



The University of
Nottingham

UNITED KINGDOM • CHINA • MALAYSIA

Dy, Angela Carmina Martinez (2010) A Conceptual Framework of Internet Contributions to Young Adult Entrepreneurship. [Dissertation (University of Nottingham only)] (Unpublished)

Access from the University of Nottingham repository:

http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/23805/9/chi-sq_Practice.pdf

Copyright and reuse:

The Nottingham ePrints service makes this work by students of the University of Nottingham available to university members under the following conditions.

This article is made available under the University of Nottingham End User licence and may be reused according to the conditions of the licence. For more details see:
http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/end_user_agreement.pdf

For more information, please contact eprints@nottingham.ac.uk

```

CROSSTABS
  /TABLES=gender ethnicity education obstacles Netobstacles BY practice
  /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES
  /STATISTICS=CHISQ
  /CELLS=COUNT EXPECTED ROW COLUMN TOTAL
  /COUNT ROUND CELL.

```

Crosstabs

[DataSet1] E:\MSc Entrepreneurship\Dissertation\Quantitative Survey\dataset 26 Aug 2010.sav

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
gender * practice	95	91.3%	9	8.7%	104	100.0%
ethnicity * practice	87	83.7%	17	16.3%	104	100.0%
education * practice	95	91.3%	9	8.7%	104	100.0%
obstacles * practice	95	91.3%	9	8.7%	104	100.0%
Netobstacles * practice	95	91.3%	9	8.7%	104	100.0%

gender * practice

Crosstab

			practice		Total
			0	1	
gender	1	Count	18	18	36
		Expected Count	22.4	13.6	36.0
		% within gender	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within practice	30.5%	50.0%	37.9%
		% of Total	18.9%	18.9%	37.9%
2	Count	41	17	58	
	Expected Count	36.0	22.0	58.0	
	% within gender	70.7%	29.3%	100.0%	

Crosstab

			practice		Total
			0	1	
gender	2	% within practice	69.5%	47.2%	61.1%
		% of Total	43.2%	17.9%	61.1%
	3	Count	0	1	1
		Expected Count	.6	.4	1.0
		% within gender	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within practice	.0%	2.8%	1.1%
		% of Total	.0%	1.1%	1.1%
	Total	Count	59	36	95
	Expected Count	59.0	36.0	95.0	
	% within gender	62.1%	37.9%	100.0%	
	% within practice	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	62.1%	37.9%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.697 ^a	2	.058
Likelihood Ratio	5.998	2	.050
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.436	1	.119
N of Valid Cases	95		

a. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .38.

ethnicity * practice

Crosstab

			practice		Total
			0	1	
ethnicity	1	Count	11	4	15
		Expected Count	9.8	5.2	15.0
		% within ethnicity	73.3%	26.7%	100.0%
		% within practice	19.3%	13.3%	17.2%
		% of Total	12.6%	4.6%	17.2%
	2	Count	15	6	21
		Expected Count	13.8	7.2	21.0
		% within ethnicity	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%

Crosstab

			practice		Total
			0	1	
ethnicity	2	% within practice	26.3%	20.0%	24.1%
		% of Total	17.2%	6.9%	24.1%
3	Count		16	11	27
	Expected Count		17.7	9.3	27.0
	% within ethnicity		59.3%	40.7%	100.0%
	% within practice		28.1%	36.7%	31.0%
	% of Total		18.4%	12.6%	31.0%
4	Count		2	0	2
	Expected Count		1.3	.7	2.0
	% within ethnicity		100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within practice		3.5%	.0%	2.3%
	% of Total		2.3%	.0%	2.3%
5	Count		6	8	14
	Expected Count		9.2	4.8	14.0
	% within ethnicity		42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
	% within practice		10.5%	26.7%	16.1%
	% of Total		6.9%	9.2%	16.1%
6	Count		2	0	2
	Expected Count		1.3	.7	2.0
	% within ethnicity		100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within practice		3.5%	.0%	2.3%
	% of Total		2.3%	.0%	2.3%
7	Count		4	1	5
	Expected Count		3.3	1.7	5.0
	% within ethnicity		80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
	% within practice		7.0%	3.3%	5.7%
	% of Total		4.6%	1.1%	5.7%
8	Count		1	0	1
	Expected Count		.7	.3	1.0
	% within ethnicity		100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within practice		1.8%	.0%	1.1%
	% of Total		1.1%	.0%	1.1%
Total	Count		57	30	87
	Expected Count		57.0	30.0	87.0
	% within ethnicity		65.5%	34.5%	100.0%
	% within practice		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total		65.5%	34.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.476 ^a	7	.381
Likelihood Ratio	8.939	7	.257
Linear-by-Linear Association	.109	1	.741
N of Valid Cases	87		

a. 9 cells (56.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .34.

education * practice

Crosstab

		practice		Total	
		0	1		
education	2	Count	0	1	1
		Expected Count	.6	.4	1.0
		% within education	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within practice	.0%	2.8%	1.1%
		% of Total	.0%	1.1%	1.1%
3	Count	8	5	13	
	Expected Count	8.1	4.9	13.0	
	% within education	61.5%	38.5%	100.0%	
	% within practice	13.6%	13.9%	13.7%	
	% of Total	8.4%	5.3%	13.7%	
4	Count	5	7	12	
	Expected Count	7.5	4.5	12.0	
	% within education	41.7%	58.3%	100.0%	
	% within practice	8.5%	19.4%	12.6%	
	% of Total	5.3%	7.4%	12.6%	
5	Count	31	16	47	
	Expected Count	29.2	17.8	47.0	
	% within education	66.0%	34.0%	100.0%	
	% within practice	52.5%	44.4%	49.5%	
	% of Total	32.6%	16.8%	49.5%	
6	Count	15	7	22	
	Expected Count	13.7	8.3	22.0	
	% within education	68.2%	31.8%	100.0%	
	% within practice	25.4%	19.4%	23.2%	

Crosstab

			practice		Total
			0	1	
education	6	% of Total	15.8%	7.4%	23.2%
Total		Count	59	36	95
		Expected Count	59.0	36.0	95.0
		% within education	62.1%	37.9%	100.0%
		% within practice	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	62.1%	37.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.412 ^a	4	.353
Likelihood Ratio	4.645	4	.326
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.551	1	.213
N of Valid Cases	95		

a. 4 cells (40.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .38.

obstacles * practice

Crosstab

			practice		Total
			0	1	
obstacles	1	Count	8	3	11
		Expected Count	6.8	4.2	11.0
		% within obstacles	72.7%	27.3%	100.0%
		% within practice	13.6%	8.3%	11.6%
		% of Total	8.4%	3.2%	11.6%
	2	Count	8	11	19
		Expected Count	11.8	7.2	19.0
		% within obstacles	42.1%	57.9%	100.0%
		% within practice	13.6%	30.6%	20.0%
		% of Total	8.4%	11.6%	20.0%
	3	Count	23	15	38
		Expected Count	23.6	14.4	38.0
		% within obstacles	60.5%	39.5%	100.0%
		% within practice	39.0%	41.7%	40.0%

Crosstab

			practice		Total
			0	1	
obstacles	3	% of Total	24.2%	15.8%	40.0%
	4	Count	9	2	11
		Expected Count	6.8	4.2	11.0
		% within obstacles	81.8%	18.2%	100.0%
		% within practice	15.3%	5.6%	11.6%
		% of Total	9.5%	2.1%	11.6%
5		Count	3	0	3
		Expected Count	1.9	1.1	3.0
		% within obstacles	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
		% within practice	5.1%	.0%	3.2%
		% of Total	3.2%	.0%	3.2%
6		Count	0	1	1
		Expected Count	.6	.4	1.0
		% within obstacles	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within practice	.0%	2.8%	1.1%
		% of Total	.0%	1.1%	1.1%
7		Count	2	2	4
		Expected Count	2.5	1.5	4.0
		% within obstacles	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within practice	3.4%	5.6%	4.2%
		% of Total	2.1%	2.1%	4.2%
8		Count	6	2	8
		Expected Count	5.0	3.0	8.0
		% within obstacles	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
		% within practice	10.2%	5.6%	8.4%
		% of Total	6.3%	2.1%	8.4%
Total		Count	59	36	95
		Expected Count	59.0	36.0	95.0
		% within obstacles	62.1%	37.9%	100.0%
		% within practice	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	62.1%	37.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.897 ^a	7	.194
Likelihood Ratio	11.363	7	.124

a. 10 cells (62.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .38.

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Linear-by-Linear Association	.641	1	.423
N of Valid Cases	95		

a. 10 cells (62.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .38.

Netobstacles * practice

Crosstab

		practice		Total	
		0	1		
Netobstacles	2	Count	8	1	9
		Expected Count	5.6	3.4	9.0
		% within Netobstacles	88.9%	11.1%	100.0%
		% within practice	13.6%	2.8%	9.5%
		% of Total	8.4%	1.1%	9.5%
	3	Count	27	9	36
		Expected Count	22.4	13.6	36.0
		% within Netobstacles	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
		% within practice	45.8%	25.0%	37.9%
		% of Total	28.4%	9.5%	37.9%
	5	Count	11	4	15
		Expected Count	9.3	5.7	15.0
		% within Netobstacles	73.3%	26.7%	100.0%
		% within practice	18.6%	11.1%	15.8%
		% of Total	11.6%	4.2%	15.8%
	6	Count	2	1	3
		Expected Count	1.9	1.1	3.0
		% within Netobstacles	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
		% within practice	3.4%	2.8%	3.2%
		% of Total	2.1%	1.1%	3.2%
	7	Count	10	19	29
		Expected Count	18.0	11.0	29.0
		% within Netobstacles	34.5%	65.5%	100.0%
		% within practice	16.9%	52.8%	30.5%
		% of Total	10.5%	20.0%	30.5%
8	Count	1	2	3	

Crosstab

			practice		Total
			0	1	
Netobstacles	8	Expected Count	1.9	1.1	3.0
		% within Netobstacles	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
		% within practice	1.7%	5.6%	3.2%
		% of Total	1.1%	2.1%	3.2%
Total		Count	59	36	95
		Expected Count	59.0	36.0	95.0
		% within Netobstacles	62.1%	37.9%	100.0%
		% within practice	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	62.1%	37.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.574 ^a	5	.005
Likelihood Ratio	16.908	5	.005
Linear-by-Linear Association	14.213	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	95		

a. 5 cells (41.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.14.