancing social well-being allows us to understand the impact of this style on individuals more deeply. Examining the role of emotional intelligence, empathy, and self-awareness in expressive communication can reveal how this communication style enhances success in social relationships and overall quality of life. These suggestions aim to improve the understanding of communication styles to enhance the social well-being of young people and to guide future research in this area.

ORCID

Ali Murat ALPARSLAN (0000-0002-1682-4202)

Merve Betül BAYKUR (0009-0003-7915-1206)

Kamuran KOCAİLİK (0000-0003-1955-0873)

References

Addae, E. (2020). The mediating role of social capital in the relationship between socioeconomic status and adolescent wellbeing: Evidence from Ghana. BMC Public Health, 20(1) 1-11.

Alessandra, T., & Hunsaker, P. (1993). Communication styles: A key to adaptive selling. Performance Today.

Almqvist, A., & Lassinantti, K. (2018). Young people with complex needs meet complex organizations: An interview study with Swedish professionals about sustainable work practices. Community Work & Family, 21(5), 620-635.

Bakker-Pieper, A., & De Vries, R. E. (2011). The impact of communication styles on organizational outcomes. Journal of Business and Psychology, 26(3), 411-418.

Bennet, M. J. (1998). Basic concepts of intercultural communication: Selected readings. Intercultural Press.

Bourne, E. (1995). The anxiety and phobia workbook. New Harbinger Publications.

Boylan, J., & Dalrymple, J. (2011). Advocacy, social justice and children's rights. Practice, 23(1), 19-30.

Bradburn, N. M. (1964). The structure of psychological well-being. Aldine.

Çetin, N. (2021). Gençlerin dini kimliğinde medya etkisi: İnönü Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi ve İlahiyat Fakültesi öğrencileri üzerine bir araştırma. Medya ve Din Araştırmaları Dergisi, 4(1), 137-152.

Cicognani, E., Mazzoni, D., Albanesi, C., & Zani, B. (2014). Sense of community and empowerment among young people: Understanding pathways from civic participation to social well-being. Voluntas International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Or-

ganizations, 26(1), 24-44.

Coverdale, G. (2017). The importance of well-being in children and young people. Journal of Public Mental Health, 16(3), 93-95.

Diotaiuti, P., Valente, G., Mancone, S., & Grambone, A. (2020). Psychometric properties and a preliminary validation study of the Italian brief version of the Communication Styles Inventory (CSI-B/I). Frontiers in Psychology, 11, 1421.

Doğan, U. (2016). Effects of social network use on happiness, psychological well-being and life satisfaction of high school students: Case of Facebook and Twitter. Ted Eğitim ve Bilim, 41(183).

Doğan, U., & Karakaş, Y. (2016). Lise öğrencilerinin sosyal ağ siteleri kullanımının yordayıcısı olarak yalnızlık. Sakarya University Journal of Education, 6(1), 57-71.

Erşahan, B., Bakan, İ., & Oğuz, M. (2020). The impact of organizational communication and organizational citizenship behavior on logistics ability. Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 17(2), 1050-1078.

Gander, F., Proyer, R. T., & Ruch, W. (2016). Positive psychology interventions addressing pleasure, engagement, meaning, positive relationships and accomplishment increase well-being and ameliorate depressive symptoms: A randomized, placebo-controlled online study. Frontiers in Psychology, 7, 686-697.

García, F., Desfilis, E., Garcia, O., Martínez, I., & Cruise, E. (2019). A third emerging stage for the current digital society? Optimal parenting styles in Spain, the United States, Germany, and Brazil. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 16(13), 2333.

Gökbulut, B. (2024). Üniversite öğrencilerinin sosyal medya bağımlılığı ile depresyon, anksiyete ve stres arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. Journal of Higher Education and Science, 14(1), 66-75.

Gölcü, A., Balcı, Ş., & Gölcü, A. (2019). Sosyal medya kullanımı ile kendini gizleme ve yaşam doyumu arasında bir bağlantı var mı?. Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 21(1), 173-190.

Gülel, E., & Daşbaş, S. (2019). Suça sürüklenmiş erkek çocuklarda aile aidiyeti ve yaşam doyumu ilişkisi. Toplum ve Sosyal Hizmet, 30(3), 965-987.

Höjer, I., & Sjöblom, Y. (2010). Young people leaving care in Sweden. Child & Family Social Work, 15(1), 118-127.

Karakuş, M. (2023). Yükseköğretim öğrencilerinin sosyal medya kullanımları ve yalnızlık düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki. International E-Journal of Advances in Social Sciences, 3(2), 209-232.

Kaya, İ. (2021). Öğretmenlerin disiplini sağlama yaklaşımları ile öğrencilerin sınıf iklimi algıları ve öğretimsel muhalefet davranışları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. Opus Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi. 18(40), 2116-2145.

Kılıç, N. (2018). Kuşaklararası iletişim: Üniversite öğrencilerinin yaşlılarla iletişim biçimleri. Journal of International Social Research, 11(55), 849-860.

Littman, D. (2021). Third places, social capital and sense of community as mechanisms of adaptive responding for young people who experience social marginalization. American Journal of Community Psychology, 69(3-4), 436-450.

Merrill, D. W., & Reid, R. H. (1999). Personal styles and effective performance: Make your style work for you. CRC Press.

Moore, S., & Leung, C. (2002). Young people's romantic attachment styles and their associations with well-being. Journal of Adolescence, 25(2), 243-255.

Murphy, M. L. (2015). Communication styles and skills. New Directions Publishing.

Özmen, M. (2023). Kişilerarası iletişimde empatinin işyeri mutluluğuna etkisi. Adıyaman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 0(44), 469-494.

Ozdemir, M., & Çetinceli, K. (2023). Psikolojik iyi oluş ve öz-anlayış: Sosyal çalışmacı örneklemi üzerinde bir araştırma. The Journal of International Scientific Researches, 8(3), 416-435.

Peleg, O., Tzischinsky, O., & Spivak-Lavi, Z. (2021). Depression and social anxiety mediate the relationship between parenting styles and risk of eating disorders: A study among Arab adolescents. International Journal of Psychology, 56(6), 853-864.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. Annual Review of Psychology, 52(1), 141-166.

Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57(6), 1069-1081.

Sezer, Ö. (2018). An investigation of university students' family evaluations, loneliness and hopelessness. Journal of Human Sciences, 15(2), 1058.

Seligman, M. E. P. (2011). Flourish: A visionary new understanding of happiness and well-being. Free Press.

Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. American Psychologist, 55(1), 5-14.

Spence, S., O'Shea, G., & Donovan, C. (2015). Improvements in interpersonal functioning following interpersonal psychotherapy (IPT) with adolescents and their association with change in depression. Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapy, 44(3), 257-272.

Stewart, K. (2000). Intrapersonal and social-contextual factors related to psychological well-being among youth experiencing homelessness.

Stewart, K., & Townley, G. (2020). Community and well-being: A qualitative study of how youth experiencing homelessness define community and its relations to their well-being. Journal of Community Psychology, 48(3), 994-1009.

Tunç, B. (2022). Aydın Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 9(1), 1-15.