

Appendix F Statistical Results

Chi-square test was applied to test all the hypotheses using $p=0.05$ as the critical significance level:

- H1: The relationship between adopting CMM/CMMI industrial standards and the IT offshoring issues.
- H2: The relationship between CMM/CMMI industrial standards Maturity level achieved and the frequency of issues experienced.
- H3: The relationship between MM/CMMI industrial standards practices and the frequency of issues experienced.
- H4.1: The relationship between adopting CMMM/CMMI industrial standards and the project success factors.
- H4.2: The relationship between CMM/CMMI industrial standards maturity levels achieved and the project success factors.
- H4.3: The relationship between CMM/CMMI industrial standards practices and the project success factors.

Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 tests the relationship between four CMM/CMMI models and the frequency of issues experienced by the client companies. Hypothesis 1.1 tests the relationship between companies that applied only CMMI for Development (DEV)/Services(SVC) and companies that did not apply any quality standard model and the 17 issues of offshoring IT projects; Hypothesis 1.2 tests the relationship between companies that applied only CMMI for Acquisition and companies that did not apply any quality standard model and the 17 issues of offshoring IT projects; Hypothesis 1.3 tests the relationship between companies that used only People CMM and companies that did not apply any quality standard models and the 17 issues of offshoring IT projects; and Hypothesis 1.4 tests the relationship between companies that applied only TSP and companies that did not apply any quality standard model and the 17 issues of offshoring IT projects.

Bonferroni's correction was used when multiple comparisons were drawn from a single sample. Hypothesis tests the 17 issues 4 times with 4 industrial standards. Bonferroni correction (adjusted) p -value = $0.05/(17*4) = 0.05/68 = 0.0007352$

H1.1 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI development/services and the IT offshoring issue.

H1.2 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI acquisition and the IT offshoring issues.

H1.3 There is a relationship between adopting CMM people and the IT offshoring issues.

H1.4 There is a relationship between adopting CMM TSP and the IT offshoring issues.

Hypothesis 1.1: Adopting CMMI-DEV/SVC and IT offshoring issues

H1.1 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI development/services and the IT offshoring issues.

1 - Hypothesis 1.1.1 Issue: Over Expenditure due to hidden costs.

H1.1 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI development/services and the over expenditure issue.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing CMMI for Development/Services and experiencing over expenditures for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 62.468 from table A-H-2 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=2 and p =.000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing CMMI Development/Services and *over expenditure* issue experienced. The analysis shows that firms applying CMM for Development/Services reported fewer than expected *over expenditure* issue. Table A-H-1 shows that 10 companies that adopted CMMI for DEV/SVC reported “Always + Almost Always” for *over expenditure* issue while the expected count was (33.5). Moreover, 41 of the companies that apply CMMI for DEV/SVC reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *over expenditure* issue while the expected count for this category was (20.2).

Cramer’s V= .610 indicates a strong association between applying CMMI-DEV and over expenditure issues. Companies that apply CMMI for DEV/SVC reported fewer over expenditure issue as shown in Table A-H-3.

Table A-H-1

Crosstab					
			CMMI_DEV/SVC_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode Issue 1: Over Expenditure	Always + Almost Always	Count	10	78	88
		Expected Count	33.5	54.5	88.0
		% within Recode Issue 1: Over Expenditure	11.4%	88.6%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	15.6%	75.0%	52.4%
		Std. Residual	-4.1	3.2	
	Occasionally	Count	13	14	27
		Expected Count	10.3	16.7	27.0
		% within Recode Issue 1: Over Expenditure	48.1%	51.9%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	20.3%	13.5%	16.1%
		Std. Residual	.8	-.7	
	Rarely + Never	Count	41	12	53
		Expected Count	20.2	32.8	53.0
		% within Recode Issue 1: Over Expenditure	77.4%	22.6%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	64.1%	11.5%	31.5%
		Std. Residual	4.6	-3.6	
Total	Count		64	104	168
	Expected Count		64.0	104.0	168.0
	% within Recode Issue 1: Over Expenditure		38.1%	61.9%	100.0%
	% within CMMI_DEV_only		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-2

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	62.468 ^a	2	.00000000
Likelihood Ratio	66.875	2	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	61.960	1	.00000000
N of Valid Cases	168		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.29.

Table A-H-3

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.610	.000
	Cramer's V	.610	.000
N of Valid Cases		168	

2 - Hypothesis 1.1.2 Issue: Poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier

H1.1.2 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI Development/Services and the frequency of poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier issues experienced.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing CMMI for Development/Services and experiencing *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 83.958 from Table A-H-5 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=2$ and $p=.000000$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing CMMI Development/Services and *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier* issue experienced. The analysis shows that firms applying CMM for Development/Services reported fewer than expected of *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier* issue. Table A-H-4 shows that 10 companies that adopted CMMI for DEV/SVC reported “Always” for *over expenditure* issue while the expected count was (34.7). Moreover, 44 of the companies that apply CMMI for DEV/SVC reported “Never” for experiencing *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier* issue while the expected count for this category was (18.7).

Cramer’s $V=.707$ indicates a strong association between applying CMMI-DEV/SVC and *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier* issues. Companies that apply CMMI for DEV/SVC reported fewer issue as shown in Table A-H-6.

Table: A-H-4

Crosstab					
			CMMI_DEV/SVC		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode Issue16: Poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier	Always + Almost Always	Count	10	81	91
		Expected Count	34.7	56.3	91.0
		% within Recode Issue16: POOR EXECUTION PLAN	11.0%	89.0%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV only	15.6%	77.9%	54.2%
		Std. Residual	-4.2	3.3	
	Occasionally	Count	10	18	28
		Expected Count	10.7	17.3	28.0
		% within Recode Issue16: POOR EXECUTION PLAN	35.7%	64.3%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV only	15.6%	17.3%	16.7%
		Std. Residual	-.2	.2	
	Rarely + Never	Count	44	5	49
		Expected Count	18.7	30.3	49.0
		% within Recode Issue16: POOR EXECUTION PLAN	89.8%	10.2%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV only	68.8%	4.8%	29.2%
		Std. Residual	5.9	-4.6	
Total	Count		64	104	168
	Expected Count		64.0	104.0	168.0
	% within Recode Issue16: POOR EXECUTION PLAN		38.1%	61.9%	100.0%
	% within CMMI_DEV only		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-5

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	83.958 ^a	2	.00000000
Likelihood Ratio	91.464	2	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	81.373	1	.00000000
N of Valid Cases	168		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.67.

Table A-H-6

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.707	.000
	Cramer's V	.707	.000
N of Valid Cases		168	

3 - Hypothesis 1.1.3 Issue: Difference in interpretation of project requirements between Client company and the supplier and CMMI for Development/Services

H1.1.3 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI Development (DEV)/Services (SVC) and the frequency of difference in interpretation of project requirements between client company and the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing CMMI for Development/Services and experiencing *difference in interpretation of project requirements between client company and the supplier* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 73.053 from Table A-H-8 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=2 and p =0.000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing CMMI Development/Services and *difference in interpretation of project requirements between client company and the supplier* issue experienced. The analysis shows that firms applying CMM for Development/Services reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-7 shows that 11 companies that adopted CMMI for DEV/SVC reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (35.8). Moreover, 42 of the companies that apply CMMI for DEV/SVC reported “Rarely + Never ” for experiencing *over expenditure* issue while the expected count for this category was (19).

Cramer’s V= .659 indicates a strong association between applying CMMI-DEV and *difference in interpretation of project requirements between client company and the supplier* as shown in Table A-H-9 .

Table A-H-7

Crosstab					
		CMMI_DEV/SVC_		Total	
		Yes	No		
Recode Issue2: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	Always + Almost Always	Count	11	83	94
		Expected Count	35.8	58.2	94.0
		% within Recode Issue2: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	11.7%	88.3%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	17.2%	79.8%	56.0%
		Std. Residual	-4.1	3.3	
	Occasion ally	Count	11	13	24
		Expected Count	9.1	14.9	24.0

		% within Recode Issue2: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	45.8%	54.2%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	17.2%	12.5%	14.3%
		Std. Residual	.6	-.5	
	Rarely + Never	Count	42	8	50
		Expected Count	19.0	31.0	50.0
		% within Recode Issue2: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	84.0%	16.0%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	65.6%	7.7%	29.8%
		Std. Residual	5.3	-4.1	
Total			Count	64	104
			Expected Count	64.0	104.0
			% within Recode Issue2: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	38.1%	61.9%
			% within CMMI_DEV_only	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-7

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	73.053 ^a	2	.00000000
Likelihood Ratio	78.352	2	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	72.583	1	.00000000
N of Valid Cases	168		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.14.

Table A-H-7

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.659	.000
	Cramer's V	.659	.000
N of Valid Cases		168	

4 - Hypothesis 1.1.4 Issue: Poorly developed and documented requirements by the client company

H1.1.4: There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Development/Service and the frequency of poorly developed and documented requirements by the client company.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing CMMI for Development/Services and experiencing *poorly developed and documented requirements by the client company* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 78.903 from Table A-H-11 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=2 and p =.000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing CMMI Development/Services and *poorly developed and documented requirements by the client company* issue experienced. The analysis shows that firms applying CMM for Development/Services reported fewer than expected *poorly developed and documented requirements by the client company* issue. Table A-H-10 shows that 9 companies that adopted CMMI for DEV/SVC reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was

(34.3). Moreover, 41 of the companies that apply CMMI for DEV/SVC reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *over expenditure* issue while the expected count for this category was (17.9).

Cramer’s V= .685 indicates a strong association between applying CMMI-DEV and over expenditure issues as shown in Table A-H-12.

Table A-H-10

Crosstab					
			CMMI_DEV_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode Issue3: POORLY DEVELOPED AND DOCUMENTED REQUIREMENTS	Always + Almost Always	Count	9	81	90
		Expected Count	34.3	55.7	90.0
		% within Recode Issue3: POORLY DEVELOPED AND DOCUMENTED REQUIREMENTS	10.0%	90.0%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	14.1%	77.9%	53.6%
		Std. Residual	-4.3	3.4	
	Occasionally	Count	14	17	31
		Expected Count	11.8	19.2	31.0
		% within Recode Issue3: POORLY DEVELOPED AND DOCUMENTED REQUIREMENTS	45.2%	54.8%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	21.9%	16.3%	18.5%
		Std. Residual	.6	-.5	
	Rarely + Never	Count	41	6	47
		Expected Count	17.9	29.1	47.0
		% within Recode Issue3: POORLY DEVELOPED AND DOCUMENTED REQUIREMENTS	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	64.1%	5.8%	28.0%
		Std. Residual	5.5	-4.3	
Total	Count		64	104	168
	Expected Count		64.0	104.0	168.0
	% within Recode Issue3: POORLY DEVELOPED AND DOCUMENTED REQUIREMENTS		38.1%	61.9%	100.0%
	% within CMMI_DEV_only		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-11

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	78.903 ^a	2	.00000000
Likelihood Ratio	86.182	2	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	78.309	1	.00000000
N of Valid Cases	168		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.81.

Table A-H-12

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.685	.000
	Cramer's V	.685	.000
N of Valid Cases		168	

5- Hypothesis 1.1.5 Issue: Poor tracking and managing requirement changes by the client company

H1.1.5: There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Development/Services and the frequency of poor tracking and managing requirement changes by the client company.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing CMMI for Development/Services and experiencing *poor tracking and managing requirement changes by the client company* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 77.925 from Table A-H-14 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=2$ and $p=0.000000$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing CMMI Development/Services and *poor tracking and managing requirement changes by the client company* issue experienced. The analysis shows that firms applying CMM for Development/Services reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-13 shows that 8 companies that adopted CMMI for DEV/SVC reported “Always + Almost Always” for *over expenditure* issue while the expected count was (33.9). Furthermore, 42 of the companies that apply CMMI for DEV/SVC reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (19).

Cramer’s $V=.681$ indicates a strong association between applying CMMI-DEV and over expenditure issues as shown in Table A-H-15.

Table A-H-13

Crosstab					
			CMMI_DEV_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode Issue5: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMEN T CHANGES	Always + Almost Always	Count	8	81	89
		Expected Count	33.9	55.1	89.0
		% within Recode Issue4: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES	9.0%	91.0%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	12.5%	77.9%	53.0%
		Std. Residual	-4.4	3.5	
	Occasionally	Count	14	15	29
		Expected Count	11.0	18.0	29.0
		% within Recode Issue4: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES	48.3%	51.7%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	21.9%	14.4%	17.3%
		Std. Residual	.9	-.7	
	Rarely + Never	Count	42	8	50
		Expected Count	19.0	31.0	50.0
		% within Recode Issue4: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES	84.0%	16.0%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	65.6%	7.7%	29.8%
		Std. Residual	5.3	-4.1	
Total	Count		64	104	168
	Expected Count		64.0	104.0	168.0
	% within Recode Issue4: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES		38.1%	61.9%	100.0%
	% within CMMI_DEV_only		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-14

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	77.925 ^a	2	.00000000
Likelihood Ratio	85.341	2	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	77.429	1	.00000000
N of Valid Cases	168		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.05.

Table A-H-15

Symmetric Measures		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.681	.000
	Cramer's V	.681	.000
N of Valid Cases		168	

6- Hypothesis 1.1.6 Issue: Lack of a full communication plan between the client company and the supplier company

H1.1.6: There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Development/Services and the frequency of lack of a full communication plan between the client company and the supplier company.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing CMMI for Development/Services and experiencing *full communication plan between the client company and the supplier company* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 70.514 from Table A-H-17 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=2$ and $p=0.000000$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing CMMI Development/Services and *full communication plan between the client company and the supplier company* issue experienced. The analysis shows that firms applying CMM for Development/Services reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-16 shows that 10 companies that adopted CMMI for DEV/SVC reported “Always + Almost Always” for *over expenditure* issue while the expected count was (33). Moreover, 42 of the companies that apply CMMI for DEV/SVC reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *over expenditure* issue while the expected count for this category was (19.8).

Cramer's $V=.641$ indicates a strong association between applying CMMI-DEV and over expenditure issues as shown in Table A-H-18.

Table A-H-16

Crosstab					
			CMMI_DEV_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode Issue 6: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATI ON PLAN	Always + Almost Always	Count	10	82	92
		Expected Count	35.0	57.0	92.0
		% within Recode Issue 5: : LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN	10.9%	89.1%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	15.6%	78.8%	54.8%
		Std. Residual	-4.2	3.3	
	Occasionally	Count	12	12	24
		Expected Count	9.1	14.9	24.0
		% within Recode Issue 5: : LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	18.8%	11.5%	14.3%
		Std. Residual	.9	-.7	
	Rarely + Never	Count	42	10	52
		Expected Count	19.8	32.2	52.0
		% within Recode Issue 5: : LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN	80.8%	19.2%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	65.6%	9.6%	31.0%
		Std. Residual	5.0	-3.9	
Total		Count	64	104	168
		Expected Count	64.0	104.0	168.0

	% within Recode Issue 5: : LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN	38.1%	61.9%	100.0%
	% within CMMI_DEV_only	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-17

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	70.514 ^a	2	.00000000
Likelihood Ratio	75.842	2	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	69.944	1	.00000000
N of Valid Cases	168		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.14.

Table A-H-18

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.648	.000
	Cramer's V	.648	.000
N of Valid Cases		168	

7- Hypothesis 1.1.7 Issue: Communication and coordination problems between the client company and the supplier company

H1.1.7 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Development/Services and the frequency of communication and coordination problems between the client company and the supplier company.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing CMMI for Development/Services and experiencing *communication and coordination problems between the client company and the supplier company* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 82.939 from Table A-H-20 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=2 and p=.000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing CMMI Development/Services and *communication and the issue of coordination problems between the client company and the supplier company*. The analysis shows that firms applying CMM for Development/Services reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-19 shows that 7 companies that adopted CMMI for DEV/SVC reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (35.4). Moreover, 37 of the companies that apply CMMI for DEV/SVC reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *over expenditure* issue while the expected count for this category was (17.9).

Cramer’s V=0.703 indicates a strong association between applying CMMI-DEV and the issue of *communication and coordination problems between the client company and the supplier company* as shown in Table A-H-21.

Table A-H-19

Crosstab					
			CMMI_DEV_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode Issue 7: COMMUNICATIO N AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS	Always + Almost Always	Count	7	86	93
		Expected Count	35.4	57.6	93.0
		% within Recode Issue 6: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS	7.5%	92.5%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	10.9%	82.7%	55.4%

	Occasionally	Std. Residual	-4.8	3.7	
		Count	20	8	28
		Expected Count	10.7	17.3	28.0
		% within Recode Issue 6: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	31.3%	7.7%	16.7%
		Std. Residual	2.9	-2.2	
	Rarely + Never	Count	37	10	47
		Expected Count	17.9	29.1	47.0
		% within Recode Issue 6: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS	78.7%	21.3%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	57.8%	9.6%	28.0%
		Std. Residual	4.5	-3.5	
		Count	64	104	168
Total		Expected Count	64.0	104.0	168.0
		% within Recode Issue 6: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS	38.1%	61.9%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-20

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	82.939 ^a	2	.00000000
Likelihood Ratio	91.451	2	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	74.722	1	.00000000
N of Valid Cases	168		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.67.

Table A-H-21

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.703	.000
	Cramer's V	.703	.000
N of Valid Cases		168	

8- Hypothesis 1.1.8 Issue: Language barriers between the client company and the supplier

H1.1.8 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Development/Services and the frequency of language barriers between the client company and the supplier.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between practicing CMMI for Development/Services and experiencing *language barriers between the client company and the supplier* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 7.778 from Table A-H-23 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=2 and p =.02046877.

Table A-H-22

Crosstab					
			CMMI_DEV_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode Issue8: LANGUAGE BARRIERS	Always + Almost Always	Count	38	82	120
		Expected Count	45.7	74.3	120.0
		% within Recode Issue7: LANGUAGE BARRIERS	31.7%	68.3%	100.0%

	Occasionally	% within CMMI_DEV_only	59.4%	78.8%	71.4%
		Std. Residual	-1.1	.9	
		Count	13	13	26
		Expected Count	9.9	16.1	26.0
		% within Recode Issue7: LANGUAGE BARRIERS	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	20.3%	12.5%	15.5%
	Rarely + Never	Std. Residual	1.0	-.8	
		Count	13	9	22
		Expected Count	8.4	13.6	22.0
		% within Recode Issue7: LANGUAGE BARRIERS	59.1%	40.9%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	20.3%	8.7%	13.1%
		Std. Residual	1.6	-1.3	
Total	Count		64	104	168
	Expected Count		64.0	104.0	168.0
	% within Recode Issue7: LANGUAGE BARRIERS		38.1%	61.9%	100.0%
	% within CMMI_DEV_only		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-22

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.778 ^a	2	.02046877
Likelihood Ratio	7.631	2	.02202399
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.558	1	.00597443
N of Valid Cases	168		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.38.

Table A-H-22

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.215	.020
	Cramer's V	.215	.020
N of Valid Cases		168	

9- Hypothesis 1.1.9 Issue: Time-zone differences between the client company and the supplier

H1.1.9 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Development/Services and the frequency of time-zone differences between the client company and the supplier.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between practicing CMMI for Development/Services and experiencing *time-zone differences between the client company and the supplier* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 2.839 from Table A-H-23 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=2 and p =0.2418349.

Table A-H-25

Crosstab					
			CMMI_DEV_only		Total
			Yes	No	
	Always +	Count	44	83	127
	Almost Always	Expected Count	48.4	78.6	127.0

Recode Issue 9: TIME ZONE DIFFERENCES		% within Recode Issue 8: TIME ZONE DIFFERENCES	34.6%	65.4%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	68.8%	79.8%	75.6%
		Std. Residual	-.6	.5	
	Occasionally	Count	11	13	24
		Expected Count	9.1	14.9	24.0
		% within Recode Issue 8: TIME ZONE DIFFERENCES	45.8%	54.2%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	17.2%	12.5%	14.3%
		Std. Residual	.6	-.5	
	Rarely + Never	Count	9	8	17
		Expected Count	6.5	10.5	17.0
		% within Recode Issue 8: TIME ZONE DIFFERENCES	52.9%	47.1%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	14.1%	7.7%	10.1%
		Std. Residual	1.0	-.8	
Total	Count		64	104	168
	Expected Count		64.0	104.0	168.0
	% within Recode Issue 8: TIME ZONE DIFFERENCES		38.1%	61.9%	100.0%
	% within CMMI_DEV_only		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-26

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.839 ^a	2	.2418349
Likelihood Ratio	2.782	2	.2488372
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.792	1	.0947338
N of Valid Cases	168		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.48.

Table A-H-27

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.130	.242
	Cramer's V	.130	.242
N of Valid Cases		168	

10- Hypothesis 1.1.10 Issue: Cultural differences between the client company and the supplier

1.1.10 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Development/Services and the frequency of cultural differences between the client company and the supplier, a relationship will be found.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between practicing CMMI for Development/Services and experiencing *cultural differences between the client company and the supplier* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 2.500 from Table A-H-29 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=2 and p = 0.287.

Table A-H-28

Crosstab				
		CMMI_DEV_		Total
		Yes	No	
	Count	40	77	117
	Expected Count	44.6	72.4	117.0

Recode_Issue10: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	Always + Almost Always	% within Recode_Issue9: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	34.2%	65.8%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	62.5%	74.0%	69.6%
		Std. Residual	-.7	.5	
	Occasionally	Count	10	11	21
		Expected Count	8.0	13.0	21.0
		% within Recode_Issue9: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	47.6%	52.4%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	15.6%	10.6%	12.5%
		Std. Residual	.7	-.6	
	Rarely + Never	Count	14	16	30
		Expected Count	11.4	18.6	30.0
		% within Recode_Issue9: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	46.7%	53.3%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	21.9%	15.4%	17.9%
		Std. Residual	.8	-.6	
Total	Count		64	104	168
	Expected Count		64.0	104.0	168.0
	% within Recode_Issue9: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES		38.1%	61.9%	100.0%
	% within CMMI_DEV_only		100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0%

Table A-H-29

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2- sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.500 ^a	2	.287
Likelihood Ratio	2.469	2	.291
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.110	1	.146
N of Valid Cases	168		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.00.

Table A-H-30

Symmetric Measures

	Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal Phi	.122	.287
Cramer's V	.122	.287
N of Valid Cases	168	

11- Hypothesis 1.1.11 Issue: Incomplete and unclear contract

H1.1.11 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Development/Services and the frequency of incomplete and unclear contract.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing CMMI for Development/Services and experiencing *incomplete and unclear contract* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 63.941 from Table A-H-32 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=2 and p =0.000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing CMMI Development/Services and the issue of *incomplete and unclear contract*. The analysis shows that firms applying CMM for Development/Services reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-31 shows that 4 companies that adopted CMMI for DEV/SVC reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected

count was (28.6). Moreover, 50 of the companies that apply CMMI for DEV/SVC reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *incomplete and unclear contract* issue while the expected count for this category was (27.8).

Cramer’s V=0.617 indicates a strong association between applying CMMI-DEV and the issue of *coordination problems between the client company and the supplier company* as shown in Table A-H-33.

Table A-H-31

Crosstab					
			CMMI_DEV_only		Total
			Yes	No	
ecode Issue 11: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	Always + Almost Always	Count	4	71	75
		Expected Count	28.6	46.4	75.0
		% within ecode Issue 10: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	5.3%	94.7%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	6.3%	68.3%	44.6%
		Std. Residual	-4.6	3.6	
	Occasionally	Count	10	10	20
		Expected Count	7.6	12.4	20.0
		% within ecode Issue 10: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	15.6%	9.6%	11.9%
		Std. Residual	.9	-.7	
	Rarely + Never	Count	50	23	73
		Expected Count	27.8	45.2	73.0
		% within ecode Issue 10: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	68.5%	31.5%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	78.1%	22.1%	43.5%
		Std. Residual	4.2	-3.3	
Total	Count		64	104	168
	Expected Count		64.0	104.0	168.0
	% within ecode Issue 10: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT		38.1%	61.9%	100.0%
	% within CMMI_DEV_only		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-32

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	63.941 ^a	2	.00000000
Likelihood Ratio	73.351	2	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	62.288	1	.00000000
N of Valid Cases	168		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.62.

Table A-H-33

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.617	.000
	Cramer's V	.617	.000

12- Hypothesis 1.1.12 Issue: Early contract renegotiation and termination

H1.1.12 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Development/Services and the frequency of early contract renegotiation and termination.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing CMMI for Development/Services and experiencing *early contract renegotiation and termination* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 58.227 from Table A-H-235 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=2 and p =0.000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing CMMI Development/Services and *the issue of early contract renegotiation and termination*. The analysis shows that firms applying CMM for Development/Services reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-34 shows that 5 companies that adopted CMMI for DEV/SVC reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (28.6). Moreover, 51 of the companies that apply CMMI for DEV/SVC reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *early contract renegotiation and termination* issue while the expected count for this category was (29.3).

Cramer’s V=0.589 indicates a relatively strong association between applying CMMI-DEV and the issue of *early contract renegotiation and termination* as shown in Table A-H-36.

Table A-H-34

Crosstab					
			CMMI_DEV_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode Issue12: EARLY CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION AND TERMINATION	Always + Almost Always	Count	5	70	75
		Expected Count	28.6	46.4	75.0
		% within Recode Issue11: EARLY CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION AND TERMINATION	6.7%	93.3%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	7.8%	67.3%	44.6%
		Std. Residual	-4.4	3.5	
	Occasionally	Count	8	8	16
		Expected Count	6.1	9.9	16.0
		% within Recode Issue: EARLY CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION AND TERMINATION	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	12.5%	7.7%	9.5%
		Std. Residual	.8	-.6	
	Rarely + Never	Count	51	26	77
		Expected Count	29.3	47.7	77.0
		% within Recode Issue: EARLY CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION AND TERMINATION	66.2%	33.8%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	79.7%	25.0%	45.8%
		Std. Residual	4.0	-3.1	
Total	Count		64	104	168
	Expected Count		64.0	104.0	168.0
	% within Recode Issue: EARLY CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION AND		38.1%	61.9%	100.0%
	% within CMMI_DEV_only		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-35

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	58.227 ^a	2	.00000000
Likelihood Ratio	65.883	2	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	56.760	1	.00000000
N of Valid Cases	168		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.10.

Table A-H-36

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.589	.000
	Cramer's V	.589	.000
N of Valid Cases		168	

13- Hypothesis 1.1.13 Issue: Difference in project management practices between your company and the supplier

H1.1.13 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Development/Services and the frequency of difference in project management practices between the client company and the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing CMMI for Development/Services and experiencing *difference in project management practices between the client company and the supplier* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 68.595 from Table A-H-38 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=2 and p =0.000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing CMMI Development/Services and *the issue of difference in project management practices between the client company and the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms applying CMM for Development/Services reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-37 shows that 8 companies that adopted CMMI for DEV/SVC reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (33.1). Besides, 45 of the companies that apply CMMI for DEV/SVC reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *difference in project management practices between the client company and the supplier issue* while the expected count for this category was (22.5).

Cramer’s V=0.639 indicates a strong association between applying CMMI-DEV and the issue of *early contract renegotiation and termination* as shown in Table A-H-39

Table A-H-37

Crosstab					
			CMMI_DEV_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode Issue13: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	Always + Almost Always	Count	8	79	87
		Expected Count	33.1	53.9	87.0
		% within Recode Issue15: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	9.2%	90.8%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	12.5%	76.0%	51.8%
		Std. Residual	-4.4	3.4	
	Occasionally	Count	11	11	22
		Expected Count	8.4	13.6	22.0
		% within Recode Issue15: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	17.2%	10.6%	13.1%
		Std. Residual	.9	-.7	
	Rarely + Never	Count	45	14	59
		Expected Count	22.5	36.5	59.0

		% within Recode Issue15: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	76.3%	23.7%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	70.3%	13.5%	35.1%
		Std. Residual	4.8	-3.7	
Total	Count		64	104	168
	Expected Count		64.0	104.0	168.0
	% within Recode Issue15: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES		38.1%	61.9%	100.0%
	% within CMMI_DEV_only		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-38

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	68.595 ^a	2	.00000000
Likelihood Ratio	74.703	2	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	67.764	1	.00000000
N of Valid Cases	168		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.38.

Table A-H-39

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.639	.000
	Cramer's V	.639	.000
N of Valid Cases		168	

14- Hypothesis 1.1.14 Issue: Unable to measure the performance of the supplier

H1.1.14 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Development/Services and the frequency of unable to measure the performance of the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing CMMI for Development/Services and experiencing *unable to measure the performance of the supplier* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 75.932 from Table A-H-41 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=2 and p =0.000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing CMMI Development/Services and *the issue of unable to measure the performance of the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms applying CMM for Development/Services reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-40 shows that 5 companies that adopted CMMI for DEV/SVC reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (28.6). Moreover, 51 of the companies that apply CMMI for DEV/SVC reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *early contract renegotiation and termination* issue while the expected count for this category was (29.3).

Cramer’s V=0.672 indicates a relatively strong association between applying CMMI-DEV and the issue of *early contract renegotiation and termination* as shown in Table A-H-42.

Table A-H-40

Crosstab					
			CMMI_DEV_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode Issue14: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	Always + Almost Always	Count	6	79	85
		Expected Count	32.4	52.6	85.0
		% within Recode Issue: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	7.1%	92.9%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	9.4%	76.0%	50.6%

	Occasionally	Std. Residual	-4.6	3.6	
		Count	12	12	24
		Expected Count	9.1	14.9	24.0
		% within Recode Issue: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	18.8%	11.5%	14.3%
	Rarely + Never	Std. Residual	.9	-.7	
		Count	46	13	59
		Expected Count	22.5	36.5	59.0
		% within Recode Issue: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	78.0%	22.0%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	71.9%	12.5%	35.1%
	Total	Std. Residual	5.0	-3.9	
		Count	64	104	168
		Expected Count	64.0	104.0	168.0
		% within Recode Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	38.1%	61.9%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-41

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	75.932 ^a	2	.00000000
Likelihood Ratio	84.408	2	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	74.997	1	.00000000
N of Valid Cases	168		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.14.

Table A-H-42

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.672	.000
	Cramer's V	.672	.000
N of Valid Cases		168	

15- Hypothesis 1.1.15 Issue: Supplier technical/security and political issues

H1.1.15 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Development/Services and the frequency of supplier technical/security and political issues.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between practicing CMMI for Development/Services and experiencing *supplier technical/security and political* issues for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 10.853 from Table A-H-29 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=2 and $p = 0.00439883$.

Table A-H-43

Crosstab					
			CMMI_DEV_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Recodee issue 15: Supplier technical political security issues	Always + Almost Always	Count	34	80	114
		Expected Count	43.4	70.6	114.0
		% within Recodee issue : Supplier technical political security issues	29.8%	70.2%	100.0%

		% within CMMI_DEV_only	53.1%	76.9%	67.9%
		Std. Residual	-1.4	1.1	
		Count	5	5	10
	Occasionally	Expected Count	5.4	5.6	9.0
		% within Recodee issue : Supplier technical political security issues	44.4%	55.6%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	6.3%	4.8%	5.4%
		Std. Residual	.3	-.2	
		Count	25	19	44
	Rarely + Never	Expected Count	16.1	27.9	44.0
		% within Recodee issue : Supplier technical political security issues	57.8%	42.2%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	40.6%	18.3%	26.8%
		Std. Residual	2.1	-1.7	
		Count	64	104	168
		Expected Count	64.0	104.0	168.0
		% within Recodee issue 14: Supplier technical political security issues	38.1%	61.9%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-44

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.853 ^a	2	.00439883
Likelihood Ratio	10.690	2	.00477230
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.787	1	.00102228
N of Valid Cases	168		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.43.

Table A-H-45

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.254	.004
	Cramer's V	.254	.004
N of Valid Cases		168	

16- Hypothesis 1.1.16 Issue: Insufficient previous experience of the supplier

H1.1.16 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Development/Services and the frequency of insufficient previous experience of the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing CMMI for Development/Services and experiencing *insufficient previous experience of the supplier* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 69.962 from Table A-H-47 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=2 and p =0.000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing CMMI Development/Services and *insufficient previous experience of the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms applying CMM for Development/Services reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-46 shows that 6 companies that adopted CMMI for DEV/SVC reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (31.6). Moreover, 48 of the companies that apply CMMI for DEV/SVC reported “Rarely +

Never” for experiencing *insufficient previous experience of the supplier* issue while the expected count for this category was (24.8).

Cramer’s V=0.645 indicates a strong association between applying CMMI-DEV and the issue of *insufficient previous experience of the supplier* as shown in Table A-H-48.

Table A-H-46

Crosstab					
			CMMI_DEV_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode Issue16: INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER	Always + Almost Always	Count	6	77	83
		Expected Count	31.6	51.4	83.0
		% within Recode Issue INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER	7.2%	92.8%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	9.4%	74.0%	49.4%
		Std. Residual	-4.6	3.6	
	Occasionally	Count	10	10	20
		Expected Count	7.6	12.4	20.0
		% within Recode Issue: INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	15.6%	9.6%	11.9%
		Std. Residual	.9	-.7	
	Rarely + Never	Count	48	17	65
		Expected Count	24.8	40.2	65.0
		% within Recode Issue: INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	75.0%	16.3%	38.7%
		Std. Residual	4.7	-3.7	
Total	Count		64	104	168
	Expected Count		64.0	104.0	168.0
	% within Recode Issue12: INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER		38.1%	61.9%	100.0%
	% within CMMI_DEV_only		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-47

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	69.962 ^a	2	.00000000
Likelihood Ratio	77.769	2	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	68.882	1	.00000000
N of Valid Cases	168		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.62.

Table A-H-48

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.645	.000
	Cramer's V	.645	.000
N of Valid Cases		168	

17- Hypothesis 1.1.17 Issue: Lack of supplier standardized working methods

H1.1.17 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Development/Services and the frequency of lack of supplier standardized working methods.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing CMMI for Development/Services and experiencing *lack of supplier standardized working methods* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 65.855 from Table A-H-50 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=2 and $p=0.000000$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing CMMI Development/Services and communication and the issue of *lack of supplier standardized working methods*. The analysis shows that firms applying CMM for Development/Services reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-49 shows that 8 companies that adopted CMMI for DEV/SVC reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (33.1). Furthermore, 48 of the companies that apply CMMI for DEV/SVC reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *lack of supplier standardized working methods* issue while the expected count for this category was (25.1).

Cramer’s $V=0.626$ indicates a strong association between applying CMMI-DEV and the issue of *lack of supplier standardized working methods* as shown in Table A-H-51.

Table A-H-49

Crosstab					
			CMMI_DEV_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode Issue17: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARDIZED WORKING METHODS	Always + Almost Always	Count	8	79	87
		Expected Count	33.1	53.9	87.0
		% within Recode Issue17:LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING METHODS	9.2%	90.8%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	12.5%	76.0%	51.8%
		Std. Residual	-4.4	3.4	
	Occasionally	Count	8	7	15
		Expected Count	5.7	9.3	15.0
		% within Recode Issue17:LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING METHODS	53.3%	46.7%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	12.5%	6.7%	8.9%
		Std. Residual	1.0	-8	
	Rarely + Never	Count	48	18	66
		Expected Count	25.1	40.9	66.0
		% within Recode Issue17:LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING METHODS	72.7%	27.3%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	75.0%	17.3%	39.3%
		Std. Residual	4.6	-3.6	
Total	Count		64	104	168
	Expected Count		64.0	104.0	168.0
	% within Recode Issue17:LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING METHODS		38.1%	61.9%	100.0%
	% within CMMI_DEV_only		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-50

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	65.855 ^a	2	.00000000

Likelihood Ratio	71.784	2	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	64.583	1	.00000000
N of Valid Cases	168		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.71.

Table A-H-51

Symmetric Measures		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.626	.000
	Cramer's V	.626	.000
N of Valid Cases		168	

Hypothesis 1.2 Adopting CMMI-ACQ and IT offshoring issues

H1.2 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI Acquisition and the frequency of issues experienced.

This hypothesis tests the relationship between CMMI for Acquisition and the frequency of 17 issues.

1 -Hypothesis 1.2.1 Issue 1: Over Expenditure due to hidden costs.

H1.2.1 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI Acquisition and the frequency of over expenditure due to hidden costs issue experienced.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing CMMI for Acquisition (ACQ) and experiencing over expenditure for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 58.437 from Table A-H-53 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=2$ and $p=.000000$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing CMMI for Acquisition and the issue of over expenditure. The analysis shows that firms applying CMM for Acquisition reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-52 shows that 20 companies that adopted CMMI for ACQ reported "Always + Almost Always" for this issue while the expected count was (41.7). Moreover, 40 of the companies that apply CMMI for ACQ reported "Rarely + Never" for experiencing *over expenditure* issue while the expected count for this category was (18.3).

Cramer's $V=0.597$ indicates a relatively strong association between applying CMMI-ACQ and the issue of over expenditure as shown in Table A-H-54.

Table A-H-52

Crosstab			
	CMMI_ACQ_only		Total
	Yes	No	

Recode2_Issue1 : OVER EXPENDITURE	Always + Almost Always + Occasionall y	Count	20	94	114
		Expected Count	41.7	72.3	114.0
		% within Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE	17.5%	82.5%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	33.3%	90.4%	69.5%
		Std. Residual	-3.4	2.6	
	Rarely + Never	Count	40	10	50
		Expected Count	18.3	31.7	50.0
		% within Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	66.7%	9.6%	30.5%
		Std. Residual	5.1	-3.9	
Total	Count		60	104	164
	Expected Count		60.0	104.0	164.0
	% within Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE		36.6%	63.4%	100.0%
	% within CMMI_ACQ_only		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-53

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	58.437 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	55.776	1	.00000000		
Likelihood Ratio	59.477	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	58.080	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	164				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 18.29.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-54

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.597	.000
	Cramer's V	.597	.000
N of Valid Cases		164	

2 - Hypothesis 1.2.2 Issue: Poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier

H1.2.2 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI Acquisition and the frequency of poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier issue.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing CMMI for Acquisition (ACQ) and experiencing *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is **79.093** from Table A-H-56 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=2$ and $p=0.0000000$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing CMMI for Acquisition and the issue of *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms applying CMM for Acquisition reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-55 shows that 18 companies that adopted CMMI for ACQ reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (42.8). Moreover, 42 of the companies that apply CMMI for ACQ reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (17.2).

Cramer’s $V=0.694$ indicates a strong association between applying CMMI-ACQ and the issue of over expenditure as shown in Table A-H-57.

Table A-H-55

Crosstab						
			CMMI_ACQ_only		Total	
			Yes	No		
Recode2_Issue2: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	18	99	117	
		Expected Count	42.8	74.2	117.0	
		% within Recode2_Issue: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING	15.4%	84.6%	100.0%	
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	30.0%	95.2%	71.3%	
		Std. Residual	-3.8	2.9		
	Rarely + Never	Count	42	5	47	
		Expected Count	17.2	29.8	47.0	
		% within Recode2_Issue: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING	89.4%	10.6%	100.0%	
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	70.0%	4.8%	28.7%	
		Std. Residual	6.0	-4.5		
Total			Count	60	104	164
			Expected Count	60.0	104.0	164.0
			% within Recode2_Issue16: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING	36.6%	63.4%	100.0%
			% within CMMI_ACQ_only	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-56

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	79.093 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	75.936	1	.00000000		
Likelihood Ratio	83.085	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	78.611	1	.00000000		0
N of Valid Cases	164				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.20.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-57

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.694	.000
	Cramer's V	.694	.000
N of Valid Cases		164	

3 - Hypothesis 1.2.3 Issue: Difference in interpretation of project requirements between client company and the supplier

H1.2.3: When testing the relationship between adopting CMMI for Acquisition and the frequency of difference in interpretation of project requirements between client company and the supplier, a relationship will be found.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing CMMI for Acquisition (ACQ) and experiencing *difference in interpretation of project requirements between Client company and the supplier* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 69.747 from Table A-H-58 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing CMMI for Acquisition and the issue of *difference in interpretation of project requirements between Client company and the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms applying CMM for Acquisition reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-59 shows that 19 companies that adopted CMMI for ACQ reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (42.4). Moreover, 41 of the companies that apply CMMI for ACQ reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *difference in interpretation of project requirements between Client company and the supplier* issue while the expected count for this category was (17.6).

Cramer’s V=0.652 indicates a strong association between applying CMMI-ACQ and the issue of over expenditure as shown in Table A-H-60.

Table A-H-58

Crosstab					
			CMMI_ACQ_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue3: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	19	97	116
		Expected Count	42.4	73.6	116.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	16.4%	83.6%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	31.7%	93.3%	70.7%
		Std. Residual	-3.6	2.7	
	Rarely + Never	Count	41	7	48
		Expected Count	17.6	30.4	48.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	85.4%	14.6%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	68.3%	6.7%	29.3%
		Std. Residual	5.6	-4.2	
Total	Count		60	104	164
	Expected Count		60.0	104.0	164.0
	% within Recode2_Issue: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS		36.6%	63.4%	100.0%
	% within CMMI_ACQ_only		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-59

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	69.747 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	66.803	1	.00000000		
Likelihood Ratio	72.072	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	69.322	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	164				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.56.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-60

Symmetric Measures		
	Value	Approx. Sig.

Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.652	.000
	Cramer's V	.652	.000
N of Valid Cases		164	

4 - Hypothesis 1.2.4 Issue: Poorly developed and documented requirements by the client company

H1.2.4: There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Acquisition and the frequency of poorly developed and documented requirements by the client company.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing CMMI for Acquisition (ACQ) and experiencing *poorly developed and documented requirements by the client company* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is **63.945** from Table A-H-62 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing CMMI for Acquisition and the issue of *poorly developed and documented requirements by the client company*. The analysis shows that firms applying CMM for Acquisition reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-61 shows that 19 companies that adopted CMMI for ACQ reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (41.7). Moreover, 41 of the companies that apply CMMI for ACQ reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (18.3).

Cramer’s V=0.624 indicates a strong association between applying CMMI-ACQ and the issue of *poorly developed and documented requirements by the client company* as shown in Table A-H-63.

Table A-H-61

Crosstab						
			CMMI_ACQ_only		Total	
			Yes	No		
Recode2_Issue4: POORLY DEVELOPED AND DOCUMENTED REQUIREMENTS	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	19	95	114	
		Expected Count	41.7	72.3	114.0	
		% within Recode2_Issue3: POORLY DEVELOPED AND DOCUMENTED REQUIREMENTS	16.7%	83.3%	100.0%	
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	31.7%	91.3%	69.5%	
		Std. Residual	-3.5	2.7		
	Rarely + Never	Count	41	9	50	
		Expected Count	18.3	31.7	50.0	
		% within Recode2_Issue3: POORLY DEVELOPED AND DOCUMENTED REQUIREMENTS	82.0%	18.0%	100.0%	
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	68.3%	8.7%	30.5%	
		Std. Residual	5.3	-4.0		
Total			Count	60	104	164
			Expected Count	60.0	104.0	164.0
			% within Recode2_Issue3: POORLY DEVELOPED AND DOCUMENTED REQUIREMENTS	36.6%	63.4%	100.0%
			% within CMMI_ACQ_only	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-62

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	63.945 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	61.160	1	.00000000		
Likelihood Ratio	65.534	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	63.555	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	164				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 18.29.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-63

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.624	.000
	Cramer's V	.624	.000
N of Valid Cases		164	

5- Hypothesis 1.2.5 Issue: Poor tracking and managing requirement changes by the client company

H1.2.5: There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Acquisition and the frequency of poor tracking and managing requirement changes by the client company.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing CMMI for Acquisition (ACQ) and experiencing *poor tracking and managing requirement changes by the client company* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 69.701 from Table A-H-65 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=0.000000$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing CMMI for Acquisition and the issue of *poor tracking and managing requirement changes by the client company*. The analysis shows that firms applying CMM for Acquisition reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H- 64 that 18 companies that adopted CMMI for ACQ reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (41.7). Moreover, 42 of the companies that apply CMMI for ACQ reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (18.3).

Cramer’s $V=0.652$ indicates a strong association between applying CMMI-ACQ and the issue of over expenditure as shown in Table A-H-66.

Table A-H-64

Crosstab					
			CMMI_ACQ_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue5: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	18	96	114
		Expected Count	41.7	72.3	114.0
		% within Recode2_Issue4: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES	15.8%	84.2%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	30.0%	92.3%	69.5%
		Std. Residual	-3.7	2.8	
	Rarely + Never	Count	42	8	50
		Expected Count	18.3	31.7	50.0
		% within Recode2_Issue4: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES	84.0%	16.0%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	70.0%	7.7%	30.5%
		Std. Residual	5.5	-4.2	

Total	Count	60	104	164
	Expected Count	60.0	104.0	164.0
	% within Recode2_Issue4: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES	36.6%	63.4%	100.0%
	% within CMMI_ACQ_only	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-65

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	69.701 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	66.792	1	.00000000		
Likelihood Ratio	71.990	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	69.276	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	164				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 18.29.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-66

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.652	.000
	Cramer's V	.652	.000
N of Valid Cases		164	

6- Hypothesis 1.2.6 Issue: Lack of a full communication plan between the client company and the supplier company

H1.2.6: There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Acquisition and the frequency of lack of a full communication plan between the client company and the supplier company, a relationship will be found.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing CMMI for Acquisition (ACQ) and experiencing *full communication plan between the client company and the supplier company* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 64.295 from Table A-H-68 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing CMMI for Acquisition and the issue of *full communication plan between the client company and the supplier company*. The analysis shows that firms applying CMM for Acquisition reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-67 shows that 17 companies that adopted CMMI for ACQ reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (40.2). Moreover, 43 of the companies that apply CMMI for ACQ reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *full communication plan between the client company and the supplier company* issue while the expected count for this category was (19.8).

Cramer’s V=0.626 indicates a strong association between applying CMMI-ACQ and the issue of over expenditure as shown in Table A-H-69.

Table A-H-67

Crosstab

			CMMI_ACQ_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue6: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	17	93	110
		Expected Count	40.2	69.8	110.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN	15.5%	84.5%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	28.3%	89.4%	67.1%
		Std. Residual	-3.7	2.8	
	Rarely + Never	Count	43	11	54
		Expected Count	19.8	34.2	54.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN	79.6%	20.4%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	71.7%	10.6%	32.9%
		Std. Residual	5.2	-4.0	
Total	Count		60	104	164
	Expected Count		60.0	104.0	164.0
	% within Recode2_Issue5: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN		36.6%	63.4%	100.0%
	% within CMMI_ACQ_only		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-68

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	64.295 ^a	1	.00000000	.00000000	.00000000
Continuity Correction ^b	61.559	1	.00000000		
Likelihood Ratio	66.095	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	63.903	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	164				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 19.76.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-69

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.626	.000
	Cramer's V	.626	.000
N of Valid Cases		164	

7- Hypothesis 1.2.7 Issue: Communication and coordination problems between the client company and the supplier company

H1.2.7 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Acquisition and the frequency of communication and coordination problems between the client company and the supplier company.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing CMMI for Acquisition (ACQ) and experiencing communication and coordination problems between the client company and the supplier company for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 48.431 from Table A-H-71 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing CMMI for Acquisition and the issue of communication and coordination problems between the client company and the supplier company

communication and coordination problems between the client company and the supplier company. The analysis shows that firms applying CMM for Acquisition reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-70 shows that 21 companies that adopted CMMI for ACQ reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (41). Moreover, 39 of the companies that apply CMMI for ACQ reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (19).

Cramer’s V=0.543 indicates a relatively strong association between applying CMMI-ACQ and the issue of communication and coordination problems between the client company and the supplier company as shown in Table A-H-73.

Table A-H-70

Crosstab					
			CMMI_ACQ_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue 7: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	21	91	112
		Expected Count	41.0	71.0	112.0
		% within Recode2_Issue6: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS	18.8%	81.3%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	35.0%	87.5%	68.3%
		Std. Residual	-3.1	2.4	
	Rarely + Never	Count	39	13	52
		Expected Count	19.0	33.0	52.0
		% within Recode2_Issue6: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	65.0%	12.5%	31.7%
		Std. Residual	4.6	-3.5	
Total	Count		60	104	164
	Expected Count		60.0	104.0	164.0
	% within Recode2_Issue6: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS		36.6%	63.4%	100.0%
	% within CMMI_ACQ_only		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-71

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	48.431 ^a	1	.00000000	.00000000	.00000000
Continuity Correction ^b	46.037	1	.00000000		
Likelihood Ratio	48.821	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	48.136	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	164				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 19.02.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-72

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.543	.000
	Cramer's V	.543	.000
N of Valid Cases		164	

8- Hypothesis 1.2.8 Issue: Language barriers between the client company and the supplier

H1.2.8 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Acquisition and the frequency of language barriers between the client company and the supplier.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between practicing CMMI for Acquisition (ACQ) and experiencing language barriers between the client company and the supplier for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 7.906 from Table A-H-74 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00492683$

Table A-H-73

Crosstab					
			CMMI_ACQ_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue8: LANGUAGE BARRIERS	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	49	99	148
		Expected Count	54.1	93.9	148.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: LANGUAGE BARRIERS	33.1%	66.9%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	81.7%	95.2%	90.2%
		Std. Residual	-.7	.5	
	Rarely + Never	Count	11	5	16
		Expected Count	5.9	10.1	16.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: LANGUAGE BARRIERS	68.8%	31.3%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	18.3%	4.8%	9.8%
		Std. Residual	2.1	-1.6	
Total		Count	60	104	164
		Expected Count	60.0	104.0	164.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: LANGUAGE BARRIERS	36.6%	63.4%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-74

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.906 ^a	1	.00492683	.01143326	.00634387
Continuity Correction ^b	6.444	1	.01112980		
Likelihood Ratio	7.584	1	.00588868		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.858	1	.00505993		
N of Valid Cases	164				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.85.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-75

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.220	.005
	Cramer's V	.220	.005
N of Valid Cases		164	

9- Hypothesis 1.2.9 Issue: Time-zone differences between the client company and the supplier

H1.2.9 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Acquisition and the frequency of time-zone differences between the client company and the supplier.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between practicing CMMI for Acquisition (ACQ) and experiencing time-zone differences for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 1.996 from Table A-H-77 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=0.15770746$

Table A-H-76

Crosstab					
			CMMI_ACQ_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue9: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	52	97	149
		Expected Count	54.5	94.5	149.0
		% within Recode2_Issue8: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES	34.9%	65.1%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	86.7%	93.3%	90.9%
		Std. Residual	-.3	.3	
	Rarely + Never	Count	8	7	15
		Expected Count	5.5	9.5	15.0
		% within Recode2_Issue8: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES	53.3%	46.7%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	13.3%	6.7%	9.1%
		Std. Residual	1.1	-.8	
Total	Count		60	104	164
	Expected Count		60.0	104.0	164.0
	% within Recode2_Issue8: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES		36.6%	63.4%	100.0%
	% within CMMI_ACQ_only		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-77

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.996 ^a	1	.15770746	.17043033	.12967009
Continuity Correction ^b	1.281	1	.25778964		
Likelihood Ratio	1.921	1	.16573413		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.984	1	.15898008		
N of Valid Cases	164				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.49.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-78

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.110	.158
	Cramer's V	.110	.158
N of Valid Cases		164	

10- Hypothesis 1.2.10 Issue: Cultural differences between the client company and the supplier

1.2.10 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Acquisition and the frequency of cultural differences between the client company and the supplier.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between practicing CMMI for Acquisition (ACQ) and experiencing cultural differences for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 9.610 from Table A-H-80 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=0.00193532$

Table A-H-79

Crosstab					
			CMMI_ACQ_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue10: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	49	100	149
		Expected Count	54.5	94.5	149.0
		% within Recode2_Issue9: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	32.9%	67.1%	100.0 %
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	81.7%	96.2%	90.9%
		Std. Residual	-.7	.6	
	Rarely + Never	Count	11	4	15
		Expected Count	5.5	9.5	15.0
		% within Recode2_Issue9: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	73.3%	26.7%	100.0 %
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	18.3%	3.8%	9.1%
		Std. Residual	2.4	-1.8	
Total	Count		60	104	164
	Expected Count		60.0	104.0	164.0
	% within Recode2_Issue9: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES		36.6%	63.4%	100.0 %
	% within CMMI_ACQ_only		100.0%	100.0%	100.0 %

Table A-H-80

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.610 ^a	1	.00193532		
Continuity Correction ^b	7.946	1	.00482051		
Likelihood Ratio	9.261	1	.00234148		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00354140	.00281850
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.551	1	.00199808		
N of Valid Cases	164				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.49.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-81

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.242	.002
	Cramer's V	.242	.002
N of Valid Cases		164	

11- Hypothesis 1.2.11 Issue: Incomplete and unclear contract

H1.2.11 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Acquisition and the frequency of incomplete and unclear contract.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing CMMI for Acquisition (ACQ) and experiencing *incomplete and unclear contract* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 52.895 from Table A-H-83 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and $p=0.000000$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing CMMI for Acquisition and the issue of *incomplete and unclear contract*. The analysis shows that firms applying CMM for Acquisition reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-82 shows that 16 companies that adopted CMMI for ACQ reported “Always + Almost Always + Occasionally” for this issue while the expected count was (37.7). Moreover, 44 of the companies that apply CMMI for ACQ reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *incomplete and unclear contract* issue while the expected count for this category was (22.3).

Cramer’s $V=0.568$ indicates a relatively strong association between applying CMMI-ACQ and the issue of *incomplete and unclear contract* as shown in Table A-H-84.

Table A-H-82

rosstab					
			CMMI_ACQ_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue10: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	16	87	103
		Expected Count	37.7	65.3	103.0
		% within Recode2_Issue10: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	15.5%	84.5%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	26.7%	83.7%	62.8%
		Std. Residual	-3.5	2.7	
	Rarely + Never	Count	44	17	61
		Expected Count	22.3	38.7	61.0
		% within Recode2_Issue10: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	72.1%	27.9%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	73.3%	16.3%	37.2%
		Std. Residual	4.6	-3.5	
Total			Count	60	104
			Expected Count	60.0	104.0
			% within Recode2_Issue10: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	36.6%	63.4%
			% within CMMI_ACQ_only	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-83

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	52.895 ^a	1	.00000000	.00000000	.00000000
Continuity Correction ^b	50.484	1	.00000000		
Likelihood Ratio	54.250	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	52.573	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	164				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 22.32.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-84

Symmetric Measures		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.568	.000
	Cramer's V	.568	.000
N of Valid Cases		164	

12- Hypothesis 1.2.12 Issue: Early contract renegotiation and termination

H1.2.12 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Acquisition and the frequency of early contract renegotiation and termination.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing CMMI for Acquisition (ACQ) and experiencing *early contract renegotiation and termination* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 52.992 from Table A-H-86 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing CMMI for Acquisition and the issue of *early contract renegotiation and termination*. The analysis shows that firms applying CMM for Acquisition reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-85 shows that 13 companies that adopted CMMI for ACQ reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (35.1). Moreover, 47 of the companies that apply CMMI for ACQ reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *early contract renegotiation and termination* issue while the expected count for this category was (24.9).

Cramer’s V=0.568 indicates a relatively strong association between applying CMMI-ACQ and the issue of *early contract renegotiation and termination* as shown in Table A-H-87.

Table A-H-85

Crosstab					
			CMMI_ACQ_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue11: EARLY CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION AND TERMINATION	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	13	83	96
		Expected Count	35.1	60.9	96.0
		% within Recode2_Issue11: EARLY CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION AND TERMINATION	13.5%	86.5%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	21.7%	79.8%	58.5%
		Std. Residual	-3.7	2.8	
	Rarely + Never	Count	47	21	68
		Expected Count	24.9	43.1	68.0
		% within Recode2_Issue11: EARLY CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION AND TERMINATION	69.1%	30.9%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	78.3%	20.2%	41.5%
		Std. Residual	4.4	-3.4	

Total	Count	60	104	164
	Expected Count	60.0	104.0	164.0
	% within Recode2_Issue11: EARLY CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION AND TERMINATION	36.6%	63.4%	100.0%
	% within CMMI_ACQ_only	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-86

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	52.992 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	50.624	1	.00000000		
Likelihood Ratio	55.194	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	52.669	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	164				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 24.88.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-87

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.568	.000
	Cramer's V	.568	.000
N of Valid Cases		164	

13- Hypothesis 1.2.13 Issue: Difference in project management practices between your company and the supplier

H1.2.13 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Acquisition and the frequency of difference in project management practices between your company and the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing CMMI for Acquisition (ACQ) and experiencing *difference in project management practices* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 66.978 from Table A-H-89 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing CMMI for Acquisition and the issue of *difference in project management practices*. The analysis shows that firms applying CMM for Acquisition reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-88 shows that 17 companies that adopted CMMI for ACQ reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (40.6). Moreover, 43 of the companies that apply CMMI for ACQ reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *difference in project management practices* issue while the expected count for this category was (19.4).

Cramer’s V=0.639 indicates a strong association between applying CMMI-ACQ and the issue of *difference in project management practices* as shown in Table A-H-90.

Table A-H-88

Crosstab					
			CMMI_ACQ_only		Total
			Yes	No	
		Count	17	94	111

Recode2_Issue13 : DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Expected Count	40.6	70.4	111.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	15.3%	84.7%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	28.3%	90.4%	67.7%
		Std. Residual	-3.7	2.8	
		Count	43	10	53
	Rarely + Never	Expected Count	19.4	33.6	53.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	81.1%	18.9%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	71.7%	9.6%	32.3%
		Std. Residual	5.4	-4.1	
		Count	60	104	164
Total	Expected Count		60.0	104.0	164.0
	% within Recode2_Issue: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES		36.6%	63.4%	100.0%
	% within CMMI_ACQ_only		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-89

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	66.978 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	64.171	1	.00000000		
Likelihood Ratio	69.018	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	66.569	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	164				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 19.39.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-90

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.639	.000
	Cramer's V	.639	.000
N of Valid Cases		164	

14- Hypothesis 1.2.14 Issue: Unable to measure the performance of the supplier

H1.2.14 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Acquisition and the frequency of unable to measure the performance of the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing CMMI for Acquisition (ACQ) and experiencing *unable to measure the performance of the supplier* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 81.957 from Table A-H-92 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing CMMI for Acquisition and the issue of *unable to measure the performance of the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms applying CMM for Acquisition reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-91 shows that 16 companies that adopted CMMI for ACQ reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was

(41.7). Moreover, 44 of the companies that apply CMMI for ACQ reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *unable to measure the performance of the supplier* issue while the expected count for this category was (18.3).

Cramer’s $V=0.707$ indicates a strong association between applying CMMI-ACQ and the issue of *unable to measure the performance of the supplier* as shown in Table A-H-93.

Table A-H-91

Crosstab					
			CMMI_ACQ_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue14: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	16	98	114
		Expected Count	41.7	72.3	114.0
		% within Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	14.0%	86.0%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	26.7%	94.2%	69.5%
		Std. Residual	-4.0	3.0	
	Rarely + Never	Count	44	6	50
		Expected Count	18.3	31.7	50.0
		% within Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	88.0%	12.0%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	73.3%	5.8%	30.5%
		Std. Residual	6.0	-4.6	
Total	Count		60	104	164
	Expected Count		60.0	104.0	164.0
	% within Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER		36.6%	63.4%	100.0%
	% within CMMI_ACQ_only		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-92

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	81.957 ^a	1	.00000000	.00000000	.00000000
Continuity Correction ^b	78.800	1	.00000000		
Likelihood Ratio	86.232	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	81.457	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	164				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 18.29.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-93

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.707	.000
	Cramer's V	.707	.000
N of Valid Cases		164	

15- Hypothesis 1.2.15 Issue: Supplier technical/security and political issues

H1.2.15 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Acquisition and the frequency of supplier technical/security and political issues.

The analysis shows a no significant relationship between practicing CMMI for Acquisition (ACQ) and experiencing language barriers between the client company and the supplier for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 3.901 from Table A-H-95 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.04824428

Table A-H-94

Crosstab					
			CMMI_ACQ_		Total
			Yes	No	
Recodee2_A_Issue 15: supplier technical and political issues	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	51	98	149
		Expected Count	54.5	94.5	149.0
		% within Recodee2_A_Issue : supplier technical and political issues	34.2%	65.8 %	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	85.0%	94.2 %	90.9%
		Std. Residual	-.5	.4	
	Rarely + Never	Count	9	6	15
		Expected Count	5.5	9.5	15.0
		% within Recodee2_A_Issue : supplier technical and political issues	60.0%	40.0 %	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	15.0%	5.8% 	9.1%
		Std. Residual	1.5	-1.1	
Total	Count		60	104	164
	Expected Count		60.0	104. 0	164.0
	% within Recodee2_A_Issue : supplier technical and political issues		36.6%	63.4 %	100.0%
	% within CMMI_ACQ_only		100.0%	100. 0%	100.0%

Table A-H-95

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2- sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.901 ^a	1	.04824428	.08807306	.04731282
Continuity Correction ^b	2.870	1	.09026202		
Likelihood Ratio	3.735	1	.05328287		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.878	1	.04893252		
N of Valid Cases	164				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.49.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-96

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.154	.048
	Cramer's V	.154	.048
N of Valid Cases		164	

16- Hypothesis 1.2.16 Issue: Insufficient previous experience of the supplier

H1.2.16 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Acquisition and the frequency of insufficient previous experience of the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing CMMI for Acquisition (ACQ) and experiencing *insufficient previous experience of the supplier* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 76.073 from Table A-H-98 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and $p=.000000$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing CMMI for Acquisition and the issue of *insufficient previous experience of the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms applying CMM for Acquisition reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-97 shows that 14 companies that adopted CMMI for ACQ reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (39.5). Moreover, 46 of the companies that apply CMMI for ACQ reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *insufficient previous experience of the supplier* issue while the expected count for this category was (20.5).

Cramer’s $V=0.681$ indicates a strong association between applying CMMI-ACQ and the issue of *insufficient previous experience of the supplier* as shown in Table A-H-99.

Table A-H-97

Crosstab					
			CMMI_ACQ_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue16: INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	14	94	108
		Expected Count	39.5	68.5	108.0
		% within Recode2_Issue12:INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER	13.0%	87.0%	100.0 %
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	23.3%	90.4%	65.9%
		Std. Residual	-4.1	3.1	
	Rarely + Never	Count	46	10	56
		Expected Count	20.5	35.5	56.0
		% within Recode2_Issue12:INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER	82.1%	17.9%	100.0 %
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	76.7%	9.6%	34.1%
		Std. Residual	5.6	-4.3	
Total	Count		60	104	164
	Expected Count		60.0	104.0	164.0
	% within Recode2_Issue12:INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER		36.6%	63.4%	100.0 %
	% within CMMI_ACQ_only		100.0%	100.0%	100.0 %

Table A-H-98

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	76.073 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	73.120	1	.00000000		
Likelihood Ratio	79.542	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	75.609	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	164				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 20.49.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-99

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.681	.000
	Cramer's V	.681	.000
N of Valid Cases		164	

17- Hypothesis 1.2.17 Issue: Lack of supplier standardized working methods

H1.2.17 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Acquisition and the frequency of lack of supplier standardized working methods.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing CMMI for Acquisition (ACQ) and experiencing *lack of supplier standardized working methods* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 82.939 from Table A-H-101 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing CMMI for Acquisition and the issue of *lack of supplier standardized working methods*. The analysis shows that firms applying CMM for Acquisition reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-100 shows that 16 companies that adopted CMMI for ACQ reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (39.9). Moreover, 44 of the companies that apply CMMI for ACQ reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *lack of supplier standardized working methods* issue while the expected count for this category was (20.1).

Cramer’s V=0.640 indicates a strong association between applying CMMI-ACQ and the issue of *lack of supplier standardized working methods* as shown in Table A-H-102.

Table A-H-100

Crosstab					
			CMMI_ACQ_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue17: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING METHODS	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	16	93	109
		Expected Count	39.9	69.1	109.0
		% within Recode2_Issue17: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING METHODS	14.7%	85.3%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	26.7%	89.4%	66.5%
		Std. Residual	-3.8	2.9	
	Rarely + Never	Count	44	11	55
		Expected Count	20.1	34.9	55.0
		% within Recode2_Issue17: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING METHODS	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	73.3%	10.6%	33.5%
		Std. Residual	5.3	-4.0	
Total			Count	60	164
			Expected Count	60.0	164.0
			% within Recode2_Issue17: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING METHODS	36.6%	63.4%
			% within CMMI_ACQ_only	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-101

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	67.229 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	64.443	1	.00000000		
Likelihood Ratio	69.430	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	66.819	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	164				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 20.12.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-102

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.640	.000
	Cramer's V	.640	.000
N of Valid Cases		164	

Hypothesis 1.3 Adopting People-CMM and IT offshoring issues

H1.3 There is a relationship between adopting People-CMM and the frequency of issues experienced.

This hypothesis tests the relationship between People-CMM and the frequency of 17 issues.

1 -Hypothesis 1.3.1 Issue: Over Expenditure due to hidden costs.

H1.3.1 There is a relationship between adopting People-CMM and the frequency of over expenditure due to hidden costs issue experienced.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between practicing People-CMM and experiencing over expenditure for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 4.814 from Table A-H-104 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=0.0282221$.

Table A-H-103

Crosstab					
			People_CMM_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	14	73	87
		Expected Count	19.0	68.0	87.0
		% within Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE	16.1%	83.9%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	48.3%	70.2%	65.4%
		Std. Residual	-1.1	.6	
	Rarely + Never	Count	15	31	46
		Expected Count	10.0	36.0	46.0
		% within Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE	32.6%	67.4%	100.0%

		% within People_CMM_only	51.7%	29.8%	34.6%
		Std. Residual	1.6	-.8	
Total		Count	29	104	133
		Expected Count	29.0	104.0	133.0
		% within Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE	21.8%	78.2%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-104

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.814 ^a	1	.02822218	.04547837	.02566429
Continuity Correction ^b	3.894	1	.04844569		
Likelihood Ratio	4.643	1	.03118448		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.778	1	.02882148		
N of Valid Cases	133				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.03.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-105

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.190	.028
	Cramer's V	.190	.028
N of Valid Cases		133	

2 - Hypothesis 1.3.2 Poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier

H1.3.2 There is a relationship between adopting People-CMM and the frequency of poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier issue.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing People-CMM and experiencing *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 12.552 from Table A-H-107 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0. 00039587.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing People-CMM and the issue of *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms applying People-CMM reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-106 shows that 12 companies that adopted People-CMM reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (19.8). Furthermore, 17 of the companies that apply People-CMM reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier* issue while the expected count for this category was (9.2).

Cramer's V=0.307 indicates moderate association between applying People-CMM and the issue of *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier* as shown in Table A-H-108.

Table A-H-106

Crosstab					
			People_CMM_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue2 : POOR	Always + Almost	Count	12	79	91
		Expected Count	19.8	71.2	91.0

EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING	Always + Occasionally	% within Recode2_Issue16: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING	13.2%	86.8%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	41.4%	76.0%	68.4%
		Std. Residual	-1.8	.9	
	Rarely + Never	Count	17	25	42
		Expected Count	9.2	32.8	42.0
		% within Recode2_Issue16: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING	40.5%	59.5%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	58.6%	24.0%	31.6%
		Std. Residual	2.6	-1.4	
Total			Count	29	104
			Expected Count	29.0	104.0
			% within Recode2_Issue16: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING	21.8%	78.2%
			% within People_CMM_only	100.0%	100.0%
				100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-107

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.552 ^a	1	.00039587	.00067527	.00061478
Continuity Correction ^b	11.002	1	.00091011		
Likelihood Ratio	11.839	1	.00057994		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.457	1	.00041638		
N of Valid Cases	133				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.16.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-108

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.307	.000
	Cramer's V	.307	.000
N of Valid Cases		133	

3 - Hypothesis 1.3.3 Issue: Difference in interpretation of project requirements between Client company and the supplier

H1.3.3: There is a relationship between adopting People-CMM and the frequency of difference in interpretation of project requirements between client company and the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing People-CMM and experiencing *difference in interpretation of project requirements between client company and the supplier* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 24.267 from Table A-H-110 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.00000084.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing People-CMM and the issue of *difference in interpretation of project requirements between client company and the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms applying People-CMM reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-109 shows that 7 companies that adopted People-CMM reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (18.3). Furthermore, 22 of the companies that apply People-CMM reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *difference in interpretation of project requirements between client company and the supplier* issue while the expected count for this category was (10.7).

Cramer's $V=0.427$ indicates a strong association between applying People-CMM and the issue of *difference in interpretation of project requirements between client company and the supplier* as shown in Table A-H-111.

Table A-H-109

Crosstab						
			People_CMM_only		Total	
			Yes	No		
Recode2_Issue3: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	7	77	84	
		Expected Count	18.3	65.7	84.0	
		% within Recode2_Issue: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	8.3%	91.7%	100.0%	
		% within People_CMM_only	24.1%	74.0%	63.2%	
		Std. Residual	-2.6	1.4		
	Rarely + Never	Count	22	27	49	
		Expected Count	10.7	38.3	49.0	
		% within Recode2_Issue: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	44.9%	55.1%	100.0%	
		% within People_CMM_only	75.9%	26.0%	36.8%	
		Std. Residual	3.5	-1.8		
Total			Count	29	104	133
			Expected Count	29.0	104.0	133.0
			% within Recode2_Issue: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	21.8%	78.2%	100.0%
			% within People_CMM_only	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-110

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2- sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.267 ^a	1	.00000084		
Continuity Correction ^b	22.170	1	.00000250		
Likelihood Ratio	23.891	1	.00000102		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000172	.00000154
Linear-by-Linear Association	24.085	1	.00000092		
N of Valid Cases	133				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.68.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-111

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.427	.000
	Cramer's V	.427	.000
N of Valid Cases		133	

4 - Hypothesis 1.3.4 Issue: Poorly developed and documented requirements by the client company

H1.3.4: There is a relationship between adopting People-CMM and the frequency of poorly developed and documented requirements by the client company.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing People-CMM and experiencing *poorly developed and documented requirements by the client company* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 19.374 from Table A-H-113 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=0.00001074$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing People-CMM and the issue of *poorly developed and documented requirements by the client company*. The analysis shows that firms applying People-CMM reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-112 shows that 9 companies that adopted People-CMM reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (19.0). Moreover, 20 of the companies that apply People-CMM reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *poorly developed and documented requirements by the client company* issue while the expected count for this category was (10.0).

Cramer’s V=0.382 indicates a moderate association between applying People-CMM and the issue of *poorly developed and documented requirements by the client company* as shown in Table A-H-114.

Table A-H-112

Crosstab					
			People_CMM		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue4: POORLY DEVELOPED AND DOCUMENTED REQUIREMENTS	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	9	78	87
		Expected Count	19.0	68.0	87.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: POORLY DEVELOPED AND DOCUMENTED REQUIREMENTS	10.3%	89.7%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	31.0%	75.0%	65.4%
		Std. Residual	-2.3	1.2	
	Rarely + Never	Count	20	26	46
		Expected Count	10.0	36.0	46.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: POORLY DEVELOPED AND DOCUMENTED REQUIREMENTS	43.5%	56.5%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	69.0%	25.0%	34.6%
		Std. Residual	3.1	-1.7	
Total			Count	29	104
			Expected Count	29.0	104.0
			% within Recode2_Issue3: POORLY DEVELOPED AND DOCUMENTED REQUIREMENTS	21.8%	78.2%
			% within People_CMM_only	100.0 %	100.0%

Table A-H-113

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.374 ^a	1	.00001074	.00003507	.00002041
Continuity Correction ^b	17.480	1	.00002904		
Likelihood Ratio	18.640	1	.00001578		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	19.229	1	.00001159		
N of Valid Cases	133				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.03.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-114

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.382	.000
	Cramer's V	.382	.000
N of Valid Cases		133	

5- Hypothesis 1.3.5 Issue: Poor tracking and managing requirement changes by the client company

H1.3.5: There is a relationship between adopting People-CMM and the frequency of poor tracking and managing requirement changes by the client company.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing People-CMM and experiencing *poor tracking and managing requirement changes by the client company* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 15.558 from Table A-H-116 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=0.00008003$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing People-CMM and the issue of *poor tracking and managing requirement changes by the client company*. The analysis shows that firms applying People-CMM reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-115 shows that 9 companies that adopted People-CMM reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (18.1). Furthermore, 20 of the companies that apply People-CMM reported “Rarely + Never” for this issue while the expected count for this category was (10.9).

Cramer’s $V=0.342$ indicates a moderate association between applying People-CMM and the issue of *poor tracking and managing requirement changes by the client company* as shown in Table A-H-117.

Table A-H-115

Crosstab					
			People_CMM_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue5: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	9	74	83
		Expected Count	18.1	64.9	83.0
		% within Recode2_Issue4: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES	10.8%	89.2%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	31.0%	71.2%	62.4%
		Std. Residual	-2.1	1.1	
	Rarely + Never	Count	20	30	50
		Expected Count	10.9	39.1	50.0
		% within Recode2_Issue4: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	69.0%	28.8%	37.6%
		Std. Residual	2.8	-1.5	
Total			Count	29	104
			Expected Count	29.0	104.0
			% within Recode2_Issue4: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES	21.8%	78.2%
			% within People_CMM_only	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-116

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.558 ^a	1	.00008003		
Continuity Correction ^b	13.895	1	.00019336		
Likelihood Ratio	15.219	1	.00009572		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00015510	.00011364
Linear-by-Linear Association	15.441	1	.00008514		

N of Valid Cases	133				
------------------	-----	--	--	--	--

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.90.
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-117

Symmetric Measures		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.342	.000
	Cramer's V	.342	.000
N of Valid Cases		133	

6- Hypothesis 1.3.6 Issue: Lack of a full communication plan between the client company and the supplier company

H1.3.6: There is a relationship between adopting People-CMM and the frequency of lack of a full communication plan between the client company and the supplier company.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing People-CMM and experiencing *lack of a full communication plan between the client company and the supplier company* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 33.165 from Table A-H-119 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.000001$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing People-CMM and the issue of *lack of a full communication plan between the client company and the supplier company*. The analysis shows that firms applying People-CMM reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-118 shows that 3 companies that adopted People-CMM reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (16.6). Moreover, 26 of the companies that apply People-CMM reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (12.4).

Cramer’s $V=0.499$ indicates a relatively strong association between applying People-CMM and the issue of *lack of a full communication plan between the client company and the supplier company* as shown in Table A-H-120.

Table A-H-118

Crosstab					
			People_CMM_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue6: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	3	73	76
		Expected Count	16.6	59.4	76.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN	3.9%	96.1%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	10.3%	70.2%	57.1%
		Std. Residual	-3.3	1.8	
	Rarely + Never	Count	26	31	57
		Expected Count	12.4	44.6	57.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN	45.6%	54.4%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	89.7%	29.8%	42.9%
		Std. Residual	3.8	-2.0	
Total	Count		29	104	133
	Expected Count		29.0	104.0	133.0
	% within Recode2_Issue: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN		21.8%	78.2%	100.0%
	% within People_CMM_only		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-119

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	33.165 ^a	1	.00000001		
Continuity Correction ^b	30.767	1	.00000003		
Likelihood Ratio	35.644	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000001	.00000001
Linear-by-Linear Association	32.916	1	.00000001		
N of Valid Cases	133				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.43.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-120

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.499	.000
	Cramer's V	.499	.000
N of Valid Cases		133	

7- Hypothesis 1.3.7 Issue: Communication and coordination problems between the client company and the supplier company

H1.3.7 There is a relationship between adopting People-CMM and the frequency of communication and coordination problems between the client company and the supplier company.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing People-CMM and experiencing *communication and coordination problems between the client company and the supplier company* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 27.330 from Table A-H-122 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=0.00000017$

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing People-CMM and the issue of *communication and coordination problems between the client company and the supplier company*. The analysis shows that firms applying People-CMM reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-121 shows that 7 companies that adopted People-CMM reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (35.4). Moreover, 37 of the companies that apply People-CMM reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (17.9).

Cramer's $V=0.453$ indicates a relatively strong association between applying People-CMM and the issue of *communication and coordination problems between the client company and the supplier company* as shown in Table A-H-123.

Table A-H-121

Crosstab					
			People_CMM_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue7: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	5	74	79
		Expected Count	17.2	61.8	79.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS	6.3%	93.7%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	17.2%	71.2%	59.4%
		Std. Residual	-2.9	1.6	

	Rarely + Never	Count	24	30	54
		Expected Count	11.8	42.2	54.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS	44.4%	55.6%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	82.8%	28.8%	40.6%
		Std. Residual	3.6	-1.9	
Total		Count	29	104	133
		Expected Count	29.0	104.0	133.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS	21.8%	78.2%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-122

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	27.330 ^a	1	.00000017	.00000023	.00000021
Continuity Correction ^b	25.140	1	.00000053		
Likelihood Ratio	28.028	1	.00000012		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	27.125	1	.00000019		
N of Valid Cases	133				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.77.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-123

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.453	.000
	Cramer's V	.453	.000
N of Valid Cases		133	

8- Hypothesis 1.3.8 Issue: Language barriers between the client company and the supplier

H1.3.8 There is a relationship between adopting People-CMM and the frequency of language barriers between the client company and the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing People-CMM and experiencing *language barriers* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 19.960 from Table A-H-125 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.00000791.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing People-CMM and the issue of *language barriers*. The analysis shows that firms applying People-CMM reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-124 shows that 12 companies that adopted People-CMM reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (21.4). Moreover, 17 of the companies that apply People-CMM reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (7.6).

Cramer’s V=0.387 indicates a relatively strong association between applying People-CMM and the issue of *language barriers* as shown in Table A-H-126.

Table A-H-124

Crosstab

			People_CMM_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue8: LANGUAGE BARRIERS	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	12	86	98
		Expected Count	21.4	76.6	98.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: LANGUAGE BARRIERS	12.2%	87.8%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	41.4%	82.7%	73.7%
		Std. Residual	-2.0	1.1	
	Rarely + Never	Count	17	18	35
		Expected Count	7.6	27.4	35.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: LANGUAGE BARRIERS	48.6%	51.4%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	58.6%	17.3%	26.3%
		Std. Residual	3.4	-1.8	
Total		Count	29	104	133
		Expected Count	29.0	104.0	133.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: LANGUAGE BARRIERS	21.8%	78.2%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-125

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.960 ^a	1	.00000791		
Continuity Correction ^b	17.886	1	.00002345		
Likelihood Ratio	18.137	1	.00002056		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00002606	.00002606
Linear-by-Linear Association	19.810	1	.00000855		
N of Valid Cases	133				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.63.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-126

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.387	.000
	Cramer's V	.387	.000
N of Valid Cases		133	

9- Hypothesis 1.3.9 Issue: Time-zone differences between the client company and the supplier

H1.3.9 There is a relationship between adopting People-CMM and the frequency of time-zone differences between the client company and the supplier.

The analysis shows a no significant relationship between practicing People-CMM and experiencing *time-zone differences* between the client company and the supplier for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is .007^a from Table A-H-128 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.93168079.

Table A-H-127

Crosstab					
			People_CMM_		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue9 : TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES	Always + Almost	Count	25	89	114
		Expected Count	24.9	89.1	114.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES	21.9%	78.1%	100.0%

	Always + Occasionally	% within People_CMM_only	86.2%	85.6%	85.7%
		Std. Residual	.0	.0	
	Rarely + Never	Count	4	15	19
		Expected Count	4.1	14.9	19.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: TIME-ZONE DIFFnc	21.1%	78.9%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	13.8%	14.4%	14.3%
Total			Std. Residual	-.1	.0
			Count	29	104
			Expected Count	29.0	104.0
			% within Recode2_Issue: TIME-ZONE DRENCES	21.8%	78.2%
			% within People_CMM_only	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-128

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.007 ^a	1	.93168079	1.00000000	.59982061
Continuity Correction ^b	.000	1	1.00000000		
Likelihood Ratio	.007	1	.93144109		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	.007	1	.93193748		
N of Valid Cases	133				

a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.14.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-129

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.007	.932
	Cramer's V	.007	.932
N of Valid Cases		133	

10- Hypothesis 1.3.10 Issue: Cultural differences between the client company and the supplier

1.3.10 There is a relationship between adopting People-CMM and the frequency of cultural differences between the client company and the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing People-CMM and experiencing *cultural differences* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 22.723 from Table A-H-131 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.00000187.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing People-CMM and the issue of *cultural differences*. The analysis shows that firms applying People-CMM reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-130 shows that 12 companies that adopted People-CMM reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (21.8). Moreover, 17 of the companies that apply People-CMM reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (7.2).

Cramer’s V=0.413 indicates a strong association between applying People-CMM and the issue of *cultural differences* as shown in Table A-H-132.

Table A-H-130

Crosstab		
	People_CMM_only	
	Yes	No
Total		

Recode2_Issue10: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	12	88	100
		Expected Count	21.8	78.2	100.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	12.0%	88.0%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	41.4%	84.6%	75.2%
		Std. Residual	-2.1	1.1	
	Rarely + Never	Count	17	16	33
		Expected Count	7.2	25.8	33.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	51.5%	48.5%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	58.6%	15.4%	24.8%
		Std. Residual	3.7	-1.9	
Total			Count	29	104
			Expected Count	29.0	104.0
			% within Recode2_Issue: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	21.8%	78.2%
			% within People_CMM_only	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-131

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.723 ^a	1	.00000187	.00000850	.00000850
Continuity Correction ^b	20.464	1	.00000608		
Likelihood Ratio	20.394	1	.00000630		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	22.552	1	.00000205		
N of Valid Cases	133				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.20.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-132

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.413	.000
	Cramer's V	.413	.000
N of Valid Cases		133	

11- Hypothesis 1.3.11 Issue: Incomplete and unclear contract

H1.3.11 There is a relationship between adopting People-CMM and the frequency of incomplete and unclear contract.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing People-CMM and issue of *incomplete and unclear contract* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 14.910 from Table A-H-132 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=2$ and $p=0.00011274$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing People-CMM and the issue of *incomplete and unclear contract*. The analysis shows that firms applying People-CMM reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-133 shows that 7 companies that adopted People-CMM reported "Always + Almost Always" for this issue while the expected count was (16.1). Moreover, 22 of the companies that apply People-CMM reported "Rarely + Never" for experiencing *over expenditure* issue while the expected count for this category was (12.9).

Cramer's V=0.335 indicates a moderate strong association between applying People-CMM and the issue of *incomplete and unclear contract* as shown in Table A-H-135.

Table A-H-133

Crosstab					
			People_CMM_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue11: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	7	67	74
		Expected Count	16.1	57.9	74.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	9.5%	90.5%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	24.1%	64.4%	55.6%
		Std. Residual	-2.3	1.2	
	Rarely + Never	Count	22	37	59
		Expected Count	12.9	46.1	59.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	37.3%	62.7%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	75.9%	35.6%	44.4%
		Std. Residual	2.5	-1.3	
Total	Count		29	104	133
	Expected Count		29.0	104.0	133.0
	% within Recode2_Issue: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT		21.8%	78.2%	100.0%
	% within People_CMM_only		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-134

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.910 ^a	1	.00011274	.00022964	.00011749
Continuity Correction ^b	13.323	1	.00026219		
Likelihood Ratio	15.231	1	.00009514		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	14.798	1	.00011964		
N of Valid Cases	133				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.86.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-135

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.335	.000
	Cramer's V	.335	.000
N of Valid Cases		133	

12- Hypothesis 1.3.12 Issue: Early contract renegotiation and termination

H1.3.12 There is a relationship between adopting People-CMM and the frequency of early contract renegotiation and termination.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between practicing People-CMM and experiencing *early contract renegotiation and termination* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 7.705 from

Table A-H-137 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00550645$.

Table A-H-136

Crosstab					
			People_CMM_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue12: EARLY CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION AND TERMINATION	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	8	59	67
		Expected Count	14.6	52.4	67.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: EARLY CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION AND TERMINATION	11.9%	88.1%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	27.6%	56.7%	50.4%
		Std. Residual	-1.7	.9	
	Rarely + Never	Count	21	45	66
		Expected Count	14.4	51.6	66.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: EARLY CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION AND TERMINATION	31.8%	68.2%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	72.4%	43.3%	49.6%
		Std. Residual	1.7	-.9	
Total		Count	29	104	133
		Expected Count	29.0	104.0	133.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: EARLY CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION AND TERMINATION	21.8%	78.2%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-137

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.705 ^a	1	.00550645		
Continuity Correction ^b	6.583	1	.01029358		
Likelihood Ratio	7.923	1	.00488045		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00643232	.00478225
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.647	1	.00568610		
N of Valid Cases	133				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.39.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-138

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.241	.006
	Cramer's V	.241	.006
N of Valid Cases		133	

13- Hypothesis 1.3.13 Issue: Difference in project management practices between your company and the supplier

H1.3.13 There is a relationship between adopting People-CMM and the frequency of difference in project management practices between your company and the supplier.

The analysis shows a no significant relationship between practicing People-CMM and experiencing difference in project management practices between your company and the supplier between the client company and the supplier for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 6.448 from Table A-H-

140 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.01110543$.

Table A-H-139

Crosstab					
			People_CMM_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue13 : DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	12	70	82
		Expected Count	17.9	64.1	82.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	14.6%	85.4%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	41.4%	67.3%	61.7%
		Std. Residual	-1.4	.7	
	Rarely + Never	Count	17	34	51
		Expected Count	11.1	39.9	51.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	58.6%	32.7%	38.3%
		Std. Residual	1.8	-.9	
Total	Count		29	104	133
	Expected Count		29.0	104.0	133.0
	% within Recode2_Issue: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES		21.8%	78.2%	100.0%
	% within People_CMM_only		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-140

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.448 ^a	1	.01110543	.01677318	.01068772
Continuity Correction ^b	5.398	1	.02015659		
Likelihood Ratio	6.297	1	.01209360		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.400	1	.01141278		
N of Valid Cases	133				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.12.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-141

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.220	.011
	Cramer's V	.220	.011
N of Valid Cases		133	

14- Hypothesis 1.3.14 Issue: Unable to measure the performance of the supplier

H1.3.14 There is a relationship between adopting People-CMM and the frequency of unable to measure the performance of the supplier.

The analysis shows a no significant relationship between practicing People-CMM and experiencing *unable to measure the performance of the supplier* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 8.844 from Table A-H-143 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00294013$.

Table A-H-142

Crosstab					
			People_CMM_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue14U NABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	13	77	90
		Expected Count	19.6	70.4	90.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	14.4%	85.6%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	44.8%	74.0%	67.7%
		Std. Residual	-1.5	.8	
	Rarely + Never	Count	16	27	43
		Expected Count	9.4	33.6	43.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	37.2%	62.8%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	55.2%	26.0%	32.3%
		Std. Residual	2.2	-1.1	
Total			Count	29	104
			Expected Count	29.0	104.0
			% within Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	21.8%	78.2%
			% within People_CMM_only	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-143

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.844a	1	.00294013	.00617935	.00356228
Continuity Correction ^b	7.559	1	.00596954		
Likelihood Ratio	8.400	1	.00375180		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.778	1	.00304926		
N of Valid Cases	133				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.38.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-144

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.258	.003
	Cramer's V	.258	.003
N of Valid Cases		133	

15- Hypothesis 1.3.15 Issue: Supplier technical/security and political issues

H1.3.15 There is a relationship between adopting People-CMM and the frequency of supplier technical/security and political issues.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between practicing People-CMM and experiencing *supplier technical/security and political issues* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 5.259 from Table A-H-146 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=0.02183280$

Table A-H-145

Crosstab					
			People_CMM_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Reoce2_Issue15: SUPPLIER TECHNICAL/SECURITY /POLITICAL ISSUES	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	19	88	107
		Expected Count	23.3	83.7	107.0
		% within Reoce2_Issue: SUPPLIER TECHNICAL/SECURITY/POLITICAL ISSUES	17.8%	82.2%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	65.5%	84.6%	80.5%
		Std. Residual	-.9	.5	
	Rarely + Never	Count	10	16	26
		Expected Count	5.7	20.3	26.0
		% within Reoce2_Issue: SUPPLIER TECHNICAL/SECURITY/POLITICAL ISSUES	38.5%	61.5%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	34.5%	15.4%	19.5%
		Std. Residual	1.8	-1.0	
Total	Count		29	104	133
	Expected Count		29.0	104.0	133.0
	% within Reoce2_Issue14: SUPPLIER TECHNICAL/SECURITY /POLITICAL ISSUES		21.8%	78.2%	100.0%
	% within People_CMM_only		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-146

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.259 ^a	1	.02183280	.03277660	.02486822
Continuity Correction ^b	4.115	1	.04250888		
Likelihood Ratio	4.765	1	.02905226		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.220	1	.02233474		
N of Valid Cases	133				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.67.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-147

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.199	.022
	Cramer's V	.199	.022
N of Valid Cases		133	

16- Hypothesis 1.3.16 Issue: Insufficient previous experience of the supplier

H1.3.16 There is a relationship between adopting People-CMM and the frequency of insufficient previous experience of the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing People-CMM and experiencing *insufficient previous experience of the supplier* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 13.106 from Table A-H-149 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=2$ and $p=0.00029442$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing People-CMM and the issue of *insufficient previous experience of the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms applying People-CMM reported fewer

than expected of this issue. Table A-H-148 shows that 10 companies that adopted People-CMM reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (18.3). Moreover, 19 of the companies that apply People-CMM reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *insufficient previous experience of the supplier* issue while the expected count for this category was (10.7).

Cramer’s V=0.314 indicates a moderate association between applying People-CMM and the issue of *insufficient previous experience of the supplier* as shown in Table A-H-150.

Table A-H-148

Crosstab					
			People_CMM_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue16:INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	10	74	84
		Expected Count	18.3	65.7	84.0
		% within Recode2_Issue:INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER	11.9%	88.1%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	34.5%	71.2%	63.2%
		Std. Residual	-1.9	1.0	
	Rarely + Never	Count	19	30	49
		Expected Count	10.7	38.3	49.0
		% within Recode2_Issue:INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER	38.8%	61.2%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	65.5%	28.8%	36.8%
		Std. Residual	2.5	-1.3	
Total			Count	29	104
			Expected Count	29.0	104.0
			% within Recode2_Issue12:INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER	21.8%	78.2%
			% within People_CMM_only	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-149

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.106 ^a	1	.00029442	.00045323	.00039438
Continuity Correction ^b	11.577	1	.00066775		
Likelihood Ratio	12.735	1	.00035894		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	13.007	1	.00031033		
N of Valid Cases	133				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.68.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-150

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.314	.000
	Cramer's V	.314	.000
N of Valid Cases		133	

17- Hypothesis 1.3.17 Issue: Lack of supplier standardized working methods

H1.3.17 There is a relationship between adopting People-CMM and the frequency of lack of supplier standardized working methods.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing People-CMM and experiencing *lack of supplier standardized working methods* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 11.659 from Table A-H-152 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00063892$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing People-CMM and the issue of *lack of supplier standardized working methods*. The analysis shows that firms applying People-CMM reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-151 shows that 9 companies that adopted People-CMM reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (17.0). Moreover, 20 of the companies that apply People-CMM reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (12.0).

Cramer’s $V=0.296$ indicates a moderate association between applying People-CMM and the issue of *lack of supplier standardized working methods* as shown in Table A-H-153.

Table A-H-151

Crosstab					
			People_CMM		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue17: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARDIZED WORKING METHODS	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	9	69	78
		Expected Count	17.0	61.0	78.0
		% within Recode2_Issue17: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARDIZED WORKING METHODS	11.5%	88.5%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	31.0%	66.3%	58.6%
		Std. Residual	-1.9	1.0	
	Rarely + Never	Count	20	35	55
		Expected Count	12.0	43.0	55.0
		% within Recode2_Issue17: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARDIZED WORKING METHODS	36.4%	63.6%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	69.0%	33.7%	41.4%
		Std. Residual	2.3	-1.2	
Total	Count		29	104	133
	Expected Count		29.0	104.0	133.0
	% within Recode2_Issue17: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARDIZED WORKING METHODS		21.8%	78.2%	100.0%
	% within People_CMM_only		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-152

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.659 ^a	1	.00063892	.00112814	.00070907
Continuity Correction ^b	10.248	1	.00136798		
Likelihood Ratio	11.604	1	.00065825		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.571	1	.00066975		
N of Valid Cases	133				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.99.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-153

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.296	.001
	Cramer's V	.296	.001
N of Valid Cases		133	

Hypothesis 1.4 Adopting TSP and IT offshoring issues

H1.4 There is a relationship between adopting TSP and the frequency of issues experienced.

This section investigates and tests the relationship between adopting TSP and the frequency of 17 issues

1 -Hypothesis 1.4.1 Issue: Over Expenditure due to hidden costs.

H1.4.1 There is a relationship between adopting TSP and the frequency of over expenditure due to hidden costs issue experienced.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between practicing TSP and experiencing *over expenditure due to hidden costs issue experienced* issue for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 1.830 from Table A-H-155 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.176.

Table A-H-154

Crosstab					
			TSP_ONLY_NEW		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	26	72	98
		Expected Count	29.6	68.4	98.0
		% within Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE	26.5%	73.5%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	57.8%	69.2%	65.8%
		Std. Residual	-.7	.4	
	Rarely + Never	Count	19	32	51
		Expected Count	15.4	35.6	51.0
		% within Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE	37.3%	62.7%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	42.2%	30.8%	34.2%
		Std. Residual	.9	-.6	
Total			Count	45	104
			Expected Count	45.0	104.0
			% within Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE	30.2%	69.8%
			% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-155

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.830 ^a	1	.176		
Continuity Correction ^b	1.357	1	.244		
Likelihood Ratio	1.800	1	.180		
Fisher's Exact Test				.192	.122
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.818	1	.178		
N of Valid Cases	149				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.40.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-156

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.111	.176
	Cramer's V	.111	.176
N of Valid Cases		149	

2 - Hypothesis 1.4.2 Issue: Poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier

H1.1.2 There is a relationship between adopting TSP and the frequency of poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier issue experienced.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing TSP and experiencing *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier issue* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 13.810 from Table A-H-158 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=0.00020228$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing TSP and the issue of *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier issue*. The analysis shows that firms applying TSP reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-157 shows that 18 companies that adopted TSP reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (28.1). Moreover, 27 of the companies that apply TSP reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (16.9).

Cramer’s $V=0.304$ indicates a moderate association between applying TSP and the issue of *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier issue* as shown in Table A-H-159.

Table A-H-157

Crosstab					
			TSP_ONLY_NEW		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue2: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	18	75	93
		Expected Count	28.1	64.9	93.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING	19.4%	80.6%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	40.0%	72.1%	62.4%
		Std. Residual	-1.9	-1.3	
	Rarely + Never	Count	27	29	56
		Expected Count	16.9	39.1	56.0
		% within Recode2_Issue16: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING	48.2%	51.8%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	60.0%	27.9%	37..6%
		Std. Residual	2.5	1.6	
Total	Count		45	104	149
	Expected Count		45.0	104.0	149.0
	% within Recode2_Issue16: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING		30.2%	69.8%	100.0%
	% within TSP_ONLY_NEW		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-158

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.810 ^a	1	.00020228		
Continuity Correction ^b	12.475	1	.00041250		

Likelihood Ratio	13.595	1	.00022677		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00038885	.00022772
Linear-by-Linear Association	13.717	1	.00021251		
N of Valid Cases	149				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.21.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-159

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.304	.000
	Cramer's V	.304	.000
N of Valid Cases		149	

3 - Hypothesis 1.4.3 Issues: Difference in interpretation of project requirements between Client company and the supplier

H1.4.3: There is a relationship between adopting TSP and the frequency of difference in interpretation of project requirements between client company and the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing TSP and experiencing *difference in interpretation of project requirements between client company and the supplier* issue for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 12.053 from Table A-H-161 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00051717

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing TSP and the issue of *difference in interpretation of project requirements between client company and the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms applying TSP reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-160 shows that 19 companies that adopted TSP reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (28.4). Moreover, 26 of the companies that apply TSP reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue, while the expected count for this category was (16.6).

Cramer’s V=0.384 indicates a moderate association between applying TSP and the issue of *difference in interpretation of project requirements between client company and the supplier* as shown in Table A-H-21.

Table A-H-160

Crosstab					
			TSP_ONLY_		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue3: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	19	75	94
		Expected Count	28.4	65.6	94.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	20.2%	79.8%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	42.2%	72.1%	63.1%
		Std. Residual	-1.8	1.2	
	Rarely + Never	Count	26	29	55
		Expected Count	16.6	38.4	55.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	47.3%	52.7%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	57.8%	27.9%	36.9%
		Std. Residual	2.3	-1.5	
Total	Count	45	104	149	
	Expected Count	45.0	104.0	149.0	

	% within Recode2_Issue: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	30.2%	69.8%	100.0%
	% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-161

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.053 ^a	1	.00051717		
Continuity Correction ^b	10.803	1	.00101323		
Likelihood Ratio	11.833	1	.00058188		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00079751	.00055879
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.972	1	.00054011		
N of Valid Cases	149				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.61.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-162

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.384	.001
	Cramer's V	.384	.001
N of Valid Cases		149	

4 - Hypothesis 1.4.4 Issue: Poorly developed and documented requirements by the client company

H1.4.4: There is a relationship between adopting TSP and the frequency of poorly developed and documented requirements by the client company.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing TSP and experiencing *poorly developed and documented requirements by the client company* issue for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 13.810 from Table A-H-164 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p=.00020228.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing TSP and the issue of *poorly developed and documented requirements by the client company*. The analysis shows that firms applying TSP reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-163 shows that 18 companies that adopted TSP reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (28.1). Moreover, 27 of the companies that apply TSP reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (16.9).

Cramer’s V=0.303 indicates a moderate association between applying TSP and the issue of *early contract renegotiation and termination* as shown in Table A-H-165.

Table A-H-163

Crosstab					
			TSP_ONLY_NEW		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue4: POORLY	Always + Almost	Count	18	75	93
		Expected Count	28.1	64.9	93.0

DEVELOPED AND DOCUMENTED REQUIREMENTS	Always + Occasionally	% within Recode2_Issue3: POORLY DEVELOPED AND DOCUMENTED REQUIREMENTS	19.4%	80.6%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	40.0%	72.1%	62.4%
		Std. Residual	-1.9	1.3	
	Rarely + Never	Count	27	29	56
		Expected Count	16.9	39.1	56.0
		% within Recode2_Issue3: POORLY DEVELOPED AND DOCUMENTED REQUIREMENTS	48.2%	51.8%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	60.0%	27.9%	37.6%
Total		Std. Residual	2.5	-1.6	
		Count	45	104	149
		Expected Count	45.0	104.0	149.0
		% within Recode2_Issue3: POORLY DEVELOPED AND DOCUMENTED REQUIREMENTS	30.2%	69.8%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-164

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.810 ^a	1	.00020228		
Continuity Correction ^b	12.475	1	.00041250		
Likelihood Ratio	13.595	1	.00022677		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00038885	.00022772
Linear-by-Linear Association	13.717	1	.00021251		
N of Valid Cases	149				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.91.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-165

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.304	.000
	Cramer's V	.304	.000
N of Valid Cases		149	

5- Hypothesis 1.4.5 Issue: Poor tracking and managing requirement changes by the client company

H1.4.5: There is a relationship between adopting TSP and the frequency of poor tracking and managing requirement changes by the client company.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing TSP and experiencing *poor tracking and managing requirement changes by the client company* issue for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 15.666 from Table A-H-167 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00007556.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing TSP and the issue of *poor tracking and managing requirement changes by the client company*. The analysis shows that firms applying TSP reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-166 shows that 16 companies that adopted TSP reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (26.9). Moreover, 29 of the companies that apply TSP reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (18.1).

Cramer's $V=0.324$ indicates a moderate association between applying TSP and the issue of *poor tracking and managing requirement changes by the client company* as shown in Table A-H-168.

Table A-H-166

Crosstab					
			TSP_ONLY_NEW		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue5 : POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	16	73	89
		Expected Count	26.9	62.1	89.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES	18.0%	82.0%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	35.6%	70.2%	59.7%
		Std. Residual	-2.1	1.4	
	Rarely + Never	Count	29	31	60
		Expected Count	18.1	41.9	60.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES	48.3%	51.7%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	64.4%	29.8%	40.3%
		Std. Residual	2.6	-1.7	
Total	Count		45	104	149
	Expected Count		45.0	104.0	149.0
	% within Recode2_Issue: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES		30.2%	69.8%	100.0%
	% within TSP_ONLY_NEW		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-167

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.666 ^a	1	.00007556	.00011369	.00008331
Continuity Correction ^b	14.259	1	.00015927		
Likelihood Ratio	15.585	1	.00007889		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	15.561	1	.00007988		
N of Valid Cases	149				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 18.12.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-168

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.324	.000
	Cramer's V	.324	.000
N of Valid Cases		149	

6- Hypothesis 1.4.6 Issue: Lack of a full communication plan between the client company and the supplier company

H1.4.6: There is a relationship between adopting TSP and the frequency of lack of a full communication plan between the client company and the supplier company.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing TSP and experiencing *lack of a full communication plan between the client company and the supplier company* issue for offshored IT projects.

The value of chi-square test is 32.147 from Table A-H-170 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000001$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing TSP and the issue of *lack of a full communication plan between the client company and the supplier company*. The analysis shows that firms applying TSP reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-169 shows that 8 companies that adopted TSP reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (23.9). Moreover, 37 of the companies that apply TSP reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (21.1).

Cramer’s $V=0.464$ indicates a relatively strong association between applying TSP and the issue of *lack of a full communication plan between the client company and the supplier company* as shown in Table A-H-171.

Table A-H-169

Crosstab					
			TSP_ONLY		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue6 : LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	8	71	79
		Expected Count	23.9	55.1	79.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN	10.1%	89.9%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	17.8%	68.3%	53.0%
		Std. Residual	-3.2	2.1	
	Rarely + Never	Count	37	33	70
		Expected Count	21.1	48.9	70.0
		% within Recode2_Issue5: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN	52.9%	47.1%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	82.2%	31.7%	47.0%
		Std. Residual	3.4	-2.3	
Total	Count		45	104	149
	Expected Count		45.0	104.0	149.0
	% within Recode2_Issue5: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN		30.2%	69.8%	100.0%
	% within TSP_ONLY_NEW		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-170

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	32.147 ^a	1	.00000001	.00000001	.00000001
Continuity Correction ^b	30.152	1	.00000004		
Likelihood Ratio	33.930	1	.00000001		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	31.931	1	.00000002		
N of Valid Cases	149				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 21.14.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-171

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.464	.000
	Cramer's V	.464	.000
N of Valid Cases		149	

7- Hypothesis 1.4.7 Issue: Communication and coordination problems between the client company and the supplier company

H1.4.7 There is a relationship between adopting TSP and the frequency of communication and coordination problems between the client company and the supplier company.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing TSP and *communication and coordination problems between the client company and the supplier company* issue for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 26.729 from Table A-H-173 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000023$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing TSP and the issue of *communication and coordination problems between the client company and the supplier company*. The analysis shows that firms applying TSP reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-172 shows that 11 companies that adopted TSP reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (25.4). Moreover, 34 of the companies that apply TSP reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (19.6).

Cramer’s $V=0.424$ indicates relatively strong association between applying TSP and the issue of *communication and coordination problems between the client company and the supplier company* as shown in Table A-H-174.

Table A-H-172

Crosstab					
			TSP_ONLY_NEW		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue7: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	11	73	84
		Expected Count	25.4	58.6	84.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS	13.1%	86.9%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	24.4%	70.2%	56.4%
		Std. Residual	-2.9	1.9	
	Rarely + Never	Count	34	31	65
		Expected Count	19.6	45.4	65.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS	52.3%	47.7%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	75.6%	29.8%	43.6%
		Std. Residual	3.2	-2.1	
Total			Count	45	104
			Expected Count	45.0	104.0
			% within Recode2_Issue: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS	30.2%	69.8%
			% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-173

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2- sided)	Exact Sig. (2- sided)	Exact Sig. (1- sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	26.729 ^a	1	.00000023		
Continuity Correction ^b	24.901	1	.00000060		
Likelihood Ratio	27.356	1	.00000017		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000028	.00000023
Linear-by-Linear Association	26.550	1	.00000026		
N of Valid Cases	149				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 19.63.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-174

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.424	.000
	Cramer's V	.424	.000
N of Valid Cases		149	

8- Hypothesis 1.4.8 Issue: Language barriers between the client company and the supplier

H1.4.8 There is a relationship between adopting TSP and the frequency of language barriers between the client company and the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing TSP and experiencing *language barriers* issue for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 39.766 from Table A-H-176 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.000000$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing TSP and the issue of *language barriers*. The analysis shows that firms applying TSP reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-175 shows that 16 companies that adopted TSP reported “Always + Almost Always + Occasionally” for this issue while the expected count was (32.0). Moreover, 29 of the companies that apply TSP reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (13).

Cramer’s $V=0.517$ indicates a strong association between applying TSP and the issue of *language barriers* as shown in Table A-H-177.

Table A-H-175

Crosstab					
			TSP_ONLY		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue8: LANGUAGE BARRIERS	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	16	90	106
		Expected Count	32.0	74.0	106.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: LANGUAGE BARRIERS	15.1%	84.9%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY	35.6%	86.5%	71.1%
		Std. Residual	-2.8	1.9	
	Rarely + Never	Count	29	14	43
		Expected Count	13.0	30.0	43.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: LANGUAGE BARRIERS	67.4%	32.6%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY	64.4%	13.5%	28.9%
		Std. Residual	4.4	-2.9	
Total			Count	45	104
			Expected Count	45.0	104.0
			% within Recode2_Issue: LANGUAGE BARRIERS	30.2%	69.8%
			% within TSP_ONLY	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-176

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	39.766 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	37.321	1	.00000000		
Likelihood Ratio	38.316	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000

Linear-by-Linear Association	39.499	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	149				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.99.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-177

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.517	.000
	Cramer's V	.517	.000
N of Valid Cases		149	

9- Hypothesis 1.4.9 Issue: Time-zone differences between the client company and the supplier

H1.4.9 There is a relationship between adopting TSP and the frequency of time-zone differences between the client company and the supplier.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between practicing TSP and experiencing *time-zone differences* issue for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 2.849 from Table A-H-179 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=2 and p =.091.

Table A-H-178

Crosstab					
			TSP_ONLY_NEW		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue9: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	35	92	127
		Expected Count	38.4	88.6	127.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES	27.6%	72.4%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	77.8%	88.5%	85.2%
		Std. Residual	-.5	.4	
	Rarely + Never	Count	10	12	22
		Expected Count	6.6	15.4	22.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES	45.5%	54.5%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	22.2%	11.5%	14.8%
		Std. Residual	1.3	-.9	
Total			Count	45	104
			Expected Count	45.0	104.0
			% within Recode2_Issue: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES	30.2%	69.8%
			% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-179

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2- sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.849 ^a	1	.091		
Continuity Correction ^b	2.063	1	.151		
Likelihood Ratio	2.687	1	.101		
Fisher's Exact Test				.129	.078
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.830	1	.093		
N of Valid Cases	149				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.64.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-180

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.138	.091
	Cramer's V	.138	.091
N of Valid Cases		149	

10- Hypothesis 1.4.10 Issue: Cultural differences between the client company and the supplier

1.4.10 There is a relationship between adopting TSP and the frequency of cultural differences between the client company and the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing TSP and experiencing *cultural differences between the client company and the supplier* issue for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 36.086 from Table A-H-181 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.000000$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing TSP and the issue of *cultural differences between the client company and the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms applying TSP reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-181 shows that 19 companies that adopted TSP reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (32.9). Moreover, 27 of the companies that apply TSP reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (12.1).

Cramer’s $V=0.492$ indicates a strong association between applying TSP and the issue of *cultural differences between the client company and the supplier* as shown in Table A-H-183.

Table A-H-181

Crosstab					
			TSP_ONLY_NEW		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue10: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	18	91	109
		Expected Count	32.9	76.1	109.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	16.5%	83.5%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	40.0%	87.5%	73.2%
		Std. Residual	-2.6	1.7	
	Rarely + Never	Count	27	13	40
		Expected Count	12.1	27.9	40.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	67.5%	32.5%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	60.0%	12.5%	26.8%
		Std. Residual	4.3	-2.8	
Total	Count		45	104	149
	Expected Count		45.0	104.0	149.0
	% within Recode2_Issue: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES		30.2%	69.8%	100.0%
	% within TSP_ONLY_NEW		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-182

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1- sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	36.086 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	33.707	1	.00000001		
Likelihood Ratio	34.413	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000001	.00000001
Linear-by-Linear Association	35.843	1	.00000000		

N of Valid Cases	149				
------------------	-----	--	--	--	--

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.08.
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-183

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.492	.000
	Cramer's V	.492	.000
N of Valid Cases		149	

11- Hypothesis 1.4.11 Issue: Incomplete and unclear contract

H1.4.11 There is a relationship between adopting TSP and the frequency of incomplete and unclear contract.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing TSP and *incomplete and unclear contract* issue for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 13.810 from Table A-H-185 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00020228$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing TSP and the issue of *incomplete and unclear contract*. The analysis shows that firms applying TSP reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-184 shows that 18 companies that adopted TSP reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (28.1). Moreover, 27 of the companies that apply TSP reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (16.9).

Cramer’s $V=0.303$ indicates a moderate association between applying TSP and the issue of *incomplete and unclear contract* as shown in Table A-H-186.

Table A-H-184

Crosstab					
			TSP_ONLY_NEW		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue11: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	18	75	93
		Expected Count	28.1	64.9	93.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	19.4%	80.6%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY	40.0%	72.1%	62.4%
		Std. Residual	-1.9	-1.3	
	Rarely + Never	Count	27	29	56
		Expected Count	16.9	39.1	56.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	48.2%	51.8%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY	60.0%	27.9%	37..6%
		Std. Residual	2.5	1.6	
Total	Count		45	104	149
	Expected Count		45.0	104.0	149.0
	% within Recode2_Issue: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT		30.2%	69.8%	100%
	% within TSP_ONLY		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-185

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.810 ^a	1	.00020228		
Continuity Correction ^b	12.475	1	.00041250		
Likelihood Ratio	13.595	1	.00022677		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00038885	.00022772
Linear-by-Linear Association	13.717	1	.00021251		
N of Valid Cases	149				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.21.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-186

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.304	.000
	Cramer's V	.304	.000
N of Valid Cases		149	

12- Hypothesis 1.4.12 Issue: Early contract renegotiation and termination

H1.4.12 There is a relationship between adopting TSP and the frequency of early contract renegotiation and termination.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing TSP and experiencing *early contract renegotiation and termination* issue for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 13.810 from Table A-H-188 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00020228$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing TSP and the issue of *early contract renegotiation and termination*. The analysis shows that firms applying TSP reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-187 shows that 18 companies that adopted TSP reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (28.1). Moreover, 27 of the companies that apply TSP reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (16.9).

Cramer's $V=0.303$ indicates a moderate association between applying TSP and the issue of *incomplete and unclear contract* as shown in Table A-H-189.

Table A-H-187

Crosstab					
			TSP_ONLY_NEW		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue12 : EARLY CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION AND TERMINATION	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	18	75	93
		Expected Count	28.1	64.9	93.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: EARLY CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION AND TERMINATION	19.4%	80.6%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	40.0%	72.1%	62.4%
		Std. Residual	-1.9	-1.3	
	Rarely + Never	Count	27	29	56
		Expected Count	16.9	39.1	56.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: EARLY CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION AND TERMINATION	48.2%	51.8%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	60.0%	27.9%	37..6%
		Std. Residual	2.5	1.6	
Total		Count	45	45	104

	Expected Count	45.0	45.0	104.0
	% within Recode2_Issue: EARLY CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION AND	30.2%	30.2%	69.8%
	% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-188

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.810 ^a	1	.00020228		
Continuity Correction ^b	12.475	1	.00041250		
Likelihood Ratio	13.595	1	.00022677		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00038885	.00022772
Linear-by-Linear Association	13.717	1	.00021251		
N of Valid Cases	149				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.91.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-189

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.304	.000
	Cramer's V	.304	.000
N of Valid Cases		149	

13- Hypothesis 1.4.13 Issue: Difference in project management practices between your company and the supplier

H1.4.13 There is a relationship between adopting TSP and the frequency of difference in project management practices between client company and the supplier.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between practicing TSP and the issue *difference in project management practices between client company and the supplier* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 4.511 from Table A-H-191 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.034.

Table A-H-190

Crosstab					
			TSP_ONLY_NEW		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue13: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	22	70	92
		Expected Count	27.8	64.2	92.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	23.9%	76.1%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	48.9%	67.3%	61.7%
		Std. Residual	-1.1	.7	
	Rarely + Never	Count	23	34	57
		Expected Count	17.2	39.8	57.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	40.4%	59.6%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	51.1%	32.7%	38.3%

		Std. Residual	1.4	-.9	
Total		Count	45	104	149
		Expected Count	45.0	104.0	149.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	30.2%	69.8%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-191

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.511 ^a	1	.034		
Continuity Correction ^b	3.765	1	.052		
Likelihood Ratio	4.447	1	.035		
Fisher's Exact Test				.043	.027
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.481	1	.034		
N of Valid Cases	149				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.21.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-192

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.174	.034
	Cramer's V	.174	.034
N of Valid Cases		149	

14- Hypothesis 1.4.14 Issue: Unable to measure the performance of the supplier

H1.4.14 There is a relationship between adopting TSP and the frequency of unable to measure the performance of the supplier.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between practicing TSP and experiencing *unable to measure the performance of the supplier* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 6.155 from Table A-H-194 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.013.

Table A-H-193

Crosstab					
			TSP_ONLY		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue14: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	23	75	98
		Expected Count	29.6	68.4	98.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF SUPPLIER	23.5%	76.5%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	51.1%	72.1%	65.8%
		Std. Residual	-1.2	.8	
	Rarely + Never	Count	22	29	51
		Expected Count	15.4	35.6	51.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF SUPPLIER	43.1%	56.9%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	48.9%	27.9%	34.2%
		Std. Residual	1.7	-1.1	

Total	Count	45	104	149
	Expected Count	45.0	104.0	149.0
	% within Recode2_Issue: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF SUPPLIER	30.2%	69.8%	100.0%
	% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-194

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.155 ^a	1	.013		
Continuity Correction ^b	5.258	1	.022		
Likelihood Ratio	6.008	1	.014		
Fisher's Exact Test				.015	.012
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.114	1	.013		
N of Valid Cases	149				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.40.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-195

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.203	.013
	Cramer's V	.203	.013
N of Valid Cases		149	

15- Hypothesis 1.4.15 Issue: Supplier technical/security and political issues

H1.4.15 There is a relationship between adopting TSP and the frequency of supplier technical/security and political issues.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between practicing TSP and experiencing *supplier technical/security and political* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 7.578 from Table A-H-197 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df1 and $p = 0.00590884$

Table A-H-196

Crosstab					
			TSP_ONLY		Total
			Yes	No	
Reoce2_Issue15: SUPPLIER TECHNICAL/SEC URITY /POLITICAL ISSUES	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	29	88	117
		Expected Count	35.3	81.7	117.0
		% within Reoce2_Issue: SUPPLIER TECHNICAL/SECURITY /POLITICAL ISSUES	24.8%	75.2%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	64.4%	84.6%	78.5%
		Std. Residual	-1.1	.7	
	Rarely + Never	Count	16	16	32
		Expected Count	9.7	22.3	32.0
		% within Reoce2_Issue14: SUPPLIER TECHNICAL/ SECURITY /POLITICAL ISSUES	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	35.6%	15.4%	21.5%
		Std. Residual	2.0	-1.3	

Total	Count	45	104	149
	Expected Count	45.0	104.0	149.0
	% within Recode2_Issue14: SUPPLIER TECHNICAL/ SECURITY /POLITICAL ISSUES	30.2%	69.8%	100.0%
	% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-197

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.578 ^a	1	.00590884		
Continuity Correction ^b	6.429	1	.01122715		
Likelihood Ratio	7.147	1	.00750734		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00880547	.00662327
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.527	1	.00607798		
N of Valid Cases	149				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.66.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-198

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.226	.006
	Cramer's V	.226	.006
N of Valid Cases		149	

16- Hypothesis 1.4.16 Issue: Insufficient previous experience of the supplier

H1.4.16 There is a relationship between adopting TSP and the frequency of insufficient previous experience of the supplier, a relationship will be found.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between practicing TSP and experiencing *insufficient previous experience of the supplier* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 4.511 from Table A-H-200 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.034.

Table A-H-199

Crosstab					
			TSP_ONLY_NEW		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue16 :INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	22	70	92
		Expected Count	27.8	64.2	92.0
		% within Recode2_Issue12:INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF SUPPLIER	23.9%	76.1%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	48.9%	67.3%	61.7%
		Std. Residual	-1.1	.7	
	Rarely + Never	Count	23	34	57
		Expected Count	17.2	39.8	57.0
		% within Recode2_Issue12:INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF SUPPLIER	40.4%	59.6%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	51.1%	32.7%	38.3%
		Std. Residual	1.4	-.9	
Total			Count	45	104
			Expected Count	45.0	104.0
			% within Recode2_Issue12:INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF SUPPLIER	30.2%	69.8%
			% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-200

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.511 ^a	1	.034		
Continuity Correction ^b	3.765	1	.052		
Likelihood Ratio	4.447	1	.035		
Fisher's Exact Test				.043	.027
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.481	1	.034		
N of Valid Cases	149				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.21.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-201

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.174	.034
	Cramer's V	.174	.034
N of Valid Cases		149	

17- Hypothesis 1.4.17 Issue: Lack of supplier standardized working methods

H1.4.17 There is a relationship between adopting TSP and the frequency of lack of supplier standardized working methods.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between practicing TSP and experiencing *insufficient previous experience of the supplier* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 2.395 from Table A-H-203 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.122.

Table A-H-202

Crosstab					
			TSP_ONLY		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode2_Issue17: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING METHODS	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	22	65	87
		Expected Count	26.3	60.7	87.0
		% within Recode2_Issue17: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKIN	25.3%	74.7%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	48.9%	62.5%	58.4%
		Std. Residual	-.8	.5	
	Rarely + Never	Count	23	39	62
		Expected Count	18.7	43.3	62.0
		% within Recode2_Issue17: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING	37.1%	62.9%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	51.1%	37.5%	41.6%
		Std. Residual	1.0	-.6	
Total	Count		45	104	149
	Expected Count		45.0	104.0	149.0
	% within Recode2_Issue17: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING		30.2%	69.8%	100.0%
	% within TSP_ONLY_NEW		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-203

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.395 ^a	1	.122		
Continuity Correction ^b	1.868	1	.172		

Likelihood Ratio	2.377	1	.123		
Fisher's Exact Test				.148	.086
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.379	1	.123		
N of Valid Cases	149				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 18.72.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-204

Symmetric Measures		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.127	.122
	Cramer's V	.127	.122
N of Valid Cases		149	

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 tests the relationship between three CMM/CMMI maturity level achieved and the IT offshoring issues experienced by the client companies. Hypothesis 2.1 tests the relationship between companies that achieved maturity levels 1 and 2 when applying CMMI for Development (DEV)/Services(SVC) and companies that achieved maturity levels of 3,4 and 5 with the 17 issues of offshoring IT projects; Hypothesis 2.2 tests the relationship between companies that that achieved maturity levels 1 & 2 when applying CMMI for Acquisition and companies that achieved maturity levels 3,4 and 5 and the 17 issues of offshoring IT projects; Hypothesis 2.3 tests the relationship between companies that achieved maturity levels 1 & 2 when applying People CMM and companies that achieved maturity levels 3, 4 and 5 and the 17 issues of offshoring IT projects.

Bonferroni's correction was used when multiple comparisons were drawn from a single sample.

Hypothesis tests the 17 issues 4 times with 4 industrial standards. Bonferroni correction (adjusted) p-value= $0.05/(17*3) = 0.05/51 = P = 0.000980392$

H2.1 There is a relationship between CMMI development/services maturity levels achieved and the IT offshoring issue.

H2.2 There is a relationship between CMMI acquisition maturity levels achieved and the IT offshoring issues.

H2.3 There is a relationship between CMM people maturity levels achieved and the IT offshoring issues.

Hypothesis 2.1: CMMI-Development/Services maturity level achieved and the IT offshoring issues.

H2.1 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI development/services maturity level achieved and the IT offshoring issues.

1 -Hypothesis 2.1.1 Issue 1: Over Expenditure due to hidden costs.

H2.1.1 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI development/services maturity level achieved and the issue of over expenditure issue experienced.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between CMMI-DEV/SVC maturity levels achieved and the issue of over expenditure for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 39.971 from Table A-H-206 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between CMMI-DEV/SVC maturity level achieved and the issue of over expenditure. The analysis shows that firms achieved higher maturity levels in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-205 shows that 21 companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported “Always + Almost Always + Occasionally” for this issue while the expected count was (8.5). 2 of the companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *over expenditure* issue while the expected count for this category was (14.5).

Cramer’s V=0.678 indicates a strong association between CMMI-DEV/SVC maturity level achieved and the issue of over expenditure as shown in Table A-H-207.

Table A-H-205

Crosstab					
			Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + Maturity Level 2	Maturity Level 3 + Maturity Level 4 + Maturity Level 5	
Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	21	11	32
		Expected Count	8.5	23.5	32.0
		% within Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE	65.6%	34.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_CMMI- DEV Maturity Level	91.3%	17.2%	36.8%
		Std. Residual	4.3	-2.6	
	Rarely + Never	Count	2	53	55
		Expected Count	14.5	40.5	55.0
		% within Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE	3.6%	96.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_CMMI- DEV Maturity Level	8.7%	82.8%	63.2%
		Std. Residual	-3.3	2.0	
Total	Count		23	64	87
	Expected Count		23.0	64.0	87.0
	% within Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE		26.4%	73.6%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_CMMI- DEV Maturity Level		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-206

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2- sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)

Pearson Chi-Square	39.971 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	36.847	1	.00000000		
Likelihood Ratio	42.132	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	39.512	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	87				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.46.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-207

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.678	.000
	Cramer's V	.678	.000
N of Valid Cases		87	

2 - Hypothesis 2.1.2 Poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier

H2.1.2 There is a relationship between CMMI Development/Services maturity level achieved and the issue of poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing CMMI-DEV/SVC and the issue of *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier*. The value of chi-square test is 25.452 from Table A-H-209 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and $p=0.00000045$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between CMMI-DEV/SVC maturity level achieved and the issue of *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms achieved higher maturity levels in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-208 shows that 16 companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (6.6). 7 of the companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (16.4).

Cramer’s V=0.541 indicates a relatively strong association between CMMI-DEV/SVC maturity level achieved and the issue of *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier* as shown in Table A-H-2010.

Table A-H-208

Crosstab					
			Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + Maturity Level 2	Maturity Level 3 + Maturity Level 4 + Maturity Level 5	
Recode2_Issue2: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	16	9	25
		Expected Count	6.6	18.4	25.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING	64.0%	36.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level	69.6%	14.1%	28.7%

	Rarely + Never	Std. Residual	3.7	-2.2	
		Count	7	55	62
		Expected Count	16.4	45.6	62.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING	11.3%	88.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_CMMI- DEV Maturity Level	30.4%	85.9%	71.3%
		Std. Residual	-2.3	1.4	
Total		Count	23	64	87
		Expected Count	23.0	64.0	87.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING	26.4%	73.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_CMMI- DEV Maturity Level	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-209

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	25.452 ^a	1	.00000045		
Continuity Correction ^b	22.814	1	.00000178		
Likelihood Ratio	24.112	1	.00000091		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000167	.00000167
Linear-by-Linear Association	25.160	1	.00000053		
N of Valid Cases	87				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.61.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-210

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.541	.000
	Cramer's V	.541	.000
N of Valid Cases		87	

3 - Hypothesis 2.1.3 Issues 2: Difference in interpretation of project requirements between client company and the supplier

H2.1.3 There is a relationship between CMMI Development (DEV)/Services(SVC) maturity level achieved and the frequency of difference in interpretation of project requirements between Client company and the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing CMMI-DEV/SVC and the issue of *difference in interpretation of project requirements between Client company and the supplier* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 24.944 from Table A-H-212 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.00000059.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between CMMI-DEV/SVC maturity level achieved and the issue of *difference in interpretation of project requirements between Client company and the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms achieved higher maturity levels in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-2011 shows that 17 companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in

CMMI-DEV/SVC reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (7.4). whereas, 6 of the companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (15.6).

Cramer’s V=0.535 indicates a relatively strong association between CMMI-DEV/SVC maturity level achieved and the issue of *difference in interpretation of project requirements between Client company and the supplier* as shown in Table A-H-2013.

Table A-H-211

Crosstab					
			Recode2_CMMI-DEV ML		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + ML 2	Maturity Level 3 + ML4 + ML5	
Recode2_Issue3: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	17	11	28
		Expected Count	7.4	20.6	28.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	60.7%	39.3%	100.0 %
		% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level	73.9%	17.2%	32.2%
		Std. Residual	3.5	-2.1	
	Rarely + Never	Count	6	53	59
		Expected Count	15.6	43.4	59.0
		% within Recode2_Issue2: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	10.2%	89.8%	100.0 %
		% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level	26.1%	82.8%	67.8%
		Std. Residual	-2.4	1.5	
Total			Count	23	64
			Expected Count	23.0	64.0
			% within Recode2_Issue2: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	26.4%	73.6%
			% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-212

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.944 ^a	1	.00000059	.00000161	.00000161
Continuity Correction ^b	22.413	1	.00000220		
Likelihood Ratio	24.180	1	.00000088		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	24.658	1	.00000068		
N of Valid Cases	87				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.40.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-213

Symmetric Measures		
	Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.535
	Cramer's V	.535

N of Valid Cases	87
------------------	----

4 - Hypothesis 2.1.4 Issue: Poorly developed and documented requirements by the client company

H2.1.4: There is a relationship between CMMI for Development/Service maturity level achieved and the frequency of poorly developed and documented requirements by the client company.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing CMMI-DEV/SVC and the issue of *poorly developed and documented requirements by the client company* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 24.944 from Table A-H-215 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.00000059.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between CMMI-DEV/SVC maturity level achieved and the issue of *poorly developed and documented requirements by the client company*. The analysis shows that firms achieved higher maturity levels in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-214 shows that 17 companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (7.4). While, 6 of the companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (15.6).

Cramer’s V=0.535 indicates a relatively strong association between CMMI-DEV/SVC maturity level achieved and the issue of *poorly developed and documented requirements by the client company* as shown in Table A-H-216.

Table A-H-214

Crosstab					
			Recode2_CMMI-DEV ML		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + ML2	Maturity Level 3 + Maturity Level 4 + Maturity Level 5	
Recode2_Issue4: POORLY DEVELOPED AND DOCUMENTED REQUIREMENTS	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	17	11	28
		Expected Count	7.4	20.6	28.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: POORLY DEVELOPED AND DOCUMENTED REQUIREMENTS	60.7%	39.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level	73.9%	17.2%	32.2%
		Std. Residual	3.5	-2.1	
	Rarely + Never	Count	6	53	59
		Expected Count	15.6	43.4	59.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: POORLY DEVELOPED AND DOCUMENTED REQUIREMENTS	10.2%	89.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level	26.1%	82.8%	67.8%
		Std. Residual	-2.4	1.5	
		Total	Count	23	64
	Expected Count	23.0	64.0	87.0	

	% within Recode2_Issue: POORLY DEVELOPED AND DOCUMENTED REQUIREMENTS	26.4%	73.6%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_CMMI- DEV Maturity Level	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-215

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.944 ^a	1	.00000059		
Continuity Correction ^b	22.413	1	.00000220		
Likelihood Ratio	24.180	1	.00000088		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000161	.00000161
Linear-by-Linear Association	24.658	1	.00000068		
N of Valid Cases	87				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.40.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-216

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.535	.000
	Cramer's V	.535	.000
N of Valid Cases		87	

5- Hypothesis 2.1.5 Issue: Poor tracking and managing requirement changes by the client company

H2.1.5: There is a relationship between CMMI for Development/Services maturity level achieved and the frequency of poor tracking and managing requirement changes by the client company.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing CMMI-DEV/SVC and the issue of *poor tracking and managing requirement changes by the client company* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 26.858 from Table A-H-218 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.00000022.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between CMMI-DEV/SVC maturity level achieved and the issue of *poor tracking and managing requirement changes by the client company*. The analysis shows that firms achieved higher maturity levels in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-217 shows that 17 companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (7.1). On the other hand, 6 of the companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (15.9).

Cramer’s V=0.556 indicates a relatively strong association between CMMI-DEV/SVC maturity level achieved and the issue of *poor tracking and managing requirement changes by the client company* as shown in Table A-H-219.

Table A-H-217

Crosstab			
	Recode2_CMMI-DEV ML		Total
	Maturity Level 1 + Maturity Level 2	Maturity Level 3 + Maturity Level 4 + Maturity Level 5	

Recode2_Issue5: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	17	10	27
		Expected Count	7.1	19.9	27.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES	63.0%	37.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level	73.9%	15.6%	31.0%
		Std. Residual	3.7	-2.2	
	Rarely + Never	Count	6	54	60
		Expected Count	15.9	44.1	60.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES	10.0%	90.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level	26.1%	84.4%	69.0%
		Std. Residual	-2.5	1.5	
Total	Count		23	64	87
	Expected Count		23.0	64.0	87.0
	% within Recode2_Issue: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES		26.4%	73.6%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-218

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	26.858 ^a	1	.00000022		
Continuity Correction ^b	24.204	1	.00000087		
Likelihood Ratio	25.894	1	.00000036		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000070	.00000070
Linear-by-Linear Association	26.549	1	.00000026		
N of Valid Cases	87				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.14.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-219

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.556	.000
	Cramer's V	.556	.000
N of Valid Cases		87	

6- Hypothesis 2.1.6 Issue: Lack of a full communication plan between the client company and the supplier company

H2.1.6: There is a relationship between CMMI for Development/Services maturity level achieved and the frequency of lack of a full communication plan between the client company and the supplier company.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing CMMI-DEV/SVC and the issue of *lack of a full communication plan between the client company and the supplier company* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 23.494 from Table A-H-221 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.00000125.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between CMMI-DEV/SVC maturity level achieved and the issue of *lack of a full communication plan between the client company and the supplier company*. The

analysis shows that firms achieved higher maturity levels in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-220 shows that 16 companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (6.9). While, 7 of the companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (16.1).

Cramer’s V=0.520 indicates a relatively strong association between CMMI-DEV/SVC maturity level achieved and the issue of *lack of a full communication plan between the client company and the supplier company* as shown in Table A-H-222.

Table A-H-220

Crosstab					
			Recode2_CMMI-DEV ML		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + Maturity Level 2	Maturity Level 3 + Maturity Level 4 + Maturity Level 5	
Recode2_Issue6: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	16	10	26
		Expected Count	6.9	19.1	26.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN	61.5%	38.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level	69.6%	15.6%	29.9%
		Std. Residual	3.5	-2.1	
	Rarely + Never	Count	7	54	61
		Expected Count	16.1	44.9	61.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN	11.5%	88.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level	30.4%	84.4%	70.1%
		Std. Residual	-2.3	1.4	
Total	Count		23	64	87
	Expected Count		23.0	64.0	87.0
	% within Recode2_Issue: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN		26.4%	73.6%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-221

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.494 ^a	1	.00000125	.00000389	.00000389
Continuity Correction ^b	20.990	1	.00000462		
Likelihood Ratio	22.378	1	.00000224		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	23.224	1	.00000144		
N of Valid Cases	87				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.87.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-222

Symmetric Measures			Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi		.520	.000
	Cramer's V		.520	.000

7- Hypothesis 2.1.7 Issue 7: Communication and coordination problems between the client company and the supplier company

H2.1.7 There is a relationship between CMMI for Development/Services maturity level achieved and the frequency of communication and coordination problems between the client company and the supplier company.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing CMMI-DEV/SVC and the issue of *communication and coordination problems between the client company and the supplier company* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 17.194 from Table A-H-224 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.00003376.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between CMMI-DEV/SVC maturity level achieved and the issue of *communication and coordination problems between the client company and the supplier company*. The analysis shows that firms achieved higher maturity levels in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-223 shows that 17 companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (8.7). Moreover, 6 of the companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (14.3).

Cramer’s V=0.445 indicates a relatively strong association between CMMI-DEV/SVC maturity level achieved and the issue of *communication and coordination problems between the client company and the supplier company* as shown in Table A-H-225.

Table A-H-223

REC0111220

Crosstab					
			Recode2_CMMI-DEV ML		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + ML2	Maturity Level 3 + Maturity Level 4 + Maturity Level 5	
Recode2_Issue7: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	17	16	33
		Expected Count	8.7	24.3	33.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS	51.5%	48.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level	73.9%	25.0%	37.9%
		Std. Residual	2.8	-1.7	
	Rarely + Never	Count	6	48	54
		Expected Count	14.3	39.7	54.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS	11.1%	88.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level	26.1%	75.0%	62.1%
		Std. Residual	-2.2	1.3	
Total	Count	23	64	87	
	Expected Count	23.0	64.0	87.0	

	Expected Count	23.0	64.0	87.0
	% within Recode2_Issue7: LANGUAGE BARRIERS	26.4%	73.6%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_CMMI- DEV Maturity Level	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-227

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.107 ^a	1	.743		
Continuity Correction ^b	.003	1	.953		
Likelihood Ratio	.108	1	.742		
Fisher's Exact Test				.796	.484
Linear-by-Linear Association	.106	1	.745		
N of Valid Cases	87				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.61.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-228

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.035	.743
	Cramer's V	.035	.743
N of Valid Cases		87	

9- Hypothesis 2.1.9 Issue 9: Time-zone differences between the client company and the supplier

H2.1.9 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Development/Services maturity level achieved and the frequency of time-zone differences between the client company and the supplier.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between practicing CMMI-DEV/SVC and the issue of *time-zone differences* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 1.747 from Table A-H-230 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.186.

Table A-H-229

Crosstab					
		Recode2_CMMI-DEV ML		Total	
		Maturity Level 1 + Maturity Level 2	Maturity Level 3 + Maturity Level 4 + Maturity Level 5		
Recode2_Issue9: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	20	47	67
		Expected Count	17.7	49.3	67.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES	29.9%	70.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level	87.0%	73.4%	77.0%
		Std. Residual	.5	-.3	
	Rarely + Never	Count	3	17	20
		Expected Count	5.3	14.7	20.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES	15.0%	85.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level	13.0%	26.6%	23.0%
		Std. Residual	-1.0	.6	

Total	Count	23	64	87
	Expected Count	23.0	64.0	87.0
	% within Recode2_Issue: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES	26.4%	73.6%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-230

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.747 ^a	1	.186		
Continuity Correction ^b	1.067	1	.302		
Likelihood Ratio	1.904	1	.168		
Fisher's Exact Test				.253	.150
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.727	1	.189		
N of Valid Cases	87				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.29.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-231

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.142	.186
	Cramer's V	.142	.186
N of Valid Cases		87	

10- Hypothesis 2.1.10 Issue 10: Cultural differences between the client company and the supplier

2.1.10 There is a relationship between CMMI for Development/Services maturity level achieved and the frequency of cultural differences between the client company and the supplier.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between practicing CMMI-DEV/SVC and the issue of *cultural differences* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 1.315 from Table A-H-232 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.251.

Table A-H-231

Crosstab					
			Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + Maturity Level 2	Maturity Level 3 + Maturity Level 4 + Maturity Level 5	
Recode2_Issue10 : CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	19	45	64
		Expected Count	16.9	47.1	64.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	29.7%	70.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV ML	82.6%	70.3%	73.6%
		Std. Residual	.5	-.3	
	Rarely + Never	Count	4	19	23
		Expected Count	6.1	16.9	23.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	17.4%	82.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV ML	17.4%	29.7%	26.4%

		Std. Residual	-.8	.5	
Total		Count	23	64	87
		Expected Count	23.0	64.0	87.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	26.4%	73.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV ML	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-232

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.315 ^a	1	.251		
Continuity Correction ^b	.759	1	.384		
Likelihood Ratio	1.396	1	.237		
Fisher's Exact Test				.287	.194
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.300	1	.254		
N of Valid Cases	87				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.08.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-233

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.123	.251
	Cramer's V	.123	.251
N of Valid Cases		87	

11- Hypothesis 2.1.11 Issue 11: Incomplete and unclear contract

H2.1.11 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Development/Services and the frequency of incomplete and unclear contract.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing CMMI-DEV/SVC and the issue of *incomplete and unclear contract* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 28.813 from Table A-H-235 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=0.00000008$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between CMMI-DEV/SVC maturity level achieved and the issue of *incomplete and unclear contract*. The analysis shows that firms achieved higher maturity levels in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-234 shows that 15 companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (5.6). Moreover, 8 of the companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (17.4).

Cramer’s $V=0.575$ indicates a relatively strong association between CMMI-DEV/SVC maturity level achieved and the issue of *incomplete and unclear contract* as shown in Table A-H-236.

Table A-H-234

Crosstab				
		Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level		Total
		Maturity Level 1 + Maturity Level 2	Maturity Level 3 + Maturity Level 4 + Maturity Level 5	
	Count	15	6	21

Recode2_Issue: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Expected Count	5.6	15.4	21.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_CMMI- DEV Maturity Level	65.2%	9.4%	24.1%
		Std. Residual	4.0	-2.4	
	Rarely + Never	Count	8	58	66
		Expected Count	17.4	48.6	66.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	12.1%	87.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_CMMI- DEV Maturity Level	34.8%	90.6%	75.9%
Total	Std. Residual		-2.3	1.4	
	Count		23	64	87
	Expected Count		23.0	64.0	87.0
	% within Recode2_Issue: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT		26.4%	73.6%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_CMMI- DEV Maturity Level		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-235

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	28.813 ^a	1	.00000008		
Continuity Correction ^b	25.844	1	.00000037		
Likelihood Ratio	26.619	1	.00000025		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000051	.00000051
Linear-by-Linear Association	28.482	1	.00000009		
N of Valid Cases	87				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.55.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-236

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.575	.000
	Cramer's V	.575	.000
N of Valid Cases		87	

12- Hypothesis 2.1.12 Issue 12: Early contract renegotiation and termination

H2.1.12 There is a relationship between CMMI for Development/Services and the issue of early contract renegotiation and termination.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing CMMI-DEV/SVC and the issue of *early contract renegotiation and termination* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 27.903 from Table A-H-238 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.00000013.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between CMMI-DEV/SVC maturity level achieved and the issue of *early contract renegotiation and termination*. The analysis shows that firms achieved higher maturity levels in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-237 shows that

14 companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (5). Moreover, 9 of the companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (18).

Cramer’s V=0.566 indicates a relatively strong association between CMMI-DEV/SVC maturity level achieved and the issue of *early contract renegotiation and termination* as shown in Table A-H-239.

Table A-H-237

Crosstab						
			Recode2_CMMI-DEV ML		Total	
			Maturity Level 1 + Maturity Level 2	Maturity Level 3 + Maturity Level 4 + Maturity Level 5		
Recode2_Issue12: EARLY CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION AND TERMINATION	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	14	5	19	
		Expected Count	5.0	14.0	19.0	
		% within Recode2_Issue: EARLY CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION AND TERMINATION	73.7%	26.3%	100.0%	
		% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV ML	60.9%	7.8%	21.8%	
		Std. Residual	4.0	-2.4		
	Rarely + Never	Count	9	59	68	
		Expected Count	18.0	50.0	68.0	
		% within Recode2_Issue: EARLY CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION AND TERMINATION	13.2%	86.8%	100.0%	
		% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV ML	39.1%	92.2%	78.2%	
		Std. Residual	-2.1	1.3		
Total			Count	23	64	87
			Expected Count	23.0	64.0	87.0
			% within Recode2_Issue11: EARLY CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION AND TERMINATION	26.4%	73.6%	100.0%
			% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV ML	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-238

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	27.903 ^a	1	.00000013	.00000094	.00000094
Continuity Correction ^b	24.881	1	.00000061		
Likelihood Ratio	25.444	1	.00000046		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	27.582	1	.00000015		
N of Valid Cases	87				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.02.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-239

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.566	.000
	Cramer's V	.566	.000
N of Valid Cases		87	

13- Hypothesis 2.1.13 Issue 13: Difference in project management practices between your company and the supplier

H2.1.13 There is a relationship between CMMI for Development/Services maturity level achieved and the frequency of difference in project management practices between the client company and the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing CMMI-DEV/SVC and the issue of *difference in project management practices between the client company and the supplier* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 17.338 from Table A-H-241 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0. 00003128.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between CMMI-DEV/SVC maturity level achieved and the issue of *difference in project management practices between the client company and the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms achieved higher maturity levels in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-240 shows that 14 companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (6.3). Moreover, 9 of the companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (16.7).

Cramer’s V=0.446 indicates a relatively strong association between CMMI-DEV/SVC maturity level achieved and the issue of *difference in project management practices between the client company and the supplier* as shown in Table A-H-242.

Table A-H-240

Crosstab					
			Recode2_ CMMI-DEV Maturity Level		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + Maturity Level 2	Maturity Level 3 + Maturity Level 4 + Maturity Level 5	
Recode2_Issue13: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	14	10	24
		Expected Count	6.3	17.7	24.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	58.3%	41.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_ CMMI-DEV Maturity Level	60.9%	15.6%	27.6%
		Std. Residual	3.0	-1.8	
	Rarely + Never	Count	9	54	63
		Expected Count	16.7	46.3	63.0
		% within Recode2_Issue15: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	14.3%	85.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_ CMMI-DEV Maturity Level	39.1%	84.4%	72.4%
		Std. Residual	-1.9	1.1	
Total	Count		23	64	87
	Expected Count		23.0	64.0	87.0

	% within Recode2_Issue15: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	26.4%	73.6%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_CMMI- DEV Maturity Level	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-241

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.338 ^a	1	.00003128	.00008079	.00008079
Continuity Correction ^b	15.147	1	.00009943		
Likelihood Ratio	16.222	1	.00005633		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	17.139	1	.00003474		
N of Valid Cases	87				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.34.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-242

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.446	.000
	Cramer's V	.446	.000
N of Valid Cases		87	

14- Hypothesis 2.1.14 Issue 14: Unable to measure the performance of the supplier

H1.1.14 There is a relationship between CMMI for Development/Services maturity level achieved and the frequency of unable to measure the performance of the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing CMMI-DEV/SVC and the issue of *unable to measure the performance of the supplier* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 29.904 from Table A-H-244 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.00000005.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between CMMI-DEV/SVC maturity level achieved and the issue of *unable to measure the performance of the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms achieved higher maturity levels in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-243 shows that 16 companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (6.1). Additionally, 7 of the companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (16.9).

Cramer’s V=0.586 indicates a relatively strong association between CMMI-DEV/SVC maturity level achieved and the issue of *unable to measure the performance of the supplier* as shown in Table A-H-245.

Table A-H-243

Crosstab					
			Recode2_CMMI-DEV ML		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + Maturity Level 2	Maturity Level 3 + Maturity Level 4 + Maturity Level 5	
		Count	16	7	23

Recode2_Issue14: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Expected Count	6.1	16.9	23.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	69.6%	30.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_CMMI- DEV Maturity Level	69.6%	10.9%	26.4%
		Std. Residual	4.0	-2.4	
	Rarely + Never	Count	7	57	64
		Expected Count	16.9	47.1	64.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	10.9%	89.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_CMMI- DEV Maturity Level	30.4%	89.1%	73.6%
		Std. Residual	-2.4	1.4	
Total	Count	23	64	87	
	Expected Count	23.0	64.0	87.0	
	% within Recode2_Issue: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	26.4%	73.6%	100.0%	
	% within Recode2_CMMI- DEV Maturity Level	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table A-H-244

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	29.904 ^a	1	.00000005		
Continuity Correction ^b	26.965	1	.00000021		
Likelihood Ratio	28.045	1	.00000012		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000025	.00000025
Linear-by-Linear Association	29.560	1	.00000005		
N of Valid Cases	87				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.08.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-245

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.586	.000
	Cramer's V	.586	.000
N of Valid Cases		87	

15- Hypothesis 2.1.15 Issue 15: Supplier technical/security and political issues

H2.1.15 There is a relationship between CMMI for Development/Services maturity level achieved and the frequency of supplier technical/security and political issues.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between practicing CMMI-DEV/SVC and the issue of *supplier technical/security and political issues* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 2.280 from Table A-H-247 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.131.

Table A-H-246

Crosstab						
			Recode2_CMMI-DEV ML		Total	
			Maturity Level 1 + Maturity Level 2	Maturity Level 3 + Maturity Level 4 + Maturity Level 5		
Reoce2_Issue15 : SUPPLIER TECHNICAL/ SECURITY /POLITICAL ISSUES	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	15	30	45	
		Expected Count	11.9	33.1	45.0	
		% within Reoce2_Issue: SUPPLIER TECHNICAL/ SECURITY /POLITICAL ISSUES	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%	
		% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level	65.2%	46.9%	51.7%	
		Std. Residual	.9	-.5		
	Rarely + Never	Count	8	34	42	
		Expected Count	11.1	30.9	42.0	
		% within Reoce2_Issue: SUPPLIER TECHNICAL/ SECURITY /POLITICAL ISSUES	19.0%	81.0%	100.0%	
		% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level	34.8%	53.1%	48.3%	
		Std. Residual	-.9	.6		
Total			Count	23	64	87
			Expected Count	23.0	64.0	87.0
			% within Reoce2_Issue: SUPPLIER TECHNICAL/ SECURITY /POLITICAL ISSUES	26.4%	73.6%	100.0%
			% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-247

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.280 ^a	1	.131		
Continuity Correction ^b	1.604	1	.205		
Likelihood Ratio	2.311	1	.128		
Fisher's Exact Test				.151	.102
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.253	1	.133		
N of Valid Cases	87				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.10.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-248

Symmetric Measures			Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi		.162	.131
	Cramer's V		.162	.131
N of Valid Cases			87	

16- Hypothesis 2.1.16 Issue 16: Insufficient previous experience of the supplier

H2.1.16 There is a relationship between CMMI for Development/Services maturity level achieved and the frequency of insufficient previous experience of the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing CMMI-DEV/SVC and the issue of *insufficient previous experience of the supplier* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 31.493 from Table A-H-250 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and $p=0.00000002$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between CMMI-DEV/SVC maturity level achieved and the issue of *insufficient previous experience of the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms achieved higher maturity levels in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-249 shows that 15 companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (5.3). Additionally, 8 of the companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (17.7).

Cramer’s $V=0.602$ indicates a strong association between CMMI-DEV/SVC maturity level achieved and the issue of *insufficient previous experience of the supplier* as shown in Table A-H-251.

Table A-H-249

Crosstab					
			Recode2_CMMI-DEV ML		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + Maturity Level 2	Maturity Level 3 + Maturity Level 4 + Maturity Level 5	
Recode2_Issue16 : INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	15	5	20
		Expected Count	5.3	14.7	20.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level	65.2%	7.8%	23.0%
		Std. Residual	4.2	-2.5	
	Rarely + Never	Count	8	59	67
		Expected Count	17.7	49.3	67.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER	11.9%	88.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level	34.8%	92.2%	77.0%
		Std. Residual	-2.3	1.4	
Total			Count	23	87
			Expected Count	23.0	87.0
			% within Recode2_Issue: INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER	26.4%	73.6%
			% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-250

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)

Pearson Chi-Square	31.493 ^a	1	.00000002		
Continuity Correction ^b	28.334	1	.00000010		
Likelihood Ratio	28.997	1	.00000007		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000016	.00000016
Linear-by-Linear Association	31.131	1	.00000002		
N of Valid Cases	87				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.29.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-251

Symmetric Measures		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.602	.000
	Cramer's V	.602	.000
N of Valid Cases		87	

17- Hypothesis 2.1.17 Issue 17: Lack of supplier standardized working methods

H2.1.17 There is a relationship between CMMI for Development/Services maturity level achieved and the frequency of lack of supplier standardized working methods.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing CMMI-DEV/SVC and the issue of *lack of supplier standardized working methods* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 25.342 from Table A-H-253 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.00000048.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between CMMI-DEV/SVC maturity level achieved and the issue of *lack of supplier standardized working methods*. The analysis shows that firms achieved higher maturity levels in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-252 shows that 14 companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (5.3). Additionally, 9 of the companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (17.7).

Cramer’s V=0.540 indicates a relatively strong association between CMMI-DEV/SVC maturity level achieved and the issue of *lack of supplier standardized working methods* as shown in Table A-H-254.

Table A-H-252

Crosstab					
		Recode2_CMMI-DEV ML		Total	
		Maturity Level 1 + ML2	Maturity Level 3 + ML4 + ML5		
Recode2_Issue17 : LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING METHODS	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	14	6	20
		Expected Count	5.3	14.7	20.0
		% within Recode2_Issue17: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING METHODS	70.0%	30.0%	100.0 %
		% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV ML	60.9%	9.4%	23.0%
		Std. Residual	3.8	-2.3	
	Rarely + Never	Count	9	58	67
		Expected Count	17.7	49.3	67.0
		% within Recode2_Issue17: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING METHODS	13.4%	86.6%	100.0 %
		% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV ML	39.1%	90.6%	77.0%

		Std. Residual	-2.1	1.2	
Total		Count	23	64	87
		Expected Count	23.0	64.0	87.0
		% within Recode2_Issue17: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING METHODS	26.4%	73.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV ML	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-253

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	25.342 ^a	1	.00000048		
Continuity Correction ^b	22.517	1	.00000208		
Likelihood Ratio	23.196	1	.00000146		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000274	.00000274
Linear-by-Linear Association	25.051	1	.00000056		
N of Valid Cases	87				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.29.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-254

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.540	.000
	Cramer's V	.540	.000
N of Valid Cases		87	

Hypothesis 2.2: CMMI-Acquisition maturity level achieved and IT offshoring issues

H2.2 There is a relationship between CMMI Acquisition maturity levels achieved and the frequency of issues.

This hypothesis tests the relationship between CMMI for Acquisition maturity level achieved and the IT offshoring 17 issues.

1 -Hypothesis 2.2.1 Issue: Over Expenditure due to hidden costs

H2.2.1 There is a relationship between CMMI Acquisition maturity level achieved and the frequency of over expenditure due to hiding costs issue.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of over expenditure for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 52.593 from Table A-H-256 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of over expenditure. The analysis shows that firms achieved higher maturity levels in CMMI-ACQ reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-255 shows that 24 companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-ACQ reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (9.3). Additionally, 1 of the companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-ACQ reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (15.7).

Cramer's V=0.796 indicates a strong association between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of over expenditure as shown in Table A-H-257.

Table A-H-255

Crosstab					
			Recode2 CMMI-ACQ ML		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + ML 2	Maturity Level 3 + ML4 + ML5	
Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	24	7	31
		Expected Count	9.3	21.7	31.0
		% within Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE	77.4%	22.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI- ACQ Maturity Level	96.0%	12.1%	37.3%
		Std. Residual	4.8	-3.2	
	Rarely + Never	Count	1	51	52
		Expected Count	15.7	36.3	52.0
		% within Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE	1.9%	98.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI- ACQ Maturity Level	4.0%	87.9%	62.7%
		Std. Residual	-3.7	2.4	
Total	Count		25	58	83
	Expected Count		25.0	58.0	83.0
	% within Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE		30.1%	69.9%	100.0%
	% within Recode2 CMMI- ACQ Maturity Level		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-256

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	52.593 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	49.067	1	.00000000		
Likelihood Ratio	58.571	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	51.959	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	83				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.34.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-257

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.796	.000
	Cramer's V	.796	.000
N of Valid Cases		83	

2 - Hypothesis 2.2.2 Issue: Poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier

H2.2.2 There is a relationship between CMMI Acquisition maturity level achieved and the frequency of poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 32.309 from Table A-H-259 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=0.00000001$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms achieved higher maturity levels in CMMI-ACQ reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-258 shows that 18 companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-ACQ reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (7.2). Moreover, 7 of the companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-ACQ reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (17.8).

Cramer’s $V=0.624$ indicates a strong association between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier* as shown in Table A-H-260.

Table A-H-258

Crosstab					
			Recode2 CMMI-ACQ ML		Total
			ML1 + ML2	ML 3 + ML4 + ML5	
Recode2_Issue2: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	18	6	24
		Expected Count	7.2	16.8	24.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level	72.0%	10.3%	28.9%
		Std. Residual	4.0	-2.6	
	Rarely + Never	Count	7	52	59
		Expected Count	17.8	41.2	59.0
		% within Recode2_Issue16: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING	11.9%	88.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level	28.0%	89.7%	71.1%
		Std. Residual	-2.6	1.7	
Total			Count	25	58
			Expected Count	25.0	58.0
			% within Recode2_Issue16: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING	30.1%	69.9%
			% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-259

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	32.309 ^a	1	.00000001		
Continuity Correction ^b	29.379	1	.00000006		
Likelihood Ratio	31.603	1	.00000002		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000004	.00000004
Linear-by-Linear Association	31.920	1	.00000002		
N of Valid Cases	83				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.23.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-260

Symmetric Measures		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.624	.000
	Cramer's V	.624	.000
N of Valid Cases		83	

3 - Hypothesis 2.2.3 Issues: Difference in interpretation of project requirements between Client company and the supplier

H2.2.3: There is a relationship between CMMI for Acquisition maturity level achieved and the frequency of difference in interpretation of project requirements between Client company and the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *difference in interpretation of project requirements between Client company and the supplier* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 30.801 from Table A-H-262 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=0.00000003$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *difference in interpretation of project requirements between Client company and the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms achieved higher maturity levels in CMMI-ACQ reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-261 shows that 19 companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-ACQ reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (8.1). Moreover, 6 of the companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-ACQ reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (16.9).

Cramer’s $V=0.609$ indicates a strong association between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *difference in interpretation of project requirements between Client company and the supplier* as shown in Table A-H-263.

Table A-H-261

			Recode2 CMMI-ACQ ML		Total
			ML1 + ML2	ML3 + ML4 + ML5	
Recode2_Issue3: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	19	8	27
		Expected Count	8.1	18.9	27.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	70.4%	29.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level	76.0%	13.8%	32.5%
		Std. Residual	3.8	-2.5	
	Rarely + Never	Count	6	50	56
		Expected Count	16.9	39.1	56.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	10.7%	89.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level	24.0%	86.2%	67.5%
		Std. Residual	-2.6	1.7	
Total		Count	25	58	83
		Expected Count	25.0	58.0	83.0

	% within Recode2_Issue2: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	30.1%	69.9%	100.0%
	% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-262

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	30.801 ^a	1	.00000003		
Continuity Correction ^b	28.032	1	.00000012		
Likelihood Ratio	30.621	1	.00000003		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000007	.00000007
Linear-by-Linear Association	30.430	1	.00000003		
N of Valid Cases	83				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.13.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-263

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.609	.000
	Cramer's V	.609	.000
N of Valid Cases		83	

4 - Hypothesis 2.2.4 Issue: Poorly developed and documented requirements by the client company

H2.2.4: There is a relationship between CMMI for Acquisition maturity level achieved and the frequency of poorly developed and documented requirements by the client company.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *poorly developed and documented requirements by the client company* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 24.389 from Table A-H-265 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=0.00000079$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *poorly developed and documented requirements by the client company*. The analysis shows that firms achieved higher maturity levels in CMMI-ACQ reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-264 shows that 17 companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-ACQ reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (7.5). Furthermore, 8 of the companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-ACQ reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (17.5).

Cramer's $V=0.542$ indicates a relatively strong association between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *poorly developed and documented requirements by the client company* as shown in Table A-H-266.

Table A-H-264

Crosstab					
			Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + Maturity Level 2	Maturity Level 3 + Maturity Level 4 + Maturity Level 5	
Recode2_Issue4: POORLY DEVELOPED AND DOCUMENTED REQUIREMENTS	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	17	8	25
		Expected Count	7.5	17.5	25.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: POORLY DEVELOPED AND DOCUMENTED REQUIREMENTS	68.0%	32.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level	68.0%	13.8%	30.1%
		Std. Residual	3.5	-2.3	
	Rarely + Never	Count	8	50	58
		Expected Count	17.5	40.5	58.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: POORLY DEVELOPED AND DOCUMENTED REQUIREMENTS	13.8%	86.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level	32.0%	86.2%	69.9%
		Std. Residual	-2.3	1.5	
Total			Count	25	58
			Expected Count	25.0	58.0
			% within Recode2_Issue3: POORLY DEVELOPED AND DOCUMENTED REQUIREMENTS	30.1%	69.9%
			% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-265

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.389 ^a	1	.00000079		
Continuity Correction ^b	21.881	1	.00000290		
Likelihood Ratio	23.691	1	.00000113		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000206	.00000206
Linear-by-Linear Association	24.095	1	.00000092		
N of Valid Cases	83				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.53.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-266

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.542	.000
	Cramer's V	.542	.000
N of Valid Cases		83	

5- Hypothesis 2.2.5 Issue: Poor tracking and managing requirement changes by the client company

H2.2.5: There is a relationship between CMMI for Acquisition maturity level achieved and the frequency of poor tracking and managing requirement changes by the client company.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *poor tracking and managing requirement changes by the client company* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 23.519 from Table A-H-268 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=0.00000124$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *poor tracking and managing requirement changes by the client company*. The analysis shows that firms achieved higher maturity levels in CMMI-ACQ reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-267 shows that 16 companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-ACQ reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (6.9). Additionally, 9 of the companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-ACQ reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (18.1).

Cramer’s $V=0.532$ indicates a relatively strong association between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *poor tracking and managing requirement changes by the client company* as shown in Table A-H-269.

Table A-H-267

Crosstab					
			Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + Maturity Level 2	Maturity Level 3 + Maturity Level 4 + Maturity Level 5	
Recode2_Issue5: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	16	7	23
		Expected Count	6.9	16.1	23.0
		% within Recode2_Issue4: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES	69.6%	30.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level	64.0%	12.1%	27.7%
		Std. Residual	3.4	-2.3	
	Rarely + Never	Count	9	51	60
		Expected Count	18.1	41.9	60.0
		% within Recode2_Issue4: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES	15.0%	85.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level	36.0%	87.9%	72.3%
		Std. Residual	-2.1	1.4	
Total	Count		25	58	83
	Expected Count		25.0	58.0	83.0
	% within Recode2_Issue4: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES		30.1%	69.9%	100.0%
	% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-268

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.519 ^a	1	.00000124		
Continuity Correction ^b	20.998	1	.00000460		
Likelihood Ratio	22.580	1	.00000202		

Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	23.236	1	.00000143	.00000360	.00000360
N of Valid Cases	83				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.93.
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-269

Symmetric Measures				
			Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi		.532	.000
	Cramer's V		.532	.000
N of Valid Cases			83	

6- Hypothesis 2.2.6 Issue: Lack of a full communication plan between the client company and the supplier company

H2.2.6: There is a relationship between CMMI for Acquisition maturity level achieved and the frequency of lack of a full communication plan between the client company and the supplier company.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *lack of a full communication plan between the client company and the supplier company* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 26.588 from Table A-H-271 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=0.00000025$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *lack of a full communication plan between the client company and the supplier company*. The analysis shows that firms achieved higher maturity levels in CMMI-ACQ reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-270 shows that 17 companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-ACQ reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (7.2). Moreover, 8 of the companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-ACQ reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (17.8).

Cramer’s $V=0.566$ indicates a relatively strong association between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *lack of a full communication plan between the client company and the supplier company* as shown in Table A-H-272.

Table A-H-270

Crosstab					
			Recode2 CMMI-ACQ ML		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + ML2	Maturity Level 3 + ML 4 + ML 5	
Recode2_Issue 6: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	17	7	24
		Expected Count	7.2	16.8	24.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION	70.8%	29.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI ACQ ML	68.0%	12.1%	28.9%
		Std. Residual	3.6	-2.4	
	Rarely + Never	Count	8	51	59
		Expected Count	17.8	41.2	59.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION	13.6%	86.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ ML	32.0%	87.9%	71.1%
		Std. Residual	-2.3	1.5	
Total	Count	25	58	83	
	Expected Count	25.0	58.0	83.0	

	% within Recode2_Issue: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION	30.1%	69.9%	100.0%
	% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ ML	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-271

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	26.588 ^a	1	.00000025		
Continuity Correction ^b	23.937	1	.00000100		
Likelihood Ratio	25.766	1	.00000039		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000075	.00000075
Linear-by-Linear Association	26.268	1	.00000030		
N of Valid Cases	83				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.23.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-272

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.566	.000
	Cramer's V	.566	.000
N of Valid Cases		83	

7- Hypothesis 2.2.7 Issue: Communication and coordination problems between the client company and the supplier company

H2.2.7 There is a relationship between CMMI for Acquisition maturity level achieved and the frequency of communication and coordination problems between the client company and the supplier company.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *communication and coordination problems* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 24.622 from Table A-H-274 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.00000070.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *communication and coordination problems*. The analysis shows that firms achieved higher maturity levels in CMMI-ACQ reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-273 shows that 19 companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-ACQ reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (9.0). Additionally, 6 of the companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-ACQ reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (16.0).

Cramer’s V=0.545 indicates a relatively strong association between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *communication and coordination problems* as shown in Table A-H-275.

Table A-H-273

Crosstab					
			Recode2 CMMI-ACQ ML		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + ML 2	Maturity Level 3 + ML 4 + ML 5	
Recode2_Issue7:	Always + Almost	Count	19	11	30
		Expected Count	9.0	21.0	30.0

COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS	Always + Occasionally	% within Recode2_Issue: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS	63.3%	36.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ ML	76.0%	19.0%	36.1%
		Std. Residual	3.3	-2.2	
	Rarely + Never	Count	6	47	53
		Expected Count	16.0	37.0	53.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS	11.3%	88.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ ML	24.0%	81.0%	63.9%
		Std. Residual	-2.5	1.6	
Total	Count	25	58	83	
	Expected Count	25.0	58.0	83.0	
	% within Recode2_Issue: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS	30.1%	69.9%	100.0%	
	% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ ML	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table A-H-274

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.622 ^a	1	.00000070		
Continuity Correction ^b	22.213	1	.00000244		
Likelihood Ratio	24.707	1	.00000067		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000208	.00000124
Linear-by-Linear Association	24.325	1	.00000081		
N of Valid Cases	83				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.04.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-275

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.545	.000
	Cramer's V	.545	.000
N of Valid Cases		83	

8- Hypothesis 2.2.8 Issue: Language barriers between the client company and the supplier

H2.2.8 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Acquisition maturity level achieved and the frequency of language barriers between the client company and the supplier.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *language barriers* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 3.349 from Table A-H-277 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.067.

Table A-H-276

Crosstab		
	Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level	Total

			Maturity Level 1 + Maturity Level 2	Maturity Level 3 + Maturity Level 4 + Maturity Level 5	
Recode2_Issue8: LANGUAGE BARRIERS	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	22	40	62
		Expected Count	18.7	43.3	62.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: LANGUAGE BARRIERS	35.5%	64.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ ML	88.0%	69.0%	74.7%
		Std. Residual	.8	-.5	
	Rarely + Never	Count	3	18	21
		Expected Count	6.3	14.7	21.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: LANGUAGE BARRIERS	14.3%	85.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ ML	12.0%	31.0%	25.3%
		Std. Residual	-1.3	.9	
Total	Count	25	58	83	
	Expected Count	25.0	58.0	83.0	
	% within Recode2_Issue: LANGUAGE BARRIERS	30.1%	69.9%	100.0%	
	% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ ML	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table A-H-277

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.349 ^a	1	.067		
Continuity Correction ^b	2.418	1	.120		
Likelihood Ratio	3.699	1	.054		
Fisher's Exact Test				.098	.056
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.309	1	.069		
N of Valid Cases	83				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.33.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-278

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.201	.067
	Cramer's V	.201	.067
N of Valid Cases		83	

9- Hypothesis 2.2.9 Issue: Time-zone differences between the client company and the supplier

H2.2.9 There is a relationship between CMMI for Acquisition maturity level achieved and the frequency of time-zone differences between the client company and the supplier.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *time-zone differences* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 1.977 from Table A-H-280 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.160.

Table A-H-279

Crosstab		
	Recode2 CMMI-ACQ ML	Total

			Maturity Level 1 + Maturity Level 2	Maturity Level 3 + Maturity Level 4 + Maturity Level 5	
Recode2_Issue9: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	22	43	65
		Expected Count	19.6	45.4	65.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES	33.8%	66.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ ML	88.0%	74.1%	78.3%
		Std. Residual	.5	-.4	
	Rarely + Never	Count	3	15	18
		Expected Count	5.4	12.6	18.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES	16.7%	83.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ ML	12.0%	25.9%	21.7%
		Std. Residual	-1.0	.7	
Total		Count	25	58	83
		Expected Count	25.0	58.0	83.0
		% within Recode2_Issue8: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES	30.1%	69.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ ML	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-280

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.977 ^a	1	.160		
Continuity Correction ^b	1.245	1	.265		
Likelihood Ratio	2.151	1	.142		
Fisher's Exact Test				.246	.131
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.953	1	.162		
N of Valid Cases	83				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.42.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-281

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.154	.160
	Cramer's V	.154	.160
N of Valid Cases		83	

10- Hypothesis 2.2.10 Issue: Cultural differences between the client company and the supplier

1.2.10 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Acquisition and the frequency of cultural differences between the client company and the supplier, a relationship will be found.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *cultural differences* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 2.027 from Table A-H-283 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.155.

Table A-H-282

Crosstab		
	Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level	Total

			Maturity Level 1 + Maturity Level 2	Maturity Level 3 + Maturity Level 4 + Maturity Level 5	
Recode2_Issue10: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	21	40	61
		Expected Count	18.4	42.6	61.0
		% within Recode2_Issue9: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	34.4%	65.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level	84.0%	69.0%	73.5%
		Std. Residual	.6	-.4	
	Rarely + Never	Count	4	18	22
		Expected Count	6.6	15.4	22.0
		% within Recode2_Issue9: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	18.2%	81.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level	16.0%	31.0%	26.5%
		Std. Residual	-1.0	.7	
Total	Count		25	58	83
	Expected Count		25.0	58.0	83.0
	% within Recode2_Issue9: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES		30.1%	69.9%	100.0%
	% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-283

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.027 ^a	1	.155		
Continuity Correction ^b	1.329	1	.249		
Likelihood Ratio	2.164	1	.141		
Fisher's Exact Test				.185	.123
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.003	1	.157		
N of Valid Cases	83				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.63.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-284

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.156	.155
	Cramer's V	.156	.155
N of Valid Cases		83	

11- Hypothesis 2.2.11 Issue: Incomplete and unclear contract

H1.2.11 There is a relationship between CMMI for Acquisition maturity level achieved and the frequency of incomplete and unclear contract.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *incomplete and unclear contract* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 20.603 from Table A-H-286 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=0.00000565$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *incomplete and unclear contract*. The analysis shows that firms achieved higher maturity levels in CMMI-ACQ reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-285 shows that 15 companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-ACQ reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (6.6). Moreover, 10 of the companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-ACQ reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (18.4).

Cramer’s V=0.498 indicates a relatively strong association between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *incomplete and unclear contract* as shown in Table A-H-287.

Table A-H-285

Crosstab					
			Recode2 CMMI-ACQ ML		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + Maturity Level 2	Maturity Level 3 + Maturity Level 4 + ML5	
Recode2_Issue11: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	15	7	22
		Expected Count	6.6	15.4	22.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	68.2%	31.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level	60.0%	12.1%	26.5%
		Std. Residual	3.3	-2.1	
	Rarely + Never	Count	10	51	61
		Expected Count	18.4	42.6	61.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	16.4%	83.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level	40.0%	87.9%	73.5%
		Std. Residual	-2.0	1.3	
Total	Count		25	58	83
	Expected Count		25.0	58.0	83.0
	% within Recode2_Issue: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT		30.1%	69.9%	100.0%
	% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-286

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.603 ^a	1	.00000565	.00001548	.00001548
Continuity Correction ^b	18.216	1	.00001972		
Likelihood Ratio	19.622	1	.00000944		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	20.355	1	.00000643		
N of Valid Cases	83				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.63.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-287

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.498	.000
	Cramer's V	.498	.000
N of Valid Cases		83	

12- Hypothesis 2.2.12 Issue: Early contract renegotiation and termination

H1.2.12 There is a relationship between CMMI for Acquisition maturity level achieved and the frequency of early contract renegotiation and termination.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *early contract renegotiation and termination* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 34.251 from Table A-H-289 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *early contract renegotiation and termination*. The analysis shows that firms achieved higher maturity levels in CMMI-ACQ reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-288 shows that 16 companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-ACQ reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (5.7). Additionally, 9 of the companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-ACQ reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (19.3).

Cramer’s V=0.642 indicates a strong association between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *early contract renegotiation and termination* as shown in Table A-H-290.

Table A-H-288

Crosstab					
			Recode2 CMMI-ACQ MLI		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + MLI 2	Maturity Level 3 + ML4 + ML 5	
Recode2_Issue12: EARLY CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION AND TERMINATION	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	16	3	19
		Expected Count	5.7	13.3	19.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: EARLY CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION AND TERMINATION	84.2%	15.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ ML	64.0%	5.2%	22.9%
		Std. Residual	4.3	-2.8	
	Rarely + Never	Count	9	55	64
		Expected Count	19.3	44.7	64.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: EARLY CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION AND TERMINATION	14.1%	85.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ ML	36.0%	94.8%	77.1%
		Std. Residual	-2.3	1.5	
Total		Count	25	58	83
		Expected Count	25.0	58.0	83.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: EARLY CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION AND TERMINATION	30.1%	69.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ ML	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-289

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	34.251 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	30.999	1	.00000003		
Likelihood Ratio	33.018	1	.00000001		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000003	.00000003
Linear-by-Linear Association	33.838	1	.00000001		
N of Valid Cases	83				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.72.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-290

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.642	.000
	Cramer's V	.642	.000
N of Valid Cases		83	

13- Hypothesis 2.2.13 Issue: Difference in project management practices between your company and the supplier

H2.2.13 There is a relationship between CMMI for Acquisition maturity level achieved and the frequency of difference in project management practices between your company and the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *difference in project management practices between your company and the supplier* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 18.620 from Table A-H-292 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0. 00001595.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *difference in project management practices between your company and the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms achieved higher maturity levels in CMMI-ACQ reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-291 shows that 15 companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-ACQ reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (6.9). Moreover, 10 of the companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-ACQ reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (18.1).

Cramer’s V=0.474 indicates a relatively strong association between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *difference in project management practices between your company and the supplier* as shown in Table A-H-293.

Table A-H-291

Crosstab					
			Recode2 CMMI-ACQ ML		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + Maturity Level 2	Maturity Level 3 + ML4 + ML5	
Recode2_Issue13: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	15	8	23
		Expected Count	6.9	16.1	23.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	65.2%	34.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level	60.0%	13.8%	27.7%
		Std. Residual	3.1	-2.0	
		Count	10	50	60

	Rarely + Never	Expected Count	18.1	41.9	60.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	16.7%	83.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level	40.0%	86.2%	72.3%
		Std. Residual	-1.9	1.2	
Total		Count	25	58	83
		Expected Count	25.0	58.0	83.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	30.1%	69.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-292

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2- sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.620 ^a	1	.00001595	.00003776	.00003776
Continuity Correction ^b	16.385	1	.00005170		
Likelihood Ratio	17.785	1	.00002473		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	18.396	1	.00001795		
N of Valid Cases	83				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.93.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-293

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.474	.000
	Cramer's V	.474	.000
N of Valid Cases		83	

14- Hypothesis 2.2.14 Issue: Unable to measure the performance of the supplier

H1.2.14 There is a relationship between CMMI for Acquisition maturity level achieved and the frequency of unable to measure the performance of the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *unable to measure the performance of the supplier* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 28.349 from Table A-H-295 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.00000010.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *unable to measure the performance of the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms achieved higher maturity levels in CMMI-ACQ reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-294 shows that 21 companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-ACQ reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (8.5). 2 of the companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-ACQ reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (14.5).

Cramer's V=0.584 indicates a relatively strong association between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *unable to measure the performance of the supplier* as shown in Table A-H-296.

Table A-H-294

Crosstab						
			Recode2 CMMI-ACQ ML		Total	
			Maturity Level 1 + ML 2	Maturity Level 3 + ML4 + ML 5		
Recode2_Issue14 UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	16	5	21	
		Expected Count	6.3	14.7	21.0	
		% within Recode2_Issue: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	76.2%	23.8%	100.0 %	
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level	64.0%	8.6%	25.3%	
		Std. Residual	3.8	-2.5		
	Rarely + Never	Count	9	53	62	
		Expected Count	18.7	43.3	62.0	
		% within Recode2_Issue: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	14.5%	85.5%	100.0 %	
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level	36.0%	91.4%	74.7%	
		Std. Residual	-2.2	1.5		
Total			Count	25	58	83
			Expected Count	25.0	58.0	83.0
			% within Recode2_Issue: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	30.1%	69.9%	100.0 %
			% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level	100.0%	100.0%	100.0 %

Table A-H-295

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	28.349 ^a	1	.00000010		
Continuity Correction ^b	25.494	1	.00000044		
Likelihood Ratio	27.156	1	.00000019		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000040	.00000040
Linear-by-Linear Association	28.007	1	.00000012		
N of Valid Cases	83				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.33.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-296

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.584	.000
	Cramer's V	.584	.000
N of Valid Cases		83	

15- Hypothesis 2.2.15 Issue: Supplier technical/security and political issues

H2.2.15 There is a relationship between CMMI for Acquisition maturity level achieved and the frequency of supplier technical/security and political issues.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of over expenditure for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 2.486 from Table A-H-298 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=0.115$.

Table A-H-297

Crosstab					
			Recode2 CMMI-ACQ ML		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + MLI 2	Maturity Level 3 + ML 4 + ML 5	
Reoce2_Issue15: SUPPLIER TECHNICAL/SECURITY /POLITICAL ISSUES	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	18	31	49
		Expected Count	14.8	34.2	49.0
		% within Reoce2_Issue: SUPPLIER TECHNICAL/SECURITY /POLITICAL ISSUES	36.7%	63.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ MLI	72.0%	53.4%	59.0%
		Std. Residual	.8	-.6	
	Rarely + Never	Count	7	27	34
		Expected Count	10.2	23.8	34.0
		% within Reoce2_Issue: SUPPLIER TECHNICAL/SECURITY /POLITICAL ISSUES	20.6%	79.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ ML	28.0%	46.6%	41.0%
		Std. Residual	-1.0	.7	
Total	Count		25	58	83
	Expected Count		25.0	58.0	83.0
	% within Reoce2_Issue: SUPPLIER TECHNICAL/SECURITY /POLITICAL ISSUES		30.1%	69.9%	100.0%
	% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ MLI		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-298

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.486 ^a	1	.115		
Continuity Correction ^b	1.778	1	.182		
Likelihood Ratio	2.560	1	.110		
Fisher's Exact Test				.147	.090
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.456	1	.117		
N of Valid Cases	83				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.24.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-299

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.173	.115
	Cramer's V	.173	.115
N of Valid Cases		83	

16- Hypothesis 2.2.16 Issue: Insufficient previous experience of the supplier

H1.2.16 There is a relationship between CMMI for Acquisition maturity level achieved and the frequency of insufficient previous experience of the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *insufficient previous experience of the supplier* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 31.146 from Table A-H-300 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and $p=0.00000002$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *insufficient previous experience of the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms achieved higher maturity levels in CMMI-ACQ reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-301 shows that 16 companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-ACQ reported “Always + Almost Always + Occasionally” for this issue while the expected count was (6.0). Moreover, 9 of the companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-ACQ reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (19).

Cramer’s $V=0.613$ indicates a strong association between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *insufficient previous experience of the supplier* as shown in Table A-H-302.

Table A-H-300

Crosstab					
			Recode2 CMMI-ACQ ML		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + ML 2	Maturity Level 3 + ML 4 + ML5	
Recode2_Issue16 : INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	16	4	20
		Expected Count	6.0	14.0	20.0
		% within Recode2_Issue:INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ ML	64.0%	6.9%	24.1%
		Std. Residual	4.1	-2.7	
	Rarely + Never	Count	9	54	63
		Expected Count	19.0	44.0	63.0
		% within Recode2_Issue:INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER	14.3%	85.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ ML	36.0%	93.1%	75.9%
		Std. Residual	-2.3	1.5	
Total			Count	25	83
			Expected Count	25.0	83.0
			% within Recode2_Issue: INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER	30.1%	69.9%
			% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ ML	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-301

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	31.146 ^a	1	.00000002		
Continuity Correction ^b	28.102	1	.00000012		
Likelihood Ratio	29.882	1	.00000005		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000011	.00000011

Linear-by-Linear Association	30.771	1	.00000003		
N of Valid Cases	83				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.02.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-302

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.613	.000
	Cramer's V	.613	.000
N of Valid Cases		83	

17- Hypothesis 2.2.17 Issue: Lack of supplier standardized working methods

H2.2.17 There is a relationship between CMMI for Acquisition maturity level achieved and the frequency of lack of supplier standardized working methods.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *lack of supplier standardized working methods* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 34.512 from Table A-H-304 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p=0.000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *lack of supplier standardized working methods*. The analysis shows that firms achieved higher maturity levels in CMMI-ACQ reported fewer than expected of this issue. Table A-H-303 shows that 17 companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-ACQ reported “Always + Almost Always” for this issue while the expected count was (6.3). Moreover, 8 of the companies that achieved maturity levels 1 or 2 in CMMI-ACQ reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing this issue while the expected count for this category was (18.7).

Cramer’s V=0.645 indicates a strong association between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the issue of *lack of supplier standardized working methods* as shown in Table A-H-305.

Table A-H-303

Crosstab					
			Recode2 CMMI-ACQ ML		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + ML2	Maturity Level 3 + ML4 + ML5	
Recode2_Issue17: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING METHODS	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	17	4	21
		Expected Count	6.3	14.7	21.0
		% within Recode2_Issue17: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING METHODS	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ ML	68.0%	6.9%	25.3%
		Std. Residual	4.2	-2.8	
	Rarely + Never	Count	8	54	62
		Expected Count	18.7	43.3	62.0
		% within Recode2_Issue17: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING METHODS	12.9%	87.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ ML	32.0%	93.1%	74.7%
		Std. Residual	-2.5	1.6	
Total		Count	25	58	83

	Expected Count	25.0	58.0	83.0
	% within Recode2_Issue17: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING METHODS	30.1%	69.9%	100.0%
	% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ ML	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-304

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	34.512 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	31.354	1	.00000002		
Likelihood Ratio	33.439	1	.00000001		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000002	.00000002
Linear-by-Linear Association	34.096	1	.00000001		
N of Valid Cases	83				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.33.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-305

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.645	.000
	Cramer's V	.645	.000
N of Valid Cases		83	

Hypothesis 2.3: People-CMM maturity level achieved and IT offshoring issues

H2.3 There is a relationship between People CMM maturity level achieved and the frequency of issues experienced.

This hypothesis tests the relationship between CMMI for Acquisition maturity level achieved and the frequency of 17 issues.

1 -Hypothesis 2.3.1 Issue 1: Over Expenditure due to hidden costs

H2.3.1 There is a relationship between People CMM maturity level achieved and the frequency of over expenditure due to hidden costs issue experienced.

This section investigates the relationship between People CMM maturity level achieved and over expenditure issue experienced.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between People-CMM maturity level achieved and the issue of over expenditure for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 1.178 from Table A-H-307 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.278.

Table A-H-306

Crosstab					
			Recode2_People-CMM ML		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + ML2	Maturity Level 3 + ML4 + ML5	
Recode2_Issue1 : OVER EXPENDITURE	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	7	11	18
		Expected Count	5.5	12.5	18.0
		% within Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE	38.9%	61.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People-CMM ML	63.6%	44.0%	50.0%
		Std. Residual	.6	-.4	
	Rarely + Never	Count	4	14	18
		Expected Count	5.5	12.5	18.0
		% within Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE	22.2%	77.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People-CMM ML	36.4%	56.0%	50.0%
		Std. Residual	-.6	.4	
Total	Count		11	25	36
	Expected Count		11.0	25.0	36.0
	% within Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE		30.6%	69.4%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_People-CMM ML		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-307

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.178 ^a	1	.278		
Continuity Correction ^b	.524	1	.469		
Likelihood Ratio	1.190	1	.275		
Fisher's Exact Test				.471	.235
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.145	1	.285		
N of Valid Cases	36				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.50.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-308

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.181	.278
	Cramer's V	.181	.278
N of Valid Cases		36	

2 - Hypothesis 2.3.2 Issue: Poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier

H2.3.2 There is a relationship between People CMM maturity level and the frequency of poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between People-CMM maturity level achieved and the issue of *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 1.634 from Table A-H-310 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.201.

Because 1 cell (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.28. Additional data might change the results.

Table A-H-309

Crosstab						
			Recode2_People-CMM ML		Total	
			Maturity Level 1 + Maturity Level 2	Maturity Level 3 + Maturity Level 4 + Maturity Level 5		
Recode2_Issue2: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	6	8	14	
		Expected Count	4.3	9.7	14.0	
		% within Recode2_Issue: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%	
		% within Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level	54.5%	32.0%	38.9%	
		Std. Residual	.8	-.6		
	Rarely + Never	Count	5	17	22	
		Expected Count	6.7	15.3	22.0	
		% within Recode2_Issue: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING	22.7%	77.3%	100.0%	
		% within Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level	45.5%	68.0%	61.1%	
		Std. Residual	-.7	.4		
Total			Count	11	25	36
			Expected Count	11.0	25.0	36.0
			% within Recode2_Issue: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING	30.6%	69.4%	100.0%
			% within Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-310

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.634 ^a	1	.201		
Continuity Correction ^b	.823	1	.364		
Likelihood Ratio	1.612	1	.204		
Fisher's Exact Test				.273	.182
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.588	1	.208		
N of Valid Cases	36				

a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.28.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-311

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.213	.201
	Cramer's V	.213	.201
N of Valid Cases		36	

3 - Hypothesis 2.3.3 Issues: Difference in interpretation of project requirements between Client company and the supplier

H1.3.3: There is a relationship between People CMM maturity level achieved and the issue of difference in interpretation of project requirements between client company and the supplier.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between People-CMM maturity level achieved and the issue of difference in interpretation of project requirements between client company and the supplier for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 4.296 from Table A-H-313 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.038$.

Because 1 cell (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.36. Additional data might change the results.

Table A-H-312

Crosstab						
			Recode2_People-CMM		Total	
			Maturity Level 1 + Maturity Level 2	Maturity Level 3 + Maturity Level 4 + Maturity Level 5		
Recode2_Issue3: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	6	5	11	
		Expected Count	3.4	7.6	11.0	
		% within Recode2_Issue: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	54.5%	45.5%	100.0%	
		% within Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level	54.5%	20.0%	30.6%	
		Std. Residual	1.4	-1.0		
	Rarely + Never	Count	5	20	25	
		Expected Count	7.6	17.4	25.0	
		% within Recode2_Issue: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%	
		% within Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level	45.5%	80.0%	69.4%	
		Std. Residual	-1.0	.6		
Total			Count	11	25	36
			Expected Count	11.0	25.0	36.0
			% within Recode2_Issue: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	30.6%	69.4%	100.0%
			% within Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-313

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.296 ^a	1	.038		
Continuity Correction ^b	2.822	1	.093		
Likelihood Ratio	4.138	1	.042		
Fisher's Exact Test				.056	.048
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.177	1	.041		
N of Valid Cases	36				

a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.36.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-314

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.345	.038
	Cramer's V	.345	.038
N of Valid Cases		36	

4 - Hypothesis 2.3.4 Issue: Poorly developed and documented requirements by the client company

H1.3.4: There is a relationship between People CMM maturity level achieved and the issue of poorly developed and documented requirements by the client company.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between People-CMM maturity level achieved and the issue of *poorly developed and documented requirements by the client company* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 4.296 from Table A-H-206 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=0.038$.

Because 1 cell (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.36. Additional data might change the results.

Table A-H-315

Crosstab					
			Recode2_People-CMM		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + MLI 2	Maturity Level 3 + ML4 + ML5	
Recode2_Issue4: POORLY DEVELOPED AND DOCUMENTED REQUIREMENTS	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	6	5	11
		Expected Count	3.4	7.6	11.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: POORLY DEVELOPED AND DOCUMENTED REQUIREMENTS	54.5%	45.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level	54.5%	20.0%	30.6%
		Std. Residual	1.4	-1.0	
	Rarely + Never	Count	5	20	25
		Expected Count	7.6	17.4	25.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: POORLY DEVELOPED AND DOCUMENTED REQUIREMENTS	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level	45.5%	80.0%	69.4%
		Std. Residual	-1.0	.6	
Total			Count	11	25
			Expected Count	11.0	25.0
			% within Recode2_Issue: POORLY DEVELOPED AND DOCUMENTED REQUIREMENTS	30.6%	69.4%
			% within Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-316

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.296 ^a	1	.038		
Continuity Correction ^b	2.822	1	.093		
Likelihood Ratio	4.138	1	.042		
Fisher's Exact Test				.056	.048
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.177	1	.041		
N of Valid Cases	36				

a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.36.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-317

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.345	.038
	Cramer's V	.345	.038
N of Valid Cases		36	

5- Hypothesis 2.3.5 Issue: Poor tracking and managing requirement changes by the client company

H1.3.5: There is a relationship between People CMM maturity level achieved and the issue of poor tracking and managing requirement changes by the client company.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between People-CMM maturity level achieved and the issue of *poor tracking and managing requirement changes by the client company* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 5.657 from Table A-H-319 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.017.

Because 1 cell (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.06. Additional data might change the results.

Table A-H-318

Crosstab					
			Recode2_People-CMM		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + Maturity Level 2	Maturity Level 3 + Maturity Level 4 + Maturity Level 5	
Recode2_Issue5: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	6	4	10
		Expected Count	3.1	6.9	10.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level	54.5%	16.0%	27.8%
		Std. Residual	1.7	-1.1	
	Rarely + Never	Count	5	21	26
		Expected Count	7.9	18.1	26.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES	19.2%	80.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level	45.5%	84.0%	72.2%
		Std. Residual	-1.0	.7	
Total		Count	11	25	36
		Expected Count	11.0	25.0	36.0

	% within Recode2_Issue: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES	30.6%	69.4%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-319

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.657 ^a	1	.017		
Continuity Correction ^b	3.899	1	.048		
Likelihood Ratio	5.399	1	.020		
Fisher's Exact Test				.039	.026
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.500	1	.019		
N of Valid Cases	36				

a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.06.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-320

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.396	.017
	Cramer's V	.396	.017
N of Valid Cases		36	

6- Hypothesis 2.3.6 Issue: Lack of a full communication plan between the client company and the supplier company

H1.3.6: There is a relationship between adopting People CMM for Acquisition and the frequency of lack of a full communication plan between the client company and the supplier company.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between People-CMM maturity level achieved and the issue of *lack of a full communication plan between the client company and the supplier company* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 2.372 from Table A-H-322 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=0.123$.

Because 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.53. Additional data might change the results.

Table A-H-321

Crosstab					
			Recode2_People-CMM ML		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + ML2	Maturity Level3 + ML4 + MLI 5	
Recode2_Issue6: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	3	2	5
		Expected Count	1.5	3.5	5.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People ML	27.3%	8.0%	13.9%
		Std. Residual	1.2	-.8	
	Rarely + Never	Count	8	23	31
		Expected Count	9.5	21.5	31.0
		% within Recode2_Issue5: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN	25.8%	74.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People ML	72.7%	92.0%	86.1%

		Std. Residual	-.5	.3	
Total		Count	11	25	36
		Expected Count	11.0	25.0	36.0
		% within Recode2_Issue5: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN	30.6%	69.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People ML	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-322

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.372 ^a	1	.123		
Continuity Correction ^b	1.035	1	.309		
Likelihood Ratio	2.182	1	.140		
Fisher's Exact Test				.154	.154
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.307	1	.129		
N of Valid Cases	36				

a. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.53.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-323

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.257	.123
	Cramer's V	.257	.123
N of Valid Cases		36	

7- Hypothesis 2.3.7 Issue: Communication and coordination problems between the client company and the supplier company

H1.3.7 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Acquisition and the frequency of communication and coordination problems between the client company and the supplier company.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between People-CMM maturity level achieved and the issue of *communication and coordination problems between the client company and the supplier company* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 3.535 from Table A-H-325 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.060.

Because 1 cell (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.75. Additional data might change the results.

Table A-H-324

Crosstab					
		Recode2_People-CMM ML		Total	
		Maturity Level 1 + Maturity Level 2	Maturity Level 3 + Maturity Level 4 + Maturity Level 5		
Recode2_Issue7: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	5	4	9
		Expected Count	2.8	6.3	9.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS	55.6%	44.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level	45.5%	16.0%	25.0%
		Std. Residual	1.4	-.9	
		Count	6	21	27

	Rarely + Never	Expected Count	8.3	18.8	27.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS	22.2%	77.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People- CMM Maturity level	54.5%	84.0%	75.0%
		Std. Residual	-.8	.5	
Total		Count	11	25	36
		Expected Count	11.0	25.0	36.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS	30.6%	69.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People- CMM Maturity level	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-325

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1- sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.535 ^a	1	.060		
Continuity Correction ^b	2.138	1	.144		
Likelihood Ratio	3.346	1	.067		
Fisher's Exact Test				.096	.074
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.436	1	.064		
N of Valid Cases	36				

a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.75.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-326

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.313	.060
	Cramer's V	.313	.060
N of Valid Cases		36	

8- Hypothesis 2.3.8 Issue: Language barriers between the client company and the supplier

H1.3.8 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Acquisition and the frequency of language barriers between the client company and the supplier.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between People-CMM maturity level achieved and the issue of *language barriers* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 0.655 from Table A-H-328 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=0.418$.

Because 1 cell (25.0%) that have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.89. Thus, additional data might change the results.

Table A-H-327

Crosstab					
			Recode2_People-CMM		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + ML2	Maturity Level 3 + ML4 + ML5	
	Always + Almost	Count	6	10	16
		Expected Count	4.9	11.1	16.0

Recode2_Issue8: LANGUAGE BARRIERS	Always + Occasionally	% within Recode2_Issue: LANGUAGE BARRIERS	37.5%	62.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People- CMM Maturity level	54.5%	40.0%	44.4%
		Std. Residual	.5	-.3	
	Rarely + Never	Count	5	15	20
		Expected Count	6.1	13.9	20.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: LANGUAGE BARRIERS	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People- CMM Maturity level	45.5%	60.0%	55.6%
		Std. Residual	-.4	.3	
Total	Count		11	25	36
	Expected Count		11.0	25.0	36.0
	% within Recode2_Issue: LANGUAGE BARRIERS		30.6%	69.4%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_People-ML		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-328

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1- sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.655 ^a	1	.418		
Continuity Correction ^b	.198	1	.656		
Likelihood Ratio	.652	1	.419		
Fisher's Exact Test				.483	.327
Linear-by-Linear Association	.636	1	.425		
N of Valid Cases	36				

a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.89.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-329

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.135	.418
	Cramer's V	.135	.418
N of Valid Cases		36	

9- Hypothesis 2.3.9 Issue: Time-zone differences between the client company and the supplier

H1.3.9 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Acquisition and the frequency of time-zone differences between the client company and the supplier.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between People-CMM maturity level achieved and the issue of *time-zone differences* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 1.084 from Table A-H-331 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.298.

Because 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.14. Thus, additional data might change the results.

Table A-H-330

Crosstab					
		Recode2_People-CMM ML		Total	
		Maturity Level 1 + Maturity Level 2	Maturity Level 3 + Maturity Level 4 + Maturity Level 5		
	Always + Almost	Count	10	19	29
		Expected Count	8.9	20.1	29.0

Recode2_Issue9: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES	Always + Occasionally	% within Recode2_Issue: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES	34.5%	65.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People- CMM Maturity level	90.9%	76.0%	80.6%
		Std. Residual	.4	-.3	
	Rarely + Never	Count	1	6	7
		Expected Count	2.1	4.9	7.0
		% within Recode2_Issue8: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES	14.3%	85.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People- CMM Maturity level	9.1%	24.0%	19.4%
		Std. Residual	-.8	.5	
Total			Count	11	25
			Expected Count	11.0	25.0
			% within Recode2_Issue8: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES	30.6%	69.4%
			% within Recode2_People- CMM Maturity level	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-331

hi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.084 ^a	1	.298		
Continuity Correction ^b	.341	1	.559		
Likelihood Ratio	1.211	1	.271		
Fisher's Exact Test				.400	.291
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.054	1	.305		
N of Valid Cases	36				

a. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.14.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-332

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.174	.298
	Cramer's V	.174	.298
N of Valid Cases		36	

10- Hypothesis 2.3.10 Issue: Cultural differences between the client company and the supplier

1.3.10 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Acquisition and the frequency of cultural differences between the client company and the supplier.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between People-CMM maturity level achieved and the issue of *language barriers* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 4.134 from Table A-H-328 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.042.

Table A-H-333

Crosstab					
			Recode2_People-CMM		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + Maturity Level 2	Maturity Level 3 + Maturity Level 4 + Maturity Level 5	
Recode2_Issue10: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	8	9	17
		Expected Count	5.2	11.8	17.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	47.1%	52.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level	72.7%	36.0%	47.2%
		Std. Residual	1.2	-.8	
	Rarely + Never	Count	3	16	19
		Expected Count	5.8	13.2	19.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	15.8%	84.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level	27.3%	64.0%	52.8%
		Std. Residual	-1.2	.8	
Total		Count	11	25	36
		Expected Count	11.0	25.0	36.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	30.6%	69.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-334

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.134 ^a	1	.042		
Continuity Correction ^b	2.792	1	.095		
Likelihood Ratio	4.234	1	.040		
Fisher's Exact Test				.070	.047
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.020	1	.045		
N of Valid Cases	36				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.19.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-335

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.339	.042
	Cramer's V	.339	.042
N of Valid Cases		36	

11- Hypothesis 2.3.11 Issue: Incomplete and unclear contract

H1.3.11 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Acquisition and the frequency of incomplete and unclear contract.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between People-CMM maturity level achieved and the issue of *incomplete and unclear contract* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 10.153 from Table A-H-337 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=0.00144105$.

Because 1 cell (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.06. Thus, additional data might change the results.

Table A-H-336

Crosstab					
			Recode2_People-CMM ML		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + Maturity Level 2	Maturity Level 3 + Maturity Level 4 + Maturity Level 5	
Recode2_Issue11: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	7	3	10
		Expected Count	3.1	6.9	10.0
		% within Recode2_Issue10: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	70.0%	30.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level	63.6%	12.0%	27.8%
		Std. Residual	2.3	-1.5	
	Rarely + Never	Count	4	22	26
		Expected Count	7.9	18.1	26.0
		% within Recode2_Issue10: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	15.4%	84.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level	36.4%	88.0%	72.2%
		Std. Residual	-1.4	.9	
Total		Count	11	25	36
		Expected Count	11.0	25.0	36.0
		% within Recode2_Issue10: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	30.6%	69.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-337

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.153 ^a	1	.00144105	.00318618	.00318618
Continuity Correction ^b	7.742	1	.00539581		
Likelihood Ratio	9.774	1	.00177017		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.870	1	.00167951		
N of Valid Cases	36				

a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.06.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-338

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.531	.001
	Cramer's V	.531	.001
N of Valid Cases		36	

12- Hypothesis 2.3.12 Issue: Early contract renegotiation and termination

H1.3.12 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Acquisition and the frequency of early contract renegotiation and termination.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between People-CMM maturity level achieved and the issue of *early contract renegotiation and termination* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 10.153 from Table A-H-340 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=0.00144105$.

Because 1 cell (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.89. Thus, additional data might change the results.

Table A-H-339

Crosstab					
			Recode2_People-CMM		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + Maturity Level 2	Maturity Level 3 + Maturity Level 4 + Maturity Level 5	
Recode2_Issue12: EARLY CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION AND TERMINATION	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	7	3	10
		Expected Count	3.1	6.9	10.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: EARLY CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION AND TERMINATION	70.0%	30.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level	63.6%	12.0%	27.8%
		Std. Residual	2.3	-1.5	
	Rarely + Never	Count	4	22	26
		Expected Count	7.9	18.1	26.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: EARLY CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION AND TERMINATION	15.4%	84.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level	36.4%	88.0%	72.2%
		Std. Residual	-1.4	.9	
Total			Count	11	25
			Expected Count	11.0	25.0
			% within Recode2_Issue: EARLY CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION AND TERMINATION	30.6%	69.4%
			% within Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-340

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.153 ^a	1	.00144105		
Continuity Correction ^b	7.742	1	.00539581		
Likelihood Ratio	9.774	1	.00177017		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00318618	.00318618
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.870	1	.00167951		
N of Valid Cases	36				

a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.06.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-341

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.531	.001
	Cramer's V	.531	.001
N of Valid Cases		36	

13- Hypothesis 2.3.13 Issue: Difference in project management practices between your company and the supplier

H1.3.13 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Acquisition and the frequency of difference in project management practices between your company and the supplier.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between People-CMM maturity level achieved and the issue of *difference in project management practices between your company and the supplier* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 1.712 from Table A-H-343 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=0.191$.

Table A-H-342

Crosstab					
			Recode2_People-CMM		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + Maturity Level 2	Maturity Level 3 + Maturity Level 4 + Maturity Level 5	
Recode2_Issue13: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	7	10	17
		Expected Count	5.2	11.8	17.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	41.2%	58.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level	63.6%	40.0%	47.2%
		Std. Residual	.8	-.5	
	Rarely + Never	Count	4	15	19
		Expected Count	5.8	13.2	19.0
		% within Recode2_Issue15: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	21.1%	78.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level	36.4%	60.0%	52.8%
		Std. Residual	-.7	.5	
Total			Count	11	25
			Expected Count	11.0	25.0
			% within Recode2_Issue15: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	30.6%	69.4%
			% within Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-343

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.712 ^a	1	.191		
Continuity Correction ^b	.895	1	.344		
Likelihood Ratio	1.724	1	.189		
Fisher's Exact Test				.281	.172
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.665	1	.197		

N of Valid Cases	36				
------------------	----	--	--	--	--

- a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.19.
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-344

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.218	.191
	Cramer's V	.218	.191
N of Valid Cases		36	

14- Hypothesis 2.3.14 Issue: Unable to measure the performance of the supplier

H1.3.14 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Acquisition and the frequency of unable to measure the performance of the supplier.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between People-CMM maturity level achieved and the issue of *unable to measure the performance of the supplier* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 5.132 from Table A-H-346 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.023.

Because 1 cell (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.89. Thus, additional data might change the results.

Table A-H-345

Crosstab						
			Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level		Total	
			Maturity Level 1 + Maturity Level 2	Maturity Level 3 + Maturity Level 4 + Maturity Level 5		
Recode2_Issue14: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	8	8	16	
		Expected Count	4.9	11.1	16.0	
		% within Recode2_Issue: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	
		% within Recode2_People-CMM	72.7%	32.0%	44.4%	
		Std. Residual	1.4	-.9		
	Rarely + Never	Count	3	17	20	
		Expected Count	6.1	13.9	20.0	
		% within Recode2_Issue: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	15.0%	85.0%	100.0%	
		% within Recode2_People-CMM	27.3%	68.0%	55.6%	
		Std. Residual	-1.3	.8		
Total			Count	11	25	36
			Expected Count	11.0	25.0	36.0
			% within Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	30.6%	69.4%	100.0%
			% within Recode2_People-CMM	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-346

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.132 ^a	1	.023		
Continuity Correction ^b	3.615	1	.057		
Likelihood Ratio	5.227	1	.022		
Fisher's Exact Test				.034	.028
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.989	1	.026		
N of Valid Cases	36				

a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.89.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-347

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.378	.023
	Cramer's V	.378	.023
N of Valid Cases		36	

15- Hypothesis 2.3.15 Issue: Supplier technical/security and political issues

H1.3.15 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Acquisition and the frequency of supplier technical/security and political issues.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between People-CMM maturity level achieved and the issue of *supplier technical/security and political issues* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 3.594 from Table A-H-349 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.058.

Because 1 cell (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.58. Thus, additional data might change the results.

Table A-H-348

Crosstab					
		Recode2_People-CMM		Total	
		Maturity Level 1 + Maturity Level 2	Maturity Level 3 + Maturity Level 4 + Maturity Level 5		
Reoce2_Issue15: SUPPLIER TECHNICAL/SECURITY /POLITICAL ISSUES	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	9	12	21
		Expected Count	6.4	14.6	21.0
		% within Reoce2_Issue: SUPPLIER TECHNICAL /SECURITY /POLITICAL ISSUES	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level	81.8%	48.0%	58.3%
		Std. Residual	1.0	-.7	
		Count	2	13	15

	Rarely + Never	Expected Count	4.6	10.4	15.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: SUPPLIER TECHNICAL SECURITY /POLITICAL ISSUES	13.3%	86.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level	18.2%	52.0%	41.7%
		Std. Residual	-1.2	.8	
Total		Count	11	25	36
		Expected Count	11.0	25.0	36.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: SUPPLIER TECHNICAL /SECURITY /POLITICAL ISSUES	30.6%	69.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-349

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2- sided)	Exact Sig. (1- sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.594 ^a	1	.058		
Continuity Correction ^b	2.338	1	.126		
Likelihood Ratio	3.854	1	.050		
Fisher's Exact Test				.077	.061
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.495	1	.062		
N of Valid Cases	36				

a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.58.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-350

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.316	.058
	Cramer's V	.316	.058
N of Valid Cases		36	

16- Hypothesis 2.3.16 Issue: Insufficient previous experience of the supplier

H1.3.16 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Acquisition and the frequency of insufficient previous experience of the supplier.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between People-CMM maturity level achieved and the issue of *insufficient previous experience of the supplier* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 5.202 from Table A-H-352 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.023.

Because 1 cell (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.97. Thus, additional data might change the results.

Table A-H-351

Crosstab					
			Recode2_People-CMM		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + Maturity Level 2	Maturity Level 3 + Maturity Level 4 + Maturity Level 5	
Recode2_Issue16: INSUFFICIENT	Always + Almost	Count	7	6	13
		Expected Count	4.0	9.0	13.0

PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER	Always + Occasionally	% within Recode2_Issue: INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER	53.8%	46.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People- CMM Maturity level	63.6%	24.0%	36.1%
		Std. Residual	1.5	-1.0	
	Rarely + Never	Count	4	19	23
		Expected Count	7.0	16.0	23.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER	17.4%	82.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People- CMM Maturity level	36.4%	76.0%	63.9%
		Std. Residual	-1.1	.8	
Total			Count	11	25
			Expected Count	11.0	25.0
			% within Recode2_Issue: INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER	30.6%	69.4%
			% within Recode2_People- CMM Maturity level	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-352

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1- sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.202 ^a	1	.023		
Continuity Correction ^b	3.626	1	.057		
Likelihood Ratio	5.117	1	.024		
Fisher's Exact Test				.056	.029
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.057	1	.025		
N of Valid Cases	36				

a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.97.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-353

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.380	.023
	Cramer's V	.380	.023
N of Valid Cases		36	

17- Hypothesis 2.3.17 Issue: Lack of supplier standardized working methods

H1.3.17 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for Acquisition and the frequency of lack of supplier standardized working methods.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between People-CMM maturity level achieved and the issue of *lack of supplier standardized working methods* for offshored IT projects. The value of chi-square test is 3.207 from Table A-H-355 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =0.073.

Because 1 cell (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.67. Thus, additional data might change the results.

Table A-H-354

Crosstab					
			Recode2_People-CMM		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + Maturity Level 2	Maturity Level 3 + Maturity Level 4 + Maturity Level 5	
Recode2_Issue17: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING METHODS	Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Count	6	6	12
		Expected Count	3.7	8.3	12.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING METHODS	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People-ML	54.5%	24.0%	33.3%
		Std. Residual	1.2	-.8	
	Rarely + Never	Count	5	19	24
		Expected Count	7.3	16.7	24.0
		% within Recode2_Issue: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING METHODS	20.8%	79.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People-ML	45.5%	76.0%	66.7%
		Std. Residual	-.9	.6	
Total			Count	11	25
			Expected Count	11.0	25.0
			% within Recode2_Issue: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING METHODS	30.6%	69.4%
			% within Recode2_People-ML	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-355

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.207 ^a	1	.073		
Continuity Correction ^b	1.980	1	.159		
Likelihood Ratio	3.117	1	.077		
Fisher's Exact Test				.124	.081
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.118	1	.077		
N of Valid Cases	36				

a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.67.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-356

Symmetric Measures			Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi		.298	.073
	Cramer's V		.298	.073
N of Valid Cases			36	

Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 tests the relationship between 64 CMM/CMMI practices and the IT offshoring issues experienced by the client companies.

Bonferroni's correction was used when multiple comparisons were drawn from a single sample.

Hypothesis tests the 17 issues 4 times with 4 industrial standards. Bonferroni correction (adjusted) p-value= 0.05/(64) = P = 0.00078125

Hypothesis 3 tests the following relationships:

- H3.1:** *There is a relationship between PR1 to PR6 practices and frequency of R1 issue experienced by client firms.*
- H3.2:** *There is a relationship between PR7 to PR9 practices and frequency of R2 Issue experienced by client firms.*
- H3.3:** *There is a relationship between PR10, and PR11 practices and frequency of R3 issue experienced by client firms.*
- H3.4:** *There is a relationship between PR12 to PR14 practices and frequency of R4 issue experienced by client firms.*
- H3.5:** *There is a relationship between PR15 to PR19 practices and frequency of R5 issue experienced by client firms.*
- H3.6:** *There is a relationship between PR20 to PR23 practices and frequency of R6 issue experienced by client firms.*
- H3.7:** *There is a relationship between PR24 to PR29 practices and frequency of R7 issue experienced by client firms.*
- H3.8:** *There is a relationship between PR24 to PR29 practices and frequency of R8 issue experienced by client firms.*
- H3.9:** *There is a relationship between PR24 to PR29 practices and frequency of R9 issue experienced by client firms.*
- H3.10:** *There is a relationship between PR30, to PR34 practices and frequency of R10 issue experienced by client firms.*
- H3.11:** *There is a relationship between PR35 and PR36 practices and frequency of R11 issue experienced by client firms.*
- H3.12:** *There is a relationship between PR31, PR37, PR38, PR39 and PR40 practices and frequency of R12 issue experienced by client firms.*
- H3.13:** *There is a relationship between PR41 to PR49 practices and frequency of R13 issue experienced by client firms.*
- H3.14:** *There is a relationship between PR50 to PR52 practices and frequency of R14 Issue experienced by client firms.*
- H3.15:** *There is a relationship between PR31, PR38, PR39 practices and frequency of R15 issue experienced by client firms.*
- H3.16:** *There is a relationship between PR31, PR37, PR39, PR53 practices and frequency of R16 issue experienced by client firms.*
- H3.17:** *There is a relationship between PR54 to PR58 practices and frequency of R5 issue experienced by client firms.*

Hypothesis 3.1: There is a relationship between PR1 to PR6 practices and frequency of R1: Over Expenditure issue experienced by client firms.

Issue 1	OVER EXPENDITURE.
#	CMM/CMMI Practices
PR1	Client Company establishes and maintains a project plan as the basis for managing the project
PR2	Client Company establishes and maintains the overall project plan.

PR3	Client Company estimates the project's effort and cost for work products and tasks based on estimation rationale
PR4	Client Company establishes and maintains the project's budget and schedule, milestones, constraints, dependencies
PR5	Client Company monitors off-shoring supplier project progress and performance (effort, and cost) as defined in the contract
PR6	Client Company manages invoices submitted by the supplier

1 – Testing Hypothesis 3.1.1: Relationship between PR1: Client Company establishes and maintains a project plan as the basis for managing the project and Issue 1: Over Expenditure

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing PR1: Client Company establishes and maintains a project plan as the basis for managing the project and Issue 1: over expenditure. The value of chi-square test is 28.337 from Table A-H-358 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000010$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing PR1: Client Company establishes and maintains a project plan as the basis for managing the project and Issue 1: Over Expenditure. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR1 reported fewer than expected *over expenditure* issue. Table A-H-357 shows that 34 companies that performed PR1 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Rarely + Never” for *over expenditure* issue while the expected count was (23). Whereas, 1 of the companies that performed PR1 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *over expenditure* issue while the expected count for this category was (12).

Cramer's $V=.611$ indicates a strong association between applying performing PR1 and over expenditure issues. Companies that routinely performed PR1 reported fewer over expenditure issue as shown in Table A-H-359.

Table A-H-357

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR1_ Establish_and_maintain_project_plan_as_basis	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	16	34	50
		Expected Count	27.0	23.0	50.0
		% within Recode2_PR1 Establish_and_maintain_project_plan_as_	32.0%	68.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE	39.0%	97.1%	65.8%
		Std. Residual	-2.1	2.3	
	Rarely + Never	Count	25	1	26
		Expected Count	14.0	12.0	26.0
		% within Recode2_PR1 Establish_and_maintain_project_plan_as_	96.2%	3.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE	61.0%	2.9%	34.2%
		Std. Residual	2.9	-3.2	
Total		Count	41	35	76
		Expected Count	41.0	35.0	76.0
		% within Recode2_PR1 Establish_and_maintain_project_plan_as_	53.9%	46.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-358

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	28.337 ^a	1	.00000010		
Continuity Correction ^b	25.813	1	.00000038		
Likelihood Ratio	33.720	1	.00000001		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000003	.00000002
Linear-by-Linear Association	27.964	1	.00000012		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.97.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-359

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.611	.000
	Cramer's V	.611	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

2 – Resting Hypothesis 3.1.2 Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR2: Establishes and maintains the overall project plan and Issue 1: Over Expenditure

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing PR2: Establishes and maintains the overall project plan and Issue 1: over expenditure. The value of chi-square test is 36.408 from Table A-H-361 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000000$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing PR2: Establishes and maintains the overall project plan and Issue 1: Over Expenditure. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR2 reported fewer than expected *over expenditure* issue. Table A-H-360 shows that 1 company that performed PR2 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *over expenditure* issue while the expected count was (13.8). Whereas, 29 of the companies that performed PR2 “Rarely + Never” reported “Always + Almost Always” for experiencing *over expenditure* issue while the expected count for this category was (16.2).

Cramer's $V=.692$ indicates a strong association between applying performing PR2 and over expenditure issues. Companies that routinely performed PR2 reported fewer over expenditure issue as shown in Table A-H-362.

Table A-H-360

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recde2_PR2 Establishes and maintains overall project plan	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	12	34	46
		Expected Count	24.8	21.2	46.0
		% within Recde2_PR2 Establishes and maintains overall project plan	26.1%	73.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE	29.3%	97.1%	60.5%
		Std. Residual	-2.6	2.8	
	Rarely + Never	Count	29	1	30
		Expected Count	16.2	13.8	30.0

		% within Recde2_PR2 Establishes_and_maintains overall_project_plan	96.7%	3.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE	70.7%	2.9%	39.5%
		Std. Residual	3.2	-3.4	
Total		Count	41	35	76
		Expected Count	41.0	35.0	76.0
		% within Recde2_PR2 Establishes_and_maintains overall_project_plan	53.9%	46.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-361

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	36.408 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	33.623	1	.00000001		
Likelihood Ratio	43.311	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	35.929	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.82.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-362

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.692	.000
	Cramer's V	.692	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

3 – Testing Hypothesis 3.1.3: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR3: Estimates the project's effort and cost for work products and tasks based on estimation rationale and Issue 1 of Over expenditure

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing PR3: Estimates the project's effort and cost for work products and tasks based on estimation rationale and Issue 1: over expenditure. The value of chi-square test is 32.203 from Table A-H-364 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000001.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing PR3: Estimates the project's effort and cost for work products and tasks based on estimation rationale and Issue 1: Over Expenditure. The analysis shows that firms that routinely practiced PR3 reported fewer than expected *over expenditure* issue. Table A-H-363 shows that 1 company that performed PR3 "Rarely + Never" reported "Rarely + Never" for *over expenditure* issue while the expected count was (12.9). Whereas, 27 of the companies that performed PR3 "Rarely + Never" reported "Always + Almost Always" for experiencing *over expenditure* issue while the expected count for this category was (15.1).

Cramer's V= .651 indicates a strong association between applying performing PR3 and over expenditure issues. Companies that routinely performed PR3 reported fewer over expenditure issue as shown in Table A-H-365.

Table A-H-363

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR3 Estimates the project effort and cost for work product	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	14	34	48
		Expected Count	25.9	22.1	48.0
		% within Recode2_PR3 Estimates the project effort and cost for work product	29.2%	70.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE	34.1%	97.1%	63.2%
		Std. Residual	-2.3	2.5	
	Rarely + Never	Count	27	1	28
		Expected Count	15.1	12.9	28.0
		% within Recode2_PR3 Estimates the project effort and cost for work product	96.4%	3.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE	65.9%	2.9%	36.8%
		Std. Residual	3.1	-3.3	
Total	Count		41	35	76
	Expected Count		41.0	35.0	76.0
	% within Recode2_PR3 Estimates the project effort and cost for workprod		53.9%	46.1%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-364

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	32.203 ^a	1	.00000001		
Continuity Correction ^b	29.553	1	.00000005		
Likelihood Ratio	38.307	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	31.779	1	.00000002		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.89.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-365

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.651	.000
	Cramer's V	.651	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

4 – Testing Hypothesis 3.1.4: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR4: Establishes and maintains the project's budget and schedule, milestones, constraints, dependencies and Issue 1: Over expenditure.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing PR4: Establishes and maintains the project's budget and schedule, milestones, constraints, dependencies and Issue 1: over expenditure. The value of chi-square test is 26.518 from Table A-H-366 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000026.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing PR4: Establishes and maintains the project's budget and schedule, milestones, constraints, dependencies and Issue 1: Over Expenditure. The analysis shows that firms that routinely practiced PR4 reported fewer than expected *over expenditure* issue. Table A-H-367 shows that 1 company that performed PR4 "Rarely + Never" reported "Rarely + Never" for *over expenditure* issue while the expected count was (11.5). Whereas, 24 of the companies that performed PR4 "Rarely + Never" reported "Always + Almost Always" for experiencing *over expenditure* issue while the expected count for this category was (13.5).

Cramer's V= .591 indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR4 and over expenditure issues. Companies that routinely performed PR4 reported fewer over expenditure issue as shown in Table A-H-368.

Table A-H-365

Crosstab						
			Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE		Total	
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never		
Recode2_PR4 Establish and maintain project budget schedule	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	17	34	51	
		Expected Count	27.5	23.5	51.0	
		% within Recode2_PR4 Establish_and_maintain project budget schedule	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%	
		% within Recode2_ Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE	41.5%	97.1%	67.1%	
		Std. Residual	-2.0	2.2		
	Rarely + Never	Count	24	1	25	
		Expected Count	13.5	11.5	25.0	
		% within Recode2_PR4 Establish_and_maintain project budget schedule	96.0%	4.0%	100.0%	
		% within Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE	58.5%	2.9%	32.9%	
		Std. Residual	2.9	-3.1		
Total			Count	41	35	76
			Expected Count	41.0	35.0	76.0
			% within Recode2_PR4 Establish_and_maintain project budget schedule	53.9%	46.1%	100.0%
			% within Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-366

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2- sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	26.518 ^a	1	.00000026	.00000008	.00000007
Continuity Correction ^b	24.056	1	.00000094		
Likelihood Ratio	31.563	1	.00000002		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	26.169	1	.00000031		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.51.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-367

Symmetric Measures		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.591	.000
	Cramer's V	.591	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

5 – Testing Hypothesis 3.1.5: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR5: Monitors offshoring supplier project progress and performance and Issue 1: Over expenditure.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing PR5: Monitors offshoring supplier project progress and performance and Issue 1: over expenditure. The value of chi-square test is 27.884 from Table A-H-369 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000013$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing PR5: Monitors offshoring supplier project progress and performance and Issue 1: Over Expenditure. The analysis shows that firms that routinely practiced PR5 reported fewer than expected *over expenditure* issue. Table A-H-368 shows that 3 company that performed PR5 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *over expenditure* issue while the expected count was (14.3). However, 28 of the companies that performed PR5 “Rarely + Never” reported “Always + Almost Always” for experiencing *over expenditure* issue while the expected count for this category was (16.7).

Cramer’s V= .606 indicates a strong association between applying performing PR5 and over expenditure issues. Companies that routinely performed PR5 reported fewer over expenditure issue as shown in Table A-H-370.

Table A-H-368

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR5 Monitors offshoring supplier project progress	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	13	32	45
		Expected Count	24.3	20.7	45.0
		% within Recode2_PR5 Monitors offshoring supplier project progress	28.9%	71.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE	31.7%	91.4%	59.2%
		Std. Residual	-2.3	2.5	
	Rarely + Never	Count	28	3	31
		Expected Count	16.7	14.3	31.0
		% within Recode2_PR5 Monitors offshoring supplier project progress	90.3%	9.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE	68.3%	8.6%	40.8%
		Std. Residual	2.8	-3.0	
Total		Count	41	35	76
		Expected Count	41.0	35.0	76.0

	% within Recode2_PR5 Monitors offshoring supplier project progress	53.9%	46.1%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-369

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	27.884 ^a	1	.00000013		
Continuity Correction ^b	25.466	1	.00000045		
Likelihood Ratio	31.068	1	.00000002		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000009	.00000006
Linear-by-Linear Association	27.517	1	.00000016		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.28.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-370

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.606	.000
	Cramer's V	.606	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

6 – Testing Hypothesis 3.1.6: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR6: Client Company manages invoices submitted by the supplier and Issue 1: Over Expenditure

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing PR6: Client Company manages invoices submitted by the supplier and Issue 1: over expenditure. The value of chi-square test is 22.284 from Table A-H-372 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and $p = .00000235$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing PR6: Client Company manages invoices submitted by the supplier and Issue 1: Over Expenditure. The analysis shows that firms that routinely practiced PR6 reported fewer than expected *over expenditure* issue. Table A-H-371 shows that 3 of the companies that performed PR6 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *over expenditure* issue while the expected count was (12.9). Whereas, 25 of the companies that performed PR6 “Rarely + Never” reported “Always + Almost Always” for experiencing *over expenditure* issue while the expected count for this category was (15.1).

Cramer’s V= .541 indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR6 and over expenditure issues. Companies that routinely performed PR6 reported fewer over expenditure issue as shown in Table A-H-373.

Table A-H-371

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR6		Count	16	32	48
Manages invoices		Expected Count	25.9	22.1	48.0

submitted by the supplier	Always + Very Frequently + occasionally	% within Recode2_PR6 Manages invoices submitted by the supplier	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE	39.0%	91.4%	63.2%
		Std. Residual	-1.9	2.1	
	Rarely + Never	Count	25	3	28
		Expected Count	15.1	12.9	28.0
		% within Recode2_PR6 Manages invoices submitted by the supplier	89.3%	10.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE	61.0%	8.6%	36.8%
		Std. Residual	2.5	-2.8	
Total			Count	41	35
			Expected Count	41.0	35.0
			% within Recode2_PR6 Manages invoices submitted by the supplier	53.9%	46.1%
			% within Recode2_Issue1: OVER EXPENDITURE	100.0%	100.0%
				100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-372

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.284 ^a	1	.00000235		
Continuity Correction ^b	20.089	1	.00000739		
Likelihood Ratio	24.711	1	.00000067		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000278	.00000143
Linear-by-Linear Association	21.991	1	.00000274		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.89.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-373

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.541	.000
	Cramer's V	.541	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

Hypothesis 3.2: There is a relationship between PR7 to PR9 practices and the issue of R2: Difference in interpretation of project requirements between the client and the supplier Issue.

Issue 2	DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS BETWEEN THE CLIENT AND THE SUPPLIER
#	CMM/CMMI Practice
PR7	Client Company develops an understanding with off-shoring supplier on the meaning of requirements
PR8	Client Company validates requirements to ensure that the resulting product performs as intended in the end user's environment
PR9	Client Company obtains commitment to requirements from project participants

1 – Testing Hypothesis 3.2.1: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR7: Client Company develops an understanding with offshoring supplier on the meaning of requirements and Issue 2: Difference in interpretation of project requirements between the client and the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing PR7: Client Company develops an understanding with offshoring supplier on the meaning of requirements and Issue 2: *Difference in interpretation of project requirements between the client and the supplier*. The value of chi-square test is 15.853 from Table A-H-375 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00006848$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing PR7: Client Company develops an understanding with offshoring supplier on the meaning of requirements and Issue 2: Difference in interpretation of project requirements between the client and the supplier. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR7 reported fewer than expected *difference in interpretation of project requirements* issue. Table A-H-374 shows that 1 of the companies that performed PR7 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *difference in interpretation of project requirements* issue while the expected count was (8.7). Whereas, 21 of the companies that performed PR7 “Rarely + Never” reported “Always + Almost Always” for *difference in interpretation of project requirements* issue while the expected count for this category was (13.3).

Cramer’s $V=.451$ indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR1 and over expenditure issues. Companies that routinely performed PR1 reported fewer *differences in interpretation of project requirements* issue as shown in Table A-H-376.

Table A-H-374

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue2: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR7 Develops an understanding with off-shoring supplier on the meaning of requirements	Always + Very Frequently + occasionally	Count	26	30	56
		Expected Count	33.7	22.3	56.0
		% within Recode2_PR7 Develops an understanding with off-shoring supplier on the meaning ofrqmnt	46.4%	53.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue2: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	55.3%	96.8%	71.8%
		Std. Residual	-1.3	1.6	
	Rarely + Never	Count	21	1	22
		Expected Count	13.3	8.7	22.0
		% within Recode2_PR7 Develops an understanding with off-shoring supplier on the meaning of rqmnt	95.5%	4.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue2: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	44.7%	3.2%	28.2%
		Std. Residual	2.1	-2.6	
Total	Count		47	31	78
	Expected Count		47.0	31.0	78.0
	% within Recode2_PR7 Develops an understanding with off-shoring supplier on the meaning of requirements		60.3%	39.7%	100.0%

	% within Recode2_Issue2: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
--	---	--------	--------	--------

Table A-H-375

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.853 ^a	1	.00006848		
Continuity Correction ^b	13.871	1	.00019575		
Likelihood Ratio	19.343	1	.00001092		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00003127	.00002851
Linear-by-Linear Association	15.649	1	.00007624		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.74.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-376

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.451	.000
	Cramer's V	.451	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

2– Testing Hypothesis 3.2.2: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR8: Client Company validates requirements to ensure that the resulting product performs as intended in the end user’s environment and Issue 2: Difference in interpretation of project requirements between the client and the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing PR8: Client Company validates requirements to ensure that the resulting product performs as intended in the end user’s environment and the issue of *difference in interpretation of project requirements between the client and the supplier*. The value of chi-square test is 21.514 from Table A-H-378 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.0000351.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing PR8: Client Company validates requirements to ensure that the resulting product performs as intended in the end user’s environment and Issue 2: *Difference in interpretation of project requirements between the client and the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR8 reported fewer than expected *difference in interpretation of project requirements* issue. Table A-H-377 shows that zero companies that performed PR8 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *difference in interpretation of project requirements* issue while the expected count was (9.1). Whereas, 23 of the companies that performed PR8 “Rarely + Never” reported “Always + Almost Always” for experiencing *difference in interpretation of project requirements* issue while the expected count for this category was (13.9).

Cramer’s V= .525 indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR8 and *difference in interpretation of project requirements* issues. Companies that routinely performed PR8 reported fewer of issue *difference in interpretation of project requirements* as shown in Table A-H-379.

Table A-H-377

Crosstab

			Recode2_Issue2: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR8 Validates requirements to ensure that the resulting product performs as intended in the end user'	Always + Very Frequently + occasionally	Count	24	31	55
		Expected Count	33.1	21.9	55.0
		% within Recode2_PR8 Validates requirements to ensure that the resulting product performs as intended in the end user'	43.6%	56.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue2: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	51.1%	100.0 %	70.5%
		Std. Residual	-1.6	2.0	
	Rarely + Never	Count	23	0	23
		Expected Count	13.9	9.1	23.0
		% within Recode2_PR8 Validates requirements to ensure that the resulting product performs as intended in the end user'	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue2: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	48.9%	0.0%	29.5%
		Std. Residual	2.5	-3.0	
Total		Count	47	31	78
		Expected Count	47.0	31.0	78.0
		% within Recode2_PR8 Validates requirements to ensure that the resulting product performs as intended in the end user'	60.3%	39.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue2: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	100.0%	100.0 %	100.0%

Table A-H-378

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2- sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	21.514 ^a	1	.00000351	.00000051	.00000047
Continuity Correction ^b	19.225	1	.00001162		
Likelihood Ratio	29.473	1	.00000006		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	21.238	1	.00000406		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.14.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-379

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.525	.000
	Cramer's V	.525	.000

3 – Testing Hypothesis 3.2.3: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR9: Client Company obtains commitment to requirements from project participants and Issue 2: Difference in interpretation of project requirements between the client and the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing PR9: Client Company obtains commitment to requirements from project participants and the issue of *difference in interpretation of project requirements between the client and the supplier*. The value of chi-square test is 15.481 from Table A-H-381 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00008334$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing PR9: Client Company obtains commitment to requirements from project participants and the issue of *difference in interpretation of project requirements between the client and the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR9 reported fewer than expected *difference in interpretation of project requirements* issue. Table A-H-380 shows that 2 companies that performed PR9 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *difference in interpretation of project requirements* issue while the expected count was (9.9). Whereas, 23 of the companies that performed PR9 “Rarely + Never” reported “Always + Almost Always” for experiencing *difference in interpretation of project requirements* issue while the expected count for this category was (15.1).

Cramer’s $V=.446$ indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR9 and over expenditure issues. Companies that routinely performed PR9 reported fewer of *difference in interpretation of project requirements* issue as shown in Table A-H-382.

Table A-H-380

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue2: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR9 Obtains commitment to requirements from project participants	Always + Very Frequently + occasionally	Count	24	29	53
		Expected Count	31.9	21.1	53.0
		% within Recode2_PR9 Obtains commitment to requirements from project participants	45.3%	54.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue2: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	51.1%	93.5%	67.9%
		Std. Residual	-1.4	1.7	
	Rarely + Never	Count	23	2	25
		Expected Count	15.1	9.9	25.0
		% within Recode2_PR9 Obtains commitment to requirements from project participants	92.0%	8.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue2: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	48.9%	6.5%	32.1%

		Std. Residual	2.0	-2.5	
Total		Count	47	31	78
		Expected Count	47.0	31.0	78.0
		% within Recode2_PR9 Obtains commitment to requirements from project participants	60.3%	39.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue2: DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETATION OF PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-381

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.481 ^a	1	.00008334		
Continuity Correction ^b	13.592	1	.00022718		
Likelihood Ratio	17.886	1	.00002346		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00005660	.00004692
Linear-by-Linear Association	15.283	1	.00009257		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.94.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-382

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.446	.000
	Cramer's V	.446	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

Hypothesis 3.3: There is a relationship between PR10, and PR11 practices and frequency of R3: Poorly Developed and Documented Requirements by the client company issue.

Issue 3	POORLY DEVELOPED AND DOCUMENTED REQUIREMENTS BY THE CLIENT COMPANY
#	CMM/CMMI
PR10	Client Company stakeholder needs, expectations, constraints and interfaces are collected and translated into customer requirements
PR11	Client Company maintains bidirectional traceability among requirements and work products

1 – Testing Hypothesis 3.3.1: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR10: Client Company stakeholder needs, expectations, constraints and interfaces are collected and translated into customer requirements and Issue 2: Poorly Developed and Documented Requirements by the client company issue experienced by client firms.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing PR10: Client Company stakeholder needs, expectations, constraints and interfaces are collected and translated into customer requirements and Issue of *poorly developed and documented requirements*. The value of chi-square test is 25.763 from Table A-H-

384 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000039$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing PR10: Client Company stakeholder needs, expectations, constraints and interfaces are collected and translated into customer requirements and Issue *poorly developed and documented requirements by the client company*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR10 reported fewer than expected *poorly developed and documented requirements* issue. Table A-H-383 shows that zero companies that performed PR10 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *poorly developed and documented requirements* issue while the expected count was (10.5). Whereas, 27 of the companies that performed PR10 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *poorly developed and documented requirements* issue while the expected count for this category was (16.5).

Cramer’s $V=.561$ indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR10 and this issues. Companies that routinely performed PR10 reported fewer *poorly developed and documented requirements* issue as shown in Table A-H-385.

Table A-H-383

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue3: POORLY DEVELOPED AND DOCUMENTED REQUIREMENTS		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
RRRecode2_PR10 Collects and translates stakeholders needs expectations into customer requirements	Always + Very Frequently + occasionally	Count	23	27	50
		Expected Count	33.5	16.5	50.0
		% within RRRecode2_PR10 Collects_and_translates_stakeho lders_needs_expectations into customer requirements	46.0%	54.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue3: POORLY DEVELOPED AND DOCUMENTED REQUIREMENTS	41.8%	100.0%	61.0%
		Std. Residual	-1.8	2.6	
	Rarely + Never	Count	32	0	32
		Expected Count	21.5	10.5	32.0
		% within RRRecode2_PR10 Collects_and_translates_stakeho lders_needs_expectations into customer requirements	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue3: POORLY DEVELOPED AND DOCUMENTED REQUIREMENTS	58.2%	0.0%	39.0%
		Std. Residual	2.3	-3.2	
Total			Count	55	27
			Expected Count	55.0	27.0
			% within RRRecode2_PR10 Collects_and_translates_stakeho lders_needs_expectations into customer requirements	67.1%	32.9%
			% within Recode2_Issue3: POORLY DEVELOPED AND DOCUMENTED REQUIREMENTS	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-384

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	25.763 ^a	1	.00000039		
Continuity Correction ^b	23.376	1	.00000133		
Likelihood Ratio	34.926	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000003	.00000003
Linear-by-Linear Association	25.449	1	.00000045		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.54.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-385

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.561	.000
	Cramer's V	.561	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

2 – Testing Hypothesis 3.3.2: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR11: Client Company maintains bidirectional traceability among requirements and work products and Issue: Poorly developed and documented requirements by the client company issue experienced by client firms.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing PR11: Client Company maintains bidirectional traceability among requirements and work products and issue *poorly developed and documented requirements*. The value of chi-square test is 34.765 from Table A-H-387 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000000$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing PR11: Client Company maintains bidirectional traceability among requirements and work products and issue *poorly developed and documented requirements* by the client company. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR11 reported fewer than expected *poorly developed and documented requirements* issue. Table A-H-386 shows that zero companies that performed PR11 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *poorly developed and documented requirements* issue while the expected count was (12.5). Whereas, 27 of the companies that performed PR11 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *poorly developed and documented requirements* issue while the expected count for this category was (14.5).

Cramer’s V= .651 indicates a strong association between applying performing PR11 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR11 reported fewer *poorly developed and documented requirements* issue as shown in Table A-H-388.

Table A-H-386

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue3: POORLY DEVELOPED AND DOCUMENTED REQUIREMENTS		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
		Count	17	27	44

Recode2_PR11 Maintains bidirectional traceability among requirements and work product	Always + Very Frequently + occasionally	Expected Count	29.5	14.5	44.0
		% within Recode2_PR11 Maintains bidirectional_traceability Among requirements and work product	38.6%	61.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue3: POORLY DEVELOPED AND DOCUMENTED REQUIREMENTS	30.9%	100.0%	53.7%
		Std. Residual	-2.3	3.3	
		Count	38	0	38
	Rarely + Never	Expected Count	25.5	12.5	38.0
		% within Recode2_PR11 Maintains _bidirectional_traceability among requirements and work product	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue3: POORLY DEVELOPED AND DOCUMENTED REQUIREMENTS	69.1%	0.0%	46.3%
		Std. Residual	2.5	-3.5	
		Count	55	27	82
Total	Expected Count		55.0	27.0	82.0
	% within Recode2_PR11 Maintains _bidirectional_traceability_among_requirements and work product		67.1%	32.9%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Issue3: POORLY DEVELOPED AND DOCUMENTED REQUIREMENTS		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-387

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	34.765 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	32.042	1	.00000002		
Likelihood Ratio	45.216	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	34.341	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.51.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-388

Symmetric Measures

	Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.651
	Cramer's V	.651
N of Valid Cases	82	

Hypothesis 3.4: There is a relationship between PR12 to PR14 practices and frequency of R4 Issue: Poor tracking and managing requirement changes by client company.

Issue 4	POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES BY CLIENT COMPANY
#	CMM/CMMI Practices
PR12	Client Company manages changes to requirements as they evolve during the project.
PR13	Client Company ensures that project plans and work products remain aligned with requirements

PR14	Client Company's Customer Interface Manager leads the team in estimating and documenting the impact of every change in requirement and works with the Configuration Control Board (CCB) to get approval for changes to those requirements
------	---

1 – Testing Hypothesis 3.4.1: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR12: Client Company manages changes to requirements as they evolve during the project and Issue 4: Poor Tracking and Managing Requirement changes by the client company.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing PR12: Client Company manages changes to requirements as they evolve during the project and Issue *poor tracking and managing requirement changes*. The value of chi-square test is 33.609 from Table A-H-390 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000001.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing PR12: Client Company manages changes to requirements as they evolve during the project and Issue 4: *poor tracking and managing requirement changes*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR12 reported fewer than expected *poor tracking and managing requirement changes* issue. Table A-H-389 shows that 33 companies that performed PR12 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Rarely + Never” for *poor tracking and managing requirement changes* issue while the expected count was (20.3). Whereas, 1 of the companies that performed PR12 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *poor tracking and managing requirement changes* issue while the expected count for this category was (13.7).

Cramer's V= .640 indicates a strong association between applying performing PR12 and this issues. Companies that routinely performed PR12 reported fewer *poor tracking and managing requirement changes* issue as shown in Table A-H-391.

Table A-H-389

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue4: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR12 Manages changes to requirements as they evolve during project	Always + Very Frequently + occasionally	Count	16	33	49
		Expected Count	28.7	20.3	49.0
		% within Recode2_PR12 Manageschanges_to_requirem ents_as_they_evolve_during	32.7%	67.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue4: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES	33.3%	97.1%	59.8%
		Std. Residual	-2.4	2.8	
	Rarely + Never	Count	32	1	33
		Expected Count	19.3	13.7	33.0
		% within Recode2_PR12 Manages_changes_to_require ments_as_they_evolve_during	97.0%	3.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue4: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES	66.7%	2.9%	40.2%
		Std. Residual	2.9	-3.4	
		Total	Count	48	34

	Expected Count	48.0	34.0	82.0
	% within Recode2_PR12 Manages_changes_to_require ments_as_they_evolve_during	58.5%	41.5%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Issue4: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-390

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	33.609 ^a	1	.00000001		
Continuity Correction ^b	31.011	1	.00000003		
Likelihood Ratio	40.406	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	33.199	1	.00000001		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.68.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-391

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.640	.000
	Cramer's V	.640	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

2 – Testing Hypothesis 3.4.2: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR13: Client Company ensures that project plans and work products remain aligned with requirements and Issue 4: Poor Tracking and Managing Requirement changes by client company.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing PR13: Client Company ensures that project plans and work products remain aligned with requirements and issue *poor tracking and managing requirement changes*. The value of chi-square test is 30.906 from Table A-H-393 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000003$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing PR13: Client Company ensures that project plans and work products remain aligned with requirements and issue *poor tracking and managing requirement changes*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR13 reported fewer than expected *poor tracking and managing requirement changes* issue. Table A-H-392 shows that 31 companies that performed PR13 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Rarely + Never” for *poor tracking and managing requirement changes* issue while the expected count was (18.7). Whereas, 3 of the companies that performed PR13 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *poor tracking and managing requirement changes* issue while the expected count for this category was (15.3).

Cramer’s V= .614 indicates a strong association between applying performing PR13 and this issues. Companies that routinely performed PR13 reported fewer *poor tracking and managing requirement changes* issue as shown in Table A-H-394.

Table A-H-392

Crosstab		
	Recode2_Issue4: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES	Total

			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR13 Ensures that project Plan and work remain aligned with requirements	Always + Very Frequently + occasionally	Count	14	31	45
		Expected Count	26.3	18.7	45.0
		% within Recode2_PR13 Ensures that project Plan and work remain aligned with requirements	31.1%	68.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue4: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES	29.2%	91.2%	54.9%
		Std. Residual	-2.4	2.9	
	Rarely + Never	Count	34	3	37
		Expected Count	21.7	15.3	37.0
		% within Recode2_PR13 Ensures that project Plan_a nd_work_remain_aligned with requirements	91.9%	8.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue4: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES	70.8%	8.8%	45.1%
		Std. Residual	2.7	-3.2	
Total	Count		48	34	82
	Expected Count		48.0	34.0	82.0
	% within Recode2_PR13 Ensures that project Plan_a nd_work_remain_aligned with requirements		58.5%	41.5%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Issue4: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-393

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	30.906 ^a	1	.00000003		
Continuity Correction ^b	28.452	1	.00000010		
Likelihood Ratio	34.652	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000002	.00000001
Linear-by-Linear Association	30.529	1	.00000003		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.34.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-394

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.614	.000
	Cramer's V	.614	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

3 – Testing Hypothesis 3.4.3: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR14: Client Company's Customer Interface Manager leads the team in estimating and documenting the impact of every change in requirement and works with the Configuration Control Board (CCB) to get approval for changes to those requirements and Issue 4: Poor Tracking and Managing Requirement changes by client company.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing PR14: Client Company's Customer Interface Manager leads the team in estimating and documenting the impact of every change in requirement and works with the Configuration Control Board (CCB) to get approval for changes to those requirements and issue *poor tracking and managing requirement changes*. The value of chi-square test is 35.442 from Table A-H-396 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000000$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing PR14: Client Company's Customer Interface Manager leads the team in estimating and documenting the impact of every change in requirement and works with the Configuration Control Board (CCB) to get approval for changes to those and issue *poor tracking and managing requirement changes*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR14 reported fewer than expected *poor tracking and managing requirement changes* issue. Table A-H-395 shows that 29 companies that performed PR14 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Rarely + Never" for *poor tracking and managing requirement changes* issue while the expected count was (23). Whereas, 5 of the companies that performed PR14 "Rarely + Never" reported "Rarely + Never" for experiencing *poor tracking and managing requirement changes* issue while the expected count for this category was (18.2).

Cramer's $V=.657$ indicates a strong association between applying performing PR14 and this issues. Companies that routinely performed PR14 reported fewer *poor tracking and managing requirement changes* issue as shown in Table A-H-397.

Table A-H-395

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue4: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR14 Customer interface manager leads the team in estimating and documenting the impact of every change in requirements	Always + Very Frequently + occasionally	Count	9	29	38
		Expected Count	22.2	15.8	38.0
		% within Recode2_PR14 Customer_interface_manager_leads_the_team_in_estimating and documenting the impact of every change in requirements	23.7%	76.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue4: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES	18.8%	85.3%	46.3%
		Std. Residual	-2.8	3.3	
	Rarely + Never	Count	39	5	44
		Expected Count	25.8	18.2	44.0
		% within Recode2_PR14 Customer_interface_manager_leads_the_team_in_estimating and documenting the impact of every change in requ	88.6%	11.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue4: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES	81.3%	14.7%	53.7%
		Std. Residual	2.6	-3.1	
Total		Count	48	34	82
		Expected Count	48.0	34.0	82.0

	% within Recode2_PR14 Customer_interface_manager_ eades_the_team_in_estimating nd documenting the impact of every change in requ	58.5%	41.5%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Issue4: POOR TRACKING AND MANAGING REQUIREMENT CHANGES	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-396

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	35.442 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	32.816	1	.00000001		
Likelihood Ratio	38.514	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	35.010	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.76.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-397

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.657	.000
	Cramer's V	.657	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

Hypothesis 3.5: There is a relationship between PR15 to PR19 practices and frequency of R5 issue experienced by client firms.

Issue 5	LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN BETWEEN THE CLIENT AND THE SUPPLIER.
#	CMM/CMMI Practices
PR15	Client Company establishes and manages the coordination and collaboration between the project and relevant stakeholders
PR16	Client Company's team members track actual results and performance against plans on a weekly basis. Team members track progress against individual plans on a daily basis.
PR17	Client Company develops a documented plan to be used to communicate inter-group commitments and to coordinate and track the work performed.
PR18	Client Company team managers are responsible for the coordination across all project teams
PR19	Client company communication and coordination practices are institutionalized to ensure they are performed as managed processes

1 – Testing Hypothesis 3.5.1: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR15: Client Company establishes and manages the coordination and collaboration between the project and relevant stakeholders and Issue of Lack of full communication plan between the client and the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing PR15: Client Company establishes and manages the coordination and collaboration between the project and relevant stakeholders and issue of *lack of full communication plan between the client and the supplier*. The value of chi-square test is 32.571 from Table A-H-399 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000001$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing PR15: Client Company establishes and manages the coordination and collaboration between the project and relevant stakeholders and Issue of *lack of full communication plan between the client and the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR15 reported fewer than expected *lack of full communication plan between the client and the supplier* issue. Table A-H-398 shows that 2 companies that performed PR15 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *lack of full communication plan between the client and the supplier* issue while the expected count was (14). Whereas, 26 of the companies that performed PR15 “Rarely + Never” reported “Always + Almost Always” for experiencing *lack of full communication plan between the client and the supplier* issue while the expected count for this category was (14).

Cramer’s $V=.655$ indicates a strong association between applying performing PR15 and this issues. Companies that routinely performed PR15 reported fewer *lack of full communication plan between the client and the supplier* issue as shown in Table A-H-400.

Table A-H-398

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue5: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR15 Establishes and manages the coordination between project and stakeholders	Always + Very Frequently + occasionally	Count	12	36	48
		Expected Count	24.0	24.0	48.0
		% within Recode2_PR15_Establishes and manages the coordination between prject and stakeholders	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue5: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN	31.6%	94.7%	63.2%
		Std. Residual	-2.4	2.4	
	Rarely + Never	Count	26	2	28
		Expected Count	14.0	14.0	28.0
		% within Recode2_Pr15_ Establishes and manages_the_coordination_between_prject_and stakeholders	92.9%	7.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue5: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN	68.4%	5.3%	36.8%
		Std. Residual	3.2	-3.2	
Total			Count	38	76
			Expected Count	38.0	76.0
			% within Recode2_PR15_Establishes_and _manages_the_coordination_between_prject_an d stakeholders	50.0%	50.0%
			% within Recode2_Issue5: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-399

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	32.571 ^a	1	.00000001		
Continuity Correction ^b	29.914	1	.00000005		
Likelihood Ratio	36.964	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000001	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	32.143	1	.00000001		0
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.00.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-400

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.655	.000
	Cramer's V	.655	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

2 – Testing Hypothesis 3.5.2: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR16: Client Company's team members track actual results and performance against plans on a weekly basis. Team members track progress against individual plans on a daily basis and Issue 5: Lack of full communication plan between the client and the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing PR16: Client Company's team members track actual results and performance against plans on a weekly basis. Team members track progress against individual plans on a daily basis and issue of *lack of full communication plan between the client and the supplier*. The value of chi-square test is 36.489 from Table A-H-402 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000000$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing PR16: Client Company's team members track actual results and performance against plans on a weekly basis. Team members track progress against individual plans on a daily basis and the issue of *lack of full communication plan between the client and the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR16 reported fewer than expected *lack of full communication plan between the client and the supplier* issue. Table A-H-401 shows that 3 companies that performed PR16 "Rarely + Never" reported "Rarely + Never" for *lack of full communication plan between the client and the supplier* issue while the expected count was (16). Whereas, 29 of the companies that performed PR16 "Rarely + Never" reported "Always + Almost Always" for experiencing *lack of full communication plan between the client and the supplier* issue while the expected count for this category was (16).

Cramer's $V=.693$ indicates a strong association between applying performing PR16 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR16 reported fewer *lack of full communication plan between the client and the supplier* issue as shown in Table A-H-403.

Table A-H-401

Crosstab		
	Recode2_Issue5: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN	Total

			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR16 Project team members track results and performance	Always + Very Frequently + occasionally	Count	9	35	44
		Expected Count	22.0	22.0	44.0
		% within Recode2_PR16 Project team members track results and performance	20.5%	79.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue5: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION	23.7%	92.1%	57.9%
		Std. Residual	-2.8	2.8	
	Rarely + Never	Count	29	3	32
		Expected Count	16.0	16.0	32.0
		% within Recode2_PR16 Project team members track results and performance	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue5: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION	76.3%	7.9%	42.1%
		Std. Residual	3.3	-3.3	
Total	Count		38	38	76
	Expected Count		38.0	38.0	76.0
	% within Recode2_PR16 Project team members track results and performance		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Issue5: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION		100.0%	100.0 %	100.0%

Table A-H-402

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	36.489 ^a	1	.0000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	33.736	1	.0000000		
Likelihood Ratio	40.862	1	.0000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.0000000	.0000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	36.009	1	.0000000		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.00.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-403

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.693	.000
	Cramer's V	.693	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

3 – Testing Hypothesis 3.5.3: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR17: Client Company develops a documented plan to be used to communicate inter-group commitments and to coordinate and track the work performed and Issue 5: Lack of full communication plan between the client and the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing PR17: Client Company develops a documented plan to be used to communicate inter-group commitments and to coordinate and track the work performed and issue of *lack of full communication plan between the client and the supplier*. The value of chi-square test is 31.722 from Table A-H-405 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000002.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing PR17: Client Company develops a documented plan to be used to communicate inter-group commitments and to coordinate and track the work performed and issue of *lack of full communication plan between the client and the supplier*. The analysis

shows that firms routinely practicing PR17 reported fewer than expected *lack of full communication plan between the client and the supplier* issue. Table A-H-404 shows that 3 companies that performed PR17 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *lack of full communication plan between the client and the supplier* issue while the expected count was (15). Whereas, 27 of the companies that performed PR17 “Rarely + Never” reported “Always + Almost Always” for experiencing *lack of full communication plan between the client and the supplier* issue while the expected count for this category was (15).

Cramer’s V= .646 indicates a strong association between applying performing PR17 and this issues. Companies that routinely performed PR17 reported fewer *lack of full communication plan between the client and the supplier* issue as shown in Table A-H-406.

Table A-H-404

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue5: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR17 Develops a documented plan to be used to Communicate inter group	Always + Very Frequently + occasionally	Count	11	35	46
		Expected Count	23.0	23.0	46.0
		% within Recode2_PR17 Develops a documented_plan_tobe_used_to_Communicat	23.9%	76.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue5: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION	28.9%	92.1%	60.5%
		Std. Residual	-2.5	2.5	
	Rarely + Never	Count	27	3	30
		Expected Count	15.0	15.0	30.0
		% within Recode2_PR17 Develops a documented plan tobe used to	90.0%	10.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue5: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION	71.1%	7.9%	39.5%
		Std. Residual	3.1	-3.1	
Total	Count		38	38	76
	Expected Count		38.0	38.0	76.0
	% within Recode2_PR17 Develops_a_documented_plan_tobe_u sed_to_Communicat		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Issue5: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-405

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	31.722 ^a	1	.00000002		
Continuity Correction ^b	29.133	1	.00000007		
Likelihood Ratio	35.246	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000002	.00000001
Linear-by-Linear Association	31.304	1	.00000002		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.00.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-406

Symmetric Measures		
	Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal Phi	-.646	.000

	Cramer's V	.646	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

4 – Testing Hypothesis 3.5.4: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR18: Client Company team managers are responsible for the coordination across all project teams and Issue 5: Lack of full communication plan between the client and the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing PR18: Client Company team managers are responsible for the coordination across all project teams and issue of *lack of full communication plan between the client and the supplier*. The value of chi-square test is 34.850 from Table A-H-408 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing PR18: Client Company team managers are responsible for the coordination across all project teams and the issue of *lack of full communication plan between the client and the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR18 reported fewer than expected *lack of full communication plan between the client and the supplier* issue. Table A-H-407 shows that 2 companies that performed PR18 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *lack of full communication plan between the client and the supplier* issue while the expected count was (14.5). Whereas, 27 of the companies that performed PR18 “Rarely + Never” reported “Always + Almost Always” for experiencing *lack of full communication plan between the client and the supplier* issue while the expected count for this category was (14.5).

Cramer’s V= .677 indicates a strong association between applying performing PR18 and this issues. Companies that routinely performed PR18 reported fewer *lack of full communication plan between the client and the supplier* issue as shown in Table A-H-409.

Table A-H-407

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue5: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR18 Managers are responsible for the coordination across all project teams	Always + Very Frequently + occasionally	Count	11	36	47
		Expected Count	23.5	23.5	47.0
		% within Recode2_PR18 Managers are responsible for the coordination	23.4%	76.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue5: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN	28.9%	94.7%	61.8%
		Std. Residual	-2.6	2.6	
	Rarely + Never	Count	27	2	29
		Expected Count	14.5	14.5	29.0
		% within Recode2_PR18 Managers_are_responsible_for_the_coordination_acro	93.1%	6.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue5: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN	71.1%	5.3%	38.2%
		Std. Residual	3.3	-3.3	
Total	Count	38	38	76	
	Expected Count	38.0	38.0	76.0	

	% within Recode2_PR18 Managers_are_responsible_ for_the_coordination_acro	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Issue5: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-408

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	34.850 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	32.117	1	.00000001		
Likelihood Ratio	39.656	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	34.391	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.50.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-409

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.677	.000
	Cramer's V	.677	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

5 – Testing Hypothesis 3.5.5: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR19: Client company communication and coordination practices are institutionalized to ensure they are performed as managed processes and Issue 5: Lack of full communication plan between the client and the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing PR19: Client company communication and coordination practices are institutionalized to ensure they are performed as managed processes and the issue of *lack of full communication plan between the client and the supplier*. The value of chi-square test is 30.655 from Table A-H-411 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and $p = .00000003$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing PR19: Client company communication and coordination practices are institutionalized to ensure they are performed as managed processes and the issue of *lack of full communication plan between the client and the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR19 reported fewer than expected *lack of full communication plan between the client and the supplier* issue. Table A-H-410 shows that 5 companies that performed PR19 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *lack of full communication plan between the client and the supplier* issue while the expected count was (17). Whereas, 29 of the companies that performed PR19 “Rarely + Never” reported “Always + Almost Always” for experiencing *lack of full communication plan between the client and the supplier* issue while the expected count for this category was (17).

Cramer’s V= .635 indicates a strong association between applying performing PR19 and this issues. Companies that routinely performed PR19 reported fewer *lack of full communication plan between the client and the supplier* issue as shown in Table A-H-412.

Table A-H-410

Crosstab		
	Recode2_Issue5: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN	Total

			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR19 Communication and coordination practices are institutionalized to ensure they are performed as managed processes	Always + Very Frequently + occasionally	Count	9	33	42
		Expected Count	21.0	21.0	42.0
		% within Recode2_PR19 Communication and coordination practices are institutionalized to ensure	21.4%	78.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue5: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN	23.7%	86.8%	55.3%
		Std. Residual	-2.6	2.6	
	Rarely + Never	Count	29	5	34
		Expected Count	17.0	17.0	34.0
		% within Recode2_PR19 Communication and coordination practices are institutionalized_to_ensure_	85.3%	14.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue5: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN	76.3%	13.2%	44.7%
		Std. Residual	2.9	-2.9	
Total	Count		38	38	76
	Expected Count		38.0	38.0	76.0
	% within Recode2_PR19 Communication_and_coordination_prac tices_are_institutionalized_to_ensure_		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Issue5: LACK OF A FULL COMMUNICATION PLAN		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-411

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	30.655 ^a	1	.00000003		
Continuity Correction ^b	28.154	1	.00000011		
Likelihood Ratio	33.319	1	.00000001		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000004	.00000002
Linear-by-Linear Association	30.252	1	.00000004		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.00.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-412

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.635	.000
	Cramer's V	.635	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

Hypothesis 3.6: There is a relationship between PR20 to PR23 practices and frequency of R6 issue experienced by client firms.

Issue 6	COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS BETWEEN THE CLIENT AND THE SUPPLIER
#	CMM/CMMI Practices
PR20	Representatives of the client company project's software engineering group work with representatives of the supplier engineering groups to monitor and coordinate technical activities and resolve technical issues

PR21	Client Company selects team roles, including the role of Supplier Interface Manager, who is the liaison between the team and the supplier company representative, and is responsible for requirements change management
PR22	Client Company communicates quality issues and ensures the resolution of noncompliance issues with the staff and managers
PR23	Client Company establishes and maintains a documented policy for conducting its Communication and Coordination activities

1 – Testing Hypothesis 3.6.1: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR20: Representatives of the client company project’s software engineering group work with representatives of the supplier engineering groups to monitor and coordinate technical activities and resolve technical issues and Issue 6: Communication and coordination problems between the client and the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing PR20: Representatives of the client company project’s software engineering group work with representatives of the supplier engineering groups to monitor and coordinate technical activities and resolve technical issues and the issue of *communication and coordination problems between the client and the supplier*. The value of chi-square test is 21.501 from Table A-H-414 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and $p = .00000354$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing PR20: Representatives of the client company project’s software engineering group work with representatives of the supplier engineering groups to monitor and coordinate technical activities and resolve technical issues and the issue of *communication and coordination problems between the client and the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR20 reported fewer than expected *communication and coordination problems*. Table A-H-413 shows that 2 companies that performed PR20 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *communication and coordination problems* while the expected count was (11.4). Whereas, 28 of the companies that performed PR20 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *lack of communication and coordination problems* issue while the expected count for this category was (18.1).

Cramer’s $V = .515$ indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR20 and this issues. Companies that routinely performed PR20 reported fewer *communication and coordination problems* as shown in Table A-H-415.

Table A-H-413

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue6: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
REcode2_PR20 Representatives of client company work with representatives of the supplier engineering groups to monitor and coordinate	Always + Very Frequently + occasionally	Count	21	28	49
		Expected Count	30.9	18.1	49.0
		% within REcode2_PR20 Representatives of_client_company_work_with Rep	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue6: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS	41.2%	93.3%	60.5%
		Std. Residual	-1.8	2.3	
	Rarely + Never	Count	30	2	32
		Expected Count	20.1	11.9	32.0
		% within REcode2_PR20 Representatives of_client_company_work_with Rep	93.8%	6.3%	100.0%

technical activities		% within Recode2_Issue6: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS	58.8%	6.7%	39.5%
		Std. Residual	2.2	-2.9	
Total		Count	51	30	81
		Expected Count	51.0	30.0	81.0
		% within REcode2_PR20 Representatives of_client_company_work_with Rep	63.0%	37.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue6: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS	100.0%	100.0 %	100.0%

Table A-H-414

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	21.501 ^a	1	.00000354		
Continuity Correction ^b	19.374	1	.00001075		
Likelihood Ratio	24.895	1	.00000061		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000162	.00000144
Linear-by-Linear Association	21.235	1	.00000406		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.85.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-415

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.515	.000
	Cramer's V	.515	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

2 – Testing Hypothesis 3.6.2: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR21: Client Company selects team roles, including the role of Supplier Interface Manager, who is the liaison between the team and the supplier company representative, and is responsible for requirements change management and Issue 6: Communication and coordination problems between the client and the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing PR21: Client Company selects team roles, including the role of Supplier Interface Manager, who is the liaison between the team and the supplier company representative, and is responsible for requirements change management and the issue of *communication and coordination problems between the client and the supplier*. The value of chi-square test is 13.680 from Table A-H-417 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00021675.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing PR21: Client Company selects team roles, including the role of Supplier Interface Manager, who is the liaison between the team and the supplier company representative, and is responsible for requirements change management and the issue of *communication and coordination problems between the client and the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR21 reported fewer than expected *communication and coordination problems*. Table A-H-416 shows that 5 companies that performed PR21 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *communication and coordination problems* while the expected count was (13). Whereas, 25 of the companies that performed PR21 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *lack of communication and coordination problems* issue while the expected count for this category was (17).

Cramer's V= .411 indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR21 and this issues. Companies that routinely performed PR21 reported fewer *communication and coordination problems* as shown in Table A-H-418.

Table A-H-416

Crosstab						
			Recode2_Issue6: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS		Total	
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never		
Recode2_PR21 Selects team roles including the role of supplier	Always + Very Frequently + occasionally	Count	21	25	46	
		Expected Count	29.0	17.0	46.0	
		% within Recode2_PR21 Select team_roles_including_the_role_o f_supplier	45.7%	54.3%	100.0%	
		% within Recode2_Issue6: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS	41.2%	83.3%	56.8%	
		Std. Residual	-1.5	1.9		
	Rarely + Never	Count	30	5	35	
		Expected Count	22.0	13.0	35.0	
		% within Recode2_PR21 Selects_team_roles_including_the _role_of_supplier	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%	
		% within Recode2_Issue6: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS	58.8%	16.7%	43.2%	
		Std. Residual	1.7	-2.2		
Total			Count	51	30	81
			Expected Count	51.0	30.0	81.0
			% within Recode2_PR21 Selects_team_roles_including_the _role_of_supplier	63.0%	37.0%	100.0%
			% within Recode2_Issue6: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-417

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.680 ^a	1	.00021675	.00021368	.00018287
Continuity Correction ^b	12.016	1	.00052745		
Likelihood Ratio	14.653	1	.00012921		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	13.511	1	.00023715		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.96.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-418

Symmetric Measures			Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi		-.411	.000
	Cramer's V		.411	.000

3 – Testing Hypothesis 3.6.3: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR22: Client Company communicates quality issues and ensures the resolution of noncompliance issues with the staff and managers and Issue 6: Communication and coordination problems between the client and the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing PR22: Client Company communicates quality issues and ensures the resolution of noncompliance issues with the staff and managers and the issue of *communication and coordination problems between the client and the supplier*. The value of chi-square test is 29.225 from Table A-H-420 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000006$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing PR22: Client Company communicates quality issues and ensures the resolution of noncompliance issues with the staff and managers and the issue of *communication and coordination problems between the client and the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR22 reported fewer than expected *communication and coordination problems*. Table A-H-419 shows that 2 companies that performed PR22 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *communication and coordination problems* while the expected count was (13.7). While, 28 of the companies that performed PR22 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *lack of communication and coordination problems* issue while the expected count for this category was (16.3).

Cramer’s $V=.601$ indicates a strong association between applying performing PR22 and this issues. Companies that routinely performed PR22 reported fewer *communication and coordination problems* as shown in Table A-H-421.

Table A-H-419

2018-11-11 11:19

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue6: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
REcode2_PR22 Communicates quality issues and insures resolution	Always + Very Frequently + occasionally	Count	16	28	44
		Expected Count	27.7	16.3	44.0
		% within REcode2_PR22 Communicates quality_issues_and insures resolution	36.4%	63.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue6: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS	31.4%	93.3%	54.3%
		Std. Residual	-2.2	2.9	
	Rarely + Never	Count	35	2	37
		Expected Count	23.3	13.7	37.0
		% within REcode2_PR22 Communicates_quality_issues_an d_isures_resolution	94.6%	5.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue6: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS	68.6%	6.7%	45.7%
		Std. Residual	2.4	-3.2	
Total		Count	51	30	81
		Expected Count	51.0	30.0	81.0

	% within REcode2_PR22 Communicates_quality_issues_and d_isures_resolution	63.0%	37.0%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Issue6: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS	100.0%	100.0 %	100.0%

Table A-H-420

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1- sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	29.225 ^a	1	.00000006		
Continuity Correction ^b	26.781	1	.00000023		
Likelihood Ratio	33.539	1	.00000001		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000003	.00000002
Linear-by-Linear Association	28.864	1	.00000008		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.70.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-421

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.601	.000
	Cramer's V	.601	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

4 – Testing Hypothesis 3.6.4: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR23: Client Company establishes and maintains a documented policy for conducting its Communication and Coordination activities and Issue 6: Communication and coordination problems between the client and the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing PR23: Client Company establishes and maintains a documented policy for conducting its Communication and Coordination activities and the issue of *communication and coordination problems between the client and the supplier*. The value of chi-square test is 24.444 from Table A-H-423 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000076.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing PR23: Client Company establishes and maintains a documented policy for conducting its communication and coordination activities and the issue of *communication and coordination problems between the client and the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR23 reported fewer than expected *communication and coordination problems*. Table A-H-422 shows that 3 companies that performed PR23 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *communication and coordination problems* while the expected count was (13.7). However, 27 of the companies that performed PR23 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *lack of communication and coordination problems* issue while the expected count for this category was (16.3).

Cramer’s V= .549 indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR23 and this issues. Companies that routinely performed PR23 reported fewer *communication and coordination problems* as shown in Table A-H-424.

Table A-H-422

Crosstab

			Recode2_Issue6: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR23 Establish and maintain documented policy for conducting communication and coordination activities	Always + Very Frequently + occasionally	Count	17	27	44
		Expected Count	27.7	16.3	44.0
		% within Recode2_PR23 Establish_and_maintain_docume nted_policy_for_condu	38.6%	61.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue6: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS	33.3%	90.0%	54.3%
		Std. Residual	-2.0	2.7	
	Rarely + Never	Count	34	3	37
		Expected Count	23.3	13.7	37.0
		% within Recode2_Pr23 Establish_and_maintain_docume nted_policy_for_condu	91.9%	8.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue6: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS	66.7%	10.0%	45.7%
		Std. Residual	2.2	-2.9	
Total	Count		51	30	81
	Expected Count		51.0	30.0	81.0
	% within Recode2_PR23 Establish_and_maintain_docume nted_policy_for_condu		63.0%	37.0%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Issue6: COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-423

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.444 ^a	1	.00000076	.00000055	.00000040
Continuity Correction ^b	22.214	1	.00000244		
Likelihood Ratio	27.255	1	.00000018		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	24.143	1	.00000089		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.70.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-424

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.549	.000
	Cramer's V	.549	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

Hypothesis 3.7: There is a relationship between PR24 to PR29 practices and frequency of R7, R8 and R9 issues experienced by client firms.

Issues 7,8 &9	7) LANGUAGE BARRIERS 8) TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES 9) CULTURAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE CLIENT AND THE SUPPLIER.
#	CMM/CMMI Practices
PR24	Client Company ensures that the workforce has the skills to share information and coordinate their activities efficiently
PR25	Client Company establishes a culture for openly sharing information and concerns across organizational levels as well as among team members
PR26	Client Company establishes project teams as well as their responsibilities, authorities and interrelationships
PR27	Client Company establishes and maintains open and effective project teams' communication and coordination plan
PR28	Client Company team managers are responsible to track and resolve inter-group issues
PR29	Client Company maintains effective work-groups, interpersonal problems are addressed quickly and meetings are managed to ensure that work-group time is used most effectively

1 – Testing Hypothesis 3.7.1: Language Barriers

1.1 – Testing Hypothesis 3.7-1: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR24: Client Company ensures that the workforce has the skills to share information and coordinate their activities efficiently and Issue 7: Language Barriers

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing Practice PR24: Client Company ensures that the workforce has the skills to share information and coordinate their activities efficiently and the issue of *language barriers*. The value of chi-square test is 17.005 from Table A-H-426 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00003728$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing Practice PR24: Client Company ensures that the workforce has the skills to share information and coordinate their activities efficiently and the issue of *language barriers*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR24 reported fewer than expected *language barriers* issue. Table A-H-425 shows that 3 companies that performed PR24 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *language barriers* issue while the expected count was (11.7). However, 24 of the companies that performed PR24 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *language barriers* issue while the expected count for this category was (15.3).

Cramer’s $V=.458$ indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR24 and this issues. Companies that routinely performed PR24 reported fewer *language barriers* issue as shown in Table A-H-427.

Table A-H-425

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue7: LANGUAGE BARRIERS		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
		Count	22	24	46

Recode2_PR24 Ensures that the workforce has the skills to share	Always + Very Frequently + occasionally	Expected Count	30.7	15.3	46.0
		% within Recode2_PR24 Ensures that the workforce has the skills	47.8%	52.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue7: LANGUAGE BARRIERS	40.7%	88.9%	56.8%
		Std. Residual	-1.6	2.2	
	Rarely + Never	Count	32	3	35
		Expected Count	23.3	11.7	35.0
		% within Recode2_PR24 Ensures that the workforce has the skills	91.4%	8.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue7: LANGUAGE BARRIERS	59.3%	11.1%	43.2%
		Std. Residual	1.8	-2.5	
Total	Count		54	27	81
	Expected Count		54.0	27.0	81.0
	% within Recode2_PR24 Ensures that the workforce has the skills		66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Issue7: LANGUAGE BARRIERS		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-426

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.005 ^a	1	.00003728		
Continuity Correction ^b	15.099	1	.00010199		
Likelihood Ratio	18.957	1	.00001337		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00003463	.00002427
Linear-by-Linear Association	16.795	1	.00004164		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.67.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-427

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.458	.000
	Cramer's V	.458	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

1.2 - Testing Hypothesis 6.3.7-2: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR25: Client Company establishes a culture for openly sharing information and concerns across organizational levels as well as among team members and Issue 7: Language Barriers

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing Practice PR25: Client Company establishes a culture for openly sharing information and concerns across organizational levels as well as among team members and the issue of *language barriers*. The value of chi-square test is 12.041 from Table A-H-429 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00052056.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing Practice PR25: Client Company establishes a culture for openly sharing information and concerns across organizational levels as well as among team members and the issue of *language barriers*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR25 reported fewer than expected *language barriers* issue. Table A-H-428 shows that 5 companies that performed PR25 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *language barriers* issue while the expected count was (14). Whereas, 22 of the companies that performed PR25 “Always + Very Frequently”

reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *language barriers* issue while the expected count for this category was (14.7).

Cramer’s V= .400 indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR25 and this issues. Companies that routinely performed PR25 reported fewer *language barriers* issue as shown in Table A-H-430.

Table A-H-428

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue7: LANGUAGE BARRIERS		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR25 Establish a culture for openly sharing information	Always + Very Frequently + occasionally	Count	22	22	44
		Expected Count	29.3	14.7	44.0
		% within Recode2_PR25 establish_a_culture_for_openly_sharing_	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue7: LANGUAGE BARRIERS	40.7%	81.5%	54.3%
		Std. Residual	-1.4	1.9	
	Rarely + Never	Count	32	5	37
		Expected Count	24.7	12.3	37.0
		% within Recode2_PR25 establish_ a_culture_for_openly_sharing_	86.5%	13.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue7: LANGUAGE BARRIERS	59.3%	18.5%	45.7%
		Std. Residual	1.5	-2.1	
Total	Count		54	27	81
	Expected Count		54.0	27.0	81.0
	% within Recode2_PR25 establish_a_culture_for_openly_sharing_		66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Issue7: LANGUAGE BARRIERS		100.0%	100.0 %	100.0%

Table A-H-429

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.041 ^a	1	.00052056		
Continuity Correction ^b	10.455	1	.00122343		
Likelihood Ratio	12.812	1	.00034442		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00077016	.00046168
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.892	1	.00056379		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.33.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-430

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.400	.001
	Cramer's V	.400	.001
N of Valid Cases		81	

1.3 - Testing Hypothesis 6.3.7-3: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR26: Client Company establishes project teams as well as their responsibilities, authorities and interrelationships and Issue 7: Language Barriers

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing Practice PR26: Client Company establishes project teams as well as their responsibilities, authorities and interrelationships and the issue of *language barriers*. The value of chi-square test is 12.041 from Table A-H-432 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00052056.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing Practice PR26: Client Company establishes project teams as well as their responsibilities, authorities and interrelationships and the issue of *language barriers*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR26 reported fewer than expected *language barriers* issue. Table A-H-431 shows that 4 companies that performed PR26 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *language barriers* issue while the expected count was (12.3). Whereas, 23 of the companies that performed PR26 “Always +Very Frequently” reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *language barriers* issue while the expected count for this category was (14.7).

Cramer’s V= .438 indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR26 and this issues. Companies that routinely performed PR26 reported fewer *language barriers* issue as shown in Table A-H-433.

Table A-H-431

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue7: LANGUAGE BARRIERS		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR26 Establish project teams as well as their responsibilities	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	21	23	44
		Expected Count	29.3	14.7	44.0
		% within Recode2_PR26 Establish project_teams and their responsi	47.7%	52.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue7: LANGUAGE BARRIERS	38.9%	85.2%	54.3%
		Std. Residual	-1.5	2.2	
	Rarely + Never	Count	33	4	37
		Expected Count	24.7	12.3	37.0
		% within Recode2_PR26 Establish project teams and their responsibilities	89.2%	10.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue7: LANGUAGE BARRIERS	61.1%	14.8%	45.7%
		Std. Residual	1.7	-2.4	
Total	Count		54	27	81
	Expected Count		54.0	27.0	81.0
	% within Recode2_PR26 Establish project_teams_and_their_respons		66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Issue7: LANGUAGE BARRIERS		100.0%	100.0 %	100.0%

Table A-H-432

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.041 ^a	1	.00052056		
Continuity Correction ^b	10.455	1	.00122343		
Likelihood Ratio	12.812	1	.00034442		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00077016	.00046168
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.892	1	.00056379		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.33.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-433

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.438	.000
	Cramer's V	.438	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

1.4 - Testing Hypothesis 6.3.7-4: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR27: Client Company establishes and maintains open and effective project teams' communication and coordination plan and Issue 7: Language Barriers

The analysis shows a significant relationship between practicing Practice PR27: Client Company establishes and maintains open and effective project teams' communication and coordination plan and the issue of *language barriers*. The value of chi-square test is 16.755 from Table A-H-435 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00004253$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between practicing Practice PR27: Client Company establishes and maintains open and effective project teams' communication and coordination plan and the issue of *language barriers*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR27 reported fewer than expected *language barriers* issue. Table A-H-434 shows that 4 companies that performed PR27 "Rarely + Never" reported "Rarely + Never" for *language barriers* issue while the expected count was (12.7). Whereas, 23 of the companies that performed PR27 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Rarely + Never" for experiencing *language barriers* issue while the expected count for this category was (14.3).

Cramer's $V=.455$ indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR27 and this issues. Companies that routinely performed PR27 reported fewer *language barriers* issue as shown in Table A-H-436.

Table A-H-434

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue7: LANGUAGE BARRIERS		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR27 Establish and maintain open and effective communication	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	20	23	43
		Expected Count	28.7	14.3	43.0
		% within Recode2_PR27 Establishnd_maintain_open_and_ effective_commun	46.5%	53.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue7: LANGUAGE BARRIERS	37.0%	85.2%	53.1%
		Std. Residual	-1.6	2.3	
	Rarely + Never	Count	34	4	38
		Expected Count	25.3	12.7	38.0
		% within Recode2_PR27 establish_and_maintain_open_an d_effective_commun	89.5%	10.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue7: LANGUAGE BARRIERS	63.0%	14.8%	46.9%
		Std. Residual	1.7	-2.4	
Total			Count	54	27
			Expected Count	54.0	27.0
			% within Recode2_PR27 establish_and_maintain_open_an d_effective_commun	66.7%	33.3%
			% within Recode2_Issue7: LANGUAGE BARRIERS	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-435

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.755 ^a	1	.00004253		
Continuity Correction ^b	14.878	1	.00011471		
Likelihood Ratio	18.140	1	.00002052		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00004403	.00003386
Linear-by-Linear Association	16.548	1	.00004743		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.67.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-436

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.455	.000
	Cramer's V	.455	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

1.5 - Testing Hypothesis 6.3.7-5: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR28: Client Company team managers are responsible to track and resolve inter-group issues and Issue 7: Language Barriers

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR28: Client Company team managers are responsible to track and resolve inter-group issues and the issue of *language barriers*. The value of chi-square test is 14.400 from Table A-H-438 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00014780$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR28: Client Company team managers are responsible to track and resolve inter-group issues and the issue of *language barriers*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR28 reported fewer than expected *language barriers* issue. Table A-H-437 shows that 4 companies that performed PR28 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *language barriers* issue while the expected count was (12). Whereas, 23 of the companies that performed PR28 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *language barriers* issue while the expected count for this category was (15).

Cramer's $V=.422$ indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR28 and this issues. Companies that routinely performed PR28 reported fewer *language barriers* issue as shown in Table A-H-439.

Table A-H-437

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue7: LANGUAGE BARRIERS		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR28 Team managers are responsible to track inter-group issues	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	22	23	45
		Expected Count	30.0	15.0	45.0
		% within Recode2_PR28 Team managers_are_responsible_to_track_i ntergrou	48.9%	51.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue7: LANGUAGE BARRIERS	40.7%	85.2%	55.6%
		Std. Residual	-1.5	2.1	
	Rarely + Never	Count	32	4	36
		Expected Count	24.0	12.0	36.0

		% within Recode2_PR28 Team_managers_are_responsible_to_ track_intergrou	88.9%	11.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue7: LANGUAGE BARRIERS	59.3%	14.8%	44.4%
		Std. Residual	1.6	-2.3	
Total		Count	54	27	81
		Expected Count	54.0	27.0	81.0
		% within Recode2_PR28 Team_managers_are_responsible_to_ track_intergrou	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue7: LANGUAGE BARRIERS	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-438

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.400 ^a	1	.00014780		
Continuity Correction ^b	12.656	1	.00037431		
Likelihood Ratio	15.638	1	.00007668		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00013957	.00011773
Linear-by-Linear Association	14.222	1	.00016244		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.00.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-439

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.422	.000
	Cramer's V	.422	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

1.6 - Testing Hypothesis 6.3.7-6: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR29: Client Company maintains effective work-groups, interpersonal problems are addressed quickly and meetings are managed to ensure that work-group time is used most effectively and Issue 7: Language Barriers

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR29: Client Company maintains effective work-groups, interpersonal problems are addressed quickly and meetings are managed to ensure that work-group time is used most effectively and the issue of *language barriers*. The value of chi-square test is 13.064 from Table A-H-441 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and $p = .00030107$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR29: Client Company maintains effective work-groups, interpersonal problems are addressed quickly and meetings are managed to ensure that work-group time is used most effectively and the issue of *language barriers*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR29 reported fewer than expected *language barriers* issue. Table A-H-440 shows that 6 companies that performed PR29 "Rarely + Never" reported "Rarely + Never" for *language barriers* issue while the expected count was (13.7). Whereas, 21 of the companies that performed PR29 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Rarely + Never" for experiencing *language barriers* issue while the expected count for this category was (13.3).

Cramer's $V = .402$ indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR29 and this issues. Companies that routinely performed PR29 reported fewer *language barriers* issue as shown in Table A-H-442.

Table A-H-440

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue7: LANGUAGE BARRIERS		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR29 Maintains effective workgroup interpersonal problems are addressed quickly and meetings are managed to ensure that work-group time is used most effectively	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	19	21	40
		Expected Count	26.7	13.3	40.0
		% within Recode2_PR29 Maintains_effective_workgroup	47.5%	52.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue7: LANGUAGE BARRIERS	35.2%	77.8%	49.4%
		Std. Residual	-1.5	2.1	
	Rarely + Never	Count	35	6	41
		Expected Count	27.3	13.7	41.0
		% within Recode2_PR29 Maintains_effective_workgroup	85.4%	14.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue7: LANGUAGE BARRIERS	64.8%	22.2%	50.6%
		Std. Residual	1.5	-2.1	
Total	Count		54	27	81
	Expected Count		54.0	27.0	81.0
	% within Recode2_PR29 Maintains_effective_workgroup		66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Issue7: LANGUAGE BARRIERS		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-441

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.064 ^a	1	.00030107		
Continuity Correction ^b	11.415	1	.00072841		
Likelihood Ratio	13.626	1	.00022306		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00037549	.00029700
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.902	1	.00032815		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.33.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-442

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.402	.000
	Cramer's V	.402	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

Hypothesis 3.8: Time-Zone Difference

2.1 – Testing Hypothesis 6.3.8-1: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR24: Client Company ensures that the workforce has the skills to share information and coordinate their activities efficiently and Issue 8: Time Zone Differences

The analysis shows no significant relationship between performing practice PR24: Client Company ensures that the workforce has the skills to share information and coordinate their activities efficiently and the issue

of *time-zone differences*. The value of chi-square test is 5.729 from Table A-H-444 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.017.

Table A-H-443

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue8: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR24 Ensures that the workforce has the skills to share information and coordinate their activities efficiently	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	32	14	46
		Expected Count	36.3	9.7	46.0
		% within Recode2_PR24 Ensures_that_the_workforce_h as_the_skills_to_sha	69.6%	30.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue8: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES	50.0%	82.4%	56.8%
		Std. Residual	-.7	1.4	
	Rarely + Never	Count	32	3	35
		Expected Count	27.7	7.3	35.0
		% within Recode2_PR24 Ensures_that_the_workforce_h as_the_skills_to_sha	91.4%	8.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue8: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES	50.0%	17.6%	43.2%
		Std. Residual	.8	-1.6	
Total	Count		64	17	81
	Expected Count		64.0	17.0	81.0
	% within Recode2_PR24 Ensures_that_the_workforce_h as_the_skills_to_sha		79.0%	21.0%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Issue8: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-444

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.729 ^a	1	.017		
Continuity Correction ^b	4.487	1	.034		
Likelihood Ratio	6.225	1	.013		
Fisher's Exact Test				.026	.015
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.659	1	.017		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.35.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-445

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.266	.017
	Cramer's V	.266	.017
N of Valid Cases		81	

2.2 - Testing Hypothesis 6.3.8-2: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR25: Client Company establishes a culture for openly sharing information and concerns across organizational levels as well as among team members and Issue 8: Time Zone Difference

The analysis shows no significant relationship between performing practice PR25: Client Company establishes a culture for openly sharing information and concerns across organizational levels as well as among team members and the issue of *time-zone differences*. The value of chi-square test is 2.295 from Table A-H-447 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.130$.

Table A-H-446

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue8: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR25 establishes a culture for openly sharing information and concerns across organizational levels as well as among team members	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	32	12	44
		Expected Count	34.8	9.2	44.0
		% within Recode2_PR25 establish_a_culture_for_openly _sharing_informati	72.7%	27.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue8: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES	50.0%	70.6%	54.3%
		Std. Residual	-.5	.9	
	Rarely + Never	Count	32	5	37
		Expected Count	29.2	7.8	37.0
		% within Recode2_PR25 establish_a_culture_for_openly _sharing_informati	86.5%	13.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue8: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES	50.0%	29.4%	45.7%
		Std. Residual	.5	-1.0	
Total	Count		64	17	81
	Expected Count		64.0	17.0	81.0
	% within Recode2_PR25 establish_a_culture_for_openly _sharing_informati		79.0%	21.0%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Issue8: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-447

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.295 ^a	1	.130		
Continuity Correction ^b	1.540	1	.215		
Likelihood Ratio	2.364	1	.124		
Fisher's Exact Test				.174	.107
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.266	1	.132		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.77.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-448

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.168	.130
	Cramer's V	.168	.130
N of Valid Cases		81	

Hypothesis 6.3.8: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR26: Client Company establishes project teams as well as their responsibilities, authorities and interrelationships and Issue 8: Time Zone Difference

The analysis shows no significant relationship between performing practice PR26: Client Company establishes project teams as well as their responsibilities, authorities and interrelationships and the issue of *time-zone differences*. The value of chi-square test is 2.295 from Table A-H-450 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.130.

Table A-H-449

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue8: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR26 Establishes project teams as well as their responsibilities, authorities and interrelationships	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	32	12	44
		Expected Count	34.8	9.2	44.0
		% within Recode2_PR26 Establish project teams_and their respons	72.7%	27.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue8: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES	50.0%	70.6%	54.3%
		Std. Residual	-.5	.9	
	Rarely + Never	Count	32	5	37
		Expected Count	29.2	7.8	37.0
		% within Recode2_PR26 Establish project teams_as well as their respons	86.5%	13.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue8: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES	50.0%	29.4%	45.7%
		Std. Residual	.5	-1.0	
Total	Count		64	17	81
	Expected Count		64.0	17.0	81.0
	% within Recode2_PR26 Establish project_ teams_ll_as_their_respons		79.0%	21.0%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Issue8: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-450

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.295 ^a	1	.130		
Continuity Correction ^b	1.540	1	.215		
Likelihood Ratio	2.364	1	.124		
Fisher's Exact Test				.174	.107
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.266	1	.132		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.77.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-451

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.168	.130
	Cramer's V	.168	.130
N of Valid Cases		81	

2.4 - Testing Hypothesis 6.3.8-4: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR27: Client Company establishes and maintains open and effective project teams' communication and coordination plan and Issue 8: Time Zone Difference

The analysis shows no significant relationship between performing practice PR27: Client Company establishes and maintains open and effective project teams' communication and coordination plan and the issue of *time-zone differences*. The value of chi-square test is 7.400 from Table A-H-453 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00652347$.

Table A-H-452

Crosstab						
			Recode2_Issue8: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES		Total	
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never		
Recode2_PR27 Establishes and maintains open and effective project teams' communication and coordination plan	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	29	14	43	
		Expected Count	34.0	9.0	43.0	
		% within Recode2_PR27 establish_and_maintain_open_and_effec tive_commun	67.4%	32.6%	100.0%	
		% within Recode2_Issue8: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES	45.3%	82.4%	53.1%	
		Std. Residual	-.9	1.7		
	Rarely + Never	Count	35	3	38	
		Expected Count	30.0	8.0	38.0	
		% within Recode2_PR27 establish_and_maintain_open_and_effec tive_commun	92.1%	7.9%	100.0%	
		% within Recode2_Issue8: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES	54.7%	17.6%	46.9%	
		Std. Residual	.9	-1.8		
Total			Count	64	17	81
			Expected Count	64.0	17.0	81.0
			% within Recode2_PR27 establish_and_maintain_open_and_effec tive_commun	79.0%	21.0%	100.0%
			% within Recode2_Issue8: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-453

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.400 ^a	1	.00652347		
Continuity Correction ^b	5.987	1	.01441047		
Likelihood Ratio	7.978	1	.00473618		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00710418	.00605872
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.308	1	.00686351		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.98.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-454

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.302	.007
	Cramer's V	.302	.007
N of Valid Cases		81	

2.5 - Testing Hypothesis 6.3.8-5: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR28: Client Company team managers are responsible to track and resolve inter-group issues and Issue 8: Time Zone Difference

The analysis shows no significant relationship between performing practice PR28: Client Company team managers are responsible to track and resolve inter-group issues and the issue of *time-zone differences*. The value of chi-square test is 3.812 from Table A-H-456 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.051.

Table A-H-455

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue8: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR28 Team managers are responsible to track and resolve inter-group issues	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	32	13	45
		Expected Count	35.6	9.4	45.0
		% within Recode2_PR28 Team_managers_are_responsible_to_track_intergrou	71.1%	28.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue8: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES	50.0%	76.5%	55.6%
		Std. Residual	-.6	1.2	
	Rarely + Never	Count	32	4	36
		Expected Count	28.4	7.6	36.0
		% within Recode2_PR28 Team_managers_are_responsible_to_track_intergrou	88.9%	11.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue8: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES	50.0%	23.5%	44.4%
		Std. Residual	.7	-1.3	
Total	Count		64	17	81
	Expected Count		64.0	17.0	81.0
	% within Recode2_PR28 Team_managers_are_responsible_to_track_intergrou		79.0%	21.0%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Issue8: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Std. Residual				

Table A-H-456

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.812 ^a	1	.051		
Continuity Correction ^b	2.815	1	.093		
Likelihood Ratio	4.015	1	.045		
Fisher's Exact Test				.060	.045
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.765	1	.052		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.56.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-457

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.217	.051
	Cramer's V	.217	.051
N of Valid Cases		81	

2.6 - Testing Hypothesis 6.3.8-6: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR29: Client Company maintains effective work-groups, interpersonal problems are addressed quickly and meetings are managed to ensure that work-group time is used most effectively and Issue 8: Time Zone Difference

The analysis shows no significant relationship between performing practice PR29: Client Company maintains effective work-groups, interpersonal problems are addressed quickly and meetings are managed to ensure that work-group time is used most effectively and the issue of *time-zone differences*. The value of chi-square test is 2.021 from Table A-H-459 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.155$.

Table A-H-458

Crosstab						
			Recode2_Issue8: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES		Total	
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never		
Recode2_PR29 Maintains effective work-groups, interpersonal problems are addressed quickly and meetings are managed to ensure that work-group time is used most effectively	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	29	11	40	
		Expected Count	31.6	8.4	40.0	
		% within Recode2_PR29 Maintains _effective_workgroup	72.5%	27.5%	100.0%	
		% within Recode2_Issue8: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES	45.3%	64.7%	49.4%	
		Std. Residual	-.5	.9		
	Rarely + Never	Count	35	6	41	
		Expected Count	32.4	8.6	41.0	
		% within Recode2_PR29 Maintains _effective_workgroup	85.4%	14.6%	100.0%	
		% within Recode2_Issue8: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES	54.7%	35.3%	50.6%	
		Std. Residual	.5	-.9		
Total			Count	64	17	81
			Expected Count	64.0	17.0	81.0
			% within Recode2_PR29 Maintains _effective_workgroup	79.0%	21.0%	100.0%
			% within Recode2_Issue8: TIME-ZONE DIFFERENCES	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-459

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.021 ^a	1	.155		
Continuity Correction ^b	1.320	1	.251		
Likelihood Ratio	2.044	1	.153		
Fisher's Exact Test				.181	.125
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.996	1	.158		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.40.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-460

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.158	.155
	Cramer's V	.158	.155
N of Valid Cases		81	

Hypothesis 3.9: Cultural Differences

3.1 – Testing Hypothesis 6.3.9-1: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR24: Client Company ensures that the workforce has the skills to share information and coordinate their activities efficiently and Issue 9: Cultural Differences

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR24: Client Company ensures that the workforce has the skills to share information and coordinate their activities efficiently and the issue of *cultural differences*. The value of chi-square test is 13.680 from Table A-H-462 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00021675$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR24: Client Company ensures that the workforce has the skills to share information and coordinate their activities efficiently and the issue of *cultural differences*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR24 reported fewer than expected *cultural differences* issue. Table A-H-461 shows that 5 companies that performed PR24 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *cultural differences* issue while the expected count was (13). Whereas, 25 of the companies that performed PR24 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *cultural differences* issue while the expected count for this category was (17).

Cramer’s $V=.411$ indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR24 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR24 reported fewer *cultural differences* issue as shown in Table A-H-463.

Table A-H-461

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue9: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR24 Ensures that the workforce has the skills to share information and coordinate their activities efficiently	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	21	25	46
		Expected Count	29.0	17.0	46.0
		% within Recode2_PR24 Ensures_that_the_workforce_ has_the_skills_to_sha	45.7%	54.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue9: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	41.2%	83.3%	56.8%
		Std. Residual	-1.5	1.9	
	Rarely + Never	Count	30	5	35
		Expected Count	22.0	13.0	35.0
		% within Recode2_PR24 Ensures_that_the_workforce_ has_the_skills_to_sha	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue9: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	58.8%	16.7%	43.2%
		Std. Residual	1.7	-2.2	
Total			Count	51	30
			Expected Count	51.0	30.0
			% within Recode2_PR24 Ensures_that_the_workforce_ has_the_skills_to_sha	63.0%	37.0%
			% within Recode2_Issue9: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-462

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.680 ^a	1	.00021675		
Continuity Correction ^b	12.016	1	.00052745		
Likelihood Ratio	14.653	1	.00012921		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00021368	.00018287
Linear-by-Linear Association	13.511	1	.00023715		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.96.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-463

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.411	.000
	Cramer's V	.411	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

3.2 - Testing Hypothesis 6.3.9-2: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR25: Client Company establishes a culture for openly sharing information and concerns across organizational levels as well as among team members and Issue 9: Cultural Differences

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR25: Client Company establishes a culture for openly sharing information and concerns across organizational levels as well as among team members and the issue of *cultural differences*. The value of chi-square test is 12.662 from Table A-H-465 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00037313$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR25: Client Company establishes a culture for openly sharing information and concerns across organizational levels as well as among team members and the issue of *cultural differences*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR25 reported fewer than expected *cultural differences* issue. Table A-H-464 shows that 6 companies that performed PR25 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *cultural differences* issue while the expected count was (13.7). Whereas, 24 of the companies that performed PR25 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *cultural differences* issue while the expected count for this category was (16.3).

Cramer’s $V=.395$ indicates a moderate relatively strong association between applying performing PR25 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR25 reported fewer *cultural differences* issue as shown in Table A-H-466.

Table A-H-464

Crosstab					
		Recode2_Issue9: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES		Total	
		Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never		
Recode2_PR25	Always +	Count	20	24	44
Establishes a culture	Very	Expected Count	27.7	16.3	44.0

for openly sharing information and concerns across organizational levels as well as among team members	Frequently + Occasionally	% within Recode2_PR25 establish_a_culture_for_openly_sharing_informati	45.5%	54.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue9: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	39.2%	80.0%	54.3%
		Std. Residual	-1.5	1.9	
	Rarely + Never	Count	31	6	37
		Expected Count	23.3	13.7	37.0
		% within Recode2_PR25 establish_a_culture_for_openly_sharing_informati	83.8%	16.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue9: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	60.8%	20.0%	45.7%
		Std. Residual	1.6	-2.1	
Total	Count	51	30	81	
	Expected Count	51.0	30.0	81.0	
	% within Recode2_PR25 establish_a_culture_for_openly_sharing_informati	63.0%	37.0%	100.0%	
	% within Recode2_Issue9: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table A-H-465

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.662 ^a	1	.00037313		
Continuity Correction ^b	11.072	1	.00087647		
Likelihood Ratio	13.350	1	.00025838		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00047571	.00033937
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.506	1	.00040568		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.70.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-466

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.395	.000
	Cramer's V	.395	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

3.3 - Testing Hypothesis 3.9-3: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR26: Client Company establishes project teams as well as their responsibilities, authorities and interrelationships and Issue 9: Cultural Differences

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR26: Client Company establishes project teams as well as their responsibilities, authorities and interrelationships and the issue of *cultural differences*. The value of chi-square test is 16.163 from Table A-H-468 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p=.00005812.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR26: Client Company establishes project teams as well as their responsibilities, authorities and interrelationships and the issue of *cultural differences*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR26 reported fewer than expected *cultural differences* issue. Table A-H-467 shows that 5 companies that performed PR26 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *cultural differences* issue while the expected count was (13.7). Whereas, 25

of the companies that performed PR26 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *cultural differences* issue while the expected count for this category was (16.3).

Cramer’s V= .477 indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR26 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR26 reported fewer *cultural differences* issue as shown in Table A-H-469.

Table A-H-467

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue9: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR26 establishes project teams as well as their responsibilities, authorities and interrelationships	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	19	25	44
		Expected Count	27.7	16.3	44.0
		% within Recode2_PR26 Establish_project_teams_as well_as_their_respons	43.2%	56.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue9: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	37.3%	83.3%	54.3%
		Std. Residual	-1.7	2.2	
	Rarely + Never	Count	32	5	37
		Expected Count	23.3	13.7	37.0
		% within Recode2_PR26 Establish_project_teams_as well_as_their_respons	86.5%	13.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue9: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	62.7%	16.7%	45.7%
		Std. Residual	1.8	-2.4	
Total			Count	51	30
			Expected Count	51.0	30.0
			% within Recode2_PR26 Establish_project_teams_as well_as_their_respons	63.0%	37.0%
			% within Recode2_Issue9: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	100.0%	100.0%
				%	

Table A-H-468

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.163 ^a	1	.00005812		
Continuity Correction ^b	14.359	1	.00015104		
Likelihood Ratio	17.300	1	.00003192		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00006736	.00004881
Linear-by-Linear Association	15.963	1	.00006458		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.70.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-469

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.447	.000
	Cramer's V	.447	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

3.4 - Testing Hypothesis 6.3.9-4: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR27: Client Company establishes and maintains open and effective project teams' communication and coordination plan and Issue 9: Cultural Differences

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR27: Client Company establishes and maintains open and effective project teams' communication and coordination plan and the issue of *cultural differences*. The value of chi-square test is 17.503 from Table A-H-471 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00002868$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR27: Client Company establishes and maintains open and effective project teams' communication and coordination plan and the issue of *cultural differences*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR27 reported fewer than expected *cultural differences* issue. Table A-H-470 shows that 5 companies that performed PR27 "Rarely + Never" reported "Rarely + Never" for *cultural differences* issue while the expected count was (14.1). Whereas, 25 of the companies that performed PR27 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Rarely + Never" for experiencing *cultural differences* issue while the expected count for this category was (15.9).

Cramer's $V=.465$ indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR27 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR27 reported fewer *cultural differences* issue as shown in Table A-H-472.

Table A-H-470

Crosstab						
			Recode2_Issue9: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES		Total	
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never		
Recode2_PR27 Establishes and maintains open and effective project teams' communication and coordination plan	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	18	25	43	
		Expected Count	27.1	15.9	43.0	
		% within Recode2_PR27 Establish_and_maintain_open _and_effective_commun	41.9%	58.1%	100.0%	
		% within Recode2_Issue9: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	35.3%	83.3%	53.1%	
		Std. Residual	-1.7	2.3		
	Rarely + Never	Count	33	5	38	
		Expected Count	23.9	14.1	38.0	
		% within Recode2_PR27 establish_and_maintain_open _and_effective_commun	86.8%	13.2%	100.0%	
		% within Recode2_Issue9: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	64.7%	16.7%	46.9%	
		Std. Residual	1.9	-2.4		
Total			Count	51	30	81
			Expected Count	51.0	30.0	81.0
			% within Recode2_PR27 establish_and__open_and_eff ective_commun	63.0%	37.0%	100.0%
			% within Recode2_Issue9: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-471

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)

Pearson Chi-Square	17.503 ^a	1	.00002868		
Continuity Correction ^b	15.627	1	.00007713		
Likelihood Ratio	18.724	1	.00001511		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00002862	.00002405
Linear-by-Linear Association	17.287	1	.00003214		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.07.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-472

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.465	.000
	Cramer's V	.465	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

3.5 - Testing Hypothesis 6.3.9-5: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR28: Client Company team managers are responsible to track and resolve inter-group issue and Issue 9: Cultural Differences

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR28: Client Company team managers are responsible to track and resolve inter-group issue and the issue of *cultural differences*. The value of chi-square test is 8.600 from Table A-H-474 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00036100.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR28: Client Company team managers are responsible to track and resolve inter-group and the issue of *cultural differences*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR28 reported fewer than expected *cultural differences* issue. Table A-H-473 shows that 7 companies that performed PR28 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *cultural differences* issue while the expected count was (13.3). While, 23 of the companies that performed PR28 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *cultural differences* issue while the expected count for this category was (16.7).

Cramer’s V= .326 indicates a moderate strong association between applying performing PR28 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR28 reported fewer *cultural differences* issue as shown in Table A-H-475.

Table A-H-473

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue9: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR28 Team managers are responsible to track and resolve inter- group	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	22	23	45
		Expected Count	28.3	16.7	45.0
		% within Recode2_PR28	48.9%	51.1%	100.0%
		Team_managers_are_respons ible_to_track_intergrou			
		% within Recode2_Issue9: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	43.1%	76.7%	55.6%
		Std. Residual	-1.2	1.6	
	Rarely + Never	Count	29	7	36
		Expected Count	22.7	13.3	36.0

		% within Recode2_PR28 Team_managers_are_respons ible_to_track_intergrou	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue9: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	56.9%	23.3%	44.4%
		Std. Residual	1.3	-1.7	
Total		Count	51	30	81
		Expected Count	51.0	30.0	81.0
		% within Recode2_PR28 Team_managers_are_respons ible_to_track_intergrou	63.0%	37.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue9: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-474

0.000691					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.600 ^a	1	.00036100		
Continuity Correction ^b	7.296	1	.00691100		
Likelihood Ratio	8.954	1	.00027600		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00051200	.00030570
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.494	1	.00035630		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.33.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-475

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.326	.003
	Cramer's V	.326	.003
N of Valid Cases		81	

3.9 - Testing Hypothesis 6.3.9-6: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR29: Client Company maintains effective work-groups, interpersonal problems are addressed quickly and meetings are managed to ensure that work-group time is used most effectively and Issue 9: Cultural Differences

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR29: Client Company maintains effective work-groups, interpersonal problems are addressed quickly and meetings are managed to ensure that work-group time is used most effectively and the issue of *cultural differences*. The value of chi-square test is 10.934 from Table A-H-477 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and $p = .00009440$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR29: Client Company maintains effective work-groups, interpersonal problems are addressed quickly and meetings are managed to ensure that work-group time is used most effectively and the issue of *cultural differences*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR29 reported fewer than expected *cultural differences* issue. Table A-H-476 shows that 8 companies that performed PR29 "Rarely + Never" reported "Rarely + Never" for *cultural differences* issue while the expected count was (15.2). Whereas, 22 of the companies that performed PR29 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Rarely + Never" for experiencing *cultural differences* issue while the expected count for this category was (14.8).

Cramer's $V = .367$ indicates a moderate strong association between applying performing PR29 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR29 reported fewer *cultural differences* issue as shown in Table A-H-478.

Table A-H-476

Crosstab				
		Recode2_Issue9: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES		Total
		Always + Most Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR29 Maintains effective work- groups, interpersonal problems are addressed quickly and meetings are managed to ensure that work- group time is used most effectively	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	18	22
		Expected Count	25.2	14.8
		% within Recode2_PR29 Maintains_effective_workgroup	45.0%	55.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue9: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	35.3%	73.3%
		Std. Residual	-1.4	1.9
	Rarely + Never	Count	33	8
		Expected Count	25.8	15.2
		% within Recode2_PR29 Maintains_effective_workgroup	80.5%	19.5%
		% within Recode2_Issue9: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	64.7%	26.7%
		Std. Residual	1.4	-1.8
Total	Count		51	30
	Expected Count		51.0	30.0
	% within Recode2_PR29 Maintains_effective_workgroup		63.0%	37.0%
	% within Recode2_Issue9: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES		100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-477

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.934 ^a	1	.00009440	.00012470	.00009330
Continuity Correction ^b	9.466	1	.00020940		
Likelihood Ratio	11.259	1	.00007920		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.799	1	.00010150		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.81.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-478

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.367	.001
	Cramer's V	.367	.001
N of Valid Cases		81	

Hypothesis 3.10: There is a relationship between PR30, to PR34 practices and frequency of R10 issue experienced by client firms.

Issue 10	INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT.
#	CMM/CMMI Practices

PR30	Client Company establishes and maintains a mutual understanding of the contract with selected suppliers and end users based on acquisition needs and the suppliers' proposed approaches
PR31	Client Company stakeholder needs, expectations, constraints and interfaces are collected and translated into customer requirements.
PR32	Client Company requirements are refined and elaborated into contractual requirements.
PR33	Client Company establishes and maintains a formal contract management plan
PR34	Client Company establishes and maintains contractual requirements.

- 1- Testing Hypothesis 3.10.1: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR30: Client Company establishes and maintains a mutual understanding of the contract with selected suppliers and end users based on acquisition needs and the suppliers' proposed approaches and Issue 10: Incomplete and unclear contact

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR30: Client Company establishes and maintains a mutual understanding of the contract with selected suppliers and end users based on acquisition needs and the suppliers' proposed approaches and the issue of *incomplete and unclear contact*. The value of chi-square test is 35.668 from Table A-H-480 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR30: Client Company establishes and maintains a mutual understanding of the contract with selected suppliers and end users based on acquisition needs and the suppliers' proposed approaches and the issue of *incomplete and unclear contact*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR30 reported fewer than expected *incomplete and unclear contact* issue. Table A-H-479 shows that 6 companies that performed PR30 "Rarely + Never" reported "Rarely + Never" for *incomplete and unclear contact* issue while the expected count was (19.5). Whereas, 34 of the companies that performed PR30 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Rarely + Never" for experiencing *incomplete and unclear contact* issue while the expected count for this category was (20.5).

Cramer's V= .660 indicates a strong association between applying performing PR30 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR30 reported fewer *incomplete and unclear contact* issues as shown in Table A-H-481.

Table A-H-479

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue10: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR30 Establishes and maintains a mutual understanding of the contract with selected suppliers and end users based on acquisition needs and the suppliers' proposed approaches	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	8	34	42
		Expected Count	21.5	20.5	42.0
		% within Recode2_PR30 Establishes_and_maintains_mutu al_understanding_of_the_contract	19.0%	81.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue10: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	19.0%	85.0%	51.2%
		Std. Residual	-2.9	3.0	
	Rarely + Never	Count	34	6	40
		Expected Count	20.5	19.5	40.0

		% within Recode2_PR30 Establishes_and_maintains_mutual_understanding_of_the_contract	85.0%	15.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue10: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	81.0%	15.0%	48.8%
		Std. Residual	3.0	-3.1	
Total		Count	42	40	82
		Expected Count	42.0	40.0	82.0
		% within Recode2_PR30 Establishes_and_maintains_mutual_understanding_of_the_contract	51.2%	48.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue10: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-480

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	35.668 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	33.077	1	.00000001		
Likelihood Ratio	38.910	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	35.233	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 19.51.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-481

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.660	.000
	Cramer's V	.660	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

2 - Testing Hypothesis 6.3.10.3: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR31: Client Company stakeholder needs, expectations, constraints and interfaces are collected and translated into customer requirements and Issue 10: Incomplete and unclear contact.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR31: Client Company stakeholder needs, expectations, constraints and interfaces are collected and translated into customer requirements and the issue of *incomplete and unclear contact*. The value of chi-square test is 27.648 from Table A-H-483 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000015$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR31: Client Company stakeholder needs, expectations, constraints and interfaces are collected and translated into customer requirements and the issue of *incomplete and unclear contact*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR31 reported fewer than expected incomplete and unclear contact issue. Table A-H-482 shows that 4 companies that performed PR31 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for incomplete and unclear contact issue while the expected count was (15.6). Whereas, 28 of the companies that performed PR31 “Rarely + Never” reported “Always + Almost Always” for experiencing *incomplete and unclear contact* issue while the expected count for this category was (16.4).

Cramer's V= .581 indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR31 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR31 reported fewer *incomplete and unclear contact* issues as shown in Table A-H-484.

Table A-H-482

Crosstab							
			Recode2_Issue10: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT		Total		
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never			
RRRecode2_PR31 Collects and translates stakeholders needs expectations into customer requirements	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	14	36	50		
		Expected Count	25.6	24.4	50.0		
		% within RRRecode2_PR31 Collects and translates stakeholders needs expectations into customer requirements	28.0%	72.0%	100.0%		
		% within Recode2_Issue10: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	33.3%	90.0%	61.0%		
		Std. Residual	-2.3	2.4			
	Rarely + Never	Count	28	4	32		
		Expected Count	16.4	15.6	32.0		
		% within RRRecode2_PR31 Collects and translates stakeholders needs expectations into customer requirements	87.5%	12.5%	100.0%		
		% within Recode2_Issue10: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	66.7%	10.0%	39.0%		
		Std. Residual	2.9	-2.9			
				Count	42	40	82
				Expected Count	42.0	40.0	82.0
		% within RRRecode2_PR31 Collects and translates stakeholders needs expectations into customer requirements	51.2%	48.8%	100.0%		
		% within Recode2_Issue10: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

Table A-H-483

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	27.648 ^a	1	.00000015		
Continuity Correction ^b	25.318	1	.00000049		
Likelihood Ratio	30.219	1	.00000004		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000010	.00000009
Linear-by-Linear Association	27.311	1	.00000017		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.61.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-484

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.581	.000
	Cramer's V	.581	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

3- Testing Hypothesis 3.10.3: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR32: Client Company requirements are refined and elaborated into contractual requirements and Issue 10: Incomplete and unclear contact

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR32: Client Company requirements are refined and elaborated into contractual requirements and the issue of *incomplete and unclear contact*. The value of chi-square test is 23.624 from Table A-H-486 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000117$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR32: Client Company requirements are refined and elaborated into contractual requirements and the issue of *incomplete and unclear contact*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR32 reported fewer than expected *incomplete and unclear contact* issue. Table A-H-485 shows that 9 companies that performed PR32 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *incomplete and unclear contact* issue while the expected count was (20). While, 31 of the companies that performed PR32 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *incomplete and unclear contact* issue while the expected count for this category was (20).

Cramer’s $V=.537$ indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR32 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR32 reported fewer *incomplete and unclear contact* issues as shown in Table A-H-487.

Table A-H-485

crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue10: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR32 Requirements are refined and elaborated into contract	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	10	31	41
		Expected Count	21.0	20.0	41.0
		% within Recode2_PR32 Requirements are_refined_and_elaborated_into_	24.4%	75.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue10: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	23.8%	77.5%	50.0%
		Std. Residual	-2.4	2.5	
	Rarely + Never	Count	32	9	41
		Expected Count	21.0	20.0	41.0
		% within Recode2_PR32 Requirements are_refined_and_elaborated_into_con	78.0%	22.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue10: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	76.2%	22.5%	50.0%
		Std. Residual	2.4	-2.5	
Total	Count		42	40	82
	Expected Count		42.0	40.0	82.0
	% within Recode2_PR32 Requirements are_refined_and_elaborated_into_con		51.2%	48.8%	100.0%

	% within Recode2_Issue10: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
--	---	--------	--------	--------

Table A-H-486

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.624 ^a	1	.00000117		
Continuity Correction ^b	21.525	1	.00000349		
Likelihood Ratio	24.918	1	.00000060		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000207	.00000103
Linear-by-Linear Association	23.336	1	.00000136		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 20.00.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-487

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.537	.000
	Cramer's V	.537	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

- 4- Testing Hypothesis 6.3.10.4: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR33: Client Company establishes and maintains a formal contract management plan and Issue 10: Incomplete and unclear contact

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR33: Client Company establishes and maintains a formal contract management plan and the issue of *incomplete and unclear contact*. The value of chi-square test is 23.785 from Table A-H-489 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000108.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR33: Client Company establishes and maintains a formal contract management plan and the issue of *incomplete and unclear contact*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR33 reported fewer than expected *incomplete and unclear contact* issue. Table A-H-488 shows that 8 companies that performed PR33 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *incomplete and unclear contact* issue while the expected count was (19). Whereas, 32 of the companies that performed PR33 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *incomplete and unclear contact* issue while the expected count for this category was (21).

Cramer’s V= .539 indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR33 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR33 reported fewer *incomplete and unclear contact* issues as shown in Table A-H-490.

Table A-H-488

Crosstab		
	Recode2_Issue10: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	Total

			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR33 Establishes and maintains a formal contract management plan	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	11	32	43
		Expected Count	22.0	21.0	43.0
		% within Recode2_PR33 Establishes and_maintains_a_formal_contract_m anagement plan	25.6%	74.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue10: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	26.2%	80.0%	52.4%
		Std. Residual	-2.3	2.4	
	Rarely + Never	Count	31	8	39
		Expected Count	20.0	19.0	39.0
		% within Recode2_PR33 Establishes _and_maintains_a_formal_contract_ management plan	79.5%	20.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue10: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	73.8%	20.0%	47.6%
		Std. Residual	2.5	-2.5	
Total			Count	42	40
			Expected Count	42.0	40.0
			% within Recode2_PR33 Establishes_and_maintains_a_formal contract_management plan	51.2%	48.8%
			% within Recode2_Issue10: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	100.0%	100.0%
				100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-489

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.785 ^a	1	.00000108		
Continuity Correction ^b	21.677	1	.00000323		
Likelihood Ratio	25.145	1	.00000053		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000102	.00000093
Linear-by-Linear Association	23.495	1	.00000125		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 19.02.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-490

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.539	.000
	Cramer's V	.539	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

- 5- Testing Hypothesis 6.3.10.5: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR34: Client Company establishes and maintains contractual requirements and Issue 10: Incomplete and unclear contact

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR34: Client Company establishes and maintains contractual requirements and the issue of *incomplete and unclear contact*. The value of chi-square test is 19.666 from Table A-H-492 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000922.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR34: Client Company establishes and maintains contractual requirements and the issue of *incomplete and unclear contact*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR34 reported fewer than expected *incomplete and unclear contact* issue. Table A-H-491 shows that 9 companies that performed PR34 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *incomplete and unclear contact* issue while the expected count was (19). Whereas, 31 of the companies that performed practice PR34 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *incomplete and unclear contact* issue while the expected count for this category was (21).

Cramer’s V= .490 indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR34 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR34 reported fewer *incomplete and unclear contact* issues as shown in Table A-H-493.

Table A-H-491

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue10: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR34 Establishes and maintains contractual requirements	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	12	31	43
		Expected Count	22.0	21.0	43.0
		% within Recode2_PR34 Establishes_and_maintains contractual_requirements	27.9%	72.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue10: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	28.6%	77.5%	52.4%
		Std. Residual	-2.1	2.2	
	Rarely + Never	Count	30	9	39
		Expected Count	20.0	19.0	39.0
		% within Recode2_PR34 Establishes_and_maintains contractual_requirements	76.9%	23.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue10: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	71.4%	22.5%	47.6%
		Std. Residual	2.2	-2.3	
Total		Count	42	40	82
		Expected Count	42.0	40.0	82.0
		% within Recode2_PR34 Establishes_and_maintains contractual_requirements	51.2%	48.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue10: INCOMPLETE AND UNCLEAR CONTRACT	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-492

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.666 ^a	1	.00000922	.00000984	.00000877
Continuity Correction ^b	17.753	1	.00002515		
Likelihood Ratio	20.573	1	.00000574		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	19.426	1	.00001046		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 19.02.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-493

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.490	.000
	Cramer's V	.490	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

Hypothesis H3.11: There is a relationship between PR35 and PR36 practices and frequency of R11 issue:
Early contract negotiation and termination experienced by client firms.

Issue 11	EARLY CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION AND TERMINATION.
#	CMM/CMMI Practices
PR35	Client Company establishes and maintains negotiation plans to use in completing a supplier agreement.
PR36	Client Company insures that agreements with suppliers are satisfied by both the project and the supplier.

- 1- Testing Hypothesis 6.3.11.1: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR35: Client Company establishes and maintains negotiation plans to use in completing a supplier agreement and Issue 11: Early contract negotiation and termination experienced by client firms.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR35: Client Company establishes and maintains negotiation plans to use in completing a supplier agreement and the issue of *early contract negotiation and termination* experienced by client firms. The value of chi-square test is 15.985 from Table A-H-495 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00006384.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR35: Client Company establishes and maintains negotiation plans to use in completing a supplier agreement and the issue of *early contract negotiation and termination* experienced by client firms. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR35 reported fewer than expected *early contract negotiation and termination* issue. Table A-H-494 shows that 7 companies that performed PR35 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *early contract negotiation and termination* issue while the expected count was (15.1). Whereas, 18 of the companies that performed practice PR35 “Rarely + Never” reported “Always + Almost Always” for experiencing *early contract negotiation and termination* issue while the expected count for this category was (9.9).

Cramer’s V= .453 indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR35 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR35 reported fewer *early contract negotiation and termination* issues as shown in Table A-H-496.

Table A-H-494

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue11: EARLY CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION AND TERMINATION		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR35 Establishes and maintains negotiation plans to use in	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	13	40	53
		Expected Count	21.1	31.9	53.0
		% within Recode2_PR35 Establishes and maintains negotiation plans to use in completing a supplier agreement	24.5%	75.5%	100.0%

completing a supplier agreement		% within Recode2_Issue11: EARLY CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION AND TERMINATION	41.9%	85.1%	67.9%
		Std. Residual	-1.8	1.4	
	Rarely + Never	Count	18	7	25
		Expected Count	9.9	15.1	25.0
		% within Recode2_PR35 Establishes and maintains negotiation plans to use in completing a supplier agreement	72.0%	28.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue11: EARLY CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION AND TERMINATION	58.1%	14.9%	32.1%
		Std. Residual	2.6	-2.1	
Total	Count		31	47	78
	Expected Count		31.0	47.0	78.0
	% within Recode2_PR35 Establishes and maintains negotiation plans to use in completing a supplier agreement		39.7%	60.3%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Issue11: EARLY CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION AND TERMINATION		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-495

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.985 ^a	1	.00006384		
Continuity Correction ^b	14.064	1	.00017665		
Likelihood Ratio	16.126	1	.00005927		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00013255	.00008564
Linear-by-Linear Association	15.780	1	.00007114		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.94.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-496

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.453	.000
	Cramer's V	.453	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

2-Testing Hypothesis 6.3.11.2: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR36: Client Company insures that agreements with suppliers are satisfied by both the project and the supplier and Issue 11: Early contract negotiation and termination experienced by client firms

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR36: Client Company insures that agreements with suppliers are satisfied by both the project and the supplier and the issue of *early contract negotiation and termination experienced* by client firms. The value of chi-square test is 24.944 from Table A-H-498 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000059.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR36: Client Company insures that agreements with suppliers are satisfied by both the project and the supplier and the issue of *early contract negotiation and termination* experienced by client firms. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR36 reported fewer than expected early contract negotiation and termination issue. Table A-H-497 shows that 6 companies that performed PR36 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for early contract negotiation and termination issue while the expected count was (16.3). Whereas, 21 of the companies that performed practice PR36 “Rarely + Never” reported “Always + Almost Always” for experiencing *early contract negotiation and termination* issue while the expected count for this category was (21).

Cramer’s V= .566 indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR36 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR36 reported fewer early contract negotiation and termination issues as shown in Table A-H-499.

Table A-H-497

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue11: EARLY CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION AND TERMINATION		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR36 Insures that agreements with suppliers are satisfied by both the project and the supplier	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	10	41	51
		Expected Count	20.3	30.7	51.0
		% within Recode2_PR36	19.6%	80.4%	100.0%
		Insures that agreements with suppliers are satisfied by both the project and the supplier			
		% within Recode2_Issue11: EARLY CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION AND TERMINATION	32.3%	87.2%	65.4%
		Std. Residual	-2.3	1.9	
	Rarely + Never	Count	21	6	27
		Expected Count	10.7	16.3	27.0
		% within Recode2_PR36	77.8%	22.2%	100.0%
		Insures that agreements with suppliers are satisfied by both the project and the supplier			
		% within Recode2_Issue11: EARLY CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION AND TERMINATION	67.7%	12.8%	34.6%
		Std. Residual	3.1	-2.5	
Total	Count		31	47	78
	Expected Count		31.0	47.0	78.0
	% within Recode2_PR36		39.7%	60.3%	100.0%
	Insures that agreements with suppliers are satisfied by both the project and the supplier				
	% within Recode2_Issue11: EARLY CONTRACT RENEGOTIATION AND TERMINATION		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-498

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.944 ^a	1	.00000059		

Continuity Correction ^b	22.574	1	.00000202		
Likelihood Ratio	25.740	1	.00000039		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000135	.00000076
Linear-by-Linear Association	24.624	1	.00000070		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.73.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-499

Symmetric Measures			Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi		-.566	.000
	Cramer's V		.566	.000
N of Valid Cases			78	

Hypothesis 3.12: There is a relationship between PR37, PR38 and PR39 practices and frequency of R12 issue: Insufficient previous experience of the supplier experienced by client firms.

Issue 12	INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER
#	Question
PR37	Client Company selects suppliers based on an evaluation of their ability to meet specified requirements and established criteria
PR38	Client Company identifies and qualifies potential suppliers
PR39	Client Company selects suppliers using a formal evaluation

- 1- Testing Hypothesis 3.12.1: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR37: Client Company selects suppliers based on an evaluation of their ability to meet specified requirements and established criteria and Issue 12: Insufficient previous experience of the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR37: Client Company selects suppliers based on an evaluation of their ability to meet specified requirements and established criteria and the issue of *insufficient previous experience of the supplier*. The value of chi-square test is 22.177 from Table A-H-501 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000249$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR37: Client Company selects suppliers based on an evaluation of their ability to meet specified requirements and established criteria and the issue of *insufficient previous experience of the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR37 reported fewer than expected *insufficient previous experience of the supplier* issue. Table A-H-500 shows that 7 companies that performed PR37 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *insufficient previous experience of the supplier* issue while the expected count was (17.6). Whereas, 30 of the companies that performed practice PR37 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *insufficient previous experience of the supplier* issue while the expected count for this category was (19.4).

Cramer's $V=.520$ indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR37 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR37 reported fewer *insufficient previous experiences of the supplier* issues as shown in Table A-H-502.

Table A-H-500

Crosstab

			Recode2_Issue12:INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
RRREcode2_PR37 Selects suppliers based on an evaluation of their ability to meet specified requirements	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	13	30	43
		Expected Count	23.6	19.4	43.0
		% within RRREcode2_PR37 Selects_suppliers_based_on_an_evaluation_of_their_ability_to_meetspecified requirements	30.2%	69.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue12: INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER	28.9%	81.1%	52.4%
		Std. Residual	-2.2	2.4	
		Count	32	7	39
	Rarely + Never	Expected Count	21.4	17.6	39.0
		% within RRREcode2_PR37 Selects_suppliers_based_on_an_evaluation_of_their_ability_to_meetspecified requirements	82.1%	17.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue12: INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER	71.1%	18.9%	47.6%
		Std. Residual	2.3	-2.5	
		Count	45	37	82
Total		Expected Count	45.0	37.0	82.0
		% within RRREcode2_PR37 Selects_suppliers_based_on_an_evaluation_of_their_ability_to_meetspecified requirements	54.9%	45.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue12: INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Std. Residual			
		Count			

Table A-H-501

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.177 ^a	1	.00000249		
Continuity Correction ^b	20.134	1	.00000722		
Likelihood Ratio	23.484	1	.00000126		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000248	.00000213
Linear-by-Linear Association	21.907	1	.00000286		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.60.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-502

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.520	.000
	Cramer's V	.520	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

2- Testing Hypothesis 3.12.2: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR38: Client Company identifies and qualifies potential suppliers and Issue 12: Insufficient previous experience of the supplier experienced by client firms

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR38: Client Company identifies and qualifies potential suppliers and the issue of *insufficient previous experience of the supplier*. The value of chi-square test is 23.640 from Table A-H-504 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and $p = .00000116$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR38: Client Company identifies and qualifies potential suppliers and the issue of *insufficient previous experience of the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR38 reported fewer than expected *insufficient previous experience of the supplier* issue. Table A-H-503 shows that 8 companies that performed PR38 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *insufficient previous experience of the supplier* issue while the expected count was (19). Whereas, 29 of the companies that performed practice PR38 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *insufficient previous experience of the supplier* issue while the expected count for this category was (18).

Cramer’s $V = .537$ indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR38 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR38 reported fewer *insufficient previous experiences of the supplier* issues as shown in Table A-H-505.

Table A-H-503

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue12:INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
RRRecode2_PR38 Identifies and quantifies potential suppliers	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	11	29	40
		Expected Count	22.0	18.0	40.0
		% within RRRecode2_PR38 Identifies_and_quantifies_potential suppliers	27.5%	72.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue12: INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER	24.4%	78.4%	48.8%
		Std. Residual	-2.3	2.6	
	Rarely + Never	Count	34	8	42
		Expected Count	23.0	19.0	42.0
		% within RRRecode2_PR38 Identifies_and_quantifies_potential suppliers	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue12: INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER	75.6%	21.6%	51.2%
		Std. Residual	2.3	-2.5	
Total	Count		45	37	82
	Expected Count		45.0	37.0	82.0
	% within RRRecode2_PR38 Identifies_and_quantifies_potential suppliers		54.9%	45.1%	100.0%

	% within Recode2_Issue12: INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER	100.0%	100.0 %	100.0%
--	--	--------	------------	--------

Table A-H-504

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.640 ^a	1	.00000116		
Continuity Correction ^b	21.530	1	.00000348		
Likelihood Ratio	24.940	1	.00000059		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000180	.00000103
Linear-by-Linear Association	23.351	1	.00000135		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 18.05.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-505

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.537	.000
	Cramer's V	.537	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

- 3- Testing Hypothesis 3.12.3: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR39: Client Company selects suppliers using a formal evaluation and Issue 12: Insufficient previous experience of the supplier experienced by client firms

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR39: Client Company selects suppliers using a formal evaluation and the issue of *insufficient previous experience of the supplier*. The value of chi-square test is 35.207 from table A-H-507 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR39: Client Company selects suppliers using a formal evaluation and the issue of *insufficient previous experience of the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR39 reported fewer than expected *insufficient previous experience of the supplier issue*. Table A-H-506 shows that 7 companies that performed PR39 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *insufficient previous experience of the supplier issue* while the expected count was (20.3). Whereas, 30 of the companies that performed practice PR39 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *insufficient previous experience of the supplier issue* while the expected count for this category was (16.7).

Cramer’s V= .655 indicates a strong association between applying performing PR39 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR39 reported fewer insufficient previous experiences of the supplier issues as shown in Table A-H-508.

Table A-H-506

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue12:INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
RRRecode2_ PR39 Selects		Count	7	30	37
		Expected Count	20.3	16.7	37.0

suppliers using a formal evaluation	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	% within RRRecode2_PR39 Selects suppliers using a formal evaluation	18.9%	81.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue12: INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER	15.6%	81.1%	45.1%
		Std. Residual	-3.0	3.3	
	Rarely + Never	Count	38	7	45
		Expected Count	24.7	20.3	45.0
		% within RRRecode2_PR39 Selects suppliers using a formal evaluation	84.4%	15.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue12: INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER	84.4%	18.9%	54.9%
Total	Std. Residual		2.7	-3.0	
	Count		45	37	82
	Expected Count		45.0	37.0	82.0
	% within RRRecode2_PR39 Selects suppliers using a formal evaluation		54.9%	45.1%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Issue12: INSUFFICIENT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPLIER		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-507

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	35.207 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	32.611	1	.00000001		
Likelihood Ratio	38.101	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	34.778	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.70.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-508

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.655	.000
	Cramer's V	.655	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

Hypothesis 3.13: There is a relationship between PR40 to PR48 practices and frequency of R13 issue:
Unable to measure the performance of the supplier experienced by client firms.

Issue 13	UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER
#	CMM/CMMI Practices
PR40	Client Company establishes and maintains quantitative objectives to address quality and process performance, based on customer needs and business objectives.
PR41	Client Company manages the project using statistical and other quantitative techniques to determine whether or not the project's objectives for quality and process performance will be satisfied.
PR42	Client Company performs root cause analysis of selected issues to address deficiencies in achieving the project's quality and process performance objectives.
PR43	Client Company manages corrective actions to closure when the project's performance or results deviate significantly from the plan

PR44	Client Company periodically reviews the project's progress, performance and issues experienced.
PR45	Client Company reviews the project's accomplishments and results at selected project milestones.
PR46	Client Company establishes and maintains records of quality assurance activities.
PR47	Monitors the actual project performance and progress against the project plan
PR48	Ensures that the supplier agreement is satisfied before accepting the acquired product

- 1- Testing Hypothesis 3.13.1: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR40: Client Company establishes and maintains quantitative objectives to address quality and process performance, based on customer needs and business objectives and Issue 13: Unable to measure the performance of the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR40: Client Company establishes and maintains quantitative objectives to address quality and process performance, based on customer needs and business objectives and the issue of *unable to measure the performance of the supplier*. The value of chi-square test is 19.953 from Table A-H-510 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and $p = .00000794$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR40: Client Company establishes and maintains quantitative objectives to address quality and process performance, based on customer needs and business objectives and the issue of *unable to measure the performance of the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR40 reported fewer than expected *unable to measure the performance of the supplier issue*. Table A-H-509 shows that 2 companies that performed PR40 "Rarely + Never" reported "Rarely + Never" for *unable to measure the performance of the supplier issue* while the expected count was (11.1). Whereas, 22 of the companies that performed practice PR40 "Rarely + Never" reported "Always + Almost Always" for experiencing *unable to measure the performance of the supplier issue* while the expected count for this category was (12.9).

Cramer's $V = .506$ indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR40 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR40 reported fewer *unable to measure the performance of the supplier issues* as shown in Table A-H-511.

Table A-H-509

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode3_PR40 Establish and maintain qualitative objectives to address quantity and process performance	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	20	34	54
		Expected Count	29.1	24.9	54.0
		% within Recode3_PR40 Establish and maintain qualitative objectives to address quantity and process performance	37.0%	63.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	47.6%	94.4%	69.2%
		Std. Residual	-1.7	1.8	
	Rarely + Never	Count	22	2	24
		Expected Count	12.9	11.1	24.0

		% within Recode3_PR40 Establish and maintain qualitative objectives to address quantity and process performance	91.7%	8.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	52.4%	5.6%	30.8%
		Std. Residual	2.5	-2.7	
Total		Count	42	36	78
		Expected Count	42.0	36.0	78.0
		% within Recode3_PR40 Establish and maintain qualitative objectives to address quantity and process performance	53.8%	46.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-510

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.953 ^a	1	.00000794		
Continuity Correction ^b	17.815	1	.00002434		
Likelihood Ratio	22.712	1	.00000188		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000515	.00000430
Linear-by-Linear Association	19.697	1	.00000907		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.08.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-511

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.506	.000
	Cramer's V	.506	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

- 2- Testing Hypothesis 3.13.2: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR41: Client Company manages the project using statistical and other quantitative techniques to determine whether or not the project's objectives for quality and process performance will be satisfied and Issue 13: Unable to measure the performance of the supplier experienced by client firms

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR41: Client Company manages the project using statistical and other quantitative techniques to determine whether or not the project's objectives for quality and process performance will be satisfied and the issue of *unable to measure the performance of the supplier*. The value of chi-square test is 21.551 from Table A-H-513 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000344$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR41: Client Company manages the project using statistical and other quantitative techniques to determine whether or not the project's objectives for quality and process performance will be satisfied and the issue of *unable to measure the performance of the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR41

reported fewer than expected *unable to measure the performance of the supplier issue*. Table A-H-512 shows that 2 companies that performed PR41 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *unable to measure the performance of the supplier issue* while the expected count was (11.5). Whereas, 23 of the companies that performed practice PR41 “Rarely + Never” reported “Always + Almost Always” for experiencing *unable to measure the performance of the supplier issue* while the expected count for this category was (13.5).

Cramer’s V= .526 indicates a relatively strong association between performing PR41 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR41 reported fewer *unable to measure the performance of the supplier issues* as shown in Table A-H-514.

Table A-H-512

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR41 Manages the project using statistical and other quantitative techniques to determine whether	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	19	34	53
		Expected Count	28.5	24.5	53.0
		% within Recode2_PR41 Manages the project using statistical and other quantitative techniques to determine	35.8%	64.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	45.2%	94.4%	67.9%
		Std. Residual	-1.8	1.9	
	Rarely + Never	Count	23	2	25
		Expected Count	13.5	11.5	25.0
		% within Recode2_PR41 Manages the project using statistical and other quantitative techniques to determine	92.0%	8.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	54.8%	5.6%	32.1%
		Std. Residual	2.6	-2.8	
Total	Count		42	36	78
	Expected Count		42.0	36.0	78.0
	% within Recode2_PR41 Manages the project using statistical and other		53.8%	46.2%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF		100.0%	100.0 %	100.0%

Table A-H-513

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	21.551 ^a	1	.00000344		
Continuity Correction ^b	19.351	1	.00001088		
Likelihood Ratio	24.561	1	.00000072		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000199	.00000172
Linear-by-Linear Association	21.275	1	.00000398		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.54.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-514

Symmetric Measures		
	Value	Approx. Sig.

Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.526	.000
	Cramer's V	.526	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

- 3- Testing Hypothesis 3.13.3: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR42: Client Company performs root cause analysis of selected issues to address deficiencies in achieving the project's quality and process performance objectives and Issue 13: Unable to measure the performance of the supplier experienced by client firms

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR42: Client Company performs root cause analysis of selected issues to address deficiencies in achieving the project's quality and process performance objectives and the issue of *unable to measure the performance of the supplier*. The value of chi-square test is 18.416 from Table A-H-516 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p=.00001776.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR42: Client Company performs root cause analysis of selected issues to address deficiencies in achieving the project's quality and process performance objectives and the issue of *unable to measure the performance of the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR42 reported fewer than expected *unable to measure the performance of the supplier* issue. Table A-H-515 shows that 2 companies that performed PR42 "Rarely + Never" reported "Rarely + Never" for *unable to measure the performance of the supplier* issue while the expected count was (10.6). Whereas, 21 of the companies that performed practice PR42 "Rarely + Never" reported "Always + Almost Always" for experiencing *unable to measure the performance of the supplier* issue while the expected count for this category was (12.4).

Cramer's V= .486 indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR42 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR42 reported fewer *unable to measure the performance of the supplier* issues as shown in Table A-H-517.

Table A-H-515

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR 42 Performs root cause analysis of selected issues to address deficiencies in achieving the project's quality	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	21	34	55
		Expected Count	29.6	25.4	55.0
		% within Recode2_PR42 Performs root cause analysis of selected issues to address deficiencies in achieving the project	38.2%	61.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	50.0%	94.4%	70.5%
		Std. Residual	-1.6	1.7	
	Rarely + Never	Count	21	2	23
		Expected Count	12.4	10.6	23.0

		% within Recode2_PR42 Performs root cause analysis of selected issues to address deficiencies in achieving the project	91.3%	8.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	50.0%	5.6%	29.5%
		Std. Residual	2.4	-2.6	
Total		Count	42	36	78
		Expected Count	42.0	36.0	78.0
		% within Recode2_PR42 Performs root cause analysis of selected issues to address deficiencies in achieving the project's quality	53.8%	46.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-516

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.416 ^a	1	.00001776		
Continuity Correction ^b	16.340	1	.00005293		
Likelihood Ratio	20.935	1	.00000475		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00001295	.00001038
Linear-by-Linear Association	18.180	1	.00002010		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.62.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-517

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.486	.000
	Cramer's V	.486	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

- 4- Testing Hypothesis 3.13.4: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR43: Client Company manages corrective actions to closure when the project's performance or results deviate significantly from the plan and Issue 13: Unable to measure the performance of the supplier experienced by client firms

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR43: Client Company manages corrective actions to closure when the project's performance or results deviate significantly from the plan and the issue of *unable to measure the performance of the supplier*. The value of chi-square test is 20.057 from Table A-H-519 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000752$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR43: Client Company manages corrective actions to closure when the project's performance or results deviate significantly from the plan and the issue of *unable to measure the performance of the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR43 reported fewer than expected *unable to measure the performance of the supplier issue*. Table A-H-518 shows that zero companies that performed PR43 "Rarely + Never" reported "Rarely + Never" for *unable to measure the performance of the supplier issue* while

the expected count was (8.3). Whereas, 18 of the companies that performed practice PR43 “Rarely + Never” reported “Always + Almost Always” for experiencing *unable to measure the performance of the supplier* issue while the expected count for this category was (9.7).

Cramer’s V= .507 indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR43 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR43 reported fewer *unable to measure the performance of the supplier* issues as shown in Table A-H-520.

Table A-H-518

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR43 Manages corrective actions to closure when the project's performance or results deviate significantly	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	24	36	60
		Expected Count	32.3	27.7	60.0
		% within Recode2_PR43 Manages corrective actions to closure when the project's performance or results deviate significantly	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	57.1%	100.0%	76.9%
		Std. Residual	-1.5	1.6	
	Rarely + Never	Count	18	0	18
		Expected Count	9.7	8.3	18.0
		% within Recode2_1R13-4 Manages corrective actions to closure when the project's performance or results deviate significantly	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	42.9%	0.0%	23.1%
		Std. Residual	2.7	-2.9	
Total			Count	42	36
			Expected Count	42.0	36.0
			% within Recode2_1R13-4 Manages corrective actions to closure when the project's performance or results deviate significantly	53.8%	46.2%
			% within Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-519

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.057 ^a	1	.00000752		
Continuity Correction ^b	17.716	1	.00002565		
Likelihood Ratio	26.908	1	.00000021		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000171	.00000166
Linear-by-Linear Association	19.800	1	.00000860		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.31.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-520

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.507	.000
	Cramer's V	.507	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

- 5- Testing Hypothesis 3.13.5: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR44: Client Company periodically reviews the project's progress, performance and issues experienced and Issue 13: Unable to measure the performance of the supplier experienced by client firms

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR44: Client Company periodically reviews the project's progress, performance and the issue of *unable to measure the performance of the supplier*. The value of chi-square test is 17.253 from Table A-H-522 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00003271$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR44: Client Company periodically reviews the project's progress, performance and the issue of *unable to measure the performance of the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR44 reported fewer than expected *unable to measure the performance of the supplier* issue. Table A-H-521 shows that zero companies that performed PR44 "Rarely + Never" reported "Rarely + Never" for *unable to measure the performance of the supplier* issue while the expected count was (7.4). While, 16 of the companies that performed practice PR44 "Rarely + Never" reported "Always + Almost Always" for experiencing *unable to measure the performance of the supplier* issue while the expected count for this category was (8.6).

Cramer's $V=.470$ indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR44 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR44 reported fewer *unable to measure the performance of the supplier* issues as shown in Table A-H-523.

Table A-H-521

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR44 Periodically reviews the project's progress, performance and issues experienced	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	26	36	62
		Expected Count	33.4	28.6	62.0
		% within Recode2_PR44 Periodically reviews the project's progress, performance and issues experienced	41.9%	58.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	61.9%	100.0%	79.5%
		Std. Residual	-1.3	1.4	
	Rarely + Never	Count	16	0	16
		Expected Count	8.6	7.4	16.0

		% within Recode2_PR44 Periodically reviews the project's progress, performance and issues experienced	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	38.1%	0.0%	20.5%
		Std. Residual	2.5	-2.7	
Total		Count	42	36	78
		Expected Count	42.0	36.0	78.0
		% within Recode2_PR44 Periodically reviews the project's progress, performance and issues experienced	53.8%	46.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-522

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.253 ^a	1	.00003271		
Continuity Correction ^b	14.996	1	.00010773		
Likelihood Ratio	23.339	1	.00000136		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00001011	.00000968
Linear-by-Linear Association	17.032	1	.00003675		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.38.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-523

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.470	.000
	Cramer's V	.470	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

- 6- Testing Hypothesis 6.3.13.6: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR45: Client Company reviews the project's accomplishments and results at selected project milestones and Issue 13: Unable to measure the performance of the supplier experienced by client firms

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR45: Client Company reviews the project's accomplishments and results at selected project milestones and business objectives and the issue of *unable to measure the performance of the supplier*. The value of chi-square test is 18.632 from Table A-H-525 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00001585$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR45: Client Company reviews the project's accomplishments and results at selected project milestones and the issue of *unable to measure the performance of the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR45 reported fewer than expected *unable to measure the performance of the supplier issue*. Table A-H-524 shows that zero companies that performed PR45 "Rarely + Never" reported "Rarely + Never" for *unable to measure the performance of the supplier issue* while the expected count was (7.8). Whereas, 17 of the companies that performed practice PR45 "Rarely + Never" reported "Always + Almost Always" for experiencing *unable to measure the performance of the supplier issue* while the expected count for this category was (9.2).

Cramer's V= .489 indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR45 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR45 reported fewer *unable to measure the performance of the supplier* issues as shown in Table A-H-526.

Table A-H-524

Crosstab						
			Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER		Total	
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never		
Recode2_PR45 Reviews the project's accomplishment s and results at selected project milestones	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	25	36	61	
		Expected Count	32.8	28.2	61.0	
		% within Recode2_PR45 Reviews the project's accomplishments and results at selected project milestones	41.0%	59.0%	100.0%	
		% within Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	59.5%	100.0 %	78.2%	
		Std. Residual	-1.4	1.5		
	Rarely + Never	Count	17	0	17	
		Expected Count	9.2	7.8	17.0	
		% within Recode2_PR45 Reviews the project's accomplishments and results at selected project milestones	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
		% within Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	40.5%	0.0%	21.8%	
		Std. Residual	2.6	-2.8		
Total			Count	42	36	78
			Expected Count	42.0	36.0	78.0
			% within Recode2_PR45 Reviews the project's accomplishments and results at selected project milestones	53.8%	46.2%	100.0%
			% within Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	100.0%	100.0 %	100.0%

Table A-H-525

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.632 ^a	1	.00001585		
Continuity Correction ^b	16.333	1	.00005312		
Likelihood Ratio	25.100	1	.00000054		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000420	.00000406
Linear-by-Linear Association	18.393	1	.00001797		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.85.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-526

Symmetric Measures		
	Value	Approx. Sig.

Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.489	.000
	Cramer's V	.489	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

- 7- Testing Hypothesis 3.13.7: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR46: Client Company establishes and maintains records of quality assurance activities and Issue 13: Unable to measure the performance of the supplier experienced by client firms

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR46: Client Company establishes and maintains records of quality assurance activities and the issue of *unable to measure the performance of the supplier*. The value of chi-square test is 26.265 from Table A-H-528 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000030$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR46: Client Company establishes and maintains records of quality assurance activities and the issue of *unable to measure the performance of the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR46 reported fewer than expected *unable to measure the performance of the supplier* issue. Table A-H-527 shows that zero companies that performed PR46 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *unable to measure the performance of the supplier* issue while the expected count was (10.2). Whereas, 22 of the companies that performed practice PR46 “Rarely + Never” reported “Always + Almost Always” for experiencing *unable to measure the performance of the supplier* issue while the expected count for this category was (11.8).

Cramer’s V= .580 indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR46 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR46 reported fewer *unable to measure the performance of the supplier* issues as shown in Table A-H-529.

Table A-H-527

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR46 Establishes and maintains records of quality assurance activities	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	20	36	56
		Expected Count	30.2	25.8	56.0
		% within Recode2_PR46 Establishes and maintains records of quality assurance activities	35.7%	64.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	47.6%	100.0%	71.8%
		Std. Residual	-1.8	2.0	
	Rarely + Never	Count	22	0	22
		Expected Count	11.8	10.2	22.0
		% within Recode2_PR46 Establishes and maintains records of quality assurance activities	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	52.4%	0.0%	28.2%
		Std. Residual	3.0	-3.2	
Total		Count	42	36	78
		Expected Count	42.0	36.0	78.0

	% within Recode2_PR46 Establishes and maintains records of quality assurance activities	53.8%	46.2%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-528

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	26.265 ^a	1	.00000030		
Continuity Correction ^b	23.742	1	.00000110		
Likelihood Ratio	34.672	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000005	.00000004
Linear-by-Linear Association	25.929	1	.00000035		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.15.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-529

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.580	.000
	Cramer's V	.580	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

- 8- Testing Hypothesis 3.13.8: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR47: Monitors the actual project performance and progress against the project plan and Issue 13: Unable to measure the performance of the supplier experienced by client firms

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR47: Monitors the actual project performance and progress against the project plan and the issue of *unable to measure the performance of the supplier*. The value of chi-square test is 15.918 from Table A-H-532 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00006613$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR47: Monitors the actual project performance and progress against the project plan and the issue of *unable to measure the performance of the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR47 reported fewer than expected *unable to measure the performance of the supplier issue*. Table A-H-530 shows that zero companies that performed PR47 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *unable to measure the performance of the supplier issue* while the expected count was (6.9). Whereas, 15 of the companies that performed practice PR47 “Rarely + Never” reported “Always + Almost Always” for experiencing *unable to measure the performance of the supplier issue* while the expected count for this category was (8.1).

Cramer’s $V=.452$ indicates a strong association between applying performing PR47 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR47 reported fewer *unable to measure the performance of the supplier issues* as shown in Table A-H-532.

Table A-H-530

Crosstab

			Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR47 Monitors the actual project performance and progress against the project plan	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	27	36	63
		Expected Count	33.9	29.1	63.0
		% within Recode2_PR47 Monitors the actual project performance and progress against the project plan	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	64.3%	100.0%	80.8%
		Std. Residual	-1.2	1.3	
	Rarely + Never	Count	15	0	15
		Expected Count	8.1	6.9	15.0
		% within Recode2_PR47 Monitors the actual project performance and progress against the project plan	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	35.7%	0.0%	19.2%
		Std. Residual	2.4	-2.6	
Total	Count		42	36	78
	Expected Count		42.0	36.0	78.0
	% within Recode2_PR47 Monitors the actual project performance and progress against the project plan		53.8%	46.2%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Std. Residual				

Table A-H-531

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1- sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.918 ^a	1	.00006613	.00002387	.00002259
Continuity Correction ^b	13.702	1	.00021422		
Likelihood Ratio	21.623	1	.00000332		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	15.714	1	.00007367		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.92.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-532

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.452	.000
	Cramer's V	.452	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

- 9- Testing Hypothesis 3.13.9: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR48: Ensures that the supplier agreement is satisfied before accepting the acquired product and Issue 13: Unable to measure the performance of the supplier experienced by client firms

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR48: Ensures that the supplier agreement is satisfied before accepting the acquired product and the issue of *unable to measure the performance of the supplier*. The value of chi-square test is 16.900 from Table A-H-534

and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00003941$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR48: Ensures that the supplier agreement is satisfied before accepting the acquired product and the issue of *unable to measure the performance of the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR48 reported fewer than expected *unable to measure the performance of the supplier issue*. Table A-H-533 shows that 1 company that performed PR48 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *unable to measure the performance of the supplier issue* while the expected count was (8.8). Whereas, 18 of the companies that performed practice PR48 “Rarely + Never” reported “Always + Almost Always” for experiencing *unable to measure the performance of the supplier issue* while the expected count for this category was (10.2).

Cramer’s $V=.465$ indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR48 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR48 reported fewer *unable to measure the performance of the supplier issues* as shown in Table A-H-535.

Table A-H-533

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR48 Ensures that the supplier agreement is satisfied before accepting the acquired product	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	24	35	59
		Expected Count	31.8	27.2	59.0
		% within Recode2_PR48 Ensures that the supplier agreement is satisfied before accepting the acquired product	40.7%	59.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF THE SUPPLIER	57.1%	97.2%	75.6%
		Std. Residual	-1.4	1.5	
	Rarely + Never	Count	18	1	19
		Expected Count	10.2	8.8	19.0
		% within Recode2_PR48 Ensures that the supplier agreement is satisfied before accepting the acquired product	94.7%	5.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF supplier	42.9%	2.8%	24.4%
		Std. Residual	2.4	-2.6	
Total			Count	42	36
			Expected Count	42.0	36.0
			% within Recode2_PR48 Ensures that the supplier agreement is satisfied before accepting the acquired product	53.8%	46.2%
			% within Recode2_Issue13: UNABLE TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE OF supplier	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-534

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.900 ^a	1	.00003941		
Continuity Correction ^b	14.795	1	.00011988		
Likelihood Ratio	20.105	1	.00000733		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00003124	.00001963
Linear-by-Linear Association	16.683	1	.00004417		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.77.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-535

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.465	.000
	Cramer's V	.465	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

Hypothesis 3.14: There is a relationship between PR49 to PR51 practices and frequency of R14 Issue: Supplier technical/security/political issues experienced by client firms.

Issue 14	SUPPLIER TECHNICAL/SECURITY /POLITICAL ISSUES
#	CMM/CMMI Practices
PR49	Client Company selects supplier technical solutions to be analyzed and analysis methods to be used.
PR50	Client Company conducts technical reviews with the supplier as defined in the supplier agreement.
PR51	Client Company evaluates and categorizes each identified issue using defined risk categories and parameters and determines its relative priority.

1 -Testing Hypothesis 3.14.1: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR49: Client Company selects supplier technical solutions to be analyzed and analysis methods to be used and Issue 14: Supplier technical/security/political issues of the supplier

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR49: Client Company selects supplier technical solutions to be analyzed and analysis methods to be used and the issue of *supplier technical/security/political* issues of the supplier. The value of chi-square test is 12.132 from Table A-H-537 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00049567.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR49: Client Company selects supplier technical solutions to be analyzed and analysis methods to be used and the issue of *supplier technical/security/political* issues of the supplier. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR49 reported fewer than expected *supplier technical/security/political issues*. Table A-H-536 shows that 2 company that performed PR49 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *supplier technical/security/political* issue while the expected count was (8.8). Whereas, 21 of the companies that performed practice PR49 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *supplier technical/security/political* issue while the expected count for this category was (14.2).

Cramer’s V= .400 indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR49 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR49 reported fewer *supplier technical/security/political* issues as shown in Table A-H-538.

Table A-H-536

Crosstab					
			Reoce2_Issue14: SUPPLIER TECHNICAL/SECURITY /POLITICAL ISSUES		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR49 selects supplier technical solutions to analyzed and analysis methods to used	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	26	21	47
		Expected Count	32.8	14.2	47.0
		% within Recode2_PR49 selects_supplier_technical_solutions be_analys	55.3%	44.7%	100.0%
		% within Reoce2_Issue14: SUPPLIER TECHNICAL/SECURITY POLITICAL ISSUES	49.1%	91.3%	61.8%
		Std. Residual	-1.2	1.8	
	Rarely + Never	Count	27	2	29
		Expected Count	20.2	8.8	29.0
		% within Recode2_PR49 selects_supplier_technical_solutions be_analys	93.1%	6.9%	100.0%
		% within Reoce2_Issue14: SUPPLIER TECHNICAL/SECURITY POLITICAL ISSUES	50.9%	8.7%	38.2%
		Std. Residual	1.5	-2.3	
Total		Count	53	23	76
		Expected Count	53.0	23.0	76.0
		% within Recode2_PR49 selects_supplier_technical_solution be_analys	69.7%	30.3%	100.0%
		% within Reoce2_Issue14: SUPPLIER TECHNICAL/SECURITY POLITICAL ISSUES	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-537

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.132 ^a	1	.00049567	.00061101	.00032485
Continuity Correction ^b	10.408	1	.00125497		
Likelihood Ratio	14.010	1	.00018189		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.972	1	.00053998		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.78.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-538

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.400	.000
	Cramer's V	.400	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

2 -Testing Hypothesis 6.3.14.2: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR50: Client Company conducts technical reviews with the supplier as defined in the supplier agreement and Issue 14: Supplier technical/security/political issues of the supplier

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR50: Client Company conducts technical reviews with the supplier as defined in the supplier agreement and the issue of *supplier technical/security/political issues*. The value of chi-square test is 15.102 from Table A-H-540 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00010188$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR50: Client Company conducts technical reviews with the supplier as defined in the supplier agreement and the issue of *supplier technical/security/political issues*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR50 reported fewer than expected *supplier technical/security/political issues*. Table A-H-539 shows that 2 companies that performed PR50 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *supplier technical/ security/ political* issue while the expected count was (9.7). Whereas, 21 of the companies that performed practice PR50 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing unable to *supplier technical/security/political* issue while the expected count for this category was (13.3).

Cramer’s $V=.446$ indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR50 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR50 reported fewer *supplier technical/security/political issues* as shown in Table A-H-541.

Table A-H-539

Crosstab					
			Reoce2_Issue14: SUPPLIER TECHNICAL/SECURITY /POLITICAL ISSUES		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
ecode2_PR50 Conducts technical reviews with the supplier as defined in the supplier agreement	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	23	21	44
		Expected Count	30.7	13.3	44.0
		% within ecode2_PR50 Conducts _technical_reveiws_with_suppliee	52.3%	47.7%	100.0 %
		% within Reoce2_Issue14: SUPPLIER TECHNICAL/SECURITY /POLITICAL ISSUES	43.4%	91.3%	57.9%
		Std. Residual	-1.4	2.1	
	Rarely + Never	Count	30	2	32
		Expected Count	22.3	9.7	32.0
		% within ecode2_PR50 Conducts _technical_reveiws_with_suppliee	93.8%	6.3%	100.0 %
		% within Reoce2_Issue14: SUPPLIER TECHNICAL/SECURITY /POLITICAL ISSUES	56.6%	8.7%	42.1%
		Std. Residual	1.6	-2.5	
Total			Count	53	23
			Expected Count	53.0	23.0
			% within ecode2_PR50 Conducts _technical_reveiws_with_suppliee	69.7%	30.3%
			% within Reoce2_Issue14: SUPPLIER TECHNICAL/SECURITY /POLITICAL ISSUES	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-540

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.102 ^a	1	.00010186		
Continuity Correction ^b	13.201	1	.00027986		
Likelihood Ratio	17.319	1	.00003160		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00009553	.00006258
Linear-by-Linear Association	14.903	1	.00011317		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.68.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-541

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.446	.000
	Cramer's V	.446	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

3-Testing Hypothesis 6.3.14.3: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR51: Client Company evaluates and categorizes each identified issue using defined risk categories and parameters and determines its relative priority and Issue 14: Supplier technical/security/political issues of the supplier

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR51: Client Company evaluates and categorizes each identified issue using defined risk categories and parameters and determines its relative priority and the issue of *supplier technical/security/political* issues of the supplier. The value of chi-square test is 7.056 from Table A-H-537 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00070200.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR51: Client Company evaluates and categorizes each identified issue using defined risk categories and parameters and determines its relative priority and the issue of *supplier technical/security/political* issues of the supplier. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR51 reported fewer than expected *supplier technical/security/political* issues. Table A-H-542 shows that 5 companies that performed PR51 "Rarely + Never" reported "Rarely + Never" for *supplier technical/security/political* issue while the expected count was (10.3). While, 18 of the companies that performed practice PR51 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Rarely + Never" for experiencing *unable to supplier technical/security/political* issue while the expected count for this category was (12.7).

Cramer's V= .305 indicates a moderate association between applying performing PR51 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR51 reported fewer *supplier technical/security/political* issues as shown in Table A-H-544.

Table A-H-542

Crosstab		
	Reoce2_Issue14: SUPPLIER TECHNICAL/SECURITY /POLITICAL ISSUES	Total

			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR51 Evaluates and categorize each identified issue	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	24	18	42
		Expected Count	29.3	12.7	42.0
		% within Recode2_PR51 Evaluates_and_categorise_ each_identified_issue	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
		% within Reoce2_Issue14: SUPPLIER TECHNICAL /SECURITY /POLITICAL	45.3%	78.3%	55.3%
		Std. Residual	-1.0	1.5	
	Rarely + Never	Count	29	5	34
		Expected Count	23.7	10.3	34.0
		% within Recode2_PR51 Evaluates_and_categorise_ each_identified_issue	85.3%	14.7%	100.0%
		% within Reoce2_Issue14: SUPPLIER TECHNICAL /SECURITY /POLITICAL	54.7%	21.7%	44.7%
		Std. Residual	1.1	-1.6	
Total			Count	53	23
			Expected Count	53.0	23.0
			% within Recode2_PR51 Evaluates_and_categorise_ each_identified_issue	69.7%	30.3%
			% within Reoce2_Issue14: SUPPLIER TECHNICAL /SECURITY /POLITICAL	100.0%	100.0%
					100.0%

Table A-H-543

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.056 ^a	1	.00070200		
Continuity Correction ^b	5.785	1	.00016170		
Likelihood Ratio	7.429	1	.00064200		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00011508	.00071820
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.963	1	.00073220		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.29.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-544

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.305	.00070200
	Cramer's V	.305	.00070200
N of Valid Cases		76	

Hypothesis 3.15: There is a relationship between PR52, PR53, PR54, PR55 and PR56 practices and frequency of R15 issue: Difference in project management practices between the client and the supplier experienced by client firms.

Issue 15	DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES BETWEEN THE CLIENT AND THE SUPPLIER
#	CMM/CMMI

PR52	Client Company selects suppliers based on an evaluation of their ability to meet specified requirements and established criteria
PR53	Client Company identifies and qualifies potential suppliers
PR54	Client Company selects, monitors, and analyzes supplier processes
PR55	Client Company selects suppliers using a formal evaluation
PR56	Client Company establishes and maintains a usable set of organizational process assets, work environment standards, rules and guidelines for teams

1 -Testing Hypothesis 3.15.1: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR52: Client Company selects suppliers based on an evaluation of their ability to meet specified requirements and established criteria and Issue 15: Difference in project management practices between the client and the supplier.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR52: Client Company selects suppliers based on an evaluation of their ability to meet specified requirements and established criteria and the issue of *difference in project management practices between the client and the supplier*. The value of chi-square test is 19.744 from Table A-H-546 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and $p = .00000885$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR52: Client Company selects suppliers based on an evaluation of their ability to meet specified requirements and established criteria and the issue of *difference in project management practices between the client and the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR52 reported fewer than expected *difference in project management practices between the client and the supplier issue*. Table A-H-545 shows that 5 companies that performed PR52 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *difference in project management practices between the client and the supplier issue* while the expected count was (14.7). Whereas, 26 of the companies that performed practice PR52 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *difference in project management practices between the client and the supplier issue* while the expected count for this category was (16.3).

Cramer’s V= .491 indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR52 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR52 reported fewer *difference in project management practices between the client and the supplier issues* as shown in Table A-H-547.

Table A-H-545

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue15: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
RRRecode2_PR52 Selects_supplier_ based_on_an_ evaluation_of_their_ ability_to_meet_ specified_ requirements_and_ established_	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	17	26	43
		Expected Count	26.7	16.3	43.0
		% within RRRecode2_PR52	39.5%	60.5%	100.0%
		Selects_supplier_based_on_an_ev aluation_of_their_ability_to_meet_ specified_requirements_and_			
		% within Recode2_Issue15: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	33.3%	83.9%	52.4%
		Std. Residual	-1.9	2.4	
	Rarely + Never	Count	34	5	39
		Expected Count	24.3	14.7	39.0

		% within RRRcode2_PR52 Selects_supplier_based_on_an_evaluation_of_their_ability_to_meet_specified_requirements_and	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue15: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	66.7%	16.1%	47.6%
		Std. Residual	2.0	-2.5	
Total		Count	51	31	82
		Expected Count	51.0	31.0	82.0
		% within RRRcode2_PR52 Selects_supplier_based_on_an_evaluation_of_their_ability_to_meet_specified_requirements_and	62.2%	37.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue15: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-546

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.744 ^a	1	.00000885		
Continuity Correction ^b	17.770	1	.00002493		
Likelihood Ratio	21.165	1	.00000421		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000982	.00000713
Linear-by-Linear Association	19.504	1	.00001004		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.74.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-547

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.491	.000
	Cramer's V	.491	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

2 -Testing Hypothesis 3.15.2: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR53: Client Company identifies and qualifies potential suppliers and Issue 15: Difference in project management practices between the client and the supplier experienced by client firms

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR53: Client Company identifies and qualifies potential suppliers and the issue of *difference in project management practices between the client and the supplier*. The value of chi-square test is 24.564 from Table A-H-549 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and $p = .00000072$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR53: Client Company identifies and qualifies potential suppliers and the issue of *difference in project management practices between the client and the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR53 reported fewer than expected *difference in project management practices between the client and the supplier issues*. Table A-H-548 shows that 5 company that performed PR53 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *difference in project management practices between the client and the supplier issue* while the expected count was (15.9). Whereas, 26 of the companies that performed practice PR53 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *difference in project*

management practices between the client and the supplier issue while the expected count for this category was (15.1).

Cramer's $V = .547$ indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR53 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR53 reported fewer *difference in project management practices between the client and the supplier* issues as shown in Table A-H-550.

Table A-H-548

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue15: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
RRRecode2_PR53 Identifies_and_qual ifies_potential_sup plier	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	14	26	40
		Expected Count	24.9	15.1	40.0
		% within RRRecode2_PR53 Identifies_and_qualifies_potent ial_supplier	35.0%	65.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue15: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	27.5%	83.9%	48.8%
		Std. Residual	-2.2	2.8	
	Rarely + Never	Count	37	5	42
		Expected Count	26.1	15.9	42.0
		% within RRRecode2_PR53 Identifies_and_qualifies_potent ial_supplier	88.1%	11.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue15: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	72.5%	16.1%	51.2%
		Std. Residual	2.1	-2.7	
Total		Count	51	31	82
		Expected Count	51.0	31.0	82.0
		% within RRRecode2_PR53 Identifies_and_qualifies_potent ial_supplier	62.2%	37.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue15: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-549

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.564 ^a	1	.00000072		
Continuity Correction ^b	22.358	1	.00000226		
Likelihood Ratio	26.291	1	.00000029		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000082	.00000057
Linear-by-Linear Association	24.265	1	.00000084		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.12.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-550

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.547	.000
	Cramer's V	.547	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

3 -Testing Hypothesis 3.15.3: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR54: Client Company selects, monitors, and analyzes supplier processes and Issue 15: Difference in project management practices between the client and the supplier experienced by client firms

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR54: Client Company selects, monitors, and analyzes supplier processes and the issue of *difference in project management practices between the client and the supplier*. The value of chi-square test is 30.223 from Table A-H-552 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and $p = .00000004$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR54: Client Company selects, monitors, and analyzes supplier processes and the issue of *difference in project management practices between the client and the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR54 reported fewer than expected *difference in project management practices between the client and the supplier issues*. Table A-H-551 shows that 5 companies that performed PR54 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *difference in project management practices between the client and the supplier issue* while the expected count was (17). Whereas, 26 of the companies that performed practice PR54 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *difference in project management practices between the client and the supplier issue* while the expected count for this category was (14).

Cramer’s V= .607 indicates a strong association between applying performing PR54 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR54 reported fewer *difference in project management practices between the client and the supplier issues* as shown in Table A-H-553.

Table A-H-551

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue15: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
RRRecode2_PR54 Selects_monitors_ and_analyzes_sup plier_processe	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	11	26	37
		Expected Count	23.0	14.0	37.0
		% within RRRecode2_PR54 Selects_monitors_and_analyze s_supplier_processe	29.7%	70.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue15: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	21.6%	83.9%	45.1%
		Std. Residual	-2.5	3.2	
	Rarely + Never	Count	40	5	45
		Expected Count	28.0	17.0	45.0
		% within RRRecode2_PR54 Selects_monitors_and_analyze s_supplier_processe	88.9%	11.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue15: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	78.4%	16.1%	54.9%
		Std. Residual	2.3	-2.9	

Total	Count	51	31	82
	Expected Count	51.0	31.0	82.0
	% within RRRecode2_PR54 Selects_monitors_and_analyze s_supplier_processe	62.2%	37.8%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Issue15: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-552

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	30.223 ^a	1	.00000004		
Continuity Correction ^b	27.760	1	.00000014		
Likelihood Ratio	32.320	1	.00000001		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000004	.00000003
Linear-by-Linear Association	29.855	1	.00000005		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.99.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-553

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.607	.000
	Cramer's V	.607	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

4 -Testing Hypothesis 3.15.4: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR55: Client Company selects suppliers using a formal evaluation and Issue 15: Difference in project management practices between the client and the supplier experienced by client firms

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR55: Client Company selects suppliers using a formal evaluation and the issue of *difference in project management practices between the client and the supplier*. The value of chi-square test is 30.223 from Table A-H-555 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000004.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR55: Client Company selects suppliers using a formal evaluation and the issue of *difference in project management practices between the client and the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR55 reported fewer than expected *difference in project management practices between the client and the supplier issues*. Table A-H-554 shows that 5 companies that performed PR55 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *difference in project management practices between the client and the supplier issue* while the expected count was (17). Whereas, 18 of the companies that performed practice PR55 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *difference in project management practices between the client and the supplier issue* while the expected count for this category was (14).

Cramer’s V= .607 indicates a strong association between applying performing PR55 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR55 reported fewer *difference in project management practices between the client and the supplier issues* as shown in Table A-H-556.

Table A-H-554

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue15: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
RRRecode2_PR55 Selects_supplier_ using_formal_ evaluation	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	11	26	37
		Expected Count	23.0	14.0	37.0
		% within RRRecode2_PR55 Selects_supplier_using_formal evaluation	29.7%	70.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue15: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	21.6%	83.9%	45.1%
		Std. Residual	-2.5	3.2	
	Rarely + Never	Count	40	5	45
		Expected Count	28.0	17.0	45.0
		% within RRRecode2_PR55 Selects_supplier_using_formal evaluation	88.9%	11.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue15: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	78.4%	16.1%	54.9%
		Std. Residual	2.3	-2.9	
Total		Count	51	31	82
		Expected Count	51.0	31.0	82.0
		% within RRRecode2_PR55 Selects_supplier_using_formal evaluation	62.2%	37.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue15: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-555

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	30.223 ^a	1	.00000004		
Continuity Correction ^b	27.760	1	.00000014		
Likelihood Ratio	32.320	1	.00000001		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000004	.00000003
Linear-by-Linear Association	29.855	1	.00000005		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.99.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-556

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.607	.000
	Cramer's V	.607	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

5 -Testing Hypothesis 3.15.5: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR56: Client Company establishes and maintains a usable set of organizational process assets, work environment standards, rules and guidelines for teams and Issue 15: Difference in project management practices between the client and the supplier experienced by client firms

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR56: Client Company establishes and maintains a usable set of organizational process assets, work environment standards, rules and guidelines for teams and the issue of *difference in project management practices between the client and the supplier*. The value of chi-square test is 23.706 from Table A-H-558 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000112$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR56: Client Company establishes and maintains a usable set of organizational process assets, work environment standards, rules and guidelines for teams and the issue of *difference in project management practices between the client and the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR56 reported fewer than expected *difference in project management practices between the client and the supplier issues*. Table A-H-557 shows that 3 companies that performed PR56 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *difference in project management practices between the client and the supplier issue* while the expected count was (13.6). Whereas, 28 of the companies that performed practice PR56 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *difference in project management practices between the client and the supplier issue* while the expected count for this category was (17.2).

Cramer’s $V=.538$ indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR56 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR56 reported fewer *difference in project management practices between the client and the supplier issues* as shown in Table A-H-559.

Table A-H-557

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue15: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR56 Establishs_and_ maintains_a_usa ble_set_of_organizational process assets	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	18	28	46
		Expected Count	28.6	17.4	46.0
		% within Recode2_PR56 Establishs_and_maintains_a_usab le_set_of_organizational process	39.1%	60.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue15: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	35.3%	90.3%	56.1%
		Std. Residual	-2.0	2.5	
	Rarely + Never	Count	33	3	36
		Expected Count	22.4	13.6	36.0
		% within Recode2_PR56 Establishs_and_maintains_a_usab le_set_of_organizational process	91.7%	8.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue15: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	64.7%	9.7%	43.9%
		Std. Residual	2.2	-2.9	
Total			Count	51	31
			Expected Count	51.0	31.0
			% within Recode2_PR56 Establishs_and_maintains_a_usab le_set_of_organizational process	62.2%	37.8%
			% within Recode2_Issue15: DIFFERENCE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-558

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.706 ^a	1	.00000112		
Continuity Correction ^b	21.524	1	.00000349		
Likelihood Ratio	26.518	1	.00000026		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000073	.00000057
Linear-by-Linear Association	23.417	1	.00000130		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.61.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-559

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.538	.000
	Cramer's V	.538	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

Hypothesis 3.16: There is a relationship between PR57, PR58, PR59, PR60 practices and frequency of R16 issue: Poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier experienced by client firms.

Issue 16	POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING AND TYPE OF WORK TRANSFERRED TO THE SUPPLIER
#	CMM/CMMI Practices
PR57	Client Company establishes and maintains the off-shoring strategy
PR58	Client Company establishes and maintains the plan for performing the off-shoring
PR59	Client Company determines the type of acquisition for each product or product component to be off-shored
PR60	Client Company Plan transition to operations specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier

1 -Testing Hypothesis 3.16.1: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR57: Client Company establishes and maintains the offshoring strategy and Issue 16: Poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR57: Client Company establishes and maintains the offshoring strategy and the issue of *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier*. The value of chi-square test is 20.837 from Table A-H-561 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000500$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR57: Client Company establishes and maintains the off-shoring strategy and the issue of *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR57 reported fewer than expected *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier issue*. Table A-H-560 shows that 2 companies that performed PR57 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of*

work transferred to the supplier issue while the expected count was (11.1). Whereas, 20 of the companies that performed practice PR57 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier* issue while the expected count for this category was (10.9).

Cramer’s V= .507 indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR57 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR57 reported fewer *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier* issue as shown in Table A-H-562.

Table A-H-560

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue16: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR57 Establish_and_Maintain_the_offshoring_strateg	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	20	20	40
		Expected Count	29.1	10.9	40.0
		% within Recode2_PR57 Establish_and_Maintain_the_offshoring_strateg	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue16: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING	33.9%	90.9%	49.4%
		Std. Residual	-1.7	2.8	
	Rarely + Never	Count	39	2	41
		Expected Count	29.9	11.1	41.0
		% within Recode2_PR57 Establish_and_Maintain_the_offshoring_strateg	95.1%	4.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue16: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING	66.1%	9.1%	50.6%
		Std. Residual	1.7	-2.7	
Total	Count	59	22	81	
	Expected Count	59.0	22.0	81.0	
	% within Recode2_PR57 Establish_and_Maintain_the_offshoring_strateg	72.8%	27.2%	100.0%	
	% within Recode2_Issue16: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING	100.0%	100.0 %	100.0%	

Table A-H-561

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.837 ^a	1	.00000500	.00000348	.00000319
Continuity Correction ^b	18.618	1	.00001597		
Likelihood Ratio	23.311	1	.00000138		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	20.580	1	.00000572		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.86.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-562

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.507	.000
	Cramer's V	.507	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

2 -Testing Hypothesis 3.16.2: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR58: Client Company establishes and maintains the plan for performing the offshoring and Issue 16: Poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR58: Client Company establishes and maintains the plan for performing the offshoring and the issue of *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier*. The value of chi-square test is 20.837 from Table A-H-564 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000500.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR58: Client Company establishes and maintains the plan for performing the offshoring and the issue of *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR58 reported fewer than expected *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier* issue. Table A-H-563 shows that 2 companies that performed PR58 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier* issue while the expected count was (11.1). Although, 20 of the companies that performed practice PR58 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier* issue while the expected count for this category was (10.9).

Cramer’s V= .507 indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR58 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR58 reported fewer *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier* issue as shown in Table A-H-565.

Table A-H-563

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue16: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR58 Establish and maintain the plan for performing	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	20	20	40
		Expected Count	29.1	10.9	40.0
		% within Recode2_PR58 Establish_and_maintain_the_plan_f or_performing_th	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue16: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING	33.9%	90.9%	49.4%
		Std. Residual	-1.7	2.8	
	Rarely + Never	Count	39	2	41
		Expected Count	29.9	11.1	41.0
		% within Recode2_PR58 Establish_and_maintain_the_plan_for_perfor ming_th	95.1%	4.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue16: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING	66.1%	9.1%	50.6%
		Std. Residual	1.7	-2.7	
Total		Count	59	22	81
		Expected Count	59.0	22.0	81.0
		% within Recode2_PR58 Establish_and_maintain_the_plan_for_performing_th	72.8%	27.2%	100.0%

	% within Recode2_Issue16: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
--	---	--------	--------	--------

Table A-H-564

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.837 ^a	1	.00000500		
Continuity Correction ^b	18.618	1	.00001597		
Likelihood Ratio	23.311	1	.00000138		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000348	.00000319
Linear-by-Linear Association	20.580	1	.00000572		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.86.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-565

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.507	.000
	Cramer's V	.507	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

3 -Testing Hypothesis 3.16.3: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR59: Client Company determines the type of acquisition for each product or product component to be offshored and Issue 16: Poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR59: Client Company determines the type of acquisition for each product or product component to be offshored and the issue of *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier*. The value of chi-square test is 18.347 from Table A-H-567 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and $p = .00001841$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR59: Client Company determines the type of acquisition for each product or product component to be offshored and the issue of *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR59 reported fewer than expected *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier issue*. Table A-H-566 shows that 4 companies that performed PR59 "Rarely + Never" reported "Rarely + Never" for *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier issue* while the expected count was (12.5). Whereas, 18 of the companies that performed practice PR59 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Rarely + Never" for experiencing *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier issue* while the expected count for this category was (9.5).

Cramer's $V = .476$ indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR59 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR59 reported fewer *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier issue* as shown in Table A-H-568.

Table A-H-566

Crosstab		
	Recode2_Issue16: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING	Total

			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR59 Determines the types of acquisition for each product	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	17	18	35
		Expected Count	25.5	9.5	35.0
		% within Recode2_PR59 Determines he_types_of_acquisition_fo_each_	48.6%	51.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue16: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING	28.8%	81.8%	43.2%
		Std. Residual	-1.7	2.8	
	Rarely + Never	Count	42	4	46
		Expected Count	33.5	12.5	46.0
		% within Recode2_PR59 Determines the_types_of_acquisition_fo_each_p	91.3%	8.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue16: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING	71.2%	18.2%	56.8%
		Std. Residual	1.5	-2.4	
Total			Count	59	22
			Expected Count	59.0	22.0
			% within Recode2_PR59 Determines the_types_of_acquisition_fo_each	72.8%	27.2%
			% within Recode2_Issue16: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-567

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.347 ^a	1	.00001841		
Continuity Correction ^b	16.250	1	.00005550		
Likelihood Ratio	19.073	1	.00001258		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00002841	.00002166
Linear-by-Linear Association	18.120	1	.00002074		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.51.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-568

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.476	.000
	Cramer's V	.476	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

4 -Testing Hypothesis 3.16.4: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR60: Client Company Plan transition to operations and Issue 16: Poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR60: Client Company Plan transition to operations and the issue of *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier*. The value of chi-square test is 13.961 from Table A-H-570 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00018666.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR60: Client Company Plan transition to operations and the issue of *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work*

transferred to the supplier. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR60 reported fewer than expected *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier issue*. Table A-H-569 shows that 4 companies that performed PR60 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier issue* while the expected count was (12). Whereas, 18 of the companies that performed practice PR60 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier issue* while the expected count for this category was (10).

Cramer’s V= .443 indicates a relatively strong association between applying performing PR60 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed 60 reported fewer *poor execution plan specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier issue* as shown in Table A-H-571.

Table A-H-569

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue16: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR60 Plan transition to operation specifically timing	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	19	18	37
		Expected Count	27.0	10.0	37.0
		% within Recode2_PR60Plantransition to_operation_specifcly_timing	51.4%	48.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue16: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING	32.2%	81.8%	45.7%
		Std. Residual	-1.5	2.5	
	Rarely + Never	Count	40	4	44
		Expected Count	32.0	12.0	44.0
		% within Recode2_PR60 Platransition to_operation_specifcly_timing	90.9%	9.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue16: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING	67.8%	18.2%	54.3%
		Std. Residual	1.4	-2.3	
Total	Count		59	22	81
	Expected Count		59.0	22.0	81.0
	% within Recode2_PR60Plantransition to_operation_specifcly_timing		72.8%	27.2%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Issue16: POOR EXECUTION PLAN SPECIFICALLY TIMING		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-570

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.897 ^a	1	.00006687		
Continuity Correction ^b	13.961	1	.00018666		
Likelihood Ratio	16.672	1	.00004444		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00010482	.00007122
Linear-by-Linear Association	15.701	1	.00007418		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.05.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-571

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.443	.000
	Cramer's V	.443	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

Hypothesis 3.17: There is a relationship between PR61 to PR64 practices and frequency of R17 issue: Lack of supplier standardized working methods experienced by client firms.

Issue 17	LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING METHODS
PR61	Client company evaluates supplier technical solutions (designs) to confirm that contractual requirements continue to be met
PR62	Client company selects suppliers based on an evaluation of their ability to meet specified requirements and established criteria
PR63	Client company selects, monitors, and analyzes supplier processes
PR64	Client company selects suppliers using a formal evaluation

1 -Testing Hypothesis 3.17.1: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR61: Client company evaluates supplier technical solutions (designs) to confirm that contractual requirements continue to be met and Issue 17: Lack of supplier standardized working methods

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR61: Client company evaluates supplier technical solutions (designs) to confirm that contractual requirements continue to be met and the issue of *lack of supplier standardized working methods*. The value of chi-square test is 32.950 from Table A-H-573 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000001.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR61: Client company evaluates supplier technical solutions (designs) to confirm that contractual requirements continue to be met and the issue of *lack of supplier standardized working methods*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR61 reported fewer than expected *lack of supplier standardized working methods issue*. Table A-H-572 shows that 7 companies that performed PR61 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *lack of supplier standardized working methods* issue while the expected count was (20). Whereas, 32 of the companies that performed practice PR61 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *lack of supplier standardized working methods* issue while the expected count for this category was (19).

Cramer’s V= .634 indicates a strong association between applying performing PR61 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR61 reported fewer *lack of supplier standardized working methods* issue as shown in Table A-H-574.

Table A-H-572

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue17: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING METHODS		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR61 Evaluates	Always + Very	Count	8	32	40
		Expected Count	21.0	19.0	40.0

supplier technical solutions to confirm contractual requirements are met	Frequently + Occasionally	% within Recode2_PR61 Evaluates_supplier_technical_solutions_to_confirm_contractual_requirements_are met	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue17: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING METHODS	18.6%	82.1%	48.8%
		Std. Residual	-2.8	3.0	
	Rarely + Never	Count	35	7	42
		Expected Count	22.0	20.0	42.0
		% within Recode2_PR61 Evaluates_supplier_technical_solutions_to_confirm_contractual_requirements_are met	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue17: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING METHODS	81.4%	17.9%	51.2%
		Std. Residual	2.8	-2.9	
Total	Count		43	39	82
	Expected Count		43.0	39.0	82.0
	% within Recode2_PR61 Evaluates_supplier_technical_solutions_to_confirm_contractual_requirements_are met		52.4%	47.6%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Issue17: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING METHODS		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-573

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	32.950 ^a	1	.00000001		
Continuity Correction ^b	30.460	1	.00000003		
Likelihood Ratio	35.602	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000001	.00000001
Linear-by-Linear Association	32.548	1	.00000001		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 19.02.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-574

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.634	.000
	Cramer's V	.634	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

2 -Testing Hypothesis 3.17.2: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR62: Client company selects suppliers based on an evaluation of their ability to meet specified requirements and established criteria and Issue 17: Lack of supplier standardized working methods

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR62: Client company selects suppliers based on an evaluation of their ability to meet specified requirements and established criteria and the issue of *lack of supplier standardized working methods*. The value of chi-square test is 30.873 from Table A-H-576 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and $p = .00000003$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR62: Client company selects suppliers based on an evaluation of their ability to meet specified requirements and established criteria and the issue of *lack of supplier standardized working methods*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR62 reported fewer than expected *lack of supplier standardized working methods issue*. Table A-H-575 shows that 6 companies that performed PR62 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *lack of supplier standardized working methods* issue while the expected count was (18.5). Whereas, 33 of the companies that performed practice PR62 “Rarely + Never” reported “Always + Almost Always” for experiencing *lack of supplier standardized working methods* issue while the expected count for this category was (20.5).

Cramer’s V= .614 indicates a strong association between applying performing PR62 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR62 reported fewer *lack of supplier standardized working methods* issue as shown in Table A-H-577.

Table A-H-575

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue17: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING METHODS		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
recode2_PR62 Select supplier based on evaluation of their ability to meet specified requirement	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	10	33	43
		Expected Count	22.5	20.5	43.0
		% within recode2_PR62 Select supplier_based_on_evaluation_of_their_ability_to meet specified requirement	23.3%	76.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue17: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING METHODS	23.3%	84.6%	52.4%
		Std. Residual	-2.6	2.8	
	Rarely + Never	Count	33	6	39
		Expected Count	20.5	18.5	39.0
		% within recode2_PR62 Select supplier_based_on_evaluation_of_their_ability_to meet specified requirement	84.6%	15.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue17: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING METHODS	76.7%	15.4%	47.6%
		Std. Residual	2.8	-2.9	
Total			Count	43	39
			Expected Count	43.0	39.0
			% within recode2_PR62 Select supplier_based_on_evaluation_of_their_ability_to meet specified requirement	52.4%	47.6%
			% within Recode2_Issue17: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING METHODS	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-576

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	30.873 ^a	1	.00000003		
Continuity Correction ^b	28.462	1	.00000010		
Likelihood Ratio	33.352	1	.00000001		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000002	.00000002
Linear-by-Linear Association	30.496	1	.00000003		
N of Valid Cases	82				

- a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 18.55.
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-577

Symmetric Measures		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.614	.000
	Cramer's V	.614	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

3 -Testing Hypothesis 6.3.17.3: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR63: Client company selects, monitors, and analyzes supplier processes and Issue 17: Lack of supplier standardized working methods

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR63: Client company selects, monitors, and analyzes supplier processes and the issue of *lack of supplier standardized working methods*. The value of chi-square test is 35.470 from Table A-H-579 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.0000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR63: Client company selects, monitors, and analyzes supplier processes and the issue of *lack of supplier standardized working methods*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR63 reported fewer than expected *lack of supplier standardized working methods issue*. Table A-H-578 shows that 8 companies that performed PR63 “Rarely + Never” reported “Rarely + Never” for *lack of supplier standardized working methods issue* while the expected count was (21.4). While, 31 of the companies that performed practice PR63 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Rarely + Never” for experiencing *lack of supplier standardized working methods issue* while the expected count for this category was (17.6).

Cramer’s V= .658 indicates a strong association between applying performing PR63 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR63 reported fewer *lack of supplier standardized working methods issue* as shown in Table A-H-580.

Table A-H-578

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue17: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING METHODS		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR63 Selects Monitors and analyzes processes	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	6	31	37
		Expected Count	19.4	17.6	37.0
		% within Recode2_PR63 Selects Monitors and analyzes processes	16.2%	83.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue17: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING METHODS	14.0%	79.5%	45.1%
		Std. Residual	-3.0	3.2	
	Rarely + Never	Count	37	8	45
		Expected Count	23.6	21.4	45.0
		% within Recode2_PR63 Selects Monitors and analyzes processes	82.2%	17.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue17: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING METHODS	86.0%	20.5%	54.9%

		Std. Residual	2.8	-2.9	
Total		Count	43	39	82
		Expected Count	43.0	39.0	82.0
		% within Recode2_PR63 Selects Monitors_and_analyzes_processes	52.4%	47.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue17: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING METHODS	100.0%	100.0 %	100.0%

Table A-H-579

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	35.470 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	32.873	1	.00000001		
Likelihood Ratio	38.561	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	35.037	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.60.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-580

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.658	.000
	Cramer's V	.658	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

4 -Testing Hypothesis 3.17.4: Relationship between CMM/CMMI Practice PR64: Client company selects suppliers using a formal evaluation and Issue 17: Lack of supplier standardized working methods

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR64: Client company selects suppliers using a formal evaluation and the issue of *lack of supplier standardized working methods*. The value of chi-square test is 40.961 from Table A-H-582 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR64: Client company selects suppliers using a formal evaluation and the issue of *lack of supplier standardized working methods*. The analysis shows that firms routinely practicing PR64 reported fewer than expected *lack of supplier standardized working methods issue*. Table A-H-581 shows that 32 companies that performed PR64 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Rarely + Never” for *lack of supplier standardized working methods issue* while the expected count was (17.6). Whereas, 5 of the companies that performed practice PR64 “Always + Very Frequently ” reported “Always + Almost Always” for experiencing *lack of supplier standardized working methods issue* while the expected count for this category was (19.4).

Cramer’s V= .707 indicates a strong association between applying performing PR64 and this issue. Companies that routinely performed PR64 reported fewer *lack of supplier standardized working methods issue* as shown in Table A-H-583.

Table A-H-581

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Issue17: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING METHODS		Total
			Always + Almost Always + Occasionally	Rarely + Never	
Recode2_PR64 Selects supplier using formal evaluation	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	5	32	37
		Expected Count	19.4	17.6	37.0
		% within Recode2_PR64 Selects supplier_using_formal_evaluation	13.5%	86.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue17: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING METHODS	11.6%	82.1%	45.1%
		Std. Residual	-3.3	3.4	
	Rarely + Never	Count	38	7	45
		Expected Count	23.6	21.4	45.0
		% within Recode2_PR64 Selects supplier_using_formal_evaluation	84.4%	15.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue17: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING METHODS	88.4%	17.9%	54.9%
		Std. Residual	3.0	-3.1	
Total		Count	43	39	82
		Expected Count	43.0	39.0	82.0
		% within Recode2_PR64 Selects supplier_using_formal_evaluation	52.4%	47.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Issue17: LACK OF SUPPLIER STANDARIZED WORKING METHODS	100.0%	100.0 %	100.0%

Table A-H-582

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	40.961 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	38.166	1	.00000000		
Likelihood Ratio	45.274	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	40.461	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.60.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-583

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.707	.000
	Cramer's V	.707	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4.1: There is a relationship between adopting industrial standards and the offshored projects success

1 - H4.1.1 There is a relationship between adopting CMMI for DEV/SVC model and the offshored projects success of Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between adopting CMMI for DEV/SVC model and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 87.428 from Table A-H-585 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=4$ and $p=.00000000$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between adopting CMMI for DEV/SVC model and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms adopted CMMI-DEV/SVC reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-584 shows that 28 companies that adopted CMMI-DEV/SVC reported “On-time” for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (13). Whereas, 3 of the companies that adopted CMMI-DEV/SVC reported “Double or more of the planned time” for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (19.8).

Cramer’s $V=.721$ indicates a strong association between adopting CMMI-DEV/SVC and this project success factor. Companies that adopted CMMI-DEV/SVC reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not adopt CMMI-DEV/SVC as shown in Table A-H-586.

Table A-H-584

Crosstab					
			CMMI_DEV_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Offshored IT projects deliverables Projects Time/ Schedule	Earlier than planned time	Count	15	0	15
		Expected Count	5.7	9.3	15.0
		% within offshored IT projects deliverables Projects TimeSch	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	23.4%	0.0%	8.9%
		Std. Residual	3.9	-3.0	
	On time	Count	28	6	34
		Expected Count	13.0	21.0	34.0
		% within offshored IT projects deliverables Projects TimeSch	82.4%	17.6%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	43.8%	5.8%	20.2%
		Std. Residual	4.2	-3.3	
		Count	14	17	31

	About 20% more than planned time	Expected Count	11.8	19.2	31.0
		% within offshoredITprojects deliverables Projects TimeSch	45.2%	54.8%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	21.9%	16.3%	18.5%
		Std. Residual	.6	-.5	
	50% more than planned time	Count	4	32	36
		Expected Count	13.7	22.3	36.0
		% within offshoredITprojects deliverables Projects TimeSch	11.1%	88.9%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	6.3%	30.8%	21.4%
		Std. Residual	-2.6	2.1	
	Double or more of the planned time	Count	3	49	52
		Expected Count	19.8	32.2	52.0
		% within offshoredITprojects deliverables ProjectsTimeSch	5.8%	94.2%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	4.7%	47.1%	31.0%
		Std. Residual	-3.8	3.0	
Total	Count	64	104	168	
	Expected Count	64.0	104.0	168.0	
	% within offshoredIT projects deliverables bProjectsTimeSch	38.1%	61.9%	100.0%	
	% within CMMI_DEV_only	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table A-H-585

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	87.428 ^a	4	.00000000
Likelihood Ratio	100.854	4	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	82.211	1	.00000000
N of Valid Cases	168		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.71.

Table A-H-586

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.721	.000
	Cramer's V	.721	.000
N of Valid Cases		168	

2 – H4.1.2 There is a relationship between adopting of CMMI for DEV/SVC industrial standards and the offshored projects success of Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between adopting CMMI for DEV/SVC model and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 85.625 from Table A-H-588 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=4 and p =.00000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between adopting CMMI for DEV/SVC model and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms adopted CMMI-DEV/SVC reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-587 shows that 3 companies that adopted CMM-DEV/SVC reported “More than 50% of estimated budget” for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (25.5). Whereas, 16 of the companies that adopted CMMI-DEV/SVC reported “Less than estimated budget” for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (6.1).

Cramer's V= .714 indicates a strong association between adopting CMMI-DEV/SVC and this project success factor. Companies that adopted CMMI-DEV/SVC reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not adopt CMMI-DEVS/VC as shown in Table A-H-589.

Table A-H-587

Crosstab						
			CMMI_DEV_only		Total	
			Yes	No		
OffshoredITprojectsdeliverabProjectsCostBudg	Less than estimated budget	Count	16	0	16	
		Expected Count	6.1	9.9	16.0	
		% within OffshoredITprojectsdeliverabProjectsCost Budg	100.0 %	0.0%	100.0%	
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	25.0%	0.0%	9.5%	
		Std. Residual	4.0	-3.1		
	On budget as estimated	Count	23	9	32	
		Expected Count	12.2	19.8	32.0	
		% within OffshoredITprojectsdeliverabProjectsCost Budg	71.9%	28.1%	100.0%	
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	35.9%	8.7%	19.0%	
		Std. Residual	3.1	-2.4		
	More than 10% of estimated budget	Count	16	8	24	
		Expected Count	9.1	14.9	24.0	
		% within OffshoredITprojectsdeliverabProjectsCost Budg	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	25.0%	7.7%	14.3%	
		Std. Residual	2.3	-1.8		
	More than 20% of estimated budget	Count	6	23	29	
		Expected Count	11.0	18.0	29.0	
		% within OffshoredITprojectsdeliverabProjectsCost Budg	20.7%	79.3%	100.0%	
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	9.4%	22.1%	17.3%	
		Std. Residual	-1.5	1.2		
	More than 50% of estimated budget	Count	3	64	67	
		Expected Count	25.5	41.5	67.0	
		% within OffshoredITprojectsdeliverabProjectsCost Budg	4.5%	95.5%	100.0%	
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	4.7%	61.5%	39.9%	
		Std. Residual	-4.5	3.5		
Total			Count	64	104	168
			Expected Count	64.0	104.0	168.0
			% within OffshoredITprojectsdeliverabProjectsCost Budg	38.1%	61.9%	100.0%
			% within CMMI_DEV_only	100.0 %	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-588

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	85.625 ^a	4	.00000000
Likelihood Ratio	100.635	4	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	82.056	1	.00000000
N of Valid Cases	168		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.10.

Table A-H-589

Symmetric Measures		
		Value
		Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.714
	Cramer's V	.714
N of Valid Cases		168

3 – H4.1.3 There is a relationship between adopting of CMMI for DEV/SVC industrial standards on the offshored projects success of Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between adopting CMMI for DEV/SVC model and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 74.253 from Table A-H-591 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=4$ and $p=.00000000$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between adopting CMMI for DEV/SVC model and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms adopted CMMI-DEV/SVC reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-590 shows that 1 company that adopted CMMI-DEV/SVC reported “Bad” for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (21.3). Whereas, 55 of the companies that did not adopt CMMI-DEV/SVC reported “Bad” for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (34.7).

Cramer's $V=.665$ indicates a strong association between adopting CMMI-DEV/SVC and this project success factor. Companies that adopted CMMI-DEV/SVC reported better results on *Expected Quality* compared to companies that did not adopt CMMI-DEV/SVC as shown in Table A-H-592.

Table A-H-590

Crosstab					
			CMMI_DEV_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Projects Expected Quality	Very Good	Count	23	5	28
		Expected Count	10.7	17.3	28.0
		% within ProjectsExpectedQuality	82.1%	17.9%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	35.9%	4.8%	16.7%
		Std. Residual	3.8	-3.0	
	Good	Count	24	8	32
		Expected Count	12.2	19.8	32.0
		% within ProjectsExpectedQuality	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	37.5%	7.7%	19.0%
		Std. Residual	3.4	-2.7	
	Adequate	Count	7	13	20
		Expected Count	7.6	12.4	20.0
		% within ProjectsExpectedQuality	35.0%	65.0%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	10.9%	12.5%	11.9%
		Std. Residual	-.2	.2	
	Poor	Count	9	23	32
		Expected Count	12.2	19.8	32.0
		% within ProjectsExpectedQuality	28.1%	71.9%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	14.1%	22.1%	19.0%
		Std. Residual	-.9	.7	
	Bad	Count	1	55	56
		Expected Count	21.3	34.7	56.0
		% within ProjectsExpectedQuality	1.8%	98.2%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_DEV_only	1.6%	52.9%	33.3%
		Std. Residual	-4.4	3.5	
Total		Count	64	104	168

	Expected Count	64.0	104.0	168.0
	% within ProjectsExpectedQuality	38.1%	61.9%	100.0%
	% within CMMI_DEV_only	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-591

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	74.253 ^a	4	.00000000
Likelihood Ratio	87.061	4	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	71.334	1	.00000000
N of Valid Cases	168		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.62.

Table A-H-592

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.665	.000
	Cramer's V	.665	.000
N of Valid Cases		168	

4 - H4.1.4 There is a relationship between of adopting of CMMI for Acquisition industrial standards and the offshored projects success of Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between adopting CMMI-ACQ model and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 80.092 from Table A-H-594 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=4 and p =.00000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between adopting CMMI-ACQ model and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms adopted CMMI-ACQ reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-593 shows that 28 companies that adopted CMM-ACQ reported “On-time” for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (11.3). Whereas, 3 of the companies that did not adopt CMMI-ACQ reported “On-time” for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (19.8).

Cramer’s V= .699 indicates a strong association between adopting CMMI-ACQ and this project success factor. Companies that adopted CMMI-ACQ reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not adopt CMMI-ACQ as shown in Table A-H-595.

Table A-H-593

Crosstab					
			CMMI_ACQ_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Offshored IT projects deliverables Projects Time/Schedule	Earlier than planned time	Count	11	4	15
		Expected Count	5.5	9.5	15.0
		% within Q2of10 offshored IT projectsdeliverabProjectsTimeSch	73.3%	26.7%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	18.3%	3.8%	9.1%

		Std. Residual	2.4	-1.8	
	On time	Count	28	3	31
		Expected Count	11.3	19.7	31.0
		% within Q2of10offshoredIT projectsdeliverabProjectsTimeSch	90.3%	9.7%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	46.7%	2.9%	18.9%
		Std. Residual	4.9	-3.8	
	About 20% more than planned time	Count	11	9	20
		Expected Count	7.3	12.7	20.0
		% within Q2of10offshoredIT projectsdeliverabProjectsTimeSch	55.0%	45.0%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	18.3%	8.7%	12.2%
		Std. Residual	1.4	-1.0	
	50% more than planned time	Count	5	29	34
		Expected Count	12.4	21.6	34.0
		% within Q2of10offshoredIT projectsdeliverabProjectsTimeSch	14.7%	85.3%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	8.3%	27.9%	20.7%
		Std. Residual	-2.1	1.6	
	Double or more of the planned time	Count	5	59	64
		Expected Count	23.4	40.6	64.0
		% within Q2of10offshoredIT projectsdeliverabProjectsTimeSch	7.8%	92.2%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	8.3%	56.7%	39.0%
Std. Residual		-3.8	2.9		
Total	Count	60	104	164	
	Expected Count	60.0	104.0	164.0	
	% within Q2of10offshoredIT projectsdeliverabProjectsTimeSch	36.6%	63.4%	100.0%	
	% within CMMI_ACQ_only	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table A-H-594

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	80.092 ^a	4	.00000000
Likelihood Ratio	87.278	4	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	69.568	1	.00000000
N of Valid Cases	164		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.49.

Table A-H-595

Symmetric Measures

	Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.699
	Cramer's V	.699
N of Valid Cases	164	

- 5 - H4.1.5 There is a relationship between adopting of CMMI for Acquisition industrial standards and the offshored projects success of Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between adopting CMMI-ACQ model and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 81.661 from Table A-H-597 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=4 and p =.00000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between adopting CMMI-ACQ model and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms adopted CMMI-ACQ reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-596 shows that 4 companies that adopted CMM-ACQ reported “More than 50% of estimated budget” for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (26.7). Whereas, 22 of the companies that adopted CMMI-ACQ reported “On-budget” for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (9.5).

Cramer’s V= .706 indicates a strong association between adopting CMMI-ACQ and this project success factor. Companies that adopted CMMI-ACQ reported better results on Cost/Budget compared to companies that did not adopt CMMI-ACQ as shown in Table A-H-598.

Table A-H-596

Crosstab					
			CMMI_ACQ_		Total
			Yes	No	
Offshored IT projects deliverables Cost/Budget	Less than estimated budget	Count	11	5	16
		Expected Count	5.9	10.1	16.0
		% within OffshoredITprojectsdeliverabProjectsCostBudg	68.8%	31.3%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	18.3%	4.8%	9.8%
		Std. Residual	2.1	-1.6	
	On budget as estimated	Count	22	4	26
		Expected Count	9.5	16.5	26.0
		% within OffshoredITprojectsdeliverabProjectsCostBudg	84.6%	15.4%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	36.7%	3.8%	15.9%
		Std. Residual	4.0	-3.1	
	More than 10% of estimated budget	Count	18	6	24
		Expected Count	8.8	15.2	24.0
		% within Offshored IT projects deliverab Projects Cost/Budg	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	30.0%	5.8%	14.6%
		Std. Residual	3.1	-2.4	
	More than 20% of estimated budget	Count	5	20	25
		Expected Count	9.1	15.9	25.0
		% within offshoredITprojectsdeliverabProjectsCostBudg	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	8.3%	19.2%	15.2%
		Std. Residual	-1.4	1.0	
	More than 50% of estimated budget	Count	4	69	73
		Expected Count	26.7	46.3	73.0
		% within offshoredITprojectsdeliverabProjectsCostBudg	5.5%	94.5%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	6.7%	66.3%	44.5%
Std. Residual		-4.4	3.3		
Total		Count	60	104	164
		Expected Count	60.0	104.0	164.0

	% within offshoredITprojectsdeliverabProj ectsCostBudg	36.6%	63.4%	100.0%
	% within CMMI_ACQ_only	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-597

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	81.661 ^a	4	.00000000
Likelihood Ratio	90.180	4	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	68.115	1	.00000000
N of Valid Cases	164		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.85.

Table A-H-598

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.706	.000
	Cramer's V	.706	.000
N of Valid Cases		164	

6 - H4.1.6 There is a relationship between adopting of CMMI for Acquisition industrial standards and the offshored projects success of Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between adopting CMMI-ACQ model and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 73.919 from Table A-H-600 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=4 and p =.00000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between adopting CMMI-ACQ model and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms adopted CMMI-ACQ reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-599 shows that 1 company that adopted CMM-ACQ reported “Bad” for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (23.8). Whereas, 21 of the companies that adopted CMMI-ACQ reported “Good” for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (9.1).

Cramer’s V= .671 indicates a strong association between adopting CMMI-ACQ and this project success factor. Companies that adopted CMMI-ACQ reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not adopt CMMI-ACQ as shown in Table A-H-601.

Table A-H-599

Crosstab					
			CMMI_ACQ_only		Total
			Yes	No	
Projects Expected Quality	Very Good	Count	19	7	26
		Expected Count	9.5	16.5	26.0
		% within ProjectsExpectedQuality	73.1%	26.9%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	31.7%	6.7%	15.9%
		Std. Residual	3.1	-2.3	
	Good	Count	21	4	25
		Expected Count	9.1	15.9	25.0
		% within ProjectsExpectedQuality	84.0%	16.0%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	35.0%	3.8%	15.2%

	Adequate	Std. Residual	3.9	-3.0	
		Count	9	12	21
		Expected Count	7.7	13.3	21.0
		% within ProjectsExpectedQuality	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	15.0%	11.5%	12.8%
		Std. Residual	.5	-.4	
	Poor	Count	10	17	27
		Expected Count	9.9	17.1	27.0
		% within ProjectsExpectedQuality	37.0%	63.0%	100.0%
		% within CMMI_ACQ_only	16.7%	16.3%	16.5%
		Std. Residual	.0	.0	
		Bad	Count	1	64
	Expected Count		23.8	41.2	65.0
	% within ProjectsExpectedQuality		1.5%	98.5%	100.0%
	% within CMMI_ACQ_only		1.7%	61.5%	39.6%
Std. Residual	-4.7		3.5		
Total	Count		60	104	164
	Expected Count	60.0	104.0	164.0	
	% within ProjectsExpectedQuality	36.6%	63.4%	100.0%	
	% within CMMI_ACQ_only	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table A-H-600

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	73.919 ^a	4	.00000000
Likelihood Ratio	88.519	4	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	66.103	1	.00000000
N of Valid Cases	164		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.68.

Table A-H-601

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.671	.000
	Cramer's V	.671	.000
N of Valid Cases		164	

- 7 - H4.1.7 There is a relationship between adopting of People-CMM industrial standards and the offshored projects success of Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between adopting People-CMM model and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 17.288 from Table A-H-603 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=2 and p =.00017616.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between adopting People-CMM model and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms adopted People-CMM reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-602 shows that 4 companies that adopted People-CMM reported “50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time” for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (13).

Whereas, 16 of the companies that adopted People-CMM reported “Earlier than planned time + On time” for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (8.7).

Cramer’s V= .361 indicates a moderate association between adopting People-CMM and this project success factor. Companies that adopted People-CMM reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not adopt People-CMM as shown in Table A-H-604.

Table A-H-602

Crosstab					
			People_CMM_only		Total
			Yes	No	
REcode_project_s uccess_time	Earlier than planned time + On time	Count	16	24	40
		Expected Count	8.7	31.3	40.0
		% within REcode_project_success_time	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	55.2%	23.1%	30.1%
		Std. Residual	2.5	-1.3	
	About 20% more than planned time	Count	9	22	31
		Expected Count	6.8	24.2	31.0
		% within REcode_project_success_time	29.0%	71.0%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	31.0%	21.2%	23.3%
		Std. Residual	.9	-5	
	50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	Count	4	58	62
		Expected Count	13.5	48.5	62.0
		% within REcode_project_success_time	6.5%	93.5%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	13.8%	55.8%	46.6%
		Std. Residual	-2.6	1.4	
Total			Count	29	104
			Expected Count	29.0	104.0
			% within REcode_project_success_time	21.8%	78.2%
			% within People_CMM_only	100.0%	100.0%
					100.0%

Table A-H-603

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2- sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.288 ^a	2	.00017616
Likelihood Ratio	18.641	2	.00008956
Linear-by-Linear Association	16.697	1	.00004385
N of Valid Cases	133		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.76.

Table A-H-604

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.361	.000
	Cramer's V	.361	.000
N of Valid Cases		133	

8 - H4.1.8 There is a relationship between adopting of People-CMM industrial standards and the offshored projects success of Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between adopting People-CMM model and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 16.399 from Table A-H-604 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=2 and $p = .00027485$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between adopting People-CMM model and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms adopted People-CMM reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-605 shows that 5 companies that adopted People-CMM reported “More than 20% of estimated budget + More than 50% of estimated budget” for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (13). Whereas, 14 of the companies that adopted People-CMM reported “Less than estimated budget + On budget” for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (8.7).

Cramer’s $V = .361$ indicates a moderate association between adopting People-CMM and this project success factor. Companies that adopted People-CMM reported better results on Cost/Budget compared to companies that did not adopt People-CMM as shown in Table A-H-607.

Table A-H-605

Crosstab					
			People_CMM		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode Project success budget	Less than estimated budget + On budget	Count	14	26	40
		Expected Count	8.7	31.3	40.0
		% within REcode_Project_success_budget	35.0%	65.0%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	48.3%	25.0%	30.1%
		Std. Residual	1.8	-.9	
	More than 10% of estimated budget	Count	10	16	26
		Expected Count	5.7	20.3	26.0
		% within REcode_Project_success_budget	38.5%	61.5%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	34.5%	15.4%	19.5%
		Std. Residual	1.8	-1.0	
	More than 20% of estimated budget + More than 50% of estimated budget	Count	5	62	67
		Expected Count	14.6	52.4	67.0
		% within REcode_Project_success_budget	7.5%	92.5%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	17.2%	59.6%	50.4%
		Std. Residual	-2.5	1.3	
Total	Count	29	104	133	
	Expected Count	29.0	104.0	133.0	
	% within REcode_Project_success_budget	21.8%	78.2%	100.0%	
	% within People_CMM_only	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table A-H-606

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.399 ^a	2	.00027485
Likelihood Ratio	17.484	2	.00015970
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.708	1	.00036411
N of Valid Cases	133		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.67.

Table A-H-607

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.351	.000
	Cramer's V	.351	.000
N of Valid Cases		133	

- 9 - H4.1.9 There is a relationship between adopting of People-CMM industrial standards and the offshored projects success of Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between adopting People-CMM model and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 18.899 from Table A-H-609 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=2$ and $p=.00007875$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between adopting People-CMM model and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms adopted People-CMM reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-608 shows that 3 companies that adopted People-CMM reported "Poor + Bad" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (13.3). While 17 of the companies that adopted People-CMM reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* and the expected count for this category was (10).

Cramer's $V=.377$ indicates a moderate association between adopting People-CMM and this project success factor. Companies that adopted People-CMM reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not adopt People-CMM as shown in Table A-H-610.

Table A-H-608

Crosstab					
			People_CMM_only		Total
			Yes	No	
REcode_porject_success_quality	Very Good	Count	17	29	46
		Expected Count	10.0	36.0	46.0
		% within REcode_porject_success_quality	37.0%	63.0%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	58.6%	27.9%	34.6%
		Std. Residual	2.2	-1.2	
	Adequate	Count	9	17	26
		Expected Count	5.7	20.3	26.0
		% within REcode_porject_success_quality	34.6%	65.4%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	31.0%	16.3%	19.5%
		Std. Residual	1.4	-.7	
	Poor + Bad	Count	3	58	61
		Expected Count	13.3	47.7	61.0
		% within REcode_porject_success_quality	4.9%	95.1%	100.0%
		% within People_CMM_only	10.3%	55.8%	45.9%
		Std. Residual	-2.8	1.5	
Total	Count		29	104	133
	Expected Count		29.0	104.0	133.0
	% within REcode_porject_success_quality		21.8%	78.2%	100.0%
	% within People_CMM_only		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-609

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.899 ^a	2	.00007875
Likelihood Ratio	21.429	2	.00002223
Linear-by-Linear Association	16.487	1	.00004898

N of Valid Cases	133		
------------------	-----	--	--

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.67.

Table A-H-610

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.377	.000
	Cramer's V	.377	.000
N of Valid Cases		133	

10 - H4.1.10 There is a relationship between adopting of TSP industrial standards and the offshored projects success of Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between adopting TSP model and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 14.337 from Table A-H-612 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=2$ and $p=.00077064$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between adopting TSP model and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms adopted TSP reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-611 shows that 10 companies that adopted TSP reported “50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time” for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (20.3). Whereas, 57 of the companies that did not adopt TSP reported “50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time” for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (46.8).

Cramer’s V= .310 indicates a moderate association between adopting TSP and this project success factor. Companies that adopted TSP reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not adopt TSP as shown in Table A-H-613.

Table A-H-611

Crosstab					
			TSP_ONLY		Total
			Yes	No	
Recode project success time/schedule	Earlier than planned time + On time	Count	16	26	42
		Expected Count	12.7	29.3	42.0
		% within REcode_project_success_time	38.1%	61.9%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	35.6%	25.0%	28.2%
		Std. Residual	.9	-.6	
	About 20% more than planned time	Count	19	21	40
		Expected Count	12.1	27.9	40.0
		% within REcode_project_success_time	47.5%	52.5%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	42.2%	20.2%	26.8%
		Std. Residual	2.0	-1.3	
	50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	Count	10	57	67
		Expected Count	20.2	46.8	67.0
		% within REcode_project_success_time	14.9%	85.1%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	22.2%	54.8%	45.0%
		Std. Residual	-2.3	1.5	
Total		Count	45	104	149
		Expected Count	45.0	104.0	149.0

	% within REcode_project_success_time	30.2%	69.8%	100.0%
	% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-612

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.337 ^a	2	.00077064
Likelihood Ratio	14.902	2	.00058095
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.255	1	.00406392
N of Valid Cases	149		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.08.

Table A-H-613

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.310	.001
	Cramer's V	.310	.001
N of Valid Cases		149	

11 - H4.1.11 There is a relationship between adopting of TSP industrial standards and the offshored projects success of Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between adopting TSP model and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 11.952 from Table A-H-615 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=2 and p =.00253939.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between adopting TSP model and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms adopted TSP reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-614 shows that 13 companies that adopted TSP reported “More than 20% of estimated budget + More than 50% of estimated budget” for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (22.3). Whereas, 15 of the companies that adopted TSP reported “More than 10% of estimated budget” for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (9.4).

Cramer’s V= .283 indicates a moderate association between adopting TSP and this project success factor. Companies that adopted TSP reported better results on Cost/Budget compared to companies that did not adopt TSP as shown in Table A-H-616.

Table A-H-614

Crosstab					
			TSP_ONLY_NEW		Total
			Yes	No	
REcode_Project_s uccess_budget	Less than estimated budget + On-budget	Count	17	27	44
		Expected Count	13.3	30.7	44.0
		% within REcode_Project_success_budg et	38.6%	61.4%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	37.8%	26.0%	29.5%
		Std. Residual	1.0	-.7	
	More than 10% of estimated budget	Count	15	16	31
		Expected Count	9.4	21.6	31.0
		% within REcode_Project_success_budg et	48.4%	51.6%	100.0%

	More than 20% of estimated budget + More than 50% of estimated budget	% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	33.3%	15.4%	20.8%
		Std. Residual	1.8	-1.2	
		Count	13	61	74
		Expected Count	22.3	51.7	74.0
		% within REcode_Project_success_budget	17.6%	82.4%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	28.9%	58.7%	49.7%
Total		Std. Residual	-2.0	1.3	
		Count	45	104	149
		Expected Count	45.0	104.0	149.0
		% within REcode_Project_success_budget	30.2%	69.8%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-615

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.952 ^a	2	.00253939
Likelihood Ratio	12.110	2	.00234654
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.179	1	.00737690
N of Valid Cases	149		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.36.

Table A-H-616

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.283	.003
	Cramer's V	.283	.003
N of Valid Cases		149	

12 - H4.1.12 There is a relationship between adopting of TSP industrial standards and the offshored projects success of Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between adopting TSP model and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 20.287 from Table A-H-618 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=2 and p =.00003933.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between adopting TSP model and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms adopted TSP reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-617 shows that 8 companies that adopted TSP reported "Poor + Bad" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (20.5). While 24 of the companies that adopted TSP reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* and the expected count for this category was (16.3).

Cramer's V= .369 indicates a moderate association between adopting TSP and this project success factor. Companies that adopted TSP reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not adopt TSP as shown in Table A-H-619.

Table A-H-617

Crosstab		
	TSP_ONLY_NEW	Total

			Yes	No	
Recode project success quality	Very Good + Good	Count	24	30	54
		Expected Count	16.3	37.7	54.0
		% within REcode_porject_success_quality	44.4%	55.6%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	53.3%	28.8%	36.2%
		Std. Residual	1.9	-1.3	
	Adequate	Count	13	14	27
		Expected Count	8.2	18.8	27.0
		% within REcode_porject_success_quality	48.1%	51.9%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	28.9%	13.5%	18.1%
		Std. Residual	1.7	-1.1	
	Poor + Bad	Count	8	60	68
		Expected Count	20.5	47.5	68.0
		% within REcode_porject_success_quality	11.8%	88.2%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	17.8%	57.7%	45.6%
		Std. Residual	-2.8	1.8	
Total		Count	45	104	149
		Expected Count	45.0	104.0	149.0
		% within REcode_porject_success_quality	30.2%	69.8%	100.0%
		% within TSP_ONLY_NEW	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-618

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.287 ^a	2	.00003933
Likelihood Ratio	21.698	2	.00001943
Linear-by-Linear Association	15.976	1	.00006416
N of Valid Cases	149		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.15.

Table A-H-619

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.369	.000
	Cramer's V	.369	.000
N of Valid Cases		149	

Hypothesis 4.2: There is a relationship between the maturity levels achieved and the offshored projects' success.

- 1- H4.2.1 There is a relationship between CMMI-DEV/SVC maturity level achieved and projects success of Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between CMMI for DEV/SVC maturity level achieved and the offshored projects success of Time/Schedule. The value of chi-square test is 36.424 from Table A-H-621 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between CMMI-DEV/SVC maturity level achieved and the offshored projects success of Time/Schedule. The analysis shows that firms that achieved levels 3,4 and 5 in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported better results with regard to offshored projects success of Time/Schedule. Table A-H-620 shows that 19 companies that achieved maturity levels 1 and 2 in CMM-DEV/SVC reported “About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time” for offshored projects success of Time/Schedule while the expected count was (7.4). Whereas, 4 of the companies that achieved maturity levels 1 and 2 in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported “Earlier than planned time + On-time” for offshored projects success of Time/Schedule while the expected count for this category was (15.6).

Cramer’s V= .647 indicates a strong association between CMMI-DEV/SVC maturity level achieved and this project success factor. Companies that achieved higher maturity levels in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not achieve high maturity levels in CMMI-DEV/SVC as shown in Table A-H-622.

Table A-H-620

Crosstab					
			Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + ML 2	Maturity Level 3 + ML 4 + ML 5	
Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	Earlier than planned time + On-time	Count	4	55	59
		Expected Count	15.6	43.4	59.0
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	6.8%	93.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level	17.4%	85.9%	67.8%
		Std. Residual	-2.9	1.8	
	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	Count	19	9	28
		Expected Count	7.4	20.6	28.0
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	67.9%	32.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level	82.6%	14.1%	32.2%
		Std. Residual	4.3	-2.6	
Total			Count	23	64
			Expected Count	23.0	64.0
			% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	26.4%	73.6%
			% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-621

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	36.424 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	33.351	1	.00000001		
Likelihood Ratio	36.081	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000001	.00000001
Linear-by-Linear Association	36.005	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	87				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.40.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-622

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.647	.000
	Cramer's V	.647	.000
N of Valid Cases		87	

- 2- H4.2.2 There is a relationship between CMMI- DEV/SVC maturity level achieved and projects success of Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between CMMI for DEV/SVC maturity level achieved and the offshored projects success of *Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 42.029 from Table A-H-624 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between CMMI-DEV/SVC maturity level achieved and the offshored projects success of *Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms that achieved levels 3,4 and 5 in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported better results with regard to offshored projects success of *Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-623 shows that 22 companies that achieved maturity levels 1 and 2 in CMM-DEV/SVC reported “More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget” for offshored projects success of *Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (9). While, 1 of the companies that achieved maturity levels 1 and 2 in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported “Less than estimated budget + On-budget” for offshored projects success of *Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (14).

Cramer’s V= .695 indicates a strong association between CMMI-DEV/SVC maturity level achieved and this project success factor. Companies that achieved higher maturity levels in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not achieve high maturity levels in CMMI-DEV/VC as shown in Table A-H-625.

Table A-H-623

Crosstab					
			Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + ML 2	Maturity Level 3 + ML 4 + ML 5	
Recode2_Project Success Factors Budget cost	Less than estimated budget + On- budget	Count	1	52	53
		Expected Count	14.0	39.0	53.0
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	1.9%	98.1%	100.0 %
		% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level	4.3%	81.3%	60.9%
		Std. Residual	-3.5	2.1	
	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	Count	22	12	34
		Expected Count	9.0	25.0	34.0
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	64.7%	35.3%	100.0 %
		% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level	95.7%	18.8%	39.1%
		Std. Residual	4.3	-2.6	

Total	Count	23	64	87
	Expected Count	23.0	64.0	87.0
	% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	26.4%	73.6%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-624

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	42.029 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	38.861	1	.00000000		
Likelihood Ratio	46.428	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	41.546	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	87				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.99.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-625

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.695	.000
	Cramer's V	.695	.000
N of Valid Cases		87	

- 3- H4.2.3 There is a relationship between CMMI- DEV/SVC maturity level achieved and projects success of Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between CMMI for DEV/SVC maturity level achieved and the offshored projects success of *Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 36.424 from Table A-H-627 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between CMMI-DEV/SVC maturity level achieved and the offshored projects success of *Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms that achieved levels 3,4 and 5 in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported better results with regard to offshored projects success of *Expected Quality*. Table A-H-626 shows that 19 companies that achieved maturity levels 1 and 2 in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported “Adequate + Poor + Bad” for offshored projects success of *Expected Quality* while the expected count was (7.4). Whereas, 4 of the companies that achieved maturity levels 1 and 2 in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported “Very Good + Good” for offshored projects success of *Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (15.6).

Cramer's V= .647 indicates a strong association between CMMI-DEV/SVC maturity level achieved and this project success factor. Companies that achieved higher maturity levels in CMMI-DEV/SVC reported better results on *Expected Quality* compared to companies that did not achieve high maturity levels in CMMI-DEV/SVC as shown in Table A-H-628.

Table A-H-626

Crosstab					
			Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + ML 2	Maturity Level 3 + ML 4 + MLI 5	
		Count	4	55	59

Recode2_Porject success factor Quality	Very Good + Good	Expected Count	15.6	43.4	59.0
		% within Recode2_3_Porject_success_facore Quality	6.8%	93.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level	17.4%	85.9%	67.8%
		Std. Residual	-2.9	1.8	
	Adequate + Poor + Bad	Count	19	9	28
		Expected Count	7.4	20.6	28.0
		% within Recode2_3_Porject_success_facore Quality	67.9%	32.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level	82.6%	14.1%	32.2%
	Std. Residual	4.3	-2.6		
Total		Count	23	64	87
		Expected Count	23.0	64.0	87.0
		% within Recode2_3_Porject_success_facore Quality	26.4%	73.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_CMMI-DEV Maturity Level	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-627

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1- sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	36.424 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	33.351	1	.00000001		
Likelihood Ratio	36.081	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000001	.00000001
Linear-by-Linear Association	36.005	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	87				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.40.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-628

Symmetric Measures

	Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.647
	Cramer's V	.647
N of Valid Cases	87	

- 4- H4.2.4 There is a relationship between CMMI for Acquisition maturity level achieved and projects success of Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between CMMI for ACQ maturity level achieved and the offshored projects success of Time/Schedule. The value of chi-square test is 39.401 from Table A-H-630 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the offshored projects success of Time/Schedule. The analysis shows that firms that achieved levels 3,4 and 5 in CMMI-ACQ reported better results with regard to offshored projects success of Time/Schedule. Table A-H-629 shows that 19 companies that achieved maturity levels 1 and 2 in CMM-ACQ reported “About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time” for offshored projects success of Time/Schedule while the expected count was (7.8). Whereas, 5 of the companies that achieved maturity levels 1 and 2 in CMMI-ACQ reported “Earlier than planned time + On-

time” for offshored projects success of Time/Schedule while the expected count for this category was (17.2).

Cramer’s V= .689 indicates a strong association between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and this project success factor. Companies that achieved higher maturity levels in CMMI-ACQ reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not achieve high maturity levels in CMMI-ACQ as shown in Table A-H-631.

Table A-H-629

Crosstab					
			Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + ML 2	Maturity Level 3 + ML 4 + ML 5	
Recode2_ Project_success_ _time_schedule	Earlier than planned time + On-time	Count	5	52	57
		Expected Count	17.2	39.8	57.0
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	8.8%	91.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level	20.0%	89.7%	68.7%
		Std. Residual	-2.9	1.9	
	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	Count	20	6	26
		Expected Count	7.8	18.2	26.0
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	76.9%	23.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level	80.0%	10.3%	31.3%
		Std. Residual	4.3	-2.9	
Total			Count	25	58
			Expected Count	25.0	58.0
			% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	30.1%	69.9%
			% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-630

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	39.401 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	36.229	1	.00000000		
Likelihood Ratio	39.598	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	38.926	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	83				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.83.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-631

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.689	.000

	Cramer's V	.689	.000
N of Valid Cases		83	

5 - H4.2.5 There is a relationship between CMMI for Acquisition maturity level achieved and projects success of Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between CMMI for ACQ maturity level achieved and the offshored projects success of Cost/Budget. The value of chi-square test is 31.190 from Table A-H-633 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000002.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the offshored projects success of Cost/Budget. The analysis shows that firms that achieved levels 3,4 and 5 in CMMI-ACQ reported better results with regard to offshored projects success of Cost/Budget. Table A-H-632 shows that 21 companies that achieved maturity levels 1 and 2 in CMMI-ACQ reported “More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget” for offshored projects success of Cost/Budget while the expected count was (9.6). Whereas, 4 of the companies that achieved maturity levels 1 and 2 in CMMI-ACQ reported “Less than estimated budget + On-budget” for offshored projects success of Cost/Budget while the expected count for this category was (15.4).

Cramer's V= .613 indicates a strong association between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and this project success factor. Companies that achieved higher maturity levels in CMMI-ACQ reported better results on Cost/Budget compared to companies that did not achieve high maturity levels in CMMI-ACQ as shown in Table A-H-634.

Table A-H-632

Crosstab					
			Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + Maturity Level 2	Maturity Level 3 + Maturity Level 4 + Maturity Level 5	
Recode2_ Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	Less than estimated budget + On-budget	Count	4	47	51
		Expected Count	15.4	35.6	51.0
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	7.8%	92.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level	16.0%	81.0%	61.4%
		Std. Residual	-2.9	1.9	
	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	Count	21	11	32
		Expected Count	9.6	22.4	32.0
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	65.6%	34.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level	84.0%	19.0%	38.6%
		Std. Residual	3.7	-2.4	
Total	Count		25	58	83
	Expected Count		25.0	58.0	83.0
	% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost		30.1%	69.9%	100.0%
	% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-633

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	31.190 ^a	1	.00000002		
Continuity Correction ^b	28.505	1	.00000009		
Likelihood Ratio	32.347	1	.00000001		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000003	.00000003
Linear-by-Linear Association	30.814	1	.00000003		
N of Valid Cases	83				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.64.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-634

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.613	.000
	Cramer's V	.613	.000
N of Valid Cases		83	

6 - H4.2.6 There is a relationship between CMMI for Acquisition and maturity level achieved and projects success of Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between CMMI for ACQ maturity level achieved and the offshored projects success of *Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 36.731 from Table A-H-636 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000000$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and the offshored projects success of Expected Quality. The analysis shows that firms that achieved levels 3, 4 and 5 in CMMI-ACQ reported better results with regard to offshored projects success of Expected Quality. Table A-H-635 shows that 20 companies that achieved maturity levels 1 and 2 in CMMI-ACQ reported "Poor + Bad" for offshored projects success of Expected Quality while the expected count was (8.1). Whereas, 5 of the companies that achieved maturity levels 1 and 2 in CMMI-ACQ reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored projects success of Expected Quality while the expected count for this category was (16.9).

Cramer's $V=.665$ indicates a strong association between CMMI-ACQ maturity level achieved and this project success factor. Companies that achieved higher maturity levels in CMMI-ACQ reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not achieve high maturity levels in CMMI-ACQ as shown in Table A-H-637.

Table A-H-635

Crosstab					
			Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + ML 2	Maturity Level 3 + ML4 + ML5	
Recode2_Porject_success_fa core_Quality	Very Good + Good	Count	5	51	56
		Expected Count	16.9	39.1	56.0
		% within Recode2_3_Porject_success_fa core_Quality	8.9%	91.1%	100.0%

		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level	20.0%	87.9%	67.5%
		Std. Residual	-2.9	1.9	
	Adequate + Poor + Bad	Count	20	7	27
		Expected Count	8.1	18.9	27.0
		% within Recode2_3_Porject_success_facore Quality	74.1%	25.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level	80.0%	12.1%	32.5%
		Std. Residual	4.2	-2.7	
Total			Count	25	58
			Expected Count	25.0	58.0
			% within Recode2_3_Porject_success_facore Quality	30.1%	69.9%
			% within Recode2 CMMI-ACQ Maturity Level	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-636

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	36.731 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	33.701	1	.00000001		
Likelihood Ratio	36.970	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	36.288	1	.00000000		0
N of Valid Cases	83				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.13.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-637

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.665	.000
	Cramer's V	.665	.000
N of Valid Cases		83	

7 - H4.2.7 There is a relationship between People-CMM maturity level achieved and projects success of Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between People-CMM maturity level achieved and the offshored projects success of Time/Schedule. The value of chi-square test is 4.082 from Table A-H-639 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p=.043.

Because there is 1 cell (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.28. Additional data might change the results.

Table A-H-638

Crosstab

			Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + ML2	Maturity Level 3 + ML 4 + ML 5	
Recode2_Project_succe ss_time_sche dule	Earlier than planned time	Count	4	18	22
		Expected Count	6.7	15.3	22.0
		% within Recode2_Project_ success_time_schedule	18.2%	81.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level	36.4%	72.0%	61.1%
		Std. Residual	-1.0	.7	
	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	Count	7	7	14
		Expected Count	4.3	9.7	14.0
		% within Recode2_Project_ success_time_schedule	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level	63.6%	28.0%	38.9%
		Std. Residual	1.3	-.9	
Total	Count	11	25	36	
	Expected Count	11.0	25.0	36.0	
	% within Recode2_Project_ success_time_schedule	30.6%	69.4%	100.0%	
	% within Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table A-H-639

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.082 ^a	1	.043		
Continuity Correction ^b	2.720	1	.099		
Likelihood Ratio	4.046	1	.044		
Fisher's Exact Test				.067	.050
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.969	1	.046		
N of Valid Cases	36				

a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.28.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-640

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.337	.043
	Cramer's V	.337	.043
N of Valid Cases		36	

8 - H4.2.8 There is a relationship between People-CMM maturity level achieved and projects success of Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between People-CMM maturity level achieved and the offshored projects success of Cost/Budget. The value of chi-square test is 6.287 from Table A-H-642 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.01216009.

Because there is 1 cell (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.58. Additional data might change the results.

Table A-H-641

Crosstab					
			Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + ML 2	Maturity Level 3 + Maturity Level 4 + Maturity Level 5	
Recode2_2_Project Success Factors Budget cost	Less than estimated budget + On budget	Count	3	18	21
		Expected Count	6.4	14.6	21.0
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Budgetcost	14.3%	85.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level	27.3%	72.0%	58.3%
		Std. Residual	-1.3	.9	
	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	Count	8	7	15
		Expected Count	4.6	10.4	15.0
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success _cost	53.3%	46.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level	72.7%	28.0%	41.7%
		Std. Residual	1.6	-1.1	
Total			Count	11	25
			Expected Count	11.0	25.0
			% within Recode2_2_Project Success Budgetcost	30.6%	69.4%
			% within Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-642

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.287 ^a	1	.01216009	.02549492	.01610177
Continuity Correction ^b	4.582	1	.03231291		
Likelihood Ratio	6.363	1	.01165052		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.113	1	.01342119		
N of Valid Cases	36				

a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.58.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-643

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.418	.012
	Cramer's V	.418	.012
N of Valid Cases		36	

9 - H4.2.9 There is a relationship between People-CMM maturity level achieved and projects success of Expected Quality.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between People-CMM maturity level achieved and the offshored projects success of Expected Quality. The value of chi-square test is 7.632 from Table A-H-645 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00573471.

Because there is 1 cell (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.28. Additional data might change the results.

Table A-H-644

Crosstab					
			Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level		Total
			Maturity Level 1 + ML 2	Maturity Level 3 + ML 4 + ML 5	
Recode2_3_Porject_success_facore_Quality	Very Good + Good	Count	3	19	22
		Expected Count	6.7	15.3	22.0
		% within Recode2_3_Porject_success_facore_Quality	13.6%	86.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People-CMM Maturity level	27.3%	76.0%	61.1%
		Std. Residual	-1.4	1.0	
	Adequate + Poor + Bad	Count	8	6	14
		Expected Count	4.3	9.7	14.0
		% within Recode2_3_Porject_success_facore_Quality	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_People-CMM ML	72.7%	24.0%	38.9%
		Std. Residual	1.8	-1.2	
Total			Count	11	25
			Expected Count	11.0	25.0
			% within Recode2_3_Porject_success_facore_Quality	30.6%	69.4%
			% within Recode2_People-CMM ML	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-645

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.632 ^a	1	.00573471	.00967851	.00850437
Continuity Correction ^b	5.719	1	.01678040		
Likelihood Ratio	7.669	1	.00561796		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.420	1	.00645087		
N of Valid Cases	36				

a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.28.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-646

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.460	.006
	Cramer's V	.460	.006
N of Valid Cases		36	

Hypothesis 4.3: There is a relationship between industry standards practices and the offshored projects' success.

H4.3-A - Project's Success Factor: Time/Schedule

1A - H4.3.1A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR1: Client Company establishes and maintains a project plan as the basis for managing the project and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR1: Client Company establishes and maintains a project plan as the basis for managing the project and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 27.225 from Table A-H-648 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000018$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR1: Client Company establishes and maintains a project plan as the basis for managing the project and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR1 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-647 shows that zero companies that performed practice PR1 “Rarely + Never” reported “Earlier than planned + On-time” for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (10.6). Whereas, 26 of the companies that performed practice PR1 “Rarely + Never” reported “About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time” for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (15.4).

Cramer’s $V=.599$ indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR1 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR1 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-649.

Table A-H-647

Crosstab					
			Recode2_ Project time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On-time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR1 Establish and maintain project plan as basis	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	31	19	50
		Expected Count	20.4	29.6	50.0
		% within Recode2_PR1 Establish and maintain project plan as basis	62.0%	38.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project time_schedule	100.0%	42.2%	65.8%
		Std. Residual	2.3	-1.9	
	Rarely + Never	Count	0	26	26
		Expected Count	10.6	15.4	26.0
		% within Recode2_PR1 Establish and maintain project plan as basis	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project time_schedule	0.0%	57.8%	34.2%
		Std. Residual	-3.3	2.7	
Total			Count	31	45
			Expected Count	31.0	45.0
			% within Recode2_PR1 Establish and maintain project plan as basis	40.8%	59.2%
			% within Recode2_Project time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%
					100.0%

Table A-H-648

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	27.225 ^a	1	.00000018		
Continuity Correction ^b	24.718	1	.00000066		
Likelihood Ratio	36.358	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000002	.00000002
Linear-by-Linear Association	26.867	1	.00000022		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.61.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-649

Symmetric Measures		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.599	.000
	Cramer's V	.599	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

2A - H4.3.2A: There is a relationship between standards practice PR2: Client Company establishes and maintains the overall project plan and the offshored projects' success factor Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR2: Client Company establishes and maintains the overall project plan and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 34.145 from Table A-H-651 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000001$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR2: Client Company establishes and maintains the overall project plan and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR2 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-650 shows that zero companies that performed practice PR2 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (12.2). Whereas, 30 of the companies that performed practice PR2 "Rarely + Never" reported "About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (17.8).

Cramer's $V=.670$ indicates a strong association between performed PR2 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR2 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-652.

Table A-H-650

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Project_time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recde2_PR2 Establishes and maintains overall project plan	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	31	15	46
		Expected Count	18.8	27.2	46.0
		% within Recde2_PR2 Establishes_and_maintains _overall_project_plan	67.4%	32.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	100.0%	33.3%	60.5%
		Std. Residual	2.8	-2.3	
	Rarely + Never	Count	0	30	30
		Expected Count	12.2	17.8	30.0
		% within Recde2_PR2 Establishes_and_maintains _overall_project_plan	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	0.0%	66.7%	39.5%
		Std. Residual	-3.5	2.9	

Total	Count	31	45	76
	Expected Count	31.0	45.0	76.0
	% within Recde2_PR2 Establishes_and_maintains overall_project_plan	40.8%	59.2%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-651

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	34.145 ^a	1	.00000001		
Continuity Correction ^b	31.412	1	.00000002		
Likelihood Ratio	44.678	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	33.696	1	.00000001		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.24.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-652

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.670	.000
	Cramer's V	.670	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

3A - H4.3.3A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR3: Client Company estimates the project's effort and cost for work products and tasks based on estimation rationale and the offshored projects' success factor Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR3: Client Company estimates the project's effort and cost for work products and tasks based on estimation rationale and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 30.541 from Table A-H-654 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000003.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR3: Client Company estimates the project's effort and cost for work products and tasks based on estimation rationale and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR3 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-653 shows that zero companies that performed practice PR3 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (11.4). Whereas, 28 of the companies that performed practice PR3 "Rarely + Never" reported "About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (16.6).

Cramer's V= .634 indicates a strong association between performed PR3 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR3 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-655.

Table A-H-653

Crosstab

			Recode2_Project time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR3 Estimates the project effort and cost for work product	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	31	17	48
		Expected Count	19.6	28.4	48.0
		% within Recode2_PR3 Estimates project_effort_and_cost_for_workprod	64.6%	35.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project time_schedule	100.0%	37.8%	63.2%
		Std. Residual	2.6	-2.1	
	Rarely + Never	Count	0	28	28
		Expected Count	11.4	16.6	28.0
		% within Recode2_PR3 Estimates project_effort_and_cost_for_workprod	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_ time_schedule	0.0%	62.2%	36.8%
		Std. Residual	-3.4	2.8	
Total			Count	31	45
			Expected Count	31.0	45.0
			% within Recode2_PR3 Estimates project_effort_and_cost_for_workprod	40.8%	59.2%
			% within Recode2_Project_ time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%
					100.0%

Table A-H-654

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	30.541 ^a	1	.00000003		
Continuity Correction ^b	27.925	1	.00000013		
Likelihood Ratio	40.366	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	30.139	1	.00000004		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.42.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-655

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.634	.000
	Cramer's V	.634	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

4A - H4.3.4A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR4: Client Company establishes and maintains the project's budget and schedule, milestones, constraints, dependencies and the offshored projects' success factor Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR4: Client Company establishes and maintains the project's budget and schedule, milestones, constraints, dependencies and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 25.664 from Table A-H-657 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000041.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR4: Client Company establishes and maintains the project's budget and schedule, milestones, constraints, dependencies and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR4 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-656 shows that zero companies that performed practice PR4 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (10.2). Whereas, 25 of the companies that performed practice PR4 "Rarely + Never" reported "About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (16.6).

Cramer's V= .581 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR4 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR4 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-658.

Table A-H-656

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Project time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR4 Establish and maintain project budget schedule	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	31	20	51
		Expected Count	20.8	30.2	51.0
		% within Recode2_PR4 Establish_and_maintain_pr oject_budget_schedule	60.8%	39.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project _success_time_schedule	100.0%	44.4%	67.1%
		Std. Residual	2.2	-1.9	
	Rarely + Never	Count	0	25	25
		Expected Count	10.2	14.8	25.0
		% within Recode2_PR4 Establish_and_maintain_pr oject_budget_schedule	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project _success_time_schedule	0.0%	55.6%	32.9%
		Std. Residual	-3.2	2.7	
Total			Count	31	45
			Expected Count	31.0	45.0
			% within Recode2_PR4 Establish_and_maintain_pr oject_budget_schedule	40.8%	59.2%
			% within Recode2_Project _success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-657

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	25.664 ^a	1	.00000041		
Continuity Correction ^b	23.209	1	.00000145		

Likelihood Ratio	34.455	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000004	.00000004
Linear-by-Linear Association	25.327	1	.00000048		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.20.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-658

Symmetric Measures		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.581	.000
	Cramer's V	.581	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

5A - H4.3.5A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR5: Client Company monitors off-shoring supplier project progress and performance (effort, and cost) as defined in the contract and the offshored projects' success factor Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR5: Client Company monitors off-shoring supplier project progress and performance (effort, and cost) as defined in the contract and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 36.067 from Table A-H-661 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR5: Client Company monitors offshoring supplier project progress and performance (effort, and cost) as defined in the contract and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR5 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-659 shows that Zero companies that performed practice PR5 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (12.6). Whereas, 31 of the companies that performed practice PR5 "Rarely + Never" reported "About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (18.4).

Cramer's V= .689 indicates a strong association between performed PR5 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR5 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-661.

Table A-H-659

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Project time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR5 Monitors offshoring supplier project progress	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	31	14	45
		Expected Count	18.4	26.6	45.0
		% within Recode2_PR5 Monitors_offshoring_supplie r_project_progress	68.9%	31.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project success_time_schedule	100.0%	31.1%	59.2%
		Std. Residual	3.0	-2.4	
	Rarely + Never	Count	0	31	31
		Expected Count	12.6	18.4	31.0

		% within Recode2_PR5 Monitors_offshoring_supplie r_porject_progress	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project _success_time_schedule	0.0%	68.9%	40.8%
		Std. Residual	-3.6	3.0	
Total		Count	31	45	76
		Expected Count	31.0	45.0	76.0
		% within Recode2_PR5 Monitors_offshoring_supplie r_porject_progress	40.8%	59.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project _success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-660

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	36.067 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	33.271	1	.00000001		
Likelihood Ratio	46.966	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	35.593	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.64.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-661

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.689	.000
	Cramer's V	.689	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

6A - H4.3.6A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR6: Client Company manages invoices submitted by the supplier and the offshored projects' success factor Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR6: Client Company manages invoices submitted by the supplier and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 30.541 from Table A-H-663 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000003.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR6: Client Company manages invoices submitted by the supplier and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR6 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-662 shows that Zero companies that performed practice PR6 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (10.2). Whereas, 28 of the companies that performed practice PR6 "Rarely + Never" reported "About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (16.6).

Cramer's V= .634 indicates a strong association between performed PR6 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR6 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-664.

Table A-H-662

Crosstab					
			Recode2 Project time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR6 Manages invoices submitted by the supplier	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	31	17	48
		Expected Count	19.6	28.4	48.0
		% within Recode2_PR6 Manages invoices submitted by the supplier	64.6%	35.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project success_time_schedule	100.0%	37.8%	63.2%
		Std. Residual	2.6	-2.1	
	Rarely + Never	Count	0	28	28
		Expected Count	11.4	16.6	28.0
		% within Recode2_PR6 Manages invoices submitted by the supplier	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project success_time_schedule	0.0%	62.2%	36.8%
		Std. Residual	-3.4	2.8	
Total			Count	31	45
			Expected Count	31.0	45.0
			% within Recode2_PR6 Manages invoices submitted by the supplier	40.8%	59.2%
			% within Recode2_Project success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-663

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	30.541 ^a	1	.00000003		
Continuity Correction ^b	27.925	1	.00000013		
Likelihood Ratio	40.366	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	30.139	1	.00000004		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.42.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-664

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.634	.000
	Cramer's V	.634	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

7A - H4.3.7A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR7: Client Company develops an understanding with offshoring supplier on the meaning of requirement and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR7: Client Company develops an understanding with offshoring supplier on the meaning of requirement and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 17.902 from Table A-H-666 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00002325.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR7: Client Company develops an understanding with offshoring supplier on the meaning of requirement and the offshored *projects*

success of Time/Schedule. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR7 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-665 shows that 1 company that performed practice PR7 “Rarely + Never” reported “Earlier than planned time + On-time” for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (9.3). Whereas, 21 of the companies that performed practice PR7 “Rarely + Never” reported “About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time” for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (12.7).

Cramer’s V= .479 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR7 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR7 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-667.

Table A-H-665

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR7 Develops an understanding with off-shoring supplier on the meaning of requirements	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	32	24	56
		Expected Count	23.7	32.3	56.0
		% within Recode2_PR7 Develops an understanding with off-shoring supplier on the meaning of requirements	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	97.0%	53.3%	71.8%
		Std. Residual	1.7	-1.5	
	Rarely + Never	Count	1	21	22
		Expected Count	9.3	12.7	22.0
		% within Recode2_PR7 Develops an understanding with off-shoring supplier on the meaning of requirements	4.5%	95.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	3.0%	46.7%	28.2%
		Std. Residual	-2.7	2.3	
Total	Count		33	45	78
	Expected Count		33.0	45.0	78.0
	% within Recode2_PR7 Develops an understanding with off-shoring supplier on the meaning of requirements		42.3%	57.7%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-666

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.902 ^a	1	.00002325		
Continuity Correction ^b	15.812	1	.00006995		
Likelihood Ratio	21.656	1	.00000326		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000994	.00000908
Linear-by-Linear Association	17.673	1	.00002624		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.31.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-667

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.479	.000
	Cramer's V	.479	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

8A - H4.3.8A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR8: Client Company validates requirements to ensure that the resulting product performs as intended in the end user's environment and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR8: Client Company validates requirements to ensure that the resulting product performs as intended in the end user's environment and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 19.256 from Table A-H-669 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00001143.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR8: Client Company validates requirements to ensure that the resulting product performs as intended in the end user's environment and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR8 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-668 shows that 1 company that performed practice PR8 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (9.7). Whereas, 22 of the companies that performed practice PR8 "Rarely + Never" reported "About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (13.3).

Cramer's V= .497 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR8 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR8 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-670.

Table A-H-668

Crosstab					
			Recode2 Project time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR8 Validates requirements to ensure that the resulting product performs as intended in the end user'	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	32	23	55
		Expected Count	23.3	31.7	55.0
		% within Recode2_PR8 Validates requirements to ensure that the resulting product performs as intended in the end user'	58.2%	41.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	97.0%	51.1%	70.5%
		Std. Residual	1.8	-1.5	
	Rarely + Never	Count	1	22	23
		Expected Count	9.7	13.3	23.0
		% within Recode2_PR8 Validates requirements to ensure that the resulting product performs as intended in the end user'	4.3%	95.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	3.0%	48.9%	29.5%

		Std. Residual	-2.8	2.4	
Total		Count	33	45	78
		Expected Count	33.0	45.0	78.0
		% within Recode2_PR8 Validates requirements to ensure that the resulting product performs as intended in the end user'	42.3%	57.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-669

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.256 ^a	1	.00001143		
Continuity Correction ^b	17.114	1	.00003520		
Likelihood Ratio	23.284	1	.00000140		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000784	.00000406
Linear-by-Linear Association	19.009	1	.00001301		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.73.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-670

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.497	.000
	Cramer's V	.497	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

9A - H4.3.9A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR9: Client Company obtains commitment to requirements from project participants and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR9: Client Company obtains commitment to requirements from project participants and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 13.846 from Table A-H-672 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00019841.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR9: Client Company obtains commitment to requirements from project participants and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR9 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-671 shows that 3 companies that performed practice PR9 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (10.6). Whereas, 22 of the companies that performed practice PR9 "Rarely + Never" reported "About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (14.4).

Cramer's V= .421 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR9 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR9 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-673.

Table A-H-671

Crosstab		
	Recode2_Project time_schedule	Total

			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR9 Obtains commitment to requirements from project participants	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	30	23	53
		Expected Count	22.4	30.6	53.0
		% within Recode2_PR9 Obtains commitment to requirements from project participants	56.6%	43.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	90.9%	51.1%	67.9%
		Std. Residual	1.6	-1.4	
	Rarely + Never	Count	3	22	25
		Expected Count	10.6	14.4	25.0
		% within Recode2_PR9 Obtains commitment to requirements from project participants	12.0%	88.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	9.1%	48.9%	32.1%
		Std. Residual	-2.3	2.0	
Total		Count	33	45	78
		Expected Count	33.0	45.0	78.0
		% within Recode2_PR9 Obtains commitment to requirements from project participants	42.3%	57.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-672

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.846 ^a	1	.00019841		
Continuity Correction ^b	12.079	1	.00050993		
Likelihood Ratio	15.385	1	.00008769		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00018847	.00014499
Linear-by-Linear Association	13.669	1	.00021807		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.58.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-673

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.421	.000
	Cramer's V	.421	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

10A - H4.3.10A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR10: Client Company stakeholder needs, expectations, constraints and interfaces are collected and translated into customer requirements and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR10: Client Company stakeholder needs, expectations, constraints and interfaces are collected and translated into customer

requirements and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 28.715 from Table A-H-675 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000008.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR10: Client Company stakeholder needs, expectations, constraints and interfaces are collected and translated into customer requirements and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR10 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-674 shows that Zero companies that performed practice PR10 “Rarely + Never” reported “Earlier than planned time + On-time” for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (10.2). Whereas, 32 of the companies that performed practice PR10 “Rarely + Never” reported “About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time” for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (20.7).

Cramer’s V= .592 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR10 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR10 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-676.

Table A-H-674

Crosstab					
			Recode2 Project time schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
RRRecode2_PR10 Collects_and_translates_stakeholders_needs_expectations into customer requirements	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	29	21	50
		Expected Count	17.7	32.3	50.0
		% within Recode2_PR10 Collects and translates stakeholders needs expectations into customer requirements	58.0%	42.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_ Project timeschedule	100.0%	39.6%	61.0%
		Std. Residual	2.7	-2.0	
	Rarely + Never	Count	0	32	32
		Expected Count	11.3	20.7	32.0
		% within RRRecode2_PR10 Collects_and_translates_stakeholders_needs_expectations into customer requirements	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	0.0%	60.4%	39.0%
		Std. Residual	-3.4	2.5	
Total			Count	29	82
			Expected Count	29.0	53.0
			% within RRRecode2_PR10 Collects_and_translates_stakeholders_needs_expectations into customer requirements	35.4%	64.6%
			% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-675

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	28.715 ^a	1	.00000008		
Continuity Correction ^b	26.234	1	.00000030		
Likelihood Ratio	38.519	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000001	.00000001
Linear-by-Linear Association	28.365	1	.00000010		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.32.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-676

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.592	.000
	Cramer's V	.592	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

11A - H4.3.11A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR11: Client Company maintains bidirectional traceability among requirements and work products and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR11: Client Company maintains bidirectional traceability among requirements and work products and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 28.074 from Table A-H-678 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000012.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR11: Client Company maintains bidirectional traceability among requirements and work products and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR11 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-677 shows that 2 companies that performed practice PR11 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (13.4). Whereas, 27 of the companies that performed practice PR11 "Always + Very Frequently" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (15.6).

Cramer's V= .585 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR11 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR11 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-679.

Table A-H-677

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Project_time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR11 Maintains bidirectional traceability among requirements and work product	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	27	17	44
		Expected Count	15.6	28.4	44.0
		% within Recode2_PR11 Maintains_bidirectional_traceability_among_requirements and work product	61.4%	38.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	93.1%	32.1%	53.7%
		Std. Residual	2.9	-2.1	

	Rarely + Never	Count	2	36	38
		Expected Count	13.4	24.6	38.0
		% within Recode2_PR11 Maintains_bidirectional_trace bility_among_requirements and work product	5.3%	94.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_ success_time_schedule	6.9%	67.9%	46.3%
		Std. Residual	-3.1	2.3	
Total		Count	29	53	82
		Expected Count	29.0	53.0	82.0
		% within Recode2_PR11 Maintains_bidirectional_trace bility_among_requirements and work product	35.4%	64.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_ success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-678

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	28.074 ^a	1	.00000012		
Continuity Correction ^b	25.674	1	.00000040		
Likelihood Ratio	32.173	1	.00000001		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000004	.00000004
Linear-by-Linear Association	27.732	1	.00000014		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.44.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-679

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.585	.000
	Cramer's V	.585	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

12A - H4.3.12A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR12: Client Company manages changes to requirements as they evolve during the project and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR12: Client Company manages changes to requirements as they evolve during the project and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 30.217 from Table A-H-681 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p=.00000004.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR12: Client Company manages changes to requirements as they evolve during the project and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR12 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-680 shows that Zero companies that performed practice PR12 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (11.7). Whereas, 29 of the companies that performed practice PR12 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Earlier than planned time + On time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (17.3).

Cramer's V= .607 indicates a strong association between performed PR12 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR12 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-682.

Table A-H-680

Crosstab					
			Recode2_ Project time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR12 Manages_change s_to_requirement s_as_they_evolve _during project	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	29	20	49
		Expected Count	17.3	31.7	49.0
		% within Recode2_PR12 Manages_changes_to_requirements_as_they_evolve_during project	59.2%	40.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_time_schedule	100.0%	37.7%	59.8%
		Std. Residual	2.8	-2.1	
	Rarely + Never	Count	0	33	33
		Expected Count	11.7	21.3	33.0
		% within Recode2_PR12 Manages_changes_to_requirement s_as_they_evolve_during project	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	0.0%	62.3%	40.2%
		Std. Residual	-3.4	2.5	
Total		Count	29	53	82
		Expected Count	29.0	53.0	82.0
		% within Recode2_PR12 Manages_changes_to_requirement s_as_they_evolve_during project	35.4%	64.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-681

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	30.217 ^a	1	.00000004		
Continuity Correction ^b	27.683	1	.00000014		
Likelihood Ratio	40.282	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	29.849	1	.00000005		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.67.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-682

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.607	.000
	Cramer's V	.607	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

13A - H4.3.13A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR13: Client Company ensures that project plans and work products remain aligned with requirements and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR13: Client Company ensures that project plans and work products remain aligned with requirements and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 36.891 from Table A-H-684 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR13: Client Company ensures that project plans and work products remain aligned with requirements and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR13 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-683 shows that zero companies that performed practice PR13 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (13.1). Whereas, 29 of the companies that performed practice PR13 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Earlier than planned + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (15.9).

Cramer's V= .671 indicates a strong association between performed PR13 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR13 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-685.

Table A-H-683

Crosstab						
			Recode2Project time_schedule		Total	
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time		
Recode2_PR13 Ensures that project Plan and work remain aligned with requirements	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	29	16	45	
		Expected Count	15.9	29.1	45.0	
		% within Recode2_PR13 Ensures_that_project_Plan_and_work_remain_aligned with requirements	64.4%	35.6%	100.0%	
		% within Recode2_Project success_time_schedule	100.0%	30.2%	54.9%	
		Std. Residual	3.3	-2.4		
	Rarely + Never	Count	0	37	37	
		Expected Count	13.1	23.9	37.0	
		% within Recode2_PR13 Ensures_that_project_Plan_and_work_remain_aligned with requirements	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
		% within Recode2_Project success_time_schedule	0.0%	69.8%	45.1%	
		Std. Residual	-3.6	2.7		
Total			Count	29	53	82
			Expected Count	29.0	53.0	82.0
			% within Recode2_PR13 Ensures_that_project_Plan_and_work_remain_aligned with requirements	35.4%	64.6%	100.0%
			% within Recode2_Project success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-684

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	36.891 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	34.126	1	.00000001		
Likelihood Ratio	47.974	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	36.442	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.09.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-685

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.671	.000
	Cramer's V	.671	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

14A - H4.3.14A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR14: Client Company's Customer Interface Manager leads the team in estimating and documenting the impact of every change in requirement and works with the Configuration Control Board (CCB) to get approval for changes to those requirements and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR14: Client Company's Customer Interface Manager leads the team in estimating and documenting the impact of every change in requirement and works with the Configuration Control Board (CCB) to get approval for changes to those requirements and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 39.456 from Table A-H-687 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000000$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR14: Client Company's Customer Interface Manager leads the team in estimating and documenting the impact of every change in requirement and works with the Configuration Control Board (CCB) to get approval for changes to those requirements and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR14 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-686 shows that 2 companies that performed practice PR14 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (15.6). Whereas, 27 of the companies that performed practice PR14 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Earlier than planned + On time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (13.4).

Cramer's $V=.694$ indicates a strong association between performed PR14 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR14 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-688.

Table A-H-686

Crosstab		
	Recode2_Project time_schedule	Total

			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR14 Customer interface manager leads the team in estimating and documenting the impact of every change in requirements	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	27	11	38
		Expected Count	13.4	24.6	38.0
		% within Recode2_PR14 Customer_interface_manager_leades_the_team_in_estimating and documenting the impact of every change in	71.1%	28.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	93.1%	20.8%	46.3%
		Std. Residual	3.7	-2.7	
	Rarely + Never	Count	2	42	44
		Expected Count	15.6	28.4	44.0
		% within Recode2_PR14 Customer_interface_manager_leades_the_team_in_estimating and documenting the impact of every change in	4.5%	95.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	6.9%	79.2%	53.7%
		Std. Residual	-3.4	2.5	
Total			Count	29	53
			Expected Count	29.0	53.0
			% within Recode2_PR14 Customer_interface_manager_leades_the_team_in_estimating and documenting the impact of every change in	35.4%	64.6%
			% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%
				100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-687

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	39.456 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	36.600	1	.00000000		
Likelihood Ratio	44.548	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	38.975	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.44.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-688

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.694	.000
	Cramer's V	.694	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

15A - H4.3.15A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR15: Client Company establishes and manages the coordination and collaboration between the project and relevant stakeholders and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR15: Client Company establishes and manages the coordination and collaboration between the project and relevant stakeholders and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 30.541 from Table A-H-690 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000003.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR15: Client Company establishes and manages the coordination and collaboration between the project and relevant stakeholders and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR15 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-689 shows that Zero companies that performed practice PR15 “Rarely + Never” reported “Earlier than planned time + On-time” for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (11.4). Whereas, 28 of the companies that performed practice PR15 “Rarely + Never” reported “About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time” for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (16.6).

Cramer’s V= .634 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR15 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR15 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-691.

Table A-H-689

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Project_time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR15 Establishes and manages the coordination between project and stakeholders	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	31	17	48
		Expected Count	19.6	28.4	48.0
		% within Recode2_PR15 Establishes_and_manages_the_coordination_between_project_and_stakeholders	64.6%	35.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	100.0%	37.8%	63.2%
		Std. Residual	2.6	-2.1	
	Rarely + Never	Count	0	28	28
		Expected Count	11.4	16.6	28.0
		% within Recode2_PR15 Establishes_and_manages_the_coordination_between_project_and_stakeholders	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	0.0%	62.2%	36.8%
		Std. Residual	-3.4	2.8	
Total			Count	31	45
			Expected Count	31.0	45.0
			% within Recode2_PR15 Establishes_and_manages_the_coordination_between_project_and_stakeholders	40.8%	59.2%
			% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%
					100.0%

Table A-H-690

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)

Pearson Chi-Square	30.541 ^a	1	.00000003		
Continuity Correction ^b	27.925	1	.00000013		
Likelihood Ratio	40.366	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	30.139	1	.00000004		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.42.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-691

Symmetric Measures		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.634	.000
	Cramer's V	.634	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

16A - H4.3.16A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR16: Client Company's team members track actual results and performance against plans on a weekly basis. Team members track progress against individual plans on a daily basis and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR16: Client Company's team members track actual results and performance against plans on a weekly basis. Team members track progress against individual plans on a daily basis and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 27.302 from Table A-H-693 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000017.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR16: Client Company's team members track actual results and performance against plans on a weekly basis. Team members track progress against individual plans on a daily basis and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR16 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-692 shows that 2 companies that performed practice PR16 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (13.1). Whereas, 30 of the companies that performed practice PR16 "Rarely + Never" reported "About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (18.9).

Cramer's V= .599 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR16 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR16 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-694.

Table A-H-692

Crosstab					
			Recode2 Project time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR16 Project team	Always + Very	Count	29	15	44
		Expected Count	17.9	26.1	44.0

members track results and performance	Frequently + Occasionally	% within Recode2_PR16 Project_team_members_track_results_and_performance	65.9%	34.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	93.5%	33.3%	57.9%
		Std. Residual	2.6	-2.2	
	Rarely + Never	Count	2	30	32
		Expected Count	13.1	18.9	32.0
		% within Recode2_PR16 Project_team_members_track_results_and_performance	6.3%	93.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	6.5%	66.7%	42.1%
		Std. Residual	-3.1	2.5	
Total		Count	31	45	76
		Expected Count	31.0	45.0	76.0
		% within Recode2_PR16 Project_team_members_track_results_and_performance	40.8%	59.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-693

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	27.302 ^a	1	.00000017		
Continuity Correction ^b	24.888	1	.00000061		
Likelihood Ratio	31.338	1	.00000002		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000007	.00000006
Linear-by-Linear Association	26.943	1	.00000021		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.05.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-694

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.599	.000
	Cramer's V	.599	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

17A - H4.3.17A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR17: Client Company develops a documented plan to be used to communicate inter-group commitments and to coordinate and track the work performed and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR17: Client Company develops a documented plan to be used to communicate inter-group commitments and to coordinate and track the work performed and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 28.792 from Table A-H-696 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000008.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR17: Client Company develops a documented plan to be used to communicate inter-group commitments and to coordinate and track the work performed and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR17 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of*

Time/Schedule. Table A-H-695 shows that 1 company that performed practice PR17 “Rarely + Never” reported “Earlier than planned time + On-time” for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (12.2). Whereas, 29 of the companies that performed practice PR17 “Rarely + Never” reported “About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time” for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (17.8).

Cramer’s V= .616 indicates a strong association between performed PR17 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR17 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-697.

Table A-H-695

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Project_time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR17 Develops a documented plan to be used to Communicate	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	30	16	46
		Expected Count	18.8	27.2	46.0
		% within Recode2_PR17 Develops_a_documented_plan_tobe_used_to_Communicat	65.2%	34.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project success_time_schedule	96.8%	35.6%	60.5%
		Std. Residual	2.6	-2.2	
	Rarely + Never	Count	1	29	30
		Expected Count	12.2	17.8	30.0
		% within Recode2_PR17 Develops_a_documented_plan_tobe_used_to_Communicat	3.3%	96.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project success_time_schedule	3.2%	64.4%	39.5%
		Std. Residual	-3.2	2.7	
Total		Count	31	45	76
		Expected Count	31.0	45.0	76.0
		% within Recode2_PR17 Develops_a_documented_plan_tobe_used_to_Communicat	40.8%	59.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-696

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	28.792 ^a	1	.00000008		
Continuity Correction ^b	26.287	1	.00000029		
Likelihood Ratio	34.556	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000002	.00000002
Linear-by-Linear Association	28.413	1	.00000010		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.24.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-697

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.616	.000
	Cramer's V	.616	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

18A - H4.3.18A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR18: Client Company team managers are responsible for the coordination across all project teams and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR18: Client Company team managers are responsible for the coordination across all project teams and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 32.304 from Table A-H-699 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000001.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR18: Client Company team managers are responsible for the coordination across all project teams and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR18 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-698 shows that Zero companies that performed practice PR18 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (11.8). Whereas, 29 of the companies that performed practice PR18 "Rarely + Never" reported "About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (17.2).

Cramer's V= .652 indicates a strong association between performed PR18 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR18 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-700.

Table A-H-698

Crosstab					
			Recode2Project time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR18 Managers are responsible for the coordination across	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	31	16	47
		Expected Count	19.2	27.8	47.0
		% within Recode2_PR18 Managers are_responsible_for_coordination	66.0%	34.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project time_schedule	100.0%	35.6%	61.8%
		Std. Residual	2.7	-2.2	
	Rarely + Never	Count	0	29	29
		Expected Count	11.8	17.2	29.0
		% within Recode2_PR18 Managers are_responsible_for_coordination	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	0.0%	64.4%	38.2%
		Std. Residual	-3.4	2.9	
Total			Count	45	76
			Expected Count	31.0	45.0
			% within Recode2_PR18 Managers are_responsible_for_coordination	40.8%	59.2%

	% within Recode2_Project_success _time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
--	--	--------	--------	--------

Table A-H-699

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	32.304 ^a	1	.00000001		
Continuity Correction ^b	29.631	1	.00000005		
Likelihood Ratio	42.481	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	31.879	1	.00000002		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.83.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-700

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.652	.000
	Cramer's V	.652	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

19A - H4.3.19A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR19: Client company communication and coordination practices are institutionalized to ensure they are performed as managed processes and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR19: Client company communication and coordination practices are institutionalized to ensure they are performed as managed processes and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 36.491 from Table A-H-702 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p=.00000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR19: Client company communication and coordination practices are institutionalized to ensure they are performed as managed processes and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR19 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-701 shows that 1 company that performed practice PR19 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (13.9). Whereas, 30 of the companies that performed practice PR19 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Earlier than planned time + On time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (17.1).

Cramer's V= .693 indicates a strong association between performed PR19 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR19 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-703.

Table A-H-701

Crosstab		
	Recode2_Project_time_schedule	Total

			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR19 Communication and coordination practices are institutionalized to ensure they are performed as managed	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	30	12	42
		Expected Count	17.1	24.9	42.0
		% within Recode2_PR19 Communication_and_coordination_practices_are_institutionalized_to_ensure_they_areperformed_as_managed	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_time_schedule	96.8%	26.7%	55.3%
		Std. Residual	3.1	-2.6	
		Count	1	33	34
	Rarely + Never	Expected Count	13.9	20.1	34.0
		% within Recode2_PR19 Communication_and_coordination_practices_are_institutionalized_to_ensure_they_areperformed_as_managed	2.9%	97.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_time_schedule	3.2%	73.3%	44.7%
		Std. Residual	-3.5	2.9	
		Count	31	45	76
		Expected Count	31.0	45.0	76.0
Total			40.8%	59.2%	100.0%
			100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-702

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	36.491 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	33.711	1	.00000001		
Likelihood Ratio	43.487	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	36.011	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.87.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-703

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.693	.000
	Cramer's V	.693	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

20A - H4.3.20A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR20: Representatives of the client company project's software engineering group work with representatives of the supplier engineering groups to monitor and coordinate technical activities and resolve technical issues and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR20: Representatives of the client company project's software engineering group work with representatives of the supplier engineering groups to monitor and coordinate technical activities and resolve technical issues and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 19.075 from Table A-H-705 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00001257$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR20: Representatives of the client company project's software engineering group work with representatives of the supplier engineering groups to monitor and coordinate technical activities and resolve technical issues and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR20 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-704 shows that 1 company that performed practice PR20 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (9.9). Whereas, 24 of the companies that performed practice PR20 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Earlier than planned time + On time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (15.1).

Cramer's $V=.485$ indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR20 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR20 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-706.

Table A-H-704

Crosstab						
			Recode2_Project time_schedule		Total	
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time		
REcode2_PR20 Representatives of client company work with Rep	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	24	25	49	
		Expected Count	15.1	33.9	49.0	
		% within REcode2_PR20 Representatives_of_client_co mpany_work_with Rep	49.0%	51.0%	100.0%	
		% within Recode2_Project success_time_schedule	96.0%	44.6%	60.5%	
		Std. Residual	2.3	-1.5		
	Rarely + Never	Count	1	31	32	
		Expected Count	9.9	22.1	32.0	
		% within REcode2_PR20 Representatives_of_client_co mpany_work_with Rep	3.1%	96.9%	100.0%	
		% within Recode2_Project success_time_schedule	4.0%	55.4%	39.5%	
		Std. Residual	-2.8	1.9		
Total			Count	25	56	81
			Expected Count	25.0	56.0	81.0
			% within REcode2_PR20 Representatives_of_client_co mpany_work_with Rep	30.9%	69.1%	100.0%
			% within Recode2_Project success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-705

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.075 ^a	1	.00001257		

Continuity Correction ^b	16.987	1	.00003764		
Likelihood Ratio	23.310	1	.00000138		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000484	.00000397
Linear-by-Linear Association	18.840	1	.00001422		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.88.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-706

Symmetric Measures		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.485	.000
	Cramer's V	.485	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

21A - H4.3.21A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR21: Client Company selects team roles, including the role of Supplier Interface Manager, who is the liaison between the team and the supplier company representative, and is responsible for requirements change management and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR21: Client Company selects team roles, including the role of Supplier Interface Manager, who is the liaison between the team and the supplier company representative, and is responsible for requirements change management and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 18.269 from Table A-H-708 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p=.00001918.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR21: Client Company selects team roles, including the role of supplier interface manager, who is the liaison between the team and the supplier company representative, and is responsible for requirements change management and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR21 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-707 shows that 2 companies that performed practice PR21 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (10.8). Whereas, 23 of the companies that performed practice PR21 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Earlier than planned time + On time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (14.2).

Cramer's V= .475 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR21 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR21 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-709.

Table A-H-707

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Project_time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR21		Count	23	23	46
Selects team		Expected Count	14.2	31.8	46.0

roles including the role of supplier	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	% within Recode2_PR21 Selects_team_roles_including_the_role_of_supplier	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 Project time schedule	92.0%	41.1%	56.8%
		Std. Residual	2.3	-1.6	
	Rarely + Never	Count	2	33	35
		Expected Count	10.8	24.2	35.0
		% within Recode2_PR21 Selects_team_roles_including_the_role_of_supplier	5.7%	94.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 Project time schedule	8.0%	58.9%	43.2%
		Std. Residual	-2.7	1.8	
Total	Count		25	56	81
	Expected Count		25.0	56.0	81.0
	% within Recode2_PR21 Selects_team_roles_including_the_role_of_supplier		30.9%	69.1%	100.0%
	% within Recode2 Project time schedule		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-708

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.269 ^a	1	.00001918		
Continuity Correction ^b	16.252	1	.00005544		
Likelihood Ratio	21.016	1	.00000456		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00001909	.00000986
Linear-by-Linear Association	18.043	1	.00002159		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.80.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-709

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.475	.000
	Cramer's V	.475	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

22A - H4.3.22A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR22: Client Company communicates quality issues and ensures the resolution of noncompliance issues with the staff and managers and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR22: Client Company communicates quality issues and ensures the resolution of noncompliance issues with the staff and managers and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 20.690 from Table A-H-711 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000540.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR22: Client Company communicates quality issues and ensures the resolution of noncompliance issues with the staff and managers and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely

performed PR22 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-710 shows that 2 companies that performed practice PR22 “Rarely + Never” reported “Earlier than planned time + On-time” for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (11.4). Whereas, 23 of the companies that performed practice PR22 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Earlier than planned time + On time” for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (13.6).

Cramer’s V= .505 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR22 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR22 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-712.

Table A-H-710

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Project_time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
REcode2_PR22 Communicates_quality_issues_and_isures_resolution	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	23	21	44
		Expected Count	13.6	30.4	44.0
		% within REcode2_PR22 Communicates_quality_issues_and_isures_resolution	52.3%	47.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	92.0%	37.5%	54.3%
		Std. Residual	2.6	-1.7	
	Rarely + Never	Count	2	35	37
		Expected Count	11.4	25.6	37.0
		% within REcode2_PR22 Communicates_quality_issues_and_isures_resolution	5.4%	94.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	8.0%	62.5%	45.7%
		Std. Residual	-2.8	1.9	
Total	Count		25	56	81
	Expected Count		25.0	56.0	81.0
	% within REcode2_PR22 Communicates_quality_issues_and_isures_resolution		30.9%	69.1%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-711

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.690 ^a	1	.00000540		
Continuity Correction ^b	18.551	1	.00001654		
Likelihood Ratio	23.651	1	.00000116		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000292	.00000268
Linear-by-Linear Association	20.434	1	.00000617		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.42.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-712

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.505	.000
	Cramer's V	.505	.000

23A - H4.3.23A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR23: Client Company establishes and maintains a documented policy for conducting its Communication and Coordination activities and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR23: Client Company establishes and maintains a documented policy for conducting its Communication and Coordination activities and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 16.530 from Table A-H-714 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00004789$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR23: Client Company establishes and maintains a documented policy for conducting its Communication and Coordination activities and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR23 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-713 shows that 3 companies that performed practice PR23 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (11.4). Whereas, 22 of the companies that performed practice PR23 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Earlier than planned time + On time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (13.6).

Cramer's $V=.452$ indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR23 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR23 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-715.

Table A-H-713

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Project_time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR23 Establish_and_maintain_documented_policy_for_condu	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	22	22	44
		Expected Count	13.6	30.4	44.0
		% within Recode2_PR23 Establish_and_maintain_documented_policy_for_condu	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	88.0%	39.3%	54.3%
		Std. Residual	2.3	-1.5	
	Rarely + Never	Count	3	34	37
		Expected Count	11.4	25.6	37.0
		% within Recode2_PR23 Establish_and_maintain_documented_policy_for_condu	8.1%	91.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	12.0%	60.7%	45.7%
		Std. Residual	-2.5	1.7	
Total	Count		25	56	81
	Expected Count		25.0	56.0	81.0
	% within Recode2_PR23 Establish_and_maintain_documented_policy_for_condu		30.9%	69.1%	100.0%

	% within Recode2_Project _success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
--	--	--------	--------	--------

Table A-H-714

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.530 ^a	1	.00004789		
Continuity Correction ^b	14.625	1	.00013116		
Likelihood Ratio	18.297	1	.00001890		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00003735	.00003378
Linear-by-Linear Association	16.326	1	.00005333		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.42.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-715

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.452	.000
	Cramer's V	.452	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

24A - H4.3.24A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR24: Client Company ensures that the workforce has the skills to share information and coordinate their activities efficiently and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR24: Client Company ensures that the workforce has the skills to share information and coordinate their activities efficiently and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 14.354 from Table A-H-717 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00015148.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR24: Client Company ensures that the workforce has the skills to share information and coordinate their activities efficiently and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR24 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-716 shows that 3 companies that performed practice PR24 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (10.8). Whereas, 22 of the companies that performed practice PR24 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Earlier than planned time + On time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (14.2).

Cramer's V= .421 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR24 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR24 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-718.

Table A-H-716

Crosstab		
	Recode2_Project time_schedule	Total

			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR24 Ensures_that_the_workforce_has_the_skills_to_sha	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	22	24	46
		Expected Count	14.2	31.8	46.0
		% within Recode2_PR24 Ensures_that_the_workforce_has_the_skills_	47.8%	52.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_time_schedule	88.0%	42.9%	56.8%
		Std. Residual	2.1	-1.4	
	Rarely + Never	Count	3	32	35
		Expected Count	10.8	24.2	35.0
		% within Recode2_PR24 Ensures_that_the_workforce_has_the_skills_	8.6%	91.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_time_schedule	12.0%	57.1%	43.2%
		Std. Residual	-2.4	1.6	
Total	Count	25	56	81	
	Expected Count	25.0	56.0	81.0	
	% within Recode2_PR24 Ensures_that_the_workforce_has_the_skills_	30.9%	69.1%	100.0%	
	% within Recode2_Project_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table A-H-717

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.354 ^a	1	.00015148	.00018968	.00010810
Continuity Correction ^b	12.573	1	.00039135		
Likelihood Ratio	15.959	1	.00006471		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	14.177	1	.00016643		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.80.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-718

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.421	.000
	Cramer's V	.421	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

25A - H4.3.25A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR25: Client Company establishes a culture for openly sharing information and concerns across organizational levels as well as among team members and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR25: Client Company establishes a culture for openly sharing information and concerns across organizational levels as well as among team members and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is

16.530 from Table A-H-720 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000479$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR25: Client Company establishes a culture for openly sharing information and concerns across organizational levels as well as among team members and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR25 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-719 shows that 3 companies that performed practice PR25 “Rarely + Never” reported “Earlier than planned time + On-time” for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (11.4). While, 22 of the companies that performed practice PR25 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Earlier than planned time + On time” for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (13.6).

Cramer’s $V=.452$ indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR25 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR25 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-721.

Table A-H-719

Crosstab					
			Recode2 Project time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR25 establish_a_culture_for_openly_sharing_informati	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	22	22	44
		Expected Count	13.6	30.4	44.0
		% within Recode2_PR25 establish_a_culture_for_openly_sharing_informati	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project success_time_schedule	88.0%	39.3%	54.3%
		Std. Residual	2.3	-1.5	
	Rarely + Never	Count	3	34	37
		Expected Count	11.4	25.6	37.0
		% within Recode2_PR25 establish_a_culture_for_openly_sharing_informati	8.1%	91.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project success_time_schedule	12.0%	60.7%	45.7%
		Std. Residual	-2.5	1.7	
Total		Count	25	56	81
		Expected Count	25.0	56.0	81.0
		% within Recode2_PR25 establish_a_culture_for_openly_sharing_informati	30.9%	69.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-720

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.530 ^a	1	.0000479		
Continuity Correction ^b	14.625	1	.0001312		
Likelihood Ratio	18.297	1	.0000189		
Fisher's Exact Test				.0000374	.0000338
Linear-by-Linear Association	16.326	1	.0000533		
N of Valid Cases	81				

- a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.42.
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-721

Symmetric Measures		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.452	.000
	Cramer's V	.452	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

26A - H4.3.26A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR26: Client Company establishes project teams as well as their responsibilities, authorities and interrelationships and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR26: Client Company establishes project teams as well as their responsibilities, authorities and interrelationships and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 12.837 from Table A-H-723 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00024000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR26: Client Company establishes project teams as well as their responsibilities, authorities and interrelationships and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR26 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-722 shows that 4 companies that performed practice PR26 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (11.4). Whereas, 21 of the companies that performed practice PR26 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Earlier than planned time + On time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (13.6).

Cramer's V= .398 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR26 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR26 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-724.

Table A-H-722

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Project_time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR26 Establish_project_teams_as well_as_their_respons	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	21	23	44
		Expected Count	13.6	30.4	44.0
		% within Recode2_PR26 Establish_project_teams_as well_as_their_respons	47.7%	52.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_time_schedule	84.0%	41.1%	54.3%
		Std. Residual	2.0	-1.3	
	Rarely + Never	Count	4	33	37
		Expected Count	11.4	25.6	37.0
		% within Recode2_PR26 Establish_project_teams_as well_as_their_respons	10.8%	89.2%	100.0%

		% within Recode2_Project success_time_schedule	16.0%	58.9%	45.7%
		Std. Residual	-2.2	1.5	
Total		Count	25	56	81
		Expected Count	25.0	56.0	81.0
		% within Recode2_PR26 Establish_project_teams_as well_as_their_respons	30.9%	69.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-723

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2- sided)	Exact Sig. (1- sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.837 ^a	1	.00024000		
Continuity Correction ^b	11.165	1	.00053400		
Likelihood Ratio	13.863	1	.00019658		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00026000	.00028665
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.678	1	.00027000		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.42.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-724

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.398	.000
	Cramer's V	.398	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

27A - H4.3.27A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR27: Client Company establishes and maintains open and effective project teams' communication and coordination plan and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR27: Client Company establishes and maintains open and effective project teams' communication and coordination plan and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 13.876 from Table A-H-726 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00019531.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR27: Client Company establishes and maintains open and effective project teams' communication and coordination plan and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR27 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-725 shows that 4 companies that performed practice PR27 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (11.7). Whereas, 21 of the companies that performed practice PR27 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Earlier than planned time + On time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (13.3).

Cramer's V= .414 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR27 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR27 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-727.

Table A-H-725

Crosstab					
			Recode2_ Project time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time+ On-time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR27 Establish_and_maintain_open_and_effective_commun	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	21	22	43
		Expected Count	13.3	29.7	43.0
		% within Recode2_PR27 establish_and_maintain_op en_and_effective_commun	48.8%	51.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project _success_time_schedule	84.0%	39.3%	53.1%
		Std. Residual	2.1	-1.4	
	Rarely + Never	Count	4	34	38
		Expected Count	11.7	26.3	38.0
		% within Recode2_PR27 establish_and_maintain_op en_and_effective_commun	10.5%	89.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project _success_time_schedule	16.0%	60.7%	46.9%
		Std. Residual	-2.3	1.5	
Total		Count	25	56	81
		Expected Count	25.0	56.0	81.0
		% within Recode2_PR27 establish_and_maintain_op en_and_effective_commun	30.9%	69.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project _success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-726

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.876 ^a	1	.00019531		
Continuity Correction ^b	12.138	1	.00049396		
Likelihood Ratio	14.957	1	.00011002		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00023476	.00016596
Linear-by-Linear Association	13.704	1	.00021396		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.73.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-727

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.414	.000
	Cramer's V	.414	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

28A - 4.3.28A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR28: Client Company team managers are responsible to track and resolve inter-group issues and the offshored projects' success factor Time/Schedule.

Linear-by-Linear Association	15.226	1	.00009540		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.11.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-730

Symmetric Measures		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.436	.000
	Cramer's V	.436	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

29A - H4.3.29A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR29: Client Company maintains effective work-groups, interpersonal problems are addressed quickly and meetings are managed to ensure that work-group time is used most effectively and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR29: Client Company maintains effective work-groups, interpersonal problems are addressed quickly and meetings are managed to ensure that work-group time is used most effectively and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 17.336 from Table A-H-732 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p=.00003132.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR29: Client Company maintains effective work-groups, interpersonal problems are addressed quickly and meetings are managed to ensure that work-group time is used most effectively and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR29 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-731 shows that 4 companies that performed practice PR29 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (12.7). Whereas, 21 of the companies that performed practice PR29 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Earlier than planned time + On time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (12.3).

Cramer's V=.463 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR29 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR29 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-733.

Table A-H-731

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Project time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR29 Maintains effective_workgroup	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	21	19	40
		Expected Count	12.3	27.7	40.0
		% within Recode2_PR29 Maintains effective_workgroup	52.5%	47.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project success_time_schedule	84.0%	33.9%	49.4%
		Std. Residual	2.5	-1.6	
	Rarely + Never	Count	4	37	41
		Expected Count	12.7	28.3	41.0

		% within Recode2_PR29 Maintains_effective_workgroup	9.8%	90.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project success_time_schedule	16.0%	66.1%	50.6%
		Std. Residual	-2.4	1.6	
Total		Count	25	56	81
		Expected Count	25.0	56.0	81.0
		% within Recode2_PR29 Maintains_effective_workgroup	30.9%	69.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-732

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.336 ^a	1	.00003132		
Continuity Correction ^b	15.391	1	.00008742		
Likelihood Ratio	18.551	1	.00001654		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00003265	.00002774
Linear-by-Linear Association	17.122	1	.00003505		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.35.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-733

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.463	.000
	Cramer's V	.463	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

30A - H4.3.30A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR30: Client Company establishes and maintains a mutual understanding of the contract with selected suppliers and end users based on acquisition needs and the suppliers' proposed approaches and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR30: Client Company establishes and maintains a mutual understanding of the contract with selected suppliers and end users based on acquisition needs and the suppliers' proposed approaches and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 31.503 from Table A-H-735 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p=.00000002.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR30: Client Company establishes and maintains a mutual understanding of the contract with selected suppliers and end users based on acquisition needs and the suppliers' proposed approaches and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR30 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-734 shows that 2 companies that performed practice PR30 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (14.1). Whereas, 27 of the companies that performed practice PR30 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Earlier than planned time + On time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (14.9).

Cramer's V= .620 indicates a strong association between performed PR30 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR30 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-736.

Table A-H-734

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Project_time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR30 Establishes_and_maintains_mutual_understanding_o f_the contract	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	27	15	42
		Expected Count	14.9	27.1	42.0
		% within Recode2_PR30 Establishes_and_maintains_mutual_understanding_of_the contract	64.3%	35.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	93.1%	28.3%	51.2%
		Std. Residual	3.2	-2.3	
	Rarely + Never	Count	2	38	40
		Expected Count	14.1	25.9	40.0
		% within Recode2_PR30 Establishes_and_maintains_mutual_understanding_of_the contract	5.0%	95.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	6.9%	71.7%	48.8%
		Std. Residual	-3.2	2.4	
Total	Count	29	53	82	
	Expected Count	29.0	53.0	82.0	
	% within Recode2_PR30 Establishes_and_maintains_mutual_understanding_of_the contract	35.4%	64.6%	100.0%	
	% within Recode2_Project_success time schedule	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table A-H-735

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	31.503 ^a	1	.00000002		
Continuity Correction ^b	28.963	1	.00000007		
Likelihood Ratio	35.919	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000001	.00000001
Linear-by-Linear Association	31.119	1	.00000002		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.15.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-736

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.620	.000
	Cramer's V	.620	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

31A - H4.3.31A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR31: Client Company requirements are refined and elaborated into contractual requirements and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR32: Client Company requirements are refined and elaborated into contractual requirements and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 23.528 from Table A-H-738 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p=.00000123.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR31: Client Company requirements are refined and elaborated into contractual requirements and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR32 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-737 shows that 4 company that performed practice PR31 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (14.5). Whereas, 25 of the companies that performed practice PR31 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Earlier than planned time + On time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (14.5).

Cramer's V= .536 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR31 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR31 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-739.

Table A-H-737

Crosstab						
			Recode2_Project time_schedule		Total	
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time		
Recode2_PR31 Requirements_ are_refinded_ and_elaborated _into_con	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	25	16	41	
		Expected Count	14.5	26.5	41.0	
		% within Recode2_PR31 Requirements_ are_refinded_ and_elaborated_into_con	61.0%	39.0%	100.0%	
		% within Recode2_Project_ success_time_schedule	86.2%	30.2%	50.0%	
		Std. Residual	2.8	-2.0		
	Rarely + Never	Count	4	37	41	
		Expected Count	14.5	26.5	41.0	
		% within Recode2_PR31 Requirements_ are_refinded_ and_elaborated_into_con	9.8%	90.2%	100.0%	
		% within Recode2_Project_ success_time_schedule	13.8%	69.8%	50.0%	
		Std. Residual	-2.8	2.0		
Total			Count	29	53	82
			Expected Count	29.0	53.0	82.0
			% within Recode2_PR31 Requirements_ are_refinded_ and_elaborated_into_con	35.4%	64.6%	100.0%
			% within Recode2_Project_ success time schedule	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-738

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.528 ^a	1	.00000123		
Continuity Correction ^b	21.340	1	.00000385		
Likelihood Ratio	25.487	1	.00000045		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000177	.00000089
Linear-by-Linear Association	23.241	1	.00000143		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.50.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-739

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.536	.000
	Cramer's V	.536	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

32A - H4.3.32A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR32: Client Company establishes and maintains a formal contract management plan and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR32: Client Company establishes and maintains a formal contract management plan and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 24.917 from Table A-H-741 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p=.00000060.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR32: Client Company establishes and maintains a formal contract management plan and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR32 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-740 shows that 3 companies that performed practice PR32 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (13.8). Whereas, 26 of the companies that performed practice PR32 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Earlier than planned time + On time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (15.2).

Cramer's V=.551 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR32 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR32 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-742.

Table A-H-740

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Project_time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR32 Establishes_and_maintains_a_formal_contract_management_plan	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	26	17	43
		Expected Count	15.2	27.8	43.0
		% within Recode2_PR32 Establishes_and_maintains_a_formal_contract_management_plan	60.5%	39.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	89.7%	32.1%	52.4%

	Rarely + Never	Std. Residual	2.8	-2.0	
		Count	3	36	39
		Expected Count	13.8	25.2	39.0
		% within Recode2_PR32 Establishes_and_maintains_a_fo rmal_contract_managment plan	7.7%	92.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_ success_time_schedule	10.3%	67.9%	47.6%
		Std. Residual	-2.9	2.1	
Total		Count	29	53	82
		Expected Count	29.0	53.0	82.0
		% within Recode2_PR32 Establishes_and_maintains_a_fo rmal_contract_management plan	35.4%	64.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_ success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-741

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.917 ^a	1	.00000060		
Continuity Correction ^b	22.662	1	.00000193		
Likelihood Ratio	27.682	1	.00000014		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000048	.00000032
Linear-by-Linear Association	24.613	1	.00000070		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.79.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-741

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.551	.000
	Cramer's V	.551	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

33A - H4.3.33A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR33: Client Company establishes and maintains contractual requirements and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR33: Client Company establishes and maintains contractual requirements and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 24.917 from Table A-H-744 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000060.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR33: Client Company establishes and maintains contractual requirements and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR33 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-743 shows that 3 companies that performed practice PR33 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (13.8). Whereas, 26 of the companies that performed practice PR33 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Earlier than planned time + On time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (15.2).

Cramer's V= .551 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR33 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR33 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-745.

Table A-H-743

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Project_time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR33 Establishes_ and maintains contractual requirements	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	26	17	43
		Expected Count	15.2	27.8	43.0
		% within Recode2_PR33 Establishes_and_maintains_contractual_requirements	60.5%	39.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	89.7%	32.1%	52.4%
		Std. Residual	2.8	-2.0	
	Rarely + Never	Count	3	36	39
		Expected Count	13.8	25.2	39.0
		% within Recode2_PR33 Establishes_and_maintains_contractual_requirements	7.7%	92.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	10.3%	67.9%	47.6%
		Std. Residual	-2.9	2.1	
Total		Count	29	53	82
		Expected Count	29.0	53.0	82.0
		% within Recode2_PR33 Establishes_and_maintains_contractual_requirements	35.4%	64.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-744

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.917 ^a	1	.00000060		
Continuity Correction ^b	22.662	1	.00000193		
Likelihood Ratio	27.682	1	.00000014		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000048	.00000032
Linear-by-Linear Association	24.613	1	.00000070		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.79.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-745

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.551	.000
	Cramer's V	.551	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

34A - H4.3.34A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR34: Client Company establishes and maintains negotiation plans to use in completing a supplier agreement and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR34: Client Company establishes and maintains negotiation plans to use in completing a supplier agreement and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 13.846 from Table A-H-747 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00019841.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR34: Client Company establishes and maintains negotiation plans to use in completing a supplier agreement and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR34 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-746 shows that 3 companies that performed practice PR34 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (10.6). Whereas, 22 of the companies that performed practice PR34 "Rarely + Never" reported "About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (14.4).

Cramer's V= .421 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR34 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR34 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-748.

Table A-H-746

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Project time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR34 Establishes and maintains negotiation plans to use in completing a supplier agreement	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	30	23	53
		Expected Count	22.4	30.6	53.0
		% within Recode2_PR34 Establishes and maintains negotiation plans to use in	56.6%	43.4%	100.0 %
		% within Recode2_Project success_time_schedule	90.9%	51.1%	67.9%
		Std. Residual	1.6	-1.4	
	Rarely + Never	Count	3	22	25
		Expected Count	10.6	14.4	25.0
		% within Recode2_PR34 Establishes and maintains negotiation plans to use in	12.0%	88.0%	100.0 %
		% within Recode2_Project success_time_schedule	9.1%	48.9%	32.1%
		Std. Residual	-2.3	2.0	
Total	Count	33	45	78	
	Expected Count	33.0	45.0	78.0	
	% within Recode2_PR34 Establishes and maintains negotiation plans to use in	42.3%	57.7%	100.0 %	
	% within Recode2_Project success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%	100.0 %	

Table A-H-747

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.846 ^a	1	.00019841		
Continuity Correction ^b	12.079	1	.00050993		
Likelihood Ratio	15.385	1	.00008769		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00018847	.00014499
Linear-by-Linear Association	13.669	1	.00021807		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.58.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-748

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.421	.000
	Cramer's V	.421	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

35A - H4.3.36A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR35: Client Company insures that agreements with suppliers are satisfied by both the project and the supplier and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR35: Client Company insures that agreements with suppliers are satisfied by both the project and the supplier and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 25.212 from Table A-H-750 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000051$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR35: Client Company insures that agreements with suppliers are satisfied by both the project and the supplier and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR35 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-749 shows that 1 company that performed practice PR35 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (11.4). Whereas, 26 of the companies that performed practice PR35 "Rarely + Never" reported "About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (15.6).

Cramer's $V=.569$ indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR35 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR35 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-751.

Table A-H-749

Crosstab		
	Recode2 Project time_schedule	Total

			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time		
Recode2_PR35 Insures that agreements with suppliers are satisfied by both the project and the supplier	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	32	19	51	
		Expected Count	21.6	29.4	51.0	
		% within Recode2_PR35	62.7%	37.3%	100.0%	
		Insures that agreements with suppliers are satisfied by both the project and the supplier				
		% within Recode2_Project_ success_time_schedule	97.0%	42.2%	65.4%	
	Rarely + Never	Std. Residual	2.2	-1.9		
		Count	1	26	27	
		Expected Count	11.4	15.6	27.0	
		% within Recode2_PR35	3.7%	96.3%	100.0%	
		Insures that agreements with suppliers are satisfied by both the project and the supplier				
		% within Recode2_Project_ success_time_schedule	3.0%	57.8%	34.6%	
		Std. Residual	-3.1	2.6		
Total			Count	33	45	78
			Expected Count	33.0	45.0	78.0
			% within Recode2_PR35	42.3%	57.7%	100.0%
			Insures that agreements with suppliers are satisfied by both the project and the supplier			
			% within Recode2_Project_ success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-750

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	25.212 ^a	1	.00000051		
Continuity Correction ^b	22.852	1	.00000175		
Likelihood Ratio	30.373	1	.00000004		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000014	.00000012
Linear-by-Linear Association	24.889	1	.00000061		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.42.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-751

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.569	.000
	Cramer's V	.569	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

36A - H4.3.36A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR36: Client Company selects suppliers based on an evaluation of their ability to meet specified requirements and established criteria and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR36: Client Company selects suppliers based on an evaluation of their ability to meet specified requirements and established criteria and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 24.917 from Table A-H-

753 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000060$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR36: Client Company selects suppliers based on an evaluation of their ability to meet specified requirements and established criteria and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR36 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-752 shows that 3 companies that performed practice PR36 “Rarely + Never” reported “Earlier than planned time + On-time” for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (13.8). Whereas, 26 of the companies that performed practice PR36 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Earlier than planned time + On time” for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (15.2).

Cramer’s $V=.551$ indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR36 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR36 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-754.

Table A-H-752

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Project time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
RRREcode2_PR36 Selects suppliers based on an evaluation of their ability to meet specified requirements	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	26	17	43
		Expected Count	15.2	27.8	43.0
		% within RRREcode2_PR36 Selects_suppliers_based_on_an_evaluation_of_their ability to meets pecified requirements	60.5%	39.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	89.7%	32.1%	52.4%
		Std. Residual	2.8	-2.0	
	Rarely + Never	Count	3	36	39
		Expected Count	13.8	25.2	39.0
		% within RRREcode2_PR36 Selects_suppliers_based_on_an_evaluation_of_their ability to meetspecified requirements	7.7%	92.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	10.3%	67.9%	47.6%
		Std. Residual	-2.9	2.1	
Total		Count	29	53	82
		Expected Count	29.0	53.0	82.0
		% within RRREcode2_PR36 Selects_suppliers_based_on_an_evaluation_of_their ability to meetspecified requirements	35.4%	64.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-753

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.917 ^a	1	.00000060		
Continuity Correction ^b	22.662	1	.00000193		
Likelihood Ratio	27.682	1	.00000014		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000048	.00000032
Linear-by-Linear Association	24.613	1	.00000070		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.79.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-754

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.551	.000
	Cramer's V	.551	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

37A - H4.3.37A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR37: Client Company identifies and qualifies potential suppliers and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR37: Client Company identifies and qualifies potential suppliers and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 25.154 from Table A-H-756 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000053.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR37: Client Company identifies and qualifies potential suppliers and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR37 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-755 shows that 4 companies that performed practice PR37 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (14.9). Whereas, 25 of the companies that performed practice PR37 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Earlier than planned time + On time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (14.1).

Cramer's V= .554 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR37 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR37 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-757.

Table A-H-755

Crosstab					
		Recode2 Project time_schedule		Total	
		Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time		
RRRecode2_PR37 Identifies and quantifies potential suppliers	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	25	15	40
		Expected Count	14.1	25.9	40.0
		% within RRRecode2_PR37 Identifies_and_quantifies_potential_suppliers	62.5%	37.5%	100.0%

		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	86.2%	28.3%	48.8%
		Std. Residual	2.9	-2.1	
	Rarely + Never	Count	4	38	42
		Expected Count	14.9	27.1	42.0
		% within RRRcode2_PR37 Identifies_and_quantifies_potential_suppliers	9.5%	90.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	13.8%	71.7%	51.2%
		Std. Residual	-2.8	2.1	
Total	Count		29	53	82
	Expected Count		29.0	53.0	82.0
	% within RRRcode2_PR37 Identifies_and_quantifies_potential_suppliers		35.4%	64.6%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-756

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	25.154 ^a	1	.00000053		
Continuity Correction ^b	22.890	1	.00000172		
Likelihood Ratio	27.205	1	.00000018		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000052	.00000038
Linear-by-Linear Association	24.847	1	.00000062		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.15.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-757

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.554	.000
	Cramer's V	.554	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

38A - H4.3.38A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR38: Client Company selects suppliers using a formal evaluation and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR38: Client Company selects suppliers using a formal evaluation and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 30.585 from Table A-H-759 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p=.00000003.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR38: Client Company selects suppliers using a formal evaluation and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR38 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-758 shows that 4 companies that performed practice PR38 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (15.9). Whereas, 25 of the companies that performed practice PR38 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Earlier than planned time + On time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (13.1).

Cramer's V= .611 indicates a strong association between performed PR38 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR38 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-760.

Table A-H-758

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Project_time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
RRRecode2_PR38 Selects suppliers using a formal evaluation	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	25	12	37
		Expected Count	13.1	23.9	37.0
		% within Recode2_PR38 Selects_suppliers_using_a_formal_evaluation	67.6%	32.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2Project success_time_schedule	86.2%	22.6%	45.1%
		Std. Residual	3.3	-2.4	
	Rarely + Never	Count	4	41	45
		Expected Count	15.9	29.1	45.0
		% within RRRecode2_PR38 Selects_suppliers_using formal_evaluation	8.9%	91.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project success_time_schedule	13.8%	77.4%	54.9%
		Std. Residual	-3.0	2.2	
Total		Count	29	53	82
		Expected Count	29.0	53.0	82.0
		% within RRRecode2_PR38 Selects_suppliers using_a_formal_evaluation	35.4%	64.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-759

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	30.585 ^a	1	.00000003		
Continuity Correction ^b	28.072	1	.00000012		
Likelihood Ratio	32.925	1	.00000001		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000003	.00000002
Linear-by-Linear Association	30.212	1	.00000004		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.09.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-760

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.611	.000
	Cramer's V	.611	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

39A - H4.3.39A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR39: Client Company establishes and maintains quantitative objectives to address quality and process performance,

based on customer needs and business objectives and the offshored projects' success factor:
Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR39: Client Company establishes and maintains quantitative objectives to address quality and process performance, based on customer needs and business objectives and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 16.394 from Table A-H-762 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00005146$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR39: Client Company establishes and maintains quantitative objectives to address quality and process performance, based on customer needs and business objectives and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR39 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-761 shows that 2 companies that performed practice PR39 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (10.2). Whereas, 22 of the companies that performed practice PR39 "Rarely + Never" reported "About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (13.8).

Cramer's $V=.458$ indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR39 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR39 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-763.

Table A-H-761

Crosstab					
			Recode2 Project time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode3_PR39 Establish and maintain qualitative objectives to address quantity and process performance	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	31	23	54
		Expected Count	22.8	31.2	54.0
		% within Recode3_PR39 Establish and maintain qualitative objectives to address quantity and process performance	57.4%	42.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_ success_time_schedule	93.9%	51.1%	69.2%
		Std. Residual	1.7	-1.5	
	Rarely + Never	Count	2	22	24
		Expected Count	10.2	13.8	24.0
		% within Recode3_PR39 Establish and maintain qualitative objectives to address quantity and process performance	8.3%	91.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_ success_time_schedule	6.1%	48.9%	30.8%
		Std. Residual	-2.6	2.2	
Total			Count	33	45
			Expected Count	33.0	45.0
			% within Recode3_PR39 Establish and maintain qualitative objectives to address quantity and process performance	42.3%	57.7%
			% within Recode2_Project_ success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-762

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.394 ^a	1	.00005146		
Continuity Correction ^b	14.445	1	.00014433		
Likelihood Ratio	18.839	1	.00001422		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00004306	.00002926
Linear-by-Linear Association	16.184	1	.00005749		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.15.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-763

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.458	.000
	Cramer's V	.458	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

40A - H4.3.40A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR40: Client Company manages the project using statistical and other quantitative techniques to determine whether or not the project's objectives for quality and process performance will be satisfied and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR40: Client Company manages the project using statistical and other quantitative techniques to determine whether or not the project's objectives for quality and process performance will be satisfied and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 17.742 from Table A-H-765 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p=.00002530.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR40: Client Company manages the project using statistical and other quantitative techniques to determine whether or not the project's objectives for quality and process performance will be satisfied and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR40 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-764 shows that 2 companies that performed practice PR40 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (10.2). Whereas, 23 of the companies that performed practice PR40 "Rarely + Never" reported "About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (14.4).

Cramer's V=.477 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR40 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR40 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-766.

Table A-H-764

Crosstab

			Recode2_Project time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR40 Manages the project using statistical and other quantitative techniques to determine whether the proje	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	31	22	53
		Expected Count	22.4	30.6	53.0
		% within Recode2_PR40 Manages the project using statistical and other quantitative techniques to determine whether the proje	58.5%	41.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	93.9%	48.9%	67.9%
		Std. Residual	1.8	-1.6	
	Rarely + Never	Count	2	23	25
		Expected Count	10.6	14.4	25.0
		% within Recode2_PR40 Manages the project using statistical and other quantitative techniques to determine whether the proje	8.0%	92.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	6.1%	51.1%	32.1%
		Std. Residual	-2.6	2.3	
Total			Count	33	45
			Expected Count	33.0	45.0
			% within Recode2_PR40 Manages the project using statistical and other quantitative techniques to determine whether the proje	42.3%	57.7%
			% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%
					100.0%

Table A-H-765

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.742 ^a	1	.00002530		
Continuity Correction ^b	15.734	1	.00007291		
Likelihood Ratio	20.401	1	.00000628		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00001790	.00001348
Linear-by-Linear Association	17.515	1	.00002851		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.58.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-766

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.477	.000
	Cramer's V	.477	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

41A - H4.3.41A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR41: Client Company performs root cause analysis of selected issues to address deficiencies in achieving the project's quality and process performance objectives and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR41: Client Company performs root cause analysis of selected issues to address deficiencies in achieving the project's quality and

process performance objectives and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 16.394 from Table A-H-768 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00005146.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR41: Client Company performs root cause analysis of selected issues to address deficiencies in achieving the project's quality and process performance objectives and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR41 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-767 shows that 1 company that performed practice PR41 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (9.7). Whereas, 22 of the companies that performed practice PR41 "Rarely + Never" reported "About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (13.3).

Cramer's V= .458 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR41 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR41 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-769.

Table A-H-767

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Project time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR41 Performs root cause analysis of selected issues to address deficiencies in achieving the project's qua	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	32	23	55
		Expected Count	23.3	31.7	55.0
		% within Recode2_PR41 Performs root cause analysis of selected issues in achieving the project's qua	58.2%	41.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	97.0%	51.1%	70.5%
		Std. Residual	1.8	-1.5	
	Rarely + Never	Count	1	22	23
		Expected Count	9.7	13.3	23.0
		% within Recode2_PR41 Performs root cause analysis of selected issues in achieving the project's qua	4.3%	95.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	3.0%	48.9%	29.5%
		Std. Residual	-2.8	2.4	
Total			Count	33	45
			Expected Count	33.0	45.0
			% within Recode2_PR41 Performs root cause analysis of selected issues in achieving the project's qua	42.3%	57.7%
			% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-768

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)

Pearson Chi-Square	19.256 ^a	1	.00001143		
Continuity Correction ^b	17.114	1	.00003520		
Likelihood Ratio	23.284	1	.00000140		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000784	.00000406
Linear-by-Linear Association	19.009	1	.00001301		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.73.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-769

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.497	.000
	Cramer's V	.497	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

42A - H4.3.42A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR42: Client Company manages corrective actions to closure when the project's performance or results deviate significantly from the plan and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR42: Client Company manages corrective actions to closure when the project's performance or results deviate significantly from the plan and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 17.160 from Table A-H-771 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00003436$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR42: Client Company manages corrective actions to closure when the project's performance or results deviate significantly from the plan and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR42 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-770 shows that Zero companies that performed practice PR42 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (7.6). Whereas, 18 of the companies that performed practice PR42 "Rarely + Never" reported "About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (10.4).

Cramer's $V=.469$ indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR42 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR42 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-772.

Table A-H-770

Crosstab					
			Recode2	Project time_schedule	Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR42 Manages corrective actions to closure when the project's	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	33	27	60
		Expected Count	25.4	34.6	60.0
		% within Recode2_PR42 Manages corrective actions to closure when the project's performance or results deviate significantly	55.0%	45.0%	100.0%

performance or results deviate significantly		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	100.0%	60.0%	76.9%
		Std. Residual	1.5	-1.3	
	Rarely + Never	Count	0	18	18
		Expected Count	7.6	10.4	18.0
		% within Recode2_PR42 Manages corrective actions to closure when the project's performance or results deviate significantly	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	0.0%	40.0%	23.1%
		Std. Residual	-2.8	2.4	
Total		Count	33	45	78
		Expected Count	33.0	45.0	78.0
		% within Recode2_PR42 Manages corrective actions to closure when the project's performance or results deviate significantly	42.3%	57.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-771

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.160 ^a	1	.00003436		
Continuity Correction ^b	14.981	1	.00010862		
Likelihood Ratio	23.701	1	.00000113		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00001376	.00000807
Linear-by-Linear Association	16.940	1	.00003858		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.62.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-772

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.469	.000
	Cramer's V	.469	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

43A - H4.3.43A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR43: Client Company periodically reviews the project's progress, performance and issues experienced and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR43: Client Company periodically reviews the project's progress, performance and issues experienced and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 14.761 from Table A-H-774 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00012201.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR43: Client Company periodically reviews the project's progress, performance and issues experienced and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR43 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-773 shows that Zero companies that performed practice PR43 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (6.8). Whereas, 16 of the companies that performed practice PR43 "Rarely + Never" reported "About 20% more than planned time

+ 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time” for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (9.2).

Cramer’s V= .435 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR43 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR43 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-775.

Table A-H-773

Crosstab					
			Recode2 Project time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR43 Periodically reviews the project's progress, performance and issues experienced	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	33	29	62
		Expected Count	26.2	35.8	62.0
		% within Recode2_PR43 Periodically reviews the project's progress, performance	53.2%	46.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	100.0%	64.4%	79.5%
		Std. Residual	1.3	-1.1	
	Rarely + Never	Count	0	16	16
		Expected Count	6.8	9.2	16.0
		% within Recode2_PR43 Periodically reviews the project's progress, performance	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	0.0%	35.6%	20.5%
		Std. Residual	-2.6	2.2	
Total			Count	33	45
			Expected Count	33.0	45.0
			% within Recode2_PR43 Periodically reviews the project's progress, performance	42.3%	57.7%
			% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%
					100.0%

Table A-H-774

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.761 ^a	1	.00012201	.00004038	.00003760
Continuity Correction ^b	12.661	1	.00037333		
Likelihood Ratio	20.585	1	.00000570		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	14.572	1	.00013490		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.77.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-775

Symmetric Measures		
	Value	Approx. Sig.

Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.435	.000
	Cramer's V	.435	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

44A - H4.3.44A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR44: Client Company reviews the project's accomplishments and results at selected project milestones and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR44: Client Company reviews the project's accomplishments and results at selected project milestones and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 15.941 from Table A-H-777 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p=.00006535.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR44: Client Company reviews the project's accomplishments and results at selected project milestones and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR44 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-776 shows that Zero companies that performed practice PR44 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (7.2). Whereas, 17 of the companies that performed practice PR44 "Rarely + Never" reported "About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (9.8).

Cramer's V=.452 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR44 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR44 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-778.

Table A-H-776

2018-11-11 17:0

Crosstab					
			Recode2 Project time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR44 Reviews the project's accomplishments and results at selected project milestones	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	33	28	61
		Expected Count	25.8	35.2	61.0
		% within Recode2_PR44 Reviews the project's accomplishments and results at selected project milestones	54.1%	45.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	100.0%	62.2%	78.2%
		Std. Residual	1.4	-1.2	
	Rarely + Never	Count	0	17	17
		Expected Count	7.2	9.8	17.0
		% within Recode2_PR44 Reviews the project's accomplishments and results at selected project milestones	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	0.0%	37.8%	21.8%
		Std. Residual	-2.7	2.3	
Total	Count	33	45	78	
	Expected Count	33.0	45.0	78.0	
	% within Recode2_PR44 Reviews the project's accomplishments and results at selected project milestones	42.3%	57.7%	100.0%	

	% within Recode2_Project_ success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
--	--	--------	--------	--------

Table A-H-777

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.941 ^a	1	.00006535		
Continuity Correction ^b	13.802	1	.00020316		
Likelihood Ratio	22.124	1	.00000256		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00003481	.00001759
Linear-by-Linear Association	15.737	1	.00007280		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.19.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-778

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.452	.000
	Cramer's V	.452	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

45A - H4.3.45A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR45: Client Company establishes and maintains records of quality assurance activities and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR45: Client Company establishes and maintains records of quality assurance activities and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 22.471 from Table A-H-780 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p=.00000213.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR45: Client Company establishes and maintains records of quality assurance activities and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR45 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-779 shows that Zero companies that performed practice PR45 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (9.3). Whereas, 22 of the companies that performed practice PR45 "Rarely + Never" reported "About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (12.7).

Cramer's V=.537 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR45 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR45 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-781.

Table A-H-779

Crosstab			
	Recode2_Project time_schedule		Total
	Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	

Recode2_PR45 Establishes and maintains records of quality assurance activities	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	33	23	56
		Expected Count	23.7	32.3	56.0
		% within Recode2_PR45 Establishes and maintains records of quality assurance activities	58.9%	41.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	100.0%	51.1%	71.8%
		Std. Residual	1.9	-1.6	
	Rarely + Never	Count	0	22	22
		Expected Count	9.3	12.7	22.0
		% within Recode2_PR45 Establishes and maintains records of quality assurance activities	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	0.0%	48.9%	28.2%
		Std. Residual	-3.1	2.6	
Total	Count		33	45	78
	Expected Count		33.0	45.0	78.0
	% within Recode2_PR45 Establishes and maintains records of quality assurance activities		42.3%	57.7%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-780

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.471 ^a	1	.00000213		
Continuity Correction ^b	20.122	1	.00000727		
Likelihood Ratio	30.440	1	.00000003		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000033	.00000029
Linear-by-Linear Association	22.183	1	.00000248		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.31.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-781

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.537	.000
	Cramer's V	.537	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

46A - H4.3.46A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR46: Monitors the actual project performance and progress against the project plan and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR46: Monitors the actual project performance and progress against the project plan and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 13.619 from Table A-H-783 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00022390.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR46: Monitors the actual project performance and progress against the project plan and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR46 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-782 shows that Zero companies that performed

practice PR46 “Rarely + Never” reported “Earlier than planned time + On-time” for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (6.3). Whereas, 15 of the companies that performed practice PR46 “Rarely + Never” reported “About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time” for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (8.7).

Cramer’s V= .418 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR46 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR46 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-784.

Table A-H-782

Crosstab					
			Recode2 Project time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR46 Monitors the actual project performance and progress against the project plan	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	33	30	63
		Expected Count	26.7	36.3	63.0
		% within Recode2_PR46 Monitors the actual project performance and progress against the project plan	52.4%	47.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	100.0%	66.7%	80.8%
		Std. Residual	1.2	-1.1	
	Rarely + Never	Count	0	15	15
		Expected Count	6.3	8.7	15.0
		% within Recode2_PR46 Monitors the actual project performance and progress against the project plan	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	0.0%	33.3%	19.2%
		Std. Residual	-2.5	2.2	
Total			Count	33	45
			Expected Count	33.0	45.0
			% within Recode2_PR46 Monitors the actual project performance and progress against the project plan	42.3%	57.7%
			% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-783

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.619 ^a	1	.00022390		
Continuity Correction ^b	11.558	1	.00067474		
Likelihood Ratio	19.084	1	.00001251		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00008763	.00007895
Linear-by-Linear Association	13.444	1	.00024573		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.35.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-784

Symmetric Measures		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.418	.000
	Cramer's V	.418	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

47A - H4.3.47A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR47: Ensures that the supplier agreement is satisfied before accepting the acquired product and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR47: Ensures that the supplier agreement is satisfied before accepting the acquired product and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 14.122 from Table A-H-786 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00017130$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR47: Ensures that the supplier agreement is satisfied before accepting the acquired product and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR47 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-785 shows that 1 company that performed practice PR47 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (8). Whereas, 18 of the companies that performed practice PR47 "Rarely + Never" reported "About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (11).

Cramer's V= .426 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR47 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR47 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-787.

Table A-H-785

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Project time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR47 Ensures that the supplier agreement is satisfied before accepting the acquired product	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	32	27	59
		Expected Count	25.0	34.0	59.0
		% within Recode2_PR47 Ensures that the supplier agreement is satisfied before accepting the acquired product	54.2%	45.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_t_success_time_schedule	97.0%	60.0%	75.6%
		Std. Residual	1.4	-1.2	
	Rarely + Never	Count	1	18	19
		Expected Count	8.0	11.0	19.0
		% within Recode2_PR47 Ensures that the supplier agreement is satisfied before accepting the acquired product	5.3%	94.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	3.0%	40.0%	24.4%
		Std. Residual	-2.5	2.1	
Total		Count	33	45	78

	Expected Count	33.0	45.0	78.0
	% within Recode2_PR47 Ensures that the supplier agreement is satisfied before accepting the acquired product	42.3%	57.7%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Project_ success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-786

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.122 ^a	1	.00017130		
Continuity Correction ^b	12.187	1	.00048119		
Likelihood Ratio	17.075	1	.00003593		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00011444	.00008799
Linear-by-Linear Association	13.941	1	.00018861		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.04.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-787

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.426	.000
	Cramer's V	.426	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

48A - H4.3.48A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR48: Client Company selects supplier technical solutions to be analyzed and analysis methods to be used and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR48: Client Company selects supplier technical solutions to be analyzed and analysis methods to be used and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 32.304 from Table A-H-789 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and $p = .00000001$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR48: Client Company selects supplier technical solutions to be analyzed and analysis methods to be used and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR48 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-788 shows that Zero companies that performed practice PR48 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (11.8). While, 29 of the companies that performed practice PR48 "Rarely + Never" reported "About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (17.2).

Cramer's $V = .652$ indicates a strong association between performed PR48 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR48 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-790.

Table A-H-788

Crosstab		
	Recode2_Project_time_schedule	Total

			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR48 Selects supplier technical solutions to be analyzed	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	31	16	47
		Expected Count	19.2	27.8	47.0
		% within Recode2_PR48 Selects_supplier_technical_solutions_to_be_analys	66.0%	34.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project success_time_schedule	100.0%	35.6%	61.8%
		Std. Residual	2.7	-2.2	
	Rarely + Never	Count	0	29	29
		Expected Count	11.8	17.2	29.0
		% within Recode2_PR48 Selects_supplier_technical_solutions_to_be_analys	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project success_time_schedule	0.0%	64.4%	38.2%
		Std. Residual	-3.4	2.9	
Total	Count		31	45	76
	Expected Count		31.0	45.0	76.0
	% within Recode2_PR48 Selects_supplier_technical_solutions_to_be_analys		40.8%	59.2%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Project success_time_schedule		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-789

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	32.304 ^a	1	.00000001		
Continuity Correction ^b	29.631	1	.00000005		
Likelihood Ratio	42.481	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	31.879	1	.00000002		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.83.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-790

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.652	.000
	Cramer's V	.652	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

49A - H4.3.49A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR49: Client Company conducts technical reviews with the supplier as defined in the supplier agreement and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR49: Client Company conducts technical reviews with the supplier as defined in the supplier agreement and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 38.077 from Table A-H-792 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR49: Client Company conducts technical reviews with the supplier as defined in the supplier agreement and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR49 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-791 shows that Zero companies that performed practice PR49 “Rarely + Never” reported “Earlier than planned time + On-time” for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (13.1). While, 31 of the companies that performed practice PR49 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Earlier than planned time + On-time” for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (17.9).

Cramer’s V= .708 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR49 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR49 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-793.

Table A-H-791

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Project time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
ecode2_PR49 Conducts technical reviews with supplier	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	31	13	44
		Expected Count	17.9	26.1	44.0
		% within ecode2_PR49 Conducts_technical_reveiws_with_supplier	70.5%	29.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	100.0%	28.9%	57.9%
		Std. Residual	3.1	-2.6	
	Rarely + Never	Count	0	32	32
		Expected Count	13.1	18.9	32.0
		% within ecode2_PR49 Conducts_technical_reveiws_with_supplier	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	0.0%	71.1%	42.1%
		Std. Residual	-3.6	3.0	
Total		Count	31	45	76
		Expected Count	31.0	45.0	76.0
		% within ecode2_PR49 Conducts_technical_reveiws_with_supplier	40.8%	59.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success time schedule	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-792

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)

Pearson Chi-Square	38.077 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	35.215	1	.00000000		
Likelihood Ratio	49.352	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	37.576	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.05.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-793

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.708	.000
	Cramer's V	.708	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

50A - H4.3.50A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR50: Client Company evaluates and categorizes each identified issue using defined risk categories and parameters and determines its relative priority and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR50: Client Company evaluates and categorizes each identified issue using defined risk categories and parameters and determines its relative priority and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 42.383 from Table A-H-795 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR50: Client Company evaluates and categorizes each identified issue using defined risk categories and parameters and determines its relative priority and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR50 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-794 shows that Zero companies that performed practice PR50 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (13.9). While, 31 of the companies that performed practice PR50 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (17.1).

Cramer's V= .747 indicates a strong association between performed PR50 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR50 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-796.

Table A-H-794

Crosstab					
		Recode2_Project_time_schedule		Total	
		Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time		
Recode2_PR50 Evaluates and categorise each identified issue	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	31	11	42
		Expected Count	17.1	24.9	42.0
		% within Recode2_PR50 Evaluates_and_categorise_each_identified_issue	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	100.0%	24.4%	55.3%

	Rarely + Never	Std. Residual	3.4	-2.8	
		Count	0	34	34
		Expected Count	13.9	20.1	34.0
		% within Recode2_PR50 Evaluates_and_categorise each_identified_issue	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project success_time_schedule	0.0%	75.6%	44.7%
		Std. Residual	-3.7	3.1	
Total		Count	31	45	76
		Expected Count	31.0	45.0	76.0
		% within Recode2_PR50 Evaluates_and_categorise each_identified_issue	40.8%	59.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-795

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	42.383 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	39.382	1	.00000000		
Likelihood Ratio	54.461	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	41.825	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.87.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-796

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.747	.000
	Cramer's V	.747	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

51A - H4.3.51A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR51: Client Company establishes and maintains a usable set of organizational process assets, work environment standards, rules and guidelines for teams and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR51: Client Company establishes and maintains a usable set of organizational process assets, work environment standards, rules and guidelines for teams and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 24.949 from Table A-H-798 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000059.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR51: Client Company establishes and maintains a usable set of organizational process assets, work environment standards, rules and guidelines for teams and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR51 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-797 shows that 2 companies that performed practice PR51 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (12.7). While, 27 of the companies that performed practice PR51 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (16.3).

Cramer's V= .552 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR51 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR51 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-799.

Table A-H-797

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Project time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR51 Establishes and maintains a usable set of organizational process assets	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	27	19	46
		Expected Count	16.3	29.7	46.0
		% within Recode2_PR51 Establishes_and_maintains_a_usable_set_of_organizational process	58.7%	41.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	93.1%	35.8%	56.1%
		Std. Residual	2.7	-2.0	
	Rarely + Never	Count	2	34	36
		Expected Count	12.7	23.3	36.0
		% within Recode2_PR51 Establishes_and_maintains_a_usable_set_of_organizational process	5.6%	94.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	6.9%	64.2%	43.9%
		Std. Residual	-3.0	2.2	
Total	Count	29	53	82	
	Expected Count	29.0	53.0	82.0	
	% within Recode2_PR51 Establishes_and_maintains_a_usable_set_of_organizational process	35.4%	64.6%	100.0%	
	% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table A-H-798

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.949 ^a	1	.00000059		
Continuity Correction ^b	22.678	1	.00000192		
Likelihood Ratio	28.728	1	.00000008		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000036	.00000022
Linear-by-Linear Association	24.644	1	.00000069		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.73.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-799

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.552	.000
	Cramer's V	.552	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

52A - H4.3.52A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR52: Client Company establishes and maintains the off-shoring strategy and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR52: Client Company establishes and maintains the off-shoring strategy and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 21.574 from Table A-H-801 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000340.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR52: Client Company establishes and maintains the offshoring strategy and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR52 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-800 shows that 3 companies that performed practice PR52 “Rarely + Never” reported “Earlier than planned time + On-time” for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (12.7). While, 22 of the companies that performed practice PR52 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Earlier than planned time + On-time” for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (12.3).

Cramer’s V= .516 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR52 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR52 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-802.

Table A-H-800

Crosstab					
			Recode2Project time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR52 Establishes and maintains the offshoring strategy	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	22	18	40
		Expected Count	12.3	27.7	40.0
		% within Recode2_PR52 Establishes_and_maintains_the_offshoring_strategy	55.0%	45.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	88.0%	32.1%	49.4%
		Std. Residual	2.7	-1.8	
	Rarely + Never	Count	3	38	41
		Expected Count	12.7	28.3	41.0
		% within Recode2_PR52 Establishes_and_maintains_the_offshoring_strategy	7.3%	92.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	12.0%	67.9%	50.6%
		Std. Residual	-2.7	1.8	
Total			Count	25	81
			Expected Count	25.0	56.0
			% within Recode2_PR52 Establishes_and_maintains_the_offshoring_strategy	30.9%	69.1%
			% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-801

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	21.574 ^a	1	.00000340		
Continuity Correction ^b	19.397	1	.00001062		
Likelihood Ratio	23.602	1	.00000118		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000275	.00000244
Linear-by-Linear Association	21.307	1	.00000391		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.35.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-802

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.516	.000
	Cramer's V	.516	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

53A - H4.3.53A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR53: Client Company establishes and maintains the plan for performing the offshoring and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice 53: Client Company establishes and maintains the plan for performing the offshoring and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 26.275 from Table A-H-804 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000030.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice 53: Client Company establishes and maintains the plan for performing the offshoring and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR53 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-803 shows that 2 companies that performed practice PR53 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (12.7). While, 23 of the companies that performed practice PR53 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (12.3).

Cramer's V= .570 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR53 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR53 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-805.

Table A-H-803

Crosstab					
			Recode2 Project_time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR53 Establishes_and _maintain_the_pl an_for_performin g_the offshoring	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	23	17	40
		Expected Count	12.3	27.7	40.0
		% within Recode2_PR53 Establishes_and_maintain _the_plan_for_performing_	57.5%	42.5%	100.0%

	Rarely + Never	% within Recode2_Project _success_time_schedule	92.0%	30.4%	49.4%
		Std. Residual	3.0	-2.0	
		Count	2	39	41
		Expected Count	12.7	28.3	41.0
		% within Recode2_PR53 Establishes_and_maintain the_plan_for_performing_	4.9%	95.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project _success_time_schedule	8.0%	69.6%	50.6%
		Std. Residual	-3.0	2.0	
Total		Count	25	56	81
		Expected Count	25.0	56.0	81.0
		% within Recode2_PR53 Establishes_and_maintain the_plan_for_performing_	30.9%	69.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project _success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-804

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	26.275 ^a	1	.00000030		
Continuity Correction ^b	23.866	1	.00000103		
Likelihood Ratio	29.587	1	.00000005		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000016	.00000014
Linear-by-Linear Association	25.950	1	.00000035		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.35.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-805

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.570	.000
	Cramer's V	.570	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

54A - H4.3.54A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR54: Client Company determines the type of acquisition for each product or product component to be offshored and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR54: Client Company determines the type of acquisition for each product or product component to be offshored and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 19.945 from Table A-H-807 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000797.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR54: Client Company determines the type of acquisition for each product or product component to be offshored and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR54 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-806 shows that 5 companies that performed practice PR54 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (14.2). However, 20 of the companies that performed practice PR54 "always + Very Frequently" reported "Earlier than planned time +

On-time” for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (10.8).

Cramer’s V= .496 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR54 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR54 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-808.

Table A-H-806

Crosstab						
			Recode2_Project_time_schedule		Total	
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time		
Recode2_PR54 Determines the type of acquisition for each product	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	20	15	35	
		Expected Count	10.8	24.2	35.0	
		% within Recode2_PR54 Determines_the_type_of_acquisition_for_each_produ	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%	
		% within Recode2_Project success_time_schedule	80.0%	26.8%	43.2%	
		Std. Residual	2.8	-1.9		
	Rarely + Never	Count	5	41	46	
		Expected Count	14.2	31.8	46.0	
		% within Recode2_PR54 Determines_the_type_of_acquisition_for_each_produ	10.9%	89.1%	100.0%	
		% within Recode2_Project success_time_schedule	20.0%	73.2%	56.8%	
		Std. Residual	-2.4	1.6		
Total			Count	25	56	81
			Expected Count	25.0	56.0	81.0
			% within Recode2_PR54 Determines_the_type_of_acquisition_for_each_produ	30.9%	69.1%	100.0%
			% within Recode2_Project success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-807

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.945 ^a	1	.00000797		
Continuity Correction ^b	17.836	1	.00002408		
Likelihood Ratio	20.686	1	.00000541		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000977	.00000923
Linear-by-Linear Association	19.699	1	.00000906		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.80.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-808

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.496	.000
	Cramer's V	.496	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

556A - H4.3.55A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR55: Client Company Plan transition to operations specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR55: Client Company Plan transition to operations specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 26.101 from Table A-H-810 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000032$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR55: Client Company Plan transition to operations specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR55 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-809 shows that 3 companies that performed practice PR55 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (13.6). Whereas, 22 of the companies that performed practice PR55 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (11.4).

Cramer's $V=.568$ indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR55 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR55 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-811.

Table A-H-809

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Project_time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR55 Plan transition to operations specifically timing	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	22	15	37
		Expected Count	11.4	25.6	37.0
		% within Recode2_PR55 Plan_transition_to_operations_specifically_timing	59.5%	40.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	88.0%	26.8%	45.7%
		Std. Residual	3.1	-2.1	
	Rarely + Never	Count	3	41	44
		Expected Count	13.6	30.4	44.0
		% within Recode2_PR55 Plan_transition_to_operations_specifically_timing	6.8%	93.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	12.0%	73.2%	54.3%
		Std. Residual	-2.9	1.9	
Total		Count	25	56	81
		Expected Count	25.0	56.0	81.0

	% within Recode2_PR55 Plan_transition_to_operati ons_specifically_timing	30.9%	69.1%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Project _success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-810

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	26.101 ^a	1	.00000032		
Continuity Correction ^b	23.693	1	.00000113		
Likelihood Ratio	28.253	1	.00000011		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000037	.00000025
Linear-by-Linear Association	25.779	1	.00000038		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.42.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-811

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.568	.000
	Cramer's V	.568	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

56A - H4.3.56A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR56: Evaluates supplier technical solutions (designs) to confirm that contractual requirements continue to be met and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR56: Evaluates supplier technical solutions (designs) to confirm that contractual requirements continue to be met and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square test is 25.154 from Table A-H-813 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000053.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR56: Evaluates supplier technical solutions (designs) to confirm that contractual requirements continue to be met and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR56 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-812 shows that 4 companies that performed practice PR56 "Rarely + Never" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (14.9). While, 25 of the companies that performed practice PR56 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Earlier than planned time + On-time" for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (14.1).

Cramer's V= .554 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR56 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR56 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-814.

Table A-H-812

Crosstab		
	Recode2_Project_time_schedule	Total

			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR56 Evaluates supplier technical solutions to confirm contractual requirements are met	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	25	15	40
		Expected Count	14.1	25.9	40.0
		% within Recode2_PR56 Evaluates_supplier_technical_solutions_to_confirm_contractual_requirements_are met	62.5%	37.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	86.2%	28.3%	48.8%
		Std. Residual	2.9	-2.1	
	Rarely + Never	Count	4	38	42
		Expected Count	14.9	27.1	42.0
		% within Recode2_PR56 Evaluates_supplier_technical_solutions_to_confirm_contractual_requirements_are met	9.5%	90.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	13.8%	71.7%	51.2%
		Std. Residual	-2.8	2.1	
Total		Count	29	53	82
		Expected Count	29.0	53.0	82.0
		% within Recode2_PR56 Evaluates_supplier_technical_solutions_to_confirm_contractual_requirements_are met	35.4%	64.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_success_time_schedule	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-813

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	25.154 ^a	1	.00000053		
Continuity Correction ^b	22.890	1	.00000172		
Likelihood Ratio	27.205	1	.00000018		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000052	.00000038
Linear-by-Linear Association	24.847	1	.00000062		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.15.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-814

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.554	.000
	Cramer's V	.554	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

57A - H4.3.57A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR57: Client Company selects monitors and analyzes supplier processes and the offshored projects' success factor: Time/Schedule.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR57: Selects, monitors and analyzes supplier processes and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The value of chi-square

test is 30.585 from Table A-H-816 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000003$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR57: Client company selects, monitors and analyzes supplier processes and the offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR57 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule*. Table A-H-815 shows that 3 companies that performed practice PR57 “Rarely + Never” reported “Earlier than planned time + On time” for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count was (15.9). While, 25 of the companies that performed practice PR57 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Earlier than planned time + On time” for offshored *projects success of Time/Schedule* while the expected count for this category was (13.1).

Cramer’s $V=.611$ indicates a strong association between performed PR57 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR57 reported better results on Time/Schedule compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-817.

Table A-H-815

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Project_time_schedule		Total
			Earlier than planned time + On time	About 20% more than planned time + 50% more than planned time + Double or more of the planned time	
Recode2_PR57 Selects_Monitors_and_analyzes_processes	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	25	12	37
		Expected Count	13.1	23.9	37.0
		% within Recode2_PR57_Selects_Monitors_and_analyzes_processes	67.6%	32.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Projectschedule	86.2%	22.6%	45.1%
		Std. Residual	3.3	-2.4	
	Rarely + Never	Count	4	41	45
		Expected Count	15.9	29.1	45.0
		% within Recode2_PR57_Selects_Monitors_and_analyzes_processes	8.9%	91.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project_schedule	13.8%	77.4%	54.9%
		Std. Residual	-3.0	2.2	
Total	Count		29	53	82
	Expected Count		29.0	53.0	82.0
	% within Recode2_PR57_Selects_Monitors_and_analyzes_processes		35.4%	64.6%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Project_schedule		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-816

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	30.585 ^a	1	.00000003		
Continuity Correction ^b	28.072	1	.00000012		
Likelihood Ratio	32.925	1	.00000001		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000003	.00000002
Linear-by-Linear Association	30.212	1	.00000004		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.09.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-817

Symmetric Measures			Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi		.611	.000

	Cramer's V	.611	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

H4.3-B - Project's Success Factor: Cost/Budget

1B - H4.3.1B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR1: Client Company establishes and maintains a project plan as the basis for managing the project and the offshored projects' success factor Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR1: Client Company establishes and maintains a project plan as the basis for managing the project and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 24.385 from Table A-H-819 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000079.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR1: Client Company establishes and maintains a project plan as the basis for managing the project and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR1 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-818 shows that zero companies that performed practice PR1 "Rarely + Never" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (9.9). Whereas, 26 of the companies that performed practice PR1 "Rarely + Never" reported "More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (16.1).

Cramer's V= .566 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR1 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR1 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-820.

Table A-H-818

Crosstab					
			Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2_PR1 Establish and maintain project plan as basis	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	29	21	50
		Expected Count	19.1	30.9	50.0
		% within Recode2_PR1 Establish and_maintain_project_plan_as_basis	58.0%	42.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost	100.0%	44.7%	65.8%
		Std. Residual	2.3	-1.8	
	Rarely + Never	Count	0	26	26
		Expected Count	9.9	16.1	26.0
		% within Recode2_PR1 Establish and_maintain_project_plan_as_basis	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost	0.0%	55.3%	34.2%
		Std. Residual	-3.1	2.5	
Total		Count	29	47	76

	Expected Count	29.0	47.0	76.0
	% within Recode2_PR1 Establish _and_maintain_project_plan_as_ basis	38.2%	61.8%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-819

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.385 ^a	1	.00000079		
Continuity Correction ^b	21.989	1	.00000274		
Likelihood Ratio	33.025	1	.00000001		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000013	.00000008
Linear-by-Linear Association	24.064	1	.00000093		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.92.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-820

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.566	.000
	Cramer's V	.566	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

2B- H4.3.2B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR2: Client Company establishes and maintains the overall project plan and the offshored projects' success factor Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR2: Client Company establishes and maintains the overall project plan and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 30.583 from Table A-H-822 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000003.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR2: Client Company establishes and maintains the overall project plan and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR2 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-821 shows that zero companies that performed practice PR2 "Rarely + Never" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (11.4). While, 30 of the companies that performed practice PR2 "Rarely + Never" reported "More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (18.6).

Cramer's V= .634 indicates a strong association between performed PR2 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR2 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-823.

Table A-H-821

Crosstab		
	Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost	Total

			Less than estimated budget+ On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recde2_PR2 Establishes and maintains overall project plan	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	29	17	46
		Expected Count	17.6	28.4	46.0
		% within Recde2_PR2 Establishes_and_maintains_overall_project_plan	63.0%	37.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Budget/cost	100.0%	36.2%	60.5%
		Std. Residual	2.7	-2.1	
	Rarely + Never	Count	0	30	30
		Expected Count	11.4	18.6	30.0
		% within Recde2_PR2 Establishes_and_maintains_overall_project_plan	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost	0.0%	63.8%	39.5%
		Std. Residual	-3.4	2.7	
Total			Count	29	47
			Expected Count	29.0	47.0
			% within Recde2_PR2 Establishes_and_maintains_overall_project_plan	38.2%	61.8%
			% within Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-822

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	30.583 ^a	1	.00000003		
Continuity Correction ^b	27.970	1	.00000012		
Likelihood Ratio	40.452	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	30.180	1	.00000004		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.45.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-823

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.634	.000
	Cramer's V	.634	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

3B - H4.3.3B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR3: Client Company estimates the project's effort and cost for work products and tasks based on estimation rationale and the offshored projects' success factor Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR3: Client Company estimates the project's effort and cost for work products and tasks based on estimation rationale and the offshored projects success of Cost/Budget. The value of chi-square test is 27.355 from Table A-H-825 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000062.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR3: Client Company estimates the project's effort and cost for work products and tasks based on estimation rationale and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR3 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-824 shows that zero companies that performed practice PR3 "Rarely + Never" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (10.7). Whereas, 28 of the companies that performed practice PR3 "Rarely + Never" reported "More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (17.3).

Cramer's V= .600 indicates a strong association between performed PR3 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR3 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-826.

Table A-H-824

Crosstab					
			Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2_PR3 Estimates the project effort and cost for work product	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	29	19	48
		Expected Count	18.3	29.7	48.0
		% within Recode2_PR3 Estimates_the_project_effort_and_cost_for_workprod	60.4%	39.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost	100.0%	40.4%	63.2%
		Std. Residual	2.5	-2.0	
	Rarely + Never	Count	0	28	28
		Expected Count	10.7	17.3	28.0
		% within Recode2_PR3 Estimates_the_project_effort_and_cost_for_workprod	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost	0.0%	59.6%	36.8%
		Std. Residual	-3.3	2.6	
Total	Count	29	47	76	
	Expected Count	29.0	47.0	76.0	
	% within Recode2_PR3 Estimates_the_project_effort_and_cost_for_workprod	38.2%	61.8%	100.0%	
	% within Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table A-H-825

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	27.355 ^a	1	.00000017		
Continuity Correction ^b	24.854	1	.00000062		
Likelihood Ratio	36.611	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000002	.00000001
Linear-by-Linear Association	26.995	1	.00000020		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.68.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-826

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.600	.000
	Cramer's V	.600	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

4B- H4.3.4B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR4: Client Company establishes and maintains the project's budget and schedule, milestones, constraints, dependencies and the offshored projects' success factor *Cost/Budget*.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR4: Client Company establishes and maintains the project's budget and schedule, milestones, constraints, dependencies and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 22.987 from Table A-H-828 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000163.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR4: Client Company establishes and maintains the project's budget and schedule, milestones, constraints, dependencies and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR4 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-827 shows that Zero companies that performed practice PR4 "Rarely + Never" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (9.5). Whereas, 25 of the companies that performed practice PR4 "Rarely + Never" reported "More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (15.5).

Cramer's V= .550 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR4 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR4 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-829.

Table A-H-827

2016-11-11 02:17

Crosstab					
			Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2_PR4 Establish and maintain project budget schedule	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	29	22	51
		Expected Count	19.5	31.5	51.0
		% within Recode2_PR4 Establish_and_maintain_project_budget_schedule	56.9%	43.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Budgetcost	100.0%	46.8%	67.1%
		Std. Residual	2.2	-1.7	
	Rarely + Never	Count	0	25	25
		Expected Count	9.5	15.5	25.0
		% within Recode2_PR4 Establish_and_maintain_project_budget_schedule	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Budgetcost	0.0%	53.2%	32.9%
		Std. Residual	-3.1	2.4	
Total		Count	29	47	76
		Expected Count	29.0	47.0	76.0

	% within Recode2_PR4 Establish_and_maintain_pro ject_budget_schedule	38.2%	61.8%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_2_ Project Budgetcost	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-828

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.987 ^a	1	.00000163		
Continuity Correction ^b	20.641	1	.00000554		
Likelihood Ratio	31.317	1	.00000002		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000020	.00000019
Linear-by-Linear Association	22.685	1	.00000191		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.54.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-829

Symmetric Measures				
			Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi		.550	.000
	Cramer's V		.550	.000
N of Valid Cases			76	

5B - H4.3.5B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR5: Client Company monitors off-shoring supplier project progress and performance (effort, and cost) as defined in the contract and the offshored projects' success factor Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR5: Client Company monitors off-shoring supplier project progress and performance (effort, and cost) as defined in the contract and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 32.304 from Table A-H-831 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000001.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR5: Client Company monitors offshoring supplier project progress and performance (effort, and cost) as defined in the contract and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR5 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-830 shows that zero companies that performed practice PR5 "Rarely + Never" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (11.8). Whereas, 29 of the companies that performed practice PR5 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (17.2).

Cramer's V= .652 indicates a strong association between performed PR5 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR5 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-832.

Table A-H-830

Crosstab		
	Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost	Total

			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2_PR5 Monitors offshoring supplier project progress	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	29	16	45
		Expected Count	17.2	27.8	45.0
		% within Recode2_PR5 Monitors_offshoring_suppli er_porject_progress	64.4%	35.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode Project Success Budget_cost	100.0%	34.0%	59.2%
		Std. Residual	2.9	-2.2	
	Rarely + Never	Count	0	31	31
		Expected Count	11.8	19.2	31.0
		% within Recode2_PR5 Monitors_offshoring_suppli er_porject_progress	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_ Project Budget_cost	0.0%	66.0%	40.8%
		Std. Residual	-3.4	2.7	
Total	Count	29	47	76	
	Expected Count	29.0	47.0	76.0	
	% within Recode2_PR5 Monitors_offshoring_suppli er_porject_progress	38.2%	61.8%	100.0%	
	% within Recode2_2_ Project Budget cost	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table A-H-831

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	32.304 ^a	1	.00000001		
Continuity Correction ^b	29.631	1	.00000005		
Likelihood Ratio	42.481	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	31.879	1	.00000002		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.83.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-832

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.652	.000
	Cramer's V	.652	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

6B - H4.3.6B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR6: Client Company manages invoices submitted by the supplier and the offshored projects' success factor Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR6: Client Company manages invoices submitted by the supplier and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 27.355 from Table A-H-834 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p=.00000017.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR6: Client Company manages invoices submitted by the supplier and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows

that firms routinely performed PR6 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-833 shows that Zero companies that performed practice PR6 “Rarely + Never” reported “Less than estimated budget + On budget” for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (10.7). While, 28 of the companies that performed practice PR6 “Rarely + Never” reported “More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget” for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (17.3).

Cramer’s V= .600 indicates a strong association between performed PR6 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR6 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-835.

Table A-H-833

Crosstab					
			Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2_PR6 Manages invoices submitted by the supplier	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	29	19	48
		Expected Count	18.3	29.7	48.0
		% within Recode2_PR6 Manages_invoices_submitted_by the_supplier	60.4%	39.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project_Budget_cost	100.0%	40.4%	63.2%
		Std. Residual	2.5	-2.0	
	Rarely + Never	Count	0	28	28
		Expected Count	10.7	17.3	28.0
		% within Recode2_PR6 Manages_invoices_submitted_by the_supplier	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project_Budget_cost	0.0%	59.6%	36.8%
		Std. Residual	-3.3	2.6	
Total			Count	29	47
			Expected Count	29.0	47.0
			% within Recode2_PR6 Manages_invoices_submitted_by the_supplier	38.2%	61.8%
			% within Recode2_2_Project_Budget_cost	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-834

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	27.355 ^a	1	.00000017		
Continuity Correction ^b	24.854	1	.00000062		
Likelihood Ratio	36.611	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000002	.00000001
Linear-by-Linear Association	26.995	1	.00000020		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.68.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-835

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.600	.000
	Cramer's V	.600	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

7B - H4.3.7B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR7: Client Company develops an understanding with off-shoring supplier on the meaning of requirement and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR7: Client Company develops an understanding with off-shoring supplier on the meaning of requirement and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 13.852 from Table A-H-837 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00019780$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR7: Client Company develops an understanding with offshoring supplier on the meaning of requirement and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR7 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-836 shows that 2 companies that performed practice PR7 "Rarely + Never" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (9.3). However, 20 of the companies that performed practice PR7 "Rarely + Never" reported "More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (12.7).

Cramer's V= .421 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR7 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR7 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-838.

Table A-H-836

Crosstab					
			Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimate d budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2_PR7 Develops an understanding with offshoring supplier on the meaning of requirements	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	31	25	56
		Expected Count	23.7	32.3	56.0
		% within Recode2_PR7 Develops an understanding with off-shoring supplier on the meaning of requirement	55.4%	44.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Budgetcost	93.9%	55.6%	71.8%
		Std. Residual	1.5	-1.3	
	Rarely + Never	Count	2	20	22
		Expected Count	9.3	12.7	22.0
		% within Recode2_PR7 Develops an understanding with off-shoring supplier on the meaning of requirement	9.1%	90.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Budgetcost	6.1%	44.4%	28.2%
		Std. Residual	-2.4	2.1	
Total		Count	33	45	78
		Expected Count	33.0	45.0	78.0

	% within Recode2_PR7 Develops an understanding with off-shoring supplier on the meaning of requirement	42.3%	57.7%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_2_ Project Budgetcost	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-837

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2- sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.852 ^a	1	.00019780		
Continuity Correction ^b	12.021	1	.00052600		
Likelihood Ratio	15.885	1	.00006731		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00023956	.00012719
Linear-by-Linear Association	13.674	1	.00021742		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.31.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-838

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.421	.000
	Cramer's V	.421	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

8B - H4.3.8B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR8: Client Company validates requirements to ensure that the resulting product performs as intended in the end user's environment and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR8: Client Company validates requirements to ensure that the resulting product performs as intended in the end user's environment and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 19.256 from Table A-H-840 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00001143.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR8: Client Company validates requirements to ensure that the resulting product performs as intended in the end user's environment and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR8 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-839 shows that 1 company that performed practice PR8 "Rarely + Never" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (9.7). While, 22 of the companies that performed practice PR8 "Rarely + Never" reported "More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (13.3).

Cramer's V= .497 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR8 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR8 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-841.

Table A-H-839

Crosstab					
			Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2_PR8 Validates requirements to ensure that the resulting product performs as intended in the end user'	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	32	23	55
		Expected Count	23.3	31.7	55.0
		% within Recode2_PR8 Validates requirements to ensure that the resulting product performs as intended in the end user'	58.2%	41.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Budgetcost	97.0%	51.1%	70.5%
		Std. Residual	1.8	-1.5	
	Rarely + Never	Count	1	22	23
		Expected Count	9.7	13.3	23.0
		% within Recode2_PR8 Validates requirements to ensure that the resulting product performs as intended in the end user'	4.3%	95.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Budgetcost	3.0%	48.9%	29.5%
		Std. Residual	-2.8	2.4	
Total			Count	33	45
			Expected Count	33.0	45.0
			% within Recode2_PR8 Validates requirements to ensure that the resulting product performs as intended in the end user'	42.3%	57.7%
			% within Recode2_2_Project Budgetcost	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-840

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.256 ^a	1	.00001143		
Continuity Correction ^b	17.114	1	.00003520		
Likelihood Ratio	23.284	1	.00000140		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000784	.00000406
Linear-by-Linear Association	19.009	1	.00001301		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.73.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-841

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.497	.000
	Cramer's V	.497	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

9B - H4.3.9B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR9: Client Company obtains commitment to requirements from project participants and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between performing practice PR9: Client Company obtains commitment to requirements from project participants and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 7.501 from Table A-H-843 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00616579.

Table A-H-842

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Project Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2_PR9 Obtains commitment to requirements from project participants	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	28	25	53
		Expected Count	22.4	30.6	53.0
		% within Recode2_PR9 Obtains commitment to requirements from project participants	52.8%	47.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	84.8%	55.6%	67.9%
		Std. Residual	1.2	-1.0	
	Rarely + Never	Count	5	20	25
		Expected Count	10.6	14.4	25.0
		% within Recode2_PR9 Obtains commitment to requirements from project participants	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	15.2%	44.4%	32.1%
		Std. Residual	-1.7	1.5	
Total	Count		33	45	78
	Expected Count		33.0	45.0	78.0
	% within Recode2_PR9 Obtains commitment to requirements from project participants		42.3%	57.7%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-843

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.501 ^a	1	.00616579		
Continuity Correction ^b	6.216	1	.01265684		
Likelihood Ratio	7.954	1	.00479909		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00724613	.00545437
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.405	1	.00650417		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.58.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-844

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.310	.006
	Cramer's V	.310	.006
N of Valid Cases		78	

10B - H4.3.10B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR10: Client Company stakeholder needs, expectations, constraints and interfaces are collected and translated into customer requirements and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR10: Client Company stakeholder needs, expectations, constraints and interfaces are collected and translated into customer requirements and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 23.865 from Table A-H-846 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000001.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR10: Client Company stakeholder needs, expectations, constraints and interfaces are collected and translated into customer requirements and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR10 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-845 shows that 1 company that performed practice PR10 "Rarely + Never" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (11.3). While, 28 of the companies that performed practice PR10 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (17.7).

Cramer's V= .539 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR10 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR10 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-847.

Table A-H-845

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Project Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
RRRecode2_PR10 Collects and translates stakeholders needs expectations into customer requirements	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	28	22	50
		Expected Count	17.7	32.3	50.0
		% within RRRecode2_PR10 Collects and translates stakeholders needs expectations into customer requirements	56.0%	44.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors Budgetcost	96.6%	41.5%	61.0%
		Std. Residual	2.5	-1.8	
		Rarely + Never	Count	1	31
	Expected Count		11.3	20.7	32.0
	% within RRRecode2_PR10 Collects_and_translates_stakeholders_needs_expectations into customer requirements		3.1%	96.9%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors Budgetcost		3.4%	58.5%	39.0%
	Std. Residual		-3.1	2.3	
	Total		Count	29	53
		Expected Count	29.0	53.0	82.0

	% within RRRcode2_PR10 Collects_and_translates_stakeholders_needs_expectations into customer requirements	35.4%	64.6%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors Budgetcost	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-846

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.865 ^a	1	.0000010		
Continuity Correction ^b	21.608	1	.0000033		
Likelihood Ratio	29.055	1	.0000001		
Fisher's Exact Test				.0000003	.0000002
Linear-by-Linear Association	23.574	1	.0000012		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.32.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-847

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.539	.000
	Cramer's V	.539	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

11B - H4.3.11B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR11: Client Company maintains bidirectional traceability among requirements and work products and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR11: Client Company maintains bidirectional traceability among requirements and work products and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 23.380 from Table A-H-849 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000133.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR11: Client Company maintains bidirectional traceability among requirements and work products and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR11 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-848 shows that 3 companies that performed practice PR11 "Rarely + Never" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (13.4). Whereas, 26 of the companies that performed practice PR11 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (15.6).

Cramer's V= .534 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR11 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR11 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-850.

Table A-H-848

Crosstab		
	Recode2_Project Budget_cost	Total

			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2_PR11 Maintains bidirectional tracebility among requirements and work product	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	26	18	44
		Expected Count	15.6	28.4	44.0
		% within Recode2_PR11 Maintains _bidirectional_tracebility_among_req uirements and work product	59.1%	40.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	89.7%	34.0%	53.7%
		Std. Residual	2.6	-2.0	
	Rarely + Never	Count	3	35	38
		Expected Count	13.4	24.6	38.0
		% within Recode2_PR11 Maintain bidirectional tracebility among requirements and work product	7.9%	92.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	10.3%	66.0%	46.3%
		Std. Residual	-2.8	2.1	
Total		Count	29	53	82
		Expected Count	29.0	53.0	82.0
		% within Recode2_PR11 Maintains bidirectional_tracebility_among_requi rements and work product	35.4%	64.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-849

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.380 ^a	1	.00000133		
Continuity Correction ^b	21.194	1	.00000415		
Likelihood Ratio	26.023	1	.00000034		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000079	.00000073
Linear-by-Linear Association	23.095	1	.00000154		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.44.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-850

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.534	.000
	Cramer's V	.534	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

12B - H4.3.12B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR12: Client Company manages changes to requirements as they evolve during the project and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR12: Client Company manages changes to requirements as they evolve during the project and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 25.261 from Table A-H-852 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000050.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR12: Client Company manages changes to requirements as they evolve during the project and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR12 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-851 shows that 1 company that performed practice PR12 “Rarely + Never” reported “Less than estimated budget + On budget” for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (11.7). Whereas, 26 of the companies that performed practice PR12 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Less than estimated budget + On budget” for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (17.3).

Cramer’s V= .555 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR12 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR12 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-853.

Table A-H-851

Crosstab					
			Recode2_ Project Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimate d budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2_PR12 Manages changes to requirements as they evolve during project	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	28	21	49
		Expected Count	17.3	31.7	49.0
		% within Recode2_PR12 Manages_changes_to_requirements_as_they_evolve_during project	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	96.6%	39.6%	59.8%
		Std. Residual	2.6	-1.9	
	Rarely + Never	Count	1	32	33
		Expected Count	11.7	21.3	33.0
		% within Recode2_PR12 Manages_changes_to_requirements_as_they_evolve_during project	3.0%	97.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	3.4%	60.4%	40.2%
		Std. Residual	-3.1	2.3	
Total		Count	29	53	82
		Expected Count	29.0	53.0	82.0
		% within Recode2_PR12 Manages_changes_to_requirements_as_they_evolve_during project	35.4%	64.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget cost	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-852

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	25.261 ^a	1	.00000050		
Continuity Correction ^b	22.949	1	.00000166		
Likelihood Ratio	30.660	1	.00000003		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000011	.00000010
Linear-by-Linear Association	24.953	1	.00000059		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.67.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-853

Symmetric Measures		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.555	.000
	Cramer's V	.555	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

13B - H4.3.13A: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR13: Client Company ensures that project plans and work products remain aligned with requirements and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR13: Client Company ensures that project plans and work products remain aligned with requirements and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 26.476 from Table A-H-855 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000027.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR13: Client Company ensures that project plans and work products remain aligned with requirements and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR13 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-854 shows that 2 companies that performed practice PR13 "Rarely + Never" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (13.1). Whereas, 27 of the companies that performed practice PR13 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (15.9).

Cramer's V= .568 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR13 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR13 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-856.

Table A-H-854

Crosstab				
		Recode2_ Project Budget_cost		Total
		Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2_PR13 Ensures that project Plan and work remain aligned with requirements	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	27	18
		Expected Count	15.9	29.1
		% within Recode2_PR13 Ensures that project Plan and work remain aligned with rqrmnts	60.0%	40.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	93.1%	34.0%
		Std. Residual	2.8	-2.1
		Count	2	35
	Rarely + Never	Expected Count	13.1	23.9
		% within Recode2_PR13 Ensures that project Plan and work remain aligned with rqrmnts	5.4%	94.6%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	6.9%	66.0%
		Std. Residual	-3.1	2.3
		Count	29	53
		Expected Count	15.9	29.1

	Expected Count	29.0	53.0	82.0
	% within Recode2_PR13 Ensures that_project_Plan_and_work_remain_aligned with requirements	35.4%	64.6%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-855

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	26.476 ^a	1	.00000027		
Continuity Correction ^b	24.142	1	.00000090		
Likelihood Ratio	30.416	1	.00000003		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000012	.00000009
Linear-by-Linear Association	26.153	1	.00000032		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.09.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-856

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.568	.000
	Cramer's V	.568	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

14B - H4.3.14B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR14: Client Company's Customer Interface Manager leads the team in estimating and documenting the impact of every change in requirement and works with the Configuration Control Board (CCB) to get approval for changes to those requirements and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR14: Client Company's Customer Interface Manager leads the team in estimating and documenting the impact of every change in requirement and works with the Configuration Control Board (CCB) to get approval for changes to those requirements and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 28.676 from Table A-H-858 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p=.00000009.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR14: Client Company's Customer Interface Manager leads the team in estimating and documenting the impact of every change in requirement and works with the Configuration Control Board (CCB) to get approval for changes to those requirements and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR14 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-857 shows that 4 companies that performed practice PR14 "Rarely + Never" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (15.6). Whereas, 25 of the companies that performed practice PR14 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (13.4).

Cramer's V=.591 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR14 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR14 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-859.

Table A-H-857

Crosstab

			Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2_PR14 Customer interface manager leads the team in estimating and documenting the impact of every change in requ	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	25	13	38
		Expected Count	13.4	24.6	38.0
		% within Recode2_PR14 Customer_interface_manager_leades_the_team_in_estimating nd documenting the imapct of every change in r	65.8%	34.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project_Budget_cost	86.2%	24.5%	46.3%
		Std. Residual	3.2	-2.3	
		Count	4	40	44
	Rarely + Never	Expected Count	15.6	28.4	44.0
		% within Recode2_PR14 Customer_interface_manager_leades_the_team_in_estimating nd documenting the imapct of every change in	9.1%	90.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project_Budget_cost	13.8%	75.5%	53.7%
		Std. Residual	-2.9	2.2	
		Count	29	53	82
		Expected Count	29.0	53.0	82.0
Total			35.4%	64.6%	100.0%
			100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-858

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	28.676 ^a	1	.00000009		
Continuity Correction ^b	26.249	1	.00000030		
Likelihood Ratio	30.916	1	.00000003		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000010	.00000006
Linear-by-Linear Association	28.326	1	.00000010		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.44.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-859

Symmetric Measures

	Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal Phi	.591	.000
Cramer's V	.591	.000
N of Valid Cases	82	

15B - H4.3.15B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR15: Client Company establishes and manages the coordination and collaboration between the project and relevant stakeholders and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR15: Client Company establishes and manages the coordination and collaboration between the project and relevant stakeholders and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 27.355 from Table A-H-861 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.000000017.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR15: Client Company establishes and manages the coordination and collaboration between the project and relevant stakeholders and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR15 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-860 shows that Zero companies that performed practice PR15 “Rarely + Never” reported “Less than estimated budget + On budget” for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (10.7). Whereas, 28 of the companies that performed practice PR15 “Rarely + Never” reported “More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget” for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (17.3).

Cramer’s V= .600 indicates a strong association between performed PR15 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR15 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-862.

Table A-H-860

Crosstab					
			Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2_PR15 Establishes_and _manages_the _coordination_ between_project_ and stakeholders	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	29	19	48
		Expected Count	18.3	29.7	48.0
		% within Recode2_PR15 Establishes_and _manages_the _coordination_ between _project_ and stakeholders	60.4%	39.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project_Budget_cost	100.0%	40.4%	63.2%
		Std. Residual	2.5	-2.0	
	Rarely + Never	Count	0	28	28
		Expected Count	10.7	17.3	28.0
		% within Recode2 PR15 Establishes_and _manages_the _coordination_ between _project_ and stakeholders	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project_Budget_cost	0.0%	59.6%	36.8%
		Std. Residual	-3.3	2.6	
Total			Count	29	47
			Expected Count	29.0	47.0
			% within Recode2_PR15 Establishes_and _manages_the _coordination_ between _project_ and stakeholders	38.2%	61.8%
			% within Recode2_2_Project_Budget_cost	100.0%	100.0%
					100.0%

Table A-H-861

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	27.355 ^a	1	.00000017		
Continuity Correction ^b	24.854	1	.00000062		
Likelihood Ratio	36.611	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000002	.00000001
Linear-by-Linear Association	26.995	1	.00000020		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.68.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-862

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.600	.000
	Cramer's V	.600	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

16B - H4.3.16B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR16: Client Company's team members track actual results and performance against plans on a weekly basis. Team members track progress against individual plans on a daily basis and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR16: Client Company's team members track actual results and performance against plans on a weekly basis. Team members track progress against individual plans on a daily basis and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 23.847 from Table A-H-864 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000104$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR16: Client Company's team members track actual results and performance against plans on a weekly basis. Team members track progress against individual plans on a daily basis and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR16 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-863 shows that 2 companies that performed practice PR16 "Rarely + Never" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (12.2). Whereas, 27 of the companies that performed practice PR16 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (16.8).

Cramer's $V=.560$ indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR16 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR16 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-865.

Table A-H-863

Crosstab					
			Recode2_2 Project Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2_PR16 Project_team_members_track_results_and_performance	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	27	17	44
		Expected Count	16.8	27.2	44.0
		% within Recode2_PR16	61.4%	38.6%	100.0%
		Project_team_members_track_results_and_performance			
		% within Recode2_2 Project Success Budgetcost	93.1%	36.2%	57.9%

	Rarely + Never	Std. Residual	2.5	-2.0	
		Count	2	30	32
		Expected Count	12.2	19.8	32.0
		% within Recode2_PR16 Project_team_members_tra ck_results_and_performanc	6.3%	93.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2Project Success Budget_cost	6.9%	63.8%	42.1%
		Std. Residual	-2.9	2.3	
Total		Count	29	47	76
		Expected Count	29.0	47.0	76.0
		% within Recode2_PR16 Project_team_members_tra ck_results_and_performanc	38.2%	61.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_ Project Success Budgetcost	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-864

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.847 ^a	1	.00000104		
Continuity Correction ^b	21.569	1	.00000341		
Likelihood Ratio	27.388	1	.00000017		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000068	.00000043
Linear-by-Linear Association	23.533	1	.00000123		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.21.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-865

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.560	.000
	Cramer's V	.560	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

17B - H4.3.17B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR17: Client Company develops a documented plan to be used to communicate inter-group commitments and to coordinate and track the work performed and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR17: Client Company develops a documented plan to be used to communicate inter-group commitments and to coordinate and track the work performed and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 25.473 from Table A-H-867 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and $p = .00000045$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR17: Client Company develops a documented plan to be used to communicate inter-group commitments and to coordinate and track the work performed and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR17 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-866 shows that 1 company that performed practice PR17 "Rarely + Never" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (11.4). While, 28 of the companies that performed practice PR17 "Always + Very Frequently" reported

“Less than estimated budget + On budget” for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (17.6).

Cramer's V = .579 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR17 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR17 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-868.

Table A-H-866

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Project Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2_PR17 Develops_a_documented_plan_tobe_used_to_Communicat	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	28	18	46
		Expected Count	17.6	28.4	46.0
		% within Recode2_PR17 Develops_a_documented_plan_tobe_used_to_Communicat	60.9%	39.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	96.6%	38.3%	60.5%
		Std. Residual	2.5	-2.0	
	Rarely + Never	Count	1	29	30
		Expected Count	11.4	18.6	30.0
		% within Recode2_PR17 Develops_a_documented_plan_tobe_used_to_Communicat	3.3%	96.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	3.4%	61.7%	39.5%
		Std. Residual	-3.1	2.4	
Total	Count	29	47	76	
	Expected Count	29.0	47.0	76.0	
	% within Recode2_PR17 Develops_a_documented_plan_tobe_used_to_Communicat	38.2%	61.8%	100.0%	
	% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table A-H-867

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	25.473 ^a	1	.00000045		
Continuity Correction ^b	23.093	1	.00000154		
Likelihood Ratio	30.708	1	.00000003		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000013	.00000010
Linear-by-Linear Association	25.138	1	.00000053		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.45.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-868

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.579	.000
	Cramer's V	.579	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

18B - H4.3.18B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR18: Client Company team managers are responsible for the coordination across all project teams and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR18: Client Company team managers are responsible for the coordination across all project teams and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 28.934 from Table A-H-870 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000007.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR18: Client Company team managers are responsible for the coordination across all project teams and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR18 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-869 shows that Zero companies that performed practice PR18 "Rarely + Never" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (11.1). Whereas, 29 of the companies that performed practice PR18 "Rarely + Never" reported "More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (17.9).

Cramer's V= .617 indicates a strong association between performed PR18 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR18 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-871.

Table A-H-869

Crosstab					
			Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2_PR18 Managers_are_responsible_for_the_coordinati on_acro	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	29	18	47
		Expected Count	17.9	29.1	47.0
		% within Recode2_PR18 Managers_are_responsible_for_the_coordination_acro	61.7%	38.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Budgetcost	100.0%	38.3%	61.8%
		Std. Residual	2.6	-2.1	
	Rarely + Never	Count	0	29	29
		Expected Count	11.1	17.9	29.0
		% within Recode2_PR18 Managers_are_responsible_for_the_coordination_acro	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Budgetcost	0.0%	61.7%	38.2%
		Std. Residual	-3.3	2.6	
Total	Count	29	47	76	
	Expected Count	29.0	47.0	76.0	
	% within Recode2_PR18 Managers_are_responsible_for_the_coordination_acro	38.2%	61.8%	100.0%	
	% within Recode2_2_Project Budoetcost	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table A-H-870

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	28.934 ^a	1	.00000007		
Continuity Correction ^b	26.379	1	.00000028		
Likelihood Ratio	38.497	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000001	.00000001
Linear-by-Linear Association	28.554	1	.00000009		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.07.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-871

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.617	.000
	Cramer's V	.617	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

19B - H4.3.19B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR19: Client company communication and coordination practices are institutionalized to ensure they are performed as managed processes and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR19: Client company communication and coordination practices are institutionalized to ensure they are performed as managed processes and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 32.335 from Table A-H-873 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000001$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR19: Client company communication and coordination practices are institutionalized to ensure they are performed as managed processes and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR19 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-872 shows that 1 company that performed practice PR19 "Rarely + Never" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (13). Whereas, 26 of the companies that performed practice PR19 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (16).

Cramer's $V=.652$ indicates a strong association between performed PR19 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR19 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-874.

Table A-H-872

Crosstab					
			Recode2 Project Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2_PR19 Communication	Always + Very	Count	28	14	42
		Expected Count	16.0	26.0	42.0

and coordination practices are institutionalized to ensure they are performed as managed	Frequently + Occasionally	% within Recode2_PR19 Communication_and_coordination_practices_are_institutionalized_to_ensure_they_areperformed_as_managed_proc	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project_Budget_cost	96.6%	29.8%	55.3%
		Std. Residual	3.0	-2.3	
	Rarely + Never	Count	1	33	34
		Expected Count	13.0	21.0	34.0
		% within Recode2_PR19 Communication_and_coordination_practices_are_institutionalized_to_ensure_they_areperformed_as_managed_proc	2.9%	97.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success_cost	3.4%	70.2%	44.7%
		Std. Residual	-3.3	2.6	
Total	Count	29	47	76	
	Expected Count	29.0	47.0	76.0	
	% within Recode2_PR19 Communication_and_coordination_practices_are_institutionalized_to_ensure_they_areperformed_as_managed_proc	38.2%	61.8%	100.0%	
	% within Recode2_2_Project_Budget_cost	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table A-H-873

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	32.335 ^a	1	.00000001		
Continuity Correction ^b	29.691	1	.00000005		
Likelihood Ratio	38.564	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	31.909	1	.00000002		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.97.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-874

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.652	.000
	Cramer's V	.652	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

20B - H4.3.20B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR20: Representatives of the client company project's software engineering group work with representatives of the supplier engineering groups to monitor and coordinate technical activities and resolve technical issues and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between performing practice PR20: Representatives of the client company project's software engineering group work with representatives of the supplier engineering groups to monitor and coordinate technical activities and resolve technical and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 12.759 from Table A-H-876 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.0003544.

Table A-H-875

Crosstab					
			Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
REcode2_PR20 Representatives_of_client_comp any_work_with Rep	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	21	28	49
		Expected Count	13.9	35.1	49.0
		% within REcode2_PR20 Representatives_of_client_comp any_work_with Rep	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost	91.3%	48.3%	60.5%
		Std. Residual	1.9	-1.2	
	Rarely + Never	Count	2	30	32
		Expected Count	9.1	22.9	32.0
		% within REcode2_PR20 Representatives_of_client_comp any_work_with Rep	6.3%	93.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost	8.7%	51.7%	39.5%
		Std. Residual	-2.4	1.5	
Total			Count	23	58
			Expected Count	23.0	58.0
			% within REcode2_PR20 Representatives_of_client_comp any_work_with Rep	28.4%	71.6%
			% within Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost	100.0%	100.0%
					100.0%

Table A-H-876

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.759 ^a	1	.0003544		
Continuity Correction ^b	11.022	1	.0009005		
Likelihood Ratio	14.769	1	.0001215		
Fisher's Exact Test				.0003135	.0002203
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.601	1	.0003855		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.09.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-877

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.397	.000
	Cramer's V	.397	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

21B - H4.3.21B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR21: Client Company selects team roles, including the role of Supplier Interface Manager, who is the liaison between the team and the supplier company representative, and is responsible for requirements change management and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between performing practice PR21: Client Company selects team roles, including the role of Supplier Interface Manager, who is the liaison between the team and the supplier company representative, and is responsible for requirements change management and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 11.912 from Table A-H-879 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00055781.

Table A-H-878

Crosstab					
			Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2_PR21 Selects_team_roles_including_the_role_of_supplier	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	20	26	46
		Expected Count	13.1	32.9	46.0
		% within Recode2_PR21 Selects_team_roles_including_the_role_of_supplier	43.5%	56.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost	87.0%	44.8%	56.8%
		Std. Residual	1.9	-1.2	
	Rarely + Never	Count	3	32	35
		Expected Count	9.9	25.1	35.0
		% within Recode2_PR21 Selects_team_roles_including_the_role_of_supplier	8.6%	91.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project_Budget_cost	13.0%	55.2%	43.2%
		Std. Residual	-2.2	1.4	
Total		Count	23	58	81
		Expected Count	23.0	58.0	81.0
		% within Recode2_PR21 Selects_team_roles_including_the_role_of_supplier	28.4%	71.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-879

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.912 ^a	1	.00055781	.00050373	.00043105
Continuity Correction ^b	10.257	1	.00136182		
Likelihood Ratio	13.196	1	.00028049		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.765	1	.00060365		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.94.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-880

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.383	.001
	Cramer's V	.383	.001
N of Valid Cases		81	

22B - H4.3.22B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR22: Client Company communicates quality issues and ensures the resolution of noncompliance issues with the staff and managers and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR22: Client Company communicates quality issues and ensures the resolution of noncompliance issues with the staff and managers and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 13.787 from Table A-H-882 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00020471$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR22: Client Company communicates quality issues and ensures the resolution of noncompliance issues with the staff and managers and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR22 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-881 shows that 3 companies that performed practice PR22 "Rarely + Never" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (10.5). Whereas, 20 of the companies that performed practice PR22 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (12.5).

Cramer's $V=.413$ indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR22 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR22 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-883.

Table A-H-881

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Project Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimate d budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
REcode2_PR22 Communicates_ quality_issues_ and_isures_ resolution	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	20	24	44
		Expected Count	12.5	31.5	44.0
		% within REcode2_PR22 Communicates_quality_issues_and_isures_resolution	45.5%	54.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	87.0%	41.4%	54.3%
		Std. Residual	2.1	-1.3	
	Rarely + Never	Count	3	34	37
		Expected Count	10.5	26.5	37.0
		% within REcode2_PR22 Communicates_quality_issues_and_isures_resolution	8.1%	91.9%	100.0%
		% within RecProject Success Factors_Budget_cost	13.0%	58.6%	45.7%
		Std. Residual	-2.3	1.5	
Total	Count	23	58	81	
	Expected Count	23.0	58.0	81.0	
	% within REcode2_PR22 Communicates_quality_issues_and_isures_resolution	28.4%	71.6%	100.0%	
	% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget cost	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table A-H-882

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.787 ^a	1	.00020471		
Continuity Correction ^b	12.012	1	.00052866		
Likelihood Ratio	15.200	1	.00009670		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00018581	.00015832
Linear-by-Linear Association	13.617	1	.00022413		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.51.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-883

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.413	.000
	Cramer's V	.413	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

23B - H4.3.23B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR23: Client Company establishes and maintains a documented policy for conducting its Communication and Coordination activities and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between performing practice PR23: Client Company establishes and maintains a documented policy for conducting its Communication and Coordination activities and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 10.358 from Table A-H-885 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00128881$.

Table A-H-884

Crosstab					
			Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimated budget + On Budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2_PR23 Establish and maintain documented policy for	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	19	25	44
		Expected Count	12.5	31.5	44.0
		% within Recode2_PR23 Establish_and_maintain_documented_policy_for_condu	43.2%	56.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	82.6%	43.1%	54.3%
		Std. Residual	1.8	-1.2	
	Rarely + Never	Count	4	33	37
		Expected Count	10.5	26.5	37.0
		% within Recode2_PR23 Establish_and_maintain_documented_policy_for_condu	10.8%	89.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	17.4%	56.9%	45.7%
		Std. Residual	-2.0	1.3	
Total		Count	23	58	81

	Expected Count	23.0	58.0	81.0
	% within Recode2_PR23 Establish_and_maintain_docu mented_policy_for_condu	28.4%	71.6%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-885

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.358 ^a	1	.00128881		
Continuity Correction ^b	8.828	1	.00296716		
Likelihood Ratio	11.132	1	.00084835		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00136232	.00113365
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.231	1	.00138130		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.51.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-886

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.358	.001
	Cramer's V	.358	.001
N of Valid Cases		81	

24B - H4.3.24B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR24: Client Company ensures that the workforce has the skills to share information and coordinate their activities efficiently and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between performing practice PR24: Client Company ensures that the workforce has the skills to share information and coordinate their activities efficiently and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 11.912 from Table A-H-888 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00055781.

Table A-H-887

Crosstab					
			Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2_PR24 Ensures that the workforce has the skills to share	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	20	26	46
		Expected Count	13.1	32.9	46.0
		% within Recode2_PR24 Ensures_that_the_workforce _has_the_skills_to_sha	43.5%	56.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success factors_Budget_cost	87.0%	44.8%	56.8%
		Std. Residual	1.9	-1.2	
		Count	3	32	35
	Rarely + Never	Expected Count	9.9	25.1	35.0
		% within Recode2_PR24 Ensures_that_the_workforce _has_the_skills_to_sha	8.6%	91.4%	100.0%

		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors Budget_cost	13.0%	55.2%	43.2%
		Std. Residual	-2.2	1.4	
Total		Count	23	58	81
		Expected Count	23.0	58.0	81.0
		% within Recode2_PR24 Ensures that the workforce has the skills to sha	28.4%	71.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success factors Budgetcost	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-888

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2- sided)	Exact Sig. (1- sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.912 ^a	1	.00055781		
Continuity Correction ^b	10.257	1	.00136182		
Likelihood Ratio	13.196	1	.00028049		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00050373	.00043105
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.765	1	.00060365		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.94.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-889

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.383	.001
	Cramer's V	.383	.001
N of Valid Cases		81	

25B - H4.3.25B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR25: Client Company establishes a culture for openly sharing information and concerns across organizational levels as well as among team members and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between performing practice PR25: Client Company establishes a culture for openly sharing information and concerns across organizational levels as well as among team members and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 10.358 from Table A-H-891 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00128881.

Table A-H-890

Crosstab					
		Recode2_Project Budget_cost		Total	
		Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget		
Recode2_PR25 establish a culture for openly sharing information	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	19	25	44
		Expected Count	12.5	31.5	44.0
		% within Recode2_PR25 establish_a_culture_for_openl y_sharing_informati	43.2%	56.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors Budget_cost	82.6%	43.1%	54.3%
		Std. Residual	1.8	-1.2	
	Rarely + Never	Count	4	33	37
		Expected Count	10.5	26.5	37.0
		% within Recode2_PR25 establish_a_culture_for_openl y_sharing_informati	10.8%	89.2%	100.0%

		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	17.4%	56.9%	45.7%
		Std. Residual	-2.0	1.3	
Total		Count	23	58	81
		Expected Count	23.0	58.0	81.0
		% within Recode2_PR25 establish_a_culture_for_openl y_sharing_informati	28.4%	71.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-891

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.358 ^a	1	.00128881		
Continuity Correction ^b	8.828	1	.00296716		
Likelihood Ratio	11.132	1	.00084835		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00136232	.00113365
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.231	1	.00138130		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.51.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-892

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.358	.001
	Cramer's V	.358	.001
N of Valid Cases		81	

26B - H4.3.26B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR26: Client Company establishes project teams as well as their responsibilities, authorities and interrelationships and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between performing practice PR26: Client Company establishes project teams as well as their responsibilities, authorities and interrelationships and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 10.358 from Table A-H-894 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00128881.

Table A-H-893

Crosstab					
		Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost		Total	
		Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget		
Recode2_PR26 Establish project teams as well as their responsibilities	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	19	25	44
		Expected Count	12.5	31.5	44.0
		% within Recode2_PR26 Establish_project_teams_as well_as_their_respons	43.2%	56.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Budgetcost	82.6%	43.1%	54.3%
	Rarely + Never	Std. Residual	1.8	-1.2	
		Count	4	33	37
		Expected Count	10.5	26.5	37.0

		% within Recode2_PR26 Establish_project_teams_as well_as_their_respons	10.8%	89.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Budgetcost	17.4%	56.9%	45.7%
		Std. Residual	-2.0	1.3	
Total		Count	23	58	81
		Expected Count	23.0	58.0	81.0
		% within Recode2_PR26 Establish_project_teams_as well_as_their_respons	28.4%	71.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Budgetcost	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-894

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.358 ^a	1	.00128881		
Continuity Correction ^b	8.828	1	.00296716		
Likelihood Ratio	11.132	1	.00084835		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00136232	.00113365
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.231	1	.00138130		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.51.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-895

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.358	.001
	Cramer's V	.358	.001
N of Valid Cases		81	

27B - H4.3.27B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR27: Client Company establishes and maintains open and effective project teams' communication and coordination plan and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between performing practice PR27: Client Company establishes and maintains open and effective project teams' communication and coordination plan and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 11.241 from Table A-H-897 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00080013.

Table A-H-896

Crosstab					
		Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost		Total	
		Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget		
Recode2_PR27 establish_and_maintain_open_and_effective_communication	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	19	24	43
		Expected Count	12.2	30.8	43.0
		% within Recode2_PR27 establish_and_maintain_ope n_and_effective_commun	44.2%	55.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success factors_Budget_cost	82.6%	41.4%	53.1%
		Std. Residual	1.9	-1.2	

	Rarely + Never	Count	4	34	38
		Expected Count	10.8	27.2	38.0
		% within Recode2_PR27 establish_and_maintain_ope n_and_effective_commun	10.5%	89.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success factors_Budget_cost	17.4%	58.6%	46.9%
		Std. Residual	-2.1	1.3	
Total		Count	23	58	81
		Expected Count	23.0	58.0	81.0
		% within Recode2_PR27 establish_and_maintain_ope n_and_effective_commun	28.4%	71.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success factors_Budget_cost	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-897

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.241 ^a	1	.00080013	.00110164	.00071248
Continuity Correction ^b	9.646	1	.00189722		
Likelihood Ratio	12.055	1	.00051653		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.102	1	.00086227		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.79.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-898

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.373	.001
	Cramer's V	.373	.001
N of Valid Cases		81	

28B - H4.3.28B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR28: Client Company team managers are responsible to track and resolve inter-group issues and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between performing practice PR28: Client Company team managers are responsible to track and resolve inter-group issues and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 12.827 from Table A-H-876 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p=.00034165.

Table A-H-899

Crosstab					
		Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost		Total	
		Less than estimated budget + On Budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget		
Recode2_PR28 Team managers are responsible to track intergroup	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	20	25	45
		Expected Count	12.8	32.2	45.0
		% within Recode2_PR28 Team managers are responsible to track	44.4%	55.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success factors_Budget_cost	87.0%	43.1%	55.6%
		Std. Residual	2.0	-1.3	

	Rarely + Never	Count	3	33	36
		Expected Count	10.2	25.8	36.0
		% within Recode2_PR28 Team_managers_are_responsible_to_track_intergroup	8.3%	91.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	13.0%	56.9%	44.4%
		Std. Residual	-2.3	1.4	
Total		Count	23	58	81
		Expected Count	23.0	58.0	81.0
		% within Recode2_PR28 Team_managers_are_responsible_to_track_intergroup	28.4%	71.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-900

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.827 ^a	1	.00034165		
Continuity Correction ^b	11.112	1	.00085750		
Likelihood Ratio	14.178	1	.00016631		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00039456	.00026376
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.669	1	.00037183		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.22.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-901

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.398	.000
	Cramer's V	.398	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

29B - H4.3.29B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR29: Client Company maintains effective work-groups, interpersonal problems are addressed quickly and meetings are managed to ensure that work-group time is used most effectively and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR29: Client Company maintains effective work-groups, interpersonal problems are addressed quickly and meetings are managed to ensure that work-group time is used most effectively and the offshored projects success *of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 14.186 from Table A-H-903 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00016558.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR29: Client Company maintains effective work-groups, interpersonal problems are addressed quickly and meetings are managed to ensure that work-group time is used most effectively and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR29 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-902 shows that 4 companies that performed practice PR29 "Rarely + Never" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (11.6). Whereas, 19 of the companies that performed practice PR29 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (11.4).

Cramer's V= .418 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR29 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR29 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-904.

Table A-H-902

Crosstab					
			Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2 PR29 Maintains_effec tive_workgroup	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	19	21	40
		Expected Count	11.4	28.6	40.0
		% within Recode2_PR29 Maintains_effective_workgro	47.5%	52.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Budgetcost	82.6%	36.2%	49.4%
		Std. Residual	2.3	-1.4	
	Rarely + Never	Count	4	37	41
		Expected Count	11.6	29.4	41.0
		% within Recode2PR29 Maintains_effective_workgro	9.8%	90.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Budgetcost	17.4%	63.8%	50.6%
		Std. Residual	-2.2	1.4	
Total		Count	23	58	81
		Expected Count	23.0	58.0	81.0
		% within Recode2_PR29 Maintains_effective_workgro	28.4%	71.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Budgetcost	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-903

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.186 ^a	1	.00016558	.00018612	.00015594
Continuity Correction ^b	12.391	1	.00043150		
Likelihood Ratio	15.090	1	.00010249		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	14.011	1	.00018174		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.36.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-904

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.418	.000
	Cramer's V	.418	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

30B - H4.3.30B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR30: Client Company establishes and maintains a mutual understanding of the contract with selected suppliers and end users based on acquisition needs and the suppliers' proposed approaches and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR30: Client Company establishes and maintains a mutual understanding of the contract with selected suppliers and end users based on acquisition needs and the suppliers' proposed approaches and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 26.529 from Table A-H-906 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000026.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR30: Client Company establishes and maintains a mutual understanding of the contract with selected suppliers and end users based on acquisition needs and the suppliers' proposed approaches and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR30 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-905 shows that 3 companies that performed practice PR30 "Rarely + Never" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (14.1). However, 29 of the companies that performed practice PR30 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (14.9).

Cramer's V= .569 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR30 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR30 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-907.

Table A-H-905

Crosstab					
			Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimated budget + On Budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2_PR30 Establishes and maintains mutual understanding of the contract	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	26	16	42
		Expected Count	14.9	27.1	42.0
		% within Recode2_PR30 Establishes_and_maintains_mutual_understanding_of_the_contract	61.9%	38.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Budget_cost	89.7%	30.2%	51.2%
		Std. Residual	2.9	-2.1	
	Rarely + Never	Count	3	37	40
		Expected Count	14.1	25.9	40.0
		% within Recode2_PR30 Establishes_and_maintains_mutual_understanding_of_the_contract	7.5%	92.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Budget_cost	10.3%	69.8%	48.8%
		Std. Residual	-3.0	2.2	
Total	Count		29	53	82
	Expected Count		29.0	53.0	82.0
	% within Recode2_PR30 Establishes_and_maintains_mutual_understanding_of_the_contract		35.4%	64.6%	100.0%

	% within Recode2_2_Project Success_Budget_cost	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
--	---	--------	--------	--------

Table A-H-906

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	26.529 ^a	1	.00000026		
Continuity Correction ^b	24.202	1	.00000087		
Likelihood Ratio	29.417	1	.00000006		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000016	.00000014
Linear-by-Linear Association	26.206	1	.00000031		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.15.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-907

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.569	.000
	Cramer's V	.569	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

31B - H4.3.31B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR31: Client Company requirements are refined and elaborated into contractual requirements and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR31: Client Company requirements are refined and elaborated into contractual requirements and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 28.223 from Table A-H-909 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p=.00000011.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR31: Client Company requirements are refined and elaborated into contractual requirements and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR31 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-908 shows that 3 companies that performed practice P31 "Rarely + Never" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (14.5). Whereas, 26 of the companies that performed practice PR31 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (14.5).

Cramer's V= .587 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR31 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR31 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-910.

Table A-H-908

Crosstab					
		Count	Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimated budget + On Budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2_PR31 Requirements_a	Always + Very	Count	26	15	41
		Expected Count	14.5	26.5	41.0

re_refinded_and_elaborated_into_con	Frequently + Occasionally	% within Recode2_PR31 Requirements_are_refinded_and_elaborated_into_con	63.4%	36.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success factors_Budget_cost	89.7%	28.3%	50.0%
		Std. Residual	3.0	-2.2	
	Rarely + Never	Count	3	38	41
		Expected Count	14.5	26.5	41.0
		% within Recode2_PR31 Requirements_are_refinded_and_elaborated_into_con	7.3%	92.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success factors_Budget_cost	10.3%	71.7%	50.0%
		Std. Residual	-3.0	2.2	
Total	Count	29	53	82	
	Expected Count	29.0	53.0	82.0	
	% within Recode2_PR31 Requirements_are_refinded_and_elaborated_into_con	35.4%	64.6%	100.0%	
	% within Recode2_2_Project Success factors_Budget_cost	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table A-H-909

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	28.223 ^a	1	.00000011		
Continuity Correction ^b	25.822	1	.00000037		
Likelihood Ratio	31.233	1	.00000002		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000011	.00000006
Linear-by-Linear Association	27.878	1	.00000013		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.50.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-910

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.587	.000
	Cramer's V	.587	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

32B - H4.3.32B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR32: Client Company establishes and maintains a formal contract management plan and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR32: Client Company establishes and maintains a formal contract management plan and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 24.917 from Table A-H-912 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000060.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR32: Client Company establishes and maintains a formal contract management plan and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR32 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-911 shows that 3 companies that performed practice PR32 "Rarely + Never" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success*

of *Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (13.8). Whereas, 26 of the companies that performed practice PR32 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Less than estimated budget + On budget” for offshored projects success of *Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (15.2).

Cramer’s V= .551 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR32 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR32 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-913.

Table A-H-911

Crosstab					
			Recode2_ Project Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2_PR32 Establishes_and _maintains_a_fo rmal_contract_m anagement plan	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	26	17	43
		Expected Count	15.2	27.8	43.0
		% within Recode2_PR32 Establishes_and _maintains _a_formal_contract_manag ement plan	60.5%	39.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_ Project Budget_cost	89.7%	32.1%	52.4%
		Std. Residual	2.8	-2.0	
	Rarely + Never	Count	3	36	39
		Expected Count	13.8	25.2	39.0
		% within Recode2_PR32 Establishes_and _maintains _a_formal_contract_manag ement plan	7.7%	92.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_ Project _Budget_cost	10.3%	67.9%	47.6%
		Std. Residual	-2.9	2.1	
Total		Count	29	53	82
		Expected Count	29.0	53.0	82.0
		% within Recode2_PR32 Establishes_and _maintains _a_formal_contract_manag ement plan	35.4%	64.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_ Project Budget cost	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-912

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.917 ^a	1	.00000060		
Continuity Correction ^b	22.662	1	.00000193		
Likelihood Ratio	27.682	1	.00000014		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000048	.00000032
Linear-by-Linear Association	24.613	1	.00000070		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.79.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-913

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.551	.000
	Cramer's V	.551	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

33B - H4.3.33B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR33: Client Company establishes and maintains contractual requirements and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR33: Client Company establishes and maintains contractual requirements and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 20.513 from Table A-H-915 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000592$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR33: Client Company establishes and maintains contractual requirements and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR33 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H- 914 shows that 4 companies that performed practice PR33 "Rarely + Never" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (13.8). While, 25 of the companies that performed practice PR33 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (15.2).

Cramer's $V=.500$ indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR33 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR33 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-916.

Table A-H-914

Crosstab					
			Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2_PR33 Establishes_and_maintains_contractual_requirements	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	25	18	43
		Expected Count	15.2	27.8	43.0
		% within Recode2_PR33 Establishes_and_maintains_contractual_requirements	58.1%	41.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost	86.2%	34.0%	52.4%
		Std. Residual	2.5	-1.9	
	Rarely + Never	Count	4	35	39
		Expected Count	13.8	25.2	39.0
		% within Recode2_PR33 Establishes_and_maintains_contractual_requirements	10.3%	89.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost	13.8%	66.0%	47.6%
		Std. Residual	-2.6	2.0	
	Total		Count	29	82
			Expected Count	29.0	82.0

	% within Recode2_PR33 Establishes_and_maintains_contractual_requirements	35.4%	64.6%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_2_Project_Budget_cost	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-915

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.513 ^a	1	.00000592		
Continuity Correction ^b	18.472	1	.00001724		
Likelihood Ratio	22.289	1	.00000235		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000638	.00000430
Linear-by-Linear Association	20.263	1	.00000675		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.79.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-916

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.500	.000
	Cramer's V	.500	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

34B - H4.3.34B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR34: Client Company establishes and maintains negotiation plans to use in completing a supplier agreement and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between performing practice PR34: Client Company establishes and maintains negotiation plans to use in completing a supplier agreement and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 7.501 from Table A-H-918 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00616579.

Table A-H-917

Crosstab					
			Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2_PR34 Establishes and maintains negotiation plans to use in completing a supplier agreement	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	28	25	53
		Expected Count	22.4	30.6	53.0
		% within Recode2_PR34 Establishes and maintains negotiation plans to use in completing a supplier agrment	52.8%	47.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	84.8%	55.6%	67.9%
		Std. Residual	1.2	-1.0	
	Rarely + Never	Count	5	20	25
		Expected Count	10.6	14.4	25.0
		% within Recode2_PR34 Establishes and maintains negotiation plans to use in completing a supplier agrment	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%

		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	15.2%	44.4%	32.1%
		Std. Residual	-1.7	1.5	
Total		Count	33	45	78
		Expected Count	33.0	45.0	78.0
		% within Recode2_PR34 Establishes and maintains negotiation plans to use in completing a supplier agrment	42.3%	57.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-918

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2- sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.501 ^a	1	.00616579	.00724613	.00545437
Continuity Correction ^b	6.216	1	.01265684		
Likelihood Ratio	7.954	1	.00479909		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.405	1	.00650417		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.58.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-919

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.310	.006
	Cramer's V	.310	.006
N of Valid Cases		78	

35B - H4.3.35B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR35: Client Company insures that agreements with suppliers are satisfied by both the project and the supplier and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR35: Client Company insures that agreements with suppliers are satisfied by both the project and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 20.607 from Table A-H-918 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000564.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR35: Client Company insures that agreements with suppliers are satisfied by both the project and the supplier and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR35 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H- 920 shows that 2 companies that performed practice PR35 "Rarely + Never" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (11.4). While, 25 of the companies that performed practice PR35 "Rarely + Never" reported "More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (15.6).

Cramer's V= .514 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR35 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR35 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-922.

Table A-H-920

Crosstab					
			Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2_PR35 Insures that agreements with suppliers are satisfied by both the project and the supplier	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	31	20	51
		Expected Count	21.6	29.4	51.0
		% within Recode2_PR35	60.8%	39.2%	100.0%
		Insures that agreements with suppliers are satisfied by both the project and the supplier			
		% within Recode2_2_Project	93.9%	44.4%	65.4%
		Success factors_Budget_cost			
	Rarely + Never	Std. Residual	2.0	-1.7	
		Count	2	25	27
		Expected Count	11.4	15.6	27.0
		% within Recode2_PR35	7.4%	92.6%	100.0%
		Insures that agreements with suppliers are satisfied by both the project and the supplier			
		% within Recode2_2_Project	6.1%	55.6%	34.6%
		Success factors_Budget_cost			
		Std. Residual	-2.8	2.4	
Total			Count	33	45
			Expected Count	33.0	45.0
			% within Recode2_PR35	42.3%	57.7%
			Insures that agreements with suppliers are satisfied by both the project and the supplier		
			% within Recode2_2_Project	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-921

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.607 ^a	1	.00000564		
Continuity Correction ^b	18.478	1	.00001719		
Likelihood Ratio	23.709	1	.00000112		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000299	.00000262
Linear-by-Linear Association	20.343	1	.00000647		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.42.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-922

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.514	.000
	Cramer's V	.514	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

36B - H4.3.36B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR36: Client Company selects suppliers based on an evaluation of their ability to meet specified requirements and established criteria and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between performing practice PR36: Client Company selects suppliers based on an evaluation of their ability to meet specified requirements and established criteria and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 12.990 from Table A-H-924 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.0003132.

Table A-H-923

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Project Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimated budget + On Budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
RRREcode2_PR36 Selects suppliers based on an evaluation of their ability to meet specified requirements	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	23	20	43
		Expected Count	15.2	27.8	43.0
		% within RRREcode2_PR36 Selects_suppliers_based_on_an_evaluation_of_their ability to meetspecified requirements	53.5%	46.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	79.3%	37.7%	52.4%
		Std. Residual	2.0	-1.5	
	Rarely + Never	Count	6	33	39
		Expected Count	13.8	25.2	39.0
		% within RRREcode2_PR36 Selects_suppliers_based_on_an_evaluation_of_their ability to meetspecified requirements	15.4%	84.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	20.7%	62.3%	47.6%
		Std. Residual	-2.1	1.6	
Total			Count	29	53
			Expected Count	29.0	53.0
			% within RRREcode2_PR36 Selects_suppliers_based_on_an_evaluation_of_their ability to meetspecified requirements	35.4%	64.6%
			% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-924

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.990 ^a	1	.0003132		
Continuity Correction ^b	11.377	1	.0007438		
Likelihood Ratio	13.659	1	.0002191		
Fisher's Exact Test				.0004412	.0002901
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.832	1	.0003408		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.79.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-925

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.398	.000
	Cramer's V	.398	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

37B - H4.3.37B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR37: Client Company identifies and qualifies potential suppliers and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR37: Client Company identifies and qualifies potential suppliers and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 20.733 from Table A-H-927 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000528.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR37: Client Company identifies and qualifies potential suppliers and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR37 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-926 shows that 5 companies that performed practice PR37 "Rarely + Never" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (14.9). Whereas, 24 of the companies that performed practice PR37 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (14.1).

Cramer's V= .503 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR37 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR37 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-928.

Table A-H-926

Crosstab					
			Recode2_2_ProjectBudget_cost		Total
			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
RRRecode2_PR37 Identifies and quantifies potential suppliers	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	24	16	40
		Expected Count	14.1	25.9	40.0
		% within Recode2_PR37 Identifies and quantifies potential_suppliers	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project t_cost	82.8%	30.2%	48.8%
		Std. Residual	2.6	-1.9	
	Rarely + Never	Count	5	37	42
		Expected Count	14.9	27.1	42.0
		% within RRRecode2_PR37 _Identifies_and_quantifies_potential_suppliers	11.9%	88.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 Project Success_Budget_cost	17.2%	69.8%	51.2%
		Std. Residual	-2.6	1.9	
Total	Count		29	53	82
	Expected Count		29.0	53.0	82.0
	% within RRRecode2_PR37 Identifies_and_quantifies_potential_suppliers		35.4%	64.6%	100.0%

	% within Recode2_2_ Project Success Budget_cost	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
--	--	--------	--------	--------

Table A-H-927

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.733 ^a	1	.00000528		
Continuity Correction ^b	18.682	1	.00001544		
Likelihood Ratio	22.045	1	.00000266		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000662	.00000463
Linear-by-Linear Association	20.480	1	.00000603		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.15.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-928

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.503	.000
	Cramer's V	.503	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

38B - H4.3.38B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR38: Client Company selects suppliers using a formal evaluation and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR38: Client Company selects suppliers using a formal evaluation and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 25.667 from Table A-H-930 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p=.00000041.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR38: Client Company selects suppliers using a formal evaluation and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR38 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-929 shows that 5 companies that performed practice PR38 "Rarely + Never" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (15.9). While, 24 of the companies that performed practice PR38 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (13.1).

Cramer's V= .559 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR38 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR38 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-931.

Table A-H-929

Crosstab		
	Recode2_Project Budget_cost	Total

			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
RRRecode2_PR38 Selects_suppliers_ using_a_formal_ evaluation	Always + Very Frequently + Occassionally	Count	24	13	37
		Expected Count	13.1	23.9	37.0
		% within RRRecode2_PR38 Selects_suppliers_using_a_formal_evaluation	64.9%	35.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_ Project cost	82.8%	24.5%	45.1%
		Std. Residual	3.0	-2.2	
	Rarely + Never	Count	5	40	45
		Expected Count	15.9	29.1	45.0
		% within RRRecode2_PR38 Selects_suppliers_using_a_formal_evaluation	11.1%	88.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_ Project cost	17.2%	75.5%	54.9%
		Std. Residual	-2.7	2.0	
Total			Count	29	82
			Expected Count	29.0	82.0
			% within RRRecode2_PR38 Selects_suppliers_using_a_formal_evaluation	35.4%	64.6%
			% within Recode2_2_ Project t_cost	100.0%	100.0%
				100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-930

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	25.667 ^a	1	.00000041	.00000046	.00000037
Continuity Correction ^b	23.369	1	.00000134		
Likelihood Ratio	27.180	1	.00000019		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	25.354	1	.00000048		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.09.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-931

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.559	.000
	Cramer's V	.559	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

39B - H4.3.39B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR39: Client Company establishes and maintains quantitative objectives to address quality and process performance, based on customer needs and business objectives and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR39: Client Company establishes and maintains quantitative objectives to address quality and process performance, based on customer needs and business objectives and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 16.394 from Table A-H-933 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00005146.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR39: Client Company establishes and maintains quantitative objectives to address quality and process performance, based on customer needs and business objectives and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR39 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-932 shows that 2 companies that performed practice PR39 “Rarely + Never” reported “Less than estimated budget + On budget” for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (10.2). While, 22 of the companies that performed practice PR39 “Rarely + Never” reported “More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget” for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (13.8).

Cramer’s V= .458 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR39 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR39 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-934.

Table A-H-932

Crosstab					
			Recode2_2_ Project budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode3 PR39 Establish and maintain qualitative objectives to address quantity and process performance	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	31	23	54
		Expected Count	22.8	31.2	54.0
		% within Recode3_PR39 Establish and maintain qualitative objectives	57.4%	42.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_ Project cost	93.9%	51.1%	69.2%
		Std. Residual	1.7	-1.5	
	Rarely + Never	Count	2	22	24
		Expected Count	10.2	13.8	24.0
		% within Recode3_PR39 Establish and maintain qualitative objectives	8.3%	91.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_ Project cost	6.1%	48.9%	30.8%
		Std. Residual	-2.6	2.2	
Total		Count	33	45	78
		Expected Count	33.0	45.0	78.0
		% within Recode3_PR39 Establish and maintain qualitative objectives	42.3%	57.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_ Project cost	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-933

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.394 ^a	1	.00005146		
Continuity Correction ^b	14.445	1	.00014433		
Likelihood Ratio	18.839	1	.00001422		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00004306	.00002926
Linear-by-Linear Association	16.184	1	.00005749		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.15.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-934

Symmetric Measures		
		Value
		Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.458
	Cramer's V	.458
N of Valid Cases		78

40B - H4.3.40B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR40: Client Company manages the project using statistical and other quantitative techniques to determine whether or not the project's objectives for quality and process performance will be satisfied and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between performing practice PR40: Client Company manages the project using statistical and other quantitative techniques to determine whether or not the project's objectives for quality and process performance will be satisfied and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 10.432 from Table A-H-936 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00123819.

Table A-H-935

Crosstab					
			Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2_PR40 Manages the project using statistical and other quantitative techniques to determine whether the proje	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	29	24	53
		Expected Count	22.4	30.6	53.0
		% within Recode2_PR40	54.7%	45.3%	100.0%
		Manages the project using statistical and other quantitative techniques to determine whether the proje			
		% within Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost	87.9%	53.3%	67.9%
	Rarely + Never	Std. Residual	1.4	-1.2	
		Count	4	21	25
		Expected Count	10.6	14.4	25.0
		% within Recode2_PR40	16.0%	84.0%	100.0%
		Manages the project using statistical and other quantitative techniques to determine whether the proje			
		% within Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost	12.1%	46.7%	32.1%
		Std. Residual	-2.0	1.7	
Total	Count		33	45	78
	Expected Count		33.0	45.0	78.0
	% within Recode2_PR40		42.3%	57.7%	100.0%
	Manages the project using statistical and other quantitative techniques to determine whether the proje				
	% within Recode2_2_Project Budget cost		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-936

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.432 ^a	1	.00123819		
Continuity Correction ^b	8.907	1	.00284151		
Likelihood Ratio	11.293	1	.00077810		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00136825	.00104918
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.299	1	.00133123		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.58.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-937

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.366	.001
	Cramer's V	.366	.001
N of Valid Cases		78	

41B - H4.3.41B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR41: Client Company performs root cause analysis of selected issues to address deficiencies in achieving the project's quality and process performance objectives and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR41: Client Company performs root cause analysis of selected issues to address deficiencies in achieving the project's quality and process performance objectives and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 12.949 from Table A-H-939 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p=.0002200.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR41: Client Company performs root cause analysis of selected issues to address deficiencies in achieving the project's quality and process performance objectives and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR41 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-938 shows that 1 company that performed practice PR41 "Rarely + Never" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (7.6). While, 17 of the companies that performed practice PR41 "Rarely + Never" reported "More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (10.4).

Cramer's V= .401 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR41: Client Company performs root cause analysis of selected issues to address deficiencies in achieving the project's quality and process performance objectives PR41 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR41 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-940.

Table A-H-938

Crosstab			
	Recode2_2_Project_Budget_cost		Total
	Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	

Recode2_PR41 Performs root cause analysis of selected issues to address deficiencies in achieving the project's qua	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	32	28	60
		Expected Count	25.4	34.6	60.0
		% within Recode2_PR41 Performs root cause analysis of selected issues to address deficiencies in achieving the project's qua	53.3%	46.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_ Project Budget_cost	97.0%	62.2%	76.9%
		Std. Residual	1.3	-1.1	
	Rarely + Never	Count	1	17	18
		Expected Count	7.6	10.4	18.0
		% within Recode2_PR41 Performs root cause analysis of selected issues to address deficiencies in achieving the project's qua	5.6%	94.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_ Project_Budget_cost	3.0%	37.8%	23.1%
		Std. Residual	-2.4	2.1	
Total	Count		33	33	45
	Expected Count		33.0	33.0	45.0
	% within Recode2_PR41 Performs root cause analysis of selected issues to address deficiencies in achieving the project's qua		42.3%	42.3%	57.7%
	% within Recode2_2_ Project_Budget_cost		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-939

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.949 ^a	1	.00022000	.00025424	.00017932
Continuity Correction ^b	11.066	1	.00087937		
Likelihood Ratio	15.643	1	.00007651		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.783	1	.00034974		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.62.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-940

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.401	.000
	Cramer's V	.401	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

42B - H4.3.42B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR42: Client Company manages corrective actions to closure when the project's performance or results deviate significantly from the plan and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR42: Client Company manages corrective actions to closure when the project's performance or results deviate significantly from the plan and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 12.949 from Table A-H-942 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00022000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR42: Client Company manages corrective actions to closure when the project's performance or results deviate significantly from the plan and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR42 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-941 shows that 1 company that performed practice PR42 "Rarely + Never" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (7.6). While, 17 of the companies that performed practice PR42 "Rarely + Never" reported "More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (10.4).

Cramer's V= .407 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR42 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR42 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-943.

Table A-H-941

Crosstab					
			Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2_PR42 Manages corrective actions to closure when the project's performance or results deviate significantly	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	32	28	60
		Expected Count	25.4	34.6	60.0
		% within Recode2_PR42 Manages corrective actions to closure when the project's performance or results deviate significantly	53.3%	46.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	97.0%	62.2%	76.9%
		Std. Residual	1.3	-1.1	
	Rarely + Never	Count	1	17	18
		Expected Count	7.6	10.4	18.0
		% within Recode2_PR42 Manages corrective actions to closure when the project's performance or results deviate significantly	5.6%	94.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	3.0%	37.8%	23.1%
		Std. Residual	-2.4	2.1	
Total	Count		33	45	78
	Expected Count		33.0	45.0	78.0
	% within Recode2_PR42 Manages corrective actions to closure when the project's performance or results deviate significantly		42.3%	57.7%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-942

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.949 ^a	1	.00022000		
Continuity Correction ^b	11.066	1	.00087937		
Likelihood Ratio	15.643	1	.00007651		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00025424	.00017932
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.783	1	.00034974		
N of Valid Cases	78				

- a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.62.
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-943

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.407	.000
	Cramer's V	.407	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

43B - H4.3.43B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR43: Client Company periodically reviews the project's progress, performance and issues experienced and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR43: Client Company periodically reviews the project's progress, performance and issues experienced and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 11.949 from Table A-H-945 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00022000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR43: Client Company periodically reviews the project's progress, performance and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR43 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-944 shows that 1 company that performed practice PR43 "Rarely + Never" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (7.6). While, 17 of the companies that performed practice PR43 "Rarely + Never" reported "More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (10.4).

Cramer's V= .371 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR43 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR42 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-946.

Table A-H-944

Crosstab					
			Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2_PR43 Periodically reviews the project's progress, performance and issues experienced	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Coun	32	28	60
		Expected Count	25.4	34.6	60.0
		% within Recode2_PR43 Periodically reviews the project's progress, performance and issues experienced	53.3%	46.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost	97.0%	62.2%	76.9%
		Std. Residual	1.3	-1.1	
	Rarely + Never	Count	1	17	18
		Expected Count	7.6	10.4	18.0

		% within Recode2_PR43 Periodically reviews the project's progress, performance and issues experienced	5.6%	94.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_ Project Budget_cost	3.0%	37.8%	23.1%
		Std. Residual	-2.4	2.1	
Total		Count	33	45	78
		Expected Count	33.0	45.0	78.0
		% within Recode2_PR43 Periodically reviews the project's progress, performance and issues experienced	42.3%	57.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-945

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1- sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.949 ^a	1	.00022000		
Continuity Correction ^b	11.066	1	.00087937		
Likelihood Ratio	15.643	1	.00007651		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00025424	.00017932
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.783	1	.00034974		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.62.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-946

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.371	.000
	Cramer's V	.371	.00-
N of Valid Cases		78	

44B - H4.3.44B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR44: Client Company reviews the project's accomplishments and results at selected project milestones and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between performing practice PR44: Client Company reviews the project's accomplishments and results at selected project milestones and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 11.816 from Table A-H-948 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p=.00058713.

Table A-H-947

Crosstab				
		Recode2_Project Budget_cost		Total
		Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2_PR44 Reviews the	Count	32	29	61
	Expected Count	25.8	35.2	61.0

project's accomplishments and results at selected project milestones	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	% within Recode2_PR44 Reviews the project's accomplishments and results at selected project milestones	52.5%	47.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project_Budget_cost	97.0%	64.4%	78.2%
		Std. Residual	1.2	-1.0	
	Rarely + Never	Count	1	16	17
		Expected Count	7.2	9.8	17.0
		% within Recode2_PR44 Reviews the project's accomplishments and results at selected project milestones	5.9%	94.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project_Budget_cost	3.0%	35.6%	21.8%
		Std. Residual	-2.3	2.0	
Total	Count		33	45	78
	Expected Count		33.0	45.0	78.0
	% within Recode2_PR44 Reviews the project's accomplishments and results at selected project milestones		42.3%	57.7%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-948

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.816 ^a	1	.00058713		
Continuity Correction ^b	9.985	1	.00157806		
Likelihood Ratio	14.255	1	.00015966		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00056024	.00035778
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.665	1	.00063692		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.19.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-949

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.389	.001
	Cramer's V	.389	.001
N of Valid Cases		78	

45B - H4.3.45B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR45: Client Company establishes and maintains records of quality assurance activities and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR45: Client Company establishes and maintains records of quality assurance activities and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 17.902 from Table A-H-951 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00002325.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR45: Client Company establishes and maintains records of quality assurance activities and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR45 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-950 shows that 1 company that performed practice PR45 “Rarely + Never” reported “Less than estimated budget + On budget” for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (9.3). While, 21 of the companies that performed practice PR45 “Rarely + Never” reported “More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget” for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (12.7).

Cramer’s V= .479 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR45 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR45 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-952.

Table A-H-950

Crosstab					
			Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2_PR45 Establishes and maintains records of quality assurance activities	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	32	24	56
		Expected Count	23.7	32.3	56.0
		% within Recode2_PR45 Establishes and maintains records of quality assurance activities	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Budget_cost	97.0%	53.3%	71.8%
		Std. Residual	1.7	-1.5	
	Rarely + Never	Count	1	21	22
		Expected Count	9.3	12.7	22.0
		% within Recode2_PR45 Establishes and maintains records of quality assurance activities	4.5%	95.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Budget_cost	3.0%	46.7%	28.2%
		Std. Residual	-2.7	2.3	
Total			Count	33	45
			Expected Count	33.0	45.0
			% within Recode2_PR45 Establishes and maintains records of quality assurance activities	42.3%	57.7%
			% within Recode2_2_Project Success Budget_cost	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-951

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.902 ^a	1	.00002325		
Continuity Correction ^b	15.812	1	.00006995		
Likelihood Ratio	21.656	1	.00000326		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000994	.00000908
Linear-by-Linear Association	17.673	1	.00002624		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.31.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-952

Symmetric Measures		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.479	.000
	Cramer's V	.479	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

46B - H4.3.46B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR46: Monitors the actual project performance and progress against the project plan and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between performing practice PR46: Monitors the actual project performance and progress against the project plan and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 9.665 from Table A-H-954 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and $p = .00187797$.

Table A-H-953

Crosstab					
			Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2_PR46 Monitors the actual project performance and progress against the project plan	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	32	31	63
		Expected Count	26.7	36.3	63.0
		% within Recode2_PR46 Monitors the actual project performance and progress	50.8%	49.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project cost	97.0%	68.9%	80.8%
		Std. Residual	1.0	-.9	
	Rarely + Never	Count	1	14	15
		Expected Count	6.3	8.7	15.0
		% within Recode2_PR46 Monitors the actual project performance and progress	6.7%	93.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project cost	3.0%	31.1%	19.2%
		Std. Residual	-2.1	1.8	
Total			Count	33	45
			Expected Count	33.0	45.0
			% within Recode2_PR46 Monitors the actual project performance and progress	42.3%	57.7%
			% within Recode2_2_Project cost	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-954

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.665 ^a	1	.00187797		
Continuity Correction ^b	7.942	1	.00483053		
Likelihood Ratio	11.609	1	.00065638		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00263096	.00133968

Linear-by-Linear Association	9.541	1	.00200907		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.35.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-955

Symmetric Measures		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.352	.002
	Cramer's V	.352	.002
N of Valid Cases		78	

47B - H4.3.47B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR47: Ensures that the supplier agreement is satisfied before accepting the acquired product and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR47: Ensures that the supplier agreement is satisfied before accepting the acquired product and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 10.395 from Table A-H-957 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00022000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR47: Ensures that the supplier agreement is satisfied before accepting the acquired product and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR47 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-956 shows that 1 company that performed practice PR47 "Rarely + Never" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (7.6). While, 17 of the companies that performed practice PR47 "Rarely + Never" reported "More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (10.4).

Cramer's V= .365 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR47 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR42 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-958.

Table A-H-956

Crosstab					
		Recode2 Project Budget_cost		Total	
		Less than estimate d budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget		
Recode2_PR47 Ensures that the supplier agreement is satisfied before accepting the	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	32	28	60
		Expected Count	25.4	34.6	60.0
		% within Recode2_PR47 Ensures that the supplier agreement is satisfied before accepting the acquired product	53.3%	46.7%	100.0%

acquired product		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Budget_cost	97.0%	62.2%	76.9%
		Std. Residual	1.3	-1.1	
	Rarely + Never	Count	1	17	18
		Expected Count	7.6	10.4	18.0
		% within Recode2_PR47 Ensures that the supplier agreement is satisfied before accepting the acquired product	5.6%	94.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success_cost	3.0%	37.8%	23.1%
		Std. Residual	-2.4	2.1	
Total		Count	33	45	45
		Expected Count	33.0	45.0	78.0
		% within Recode2_Pr47 Ensures that the supplier agreement is satisfied before accepting the acquired product	42.3%	57.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Budget_cost	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-957

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.949 ^a	1	.00022000		
Continuity Correction ^b	8.744	1	.00087937		
Likelihood Ratio	11.852	1	.00007651		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00025424	.00017932
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.783	1	.00034974		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.62.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-958

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.365	.000
	Cramer's V	.365	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

48B - H4.3.48B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR48: Client Company selects supplier technical solutions to be analyzed and analysis methods to be used and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR48: Client Company selects supplier technical solutions to be analyzed and analysis methods to be used and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 28.934 from Table A-H-960 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000007.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR48: Client Company selects supplier technical solutions to be analyzed and analysis methods to be used and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR48 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-959 shows that Zero companies that performed practice PR48 "Rarely + Never" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (10.2). While, 29 of the companies that performed practice PR48 "Rarely + Never" reported "More than 10% of estimated budget +

More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget” for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (17.9).

Cramer’s V= .617 indicates a strong association between performed PR48 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR48 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-961.

Table A-H-959

Crosstab					
			Recode2_2_Project_Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2_PR48 Selects_supplier_technical_solutions_to_be_analys	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	29	18	47
		Expected Count	17.9	29.1	47.0
		% within Recode2_PR48 Selects_supplier_technical_solutions_to_be_analys	61.7%	38.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project Success_Budget_cost	100.0%	38.3%	61.8%
		Std. Residual	2.6	-2.1	
	Rarely + Never	Count	0	29	29
		Expected Count	11.1	17.9	29.0
		% within Recode2_PR48 Selects_supplier_technical_solutions_to_be_analys	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project Success_Budget_cost	0.0%	61.7%	38.2%
		Std. Residual	-3.3	2.6	
Total			Count	29	47
			Expected Count	29.0	47.0
			% within Recode2_PR48 Selects_supplier_technical_solutions_to_be_analys	38.2%	61.8%
			% within Recode2_Project Success_Budget_cost	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-960

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	28.934 ^a	1	.00000007		
Continuity Correction ^b	26.379	1	.00000028		
Likelihood Ratio	38.497	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000001	.00000001
Linear-by-Linear Association	28.554	1	.00000009		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.07.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-961

Symmetric Measures		
	Value	Approx. Sig.

Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.617	.000
	Cramer's V	.617	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

49B - H4.3.49B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR49: Client Company conducts technical reviews with the supplier as defined in the supplier agreement and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR49: Client Company conducts technical reviews with the supplier as defined in the supplier agreement and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 34.104 from Table A-H-963 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000001$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR49: Client Company conducts technical reviews with the supplier as defined in the supplier agreement and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR49 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-962 shows that Zero companies that performed practice PR49 "Rarely + Never" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (12.2). While, 29 of the companies that performed practice PR49 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (16.8).

Cramer's $V=.670$ indicates a strong association between performed PR49 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR49 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-964.

Table A-H-962

Crosstab						
			Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost		Total	
			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget		
ecode2_PR49 Conducts technical reviews with supplier	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	29	15	44	
		Expected Count	16.8	27.2	44.0	
		% within ecode2_PR49 Conducts_technical_reveiwswith_suppliee	65.9%	34.1%	100.0%	
		% within Recode2_2_Project_Budget_cost	100.0%	31.9%	57.9%	
		Std. Residual	3.0	-2.3		
	Rarely + Never	Count	0	32	32	
		Expected Count	12.2	19.8	32.0	
		% within ecode2_PR49 Conducts_technical_reveiwswith_suppliee	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
		% within Recode2_2_Project_Budget_cost	0.0%	68.1%	42.1%	
		Std. Residual	-3.5	2.7		
Total			Count	29	47	76
			Expected Count	29.0	47.0	76.0
			% within ecode2_PR49 Conducts_technical_reveiwswith_suppliee	38.2%	61.8%	100.0%

	% within Recode2_2_Project _Budget_cost	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
--	--	--------	--------	--------

Table A-H-963

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	34.104 ^a	1	.00000001		
Continuity Correction ^b	31.369	1	.00000002		
Likelihood Ratio	44.590	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	33.656	1	.00000001		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.21.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-964

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.670	.000
	Cramer's V	.670	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

50B - H4.3.50B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR50: Client Company evaluates and categorizes each identified issue using defined risk categories and parameters and determines its relative priority and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR50: Client Company evaluates and categorizes each identified issue using defined risk categories and parameters and determines its relative priority and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 37.961 from Table A-H-966 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR50: Client Company evaluates and categorizes each identified issue using defined risk categories and parameters and determines its relative priority and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR50 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-965 shows that Zero companies that performed practice PR50 "Rarely + Never" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (13). While, 29 of the companies that performed practice PR50 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (16).

Cramer's V= .707 indicates a strong association between performed PR50 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR50 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-967.

Table A-H-965

rosstab			
	Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost		Total
	Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	

Recode2_PR50 Evaluates_and categorise_each identified_issue	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	29	13	42
		Expected Count	16.0	26.0	42.0
		% within Recode2_PR50 Evaluates_and_categorise each_identified_issue	69.0%	31.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_ Project Budget_cost	100.0%	27.7%	55.3%
		Std. Residual	3.2	-2.5	
	Rarely + Never	Count	0	34	34
		Expected Count	13.0	21.0	34.0
		% within Recode2_PR50 Evaluates_and_categorise each_identified_issue	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_ Project cost	0.0%	72.3%	44.7%
		Std. Residual	-3.6	2.8	
Total			Count	29	47
			Expected Count	29.0	47.0
			% within Recode2_PR50 Evaluates_and_categorise each_identified_issue	38.2%	61.8%
			% within Recode2_2_ Project Budget_cost	100.0%	100.0%
				100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-966

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	37.961 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	35.092	1	.00000000		
Likelihood Ratio	49.082	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	37.462	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.97.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-967

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.707	.000
	Cramer's V	.707	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

51B - H4.3.51B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR51: Client Company establishes and maintains a usable set of organizational process assets, work environment standards, rules and guidelines for teams and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR51: Client Company establishes and maintains a usable set of organizational process assets, work environment standards, rules and guidelines for teams and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 20.516 from Table A-H-969 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000591.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR51: Client Company establishes and maintains a usable set of organizational process assets, work environment standards, rules and guidelines for teams and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR51 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*.

Table A-H-968 shows that 3 companies that performed practice PR51 “Rarely + Never” reported “Less than estimated budget + On budget” for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (12.7). While, 26 of the companies that performed practice PR51 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Less than estimated budget + On budget” for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (16.3).

Cramer’s V= .500 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR51 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR51 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-970.

Table A-H-968

Crosstab						
			Recode2_Project Budget_cost		Total	
			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget		
Recode2_PR51 Establishs_and_maintains_a_usable_set_of_organizational process assets	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	26	20	46	
		Expected Count	16.3	29.7	46.0	
		% within Recode2_PR51 Establishs_and_maintains_a_usable_set_of_organizational process assets	56.5%	43.5%	100.0%	
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Budget_cost	89.7%	37.7%	56.1%	
		Std. Residual	2.4	-1.8		
	Rarely + Never	Count	3	33	36	
		Expected Count	12.7	23.3	36.0	
		% within Recode2_PR51 Establishs_and_maintains_a_usable_set_of_organizational process assets	8.3%	91.7%	100.0%	
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Budget_cost	10.3%	62.3%	43.9%	
		Std. Residual	-2.7	2.0		
Total			Count	29	53	82
			Expected Count	29.0	53.0	82.0
			% within Recode2_PR51 Establishs_and_maintains_a_usable_set_of_organizational process assets	35.4%	64.6%	100.0%
			% within Recode2_Project Success Budget_cost	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-969

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.516 ^a	1	.00000591		
Continuity Correction ^b	18.462	1	.00001734		
Likelihood Ratio	22.911	1	.00000170		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000527	.00000340
Linear-by-Linear Association	20.265	1	.00000674		

N of Valid Cases	82				
------------------	----	--	--	--	--

- a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.73.
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-970

Symmetric Measures		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.500	.000
	Cramer's V	.500	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

52B - H4.3.52B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR52: Client Company establishes and maintains the offshoring strategy and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR52: Client Company establishes and maintains the offshoring strategy and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 18.142 from Table A-H-972 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00002050.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR52: Client Company establishes and maintains the offshoring strategy and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR52 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-971 shows that 3 companies that performed practice PR52 "Rarely + Never" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (11.6). While, 20 of the companies that performed practice PR52 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (11.4).

Cramer's V= .473 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR52 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR52 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-973.

Table A-H-971

Crosstab					
		Recode2 Project Budget_cost		Total	
		Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget		
Recode2_PR52 Establishes_and_maintains_the_offshoring_strategy	Always + Very Frequently + Occassionally	Count	20	20	40
		Expected Count	11.4	28.6	40.0
		% within Recode2_PR52 Establishes_and_maintains_the_offshoring_strategy	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project_Budget_cost	87.0%	34.5%	49.4%
		Std. Residual	2.6	-1.6	
	Rarely + Never	Count	3	38	41
		Expected Count	11.6	29.4	41.0
		% within Recode2_PR52 Establishes_and_maintains_the_offshoring_strategy	7.3%	92.7%	100.0%

		% within Recode2_2_ Project Budget_cost	13.0%	65.5%	50.6%
		Std. Residual	-2.5	1.6	
Total		Count	23	58	81
		Expected Count	23.0	58.0	81.0
		% within Recode2_PR52 Establishes_and_maintains _the_offshoring_strategy	28.4%	71.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_ Project_Budget_cost	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-972

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.142 ^a	1	.00002050		
Continuity Correction ^b	16.103	1	.00005998		
Likelihood Ratio	19.740	1	.00000887		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00001889	.00001658
Linear-by-Linear Association	17.918	1	.00002306		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.36.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-973

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.473	.000
	Cramer's V	.473	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

53B - H4.3.53B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR53: Client Company establishes and maintains the plan for performing the offshoring and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR53: Client Company establishes and maintains the plan for performing the offshoring and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 18.142 from Table A-H-975 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00002050.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR53: Client Company establishes and maintains the plan for performing the offshoring and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR53 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-974 shows that 3 companies that performed practice PR53 "Rarely + Never" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (11.6). While, 22 of the companies that performed practice PR53 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (11.4).

Cramer's V= .473 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR53 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR53 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-976.

Table A-H-974

Crosstab

			Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2_PR53 Establishes and maintain the plan for performing the offshoring	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	20	20	40
		Expected Count	11.4	28.6	40.0
		% within Recode2_PR53 Establishes_and_maintain_t he_plan_for_performing_the	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project cost	87.0%	34.5%	49.4%
		Std. Residual	2.6	-1.6	
	Rarely + Never	Count	3	38	41
		Expected Count	11.6	29.4	41.0
		% within Recode2_PR53 Establishes_and_maintain_t he_plan_for_performing_the	7.3%	92.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost	13.0%	65.5%	50.6%
		Std. Residual	-2.5	1.6	
Total		Count	23	58	81
		Expected Count	23.0	58.0	81.0
		% within Recode2_PR53 Establishes_and_maintain_t he_plan_for_performing_the	28.4%	71.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-975

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.142 ^a	1	.00002050	.00001889	.00001658
Continuity Correction ^b	16.103	1	.00005998		
Likelihood Ratio	19.740	1	.00000887		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	17.918	1	.00002306		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.36.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-976

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.473	.000
	Cramer's V	.473	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

54B - H4.3.54B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR54: Client Company determines the type of acquisition for each product or product component to be offshored and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR54: Client Company determines the type of acquisition for each product or product component to be offshored and the offshored projects success of Cost/Budget. The value of chi-square test is 20.319 from Table A-H-978 and

differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000656$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR54: Client Company determines the type of acquisition for each product or product component to be offshored and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR54 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-977 shows that 4 companies that performed practice PR54 “Rarely + Never” reported “Less than estimated budget + On budget” for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (13.1). While, 19 of the companies that performed practice PR54 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Less than estimated budget + On budget” for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (9.9).

Cramer’s $V=.501$ indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR54 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR54 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-979.

Table A-H-977

Crosstab					
			Recode2_2_Project Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2_PR54 Determines_the_type_of_acquisition_for_each_produ	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	19	16	35
		Expected Count	9.9	25.1	35.0
		% within Recode2_PR54 Determines_the_type_of_acquisition_for_each_produ	54.3%	45.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Budget_cost	82.6%	27.6%	43.2%
		Std. Residual	2.9	-1.8	
	Rarely + Never	Count	4	42	46
		Expected Count	13.1	32.9	46.0
		% within Recode2_PR54 Determines_the_type_of_acquisition_for_each_produ	8.7%	91.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Budget_cost	17.4%	72.4%	56.8%
		Std. Residual	-2.5	1.6	
Total		Count	23	58	81
		Expected Count	23.0	58.0	81.0
		% within Recode2_PR54 Determines_the_type_of_acquisition_for_each_produ	28.4%	71.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Budget cost	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-978

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)

Pearson Chi-Square	20.319 ^a	1	.00000656		
Continuity Correction ^b	18.138	1	.00002054		
Likelihood Ratio	21.213	1	.00000411		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00001047	.00000749
Linear-by-Linear Association	20.068	1	.00000747		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.94.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-979

Symmetric Measures		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.501	.000
	Cramer's V	.501	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

55B - H4.3.55B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR55: Client Company Plan transition to operations specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR55: Client Company Plan transition to operations specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 13.742 from Table A-H-981 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00020970.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR55: Client Company Plan transition to operations specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR55 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-980 shows that 5 companies that performed practice PR55 "Rarely + Never" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (12.5). While, 18 of the companies that performed practice PR55 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (10.5).

Cramer's V= .412 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR55 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR55 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-982.

Table A-H-980

Crosstab					
			Recode2_2 Project Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2 PR55 Plan_transition_to_operations_specifically_timing	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	18	19	37
		Expected Count	10.5	26.5	37.0
		% within Recode2_PR55 Plan_transition_to_operations_specifically_timing	48.6%	51.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2 Project Budget_cost	78.3%	32.8%	45.7%

	Rarely + Never	Std. Residual	2.3	-1.5	
		Count	5	39	44
		Expected Count	12.5	31.5	44.0
		% within Recode2_PR55 Plan_transition_to_operati ons_specifically_timing	11.4%	88.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_ Project Budget_cost	21.7%	67.2%	54.3%
		Std. Residual	-2.1	1.3	
Total		Count	23	58	81
		Expected Count	23.0	58.0	81.0
		% within Recode2_PR55 Plan_transition_to_operati ons_specifically_timing	28.4%	71.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_ Project Budget_cost	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-981

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.742 ^a	1	.00020970		
Continuity Correction ^b	11.969	1	.00054080		
Likelihood Ratio	14.234	1	.00016140		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00038699	.00022867
Linear-by-Linear Association	13.572	1	.00022953		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.51.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-982

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.412	.000
	Cramer's V	.412	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

56B - H4.3.56B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR56: Evaluates supplier technical solutions (designs) to confirm that contractual requirements continue to be met and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR56: Evaluates supplier technical solutions (designs) to confirm that contractual requirements continue to be met and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 16.738 from Table A-H-984 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00004291.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR56: Evaluates supplier technical solutions (designs) to confirm that contractual requirements continue to be met and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR56 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-983 shows that 6 companies that performed practice PR56 "Rarely + Never" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (14.9). While, 23 of the companies that performed practice PR56 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (14.1).

Cramer's V= .452 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR56 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR56 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-985.

Table A-H-983

Crosstab					
			Recode2_2_Project_Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2_PR56 Evaluates supplier technical solutions to confirm contractual requirements are met	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	23	17	40
		Expected Count	14.1	25.9	40.0
		% within Recode2_PR56 Evaluates_supplier_technical_solutions_to_confirm_contractual_requirements_are met	57.5%	42.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2Project Success Budget_cost	79.3%	32.1%	48.8%
		Std. Residual	2.4	-1.7	
	Rarely + Never	Count	6	36	42
		Expected Count	14.9	27.1	42.0
		% within Recode2_PR56 Evaluates_supplier_technical_solutions_to_confirm_contractual_requirements_are met	14.3%	85.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project Success Budget_cost	20.7%	67.9%	51.2%
		Std. Residual	-2.3	1.7	
Total		Count	29	53	82
		Expected Count	29.0	53.0	82.0
		% within Recode2_PR56 Evaluates_supplier_technical_solutions_to_confirm_contractual_requirements_are met	35.4%	64.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2Project Success Budget_cost	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-984

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.738 ^a	1	.00004291		
Continuity Correction ^b	14.901	1	.00011331		
Likelihood Ratio	17.550	1	.00002799		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00006214	.00004164
Linear-by-Linear Association	16.534	1	.00004779		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.15.
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-985

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.452	.000
	Cramer's V	.452	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

57B - H4.3.57B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR57: Selects, monitors and analyzes supplier processes and the offshored projects' success factor: Cost/Budget.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR57: Selects, monitors and analyzes supplier processes and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The value of chi-square test is 25.667 from Table A-H-987 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p=.00000041.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR57: Selects, monitors and analyzes supplier processes and the offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR57 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget*. Table A-H-986 shows that 5 companies that performed practice PR57 "Rarely + Never" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count was (15.9). While, 24 of the companies that performed practice PR57 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Less than estimated budget + On budget" for offshored *projects success of Cost/Budget* while the expected count for this category was (13.1).

Cramer's V= .559 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR57 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR57 reported better results on *Cost/Budget* compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-988.

Table A-H-986

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Project Budget_cost		Total
			Less than estimated budget + On budget	More than 10% of estimated budget + More than 20% of estimated budget + more than 50% of estimated budget	
Recode2_PR57 Selects Monitors and analyzes processes	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	24	13	37
		Expected Count	13.1	23.9	37.0
		% within Recode2_PR57 Selects_Monitors_and_analyz es_processes	64.9%	35.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	82.8%	24.5%	45.1%
		Std. Residual	3.0	-2.2	
	Rarely + Never	Count	5	40	45
		Expected Count	15.9	29.1	45.0
		% within Recode2_PR57 Selects_Monitors_and_analyz es_processes	11.1%	88.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	17.2%	75.5%	54.9%
		Std. Residual	-2.7	2.0	
Total			Count	29	53
			Expected Count	29.0	53.0
			% within Recode2_PR57 Selects_Monitors_and_analyz es_processes	35.4%	64.6%
			% within Recode2_2_Project Success Factors_Budget_cost	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-987

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	25.667 ^a	1	.00000041		
Continuity Correction ^b	23.369	1	.00000134		
Likelihood Ratio	27.180	1	.00000019		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000046	.00000037
Linear-by-Linear Association	25.354	1	.00000048		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.09.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-988

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.559	.000
	Cramer's V	.559	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

H4.3-C - Project's Success Factor: Expected Quality

1C - H4.3.1C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR1: Client Company establishes and maintains a project plan as the basis for managing the project and the offshored projects' success factor Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR1: Client Company establishes and maintains a project plan as the basis for managing the project and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 33.674 from Table A-H-990 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000001$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR1: Client Company establishes and maintains a project plan as the basis for managing the project and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR1 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-989 shows that 1 company that performed practice PR1 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (13). Whereas, 25 of the companies that performed practice PR1 "Rarely + Never" reported "Adequate + Poor + Bad" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (13).

Cramer's $V=.666$ indicates a strong association between performed PR1 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR1 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-991.

Table A-H-989

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Porject_Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR1	Always +	Count	37	13	50
Establish_and_	Very	Expected Count	25.0	25.0	50.0

maintain_project _plan_as_basis	Frequently + Occasionally	% within Recode2_PR1 Establish_and maintain_project_plan_as_basis	74.0%	26.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject_ Success facore_Quality	97.4%	34.2%	65.8%
		Std. Residual	2.4	-2.4	
	Rarely + Never	Count	1	25	26
		Expected Count	13.0	13.0	26.0
		% within Recode2_PR1 Establish_and maintain_project_plan_as_basis	3.8%	96.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject success_facore_Quality	2.6%	65.8%	34.2%
		Std. Residual	-3.3	3.3	
Total			Count	38	76
			Expected Count	38.0	76.0
			% within Recode2_PR1 Establish_and maintain_project_plan_as_basis	50.0%	100.0%
			% within Recode2_Porject success_facore_Quality	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-990

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1- sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	33.674 ^a	1	.00000001		
Continuity Correction ^b	30.926	1	.00000003		
Likelihood Ratio	39.575	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	33.231	1	.00000001		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.00.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-991

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.666	.000
	Cramer's V	.666	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

2C- H4.3.2C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR2: Client Company establishes and maintains the overall project plan and the offshored projects' success factor Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR2: Client Company establishes and maintains the overall project plan and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 43.177 from Table A-H-993 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR2: Client Company establishes and maintains the overall project plan and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR2 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-992 shows that 1 company that performed practice PR2 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (15). Whereas, 29 of the companies that performed practice PR2 "Rarely + Never" reported "Adequate + Poor + Bad" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (15).

Cramer's V= .754 indicates a strong association between performed PR2 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR2 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-994.

Table A-H-992

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Porject_Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recde2_PR2 Establishes and maintains overall project plan	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	37	9	46
		Expected Count	23.0	23.0	46.0
		% within Recde2_PR2 Establishes_and_maintains _overall_project_plan	80.4%	19.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject_success_Quality	97.4%	23.7%	60.5%
		Std. Residual	2.9	-2.9	
	Rarely + Never	Count	1	29	30
		Expected Count	15.0	15.0	30.0
		% within Recde2_PR2 Establishes_and_maintains _overall_project_plan	3.3%	96.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Porject_success Quality	2.6%	76.3%	39.5%
		Std. Residual	-3.6	3.6	
Total		Count	38	38	76
		Expected Count	38.0	38.0	76.0
		% within Recde2_PR2 Establishes_and_maintains _overall_project_plan	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Porject_success_Quality	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-993

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	43.177 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	40.148	1	.00000000		
Likelihood Ratio	51.113	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	42.609	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.00.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-994

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.754	.000
	Cramer's V	.754	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

3C - H4.3.3C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR3: Client Company estimates the project's effort and cost for work products and tasks based on estimation rationale and the offshored projects' success factor Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR3: Client Company estimates the project's effort and cost for work products and tasks based on estimation rationale and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 38.226 from Table A-H-996 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR3: Client Company estimates the project's effort and cost for work products and tasks based on estimation rationale and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR3 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-995 shows that 1 company that performed practice PR3 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (14). Whereas, 27 of the companies that performed practice PR3 "Rarely + Never" reported "Adequate + Poor + Bad" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (14).

Cramer's V= .709 indicates a strong association between performed PR3 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR3 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-997.

Table A-H-995

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Porject_Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR3 Estimates_the_project_effort_and_cost_for_workprod	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	37	11	48
		Expected Count	24.0	24.0	48.0
		% within Recode2_PR3 Estimates_the_project_effort_and_cost_for_workprod	77.1%	22.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Porject_success_Quality	97.4%	28.9%	63.2%
		Std. Residual	2.7	-2.7	
	Rarely + Never	Count	1	27	28
		Expected Count	14.0	14.0	28.0
		% within Recode2_PR3 Estimates_the_project_effort_and_cost_for_workprod	3.6%	96.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Porject_success_facore_Quality	2.6%	71.1%	36.8%
		Std. Residual	-3.5	3.5	
Total			Count	38	38
			Expected Count	38.0	38.0
			% within Recode2_PR3 Estimates_the_project_effort_and_cost_for_workprod	50.0%	50.0%
			% within Recode2_3_Porject_success_facore_Quality	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-996

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	38.226 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	35.342	1	.00000000		
Likelihood Ratio	45.056	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	37.723	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.00.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-997

Symmetric Measures		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.709	.000
	Cramer's V	.709	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

4C - H4.3.4C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR4: Client Company establishes and maintains the project's budget and schedule, milestones, constraints, dependencies and the offshored projects' success factor Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR4: Client Company establishes and maintains the project's budget and schedule, milestones, constraints, dependencies and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 31.533 from Table A-H-999 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000002.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR4: Client Company establishes and maintains the project's budget and schedule, milestones, constraints, dependencies and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR4 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-998 shows that 1 company that performed practice PR4 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (12.5). While, 24 of the companies that performed practice PR4 "Rarely + Never" reported "Adequate + Poor + Bad" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (12.5).

Cramer's V= .644 indicates a strong association between performed PR4 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR4 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1000.

Table A-H-998

Crosstab					
			Recode2_3_Porject_Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR4 Establish_an maintain project budget schedule	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	37	14	51
		Expected Count	25.5	25.5	51.0
		% within Recode2_PR4 Establish_and_maintain_proje ct_budget_schedule	72.5%	27.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Porject _success_facore_Quality	97.4%	36.8%	67.1%
		Std. Residual	2.3	-2.3	
	Rarely + Never	Count	1	24	25
		Expected Count	12.5	12.5	25.0
		% within Recode2_PR4 Establish_and_maintain_proje ct_budget_schedule	4.0%	96.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Porject _success_facore_Quality	2.6%	63.2%	32.9%
		Std. Residual	-3.3	3.3	
Total		Count	38	38	76
		Expected Count	38.0	38.0	76.0
		% within Recode2_PR4 Establish_and_maintain_proje ct_budget_schedule	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%

	% within Recode2_3_Porject _success_facore_Quality	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
--	---	--------	--------	--------

Table A-H-999

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	31.533 ^a	1	.00000002		
Continuity Correction ^b	28.850	1	.00000008		
Likelihood Ratio	37.016	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000001	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	31.118	1	.00000002		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.50.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1000

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.644	.000
	Cramer's V	.644	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

5B - H4.3.5B: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR5: Client Company monitors off-shoring supplier project progress and performance (effort, and cost) as defined in the contract and the offshored projects' success factor Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR5: Client Company monitors off-shoring supplier project progress and performance (effort, and cost) as defined in the contract and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 34.050 from Table A-H-1002 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000001.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR5: Client Company monitors offshoring supplier project progress and performance (effort, and cost) as defined in the contract and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR5 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1001 shows that 3 companies that performed practice PR5 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (15.5). While, 28 of the companies that performed practice PR5 "Rarely + Never" reported "Adequate + Poor + Bad" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (15.5).

Cramer's V= .669 indicates a strong association between performed PR5 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR5 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1003.

Table A-H-1001

Crosstab					
			Recode2_3_Porject_Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR5 Monitors offshoring supplier	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	35	10	45
		Expected Count	22.5	22.5	45.0
		% within Recode2_PR5 Monitors offshoring supplier project progress	77.8%	22.2%	100.0%

project progress		% within Recode2_3_Porject_success_Quality	92.1%	26.3%	59.2%
		Std. Residual	2.6	-2.6	
		Count	3	28	31
	Rarely + Never	Expected Count	15.5	15.5	31.0
		% within Recode2_PR5 Monitors offshoring supplier poroject progress	9.7%	90.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Porject success_Quality	7.9%	73.7%	40.8%
		Std. Residual	-3.2	3.2	
Total	Count		38	38	76
	Expected Count		38.0	38.0	76.0
	% within Recode2_PR5 Monitors_offshoring_supplier_poroject_progress		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_3_Porject_success_Quality		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1002

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	34.050 ^a	1	.00000001		
Continuity Correction ^b	31.381	1	.00000002		
Likelihood Ratio	37.973	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	33.602	1	.00000001		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.50.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1003

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.669	.000
	Cramer's V	.669	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

6C - H4.3.6C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR6: Client Company manages invoices submitted by the supplier and the offshored projects' success factor Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR6: Client Company manages invoices submitted by the supplier and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 27.369 from Table A-H-1005 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000017$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR6: Client Company manages invoices submitted by the supplier and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR6 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1004 shows that 3 companies that performed practice PR6 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (14). Whereas, 25 of the companies that performed practice PR6 "Rarely + Never"

reported “Adequate + Poor + Bad” for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (14).

Cramer’s V= .600 indicates a strong association between performed PR6 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR6 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1006.

Table A-H-1004

Crosstab					
			Recode2_3_Porject_Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR6 Manages_invoices_submitted_by the_supplier	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	35	13	48
		Expected Count	24.0	24.0	48.0
		% within Recode2_PR6 Manages_invoices_submitted_by the_supplier	72.9%	27.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_ Porject_success_Quality	92.1%	34.2%	63.2%
		Std. Residual	2.2	-2.2	
	Rarely + Never	Count	3	25	28
		Expected Count	14.0	14.0	28.0
		% within Recode2_PR6 Manages_invoices_submitted_by the_supplier	10.7%	89.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_ Porject_success_Quality	7.9%	65.8%	36.8%
		Std. Residual	-2.9	2.9	
Total			Count	38	76
			Expected Count	38.0	76.0
			% within Recode2_PR6 Manages_invoices_submitted_by the_supplier	50.0%	50.0%
			% within Recode2_3_ Porject_success_Quality	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1005

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	27.369 ^a	1	.00000017		
Continuity Correction ^b	24.938	1	.00000059		
Likelihood Ratio	30.218	1	.00000004		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000019	.00000010
Linear-by-Linear Association	27.009	1	.00000020		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.00.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1006

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.600	.000
	Cramer's V	.600	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

7C - H4.3.7C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR7: Client Company develops an understanding with off-shoring supplier on the meaning of requirement and the offshored projects’ success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR7: Client Company develops an understanding with off-shoring supplier on the meaning of requirement and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 18.070 from Table A-H-1008 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00002130$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR7: Client Company develops an understanding with offshoring supplier on the meaning of requirement and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR7 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1007 shows that 2 companies that performed practice PR7 “Rarely + Never” reported “Very Good + Good” for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (10.4). However, 20 of the companies that performed practice PR7 “Rarely + Never” reported “Adequate + Poor + Bad” for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (11.6).

Cramer’s $V=.481$ indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR7 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR7 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1009.

Table A-H-1007

2025-11-11 10:57

Crosstab					
			Recode2_3_Porject_ Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR7 Develops an understanding with off-shoring supplier on the meaning of requirements	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	35	21	56
		Expected Count	26.6	29.4	56.0
		% within Recode2_PR7 Develops an understanding with off-shoring supplier on the meaning of requirements	62.5%	37.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Porject_success_facore_Quality	94.6%	51.2%	71.8%
		Std. Residual	1.6	-1.6	
		Count	2	20	22
	Rarely + Never	Expected Count	10.4	11.6	22.0
		% within Recode2_PR7 Develops an understanding with off-shoring supplier on the meaning of requirements	9.1%	90.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Porject_success_facore_Quality	5.4%	48.8%	28.2%
		Std. Residual	-2.6	2.5	
		Count	37	41	78
Total	Expected Count	37.0	41.0	78.0	
	% within Recode2_PR7 Develops an understanding with off-shoring supplier on the meaning of requirements	47.4%	52.6%	100.0%	
	% within Recode2_3_Porject_success_facore_Quality	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table A-H-1008

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.070 ^a	1	.00002130		
Continuity Correction ^b	15.991	1	.00006364		
Likelihood Ratio	20.427	1	.00000620		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00001433	.00001337
Linear-by-Linear Association	17.838	1	.00002405		

N of Valid Cases	78				
------------------	----	--	--	--	--

- a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.44.
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1009

Symmetric Measures		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.481	.000
	Cramer's V	.481	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

8C - H4.3.8C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR8: Client Company validates requirements to ensure that the resulting product performs as intended in the end user's environment and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR8: Client Company validates requirements to ensure that the resulting product performs as intended in the end user's environment and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 19.633 from Table A-H-1011 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and $p=.00000838$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR8: Client Company validates requirements to ensure that the resulting product performs as intended in the end user's environment and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR8 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1010 shows that 2 companies that performed practice PR8 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (10.9). Whereas, 21 of the companies that performed practice PR8 "Rarely + Never" reported "Adequate + Poor + Bad" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (12.1).

Cramer's $V=.502$ indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR8 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR8 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1012.

Table A-H-1010

Crosstab					
			Recode2_3_Porject_Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR8 Validates requirements to ensure that the resulting product performs as intended in the end user'	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	35	20	55
		Expected Count	26.1	28.9	55.0
		% within Recode2_PR8 Validates requirements to ensure that the resulting	63.6%	36.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_ Porject_success_Quality	94.6%	48.8%	70.5%
		Std. Residual	1.7	-1.7	
	Rarely + Never	Count	2	21	23
		Expected Count	10.9	12.1	23.0
		% within Recode2_PR8 Validates requirements to ensure that the resulting	8.7%	91.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_ Porject_success_Quality	5.4%	51.2%	29.5%
		Std. Residual	-2.7	2.6	
	Total	Count	37	41	78
		Expected Count	37.0	41.0	78.0

	% within Recode2_PR8 Validates requirements to ensure that the resulting	47.4%	52.6%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_3_ Project_success_Quality	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1011

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.633 ^a	1	.00000938		
Continuity Correction ^b	17.491	1	.00002886		
Likelihood Ratio	22.233	1	.00000242		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00001070	.00000546
Linear-by-Linear Association	19.381	1	.00001070		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.91.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1012

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.502	.000
	Cramer's V	.502	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

9C - H4.3.9C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR9: Client Company obtains commitment to requirements from project participants and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR9: Client Company obtains commitment to requirements from project participants and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 14.582 from Table A-H-1013 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00013420.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR9: Client Company obtains commitment to requirements from project participants and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR9 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1014 shows that 4 companies that performed practice PR9 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (11.9). Whereas, 21 of the companies that performed practice PR9 "Rarely + Never" reported "Adequate + Poor + Bad" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (13.1).

Cramer's V= .432 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR9 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR9 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1015.

Table A-H-1013

Crosstab					
			Recode2Project_Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR9	Always +	Count	33	20	53
Obtains	Very	Expected Count	25.1	27.9	53.0

commitment to requirements from project participants	Frequently + Occasionally	% within Recode2_PR9 Obtains commitment to requirements from project participants	62.3%	37.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 Porject_Quality	89.2%	48.8%	67.9%
		Std. Residual	1.6	-1.5	
	Rarely + Never	Count	4	21	25
		Expected Count	11.9	13.1	25.0
		% within Recode2_PR9 Obtains commitment to requirements from project participants	16.0%	84.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 Porject Quality	10.8%	51.2%	32.1%
		Std. Residual	-2.3	2.2	
Total	Count		37	41	78
	Expected Count		37.0	41.0	78.0
	% within Recode2_PR9 Obtains commitment to requirements from project participants		47.4%	52.6%	100.0%
	% within Recode2Porject_Quality		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1014

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.582 ^a	1	.00013420		
Continuity Correction ^b	12.785	1	.00034932		
Likelihood Ratio	15.690	1	.00007461		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00019407	.00011603
Linear-by-Linear Association	14.395	1	.00014820		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.86.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1015

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.432	.000
	Cramer's V	.432	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

10C - H4.3.10C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR10: Client Company stakeholder needs, expectations, constraints and interfaces are collected and translated into customer requirements and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR10: Client Company stakeholder needs, expectations, constraints and interfaces are collected and translated into customer requirements and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 37.173 from Table A-H-1017 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR10: Client Company stakeholder needs, expectations, constraints and interfaces are collected and translated into customer requirements and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR10 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1016 shows that Zero company that performed practice PR10 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (13.3). While, 32 of the companies that performed practice PR10 "Rarely + Never" reported "Adequate + Poor + Bad" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (18.7).

Cramer's V= .673 indicates a strong association between performed PR10 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR10 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1018.

Table A-H-1016

Crosstab					
			Recode2_3_Porject_Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
RRRecode2_PR10 Collects and translates stakeholders needs expectations into customer requirements	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	34	16	50
		Expected Count	20.7	29.3	50.0
		% within RRRecode2_PR10 Collects_and_translates_stakeholders_needs_expectations into customer requirements	68.0%	32.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Porject success_Quality	100.0%	33.3%	61.0%
		Std. Residual	2.9	-2.5	
	Rarely + Never	Count	0	32	32
		Expected Count	13.3	18.7	32.0
		% within RRRecode2_PR10 Collects_and_translates_stakeholders_needs_expectations into customer requirements	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Porject success_Quality	0.0%	66.7%	39.0%
		Std. Residual	-3.6	3.1	
Total		Count	34	48	82
		Expected Count	34.0	48.0	82.0
		% within RRRecode2_PR10 Collects_and_translates_stakeholders_needs_expectations into customer requirements	41.5%	58.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Porject success_Quality	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1017

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	37.173 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	34.424	1	.00000000		
Likelihood Ratio	48.587	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	36.720	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.27.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1018

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.673	.000
	Cramer's V	.673	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

11C - H4.3.11C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR11: Client Company maintains bidirectional traceability among requirements and work products and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR11: Client Company maintains bidirectional traceability among requirements and work products and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 27.926 from Table A-H-1020 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000013$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR11: Client Company maintains bidirectional traceability among requirements and work products and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR11 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1019 shows that 4 companies that performed practice PR11 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (15.8). However, 30 of the companies that performed practice PR11 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (18.2).

Cramer's $V=.584$ indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR11 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR11 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1021.

Table A-H-1019

Crosstab					
			Recode2_3 Porject_Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR11 Maintains bidirectional traceability among requirements and work product	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	30	14	44
		Expected Count	18.2	25.8	44.0
		% within Recode2_PR11 Maintains_bidirectional_trac ebility_among_requirements	68.2%	31.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_ Porject success_Quality	88.2%	29.2%	53.7%
		Std. Residual	2.8	-2.3	
	Rarely + Never	Count	4	34	38
		Expected Count	15.8	22.2	38.0
		% within Recode2_PR11 Maintains_bidirectional_trac ebility_among_requirements	10.5%	89.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_ Porject success_Quality	11.8%	70.8%	46.3%
		Std. Residual	-3.0	2.5	
Total			Count	34	48
			Expected Count	34.0	48.0
			% within Recode2_PR11 Maintains_bidirectional_trac ebility_among_requirements	41.5%	58.5%
			% within Recode2_3_ Porject success_Quality	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1020

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	27.926 ^a	1	.00000013		
Continuity Correction ^b	25.601	1	.00000042		
Likelihood Ratio	30.657	1	.00000003		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000010	.00000007

Linear-by-Linear Association	27.586	1	.00000015		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.76.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1021

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.584	.000
	Cramer's V	.584	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

12C - H4.3.12C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR12: Client Company manages changes to requirements as they evolve during the project and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR12: Client Company manages changes to requirements as they evolve during the project and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 28.518 from Table A-H-1023 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000009.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR12: Client Company manages changes to requirements as they evolve during the project and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR12 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1022 shows that 2 companies that performed practice PR12 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (13.7). While, 31 of the companies that performed practice PR12 "Rarely + Never" reported "Adequate + Poor + Bad" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (19.3).

Cramer's V= .590 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR12 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR12 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1024.

Table A-H-1022

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Porject_Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR12 Manages changes to requirements as they evolve during project	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	32	17	49
		Expected Count	20.3	28.7	49.0
		% within Recode2_PR12 Manages_changes_to_requiremen ts_as_they_evolve_during project	65.3%	34.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Porject _success_facore_Quality	94.1%	35.4%	59.8%
		Std. Residual	2.6	-2.2	
	Rarely + Never	Count	2	31	33
		Expected Count	13.7	19.3	33.0
		% within Recode2_PR12 Manages_changes_to_requiremen ts_as_they_evolve_during project	6.1%	93.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Porject _success_facore_Quality	5.9%	64.6%	40.2%
		Std. Residual	-3.2	2.7	
Total		Count	34	48	82

	Expected Count	34.0	48.0	82.0
	% within Recode2_PR12 Manages_changes_to_requirements_as_they_evolve_during_project	41.5%	58.5%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_3_Porject _success_facore_Quality	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1023

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	28.518 ^a	1	.00000009		
Continuity Correction ^b	26.129	1	.00000032		
Likelihood Ratio	32.922	1	.00000001		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000004	.00000003
Linear-by-Linear Association	28.170	1	.00000011		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.68.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1024

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.590	.000
	Cramer's V	.590	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

13C - H4.3.13C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR13: Client Company ensures that project plans and work products remain aligned with requirements and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR13: Client Company ensures that project plans and work products remain aligned with requirements and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 26.100 from Table A-H-1026 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000032.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR13: Client Company ensures that project plans and work products remain aligned with requirements and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR13 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1025 shows that 4 companies that performed practice PR13 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (15.3). Whereas, 30 of the companies that performed practice PR13 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (18.7).

Cramer's V= .564 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR13 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR13 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1027.

Table A-H-1025

Crosstab					
			Recode2_3_Porject_Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
		Count	30	15	45

Recode2_PR13 Ensures that project Plan and work remain aligned with requirements	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Expected Count	18.7	26.3	45.0
		% within Recode2_PR13 Ensures that_project_Plan_and_work_remain_aligned with requirements	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Porject_success_Quality	88.2%	31.3%	54.9%
		Std. Residual	2.6	-2.2	
		Count	4	33	37
	Rarely + Never	Expected Count	15.3	21.7	37.0
		% within Recode2_PR13 Ensures that_project_Plan_and_work_remain_aligned with requirements	10.8%	89.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Porject_success_Quality	11.8%	68.8%	45.1%
		Std. Residual	-2.9	2.4	
		Count	34	48	82
Total	Expected Count		34.0	48.0	82.0
	% within Recode2_PR13 Ensures that_project_Plan_and_work_remain_aligned with requirements		41.5%	58.5%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_3_Porject_success_Quality		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1026

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	26.100 ^a	1	.00000032		
Continuity Correction ^b	23.850	1	.00000104		
Likelihood Ratio	28.640	1	.00000009		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000032	.00000019
Linear-by-Linear Association	25.782	1	.00000038		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.34.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1027

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.564	.000
	Cramer's V	.564	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

14C - H4.3.14C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR14: Client Company's Customer Interface Manager leads the team in estimating and documenting the impact of every change in requirement and works with the Configuration Control Board (CCB) to get approval for changes to those requirements and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR14: Client Company's Customer Interface Manager leads the team in estimating and documenting the impact of every change in requirement and works with the Configuration Control Board (CCB) to get approval for changes to those requirements and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 35.442 from Table A-H-1029 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p=.00000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR14: Client Company's Customer Interface Manager leads the team in estimating and documenting the impact of every change in requirement and works with the Configuration Control Board (CCB) to get approval for changes to those requirements and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR14 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected*

Quality. Table A-H-1028 shows that 5 companies that performed practice PR14 “Rarely + Never” reported “Very Good + Good” for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (18.2). While, 29 of the companies that performed practice PR14 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Very Good + Good” for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (15.8).

Cramer’s V= .657 indicates a strong association between performed PR14 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR14 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1030.

Table A-H-1028

Crosstab					
			Recode2_3_Porject_Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR14 Customer interface manager leads the team in estimating and documenting the impact of every change in requ	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	29	9	38
		Expected Count	15.8	22.2	38.0
		% within Recode2_PR14 Customer interface_manager_leades_the_team_in_estimating and documenting the	76.3%	23.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Porject_Quality	85.3%	18.8%	46.3%
		Std. Residual	3.3	-2.8	
	Rarely + Never	Count	5	39	44
		Expected Count	18.2	25.8	44.0
		% within Recode2_PR14 Customer interface_manager_leades_the_team_in_estimating nd documenting the	11.4%	88.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Porject Quality	14.7%	81.3%	53.7%
		Std. Residual	-3.1	2.6	
Total			Count	34	48
			Expected Count	34.0	48.0
			% within Recode2_PR14 Customer interface_manager_leades_the_team_in_estimating nd documenting the	41.5%	58.5%
			% within Recode2_3_Porject Quality	100.0%	100.0%
					100.0%

Table A-H-1029

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	35.442 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	32.816	1	.00000001		
Likelihood Ratio	38.514	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	35.010	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.76.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1030

Symmetric Measures			Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi		.657	.000

N of Valid Cases	Cramer's V	.657 82	.000
------------------	------------	------------	------

15C - H4.3.15C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR15: Client Company establishes and manages the coordination and collaboration between the project and relevant stakeholders and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR15: Client Company establishes and manages the coordination and collaboration between the project and relevant stakeholders and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 38.226 from Table A-H-1032 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR15: Client Company establishes and manages the coordination and collaboration between the project and relevant stakeholders and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR15 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1031 shows that 1 company that performed practice PR15 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (14). Whereas, 27 of the companies that performed practice PR15 "Rarely + Never" reported "Adequate + Poor + Bad" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (14).

Cramer's V= .709 indicates a strong association between performed PR15 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR15 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1033.

Table A-H-1031

Crosstab					
			Recode2_3 Porject_ Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR15 Establishes and manages the coordination between project and stakeholders	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	37	11	48
		Expected Count	24.0	24.0	48.0
		% within Recode2_PR15 Establishes_and_manages_the_coordination_between_prject_and_stakeholders	77.1%	22.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Porject_success_Quality	97.4%	28.9%	63.2%
		Std. Residual	2.7	-2.7	
	Rarely + Never	Count	1	27	28
		Expected Count	14.0	14.0	28.0
		% within Recode2_PR15 Establishes_and_manages_the_coordination_between_prject_and_stakeholders	3.6%	96.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Porject_success_Quality	2.6%	71.1%	36.8%
		Std. Residual	-3.5	3.5	
Total			Count	38	38
			Expected Count	38.0	38.0
			% within Recode2_PR15 Establishes_and_manages_the_coordination_between_prject_and_stakeholders	50.0%	50.0%
			% within Recode2_3_Porject_success_Quality	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1032

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	38.226 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	35.342	1	.00000000		
Likelihood Ratio	45.056	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	37.723	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.00.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1033

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.709	.000
	Cramer's V	.709	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

16C - H4.3.16C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR16: Client Company's team members track actual results and performance against plans on a weekly basis. Team members track progress against individual plans on a daily basis and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR16: Client Company's team members track actual results and performance against plans on a weekly basis. Team members track progress against individual plans on a daily basis and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 42.318 from Table A-H-1035 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000000$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR16: Client Company's team members track actual results and performance against plans on a weekly basis. Team members track progress against individual plans on a daily basis and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR16 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1034 shows that 2 companies that performed practice PR16 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (16). Whereas, 30 of the companies that performed practice PR16 "Rarely + Never" reported "Adequate + Poor + Bad" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (16).

Cramer's $V=.746$ indicates a strong association between performed PR16 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR16 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1036.

Table A-H-1034

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Porject Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR16		Count	36	8	44
Project team		Expected Count	22.0	22.0	44.0

members track results and performance	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	% within Recode2_PR16 Project team_members_track_results_and_performance	81.8%	18.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 orject Quality	94.7%	21.1%	57.9%
		Std. Residual	3.0	-3.0	
	Rarely + Never	Count	2	30	32
		Expected Count	16.0	16.0	32.0
		% within Recode2 PR16 Project _teammembers_track_results_and_performance	6.3%	93.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject Quality	5.3%	78.9%	42.1%
		Std. Residual	-3.5	3.5	
Total		Count	38	38	76
		Expected Count	38.0	38.0	76.0
		% within Recode2_PR16 Project _team_members_track_results_and_performance	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject Quality	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1035

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	42.318 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	39.349	1	.00000000		
Likelihood Ratio	48.671	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	41.761	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.00.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1036

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.746	.000
	Cramer's V	.746	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

17C - H4.3.17C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR17: Client Company develops a documented plan to be used to communicate inter-group commitments and to coordinate and track the work performed and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR17: Client Company develops a documented plan to be used to communicate inter-group commitments and to coordinate and track the work performed and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 43.177 from Table A-H-1038 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p=.00000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR17: Client Company develops a documented plan to be used to communicate inter-group commitments and to coordinate and track the work performed and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR17 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1037 shows that 1 company that performed practice PR17 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (15). Whereas, 29 of the companies that performed practice PR17 "Rarely + Never" reported "Adequate + Poor + Bad" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (15).

Cramer's V= .754 indicates a strong association between performed PR17 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR17 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1039.

Table A-H-1037

Crosstab					
			Recode2_3_Porject_Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR17 Develops a documented plan to be used to Communicat	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	37	9	46
		Expected Count	23.0	23.0	46.0
		% within Recode2_PR17 Develops_a_documented_plan_to be_used_to_Communicat	80.4%	19.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject Quality	97.4%	23.7%	60.5%
		Std. Residual	2.9	-2.9	
	Rarely + Never	Count	1	29	30
		Expected Count	15.0	15.0	30.0
		% within Recode2_PR17 Develops_a_documented_plan_to be_used_to_Communicat	3.3%	96.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject Quality	2.6%	76.3%	39.5%
		Std. Residual	-3.6	3.6	
Total	Count		38	38	76
	Expected Count		38.0	38.0	76.0
	% within Recode2_PR17 Develops_a_documented_plan_to be_used_to_Communicat		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Porject Quality		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1038

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	43.177 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	40.148	1	.00000000		
Likelihood Ratio	51.113	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	42.609	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.00.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1039

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.754	.000
	Cramer's V	.754	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

18C - H4.3.18C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR18: Client Company team managers are responsible for the coordination across all project teams and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR18: Client Company team managers are responsible for the coordination across all project teams and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 40.649 from Table A-H-1041 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR18: Client Company team managers are responsible for the coordination across all project teams and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR18 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1040 shows that 1 company that performed practice PR18 “Rarely + Never” reported “Very Good + Good” for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (14.5). Whereas, 28 of the companies that performed practice PR18 “Rarely + Never” reported “Adequate + Poor + Bad” for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (14.5).

Cramer’s V = .731 indicates a strong association between performed PR18 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR18 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1042.

Table A-H-1040

Crosstab					
			Recode2_3_Porject_ Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR18 Managers are responsible for the coordination across	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	37	10	47
		Expected Count	23.5	23.5	47.0
		% within Recode2_PR18 Managers_are_responsible_for_the_coordination_acro	78.7%	21.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject Quality	97.4%	26.3%	61.8%
		Std. Residual	2.8	-2.8	
	Rarely + Never	Count	1	28	29
		Expected Count	14.5	14.5	29.0
		% within Recode2_PR18 Managersare_responsible_for_th e_coordination_acro	3.4%	96.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 Project Quality	2.6%	73.7%	38.2%
		Std. Residual	-3.5	3.5	
Total			Count	38	76
			Expected Count	38.0	76.0
			% within Recode2_Pr18 Managers_are_responsible_for_t he_coordination_acro	50.0%	100.0%
			% within Recode2project Quality	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1041

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	40.649 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	37.693	1	.00000000		
Likelihood Ratio	48.004	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	40.114	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.50.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1042

Symmetric Measures			Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi		.731	.000
	Cramer's V		.731	.000
N of Valid Cases			76	

19C - H4.3.19C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR19: Client company communication and coordination practices are institutionalized to ensure they are performed as managed processes and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR19: Client company communication and coordination practices are institutionalized to ensure they are performed as managed processes and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 35.978 from Table A-H-1044 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR19: Client company communication and coordination practices are institutionalized to ensure they are performed as managed processes and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR19 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1043 shows that 4 companies that performed practice PR19 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (17). Whereas, 30 of the companies that performed practice PR19 "Rarely + Never" reported "Adequate + Poor + Bad" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (17).

Cramer's V= .688 indicates a strong association between performed PR19 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR19 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1045.

Table A-H-1043

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Porject Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR19 Communication and coordination practices are institutionalized to ensure they are performed as managed processes	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	34	8	42
		Expected Count	21.0	21.0	42.0
		% within Recode2_PR19 Communication_and_coordination_practices_are_institutionalized	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Porject_Quality	89.5%	21.1%	55.3%
		Std. Residual	2.8	-2.8	
	Rarely + Never	Count	4	30	34
		Expected Count	17.0	17.0	34.0
		% within Recode2_PR19 Communication_and_coordination_practices_are_institutionalized	11.8%	88.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Porject_Quality	10.5%	78.9%	44.7%
		Std. Residual	-3.2	3.2	
Total	Count		38	38	76
	Expected Count		38.0	38.0	76.0
	% within Recode2_PR19 Communication_and_coordination_practices_are_institutionalized		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_3_Porject_Quality		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1044

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	35.978 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	33.263	1	.00000001		

Likelihood Ratio	39.827	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	35.504	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.00.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1045

Symmetric Measures		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.688	.000
	Cramer's V	.688	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

20C - H4.3.20C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR20: Representatives of the client company project's software engineering group work with representatives of the supplier engineering groups to monitor and coordinate technical activities and resolve technical issues and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR20: Representatives of the client company project's software engineering group work with representatives of the supplier engineering groups to monitor and coordinate technical activities and resolve technical issues and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 17.460 from Table A-H-1047 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00002933.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR20: Representatives of the client company project's software engineering group work with representatives of the supplier engineering groups to monitor and coordinate technical activities and resolve technical issues and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR20 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1046 shows that 2 companies that performed practice PR20 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (10.7). However, 25 of the companies that performed practice PR20 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (16.3).

Cramer's V= .464 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR20 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR20 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1048.

Table A-H-1046

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Porject Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
REcode2_PR20 Representatives of client company work with Representatives	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	25	24	49
		Expected Count	16.3	32.7	49.0
		% within REcode2_PR20	51.0%	49.0%	100.0%
		Representatives_of_client_			
		company_work_with Rep			
		% within Recode2_3_	92.6%	44.4%	60.5%
		Porject_Quality			
		Std. Residual	2.1	-1.5	
	Rarely + Never	Count	2	30	32
		Expected Count	10.7	21.3	32.0

		% within REcode2_PR20 Representatives_of_client_ company_work_with Rep	6.3%	93.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_ Project_success_Quality	7.4%	55.6%	39.5%
		Std. Residual	-2.7	1.9	
Total		Count	27	54	81
		Expected Count	27.0	54.0	81.0
		% within REcode2_PR20 Representatives_of_client_ company_work_with Rep	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_ Project_success_Quality	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1047

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.460 ^a	1	.00002933		
Continuity Correction ^b	15.504	1	.00008233		
Likelihood Ratio	20.245	1	.00000681		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00002367	.00001442
Linear-by-Linear Association	17.245	1	.00003286		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.67.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1048

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.464	.000
	Cramer's V	.464	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

21C - H4.3.21C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR21: Client Company selects team roles, including the role of Supplier Interface Manager, who is the liaison between the team and the supplier company representative, and is responsible for requirements change management and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR21: Client Company selects team roles, including the role of Supplier Interface Manager, who is the liaison between the team and the supplier company representative, and is responsible for requirements change management the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 13.307 from Table A-H-1050 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00026440.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR21: Client Company selects team roles, including the role of Supplier Interface Manager, who is the liaison between the team and the supplier company representative, and is responsible for requirements change management and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR21 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1049 shows that 4 companies that performed practice PR21 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (11.7). While, 23 of the companies that performed practice PR21 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (15.3).

Cramer's V= .405 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR21 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR21 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1051.

Table A-H-1049

Crosstab					
			Recode2_3_Porject_Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR21 Selects team roles including the role of supplier	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	23	23	46
		Expected Count	15.3	30.7	46.0
		% within Recode2_PR21 Selects_team_roles_including_the_role_of_supplier	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Porject_Quality	85.2%	42.6%	56.8%
		Std. Residual	2.0	-1.4	
	Rarely + Never	Count	4	31	35
		Expected Count	11.7	23.3	35.0
		% within Recode2_PR21 Selects_team_roles_including_the_role_of_supplier	11.4%	88.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Porject_Quality	14.8%	57.4%	43.2%
		Std. Residual	-2.2	1.6	
Total		Count	27	54	81
		Expected Count	27.0	54.0	81.0
		% within Recode2_PR21 Selects_team_roles_including_the_role_of_supplier	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Porject_Quality	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1050

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.307 ^a	1	.00026440	.00029694	.00021120
Continuity Correction ^b	11.628	1	.00064965		
Likelihood Ratio	14.469	1	.00014249		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	13.143	1	.00028862		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.67.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1051

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.405	.000
	Cramer's V	.405	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

22C - H4.3.22C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR22: Client Company communicates quality issues and ensures the resolution of noncompliance issues with the staff and managers and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR22: Client Company communicates quality issues and ensures the resolution of noncompliance issues with the staff and managers and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 21.649 from Table A-H-1053 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000101.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR22: Client Company communicates quality issues and ensures the resolution of noncompliance issues with the staff and managers and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR22 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1052 shows that 2 companies that performed practice PR22 “Rarely + Never” reported “Very Good + Good” for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (12.3). Whereas, 25 of the companies that performed practice PR22 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Very Good + Good” for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (14.7).

Cramer’s V= .543 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR22 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR22 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1054.

Table A-H-1052

Crosstab					
			Recode2_3_Porject_ Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
REcode2_PR22 Communicates quality issues and isures resolution	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	25	19	44
		Expected Count	14.7	29.3	44.0
		% within REcode2_PR22 Communicates_quality_issues_and_isures_resolution	56.8%	43.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Porject_success_factore_Quality	92.6%	35.2%	54.3%
		Std. Residual	2.7	-1.9	
	Rarely + Never	Count	2	35	37
		Expected Count	12.3	24.7	37.0
		% within REcode2_PR22 Communicates_quality_issues_and_isures_resolution	5.4%	94.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Porject_success_factore_Quality	7.4%	64.8%	45.7%
		Std. Residual	-2.9	2.1	
Total			Count	27	54
			Expected Count	27.0	54.0
			% within REcode2_PR22 Communicates_qualityissues_and_isures_resolution	33.3%	66.7%
			% within Recode2_3_Porject_success_factore_Quality	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1053

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.907 ^a	1	.00000101		
Continuity Correction ^b	21.649	1	.00000327		
Likelihood Ratio	27.378	1	.00000017		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000080	.00000042
Linear-by-Linear Association	23.612	1	.00000118		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.33.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1054

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.543	.000
	Cramer's V	.543	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

23C - H4.3.23C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR23: Client Company establishes and maintains a documented policy for conducting its Communication and Coordination activities and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR23: Client Company establishes and maintains a documented policy for conducting its Communication and Coordination activities and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 15.548 from Table A-H-1056 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00008043.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR23: Client Company establishes and maintains a documented policy for conducting its Communication and Coordination activities and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR23 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1055 shows that 4 companies that performed practice PR23 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (12.3). Whereas, 23 of the companies that performed practice PR23 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (14.7).

Cramer's V= .438 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR23 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR23 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1057.

Table A-H-1055

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Porject_Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR23 Establish and maintain documented policy for conducting	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	23	21	44
		Expected Count	14.7	29.3	44.0
		% within Recode2_PR23 Establish_and_maintain_d ocumented_policy_for_	52.3%	47.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_ Porject_Quality	85.2%	38.9%	54.3%
		Std. Residual	2.2	-1.5	
	Rarely + Never	Count	4	33	37

		Expected Count	12.3	24.7	37.0
		% within Recode2_PR23 Establish_and_maintain_d ocumented_policy_for_	10.8%	89.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_ Porject_ Quality	14.8%	61.1%	45.7%
		Std. Residual	-2.4	1.7	
Total		Count	27	54	81
		Expected Count	27.0	54.0	81.0
		% within Recode2_PR23 Establish_and_maintain_d ocumented_policy_for_	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_ Porject_ Quality	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1056

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.548 ^a	1	.00008043		
Continuity Correction ^b	13.738	1	.00021011		
Likelihood Ratio	16.861	1	.00004022		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00010819	.00006399
Linear-by-Linear Association	15.356	1	.00008903		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.33.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1057

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.438	.000
	Cramer's V	.438	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

24C - H4.3.24C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR24: Client Company ensures that the workforce has the skills to share information and coordinate their activities efficiently and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR24: Client Company ensures that the workforce has the skills to share information and coordinate their activities efficiently and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 13.307 from Table A-H-1059 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00026440.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR24: Client Company ensures that the workforce has the skills to share information and coordinate their activities efficiently and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR24 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1058 shows that 4 companies that performed practice PR24 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (11.7). While, 23 of the companies that performed practice PR24 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (15.3).

Cramer's V= .405 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR24 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR24 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1060.

Table A-H-1058

Crosstab					
			Recode2_3_Porject_Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR24 Ensures that the workforce has the skills to share	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	23	23	46
		Expected Count	15.3	30.7	46.0
		% within Recode2_PR24 Ensures that the workforce has the skills to share	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Porject_Quality	85.2%	42.6%	56.8%
		Std. Residual	2.0	-1.4	
	Rarely + Never	Count	4	31	35
		Expected Count	11.7	23.3	35.0
		% within Recode2_PR24 Ensures that the workforce has the skills to share	11.4%	88.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Porject_Quality	14.8%	57.4%	43.2%
		Std. Residual	-2.2	1.6	
Total		Count	27	54	81
		Expected Count	27.0	54.0	81.0
		% within Recode2_PR24 Ensures that the workforce has the skills to share	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Porject_Quality	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1059

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.307 ^a	1	.00026440		
Continuity Correction ^b	11.628	1	.00064965		
Likelihood Ratio	14.469	1	.00014249		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00029694	.00021120
Linear-by-Linear Association	13.143	1	.00028862		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.67.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1060

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.405	.000
	Cramer's V	.405	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

25C - H4.3.25C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR25: Client Company establishes a culture for openly sharing information and concerns across organizational levels as well as among team members and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR25: Client Company establishes a culture for openly sharing information and concerns across organizational levels as well as among team members and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 19.504 from Table A-H-1062 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00001004.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR25: Client Company establishes a culture for openly sharing information and concerns across organizational levels as well as among team members and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR25 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1061 shows that 3 companies that performed practice PR25 “Rarely + Never” reported “Very Good + Good” for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (12.3). Whereas, 24 of the companies that performed practice PR25 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Very Good + Good” for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (14.7).

Cramer’s V= .491 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR25 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR25 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1063.

Table A-H-1061

Crosstab					
			Recode2_3_Porject_Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR25 establish a culture for openly sharing information	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	24	20	44
		Expected Count	14.7	29.3	44.0
		% within Recode2_PR25 establish_a_culture_for_open ly_sharing_information	54.5%	45.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Porject _Quality	88.9%	37.0%	54.3%
		Std. Residual	2.4	-1.7	
	Rarely + Never	Count	3	34	37
		Expected Count	12.3	24.7	37.0
		% within Recode2_PR25 establish_a_culture_for_open ly_sharing_information	8.1%	91.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Porject _Quality	11.1%	63.0%	45.7%
		Std. Residual	-2.7	1.9	
Total		Count	27	54	81
		Expected Count	27.0	54.0	81.0
		% within Recode2_PR25 establish_a_culture_for_open ly_sharing_information	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Porject _Quality	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1062

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.504 ^a	1	.00001004		
Continuity Correction ^b	17.470	1	.00002919		
Likelihood Ratio	21.659	1	.00000326		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00001115	.00000636
Linear-by-Linear Association	19.263	1	.00001139		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.33.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1063

Symmetric Measures		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.491	.000
	Cramer's V	.491	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

26C - H4.3.26C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR26: Client Company establishes project teams as well as their responsibilities, authorities and interrelationships and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR26: Client Company establishes project teams as well as their responsibilities, authorities and interrelationships and managers and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 19.504 from Table A-H-1065 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p = .00001004$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR26: Client Company establishes project teams as well as their responsibilities, authorities and interrelationships and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR26 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1064 shows that 3 companies that performed practice PR26 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (12.3). Whereas, 24 of the companies that performed practice PR26 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (14.7).

Cramer's $V = .491$ indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR26 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR26 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1066.

Table A-H-1064

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Porject_Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR26 Establish_ project_teams_ as well_as_ their responsibilities	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	24	20	44
		Expected Count	14.7	29.3	44.0
		% within Recode2_PR26 Establish_project_teams_as well_as_their_respons	54.5%	45.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_ Porject_Quality	88.9%	37.0%	54.3%
		Std. Residual	2.4	-1.7	
		Rarely + Never	Count	3	34
	Expected Count		12.3	24.7	37.0
	% within Recode2_PR26 Establish_project_teams_as well_as_their_respons		8.1%	91.9%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_3_ Porject_Quality		11.1%	63.0%	45.7%
	Std. Residual		-2.7	1.9	
	Total		Count	27	54
		Expected Count	27.0	54.0	81.0

	% within Recode2_PR26 Establish_project_teams_as well_as_their_respons	33.3%	66.7%	100.0 %
	% within Recode2_3_ Porject_Quality	100.0%	100.0%	100.0 %

Table A-H-1065

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1- sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.504 ^a	1	.00001004		
Continuity Correction ^b	17.470	1	.00002919		
Likelihood Ratio	21.659	1	.00000326		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00001115	.00000636
Linear-by-Linear Association	19.263	1	.00001139		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.33.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1066

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.491	.000
	Cramer's V	.491	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

27C - H4.3.27C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR27: Client Company establishes and maintains open and effective project teams' communication and coordination plan and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR27: Client Company establishes and maintains open and effective project teams' communication and coordination plan and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 16.755 from Table A-H-1068 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00004253.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR27: Client Company establishes and maintains open and effective project teams' communication and coordination plan and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR27 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1067 shows that 4 companies that performed practice PR27 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (12.7). While, 23 of the companies that performed practice PR27 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (14.3).

Cramer's V= .455 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR27 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR27 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1069.

Table A-H-1067

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Porject_Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR27	Always +	Count	23	20	43
establish and	Very	Expected Count	14.3	28.7	43.0

maintain open and effective commun	Frequently + Occasionally	% within Recode2_PR27 establish and_maintain_open_and_effective_c ommun	53.5%	46.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject Quality	85.2%	37.0%	53.1%
		Std. Residual	2.3	-1.6	
	Rarely + Never	Count	4	34	38
		Expected Count	12.7	25.3	38.0
		% within Recode2_PR27 establish _and_maintain_open_and_effective_ commun	10.5%	89.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject Quality	14.8%	63.0%	46.9%
		Std. Residual	-2.4	1.7	
Total	Count		27	54	81
	Expected Count		27.0	54.0	81.0
	% within Recode2_PR27 establish _and_maintain_open_and_effective_ commun		33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Porject_Quality		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1068

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.755 ^a	1	.00004253		
Continuity Correction ^b	14.878	1	.00011471		
Likelihood Ratio	18.140	1	.00002052		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00004403	.00003386
Linear-by-Linear Association	16.548	1	.00004743		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.67.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1069

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.455	.000
	Cramer's V	.455	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

28C - H4.3.28C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR28: Client Company team managers are responsible to track and resolve inter-group issues and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between performing practice PR28: Client Company team managers are responsible to track and resolve inter-group issues and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 11.025 from Table A-H-1071 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p=.00089891.

Table A-H-1070

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Porject_Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR28 Team managers are responsible to track intergroup	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	22	23	45
		Expected Count	15.0	30.0	45.0
		% within Recode2_PR28	48.9%	51.1%	100.0%
		Team_managers_are_responsible_to_track_intergroup			

		% within Recode2 Porject_Quality	81.5%	42.6%	55.6%
		Std. Residual	1.8	-1.3	
	Rarely + Never	Count	5	31	36
		Expected Count	12.0	24.0	36.0
		% within Recode2_PR28 Team_managers_are_responsible to_track_intergrou	13.9%	86.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject_Quality	18.5%	57.4%	44.4%
Total		Std. Residual	-2.0	1.4	
		Count	27	54	81
		Expected Count	27.0	54.0	81.0
		% within Recode2_PR28 Team_managers_are_responsible to_track_intergrou	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 Porject_Quality	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1071

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.025 ^a	1	.00089891		
Continuity Correction ^b	9.506	1	.00204773		
Likelihood Ratio	11.742	1	.00061089		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00095629	.00079066
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.889	1	.00096743		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.00.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1072

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.369	.001
	Cramer's V	.369	.001
N of Valid Cases		81	

29C - H4.3.29C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR29: Client Company maintains effective work-groups, interpersonal problems are addressed quickly and meetings are managed to ensure that work-group time is used most effectively and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR29: Client Company maintains effective work-groups, interpersonal problems are addressed quickly and meetings are managed to ensure that work-group time is used most effectively and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 16.694 from Table A-H-1074 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00004392.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR29: Client Company maintains effective work-groups, interpersonal problems are addressed quickly and meetings are managed to ensure that work-group time is used most effectively and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR29 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1073 shows that 5 companies that performed practice PR29 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (13.7). Whereas, 22 of the companies that performed practice PR29 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (13.3).

Cramer's V= .454 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR29 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR29 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1075.

Table A-H-1073

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Porject_Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR29 Maintains effective workgroup	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	22	18	40
		Expected Count	13.3	26.7	40.0
		% within Recode2_PR29 Maintains_effective_workgroup	55.0%	45.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject_Quality	81.5%	33.3%	49.4%
		Std. Residual	2.4	-1.7	
	Rarely + Never	Count	5	36	41
		Expected Count	13.7	27.3	41.0
		% within Recode2_PR29 Maintains_effective_workgroup	12.2%	87.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject_Quality	18.5%	66.7%	50.6%
		Std. Residual	-2.3	1.7	
Total	Count		27	54	81
	Expected Count		27.0	54.0	81.0
	% within Recode2_PR29 Maintains_effective_workgroup		33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Porject_Quality		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1074

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.694 ^a	1	.00004392		
Continuity Correction ^b	14.823	1	.00011807		
Likelihood Ratio	17.659	1	.00002643		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00004974	.00004104
Linear-by-Linear Association	16.488	1	.00004896		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.33.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1075

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.454	.000
	Cramer's V	.454	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

30C - H4.3.30C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR30: Client Company establishes and maintains a mutual understanding of the contract with selected suppliers and end users based on acquisition needs and the suppliers' proposed approaches and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR30: Client Company establishes and maintains a mutual understanding of the contract with selected suppliers and end users based on acquisition needs and the suppliers' proposed approaches and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 31.853 from Table A-H-1077 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p=.00000002

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR30: Client Company establishes and maintains a mutual understanding of the contract with selected suppliers and end users based on acquisition needs and the suppliers' proposed approaches and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR30 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1076 shows that 4 companies that performed practice PR30 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (16.6). While, 30 of the companies that performed practice PR30 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (17.4).

Cramer's V= .623 indicates a strong association between performed PR30 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR30 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1078.

Table A-H-1076

Crosstab					
			Recode2_3_Porject_ Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR30 Establishes and maintains mutual understanding of the contract	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	30	12	42
		Expected Count	17.4	24.6	42.0
		% within Recode2_PR30	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%
		Establishes_and_maintains_mutual_understanding_of_the_contract			
		% within Recode2_Porject_Quality	88.2%	25.0%	51.2%
		Std. Residual	3.0	-2.5	
	Rarely + Never	Count	4	36	40
		Expected Count	16.6	23.4	40.0
		% within Recode2_PR30	10.0%	90.0%	100.0%
		Establishes_and_maintains_mutual_understanding_of_the_contract			
		% within Recode2_Porject_Quality	11.8%	75.0%	48.8%
		Std. Residual	-3.1	2.6	
Total	Count		34	48	82
	Expected Count		34.0	48.0	82.0
	% within Recode2_PR30		41.5%	58.5%	100.0%
	Establishes_and_maintains_mutual_understanding_of_the_contract				
	% within Recode2_Porject Quality		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1077

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	31.853 ^a	1	.00000002		
Continuity Correction ^b	29.372	1	.00000006		
Likelihood Ratio	35.013	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000001	.00000001
Linear-by-Linear Association	31.464	1	.00000002		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.59.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1078

Symmetric Measures		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.623	.000
	Cramer's V	.623	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

31C - H4.3.31C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR31: Client Company requirements are refined and elaborated into contractual requirements and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR31: Client Company requirements are refined and elaborated into contractual requirements and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 28.941 from Table A-H-1080 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000007.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR31: Client Company requirements are refined and elaborated into contractual requirements and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR31 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1079 shows that 5 companies that performed practice PR31 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (17). Whereas, 29 of the companies that performed practice PR31 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (17).

Cramer's V= .594 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR31 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR31 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1081.

Table A-H-1079

2018-11-11 16:19

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Porject_Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR31 Requirements are refined and elaborated into contractual	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	29	12	41
		Expected Count	17.0	24.0	41.0
		% within Recode2_PR31 Requirements are refined and elaborated into contractual	70.7%	29.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject Quality	85.3%	25.0%	50.0%
		Std. Residual	2.9	-2.4	
	Rarely + Never	Count	5	36	41
		Expected Count	17.0	24.0	41.0
		% within Recode2_PR31 Requirements_are_refinded_and_elaborated_into_con	12.2%	87.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_PorjectQuality	14.7%	75.0%	50.0%
		Std. Residual	-2.9	2.4	
Total	Count	34	48	82	
	Expected Count	34.0	48.0	82.0	
	% within Recode2_PR31 Requirements_are_refinded_and_elaborated_into_con	41.5%	58.5%	100.0%	
	% within Recode2_Porject Quality	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table A-H-1080

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	28.941 ^a	1	.00000007		
Continuity Correction ^b	26.580	1	.00000025		
Likelihood Ratio	31.297	1	.00000002		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000010	.00000005
Linear-by-Linear Association	28.588	1	.00000009		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.00.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1081

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.594	.000
	Cramer's V	.594	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

32C - H4.3.32C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR32: Client Company establishes and maintains a formal contract management plan and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR32: Client Company establishes and maintains a formal contract management plan and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 25.139 from Table A-H-1083 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p=.00000053.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR32: Client Company establishes and maintains a formal contract management plan and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR32 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1082 shows that 5 companies that performed practice PR32 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (16.2). Whereas, 29 of the companies that performed practice PR32 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (17.8).

Cramer's V= .554 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR32 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR32 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1084.

Table A-H-1082

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Porject_Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR32 Establishes and maintains a formal contract management plan	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	29	14	43
		Expected Count	17.8	25.2	43.0
		% within Recode2_PR32 Establishes_and_maintains_a_for mal_contract_management plan	67.4%	32.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject Quality	85.3%	29.2%	52.4%
		Std. Residual	2.6	-2.2	
	Rarely + Never	Count	5	34	39
		Expected Count	16.2	22.8	39.0

		% within Recode2_PR32 Establishes_and_maintains_a_for mal_contract_management plan	12.8%	87.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_PorjectQuality	14.7%	70.8%	47.6%
		Std. Residual	-2.8	2.3	
Total		Count	34	48	82
		Expected Count	34.0	48.0	82.0
		% within Recode2_PR32 Establishes_and_maintains_a_for mal_contract_management plan	41.5%	58.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_PorjectQuality	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1083

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	25.139 ^a	1	.00000053		
Continuity Correction ^b	22.939	1	.00000167		
Likelihood Ratio	27.137	1	.00000019		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000046	.00000037
Linear-by-Linear Association	24.833	1	.00000063		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.17.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1084

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.554	.000
	Cramer's V	.554	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

33C - H4.3.33C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR33: Client Company establishes and maintains contractual requirements and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR33: Client Company establishes and maintains contractual requirements and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 20.840 from Table A-H-1086 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000499.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR33: Client Company establishes and maintains contractual requirements and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR33 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1085 shows that 6 companies that performed practice PR33 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (16.2). While, 28 of the companies that performed practice PR33 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (17.8).

Cramer's V= .504 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR33 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR33 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1087.

Table A-H-1085

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Porject_ Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR33 Establishes and maintains contractual requirements	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	28	15	43
		Expected Count	17.8	25.2	43.0
		% within Recode2_PR33 Establishes_and_maintains_contr actual_requirements	65.1%	34.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject Quality	82.4%	31.3%	52.4%
		Std. Residual	2.4	-2.0	
	Rarely + Never	Count	6	33	39
		Expected Count	16.2	22.8	39.0
		% within Recode2_PR33 Establishes_and_maintains_contr actual_requirements	15.4%	84.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject Quality	17.6%	68.8%	47.6%
		Std. Residual	-2.5	2.1	
Total		Count	34	48	82
		Expected Count	34.0	48.0	82.0
		% within Recode2_PR33 Establishes_and_maintains_contr actual_requirements	41.5%	58.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject Quality	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1086

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.840 ^a	1	.00000499		
Continuity Correction ^b	18.841	1	.00001421		
Likelihood Ratio	22.169	1	.00000250		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000524	.00000418
Linear-by-Linear Association	20.586	1	.00000570		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.17.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1087

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.504	.000
	Cramer's V	.504	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

34C - H4.3.34C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR34: Client Company establishes and maintains negotiation plans to use in completing a supplier agreement and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR34: Client Company establishes and maintains negotiation plans to use in completing a supplier agreement and the offshored projects success of Expected Quality. The value of chi-square test is 14.582 from Table A-H-1089 and

differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00013420$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR34: Client Company establishes and maintains negotiation plans to use in completing a supplier agreement and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR34 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1088 shows that 4 companies that performed practice PR34 “Rarely + Never” reported “Very Good + Good” for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (11.9). Whereas, 21 of the companies that performed practice PR34 “Rarely + Never” reported “Adequate + Poor + Bad” for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (13.1).

Cramer’s $V=.432$ indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR34 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR34 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1090.

Table A-H-1088

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Porject_Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR34 Establishes and maintains negotiation plans to use in completing a supplier agreement	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	33	20	53
		Expected Count	25.1	27.9	53.0
		% within Recode2_PR34 Establishes and maintains negotiation plans to use in	62.3%	37.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject_Quality	89.2%	48.8%	67.9%
		Std. Residual	1.6	-1.5	
	Rarely + Never	Count	4	21	25
		Expected Count	11.9	13.1	25.0
		% within Recode2_PR34 Establishes and maintains negotiation plans to use in	16.0%	84.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Porject Quality	10.8%	51.2%	32.1%
		Std. Residual	-2.3	2.2	
Total	Count		37	41	78
	Expected Count		37.0	41.0	78.0
	% within Recode2_PR34 Establishes and maintains negotiation plans to use in		47.4%	52.6%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_3_Porject Quality		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1089

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.582 ^a	1	.00013420	.00019407	.00011603
Continuity Correction ^b	12.785	1	.00034932		
Likelihood Ratio	15.690	1	.00007461		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	14.395	1	.00014820		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.86.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1090

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.432	.000
	Cramer's V	.432	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

35C - H4.3.35C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR35: Client Company insures that agreements with suppliers are satisfied by both the project and the supplier and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR35: Client Company insures that agreements with suppliers are satisfied by both the project and the supplier and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 21.852 from Table A-H-1092 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000294$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR35: Client Company insures that agreements with suppliers are satisfied by both the project and the supplier and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR35 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1091 shows that 3 companies that performed practice PR35 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (12.8). However, 24 of the companies that performed practice PR35 "Rarely + Never" reported "Adequate + Poor + Bad" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (14.2).

Cramer's $V=.529$ indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR35 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR35 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1093.

Table A-H-1091

Recode2_PR35

Crosstab						
			Recode2_Porject_Quality		Total	
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad		
Recode2_PR35 Insures that agreements with suppliers are satisfied by both the project and the supplier	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	34	17	51	
		Expected Count	24.2	26.8	51.0	
		% within Recode2_PR35 Insures that agreements with suppliers are satisfied by both the project and the supplier	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	
		% within Recode2_Porject_Quality	91.9%	41.5%	65.4%	
		Std. Residual	2.0	-1.9		
	Rarely + Never	Count	3	24	27	
		Expected Count	12.8	14.2	27.0	
		% within Recode2_PR35 Insures that agreements with suppliers are satisfied by both the project and the supplier	11.1%	88.9%	100.0%	
		% within Recode2_Porject Quality	8.1%	58.5%	34.6%	
		Std. Residual	-2.7	2.6		
Total			Count	37	78	
			Expected Count	37.0	41.0	78.0
			% within Recode2_PR35 Insures that agreements with suppliers are satisfied by both the project and the supplier	47.4%	52.6%	100.0%
			% within Recode2_Porject Quality	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1092

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	21.852 ^a	1	.00000294		
Continuity Correction ^b	19.681	1	.00000915		
Likelihood Ratio	24.164	1	.00000088		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000284	.00000186
Linear-by-Linear Association	21.572	1	.00000341		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.81.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1093

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.529	.000
	Cramer's V	.529	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

36C - H4.3.36C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR36: Client Company selects suppliers based on an evaluation of their ability to meet specified requirements and established criteria and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR36: Client Company selects suppliers based on an evaluation of their ability to meet specified requirements and established criteria and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 25.139 from Table A-H-1095 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and $p = .00000053$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR36: Client Company selects suppliers based on an evaluation of their ability to meet specified requirements and established criteria and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR36 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1094 shows that 5 companies that performed practice PR3 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (16.2). Whereas, 29 of the companies that performed practice PR36 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (17.8).

Cramer's $V = .554$ indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR36 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR36 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1096.

Table A-H-1094

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Porject_Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
RRREcode2_PR36 Selects_suppliers_ based_on_an_ evaluation_of_their ability to meet specified requirements	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	29	14	43
		Expected Count	17.8	25.2	43.0
		% within RRREcode2_PR36	67.4%	32.6%	100.0%
		Selects_suppliers_based_on_an_e valuation_of_their ability to meet specified requirements			
		% within Recode2_Porject Quality	85.3%	29.2%	52.4%
		Std. Residual	2.6	-2.2	
	Rarely + Never	Count	5	34	39
		Expected Count	16.2	22.8	39.0

		% within RRREcode2_PR36 Selects_suppliers_based_on_an_e valuation_of_their_ability_to_meet specified_requirements	12.8%	87.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 Porject Quality	14.7%	70.8%	47.6%
		Std. Residual	-2.8	2.3	
Total		Count	34	48	82
		Expected Count	34.0	48.0	82.0
		% within RRREcode2_PR36 Selects_suppliers_based_on_an_e valuation_of_their_ability_to_meet specified_requirements	41.5%	58.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 Porject Quality	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1095

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	25.139 ^a	1	.00000053		
Continuity Correction ^b	22.939	1	.00000167		
Likelihood Ratio	27.137	1	.00000019		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000046	.00000037
Linear-by-Linear Association	24.833	1	.00000063		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.17.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1096

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.554	.000
	Cramer's V	.554	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

37C - H4.3.37C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR37: Client Company identifies and qualifies potential suppliers and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR37: Client Company identifies and qualifies potential suppliers and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 26.202 from Table A-H-1098 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000031.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR37: Client Company identifies and qualifies potential suppliers and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR37 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1097 shows that 6 companies that performed practice PR37 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (17.4). While, 28 of the companies that performed practice PR37 "Always + Very

Frequently” reported “Very Good + Good” for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (16.6).

Cramer’s V= .565 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR37 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR37 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1099.

Table A-H-1097

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Porject_Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
RRRecode2_PR37 Identifies_and_quantifies_potential_suppliers	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	28	12	40
		Expected Count	16.6	23.4	40.0
		% within RRRecode2_PR37 Identifies_and_quantifies_potential_suppliers	70.0%	30.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject Quality	82.4%	25.0%	48.8%
		Std. Residual	2.8	-2.4	
	Rarely + Never	Count	6	36	42
		Expected Count	17.4	24.6	42.0
		% within RRRecode2_PR37 Identifies_and_quantifies_potential_suppliers	14.3%	85.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject Quality	17.6%	75.0%	51.2%
		Std. Residual	-2.7	2.3	
Total			Count	34	48
			Expected Count	34.0	48.0
			% within RRRecode2_PR37 Identifies_and_quantifies_potential_suppliers	41.5%	58.5%
			% within Recode2_Porject Quality	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1098

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	26.202 ^a	1	.00000031		
Continuity Correction ^b	23.957	1	.00000099		
Likelihood Ratio	27.955	1	.00000012		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000038	.00000024
Linear-by-Linear Association	25.883	1	.00000036		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.59.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1099

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.565	.000
	Cramer's V	.565	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

38C - H4.3.38C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR38: Client Company selects suppliers using a formal evaluation and the offshored projects’ success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR38: Client Company selects suppliers using a formal evaluation and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of

chi-square test is 27.580 from Table A-H-1101 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000015$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR38: Client Company selects suppliers using a formal evaluation and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR38 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1100 shows that 7 companies that performed practice PR38 “Rarely + Never” reported “Very Good + Good” for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (18.7). While, 27 of the companies that performed practice PR38 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Very Good + Good” for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (13.1).

Cramer’s $V=.580$ indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR38 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR38 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1102.

Table A-H-1100

RRRecode2_PR38

Crosstab						
			Recode2_Porject_Quality		Total	
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad		
RRRecode2_PR38 Selects_suppliers_ using_a_formal_ev aluation	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	27	10	37	
		Expected Count	15.3	21.7	37.0	
		% within RRRecode2_PR38	73.0%	27.0%	100.0%	
		Selects_suppliers_using_a_formal_evaluation				
		% within Recode2_Porject Quality	79.4%	20.8%	45.1%	
	Std. Residual		3.0	-2.5		
		Rarely + Never	Count	7	38	45
			Expected Count	18.7	26.3	45.0
			% within RRRecode2_PR38	15.6%	84.4%	100.0%
			Selects_suppliers_using_a_formal_evaluation			
% within Recode2_Porject Quality	20.6%		79.2%	54.9%		
Std. Residual		-2.7	2.3			
	Total	Count	34	48	82	
		Expected Count	34.0	48.0	82.0	
		% within RRRecode2_PR38	41.5%	58.5%	100.0%	
		Selects_suppliers_using_a_formal_evaluation				
% within Recode2_Porject Quality		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

Table A-H-1101

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	27.580 ^a	1	.00000015		
Continuity Correction ^b	25.265	1	.00000050		
Likelihood Ratio	29.193	1	.00000007		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000014	.00000013
Linear-by-Linear Association	27.244	1	.00000018		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.34.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1102

Symmetric Measures		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.580	.000
	Cramer's V	.580	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

39C - H4.3.39C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR39: Client Company establishes and maintains quantitative objectives to address quality and process performance, based on customer needs and business objectives and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR39: Client Company establishes and maintains quantitative objectives to address quality and process performance, based on customer needs and business objectives and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 21.258 from Table A-H-1102 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000401$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR39: Client Company establishes and maintains quantitative objectives to address quality and process performance, based on customer needs and business objectives and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR39 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1103 shows that 2 companies that performed practice PR39 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (11.4). While, 22 of the companies that performed practice PR39 "Rarely + Never" reported "Adequate + Poor + Bad" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (12.6).

Cramer's $V=.522$ indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR39 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR39 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1105.

Table A-H-1103

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Porject_Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode3_PR39 Establish and maintain qualitative objectives to address quantity and process performance	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	35	19	54
		Expected Count	25.6	28.4	54.0
		% within Recode3_PR39 Establish and maintain qualitative objectives to address quantity and process performance	64.8%	35.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject Quality	94.6%	46.3%	69.2%
		Std. Residual	1.9	-1.8	
	Rarely + Never	Count	2	22	24
		Expected Count	11.4	12.6	24.0
		% within Recode3_PR39 Establish and maintain qualitative objectives to address quantity and process performance	8.3%	91.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject Quality	5.4%	53.7%	30.8%

		Std. Residual	-2.8	2.6	
Total		Count	37	41	78
		Expected Count	37.0	41.0	78.0
		% within Recode3_PR39 Establish and maintain qualitative objectives to address quantity and process	47.4%	52.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject Quality	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1104

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	21.258 ^a	1	.00000401		
Continuity Correction ^b	19.053	1	.00001271		
Likelihood Ratio	24.110	1	.00000091		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000399	.00000216
Linear-by-Linear Association	20.986	1	.00000463		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.38.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1105

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.522	.000
	Cramer's V	.522	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

40C - H4.3.40C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR40: Client Company manages the project using statistical and other quantitative techniques to determine whether or not the project's objectives for quality and process performance will be satisfied and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR40: Client Company manages the project using statistical and other quantitative techniques to determine whether or not the project's objectives for quality and process performance will be satisfied and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 18.529 from Table A-H-1107 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00001673.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR40: Client Company manages the project using statistical and other quantitative techniques to determine whether or not the project's objectives for quality and process performance will be satisfied and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR40 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1106 shows that 3 companies that performed practice PR40 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (11.9). Whereas, 22 of the companies that performed practice PR40 "Rarely + Never" reported "Adequate + Poor + Bad" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (13.1).

Cramer's V= .487 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR40 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR40 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1108.

Table A-H-1106

Crosstab			
		Recode2_Porject_Quality	Total
		Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad

Recode2_PR40 Manages the project using statistical and other quantitative techniques to determine whether the proje	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	34	19	53
		Expected Count	25.1	27.9	53.0
		% within Recode2_ PR40 Manages the project using statistical and other quantitative techniques to determine whether the proje	64.2%	35.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Porject_ Quality	91.9%	46.3%	67.9%
		Std. Residual	1.8	-1.7	
	Rarely + Never	Count	3	22	25
		Expected Count	11.9	13.1	25.0
		% within Recode2_PR40 Manages the project using statistical and other quantitative techniques to determine whether the proje	12.0%	88.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Porject_ Quality	8.1%	53.7%	32.1%
		Std. Residual	-2.6	2.4	
Total		Count	37	41	78
		Expected Count	37.0	41.0	78.0
		% within Recode2_PR40 Manages the project using statistical and other quantitative techniques to determine whether the proje	47.4%	52.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Porject_ Quality	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1107

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.529 ^a	1	.00001673		
Continuity Correction ^b	16.496	1	.00004874		
Likelihood Ratio	20.410	1	.00000625		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00002020	.00001195
Linear-by-Linear Association	18.291	1	.00001896		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.86.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1108

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.487	.000
	Cramer's V	.487	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

41C - H4.3.41C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR41: Client Company performs root cause analysis of selected issues to address deficiencies in achieving the project's quality and process performance objectives and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR41: Client Company performs root cause analysis of selected issues to address deficiencies in achieving the project's quality and process performance objectives and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-

square test is 19.633 from Table A-H-1110 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000938$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR41: Client Company performs root cause analysis of selected issues to address deficiencies in achieving the project's quality and process performance objectives and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR41 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1109 shows that 2 companies that performed practice PR41 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (10.9). While, 21 of the companies that performed practice PR41 "Rarely + Never" reported "Adequate + Poor + Bad" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (12.1).

Cramer's $V=.502$ indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR41 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR41 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1111.

Table A-H-1109

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Porject_Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR41 Performs root cause analysis of selected issues to address deficiencies in achieving the project's qua	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	35	20	55
		Expected Count	26.1	28.9	55.0
		% within Recode2_PR41 Performs root cause analysis of selected issues to address deficiencies in achieving the project's qua	63.6%	36.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_PorjectQuality	94.6%	48.8%	70.5%
		Std. Residual	1.7	-1.7	
	Rarely + Never	Count	2	21	23
		Expected Count	10.9	12.1	23.0
		% within Recode2_PR41 Performs root cause analysis of selected issues to address deficiencies in achieving the project's qua	8.7%	91.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_PorjectQuality	5.4%	51.2%	29.5%
		Std. Residual	-2.7	2.6	
Total	Count	37	41	78	
	Expected Count	37.0	41.0	78.0	
	% within Recode2_PR41 Performs root cause analysis of selected issues to address deficiencies in achieving the project's qua	47.4%	52.6%	100.0%	
	% within Recode2_3_PorjectQuality	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table A-H-1110

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.633 ^a	1	.00000938		
Continuity Correction ^b	17.491	1	.00002886		
Likelihood Ratio	22.233	1	.00000242		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00001070	.00000546
Linear-by-Linear Association	19.381	1	.00001070		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.91.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1111

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.502	.000
	Cramer's V	.502	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

42C - H4.3.42C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR42: Client Company manages corrective actions to closure when the project's performance or results deviate significantly from the plan and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR42: Client Company manages corrective actions to closure when the project's performance or results deviate significantly from the plan and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 16.460 from Table A-H-1113 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00004968.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR42: Client Company manages corrective actions to closure when the project's performance or results deviate significantly from the plan and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR42 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1112 shows that 1 company that performed practice PR42 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (10.9). While, 17 of the companies that performed practice PR42 "Rarely + Never" reported "Adequate + Poor + Bad" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (9.5).

Cramer's V= .459 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR42 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR42 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1114.

Table A-H-1112

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Porject_Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR42 Manages corrective actions to closure when the project's performance or results deviate significantly	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	36	24	60
		Expected Count	28.5	31.5	60.0
		% within Recode2_PR42 Manages corrective actions to closure when the project's performance or results deviate	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject Quality	97.3%	58.5%	76.9%
		Std. Residual	1.4	-1.3	
	Rarely + Never	Count	1	17	18
		Expected Count	8.5	9.5	18.0
		% within Recode2_PR42 Manages corrective actions to closure when the project's performance or results deviate	5.6%	94.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject Quality	2.7%	41.5%	23.1%
		Std. Residual	-2.6	2.5	
Total	Count		37	41	78
	Expected Count		37.0	41.0	78.0
	% within Recode2_PR42 Manages corrective actions to closure when the project's performance or results deviate		47.4%	52.6%	100.0%

	% within Recode2_Porject Quality	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
--	----------------------------------	--------	--------	--------

Table A-H-1113

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.460 ^a	1	.00004968		
Continuity Correction ^b	14.349	1	.00015184		
Likelihood Ratio	19.440	1	.00001038		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00003049	.00002734
Linear-by-Linear Association	16.249	1	.00005553		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.54.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1114

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.459	.000
	Cramer's V	.459	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

43C - H4.3.43C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR43: Client Company periodically reviews the project's progress, performance and issues experienced and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR43: Client Company periodically reviews the project's progress, performance and issues experienced and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 18.165 from Table A-H-1116 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00002025.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR43: Client Company periodically reviews the project's progress, performance and issues experienced and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR43 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1115 shows that Zero companies that performed practice PR43 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (7.6). While, 16 of the companies that performed practice PR43 "Rarely + Never" reported "Adequate + Poor + Bad" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (8.4).

Cramer's V= .483 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR43 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR43 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1117.

Table A-H-1115

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Porject_Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR43 Periodically reviews the project's progress, performance and issues experienced	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	37	25	62
		Expected Count	29.4	32.6	62.0
		% within Recode2_PR43 Periodically reviews the project's progress, performance and issues experienced	59.7%	40.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject Quality	100.0%	61.0%	79.5%
		Std. Residual	1.4	-1.3	
		Count	0	16	16

	Rarely + Never	Expected Count	7.6	8.4	16.0
		% within Recode2_PR43 Periodically reviews the project's progress, performance and issues experienced	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject Quality	0.0%	39.0%	20.5%
		Std. Residual	-2.8	2.6	
Total		Count	37	41	78
		Expected Count	37.0	41.0	78.0
		% within Recode2_PR43 Periodically reviews the project's progress, performance and issues experienced	47.4%	52.6%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject_Quality	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1116

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.165 ^a	1	.00002025		
Continuity Correction ^b	15.851	1	.00006854		
Likelihood Ratio	24.313	1	.00000082		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000674	.00000599
Linear-by-Linear Association	17.932	1	.00002289		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.59.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1117

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.483	.000
	Cramer's V	.483	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

44C - H4.3.44C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR44: Client Company reviews the project's accomplishments and results at selected project milestones and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR44: Client Company reviews the project's accomplishments and results at selected project milestones and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 15.053 from Table A-H-1119 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00010451.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR44: Client Company reviews the project's accomplishments and results at selected project milestones and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR44 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1118 shows that 1 company that performed practice PR44 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (8.1). While, 16 of the companies that performed practice PR44 "Rarely + Never" reported "Adequate + Poor + Bad" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (8.9).

Cramer's V= .439 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR44 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR44 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1120.

Table A-H-1118

Crosstab		
	Recode2_Porject_Quality	Total

			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR44 Reviews the project's accomplishmen ts and results at selected project milestones	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	36	25	61
		Expected Count	28.9	32.1	61.0
		% within Recode2_PR44 Reviews the project's accomplishments and results at selected project milestones	59.0%	41.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject Quality	97.3%	61.0%	78.2%
		Std. Residual	1.3	-1.2	
	Rarely + Never	Count	1	16	17
		Expected Count	8.1	8.9	17.0
		% within Recode2_PR44 Reviews the project's accomplishments and results at selected project milestones	5.9%	94.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject Quality	2.7%	39.0%	21.8%
		Std. Residual	-2.5	2.4	
Total	Count		37	41	78
	Expected Count		37.0	41.0	78.0
	% within Recode2_PR44 Reviews the project's accomplishments and results at selected project milestones		47.4%	52.6%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Porject Quality		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1119

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.053 ^a	1	.00010451	.00007189	.00006322
Continuity Correction ^b	12.998	1	.00031186		
Likelihood Ratio	17.750	1	.00002519		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	14.860	1	.00011577		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.06.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1120

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.439	.000
	Cramer's V	.439	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

45C - H4.3.45C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR45: Client Company establishes and maintains records of quality assurance activities and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR45: Client Company establishes and maintains records of quality assurance activities and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 22.608 from Table A-H-1122 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p=.00000199.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR45: Client Company establishes and maintains records of quality assurance activities and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR45 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1121 shows that 1 company that performed practice PR45 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (10.4). While, 21 of the companies that performed practice

PR45 “Rarely + Never” reported “Adequate + Poor + Bad” for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (11.6).

Cramer’s V= .538 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR45 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR45 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1123.

Table A-H-1121

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Porject_ Qualit		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR45 Establishes and maintains records of quality assurance activities	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	36	20	56
		Expected Count	26.6	29.4	56.0
		% within Recode2_PR45	64.3%	35.7%	100.0%
		Establishes and maintains records of quality assurance activities			
		% within Recode2_Porject Quality	97.3%	48.8%	71.8%
		Std. Residual	1.8	-1.7	
	Rarely + Never	Count	1	21	22
		Expected Count	10.4	11.6	22.0
		% within Recode2_PR45	4.5%	95.5%	100.0%
		Establishes and maintains records of quality assurance activities			
		% within Recode2_Porject Quality	2.7%	51.2%	28.2%
Std. Residual		-2.9	2.8		
Total	Count	37	41	78	
	Expected Count	37.0	41.0	78.0	
	% within Recode2_PR45	47.4%	52.6%	100.0%	
	Establishes and maintains records of quality assurance activities				
	% within Recode2_Porject Quality	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table A-H-1122

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.608 ^a	1	.00000199	.00000076	.00000072
Continuity Correction ^b	20.275	1	.00000671		
Likelihood Ratio	26.793	1	.00000023		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	22.318	1	.00000231		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.44.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1123

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.538	.000
	Cramer's V	.538	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

46C - H4.3.46C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR46: Monitors the actual project performance and progress against the project plan and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows no significant relationship between performing practice PR46: Monitors the actual project performance and progress against the project plan and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 12.380 from Table A-H-1125 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00043400.

Table A-H-1124

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Porject_Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR46 Monitors the actual project performance and progress against the project plan	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	36	27	63
		Expected Count	29.9	33.1	63.0
		% within Recode2_PR46 Monitors the actual project performance and progress against the project plan	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject Quality	97.3%	65.9%	80.8%
		Std. Residual	1.1	-1.1	
	Rarely + Never	Count	1	14	15
		Expected Count	7.1	7.9	15.0
		% within Recode2_PR46 Monitors the actual project performance and progress against the project plan	6.7%	93.3%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject Quality	2.7%	34.1%	19.2%
		Std. Residual	-2.3	2.2	
Total			Count	37	41
			Expected Count	37.0	41.0
			% within Recode2_PR46 Monitors the actual project performance and progress against the project plan	47.4%	52.6%
			% within Recode2_Porject Quality	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1125

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.380 ^a	1	.00043400		
Continuity Correction ^b	10.438	1	.00123436		
Likelihood Ratio	14.531	1	.00013784		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00037251	.00031304
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.221	1	.00047252		
N of Valid Cases	78				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.12.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1126

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.398	.000
	Cramer's V	.398	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

47C - H4.3.47C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR47: Ensures that the supplier agreement is satisfied before accepting the acquired product and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR47: Ensures that the supplier agreement is satisfied before accepting the acquired product and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 13.724 from Table A-H-1128 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00021174.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR47: Ensures that the supplier agreement is satisfied before accepting the acquired product and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR47 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1127 shows that 2 companies that performed practice PR47 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (9). While, 17 of the companies that performed practice PR47 "Rarely + Never" reported "Adequate + Poor + Bad" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (10).

Cramer's V= .419 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR47 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR47 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1129.

Table A-H-1127

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Porject_Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR47 Ensures that the supplier agreement is satisfied before accepting the acquired product	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	35	24	59
		Expected Count	28.0	31.0	59.0
		% within Recode2_PR47 Ensures that the supplier agreement is satisfied before accepting	59.3%	40.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject_Quality	94.6%	58.5%	75.6%
		Std. Residual	1.3	-1.3	
	Rarely + Never	Count	2	17	19
		Expected Count	9.0	10.0	19.0
		% within Recode2_PR47 Ensures that the supplier agreement is satisfied before accepting	10.5%	89.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject_Quality	5.4%	41.5%	24.4%
		Std. Residual	-2.3	2.2	
Total			Count	37	41
			Expected Count	37.0	41.0
			% within Recode2_PR47 Ensures that the supplier agreement is satisfied before accepting	47.4%	52.6%
			% within Recode2_Porject_Quality	100.0%	100.0%
				100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1128

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.724 ^a	1	.00021174		
Continuity Correction ^b	11.837	1	.00058074		
Likelihood Ratio	15.410	1	.00008651		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00018244	.00016190
Linear-by-Linear Association	13.548	1	.00023254		

N of Valid Cases	78			
------------------	----	--	--	--

- a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.01.
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1129

Symmetric Measures		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.419	.000
	Cramer's V	.419	.000
N of Valid Cases		78	

48C - H4.3.48C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR48: Client Company selects supplier technical solutions to be analyzed and analysis methods to be used and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR48: Client Company selects supplier technical solutions to be analyzed and analysis methods to be used and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 34.850 from Table A-H-1131 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000000$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR48: Client Company selects supplier technical solutions to be analyzed and analysis methods to be used and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR48 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1130 shows that 2 companies that performed practice PR48 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (14.5). While, 27 of the companies that performed practice PR48 "Rarely + Never" reported "Adequate + Poor + Bad" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (14.5).

Cramer's $V=.677$ indicates a strong association between performed PR48 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR48 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1132.

Table A-H-1130

Crosstab					
			Recode2 Porject_ Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR48 Selects supplier technical solutions to be analyzed	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	36	11	47
		Expected Count	23.5	23.5	47.0
		% within Recode2_PR48 Selects supplier_technical_solutions_to_be_analys	76.6%	23.4%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject_ Quality	94.7%	28.9%	61.8%
		Std. Residual	2.6	-2.6	
	Rarely + Never	Count	2	27	29
		Expected Count	14.5	14.5	29.0
		% within Recode2_PR48 Selects supplier technical solutions to be analyzed	6.9%	93.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Porject_ _Quality	5.3%	71.1%	38.2%
		Std. Residual	-3.3	3.3	

Total	Count	38	38	76
	Expected Count	38.0	38.0	76.0
	% within Recode2_PR48 Selects_supplier_technical_solutions to_be_analys	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Recode2 Porject_ Quality	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1131

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	34.850 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	32.117	1	.00000001		
Likelihood Ratio	39.656	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	34.391	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.50.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1132

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.677	.000
	Cramer's V	.677	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

49C - H4.3.49C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR49: Client Company conducts technical reviews with the supplier as defined in the supplier agreement and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR49: Client Company conducts technical reviews with the supplier as defined in the supplier agreement and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 42.318 from Table A-H-1134 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR49: Client Company conducts technical reviews with the supplier as defined in the supplier agreement and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR49 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1133 shows that 2 companies that performed practice PR49 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (16). While, 30 of the companies that performed practice PR49 "Rarely + Never" reported "Adequate + Poor + Bad" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (16).

Cramer's V= .746 indicates a strong association between performed PR49 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR49 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1135.

Table A-H-1133

Crosstab				
		Recode2_3_Porject_ Quality		Total
		Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
ecode2_PR49	Count	36	8	44
Conducts	Expected Count	22.0	22.0	44.0

technical reviews with supplier	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	% within ecode2_PR49 Conducts technical reviews with supplee	81.8%	18.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project Quality	94.7%	21.1%	57.9%
		Std. Residual	3.0	-3.0	
	Rarely + Never	Count	2	30	32
		Expected Count	16.0	16.0	32.0
		% within ecode2_PR49 Conducts technical reviews with supplier	6.3%	93.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_Project Quality	5.3%	78.9%	42.1%
		Std. Residual	-3.5	3.5	
Total			Count	38	76
			Expected Count	38.0	76.0
			% within ecode2_PR49 Conducts technical reveiws with supplier	50.0%	50.0%
			% within Recode2_Project Quality	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1134

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	42.318 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	39.349	1	.00000000		
Likelihood Ratio	48.671	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	41.761	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.00.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1135

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.746	.000
	Cramer's V	.746	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

50C - H4.3.50C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR50: Client Company evaluates and categorizes each identified issue using defined risk categories and parameters and determines its relative priority and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR50: Client Company evaluates and categorizes each identified issue using defined risk categories and parameters and determines its relative priority and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 41.725 from Table A-H-1137 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000000.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR50: Client Company evaluates and categorizes each identified issue using defined risk categories and parameters and determines its relative priority and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR50 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1136 shows that 3 companies that performed practice PR50 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (17). While, 31 of the companies that performed practice PR50 "Rarely + Never" reported "Adequate +

Poor + Bad” for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (17).

Cramer’s V= .741 indicates a strong association between performed PR50 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR50 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1138.

Table A-H-1136

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Porject_ Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR50 Evaluates_and_categorise_each_identified_issue	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	35	7	42
		Expected Count	21.0	21.0	42.0
		% within Recode2_PR50 Evaluates and_categorise_each_identified_issue	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 Porject Quality	92.1%	18.4%	55.3%
		Std. Residual	3.1	-3.1	
	Rarely + Never	Count	3	31	34
		Expected Count	17.0	17.0	34.0
		% within Recode2_PR50 Evaluates and_categorise_each_identified_issue	8.8%	91.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 Porject Quality	7.9%	81.6%	44.7%
		Std. Residual	-3.4	3.4	
Total	Count		38	38	76
	Expected Count		38.0	38.0	76.0
	% within Recode2_PR50 Evaluates and_categorise_each_identified_issue		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Recode2 Porject Quality		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1137

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	41.725 ^a	1	.00000000		
Continuity Correction ^b	38.798	1	.00000000		
Likelihood Ratio	47.218	1	.00000000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000000	.00000000
Linear-by-Linear Association	41.176	1	.00000000		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.00.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1138

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.741	.000
	Cramer's V	.741	.000
N of Valid Cases		76	

51C - H4.3.51C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR51: Client Company establishes and maintains a usable set of organizational process assets, work environment standards, rules and guidelines for teams and the offshored projects’ success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR51: Client Company establishes and maintains a usable set of organizational process assets, work environment standards, rules and guidelines for teams and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 24.358 from Table A-H-1140 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000080$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR51: Client Company establishes and maintains a usable set of organizational process assets, work environment standards, rules and guidelines for teams and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR51 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1139 shows that 4 companies that performed practice PR51 “Rarely + Never” reported “Very Good + Good” for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (14.9). While, 30 of the companies that performed practice PR51 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Very Good + Good” for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (19.1).

Cramer’s $V=.506$ indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR51 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR51 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1141.

Table A-H-1139

Crosstab					
			Recode2Porject Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR51 Establishs_and_maintains_a_usable_set_of_organizational process assets	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	30	16	46
		Expected Count	19.1	26.9	46.0
		% within Recode2_PR51 Establishs and_maintains_a_usable_set_of_organizational process assets	65.2%	34.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 Porject Quality	88.2%	33.3%	56.1%
		Std. Residual	2.5	-2.1	
	Rarely + Never	Count	4	32	36
		Expected Count	14.9	21.1	36.0
		% within Recode2_PR51 Establishs and_maintains_a_usable_set_of_or ganizational process assets	11.1%	88.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2 Porject Quality	11.8%	66.7%	43.9%
		Std. Residual	-2.8	2.4	
Total	Count		34	48	82
	Expected Count		34.0	48.0	82.0
	% within Recode2_PR51 Establishs _and_maintains_a_usable_set_of_organizational process assets		41.5%	58.5%	100.0%
	% within Recode2 Porject Quality		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1140

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.358 ^a	1	.00000080		
Continuity Correction ^b	22.180	1	.00000248		
Likelihood Ratio	26.718	1	.00000024		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000052	.00000048
Linear-by-Linear Association	24.061	1	.00000093		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.93.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1141

Symmetric Measures		
		Value
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.506
	Cramer's V	.506
N of Valid Cases		81

52C - H4.3.52C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR52: Client Company establishes and maintains the offshoring strategy and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR52: Client Company establishes and maintains the offshoring strategy and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 20.769 from Table A-H-1143 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000518$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR52: Client Company establishes and maintains the offshoring strategy and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR52 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1142 shows that 4 companies that performed practice PR52 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (13.7). While, 23 of the companies that performed practice PR52 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (13.3).

Cramer's $V=.506$ indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR52 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR52 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1144.

Table A-H-1142

Crosstab					
			Recode2Project_Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR52 Establishes_ and maintain the plan for performing the offshoring	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	23	17	40
		Expected Count	13.3	26.7	40.0
		% within Recode2_PR52 Establishes_and_maintain_the_pl an_for_performing_the offshoring	57.5%	42.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project Quality	85.2%	31.5%	49.4%
		Std. Residual	2.6	-1.9	
	Rarely + Never	Count	4	37	41
		Expected Count	13.7	27.3	41.0
		% within Recode2_PR52 Establishes_and_maintain_the_pl an_for_performing_the offshoring	9.8%	90.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Project Quality	14.8%	68.5%	50.6%
		Std. Residual	-2.6	1.8	
Total	Count		27	54	81
	Expected Count		27.0	54.0	81.0
	% within Recode2_PR52 Establishes_and_maintain_the_pl an_for_performing_the offshoring		33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Project Quality		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1143

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.769 ^a	1	.00000518		
Continuity Correction ^b	18.676	1	.00001549		
Likelihood Ratio	22.352	1	.00000227		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000489	.00000420
Linear-by-Linear Association	20.512	1	.00000593		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.33.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1144

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.506	.000
	Cramer's V	.506	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

53C- H4.3.53C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR53: Client Company establishes and maintains the plan for performing the offshoring and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR53: Client Company establishes and maintains the plan for performing the offshoring and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 20.769 from Table A-H-1146 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p=.00000518.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR53: Client Company establishes and maintains the plan for performing the offshoring and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR53 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1145 shows that 4 companies that performed practice PR53 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (10.9). While, 23 of the companies that performed practice PR53 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (13.3).

Cramer's V=.506 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR53 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR53 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1147.

Table A-H-1145

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Porject_Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR53 Establishes and maintain the plan for performing the offshoring	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	23	17	40
		Expected Count	13.3	26.7	40.0
		% within Recode2_PR53	57.5%	42.5%	100.0%
		Establishes_and_maintain_the_pla n_for_performing_the_offshoring			
		% within Recode2_Porject_Quality	85.2%	31.5%	49.4%

	Rarely + Never	Std. Residual	2.6	-1.9	
		Count	4	37	41
		Expected Count	13.7	27.3	41.0
		% within Recode2_PR53 Establishes_and_maintain_the_pla n_for_performing_the offshoring	9.8%	90.2%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject_Quality	14.8%	68.5%	50.6%
		Std. Residual	-2.6	1.8	
Total		Count	27	54	81
		Expected Count	27.0	54.0	81.0
		% within Recode2_PR53 Establishes and maintain the plan for_performing_the offshoring	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject_Quality	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1146

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.769 ^a	1	.00000518		
Continuity Correction ^b	18.676	1	.00001549		
Likelihood Ratio	22.352	1	.00000227		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000489	.00000420
Linear-by-Linear Association	20.512	1	.00000593		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.33.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1147

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.506	.000
	Cramer's V	.506	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

54C - H4.3.54C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR54: Client Company determines the type of acquisition for each product or product component to be offshored and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR54: Client Company determines the type of acquisition for each product or product component to be offshored and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 24.174 from Table A-H-1149 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000088.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR54: Client Company determines the type of acquisition for each product or product component to be offshored and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR54 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1148 shows that 5 companies that performed practice PR54 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (15.3). While, 22 of the companies that performed practice PR54 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (11.7).

Cramer's V= .546 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR54 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR54 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1150.

Table A-H-1148

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Porject Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR54 Determines the type of acquisition for each product	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	22	13	35
		Expected Count	11.7	23.3	35.0
		% within Recode2_PR54 Determines the_type_of_acquisition_for_each_	62.9%	37.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject_Quality	81.5%	24.1%	43.2%
		Std. Residual	3.0	-2.1	
	Rarely + Never	Count	5	41	46
		Expected Count	15.3	30.7	46.0
		% within Recode2_PR54 Determines the_type_of_acquisition_for_each_	10.9%	89.1%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject_Quality	18.5%	75.9%	56.8%
		Std. Residual	-2.6	1.9	
Total		Count	27	54	81
		Expected Count	27.0	54.0	81.0
		% within Recode2_PR54 Determines the_type_of_acquisition_for_each_	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject_Quality	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1149

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.174 ^a	1	.00000088		
Continuity Correction ^b	21.891	1	.00000289		
Likelihood Ratio	25.308	1	.00000049		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000103	.00000094
Linear-by-Linear Association	23.876	1	.00000103		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.67.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1150

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.546	.000
	Cramer's V	.546	.000
N of Valid Cases		81	

55C - H4.3.55C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR55: Client Company Plan transition to operations specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR55: Client Company Plan transition to operations specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 25.474 from Table A-H-1152 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000045.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR55: Client Company Plan transition to operations specifically timing and type of work transferred to the supplier and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR55 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1151 shows that 4 companies that performed practice PR55 “Rarely + Never” reported “Very Good + Good” for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (14.7). While, 23 of the companies that performed practice PR55 “Always + Very Frequently” reported “Very Good + Good” for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (12.3).

Cramer’s V= .561 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR55 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR55 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1153.

Table A-H-1151

Crosstab					
			Recode2_3_Porject Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR55 Plan transition to operations specifically timing	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	23	14	37
		Expected Count	12.3	24.7	37.0
		% within Recode2_PR55 Plan transition to operations specifically timing	62.2%	37.8%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject Quality	85.2%	25.9%	45.7%
		Std. Residual	3.0	-2.1	
	Rarely + Never	Count	4	40	44
		Expected Count	14.7	29.3	44.0
		% within Recode2_PR55 Plan transition to operations specifically timing	9.1%	90.9%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject Quality	14.8%	74.1%	54.3%
		Std. Residual	-2.8	2.0	
Total	Count		27	54	81
	Expected Count		27.0	54.0	81.0
	% within Recode2_PR55 Plan transition to operations specifically timing		33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Porject Quality		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1152

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	25.474 ^a	1	.00000045		
Continuity Correction ^b	23.142	1	.00000150		
Likelihood Ratio	27.226	1	.00000018		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000040	.00000038
Linear-by-Linear Association	25.160	1	.00000053		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.33.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1153

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.561	.000
	Cramer's V	.561	.000

56C - H4.3.56C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR56: Evaluates supplier technical solutions (designs) to confirm that contractual requirements continue to be met and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR56: Evaluates supplier technical solutions (designs) to confirm that contractual requirements continue to be met and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 26.202 from Table A-H-1155 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with $df=1$ and $p=.00000031$.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR56: Evaluates supplier technical solutions (designs) to confirm that contractual requirements continue to be met and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR56 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1154 shows that 6 companies that performed practice PR56 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (17.4). While, 28 of the companies that performed practice PR56 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (16.6).

Cramer's $V=.565$ indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR56 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR56 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1156.

Table A-H-1154

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Porject Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR56 Evaluates supplier technical solutions to confirm contractual requirements are met	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	28	12	40
		Expected Count	16.6	23.4	40.0
		% within Recode2_PR56 Evaluates _supplier_technical_solutions_to_confir m_contractual_requirements_are met	70.0%	30.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject_Quality	82.4%	25.0%	48.8%
		Std. Residual	2.8	-2.4	
	Rarely + Never	Count	6	36	42
		Expected Count	17.4	24.6	42.0
		% within Recode2_PR56 Evaluates _supplier_technical_solutions_to_confir m_contractual_requirements_are met	14.3%	85.7%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject_Quality	17.6%	75.0%	51.2%
		Std. Residual	-2.7	2.3	
Total	Count		34	48	82
	Expected Count		34.0	48.0	82.0
	% within Recode2_PR56 Evaluates _supplier_technical_solutions_to_confir m_contractual_requirements_are met		41.5%	58.5%	100.0%
	% within Recode2_Porject_Quality		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1155

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)

Pearson Chi-Square	26.202 ^a	1	.00000031		
Continuity Correction ^b	23.957	1	.00000099		
Likelihood Ratio	27.955	1	.00000012		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000038	.00000024
Linear-by-Linear Association	25.883	1	.00000036		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.59.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1156

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.565	.000
	Cramer's V	.565	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	

57C - H4.3.57C: There is a relationship between industry standards practice PR57: Selects, monitors and analyzes supplier processes and the offshored projects' success factor: Expected Quality.

The analysis shows a significant relationship between performing practice PR57: Selects, monitors and analyzes supplier processes and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The value of chi-square test is 27.580 from Table A-H-1158 and differences among the observed and expected groups are statistically significant with df=1 and p =.00000015.

This hypothesis investigates the relationship between performing practice PR57: Selects, monitors and analyzes supplier processes and the offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. The analysis shows that firms routinely performed PR57 reported better results with regard to offshored *projects success of Expected Quality*. Table A-H-1157 shows that 7 companies that performed practice PR57 "Rarely + Never" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count was (18.7). While, 27 of the companies that performed practice PR57 "Always + Very Frequently" reported "Very Good + Good" for offshored *projects success of Expected Quality* while the expected count for this category was (15.3).

Cramer's V= .580 indicates a relatively strong association between performed PR57 and this project success factor. Companies that performed practice PR57 reported better results on Expected Quality compared to companies that did not perform this practice as shown in Table A-H-1159.

Table A-H-1157

Crosstab					
			Recode2_Porject_Quality		Total
			Very Good + Good	Adequate + Poor + Bad	
Recode2_PR57 Selects Monitors and analyzes processes	Always + Very Frequently + Occasionally	Count	27	10	37
		Expected Count	15.3	21.7	37.0
		% within Recode2_PR57 Selects_Monitors_and_anal yzes_processes	73.0%	27.0%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_Porject Quality	79.4%	20.8%	45.1%
		Std. Residual	3.0	-2.5	
	Rarely + Never	Count	7	38	45
		Expected Count	18.7	26.3	45.0
		% within Recode2_PR57 Selects_Monitors_and_anal yzes_processes	15.6%	84.4%	100.0%

		% within Recode2_3_ Porject Quality	20.6%	79.2%	54.9%
		Std. Residual	-2.7	2.3	
Total		Count	34	48	82
		Expected Count	34.0	48.0	82.0
		% within Recode2 PR57 Selects_Monitors_and_anal yzes_processes	41.5%	58.5%	100.0%
		% within Recode2_3_ Porject Quality	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A-H-1158

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	27.580 ^a	1	.00000015		
Continuity Correction ^b	25.265	1	.00000050		
Likelihood Ratio	29.193	1	.00000007		
Fisher's Exact Test				.00000014	.00000013
Linear-by-Linear Association	27.244	1	.00000018		
N of Valid Cases	82				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.34.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table A-H-1159

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.580	.000
	Cramer's V	.580	.000
N of Valid Cases		82	