

Unveiling the Influence of Leader Narcissism on Workplace Stress and Organizational Communication: Insights from the Information Technology Sector

Begüm Al¹

Abstract

This study delves into the intricate relationship between leader narcissism, stress levels, and organizational communication, providing insights into the dynamics of contemporary workplaces. Utilizing a sample survey conducted within an information technology department, participants assessed leader narcissism, job stress, and organizational communication through comprehensive questionnaires. The findings illuminate the positive correlation between the “exploitativeness” dimension of leader narcissism and the “work-family conflict” sub-dimension of job stress, as well as the “feedback” sub-dimension of organizational communication. Similarly, a positive association emerged between the “superiority” dimension of leader narcissism and the “critical communication” sub-dimension of organizational communication. Conversely, a negative relationship was observed between the “self-sufficiency” dimension of leader narcissism and the “information sharing” sub-dimension of organizational communication.

Moreover, a statistically significant negative correlation was identified between the “authority” dimension of leader narcissism and the “role ambiguity” sub-dimension of job stress, while a positive relationship was detected with the “role stress” sub-dimension. These empirical findings underscore the nuanced effects of leader narcissism on job stress and the quality of organizational communication within the workplace. These significant insights offer valuable implications for leadership practices and organizational communication strategies, empowering organizations to address the challenges associated with leader narcissism. The scholarly contribution of this study advances the field of organizational behavior, providing actionable recommendations for leaders and managers striving to cultivate a conducive work environment.

1 Dr, Istanbul Kent University, begum.al@kent.edu.tr, Orcid: 0000-0001-8839-4478

Introduction

Narcissism is a term commonly employed in psychological and sociological research, with its roots traced back to an ancient Greek mythological narrative. This mythological account recounts the tale of a young man named Narcissus, who harbored an obsessive love for his own reflection (Braun, 2017). The term narcissism, deriving from the protagonist's name in the myth, is frequently utilized to signify traits such as excessive self-admiration, preoccupation with one's own self, and tendencies to belittle the significance of others. Its conceptualization has sparked numerous discussions within the domains of modern psychology and social sciences, where diverse theoretical approaches have been employed to investigate this phenomenon. In light of the mythological narrative, Freud approached narcissism from two distinct perspectives: non-clinical narcissism, focusing on individuals' self-love and self-evaluation, and narcissism as a personality disorder. In the realm of organizational psychology, narcissism is defined based on the aforementioned criteria, albeit approached as a personality trait rather than a psychiatric condition. This trait is postulated to exist within all individuals to varying degrees. Paradoxically, narcissists, despite believing in the absence of a fundamental basis for trust in others' love or loyalty, internalize feelings of adequacy, power, beauty, status, prestige, and superiority (Kets De Vries and Miller, 1985). As a personality trait, narcissism engenders an egocentric, self-enhancing, dominant, and manipulative interpersonal orientation (Sedikides et al., 2004). Broadly speaking, narcissistic personality traits encompass a flamboyant yet vulnerable sense of self, wherein the pursuit of success is intertwined with a desire to be admired. Due to deficiencies in empathy, trust, and interest in others, individuals with narcissistic tendencies encounter challenges in fostering interpersonal relationships. A salient feature of narcissistic individuals is their perception of themselves as special and unique. They tend to inflate their abilities, perceiving themselves as more intelligent, creative, and attractive than others, and lay claim to superior leadership potential. Consequently, narcissistic individuals exhibit a natural inclination to vie for leadership positions driven by aspirations to demonstrate their power, garner attention, and showcase their capabilities (Morf and Rhodewalt, 2001). Moreover, they prefer not to assume followership roles unless they possess unwavering confidence in their leadership potential (Zitek and Jordan, 2016). Empirical evidence suggests that individuals possessing narcissistic personality traits are prone to emerge as leaders within group settings, particularly in times of uncertainty (Nevicka et al., 2013; Grijalva et al., 2015).

Research exploring the contributions of leaders characterized by narcissistic personality traits to organizational contexts has yielded divergent outcomes, giving rise to debates surrounding narcissistic leadership. While some scholars (e.g., Blair et al., 2008) classify narcissistic leaders as effective, others (e.g., Maccoby, 2000) contend that leaders exhibiting narcissistic personality traits exert adverse effects on organizations and employees. This study aims to investigate the influence of leader narcissism on workplace stress and organizational communication.

Leadership and Narcissism

Narcissism is examined from two distinct perspectives in the field of leadership. Firstly, researchers (e.g., Campbell et al., 2011; Padilla et al., 2007; Sedikides and Campbell, 2017) have focused on the reasons why narcissistic individuals are selected as leaders. These studies have consistently demonstrated that narcissistic individuals are often chosen as leaders. This phenomenon is often explained by Implicit Leadership Theory (Lord and Maher, 1991). Implicit leadership theory posits that if a person's characteristics align with people's implicit leadership schemas (i.e., leader prototypes), then the likelihood of that person being perceived as a leader is higher. In other words, narcissistic traits such as dominance, confidence, extraversion, and high self-esteem are perceived as congruent with leader prototypes, leading to the perception of narcissistic individuals as possessing leader-like qualities and thus emerging as leaders (Sedikides and Campbell, 2017).

Another factor that could explain why people prefer narcissistic individuals in leadership positions is that narcissists tend to leave positive initial impressions (Ong et al., 2016). This tendency becomes particularly pronounced in short-term evaluations, such as interviews. Positive initial impressions of narcissists arise from the perception that they have high self-esteem (Giacomin and Jordan, 2014). This effect stems from the self-presentation function of self-esteem. People tend to accept self-evaluations reflected in a person's social behavior as valid and reliable sources of information. Therefore, an increase in self-esteem leads to an enhanced perception of popularity (Zeigler-Hill et al., 2014). These positive initial impressions enable narcissistic individuals to receive excessively favorable hiring evaluations, despite not actually possessing the necessary qualifications and having many negative traits. Previous research has revealed that narcissistic individuals hired as managers have less organizational experience compared to other managers, which is an important criterion in the hiring

process (Nevicka et al., 2013). Consequently, factors that encourage promoting narcissists to leadership positions include their determination to attain such positions, the alignment between their own qualities and prototypical leader attributes, and the positive impressions they create in the short term. Although the ascent of narcissists to leadership positions is well-documented and understood, research on the effects of narcissistic individuals in leadership positions on their subordinates has yielded complex results. In other words, studies on the effectiveness of narcissistic leadership emerge at the intersection of two different approaches to narcissism and leadership. According to Kets De Vries and Miller (1985), the influence of the narcissistic personality dimension is present in the behavior of many leaders, and this influence varies from leader to leader. Narcissistic behavior of leaders primarily manifests in their interpersonal communication, exploitative tendencies, and inclination to exercise their authority (Raskin and Hall, 1979).

Despite appearing as a negative personality trait, in some cases, narcissism is argued to not only benefit the narcissistic individual but also the organization as a whole (Chatterjee and Hambrick, 2007; Sedikides and Campbell, 2017). For instance, according to Maccoby (2000), narcissism can be extraordinarily beneficial and sometimes even necessary. Maccoby (2000) differentiates between productive and unproductive narcissism, stating that productive narcissists are individuals who are willing to get the job done, take risks, and can persuade others through their rhetoric. Unproductive narcissists, on the other hand, are individuals who exaggerate their own abilities, avoid seeking advice from others, and indulge in unrealistic fantasies. Therefore, while narcissistic leaders may exhibit visionary qualities, they may lack collaboration skills. This view is also consistent with researchers who argue that narcissistic leadership has both dark and bright sides (Hogan and Kaiser, 2005).

On the dark side of this discussion, narcissism is associated with lower managerial performance ratings (Blair, Hoffman, & Helland, 2008), higher gains and losses associated with capricious and extreme decision-making, resulting in fluctuations in returns (Chatterjee & Hambrick, 2007; Blair et al., 2008), as well as negative aspects such as displaying less organizational citizenship behavior (Judge, Piccolo, & Kosalka, 2006), providing self-benefits at the long-term expense of others and the organization (Campbell, Hoffman, Campbell, & Marchisio, 2005), and engaging in devaluation of others and unethical accounting practices (Amernic & Craig, 2010).

Consequently, narcissistic leadership is often referred to as destructive leadership (Maccoby, 2000).

On the bright side of this discussion, research has defined the positive outcomes of narcissistic leadership as embracing a bold vision (Galvin, Waldman, & Balthazard, 2010). It has been suggested that narcissistic leaders' determination and charisma can be constructive and even necessary in situations characterized by uncertainty and social crises (Campbell & Campbell, 2009; Post, 1986). For example, employees tend to evaluate narcissists as more preferable leaders in uncertain situations (Nevecka et al., 2013). It is proposed that narcissists are perceived as uncertainty reducers and that their negative characteristics can enhance their apparent power and attractiveness as leaders (Nevecka et al., 2013).

Furthermore, Maccoby (2000) argues that today's hectic and chaotic world requires "productive narcissists." In this sense, narcissistic leaders, as charismatic visionaries, can achieve transformative innovation, inspire numerous followers, and represent a solid and stable foundation rather than leaders who preserve the status quo (Maccoby, 2000).

To sum up, narcissism in leadership has been examined from two distinct perspectives. One focuses on why narcissistic individuals are often chosen as leaders, attributing it to Implicit Leadership Theory and the alignment of narcissistic traits with leader prototypes. Additionally, narcissists tend to leave positive initial impressions, leading to favorable hiring evaluations despite lacking necessary qualifications. While research on the effects of narcissistic leaders on subordinates yields complex results, narcissistic behavior manifests in interpersonal communication, exploitative tendencies, and the exercise of authority. While narcissism is generally viewed as negative, it can also have positive outcomes. Productive narcissists are individuals who get the job done, take risks, and persuade others, while unproductive narcissists exaggerate abilities and indulge in unrealistic fantasies. The dark side of narcissistic leadership includes lower performance ratings, capricious decision-making, and unethical practices. On the bright side, narcissistic leaders can embrace a bold vision, be effective in uncertain situations, and drive transformative innovation.

Workplace Stress

As a term, 'job stress' refers to the distress arising from a situation where the requirements of a job are incompatible with the resources provided for its execution. In this equation, both demands or stress factors and job resources can be modified to reduce or prevent job stress (e.g., Yapraklı and Yılmaz,

2007). There are various job stress terms, concepts, models, and theories that can be understood in the process of job stress. This process begins with exposure to stressors. Stressors originating from the work environment can be classified as psychosocial or physical. Psychosocial stress sources may include job demands, job control, job insecurity, bullying, harassment, and similar factors, while physical stress factors include noise and ergonomic risks. Exposure to stress factors can lead to tangible problems. Perceived problems can result in physiological or behavioral short-term negative reactions. Alongside short-term reactions, these problems can increase the risk of long-lasting physiological or behavioral health outcomes. Job stress can affect both neuroendocrine mechanisms directly and indirectly influence health behaviors (Saranya and Sudhahar, 2016).

Job stress is a phenomenon that arises from the interaction between the employee and working conditions (Murphy, 1995). Researchers emphasize the importance of individual characteristics in relation to working conditions as the primary cause of job stress. Accordingly, individual differences such as personality and coping skills play a significant role in predicting whether specific job conditions will create stress. In other words, a situation that is a source of stress for one person may not pose a problem for another person. However, while the importance of individual differences should not be overlooked, scientific evidence demonstrates that certain working conditions are stressful for most people. Such evidence supports placing greater emphasis on working conditions as the primary source of job stress and advocating for job redesign as a primary prevention strategy (Saranya and Sudhahar, 2016).

To sum up, job stress refers to the distress caused by a mismatch between job requirements and available resources. It can be mitigated by modifying both stress factors and job resources. Stressors in the work environment can be categorized as psychosocial or physical, such as job demands, control, insecurity, bullying, and noise. Exposure to stress factors can lead to short-term negative reactions and increase the risk of long-term health issues. Individual characteristics, including personality and coping skills, influence the impact of working conditions on job stress. While individual differences are important, research highlights the significance of working conditions as the primary cause of job stress. Thus, advocating for job redesign as a preventive measure becomes crucial in addressing job stress.

Organizational Communication

Communication enables employees to access information related to their work and enhance their performance. Effective communication increases employee motivation and encourages greater involvement, taking responsibility, and displaying purposeful behaviors. A good leader interacts with their employees through effective communication, informing and directing them. Communication is an important tool in fulfilling the leadership role, enabling leaders to convey their visions to employees, set goals, and promote teamwork. Communication allows different stakeholders to come together, share information, and make decisions collectively. Good communication encourages employees to express their ideas, share their opinions, and collaborate effectively (Berger, 1969). The establishment and functioning of bureaucratic rules influence the flow of internal communication within organizations. Bureaucratic structures prescribe specific communication channels and procedures. The clarity and functioning of rules determine how employees communicate and share information with each other. According to Weber, the rules and hierarchy provided by bureaucracy enhance the effectiveness of internal communication. Having a certain order ensures that employees understand their roles and responsibilities clearly. Additionally, following established procedures ensures the continuity and consistency of communication. This reduces misunderstandings, errors, and uncertainties, thereby increasing the effectiveness of communication. The notion that bureaucratic structures shape the flow and effectiveness of communication helps organizations develop effective communication strategies within a certain order and discipline (Weber, 1978). Good communication enables employees to gather information from various sources and integrate that information. This supports making comprehensive and knowledge-based decisions in the decision-making process. Moreover, communication plays a significant role in the analysis stage of the decision-making process. Good communication ensures accurate transmission and comprehensible sharing of gathered information. This facilitates proper analysis in the decision-making process and evaluation of different perspectives. Another impact of internal communication on the decision-making process is the implementation of decisions. Good communication ensures clear communication and understanding of decisions by employees. Furthermore, it supports monitoring and evaluating results through feedback. This enables effective implementation of decisions and allows for necessary adjustments. Good communication facilitates employees' access to information, encourages sharing of different perspectives, and supports the creation of shared meaning. Additionally, communication networks and channels shape interactions in the

sense-making process and direct the flow of information among employees (Weick, 1995). Regardless of the type of organization, communication is one of the fundamental elements that sustains and continues relationships within the organization. A message conveyed from one person to another not only has an impact on these two individuals but can also have a meaningful effect on the entire organizational system when viewed as a system. Communication between managers and employees is a significant determinant of employees' satisfaction. Organizational communication plays a vital role in the success of an organization (Richmond et al., 2005; FitzPatrick and Valskov, 2015). Defining internal communication presents the challenge of expressing the complexity of communication within the organization. For example, Pace and Faules (1994) suggest that it consists of messages transmitted and interpreted among specific organizational units. An organization consists of communication units that operate within hierarchical relationships and an environment (Pace and Faules, 1994). According to Miller (2015), an organization includes a social collective (or a group of individuals) that coordinates activities to achieve individual and collective goals, necessitating communication. Accordingly, communication among individuals within the organization and with others in the broader organizational context constitutes organizational communication. Kock's Multiple Channel Communication Model suggests that communication occurs through various channels, and the communication effect varies depending on the richness level of the communication channels. The model ranks communication channels in terms of richness, with face-to-face communication being the richest and written communication, such as email, being less rich. Kock also argues that the richness of communication channels affects the level of agreement, empathy, and interaction in communication (Kock, 2004). The increasing trend of remote work triggered by the Covid-19 pandemic has brought about permanent changes in internal communication methods. Traditional face-to-face communication has been replaced by virtual communication tools, video conferencing applications, instant messaging platforms, and other technologies that offer more interaction opportunities. It is also observed that organizations are turning to the use of more visual and auditory content in communication processes. Enriched media content supports text-based communication, enhancing the impact of communication and facilitating better understanding of messages. In the future, we can anticipate that organizations will invest more in digital platforms that support and strengthen communication in remote work environments. The use and functionality of communication tools will play a critical role in the effectiveness of organizational communication. Organizations will focus on

providing user-friendly, secure, and easily accessible digital communication tools to enable effective communication among employees.

Methodology

Research Universe

In this study, the information technology department of a private bank was selected, which consists of a total of 65 team leaders and 370 team members and located in Istanbul, Türkiye. The study did not employ sampling, and the surveys were conducted among all the mentioned employees. The first survey, the Narcissistic Personality Inventory, was conducted with a total of 65 team leaders. The second survey, the Job Stress Scale and Organizational Communication Scale, was administered to 370 team members.

Data Collection Instruments

In this research, two different surveys were created using the survey method. The first survey aims to measure the dimensions and levels of narcissistic personality of team leaders. This survey consists of two parts: a demographic questionnaire and the Narcissistic Personality Inventory. The demographic questionnaire includes three questions such as gender, age, and marital status, which are used to determine the participants' profiles. To measure participants' narcissistic personality traits, the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI), developed by Raskin and Hall (1979) and revised by Ames et al. (2006), was used. The revised version of the scale contains a total of 16 items and six sub-dimensions: Exhibitionism, Exploitativeness, Superiority, Self-sufficiency, Entitlement, and Authority. The Narcissistic Personality Inventory is a scale of comparative type, and the items consist of paired choices.

The second survey was administered to team members who responded to the narcissistic personality inventory filled out by team leaders. The purpose of this survey is to measure team members' levels of job stress and perceptions of organizational communication. By examining the relationship between the results of the first and second surveys, the study aims to reach a conclusion.

The survey conducted among team members consists of three different forms. The first form is the demographic questionnaire, which is used to determine the participants' profiles. This form includes three questions such as gender, age, and marital status.

The second form includes a scale created to determine job stress. This scale was developed by Yapraklı and Yılmaz (2007) by considering relevant studies in the literature and industry. The scale consists of a total of 31 questions and four sub-dimensions: role conflict, role ambiguity, work-family conflict, and role stress. A 5-point Likert scale was used to answer the questions related to job stress, with the first statement of the scale being “strongly disagree” and the last statement being “strongly agree”.

The third form includes a scale used to determine organizational communication. This scale was developed by Miles et al. (1996) and translated into Turkish by Yüksel (2013) after reliability and validity studies. The scale consists of a total of 24 statements and five sub-dimensions: information, goal setting, critical communication, primary relationships, and feedback. A 5-point Likert scale was also used to answer the questions related to organizational communication, with the first statement of the scale being “strongly disagree” and the last statement being “strongly agree”.

In this way, the surveys used in the study represent an approach that aims to measure the narcissistic personality dimensions of team leaders and the levels of job stress and perceptions of organizational communication among team members.

Data Analysis

The data obtained within the framework of this research were analyzed using the SPSS program. In the analysis process, the reliability of the scales was measured through Cronbach’s alpha analysis. In this step, confirmatory factor analysis was conducted for each scale to determine the reliability levels of the scale sub-dimensions and questions.

Subsequently, descriptive analysis was performed for each scale to determine the levels of narcissistic personality traits of team leaders participating in the first survey and the levels of job stress and perceived effectiveness of organizational communication of team members participating in the second survey. This stage aimed to describe the results of each scale in detail. Finally, the relationship between the results of the first and second surveys, that is, the relationship between the levels of narcissistic personality traits of team leaders and the perceptions of job stress and organizational communication effectiveness of team members, was examined. Correlation and regression analyses were utilized to determine this relationship. These analyses contributed to the statistical evaluation of the obtained data and understanding the relationships between them.

Findings

The findings of this study shed light on the effects of leader narcissism on workplace dynamics, specifically focusing on job stress levels and organizational communication. Through statistical and regression analyses, several significant relationships were identified, providing valuable insights into the impact of leader narcissism on these variables.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Team Leaders

		(%)
Gender	Female	48
	Man	52
Age	18-25	2
	26-35	22
	36-45	71
	46+	5
Marital Status	Married	52
	Single	48

The above table provides information about the demographic characteristics of a total of 65 team leaders included in the study. The findings in the table indicate that the gender distribution of the participating team leaders is 48% female and 52% male. Additionally, it was determined that the majority (71%) falls within the age range of 36-45 and that 52% of them are married.

Table 2. Demographic Characteristics of Team Members

		Yüzde (%)
Gender	Female	43
	Man	57
Age	18-25	4
	26-35	69
	36-45	24
	46+	3
Marital Status	Married	55
	Single	45

The table above provides information about the demographic characteristics of the total of 370 team members included in the study. According to the findings in the table, it can be observed that the gender distribution of the participant members is 43% female and 57% male. Additionally, it has been determined that the majority (69%) falls within the age range of 26-35 and that they are married (55%).

Table 3. Factor and Reliability Analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory

Factor Name	Factor Items	Factor Loadings	Reliability (Cronbach Alpha)
Exhibitionism	NKE-2	,857	.898
	NKE-7	,864	
	NKE-11	,864	
Exploitativeness	NKE-5	,848	.945
	NKE-9	,787	
	NKE-14	,889	
Dominance	NKE-1	,864	.880
	NKE-3	,987	
	NKE-16	,876	
Self-Sufficiency	NKE-8	,848	.858
	NKE-13	,877	
	NKE-15	,865	
Assertion of Rights	NKE-6	,890	.915
	NKE-10	,863	
Authority	NKE-4	,859	.884
	NKE-12	,927	
Narcissistic Personality Inventory / Total Reliability			.905

Reliability Analysis Results of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory indicate that the scale has a reliability coefficient of 0.905. This result indicates that the scale is highly reliable. Furthermore, factor analysis

conducted on the scale revealed the presence of six distinct subscales. The reliability coefficients of the subscales range from 0.880 to 0.945.

Table 4. Factor and Reliability Analysis of the Job Stress Scale

Factor Name	Factor Items	Factor Loadings	Reliability (Cronbach Alpha)
Role conflict	İS-1	,846	.868
	İS-2	,857	
	İS-3	,948	
	İS-4	,943	
	İS-5	,935	
	İS-6	,823	
	İS-7	,849	
	İS-8	,800	
Role ambiguity	İS-9	,848	.803
	İS-10	,867	
	İS-11	,789	
	İS-12	,776	
	İS-13	,746	
	İS-14	,746	
Work-family conflict	İS-15	,865	.854
	İS-16	,874	
	İS-17	,847	
	İS-18	,889	
Role stress	İS-19	,902	.902
	İS-20	,927	
	İS-21	,915	
	İS-22	,946	
	İS-23	,835	
	İS-24	,935	
	İS-25	,932	
	İS-26	,925	
	İS-27	,833	
	İS-28	,838	
	İS-29	,861	
	İS-30	,894	
	İS-31	,901	
Workplace Stress Inventory / Total Reliability			.886

According to the reliability analysis results conducted for the Job Stress Scale, the reliability coefficient of the scale was found to be 0.886. This result

indicates that the scale is highly reliable. Additionally, through the applied factor analysis, a total of four separate sub-dimensions were identified. The reliability coefficients of these sub-dimensions range from 0.803 to 0.902.

Table 5. Factor and Reliability Analysis of the Organizational Communication Scale

Factor Name	Factor Items	Factor Loadings	Reliability (Cronbach Alpha)
Information sharing	Öİ-1	,926	.915
	Öİ-2	,957	
	Öİ-3	,898	
	Öİ-18	,943	
	Öİ-19	,935	
	Öİ-24	,923	
Goal setting	Öİ-4	,948	.987
	Öİ-9	,887	
	Öİ-10	,989	
	Öİ-11	,976	
	Öİ-12	,916	
Critical communication	Öİ-13	,965	.931
	Öİ-14	,935	
	Öİ-20	,937	
	Öİ-21	,943	
	Öİ-22	,920	
Primary relationships	Öİ-5	,948	.964
	Öİ-6	,923	
	Öİ-7	,965	
	Öİ-8	,983	
Feedback	Öİ-15	,933	.916
	Öİ-16	,901	
	Öİ-17	,951	
	Öİ-23	,994	
Organizational communication scale / Total reliability			.965

Reliability Analysis Results for the Organizational Communication Scale indicate a reliability coefficient of 0.965. This result indicates that the scale

is highly reliable. Furthermore, factor analysis was conducted, revealing the presence of five distinct subdimensions. The reliability coefficients for these subdimensions range from 0.915 to 0.987.

Table 6. Descriptive Statistics

		N	Min.	Max.	Avg.	Standard deviation
Narcissistic Personality Inventory	Exhibitionism	65	0,00	3,00	1,10	,3556
	Exploitativeness	65	0,00	3,00	1,80	,3566
	Dominance	65	0,00	3,00	1,85	,2355
	Self-Sufficiency	65	0,00	3,00	1,83	,2643
	Assertion of Rights	65	0,00	2,00	1,65	,2352
	Authority	65	0,00	2,00	1,95	,2346
Workplace Stress	Role conflict	370	1,00	5,00	3,60	,4567
	Role ambiguity	370	1,00	5,00	4,75	,2461
	Work-family conflict	370	1,00	5,00	4,45	,3677
	Role stress	370	1,00	5,00	4,65	,1456
Organizational Communication	Information sharing	370	1,00	5,00	3,80	,3225
	Goal setting	370	1,00	5,00	4,15	,2356
	Critical communication	370	1,00	5,00	3,65	,3766
	Primary relationships	370	1,00	5,00	3,50	,2506
	Feedback	370	1,00	5,00	3,25	,3744

The above table presents descriptive statistics regarding the scales and sub-dimensions. According to the obtained results, the sub-dimension with the highest mean score in the narcissistic personality inventory is “Authority” (mean = 1.95), while the sub-dimension with the lowest mean score is “Exhibitionism” (mean = 1.10). In the job stress scale, the sub-dimension of “Role ambiguity” (mean = 4.75) has the highest mean score, whereas the sub-dimension of “Role conflict” (mean = 3.60) has the lowest mean score. In the organizational communication scale, the sub-dimension of “Goal set-

ting” (mean = 4.15) has the highest mean score, whereas the sub-dimension of “Feedback” (mean = 3.25) has the lowest mean score.

Table 7. Relationship Between Narcissistic Personality Traits, Job Stress, and Organizational Communication - Correlation Analysis Results

		Exhibitionism	Exploitativeness	Dominance	Self-Sufficiency	Assertion of Rights	Authority	Narcissistic Personality Inventory / Total
Role conflict	Pearson (r)	,535	,546	,535	,570	,643	-,467	,678
	Sig. (p)	,174	,357	,677	,336	,245	,090	,467
Role ambiguity	Pearson (r)	,345	,532	-,897	-,367	-,550	-,268**	-,566
	Sig. (p)	,532	,357	,488	,336	,245	,001	,067
Work-family conflict	Pearson (r)	,415	,646**	,797	-,546	,784	,346	,546
	Sig. (p)	,100	,012	,174	,357	,789	,073	,357
Role stress	Pearson (r)	,579	,466	,654	,578	,785	,644**	,578
	Sig. (p)	,296	,357	,377	,226	,245	,010	,226
Workplace Stress / Total	Pearson (r)	,754	,678	,654	,546	,786	,543	,677
	Sig. (p)	,566	,467	,677	,445	,546	,080	,464
Information Sharing	Pearson (r)	-,799	-,566	-,125	-,564**	-,466	-,574	-,532
	Sig. (p)	,678	,067	,099	,000	,478	,113	,415
Goal Setting	Pearson (r)	-,789	,543	-,579	-,356	,325	,112	,100
	Sig. (p)	,568	,368	,364	,467	,454	,134	,579
Critical communication	Pearson (r)	,333	,568	,374**	,394	,457	,446	,296
	Sig. (p)	,062	,643	,000	,545	,356	,064	,754
Primary Relationships	Pearson (r)	-,678	-,456	-,564	-,546	-,654	-,784	-,566
	Sig. (p)	,467	,252	,077	,457	,637	,789	,799
Feedback	Pearson (r)	,566	,568**	,125	-,248	,125	,085	,678
	Sig. (p)	,067	,023	,089	,656	,099	,245	,089
Organizational Communication / Total	Pearson (r)	,125	,467	,543	,743	,567	,786	-,687
	Sig. (p)	,086	,357	,065	,069	,347	,078	,078

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between narcissistic personality traits of team leaders and job stress and organizational communication levels of team members. The correlation analysis results conducted for this purpose are presented in the table above.

According to the obtained findings, a positive and statistically significant relationship ($r=.646, p=.012<.05$) was found between the sub-dimension of “exploitativeness” of the narcissistic personality inventory and the sub-dimension of “work-family conflict” of the job stress scale. Additionally, a positive and statistically significant relationship ($r=.568, p=.023<.05$) was observed between the sub-dimension of “exploitativeness” of the narcissistic personality inventory and the sub-dimension of “feedback” of the organizational communication scale.

Furthermore, a positive and statistically significant relationship ($r=.374, p=.000<.05$) was found between the sub-dimension of “superiority” of the narcissistic personality inventory and the sub-dimension of “critical communication” of the organizational communication scale. In contrast, a negative and statistically significant relationship ($r=-.564, p=.000<.05$) was observed between the sub-dimension of “self-sufficiency” of the narcissistic personality inventory and the sub-dimension of “information sharing” of the organizational communication scale. Lastly, a negative and statistically significant relationship ($r=-.268, p=.001<.05$) was identified between the sub-dimension of “authority” of the narcissistic personality inventory and the sub-dimension of “role ambiguity” of the job stress scale. Additionally, a positive and statistically significant relationship ($r=.644, p=.010<.05$) was found between the sub-dimension of “authority” and the sub-dimension of “role stress” of the job stress scale.

Table 8. Regression Analysis Results on the Impact of Narcissistic Personality Traits on Sub-Dimensions of Job Stress

	R ²	B	Sig (p)
* Exploitativeness → Work-family conflict	.275	-.599	.012
* Authority → Role ambiguity	.346	.635	.001
* Authority → Role stress	.378	-.623	.010

* Dependent variable

The table presented above displays the results of regression analyses conducted to determine the effects of narcissistic personality traits of team leaders on job stress and its sub-dimensions among team members.

According to the analysis results, it is observed that the “exploitativeness” traits of team leaders have a statistically significant and negative effect on the sub-dimension of job stress, namely “work-family conflict” ($\beta = -.599$, $p = .012 < .05$). Furthermore, it has been determined that the “authority” traits within the narcissistic personality traits of team leaders have a positive effect on one of the sub-dimensions of job stress, namely “role ambiguity” ($\beta = .635$, $p = .001 < .05$). Additionally, it has been found that the “authority” traits have a statistically significant and negative effect on another sub-dimension of job stress, namely “role stress” ($\beta = -.623$, $p = .010 < .05$).

Table 9. Effect of Narcissistic Personality Traits on Sub-Dimensions of Organizational Communication - Regression Analysis Results

	R ²	β	Sig (p)
* Exploitativeness → Feedback	.245	.637	.023
*Dominance → Critical communication	.367	.563	.000
* Self-Sufficiency → Information Sharing	.356	-.572	.000

Table 9 presents the results of regression analyses conducted to determine the influence of narcissistic personality traits in team leaders on organizational communication and its sub-dimensions among team members. According to the analysis results, it is observed that team leaders’ “exploitativeness” traits have a statistically significant and positive effect on the sub-dimension of “feedback” within organizational communication ($\beta = .637$, $p = .023 < .05$). Additionally, it is found that team leaders’ “dominance” traits, which are part of their narcissistic personality, have a statistically significant and positive impact on the sub-dimension of “critical communication” ($\beta = .563$, $p = .000 < .05$). Lastly, the analysis reveals a statistically significant and negative influence of team leaders’ “self-sufficiency” traits, included in their narcissistic personality, on the sub-dimension of “information sharing” within organizational communication ($\beta = -.572$, $p = .000 < .05$).

Conclusion

Examining the effects of leaders’ personality traits on workplace dynamics has garnered increasing attention in contemporary research. In this regard, leader narcissism has emerged as a significant research area, particularly in the field of organizational behavior. This study systematically investigates the impact of leader narcissism on levels of job stress and organizational communication. Surveys were administered to participants to assess leader narcissism, job stress levels, and organizational communication. The collect-

ed data were subjected to statistical and regression analyses. The findings of this research reveal a positive relationship between the “exploitativeness” dimension of leader narcissism and the “work-family conflict” sub-dimension of the job stress scale, as well as the “feedback” sub-dimension of the organizational communication scale. Additionally, a positive relationship is observed between the “superiority” dimension of leader narcissism and the “critical communication” sub-dimension of the organizational communication scale. These findings highlight narcissistic leaders’ tendency to portray themselves as superior through critical communication and emphasize their behavior of providing negative feedback. Furthermore, it was found that the “self-sufficiency” dimension of leader narcissism exhibited a negative relationship with the “information sharing” sub-dimension of the organizational communication scale, indicating deficiencies in providing positive feedback among narcissistic leaders. Lastly, while the “authority” dimension of leader narcissism showed a positive relationship with the “role ambiguity” sub-dimension of the job stress scale, it exhibited a negative relationship with the “role stress” sub-dimension. These findings explain that individuals working under authoritarian figures may possess effective task understanding, yet they may still experience stress while performing their tasks due to increased role ambiguity. The results underscore the significant impact of leader narcissism on stress levels and organizational communication in the workplace. These findings provide a fundamental basis for the development of leadership training programs and human resource management strategies aimed at mitigating the negative effects of narcissistic leaders. Specifically, it is recommended to provide training that emphasizes the importance of work-life balance to leaders, focuses on reducing exploitative behaviors, and improves feedback processes. Additionally, organizing training programs that facilitate the effective distribution of tasks and responsibilities and reduce role ambiguity can be crucial steps. Technological advancements provide further opportunities to develop approaches that aim to mitigate the negative effects of narcissistic leaders. For instance, technologies such as artificial intelligence and data analytics can be utilized to monitor and evaluate leader behaviors, thus enabling more objective and data-driven insights regarding narcissistic leaders. Furthermore, paying more attention to the selection process for leadership positions can enable early detection of individuals with narcissistic tendencies. In conclusion, organizations can implement more effective measures to minimize the impact of narcissistic leaders and foster a healthier leadership culture. Considering the limitations of this study, future research is recommended to expand on the current findings by using larger sample groups and examining different sectors. Future research should consider

conducting studies with larger samples and in different sectors to further explore the relationships between leader narcissism and other variables. Such investigations will contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of the effects of leader narcissism in the workplace and provide important guidance for management practices.

References

- Amernic, J.H. and Craig, R.J. (2010). Accounting as a facilitator of extreme narcissism. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 96(1), 79-93.
- Ames, D.R., Rose, P. and Anderson, C.P. (2006). The NPI-16 as a short measure of narcissism. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40(4), 440-450.
- Berger, P. L., Luckmann, T., & Zuleta, S. (1968). *La construcción social de la realidad (Vol. 975)*. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu.
- Blair, C.A., Hoffman, B.J. and Helland, K.R. (2008). Narcissism in organizations: a multisource appraisal reflects different perspectives. *Human Performance*, 21, 254-276.
- Braun, S. (2017). Leader Narcissism and Outcomes in Organizations: A Review at Multiple Levels of Analysis and Implications for Future Research. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8(773), 1-22.
- Campbell, W.K. and Campbell, S.M. (2009). On the self-regulatory dynamics created by the peculiar benefits and costs of narcissism: A contextual reinforcement model and examination of leadership. *Self and Identity*, 8(2-3), 214-232.
- Campbell, W.K., Bush, C.P., Brunell, A.B. and Shelton, J. (2005). Understanding the social costs of narcissism: The case of the tragedy of the commons. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31(10), 1358-1368.
- Campbell, W.K., Hoffman, B.J., Campbell, S.M. and Marchisio, G. (2011). Narcissism in organizational contexts. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21(4), 268-284.
- Chatterjee, A., & Hambrick, D. C. (2007). It's all about me: Narcissistic chief executive officers and their effects on company strategy and performance. *Administrative science quarterly*, 52(3), 351-386.
- FitzPatrick, L. and Valskov, K. (2015). *Internal Communications: A Manual for Practitioners*. Seattle, WA: Amazon Digital Services.
- Freud, S. (1957). On narcissism: an introduction, in J. Strachey (Eds.). *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, London: Hogarth Press, ss. 67-104.
- Galvin, B.M., Waldman, D.A. and Balthazard, P. (2010). Visionary communication qualities as mediators of the relationship between narcissism and attributions of leader charisma. *Personnel Psychology*, 63(3), 509-537.
- Giacomin, M. and Jordan, C.H. (2014). Down-regulating narcissistic tendencies: Communal focus reduces state narcissism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 40(4), 488-500.
- Grijalva, E., Harms, P.D., Newman, D.A., Gaddis, B.H. and Fraley, R.C. (2015). Narcissism and leadership: A meta-analytic review of linear and nonlinear relationships. *Personnel Psychology*, 68(1), 1-47.

- Hogan, R. and Kaiser, R.B. (2005). What we know about leadership. *Review of Gen. Psychol.* 9, 169-180.
- Judge, T.A., LePine, J.A. and Rich, B.L. (2006). Loving yourself abundantly: relationship of the narcissistic personality to self-and other perceptions of workplace deviance, leadership, and task and contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(4), 762-776.
- Kets De Vries, M.F.R. and Miller, D. (1985). Narcissism and leadership - an object relations perspective. *Human Relations*, 38, 583-601.
- Lord, R.G. and Maher, K.J. (1991). *Leadership and information processing: linking perceptions and performance*. Boston: Routledge.
- Maccoby, M. (2000). Narcissistic leaders: The incredible pros, the inevitable cons. *Harvard Business Review*, 78(1), 68-78.
- Miller, K. (2015). *Organizational Communication: Approaches and Processes*. 7th Ed. Belmont, CA: Cengage/Wadsworth
- Morf, C. C., & Rhodewalt, F. (2001). Unraveling the paradoxes of narcissism: A dynamic self-regulatory processing model. *Psychological inquiry*, 12(4), 177-196.
- Murphy, L.R. (1995). Managing job stress: an employees assistance/human resource management partnership. *Personel Review*, 24(1), 41-50.
- Neuvicka, B., De Hoogh, A.H.B., Van Vianen, A.E.M. and Ten Velden, F.S. (2013). Uncertainty enhances the preference for narcissistic leaders. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 43, 370-380.
- Ong, C.W., Roberts, R., Arthur, C.A., Woodman, T. and Akehurst, S. (2016). The leadership is sinking: a temporal investigation of narcissistic leadership. *Journal of Personality*, 84, 237-247.
- Pace, R. and Faules, D. (1994). *Organizational Communication*. 3rd Ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Padilla, A., Hogan, R. and Kaiser, R.B. (2007). The toxic triangle: Destructive leaders, susceptible followers, and conducive environments. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18(3), 176-194.
- Post, J.M. (1986). Narcissism and the charismatic leader-follower relationship. *Political Psychology*, 7(4), 675-688.
- Raskin, R. N., & Hall, C. S. (1979). A narcissistic personality inventory. *Psychological reports*, 45(2), 590-590.
- Richmond, V., McCroskey, J. and McCroskey, L. (2005). *Organizational Communication for Survival: Making Work, Work*. Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn & Bacon.
- Saranya, E. and Sudhahar, J.C. (2016). Job stress: causes, consequences and prevention. *International Journal of Exclusive Management Research*, 6(2), 1-13.

- Sedikides C. and Campbell W.K. (2017). Narcissistic force meets systemic resistance: the energy clash model. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 12(3), 400-421.
- Sedikides, C., Rudich, E.A., Gregg, A.P., Kumashiro, M. and Rusbult, C. (2004). Are normal narcissists psychologically healthy?: self-esteem matters. *Journal of Personal Society Psychology*, 87, 400-416.
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology* (Vol. 2), Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations* (Vol. 3), California: Sage Publications.
- Yapraklı, Ş. ve Yılmaz, M.K. (2007). Çalışanların iş stresi algılarının iş tatminleri üzerindeki etkisi: Erzurum’da ilaç mümessilleri üzerinde bir saha araştırması. *İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 21(1), 155-183.
- Zeigler-Hill, V., Enjaian, B., Holden, C.J. and Southard, A.C. (2014). Using self-esteem instability to disentangle the connection between self-esteem level and perceived aggression. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 49, 47-51.
- Zitek, E.M. and Jordan, A.H. (2016). Narcissism predicts support for hierarchy (At Least When Narcissists Think They Can Rise To The Top). *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 7(7), 707-716.