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Abstract

Research on empowerment has to this date been inconsistent with respect to the logical structure of concepts, and research on the effectiveness of empowerment has provided mixed results. The findings of this study may shed light on the previous, inconsistent results found in empowerment research, which are considered problematic to its theory development (Kirkman & Shapiro, 2001). To address this issue, the present paper will test the moderating role of leader prototypicality in the relationship between two leadership empowerment behaviours, respectively encouraging self-development and encouraging independent action, and organizational citizenship behaviours directed towards the organization (OCB-O) and towards the individual (OCB-I). We propose a model where leader prototypicality work as a moderator on the positive relationship between empowering leadership behaviour (encouraging independent action and encouraging self-development) and organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB-O and OCB-I). In order to explore this relationship, a cross-sectional study among 88 employees and 13 leaders from in total three different organizations in Norway were conducted. Through multilevel analysis, the results showed that encouraging independent action and encouraging self-development had a positive and significant relationship with OCB-O, while they had a non-significant relationship to OCB-I. In regards to the moderating effect of leader prototypicality, our results concluded that it marginally supported the relationship for the two leadership empowerment behaviours in relation to OCB-I. However, the results also showed that the moderating effect of leader prototypicality on the relationship between encouraging self-development and OCB-O was non-significant. In contrast, our results showed that encouraging independent action and OCB-O had a significant and positive relationship when moderated by leader prototypicality. These findings suggest that leaders who are high in leader prototypicality and engage in certain types of empowering leadership such as independent action, are more likely to have employees that are rising above and beyond their job description to benefit the organization as a whole. While other types of leader empowering behaviour like self-development appear to be not as effective. Future research is recommended to investigate its boundary conditions. Discussion of our findings, implications and directions for future research is deliberated.
1.0 Introduction

Empowerment has received noticeable attention in organizational research and practice over the last decades, and scholars in the management and leadership disciplines have consistently recognized the important role of the leader in influencing employee empowerment (Raub & Robert, 2010). As the 21st century began, the organizational landscape was transformed (Ahearne, Mathieu, & Rapp, 2005). Advances in technology, a global marketplace, a constant demand for change and innovativeness and many other factors demanded that organizations made their practices more cost-effective, and otherwise became more efficient (Ahearne et al., 2005). To be as effective as possible, leaders are expected to inspire and motivate their followers, rather than purely control and direct them (Hakimi, 2010). A key ingredient in this transformation has been the empowerment of employees (Forrester, 2000). Empowerment is thought to unleash employees’ potential, enhance their motivation and allow them to be more adaptive and receptive to their environment (Ahearne et al., 2005; Forrester, 2000). Yet, a number of researchers have argued that efforts to empower employees do not always yield positive dividends and, in fact, can even be detrimental (Forrester, 2000). Perhaps the biggest challenge to successfully empowering employees, lies in the role of the management (Ahearne et al., 2005). This makes employee empowerment an important criterion for leadership effectiveness (Conger & Kanungo, 1988). The primary goal of this study is therefore to examine the impact of leadership empowerment behaviour on employee organizational citizenship behaviour.

Empowerment is defined by Cheong, Spain, Yammarino, and Yun (2016, p. 603) as “a process of sharing power, and allocating more autonomy and responsibilities to followers through a specific set of leader behaviours that entails enhancing the meaningfulness of work, fostering participation in decision making, expressing confidence in high performance, and providing autonomy for bureaucratic constraints”. In line with previous research, we will adapt the definition from van Dijke, Cremer, Mayer, and Quaquebeke (2012) which argues that leaders have two broad classes of options to empower their followers, which the literature refers to as: “encouraging self-development” (ESD) and “encouraging independent action” (EIA). First, leaders can stimulate employees to develop competencies that support their employees in effectively directing their own functioning, referred to as “encouraging self-development” (van Djike et al.,
Second, leaders can focus more immediately on empowerment by stimulating independent employee action, referred to as “encouraging independent action” (van Djike et al., 2012). Encouraging self-development and encouraging independent action are, however, not necessarily strongly related. That is, a leader might decide for one or the other, but not necessarily both. Most importantly, in the context of the present study, we argue that each of these leader empowering behaviours (LEB) will have a significant effect on employee OCB.

Following these developments, leaders now face an increasing demand to empower and engage their employees to enhance the employees’ commitment to the organization. Hence, this paper proposes that organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) is a likely outcome when empowerment is present in an organization. The present study will conceptualize OCB as proposed by Williams and Anderson (1991), who separates between behaviour that is directed towards the individual (OCB-I), and behaviour that is directed towards the organization (OCB-O). Even though LePine, Erez & Johnson (2002) have concluded that there are few differences in the nature of the relationships between predictors of OCB-O and OCB-I, we find this distinction important as some recent studies appear to raise questions about this conclusion. For example, Ilies, Nahrgang, and Morgeson (2007) reported that leader–member exchange was more strongly related to OCB-I than to OCB-O. Furthermore, Halbesleben and Bowler (2007) reported that emotional exhaustion was positively related to OCB-I and negatively related to OCB-O in two studies. Podsakoff, Whiting, Blume, & Podsakoff, (2009), also found that OCB-I were positively related to ratings of employee performance and to reward allocation decisions, and negatively related to employee turnover intentions, actual turnover and absenteeism, whereas OCB-O were positively related to a variety of organizational effectiveness measures (e.g., productivity, efficiency, and profitability) and customer satisfaction, and negatively related to costs and unit-level turnover. Similarly, Van Dyne and colleagues (Graham & Van Dyne, 2006; LePine & Van Dyne, 2001; Stamper & Dyne, 2001), have reported that employee personality traits (e.g., agreeableness and self-esteem) and perceptions (e.g., justice beliefs and perceptions of bureaucratic organizational culture) have different relationships with helping behaviours (a form of OCB-I) than they do to voice behaviours (a form of OCB-O). Taken together, these results suggest that OCB-Os and OCB-Is might have differential relationships with at least some antecedents of OCBs (Podsakoff et al.,...
However, we are not aware of any research that has attempted to examine whether OCB-I and OCB-O are differently related to leadership empowerment behaviours, although there may be some reason to believe such differences exists.

Although previous research on leadership has focused on traits and behaviours of leaders that may enhance effectiveness (Yukl, 2010), there is little evidence about which factors are important for enabling or motivating leaders to empower their subordinates (Argyris, 1998; Hakimi et al., 2010). Given the large number of studies that address the empowerment – OCB relationship, we found it interesting to investigate how leader prototypicality would work as a moderator on this relationship. The present study proposes that leader prototypicality - the degree to which the leader is representative of the group’s values and norms, is a crucial component for enhancing OCB and empowerment among employees (Cremer, van Dijke, Mayer & Kozlowski, 2010). According to Cremer, van Dijke, Mayer, & Kozlowski (2010), when group leaders are highly prototypical, they are perceived as more effective, and receive more support by the members of their group. Hence, we propose that leader prototypicality will work as a moderator on the positive relationship between leader empowering behaviour and OCB.

To start addressing this gap in the literature, this paper will look into how leader prototypicality moderates the relationship between the two types of empowering leadership (ESD and EIA) and the two types of employee OCB (OCB-I and OCB-O). The objective of the present paper is therefore to contribute to the literature of both empowerment, OCB and leader prototypicality, by shedding light on leader empowering behaviour, and how this is linked to leader prototypicality and OCB. Our contribution to the research is therefore as follows. First, by focusing on the relationship between the two types of LEB on the two types of employee OCB, we contribute to both the empowerment and OCB literature. Research has revealed various positive effects of empowerment on variables such as employee job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job performance (van Djike et al., 2012). However, there is also a growing body of research indicating potentially negative consequences of empowering leadership (Wong & Giessner, 2018). For instance, van Dijke and colleagues (2012), showed that leaders who encourage independent follower action can weaken individuals’ needs for relatedness toward their organizations and, subsequently, reduce followers’ organizational citizenship behaviours.
Yet, to our knowledge, no prior work has distinguished between the workings of the two different types of empowering leadership (ESD and EIA) on the two different types of OCB (OCB-I and OCB-O). Secondly, a further intended contribution to the OCB and LP literature is to look into LP as a factor that influence employee’s levels of OCB behaviour that we have not found in any earlier research. Understanding how leaders should coordinate their empowerment efforts to stimulate employee OCB is clearly relevant from a practical perspective. In addition, we aim to show empirically that a distinction between OCB-O and OCB-I is important as it influences the extent to which leader prototypicality is associated with employee OCB. Similarly, understanding how leader prototypicality may stimulate OCB, could be important for our understanding of leadership effectiveness. Predicting that leaders are most effective in stimulating follower cooperation when they are prototypical, also highlight the important role of leaders as representing the group’s values and norms (De Cremer et al., 2010).

Moreover, the present paper proposes that the positive relationship between ESD/EIA on OCB-O is stronger when leader prototypicality is high. The reason behind this hypothesis is that managers might pay more attention to OCB-Os than OCB-Is, and therefore exert more empowering behaviour toward those employees engaging in OCB-O behaviours. This is because behaviours that are directed towards the organization are more likely to impact more people (i.e. have more leverage) than behaviours aimed at helping specific individuals (Podsakoff, Whiting, Blume, & Podsakoff, 2009). Furthermore, Podsakoff et al. (2009) argues that employees who makes suggestions on how to improve the organization or takes the initiative to make the necessary changes to solve an organizational bottleneck, has the potential to help the manager (and the organization) more than an employee who helps a co-worker with a specific problem he or she is facing. In addition, a prototypical leader might make the employee engage more in OCB-O behaviour to help both the manager and organization. Therefore, this paper proposes that the positive relationship between ESD/EIA on OCB-O is stronger when leader prototypicality is high, as the employees feel supported by both the manager and organization and wants to contribute their part to make the firm as efficient as possible.

Therefore, our research question is as follows:
“How does leader prototypicality affect the relationship between empowering leadership and organizational citizenship behaviour?”

In the following sections our theoretical background and hypotheses will be presented, followed by our conceptual models, and finally the methodology and the results of this study will be presented.

2.0 Theoretical Background and hypotheses

2.1 Empowerment

Over the past decades, the need for companies to adapt themselves to the new economic market, has meant a need to change their leadership style from a directive leadership style, to a more motivational leadership style (Hakimi, 2010). Leaders are no longer seen as solely controlling employees, they also need to enhance employees’ motivation and foster their individual development at work (Hakimi, 2010). This is where empowering leadership behaviour comes in. According to Kanter (1977), employees display different behaviour depending on whether certain structural supports (power and opportunity) were in place. Empowered employees create an effective work unit within the organization, while powerless individuals are more rigid, rule-minded and less committed to the achievement of the organizations goals (Hakimi, 2010). Indeed, empowered employees can access and mobilize support, information, resources and opportunities and therefore afford more flexibility to achieve organizational goals than those individuals who lack this control and power (Kanter, 1977). Thus, the process of empowerment has been shown to be beneficial for both the employee, leader and organization (Conger & Kanugo, 1988).

The concept of empowerment has been developed and advanced by several researchers, and has emerged from other research topics such as supportive leadership, behaviourial self-management and participative goal-setting research (Ahearne et al., 2005; Pearce & Sims Jr, 2002). However, two main conceptions of empowerment have emerged from the literature. One approach roots empowerment in the organizational context and defines it in terms of “a practice, or set of practices involving the delegation of responsibility down the hierarchy so as to give employees increased decision-making authority in respect to the execution of their primary work tasks” (Leach, Wall, & Jackson, 2003, p.
This first approach describes empowerment as a relational construct (Hakimi, 2010). In this definition, empowerment is a transfer of power from one who has more (the leader), to the one who has less (the subordinate) (Forrester, 2000). This approach therefore defines empowerment in the organizational context, and focuses on the behaviour of the leader (Hakimi, 2010). The second approach defines empowerment as a motivational construct, and considers empowerment as a four-dimensional psychological state based on employees’ perceptions of (a) meaningfulness, (b) competence, (c) self-determination, and (d) impact (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Spreitzer, 1995; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990), also referred to as psychological empowerment. A lot of the empowerment research focus on the latter, which emphasise the employee’s feeling of empowerment. In the present study however, the aim is to understand the antecedents and consequences of relational empowerment, and this paper therefore roots empowerment in the organizational context, where the focus will be on different empowering leadership behaviours.

There are, however, critics of LEB who do not fully support its efficiency in firms. For example, Conger and Kanungo (1988) argued that unregulated empowerment practices exerted by a leader could result in followers becoming overconfident, causing them to make tactical or strategic errors. This shows the importance of being critical when implementing empowerment practices in organization, and that leaders should be clear in their empowerment practices. In addition, Vroom and Yetton’s (1973) normative decision model conceptualizes that employee participation in decision-making does not necessarily produce better outcomes than autocratic decision-making processes. In other words, they argue that participation in decision-making does not automatically result in a better quality or rationality of the decision, an increase in acceptance or commitment from the subordinates to execute the decision effectively, nor that the time required to make the decision is reduced (Vroom & Yetton, 1973). Taken together, this shows that LEB may not always produce the intended outcomes such as organizational citizenship behaviour (Cheong et al., 2016).

Another important theory behind our research question is social cognitive theory. One of the key contributions of social cognitive theory is a framework for understanding how modelling influences individual behaviour (Pearce et al., 2002). In terms of empowering leadership, social cognitive theory argues that the leader is a model of how their employees should self-lead themselves, which is
subsequently adopted by their followers (Pearce et al., 2002). This theory supports our conceptualization that subordinates are affected by their leaders and will act accordingly. The reason for this is that people often are more inclined to be influenced by their leaders both negatively and positively (Pearce et al., 2002). However, it is important to note that the degree to how much a person is influenced will vary depending on how strong relationship they have to their leader (Pearce et al., 2002). In this study the focus will be on LEB and the dyadic relationship between the leader and follower, and we will therefore use the empowerment definition as emphasized by van Dijke et al. (2012). Specifically, we adapt the definition from van Dijke et al. (2012), which focuses on two core empowering leadership types; encouraging self-development (ESD) and encouraging independent action (EIA). They are both strategies used by leaders to empower their subordinates, but this does not mean that they affect employees in the same way and is used simultaneously (van Dijke et al., 2012). However, we propose that both of these empowerment strategies will have a significant effect on both OCB-O and OCB-I, but that OCB-O is stronger when leader prototypicality is high.

2.1.1 Encouraging independent action

Encouraging independent action (EIA) is one type of empowering leadership behaviour that can be used to increase autonomy and efficiency among employees. It focuses on encouraging the employees to take action on their own, without needing the supervision from a leader when performing tasks (van Dijke et al., 2012). By engaging in this empowering leadership behaviour, subordinates will be better able to take control of their own work responsibilities and tasks, and make their own decision. This leadership type will likely have a different effect on the employees than encouraging self-development, since previous research has shown that when leaders encourage independent action, a stronger trust-relationship is created between them (van Dijke et al., 2012). Being stimulated towards independent action will give the employee the perception that the supervisor trusts his or hers competencies and performance, and as a result, they will perform more effectively as they are given more responsibility (van Dijke et al., 2012). In addition, this leadership type might also reduce the employees’ desire for approval and information about one’s value to the organization, as they feel trusted by their supervisor (van Dijke et al., 2012).
2.1.2 Encouraging self-development

Encouraging self-development is another type of empowering leadership that can be used to increase the efficiency among employees. Encouraging self-development emphasizes how leaders can motivate their employees to take their career into their own hands by following different developmental programmes to develop themselves and their abilities (Pearce, Sims, & Kivlighan, 2002). More generally, encouraging self-development implies that employees consider different ways and directions in which they can develop themselves (van Dijke et al., 2012). The subordinates should consider what they need to develop and what type of directions they can take to keep developing in their role (van Dijke et al., 2012). However, this type of LEB has been associated to employees having a higher need for information about their performance on the job, because they might not always understand why their leaders want them to engage in self-developmental activities (van Dijke et al., 2012). As van Dijke and colleagues (2012) argues, it might increase the employees desire for information about their value to the organization. Such a desire may result because it is less clear to the employees why their leader encourages them to develop themselves (i.e., “Why does my leader think I need to develop myself more? Do I not contribute to the organization sufficiently?”).

2.2 Organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB)

As discussed, empowerment is linked to a wide range of positive individual and organizational outcomes such as job satisfaction, job performance, extra-role behaviour, and organizational commitment (Konczak, Stelly, & Trusty, 2000). Organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) is in other words a likely outcome when empowerment is present in an organization. Hence, the success or failure of an organization is closely related to the effort and motivation of its employees (Robertson, Smith, & Cooper, 1994). Some employees are not merely completing their assigned tasks, they are also rising above and beyond their job description to benefit the organization as a whole (Newland, 2012). This extra-role performance has been termed organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB). OCB is commonly defined as “participating in activities or actions that are not formally a part of the job description, but that benefit the organization as a whole” (Borman, 2004, p.238). This can include volunteering for extra work, cooperating with colleagues and sharing ideas (Newland, 2012). Further, research has
demonstrated that OCB is strongly correlated with employee effectiveness (Yen & Niehoff, 2004) and organizational success (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994). Due to the reason that OCB has such a profound impact on individual and organizational functioning, organizations are interested in predicting, stimulating and rewarding OCB.

Although there are a number of ways in which OCB have been conceptualized, the two most popular conceptualizations are those developed by Organ (1988, 1990) and Williams and Anderson (1991). Organ (1988) originally proposed that there are five different dimensions of OCB, respectively; conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, civic virtue and helping behaviour (Organ, 1988). However, he subsequently expanded this model to also include two other dimensions – peacekeeping and cheerleading (Organ, 1990). The second major conceptualization of OCB is that proposed by Williams and Anderson (1991), who further categorized these five dimensions of OCB into behaviour that is directed towards the individual (OCB-I) and behaviour that is directed towards the organization (OCB-O). OCB-O refers to behaviours benefit the organization in general (e.g. gives advance notice when they are unable to come to work), whereas OCB-I behaviours immediately benefit specific individuals and indirectly through these means contribute to the organization as a whole (e.g. help others who have been absent) (Williams & Anderson, 1991). A reason for the use of the OCB-I and OCB-O labels is to avoid confusion between the measures developed and used in the previous studies, which have contained mixtures of the two dimensions (Williams & Anderson, 1991). Another important reason for the two dimensions is because prior work suggests that these two forms of OCB activities can have different antecedents and because much research has not included both dimensions (Williams & Anderson, 1991). The present study will conceptualize OCB as proposed by Williams and Anderson (1991), who categorize OCB into behaviour that is directed towards the individual (OCB-I) and behaviour that is directed towards the organization (OCB-O).

2.2.1 OCB-I

Williams and Anderson’s (1991) individual-level OCB includes Organ’s (1988, 1990) dimensions of helping behaviour and courtesy. However, based on the fact that peacekeeping, and cheerleading behaviours also are aimed at helping other individuals, it is also appropriate to include them as part of the overall
helping dimension in the OCB-I category (Podsakoff et al., 2009).

*Courteous* is demonstrated by preventing organization problems through communication and general consideration for others (Newland, 2012). An example of courtesy involves letting co-workers know how they can reach an employee who is on vacation. The courteous behaviours attempt to prevent other employees from encountering unpleasant surprises.

*Helping behaviour* includes altruism, peacekeeping, and cheerleading (Newland, 2012). Some examples of helping behaviour include volunteering to orient a new employee, solving conflicts among employees, and acknowledging fellow employees’ accomplishments.

### 2.2.2 OCB-O

Williams and Anderson (1991) organizational-level behaviour was originally based on Organ’s (1988, 1990) conscientiousness dimensions, but other authors have also included the civic virtue and sportsmanship dimensions in this category (Podsakoff et al., 2009).

*Conscientiousness* refers to impersonal behaviour that benefits the organization as a whole (Newland, 2012). In other words, it refers to behaviour that is not directed at another individual. Examples of conscientiousness include an employee adhering to an organization’s rules and regulations or an employee not using all of their vacation or sick days.

*Sportsmanship* is an employee’s willingness to deal with poor situations without complaining (Newland, 2012). It is the only form of OCB that involves declining to participate in certain behaviours. For example, not engaging in gossip and not complaining about office size would be considered good sportsmanship.

*Civic virtue* is participating in the life and culture of the organization; this is not considered behaviour that is targeted at individuals, rather, this behaviour targets the organization (Newland, 2012). An example of civic virtue would be attending company events, such as meetings or picnics, which are not required for employees. It also includes contributing opinions on important organizational issues.

### 2.3 Encouraging self-development and OCB

While OCB-O refers to behaviours that benefit the organization in general (e.g., attending functions that are not required), OCB-I refers to behaviours that
directly benefit the individual, and indirectly benefit the organization (e.g., helping a colleague that is overworked or absent) (Rupp & Cropanzano, 2002).

We propose that empowering leadership behaviour, will increase employee OCBs through providing employees with a sense of meaning, competence, self-determination and impact. Empowered employees are assumed to perform beyond their prescribed work tasks, which can take the form of organizational citizenship behaviours (Chan, Taylor, & Markham, 2008). Hence, we argue that leaders encouraging their employees to engage in self-development activities will in turn lead the employees to express a higher level of organizational citizenship behaviour, both towards the individual and the organization. This is due to the reason that when employees get access to more training and development opportunities, they are more likely to feel supported by their organization (London & Smither, 1999). Furthermore, London and Smither (1999) also argues that self-development is effective in motivating employees because it gives them more autonomy and the ability to make their own decisions regarding their career path. Thus, by empowering subordinates through self-development, we think that this will lead the employees to express a greater amount of OCB-I and OCB-O because they feel supported by the organization.

Moreover, through LEB, the leader shares tasks and responsibilities with the employees, whom in turn are thought to increase their commitment to the given responsibilities and hence, the frequency of reciprocal OCBs (Collins, 1999). The logic behind this is that such empowerment interventions are perceived as good deeds that will stimulate employees to go beyond their defined work tasks to reciprocate to their employers (Humborstad, 2010). Accordingly, when employees feel psychologically empowered, they should feel an obligation to reciprocate with positive employee behaviours, which may take the form of OCBs. The theoretical background for such arguments is grounded in the norm of reciprocity, which refers to “the societal rule that obligates individuals to repay gifts, favours, and services that have been performed for them” (Goldstein, Griskevicius, & Cialdini, 2011, p. 441). Through enhancing the meaningfulness of work, leaders are likely to increase employee identification and involvement with their work (Mento, Cartledge, & Locke, 1980), and hence the employees are more likely to engage in extra efforts in terms of OCB-O and OCB-I. Accordingly, empowering leadership behaviour such as encouraging self-development will in
most cases increase motivation in their employees and they will thereby feel enabled and encouraged (Raub & Robert, 2010). Therefore, we propose that:

\[ H1: \text{Encouraging Self-Development is positively related to} \]
\[ (a) \text{OCB-O and (b)OCB-I}. \]

2.4. Encouraging independent action and OCB

Next, just as we propose that encouraging self-development is positively related to OCB-O and OCB-I behaviour, we also believe that leaders encouraging their employees to seek independent action, will also have employees expressing higher levels of OCB in their organization. The arguments behind this proposition, is much like the above, that empowered employees feel meaning and impact in their work. Through allowing employees to participate in decision making and providing autonomy, it is likely that employees feel a sense of self-determination and impact in their work which in turn could enable them to engage in OCBs (Wat & Shaffer, 2005). Encouraging independent action has been shown to have a significantly positive effect on employees as they receive more autonomy and responsibility that ultimately makes the employees feel valued. The employees then in turn become more intrinsically motivated to take ownership of their own job, and a strengthened belief in their own self-efficacy (Chan, Taylor, & Markham, 2008).

Furthermore, empowered employees feel meaning and impact in their work. According to Berntzen and Steen (2013), feelings of meaning and impact at work are not isolated perceptions; rather they are a product of the employees’ daily interaction and experiences with the organization. These interactions create conditions that enhance the value of belonging to the organization (Alge et al., 2006). Accordingly, feelings of meaning and impact in one’s work should increase the perceived value of the organizational membership. Consistent with social identity theory, when an organization increases the perceived social value of organizational membership, the employees should reciprocate by engaging in OCB-Os in order to increase the value of the organization and to maintain their status as valued group members (Alge et al., 2006). Therefore, we argue that encouraging employees to take independent action will lead them to build a stronger relationship with the organizations as they will feel more trusted and supported, and thereby reciprocate the feeling by expressing OCB towards colleagues and the organization (Wat & Shaffer, 2005).
Additionally, psychologically empowered employees feel less constrained by their jobs through their experience of impact and self-determination (Spreitzer, 1995). Hence, they may more easily engage in helping behaviours directed at individuals without having to feel that they have to move off tasks to the same degree as if they had highly prescribed work tasks (Alge et al., 2006). Empowered employees also feel competent, that is, they feel capable to perform tasks skilfully (Spreitzer, 1995). When employees are feeling supported, their intrinsic motivation will be heightened and this will thereby affect employees’ attitudes (Chan et al., 2008). In addition, encouraging independent action can influence the subordinates perceived view of themselves by increasing their confidence in their work performance. By this increase in confidence, the employees might feel that they have a higher value to the organization and are therefore more likely to have an increased positive impact on both its colleagues and its work performance (Raub & Robert, 2010). In addition, this will also give the employees more meaning, as they will feel that they are able to make a bigger change in the organization through their actions (Raub & Robert, 2010). Thus, it should be easier for psychologically empowered employees to engage in OCBs benefitting their colleagues/supervisor since they should not worry about not being able to succeed in performing their tasks. Moreover, we argue that OCB-O and OCB-I will both have a positive relationship with encouraging independent action, but that there will be a difference between how strong the different outcomes will be. This is due to the reason that OCB-O is linked to the organization and will therefore notice a greater effect than OCB-I (Williams & Anderson, 1991). Hence, we hypothesize as follows:

H2: Encouraging Independent Action is positively related to
(a) OCB-O and (b) OCB-I.

2.5 Leader prototypicality

The research on leaders are constantly expanding, and one of the main models in the leadership theory is the social identity analysis of leadership. This theory focuses on that leaders not only lead groups of people, but they are also members of these groups, which make them affected by the same social influences as the subordinates (van Dijke & Cremer, 2010). Leadership processes are thus enacted in the context of shared group membership, and leaders’ characteristics as a group member may therefore play an important role in leadership effectiveness.
(van Knippenberg et al., 2005). Social cognitive theory follows in line with the social identity analysis as it emphasizes that there is a higher chance for a follower to replicate the leader’s behaviour if he or she identifies with their leader (Grille, Schulte, & Kauffeld, 2015). There are many different leadership theories, but few of them examine the fact that leaders are a part of the group they are leading (van Knippenberg, 2011). However, leader prototypicality examine this aspect and is defined as “leaders who represent important and salient group characteristics” (van Dijke & Cremer, 2010, p. 85). Grille et al. (2015) argues that subordinates are affected by their leader’s behaviour only if they see the leader as being prototypical. In other words, this means that efficient leaders who are perceived to share the same values as their followers will have more efficient subordinates as well. According to van Knippenberg et al. (2005), a leader’s prototypicality of the group should be tied to leadership effectiveness, because individuals that are more representative of the group are more influential and attractive. In fact, the proposition that leader prototypicality is a determinant of leadership effectiveness is supported by an increasing number of studies showing, for instance, that prototypical group members are more likely to emerge as leaders (Fielding & Hogg, 1997) and that group-prototypical leaders are more influential and effective (van Knippenberg, van Knippenberg, & van Dijke, 2000). Furthermore, research on leader prototypicality has shown that subordinates who does not perceive their leader to be prototypical, feels less trust and feel that they are less attractive as leaders, compared to those who are viewed as prototypical. This is in line with the social identity theory which emphasizes that people who do not think of their leader as having personal similarities with them will be less likely to follow their guidance and help the leader achieve optimal efficiency (Grille et al., 2015). Similarly, Grille et al. (2015) argues that a leader needs to share the same values and beliefs as their followers. They also state that the most optimal way to achieve a prototypical leader is if the followers choose him or her autonomously. However, in many cases, the structure in the organization will not allow for this and it is better in situations where a team leader of a group should be chosen than in a hierarchical structure where the top management needs to make the correct leader recruitment decisions.

However, leader prototypicality is an area where there is still lack of a large research base. Yet, it is evident that prototypicality is linked to leaders being more efficient because they share the same values and norms as their followers.
Furthermore, prototypical leaders are more likely to identify with the group, and therefore should be more likely to take the group’s interest to heart (van Knippenberg et al., 2000). As a result, leader prototypicality might cause the subordinates to express higher levels of OCB because their followers have faith in the leader’s disposition to be group-oriented (van Knippenberg et al., 2000). However, the notion that prototypicality is a basis for leadership effectiveness, does by no means imply that in order for a leader to be efficient it has to be prototypical for their group, but it will clearly be beneficial to develop a strong relationship with the subordinates (van Knippenberg, 2011).

2.6 Leader prototypicality as a moderator

In order to be an empowering leader, it is important to both encourage and enable your subordinates to take the lead themselves (Albrecht & Andreetta, 2011). Research on empowerment have supported the claim that leaders using an empowerment leadership style will lead to employees feeling empowered and thereby leading to commitment and employee engagement (Albrecht & Andreetta, 2011). Furthermore, a team leader can represent his or her team in terms of attitudes, behaviour styles, and personal characteristics, thus representing a prototype for the team with which followers can identify, referred to as leader prototypicality (Grille et al., 2015). In line with the concept of social cognitive theory, it can be assumed that the likelihood that an observer (i.e., the employee/team member) will copy behaviour demonstrated by a model (i.e., the team leader) is enhanced when he or she identifies with the model (Grille et al., 2015). It could therefore be argued that leader prototypicality may enhance the likelihood that team members will pick up OCB behaviour demonstrated by their team leader. Consequently, team members are more favourable and supportive of their leader’s behaviour. Hence, leader prototypicality can have an effect on their subordinates by empowering them and thereby make them feel valued (Raub & Robert, 2010). Similarly, Srivastava, Bartol, and Locke (2006) argue that employees are more likely to help other people when they feel supported themselves through empowerment.

Thus, we argue that leader prototypicality will affect the positive relationship between the two empowering leadership behaviours (EIA/ESD) and OCB, because how an employee will respond to LEB, will be highly dependent
on how they perceive their leader. This is based on the fact that the leader-employee relationship is stronger when the subordinates perceive the leader to be prototypical (van Knippenberg & Hogg, 2003). When group leaders are prototypical (as determined by the intergroup context), they are perceived as more effective, and they are supported more by the members of the group they lead (Hogg & van Knippenberg, 2003). Indeed, as the prototypical leader is the group member that best represents the group’s identity, his or her actions and decisions signal the group opinion. This observation is relevant as this might cause the employees to exhibit higher levels of OCB. In other words, this means that if a subordinate perceives their leaders to hold the same values as themselves, they will view the leader as more prototypical and thereby express a larger amount of OCB (van Knippenberg & Hogg, 2003).

Based on this, we propose that:

**H3:** Leader prototypicality will moderate the positive relationship between encouraging self-development and (a) OCB-O and (b) OCB-I

**H4:** Leader prototypicality will moderate the positive relationship between encouraging independent action and (a) OCB-O and (b) OCB-I

However, the present paper also argues that there will be a difference between the level of OCB-O and OCB-I that is expressed by the employees when the leader is described as prototypical. We propose that the positive relationship between ESD/EIA on OCB-O is stronger when leader prototypicality is high. OCB-O, we argue, will more likely have a stronger relationship due to the reason that when a leader is more prototypical it will lead followers wanting to do more for their organization - thereby, expressing OCB-O at a greater extent. In addition, managers might pay more attention to employees expressing OCB-O behaviour that OCB-I behaviour, and therefore exert more LEB to those employees engaging in OCB-Os. This is because behaviours that are directed towards the organization are more likely to impact more people (i.e. have more leverage) than behaviours aimed at helping specific individuals (Podsakoff et al., 2009). Similarly, Podsakoff et al. (2009) argues that employees who makes suggestions on how to improve the organization or takes the initiative to make the necessary changes to solve an organizational bottleneck has the potential to help the manager and the organization (OCB-O) more than an employee who helps a co-worker with a specific problem he or she is facing (OCB-I). In addition, a prototypical leader
might make the employee engage more in OCB-O behaviour to help both the manager and the organization. Therefore, when prototypical leaders encourage their subordinates to engage in self-development activities and take independent action, this paper propose that it will lead to a significantly higher level of OCB-O among the employees as they feel supported by the organization and wants to contribute their part to make the firm as efficient as possible by going above and beyond their job description (Williams & Anderson, 1991). Organizations provide empowerment practices to support their organization by empowering their employees with the hope for reaching greater organizational outcomes (Chan et al., 2008). EIA and ESD can contribute to building a higher level of trust between the organization and the employee, and this trust-relationship will likely be heightened by a prototypical leader. Chan et al. (2008) state that trust is one of the most important components for empowerment practices to be successful. This is due to the reason that they will feel that the leader and themselves share the same values and thereby, they do not see the LEB as threatening, but rather beneficial. This will then contribute to a strengthened relationship with the organization. (Chan et al., 2008).

3.0 Conceptual framework

*Figure 1. The hypothesized model of the relationship between encouraging self-development and OCB, as moderated by leader prototypicality.*
The models above (see figure 1 and figure 2) is graphic illustrations and descriptions of the present paper’s research question – how leader prototypicality affect the relationship between LEB and organizational citizenship behaviour. Moreover, these two models focus on how the two types of LEB (encouraging self-development and encouraging independent action) uniquely interact with leader prototypicality to relate to the two dimensions of OCB (OCB-O and OCB-I).

3.0 Method

3.1 Data collection

To investigate the research question, we collected data using the quantitative method field surveys by distributing questionnaires to leaders and subordinates in three different organizations. Data was collected from both leaders and subordinates to avoid common method bias (Conway & Lance, 2010).

The cross-sectional design was chosen because it would make it possible to collect data from more than one case and at a single point in time. In addition, this type of design will show if there are relationships between the different variables presented in this study. Field study is an easy way to administer data, it is convenient for the individuals that are given the questionnaire to finish the questionnaire in their own time and it makes it easier to collect a larger sample of individuals to generalize our findings in the population (Bryman & Bell, 2015). In other words, this means that the results from this study will give an indication of how leader prototypicality moderates the relationship between LEB and OCB.
3.2 Procedure and sample strategy

To be able to collect the largest amount of data as possible and to keep the anonymity as large as possible, we used both an online survey using a web-based program called Qualtrics, and paper surveys. The respective leaders in the organizations received the surveys on their work e-mail, but in order to ensure full confidentiality, we distributed the surveys on both paper and online to the subordinates, as not all of them had a work e-mail address. Using individual links made it possible to distinguish which team the leader belonged to, and the questionnaires distributed on paper had different colours, so that each team had one colour, which made it easier to distinguish which subordinates who belonged to which team leader. Furthermore, in order to make sure that the participants understood the scope of the survey, we contacted the respective leaders in each organization, to explain the purpose of our study, so that the respective contact person could bring the information further. We also hang up the cover letter about our research and procedure on several boards in the organizations, and attached it on both the online and paper surveys to ensure full confidentiality and transparency.

The questionnaires were distributed at one point in time to three different organizations that operates in three different fields. The reason behind collecting data from multiple organizations was to strengthen the generalizability of our findings (Bryman & Bell, 2015). Furthermore, our analysis was based on surveys from 88 employees and 13 leaders from in total three different organizations. These organizations were in the fields of the medical industry, furniture industry and retail industry in Norway. To collect a representative sample, the survey was sent out to 187 individuals, whereas 174 were employees and 13 were leaders. However, of the in total 187 individuals who received the survey, only 88 (approximately 50%) of the employees and 13 (100%) of the leaders responded to the survey. Furthermore, because of the need of a leader-employee dyad, we expected to not be able to use all of the collected data further in our research. However, because of a 100% response rate from the leaders, we could use all of the data that was collected in our research. In terms of dyads, there were 13 dyads. The responses from employees consisted of 31 male (42%) and 51 female (58%) respondents, whereas the responses from leaders consisted of 6 male (46%) and 7 female (54%) respondents. The response rate was in the age-differences ranging from 18-65, for both employees and leaders.
3.3 Measures

The questionnaires had to be authorized by NSD (Norwegian Social Science Data Services) before distributing it out to companies in Norway. After approval from NSD, the process of sending out surveys started. To ensure valuable and reliable measures, the questionnaire had items that covered all variables we wanted to measure. The items were measured by using self-ratings questionnaires, where the participants were asked to answer questions, using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree) or 1 (always) to 5 (never), except from the control variables. The measures were adopted from previous research to ensure that they had high reliability and validity (Van Knippenberg & Van Knippenberg (2005); Pearce et al. (2002); Lee and Allen (2002)). Likert scales are used in survey questions about an issue where respondents answer to the degree they feel about an issue. The reason as to why one chooses to use the Likert scale is to isolate personal opinion from collective response (Bryman & Bell, 2015). Using the Likert scale will therefore provide us with quantifiable data.

The scales used in our thesis will be presented in the next section. In addition to collecting data from employees, data was also collected from the leaders. The reason why data was collected from both the leaders and subordinates was to capture the leader-follower dyad: the link between the leader and the team. The measures of leader prototypicality, OCB and empowerment was collected from the subordinates, while only the measures of empowerment were collected from the leaders. One of the reasons for using multiple source data, was to avoid common method bias. Because one of the major causes of common method variance is obtaining the measures of both predictor and criterion variables from the same rater or source, one way of controlling for it is to collect the measures of these variables from different sources (Podsakoff et al., 2003). The advantage of this procedure is therefore that it makes it impossible for the mind-set of the source or rater to bias the observed relationship between the predictor and criterion variable, thus eliminating the effects of any tendencies on the part of the rater to respond in a lenient manner (Podsakoff et al., 2003).

**Leader prototypicality**

Leader prototypicality is a moderating variable in this study, and in agreement with previous research, we used a 5-item scale developed from van
Examples from these questions are: “My supervisor is a good example of the kind of people in my team”, “my supervisor is very similar to what the members of my team value” and “my supervisor represent what this team stands for”. The leader prototypicality construct was measured by using self-ratings questionnaires, where the subordinates were asked to answer questions, using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). The measures of leader prototypicality was only collected from the subordinates.

**Encouraging self-development**

The measures for encouraging self-development was collected from both the leaders and subordinates to capture the leader-follower dyad. The measurement for encouraging self-development is derived from Pearce et al.’s (2002) six item scale, and was firstly measured by looking at the subordinates’ ratings of their leader’s empowerment strategies towards them. The subordinates were asked to rate their answers on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (always) to 5 (never). Some of the questions included were: “My team leader encourages me to develop myself”, My team leader encourages me to develop my skills and abilities and “My team leader encourages me to seek out opportunities to learn”. Secondly, using the same five item scale from Pearce et al.’s (2002), the leaders were asked to rate their answers on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (always) to 5 (never). The same items were used both in leader and employee survey, with different wording to concern oneself (in case of the leaders) or my team-leader (in case of the employees) to reflect the unique aspect of the leaders/subordinates. For example, phrases such as “My team leader encourages me to develop myself” were changed to “I encourage my subordinates to develop themselves”. Some of the questions included were: “I encourage subordinates to seek out opportunities to learn” and “I encourage my subordinates to develop their skills and abilities”.

**Encouraging independent action**

Encouraging independent action was measured with a four item scale derived from Pearce et al. (2002). The variable was measured by looking at the subordinates’ ratings of their leader’s empowerment strategies towards them. The subordinates were asked to rate their answers on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (always) to 5 (never). Some of the questions included were: “My team
leader encourages me to search for solutions to my problems without supervision” and “My team leader encourages me to find solutions to my problems without his/her direct input”.

Using the same five item scale from Pearce et al.’s (2002), the leaders were asked to rate their answers on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (always) to 5 (never). The same items were used both in leader and employee survey, with different wording to concern oneself (in case of the leaders) or my team-leader (in case of the employees) to reflect the unique aspect of the leaders/subordinates. For example, phrases such as “My team leader encourages me to search for solutions to my problems without supervision” were changed to “I encourage my subordinates to search for solutions to their problems without my supervision”. Some of the questions included were: “I encourage my subordinates to find solutions to their problems without my direct input” and “I urge my subordinates to assume responsibilities on their own”.

**OCB-O (Organizational citizenship behaviour – organization)**

OCB-O were measured using the eight item scale developed by Lee and Allen (2002). The measures of OCB-O were only collected from the subordinates, which were asked to rate their answers on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (always) to 5 (never). Some of the questions included were: “I show pride when representing the organization in public”, “I express loyalty to the organization” and “I take action to protect the organization from potential problems”.

**OCB-I (Organizational citizenship behaviour- individual)**

OCB-I were measured using a six item scale derived from the Lee and Allen (2002). The measures of OCB-I was only collected from the subordinates, which were asked to rate their answers on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (always) to 5 (never). Examples from these questions are: “I help others who have been absent”, “I willingly give my time to help others who have work-related problems” and “I adjust my work schedule to accommodate other employees’ requests for time off.” In addition, we mixed the items of OCB-I and OCB-O in the questionnaire, so that the participants would not be able to understand which of the items measured OCB-O, and which measured OCB-I.
Control variables

A number of different variables were controlled to avoid any alternative reasons of the relationships between the dependent and independent variables, and to investigate if any of the control variables have any sort of effect on the relationship (Van Der Vegt & Bunderson, 2005). The control variables were also included to make sure that there are no pre-existing socio-demographic differences in the findings (Porta & Keating, 2008). The different control variables used in this study are age, gender, education, position, tenure and how long they have worked for their current leader. Research has shown that gender can affect OCB, as women are linked to expressing a larger amount of OCB than men, regardless of the circumstances (Beauregard, 2012).

Age, position, tenure and how long they have worked for their current leader was measured with an open question, while gender was coded as 1: male and 2: female. Education was measured with eight categories (1: Middle School, 2: High School, 3: Certificate of completed apprenticeship, 4: Bachelor’s degree, 5: Master’s degree, 6: Doctorate degree, 7: None of the mentioned and 8: Craft certificate).

4.0 Results

4.1 Reliability

The different types of variables used in this study is based on measures that have been previously tested and validated through many different studies. In addition, the constructs used in the questionnaire are all based on constructs that have been previously tested and confirmed as reliable. However, the reliability was also tested in this study to confirm that all of the different constructs actually measured what it was supposed to measure. According to Bonett & Wright (2015), Cronbach’s Alpha is one of the most common measures of reliability. Thus, the Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient was used to estimate the reliability for all constructs, this is to ensure that the constructs included in this study are measuring what they are supposed to measure. According to Pallant (2010) for a construct to be reliable the Cronbach’s Alpha score should be above 0.7. The Cronbach alphas are presented in table 1. Leader prototypicality was reliable with a score of 0.929 measuring five items, OCB-I had a score of 0.804 measuring eight items and OCB-O had a score of 0.836 measuring eight items. For encouraging self-development, the results indicated a score of 0.915
measuring six items, whereas encouraging independent action had a score of 0.894 measuring four items. Thus, all the scales provided the desired score above 0.7, in fact, all of the constructs had a reliability above 0.8, which illustrates reliable measures for all constructs.

4.2 Data Analysis

Table 2 displays the means, standard deviations, and reliability coefficients for the measures in this study. The four proposed hypotheses were tested using the data analysis software SPSS. A confirmatory factor analysis was conducted to see if the questionnaire actually measured five different factors. However, the results from the factor analysis presented us with seven factors, due to the reason that six of the items had cross-loadings or were freestanding. These items were therefore disregarded from this analysis to achieve a five-factor structure. The items that was eliminated for being freestanding were two of the ESD items, respectively; “My team leader encourages me to seek out education opportunities” and “My team leader encourages me to seek out opportunities to learn”. In addition, the OCB-O item; “I keep up with developments in the organization” and the OCB-I item; “I willingly give my time to help others who have work-related problems” was removed. Furthermore, the two OCB-O items: “I share personal property with others to help their work”, and “I assist others with their duties” was eliminated due to the reason of having cross-loadings above 0.3 (Kuvaas, 2008). This is in line with Kline (2014) who argues that dropping problematic items (ones that are low-loading, cross-loading or freestanding) and rerunning the analysis can solve the problem with too many factors.

The final confirmatory factor analysis had a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of .86 which is above the recommended value of 0.5 (Dziuban & Shirkey, 1974), and the Bartlett’s test of sphericity was significant ($\chi^2 (300) = 1603.67, p < .001$). The factor analysis was therefore seen as suitable and the final five factor loadings can be seen in table 1 below. Furthermore, the factor analysis did not show two clear loadings for OCB-I and OCB-O. However, Lee and Allen (2002) argues that there are items within the OCB-O and OCB-I scales that clearly overlaps, and that this is a possible problem when conducting a factor analysis even though these measures has been found to measure two different constructs. We therefore chose to continue with using OCB-O and OCB-I as two different constructs instead of merging it into one.
Table 1. CFA on the full scales of ESD, EIA, LP, OCB-O and OCB-I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>LP</th>
<th>OCB</th>
<th>OCB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LP1:</td>
<td>My supervisor is a good example of the kind of people in my team</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP2:</td>
<td>My supervisor represents what this team stands for</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP3:</td>
<td>My supervisor has a lot in common with the members of my team</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP4:</td>
<td>My supervisor represents what is characteristic about my team</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP5:</td>
<td>My supervisor is very similar to what the members of the team value</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB-O1:</td>
<td>I show pride when representing the organization in public</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB-O2:</td>
<td>I express loyalty toward the organization</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB-O3:</td>
<td>I defend the organization when other employees criticize it</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB-O4:</td>
<td>I take action to protect the organization from potential problems in the bottom</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB-O5:</td>
<td>I demonstrate concern about the image of the organization</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB-O6:</td>
<td>I maintain friendships that are not required but that help the organization</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB-O7:</td>
<td>I offer ideas to improve the functioning of the organization</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB-O8:</td>
<td>I help others who have been absent</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB-I1:</td>
<td>I help others who have been absent</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB-I2:</td>
<td>I show genuine concern and courtesy toward co-workers, even under the most trying business or personal situations</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB-I3:</td>
<td>I adjust my work schedule to accommodate other employees' requests for time off</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB-I4:</td>
<td>I go out of the way to make newer employees feel welcome in the work group</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB-I5:</td>
<td>I give up time to help others who have work or non-work-related problems</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 101. Standardized factor loadings are shown. A principal components factor analysis was used for the 25 items. Rotation method: Quartimax rotation with Kaiser Normalization. LP = Leader prototypality; OCB-O = Organizational citizenship behaviour - organization; OCB-I = Organizational citizenship behaviour - individual; ESD = Encouraging self-development; EIA = Encouraging independent action. Note that due to OCB-I and OCB-O mixed results in the factor analysis, the results are only given as OCB.

Table 1. Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ESD</th>
<th>EIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESD1:</td>
<td>My team leader encourages me to develop myself</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD2:</td>
<td>My team leader encourages me to develop my skills and abilities</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD3:</td>
<td>My team leader encourages me to learn new things</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD4:</td>
<td>My team leader encourages me to learn by extending myself</td>
<td>,82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIA1:</td>
<td>My team leader encourages me to search for solutions to my problems without supervision</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIA2:</td>
<td>My team leader encourages me to find solutions to my problems without my direct input</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIA3:</td>
<td>My team leader encourages me to solve problems when they pop up without always getting a stamp of approval</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIA4:</td>
<td>My team leader encourages me to assume responsibilities on my own</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 101. Standardized factor loadings are shown. A principal components factor analysis was used for the 25 items. Rotation method: Quartimax rotation with Kaiser Normalization. LP = Leader prototypality; OCB-O = Organizational citizenship behaviour - organization; OCB-I = Organizational citizenship behaviour - individual; ESD = Encouraging self-development; EIA = Encouraging independent action. Note that due to OCB-I and OCB-O mixed results in the factor analysis, the results are only given as OCB.

Table 2. Means, standard deviations and correlations among variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>42.26</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gender</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Education</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Tenure</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>- .22</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Independent action</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>- .07</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Self-development</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Leader prototypality</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. OCB-O</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. OCB-I</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 101

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01

*Men = 1; Women = 2

*Coded from 1(Middle School) to 9(Craft certificate).

Next, a multilevel analysis was conducted since our dataset consisted of two hierarchically nested levels: 88 employees nested within 13 teams, which all had one team leader (ranging from 2-19 employees per leader). In addition, we also wanted to avoid Type I errors such as the independence assumption that is
found in regression analysis, since those within one organization are likely to be more closely linked together than those from different organizations (Peugh, 2010). As suggested by Raudenbush and Bryk (2002), this study first tested the existence of a multilevel structure in the model we proposed, by running an ICC (intraclass correlation). The following results suggested that there is not a significant unexplained variance between teams, only within teams. Firstly, the null model was tested with OCB-O, which indicated that the unexplained variance within teams was 0.42, whereas 0.13 was between teams, with an ICC score of 0.24. Secondly, the null model was tested in relation to OCB-I, where the following results showed that there were only significant unexplained variances within teams (0.39), but not a significant relationship between teams (0.09) with an ICC score of 0.18. This means that for OCB-O 24% of the unexplained variation was on team level, while for OCB-I, 18% of the unexplained variation was on the team level. These ICC scores are low, which suggests that there are high amounts of variance within the teams. Nonetheless, we decided to continue to use the multilevel analysis as a more conservative analyses taking into account the potential variances that can be across teams.

The multilevel analysis tests the relationship between encouraging self-development/encouraging independent action, and OCB-O/OCB-O with leader prototypicality as a moderator. Leader ratings was used for encouraging self-development and encouraging independent action, and employee ratings was used for leader prototypicality and OCB-I and OCB-O, to avoid common method bias. Further, the alpha level was set to .05 for the p-values for all the statistical tests, to determine whether the results were significant $p < 0.05$, marginally significant $p < 0.1$ or non-significant $p > 0.1$. Table 3 shows the results from the multilevel analysis.
To test our hypotheses, we developed a set of multilevel models. In the construction of these models, all variables were grand-mean centred. The results from the multilevel analysis for all models are presented in Table 3.

For the first hypothesis (H1) we predicted that encouraging self-development is positively related to (a) OCB-O and (b) OCB-I. For hypothesis 1a, OCB-O was put as the dependent variable and encouraging self-development as the independent variable, as well as all of the categorical variables were included. The results from the analysis showed the relationship between OCB-O and encouraging self-development are strongly related \(r=0.14, p=0.018\), and hypothesis 1a is therefore supported. Thereafter, for hypothesis 1b, the relationship between OCB-I as the dependent variable and encouraging self-development was analysed, and this relationship was found to be non-significant \(r=0.21, p=0.154\). Thus, Hypothesis 1b could not be confirmed and is therefore rejected.

Furthermore, hypothesis 2 stated that encouraging independent action is positively related to (a) OCB-O and (b) OCB-I. The analysis therefore included the same dependent variables, however, it focused on encouraging independent action as the independent variable. As can be seen in table 3, the results from hypothesis 2a shows that encouraging independent action had a strong, positive relationship to OCB-o \(r=0.29, p=0.04\), but for hypothesis 2b it showed a non-significant relationship with OCB-I \(r=0.17, p=0.264\). Hypothesis 2a is therefore supported, while hypothesis 2b is rejected due to the non-significant relationship.

### Table 3. Multilevel analysis for OCB-O and OCB-I as the dependent variable

| Variables                  | OCB-O   | OCB-I   |
|----------------------------|---------|
|                            | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 4 |
| Intercept                  | .14**   | .21**   | .17**   | .19**   |
| Age                       | -.00    | -.01    | .01     | .00     |
| Gender                     | .50     | .42     | .30     | .23     |
| Education                  | -.02    | .07     | .05     | .13     |
| Tenure                     | -.03    | -.05    | -.02    | -.04    |
| Encouraging Self-Development | 1.4*    |        |         |         |
| Encouraging Independent Action | 3.0*    | 3.2    | 3.2**   | 3.2**   |
| Leader prototypicality     | .37**   | .39**   | .22**   | .25**   |
| Leader prototypicality \*  |         | .37*    |         |         |
| Encouraging Independent action | 1.2    |        | .22     |         |
| Leader prototypicality \*  |         |        |         |         |
| Encouraging Self-development | .31     | .30     | .34     | .35     |

*Estimations of fixed effect are shown. N\text{num}=101, N\text{num}=113.

\*p<0.05; \**p<0.01
Moving on to hypothesis 3, we proposed that leader prototypicality would moderate the positive relationship between encouraging self-development and (a) OCB-O and (b) OCB-I. The analysis therefore included ESD as the independent variable and OCB-O and OCB-I as the dependent variables. However, it also included leader prototypicality as a moderating variable to see if this affected the relationship between the specific leadership empowerment behaviour and the type of OCB. Figure 1-4 show the relationship between the different variables and the moderator.

For hypothesis 3a, and as can be seen in Figure 1, the slopes suggest that the association between encouraging self-development action and OCB-O does not seem to be moderated by leader prototypicality ($r=0.12, p=0.29$). Hypothesis 3a is therefore rejected. For hypothesis 3b, the slopes suggest that the relationship between OCB-I and ESD with leader prototypicality as the moderator is only marginally supported ($r=0.22, p=0.06$), as can be seen in figure 2.

*Figure 1. The moderating role of LP on the association between OCB-O and encouraging self-development. (Hypothesis 3a)*
Lastly, hypothesis 4 stated that leader prototypicality would moderate the positive relationship between encouraging independent action and (a) OCB-O and (b) OCB-I. The analysis therefore included EIA as the independent variable and OCB-O and OCB-I as the dependent variables. However, it also included leader prototypicality as a moderating variable to see if this affected the relationship between the specific leadership empowerment behaviour and the type of OCB. For hypothesis 4a, the slopes presented in figure 3, suggests that leader prototypicality as a moderator had a significant effect on the relationship between independent action and OCB-O (r=0.27, p=0.02). Hypothesis 4a is therefore supported. Finally, hypothesis 4b stated that LP would moderate the positive relationships between EIA and OCB-I. As can be seen in figure 4, the slopes suggest that this is only marginally supported (r=0.23, p=0.07). The sample size is rather small, but the results given from our analysis are rather robust, hence the marginally supported hypotheses appear to be relatively significant. Figure 1-4 suggest that leader prototypicality as a moderator has a positive pattern with the different types of OCB and ESD and EIA. However, the positive pattern is stronger in figure 2-4 due to a significant relationship between the variables.

These results indicate that it depends on the type of leadership empowerment behaviour one engages in when it comes to how much prototypical leaders are likely to affect the relationship on the two OCBs. However, it is apparent that leader prototypicality has a positive impact as a moderator on the relationship between the two types of OCB and the two types of leadership empowerment behaviour which is noticeable in the slopes below.
5.0 Discussion

The aim of our research was to find out whether two empowerment leadership types (encouraging independent action and encouraging self-development) and two types of OCB behaviour (OCB-O and OCB-I) had a significant relationship. In addition, we also wanted to find out if prototypical leaders moderated this relationship. In other words, we proposed that leaders’ empowerment behaviour will have a greater effect on subordinates’ levels of OCB-O and OCB-I when they are more prototypical. Furthermore, we also investigated if there was a difference between OCB-O and OCB-I, and we proposed that OCB-O would have a stronger relationship with the two empowerment styles. The results indicated that encouraging independent action
and encouraging self-development is positively associated with OCB-O, while our proposed hypothesis (1b and 2b) for OCB-I were not supported. Hence, leader prototypicality seems to moderate the relationship between OCB-O and OCB-I and EIA/ESD to various degrees. However, our results indicated that a higher degree of leader prototypicality was found to reduce the extent to which encouraging self-development affects OCB-O. These results will give new insight into the influence of prototypical leaders on the relationship between ESD/EIA and OCB-O/OCB-I.

First, and in line with Hypothesis 1a and 1b, the analyses revealed a positive and significant relationship between encouraging self-development and OCB-O. We predicted that leaders who encouraged their subordinates to engage in self-development activities would express a high level of both OCB-O and OCB-I. However, this hypothesis was only partly supported, as the analysis showed that encouraging self-development and OCB-I had a non-significant relationship. Previous research (London & Smither, 1999; Raub & Robert, 2010) argues that self-development is effective in making employees feel supported and motivated and thereby making them more likely to engage in OCB. However, in contradiction to previous research we found that only OCB-O has a significant relationship with ESD. The reason for this could possibly be that when the subordinates are given more autonomy in their job it will likely give the subordinates a positive encouragement to commit more to the organization, which can then evidently lead to them expressing a larger amount of OCB-O (Collins, 1999).

For our second hypothesis, we proposed that encouraging independent action would be positively related to OCB-O and OCB-I. However, OCB-O and independent action were the only relationship which was found to be significant. This indicates that if leaders encourage their employees to seek independent action, there is a larger likelihood that the employees will exhibit higher levels of OCB-O than OCB-I. These results supports our arguments to a certain extent concerning OCB-O and OCB-I, as it is derived from our results that OCB-O is more highly related to encouraging independent action than OCB-I. Earlier studies (van Dijke, Cremer, Mayer, & Quaquebeke, 2012; Wong & Giessner, 2018) have questioned the relationship between independent action and OCB due to the fact that when leaders encourage independent action it can weaken the subordinates need to belong in the organization and thereby, reduce their organizational
citizenship behaviour. However, Wat & Shaffer’s (2005) study found a relationship between independent action and OCB, so it is apparent that there are conflicting results regarding these two variables and the significance of their relationship, but that this might be explained by the type of OCB that is measured. Nevertheless, our results make a clear contribution to the literature as they indicate that both encouraging self-development and encouraging independent action only affect OCB when it is organization focused, meaning behaviour that benefits the organization as a whole. However, more research needs to be performed on these variables as there are certain limitations with our study which we will discuss later in our paper.

Additionally, our results indicate that it is beneficial to differ between the different OCB types. This is in line with previous research (Ma & Qu, 2011; Williams & Anderson, 1991) who argues that OCB is a multidimensional construct, and it is therefore vital to separate OCB-I and OCB-O to understand what differentiates the two. However, Lepine, Erez, and Johnson (2002) could not find enough evidence that OCB-I and OCB-O are multidimensional constructs, but only OCB as a general construct. Hence, it is important to look at the differences between them as people might receive a low score on OCB as a general construct due to the fact that they might not express a high level of OCB-I, but are more involved in helping the organization, or vice-versa. Thus, our results supports the argumentation from Williams and Anderson (1991) that the two types of OCB has different descendants to a certain extent, as we found there to be differences in how they are connected with other variables. In addition, more recent studies (Dalal, 2005; Ilies, Fulmer, Spitzmuller, & Johnson, 2009) have found OCB-O and OCB-I to be different measures and our results clearly shows that there are differences between them which should therefore be further studied. The differences that there appear to be between OCB-O and OCB-I in relation to LEB is in line with our arguments where we proposed that OCB-O will have a stronger relationship. The reason for these results could arguably be due to the reason that they impact a greater amount of people when expressing OCB-O and thereby creates a greater connection to the organization by contributing to improve it (Podsakoff et al., 2009).

For hypothesis 3a and 3b, we hypothesized that leader prototypicality would moderate the relationship between encouraging self-development and the two types of OCB. For hypothesis 3b, our analysis indicated that leader
prototypicality as a moderator only marginally supported the relationship between self-development and OCB-I. This indicates that when prototypical leaders encourage their employees in self-development activities, it makes the subordinates more likely to express higher levels of OCB-I. In contrast, for hypothesis 3a, our analysis indicates that the positive relationship between encouraging self-development and OCB-O is actually reduced when the leader is prototypical. This is particularly interesting, since research on leader prototypicality has shown that people who think of their leader as prototypical, will be more likely to help the leader achieve optimal efficiency (Grille et al., 2015). There can be many explanations as to why our study indicates that the relationship between encouraging self-development and OCB-O is weakened when the leader is prototypical, but one possible explanation could be that the employees might not always understand why their leaders want them to engage in self-developmental activities (van Dijke et al., 2012). The question that also arises, however, is the employees’ ability to perceive and to interpret their leader’s intentions accurately (Dasborough & Ashkanasy, 2002). Specifically, when a leader attempts to empower his or her employees, can the employees discern if she or he is acting sincerely for the benefit of the organization and its employees? Subordinates’ attributions about their leader’s intentions influence how the members evaluate, interpret, and eventually label the leader’s empowering leadership behaviour. Thus, when the leader is prototypical for his or her group, the employees might attribute more positively by responding with reciprocity and engaging in OCB behaviour. This is in line with the social identity theory which emphasizes that people who think of their leader as having personal similarities with them will be more likely to follow their guidance and help the leader achieve optimal efficiency (Grille et al., 2015).

In regards to hypothesis 4a and 4b, the relationship between independent action and OCB-O appears to be moderated by a prototypical leader, while the results indicate that the relationship between independent action and OCB-I is only marginally moderated by a prototypical leader. This indicates that even though independent action and OCB-I had a non-significant relationship on their own based on our sample, the positive relationship is strengthened when the leader is prototypical. It is clear that prototypical leaders as a moderator does not affect OCB-O more strongly than OCB-I, but rather, it appears that it has at least an equally strong relation with OCB-I. In fact, OCB-I has been found to be
positively related to OCB-O in the case where leaders encourages a “helping”
environment, and this will thereby positively affect how their subordinates feel
and they are therefore more likely to exhibit OCB-O (Ma & Qu, 2011). A
prototypical leader can thereby help creating a more “helpful” environment which
then could lead to a higher amount of OCB-I being expressed. Due to the fact that
OCB-I is non-significant when measured in relation to ESD/EIA on its own, but
becomes marginally significant when measured with leader prototypicality as a
moderator, our results give an indication that the leader behaviour can possibly
have a role in the expression of OCB-I. In line with these arguments, prototypical
leaders have been found to display certain behaviour that can influence the
perception of the followers (Grille, Schulte, & Kauffeld, 2015) and we argue that
this can be the reason why prototypical leaders have such a significant effect on
the relationship between OCB and leadership empowerment behaviour. However,
these results call for more research to be executed to understand leadership
behaviour and their impact on OCB-O and OCB-I. van Dijke et al. (2012) argue
that encouraging independent action will lead to a stronger trust relationship
between the leader and the follower. It is important for employees to have trust in
their relationship with their leader, and previous research such as Grille et al.’s,
(2015) research found that prototypical leaders are more trusted and their
subordinates are therefore more likely to receive help from the leaders, such as
empowerment activities and perceive it as something positive. In addition, the
employees are also more likely to exhibit organizational citizenship behaviour
(both OCB-O and OCB-I) when the leader share the same values and norms as the
employee, however our results showed that the relationship was not as strong in
the case of OCB-O and ESD. As stated earlier, Chan et al. (2008) argues that trust
is one of the key components for empowerment practices to be successful and by
having a leader that is highly prototypical, this will lead to greater results for
organizations. Prototypical leaders are seen as more effective, more charismatic
and more group-oriented. They get more leeway to do it their way due to the
reason that their subordinates have a high level of trust in them (Van Knippenberg
& Van Knippenberg, 2005).

Moreover, the research on leadership empowerment behaviour has also
shown inconsistent results and has been shown to not always have a direct effect
on OCB, but is moderated by other variables which can explain the relationship to
a greater extent (Jiang, Sun, & Law, 2011). A leader that is more prototypical will
share the same values as their followers and thereby create a greater relationship with higher levels of trust. We argue that this relationship is important due to the fact that Yaffe and Kark (2011) found that when leaders express high levels of OCB, followers will also express a higher level of OCB as they will lead by example. Being a good personal example for your subordinates is important, because if the leader does not exhibit organizational citizenship behaviour, he or she cannot expect that behaviour from the followers either. However, if a leader is very prototypical for his or her team, the subordinates are more likely to do the same as their leader. When the leader is seen as a worthy role model (as they often are when they are highly prototypical), Yaffe and Kark (2011) found a significant effect with heightened levels of OCB among followers, which is also supported by our study.

5.1 Limitations, strengths and future research

As with all research, our study has certain limitations, which need to be taken into account when interpreting these results. First, the small sample size obtained (n=101), resulted in several weaknesses of the study, and a larger sample size would therefore be desirable. Although our field study was conducted across multiple organizations which gives the benefit of increased generalizability, with a small sample size, the chances of detecting a true effect is reduced, thus our results could not be generalized (Bryman & Bell, 2015). However, since our study relied on data from the leader-employee dyad, we are quite satisfied with getting as much data as we did, and from different types of organizations with different leader-subordinate relationships. Therefore, we believe that a great strength of our study is the 100% response-rate from our leaders, and that we managed to capture in total 13 different dyads. However, for future research, to make the study more generalizable, the study should be conducted with a bigger sample to make it more empirically valid. A second limitation is that the data was collected through questionnaires and consisted of self-reported data only. Our measures of LEB, OCB, and leader prototypicality all relied on self-reported data. This leaves the possibility of common method bias. According to Rosenman, Tennekoon and Hill (2011) there are several reasons as to why individuals offer biased estimates. The respondents might misinterpret certain questions on the survey, or they may also want to ‘look good’ even though the survey is anonymous.
However, even though this study relies on self-reported data only, the respondents were ensured full anonymity and were informed that there were no right or wrong answers, and that they should answer questions as honestly as possible. These procedures should decrease the likelihood of social desirable responding and evaluation apprehension (Podsakoff et al., 2003). In addition, perceptual data is best represented by self-reported data, and since all the constructs in our model are perceptual, self-reported questionnaires are probably the best way of gaining knowledge about these constructs (Conway & Lance, 2010). All in all, we do not believe that common method bias constitutes a big threat to the validity our findings. That being said, future research should include measures of leader prototypicality and OCB both from the leader and the subordinate’s point of view in order to gain more reliable measures (Kammeyer-Mueller, Steel, & Rubenstein, 2010). Furthermore, because of the cross-sectional design of the study, we cannot refute reverse causality (Cohen et al., 2003). For instance, it can be a bidirectional relationship between the variables. That is, while LEB may increase citizenship behaviours, engaging in OCBs may also increase LEB. In addition, leaders benefitting from employees engaging in OCBs may also reciprocate by engaging in empowering behaviours. Accordingly, for future research, experimental and longitudinal studies should be conducted in order to rule out the possibility of other causal explanations for the relationships between the variables (Mathieu & Taylor, 2006).

Additionally, for future research it could also be interesting to see how other moderators will affect the relationship between the two types of LEB (encouraging self-development and encouraging independent action) and OCB (OCB-I and OCB-O) to see if this will make a difference to the relationship between them. In addition, it would be interesting to see how different forms of empowerment than the two types that were used in this study will have a different relationship with OCB. Furthermore, McNeely and Meglino (1994) noted that using OCB-O and OCB-I as subscales to distinguish intended beneficiaries, may be problematic. For example, the altruism scale of this measure (supposed to measure OCB-I) contains items that clearly tap OCB-O (e.g., making suggestions to improve the department). Another limitation is also the possibility of respondent confusion related to whether the OCBs are to be considered in-role or extra-role behaviours (Organ, 1997). If employees perceive the OCB items as measuring in-role behaviours, they might score themselves low on OCBs even
though they might actually perform OCBs at work. If this is the case, this would most likely have underestimated the relationship between LEB and OCBs in relation to leader prototypicality, resulting in deflated relationships. Therefore, future research on OCB could investigate this further by measuring OCB from both a leader’s and a subordinate’s point of view (Kammeyer-Muller et al., 2010).

5.2 Practical and Theoretical Implications

There are some theoretical implications for this study, as the results from this study contributes to the empowerment and leader prototypicality literature. The results from this research shows that leader prototypicality does greatly affect the relationship between the two leadership empowerment behaviours and the two types of OCB. In addition, this is the first study who have tested these specific variables towards each other and does therefore contribute significantly to the literature. Our findings also showed that there are significant differences between OCB-O and OCB-I as well, but that this depends on the type of leadership empowerment behaviour that is used. OCB-I is more highly influenced by prototypical leaders as a moderator, while it only affects OCB-O in relation to encouraging independent action.

However, the practical implications are clear, as it shows that organizations should not only consider what type of leadership empowerment behaviour they want to use to make their subordinates express higher levels of OCB. They also need to consider the important role of leaders and their behaviour, as prototypical leaders can make the difference on how the empowerment practices is perceived for the subordinates. Organizations therefore needs to consider when recruiting and developing leaders, that it will be beneficial to find someone who shares the same values and norms as the subordinates to some extent. However, there are significant challenges with this as people are often perceived differently in a recruitment process, in contrast to their normal behaviour and values, and it can therefore be difficult for organizations to recruit a specific type of leader. It is therefore highly recommended that a leader is chosen by their subordinates autonomously (Grille et al., 2015), or otherwise find the members within the team which are perceived to be the most ideal prototypical leader, and make that person the leader. It is understandable that this might be viewed as difficult for the top management as they may view others to be more qualified for the position. However, prototypical leaders is continuously found to
be highly effective and it should therefore be worth considering (van Dijke et al., 2012). van Dijke et al. (2012) suggest that it is possible to train leaders to be able to recognize attributes and characteristics in teams and thereby try to embody this ideal prototypical leader. Furthermore, previous research (Yen & Niehoff, 2004; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994) has linked OCB to employee effectiveness and organizational success and it is therefore vital for organizations to take into consideration the results from this study. For them to understand what type of leadership empowerment behaviour they want to express and the vitality of having employees expressing organizational citizenship behaviour. There needs to be an understanding of what they want to achieve and how to achieve it by considering different variables that are likely to affect this relationship such as the type of leaders they have and what effect they want to achieve in the organization to reach their most optimal goals.

All in all, employee OCB in organizations is important for many reasons. As several scholars have already noted, OCBs are important because it provides the organization with additional resources and eliminates the need for expensive formal mechanisms otherwise crucial to successful restructuring processes. In other words, employee OCB is a crucial component for organizational success. However, there are also many reasons for why subordinates engage in OCB behaviour. As the present paper has pointed out, empowering leadership behaviour could be one of the reasons why. LEB gives the subordinates the needed flexibility to engage their own ability more fully in order to help the whole organization enhance its competitiveness and effectiveness. Furthermore, the present study also indicates that leader prototypicality is an important driver for employee OCB. With the recent movement towards more empowering organizations, it is fair to say that “leaders appear to be a forgotten group” (Druskat & Wheeler, 2003). Yet, effective leadership is an important driver of the success of empowered organizations (Druskat & Wheeler, 2003). Leaders nowadays must take into consideration the new expectations employees have about their job. Increasingly, employees view their job as means of personal fulfilment, and therefore expect control and influence over their own jobs and careers (Hakimi, 2010). This expectation requires leaders to interact with their followers in ways different from traditional leadership. This has made LEB an important criterion for leadership effectiveness. For this reason, organizations worldwide have increasingly made use of LEB. The key point is that the nature of
effective leadership is different in empowered settings than it is in more traditional designs. Moreover, LEB may also resonate better with some employees than with others. In addition, from this study it is also evident that which type of LEB the leader engages in and whether or not the leader is in fact prototypical, clearly has an effect on employee OCB.

### 6.0 Conclusion

This study had two purposes. The first purpose was to investigate whether two empowering leadership behaviours, respectively *encourage self-development* and *encouraging independent action* are related to OCB-O and OCB-I. The second purpose of the present paper was to investigate whether this relationship is moderated by leader prototypicality. In other words, this study proposed that when prototypical leaders engage in LEB, the employees would engage in more OCB-O and OCB-I behaviour. Interestingly, our findings indicate that this seems to hold for leaders who encourages their subordinates to engage in self-development activities and independent action only in relation to OCB-O, but not in relation to OCB-I. These findings indicate that not all leadership empowerment behaviours work as a “boost” for both OCB-O and OCB-I, but could rather not have any effect at all. In addition, the results from this study also implies that OCB-O was more significantly linked to encouraging independent action with leader prototypicality as a moderator, but the same results was not given by encouraging self-development. This is interesting due to the reason that self-development does have a significant relationship on its own, but the relationship becomes non-significant when the leader is prototypical. All in all, the results from the present paper indicates that LEB do not always have a direct effect on OCB-O and OCB-I, but is moderated by other variables which can explain the relationship to a greater extent, whereas leader prototypicality is one of them.
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8.0 Appendices

8.1 Appendix 1 – Subordinate questionnaire/survey

Thank you for your participation in this survey! You will now be presented with several questions that we want you answer as accurately as possible. Please select the answers that feels right for you, rather than what you think others will respond. This survey will take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Thank you for your time!

I have received and understood the information regarding the project, and have been given the opportunity to ask questions

☐ I agree to participate in the survey (1)

Q1 Gender

☐ Male (1)

☐ Female (2)

Q2 What is your age?

________________________________________________________________

Q3 Education

☐ Middle school (1)

☐ High school (2)

☐ Diploma degree (3)

☐ Bachelor's degree (4)

☐ Master's degree (5)

☐ Doctorate degree (6)
Q4 Do you have any managerial responsibilities?

Q5 How many years have you been working for this organization?

Q6 How long have you been working for your current leader?

Leader prototypicality

Please indicate how strongly you agree with the statements below. All items should be rated on a 5-poing scale, ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

Q7 My supervisor is a good example of the kind of people in my team

- Strongly agree (1)
- Somewhat agree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Somewhat disagree (4)
- Strongly disagree (5)

Q8 My supervisor represents what this team stands for

- Strongly agree (1)
Q9 My supervisor has a lot in common with the members of my team

- Strongly agree (1)
- Somewhat agree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Somewhat disagree (4)
- Strongly disagree (5)

Q10 My supervisor represents what is characteristic about my team

- Strongly agree (1)
- Somewhat agree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Somewhat disagree (4)
- Strongly disagree (5)

Q11 My supervisor is very similar to what the members of my team value

- Strongly agree (1)
- Somewhat agree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Somewhat disagree (4)
Organizational citizenship behavior
Further, please indicate how strongly you agree with the statements below. All items should be rated on a 5-point scale, ranging from always to never.

Q12 I show pride when representing the organization in public

- Always (1)
- Most of the time (2)
- About half the time (3)
- Sometimes (4)
- Never (5)

Q13 I express loyalty toward the organization

- Always (1)
- Most of the time (2)
- About half the time (3)
- Sometimes (4)
- Never (5)

Q14 I willingly give myself time to help others who have work-related problems

- Always (1)
- Most of the time (2)
- About half the time (3)
Q15 I defend the organization when other employees criticize it

- Always (1)
- Most of the time (2)
- About half the time (3)
- Sometimes (4)
- Never (5)

Q16 I help others who have been absent

- Always (1)
- Most of the time (2)
- About half the time (3)
- Sometimes (4)
- Never (5)

Q17 I share personal property with others to help their work

- Always (1)
- Most of the time (2)
- About half the time (3)
- Sometimes (4)
- Never (5)
Q18 I assist others with their duties

- Always (1)
- Most of the time (2)
- About half the time (3)
- Sometimes (4)
- Never (5)

Q19 I show genuine concern and curiosity toward co-workers, even under the most trying business or personal situations

- Always (1)
- Most of the time (2)
- About half the time (3)
- Sometimes (4)
- Never (5)

Q20 I keep up with developments in the organization

- Always (1)
- Most of the time (2)
- About half the time (3)
- Sometimes (4)
- Never (5)

Q21 I take action to protect the organization from potential problems

- Always (1)
Q22 I demonstrate concern about the image of the organization

- Always (1)
- Most of the time (2)
- About half the time (3)
- Sometimes (4)
- Never (5)

Q23 I adjust my work schedule to accommodate other employees' requests for time off

- Always (1)
- Most of the time (2)
- About half the time (3)
- Sometimes (4)
- Never (5)

Q24 I attend functions that are not required, but that help the organizational image

- Always (1)
- Most of the time (2)
Q25 I go out of the way to make new employees feel welcome in the work group

- Always (1)
- Most of the time (2)
- About half the time (3)
- Sometimes (4)
- Never (5)

Q26 I offer ideas to improve the functioning of the organization

- Always (1)
- Most of the time (2)
- About half the time (3)
- Sometimes (4)
- Never (5)

Q27 I give up time to help others who have work or nonwork problems

- Always (1)
- Most of the time (2)
- About half the time (3)
- Sometimes (4)
- Never (5)
Encourage self-development
First, please indicate how strongly you agree with the statements below. All items should be rated on a 5-point scale, ranging from always to never.

Q28 My team leader encourages me to develop myself

○ Always (1)
○ Most of the time (2)
○ About half the time (3)
○ Sometimes (4)
○ Never (5)

Q29 My team leader encourages me to develop my skills and abilities

○ Always (1)
○ Most of the time (2)
○ About half the time (3)
○ Sometimes (4)
○ Never (5)

Q30 My team leader encourages me to seek out opportunities to learn

○ Always (1)
○ Most of the time (2)
○ About half the time (3)
○ Sometimes (4)
○ Never (5)
Q31 My team leader encourages me to seek out educational opportunities

- Always (1)
- Most of the time (2)
- About half the time (3)
- Sometimes (4)
- Never (5)

Q32 My team leader encourages me to learn new things

- Always (1)
- Most of the time (2)
- About half the time (3)
- Sometimes (4)
- Never (5)

Q33 My team leader encourages me to learn by extending myself

- Always (1)
- Most of the time (2)
- About half the time (3)
- Sometimes (4)
- Never (5)

Encourage independent action

Please indicate how strongly you agree with the statements below. All items should be rated on a 5-point scale, ranging from always to never.
Q34 My team leader encourages me to search for solutions to my problems without supervision

- Always (1)
- Most of the time (2)
- About half the time (3)
- Sometimes (4)
- Never (5)

Q35 My team leader encourages me to find solutions to my problems without my direct input

- Always (1)
- Most of the time (2)
- About half the time (3)
- Sometimes (4)
- Never (5)

Q36 My team leader encourages me to solve problems when they pop up without always getting a stamp of approval

- Always (1)
- Most of the time (2)
- About half the time (3)
- Sometimes (4)
- Never (5)

Q37 My team leader encourages me to assume responsibilities on my own
Always (1)
Most of the time (2)
About half the time (3)
Sometimes (4)
Never (5)

8.2 Appendix 2 – Leader questionnaire/survey

Thank you for your participation in this survey! You will now be presented with several questions that we want you to answer as accurately as possible. Please select the answers that feel right for you, rather than what you think others will respond. This survey will take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Thank you for your time!

I have received and understood the information regarding the project, and have been given the opportunity to ask questions. I agree to participate in this survey and to allow my employees to answer questions that concern me as a manager

☐ I agree to participate in this survey (1)
☐ I do not agree to participate in this survey (2)

Q1 Gender

☐ Male (1)
☐ Female (2)

Q2 What is your age?

Q3 Education
Q4 My position

- Leader (1)
- Subordinate (2)

Q5 How many years have you been working for this organization?

Encourage self-development

First, please indicate how strongly you agree with the statements below. All items should be rated on a 5-point scale, ranging from always to never.

Q6 I encourage my subordinates to develop themselves

- Always (1)
- Most of the time (2)
- About half the time (3)
- Sometimes (4)
- Never (5)
Q7 I encourage my subordinates to develop their skills and abilities

- Always (1)
- Most of the time (2)
- About half the time (3)
- Sometimes (4)
- Never (5)

Q8 I encourage my subordinates to seek out opportunities to learn

- Always (1)
- Most of the time (2)
- About half the time (3)
- Sometimes (4)
- Never (5)

Q9 I encourage my subordinates to seek out educational opportunities

- Always (1)
- Most of the time (2)
- About half the time (3)
- Sometimes (4)
- Never (5)

Q10 I encourage my subordinates to learn by extending themselves
Q11 I encourage my subordinates to learn new things

- Always (1)
- Most of the time (2)
- About half the time (3)
- Sometimes (4)
- Never (5)

Independent action

Please indicate how strongly you agree with the statements below. All items should be rated on a 5-point scale, ranging from always to never.

Q12 I encourage my subordinates to search for solutions to their problems without supervision

- Always (1)
- Most of the time (2)
- About half the time (3)
- Sometimes (4)
- Never (5)
Q13 I encourage my subordinates to find solutions to their problems without my direct input

○ Always (1)
○ Most of the time (2)
○ About half the time (3)
○ Sometimes (4)
○ Never (5)

Q14 I encourage my subordinates to solve problems when they pop up without always getting a stamp of approval

○ Always (1)
○ Most of the time (2)
○ About half the time (3)
○ Sometimes (4)
○ Never (5)

Q15 I encourage my subordinates to assume responsibilities on their own

○ Always (1)
○ Most of the time (2)
○ About half the time (3)
○ Sometimes (4)
○ Never (5)