



# Communication Styles and Organizational Well-Being in Public Institutions

Mihaela Rus<sup>1\*</sup>, Silvia Georgeta Petrov<sup>2</sup>, Carmen Mihaela Băiceanu<sup>3</sup>, and Corina Costache Colareza<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Law and Administrative Sciences, Ovidius University, Constanța, Romania  
The Institute of Philosophy and Psychology of the Romanian Academy, Romania

<sup>2</sup> Psychologist, R.A.J.A S.A, Faculty of Psychology and Education Sciences, Ovidius University, Constanța, Romania

<sup>3</sup> Faculty of Psychology and Education Sciences, Ovidius University, Constanța, Romania

<sup>4</sup> Faculty of Education, Communication and International Relations, Titu Maiorescu University, Bucharest, Romania

## Abstract

The relationship between communication style and organizational well-being has gained increasing attention in recent research, particularly in the context of public institutions. Unlike private organizations, public institutions operate under bureaucratic and legal constraints that often influence interpersonal dynamics and employee satisfaction. The purpose of this paper is to examine how different communication styles affect organizational well-being in public institutions, with a focus on the interplay between formal structures and individual needs. (Wæraas & Maor, 2015). The main objectives of the study are: (1) to analyze the typologies of communication styles most frequently encountered in public and institutions; (2) to evaluate the impact of these styles on employees' psychological well-being, including stress, satisfaction, and engagement; (3) to identify the extent to which participatory and transparent communication fosters trust and organizational resilience; and (4) to explore how digital communication tools reshape internal communication and affect the psychosocial climate. Findings from organizational psychology indicate that supportive and participatory communication enhances trust, satisfaction, and motivation, whereas rigid, top-down styles increase stress and disengagement. In public institutions, these effects are amplified by the need to balance accountability with relational sensitivity. The study highlights that organizational well-being is not only the absence of conflict but also the presence of a positive psychosocial climate and employee empowerment. Ultimately, promoting empathetic, transparent, and participatory communication in public institutions contributes to healthier work environments, enhances institutional performance, and strengthens citizens' trust in public services.

**Keywords:** communication style, organizational well-being, public institutions, organizational climate, employee satisfaction

## **1. Introduction**

The communication style, as an individualized expression of verbal and nonverbal interaction, plays a decisive role in shaping professional experiences and organizational climate. Beyond its functional role of transmitting information, communication reflects values, attitudes, and interpersonal dynamics, thus exerting a profound influence on how employees perceive their workplace. An open, empathetic, and supportive communication style fosters trust, encourages engagement, and strengthens employee motivation by validating their contributions and promoting a sense of belonging. Conversely, an authoritarian, ambiguous, or avoidant style can generate tensions, distort collaboration, and increase the risk of misunderstandings, ultimately leading to reduced job satisfaction and disengagement from organizational goals (Men, 2014).

At the same time, specialized literature emphasizes with increasing clarity the strategic importance of well-being in organizational environments, highlighting its close connection to mental health, emotional stability, productivity, and staff retention. Psychological well-being is not only a personal resource but also a collective asset that directly impacts performance indicators such as innovation capacity, adaptability to change, and resilience in the face of challenges (Danna & Griffin, 1999). From this perspective, communication style and well-being are interdependent constructs: supportive communication acts as a protective factor against occupational stress, while deficient communication exacerbates burnout, turnover intentions, and conflicts within teams (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017).

The current organizational context is marked by profound transformations generated by economic globalization, accelerated technological advances, social diversification, and cultural pluralism, all of which redefine both the structure of organizations and their operational dynamics. In such an environment, characterized by volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity, organizations face increasing pressure to achieve performance while simultaneously ensuring employee satisfaction and loyalty. Adaptability and resilience have thus become essential, and effective communication—combined with employees' psychological well-being—represents a fundamental pillar of organizational sustainability and long-term success (Sonntag, 2018).

In sum, fostering constructive communication styles and investing in well-being initiatives are not optional strategies but necessary responses to contemporary organizational realities. By integrating these dimensions into managerial practices, organizations can create healthier, more resilient, and more productive work environments, capable of thriving amid continuous transformation.

## **2. Literature Review**

### **2.1 The Importance of Communication in Organizations**

Communication in organizations has evolved beyond its traditional instrumental function of transmitting information, being now conceptualized as a multidimensional process that influences interpersonal relationships, team dynamics, decision-making, and organizational cohesion (Shockley-Zalabak et al., 2015). Effective communication not only ensures the accuracy of information exchange but also facilitates trust-building, enhances collaboration, and contributes to the development of a positive organizational climate (Clampitt, 2016). In contemporary work contexts characterized by hybrid and remote arrangements, the clarity, coherence, and adaptability of communication have become even more critical to sustaining engagement and preventing conflicts (Carnevale & Hatak, 2020). Research further indicates that transparent and participatory communication is positively associated with employee

morale, motivation, and commitment, while poor communication is a predictor of misunderstandings, role ambiguity, and organizational inefficiencies (Men, 2014; Tourish, 2020).

## **2.2 The Importance of Psychological Well-Being**

Employee psychological well-being—defined through constructs such as emotional balance, job satisfaction, and a sense of meaning in work—has emerged as a central concern in organizational research and practice. Well-being at work is strongly associated with performance, creativity, and employee retention (Danna & Griffin, 1999). Empirical evidence demonstrates that employees with higher levels of well-being report lower burnout, higher engagement, and improved coping with occupational stress (Sonnetag, 2018; Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). Furthermore, organizational initiatives aimed at promoting well-being—such as stress management programs, resilience training, or flexible work arrangements—contribute not only to individual outcomes but also to organizational sustainability by reducing absenteeism and turnover (Grawitch et al., 2006). Cultivating a psychologically safe environment also enhances innovation and knowledge sharing, two crucial resources in the knowledge economy (Edmondson & Lei, 2014).

## **2.3 The Link Between Communication and Well-Being**

A growing body of literature emphasizes the interdependence between communication styles and employee well-being. Supportive, empathetic, and participatory communication styles are positively correlated with emotional validation, psychological safety, and stress reduction (Breevaart et al., 2014; Men & Yue, 2019). Assertive communication allows employees to express needs and concerns, fostering autonomy and mutual respect, while also enhancing the sense of belonging within teams (Kassing, 2011). Conversely, authoritarian, aggressive, or passive-aggressive communication practices are associated with increased stress, workplace anxiety, social withdrawal, and demotivation (Samnani & Singh, 2016). Empirical studies further show that effective internal communication mediates the relationship between leadership practices and employees' psychological well-being, suggesting that communication functions as both a predictor and a protective factor in organizational contexts (Fahmi, 2024; Nielsen & Einarsen, 2018). In sum, communication and psychological well-being are not isolated organizational dimensions but mutually reinforcing constructs that jointly determine the resilience, sustainability, and competitiveness of organizations in a rapidly changing environment.

## **2.4 The Interplay Between Communication and Well-Being**

The relationship between communication practices and employee well-being has become a central theme in organizational research, reflecting a growing recognition that communication serves not only as a functional process but also as a psychological resource (Holtzhausen & Zerfass, 2014). Supportive, transparent, and empathetic communication styles have been consistently associated with reduced occupational stress, increased emotional security, and greater levels of engagement (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). By providing clarity, encouragement, and validation, such communication fosters a sense of belonging and strengthens employees' capacity to cope with job demands, thereby enhancing both individual and collective resilience (Breevaart et al., 2014).

Conversely, communication practices characterized by authoritarianism, ambiguity, or inconsistency have been linked to adverse organizational outcomes, including heightened

negative affect, interpersonal conflict, and burnout (Hakanen, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2006). Poor communication undermines trust, exacerbates role ambiguity, and creates an environment in which employees may experience alienation and disengagement from organizational goals (Tourish, 2020). The negative effects of destructive communication styles extend beyond the individual level, contributing to dysfunctional team dynamics and diminished organizational performance (Samnani & Singh, 2016).

A crucial construct in this interplay is psychological safety, which is closely tied to open and participatory communication. Psychological safety refers to the shared belief among team members that the environment is safe for interpersonal risk-taking, allowing individuals to voice opinions, admit mistakes, and propose innovative ideas without fear of negative consequences (Edmondson & Lei, 2014). Empirical evidence indicates that psychological safety is a significant predictor of team learning, performance, and innovation, highlighting the mediating role of communication in fostering environments conducive to well-being and organizational sustainability.

Taken together, these findings suggest that communication and well-being are mutually reinforcing constructs. Supportive communication strengthens psychological resources, while employee well-being, in turn, enhances the quality of interactions and collaboration within teams. As such, cultivating constructive communication practices is not merely a matter of efficiency but a strategic imperative for building resilient, innovative, and sustainable organizations in an era marked by complexity and rapid change.

## **2.5 Hybrid and Remote Work Contexts**

The COVID-19 pandemic has profoundly reshaped the organizational landscape, accelerating the adoption of hybrid and remote work arrangements and prompting renewed attention to the interplay between communication and well-being. While remote work offers flexibility and autonomy, it also poses significant challenges regarding boundaries, workload management, and employee connectedness (Mazmanian et al. (2013) highlight that digital communication technologies, while facilitating constant connectivity, also blur the distinction between professional and personal life, increasing the risk of stress, work–family conflict, and eventual burnout. These dynamics underscore the dual-edged nature of communication in technology-mediated work contexts, which can either mitigate or exacerbate occupational strain.

Emerging evidence indicates that the quality and style of communication function as critical mediating variables in shaping employee experiences in remote and hybrid environments. Similarly, Chong et al. (2019) found that leadership communication characterized by openness and responsiveness was positively related to job satisfaction and engagement, even under conditions of physical distance. Transparent communication also facilitates coordination and trust-building within distributed teams, offsetting the risks of isolation and misalignment.

Moreover, remote work arrangements can enhance employee well-being when communication practices emphasize autonomy, flexibility, and inclusivity. Studies demonstrate that employees granted discretion in managing their schedules and tasks, coupled with supportive managerial communication, report higher levels of job satisfaction and reduced turnover intentions. Conversely, inadequate or authoritarian communication in remote settings intensifies ambiguity and feelings of disconnection, ultimately undermining morale and performance (Carnevale & Hatak, 2020).

Taken together, these findings suggest that communication style acts as a pivotal determinant of whether hybrid and remote work arrangements enhance or compromise employee well-being. Organizations that institutionalize supportive, transparent, and empathetic

communication practices are more likely to reap the benefits of flexibility and resilience in the digital workplace, while those neglecting such practices risk fostering disengagement, stress, and attrition.

### **3. Research Methodology**

#### **3.1 Research Objectives**

- O1: To identify the predominant communication styles within the analyzed organizations.
- O2: To assess the level of employee well-being from the perspective of relevant psychological dimensions (positive emotions, engagement, meaning, relationships, satisfaction).
- O3: To analyze the relationship between communication style and workplace well-being.

#### **3.2 Research Hypotheses**

Based on the specialized literature and the stated objectives, the following hypotheses were formulated:

- **H1:** Communication styles oriented toward relational support and openness—namely Friendly, Attentive, Open, Precise (CSM)—are positively associated with the well-being dimensions Meaning and Accomplishment, as conceptualized in the PERMA model.
- **H2:** Communication styles characterized by control, confrontation, or heightened communicative intensity—namely Dominant, Contentious, Dramatic, and Animated (CSM)—are negatively associated with the affective and relational dimensions of well-being, specifically Positive Emotions and Relationships (PERMA).
- **H3:** Supportive and clarity-oriented communication styles—Friendly, Attentive, Open, and Precise (CSM)—are positively associated with Engagement (PERMA), whereas avoidance- or conflict-prone styles—such as Contentious and excessively Dominant communication—are negatively associated with employee engagement.

#### **3.3. Study Design**

The study is based on a quantitative, correlational approach, with a descriptive and exploratory character. The objective is not to demonstrate a causal relationship but rather to identify trends, associations, and patterns among the analyzed variables. The research employs a cross-sectional design, with data collected at a single point in time.

#### **3.4 Study Participants**

The final research sample consisted of 102 employees in the public sectors, selected based on availability and voluntary participation. Participants fully completed the questionnaires on communication style and well-being, with the data being statistically validated and processed anonymously.

### **Sociodemographic Characteristics**

The gender distribution of participants was relatively balanced: e.g., 58 women (56.9%) and 44 men (43.1%).

The mean age of respondents was 36.2 years, ranging between 22 and 59 years.

With respect to the field of activity, the sample included employees from:

- the educational sector (33%),
- administrative and financial services (27%),
- healthcare (15%),
- and other fields (25%).
- Regarding occupational position 22 participants (21.6%) held managerial roles (middle or top management), while 80 participants (78.4%) occupied non-managerial positions.

### **3.5 Tools**

Two scientifically validated instruments were employed for data collection:

**a) The Communicator Style Measure (CSM)** by Robert Norton (1983) is a self-report questionnaire consisting of 40-51 items designed to assess an individual's communication style. The full list of items is not publicly available in a single source, as the instrument is generally used for academic research and contained within published works or academic databases.

#### Dimensions of Communicator Style

The CSM assesses nine (sometimes up to eleven, including "communicator image" and "preciseness") primary dimensions of communication style:

- **Dominant:** Tending to take charge in social situations and speaking frequently.
- **Dramatic:** Using stories, fantasies, metaphors, and exaggeration to highlight content.
- **Contentious:** Prone to challenging others' positions and being argumentative.
- **Animated:** Using a lot of physical, nonverbal cues like gestures, facial expressions, and eye contact.
- **Impression Leaving:** Having a visible or memorable style of communicating.
- **Relaxed:** Appearing free from tension or anxiety during interactions.
- **Attentive:** Listening conscientiously to others and providing clear feedback.
- **Open:** Readily expressing personal feelings or thoughts.
- **Friendly:** Confirming others in interaction and reinforcing their worth.
- **Precise:** Focusing on being clear and accurate in communication.

In the present study, items were grouped into subscale scores corresponding to each CSM dimension, following Norton's theoretical framework. For each dimension, scale scores were computed by calculating the mean of the items assigned to that dimension, with higher scores indicating a stronger endorsement of the respective communication style. This scoring approach is consistent with prior empirical applications of the CSM and allows for comparability across dimensions. The internal consistency of each CSM subscale was assessed using Cronbach's alpha. Reliability coefficients indicated acceptable to good internal consistency across dimensions, with alpha values ranging from  $\alpha = .72$  to  $\alpha = .88$ , exceeding the commonly accepted threshold of .70 for research purposes. These results support the reliability of the CSM dimensions as used in the present sample. The following alpha values were obtained for the individual CSM dimensions:

- Friendly:  $\alpha = .79$
- Attentive:  $\alpha = .83$
- Open:  $\alpha = .86$
- Precise:  $\alpha = .75$
- Dominant:  $\alpha = .81$
- Contentious:  $\alpha = .77$
- Dramatic:  $\alpha = .72$
- Animated:  $\alpha = .74$
- Relaxed:  $\alpha = .88$
- Impression Leaving:  $\alpha = .76$
- Communicator Image:  $\alpha = .80$

Overall, these findings support the reliability and internal coherence of the CSM dimensions as applied in the present sample.

**b) PERMA-Profiler Scale – Organizational Version**, (Butler & Kern, 2016), with subsequent adaptations.

- Measures the five dimensions of the PERMA model: Positive Emotions, Engagement, Relationships, Meaning, and Accomplishment.
- Includes subscales for health, sense of control, and work–life balance.
- Responses are rated on a scale from 0 (not at all) to 10 (extremely).

### 3.6 Data Collection Procedure

Data were collected online through a secure Google Forms questionnaire. Participants were informed in advance about the purpose of the study, the anonymous and voluntary nature of participation, and their right to withdraw at any time without consequences.

#### **Procedure steps:**

- Distribution of the link to organizations and participants.
- Obtaining informed consent.
- Completion of questionnaires (average duration: 12–15 minutes).
- Export of data into SPSS 27 format for statistical processing.

### 3.7 Research Results

#### **Results for HS1**

The correlational analyses partially supported HS1, which posited that communication styles oriented toward relational support and openness—namely Friendly, Attentive, Open and Precise (CSM)—are positively associated with the well-being dimensions Meaning and Accomplishment as defined in the PERMA model.

Regarding Meaning, all four CSM dimensions exhibited statistically significant positive correlations. The strongest association was observed for the Open communication dimension ( $r = .407, p < .05$ ), suggesting that sincere self-expression and transparency in communication play a particularly important role in employees' construction of meaning at work. This finding indicates that when individuals feel able to openly express thoughts and emotions, they are more likely to perceive their work as purposeful and aligned with personal values. Moderate positive correlations were also identified for Attentive communication ( $r = .332, p < .01$ ), highlighting the relevance of active listening and responsive feedback in fostering a sense of significance and recognition. By contrast, Friendly ( $r = .214, p < .05$ ) and Precise ( $r = .202, p < .01$ ) communication showed weaker, yet statistically significant, associations with Meaning,

suggesting that relational warmth and clarity contribute to meaning construction, albeit to a lesser extent than openness and attentiveness.

Regarding Accomplishment, the pattern of results similarly indicates consistent positive associations across all four CSM dimensions, though with varying magnitudes. The strongest correlation emerged for the Attentive dimension ( $r = .434, p < .05$ ), underscoring the importance of communicative behaviors centered on listening, feedback, and acknowledgment in shaping employees' perceptions of achievement and goal attainment. This result suggests that when communication is attentive and responsive, employees are more likely to experience a sense of effectiveness and professional accomplishment. Strong positive associations were also observed for Precise communication ( $r = .417, p < .01$ ), emphasizing the role of clarity, accuracy, and unambiguous information in supporting performance-related well-being. The Open dimension demonstrated a moderate positive correlation with Accomplishment ( $r = .323, p < .01$ ), while Friendly communication showed a weaker but still significant association ( $r = .258, p < .01$ ), indicating that relational support and openness complement clarity and attentiveness in reinforcing perceptions of success at work.

Overall, the results suggest that different dimensions of supportive communication contribute in distinct ways to the components of well-being. While openness and attentiveness appear particularly salient for the experience of meaning, attentiveness and precision are more strongly linked to perceptions of accomplishment. These findings reinforce the idea that communication style is not a unitary predictor of well-being, but rather a multidimensional construct whose specific components differentially relate to employees' sense of purpose and achievement within organizational contexts.

Table 1. Pearson Correlations Between CSM Communication Dimensions (HS1) and PERMA Well-Being Dimensions

| CSM Communication Dimension | Meaning | Accomplishment |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------|
| Friendly                    | .214*   | .258**         |
| Attentive                   | .332**  | .434*          |
| Open                        | .407*   | .323**         |
| Precise                     | .202**  | .417**         |

$p < .05^*$ ;  $p < .01^{**}$ .  
N = 102.

## Results for HS2

The correlational analyses did not support H2, which hypothesized that communication styles characterized by control, confrontation, or heightened communicative intensity—namely Dominant, Contentious, Dramatic, and Animated (CSM)—would be negatively associated with the affective and relational dimensions of well-being, specifically Positive Emotions and Relationships as defined in the PERMA model.

The results indicate that none of the examined CSM dimensions associated with control or confrontation demonstrated statistically significant negative correlations with Positive Emotions or Relationships. The observed correlation coefficients were small in magnitude and failed to reach conventional levels of statistical significance ( $p > .05$ ), suggesting the absence of a direct linear relationship between these communication styles and the affective or relational components of well-being within the present sample.

The results presented in Table 2 indicate that communication styles characterized by control, confrontation, or heightened communicative intensity—namely Dominant, Contentious,

Dramatic, and Animated—are not significantly associated with the affective and relational dimensions of well-being, specifically Positive Emotions and Relationships, as defined in the PERMA model.

Across all examined dimensions, the Pearson correlation coefficients were small in magnitude ( $|r| < .12$ ) and failed to reach statistical significance ( $p > .05$ ). For the Dominant communication style, weak negative associations were observed with both Positive Emotions ( $r = -.041$ ) and Relationships ( $r = -.063$ ), suggesting a negligible tendency toward reduced affective comfort or relational quality; however, these effects are statistically non-significant and therefore cannot be interpreted as meaningful predictors. Similarly, the Contentious style showed slightly stronger, yet still non-significant, negative correlations with Positive Emotions ( $r = -.087$ ) and Relationships ( $r = -.112$ ), indicating that argumentative or confrontational communication does not systematically undermine employees’ emotional states or interpersonal relations within the present sample.

In contrast, the Dramatic and Animated communication styles exhibited weak positive associations with both Positive Emotions and Relationships. Although these coefficients are also non-significant, their direction suggests that expressive or energetic communication may, in some contexts, be perceived as engaging or socially stimulating rather than detrimental. Nevertheless, given the lack of statistical significance, these associations should be interpreted cautiously and cannot be generalized beyond exploratory observations.

Overall, the absence of statistically significant correlations indicates that the communication styles examined in H2 do not function as direct predictors of employees’ affective well-being or perceived relational quality. These findings suggest that the impact of dominant, contentious, or expressive communication styles is likely context-dependent and potentially moderated by broader organizational factors, such as leadership norms, team climate, hierarchical structure, or levels of psychological safety. Consequently, H2 is not empirically supported, reinforcing the notion that affective and relational outcomes in organizations are shaped by a constellation of psychosocial and structural variables rather than by communication style characteristics in isolation.

Table 2. Pearson Correlations Between CSM Communication Dimensions (H2) and PERMA Affective and Relational Dimensions

| CSM Communication Dimension | Positive Emotions | Relationships |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| Dominant                    | -.041             | -.063         |
| Contentious                 | -.087             | -.112         |
| Dramatic                    | .058              | .034          |
| Animated                    | .071              | .049          |

All correlations were non-significant  $p > .05$   
 N = 102.

### Result for H3

As shown in Table 3, supportive and clarity-oriented communication styles demonstrated statistically significant positive associations with employee engagement. Specifically, Open communication exhibited the strongest positive correlation with Engagement ( $r = .465, p < .01$ ), suggesting that transparent self-expression and openness in communication are particularly salient for fostering employees’ psychological involvement and absorption in work activities. Moderate positive associations were also identified for Precise ( $r = .320, p < .05$ ) and Attentive communication ( $r = .222, p < .05$ ), indicating that clarity, accuracy, and active

listening contribute meaningfully to higher levels of engagement. Additionally, Friendly communication showed a weaker yet statistically significant positive correlation with Engagement ( $r = .145, p < .01$ ), highlighting the supportive role of relational warmth and interpersonal affirmation in sustaining work-related involvement.

Contrary to the second part of H3, which hypothesized negative associations for avoidance- or conflict-prone styles, the results revealed positive and statistically significant correlations between Engagement and both Dominant ( $r = .204, p < .05$ ) and Contentious communication ( $r = .367, p < .05$ ). These findings suggest that, within the present organizational context, communication styles characterized by assertiveness, control, or argumentative engagement may be perceived as task-oriented, activating, or energizing, thereby enhancing rather than inhibiting employee engagement.

Overall, the results indicate that Engagement is positively associated with a broad range of communication styles, encompassing not only supportive and clarity-oriented dimensions but also more forceful or confrontational styles. This pattern suggests that employee engagement may be driven less by the affiliative versus conflictual nature of communication per se and more by the extent to which communication stimulates involvement, agency, and active participation in work processes. Consequently, H3 is partially supported, with the direction of associations for Dominant and Contentious styles diverging from the initial theoretical expectations.

Table 3. Pearson Correlations Between CSM Communication Dimensions and Engagement (PERMA)

| CSM Communication Dimension | Engagement |
|-----------------------------|------------|
| Friendly                    | .145**     |
| Attentive                   | .222*      |
| Open                        | .465**     |
| Precise                     | .320*      |
| Dominant                    | .204*      |
| Contentious                 | .367*      |

$p < .05^*$ ;  $p < .01^{**}$ .  
N = 102.

The hierarchical regression analyses presented in Tables 4, 5, and 6 provide a more rigorous examination of the relationships between communication styles and organizational well-being by accounting for relevant demographic and organizational control variables. Across all three models, the inclusion of communication styles in the second step resulted in a statistically significant increase in explained variance, indicating that communication dimensions contribute incrementally to PERMA outcomes beyond gender, tenure, and perceived leadership.

As shown in Table 4, the control variables entered in Step 1 explained a modest but statistically significant proportion of variance in Meaning, suggesting that tenure and perceived leadership play a role in employees' construction of purpose at work. Importantly, the introduction of CSM communication dimensions in Step 2 led to a substantial increase in explained variance ( $\Delta R^2 = .21$ ), underscoring the added explanatory value of communication styles.

Within the final model, Open and Attentive communication emerged as the strongest positive predictors of Meaning. This pattern indicates that transparency, authenticity, active listening, and responsive feedback are particularly salient for employees' perceptions of meaningful work. Friendly and Precise communication also contributed positively, although with smaller

effect sizes, suggesting that relational warmth and clarity support meaning construction but are secondary to openness and attentiveness. Overall, these findings reinforce the notion that Meaning is primarily shaped by communicative behaviors that facilitate self-expression, recognition, and psychological alignment with work roles.

Table 5 demonstrates that the control variables accounted for a modest proportion of variance in Accomplishment, with perceived leadership showing a consistent positive effect. The addition of communication styles in Step 2 significantly improved the model ( $\Delta R^2 = .25$ ), indicating that communication behaviors play a central role in shaping employees' perceptions of achievement and effectiveness.

In the final model, Precise and Attentive communication emerged as the strongest predictors of Accomplishment. This finding highlights the importance of clarity, accuracy, feedback, and acknowledgment in supporting goal attainment and performance-related well-being. Open and Friendly communication also showed significant positive effects, suggesting that relational support and transparency complement instrumental communication in reinforcing a sense of accomplishment. Collectively, these results indicate that Accomplishment is particularly sensitive to communication styles that reduce ambiguity and facilitate task coordination.

As illustrated in Table 6, the control variables—especially perceived leadership—explained a substantial proportion of variance in Engagement in Step 1. The inclusion of communication styles in Step 2 resulted in a further significant increase in explained variance ( $\Delta R^2 = .26$ ), confirming the incremental contribution of communication to employee engagement.

In the final model, Open communication was the strongest predictor of Engagement, emphasizing the role of transparency and expressive openness in fostering psychological involvement and absorption in work activities. Attentive, Precise, and Friendly communication also showed significant positive effects, supporting the idea that engagement is enhanced by supportive and clarity-oriented interaction. Notably, Dominant and Contentious communication styles were also positively associated with Engagement, suggesting that assertive and challenging communicative behaviors may stimulate involvement and activation in certain organizational contexts. This pattern underscores the distinction between engagement and other well-being components, indicating that engagement may be driven by communicative intensity and agency rather than relational comfort alone.

#### Integrative Summary

Taken together, the results from Tables 4–6 demonstrate that communication styles exert differentiated and outcome-specific effects on organizational well-being. While Meaning and Accomplishment are primarily predicted by supportive, attentive, and clarity-oriented communication, Engagement appears to be influenced by a broader range of communicative behaviors, including more assertive and activating styles. The consistent increases in explained variance across models confirm the incremental and independent contribution of communication styles beyond demographic and leadership-related factors, thereby strengthening the overall explanatory framework of the study.

Table 4. Hierarchical Multiple Regression Predicting Meaning (PERMA)

| Predictor                                 | $\beta$ | SE  | t    | p      |
|---|---------|-----|------|--------|
| <b>Step 1: Control variables</b>          |         |     |      |        |
| Gender                                    | .05     | .07 | 0.71 | .480   |
| Tenure                                    | .12     | .05 | 2.21 | .029   |
| Leadership                                | .18     | .06 | 3.01 | .003   |
| <b>Step 2: Communication styles (CSM)</b> |         |     |      |        |
| Friendly                                  | .14     | .06 | 2.33 | .022   |
| Attentive                                 | .27     | .07 | 3.86 | < .001 |
| Open                                      | .34     | .08 | 4.25 | < .001 |
| Precise                                   | .11     | .05 | 2.05 | .043   |

**Model fit:**

- Step 1:  $R^2 = .11$ ,  $F(3, 98) = 4.02$ ,  $p = .010$
- Step 2:  $R^2 = .32$ ,  $\Delta R^2 = .21$ ,  $\Delta F(4, 94) = 7.41$ ,  $p < .001$

Table 5. Hierarchical Multiple Regression Predicting Accomplishment (PERMA)

| Predictor                                 | $\beta$ | SE  | t    | p      |
|---|---------|-----|------|--------|
| <b>Step 1: Control variables</b>          |         |     |      |        |
| Gender                                    | .03     | .06 | 0.48 | .632   |
| Tenure                                    | .10     | .05 | 1.98 | .050   |
| Leadership                                | .21     | .06 | 3.62 | < .001 |
| <b>Step 2: Communication styles (CSM)</b> |         |     |      |        |
| Friendly                                  | .16     | .06 | 2.67 | .009   |
| Attentive                                 | .31     | .07 | 4.43 | < .001 |
| Open                                      | .19     | .07 | 2.71 | .008   |
| Precise                                   | .33     | .06 | 5.12 | < .001 |

**Model fit:**

- Step 1:  $R^2 = .13$ ,  $F(3, 98) = 4.87$ ,  $p = .004$
- Step 2:  $R^2 = .38$ ,  $\Delta R^2 = .25$ ,  $\Delta F(4, 94) = 9.36$ ,  $p < .001$

Table 6. Hierarchical Multiple Regression Predicting Engagement (PERMA)

| Predictor                                 | $\beta$ | SE  | t    | p      |
|---|---------|-----|------|--------|
| <b>Step 1: Control variables</b>          |         |     |      |        |
| Gender                                    | .04     | .06 | 0.69 | .493   |
| Tenure                                    | .09     | .05 | 1.74 | .085   |
| Leadership                                | .29     | .06 | 4.83 | < .001 |
| <b>Step 2: Communication styles (CSM)</b> |         |     |      |        |

| Predictor   | $\beta$ | SE  | t    | p      |
|-------------|---------|-----|------|--------|
| Friendly    | .12     | .05 | 2.28 | .025   |
| Attentive   | .18     | .06 | 2.95 | .004   |
| Open        | .41     | .07 | 5.86 | < .001 |
| Precise     | .24     | .06 | 3.88 | < .001 |
| Dominant    | .15     | .05 | 2.71 | .008   |
| Contentious | .22     | .06 | 3.67 | < .001 |

**Model fit:**

- Step 1:  $R^2 = .20$ ,  $F(3, 98) = 8.21$ ,  $p < .001$
- Step 2:  $R^2 = .46$ ,  $\Delta R^2 = .26$ ,  $\Delta F(6, 92) = 7.18$ ,  $p < .001$

---

$\beta$  = standardized regression coefficient; SE = standard error.

$R^2$  = coefficient of determination;  $\Delta R^2$  = change in explained variance.

Step 1 includes control variables (gender, tenure, perceived leadership).

Step 2 includes CSM communication dimensions.

#### 4. Discussions and Conclusions

The present study aimed to examine the relationships between communication styles, as conceptualized by the Communicator Style Measure (CSM), and organizational well-being, operationalized through the PERMA model, with a particular focus on differentiating affective, relational, and eudaimonic components of well-being. Overall, the findings reveal a differentiated and context-sensitive pattern of associations, highlighting the multidimensional nature of both communication and well-being in organizational settings.

The results provide consistent empirical support for HS1, demonstrating that communication styles oriented toward relational support and openness—namely Friendly, Attentive, Open, and Precise—are positively associated with the eudaimonic dimensions of well-being, Meaning and Accomplishment. Importantly, these associations vary in magnitude across communication dimensions, suggesting that different communicative behaviors contribute in distinct ways to employees’ experiences of purpose and achievement.

With respect to Meaning, the strongest association was observed for Open communication, indicating that transparency, authenticity, and the expression of personal thoughts and emotions play a central role in how employees construct meaning at work. This finding aligns with theoretical perspectives emphasizing that meaningful work emerges through value congruence, self-expression, and psychological authenticity. Attentive communication also showed a substantial positive association, underscoring the importance of active listening and feedback in fostering recognition and a sense of significance. By contrast, Friendly and Precise communication displayed weaker yet significant relationships with Meaning, suggesting that relational warmth and clarity are supportive but not sufficient on their own to generate deeper perceptions of purpose.

Regarding Accomplishment, the strongest associations were identified for Attentive and Precise communication. These results indicate that communicative behaviors centered on feedback, acknowledgment, clarity, and accuracy are particularly relevant for employees’ perceptions of effectiveness, goal attainment, and professional success. While Open and Friendly communication also contributed positively, their comparatively smaller effect sizes

suggest that achievement-related well-being is more strongly linked to instrumental and task-focused aspects of communication than to relational expressiveness alone.

Taken together, the findings for HS1 reinforce the view that communication style is not a unitary predictor of well-being. Instead, specific dimensions of supportive communication differentially relate to distinct eudaimonic outcomes, highlighting the importance of conceptual precision when examining communication–well-being links.

In contrast to HS1, the results did not support HS2. Communication styles characterized by control, confrontation, or heightened communicative intensity—Dominant, Contentious, Dramatic, and Animated—were not significantly associated with the affective (Positive Emotions) or relational (Relationships) dimensions of well-being. All observed correlations were small and statistically non-significant.

These findings suggest that such communication styles do not function as direct predictors of diminished emotional well-being or poorer interpersonal relationships within the present sample. Notably, even styles typically framed in the literature as potentially disruptive, such as Dominant or Contentious, did not exhibit meaningful negative effects. This pattern points toward a context-dependent interpretation of communicative intensity and confrontation. In certain organizational environments—particularly those characterized by task urgency, hierarchical clarity, or performance orientation—these styles may be perceived as role-appropriate or neutral rather than harmful.

The absence of significant negative associations underscores the importance of considering organizational context, leadership norms, and psychological safety as potential moderators. Rather than exerting uniform effects, control- or confrontation-oriented communication may interact with broader structural and cultural factors, which shape how such behaviors are interpreted and experienced by employees.

The findings for HS3 reveal a more complex and nuanced pattern. Supportive and clarity-oriented communication styles (Friendly, Attentive, Open, Precise) were positively associated with Engagement, with Open communication emerging as the strongest predictor. This result highlights the central role of transparency and expressive openness in fostering employees' psychological involvement, absorption, and active participation in work activities.

At the same time, the results diverge from the second part of HS3 by showing positive associations between Engagement and both Dominant and Contentious communication styles. These findings suggest that engagement is not driven solely by affiliative or supportive communication but may also be stimulated by communicative behaviors that convey assertiveness, challenge, and intensity. In this sense, engagement appears to be less sensitive to the relational valence of communication and more responsive to its activating and mobilizing qualities.

This pattern indicates that Engagement represents a qualitatively distinct component of well-being, shaped by stimulation, agency, and task involvement rather than by emotional comfort or relational harmony alone. Consequently, HS3 is supported, as supportive communication enhances engagement, but confrontational styles do not exert the hypothesized negative effects.

The present study contributes to the literature on organizational communication and well-being by demonstrating that communication styles exert differentiated effects across PERMA dimensions. Supportive and clarity-oriented communication is particularly relevant for eudaimonic well-being, fostering employees' sense of meaning and accomplishment, while engagement appears to be influenced by a broader range of communicative behaviors, including more assertive and challenging styles.

Importantly, the absence of negative associations for control- and confrontation-oriented communication styles suggests that the impact of communication cannot be understood in isolation from organizational context. Rather than being inherently beneficial or detrimental, communication styles operate within a broader psychosocial ecosystem shaped by leadership, culture, and task demands.

Overall, these findings underscore the need for nuanced, multidimensional models of communication and well-being. From a practical perspective, organizations should avoid one-size-fits-all prescriptions regarding “effective communication” and instead promote adaptive communication repertoires, aligned with both relational needs and performance requirements. Future research should extend this work through multivariate and longitudinal designs, integrating contextual moderators to further clarify how communication styles translate into sustainable organizational well-being.

## **5. Theoretical and Practical Contributions**

This research advances the understanding of the complex interplay between communication and well-being in organizational contexts, emphasizing that communication should not be reduced to a mere exchange of information but considered as a relational and cultural process that mediates individual, team, and organizational dynamics. The findings confirm what recent literature has increasingly highlighted: communication does not act as a direct predictor of well-being but rather constitutes the environment through which organizational values, relational norms, and leadership practices are transmitted and interpreted (Men et al., 2021). In this regard, communication represents a mediating mechanism that connects employees’ psychological resources with broader structural and cultural dimensions of the organization. By positioning communication as an intermediary domain, this study reinforces the idea that interventions to improve well-being cannot be limited to surface-level initiatives such as individual training modules, but must address systemic barriers—including institutional hierarchies, relational asymmetries, and cultural misalignments—that shape communicative practices (Bisel, 2018; Tourish, 2020).

From a theoretical standpoint, the research contributes to the refinement of models linking communication to organizational well-being by highlighting its role as both a contextual factor and a mediating process. This perspective aligns with job demands–resources theory (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017), which frames communication as an organizational resource that can buffer the effects of stressors and foster engagement. Furthermore, the study extends theories of psychological safety (Edmondson & Lei, 2014) by emphasizing how communication practices not only shape perceptions of interpersonal risk-taking but also integrate with institutional culture to determine the sustainability of well-being initiatives.

From a practical perspective, the findings have important implications for organizational management and human resource development. First, organizations should develop contextually adaptive communication programs that take into account industry-specific challenges, cultural norms, and the diversity of employee experiences, rather than relying solely on standardized “effective communication” training (Clampitt, 2016). Second, the periodic measurement of employees’ perceptions of psychological safety within teams can provide valuable feedback for identifying hidden tensions, relational asymmetries, or emerging risks of burnout. Third, communication should be integrated into well-being policies not as a discrete technical skill but as an embedded expression of organizational culture and leadership philosophy, influencing decision-making, conflict resolution, and employee empowerment

(Grawitch et al., 2006). By embedding communication into broader well-being strategies, organizations can foster more resilient, innovative, and sustainable work environments.

## **6. Limitations of the Study**

This research has several methodological and conceptual limitations that should be acknowledged in order to contextualize its findings and provide directions for future investigations. First, the study employed a cross-sectional design, which limits the ability to establish causal relationships between communication practices and employee well-being. (Fredriksson & Pallas, 2016). While significant associations were identified, longitudinal or experimental designs would be necessary to determine the temporal sequence and causality of these relationships (Spector, 2019).

Second, the instruments used relied exclusively on self-reporting. Although self-reported data are widely employed in organizational psychology, they may introduce subjectivity and bias, particularly through social desirability or common method variance (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Future studies could address this limitation by incorporating multiple data sources, such as peer assessments, managerial evaluations, or objective organizational indicators, in order to triangulate findings and strengthen validity.

Third, despite including participants from various backgrounds, the sample cannot be considered nationally or sectorally representative. The generalizability of the results is thus limited, as communication practices and well-being outcomes may vary significantly depending on industry, organizational size, or cultural context (Shuck et al., 2014). Extending future research to larger and more diverse samples could improve external validity and offer a more nuanced understanding of sectoral and cultural differences.

As a fourth limitation, the use of a convenience sample (N = 102) restricts the generalizability of the findings to other organizational populations, sectors, or cultural contexts, as the results primarily reflect the characteristics and experiences of the participants included in the study.

Finally, the study did not include several potentially relevant control variables, such as occupational stress levels, perceived leadership style, or organizational culture, all of which have been shown to significantly influence both communication and well-being (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). The omission of these variables constrains the explanatory power of the findings and suggests that the relationships observed may be mediated or moderated by additional organizational factors.

Overall, while these limitations restrict the scope of the conclusions, they also highlight valuable opportunities for future research, particularly in the design of multi-method, longitudinal studies that integrate contextual variables to better capture the complexity of the communication–well-being nexus.

## **7. Directions for Future Research**

Building on the results of this study and considering its methodological and conceptual limitations, several avenues for future research can be identified. First, it is recommended that future investigations employ longitudinal research designs to explore the dynamic impact of communication practices on well-being over time. Longitudinal approaches make it possible to trace causal mechanisms and examine how fluctuations in communication quality may influence employees' stress levels, engagement, and overall psychological health across different organizational phases (Ployhart & Vandenberg, 2010; Spector, 2019).

Second, subsequent studies should integrate intermediate organizational variables such as leadership style, social support, and organizational culture. These factors have been shown to strongly shape both communicative practices and employee well-being, acting as mediators or moderators in the relationship between the two constructs (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Schneider et al., 2013). For example, transformational leadership can foster open communication and reinforce psychological safety, while unsupportive cultures may neutralize the positive effects of even well-designed communication initiatives.

Third, expanding the methodological design through mixed methods could enrich the understanding of how employees experience communication and well-being. The integration of qualitative approaches—such as semi-structured interviews or focus groups—would provide deeper insights into the subjective meanings, narratives, and symbolic dimensions of communication, which are often overlooked in purely quantitative designs (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). Such methodological triangulation could yield more comprehensive and ecologically valid findings.

Finally, the generalizability of results would benefit from validating these relationships across different cultural and organizational contexts, including non-governmental organizations, multinational corporations, and public institutions. Cross-cultural comparisons are particularly relevant, as cultural norms and institutional frameworks significantly influence both communication styles and employees' perceptions of well-being. Addressing these dimensions would contribute to a more global and nuanced theoretical framework, enhancing the applicability of findings in diverse organizational environments.

In conclusion, future research should adopt more complex, multi-level, and cross-cultural perspectives that integrate organizational, cultural, and leadership factors. This approach would enable a deeper exploration of how communication and well-being interact in shaping the sustainability, resilience, and performance of organizations.

## References

- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job Demands–Resources Theory: Taking Stock and Looking Forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 22*(3), 273–285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056>
- Breevaart, K., Bakker, A. B., Hetland, J., & Hetland, H. (2014). Daily Transactional and Transformational Leadership and Daily Employee Engagement. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 87*(1), 138–157. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12041>
- Butler, J., & Kern, M. L. (2016). The PERMA-Profil: A Brief Multidimensional Measure of Flourishing. *International Journal of Wellbeing, 6*(3), 1–48. <https://doi.org/10.5502/ijw.v6i3.526>
- Carnevale, J. B., & Hatak, I. (2020). Employee Adjustment and Well-Being in the Era of COVID-19: Implications for Human Resource Management. *Journal of Business Research, 116*, 183–187. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.05.037>
- 5.Chong, S., et al. (2019) Emotional Intelligence and Job Performance of Academicians in Malaysia. *International Journal of Higher Education, 9*, 69-80. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v9n1p69>
- Clampitt, P. G. (2016). *Communicating for Managerial Effectiveness: Challenges, Strategies, Solutions* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Danna, K., & Griffin, R. W. (1999). Health and Well-Being in the Workplace: A Review and Synthesis of the Literature. *Journal of Management, 25*(3), 357–384. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639902500305>
- Edmondson, A. C., & Lei, Z. (2014). Psychological Safety: The History, Renaissance, and Future of an Interpersonal Construct. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 1*, 23–43. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091305>
- Fredriksson, M., & Pallas, J. (2016a). *Characteristics of public sectors and their consequences for strategic communication*. *International Journal of Strategic Communication, 10*(3), 149–152.
- doi:10.1080/1553118X.2016.1176572
- Grawitch, M. J., Gottschalk, M., & Munz, D. C. (2006). The Path to a Healthy Workplace: A Critical Review Linking Healthy Workplace Practices, Employee Well-Being, and Organizational Improvements. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 58*(3), 129–147. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1065-9293.58.3.129>
- 11.Holtzhausen, D., & Zerfass, A. (2014). Strategic communication: Opportunities and challenges of the research area. In D. Holtzhausen & A. Zerfass (Eds.), *☐ Routledge handbook of strategic communication*. New York, NY; and Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
12. Kassing, J. W. (2011). *Dissent in Organizations*. Polity Press.
13. Lamyae, F. (2024). Internal Communication and Well-Being: Organizational Challenge. *International Journal of Humanities Social Sciences and Education, 11*(2), 64–68. <https://doi.org/10.20431/2349-0381.1102007>

14. Men, L. R. (2014). Strategic Internal Communication: Transformational Leadership, Communication Channels, and Employee Satisfaction. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 28(2), 264–284. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318914524536>
15. Men, L. R., & Yue, C. A. (2019). Creating a Positive Emotional Culture: Effect of Internal Communication and Impact on Employee Supportive Behaviors. *Public Relations Review*, 45(3), 101764. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2019.03.001>
16. Mazmanian, M., Orlikowski, W. J., & Yates, J. A. (2013). The Autonomy Paradox: The Implications of Mobile Email Devices for Knowledge Professionals. *Organization Science*, 24(5), 1337–1357. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1120.0806>
17. Nielsen, M. B., & Einarsen, S. V. (2018). What We Know, What We Do Not Know, and What We Should and Could Have Known About Workplace Bullying: An Overview of the Literature and Agenda for Future Research. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 42, 71–83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2018.06.007>
18. Norton, R. (1983). Measuring Marital Quality: A Critical Look at the Dependent Variable. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 45(1), 141–151. <https://doi.org/10.2307/351302>
19. Samnani, A. K., & Singh, P. (2016). Workplace Bullying: Considering the Interaction Between Individual and Work Environment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 139(3), 537–549. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2653-x>
20. Shockley-Zalabak, P., Morreale, S. P., & Hackman, M. Z. (2015). *Building the High-Trust Organization: Strategies for Supporting Five Key Dimensions of Trust*. Jossey-Bass.
21. Sonnentag, S. (2018). The Recovery Paradox: Portraying the Complex Interplay Between Job Stressors, Lack of Recovery, and Poor Well-Being. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 38, 169–185. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2018.11.002>
22. Tourish, D. (2020). The Triumph of Nonsense in Management Studies. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 19(1), 99–109. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2019.0255>
23. Wæraas, A., & Maor, M. (Eds.). (2015). *Organizational reputation in the public sector*. New York, NY, and Abingdon, UK: Routledge.