

STRATEGIC LEADERSHIP SKILLS AND ORGANISATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR: THE ROLE OF PERCEIVED ORGANISATIONAL SUPPORT AMONG EMPLOYEES IN THE PUBLIC SECTOR

ADELEKE, OLUSEGUN JOHN

Department of Business Administration
University of Lagos
sildelk11@yahoo.com

OKON, SAMUEL ESSIEN

Department of Business Administration
University of Lagos
okonsamuel1212@gmail.com

O. L. KUYE

Department of Business Administration
University of Lagos
okuye@unilag.edu.ng

ABSTRACT

The study of leadership has continuously played a pivotal role in any organisational setting, and its importance cannot be overemphasized. This study however, examines if organisational citizenship behaviour of employees differs from strategic leadership skills, and the role of perceived organisational support. Cross-sectional research design using simple random sampling technique was employed. Structured questionnaire was administered to 150 participants of a public sector organisation in Lagos out of which 108 were deemed usable. The scale reliabilities are organisational citizenship behaviour ($\alpha = .78$) and perceived organisational support ($\alpha = .84$) showing internal consistency between the items. Analysis was done using analysis of variance analysis, two hypotheses were tested; the result revealed no significant differences between organisational citizenship behaviour of employees strategic leadership skills. Also, no significant difference was found after controlling for perceived support. The study, therefore, recommends that leaders of organisation needs to be strategic and have the required skills, as it is fundamental for organisational success. Also, the study recommends that government should give attention to strategic leadership skills that can improve organisational citizenship behaviour among employees in public sector organisations.

Keywords: Strategic leadership, organisational citizenship behaviour, perceive organisational support

INTRODUCTION

In any sector of an economy, leadership discourse is an important subject matter in the course of organisations achieving their objectives. The subject of leadership is fundamental for the smooth operation of any organisation, because the importance of leadership in any organisation cannot be overemphasized. According to (Viitala, Kultalahti,

& Kangas, 2017) leadership has significant influence on both the individual and the organisation as a whole, no wonder the leadership literature has continued to gain prominence, because of how critical and fundamental it is to employees' well-being and the organisation.

It is noteworthy, to understand that the success of any organisation depends on the leader whose responsibility is to pull all the available resources strategically together to achieve both individual and organisational objectives. Also, the proper functioning of an organisation depends not only on the leader, but the skills possessed by the leader and this has significant impact on the organisation (Schoemaker, Krupp & Howland, 2013). A leader needs to be strategic and possess the relevant skills, which can be employed in the day to day running of the organisations, this study therefore, intends to look at six categories of strategic leadership skills which are: anticipating, to challenge, interpret, decide, align and learn in line with (Schoemaker, *et al.*, 2013)

According to Drucker (1990, p. 145), "People determine the performance capacity of organisation" and "no organisation can do better than the people it has". In order to be effective, leaders of organisations have the obligation to ensure that employees under them give their best and even go the extra mile (Chattopadhyay, 2017). Employee behaviours that are outside formal job requirements but help make the workplace better and thus contribute to unit functioning of the organisation is called organisational citizenship behaviours (Cetin, Gürbüz & Sert, 2015; Organ, 1988). Delineating this, studies have shown that organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) plays an important role in achievement of organisational objectives (Bolino, Turnley, & Bloodgood, 2002; Cetin *et al.*, 2015). Various scholars have defined OCB, but this study describes OCB in line with the definition given by Organ (1988), where OCB is defined as a discretionary behaviour of employees either towards his or her colleague or the organisation that ensures improvement of the organisational.

However, it is imperative for leaders to understand that for employees to go the extra mile depends on how they perceive the support given to them. Perceived organisational support (POS) refers to the way employees' view that the organisation appreciates them, cares for them and even supports them (Jain, Giga & Cooper, 2013).

This study therefore seeks to understand if organisational citizenship behaviour of employees differs from the strategic leadership skills and also, know if there is any role played by perceived organisational support in this difference.

Statement of problem

Going beyond formal organisational role is a fundamental problem observed by this study in the Nigerian public sector organisations today. Based on observation of the researchers, there are reasons to suggest that employees of public sector do not put in their best to their work and do not go the extra mile outside their formal role requirements. The reason for this is may be not farfetched; as the leadership skills may have impacted negatively on employees. Employees lack motivation and capabilities, they have insufficient knowledge and skills of what to do; they just do the job for the sake of getting their salaries.

Leadership determines where an organisation wants to be and how the organisation intends to get there. Imperatively, leadership affects every aspect of our lives, and today, it is not just about being a leader, but a leader with the required strategic skills to help solve organisational problems. While research seems to suggest that certain leadership

behaviours affect employees' OCB, there is a dearth in literature to the best of the knowledge of the researchers, and the study seeks to investigate on if OCB differs for each strategic leadership skills among employees in the Nigerian public sector, using POS has an intervening variable. This study, therefore, aims at contributing to the literature on OCB and strategic leadership skills, while bridging the existing gap on empirical findings.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretically, organisational support theory posits that, perceived organisational support (POS) strongly depends on employees' attributions concerning the organisation's intent behind their receipt of favorable or unfavorable treatment (Kurtessis, Eisenberger, Ford, Buffardi, Stewart, & Adis, 2015). A social exchange process wherein employees feel obligated to help the organization achieve its goals and objectives and expect that increased efforts on the organization's behalf will lead to greater rewards. POS also fulfills socio-emotional needs, resulting in greater identification and commitment to the organisation, an increased desire to help the organisation succeed, and greater psychological well-being.

Also, this theory explains the fact that employees develop a general perception concerning the extent to which the organisation values their contributions and cares about their well-being (Eisenberger & Stinglhamber, 2011). Organisational support theory has attracted considerable interest because of the potential value of viewing the employee – organization relationship from the employees' viewpoint. Organisational support theory invokes social exchange theory wherein employment is viewed as the trade of effort and loyalty by the employee for tangible benefits and social resources from the organisation (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005).

POS should elicit the norm of reciprocity, leading to a felt obligation to help the organisation, as well as the expectation that increased performance on behalf of the organisation will be noticed and rewarded. As a result, employees with high POS should engage in greater job-related efforts, resulting in enhanced in-role job performance and extra role performance helpful to the organization. With regard to affective organisational commitment, employees seek balance in their relationship with the organisation by developing favorable attitudes and behaviors consistent with POS (Eisenberger & Stinglhamber, 2011)

OCB was originally defined as individual behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization (Yadav & Gupa, 2017; Organ 1988). Though there were disagreements by researchers concerning this definition, Organ (1997) later acknowledged that OCB may be recognized and rewarded during performance appraisals. According to Spitzmuller, Van Dyne, and Ilies, (2008) Organ and colleagues gave emphasis to the discretionary nature of OCB and redefined it as 'discretionary contributions that go beyond the strict description and that do not lay claim to contractual recompense from the formal reward system'.

According to Eisenberger and Stinglhamber (2011), it is suggestive that POS is positively related with affective commitment, job satisfaction, performance and OCB, while it negates turnover intentions. Research suggests that for mid-level employees, OCB is positively associated with organisational performance (Organ, 1997) as well as work group performance (Podsakoff *et al.*, 1997). Employees have various motives for engaging in OCBs. For example, some individuals might be predisposed towards helping others. Research

suggests that people who are characterized as conscientious (Organ, 1997) and with positive effect engages in more citizenship behaviours. It is also acknowledged that individuals may engage in OCBs to enhance their own image in the organisation (Spitzmuller, *et al.*, 2008). Based on social exchange theory, it can also be argued that employees who are treated well by their organisations may reciprocate by engaging in OCBs. Furthermore, the impact of OCB is seen on managerial evaluation of employee and organisational performance, and judgment relating to rewards such as pay rises and promotions (Podsakoff *et al.*, 1997).

Kurtessis, *et al.*, (2015) carried out a meta-analytic evaluation of organisational support theory, based on hypotheses involving social exchange, attribution, and self-enhancement, the meta-analytic assessment was done using results from 558 studies. The study found that organizational support theory predicted leadership, employee - organization context, human resource practices, and working conditions and also employee's orientation toward the organization and work, employee performance, and well-being. Furthermore, Jain *et al.*, (2013), in their study found a significant positive relationship between perceived organizational support and OCB, similarly POS moderated the relationship between organisational stressors and OCB.

The improvement of strategic leadership theory came from the original upper echelons theory developed by Hambrick and Mason in 1984; a study of not only the instrumental ways in which the prevailing combination impacts organisational outcomes, but also the symbolism and social construction of top executives (Hambrick & Pettigrew, 2001).

These authors further made a clear distinction between leadership and strategic leadership, leadership theory refers to leaders at any level in the organisation, while employees at the upper echelon of the organisation are called strategic leaders (Vera & Crossan, 2004). These scholars opine that leadership research focuses particularly on the relationship between leaders and followers. While strategic leadership goes beyond that, strategic leadership research focuses on executive work, as a strategic activity and a symbolic activity (Hambrick & Pettigrew, 2001).

Pearce, Wassenaar, and Manz (2014) examined shared leadership as the key to responsible leadership. The study found that irresponsible leadership has affected Nigeria generally both locally and internationally. The study further clarified how shared leadership is important and how leaders should avoid irresponsible leadership and offered advice on how shared leadership can benefit the country.

Vera and Crossan (2004) developed a theoretical model of the impact of CEO and top manager leadership styles. The study described how strategic leaders influence each element of the learning system. Schoemaker, *et al.*, (2013) in their study, opined that becoming a strategic leader means identifying weaknesses in the six skills, namely: anticipating, making right decision, learn, align, interpret and challenge as identify in their study. From their research they opined that having a strong point in one of the skills cannot make up for dearth in other skills, so it is important to methodically optimize all six skills. Therefore the extent to which organisational citizenship behaviour of employees may differ for strategic leadership skills requires further investigation, and if there is any role played by perceived organisational support.

In attempt to adequately address problems of the study, the research hypotheses are drafted as follows:

H₁: OCB of does not differ for each category of strategic leadership skill.

H₂: OCB of does not differ for each category of strategic leadership skill after controlling for POS.

RESEARCH METHODS

The study employed cross-sectional survey design. The population of this study consists of 338 employees from junior cadre as well as lower and middle management levels. Since the entire population of the employees cannot be included in this study, 150 staff randomly selected through simple random sampling technique constituted the sample size. Simple random technique was adopted in the course of the study because it ensures that every member of the population is represented and each member of the population has a fair chance of being selected.

The questionnaire was divided into two. Section A consists of all demographic variables such as age, religious affiliation, sex and qualification, while section B consists of questions on OCB adapted from previous studies by (Williams & Anderson, 1991). While perceived organizational support was measured using scale adapted from (Eisenberger, Armeli, Rexwinkel, Lynch and Rhoades, 2001) with six items. All items were rated on a 5 point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Strategic leadership skills were divided into six categories in line with Shcoemaker *et al.*, (2013). These skills are anticipation skill, decision skill, learning skill, align skill, interpret skill and challenge skill.

The reliability of the instrument was done using Cronbach Alpha correlation technique. OCB had a coefficient of .78, while perceived organizational support had a coefficient alpha of .84. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test the first hypothesis, the justification for this is to test if OCB differs for each category of strategic leadership skills. While analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was used to test the second hypothesis the test if perceive organisational support has any role to play. ANOVA is used to test for mean differences between three or more groups, when there is only one dependent variable (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 2006).

For this study strategic leadership has six groups (anticipation skill, decision skill, learning skill, align skill, interpret skill and challenge skill) while the dependent variable is OCB and perceived organisational support is the control variable.

RESULT OF HYPOTHESIS TESTING AND DISCUSSION

Hypothesis One

Hypothesis one states that OCB of employees does not significantly differ for each category of strategic leadership skills in the Nigeria public sector. The result of the ANOVA shows that the Levine's test for homogeneity of variance is not significant. So equal variance can be assumed. The result further showed that OCB does not differ for each category of strategic leadership skills ($F=.635$, $p = .673$). Therefore hypothesis one is accepted, further explanation is shown in tables below.

Table 1

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

OCB

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.

1.350	5	102	.250
-------	---	-----	------

Source: Field survey, 2017

From Table, the Levene test of equality of error variances shows if the assumption of equality of variance is violated. If the significant value is smaller than 0.05 and therefore significant, it means the assumption has been violated. However, the result of the table above shows that the significant level is .250; the assumption is not violated.

Table 2

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: OCB

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	233.171 ^a	5	46.634	.635	.673	.030
Intercept	160151.417	1	160151.417	2182.380	.000	.955
SL	233.171	5	46.634	.635	.673	.030
Error	7485.153	102	73.384			
Total	394481.000	108				
Corrected Total	7718.324	107				

a. R Squared = .030 (Adjusted R Squared = -.017)

Source: Field survey, 2017

Also the test between subject effects shows the ANOVA result. The result of the test between –subject effect shows if the strategic leadership skills are not significantly different in terms of their score on the OCB.

The result shows a value of .673, which is greater than .05; therefore the result is not significant which implies that there is no significant difference in OCB of employees for strategic leadership skills. The Partial Eta squared value shows the effect size, this value explains how much of the dependent variable is explained by the independent variable. From the result obtained only 3% of the variance is explained by the independent variable. Therefore the null hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis Two

Hypothesis two states that OCB of employees does not significantly differ for each category of strategic leadership skill after controlling for perceived organisational support.

The result of the univariate ANCOVA shows that the Levine's test for homogeneity of variance is not significant, so equal variance can be assumed. Furthermore, the result shows that OCB does not differ for each category of strategic leadership skill after controlling for perceived organizational support ($F=.278$, $p = .924$). Therefore hypothesis two is accepted.

Table 3

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a

Dependent Variable: OCB

F	df1	df2	Sig.
1.322	5	102	.261

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.

a. Design: Intercept + POS + SL

Source: Field survey, 2017

From the table, the Levene test of equality of error variances shows if the assumption of equality of variance is violated. If the significant value is smaller than 0.05 and significant, it means the assumption has been violated. However, the result of the table above shows that the significant level is .261; which means the assumption of equality of error of variances is not violated.

Table 4.2.2

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: OCB

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	1612.466 ^a	6	268.744	4.445	.000	.209
Intercept	7069.314	1	7069.314	116.937	.000	.537
POS	1379.295	1	1379.295	22.816	.000	.184
SL	83.979	5	16.796	.278	.924	.014
Error	6105.858	101	60.454			
Total	394481.000	108				
Corrected Total	7718.324	107				

a. R Squared = .209 (Adjusted R Squared = .162)

The test between subject effects shows the ANCOVA result. The result of the test between –subject effect shows if the strategic leadership skills are significantly different on employees OCB. The result shows a value of .924, which is greater than .05; therefore the result is not significant which implies that there is no significant difference in OCB of employees for strategic leadership skills. Therefore the null hypothesis is accepted. The Partial Eta squared value shows the effect size, this value explains how much of the dependent variable is explained by the independent variable. From the result obtained only 1.4% of the variance is explained by the independent variable.

Furthermore, the covariate which is perceived organizational support has a value of .000, which is less than .05. This implies that significant relationship exist between perceived organisational support and OCB. In fact, it explained 18.4 percent of the variance in the dependent variable (OCB).

It is imperative to note that further test can be carried out if a significant result is found on the test between subjects, because this gives permission for further investigation on the relationship between the variables.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the strategic leadership skills and organisational citizenship behaviour: the role of perceived organisational support. The study used ANOVA and also control for perceived organisational support using ANCOVA. The findings of the study revealed that OCB does not differ for each category of strategic leadership skill of anticipation, decision, learn, align, interpret and challenge as put forward by Schoemaker *et al.*, (2013). Also, the second hypothesis showed that after controlling for perceived

organisational support, OCB still does not differ for each category of strategic leadership skills. Though studies have continuously shown the leadership commitment relationship and the leadership – OCB relationship.

It is imperative to note that the importance of leadership in any organisation cannot be overemphasized. Leadership is considered a vital tool in today's organisation whether public or private (Kaiser *et al.*, 2008). A leader, regardless of how good he or she is, cannot operate in a vacuum, employees are needed and the way a leader is viewed by the employees is fundamental to the smooth running of the organisation. The success enjoyed by some organization depends on the type of leader they have in place. Fundamentally, the Nigerian case seems more complex with having square pegs in round holes in most public organistaon., because the success of organisation lies on employees who are ready to go the extra mile for the organisation, with a leader that is strategic. In line with this studies have shown how leadership influences employees attached to the organisation and make them go beyond their normal line of work (Gyensare, *et al.*, 2016; Yadav & Gupa, 2017).

RECOMMENDATIONS

The study recommends that:

1. Management of the organisations should endeavor to put in place a leadership style that goes beyond interpersonal relationship. A leader that is strategic, that can anticipate, learn, challenge, interpret and move organisation to the next level.
2. Designing the proper climate is important for both the organisation and the employees, and how this is perceived by employees is likely to go the extra mile for the organisation.
3. Government should give attention to strategic leadership skills that can improve organisational citizenship behaviour of employees in public sector organisations.

LIMITATION AND SUGGESTION FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The result of this study should be considered in light of its limitations. Cross industry analysis can be done with a larger sample size to see if the same result will be obtained. Also similar study should be carried out in the private sector organisations to confirm if similar result would be achieved. Likewise, other statistical tools can be used to further ascertain the relationship between the variables. Also, a comparative study comparing the public and private sector organisations should be carried out. Further studies should add control variables for better analysis and improved findings.

REFERENCE

- Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W. H., & Bloodgood, J. M. (2002). Citizenship behaviour and the creation of social capital in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(4), 505–522.
- Chattopadhyay, R (2017). Impact of force distribution system on performance evaluation on organisational citizenship behavior. *Global Business Review*, 20(3), 1 – 12.
- Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 31, 874-900.
- Drucker, P. F. (1990). *Managing the Non-profit Organisation*. Harper Collins, New York, NY.
- Eisenberger, R., Armeli, S., Rexwinkel, B., Lynch, P. D. and Rhoades, L. (2001). Reciprocation of perceived organisational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 42-51.

- Eisenberger, R., & Stinglhamber, F. (2011). *Perceived organisational support: Fostering enthusiastic and productive employees*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Gürbüz, S. (2009). Some possible antecedents of military personnel organisational citizenship behavior. *Military Psychology, 21*, 200–215.
- Hair, J. F. J., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (2006). *Multivariate data analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hambrick, D., & Mason, P. (1984). Upper echelons: The organisation as a reflection of its top managers. *Academy of Management Review, 9*, 193–206.
- Hambrick, D., & Pettigrew, A. (2001). Upper echelons: Donald Hambrick on executives and strategy. *Academy of Management Executive, 15*(3), 36–44.
- Jain, A. K., Giga, S. I., & Cooper, C. L. (2013). Perceived organisational support as a moderator in the relationship between organisational stressors and organizational citizenship behaviors. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 21*(3) 313-334. doi 10.1108/IJOA-Mar-2012-0574
- Kurtessis, J. N., Eisenberger, R., Ford, M. T, Buffardi, L. C, Stewart, K. A. & Adis, C. S. (2015). Perceive organisational support: A meta-analytic evaluation of organisational support theory. *Journal of Management, 20*(10), 1-31
- Leroy, H., Palanski, M. E. & Simons, T. (2012). Authentic leadership and behavioural integrity as drivers of follower commitment and performance. *Journal of Business Ethics, 107*(3), 255-264.
- MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Fetter, R. (1991). Organisational citizenship behaviour and objective productivity as determinants of managerial evaluations of salesperson's performance. *Organisational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50*(1), 123–150.
- Organ, D. W. (1997). Organisational citizenship behavior: it's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance, 10*, 85–97.
- Organ, D.W. (1988), *Organisational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington Books, Lexington, M A.
- Pearce, C. L., Wassenaar, C. L. & Manz, C. C (2014). Is shared leadership the key to responsible leadership? *The Academy of Management Perspectives, 28*(3), 275–288. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/amp.2014.0017>
- Podsakoff, P. M., Ahearne, M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*, 262–270.
- Riggle, R. J., Edmondson, D. R., & Hansen, J. D. (2009). A meta-analysis of the relationship between perceived organisational support and job outcomes: 20 years of research. *Journal of Business Research, 62*, 1027-1030.
- Cetin, S., Gürbüz, S., & Sert, M. (2015). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organisational commitment and organisational citizenship behavior: Test of potential moderator variables. *Employee responsibility Rights Journal, 1-23*

Schoemaker, P. J. H., Krupp, S., & Howland, S. (2013). Strategic leadership: The essential skills. *Harvard Business Review*. January-February, 1-5.

Spitzmuller, M., Van Dyne, L., & Ilies, R. (2008). Organisational citizenship behavior: A review and extension of its nomological network. In J. Barling & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organisational behavior: Volume 1—Micro approaches* (pp. 106–123). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Vera, D. & Crossan, M. (2004). Strategic leadership and Organisational learning. *Academy of Management Review*. 29(2), 222–240.

Viitala, R., Kultalahti, S., & Kangas, H. (2017). Does strategic leadership development feature in managers’ response to future HRM challenges? *Leadership & Organisation Development Journal*, 38(4), 576-587

Williams, L. J. and Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organisational commitment as predictor of organisational citizenship behaviour and in-role behaviour. *Journal of Management*, 17, 601-617.

Yadav, L. K., & Gupa, P. (2017). Procedural justice, job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviour: Mediating role of organizational trust-Indian Tourism Industry study. *Management and Labour Studies*, 42(3), 1-18

Appendix
Post Hoc Tests

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: OCB
Bonferroni

(I) SLS	(J) SLS	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Anticipates	Make right decision	2.778	6.385	1.000	-16.42	21.97
	Learn	4.533	6.449	1.000	-14.85	23.92
	Align	5.680	6.177	1.000	-12.89	24.25
	Interpret	7.000	6.697	1.000	-13.13	27.13
	Challenge	6.571	6.476	1.000	-12.89	26.04
Make right decision	Anticipates	-2.778	6.385	1.000	-21.97	16.42
	Learn	1.756	2.995	1.000	-7.25	10.76
	Align	2.902	2.355	1.000	-4.18	9.98
	Interpret	4.222	3.497	1.000	-6.29	14.73
	Challenge	3.794	3.053	1.000	-5.38	12.97
Learn	Anticipates	-4.533	6.449	1.000	-23.92	14.85
	Make right decision	-1.756	2.995	1.000	-10.76	7.25
	Align	1.147	2.522	1.000	-6.43	8.73
	Interpret	2.467	3.612	1.000	-8.39	13.32
	Challenge	2.038	3.183	1.000	-7.53	11.61
Align	Anticipates	-5.680	6.177	1.000	-24.25	12.89
	Make right decision	-2.902	2.355	1.000	-9.98	4.18
	Learn	-1.147	2.522	1.000	-8.73	6.43
	Interpret	1.320	3.102	1.000	-8.00	10.64
	Challenge	.891	2.590	1.000	-6.89	8.68
Interpret	Anticipates	-7.000	6.697	1.000	-27.13	13.13
	Make right decision	-4.222	3.497	1.000	-14.73	6.29
	Learn	-2.467	3.612	1.000	-13.32	8.39
	Align	-1.320	3.102	1.000	-10.64	8.00
	Challenge	6.571	6.476	1.000	-12.89	26.04

Challenge	Challenge	-.429	3.660	1.000	-11.43	10.57
	Anticipates	-6.571	6.476	1.000	-26.04	12.89
	Make right decision	-3.794	3.053	1.000	-12.97	5.38
	Learn	-2.038	3.183	1.000	-11.61	7.53
	Align	-.891	2.590	1.000	-8.68	6.89
	Interpret	.429	3.660	1.000	-10.57	11.43

Furthermore a Post hoc test was conducted and the result showed no significant difference among the variables. It is imperative to note that once the ANOVA result shows no significant relationship no further test can be embarked on.