**The Findings of Quantitative Data**

1. **Descriptive Test**

* **Frequency Tables**

The following tables 1-5 demonstrate the frequencies of demographic variables, which are used in this research:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | | | | | |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | Male | 80 | 77.7 | 77.7 | 77.7 |
| Female | 23 | 22.3 | 22.3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 103 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

The above table describe that the sample of this research consists of 80 males and 23 females.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Occupation** | | | | | |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | Contractor | 27 | 26.2 | 26.2 | 26.2 |
| Client | 10 | 9.7 | 9.7 | 35.9 |
| Engineer | 63 | 61.2 | 61.2 | 97.1 |
| others | 3 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 100.0 |
| Total | 103 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

The above table describes the occupation of the study sample, where it shows that the sample includes 27 contractors, 10 clients, 63 engineers, while 3 of respondents were classified as others.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Education** | | | | | |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | Secondary School | 4 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 3.9 |
| High Institute Level | 12 | 11.7 | 11.7 | 15.5 |
| University Level | 50 | 48.5 | 48.5 | 64.1 |
| Post graduate Level | 37 | 35.9 | 35.9 | 100.0 |
| Total | 103 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

The above table relates to the education levels of the study's respondents. Where, it shows that the number of people with secondary school is 4, 12 with high institute level, 50 individuals with a university level, and 37 are holding post graduate certificates.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sector** | | | | | |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | Private | 40 | 38.8 | 38.8 | 38.8 |
| Public | 6 | 5.8 | 5.8 | 44.7 |
| Both | 57 | 55.3 | 55.3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 103 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

The above table relates to the sector of the study's sample. Where, 40 companies are relating to the private sector, 6 are classified as public, 57 are relating to both.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Experience** | | | | | |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | <5 years | 28 | 27.2 | 27.2 | 27.2 |
| 5-10 years | 54 | 52.4 | 52.4 | 79.6 |
| 10-15 years | 19 | 18.4 | 18.4 | 98.1 |
| >15 years | 2 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 100.0 |
| Total | 103 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Relating to experience, the above table certifies that 28 respondents have an experience less than five years, 54 respondents have five to ten years of experience, 19 between ten to fifteen, and only 2 having an experience more than fifteen.

**2. The Normality Test for Demographic Variables**

The following graphs explained that the demographic variables of this study are abnormally distributed:
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1. **Cronbach Alpha**

Results from the reliability test found that the data collection’s instrument is reliable.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Item-Total Statistics** | |
|  | Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted |
| PowerDisteancePD | .693 |
| UncertainityAvoidanceUA | .644 |
| IndividualCollectivismID | .760 |
| MasculinityFeminityMAS | .658 |
| EquipmentDV | -.044-a |
| LabourersDV | .742 |
| ProjectManagementDV | .763 |
| MaterialsDV | .650 |
| CLAN | .646 |
| ADHOCRACY | .681 |
| HIERARCHY | .751 |
| MARKET | .631 |
| projectDelay | .812 |

1. **Correlation Test**

* **Correlation Matrix of National Culture and Project Delay**

This Study Ran the Pearson Correlation test to check the relationship status of between national culture represented by PD, UA, ID and MAS along with project delay. As it is shown in the following table the project delay is insignificantly related to PD and MAS, while there are significant correlation between UA and ID along with project delay.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | | | | |
|  | | PD | UA | IID | MAS | projectDelay |
| PD | Pearson Corr | 1 | .259\*\* | .146 | .181 | -.065- |
| Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .008 | .141 | .068 | .515 |
| N | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 |
| UA | Pearson Corr | .259\*\* | 1 | .549\*\* | .218\* | .217\* |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .008 |  | .000 | .027 | .028 |
| N | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 |
| ID | Pearson Corr | .146 | .549\*\* | 1 | .011 | .212\* |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .141 | .000 |  | .909 | .031 |
| N | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 |
| MAS | Pearson Corr | .181 | .218\* | .011 | 1 | .007 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .068 | .027 | .909 |  | .944 |
| N | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 |
| projectDelay | Pearson Corr | -.065- | .217\* | .212\* | .007 | 1 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .515 | .028 | .031 | .944 |  |
| N | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 |

|  |
| --- |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). |
| \*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). |

* **Correlation Matrix of National Culture and Contractor's Delay Factors**

This table describes the relationship between the variables of national culture as captured by PD, UA, ID and MAS along with the factors of contractor's delay. Consequently, the results proved that except adhocracy the contractor's delay factors are significantly related to power distance. The UA is found to be significantly correlated with adhocracy and market. Additionally, the results confirmed a significant while negative correlation between MAS along with adhocracy.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | PD | UA | ID | MAS | CLAN | ADHOCRACY | HIERARCHY | MARKET |
| PD | Pearson Corr | 1 | .259\*\* | .146 | .181 | -.197-\* | .116 | .205\* | -.211-\* |
| Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .008 | .141 | .068 | .046 | .244 | .038 | .032 |
| N | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 |
| UA | Pearson Corr | .259\*\* | 1 | .549\*\* | .218\* | -.050- | .365\*\* | .042 | -.317-\*\* |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .008 |  | .000 | .027 | .613 | .000 | .673 | .001 |
| N | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 |
| ID | Pearson Corr | .146 | .549\*\* | 1 | .011 | -.054- | .210\* | .062 | -.270-\*\* |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .141 | .000 |  | .909 | .587 | .033 | .535 | .006 |
| N | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 |
| MAS | Pearson Corr | .181 | .218\* | .011 | 1 | -.076- | .001 | -.266-\*\* | .166 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .068 | .027 | .909 |  | .447 | .992 | .007 | .094 |
| N | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 |
| CLAN | Pearson Corr | -.197-\* | -.050- | -.054- | -.076- | 1 | -.015- | .148 | -.205-\* |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .046 | .613 | .587 | .447 |  | .880 | .136 | .037 |
| N | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 |
| ADHOCRACY | Pearson Corr | .116 | .365\*\* | .210\* | .001 | -.015- | 1 | .214\* | -.631-\*\* |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .244 | .000 | .033 | .992 | .880 |  | .030 | .000 |
| N | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 |
| HIERARCHY | Pearson Corr | .205\* | .042 | .062 | -.266-\*\* | .148 | .214\* | 1 | -.770-\*\* |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .038 | .673 | .535 | .007 | .136 | .030 |  | .000 |
| N | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 |
| MARKET | Pearson Corr | -.211-\* | -.317-\*\* | -.270-\*\* | .166 | -.205-\* | -.631-\*\* | -.770-\*\* | 1 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .032 | .001 | .006 | .094 | .037 | .000 | .000 |  |
| N | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | | | | | | | |
| \*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). | | | | | | | | | |

**3. Linear Regression Tests**

**First Hypothesis:** H1: There is a significant positive correlation between a national culture high in collectivism (and low in individualism) and a clan organizational culture this will have a positive effect on project delivery on time.

**The Impact of Individualism/Collectivism (ID) in Project Delay**

This study utilized the linear regression test to check the effect of individualism in the project delay. As a result, the following tables confirmed that individualism is significantly causing a delay in the project.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model Summary** | | | | |
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| 1 | .212a | .045 | .036 | .71026 |

|  |
| --- |
| a. Predictors: (Constant), IndividualCollectivismID |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ANOVAa** | | | | | | |
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | 2.408 | 1 | 2.408 | 4.774 | .031b |
| Residual | 50.951 | 101 | .504 |  |  |
| Total | 53.359 | 102 |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| a. Dependent Variable: projectDelay |
| b. Predictors: (Constant), IndividualCollectivismID |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Coefficientsa** | | | | | | |
| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
| B | Std. Error | Beta |
| 1 | (Constant) | 1.338 | .255 |  | 5.250 | .000 |
| IndividualCollectivismID | .047 | .021 | .212 | 2.185 | .031 |

|  |
| --- |
| a. Dependent Variable: projectDelay |

* **The Impact of Individualism and Clan in Project Delay (Mediator)**

The previous test revealed a significant impact to the individualism in project delay. Thus, since the first hypothesis aims at finding out the ability of clan to mediate the relationship between individualism and project delay; the following test was mainly applied. As a result, the following tables showed that when the Clan variable was used in the regression test the relationship between individualism and Clan along with project delay is showed to be insignificant. Which in other words mean that the project delay is not significantly impacted by Clan.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model Summary** | | | | |
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| 1 | .216a | .047 | .028 | .71322 |

|  |
| --- |
| a. Predictors: (Constant), Clan, IndividualCollectivismID |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ANOVAa** | | | | | | |
| Model | | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | 2.491 | 2 | 1.245 | 2.448 | .092b |
| Residual | 50.869 | 100 | .509 |  |  |
| Total | 53.359 | 102 |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| a. Dependent Variable: projectDelay |
| b. Predictors: (Constant), Clan, IndividualCollectivismID |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Coefficientsa** | | | | | | |
| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
| B | Std. Error | Beta |
| 1 | (Constant) | 1.088 | .673 |  | 1.616 | .109 |
| IndividualCollectivismID | .052 | .025 | .234 | 2.102 | .038 |
| Clan | .003 | .009 | .045 | .403 | .688 |

|  |
| --- |
| a. Dependent Variable: projectDelay |

* **The Impact of Uncertainty Avoidance in Project Delay**

**Second Hypothesis:** H2: There is a significant positive correlation between a national culture low in uncertainty avoidance and an adhocracy organizational culture this will have a positive effect on project delivery on time.

This study utilized the linear regression test to check the effect of uncertainty avoidance in project delay. As a result, the following tables confirmed that individualism is significantly causing a project delay.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model Summary** | | | | |
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| 1 | .217a | .047 | .038 | .70957 |

|  |
| --- |
| a. Predictors: (Constant), UncertainityAvoidanceUA |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ANOVAa** | | | | | | |
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | 2.507 | 1 | 2.507 | 4.979 | .028b |
| Residual | 50.852 | 101 | .503 |  |  |
| Total | 53.359 | 102 |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| a. Dependent Variable: projectDelay |
| b. Predictors: (Constant), UncertainityAvoidanceUA |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Coefficientsa** | | | | | | |
| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
| B | Std. Error | Beta |
| 1 | (Constant) | 1.211 | .305 |  | 3.966 | .000 |
| UncertainityAvoidanceUA | .050 | .022 | .217 | 2.231 | .028 |

|  |
| --- |
| a. Dependent Variable: projectDelay |

* **The Impact of Uncertainty Avoidance and Adhocracy in Project Delay (Mediator)**

The above test revealed that uncertainty avoidance is significantly impacting a project delay. Thus, since the second hypothesis aims at finding out the validity of adhocracy to mediate the relationship between uncertainty and project delay; the following test was mainly applied. As a result, results from the regression tables revealed that when the adhocracy variable was used in the regression test the relationship between uncertainty avoidance and adhocracy along with project delay is found to be insignificant. Which in other words mean that the project delay is not significantly impacted by adhocracy.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model Summary** | | | | |
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| 1 | .223a | .050 | .031 | .71201 |

|  |
| --- |
| a. Predictors: (Constant), adhocracy, UncertainityAvoidanceUA |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ANOVAa | | | | | | |
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | 2.663 | 2 | 1.332 | 2.627 | .077b |
| Residual | 50.696 | 100 | .507 |  |  |
| Total | 53.359 | 102 |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| a. Dependent Variable: projectDelay |
| b. Predictors: (Constant), adhocracy, UncertainityAvoidanceUA |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Coefficientsa** | | | | | | |
| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
| B | Std. Error | Beta |
| 1 | (Constant) | .830 | .750 |  | 1.107 | .271 |
| UncertainityAvoidanceUA | .058 | .026 | .250 | 2.185 | .031 |
| Adhocracy | .005 | .009 | .064 | .555 | .580 |

|  |
| --- |
| a. Dependent Variable: projectDelay |

* **The Impact of Masculinity/Feminity (MAS) in Project Delay**

**Third Hypothesis:** H3: There is a significant positive correlation between a national culture high in masculinity and a market organizational culture this will have a positive effect on project delivery on time.

This study utilized the linear regression test to check the impact of masculinity in project delay. Consequently, results from the regression technique showed that a project delay is insignificantly affected by Masculinity.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model Summary** | | | | |
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| 1 | .007a | .000 | -.010- | .72683 |

|  |
| --- |
| a. Predictors: (Constant), MasculinityFeminityMAS |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ANOVAa** | | | | | | |
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | .003 | 1 | .003 | .005 | .944b |
| Residual | 53.357 | 101 | .528 |  |  |
| Total | 53.359 | 102 |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| a. Dependent Variable: projectDelay |
| b. Predictors: (Constant), MasculinityFeminityMAS |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Coefficientsa** | | | | | | |
| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
| B | Std. Error | Beta |
| 1 | (Constant) | 1.853 | .306 |  | 6.060 | .000 |
| MasculinityFeminityMAS | .004 | .055 | .007 | .070 | .944 |

|  |
| --- |
| a. Dependent Variable: projectDelay |

* **The Impact of Masculinity/Feminity and Market in Project Delay (Mediator)**

When the study tried to test the impact of Masculinity in project delay, the regression results showed that project delay is insignificantly related to masculinity. However, since the third hypothesis of this research aims at finding out the role of market to mediate the relationship between masculinity and project delay; the following test was mainly applied. Consequently, results from the regression test revealed that although the market variable was entered to the model the results still show insignificant correlation between masculinity and market along with a project delay. However, to be more accurate, the usage of market in the model contributed to enhance the amount of P-value, while the relationship still insignificant. Which in other words mean that the project delay is insignificantly relating to masculinity and market.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model Summary** | | | | |
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| 1 | .068a | .005 | -.015- | .72880 |

|  |
| --- |
| a. Predictors: (Constant), Market, MasculinityFeminityMAS |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ANOVAa** | | | | | | |
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | .244 | 2 | .122 | .230 | .795b |
| Residual | 53.115 | 100 | .531 |  |  |
| Total | 53.359 | 102 |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| a. Dependent Variable: projectDelay |
| b. Predictors: (Constant), Market, MasculinityFeminityMAS |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Coefficientsa** | | | | | | |
| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
| B | Std. Error | Beta |
| 1 | (Constant) | 2.189 | .585 |  | 3.742 | .000 |
| MasculinityFeminityMAS | -.003- | .057 | -.005- | -.051- | .960 |
| Market | -.005- | .008 | -.068- | -.675- | .501 |

|  |
| --- |
| a. Dependent Variable: projectDelay |

* **The Impact of Power Distance in Project Delay**

**Fourth Hypothesis**: H4: There is a significant positive correlation between a national culture high in power distance and a hierarchy organizational culture this will have a positive effect on project delivery on time.

This study utilized the linear regression test to examine the impact of power distance in project delay. Consequently, results from the regression technique showed that a project delay is insignificantly related to power distance.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model Summary** | | | | |
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| 1 | .065a | .004 | -.006- | .72532 |

|  |
| --- |
| a. Predictors: (Constant), PowerDisteancePD |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ANOVAa** | | | | | | |
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | .224 | 1 | .224 | .426 | .515b |
| Residual | 53.135 | 101 | .526 |  |  |
| Total | 53.359 | 102 |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| a. Dependent Variable: projectDelay |
| b. Predictors: (Constant), PowerDisteancePD |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Coefficientsa** | | | | | | |
| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
| B | Std. Error | Beta |
| 1 | (Constant) | 2.088 | .336 |  | 6.210 | .000 |
| PowerDisteancePD | -.019- | .029 | -.065- | -.653- | .515 |

|  |
| --- |
| a. Dependent Variable: projectDelay |

* **The Impact of Power Distance and Hierarchy in Project Delay (Mediator)**

When the study tried to test the impact of power distance in project delay, the regression results showed that project delay is insignificantly related to power distance. However, since the fourth hypothesis of this research aims at finding out the role of hierarchy to mediate the relationship between power distance and project delay; the following test was mainly applied. Consequently, results from the regression test revealed that although the hierarchy variable was used in the regression model; the findings still show insignificant correlation between power distance and hierarchy along with a project delay. However, to be more accurate, the usage of hierarchy in the model contributed to enhance the P-value, while the relationship still insignificant. To sum up, the results confirmed that project delay is insignificantly relating to power distance and hierarchy.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model Summary** | | | | |
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| 1 | .112a | .013 | -.007- | .72585 |

|  |
| --- |
| a. Predictors: (Constant), Hierarchy, PowerDisteancePD |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ANOVAa** | | | | | | |
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | .673 | 2 | .337 | .639 | .530b |
| Residual | 52.686 | 100 | .527 |  |  |
| Total | 53.359 | 102 |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| a. Dependent Variable: projectDelay |
| b. Predictors: (Constant), Hierarchy, PowerDisteancePD |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Coefficientsa** | | | | | | |
| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
| B | Std. Error | Beta |
| 1 | (Constant) | 2.608 | .656 |  | 3.976 | .000 |
| PowerDisteancePD | -.028- | .031 | -.094- | -.904- | .368 |
| Hierarchy | -.007- | .008 | -.096- | -.923- | .358 |

|  |
| --- |
| a. Dependent Variable: projectDelay |