BI

Handelshøyskolen BI

GRA 19703 Master Thesis

Thesis Master of Science 100% - W

Predefinert informasjon

Startdato:	16-01-2022 09:00	**Termin:**	202210
Sluttdato:	01-07-2022 12:00	**Vurderingsform:**	Norsk 6-trinns skala (A-F)
Eksamensform:	T		
Flowkode:	202210||10936||IN00||W||T		
Intern sensor:	(Anonymisert)		

Deltaker

Navn:	Camilla Øisang Aulie og Fredrik Adam Berget

Informasjon fra deltaker

Tittel *:	Developing a Scale Measuring Emotion Validation and Invalidation
Navn på veileder *:	Per-Magnus Thompson

Inneholder besvarelsen konfidensielt materiale?:	Nei	**Kan besvarelsen offentliggjøres?:**	Ja

---

Gruppe

Gruppenaun:	(Anonymisert)
Gruppenummer:	64
Andre medlemmer i gruppen:	

Master Thesis

- Developing a Scale Measuring Emotion Validation and Invalidation -

Hand-in Date:
01.07.2022

Campus:
BI Norwegian Business School, Oslo

Examination Code and Name:
GRA19703 – Master Thesis

Programme:
Master of Science in Leadership and Organizational Psychology

Acknowledgment

This thesis represents the end of our time as students, studying Master of Science in Leadership and Organizational Psychology, at BI Norwegian Business School. Despite most of our time as master's students being influenced by the pandemic, we are left with good memories, academic knowledge, and practical skills relevant for future working contexts. Similarly, writing our master thesis has been a rewarding experience, although it has been challenging at times. We would thus like to thank each other for the great teamwork and support throughout this project

We would like to express our gratitude to our supervisor, Per-Magnus Thompson. We thank you for taking the time to help us overcome various obstacles we have faced along the way, for your patience, and for including us in an extensive and interesting study. We would also like to show our gratitude to Jon Magnus Frostad Haakonsen, who has served as an assistant supervisor. Thank you for all the interesting discussions about theoretical and practical matters, your eagerness to help, and for providing us with insights and answers to all types of questions. You have both contributed to our master thesis with your academic and practical knowledge, dedication, support, and enthusiasm. We therefore thank you for including us in such an exciting research project, for giving us valuable feedback, and guiding us throughout this period. Simultaneously, we are grateful for the participation of the 30 MBA students in our qualitative study and for the respondents in the quantitative study. We are also thankful for the help provided by experts and Ph.D. candidates.

Ultimately, we would like to express our appreciation and gratitude for all the support from our families, friends, and fellow students. Thank you for your support, time, and patience in a time which has been challenging but pleasant.

Camilla Øisang Aulie   Fredrik Adam Berget

Oslo, 29.06.2022

Abstract

How leaders attempt to manage employees' emotions serves as a prominent topic within the fields of leadership and emotions. Emotion validation and invalidation refer to various ways leaders respond to employees' emotions. Based on a lack of research and literature on how leaders manage employees' emotions, researchers and scholars often refer to these concepts as promising topics of investigation. To contribute to the literature and research regarding how leaders manage employees' emotions, we attempt to develop a valid scale measuring emotion validation and invalidation. Three studies were included in the scale development process. The first study involved a qualitative investigation of 30 MBA students' experiences with emotion validation and invalidation. This study resulted in categories and a pool of items, which were further reviewed by experts in our second study. The expert review resulted in 44 items, which were included in a quantitative study. By performing principal component analyses and conducting post-analyses assessing for validity and unidimensionality, the pool of items was reduced to 10 items. The scale of 10 items contributes to theory and research about emotion validation and invalidation, which thus reflect different ways leaders attempt to manage employees' emotions.

Table of Contents

1.0 Introduction

Empirical studies focusing on the impact and importance of emotions in leadership have traditionally emphasized how leaders' expression of positive and negative emotions affect followers and, thus, several organizational outcomes (Little et al., 2016). However, within the field of leadership and organizational behavior, followers' expression of emotions and how leaders respond to followers' emotions serve as a growing interest among researchers (Little et al., 2016). *Emotions* are often conceptualized as "multicomponent response tendencies that unfold over relatively short times" (Fredrickson, 2001, p. 218). These response tendencies are short-lived, positive, or negative, affective reactions to stimuli (Fredrickson, 2001; Kemeny & Shestyuk, 2008).

Emotions can be divided into positive (e.g., joy and interest) and negative emotions (e.g., anger, fear, and disgust) (Fredrickson, 2013; Lin et al., 2016). The experience of negative emotions at work is commonly associated with an immediate reduction in an individual's cognitive capacity. In contrast, a reduction in an individual's commitment, involvement, and work engagement might serve as long-term consequences based on repeated experiences of negative emotions at the workplace (Reschly et al., 2008). On the other hand, a leader facilitating a positive emotional climate at work is, according to Yan et al. (2021), likely to promote positive affect in followers, which in turn can contribute to an increase in followers' work performance. Fredrickson (2004) advocates for this perspective by highlighting how positive emotions can broaden individuals' though-action repertoire, such as increased attention and persistence, in different situations, and how these emotions can contribute to one's personal resources being increased (Bissing-Olson et al., 2013; Estrada et al., 1997). The latter involves an individual's social, psychological, and cognitive resources, which are often considered to positively influence an individual's motivation, well-being, problem-solving, and the establishment and maintenance of interpersonal relationships (Fredrickson 2013; Lin et al., 2016).

Employees' experiencing negative emotions at the workplace can be seen as unavoidable (Pearson, 2017). Negative emotions among employees can arise due to interpersonal conflicts among employees, the perception of having high work demands, an uncertain future, inadequate working conditions, and if the implicit work contract between managers and employees is breached (Kiefer, 2005; Pearson, 2017). Smollan and Parry (2011) state that leaders' helpful responses

might assist followers in coping with stressful situations, hence followers' emotional reactions to the situations. This refers to a leader's role in managing employees' emotions, and a leader attempting to manage his or her employees' emotions engages in what is known as *emotion regulation* (Gross, 2002; Little et al., 2016). The latter involves conscious behaviors demonstrated by an intention of changing how oneself or others think, feel, or behave and to steer the emotions towards what is perceived as constructive, desirable, or appropriate (Gross, 2002). One way a leader might regulate employees' emotions is by acknowledging their emotions by communicating that the emotions being shared are appropriate and acceptable. Empirical findings indicate that a leader's acknowledgment of employees' shared emotions can make employees better equipped to cope with demanding experiences and hence regulate their emotions more effectively (Piccolo et al., 2012; Rafferty & Griffin, 2010).

Zielinski and Veilleux (2018) argue that some ways leaders attempt to manage employees' emotions involve the leader responding by criticizing or ignoring the emotions being shared. This can result in the followers feeling misunderstood, frustrated, or rejected, which in turn might result in the employees experiencing increased discomfort and decreased ability to regulate their emotions (Holt & Marques, 2012; Witkowski, 2017). When leaders react to followers' shared emotions by criticizing or ignoring their emotional experiences, they respond to their emotional reactions with emotionally invalidating responses which have previously been the subject of efforts in generating a scale measuring emotion invalidation (Zielinski & Veilleux, 2018). While emotion validation can be defined as "the process of communicating to an individual that their internal experiences make sense and are understood" (Benitez et al., 2020, p. 2), emotion invalidation typically involves an individual ignoring, rejecting, or attempting to change how someone feels, hence indicating that their shared emotions are undesirable, unacceptable, or inappropriate (Shenk & Fruzetti, 2011; Zielinski & Veilleux, 2018). Both concepts will be emphasized and discussed in this paper.

1.1 Purpose of the Study and Thesis Outline

This thesis aims to generate a validated scale for emotion validation and invalidation. Firstly, our study contributes to the literature and research regarding how leaders manage employees' emotions at the workplace. In general, there is a lack of literature and research on how leaders engage in emotion management at

the workplace and, mainly, their efforts in regulating employees' emotions (Bono et al., 2007; Little et al., 2016). Therefore, our research primarily serves as a theoretical contribution to the field of leadership and organizational behavior. It contributes with relevant insights into how leaders attempt to manage, monitor, and influence employees' emotions. Specifically, there seems to be a gap in the transformational leadership and emotional intelligence literature and research on how leaders attempt to manage and hence influence followers' emotions (Nozaki & Mikolajczak, 2020). Our efforts in developing a scale measuring emotion validation and invalidation can thus contribute with insights relevant to this matter.

Secondly, another study objective is to contribute to literature and research regarding emotion validation and invalidation, commonly considered understudied subjects (Witkowski, 2017). Emotion validation and invalidation, as narrow constructs, involve specific actions an individual can perform to demonstrate concern and care for another individual. The constructs thus involve actions related to the provision of support, and more insights on these phenomena can therefore contribute to the literature and research regarding supportive leadership (Rafferty & Griffin, 2010; Witkowski, 2017).

Thirdly, we argue that there is a lack of a valid scale measuring both emotion validation and invalidation, which can be utilized in a business context, and developing a valid scale measuring these two constructs thus serves as our third study objective. The development of such a scale can be seen as a practical contribution as the development of scales enables latent constructs to be measured directly (Boateng et al., 2018). Additionally, as there is a lack of emphasis and attempts in previous research in developing a scale measuring both emotion validation and invalidation (Zielinski & Veilleux, 2018), our attempt to develop such a scale can encourage other researchers and scholars to investigate the phenomena further.

In alignment with the purpose of the study, three studies have been conducted. Particularly, several of the practices considered *Best Practices* when developing a scale have been followed, which is illustrated and described in 'Methodology' (Boateng et al., 2018; Zielinski & Veilleux, 2018). The first study conducted was a qualitative study. We conducted focus group interviews with executive MBA students to generate relevant themes related to emotion validation and invalidation. This study resulted in the development of items reflecting the themes, which were further reviewed and assessed by experts within the field,

which thus constitutes our second study. In the third study, an Explanatory Factor Analysis of the findings resulting from a survey study involving 522 respondents was conducted to develop a valid scale. The analysis and hence the research findings led to the initial extraction of three components mainly related to emotion invalidation and the inclusion of 31 items in our initial pool of items. The findings from the initial analysis indicated the potential for the scale to be unidimensional, and a single-factor analysis was conducted. This resulted in a valid scale of 10 items reflecting nuances of emotion validation and invalidation. The components and related items considered relevant based on the analyses are discussed in 'Discussion,' highlighting the importance of the specific components and items by connecting these to theory relevant to our research purpose and hence to how leaders manage employees' emotions. Finally, strengths, limitations, directions for future research, and practical implications are discussed.

2.0 Literature Review

2.1 How Leaders Influence and Manage Followers' Emotions

2.1.1 Leadership and Emotions

Leadership can be defined as "a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal" (Northouse, 2019, p. 43). As this definition implies, leadership can be seen as involving both the leader and his or her followers. Furthermore, the term influence is emphasized in the definition, and it refers to the leader's impact on followers. However, leadership can be seen as an interactive event, which indicates that the leader must both be given and acquire influence from his or her followers (Kellerman, 2007; Northouse, 2019). Hence, how much influence followers give the leader is arguably based on how followers respond to how the leader behaves and interact with them. One might therefore argue that a leader who provides followers with support and acceptance is, to a certain extent, likely to be given support from followers in return (Kock et al., 2019; Northouse, 2019).

Yusof et al. (2014) argue that effective leaders typically possess the capability to understand followers' emotions. In turn, if followers feel that their shared emotions are understood and appropriate based on what their leader expresses, their trust and confidence in their leader are likely to increase. Emotions can thus be seen as an essential matter regarding leadership as the intelligent use of emotions is likely to result in a leader gaining influence from followers thus being considered effective in his or her way of leading subordinates (Yusof et al., 2014).

Fredrickson (2001) refers to emotions as involving response tendencies, and more specifically, such subjective responses serve as affective reactions, or individual assessments, to stimuli (Fredrickson, 2001; Kemeny & Shestyuk, 2008). These affective reactions can be considered as being somewhat short-lived, often not lasting for more than some seconds or minutes (Kemeny & Shestyuk, 2008). Moreover, these reactions can be positive or negative and involve behavioral, physiological, cognitive, and affective processes (Shariff & Tracy, 2011). If an individual reacts positively to an event, hence perceiving something as being positive, one might argue that the individual is experiencing positive emotions (e.g., joy or interest) (Fredrickson, 2013; Lin et al., 2016). On the other hand, if an individual experiences something as negative and potentially threatening, negative emotions can arise (e.g., anger, fear, or disgust) (Fredrickson, 2013). Further,

previous literature and research on emotions have frequently highlighted how negative emotions can constrain an individual's learning and information processing in general (Reschly et al., 2008; Vacharkulksemsuk et al., 2010). For example, a qualitative study involving students from an Australian university, which explored the relationship between negative emotions (e.g., anxiety and anger) and learning, generated results indicating negative emotions as likely to impair the students' learning ability and working memory (Rowe & Fitness, 2018). As this implies, negative emotions can potentially reduce an individual's capability to process information (Reschly et al., 2008).

2.1.2 Leaders Attempt in Managing Employees' Emotions

Steering employees toward positive emotions often serves as a perceived norm among executives (Pearson, 2017). However, research indicates that ignoring or disclaiming negative emotions at the workplace is a short-term solution that can be extremely costly for organizations in the long term. As previously mentioned, employees experiencing negative emotions at work or outside work can be considered unavoidable, and leaders refusing to deal with employees' negative emotional reactions can result in a reduction in productivity, engagement, effectiveness, effort, and cooperation among employees (Pearson, 2017). The results from an American study from 2012, which involved 137 leaders that were enrolled in an executive MBA program, indicate that employees' negative emotions have the potential to contribute to a decrease in their effort, performance, and commitment to the organization (Pearson, 2017; Porath & Pearson, 2012). Because of the negative outcomes commonly associated with negative emotions at the workplace, many leaders feel the need to solve employees' problems instead of listening and offering support (Pearson, 2017). Nonetheless, Pearson (2017) advocates for the relevance of leaders providing employees with opportunities to voice their concerns, acknowledging their emotions, and for the leader to focus on understanding the problem instead of trying to fix it. These actions can be considered as preventive actions and might hence maintain or increase the degree of employee satisfaction, engagement, and effectiveness within the organization (Pearson, 2017).

2.1.3 Emotion Regulation

Leaders attempting to manage followers' emotions by either engaging in problem-solving or focusing on acknowledging their internal experiences engage

in what is commonly known as emotion regulation (Gross, 2002). Gross (2015) defines the latter construct as "the activation of a goal to influence the emotion trajectory" (p. 5). As the definition implies, one might try to engage in ways of thinking, feeling, and acting to influence which emotions that are being experienced, how they are being expressed, and when they are experienced and expressed (Gross, 2002). Both positive and negative emotions can be either down-regulated or up-regulated. An emotion can be down-regulated by someone else, such as a leader telling a nervous employee to calm down before meeting a demanding client, or up-regulated by the individual experiencing the emotion, such as an employee trying to look more interested in a conversation than what she truly is with a potential client (Gross, 2002; Nozaki & Mikolajczak, 2020). Further, and as the two examples indicate, emotions can be regulated intrinsically (i.e., regulating one's own emotions) or extrinsically (i.e., regulating another individual's emotions) (McRae & Gross, 2020). According to Nozaki and Mikolajczak (2020), intrinsic emotion regulation has been investigated the most within the field of emotion regulation. However, they imply that there is a lack of research on extrinsic emotion regulation and hence how leaders manage employees' emotions, although they argue that extrinsic emotion regulation is an increasingly popular topic of investigation (Nozaki & Mikolajczak, 2020).

Leaders engaging in interpersonal emotion management, hence referring to extrinsic emotion regulation, are typically expected to intervene effectively when employees experience strong negative emotions. This is to prevent the emotions of disrupting organizational efficiency and thus prevent the organization from reaching desired outcomes (Nozaki & Mikolajczak, 2020; Thiel et al., 2015). A leader might perceive a discrepancy between which emotions employees express and which emotions are considered appropriate to a given situation or desirable in general. Consequently, the leader might perceive the need or that there is an opportunity to regulate the employees' emotions (Kock et al., 2019). A leader can place emotional demands on an employee, hence aiming at managing his or her emotions to reach desired outcomes, by requesting the employee to decrease the behavioral expression, suppress the emotions being experienced, or think differently about a given situation (Gross, 2002; Thiel et al., 2015). In turn, the leader signals to the employee that the shared emotions are undesirable, inappropriate, or unacceptable in terms of organizational efficiency (Nozaki & Mikolajczak, 2020; Thiel et al., 2015).

Nozaki and Mikolajczak (2020) suggest that there are some pitfalls associated with extrinsic emotion regulation. One potential pitfall is an individual's inaccurate perception of another individual's emotions, which might result in the individual experiencing the particular emotion feeling misunderstood if the other person attempts to regulate how the emotion is expressed and experienced. In addition to an unsuccessful attempt to identify someone's emotions, Rubin et al. (2005) propose managerial derailment as a potential outcome if a leader is perceived as insensitive by employees based on his or her inability to understand their perspectives. To avoid being perceived as insensitive by employees, Little et al. (2016) advocate for the relevancy of leaders engaging in leader behaviors such as demonstrating concern, acknowledging emotions, and recognizing the employees' work efforts. A leader expressing understanding and acceptance for employees' emotions, and hence not engaging in actions implying the leader evaluating employees' internal experiences, can potentially result in employees feeling understood, appreciated, and secure (Kock et al., 2019; McRae & Gross, 2020). In turn, this type of emotion regulation can contribute to soothing employees' emotions, increasing their optimism and excitement, and reducing the impact of the emotional demands they might experience (Grandey, 2008; Thiel et al., 2015).

A leader directly or indirectly communicating display rules, referring to whether or not particular emotions should be expressed or how to appropriately express one's emotions to his or her employees, risks placing emotional demands on employees (Thiel et al., 2015). Placing emotional demands on employees thus serves as another pitfall in leaders' attempt to manage employees' emotions. The emotional demands might involve the leader attempting to down-regulate employees' emotions, such as requesting employees to decrease their emotional experience and thereby suppress the emotions being experienced (Thiel et al., 2015). Followers may feel the need to suppress their inner feelings to not engage in behaviors deviating from the perceived norm or organizational policies. Although behavioral expression decreases, the emotional experience is likely to remain consistent (Gross, 2002; Thiel et al., 2015). Research on the effectiveness of suppression as an emotion regulation strategy has generated mixed results (Gross, 2002; McRae & Gross, 2020; Nozaki & Mikolajczak, 2020). Nevertheless, Thiel and colleagues' (2015) quantitative study garnered results indicating emotional demands, as a result of emotional display results, as contributing to employee burnout and reduced employee well-being. This implies that leaders' attempts to

regulate employees' emotions can result in unintended and unwanted outcomes, which indicates that the potential pitfalls of regulating and hence managing employees' emotions should be a managerial concern and be taken seriously (Thiel et al., 2015).

2.2 Different Theoretical Perspectives on How Leaders Manage Employees' Emotions

How leaders influence and manage followers' emotions has become an increasingly popular topic within the field of leadership and organizational behavior (Nozak & Mikolajczak, 2020; Shenk & Fruzzetti, 2011). This topic has however been highlighted, illustrated, and investigated by researchers and scholars using different theoretical perspectives to understand the phenomena. Therefore, two of the most popular theories, which include different approaches to describing how managers influence and manage employees' emotions, will be emphasized and briefly discussed in the following section.

2.2.1 Transformational Leadership and individualized consideration

Transformational leaders typically engage in behaviors signaling to both the organization and the environment that followers are highly valued and thus important contributors to the organization's success (Chebon et al., 2019). One of the defining features of transformational leadership is the relationship between the leader and the employee, which in turn increases employees' morality and motivation (Thomson et al., 2016). Furthermore, leaders engaging in actions resembling their concern, respect, and appreciation for followers can be considered as demonstrating relationship-oriented behaviors toward employees (Bass, 1990; Fleishman, 1953). This notion is central to the dimension of *consideration*, which is a dimension of leadership involving relationship-oriented leadership behaviors (Stogdill, 1950). Additionally, the Ohio State Leadership studies in the 1940s, which are some of the works that resulted in the emergence of transformational leadership, resulted in findings indicating the relevance of a leader engaging in relationship-oriented behaviors to be considered effective (Bass, 1990; Fleishman, 1953). Similarly, transformational leaders typically attempt to motivate and actively engage with followers to establish relationships going beyond what is considered transactional (Rubin et a., 2005). This often includes the leader paying attention to followers' needs and providing them with support and developmental opportunities (Avolio & Bass, 1995; Ogola, 2017). Consequently, change is promoted by the

leader engaging in actions likely to influence followers' emotions (Rubin et al., 2005).

A quantitative study investigating the relationship between effective leadership and interpersonal skills generated empirical findings indicating that individualized consideration, as a component of transformational leadership, is closely related to the skill of monitoring and managing one's own and others' emotions, which have previously been referred to as intrinsic and extrinsic emotion regulation (McRae & Gross, 2020; Palmer et al., 2001). In this study, the leaders who rated themselves as concerned about followers' achievement and developmental needs, which are fundamental notions related to individualized consideration, also rated themselves as more likely to manage their own and their followers' emotions (Palmer et al., 2001). Further, individualized consideration is often considered as the component of transformational leadership focusing on each follower's needs, capabilities, and interests (Avolio & Bass, 1995). This can involve the leader attempting to identify the needs of followers by engaging in two-way communication with followers, and hence using this insight to provide followers with support, encouragement, and work-related developmental opportunities (Avolio & Bass, 1995; Ogola, 2017).

Bass and Riggio (2006) define individualized consideration as a component of transformational leadership involving the leader paying "attention to each follower's needs for achievement and growth by acting as a coach or mentor" (p. 7). Moreover, Cetin and Kinik (2015) argue that transformational leaders are leaders focusing on the needs and potential of each employee, and that the actions resulting from such a focus might contribute to establishing a supportive climate within the organization. These efforts are typically directed toward the purpose of emotionally engaging followers to perform beyond expectations, which can be considered as related to a leader's focus on monitoring and managing employees' emotions (Megerian & Sosik, 1996). Transformational leaders can thus be seen as leaders treating followers as essential contributors to the organization's success, and the behaviors of supporting and developing employees can be seen as fundamental transformational leadership behaviors (Chebon et al., 2019). Transformational leaders can hence be seen as leaders looking beyond themselves and who typically engage in actions contributing to followers' emotional needs being met (Bass, 1990).

Transformational leadership is often referred to as a leadership style involving a leader creating enthusiasm between employees, motivating employees to share their perspectives and emotions, creating a collective vision, and making the company's objectives clear and known to the employees (Yusof et al., 2014). This widely researched leadership style involves a leader influencing his or her followers through certain behavioral dimensions (Zacher et al., 2014).

Individualized consideration, inspirational motivation, idealized influence, and intellectual stimulation are often referred to as the four components, or behavioral dimensions, which the transformational leadership style encompasses (Zacher et al., 2014). Avolio and Bass (1995) claim that empirical findings from research on transformational leadership typically indicate that the four components of transformational leadership are closely related. This might imply that a leader demonstrating individual consideration towards his or her followers is also somewhat likely to demonstrate behaviors congruent to the three other components. Furthermore, Avolio and Bass (1995) elaborate and illustrate the relationships between the components by highlighting the relationship between individual consideration and inspirational motivation. Zacher et al. (2014) argue that the behavioral dimension *inspirational motivation* can be demonstrated by the leader if he or she communicates an inspiring and motivating vision for the organization. Further, Avolio and Bass (1995) argue that a message expressed by a leader might evoke positive feelings, such as being inspired or interest, among some followers, but that the same message might be interpreted as trivial or as something negative by other followers. However, a leader focusing on followers' characteristics when conveying a message is, according to Avolio and Bass, more likely to inspire more followers (Avolio & Bass, 1995). A leader can demonstrate individual consideration, by focusing on individual characteristics, expressing concern for followers´ needs, and crafting and adjusting the message to what the followers communicate and express (Avolio & Bass, 1995). Consequently, a leader can thus demonstrate individual consideration to be able to inspire followers. As this illustration implies, the behavioral dimensions of transformational leadership can be seen as interconnected (Khan et al., 2020).

2.2.2 Emotional Intelligence, Empathy & Interactive Empathy

2.2.2.1 Emotional Intelligence

Emotional intelligence can be defined as "the capacity for recognizing our own feelings and those of others, for motivating ourselves, and for managing emotions well in ourselves and in our relationships" (Goleman, 1998, p. 317). The construct can thus be seen as involving a person's ability to understand, recognize, and to appropriately express emotions congruent to a given situation (Gooty et al., 2010). This indicates the relevance of a leader demonstrating emotional regulation, which can involve the leader attempting to regulate his or her own emotional reactions, such as if, when or how one wants to express his or her emotions, or to monitor or manage the emotions of others, hence referring to extrinsic emotion regulation (Gooty et al., 2010; McRae & Gross, 2020). To manage and thus regulate followers' emotions, a leader needs to accurately recognize the emotions followers express. Based on what is being verbally and non-verbally expressed by followers in a certain situation, the leader must decode the message and interpret what is being communicated (Rubin et al., 2005). Furthermore, Edelman and van Knippenberg (2018) argue that an individual with high emotional intelligence is likely to construct and convey appropriate responses to others. The response is likely to be appropriate based on the individual's ability to accurately assess what is being communicated, which stems from his or her ability to recognize, understand and manage another individual's emotions (Edelman & van Knippenberg, 2018). Moreover, individuals with high emotional intelligence are sensitive to the emotions others express, which enables emotionally intelligent individuals to infer appropriately and hence manage their own and others' emotions. Consequently, they often employ the most appropriate emotion regulation strategy in a given context (Nozaki & Mikolajczak, 2020).

Self-awareness, social skills, and relationship management are often seen as skills and actions associated with effective leadership (Rahman et al., 2012). Additionally, Rahman et al. (2012) suggest these skills as positively related to emotional intelligence based on the notion of emotionally intelligent leaders as able to recognize and manage their own and followers' emotions. As a result of such leaders' interpersonal skills, they are often able to inspire and build strong relationships with employees. Inspiring and building strong relationships with

employees is also often referred to as essential for a leader to be perceived as effective by followers (Rahman et al., 2012).

2.2.2.2 Empathy

Rahman and colleagues (2012) argue that there are five components of emotional intelligence: self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, social skills, and empathy. Moreover, Nozaki and Mikolajczak (2020) propose empathy as the most prominent component of emotional intelligence regarding leaders' management of employees' emotions, which they reason by suggesting empathy as a solid promoter of extrinsic emotion regulation. Holt and Marques (2012) define empathy as "one's ability to understand the feelings transmitted through verbal and non-verbal messages, to provide emotional support to people when needed, and to understand the links between others' emotions and behavior" (p. 96). Although an employee can reach out to other coworkers when they experience the need for emotional support, a leader has, according to Kock et al. (2019), a great influence on employees' feeling of security at work, job motivation, workplace effort, and job satisfaction. Consequently, they advocate for the necessity of leaders demonstrating actions resembling their understanding of followers' job situations, a genuine concern for their well-being, and efforts to create bonds with employees (Kock et al., 2019).

Leaders expressing acceptance and acknowledgment of employees' feelings and hence engaging in actions indicating concerns for the well-being of employees can be considered as expressing emotional support towards employees (Kock et al., 2019). Holt and Marques' (2012) definition of empathy implies that emotional support is an essential component of empathy. Furthermore, Rafferty and Griffin (2006) suggest emotional support, in terms of leadership, involves a leader supporting followers by initiating in efforts of liking, caring, listening, and attending to what followers have to say. Although other forms of support exist, such as instrumental and informational, the relevancy of emotional support in leaders' attempt to manage and influence employees is reflected in Rafferty and Griffin's (2006) definition of supportive leadership, which they define as "occurring when leaders express concern for, and take account of, followers' needs and preferences when making decisions" (p. 39). The definition arguably implies the importance of leaders supporting employees by expressing empathy and hence showing concern for their internal experiences.

Although we have highlighted the importance of leaders managing employees' emotions by providing them with emotional support, Stein et al. (2020) argue that there are some challenges related to leaders' provision of support to followers. Support provision can be considered as a time-consuming process, and even if a leader perceives the relevance and need for allocating resources to have followers feel supported by their superiors, he or she might feel that they do not have enough time based on their time schedule and workload. This might indicate that support provision might be limited because of other factors than solely the leaders' willingness and skills (Stein et al., 2020). However, this might depend on what kind of support is needed for a given situation, as some actions in supporting followers might require less effort than others (Rafferty & Griffin, 2006).

Despite the challenges associated with leaders' efforts to support followers (Stein et al., 2020), Holt and Marques (2012) argue that leaders are likely to face more significant challenges by not allocating considerable attention and resources to providing followers with emotional support. If followers do not feel supported by their superiors, the feelings of being misunderstood, not listened to, or cared for are likely to occur, and, in result, they can potentially experience difficulties in regulating their emotions (Holt & Marques, 2012; Witkowski, 2017). Consequently, one might assume that the value of leaders supporting their followers cannot be underestimated, as support provision is likely to have a tremendous impact on followers' job satisfaction and their perceptions and assessments of their leaders' overall effectiveness (Judge et al., 2004; Piccolo et al., 2012; Rafferty & Griffin, 2006). Furthermore, leaders who are considerate, supportive, and empathetic with their followers are often more successful in establishing positive interpersonal relationships at work (Judge et al., 2004). Listening closely to followers to understand their concerns and to provide them with support and individualized consideration in general can thus be seen as efforts beneficial for leaders establishing positive interpersonal relationships with followers. This will likely contribute to the employees being able to cope with and handle negative emotions and encourage them to share positive emotions when such are experienced (Cheung & Wong, 2011).

According to Kellett et al. (2006), leaders perceived as empathetic by followers are more likely to be approached by followers when they experience the need for support or guidance. Additionally, based on their quantitative study involving 231 participants, Kellett et al. (2006) found that leaders rated high on

empathy by their peers were also perceived as effective leaders. Emotional abilities, such as empathy or one's ability to identify others' emotions, served as one of the main focal points in the study. Moreover, empathy was found to be positively related to other emotional abilities, such as the ability to express one's own emotions and identify others' emotions (Kellett et al., 2006). In congruence to the findings Kellett and colleagues' study generated, Miao et al. (2016) conducted a meta-analysis, focusing on the relationship between a leader's emotional intelligence and subordinates' job satisfaction, that resulted in the researchers concluding that there is a positive relationship between emotional intelligence and subordinates' job satisfaction. Furthermore, Miao and colleagues (2016) linked leaders' emotional intelligence to various organizational outcomes, such as job performance and psychological health outcomes among employees, by highlighting the positive relationship between job satisfaction and these organizational outcomes. Based on the findings from these two studies, leaders rated highly on empathy and emotional intelligence by followers are arguably somewhat likely to have followers feeling satisfied, performing better at work, and perceiving their leader as being effective (Kellett et al., 2006; Miao et al., 2016).

2.2.2.3 Interactive Empathy

Nozaki and Mikoljczak (2020) argue that empathy does not necessarily involve a leader engaging in outother-oriented behaviors and thus suggest that it is insufficient to experience genuine concerns for employees' emotions and well-being if the intention is to manage and hence influence followers' emotions. Congruently, Kellett and colleagues (2006) distinguish between two types of empathy: passive and interactive empathy. Passive empathy refers to an individual sympathizing with others but without exerting influence on others' emotional experiences. A leader demonstrating passive empathy cares about followers and sympathizes with them, but the leader's care and concern might not be recognized by followers (Kellett et al., 2006). The leader might therefore not be considered as empathetic by followers because of the leader not engaging in actions indicating his or her care and concern for followers. Consequently, Kellett et al. (2006) argued that a leader demonstrating interactive empathy must thus involve the followers' acknowledging the leader's intention and attempt to provide them with care and concern. This can imply that a leader must try to understand followers' emotions and demonstrate this understanding in the attempt of influencing followers'

emotions to be considered empathetic by followers (Gregory & Levy, 2011). If a leader takes the initiative to engage in the process of influencing followers' emotions, he or she is arguably more likely to create a two-way emotional bond with followers (Humphrey, 2013). This two-way emotional bond between the leader and followers can be seen as essential for the leader to receive trust, commitment, and respect from followers, which is likely to affect the amount of influence followers are willing to offer their leader in return (Gregory & Levy, 2011; Humphrey, 2013; Yusof et al., 2014).

2.3 The Interconnection Between Theories and How an Investigation on Leaders Management of Employees' Emotions Contributes to the Field

Bono and colleagues (2007) suggest that there is an increasing interest among researchers in the relationship between emotions and leadership. Many researchers have investigated the relationship between transformational leadership and emotional intelligence, which has thus led to several studies generating empirical findings indicating a positive relationship between the two constructs (Polychroniou, 2009; Rahman et al., 2012). However, Bono and colleagues (2007) argue that there is a lack of empirical findings linking actual leadership behaviors to employees' emotions. Consequently, one might argue that how leaders engage in extrinsic emotion regulation, hence how they attempt to manage, monitor, and influence followers' emotions, has received minimal attention in leadership literature and research (Bono et al., 2007; Nozaki & Mikolajczak, 2020). Congruently, and as previously mentioned, Nozaki and Mikolajczak (2020) suggest that there is a lack of research that has investigated extrinsic emotion regulation and how it relates to leadership. Nonetheless, during the last two decades, a stream of research has investigated the relationship between emotion regulation and transformational leadership (Chuang et al., 2012). This emphasis is often guided by an objective of investigating the relationship between transformational leadership and emotional intelligence, which is based on the assumption of emotion regulation as a fundamental aspect of emotional intelligence (Gooty et al., 2010; McRae & Gross, 2020; Nozaki & Mikolajczak, 2020). However, most studies investigating the link between transformational leadership and emotion regulation have emphasized how transformational leaders influence employees' intrinsic emotion regulation instead of highlighting how transformational leaders regulate employees' emotions (Chuang et al., 2012; Nozaki & Mikolajczak, 2020).

A study that has contributed to the literature and research regarding leaders' management of employees' emotions, is Rahman and colleagues' (2012) quantitative study which investigated the relationship between the components of transformational leadership and emotional intelligence. The study, which involved 166 British subordinates, and who were tasked to rate their supervisors' emotional intelligence, generated research findings supporting the notion of all the transformational leadership components as being positively related to emotional intelligence. Furthermore, the research findings implied a positive relationship between individualized consideration and emotional intelligence (Rahman et al., 2012). Therefore, emotionally intelligent leaders can thus be considered as leaders focusing on followers' needs, providing support, and expressing acceptance for followers' individual differences (Avolio & Bass, 1995; Rahman et al., 2012). These kinds of actions have previously been presented as something commonly executed by individually considerate leaders (Avolio & Bass, 1995).

Rahman et al. (2012) claim that individually considerate leaders must be empathetic to be able to listen to, accept and acknowledge the needs of subordinates. Furthermore, to be able to adapt to employees' needs and to tune in to their emotions, the leader must also demonstrate empathy by being able to recognize and thus identify the needs and emotions of employees (Polychroniou, 2009). Employees can potentially have the need for achievement, belonging, or esteem, and these needs can often be identified by having the leader listen to what is behind the words being verbally communicated by subordinates (Benitez et al., 2020; Rahman et al., 2012). This form of listening is often referred to as non-defensive listening, which regards an individual focusing on what the other person communicates without interrupting or trying to immediately react in a certain manner to be able to understand and react appropriately (Ellison, 2009; Rahman et al., 2012). Engaging in non-defensive listening enables the leader to recognize and understand followers' emotions, which in turn can result in followers perceiving the leader as open-minded and as considerate of individual differences.

Individually considerate leaders typically express empathy towards followers by listening, accepting, and acknowledging the needs and feelings of subordinates (Ogola, 2017; Rahman et al., 2012). However, Kellett and colleagues' (2006) descriptions of passive and interactive empathy imply that followers might not consider their leader as empathetic unless demonstrated through actions and words. Therefore, for followers to perceive their leader as empathetic and

individually considerate, the leader must demonstrate empathy through various types of actions, such as by engaging in emotion validation (Kellett et al., 2006; Linton et al., 2012; Rahman et al., 2012). Both interactive empathy and emotional validation can involve the act of a leader engaging in a two-way communication with a follower and thus intending to understand and express this understanding with the person of interest (Kellett et al., 2006; Gregory & Levy, 2011). Moreover, such actions might resemble the notions often considered as fundamental in the transformational leadership model and hence individualized consideration (Avolio & Bass, 1995; Chebon et al., 2019).

2.4 Managing Employees' Emotions by Engaging in Emotion Validation or Invalidation

As discussed and implied in the previous section, how leaders manage employees' emotions is a prominent topic in research and literature regarding transformational leadership, emotional intelligence, and hence empathy and interactive empathy (Kellett et al., 2006; Polychroniou, 2009; Rahman et al., 2012). Although a large number of studies have investigated the relationships between these behaviors and theories, which typically have resulted in research findings indicating an overlap between the constructs, there seems to be a lack of research and literature investigating how leaders engage in managing employees' emotions and how this relates to each theory/behavior in particular (Bono et al., 2007; Kellett et al., 2006; Nozaki & Mikolajczak, 2020; Polychroniou, 2009; Rahman et al., 2012).

To be able to manage employees' emotions, leaders should demonstrate their concern and care for the employees by actively engaging in behaviors indicating their understanding and acknowledgment of employees' internal experiences. This implies the importance of interactive empathy in leaders' efforts of managing employees' emotions (Gregory & Levy, 2011; Kellett et al., 2006). One way of influencing employees' emotions is through the act of validating their emotions (Witkowski, 2017). Emotion validation is a smaller construct that regards central notions regarding the provision of emotional support and supportive leadership in general. However, emotion validation is a more concrete construct than emotional support, although both constructs emphasize the importance of expressing support of employees' internal experiences. Emotion validation, however, refers to specific acts of expressing acknowledgment and acceptance for

employees' emotions, and further research on this topic will therefore contribute to more insights on what can be considered as effective in the provision of support among leaders (Raffety & Griffin, 2010; Witkowski, 2017).

2.4.1 Emotion Validation and Invalidation

The validation of emotions occurs when an individual communicates and expresses understanding, legitimacy, and acceptance in response to another person's expression of private experiences (Shenk & Fruzzetti, 2011). One can thus validate other individuals' emotions by providing them with feedback congruent to the emotions, experiences, and thoughts that are being expressed. To demonstrate understanding and acceptance of another individual's emotions, a leader can thus attempt to be curious about how an employee feels and then reflect to his or her follower the validity of the emotions being shared. Further, by expressing acceptance and acknowledgment of someone's emotions, the individual being validated might feel encouraged to accept his or her own internal experience and thus not feel that he or she should feel differently (Shenk & Fruzzetti, 2011; Witkowski, 2017). However, such supportive interpersonal communication might not be demonstrated if an individual expresses that another individual's emotions, experiences, or thoughts are inappropriate or unacceptable, which refers to the act of emotional invalidation (Benitez et al., 2020).

In contrast to emotion validation, emotion invalidation typically regards an individual punishing or trivializing another individual's positive or negative experiences, which are thus perceived as incorrect or socially undesirable (Shenk & Fruzetti, 2011). If the individual sharing his or her experiences perceives that he or she is being invalidated, such as experiencing that one is being criticized or ignored based on the emotions that are being expressed, the person might feel alienated, not listened to, rejected, or frustrated (Holt & Marques, 2012; Witkowski, 2017). Therefore, the individual might experience difficulties regulating his or her emotions (Witkowski, 2017). One of the main functions of emotions is that these can reflect and communicate to the environment what an individual needs and desires, however, when an individual perceives that he or she is being emotionally invalidated, he or she might feel that his or her needs and desires are not being met (Zielinski & Veilleux, 2018). Additionally, Zielinski and Veilleux (2018) suggest that emotion invalidation is related to psychological and physical health problems and mental disorders. Similarly, several studies have generated research findings

indicating that emotion invalidation is related to various health problems and mental disorders (Zielinski et al., 2022), such as emotion dysregulation (Zielinski & Veilleux, 2018), borderline personality disorder (Linehan, 1993), eating disorders (Haslam et al., 2008), chronic pain (Linton et al., 2012), and rheumatic diseases (Cano et al., 2012). Difficulties in regulating one's emotions, which is often referred to as emotion dysregulation, is commonly considered a characteristic of different psychological disorders, such as depression and anxiety (Weinberg & Klonsky, 2009; Zielinski & Veilleux, 2018). Emotion dysregulation can involve a limited capability of understanding or accepting one's own and others' emotions, a lack of control of impulsive behaviors, and difficulties in expressing emotions in situationally appropriate ways (Weinberg & Klonsky, 2009). Such difficulties might originate from parents frequently invalidating their children's emotional experiences (Zielinski & Veilleux, 2018).

Linton et al. (2012) conducted an experimental investigation focusing on the effects emotion validation and invalidation have on participants' emotions and adherence while they were going through several pain tests. The results from the study indicated that participants who are going through pain and are expressing worry but perceive that they are being emotionally validated by others, such as health care personnel, might find it easier to cope with the stressful situation than those who do not perceive that they are being validated (Linton et al., 2012). This indicates that an individual validating another individual's negative emotions might contribute to the soothing of such emotions and thus decrease the impact the emotions might have on the individual. Furthermore, the study findings indicated that a person experiencing discomfort and is under pressure might have their physiological and emotional arousal increased if invalidated by others (Linton et al., 2012). As this implies, if an individual expresses concern but is logically reassured by an authority figure that there is nothing to worry about, the individual might feel misunderstood, frustrated, or alienated. The reassurance might be based on the authority figure's good intentions of trying to fix or hinder the occurrence of a perceived problem (Linton et al., 2012). However, such reassurance might resemble what concerns emotion invalidation, and Linton et al. (2012) suggest that this often results in individuals expressing even more negative affect. This might indicate that interpersonal affective communication between individuals might not benefit from one individual attempting to change the other person's personal experience or feelings (Benitez et al., 2020; Witkowski, 2017). Moreover, Benitez

et al. (2020) argue that this also applies to the expression of emotions often regarded as socially undesirable, such as anger, and which is typically invalidated when expressed by one or more individuals.

2.4.2 Measuring Emotional Validation and Invalidation

There are considerable benefits of an individual's shared emotions being validated by others, whereas there are various disadvantages associated with emotion invalidation (Shenk & Fruzzetti, 2011; Zielinski & Veilleux, 2018). One of the scales most widely used in measuring invalidation is the Invalidating Childhood Environment Scale (ICES) (Mountford et al., 2007), which is a scale focusing on the behavior of parents and it thus assesses previous parental invalidation experiences (Robertson et al., 2013; Zielinski & Veilleux, 2018). As such, the scale might reflect an invalidating environment. For example, an item from the scale, which reflects how invalidation can be measured, is: "When I was anxious, my parents ignored this" (Witkowski, 2017). However, this scale is often criticized for not measuring invalidation of emotions, and its applicability to nonclinical samples has been questioned by researchers (Zielinski & Veilleux, 2018). Another self-report measure is the Illness Invalidation Inventory (Kool et al., 2010), which is a scale measuring rheumatic disease patients' perception of being invalidated by others (Zielinski & Veilleux, 2018). However, in similarity to ICES, this scale regards invalidation of medical conditions, which implies the scale as non-applicable to an organizational setting. Contrarily, the Socialization of Emotions Scale (SES) is another alternative to the measurement of emotion invalidation (Krause et al., 2003). Additionally, emotion validation and emotion invalidation serve as two factors being measured by the scale. However, this scale assesses childhood emotion validation and invalidation and is thus not applicable to a sample consisting of adults (Zielinski & Veilleux, 2018).

Based on their observed need for validated scales measuring emotion invalidation, Zielinski and Veilleux (2018) developed a scale named the Perceived Invalidation of Emotion Scale (PIES). One of their arguments for developing such a scale was an observed lack of validated instruments that measure current perceptions of emotion invalidation, which in turn permits researchers to investigate the effects emotion invalidation might have on the development of various mental and health problems (Zielinski & Veilleux, 2018). However, Zielinski and Veilleux's (2018) efforts were directed toward developing a novel scale measuring

emotion invalidation, although emotion validation arguably did not serve as a particular focus. This can be reflected in the items included in PIES, which involve emotion invalidation. Furthermore, and based on the many benefits of having leaders validating their followers' shared emotions, such a scale should arguably also measure emotion validation (Benson et al., 2012; Kellett et al., 2006; Linton et al., 2012; Miao et al., 2016; Rahman et al., 2012). A scale measuring both emotion validation and invalidation can be used to provide leaders with insight into how their behaviors and actions affect followers (Benitez et al., 2020). Efforts associated with this matter can thus contribute with relevant insights on how leaders manage employees' emotions and, in particular, serve as a contribution to the literature and research of emotion validation and invalidation.

3.0 Methodology

3.1 Study 1 – A Qualitative Study

In this study, a qualitative approach was undertaken to generate items to the scale, and which therefore are based on the participants of the study's explanations and experiences regarding validation and invalidation (Bell et al., 2019). The qualitative study took place at BI Norwegian Business School in September 2021. Furthermore, we chose to include a qualitative study in the process of developing a scale because of this research strategy's emphasis on exploration and flexibility (Gergen & Gergen, 2000). Moreover, such an emphasis can contribute to the collection of rich descriptions of the phenomena of interest, and such descriptions often include individuals' explanations of their own experiences, which in turn might increase the likelihood of the resulting items mirroring actual human experiences (Bell et a., 2019; Zielinski & Veilleux, 2018). Rigor can be demonstrated in qualitative research by including multiple methods in the study, which might reduce the likelihood of generating systematically biased inferences based on the data (Zielinski & Veilleux, 2018). The methods used in this study are individual interviews, in the form of written essay questions, and focus groups. Both methods are often used by researchers to gather in-depth data and thus in the exploration of participants' experiences, thus contributing to the construction of items (Bell et al., 2019; Gergen & Gergen, 2000).

3.1.1 Sample and Procedure

The sample consisted of 30 executive MBA students studying at BI Norwegian Business School, and the participants aged between 32 and 47 ($M = 39$, $SD = 10.61$). The sample included 19 men and 11 women. Participation in the study served as an activity related to a study course the students were enrolled in, however, participation was voluntary. Because of the aspiration and intention of developing a scale measuring leaders' validation or invalidation of followers' emotions, there was a criterion of the participants being either leaders or leadership students at a graduate level or higher. Moreover, the participants had a minimum of five years of working experience. Strategic sampling can therefore be considered as the form of sampling employed in the study because of the inclusion of a criterion in the selection of participants, hence contributing to the sample being more purposive (Bell et al., 2019).

There were in total six focus groups, consisting of 6 to 8 participants in each group. Bell et al. (2019) argue that there is a norm of including 12 to 15 focus groups, with six to ten participants in each group, in a focus group study. However, they also argue that it is common to have less than 12 groups (Bell et al., 2019). Consequently, one might argue that the sample of this study meets these criteria.

3.1.2 Individual Essay Questions

Before having the participants complete the individual essay questions on their own computers, they were shortly informed about the study and that its purpose is to develop a scientific scale measuring followers' perception of the tendency of leaders validating or invalidating followers' emotions, which in turn will contribute to leadership research and in the study of leader-follower relationships and dynamics (Appendix A). Moreover, the participants were also informed about what involvement in the study meant, how the data would be stored and used in the project, and their rights. This information was also given to the participants in a written form of consent, which had to be signed and returned to the research team before the focus group interviews.

The two individual essay questions asked the participants to reflect on their own experiences of expressing positive or negative emotions to their leaders and how the leaders reacted (Appendix B). More specifically, they were asked to describe the situation, outline what the leaders said and did, and reflect on how it made them feel. Further, for each question, the participants were asked to come up with three examples, and, in addition, they were provided with examples of positive emotions, such as excitement and joy, and negative emotions, such as sadness and anger. Consequently, the participants were encouraged to share both pleasant and unpleasant experiences of expressing their emotions to their own leaders.

3.1.3 Focus Groups

The focus group method is a qualitative method of interviewing several people simultaneously, and it often involves a moderator facilitating a discussion about a specific topic among the participants (Bell et al., 2019). This data collection method was a primary focus in our qualitative study (Appendix C). As a qualitative method of interviewing participants, the focus group method is commonly employed in academic research and in work settings to investigate and explore individuals' experiences and perceptions of a specific issue. It allows the participants to discuss a topic, thus probing and challenging each other's arguments

and perspectives. In turn, this might result in the participants' sharing extensive explanations and descriptions of their insights, beliefs, and experiences related to a given topic (Bell et al., 2019).

Two of the six focus groups interviews were performed digitally by the use of the software platform *Zoom*, while the other interviews were conducted physically at BI. Although online interviews might result in constraints in terms of limited expression of non-verbal communication between the moderator and participants (Bell et al., 2019), such constraints were not considered as restricting the participants' participation and involvement in the group discussions. Further, we provided limited attention towards warming up the participants before the interviews, however, some time was utilized to introduce ourselves and to ease the tension by saying that there are not any right or wrong answers. This is often considered as a relevant practice of establishing a comfortable atmosphere in the interview session (Yeo et al., 2014).

The interview was conducted in a semi-structured manner, which allows for flexibility and for the participants to freely share and reflect upon their own experiences (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2007; Yeo et al., 2014). In turn, this might result in the researchers receiving detailed information about the participants' experiences, which might contribute to the researchers' ability to understand and describe the participants' lifeworld (Yeo et al., 2014). To adjust to what was being said by the participants during the focus group interview, indicating the interview was semi-structured, we constructed a relatively flexible interview guide with broad questions facilitating topic-related discussions between participants.

The interview guide included four questions asking the participants to share personal examples of leaders' validating or invalidating employees' emotions. The questions asked the participants to reflect on experiences of themselves being the follower, hence being emotionally validated or invalidated by the leader, and of being the leader, hence validating or invalidating followers' emotions. For example, one question asked the participants to come up with examples of what the leaders could say or do that would make followers feel that their emotions are accepted and understood.

The four questions from the interview guide were followed in a specific order. Nevertheless, as a semi-structured interview, it allowed for improvised follow-up questions from the moderators and for the moderators to steer the conversation back to the main topic if observing indications that the conversation

was going off tangent (Kvale & Brinckmann, 2007). This relates to what is often considered as a criterion of a successful moderator, which is to steer the conversation toward the topic without being too intrusive (Bell et al., 2019; Kvale, 1996). Moreover, the focus group interviews were theoretically driven, but the words "validate" or "invalidate" were not used during the interviews, and the moderators were thus open to what the participants wanted to share.

3.1.4 Qualitative Analysis and the Construction of Items

Most of the interviews lasted for approximately 45 minutes, the shortest interview lasted for 30 minutes, and the longest interview lasted for 60 minutes. All the interviews were recorded using tape recorders, and the tapes were later uploaded to a Microsoft OneDrive on a secured BI account. Subsequently, the tapes were deleted from the tape recorders. The participants were told, both through the consent form and during the beginning of the interviews, that the interviews were to be recorded using tape recorders.

To initiate the qualitative data analysis and to familiarize ourselves with the material, we transcribed the tape recordings into an Excel document. Braun and Clarke (2006) argue that the transcription of data can be seen as an essential practice in the initial phase of analyzing the data, as transcription of data serves as a way of familiarizing oneself with the material, and that it should be performed thoroughly. Moreover, Bell et al. (2019) suggest that it is adequate to include only the relevant sections for the research question when transcribing material from focus group interviews. This was therefore a primary concern in the transcription of the material, and, in addition, the data was later anonymized.

As previously mentioned, we were theoretically driven in our data collection and thus looked for theory-related material (Bell et al., 2019). Similarly, the data analysis was approached through a theoretical lens because of our preconception regarding theories and research about validation and invalidation of emotion. However, we also analyzed the data inductively by focusing on what was explicitly being said (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Moreover, we used thematic analysis as the qualitative method of analyzing the data material. This method can be used to identify, analyze, and report themes from the data material. Its flexibility can be considered as aligning with the qualitative method in general and with our qualitative inquiry. Moreover, it allows the researcher to take on an active role in

identifying and deciding which themes are significant for one's specific research (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

After transcribing the data material, initial codes were constructed. We coded which emotions that were expressed, the situations, and the social responses to the emotions which the participants described. Moreover, this systematic process represents a phase in the data analysis which allows the researcher to be more involved with the data and hence identify and organize what is subjectively perceived as relevant for one's project (Braun & Clarke, 2006). As previously mentioned, the initial coding was done manually in an Excel document. The coding of the transcribed material was first performed individually, but the codes were later subject to triangulation as we compared our codes with each other. Moreover, such a practice is often associated with the establishment of credibility in qualitative research, and it thus emphasizes if there is congruence between what the researchers observe (Bell et al., 2019).

Following the identification and comparison of the initial codes, we performed a second-level coding, which involves a deeper analysis of the content (Bell et al., 2019). These codes, or themes, were constructed by comparing the codes with each other and then organizing them into various groups. The grouping of codes was somewhat theoretically driven because of our focus on constructing items that will be included in a scale, hence relating to our thesis. Based on a more thorough analysis of the codes and on the comparison of codes among the researchers, some codes were merged, and some were excluded from the analysis. These codes were later subject to the construction of items.

3.1.4.1 Results and Discussion

After merging and excluding various codes from the analysis, we ended up with 14 categories (Appendix D). Initially, we constructed one item for each category, but we later saw the relevance of constructing more items for each category. This is reasoned by an observed need for including items with different syntax and semantics for each category. Therefore, in the second round of generating items, we ended up with 160 items based on the 14 predefined categories. Some items can be considered as more general, while some were arguably more specific. However, before the second round of generating items, we anticipated many items to be somewhat similar, and we thus had to exclude most of the items when constructing the preliminary scale.

3.1.5 Ethical Considerations

The research project was submitted to NSD, the Norwegian Centre for Research Data AS, on behalf of a project led by Per-Magnus Thompson. Based on an agreement with BI Norwegian Business School, NSD assessed the processing of personal data in this project as in accordance with data protection legislation and thus approved the project. Moreover, the respondents were given time to read the consent form carefully (Appendix A). Further, we ensured that the participants were fully informed and could thus give their consent before participating in the study by having the participants familiarize themselves with the purpose of the project, what it means to be involved in the study, their rights, and how the data material is to be treated after the data collection is completed. Before and after each focus group interview, all the researchers repeated the most essential information from the consent form and thus underlined that participation is voluntary and that the data collected would be anonymized and treated confidentially. Furthermore, the participants were informed about the use of USB voice recorders, which would later be used for purposes such as transcription. The participants were also informed that the files would be saved as private files on a BI OneDrive, but that all the files would be deleted after the completion of the research project. We therefore argue that the participants' personal privacy has been treated in accordance with data protection legislation (the General Data Protection Regulation and Personal Data Act). Additionally, the consent form also included Per-Magnus Thompson, our Data Protection Officer, and NSD's contact information for further questions.

3.2 Study 2 – Expert Review

To assess and select which items are going to be included in the preliminary version of the scale and potentially include additional items and categories, we conducted an expert review consisting of four researchers with relevant expertise and background. Ultimately, expert review serves as the second study in our research and work regarding developing a scale. Expert review is a traditional, often-used, quick, and inexpensive method of evaluating a draft questionnaire (DeMaio & Landreth, 2004; Olson, 2010). To evaluate questionnaires, this method is often used in combination with other methods (DeMaio & Landreth, 2004). Consequently, we have used this method in the initial stage of developing the scale, and we have thus combined this study with other studies in our work of generating, assessing, and selecting a pool of items that were going to be included in our scale.

Moreover, Ikart (2019) argues that expert review can be used as a method of pretesting questionnaires. Therefore, we have applied this method as a way of pretesting the items generated based on our qualitative study. As such, we used this method to assess whether our questionnaire would potentially result in different kinds of errors or question problems, such as the items being perceived as confusing or misleading by the respondents (Ikart, 2019; Olson, 2010).

3.2.1 Internal and External Experts

When conducting an expert review, psychologists, survey methodologists, or other professionals are included in the study and hence asked to contribute to the work of identifying potential problems related to a preliminary questionnaire (Olson, 2010). Olson (2010) argues that an expert review typically involves only two or three experts, however, he also claims that there might be as many as 20 researchers involved in such a study. In our study, we chose to include four experts. Three of the four experts are trained in Emotion-Focused Therapy (EFT) and/or Emotion-Focused Skills Training (EFST), and they thus possess relevant knowledge of emotion validation as this is a central component of such training (Ansar, 2019; Greenberg, 2014). Two of the experts were internal and are thus involved in the study and have contributed to some of the work related to certain processes in study 1. Per-Magnus Thompson, who is one of the two internal experts, is a practicing clinical psychologist from BI. Thompson is an approved specialist in work- and organizational psychology, is trained in EFT and Cognitive therapy, and has extensive experience working as an organizational consultant. The other internal expert is Jon Magnus Frostad Haakonsen. Haakonsen is a clinical psychologist, has extensive leadership experience from the public health sector, and he is currently a Ph.D. student at BI. Much of his work concerns the significance of relations and feelings at the workplace, focusing on organizational psychology and leadership topics.

In addition to including two internal experts, we chose to include two external experts. Tonje Moe Thompson served as one of our external experts. She is a practicing clinical psychologist and has specialized in EFT and organizational psychology. Furthermore, she has also taken further education within emotion-focused couple therapy. She is also serving as the general manager and partner at the Department of Psychological Counseling Oslo. The other external expert, and thus the fourth and final expert included in the study, is Joanne Dolhanty. Dolhanty,

which is based in Canada, is one of the leading researchers and therapists in EFT, and she has published several articles and other publications on this topic. She holds a Ph.D. in clinical psychology and is the founder, lead trainer, and facilitator at Powered by Emotion. In addition, she is a psychologist at the Center for Clinical Training and Supervision and is the developer of EFST and co-founder of the application of EFT to eating disorders. Simultaneously, Dolthanty has conducted several hundred workshops and trainings for organizations and individuals globally and is considered a great expert in the field of emotions, validation, and invalidation.

3.2.2 Procedure and Analytical Approach

The aim of our expert review was to have the experts assess the preliminary questionnaire by identifying potential problems with the various items included in the questionnaire. Things that might be considered during such an assessment can be the wording of the questions and/or to look for any discrepancies, which might lead to measurement errors in the questionnaire (Ikart, 2019). To enable the expert assessment of the draft questionnaire, we initially sent the questionnaire to the experts through email. Further, two meetings with all the experts took place on the digital platform *Zoom*. Each meeting lasted for approximately two hours. The meetings included general discussions regarding the drafts of categories, items, and the scaling of responses. Furthermore, the discussions were based on the experts' own judgments and informal assessments, which were given both orally and in written documents, regarding various aspects related to the questionnaire, which is also considered a common practice when conducting an expert review (Ikart, 2019). Olson (2010) argues that experts are commonly asked to come up with changes to question wording while attempting to identify problems, which we also did in our study by encouraging the experts to proofread the material and to feel free to adjust, improve, or add things perceived as relevant to improve the questionnaire. Based on the qualitative study, the experts suggested that we also include equivalents to increase the likelihood of the questionnaire including items covering categories perceived as relevant. As this implies, for a category resembling emotion validation, a category resembling emotion invalidation is added (Appendix D). Further, this resulted in a small number of new categories and items being added to the scale. After that, the experts assessed whether the categories and items reflected the

concepts perceived as the most relevant regarding emotion validation and invalidation, focusing on the scale's content.

The experts also came up with some modifications to the scale. More specifically, they conducted a language revision of the items and gave feedback regarding the phrasing of various items. For example, they suggested us to have the items being more definitive instead of including words such as "sometimes". In addition, they also pointed out some asymmetrical or false binary comparisons which they observed in some of the items. This might imply that a particular item might include two parts, and in turn, the respondent or researcher might not necessarily know which part of the question was answered. One example of an item including two dimensions is "my leader either gives me empty reassurance, or they attempt to understand me". However, as the researchers highlighted, this item can be split into two parts and hence potentially result in two different items with different content.

We observed that there was in general a high level of agreement among the experts, which DeMaio and Landreth (2004) claim to be of high importance in terms of the expert review results' generalizability. Moreover, the question problems identified by the experts in our study might prevent the scale of generating data quality issues (Olson, 2010). Having the experts identify potential problems with the scale can contribute to the problems being remedied before being sent out to respondents, which in turn might prevent measurement errors from occurring in the data (Olson, 2010). Such errors might include item nonresponse or report inaccuracy on particular items, which, as previously discussed, can be prevented by having the experts reveal potential linguistic and structural issues in the pool of items (Ikart, 2019).

3.2.2.1 Results and Discussion

Based on the experts' clarity and relevance ratings, we ended up with an initial pool of items consisting of 44 items (Appendix E). We argue that our expert review study provided support for the measurement's pool of items having strong content validity. The latter refers to "a process that aims to provide assurance that an instrument measures the content area it is expected to measure" (Ayre & Scally, 2014, p. 79). The reasoning behind the argument is that most categories and items assessed by the experts were considered as relevant in terms of measuring emotion validation and invalidation, and most of the items were therefore retained. This

arguably demonstrates support for the scale's content validity, and, consequently, the feedback given by the experts was used to finalize our draft questionnaire (Ayre & Scally, 2014; Zielinski & Veilleux, 2018).

3.3 Study 3 – Quantitative Study

3.3.1 Research Strategy and Design

The purpose of our thesis is to develop a validated scale measuring emotion validation and invalidation. Based on our qualitative study and the expert review, we ended up with 44 items in our preliminary scale and which were thus retained after having experts assess the items resulting from our qualitative inquiry. Boateng et al. (2018) refer to these steps, such as identification of items, consideration of content validity, and pre-testing items, as best practices in the initial phases of developing a scale. However, after developing and pre-testing the items, it is considered a best practice to continue the process of developing a scale by administering the survey and sampling (Boateng et al., 2018). Consequently, and following the qualitative study and expert review, we conducted a cross-sectional study, which can be conducted to gather data from many respondents in a short period of time. The data can thereafter be examined to assess and thus identify which items will be included in the new measure (Boateng et al., 2018; Hinkin, 1998). Hinkin (1998), however, suggests the development of an accurate measurement as a complicated process, and he reasons this argument by highlighting the work, time, and funding needed if intending to assess whether individual items measure the construct under examination or not.

A cross-sectional design is a quantitative research method, which is commonly considered a distinct research strategy concerning numerical data (Bell et al., 2019). Moreover, our quantitative study follows a deductive approach, which means that our qualitative study, expert review, and chosen theories serve as a basis for this particular study, and not as the end product itself (Bell et al., 2019). This is often considered a common approach to research when employing a quantitative research strategy and when intending to develop a scale, and such approaches and methods are often chosen when one aspires to measure and quantify behaviors, attitudes, and opinions (Bell et al., 2019; Boateng et al., 2018). With a focus on quantifying social phenomena, such as emotion validation and invalidation, one might argue that objectivism and positivism are the underlying philosophical assumptions likely to influence the decisions being taken and the procedures being

followed (Bell et al., 2019). Objectivism, which is an ontological position referring to an assumption of social phenomena as something independent and thus external of our influence, and positivism, which is an epistemological position referring to a view of reality as something objective and thus as something that needs to be either directly observed or measured, are therefore arguably the philosophical assumptions guiding the process and our attempt of developing a scale (Bell et al., 2019).

To develop a scale, we chose to employ a social survey design, specifically a *self-completion questionnaire*, which is often referred to as the most common cross-sectional design (Bell et al., 2019). This type of questionnaire is inexpensive to administer compared to most other designs. It reduces the impact of interviewer characteristics, and it is often more convenient for respondents to complete a survey as it requires little effort and time to complete (Bell et al., 2019). As a quantitative method, cross-sectional designs involve the examination of relationships between variables. When conducting a survey study, the data is typically collected simultaneously, and to be able to observe variation and associations between variables, the data collection process is often systemized and standardized by researchers (Bell et al., 2019). Based on our intention of measuring the relationship between various items and between items and the constructs of interest, namely validation and invalidation of emotions, we chose to conduct a survey study, which in turn is often considered a method well-suited to the collection of data with minimum measurement errors (Boateng et al., 2018). Research findings with few measurement errors are in turn often considered as more generalizable (Alkharusi, 2012). Hinkin (1998) argues that a typical emphasis when engaging in questionnaire administration is to collect data to assess the factor structure and examine the research findings' validity. Consequently, as we want to check whether our initial scale measures behaviors reflecting central notions of emotion validation and invalidation, we share this emphasis in our quantitative study and thus evaluate the scale's psychometric properties (Zielinski & Veilleux, 2018).

3.3.2 Instrument

The pool of items used in the quantitative study results from the qualitative inquiry and expert study. As previously mentioned, these two studies resulted in an initial scale of 44 items measuring emotional validation and invalidation. The first 27 items measure emotion invalidation, and the remaining 17 items measure

emotion validation (Appendix E). The items were rated on a 7-point Likert Scale from 1 (i.e., Strongly Disagree) to 7 (i.e., Strongly Agree), while another response alternative, which is response alternative 8, represents the response "I don't know/Not applicable".

The survey was administered through Qualtrics, a web-based tool often used by researchers to administer surveys (Qualtrics, n.d.). Furthermore, the survey includes an introduction and a section regarding the purpose of the study, informing participants about the significance of emotions at work, what the survey comprises, and how to respond to the various items, such as to think of their current leader only when selecting a response alternative from the Likert scale. Additionally, the survey also includes a section regarding informed consent, which encompasses information regarding the purpose of the project, what data will be collected, the individuals responsible for the research project, voluntary participation, the participants' personal privacy and rights, how the personal data will be treated at the end of the research project, and contact information (Appendix A).

3.3.3 Sample and Procedure

Johnson and Christensen (2014) argue that an optimal sampling method for a social survey design is to specify the criteria for which participants to include in the study and, subsequently, engage in random sampling of respondents. Congruently, we initiated our data collection by specifying the criteria we assume are relevant for our study's purpose. As we aim to develop a scale that can be applied to work settings and research purposes, we consider most types of employees as relevant to our study, hence serving as the population for our study (Acharya et al., 2013). Therefore, we chose to conduct what can be considered a flexible approach of sampling respondents to our study. This is based on our intention of testing our scale on a heterogeneous sample, which Boateng et al. (2012) describe as "a sample that both reflects and captures the range of the target population" (p. 8). This is reflected in the various criteria used to select respondents for our quantitative study.

To collect data, we used the survey site *Prolific*. Prolific is a survey site where respondents, based on demographic screening, are being matched with the criteria specified for a particular study, and a small amount of money is reciprocated to the respondents for their participation (Prolific, 2022). Moreover, this way of collecting samples is often considered a convenience sampling method (Edgar &

Manz, 2017). Convenience sampling typically involves the recruitment of respondents considered as convenient to the researcher, and this non-probabilistic sampling method often involves including participants located in a specific location or on an Internet service (e.g., Prolific) (Edgar & Manz, 2017; Galloway, 2005; Pickering & Blaszczynski, 2021). By using Internet services, such as Prolific, participants are most often anonymous, which can reduce the likelihood of participants refusing to disclose sensitive information and the likelihood of respondents responding in a fashion resembling central notions of social desirability (Pickering & Blaszczynski, 2021). Additionally, the use of this method arguably aligns with constraints related to our thesis, as our research is somewhat restricted by variables such as time and funding. This sampling method's adequacy can reason this in terms of collecting a large amount of data within a short time period, and not much funding or effort is needed from the researcher (Pickering & Blaszcynski, 2021). However, the respondent pool might be a result of who is online at a given time, which implies that the pool of respondents might have been somewhat different if the study had been launched at another time of day or week (Pickering & Blaszcynski, 2021).

By using Prolific, we typed in the criteria relevant to our sample (Appendix F). British or American citizens, within the age range of 20 to 65, working part-time or full-time, working remotely or at the office, and having been employed at their current workplace for a minimum of five months, were some of the criteria selected in Prolific. Further, after inserting our survey link and typing in the various criteria, Prolific automatically matched our study with the demographics of 7508 participants. Thereafter, we started our data collection. After approximately 30 minutes, 605 respondents had completed the survey and we chose to stop the data collection.

According to Boateng et al. (2018), a rule of thumb is to have a minimum of 10 participants for each item and based on this 10:1 ratio, we considered 444 participants as sufficient. However, they also refer to a sample of more than 500 respondents as "very good" if one is to use the collected data to perform a factor analysis (Boateng et al., 2018). Furthermore, we assumed that some of the responders would be considered careless responders, typically referred to as responders "responding without regard to item content" (Meade & Craig, 2012, p. 1). Consequently, we considered 605 responses as well above our sample size

criteria of 500 and thus assumed our sample to be more than 500 after eliminating the responses from what we considered careless responders.

3.3.4 Careless Responders

As previously mentioned, we chose to include a total number of 605 responses based on our assumption that some responses would be considered *careless responses* and hence removed from further analysis. Based on our choice of employing a somewhat lengthy self-administered questionnaire as our data collection tool, we assumed that content non-responsivity would be present in some of the responses (Meade & Craig, 2012). Furthermore, as we aim to develop a valid measure of emotion validation and invalidation, we consider response validity as an important issue. Response validity can be defined as "the extent to which data collected from a respondent reflects his or her actual thoughts and beliefs regarding the phenomena under study" (Edwards, 2019, p. 62). As such, to increase the likelihood of including valid responses in our analysis, we attempted to detect and thus remove what we considered careless responses. We chose to perform a post hoc analysis, which means that we used several criteria to screen and detect careless responses following the data collection. However, studies often apply methods of detecting careless responses prior to the data collection. Instructions on how to answer specific questions or to include items asking the respondents if they were attentive and responded with care, serve as two examples of methods used to prevent careless responses from occurring in the data (Edwards, 2019). However, such methods were not included in the procedure of constructing items and the scale in general.

To detect careless responders, we first inspected if there were any missing responses in the data set (Edwards, 2019). However, no missing responses were detected. Secondly, we aimed at detecting responses considered as "too short", and Edwards (2019) refers to respondents using less than two seconds per item as a rule of thumb when assessing respondents' response time. We therefore removed any responder using less than 88 seconds (44 * 2) on completing the survey, which led to two responders being removed from our sample. Thirdly, we visually inspected whether the respondents had responded too consistently to items measuring emotion validation and emotion invalidation (i.e., selecting the same response alternative for all items) (Meade & Craig, 2012). Thereafter, we removed all responders who had selected 1 (i.e., strongly disagree) and 7 (i.e., strongly agree)

from the Likert scale 11 times or more in a row. This is based on Edwards' (2019) argument of the relevance of removing all extreme scores, although what is considered as *extreme scores* is somewhat relative. We therefore chose to remove all respondents who selected response alternative 1 or 7 eleven times or more in a row. We used 11 as this is equal to 25% of all the items in the scale, however, as argued by Edwards (2019), what is considered as extreme scores is relative, and we thus acknowledge the potential of removing true responses from our data. However, we consider the inclusion of extreme scores in a data set as a more significant threat to the scale's validity than by eliminating what we consider extreme scores (Edwards, 2019). Lastly, we chose to remove all respondents who had selected the same response alternative for all 27 negatively worded items and the same response alternative for all 17 positively worded items. This criterion resembles a long-string analysis, which involves the researcher counting how many times a respondent has provided the same response to every item (Edwards, 2019; Meade & Craig, 2012).

Based on the various criteria commonly employed to detect careless responders, we removed 83 responses from our sample. Our initial sample of 605 was therefore reduced to a total of 522 responders. Although this might affect the reliability and statistical power of the research findings, based on the sample size being reduced (Field, 2018), we suggest our sample size as adequate as it meets Boateng's (2018) criteria to be considered as "very good" (i.e., more than 500 responders). Consequently, we argue that removing 83 respondents does not significantly reduce the reliability and validity of the research findings.

3.3.5 Data Credibility

Based on our aim of developing a valid scale, we advocate for the importance of data credibility in our study. Reliability and validity are often emphasized when examining studies' data credibility and evaluating business research in general (Bell et al., 2019; Saunders et al., 2019). Reliability concerns whether the study results can be repeated under the same conditions and hence if the measure being used can be considered consistent and stable (Bell et al., 2019). To examine whether a scale generates reliable results, researchers typically measure Cronbach's alpha for all components and variables (Cortina, 1993; Field, 2018).

When conducting a principal component analysis, one usually examines and assesses items and components' reliability in the post-analysis (Field, 2018). Reliability and validity might be emphasized when determining how well a measure

measures a construct, implying that these two criteria for evaluating a study and its credibility are closely related. However, reliability does not guarantee validity, although a valid construct is typically considered reliable (Bell et al., 2019; Field, 2018). Therefore, as we aim at developing a valid scale, we have emphasized different forms of validity typically examined when developing scales. Validity regards how accurately a method measures the construct it is intended to measure, hence concerning to what extent one can make trustworthy inferences based on the research findings (Bell et al., 2019; Johnson & Christensen, 2014). Measurement validity, as a type of validity, is often considered one of the most prominent types of validity to examine when developing social scientific measures. This type of validity concerns whether the measure measures the phenomena of interest (Bell et al., 2019).

Exploratory Factor Analysis is commonly employed in quantitative studies to measure whether a construct demonstrates discriminant and convergent validity, which are two types of measurement validity (Hurley et al., 1997). Discriminant validity is commonly used to assess whether one can distinguish constructs from each other, whereas convergent validity regards whether items, which should be related, within a construct are related (Colquitt, 2001; Trochim, n.d.). A standard method to examine the former is by inspecting the Component Correlation Matrix in SPSS and checking whether any correlations are above .7. Correlations above .7 might indicate redundancy, and one might thus experience difficulties in distinguishing the constructs from each other (Boateng et al., 2018; Field, 2018; Hurley et al., 1997). To assess convergent validity, however, one should look at the Correlation Matrix in SPSS, showing the correlations between items. To ensure that the findings demonstrate convergent validity, one should visually inspect whether the correlations between items are between .3 and .7 (Abma et al., 2016; Boateng et al., 2018). The inspection of the correlations between components and items is further discussed in 'Discussion'.

3.3.6 Ethical Considerations

Research ethics is important based on its contribution to increasing knowledge and creating mutual benefit for participants and researchers (Bell et al., 2019). Diener and Crandall (1978) present four ethical principles within research ethics that a researcher should follow: *harm to participants*, *lack of informed consent*, *invasion of privacy*, and *deception* (Bell et al., 2019). We argue that all

ethical principles have been followed in our quantitative research. The respondents were prevented from being harmed through that we developed and gave the respondents an informed consent before they started answering the questionnaire. Here we included what the purpose of the project was, which data we strived to collect, who was responsible for the project, that participation was voluntary, how we would store and use personal data, what happens to the collected data at the end of the project, and what rights the respondent had (i.e., personal data). Moreover, the data resulting from the data collection has been treated confidentially to protect the participants' privacy, which can thus be seen to be in accordance with the GDPR (the General Data Protection Regulation) guidelines. By the respondent clicking further in the questionnaire, they approved our terms, and we therefore argue that informed consent was to be found in our paper (Diener & Crandall, 1978). This supports that we have taken care of personal data and that deception does not take place in our study (Bell et al., 2019). Further, Drew et al. (2008) argues that through conducting surveys, the researcher has an ethical responsibility to not waste the respondent's time, thus the collected data should contribute to answering the research question. Therefore, we argue that our study follows Diener and Crandall's (1978) four primary areas of research ethics and that we further do not waste the respondents' time by including the collected data in our research project and thereby contributing to increased knowledge and mutual benefits (Bell et al., 2019).

3.3.7 Control Variables

The purpose of our control variables was to see how they correlated with emotional validation and invalidation and how the socio-demographic differences could affect the result. The first part of our study included demographic data, such as gender, age, nationality, language, employment status, office or remote job, work week in hours, and organizational tenure. These control variables were included so that we could adjust the sample in the questionnaire according to what we wanted to inspect. Additionally, the control variables were included to get a broad overview of the sample (Salkind, 2010). The age aspect was with the aim to collect factual information, and the general geographical requirements were included to ensure that the sample has English as their first language and thus understands the context of the questionnaire. In addition, the requirements related to the organizational aspects were set to map how long the respondent has been in the organization, as the number of years with the leader can affect the results (Lee et al., 2018).

Furthermore, our control variables were divided according to dyadic tenure and intensity. The former included the question "How long have you been the subordinate of your current leader?", which contained an 8-point scale: "Less than 2 months", "2-4 months", "5-6 months", "7-12 months", "1-2 years", "2-5 years", "More than 5 years" and "I don't know / Not applicable". Furthermore, we took inspiration from Pearce and Gregersen (1991) in the concept of their questions about dyadic intensity. The respondents were assigned four statements that dealt with how closely they work with their current leader. The statements were "I work closely with my leader in doing my work", "I frequently must coordinate my efforts with my leader", "The way I perform my job has a significant impact on my leader", and "My work requires me to consult with my leader fairly frequently". To measure these control variables, we used a scale that ranged from 1 to 7 (Strongly Disagree – Strongly Agree) and included an eighth point (I do not know / Not applicable).

3.3.8 Results

3.3.8.1 Initial Principal Component Analysis

A Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was conducted on the 44 items which resulted from the expert review study. This analysis was conducted on these items using direct oblimin, which is a method for oblique rotation. Firstly, we performed initial assessments of the data. Andy Field (2018) recommends starting the initial check by assessing the analysis' sampling adequacy. Further, he proposes 300 as an adequate number of respondents to increase the likelihood of the EFA generating valid and reliable results. After identifying what was considered as 'Careless Responders' and hence removing these from our sample of respondents, we ended up with 522 responders ($N = 522$), which exceeds Field's (2018) criteria of sample size. As seen in Table 1, a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test, which measures sampling adequacy, verified sample adequacy as the KMO value was larger than .6 (KMO = .98) (Field, 2018; Kaiser & Rice, 1974). Following the assessment of the analysis' KMO value, we assessed the correlations between items and hence assessed whether the correlations were too small or too big. Field (2018) refers to correlations of lower or equal to .3 as too small because such values might indicate a weak or ambiguous relationship between items. Furthermore, to avoid variables correlating too strongly, often referred to as *collinear correlations* or *multicollinearity*, we looked for correlations with a Pearson correlation coefficient higher than .9. Based on our visual inspection of the Correlation Matrix, we

conclude that the correlations are acceptable, based on most values being between .3 and .9. In addition, we observed that all coefficients are significant at $p < .001$ ($p = .000$). Similarly, Bartlett's Test of Sphericity proved significant at $p < .001$, indicating that the correlations between items are significantly different from zero.

Table 1 – KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.98
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	27887.52
	df	95
	Sig.	.00

Note: N = 522

Following the initial analysis, we initiated the main analysis by attempting to extract and retain components perceived as reflecting and explaining the most variance in the data set. To assess which components that can be considered as the most prominent based on our data set, we assessed the eigenvalues related to each component, screened the communality related to each item, visually inspected the Scree plot, and, thereafter, conducted a parallel analysis. To assess the eigenvalues, we used Kaiser's criteria of retaining factors or components with eigenvalues equal to or larger than 1 (Field, 2018). Based on this criterion, we chose to extract four components that altogether explained 75.18% of the variance (see Table 2). The first component, which is the component with the largest eigenvalue and hence explained the most total variance, had an eigenvalue of 27.28 and explained 62% of the variance in the data. The second component we chose to extract had an eigenvalue of 3.06, while the third and fourth component we chose to extract had eigenvalues of respectively 1.61 and 1.13.

Table 2 – The Initial Extraction of Four Components

	Initial Eigenvalues		
Component	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	27.28	62.00	62.00
2	3.06	6.95	68.95
3	1.61	3.66	72.61
4	1.13	2.57	75.18

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

After extracting four factors for further analyses, we inspected each item's communality coefficient. Field (2018) advocates for the importance of assessing each item's communality as these tend to be somewhat large if one has extracted a sufficient number of factors. Therefore, the communalities arguably contribute to the explanation of how much variance the extracted factors explain (Field, 2018). Furthermore, Field (2018) argues that most communalities should be equal to or greater than .6 if the sample size is equal to 250 or above. Consequently, we suggest our communalities to be acceptable, as most of the communalities from our analysis are between .7 and .8. However, the communality of one of the items, which is the item "When I feel sad, worried, frustrated or experience other negative emotions, my leader tells me to change my perspective rather than acknowledging how I'm doing", was below the value of .6. Nonetheless, we chose to retain the item based on the observation of most items having high communalities and the specific communality of being somewhat close to .6 (.56).

After assessing the eigenvalues and communalities associated with the components and items, we visually inspected the data by looking at a graphical representation of the eigenvalues, which is typically referred to as a S*cree plot* (Field, 2018). Furthermore, as our sample size contributed to a relatively high KMO and can hence be considered as a large sample, we suggest that our sample meets Field's (2018) criteria for a sample size to include more than 300 respondents for scree plot to be considered as a reliable criterion to extracting factors. Particularly, we observed that the point of inflexion was apparent between component four and five, and based on the rule of thumb of extracting factors to the left of this specific point, we chose to retain all four components, which were also considered as acceptable after using Kaiser's criterion to assess components (Field, 2018).

Before performing a factor rotation, we conducted a parallel analysis to assess the relative importance of the four components retained after inspecting their eigenvalues and how they chart on a Scree plot (Franklin et al., 1995). Further, parallel analysis is often considered an accurate method in determining the relative importance of components. A typical procedure associated with this method is to assess whether the component eigenvalues generated by SPSS are larger than the new parallel analysis eigenvalues. The component eigenvalues larger than the parallel analysis eigenvalues will, according to the logic behind this method, be retained (Franklin et al., 1995; Horn, 1965; Patil et al., 2017). After typing in the number of variables (i.e., 44 items) and sample size ($N = 522$) in the boxes apparent

in Patil and colleagues' (2017) Parallel Analysis Engine, new calculations were made by the Engine. We observed that the three largest components had component eigenvalues larger than the Parallel Analysis eigenvalues (Appendix G). As this implies, these components are relatively important to retain for further analyses (Franklin et al., 1995). However, the fourth component from our initial analysis had an eigenvalue of 1.13, while the Parallel Analysis eigenvalue for this component was equal to 1.45. As the logic behind this type of analysis indicates, we should not retain the fourth component based on the observation of the component eigenvalue being somewhat lower than the Parallel Analysis eigenvalue (Franklin et al., 1995). Similarly, the remaining 40 components did not meet this criterion, which supports the results from the Scree plot test and the use of Kaiser's criterion. In result, we chose to retain the first three components for further interpretation and subsequent analysis. However, we acknowledge the descriptive value of the fourth component based on the results from the two other factor extraction analyses (Franklin et al., 1995).

As the next step in the main analysis, we conducted a factor rotation, a commonly used method to discriminate factors and reduce the complexity associated with the factor loadings (Field, 2018). As previously mentioned, we chose to perform an oblique rotation, and the three extracted factors were the subjects of this analysis. We argue that the components are related to each other, which thus implies the relevance of performing an oblique rotation, based on a visual inspection of the component correlation matrix (Field, 2018). The decision to inspect the correlations between components, by using Component Correlation Matrix, is based on the observation of Bartlett's Test being significant $(p < .01)$, which thus indicates that the Component Correlation Matrix is significantly different from an Identity Matrix. In turn, this implies that all the correlations in the Correlation Matrix are significantly different from zero (Field, 2018). We observed that all the correlations were arguably moderate as they were all well above zero, however, all relationships between components were not greater than .5, which is often considered as the criteria for performing an oblique rotation (Field, 2018). However, the relationship between component 1 and component 3 and the relationship between component 2 and 3 were all close but did not meet the criteria $(r = .49)$, while component 1 and 2 arguably have a somewhat stronger relationship $(r = .64)$ and thus meets the criteria, as presented in Table 3. Nevertheless, Field (2018) argues that most psychological constructs are related to other constructs,

and, based on previously mentioned theoretical notions and empirical findings, we assume that there is an association between emotion validation and emotion invalidation (Benitez et al., 2020; Linton et al., 2012; Zielinski & Veilleux, 2018). Consequently, we chose to perform an oblique rotation based on theoretical grounds, empirical findings, and the correlations observed in the Component Correlation Matrix. More specifically, we chose to employ direct oblimin as our rotation method based on the assumption of this method serving as the most convenient method to performing an oblique rotation (Field, 2018).

Table 3 – Component Correlation Matrix

Component	1	2	3
1	1.00	.64	.49
2	.64	1.00	.49
3	.49	.49	1.00

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis

Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization

Before the rotation, most communalities were above the critical value of .6 (Field, 2018). However, in addition to the item with a communality below .6 from the analysis of the unrotated components, another item turned out to receive such a value after the rotation (Appendix H). The item's "When I feel excitement, enthusiasm, joy or other positive emotions, my leader tries to move the conversation away from how I feel and implies we should get back to work" communality went from .60 to .57 when rotating the factors. However, we chose to retain this item as the communality for this item did arguably not drop considerably when rotating the factors and is also close to the critical value of .6. The communality for the item with a value of below .6 did not change when performing a rotation, as the value was equal to .56 on both occasions, and we therefore chose to retain this item. We therefore conclude that the communalities after the rotation are acceptable.

Table 4 shows all the factor loadings after the oblique rotation of components. Based on our sample size consisting of more than 300 respondents, which according to Field (2018), is a criterion for interpreting factor loadings, we chose to interpret the factor structure and inspect the factor loadings. Out of the 44 items, 50% of the items (i.e., 22 items) loaded the highest on component 1, while 17 items loaded the highest on component 2, and five items loaded the highest on

component 3. All factor loadings with an absolute value greater than .4 are in bold in the table, which is, according to Stevens (2002; Field, 2018), a value indicating that the item loads highly on a particular component. Of the 44 items, item 7 and item 16 were the only two items that generated factor loadings below the absolute value of greater than .4.

Table 4 – Factor Loadings for all 44 Items after Rotation

Item Number	Lack of Emotional Support	Incorrect Emotions	Fixing Problems
Item 30	**-.93**	.18	-.12
Item 31	**-.93**	.18	-.12
Item 44	**-.92**	.10	-.03
Item 42	**-.88**	.06	-.10
Item 40	**-.87**	-.01	-.03
Item 43	**-.86**	.06	-.10
Item 29	**-.86**	.11	-.14
Item 35	**-.85**	-.08	.03
Item 37	**-.85**	-.12	.02
Item 41	**-.84**	-.06	-.02
Item 38	**-.81**	-.02	.03
Item 36	**-.81**	-.19	.08
Item 33	**-.78**	-.16	-.02
Item 32	**-.73**	-.10	.01
Item 28	**-.73**	-.16	.05
Item 34	**-.67**[x]	-.38[x]	.23
Item 39	**-.63**[x]	**-.42**[x]	.21
Item 2	**.45**	.28	.31
Item 19	**.44**[x]	**.42**[x]	.20
Item 3	**.43**[x]	.19	**.41**[x]
Item 8	**.42**[x]	.31	.32[x]
Item 7	.38[x]	.38[x]	.31
Item 17	-.03	**.93**	-.09
Item 6	-.08	**.91**	-.02

Item 24	-.04	**.90**	-.05
Item 18	.07	**.77**	.08
Item 13	-.08	**.76**	.19
Item 26	.21	**.68**	-.02
Item 12	.08	**.65**	.17
Item 10	-.09	**.63^x**	.32^x
Item 21	.13	**.63**	.06
Item 23	.28	**.60**	.09
Item 15	.11	**.57**	.29
Item 22	.34^x	**.57^x**	-.01
Item 5	-.02	**.54^x**	.33^x
Item 11	.30	**.53**	.22
Item 25	**.43^x**	**.51^x**	.07
Item 27	.38^x	**.46^x**	.04
Item 14	.38^x	**.41^x**	.26
Item 9	-.01	.06	**.82**
Item 20	.01	.15	**.77**
Item 1	.28	.02	**.59**
Item 4	.25	.20	**.55**
Item 16	.35^x	.30	**.38^x**
Eigenvalues	27.28	3.06	1.61
% of Variance	62.00	6.95	3.66
Total Variance			72.61

Note. N = 522, Rotation Method: Direct Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization.

Text in bold: Factor loading > .4. Text with potency (x^x):

Cross loadings (x ≥ .32).

Although only two items included factor loadings below the critical value of .4, we observed that several items cross load. This implies that there are multiple items with relatively high factor loadings on more than one component, and a cross loading item can thus be seen as reflecting related constructs and including cross loading items in a scale can complicate efforts in distinguishing the constructs from each other (Field, 2018). Costello and Osborne (2005) suggested that two or more items with factor loadings equal to .32 or higher on the same component can be considered as *cross loading items*, and that these can be dropped from the analysis

if there are several strong loaders (i.e., .40 or better) on a single factor (Field, 2018; Samuels, 2017). Further, Samuels (2017) argues that there should be at least three non-cross loading items with a factor loading higher than .4. Consequently, as we observed that all factors include several items which do not cross load and are above the critical value, we decided to drop all cross-loading items from our scale. After assessing the initial scale's factor structure (i.e., factor loadings), 13 items were dropped, which hence resulted in the scale consisting of 31 items.

Field (2018) argues that it is a common procedure to conduct a post analysis after performing an initial and the main analysis. Furthermore, he advocates for the importance of assessing a scale's reliability if one attempts to develop a valid measure. A reliable scale can be considered as a measure consistently reflecting the constructs being measured, hence demonstrating internal consistency, and Cronbach's alpha is typically referred to as the most common measure of reliability in scales (Field, 2018). The critical Cronbach's alpha values typically referred to in research are .7 and .8 (Cortina, 1993; Field, 2018). As shown in Table 5, component 1 (α = .95), component 2 (α = .95), and component 3 (α = .87) can all be seen as reliable components as their Cronbach's alpha coefficients were above .7.

Table 5 – Post-Analysis: Cronbach's Alpha

	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
Component 1	.95	16
Component 2	.95	11
Component 3	.87	4

Field (2018) highlights the importance of inspecting whether the removal of an item leads to substantial differences in the Cronbach's alpha value. If deleting an item results in the component's Cronbach's alpha increasing substantially, then the specific item should be removed to increase the scale's reliability (Field, 2018). In result, we inspected all the *Cronbach's alpha if item deleted* values for each item in SPSS and observed that none of the Cronbach's alpha coefficients would increase substantially by removing specific items. Field (2018) also advocates for the relevance of inspecting all the *corrected item-total correlation* values for each item in SPSS to ensure all items correlate with the overall score from the scale. Further, he suggests that the correlations between the scale's overall score and each item

should not be less than .3 (Field, 2018). In result, we inspected all such coefficients and observed that all coefficients were well above .3, which implies that all items correlate with the overall score from the scale.

3.3.8.2 Developing a Unidimensional Scale

Component 1, as previously mentioned, has an eigenvalue of 27.28 and explains 62% of the variance in the data, and its eigenvalue is thus substantially larger than the eigenvalues of the other components. The eigenvalue of component 2 is equal to 3.06 and is thus considerably lower than component 1. Based on the large difference in the components' eigenvalues, we decided to perform an analysis to assess whether there is a potential for scale being unidimensional. Unidimensionality can regard scales measuring a dominant latent variable, and efforts related to the assessment of the potential for the scale being unidimensional can hence be considered as relevant to ensure that the scale measures the construct of interest, hence relating to measurement validity (Bell et al., 2019; Gerbing & Anderson, 1988; Slocum-Gori & Zumbo, 2010).

To assess whether the scale can potentially be considered as unidimensional, we performed a single-factor EFA. We performed this analysis without rotation, as the rotation of factor loadings regards analyses involving two or more components (Field, 2018). All the initial 44 items were therefore included in this analysis. The results of this analysis indicated that emotion validation and invalidation can be reflected in the factor loadings. We observed that the items intended to measure emotion validation resulted in negative factor loadings after conducting a single-factor analysis, whereas the items intended to measure emotion invalidation resulted in positive factor loadings (Appendix I). Based on this observation, we performed two separate principal component analyses to assess the relationships between the construct, referring to either emotion validation or invalidation, and the items related to the specific construct. Therefore, one analysis included the 27 items intended to measure perceived emotion invalidation, and the other analysis included the 17 items intended to measure perceived emotion validation. Initially, we observed that all the 44 factor loadings were well above the critical point of .4 (Stevens, 2002), and most of the items resulted in loadings in the range between .7 and .8.

Based on the observation of component 1 having a substantially larger eigenvalue than the other components and the factor loadings being strong and

reflecting whether specific items are measuring emotion validation or invalidation, we argue that a unidimensional scale, which includes items reflecting the nuances of emotion validation and invalidation, aligns with our intention of developing a scale measuring both concepts. Additionally, as presented in Table 6, the one-factor analysis resulted in a KMO equal to .98, a significant Bartlett's Test *(p < .01)*, and a Cronbach's alpha equal to .78 (α = .78). These findings indicate that a unidimensional scale involving items measuring various aspects related to emotion validation and invalidation is relevant to our research purpose. Hence, we decided to include 10 items in our final scale, which reflect the nuances of the two concepts. Furthermore, Zielinski and Veilleux' (2018) unidimensional scale measuring perceived invalidation included 10 items, and we therefore chose to direct our further analysis towards the development of a scale including 10 items, which measure both emotion validation and invalidation.

Table 6 – Single-Factor Analysis: KMO, Bartlett's Test, and Cronbach's alpha

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.98
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	27887.52
	df	95
	Sig.	.00
Cronbach's alpha		.78

Note: 44 Items

To finalize a unidimensional scale including 10 items, which measures both concepts, we intended to select items related to the categories resulting from the qualitative study and expert review. The intention of selecting items from different categories of emotion validation and invalidation is to ensure that the scale demonstrates breadth in terms of capturing the nuances of the two concepts. As we have previously performed an EFA, which resulted in the extraction of three factors and 31 items retained in our initial pool of items, we wanted our final scale to include 10 of the 31 items. The 10 items and the category related to each specific item are presented in Table 7. Particularly, as we want our scale to measure emotion validation and invalidation, we chose to include five items measuring each concept. Therefore, we selected items based on large factor loadings, which concept the item measures, and the specific category of emotion validation or invalidation an item represents. By using categories to develop a scale demonstrating nuances of the two

concepts, we were thus theoretically driven when selecting items. However, how the items resulting from the one-factor analysis relate to both theory and the initial EFA, which resulted in the extraction of three components, will be discussed in the next section.

Table 7 – Final Scale

Category	Item
Emotion Validation	
Sharing Emotion	When I feel excited, enthusiastic, joy, or other positive emotions … my leader "tunes in" to how I am feeling
Showing Respect	When I show or express negative emotions … I feel seen and heard by my leader
Communicating Support	When I feel worried, frustrated, sad, or other negative emotions … my leader gives me emotional support
Acknowledging Feelings	When I show or express negative emotions … I feel acknowledged by my leader
Express Understanding	When I show or express negative emotions … my leader makes me feel understood and accepted
Emotion Invalidation	
Minimize	If I struggle and could benefit from emotional support … my leader is more likely to give me empty reassurance than attempt to understand me
Feeling is Wrong	When I show or express negative emotions … my leader tells me to stop feeling what I'm feeling
Lack of Interest	When I show or express negative emotions … my leader shows little or no interest
Shut Down Conversation	When I feel excitement, enthusiasm, joy, or other positive emotions … my leader tries to move the conversation away from how I feel and implies we should "get back to work"

Fixing Problems	When I show or express negative emotions … my leader's initial response is to try to fix the problem rather than understand how I'm feeling

3.3.9 Discussion

The findings from an initial PCA indicated that three components should be extracted and 31 items should be retained in the initial pool of items. Based on a visual screening of the item's factor loadings, we argue that the three components reflect different features of emotion invalidation. The components were named *Lack of Emotional Support, Incorrect Emotions*, and *Fixing Problems*, which thus reflect the items being the most related to a particular component. However, as we intended to develop a scale measuring emotion validation and invalidation and based on the observation of one of the components having a substantially larger eigenvalue than the two other components, we conducted a single-factor analysis. The findings resulting from this analysis indicated the relevance of constructing a unidimensional scale, and that a scale including a limited number of items can potentially reflect the nuances of emotion validation and invalidation and hence capture the breadth of central notions concerning the two concepts. Therefore, in similarity to Zielinski and Veilleux' (2018) PIES, we consider the inclusion of 10 items in the final scale as sufficient (see Table 7). To ensure that both emotion validation and invalidation are being measured, we selected five items for the measurement of each concept. However, before discussing the findings from the single-factor analysis, we argue that it is essential to discuss how the three components from the initial PCA relate to theory and previous research. This can be reasoned by the initial PCA and the three components resulting from this analysis serving as the basis for developing a validated scale measuring emotion validation and invalidation.

3.3.9.1 Lack of Emotional Support

The component that proved to explain the most variance in the data was *Lack of Emotional Support*, which had an eigenvalue of 27.28 and hence explained 62% of the variance of the data resulting from our analysis. Out of the 31 items from the pool of items, 16 items correlate the highest with this component, have

factor loadings above .4, and did not cross load with other items (Costello & Osborne, 2005; Stevens, 2002). These items concern themes such as emotional support, if one perceives that one's emotional needs are understood and accepted, if one feels listened to, that the leader tries to "tune in" to one's emotions, and that one can open up to his or her leader. This pool of items includes both positively and negatively worded items, and factor loadings implying emotion invalidation are thus negative on the positively worded items and positive on the negatively worded items (see Table 4).

Some items measure whether or not employees perceive that they are receiving emotional support from their leader. An individual perceiving that there is a lack of emotional support from one's superior might experience emotion invalidation. This arguably implies a relationship between lack of emotional support and emotion invalidation, which in turn aligns with Witkowski's (2017) argument of the act of invalidating someone's emotions as something which can contribute to the experience of not receiving emotional support. In congruence to outcomes typically associated with emotion invalidation, the perception of not receiving sufficient emotional support can result in several outcomes potentially detrimental for organizations, such as lack of productivity, engagement, and cooperation among employees (Pearson, 2017; Witkowski, 2017). Moreover, individually considerate leaders typically provide followers with emotional support, which stems from a concern of meeting followers' needs and interests (Avolio & Bass, 1995; Bass, 1990).

Rahman and colleagues' (2012) study generated findings indicating individualized consideration and emotional intelligence as closely related. Consequently, they argued that emotionally intelligent leaders typically focus on followers' needs and emotions (Rahman et al., 2012). Additionally, expressing acceptance and acknowledging employees' needs can be seen as related to emotion validation (Arnold & Loughlin, 2010; Avolio & Bass, 1995; Linton et al., 2012). Furthermore, several items related to *Lack of Emotional Support* reflect the negative relationship between perceived emotion invalidation and perceiving that one's emotional needs are understood and acknowledged by his or her leader (Witkowski, 2017; Zielinski & Veilleux, 2018). Employees perceiving that their emotional needs are not being met by their leader, which in turn might contribute to the perception of not being listened to or seen, might therefore also perceive that they are being emotionally invalidated, which in turn might indicate that their leaders' behavior is

not reflecting central notions and behaviors associated with individualized consideration (Avolio & Bass, 1995; Holt & Marques, 2012; Witkowski, 2017; Zielinski & Veilleux, 2018).

3.3.9.2 Incorrect Emotions

Based on the items loading the highest on the second largest component, we named the construct *Incorrect Emotions*. This component was not as large as the first component, as its eigenvalue is equal to 3.06 and explains 6.95% of the variance in the data resulting from the analysis. However, by inspecting the component correlation matrix (see Table 3), we observed that the relationship between the first and second component is somewhat large ($r = .64$). This correlation might be somewhat large based on the perception of not receiving emotional support and being told that one's shared emotions are incorrect or inappropriate as two notions central to the conceptualization of emotion invalidation (Linton et al., 2012; Witkowski, 2017). Additionally, we observed 10 cross loading items on these two components, and several of these included factor loadings above the critical value of .4, which might indicate that several items reflect both components and hence signal a relationship between the constructs (Costello & Osborne, 2005; Field, 2018).

After assessing the items which loaded the highest on *Incorrect Emotions* and thus inspecting whether these items were above .4 and if they cross loaded with other items, we chose to retain 11 items in the initial pool of items (Field, 2018; Samuels, 2017). As observed in the table of factor loadings (see Table 4), three of the items related to the second component, which include the highest factor loadings on this specific component, all involve the experience of being criticized by one's leader based on the emotions being expressed. This might indicate that one's superior does not accept nor acknowledge one's emotions, hence not demonstrating emotion validation, based on the leader criticizing one's emotional experience and thus communicating that one's emotions are incorrect (Linton et al., 2012; Witkowski, 2017). Congruently, the other items related to the component *Incorrect Emotions,* are arguably related to the notion of the leader communicating that the employee's shared emotions are unacceptable or inappropriate. Particularly, most of these items involve, when emotions are being expressed by an employee, that the leader expresses that one has the wrong perspective, is overreacting, or that the individual should change how they feel. In addition, some of the items involve that

the leader more indirectly communicates that the shared emotions are incorrect or undesirable by moving the conversation over to another topic, not expressing genuine concern, or attempting to deflate the employee's feelings (Holt & Marques, 2012; Shenk & Fruzetti, 2011; Witkowski, 2017).

The items related to *Incorrect Emotions* arguably involve the notion of a leader communicating that an employee's shared emotions are incorrect or undesirable. This might involve the leader criticizing an employee for experiencing and sharing their emotions in a certain way or the leader implying that what is being expressed is irrelevant, moving the conversation over to other topics (Linton et al., 2012). These kinds of actions are often considered as common of leaders engaging in invalidation of employees' emotions (Yusof et al., 2014; Zielinski & Veilleux, 2018). However, these kinds of actions can serve as detrimental for a leader attempting to gain more influence by earning employees' trust and confidence, which can be reasoned by the relevance of demonstrating emotion validation to establish interpersonal relationships characterized by mutual trust, reciprocity, and acceptance (Yusof et al., 2014; Zielinski & Veilleux, 2018). As this indicates, leaders not validating employees' emotions, and hence implying that these are incorrect, might have their employees feeling misunderstood, aliened, and rejected, which in turn might result in employees experiencing difficulties in regulating their emotions (Gross, 2002; Holt & Marques, 2012; Zielinski et al., 2022).

Leaders trying to change how employees feel by communicating that they should calm down or feel differently might not understand why employees feel the way they do, which can be reflected by how followers answer to the items related to the component *Incorrect Emotions*. Additionally, understanding and recognizing others' emotions is commonly associated with emotional intelligence and empathy (Gooty et al., 2010; Rahman et al., 2012). However, if organizations employ the validated scale measuring perceived emotion validation and invalidation, leaders might get more insight into how their way of leading and managing employees' emotions is perceived by followers (Goleman, 1998).

3.3.9.3 Fixing Problems

The third component we extracted based on the findings from the initial PCA is *Fixing Problems*. This component has a considerably lower eigenvalue and explains less variance of the data than the two other components, by having an eigenvalue of 1.61 and 3.66 as the percent variance explained. Moreover, the

component's correlation with the first and second component was the weakest of the three relationships, and both correlations were equal to .49 ($r = .49$). As previously mentioned, this correlation is not as strong as the correlation between the two other components, however, based on the observation of no correlations exceeding the value of .7, we argue that all the constructs measured by the pool of items demonstrate discriminant validity (Field, 2018; Hurley et al., 1997). This contributes to the research purpose of developing a validated scale.

Although this component proved to be reliable ($\alpha = .87$) and had a sufficient eigenvalue according to Kaiser's criterion, only four items related to this component were included in the scale after cross loading items and items not loading higher than .4 were removed from the initial pool of items (see Table 4). Additionally, three of the four items related to the component and which are included in the scale are all related to the leader attempting to devise practical solutions and fix the problem instead of providing employees with emotional support. The fourth item, however, involves the leader providing employees with empty reassurance when they experience resistance instead of providing employees with emotional support and attempting to understand them.

The item involving empty reassurance can be considered as somewhat different than the three other items related to the component *Fixing Problems* because of its emphasis on the leader attempting to provide employees with reassurance rather than trying to engage in problem-solving. Moreover, this item has the lowest factor loading of the four items related to *Fixing Problems*, with a loading of .55. Two of the three other items arguably have considerably higher factor loadings, with loadings of .77 and .82. These two items, in addition to the item involving practical solutions, all arguably involved a leader's attempt to fix a problem, which is why this component was named *Fixing Problems*.

In congruence to the semantics of the item involving empty reassurance, the research findings based on Linton's (2012) experimental investigation generated empirical support for the notion that leaders' providing employees with empty reassurance typically results in employees feeling misunderstood or alienated. Further, Linton (2012) suggests that empty reassurance is often given based on good intentions but nonetheless results in employees perceiving their emotions as invalidated by the leader. Therefore, the item concerning empty reassurance can be argued to highlight central features of emotion invalidation. However, its

relationship with *Fixing Problems* is arguably somewhat more ambiguous than the relationships between the component and the three other items.

The three items related to a leader's attempt to engage in problem-solving rather than emotion validation can be seen as reflecting a common phenomenon, which can be reasoned by Pearson's (2017) argument of the tendency of leaders feeling the need to solve employees' problems instead of listening and offering support. Although the leader might sympathize with followers, his or her concern for followers might not come across as genuine based on the leader jumping straight into problem-solving when employees share their emotions (Kellett et al., 2006). Therefore, a leader might need to demonstrate empathy by listening, expressing concern, and hence trying to understand how employees feel, which has previously been referred to as interactive empathy, to be considered as empathetic and thus engaging in what can be considered as emotion validation (Gregory & Levy, 2011; Kellett et al., 2006; Linton et al., 2012).

3.3.9.4 Unidimensional Scale

As identified after the initial PCA, the eigenvalue of *Lack of Emotional Support* was substantially larger than the other components. Based on the observation of this component explaining significantly more of the total variance than the other components, we argue that the final scale should reflect this ratio. Similarly, six of the ten items included in the final scale are arguably related to central notions of what concerns emotional support. Based on the visual inspection of the findings resulting from the single-factor analysis, which indicated that the items related to emotion validation were negatively related to 'Lack of Emotional Support', we suggest that five of these six items as reflecting the relationship between emotional support and emotion validation (Appendix I). Employees might perceive that they are being emotionally validated by their leader when he or she demonstrates emotional support, such as the leader tuning in to employees' emotions or if the leader communicates and engages in actions demonstrating a genuine concern and understanding of the emotions being shared (Holt & Marques, 2012; Kock et al., 2019; Witkowski, 2017). In congruence to these ways of demonstrating empathy, which involves the provision of emotional support (Holt & Marques, 2012), the categories related to the items included in the scale, reflect various aspects of emotional support (e.g., *communicating support, express understanding,* and *acknowledging feelings*). However, one of the six items

representing the first component reflects the relationship between emotional support and emotion invalidation, hence indicating a lack of emotional support. In particular, the item involves a leader not being interested in how an employee feels (Appendix I), which indicates that the leader is not expressing support, understanding, and concern for the employee and his or her well-being (Holt & Marques, 2012; Kock et al., 2019).

As indicated by the initial PCA, two items included in the final scale are related to the component *Incorrect Emotions*. The items represent a leader's invalidating responses to employees' emotions, such as the leader trying to move the conversation over to another topic or the leader communicating that what an employee feels is wrong and hence ask them to stop feeling the way they do (Appendix I). These kinds of actions can potentially resemble that a leader perceives and expresses that the emotions being shared are undesirable, inappropriate, or unacceptable, which in turn might indicate that the leader does not understand why the employee is feeling the way he or she does (Shenk & Fruzetti, 2011). Therefore, a leader attempting to manage employees' emotions by trying to have them feel differently or to suppress their emotions can thus be considered as not demonstrating empathy towards his or her employees, which can in turn can negatively affect employees' intrinsic emotion regulation (Bono et al., 2007; McRae & Gross, 2020).

The two last items included in the scale involve emotion invalidation in terms of a leader's attempt to manage employees' emotions by engaging in efforts of fixing their problems (Appendix I). This regards central notions associated with the third component *Fixing Problems*, which, in similarity to *Lack of Emotional Support* and *Incorrect Emotions*, were identified by inspecting the findings generated by the initial PCA. The two items included in the scale, perceived as relevant to *Fixing Problems,* involve a leader minimizing an employee's shared emotions and providing employees with empty reassurance. As the findings from both analyses indicate, a leader attempting to help employees in solving various problems or by reassuring them that everything will be fine can result in employees' perceiving that their emotions are being invalidated and thus feel misunderstood or alienated (Linton et al., 2012; Pearson, 2017). As this implies, if the leader does not demonstrate interactive empathy in their efforts of managing employees' emotions, his or her actions of solving a perceived problem can potentially result in unintended consequences (Kellett et al., 2006; Humphrey, 2013).

4.0 General Discussion

The purpose of our research was to develop a validated scale measuring the constructs *emotion validation* and *emotion invalidation.* These efforts result from an identified gap in the research and literature on how leaders attempt to manage employees' emotions (Bono et al., 2007), hence referring to extrinsic emotion regulation (McRae & Gross, 2020; Little et al., 2016), and the lack of efforts among researchers and scholars in developing a valid scale measuring perceived emotion validation or invalidation among employees (Zielinski & Veilleux, 2018). A scale and the efforts related to this matter can thus contribute to a deeper understanding of the mechanisms associated with emotion validation and invalidation (Witkowski, 2017; Zielinski & Veilleux, 2018). Consequently, we aimed to develop a valid instrument measuring perceived emotion validation or invalidation among employees and followed what Boateng et al. (2018) and Zielinski and Veilleux (2018) referred to as best practices for developing valid scales. As such, we conducted three studies, which thus align with the procedures and principles recommended by these researchers. The first study involved a qualitative investigation of the experiences executive MBA students had with emotion validation and invalidation. This study resulted in an initial pool of items, which expert reviewers thereafter assessed. The expert review study enabled a further investigation of the items generated based on the qualitative study, as it contributed to the demonstration of content validity and a pool of 44 items. These items were further examined by using an exploratory factor analysis, by performing a principal component analysis, which in turn is an analysis allowing discriminant and convergent validity of the items to be measured (Hurley et al., 1997). This analysis resulted in the extraction of three constructs measuring distinct features of emotion invalidation, which all proved to be reliable. Based on their content, we named these constructs *Lack of Emotional Support*, *Incorrect Emotions,* and *Fixing Problems*. Additionally, after assessing the factor loadings, the item pool was reduced to 31 items.

As referred to as the purpose of our research, we attempted to develop a scale measuring both emotion validation and emotion invalidation. Based on this emphasis, we included items measuring both emotion validation and invalidation in our final scale. Based on the research findings, we observed the relevancy of assessing whether the scale might be unidimensional. Furthermore, the findings from a single-factor EFA indicated that nuances of emotion validation and

invalidation could be measured by using a unidimensional scale. Consequently, in our attempt to ensure that the items included in the scale reflect various features relevant to emotion validation and invalidation, we included five items for each concept. We selected items that resulted in large factor loadings on categories considered relevant to the two concepts. We argue that these efforts contribute to the scale, including items reflecting the nuances of emotional validation and invalidation, hence referring to different ways a leader might validate or invalidate employees' emotions. Furthermore, to assess which categories and hence the items can be considered as relevant for our final scale, we used the three components resulting from the initial PCA as a basis for comparison. We therefore argue that the 10 items included in the final scale reflect both the categories resulting from the qualitative inquiry and expert review and the three components resulting from our initial PCA. In conclusion, we propose that the items included in our scale reflect certain ways leaders manage employees' emotions, mainly how leaders validate or invalidate employees' emotions and how employees perceive such efforts and behaviors.

4.1 Strengths, Limitations and Directions for Future Research

4.1.1 Strengths

A major strength of this study is that three comprehensive studies (i.e., qualitative, expert assessment, and quantitative) have been conducted. The reasoning behind the inclusion of these studies in our research is to create a rigorous scale. We have followed what Boateng et al. (2018) refer to as best practices for scale development. In particular, we have carefully followed the steps they suggest, such as *identification of the domain(s) and item generation*, *consideration of content validity*, *item reduction*, and *tests of validity*. Following these steps, we developed a scale consisting of multiple items, which Boateng et al. (2018) argue can contribute to the isolation of item-specific measurement error. Therefore, we have increased the likelihood of our scale contributing with accurate research findings by following best practices to develop a valid scale (Boateng et al., 2018).

Before conducting our study, we decided to investigate emotion validation and invalidation, and this decision contributed to the initial specification of boundaries for our scope and research. In turn, this eased the process of developing items. However, we have followed both a deductive and inductive approach to item generation, which imply that although we narrowed our scope by focusing on

employees' perception of being emotionally validated or invalidated by their leaders, the scale includes items reflecting what the informants from the focus groups interviews expressed. Therefore, the inclusion of both deductive and inductive approaches in our research serves as a strength (Boateng et al., 2018).

The experts we have used in our study have long experience with and/or trained in EFTS and EFT, and by having the experts assess the initial items, we increased the scale's content validity (Boateng et al., 2018).

By collecting a somewhat large number of respondents for our quantitative study, we increased the generalizability of the results, which has further contributed to reducing errors in our data (Osborne & Costello, 2004). Additionally, we increased the generalizability of our research findings by including a heterogeneous sample (Bell et al., 2019; Salkind, 2010). In addition, we also chose to remove respondents according to various criteria commonly employed in research to reduce the likelihood of including careless responses in the final sample (Meade & Craig, 2012). In result, this increased the response validity. Based on our efforts to reduce careless responders from our final sample, we argue that the resulting respondents in our study gave honest answers to the various items. As we guaranteed the respondents that their answers would be anonymous and that the data would be treated confidentially, we argue that most responses can be considered as trustworthy (Pickering & Blaszczynski, 2021).

By using EFA as our method of analysis in our quantitative study, we were able to demonstrate measurement validity. Particularly, our results implied that our construct demonstrates convergent and discriminant validity. Both of these are related to measurement validity and hence important to assess when attempting to develop a valid scale (Boateng et al., 2018).

In conclusion, we argue that our study findings contribute with valuable information on how leaders manage employees' emotions and, in particular, how leaders validate or invalidate employees' emotions.

4.1.2 Limitations and Directions for Future Research

We propose our research as a valuable contribution to theories and conceptualizations regarding emotions (e.g., emotion validation and invalidation) and to the fields of leadership and organizational behavior in general. However, we acknowledge that there are some limitations pertaining to our study.

Time constraints influenced the selection of studies and analyses to include in our research. Our research has arguably contributed to the fields of leadership and organizational behavior with a valid scale measuring two promising and prominent constructs, however, we acknowledge the potential benefits of including a confirmatory factor analysis and a short-term longitudinal study in further research to investigate the relationships between the constructs (Boateng et al., 2018; Zielinski & Veilleux, 2018). The latter study involves collecting data over time and could be applied to the purpose of examining the items' psychometric properties and hence assessing the internal consistency, test-retest reliability, and validity of the survey responses (Zielinski & Veilleux, 2018). To assess test-retest reliability, further research can include longitudinal studies involving baseline and follow-up data (Boateng et al., 2018). Additionally, including a longitudinal study could contribute to the potential of drawing causal inferences based on the data, which can be reasoned by the relevancy of including other data collection methods to improve the validity of the scale (Podsakoff et al., 2003; Rindfleisch et al., 2008). Moreover, further research can employ tests of dimensionality to examine whether the items and components are similar when involving two independent samples or to have one sample of participants completing the survey on two occasions. Further, by using an independent cluster model (ICM), hence referring to confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), dimensionality can be assessed (Boateng et al., 2018). Furthermore, cross-sectional studies are limited in the way such studies can contribute to the basis of drawing causal inferences, and by including a longitudinal study or a CFA in the research, valuable insights of the constructs might be provided (Podsakoff et al., 2003; Rindfleisch et al., 2008). Consequently, by performing a CFA to evaluate the scale and by including a longitudinal study, the research will contribute with more than a hypothetical structure of the scale (Boateng et al., 2018).

Although we aimed to develop a valid scale, we acknowledge that the use of self-report questionnaires might have influenced the validity of our research findings (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Respondents' answers to the final scale might have been influenced by their disposition to experience negative emotions, and hence typically view the world in a negative way, or positive emotions, hence typically view the world in a positive way. As such, their disposition to feel and view the world in a certain way might have influenced how they answer to the various items (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Furthermore, self-reporting bias is a type of

bias often associated with self-report questionnaires. This bias typically involves respondents responding to the items in a way they perceive as socially desirable. However, as we guaranteed the respondents complete anonymity in our cross-sectional study, we suggest that this bias does not significantly affect the research findings (Donaldson & Grant-Vallone, 2002).

As our sample involved more than 600 respondents and the scale involved 44 items, we expected the survey data to include some careless responses, which also serves as another limitation typically associated with self-report questionnaires (Meade & Craig, 2012). In addition, careless responders affect the response validity of the data as it influences the extent to which the researcher can interpret the item scores in light of the phenomena of interest. As previously discussed, we used several methods to detect careless responders and thus screening out what were perceived as invalid responses, hence attempting to increase the study's response validity (Edwards, 2019). However, our scale could have included other methods to increase the response validity. One might increase the response validity by including screening items, instructions to answer the survey in a specific way, or by including items asking respondents whether they were honest and paid attention. However, these methods are associated with various limitations and should be carefully considered before being applied in research (Edwards, 2019).

We propose our sample as diverse and hence heterogeneous, which can be reasoned by the sample including men and women in the age range of 20 years old and 65 years old, working within various industries, and having a full-time or a part-time job. However, the gender distribution between men ($N = 208$) and women ($N = 312$) is arguably somewhat skewed, and all the respondents are from the United Kingdom or the United States. As this indicates, our research findings might have demonstrated external validity to a greater extent and thus contribute to the generalization of our research findings by having our sample even more diverse (Bell et al., 2019). Further, this would align with our intention and aim of developing a scale that can be applied to various types of jobs and industries. Therefore, to contribute to more variance within the sample, researchers should focus on recruiting respondents with various individual differences, such as race, cultural background, and sexual orientation (Bell et al., 2019; Osborne & Costello, 2004). Additionally, future research could explore how these types of differences are related to how employees respond to the various items measuring emotion validation and invalidation.

We used the Internet service site Prolific to collect data from participants for our quantitative study, hence referring to the use of the convenience sampling method (Edgar & Manz, 2017). Convenience sampling might contribute with interesting data, although this sampling method is somewhat limited in terms of generalizability (Bell et al., 2019). Based on the decision of selecting participants based on their accessibility, availability, and geographical proximity, hence referring to a non-probabilistic way of sampling participants, our sample is somewhat restricted in terms of its representability for the population of interest. This implies the potential relevance of randomly sampling participants to our study, however, based on our constraints in terms of time and funding, we argue that the convenience sampling method was adequate for our intention of collecting a large amount of data within a short time period and without much funding needed for this purpose (Edgar & Manz, 2017; Etikan et al., 2016; Galloway, 2005; Pickering & Blaszcynski, 2021).

4.2 Implications

Our study contributes to the field of leadership and organizational behavior with a valid and reliable scale measuring employees' perception of being emotionally validated or invalidated by their leader. The development of scales can contribute to the investigation of latent constructs that cannot be assessed directly. The measurement of emotion validation and invalidation might thus result in an increased understanding of these phenomena (Boateng et al., 2018). To our knowledge, the development of such an instrument has not previously been conducted within an organizational behavior context. Moreover, our study contributes to covering a gap in the leadership literature, of which our contribution is to incorporate emotion validation and invalidation as a component of the literature regarding how leaders manage employees' emotions (Thiel et al., 2015). However, there is a lack of research and literature regarding how leaders manage, monitor, and influence employees' emotions (Bono et al., 2007), and, in particular, emotion validation and invalidation have received little attention despite their importance for the quality of leadership, interpersonal relations, mental and physical health outcomes, and several organizational outcomes. Therefore, we argue that our research contributes to an increased understanding of mechanisms related to leadership and emotions and, in particular, to the literature involving supportive leadership, with more insights on a narrower concept (i.e., leaders'

validating or invalidating employees' emotions). Our study can thus be seen as a contribution and possibly a starting point for further research and development in the field of emotion validation and invalidation in leadership literature.

Based on the many benefits of having leaders validate their followers' shared emotions, we argue that our scale is an important contribution to the field of leadership by including items measuring both emotion validation and invalidation. Although both constructs have been included in other scales (e.g., The Socialization of Emotions Scale), however, to our knowledge, a scale measuring adults' perception of being either emotionally validated or invalidated in a non-clinical context has not been developed in the past (Krause et al., 2003; Zielinski & Veilleux, 2018). Therefore, we assume that developing a valid scale measuring employees' perception of being either validated or invalidated by their leader contributes to this matter.

We argue that our scale can be used by organizations and leaders themselves to gain more insight and a more thorough understanding of how the leaders' behaviors and actions affect followers (Benitez et al., 2020). Additionally, Ansar (2019) proposes emotion validation as trainable. Consequently, we propose that our scale, or other potential scales influenced by our research, can be employed by leaders for self-development purposes or by organizations in their development programs as a way of developing leaders' emotional intelligence (Sadri, 2012; Warrick, 2011). Leaders might thus become more aware of to what extent their followers feel that their emotions are recognized, acknowledged, and accepted (Linton et al., 2012; Sadri, 2012).

5.0 Conclusion

This research aimed to develop a validated scale measuring employees' perception of being emotionally validated or invalidated by their leader. As there has been identified a lack of literature and research on how leaders manage employees' emotions at the workplace, our research mainly serves as a theoretical contribution to the fields of leadership and organizational behavior. Particularly, how leaders manage employees' emotions is central to the theories of transformational leadership, emotional intelligence, and empathy, and our research thus serves as a theoretical contribution in terms of understanding mechanisms related to these concepts. Emotion validation and invalidation are commonly considered as understudied subjects, and our efforts in developing a scale measuring both concepts, therefore, contribute with insights and findings which lay the foundation for future research on how leaders engage in emotion management and, more specifically, on how leaders validate or invalidate employees' emotions. By following what is commonly considered as best practices in developing valid scales, we constructed a valid scale measuring both emotion validation and invalidation, including 10 items reflecting the nuances of both concepts. Consequently, the qualitative inquiry, expert review, and quantitative study all contributed to the development of a valid scale, and we argue that content, response, discriminant, and convergent validity have all been demonstrated by carefully following steps proposed as essential for developing valid scales (Boateng et al., 2018).

The finalized scale reflects the components identified after conducting a PCA of the data resulting from a cross-sectional study. The components *Lack of Emotional Support*, *Incorrect Emotions*, and *Fixing Problems* reflect nuances of emotion validation and invalidation. These were therefore emphasized in the process of narrowing down a pool of 31 items into a finalized scale of 10 items. The scale development process resulted in our proposal of a valid, unidimensional scale measuring emotion validation and invalidation. However, we acknowledge the value of including tests of dimensionality in the process of evaluating the scale and to further investigating the relationships between the mechanisms of emotion validation and invalidation. We thus recommend future studies attempting to develop valid scales measuring employees' perception of being emotionally validated or invalidated by their leader, to include a CFA and a longitudinal study to validate and hence evaluate the scale. Despite the acknowledgment of the utility

of including tests of dimensionality in the process of developing a valid scale, we highlight that our study contributes with important insights on emotion validation and invalidation as promising concepts related to leaders' attempts to manage employees' emotions.

6.0 References

Abma, I. L., Rovers, M., & van der Wees, P. J. (2016). Appraising convergent validity of patient-reported outcome measures in systematic reviews: Constructing hypotheses and interpreting outcomes. *BMC Research Notes*, *9*(1). 1-5. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13104-016-2034-2

Acharya, A. S., Prakash, A., Saxena, P., & Nigam, A. (2013). Sampling: Why and how of it. *Indian Journal of Medical Specialties*, *4*(2), 330-333. http://dx.doi.org/10.7713/ijms.2013.0032

Alkharusi, H. (2012). Generalizability theory: An analysis of variance approach to measurement problems in educational assessment. *Journal of Studies in Education*, *2*(1), 184-196. http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/jse.v2i1.1227

Ansar, N. (2019). *Emotion-Focused Skills Training (EFST) for parents of children with externalizing and internalizing symptoms*. International Society for Emotion-Focused Therapy onference 2019, Glasgow, United Kingdom.

Arnold, K. A., & Loughlin, C. (2010). Individually considerate transformational leadership behaviour and self sacrifice. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *31*(8), 670–686. https://doi.org/10.1108/01437731011094748

Avolio, B. J. & Bass, B. M. (1995). Individual consideration viewed at multiple levels of analysis: A multi-level framework for examining the influence of transformational leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, *6*(2), 199– 218. https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(95)90035-7

Ayre, C., & Scally, A. J. (2014). Critical values for Lawshe's content validity ratio. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, *47*(1), 79–86. https://doi.org/10.1177/0748175613513808

Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, *18*(3), 19-31. https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616(90)90061-s

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Psychology press.

Bell, E., Harley, B., & Bryman, A. (2018). *Business research methods* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Benitez, C., Howard, K., & Cheavens, J. (2020). The effect of validation and invalidation on positive and negative affective experiences. *The Journal Of Positive Psychology*, *17*(1), 46-58. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2020.1832243

Benson, J., Zigarmi, D., & Nimon, K. (2012). Manager's emotional intelligence, their perceived use of directive and supportive leader behaviors and resultant employee satisfaction. *Journal of Business Administration Research*, *1*(2). https://doi.org/10.5430/jbar.v1n2p30

Bissing-Olson, M. J., Iyer, A., Fielding, K. S., & Zacher, H. (2013). Relationships between daily affect and pro-environmental behavior at work: The moderating role of pro-environmental attitude. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *34*(2), 156-175. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1788

Boateng, G., Neilands, T., Frongillo, E., Melgar-Quiñonez, H., & Young, S. (2018). Best Practices for Developing and Validating Scales for Health, Social, and Behavioral Research: A Primer. *Frontiers In Public Health*, *6*(149), 1-18. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2018.00149

Bono, J. E., Foldes, H. J., Vinson, G., & Muros, J. P. (2007). Workplace emotions: the role of supervision and leadership. *Journal of applied Psychology*, *92*(5), 1357-1367. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.5.1357

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Cano, A., Leong, L. E. M., Williams, A. M., May, D. K. K., & Lutz, J. R. (2012). Correlates and consequences of the disclosure of pain-related distress to one's spouse. *Pain*, *153*, 2441–2447. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pain.2012.08.015

Cetin, M. O., & Kinik, F. S. (2015). An analysis of academic leadership behavior from the perspective of transformational leadership. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *207*, 519–527. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.10.122

Chebon, S. K., Aruasa, D. W., & Chirchir, L. K. (2019). Effect of inspirational motivation and idealized influence on employee performance at moi teaching and Referral Hospital, Eldoret, Kenya. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, *10*(7). https://doi.org/10.30845/ijbss.v10n7p14

Cheung, M. F., & Wong, C. S. (2011). Transformational leadership, leader support, and employee creativity. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *32*(7), 656-672. https://doi.org/10.1108/01437731111169988

Chuang, A., Judge, T. A., & Liaw, Y. J. (2012). Transformational leadership and customer service: A moderated mediation model of negative affectivity and emotion regulation. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *21*(1), 28-56. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2010.532911

Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the Dimensionality of Organizational Justice: A Construct Validation of a Measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*(3), 15. https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.86.3.386

Cortina, J. M. (1993). What is Coefficient Alpha? An Examination of Theory and Applications. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *78*(1), 98–104. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.78.1.98

Costello, A. B., & Osborne, J. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical assessment, research, and evaluation*, *10*(1), 86-99. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412995627.d8

DeMaio, T., & Landreth, A. (2004). Examining expert reviews as a pretest method. In *Conference on Questionnaire Evaluation Standards-QUEST 2003* (Vol. 9, pp. 60-73).

Diener, E., & Crandall, R. (1978). *Ethics in social and behavioral research*. U Chicago Press.

Donaldson, S. I., & Grant-Vallone, E. J. (2002). Understanding self-report bias in organizational behavior research. *Journal of business and Psychology*, *17*(2), 245-260. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1019637632584

Drew, C. J., Hardman, M. L. & Hosp, J. L. (2008). Ethical issues in conducting research. *In Designing and conducting research in education* (pp. 55-80). SAGE Publications, Inc., https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781483385648

Edelman, P., & van Knippenberg, D. (2018). Emotional intelligence, management of subordinate's emotions, and leadership effectiveness. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *39*(5), 592–607. https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-04-2018-0154

Edgar, T., & Manz, D. (2017). *Research methods for cyber security*. Syngress.

Edwards, J. R. (2019). Response invalidity in empirical research: Causes, detection, and remedies. *Journal of Operations Management*, *65*(1), 62-76. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jom.2018.12.002

Ellison, S. S. (2009). *Taking the war out of our words*. Voices of Integrity Innbinding: Paperback

Estrada, C. A., Isen, A. M., & Young, M. J. (1997). Positive affect facilitates integration of information and decreases anchoring in reasoning among physicians. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, *72*(1), 117-135. https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1997.2734

Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American journal of theoretical and applied statistics*, *5*(1), 1-4.

Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS Statistics* (5th edition.). Sage.

Fleishman, E. (1953). The measurement of leadership attitudes in industry. *Journal Of Applied Psychology*, *37*(3), 153-158. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0063436

Franklin, S. B., Gibson, D. J., Robertson, P. A., Pohlmann, J. T., & Fralish, J. S. (1995). Parallel Analysis: A method for determining significant principal components. *Journal of Vegetation Science*, *6*(1), 99–106. https://doi.org/10.2307/3236261

Fredrickson B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology. The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *The American psychologist*, *56*(3), 218–226. https://doi.org/10.1037//0003-066x.56.3.218

Fredrickson, B. L. (2004). The broaden–and–build theory of positive emotions. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, *359*(1449), 1367–1377. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2004.1512

Fredrickson, B. L. (2013). Positive emotions broaden and build. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 1–53. https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-407236-7.00001-2

Galloway, A. (2005). Non-Probability Sampling. *Encyclopedia of Social Measurement*, 859-864. https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-12-369398-5/00382-0

Gerbing, D. W., & Anderson, J. C. (1988). An Updated Paradigm for Scale Development Incorporating Unidimensionality and Its Assessment. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *25*(2), 186–192. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224378802500207

Gergen, M. M., & Gergen, K. J. (2000). Qualitative inquiry: Tensions and transformations. *Handbook of qualitative research*, *2*, 1025-1046.

Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with Emotional Intelligence*. Bantam Books.

Gooty, J., Connelly, S., Griffith, J., & Gupta, A. (2010). Leadership, affect and emotions: A state of the science review. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *21*(6), 979-1004. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.10.005

Grandey, A. A. (2008). Emotions at work: A review and research agenda. *Handbook of organizational behavior*, 235-261. https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781849200448.n14

Greenberg, L. (2014). The therapeutic relationship in emotion-focused therapy. *Psychotherapy*, *51*(3), 350-357. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037336

Gregory, J., & Levy, P. (2011). It's not me, it's you: A multilevel examination of variables that impact employee coaching relationships. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice And Research*, *63*(2), 67-88. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024152

Gross, J. J. (2002). Emotion regulation: Affective, cognitive, and social consequences. *Psychophysiology*, *39*(3), 281-291. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0048577201393198

Gross, J. J. (2015). Emotion regulation: Current status and future prospects. *Psychological inquiry*, *26*(1), 1-26. https://doi.org/10.1080/1047840X.2014.940781

Haslam, M., Mountford, V., Meyer, C., & Waller, G. (2008). Invalidating childhood environments in anorexia and bulimia nervosa. *Eating Behaviors: an International Journal*, *9*(3), 313-318. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eatbeh.2007.10.005

Hinkin, T. R. (1998). A brief tutorial on the development of measures for use in survey questionnaires. *Organizational research methods*, *1*(1), 104-121.

Holt, S., & Marques, J. (2012). Empathy in Leadership: Appropriate or Misplaced? An Empirical Study on a Topic that is Asking for Attention. *Journal Of Business Ethics*, *105*(1), 95-105. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-0951-5

Horn, J. L. (1965). A rationale and test for the number of factors in factor analysis. *Psychometrika*, *30*(2), 179–185. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02289447

Humphrey, R. H. (2013). The benefits of Emotional Intelligence and empathy to entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Research Journal*, *3*(3). https://doi.org/10.1515/erj-2013-0057

Hurley, A. E., Scandura, T. A., Schriesheim, C. A., Brannick, M. T., Seers, A., Vandenberg, R. J., & Williams, L. J. (1997). Exploratory and Confirmatory Factor Analysis: Guidelines, Issues, and Alternatives. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 18(6), 667–683.

Ikart, E. M. (2019). Survey questionnaire survey pretesting method: An evaluation of survey questionnaire via expert reviews technique. *Asian Journal of Social Science Studies*, *4*(2), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.20849/ajsss.v4i2.565

Johnson, R. B., & Christensen, L. (2014). *Educational research: Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Approaches* (5th edition). SAGE Publications

Judge, T., Piccolo, R., & Ilies, R. (2004). The Forgotten Ones? The Validity of Consideration and Initiating Structure in Leadership Research. *Journal Of Applied Psychology*, *89*(1), 36-51. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.1.36

Kaiser, H. F., & Rice, J. (1974). Little Jiffy, Mark IV. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *34*(1), 111–117. https://doi.org/10.1177/001316447403400115

Kellerman, B. (2007). What every leader needs to know about followers. *Harvard Business Review*, *85*(12), 84-145.

Kellett, J., Humphrey, R., & Sleeth, R. (2006). Empathy and the emergence of task and relations leaders. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *17*(2), 146-162. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.12.003

Kemeny, M. E., & Shestyuk, A. (2008). Emotions, the neuroendocrine and immune systems, and health. In M. Lewis, J. M. Haviland-Jones, & L. F. Barrett (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions*, 661–675. The Guilford Press.

Khan, H., Rehmat, M., Butt, T. H., Farooqi, S., & Asim, J. (2020). Impact of transformational leadership on work performance, Burnout and Social Loafing: A mediation model. *Future Business Journal*, *6*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s43093-020-00043-8

Kiefer, T. (2005). Feeling Bad: Antecedents and Consequences of Negative Emotions in Ongoing Change. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *26*(8), 875–897. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.339

Kock, N., Mayfield, M., Mayfield, J., Sexton, S., & De La Garza, L. M. (2019). Empathetic leadership: How leader emotional support and understanding influences follower performance. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *26*(2), 217-236. https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051818806290

Kool, M. B., van Middendorp, H., Lumley, M. A., Schenk, Y., Jacobs, J. W., Bijlsma, J. W., & Geenen, R. (2010). Lack of understanding in fibromyalgia and rheumatoid arthritis: The illness invalidation inventory (3*I). *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases*, *69*(11), 1990–1995. https://doi.org/10.1136/ard.2009.123224

Krause, E. D., Mendelson, T., & Lynch, T. R. (2003). Childhood emotional invalidation and adult psychological distress: The mediating role of emotional inhibition. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *27*(2), 199–213. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0145-2134(02)00536-7

Kvale, S. (1996). *Interview Views: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing*. Sage Publications.

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2007). Introduction to interview research. *Doing interviews*, 2- 11. https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781849208963.n1

Lee, T., W., Hom, P., Eberly, M., & Li, J. (2018). Managing employee retention and turnover with 21st century ideas. *Organizational Dynamics*, 47(2), 88- 98. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2017.08.004

Lin, C.-C., Kao, Y.-T., Chen, Y.-L., & Lu, S.-C. (2016). Fostering change-oriented behaviors: A broaden-and-build model. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *31*(3), 399–414. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-015-9417-6

Linehan, M. M. (1993). *Skills training manual for treating borderline personality disorder*. Guilford press.

Linton, S., Boersma, K., Vangronsveld, K., & Fruzzetti, A. (2012). Painfully reassuring? The effects of validation on emotions and adherence in a pain test. *European Journal Of Pain*, *16*(4), 592-599. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpain.2011.07.011

Little, L., Gooty, J., & Williams, M. (2016). The role of leader emotion management in leader–member exchange and follower outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *27*(1), 85-97. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2015.08.007

McRae, K., & Gross, J. J. (2020). Emotion regulation. *Emotion*, *20*(1), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000703

Meade, A. W., & Craig, S. B. (2012). Identifying careless responses in survey data. *Psychological Methods*, *17*(3), 437–455. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028085

Megerian, L. E., & Sosik, J. J. (1996). An affair of the heart: Emotional intelligence and transformational leadership. *The Journal of Leadership studies*, *3*(3), 31-48. https://doi.org/10.1177/107179199700300305

Miao, C., Humphrey, R. H., & Qian, S. (2016). Leader emotional intelligence and subordinate job satisfaction: A meta-analysis of main, mediator, and moderator effects. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *102*, 13–24. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.06.056

Mountford, V., Corstorphine, E., Tomlinson, S., & Waller, G. (2007). Development of a measure to assess invalidating childhood environments in the eating disorders. *Eating Behaviors*, *8*(1), 48–58. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eatbeh.2006.01.003

Northouse, P. (2019). *Leadership: theory and practice* (8th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Nozaki, Y., & Mikolajczak, M. (2020). Extrinsic Emotion Regulation. *Emotion*, *20*(1), 10-15. https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000636

Ogola, M. G. (2017). The Influence of Individualized Consideration Leadership Behavior on Employee Performance in Small and Medium Enterprises in Kenya. *Journal Of Humanities And Social Science*, *24*(7), 11-22. https://doi.org/10.9790/0837-2407041122

Olson, K. (2010). An examination of questionnaire evaluation by expert reviewers. *Field Methods*, *22*(4), 295–318. https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822x10379795

Osborne, J. W., & Costello, A. B. (2004). Sample size and subject to item ratio in principal components analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*, *9*(1), 11.

Palmer, B., Walls, M., Burgess, Z., & Stough, C. (2001). Emotional intelligence and effective leadership. *Leadership & Organization development journal*, *22*(1), 5–10. https://doi.org/10.1108/01437730110380174

Patil, V. H., Surendra., N. Singh, S. M., and Todd D. D. (2017). Parallel Analysis Engine to Aid in Determining Number of Factors to Retain using R [Computer software], available from https://analytics.gonzaga.edu/parallelengine/.

Pearce, J. L., & Gregersen, H. B. (1991). Task interdependence and extrarole behavior: A test of the mediating effects of felt responsibility. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *76*(6), 838–844. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.76.6.838

Pearson, C. (2017). The smart way to respond to negative emotions at work. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, *58*(3), 49-56.

Piccolo, R., Bono, J., Heinitz, K., Rowold, J., Duehr, E., & Judge, T. (2012). The relative impact of complementary leader behaviors: Which matter most?. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *23*(3), 567-581. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.12.008

Pickering, D., & Blaszczynski, A. (2021). Paid online convenience samples in gambling studies: Questionable data quality. *International Gambling Studies*, *21*(3), 516–536. https://doi.org/10.1080/14459795.2021.1884735

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of applied psychology*, *88*(5), 879-903. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879

Polychroniou, P. V. (2009). Relationship between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership of supervisors: The impact on team effectiveness. *Team Performance Management: An International Journal, 15*(7/8), 343–356. https://doi.org/10.1108/13527590911002122

Porath, C. L., & Pearson, C. M. (2012). Emotional and behavioral responses to workplace incivility and the impact of hierarchical status. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *42*(Suppl 1), E326–E357. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2012.01020.x

Qualtrics (n.d.) Survey Methodology & Compliance Best Practices, retrieved from https://www.qualtrics.com/support/survey-platform/surveymodule/survey-checker/survey-methodology-compliance-bestpractices/?utm_medium=ExpertReview&utm_source=product&utm_camp aign=NumberMatrix&utm_content=#NumberMatrix

Prolific. (2022). *About Prolific. https://www.prolific.co/about*

Rafferty, A., & Griffin, M. (2006). Refining individualized consideration: Distinguishing developmental leadership and supportive leadership. *Journal Of Occupational And Organizational Psychology*, 79(1), 37-61. https://doi.org/10.1348/096317905x36731

Rahman, M. S., Ferdausy, S., & Uddin, M. A. (2012). Examining the relationships between emotional intelligence and the components of transformational leadership. *ABAC Journal*, *32*(1).

Reschly, A. L., Huebner, E. S., Appleton, J. J., & Antaramian, S. (2008). Engagement as flourishing: The contribution of positive emotions and coping to adolescents' engagement at school and with learning. *Psychology in the Schools*, *45*(5), 419-431. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.20306

Rindfleisch, A., Malter, A. J., Ganesan, S., & Moorman, C. (2008). Cross-sectional versus longitudinal survey research: Concepts, findings, and guidelines. *Journal of marketing research*, *45*(3), 261-279. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.45.3.261

Robertson, C. D., Kimbrel, N. A., & Nelson-Gray, R. O. (2013). The Invalidating Childhood Environment Scale (ICES): Psychometric properties and relationship to borderline personality symptomatology. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, *27*(3), 402–410. https://doi.org/10.1521/pedi_2012_26_062

Rowe, A. D., & Fitness, J. (2018). Understanding the Role of Negative Emotions in Adult Learning and Achievement: A social functional perspective. *Behavioral sciences*, *8*(2), 27. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs8020027

Rubin, R. S., Munz, D. C., & Bommer, W. H. (2005). Leading from within: The effects of emotion recognition and personality on transformational leadership behavior. *Academy of management journal*, *48*(5), 845-858. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2005.18803926

Sadri, G. (2012). Emotional Intelligence and Leadership Development. *Public Personnel Management*, *41*(3), 535–548. https://doi.org/10.1177/009102601204100308

Salkind, J. (2010). *Encyclopedia of Research Design*. SAGE Publications

Samuels, P. (2017). *Advice on Exploratory Factor Analysis*. Birmingham City University.

Saunders, M. N. K., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2019). *Research methods for business students* (Eighth Edition.). Pearson.

Shariff, A. F., & Tracy, J. L. (2011). What Are Emotion Expressions For? *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20(6), 395–399. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721411424739

Shenk, C., & Fruzzetti, A. (2011). The Impact of Validating and Invalidating Responses on Emotional Reactivity. *Journal Of Social And Clinical Psychology*, *30*(2), 163-183. https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.2011.30.2.163

Slocum-Gori, S. L., & Zumbo, B. D. (2011). Assessing the unidimensionality of psychological scales: Using multiple criteria from factor analysis. *Social Indicators Research*, *102*(3), 443-461. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-010-9682-8

Smollan, R., & Parry, K. (2011). Follower perceptions of the emotional intelligence of change leaders: A qualitative study. *Leadership*, *7*(4), 435–462. https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715011416890

Stein, M., Vincent-Höper, S., & Gregersen, S. (2020). Why busy leaders may have exhausted followers: a multilevel perspective on supportive leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *41*(6), 829-845. https://doi.org/10.1108/lodj-11-2019-0477

Stevens J. (2002) Applied Multivariate Statistics for the Social Sciences, (4th edn), Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, *Inc. Publishers*

Stogdill, R. (1950). Leadership, membership and organization. *Psychological Bulletin*, *47*(1), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0053857

Thiel, C., Griffith, J., & Connelly, S. (2015). Leader–Follower Interpersonal Emotion Management: Managing stress by person-focused and emotion-focused emotion management. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *22*(1), 5-20. https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051813515754

Thomson, N. B., Rawson, J. V., Slade, C. P., & Bledsoe, M. (2016). Transformation and transformational leadership:: a review of the current and relevant literature for academic radiologists. *Academic radiology*, *23*(5), 592-599. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acra.2016.01.010

Vacharkulksemsuk, T., Sekerka, L., & Fredrickson, B. (2010). Establishing a positive emotional climate to create 21st-century organizational change. In Ashkanasy., N. M., Wilderom., C. P. & Peterson., M. F. *The handbook of organizational culture and climate* (pp. 101-118). SAGE Publications, Inc., https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781483307961.n7

Warrick, D.D. (2011). The Urgent Need for Skilled Transformational
Leaders: Integrating Transformational Leadership and Organization
Development. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability, and Ethics*, *8*(5),
11-26. https://doi.org/10.9790/487X-171210107

Weinberg, A., & Klonsky, E. D. (2009). Measurement of emotion
dysregulation in adolescents. *Psychological Assessment*, *21*(4), 616–621.
https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016669

Witkowski, G. (2017). *The Effect of Emotionally Validating and Invalidating
Responses on Emotional Self-Efficacy*. Walden Dissertations and
Doctoral Studies Collection.

Yan, Y., Zhang, J., Akhtar, M. N., & Liang, S. (2021). Positive leadership
and employee engagement: The roles of state positive affect and
individualism-collectivism. *Current Psychology*, 1-10.
https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-021-02192-7

Yeo, A., Legard, R., Keegan, J., Ward, K., Nicholls, C. M. & Lewis. J.
(2014). In-depth Interviews. I J. Ritchie, J. Lewis, C. M. Nicholls and R.
Ormston (Red.), *Qualitative Research Practice: A guide for social
science students and researchers*, 178-210. Sage

Yusof, H. M., Kadir, H. A., & Mahfar, M. (2014). The role of emotions in
leadership. *Asian Social Science*, *10*(10), 41.
https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v10n10p41

Zacher, H., Pearce, L. K., Rooney, D., & McKenna, B. (2014). Leaders'
personal wisdom and leader–member exchange quality: The role of
individualized consideration. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *121*(2), 171–
187. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1692-4

Zielinski, M. J., & Veilleux, J. C (2018). The Perceived Invalidation of
Emotion Scale (PIES): Development and psychometric properties of a
novel measure of current emotion invalidation. *Psychological
Assessment*, *30*(11), 1454-1467. https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000584

Zielinski, M. J., & Veilleux, J. C., Fradley, M. F., & Skinner, K. D. (2022).
Perceived emotion invalidation predicts daily affect and stressors.
Anxiety, Stress, & Coping, 1–15.
https://doi.org/10.1080/10615806.2022.2033973

7.0 Appendix

Appendix A – Purpose of the Study and Informed Consent

Purpose of the Project

The purpose of this project is to contribute to leadership research by generating a questionnaire for emotion validation and emotion invalidation that can be utilized in the study of leader- follower relationships and dynamics. Results will be published in an academic peer- reviewed journal. Data from the project will also appear in a master's thesis (Master of Science in Organizational Psychology, 2022) at BI Norwegian Business School. The data collected will not be used for any other purpose.

What Data Will Be Collected?

We will ask you questions regarding 1) how your immediate manager responds when you show or share emotions at work; 2) your relationship with your immediate manager; and 3) a few other work-related topics. The survey will take approximately 7 minutes to complete.

Who is responsible for the Research Project?

Per-Magnus Moe Thompson, Associate Professor, BI Norwegian Business School.

Participation is Voluntary

Participation in the project is voluntary. If you choose to participate, you can withdraw your consent without giving a reason. However, this needs to be done before the information about you is being anonymized.

Your Personal Privacy – How We Will Store and Use Your Personal Data

We will use your personal data only for the purpose(s) specified above. Only researchers and master's students at BI Norwegian Business School involved in this project will have access to the data. We will process your personal data confidentially and in accordance with data protection legislation (the General Data Protection Regulation and Personal Data Act). Data will be anonymized as soon as we the researchers have received responses from Prolific.

What Will Happen to Your Personal Data at The End of The Research Project?

The project is scheduled to end on December 31st, 2022. Data will be anonymized as soon as possible, and all data that can identify participants will be deleted after the end of this project.

Your Rights

As long as you can be identified in the collected data, you have the right to:

- Access your personal data
- Request that your personal data be deleted
- Request that any incorrect personal data about you be corrected/rectified
- Receive a copy of your personal data (data portability), and
- Send a complaint to the Data Protection Officer or The Norwegian Data Protection Authority regarding the processing of your personal data

What Gives Us the Right to Process Your Personal Data?

We will process your personal data based on your consent.

Where Can I Find Out More?

If you have questions about the project, or want to exercise your rights, contact:

- BI Norwegian Business School, Associate Professor Per-Magnus Thompson, per-magnus.thompson@bi.no
- BI Norwegian Business School, Data Protection Officer Vibeke Nesbakken, personvernombud@bi.no

By clicking to the next page, you indicate that you have received and understood the information above, and that you give your consent to participate in this research project

Consent form

I have received and understood information about the project about leader responses to followers' emotions and have been given the opportunity to ask questions.

☐ I give consent to participate in this research project and for my personal data to be processed until the end date of the project. The project is scheduled to end 1st of October 2023.

Study 1 Individual Essay Questions

1. Think of situations where you interacted with a former or your current leader and...

…expressed your positive emotions (e.g., excitement, joy, strongly motivated). How did he/she react? Please write down 3 examples.

a) Describe the situation (approximately two sentences).

b) What did your leader say and/or do?

c) How did that make you feel?

Example: *I remember a time when me and my team had finished a project and felt that we had done a really good job. So, I told my leader about this. He responded by asking a lot of critical questions. This made me walk away from the conversation feeling less excited and proud about our team effort.*

Situation 1:

Situation 2:

Situation 3:

2. Think of situations where you interacted with a former or your current leader and...

…expressed your negative emotions (e.g., sad, angry, frightened, embarrassed, envy). How did he/she react? Please write down 3 examples.

a) Describe the situation (approximately two sentences).

b) What did your leader say and/or do?

c) How did that make you feel?

Example: *I remember a time when I felt treated unfairly for not receiving a bonus. Confronting my leader with this issue, she really took the time to listen to my perspective. So even though she stuck to her decision, at least, the conversation made me feel taken seriously.*

Situation 1:

Situation 2:

Situation 3:

Appendix C – Focus Group Interviews

Focus Group Questions and Facilitator Instructions

Facilitator: "Hello everyone! Thank you again for being willing to participate in our group interview. We hope that each of you will be open to sharing your experiences, and that each of you respect and listen to what other group members have to say. There are not any right or wrong answers to our questions today. We are just interested in hearing your feelings and opinions.

Facilitator: "Thanks for doing that! you will need to keep everything shared in this session confidential. We hope this will help everyone to feel comfortable participating today, without fear that information that they share will leave the room.

Facilitator: "Okay, let's get started with our interview. We are going to start by talking a little bit about the essay assignment that you just completed."

(Continue with questions, calling on participants to speak if necessary).

Share with the group some examples that illustrate how leaders differ in responding when followers express their emotions (positive/negative).

> *Facilitator*: Ask for examples! (What leaders say and do)
>
> *Reflecting in groups*: There are ways that leaders communicate that followers' emotions are counterproductive, inappropriate and/or incorrect.

Q: Give examples of what leaders could say/do that would make followers feel that their emotions are counterproductive, inappropriate and/or incorrect.

Reflecting in groups: There are ways that leaders communicate that followers' emotions are accepted and understandable.

Q: Give examples of what leaders could say/do that would make followers feel that their emotions are accepted and understandable.

Sharing with the group: In the role as leader, what are your ways of responding when followers express their emotions? Give examples of what you say/do in different situations / with different followers.

Appendix D – Final Categories

	Validation	Invalidation
1	Listening And Showing Interest	Lack Of Interest
2	Sharing Emotion	Not Sharing or Mirroring Emotion
3	Showing Respect / Taken Seriously	Not Show Respect/Take Seriously
4	Understanding / Acceptance of Follower's Needs	Not Accept Follower's Needs
5	Communicating Support	Not Communicate Support
6	Acknowledging Feelings	Not Acknowledge Feelings
7	Express Understanding	Not Express Understanding
8	Not Minimize	Minimizing
9	Feeling Is Appropriate	Feeling Is Inappropriate
10	Keep Conversation Open	Shut Down Conversation
11	Thinking Makes Sense	Wrong Thinking
12	Praise And Positive Feedback	Criticism Or Negative Feedback
13	React	No Reaction
14	Feeling Makes Sense	Feeling Is Wrong

Invalidation

If I struggle and could benefit from emotional support

1.   … my leader ignores how I'm feeling and instead looks for practical solutions to my problems

2.   … my leader seems uninterested in how I feel

3.   … I often get the impression that my leader doesn't understand why I feel the way I feel

4.   … my leader is more likely to give me empty reassurance (e.g., don't worry about it, it will get better) than attempt to understand me

When I feel sad, worried, frustrated, or experience other negative emotions

5.   … my leader tells me to change my perspective rather than acknowledging how I'm doing

6.   … my leader criticizes me for feeling the way I feel

7.   … my leader seems uninterested in how I feel

8.   … my leader doesn't seem to understand me

9.   … my leader's initial response is to try to fix the problem rather than understand how I'm feeling

When I show or express negative emotions (e.g., worries, frustrations, sadness)

10.   … my leader tries to minimize the feeling (e.g., It can't be that bad)

11.   … I get the impression that my leader doesn't take me seriously

12.   … my leader gives me the impression that I blow things out of proportion

13.   … my leader tells me to stop feeling what I'm feeling (e.g., stop worrying; or there's no reason to get upset)

14.   … I get the sense that my leader isn't really listening

15.   … my leader tries to move the conversation away from how I feel and implies we should "get back to work"

16.   … my leader has a hard time understanding how I'm feeling

17.   … my leader responds by criticizing me for the way I'm feeling

18.   … my leader indicates that my perspective or way of thinking is wrong

19.   … my leader shows little or no interest

20. … my leader's initial response is to try to fix the problem rather than understand how I'm feeling

When I feel excitement, enthusiasm, joy, or other positive emotions

21. … my leader tries to move the conversation away from how I feel and implies we should "get back to work"
22. … my leader is unresponsive
23. … I get the impression that my leader doesn't take me seriously
24. … my leader responds by criticizing me for the way I'm feeling (e.g., by telling me to calm down)
25. … my leader shows little or no interest

When I'm enthusiastic

26. … my leader deflates my enthusiasm (e.g., by responding with an emotionally "flat" response)

When I'm excited

27. … my leader does not show excitement in response

Validation

When I feel worried, frustrated, sad, or other negative emotions

28. … my leader listens to what I have to say and takes it seriously
29. … my leader "tunes in" to how I am feeling
30. … my leader gives me emotional support
31. … my leader has a good sense of what my emotional needs are

When I show or express negative emotions (e.g., worries, frustrations, sadness)

32 … my leader takes the time to listen rather than jump to conclusions about the situation
33. … I feel seen and heard by my leader
34. … my leader treats me with respect
35. … my leader "gets" and accepts me
36. … I feel acknowledged by my leader
37. … my leader makes me feel understood and accepted

When I feel excited, enthusiastic, joy, or other positive emotions

38.   … my leader responds in a way that makes me feel that he/she shares the energy of what I'm feeling (e.g., shares excitement with me when I am excited)

39.   … my leader treats me with respect

40.   … my leader "tunes in" to how I am feeling

General Validation

41.   My leader shows interest in how I'm feeling

42.   I can get emotional support from my leader if I need it

43.   My leader makes me feel that my emotions are important

44.   My leader understands me when I open up about what I'm feeling

---

Appendix F – Prolific Criteria

Age Minimum Age: 20, Maximum Age: 65	Edit	Remove
Nationality United Kingdom, United States	Edit	Remove
First Language English	Edit	Remove
Employment Status Full-Time, Part-Time	Edit	Remove
Remote/office work I always work from a central place of work, I sometimes work from a central place of work and sometimes remotely	Edit	Remove
Work week in hours 21-30 hours per week, 31-40 hours per week, 41-50 hours per week, 51-60 hours per week, More than 60 hours per week	Edit	Remove
Organizational tenure 5-6 months, 7-12 months, 1-2 years, 2-5 years, More than 5 years	Edit	Remove
Supervisor Yes	Edit	Remove
+ Add screener		

We've found 7,508 matching participants who have been active in the past 90 days

Parallel Analysis

Number of Variables in Your Dataset to be Factor Analyzed (Please change)

44

Sample Size of Your Dataset (Please change)

522

Type of Analysis

Principal Components ▾

Number of Random Correlation Matrices to Generate (default of 100 currently set)

100

Percentile of Eigenvalues (default of 95th percentile currently set)

95

Seed

1000

Citing this Application:

Patil Vivek H, Surendra N. Singh, Sanjay Mishra, and D. Todd Donavan (2017). Retain using R [Computer software], available from https://analytics.gonzaga.

Using this Application

Based on parameters provided by the researcher, this engine calculates eigen then compared with eigenvalues extracted from the researcher's dataset. The (generated from the researcher's dataset) that are larger than the correspondir

The default (and recommended) values for number of random correlation matr Cota et al. 1993; Glorfeld 1995; Turner 1998; Velicer et al. 2000). Based on the default options. Higher (lower) values of number of correlation matrices genera data points in the distribution of different eigenvalues. The percentile determir comparison purposes. Lower values of the percentile tend to lead to over extr

Component or Factor	Mean Eigenvalue	Percentile Eigenvalue
1	1.599372	1.647535
2	1.542617	1.585832
3	1.490577	1.527198
4	1.449241	1.488531
5	1.414630	1.447901
6	1.378166	1.412276
7	1.344274	1.376602
8	1.315723	1.350983

Communalities

Items	Initial	Extraction
If I struggle and could benefit from emotional support… - ... my leader ignores how I'm feeling and instead looks for practical solutions to my problems	1.00	.61
If I struggle and could benefit from emotional support… - ... my leader seems uninterested in how I feel	1.00	.77
If I struggle and could benefit from emotional support… - ... I often get the impression that my leader doesn't understand why I feel the way I feel	1.00	.74
If I struggle and could benefit from emotional support… - ... my leader is more likely to give me empty reassurance (e.g., don't worry about it, it will get better) than attempt to understand me	1.00	.71
When I feel sad, worried, frustrated, or experience other negative emotions... - ... my leader tells me to change my perspective rather than acknowledging how I'm doing	1.00	.56
When I feel sad, worried, frustrated, or experience other negative emotions... - ... my leader criticizes me for feeling the way I feel	1.00	.72
When I feel sad, worried, frustrated, or experience other negative emotions... - ... my leader seems uninterested in how I feel	1.00	.81

When I feel sad, worried, frustrated, or experience other negative emotions... - ... my leader doesn't seem to understand me	1.00	.77
When I feel sad, worried, frustrated, or experience other negative emotions... - ... my leader's initial response is to try to fix the problem rather than understand how I'm feeling	1.00	.71
When I show or express negative emotions (e.g., worries, frustrations, sadness) … - ... my leader tries to minimize the feeling (e.g., It can't be that bad).	1.00	.61
When I show or express negative emotions (e.g., worries, frustrations, sadness) … - ... I get the impression that my leader doesn't take me seriously	1.00	.79
When I show or express negative emotions (e.g., worries, frustrations, sadness) … - ... my leader gives me the impression that I blow things out of proportion	1.00	.65
When I show or express negative emotions (e.g., worries, frustrations, sadness) … - ... my leader tells me to stop feeling what I'm feeling (e.g., stop worrying; or, there's no reason to get upset)	1.00	.67
When I show or express negative emotions (e.g., worries, frustrations, sadness) … - ... I get the sense that my leader isn't really listening	1.00	.79
When I show or express negative emotions (e.g., worries, frustrations, sadness) … - ... my leader tries to move the conversation away from how I feel and implies we should "get back to work"	1.00	.68

When I show or express negative emotions (e.g., worries, frustrations, sadness) … - … my leader has a hard time understanding how I'm feeling	1.00	.74
When I show or express negative emotions (e.g., worries, frustrations, sadness) … - … my leader responds by criticizing me for the way I'm feeling	1.00	.76
When I show or express negative emotions (e.g., worries, frustrations, sadness) … - … my leader indicates that my perspective or way of thinking is wrong	1.00	.74
When I show or express negative emotions (e.g., worries, frustrations, sadness) … - … my leader shows little or no interest	1.00	.80
When I show or express negative emotions (e.g., worries, frustrations, sadness) … - … my leader's initial response is to try to fix the problem rather than understand how I'm feeling	1.00	.73
When I feel excitement, enthusiasm, joy, or other positive emotions... - ... my leader tries to move the conversation away from how I feel and implies we should "get back to work"	1.00	.57
When I feel excitement, enthusiasm, joy, or other positive emotions... - ... my leader is unresponsive	1.00	.67
When I feel excitement, enthusiasm, joy, or other positive emotions... - ... I get the impression that my leader doesn't take me seriously	1.00	.74

When I feel excitement, enthusiasm, joy, or other positive emotions... - ... my leader responds by criticizing me for the way I'm feeling (e.g., by telling me to calm down)	1.00	.72
When I feel excitement, enthusiasm, joy, or other positive emotions... - ... my leader shows little or no interest	1.00	.78
When I'm enthusiastic, my leader deflates my enthusiasm (e.g., by responding with an emotionally "flat" response)	1.00	.67
When I'm excited, my leader does not show excitement in response	1.00	.60
When I feel worried, frustrated, sad, or other negative emotions... - ... my leader listens to what I have to say and takes it seriously	1.00	.66
When I feel worried, frustrated, sad, or other negative emotions... - ... my leader "tunes in" to how I am feeling	1.00	.74
When I feel worried, frustrated, sad, or other negative emotions... - ... my leader gives me emotional support	1.00	.79
When I feel worried, frustrated, sad, or other negative emotions... - ... my leader has a good sense of what my emotional needs are	1.00	.79
When I show or express negative emotions (e.g., worries, frustrations, sadness) … - ... my leader takes the time to listen rather than jump to conclusions about the situation	1.00	.62

When I show or express negative emotions (e.g., worries, frustrations, sadness) … - … I feel seen and heard by my leader	1.00	.80
When I show or express negative emotions (e.g., worries, frustrations, sadness) … - … my leader treats me with respect	1.00	.74
When I show or express negative emotions (e.g., worries, frustrations, sadness) … - … my leader "gets" and accepts me	1.00	.79
When I show or express negative emotions (e.g., worries, frustrations, sadness) … - … I feel acknowledged by my leader	1.00	.81
When I show or express negative emotions (e.g., worries, frustrations, sadness) … - … my leader makes me feel understood and accepted	1.00	.84

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Appendix I – Single-Factor Analysis	Component 1
When I show or express negative emotions (e.g., worries, frustrations, sadness) … - ... my leader shows little or no interest	.89
When I feel sad, worried, frustrated, or experience other negative emotions... - ... my leader seems uninterested in how I feel	.89
When I show or express negative emotions (e.g., worries, frustrations, sadness) … - ... I get the sense that my leader isn't really listening	.88
When I feel excitement, enthusiasm, joy, or other positive emotions... - ... my leader shows little or no interest	.88
When I show or express negative emotions (e.g., worries, frustrations, sadness) … - ... I get the impression that my leader doesn't take me seriously	.87
When I show or express negative emotions (e.g., worries, frustrations, sadness) … - ... my leader makes me feel understood and accepted	-.87
When I feel sad, worried, frustrated, or experience other negative emotions... - ... my leader doesn't seem to understand me	.87
When I show or express negative emotions (e.g., worries, frustrations, sadness) … - ... I feel seen and heard by my leader	-.87
If I struggle and could benefit from emotional support… - ... my leader seems uninterested in how I feel	.86

When I show or express negative emotions (e.g., worries, frustrations, sadness) … - ... I feel acknowledged by my leader	-.86
My leader shows interest in how I'm feeling	-.84
When I show or express negative emotions (e.g., worries, frustrations, sadness) … - ... my leader has a hard time understanding how I'm feeling	.84
When I feel excitement, enthusiasm, joy, or other positive emotions... - ... I get the impression that my leader doesn't take me seriously	.84
When I show or express negative emotions (e.g., worries, frustrations, sadness) … - ... my leader "gets" and accepts me	-.83
When I feel excited, enthusiastic, joy, or other positive emotions... - ... my leader "tunes in" to how I am feeling	-.83
If I struggle and could benefit from emotional support… - ... I often get the impression that my leader doesn't understand why I feel the way I feel	.83
I can get emotional support from my leader if I need it	-.82
When I feel excited, enthusiastic, joy, or other positive emotions... - ... my leader treats me with respect	-.81
My leader makes me feel that my emotions are important	-.80
When I show or express negative emotions (e.g., worries, frustrations, sadness) … - ... my leader treats me with respect	-.80

When I feel excitement, enthusiasm, joy, or other positive emotions... - ... my leader is unresponsive	.80
My leader understands me when I open up about what I'm feeling	-.79
When I feel worried, frustrated, sad, or other negative emotions... - ... my leader "tunes in" to how I am feeling	-.79
When I feel worried, frustrated, sad, or other negative emotions... - ... my leader gives me emotional support	-.78
When I feel worried, frustrated, sad, or other negative emotions... - ... my leader has a good sense of what my emotional needs are	-.78
When I show or express negative emotions (e.g., worries, frustrations, sadness) … - ... my leader indicates that my perspective or way of thinking is wrong	.78
When I show or express negative emotions (e.g., worries, frustrations, sadness) … - ... my leader tries to move the conversation away from how I feel and implies we should "get back to work"	.78
When I feel worried, frustrated, sad, or other negative emotions... - ... my leader listens to what I have to say and takes it seriously	-.77
When I'm excited, my leader does not show excitement in response	.77
When I'm enthusiastic, my leader deflates my enthusiasm (e.g., by responding with an emotionally "flat" response)	.77

If I struggle and could benefit from emotional support… - ... my leader is more likely to give me empty reassurance (e.g., don't worry about it, it will get better) than attempt to understand me	.76
When I show or express negative emotions (e.g., worries, frustrations, sadness) … - ... my leader gives me the impression that I blow things out of proportion	.75
When I show or express negative emotions (e.g., worries, frustrations, sadness) … - ... my leader takes the time to listen rather than jump to conclusions about the situation	-.75
When I feel excited, enthusiastic, joy, or other positive emotions... - ... my leader responds in a way that makes me feel that he/she shares the energy of what I'm feeling (e.g., shares excitement with me when I am excited)	-.74
When I show or express negative emotions (e.g., worries, frustrations, sadness) … - ... my leader responds by criticizing me for the way I'm feeling	.71
When I show or express negative emotions (e.g., worries, frustrations, sadness) … - ... my leader tells me to stop feeling what I'm feeling (e.g., stop worrying; or there's no reason to get upset)	.71
When I feel excitement, enthusiasm, joy, or other positive emotions... - ... my leader tries to move the conversation away from how I feel and implies we should "get back to work"	.70
When I feel excitement, enthusiasm, joy, or other positive emotions... - ... my leader responds by criticizing me for the way I'm feeling (e.g., by telling me to calm down)	.70

When I feel sad, worried, frustrated, or experience other negative emotions... - ... my leader criticizes me for feeling the way I feel	.69
When I show or express negative emotions (e.g., worries, frustrations, sadness) … - ... my leader tries to minimize the feeling (e.g., It can't be that bad).	.67
When I feel sad, worried, frustrated, or experience other negative emotions... - ... my leader tells me to change my perspective rather than acknowledging how I'm doing	.67
If I struggle and could benefit from emotional support… - ... my leader ignores how I'm feeling and instead looks for practical solutions to my problems	.67
When I show or express negative emotions (e.g., worries, frustrations, sadness) … - ... my leader's initial response is to try to fix the problem rather than understand how I'm feeling	.64
When I feel sad, worried, frustrated, or experience other negative emotions... - ... my leader's initial response is to try to fix the problem rather than understand how I'm feeling	.58

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 1 components extracted.