The Predictive Ability of Administrative Empowerment and Narcissistic Leadership on Burnout among Faculty Members in Jordanian Universities

Rawan Kheder Abu Shaqra[1], Mohammad Alsadi[2]

Abstract

This study aims to explore the predictive ability of administrative bullying and narcissistic leadership on burnout among faculty members in Jordanian universities. The descriptive correlational predictive method was used to analyze the relationship between these variables, focusing on the impact of administrative bullying and narcissistic leadership in predicting the level of burnout. The sample included 296 faculty members from Jordanian universities. The results showed that the studied variables had a low level of impact, yet there was a positive relationship between administrative bullying, narcissistic leadership, and burnout, suggesting that an increase in administrative bullying or narcissistic leadership could be associated with higher levels of burnout. The findings also indicated a predictive ability of administrative bullying and narcissistic leadership on burnout among faculty members in Jordanian universities. Based on these results, the study recommends improving the administrative and leadership environment in universities to reduce the impact of these factors on faculty well-being.

Keywords: *Administrative Bullying, Narcissistic Leadership, Burnout, Faculty Members, Jordanian Universities.*

Introduction

The world in this century faces numerous challenges and transformations across various domains such as economics, culture, science, and education. This necessitates that institutions of all types keep pace with modernization, diversity, and change in all fields due to their direct impact on performance, efficiency, and scientific productivity, whether positively or negatively (Awour, 2023).

Higher education is considered one of the most critical stages in the overall educational system and garners significant attention across various academic levels (Al-Fattah, 2019). This level of education has undergone numerous changes and transformations in fields that affect both students and the local community. Higher education plays a vital role in supporting global human development, not only by equipping individuals with the essential skills required for the labor market but also by providing the necessary training across various disciplines. Consequently, individuals are empowered to enhance their analytical skills, which contributes to stimulating the local economy, supporting civil society, educating children, and improving decision-making that impacts society as a whole (Ramadan, 2015, 2019; Philippa).

Universities, as key educational institutions, significantly influence society by shaping behaviors and practices that play a crucial role in educational and administrative transformations. Hence, these institutions must adapt to changes by leveraging available resources—both human and material, such as faculty and staff (Rashid, 2019). However, this transition can lead to organizational and educational tensions and challenges in employee behaviors, requiring effective management to reflect positively on individual and collective performance (Zaidan, 2021). Furthermore, administrative bullying is a critical factor that significantly impacts the morale of faculty members. If left unaddressed or managed unfairly, it can affect their performance and job loyalty, leading to feelings of injustice (Budiyono, 2020). The covert nature of administrative bullying presents additional challenges in identifying its presence and understanding its adverse effects on institutional performance (Tambur, 2012).

The concept of bullying first emerged in the mid-1980s within Norwegian and Swedish institutions, where researchers began exploring its impact on workplace environments. In the 1990s, Leymann (1990) analyzed

[1] Department of Educational Foundations and Administration, Faculty of Educational Sciences, The Hashemite University, Zarqa, Jordan

[2] Department of Educational Administration, Ajloun national University, Ajloun, Jordan

workplace bullying, focusing on abusive behaviors directed at employees by their superiors. His findings revealed that employees subjected to humiliation, exclusion, or punitive measures experienced significant psychological effects, such as depression, anxiety, and social isolation (Al-Shafei, 2021).

In educational settings, some administrators exercise authority and bullying behaviors to intimidate or embarrass teachers, leading to the deterioration of the work environment and negatively affecting the educational process (Ahmed, 2022). In contrast, educational administrations in developed countries prioritize diagnosing educational challenges and implementing appropriate solutions rather than superficial measures that hinder educational progress (Atari & Al-Mousa, 2015).

Teaching, particularly in higher education, is among the professions most prone to burnout due to continuous interaction with students, colleagues, and administration. Burnout is defined as a state of emotional, mental, and physical exhaustion, manifested in reduced responsibility, emotional depletion, low personal accomplishment, and isolation (Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Attallah, 2021). Research indicates that burnout symptoms are more closely associated with occupational stress than with depression (Isabelle, 2000).

Narcissism is a complex psychological behavior, sometimes reaching pathological levels, characterized by self-centeredness and the pursuit of personal gains at others' expense. Narcissistic leaders exhibit charisma, yet their authoritarian and selfish behaviors can lead to the collapse of the institutions they manage (Braun, 2017). Such leadership fosters unhealthy competition, ignores employees' needs, and increases burnout levels among staff (Budiyono & Fitria, 2020).

The Link Between Administrative Bullying, Narcissistic Leadership, and Burnout

Administrative bullying, defined as the misuse of authority to achieve personal interests or impose unjust decisions, contributes to unhealthy work environments. This behavior causes anxiety and frustration among employees, reducing their adaptability to stress and weakening their job performance (Zidan, 2021). Studies reveal a positive correlation between administrative bullying, narcissistic leadership, and burnout. These negative leadership patterns amplify emotional exhaustion and stress levels among employees and faculty members (Philippa, 2015; Ahmed, 2022).

Literature Review

Al-Anzi (2021) conducted a study to assess the extent of administrative bullying among primary school principals in Kuwait from the perspective of teaching staff and its relationship to variables like gender and years of experience (Daradkeh, 2017). Using a specialized instrument for Kuwaiti teachers, the results revealed a moderate level of administrative bullying, with statistically significant differences based on years of experience, but no significant gender differences. In a similar vein, Makhamreh (2022) investigated administrative bullying in government schools in the Galilee governorate from the perspective of teachers. The study found that teachers rated administrative bullying as moderate, with statistically significant differences related to years of experience, but no significant gender differences. Awad (2022) explored the relationship between administrative bullying and self-esteem among basic school teachers in Jerusalem, discovering a medium level of administrative bullying and its impact on self-esteem levels, particularly among private school teachers. Huffman (2015) conducted a study in Ohio's public schools, applying a tool to 321 teachers, and found a very low level of administrative bullying, with a positive relationship between bullying and job satisfaction.

On the topic of burnout, Lebied (2021) examined its prevalence among university professors at the University of Algiers, finding moderate levels of burnout, with significant gender differences favoring females and no significant differences based on marital status. Hamedoğlu (2019) researched organizational narcissism in 18 secondary schools in Sakarya Province, Turkey, involving 299 teachers and administrators. The study found overall low levels of narcissism, but a positive relationship with socioeconomic status and academic performance, with private and selective schools exhibiting higher levels of organizational narcissism compared to public schools. Similarly, Al-Mahrazi (2018) investigated burnout among university

professors at Hassiba Ben Bouali University in Algeria, finding moderate levels of burnout with statistically significant differences based on academic rank, but no significant marital status differences. Barakat (2021) explored burnout symptoms among university professors during the COVID-19 pandemic, noting significant differences in burnout levels based on gender. Nassif (2017) examined the relationship between burnout and self-efficacy among university professors, uncovering a negative correlation between the two variables. Sharnoubi (2001) studied stress sources among faculty members at Al-Azhar University's Faculty of Education, revealing a positive relationship between stress and burnout.

The findings of Schyns and Schilling (2013) support the connection between toxic leadership and burnout, showing a significant link between narcissistic leadership and emotional exhaustion. This is consistent with the current study's findings, where narcissistic leadership showed a stronger contribution to burnout compared to administrative empowerment. Schyns and Schilling (2013) argue that leaders who engage in manipulative or exploitative behaviors create stress-filled environments, exacerbating burnout among employees. In contrast, Seibert et al. (2011) discussed the dual effects of empowerment on employees, suggesting that while empowerment can lead to increased responsibility and stress, it can be less impactful than narcissistic leadership, especially when not well-supported. This aligns with the current study, where administrative empowerment showed a moderate correlation with burnout, but its effect was less significant compared to narcissistic leadership. Empowerment can be positive when it fosters autonomy, but it may also increase stress if employees feel overwhelmed or lack support (Lee & Ashforth, 1996).

The work of Lee and Ashforth (1996) on the job demands-resources model is relevant here, as it suggests that empowerment, while enhancing engagement and satisfaction, can contribute to burnout when the demands of the role exceed the resources available to cope with them. In the context of the current study, administrative empowerment may have contributed to a moderate increase in burnout, as faculty members could have felt additional pressure to meet role demands without sufficient resources or support.

Commentary on Previous Studies

The reviewed studies reveal varied results on administrative bullying and burnout in educational contexts, highlighting their impact on teachers and university professors. Many studies, such as those by Al-Anzi and Makhamreh, found moderate levels of administrative bullying, with differences based on experience. Conversely, Huffman's study linked administrative bullying to job satisfaction, emphasizing the psychological outcomes of workplace dynamics.

Regarding burnout, studies like those by Lebied and Al-Mahrazi indicate moderate levels of burnout influenced by personal factors such as gender and academic rank. Nassif's findings further underscore the detrimental effects of burnout on self-efficacy, suggesting its role in diminishing individuals' self-perception and capabilities. Together, these studies underline the importance of educational and administrative environments in shaping the experiences of educators, with factors like experience and gender playing significant roles.

Study Problem

This study aims to explore the impact of administrative bullying and narcissistic leadership on burnout levels among university faculty members in Jordan. Given the increasing academic and administrative challenges faced by faculty, it is crucial to investigate how these negative administrative behaviors affect their psychological well-being and professional performance. Existing research suggests a potential link between negative leadership behaviors, such as administrative bullying and narcissistic tendencies, and the emergence of burnout symptoms. However, this issue has not been adequately studied in the Jordanian context, necessitating an investigation into how these factors influence the academic work environment.

Research Questions

The research questions included the following:

What is the level of administrative bullying in Jordanian universities from the perspective of faculty members?

What is the level of narcissistic leadership in Jordanian universities from the perspective of faculty members?

What is the level of burnout among faculty members in Jordanian universities from their perspective?

What is the relationship between burnout and administrative bullying among faculty members in Jordanian universities?

Can burnout among faculty members be predicted through administrative bullying and narcissistic leadership?

Significance of the Study

The significance of this study lies in several aspects related to faculty members in Jordanian universities. First, it highlights the level of administrative bullying, which helps in understanding the impact of negative administrative behaviors on the academic environment and university work. Second, the study focuses on the level of narcissistic leadership, which is crucial in evaluating how this leadership style affects faculty members. Third, the study emphasizes the importance of measuring the level of burnout among faculty members, reflecting the extent of psychological pressures they face in the academic work environment. Fourth, the study provides a comprehensive understanding of the relationship between burnout and administrative bullying, helping identify factors that affect the psychological health of faculty members. Finally, it addresses whether burnout can be predicted through administrative bullying and narcissistic leadership, which could assist in developing preventive strategies to improve faculty members' well-being and reduce the psychological pressures they may face.

Operational and Conceptual Definitions

The concepts of the study were defined operationally as follows:

Administrative Bullying: Administrative bullying is defined as the actions and behaviors of individuals in managerial positions who use their authority to achieve personal interests, either through making unfair decisions or exerting pressure on employees. Administrative bullying is measured through faculty members' responses to a set of statements reflecting administrative bullying behaviors by university leadership.

Narcissistic Leadership: Narcissistic leadership is defined as a leadership style characterized by self-focus and the belief in superiority over others. The narcissistic leader seeks to achieve personal interests and uses their authority to control subordinates. Narcissistic leadership is measured through faculty members' responses to questions regarding the leader's practices in interactions with employees, including behaviors related to control, imposing opinions, and rejecting criticism.

Burnout: Burnout is defined as a state of extreme fatigue and emotional and mental exhaustion resulting from continuous pressure at work, which impacts the ability to perform tasks effectively. Burnout is measured through faculty members' responses to questions about feelings of exhaustion, frustration, loss of motivation, and difficulty in dealing with academic work challenges.

Study Boundaries

The study was limited to a sample of 294 faculty members from Jordanian universities.

The study focused on examining the impact of administrative bullying and narcissistic leadership on burnout among faculty members at Jordanian universities.

The study was restricted to Jordanian universities and did not include other educational institutions outside the Kingdom.

Study Limitations

The generalization of the results of this study is limited by the psychometric properties of the study tools, as well as the validity and objectivity of the responses of the study sample members to the items of the study tools.

Methodology and Procedures

This section provides a description of the study method, including an overview of the study's methodology, population, and sample, as follows.

Study Methodology

To achieve the study's objectives, a correlational descriptive predictive approach was followed.

Study Population

The study population consisted of all faculty members at Jordanian and private universities, including (Jordan University of Science and Technology, Jadara University, Irbid National University, Al al-Bayt University, Yarmouk University), totaling 3843 faculty members, during the first and second semesters of the 2024/2025 academic year, according to statistics from the Ministry of Higher Education.

Study Sample: The study sample was selected using the convenient sampling method, and the sample size was 294 faculty members from Jordanian public universities.

Table (1). Demographic Variables of the Study Sample Members

Variable	Level/Category	Number	Percentage %
Gender	Male	190	64.6%
	Female	104	35.4%
	Total	294	100%
Faculty	Humanity	188	63.9%
	Scientific	106	36.1%
	Total	294	100%
Rank academic	Assistant Professor	126	42.9%
	Associate Professor	102	34.7%
	Professor	66	22.4%
	Total	294	100%
Years of experience	1-5	53	18.0%
	6-10	57	19.4%
	More than 10 years	184	62.6%
	Total	294	100%

The table shows the distribution of study participants by gender, academic specialization, academic rank, and years of experience. Regarding gender, there were 190 males (64.6%) and 104 females (35.4%). In terms of academic specialization, the majority of faculty members were in the humanities faculties (188), representing 63.9%, compared to 106 (36.1%) in the scientific faculties. Regarding academic rank, the majority of participants held the rank of Assistant Professor (126) at 42.9%, followed by Associate Professor (102) at 34.7%, and Professor (66) at 22.4%. As for years of experience, the majority (184) or 62.6% had over ten years of experience, while the rest were distributed between those with 1–5 years (53)

at 18.0%, and 6–10 years (57) at 19.4%. These distributions provide valuable information about the characteristics of the study sample.

Study Tool

The study tools consisted of four parts. The first part included demographic data such as gender, years of experience, academic degree, and faculty. The second part included the administrative bullying scale, the third part included the narcissistic leadership scale, and the fourth part included the burnout scale for faculty members. The psychometric properties (validity and reliability) of the scales were verified. The validity results indicated that the three scales had a high level of validity. The reliability of the tool was verified using the test-retest method, applying the scale and reapplying it after two weeks to a group outside the study sample, consisting of 30 faculty members. The Pearson correlation coefficient between their two-time evaluations was calculated. The internal consistency reliability was also calculated using Cronbach's alpha. Table (3) shows the internal consistency reliability and test-retest reliability for the scales, and these values were deemed suitable for the purposes of this study, as follows:

Table (2). Cronbach's Alpha Internal Consistency and Test-Retest Reliability for Study Scales

Scale	Test-Retest Reliability	Internal Consistency (Cronbach's Alpha)
Administrative Bullying	0.88	0.86
Narcissistic Leadership	0.89	0.89
Burnout among Faculty Members	0.92	0.91

As shown in Table (2), the Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients and test-retest reliability values for the scale areas were greater than 0.80, which are considered suitable and make the tool applicable to the original sample.

Study Variables

The study includes the following variables:

First: Independent Variables:

Administrative Bullying.

Narcissistic Leadership.

Second: Dependent Variable

Burnout.

Study Tool Scoring

To calculate the total score for the tool, five alternatives were provided for the respondent to choose from, which represent their opinion. The scores (5, 4, 3, 2, 1) were assigned to the five alternatives, with a score of (5) for "Very High," (4) for "High," (3) for "Moderate," (2) for "Low," and (1) for "Very Low." To judge the level of the mean scores for the items, domains, and the tool as a whole, the statistical criterion was applied using the following formula:

Table (3). Statistical Criterion for Determining the Level of Mean Scores

Mean Score	Rating
From 1.00 to less than 2.34	Low
From 2.34 to less than 3.67	Moderate
From 3.67 to 5.00	High

Statistical Methods and Treatments

To answer questions 1, 2, and 3, the mean scores and standard deviations were calculated.

To answer questions 4 and 5, Pearson correlation coefficients and multiple regression analysis were used

Results Presentation

First: Results Related to the First Question: What is the level of administrative bullying in Jordanian universities from the perspective of faculty members?

To answer the first question, the means and standard deviations of the level of administrative bullying were calculated, and Table (4) illustrates these results:

Table (4). Means and Standard Deviations of Administrative Bullying Level

No.	Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank	Level
12	The department head has an influence on hiring and promotion decisions.	2.59	1.265	1	Moderate
1	Department heads have a significant influence on academic decisions within the department.	2.49	1.292	2	Moderate
10	The department head uses their position to distribute resources unfairly.	2.47	1.104	3	Moderate
15	Administrative bullying by the department head hinders the development of the academic work environment.	2.42	1.141	4	Moderate
11	Administrative bullying by the department head affects the selection of research projects and grants.	2.26	0.996	5	Low
5	The department head sets academic and research priorities.	2.12	1.258	6	Low
3	Some department heads exploit their power to achieve personal interests.	2.09	1.175	7	Low
13	Administrative bullying by the department head affects the support for new members.	2.03	0.811	8	Low
14	Some department heads use their authority to strengthen their relationships with top administration.	2.03	0.945	9	Low
8	The department head prefers to support members who agree with them.	1.98	1.033	10	Low
4	The department head controls the distribution of academic tasks.	1.92	1.136	11	Low
9	Administrative bullying by the department head leads to unequal academic opportunities.	1.88	0.741	12	Low
7	Administrative bullying by the department head enhances their position and influence.	1.59	0.778	13	Low

2	The department head uses their authority only for the department's benefit.	1.48	0.638	14	Low
6	The department head imposes their administrative opinions without discussion.	1.47	0.723	15	Low
Total	Administrative Bullying	2.05	0.410		Low

The results in the table indicate that the impact of administrative bullying in Jordanian universities, from the perspective of faculty members, has a generally low mean score, with values ranging from (1.47) to (2.59). The item referring to the department head's influence on hiring and promotion decisions obtained the highest mean score (2.59), indicating that this aspect is the most apparent in administrative bullying's impact. Conversely, the item about the department head using their authority solely for the benefit of the department received the lowest mean score (1.48), suggesting that faculty members do not perceive department heads as heavily using their authority in this regard. Moreover, the standard deviation shows variation in opinions among members, as item (1), concerning the department heads' influence on academic decisions, has a relatively high standard deviation (1.292), indicating differing evaluations among members regarding the extent of this influence. Overall, the total mean score for administrative bullying was (2.05) with a relatively low standard deviation (0.410), reflecting a general consensus among faculty members in evaluating this variable, although the impact is not perceived as strong across all areas.

Second: Results Related to the Second Question: What is the level of narcissistic leadership in Jordanian universities from the perspective of faculty members?

To answer the second question, the means and standard deviations of the level of narcissistic leadership in Jordanian universities were calculated, as shown in Table (4):

Table (4). Means and Standard Deviations of the Level of Narcissistic Leadership in Jordanian Universities from the Perspective of Faculty Members

Rank	No.	Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Level
1	1	My manager reminds me of his friendship to achieve his requests.	2.68	1.242	Moderate
2	3	He exploits his position for personal gain.	2.38	1.182	Moderate
3	5	He issues orders without discussion and expects them to be followed.	2.24	1.316	Low
4	4	He rejects excuses for not completing required work.	2.24	1.186	Low
5	10	He feels distinguished among managers.	2.22	1.020	Low
6	12	He enjoys controlling and manipulating employees.	2.19	1.062	Low
7	11	He does not accept criticism from others.	2.11	0.866	Low
8	9	He punishes teachers to ensure the work runs smoothly.	2.00	0.880	Low
9	8	He uses threats and warnings to complete tasks.	1.97	1.064	Low
10	2	He applies laws to suit his personal interests.	1.89	0.893	Low
11	7	He pressures me to do the required work.	1.83	0.965	Low
12	6	He insists that I do what he wants.	1.73	0.930	Low
		Narcissistic Leadership	2.12	0.614	Low

The results of the study suggest that narcissistic leadership in Jordanian universities, as perceived by faculty members, is generally moderate to low, with some variations in different behaviors. The item "My manager reminds me of his friendship to achieve his requests" received the highest mean, which aligns with previous

research indicating that narcissistic leaders often use personal connections to advance their interests, though this behavior may not be overly pervasive. Similarly, behaviors such as "He exploits his position for personal gain" and "He issues orders without discussion" indicate the presence of narcissistic traits, particularly the desire for control and manipulation, which is consistent with studies on narcissistic leadership that emphasize a tendency toward authoritarian management styles (Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006). However, the relatively lower mean scores for behaviors like "He applies laws to suit his personal interests" and "He insists that I do what he wants" suggest that these more extreme narcissistic traits, which are typically linked to a toxic work environment, are not as common, highlighting a more nuanced presence of narcissism.

Previous studies, such as those by Grijalva et al. (2015), have noted that narcissistic leaders often exhibit a sense of superiority and entitlement, yet the behaviors in the Jordanian context suggest a somewhat restrained manifestation of these traits. The moderate to low perception of narcissistic leadership could be attributed to cultural differences or contextual factors that influence how such behaviors are expressed or tolerated within academic environments. It would be insightful to consider how these findings relate to broader organizational dynamics, as narcissistic leadership has been linked to both negative outcomes, such as burnout (Schyns & Schilling, 2013), and positive outcomes in some cases, like innovation in specific contexts. Given that the study also addresses burnout (a related concept in Hilda Faheem Khoury Anton's study), further exploration of how narcissistic leadership contributes to faculty well-being or dissatisfaction would be valuable.

Overall, the findings contribute to a growing body of research on leadership styles in academia, where the presence of narcissism is often subtle but still impacts faculty members' perceptions of their work environment. Further studies could examine the interplay between narcissistic leadership and other factors, such as institutional policies or faculty resilience, to offer deeper insights into its effects on academic performance and staff morale.

Third: Results Related to the Third Question: What is the level of burnout among faculty members in Jordanian universities from their perspective?

To answer the third question, the means and standard deviations of the level of burnout among faculty members in Jordanian universities were calculated, as shown in Table (5):

Table (5). Means and Standard Deviations of Burnout Levels Ranked by Mean Scores

Rank	No.	Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Level
1	1	I feel tired and exhausted after academic work.	2.89	1.289	Moderate
2	3	I feel constant pressure due to academic work.	2.53	1.244	Moderate
3	5	I have become more negative toward students and colleagues.	2.53	1.326	Moderate
4	10	I notice a loss of motivation and desire to accomplish academic tasks effectively.	2.35	1.097	Moderate
5	4	I feel less capable of dealing with academic challenges.	2.26	1.240	Low
6	8	I find it difficult to maintain a balance between work and personal life.	1.98	1.059	Low
7	9	I feel that I cannot provide my best academic performance.	1.92	0.771	Low
8	7	I feel that academic work negatively affects my personal life.	1.74	0.856	Low
9	6	I experience feelings of frustration and lack of appreciation from administration or students.	1.66	0.805	Low
10	2	I find it difficult to enjoy the work I once enjoyed.	1.63	0.688	Low
		Total Burnout	2.15	0.559	Low

The results indicating moderate to low levels of burnout among faculty members align with previous studies that have explored the prevalence of burnout in academic settings. The relatively higher mean score for the item "I feel tired and exhausted after academic work" (mean = 2.89) reflects a common finding in burnout research, where fatigue is one of the primary symptoms experienced by educators (Maslach & Leiter, 2016). Similar to the results in the present study, Maslach and Leiter (2016) found that teachers often report feelings of exhaustion due to excessive workload, a critical factor contributing to burnout.

The findings that faculty members feel "constant pressure due to academic work" and have become "more negative toward students and colleagues" (mean = 2.53) are consistent with the burnout model proposed by Maslach (1982), where emotional exhaustion and depersonalization are key dimensions of burnout. Emotional exhaustion leads to a sense of being overwhelmed, while depersonalization manifests in negative attitudes toward others, both of which were noted in the present study. This reflects the experience of many educators, as observed by Schaufeli et al. (2009), who linked burnout to the increasing workload and emotional demands placed on faculty members.

Conversely, the lower mean score for "I find it difficult to enjoy the work I once enjoyed" (mean = 1.63) suggests that faculty members in this study are not heavily impacted by a loss of job satisfaction, a factor that is often more pronounced in individuals experiencing severe burnout (Bakker et al., 2005). This may indicate that the overall level of burnout in the studied sample is relatively low, which is supported by the total mean score of 2.15, suggesting a moderate level of burnout in the population.

In terms of the broader literature, research by Leiter and Maslach (2004) highlights that burnout levels can fluctuate depending on various factors such as institutional support, work-life balance, and individual coping mechanisms. The relatively low level of burnout observed in this study may be attributed to factors like supportive leadership, manageable workloads, or faculty resilience. Further exploration of these factors could provide more context to understanding the lower levels of burnout in this sample.

Overall, the study's results contribute to a nuanced understanding of burnout in academic settings, reflecting both the pressures faculty members face and their capacity to maintain professional satisfaction. These findings can inform future research that explores burnout prevention strategies and the role of leadership and organizational culture in mitigating burnout in higher education institutions.

Fourth: Results of Question Four: "What is the relationship between burnout and empowerment through burnout among faculty members in Jordanian universities?"

To answer this question, Pearson correlation coefficients were extracted between burnout and empowerment through burnout among faculty members in Jordanian universities, as follows:

Table (6). Pearson Correlation between Burnout and Empowerment through Burnout among Faculty Members in Jordanian Universities

Measures	Pearson Correlation (r)	Burnout
Administrative Empowerment	Pearson Correlation (r)	0.431(**)
Statistical Significance	0.000	
Sample Size	294	
Narcissistic Leadership	Pearson Correlation (r)	0.573(**)
Statistical Significance	0.000	
Sample Size	294	

The results of the correlation analysis suggest that both administrative empowerment and narcissistic leadership contribute positively to burnout among faculty members, with narcissistic leadership having a stronger impact. The moderate positive correlation between administrative empowerment and burnout (r = 0.431, p = 0.000) reflects the complex relationship between empowerment and burnout. Previous research has shown that while administrative empowerment can provide faculty members with more autonomy and control, it can also increase stress and workload, leading to higher levels of burnout (Lee &

Ashforth, 1996). Empowerment, when not properly managed or balanced, can become a double-edged sword, where the increased responsibility and pressure to perform can negatively affect well-being (Seibert et al., 2004).

On the other hand, the stronger positive correlation between narcissistic leadership and burnout (r = 0.573, p = 0.000) suggests that narcissistic behaviors in leadership—such as self-centeredness, lack of empathy, and manipulation—are significant stressors that contribute to faculty members' exhaustion. This finding is consistent with studies indicating that narcissistic leaders tend to create toxic work environments by imposing unrealistic expectations, dismissing others' perspectives, and engaging in self-serving behaviors (Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006). Faculty members may experience increased stress and emotional exhaustion in such environments due to the constant pressure to meet the leader's demands and the lack of supportive interactions.

The findings corroborate the work of Maslach and Leiter (2016), who noted that toxic leadership behaviors, like those exhibited by narcissistic leaders, are strongly linked to burnout. Furthermore, Schyns and Schilling (2013) found that narcissistic leadership contributes to higher levels of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization in employees. Therefore, it is not surprising that narcissistic leadership has a more substantial impact on burnout compared to administrative empowerment, as the negative behavioral traits associated with narcissism, such as exploitation and lack of empathy, directly affect employees' emotional well-being.

In summary, the results of this study support the growing body of literature on the harmful effects of narcissistic leadership and the potential downsides of administrative empowerment. Both factors contribute to burnout, with narcissistic leadership being the more significant contributor. These findings emphasize the need for universities to address leadership practices and empowerment strategies to mitigate burnout and improve the overall work environment for faculty members.

Fifth: Results of Question Five: "Can burnout among faculty members be predicted through burnout and administrative empowerment?"

To answer this question, multiple regression analysis was conducted to predict burnout based on burnout and narcissistic leadership, as follows:

Table (7). Multiple Regression Analysis to Predict Burnout among Faculty Members Based on Narcissistic Leadership and Administrative Empowerment

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standardized Beta Coefficients	t Value	Significance Level	Correlation (R)	Explained Variance (R^2)
Constant	0.839		6.125	0.000	0.582(a)	0.338
Administrative Empowerment	0.170	0.124	2.050	0.041		
Narcissistic Leadership	0.452	0.496	8.176	0.000		

F Value = 74.338 Significance Level = 0.000

The results of the multiple regression analysis in Table (7) provide strong evidence for the predictive power of narcissistic leadership and administrative empowerment on burnout among faculty members. The F value of 74.338 with a significance level of 0.000 indicates that the overall regression model is statistically significant, confirming that narcissistic leadership and administrative empowerment are important predictors of burnout. This aligns with previous studies that have highlighted the significant role of leadership styles in influencing employee well-being and burnout (Maslach & Leiter, 2016; Schyns & Schilling, 2013).

The stronger impact of narcissistic leadership on burnout (Beta = 0.496) reflects findings from research that has established a robust relationship between narcissistic leadership and negative psychological outcomes, including burnout. Narcissistic leaders, characterized by self-centered behaviors and lack of empathy, can create stressful work environments that significantly contribute to employee emotional exhaustion and burnout (Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006). This result is consistent with Schyns and Schilling's (2013) meta-analysis, which found that narcissistic leadership is strongly associated with increased emotional exhaustion, a core component of burnout. The beta coefficient suggests that narcissistic leadership is a critical factor in the burnout phenomenon among faculty members, highlighting the importance of addressing leadership styles in reducing burnout.

On the other hand, administrative empowerment (Beta = 0.124) had a less significant impact on burnout, which aligns with studies suggesting that while empowerment can have both positive and negative effects, its influence on burnout is generally weaker compared to leadership behaviors (Seibert et al., 2011). While empowerment can lead to increased autonomy and job satisfaction, it can also contribute to stress if it results in higher expectations or greater responsibility without adequate support (Lee & Ashforth, 1996). The relatively low beta for administrative empowerment suggests that, in this case, it does not play as substantial a role in burnout as narcissistic leadership does.

The correlation coefficient (R = 0.582) reflects a moderate relationship between the three variables, indicating that while narcissistic leadership and administrative empowerment are related to burnout, other factors may also contribute to explaining burnout levels. The model explains approximately 33.8% of the variance in burnout, indicating that while narcissistic leadership and administrative empowerment are important predictors, additional variables, such as work environment, workload, and individual coping mechanisms, may also play a significant role in faculty burnout.

In summary, the regression analysis underscores the significant impact of narcissistic leadership on burnout among faculty members, while administrative empowerment appears to have a more limited effect. These findings suggest that addressing leadership styles, particularly narcissistic behaviors, could be an effective strategy for reducing burnout in academic environments.

Table (7) illustrates the multiple regression analysis for predicting burnout among faculty members based on narcissistic leadership and administrative empowerment. The results show that narcissistic leadership (Beta = 0.496) has a strong positive effect on burnout, meaning that narcissistic leadership styles significantly contribute to increasing burnout levels. In contrast, the impact of administrative empowerment (Beta = 0.124) was less significant, indicating that it plays a lesser role in explaining burnout compared to narcissistic leadership. The correlation coefficient (R = 0.582) indicates a moderate relationship between the three variables, and the model explains approximately 33.8% of the variance in burnout among faculty members. Finally, the F value (74.338) with a significance level of (0.000) confirms that the regression model as a whole is statistically significant, supporting that narcissistic leadership and administrative empowerment can reliably predict burnout among faculty members.

Ethical Considerations

In conducting this study on the predictive ability of administrative empowerment and narcissistic leadership on burnout among faculty members in Jordanian universities, several ethical considerations were taken into account. First, the participants' informed consent was obtained prior to their involvement, ensuring that they were fully aware of the study's objectives, methods, and potential risks. Confidentiality was maintained by anonymizing all data and ensuring that personal identifiers were not linked to responses. The participants were assured that their participation was voluntary and that they could withdraw from the study at any point without any consequences. Furthermore, the research was conducted in accordance with ethical guidelines for academic research, prioritizing the well-being and privacy of the participants. The findings were reported honestly and without bias, ensuring that the study's results would contribute to the academic community in a responsible manner.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the study highlights the significant predictive roles of administrative empowerment and narcissistic leadership in contributing to burnout among faculty members in Jordanian universities. The findings reveal that both factors are positively correlated with burnout, with narcissistic leadership having a stronger impact. These results underscore the importance of addressing leadership styles and administrative practices in academic environments to reduce burnout and improve faculty well-being. Further research is recommended to explore interventions and strategies that can mitigate the negative effects of these factors on faculty health and performance.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Recommendations

Based on the results of the study, the researcher recommends the following:

Universities should work to reduce the negative impact of narcissistic leadership by training department heads on humanistic leadership styles based on mutual understanding and respect, which contributes to reducing burnout levels among faculty members.

It is necessary to promote a culture of participative leadership in universities, including involving faculty members in academic and administrative decision-making, which reduces the impact of administrative empowerment on employee well-being.

Develop ongoing psychological support programs: Universities should offer continuous psychological support to faculty members to help them cope with academic and administrative pressures and reduce burnout levels resulting from narcissistic leadership and administrative empowerment pressures.

Reevaluate administrative policies within universities to ensure fairness in task and resource distribution and promotions, ensuring that administrative empowerment is not exploited for personal gain.

Encourage a collaborative work environment among faculty members to enhance relationships between colleagues and reduce negativity and isolation, which may contribute to increased burnout.

Conduct regular evaluations of leadership and administrative empowerment levels in universities using scientific measurement tools to monitor their impact on faculty health and provide early solutions to mitigate negative effects.

References

Aawar, T. (2023). Administrative empowerment among school principals in Jerusalem and its relation to organizational silence and teachers' job performance from the teachers' perspective (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Arab American University, Palestine.

Ahmed, G. (2022). Organizational silence and its effect on job attitudes: An empirical study on employees at Zagazig University. Scientific Journal of Financial and Administrative Studies, 29, 180-195.

Akdemir, B., Kırmızıgül, B. & Zengin, Y. (2016). Örgütsel sinizm ile iş performansı arasındaki ilişki ve bir araştırma. [The relationship between organization cynicsm and job performance: a research]. Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences Journal, 6(2), 115-130.

Al-Anzi, T. M. (2021). Degree of administrative empowerment among primary school principals in Kuwait. International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 19, 192-207. Kuwait.

Al-Fattah, W. A. (2019). Burnout among faculty members in the colleges of Wadi Al-Dawaser governorate and its relationship with psychological empowerment and several demographic variables. Master's thesis, Prince Sultan Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia.

Al-Shafie, H. (2021). Administrative bullying among middle school principals in the Negev area from the perspective of teachers. Jordanian Educational Journal, 6(3), 2220-2422.

Al-Sharnoubi, N. S. (2001). Sources of stress among a sample of university faculty members and their relationship to burnout and some demographic variables. Journal of Education, Al-Azhar University, 97, 305-269.

Atallah, A. (2021). Burnout among teachers in schools.

Attari, A., & Mousa, R. (2015). The role of school management in addressing the phenomenon of administrative bullying in public schools under the Jerash Directorate of Education from the perspective of school principals and teachers. Islamic University Journal of Educational and Psychological Studies, 1, 90-2369.

Awar, T. (2023). Administrative bullying among school principals in Jerusalem and its relationship with organizational silence and job performance from the perspective of the teachers themselves. Published PhD dissertation, Arab American University, Palestine.

Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Verbeke, W. (2005). Using the job demands-resources model to predict burnout and performance. Human Resource Management, 44(2), 99-113. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20061

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.

Budiyono, L. B., & Fitria, H. (2020). The influence of principal supervision and organizational climate toward teacher's performance. Electronic Research Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 2(2), 172-187.

Daradkeh, A. (2017). Administrative empowerment and its relationship with organizational excellence among the academic leaders of Ta'if University from the perspective of the faculty members. Al-Najah University Journal for Research and Humanities, An-Najah University, 31(8), 1251–1296

Grijalva, E., Newman, D. A., & Hinkin, T. R. (2015). Narcissism and leadership: A meta-analytic review of the literature. The Leadership Quarterly, 26(1), 127-146. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2014.10.004

Isabel, A. (2000). Workplace burnout and stress management. New York: Springer Publishing

Kalağan, G. & Aksu, M. B. (2010). Organizational cynicism of the research assistants: A case of Akdeniz University. Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 2, 4820-4825.

Labied, T. (2021). Level of burnout among university professors. Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 8(12), 135-155.

Lee, R. T., & Ashforth, B. E. (1996). A meta-analytic examination of the correlates of the three dimensions of job burnout. Journal of Applied Psychology, 81(2), 123-133. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.81.2.123

Leiter, M. P., & Maslach, C. (2004). Burnout and engagement: A new perspective. In P. L. Perrewé & D. C. Ganster (Eds.), Exploring theoretical mechanisms and perspectives (pp. 83-111). Elsevier.

Mahrazi, M. (2018). Burnout among university professors. Researcher in Humanities and Social Sciences Journal, 3, 783-792.

Makhmara, I. (2022). The reality of administrative empowerment among principals of public schools in the Galilee region. Academic Journal for Research and Scientific Publishing, 40, 193-220.

Maslach, C. (1982). Burnout: The cost of caring. Malor Books.

Maslach, C., & Jackson, M. (1981). The Maslach Burnout Inventory*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. Journal of Occupational Behavior, 2(2), 99-113.

Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2016). Burnout inventory manual (3rd ed.). Consulting Psychologists Press.

Nasif, E. (2017). Burnout and its relationship to self-efficacy expectations among university professors. Wasit University, College of Arts, 24(31), 189-211.

Philippa, Sheail. (2015). "Time – Shifting in the digital university: temporality and online distance education". PhD, University of Edinburgh.

Ramadan, M. S. (2019). A comparative study of some foreign and Arab digital universities and their potential benefits in the Arab Republic of Egypt. Journal of the Faculty of Education (Ain Shams University, Issue 43, Part 4).

Rashid, H., & Zidan, A. (2022). The 26th International Scientific Conference, Digital Media and Executive Media: Pathways to Integration and Competition.

Rosenthal, S. A., & Pittinsky, T. L. (2006). Narcissistic leadership. The Leadership Quarterly, 17(6), 617-633. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.004

Rosenthal, S. A., & Pittinsky, T. L. (2006). Narcissistic leadership. The Leadership Quarterly, 17(6), 617-633. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.004

Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., & Maslach, C. (2009). Burnout: 35 years of research and practice. Career Development International, 14(3), 204-220. https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430910966406

Schyns, B., & Schilling, J. (2013). How bad are the effects of bad leaders? A meta-analysis of the impact of bad leadership on followers' outcomes. The Leadership Quarterly, 24(1), 138-158. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.09.002

Seibert, S. E., Wang, G., & Courtright, S. H. (2011). Antecedents and consequences of psychological and team empowerment in organizations: A meta-analytic review. Journal of Applied Psychology, 96(5), 981-1003. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022676

Shamkhi, H. (2021). Narcissistic administrative leadership, retrieved from source on 18/12/2024: https://business.uokerbala.edu.iq

Tambur, Merle, Vadi, Maaja. (2012). "Workplace bullying and organizational culture in a post-transitional country." International Journal of Manpower, Vol. 33 No. 7, pp. 754-768.

Zidan, A. (2021). The impact of narcissistic leadership on organizational performance in higher education institutions. Journal of Higher Education Studies, 11(3), 45-59.