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Abstract:
The purpose of this article is to have a better understanding of the relationships between relational models, life style and life satisfaction of professionals in the Turkish business context. The relational models theory, which was proposed by A. Fiske, covers four major ways of forming social relationships; communal sharing, market pricing, authority ranking, and equality matching. The concept of lifestyle has been also a hot topic that requires more explanation both in people’s work lives and social lives. Life satisfaction implies the feeling of happiness that is known as subjective wellbeing (SWL) in academic world. The survey covers 403 respondents who are all working mainly in large-scale organizations and three different Likert type questionnaires were used to collect data both through personal administration and Internet based applications. Reliability and factor analysis all of which resulted in highly satisfactory results and different sets of data analyses methods and techniques were performed. Research findings clearly indicated that communal sharing is the most preferred relational model followed by equality matching by Turkish employees. The most interesting finding of the study is the fact that healthy life-style is the most important one despite to the respondents’ desire to have luxurious life style. Furthermore, higher their social class will be resulted in more life satisfaction than the others. It would be emphasized that the association between leisure time activities and SWL has a critical importance regarding their satisfaction of life.
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1. Introduction
The relational models (RLTM) theory, which was proposed by A. Fiske (1991), covers four major ways of forming social relationships; communal sharing, market pricing, authority ranking, and equality matching. Regardless of their social status or their educational background, people have to use one of these four distinct forms to understand others, to establish relations, to interact with others, and to evaluate others’ acts and behaviors in social or work settings. The concept of lifestyle (LS) which actually has not been clearly defined and explained in peoples’ way of living and their leisure and work behavior patterns in connection to their level of wealth, influence, and status namely, social class. Adler defined lifestyle as “the sum total of the values, passions, knowledge, meaningful deeds and eccentricities that constitute the uniqueness of each individual” as cited in the study by Diamond, R. and David C. M, 1967.

Satisfaction with life (SWL) is “a person’s evaluative reaction to his or her life—either in terms of life satisfaction (cognitive evaluations) or affect (ongoing emotional reactions)” as defined by Diener & Diener, 1995. As lay person calls, it is the feeling of happiness that is known as subjective wellbeing in academic world.

The purpose of this study aims at understanding the nature of the link between these three concepts that are relational models, life style and life satisfaction through learning the responses of highly educated employees working at different large and mid-scale organizations in Turkey.

2. Literature Survey

2.1. Relational Models
According to Fiske “each of the four elementary relational models consists of a cognitive relational structure, potentiated by specific emotions and motives, constituted and communicated in a distinct medium” (2004, 2009). As theory assumes the four ways of establishment of social relationships might be summarized as follows: In the relational model of communal sharing (CS), all members of a group are treated as equivalent and this model is based on the sense that people have always something in common in their social relations and these common essences connect them. The relations in communal sharing model are assumed to be as equivalent and undifferentiated.

Authority ranking (AR) is a linear ordering and in this model every person’s rank can be compared with other people. This model explains “sociality on asymmetrical difference, typically transitive and hence linearly ordered, Haslam (2004). This mode itself does not define how people are ordered with respect to social practices or values. In most cultures, each person participates in a variety of AR relations with all kinds of tangible and intangible beings,
People in equality matching (EM), always keep track of the imbalances in a relation. According to the EM, people are comparing quantities and using the operations of addition and subtraction for assessing the imbalance between them. (e.g., I did two favors for him (or her) and he (or she) did me one favor in return, so he (or she) owes me one). According to the EM model, in social relations, the concerns of people are on; whether a particular relationship is fairly balanced.

The final model is market pricing (MP) and within this model people’s desire to establish social relations with others depends on ratios or rates. “MP is based a socially meaningful proportionality where the ratio may concern monetary value, utility, efficiency, effort or merit” (Haslam & Fiske, 2004). Market pricing focuses mainly on monetary value, utility and efficiency in the course of relationships between two persons.

2.2. Life Style
The concept of life style (LS) has been defined from different perspectives such as psychological, Weberian or cultural and it includes a number of dimensions ranging from membership of a status group or consumption styles to leisure styles. LS which is no doubt, about attitudes, interests, behaviors and acts of individuals and in extent, is the reflection of their social status in societies where they live. Sessoms as cited in Veal’s review (2000, p.100) defines lifestyle as a mode of expression (...) that characterize one’s existence.

2.3. Satisfaction with Life
In terms of the purpose of this study, the assumption of the authors is if there are four major way of establishment of personal relations, there ought to be distinct lifestyles that make persons unique concerning their values as their motivational goals, their attitudes and their behaviors to have life satisfaction.

Thus, H1 is formulated as follows:

- **H1)** The influence of LS on SWL is more than that of RLMT on SWL.

There are empirical evidence supporting positive and negative relationship exist between universal values and each type of relational models. There are many studies in the literature to link the basic universal values defined by Schwartz (1992) to Fiske’s RLMT. Each relational model can only be related to a subset of values. Fiske (1991, 1992) also assumed that the use of relational models by people might depend on the presence of certain social motives and consequently on value priorities as shown in below chart.

![Figure 1: Type of Relational Models and Big Three Motives](Base64EncodedImage)

*Source: Strasser, M (2013, P. 70)*

People are motivated to construct a relationship that enables them to express and fulfill their most important values. For example, if the achievement values like ambition, success, capability and influence are important to a person, he or she will place great importance to relational model of MP than relational model of CS. Relational models are sets of different expectations and prescriptions. If a person has incompatible values and act in accordance of these values, he or she may violate the norms and this in turn may lead to punishment, neglect or even banishment by his or her partner in a specific relationship. This specific model might result in avoidance of relationships. H2 is formulated as follows:

Thus, the second research hypothesis is formulated as follows:

- **H2)** Communal sharing would be the most preferred type of relational model in the Turkish business world.

Satisfaction with life (SWL) is one major component of the construct of subjective well-being (SWB). The concept of well-being covers SWB as cognitive and affective life experiences, as well as emotional well-being (EWB) that is related to psychological functioning of universals (Yahyagil, 2015). There are numerous factors that might affect a universal’s subjective well-being. The findings of earlier researches support that there is a correlation between lifestyle and subjective well-being. Previous research has shown a positive relationship between life satisfaction and participation in physical leisure activities such as sports and exercise (Leung and Lee 2005; Melin et al., 2003; Schnoehr et al., 2005).
Physical and leisure activities (Menec 2003), exercising (Menec and Chipperfield 1997), and participation in activities in general (Fernandez-Ballesteros et al., 2001) have been reported to be significant predictors of well-being among adults. Lifestyle implies a specific pattern, which define the attitudes, behaviors and actions of people affected by both the societal factors, personality traits, educational and cultural background and level of income. From Weberian perspective, as cited in (Bagus and Utamo, 2015), “lifestyle is the way people live their life, usually based upon membership of a status group” (p.1). This statement explains the association between social class and life style in any given society.

Numerous factors might be influential on a universal’s subjective well-being. The outcomes of previous research studies support that there is a relationship between people's lifestyle and subjective well-being (See: Leung and Lee 2005; Melin et al., 2003) The findings of different research studies conducted by correlation between life satisfaction and of people’s active in physical leisure engagements such as sports and exercise (Menec and Chipperfield 1997; Menec 2003 Fernandez-Ballesteros and their colleagues (2001) stated that involving physical and leisure activities could be considered among the indicators of well-being for adults.

Consistent with the outcomes of aforementioned research studies, Csikszentmihalyi and Wong (1991) also stated that young universals’ level of SWB was at its peak as they participated in different type of sport activities or involved in games, art and hobbies. These leisure activities which require continuous participation are the choices of persons according to their desires. Like productive activities, they have clear rules and goals. According to Farina (1976) recreational activities of people are actually motivators for the work life and may encourage interest for the protection of the environment (Devall, 1988); and may make universals to feel more satisfaction from their lives and positive affect. Consequently, the third research hypothesis is as follows:

H3) The variable of lifestyle mediates the relationship between RLTM and SWL.

3. Methodology

3.1. Sampling

The data obtained from two different sources. The first part of the data was taken from a thesis study (Atalay, 2017) that included 276 respondents. The second part of the data was extracted from internet-based tools and included 127 respondents. Thus, the current study covers 403 respondents; all of them are the members of large and middle-scale organizations that are mainly operating in finance, health, insurance, and education sectors.

3.2. Instrumentation

Three measurement instruments were used to collect data, the first one, abbreviated as (MORO) and developed by Haslam & Fiske, (1999) is a seven-point Likert type scale to measure people’s way of establishing social interactions with others. This scale comprises five items for each of the four relational models totaling 20 items ranging from ‘not true at all of this relationship’ to ‘very true of this.’

The second instrument was developed by Safr in 2006 to get a detailed description of the lifestyle of the Czech society. This four-point scale originally covered 29 items of three types of cultural, social, and leisure activities divided into three groups, namely, “high-brow”, “luxury consumption” and “healthy lifestyle.” The authors reduced the number of items to 15 items, which can be used in most of the countries. The third measurement scale is a well-known instrument developed by Dienner and his colleagues (1985). It is used to assess the satisfaction level of the respondents’ life as a whole. This 7-point scale includes five items ranging from ‘strongly disagree’ to ‘strongly agree.’

4. Research Findings

4.1. Descriptive Statistics

Among the 403 respondents, there were 222 (55.1%) females and 181 (44.9%) males. The respondents, according to the age groups, were 23 (21–25 years, 8.5%), 74 (26–30 years, 27.3%), 65 (31–35 years, 23.9%), 45 (36–40 years, 14.8%), 36 (41–45 years, 13.3%), 17 (46–50 years, 6.3%), 10 (51–55 years, 3.7%), 6 (56+ years, 2.2%).

By the level of education, the population fell into the following grades—college graduates 28 (6.9%), high school graduates 18 (4.5%), University graduates 193 (47.9%), Master degree 122 (30.3%), Doctoral degree 42 (10.4%).

The respondents belonged to various income grades as follows: low income 7 (1.7%), sub-middle income 52 (12.9%), middle income 222 (55.1%), upper-middle income 114 (28.3%), upper class 8 (2%).

4.2. Reliability Analysis

The reliability analyses of three measurement instruments are as follows:

| Measurement Scale | Cronbach’s Alpha |
|-------------------|------------------|
| Relational Model Scale | .817 |
| Life Style Scale | .776 |
| Satisfaction with Life | .834 |

Table 1: Reliability Analyses of Measurement Instruments

All of the measurement instruments have a satisfactory level of reliability.
4.3. Mean Values

The mean values of both types of relational models and the types of lifestyle are shown in the following figures.

| Relational Models   | Mean Values |
|---------------------|-------------|
| Communal Sharing    | 26.97       |
| Equality Matching   | 23.30       |
| Authority Ranking   | 17.12       |
| Market Pricing      | 16.20       |

*Table 2: The Mean Values of Relational Models*

| Types of Life-Style | Mean Values |
|---------------------|-------------|
| High Brow           | 26.97       |
| Luxurious           | 23.30       |
| Healthy             | 17.12       |

*Table 3: The Mean Values of Life-Style*

4.4. Factor Analyses

- Three factor analyses were performed, and all of them resulted in statistically meaningful outputs.
- The first factor analysis, which was used for relational models resulted in three factors.

KMO value of 0.850, which means “meritorious” and the data is useful for further data analyses. The analysis resulted in three distinct factors which can be labeled as follows: “market pricing/equal matching,” “communal sharing” and “authority ranking” as tabulated below.

| Relational Models         | Factor Loadings |
|---------------------------|-----------------|
| Market Pricing 4          | .709            |
| Equality Matching 4       | .660            |
| Market Pricing 5          | .655            |
| Equality Matching 5       | .644            |
| Market Pricing 3          | .638            |
| Market Pricing 1          | .595            |
| Communal Sharing 2        | .427            |

*Table 4: Factor Analysis of Relational Model*

The analysis of lifestyle also resulted in three factors, and KMO value (0.789) can be considered as ‘middling’ and Bartlett Test value was highly significant. The three factors were reflected in three dimensions of the concept of lifestyle, and the factors were named as “luxury,” “health style,” and “high-brow.” (See, Table 5).
4.5. Hypotheses Testing:
The three research hypotheses that were formulated are as follows:

- **H1)** The influence of lifestyle on SWL is more than that of relational models on SWL.
- **H2)** Communal sharing would be the most preferred type of relational model in the Turkish business world.
- **H3)** The variable of lifestyle mediates the relationship between RLTM and SWL.

A set of regression analyses were used to test the research hypotheses and results of the analyses indicated that the influence of two types of lifestyles (luxury and healthy style) accounts for the much of the variance in the criterion variable of SWL than that of the relational models except in communal sharing.

All the conceptual dimensions of LS and RLTM are explained. There is a 15% variance of the criterion variable of SWL. However, luxury LS and healthy LS together with communal sharing made a highly significant contribution to the model and the relevant t-tests indicated that healthy LS and communal sharing had more impact on SWL:

Hence the first hypothesis was supported (See, Table 6).

| Model Summary |
|----------------|
| Model | R | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
|-------|---|-------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|---------|-----|-----|--------------|
| 1     | .316* | .100 | .093 | 5.35165 | .100 | 14.724 | 3 | 399 | .000 |
| 2     | .386b | .149 | .134 | 5.22928 | .049 | 5.723 | 4 | 395 | .000 |

Table 6: Regression Analysis of LS and RM

a. Predictors: (Constant), LSHighBrow, LSHealthy, LSLuxury, LSHighBrow, AuthRanking, ComSharing, MarkPricing, EquaMatching

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. | Correlations |
|-------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|---|------|-------------|
|       | B | Std. Error | Beta |       | Zero-order | Partial | Part |
| 1     | (Constant) | 11.233 | 1.903 | 5.903 | .000 | |
|       | LSHighBrow | .169 | .093 | .089 | 1.815 | .070 | .158 | .091 | .086 |
|       | LSLuxury | .168 | .077 | .106 | 2.186 | .029 | .166 | .109 | .104 |
|       | LSHealthy | .710 | .147 | .240 | 4.816 | .000 | .283 | .234 | .229 |
| 2     | (Constant) | 5.898 | 2.341 | 2.519 | .012 | |
|       | LSHighBrow | .165 | .091 | .087 | 1.804 | .072 | .158 | .090 | .084 |
|       | LSLuxury | .161 | .076 | .103 | 2.135 | .033 | .166 | .107 | .099 |
|       | LSHealthy | .615 | .147 | .208 | 4.171 | .000 | .283 | .205 | .194 |
|       | Com Sharing | .218 | .064 | .193 | 3.389 | .001 | .256 | .168 | .157 |
|       | Mark Pricing | .098 | .052 | .113 | 1.862 | .061 | .004 | .094 | .087 |
|       | EquaMatching | .034 | .071 | .030 | 1.817 | .068 | .078 | .072 |

Table 7: Coefficients of Regression Analysis of LS and RM

a. Dependent Variable: Satisfaction with Life
However, it should be noted that the explanatory power of regression analysis is rather low at 0.15, yet it still indicates the presence of an association among these three concepts. As shown on Table 2 the mean values of the types of the relational model (communal sharing) has the largest mean value.

The test result of the second hypothesis indicated that, as it was expected, the relational model of communal sharing is the preferred model by Turkish businessmen, though the explanatory power of the analysis is weak, this outcome shows that “communal sharing” is the most influential relational model among the three considering the beta value and associated t-test values.

| Coefficients\(a,b\) | Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | t  | Sig. |
|----------------------|-------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|----|------|
|                      |       | B                           | Std. Error                |    |      |
| 1                    | (Constant) | 13,153 | 1,948 | 6,754 | .000 |
|                      | ComSharing | .329  | .070  | .301  | 4,681 | .000 |

*Table: 8 Coefficients of Regression Analysis of RM*

Notes: \(R^2 = 0.091\) \(F\) value = 21.907, \(P = .000\)

A regression analysis was used to test the third hypothesis through centering the research variables failed. However, another regression analysis was performed to test the hypothesis by using the 'healthy-style' dimension of LS as mediator. A. Hayes’s Process version 3.3 (2018) was used, and the outcome indicated that the conceptual dimension of healthy-style mediated the relationship between RLTM and SWL, which meant that the third hypothesis was minimally supported. The outcome is displayed as follows:

| Hayes: MODEL 4 | Y: SWLife | X: RLT | M: Healthy Lifestyle | Effect | BootSE | BootLLCI | BootULCI |
|----------------|-----------|-------|----------------------|--------|--------|----------|----------|
| Step1: Indirect effect(s) of X on Y: |          |       |                      | .0120  | .00051 | .0031    | .0234    |
| (M) Healthy Life Style |          |       |                      |        |        |          |          |
| Step2: Partially standard. indirect effect(s) of X on Y |          |       |                      | .0021  | .0009  | .0006    | .0041    |
| (M) Healthy Life Style |          |       |                      |        |        |          |          |
| Step3: Completely stand. indirect effect(s) of X on Y: |          |       |                      | .0354  | .0147  | .0094    | .0678    |
| (M) Healthy Life Style |          |       |                      |        |        |          |          |
| Sample size = 403 |          |       |                      |        |        |          |          |

*Table 9. Regression Analysis of Healthy LS as Mediator (A. Hayes’s Process version 3.3)*

Notes: \(R = .1314\) \(R^2 = .0173\) \(MSE = 3,5520\) \(F = 7,0498\) \(df1 = 1,000\) \(df2 = 401,000\) \(p = .008\)

Thus, healthy lifestyle partially mediates the relationship between RLTM and SWL, yet it must be recognized that the R square is considerably low, but it indicates definite associations among the key variables.

Three Pearson Correlation Coefficient analyses were showed the magnitudes of associations among the key research concepts. While lifestyle has a correlation coefficient value of 28.0 %; it is half, at 14.0 %, for the relational models. Two further correlation analyses also indicated the same level of associations, as shown in detail on Table 10 and Table 11.
The outcomes of the correlation tests between the key concepts of the present study indicated that healthy lifestyle is an outstanding issue \((r = 0.28)\) in the lives of people as it explains 8% variance in the dependent variable of SWL.

| SWLife   | ComSharing | MarkPricing | EquaMatching | AuthRanking |
|----------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| Pearson Correlation | \(1\) | ,256** | ,004 | ,122* |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | \(.000\) | \(.934\) | \(.014\) | \(.171\) |
| N | 403 | 403 | 403 | 403 |
| ComSharing   | Pearson Correlation | ,256** | 1 | ,544** | ,163** |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | \(.000\) | \(.000\) | \(.000\) | \(.001\) |
| N | 403 | 403 | 403 | 403 |
| MarkPricing   | Pearson Correlation | ,004 | ,176** | 1 | ,466** | ,500** |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | \(.934\) | \(.000\) | \(.000\) | \(.000\) |
| N | 403 | 403 | 403 | 403 |
| EquaMatching   | Pearson Correlation | ,122* | ,544** | ,466** | 1 | ,246** |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | \(.014\) | \(.000\) | \(.000\) | \(.000\) |
| N | 403 | 403 | 403 | 403 |
| AuthRanking   | Pearson Correlation | ,068 | ,163** | ,500** | ,246** | 1 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | \(.171\) | \(.001\) | \(.000\) | \(.000\) |
| N | 403 | 403 | 403 | 403 |

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)**

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)*

Finally, a general linear model (GLM) was used to understand the differences in the perceptions of male and female employees of SWL. The Levene's test was \((F= 1497)\) insignificant \((p= 0.147)\) as expected. In terms of partial eta squared values, the effects of communal sharing \((0.044)\) and healthy lifestyle \((0.041)\) were considerably low; the effect of social class at 0.135 is fairly high.

In consonance with the results of the earlier studies conducted in this field of interest, as the level of social class increases, the perceptions of SWL by the employees also increase. In this context, female employees are more optimistic than male employees as evident from the chart below.
5. Discussion

The first issue is the fact that communal sharing is the most preferred relational model by Turkish employees for establishing communicative links with others. The fact that the respondents of the present study are highly educated professionals explains why ‘equality matching’ and “market pricing” are of importance as well. Although ‘authority ranking’ looks like having a great impact on the preference as the primary model of communication among the employees of Turkish business world, this is likely related to the fact that the respondents are the members of large-scale and hierarchical organizations. It must also be indicated that the association between communal sharing and SWL was the highest (25%) in comparison with the remaining types of relational models. Consequently, the present study suggests that the use of two RLTM, namely communal sharing and equality matching are more effective in the lives of business people. The second and perhaps the most interesting findings of the study is the fact that healthy life-style is the most important one despite to the respondents’ desire to have luxurious LS. There is empirical evidence that a healthy life style becomes more effective with the use of right type of relational models (i.e. communal sharing for this study) to feeling more satisfied in life. This may well be an indicator of having a balanced work life and social life.

Those who mostly prefer to use ‘communal sharing’ for developing friendly and rather close relations with others, have healthy life style. Moreover, higher their social class will be resulted in more life satisfaction than the others. It must be also noted that females are bit more positive and get more satisfaction from their lives. Finally, it would be almost a must to emphasize the functional link between leisure time activities and SWL (Brajša-Žganec et. al., 2011) has a critical importance. This is due to the fact that participation in leisure activities makes it easier for people to meet new friends, to join new social groups all of which is likely to have an impact on quality of life and as a result, on life satisfaction. It would be also right to suggest the HR Departments of organizations to organize social gatherings by inviting their members to participate in different events throughout year.

6. Limitations

The major limitation is related to the sample frame which includes only the respondents from well-known large-scale organizations. Selection of respondents both from small-size firms and from different industrialized cities would be useful to gain insight about the subject. The second limitation is about the use of life-style scale which may be revised to reflect some specific values and activities following an explorative research.
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