

Appendix F

Statistical tables for survey of social enterprises within social economy networks Chapter 7

Table F.1 - Frequency distribution of respondents by county

County	Population	Total number of social enterprises identified	Number of social enterprises that returned the questionnaire	Response Rate in %
Carlow	50349	3	0	0.00
Cavan	64003	7	2	0.29
Clare	110950	7	1	0.14
Cork	481295	11	4	0.36
Donegal	147264	18	6	0.33
Dublin	1187176	61	26	0.43
Galway	231670	13	5	0.38
Kerry	139835	11	5	0.45
Kildare	186335	6	2	0.33
Kilkenny	87558	4	2	0.50
Laois	67059	4	2	0.50
Leitrim	28950	12	5	0.42
Limerick	184055	6	1	0.17
Longford	34391	2	0	0.00
Louth	111267	9	3	0.33
Mayo	123839	19	5	0.26
Meath	162831	6	5	0.83
Monaghan	55997	4	2	0.50
Offaly	70868	9	3	0.33
Roscommon	58768	13	6	0.46
Sligo	60894	5	1	0.20
Tipperary	149244	6	1	0.17
Waterford	107961	5	3	0.60
Westmeath	79346	12	1	0.08
Wexford	131749	16	5	0.31
Wicklow	126194	12	6	0.50
Total	4239848	281	102	0.36

Table F.2 – Frequency distribution of respondents by region

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
Dublin	26	25.5	25.5
Rest of east coast	19	18.6	18.6
Midlands	7	6.9	6.9
West	15	14.7	14.7
South	17	16.7	16.7
North-west	18	17.6	17.6
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.3 – Frequency distribution of respondents by urban/rural location

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
Urban	41	40.2	40.2
Rural	61	59.8	59.8
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Figure F.1 – Frequency of role of respondent within social enterprise

	Number
Manager	76
Assistant Manager/Administrator	11
Board member	3
Not specified	12
Total	102

Table F.4 – Frequency of duration of involvement in respondent social enterprise (Question i)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
Under 1 year	8	7.8	8.2
1-3 years	32	31.4	32.7
4-6 years	37	36.3	37.7
7 years or greater	21	20.6	21.4
Not disclosed	4	3.9	0
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.5 – Frequency of duration of involvement in the Social Economy (Question ii)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
Under 1 year	4	3.9	4.1
1-3 years	29	28.4	29.6
4-6 years	49	48.0	50
7 years	16	15.7	16.3
Not disclosed	4	3.9	0
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.6 – Frequency of main good or service provided by respondent social enterprise (Question 1)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
Tourism/cultural/heritage and recreation	28	27.5	27.5
Enterprise/employment service or centre	8	7.8	7.8
General service including transport	34	33.3	33.3
Community centre/facility	16	15.7	15.7
Childcare/education and training	16	15.7	15.7
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.7 – Frequency of main social objective identified by social enterprise (Question 2)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
Community development and facilities	21	20.6	20.6
Education, training and childcare	12	11.8	11.8
Local economic/enterprise development	26	25.5	25.5
Promote tourism, heritage, recreation and arts	24	23.5	23.5
Provide general services to the community	19	18.6	18.6
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.8 – Frequency of whether a specific main target group was identified by social enterprise (Question 3)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
Community/general public	64	62.7	62.7
Established for specific target group	36	35.3	35.3
Not disclosed	2	2.0	2.0
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.9 – Frequency as to whether there a specific reason/event resulting in the establishment of social enterprise (Question 4)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
Yes	19	18.6	18.8
No	82	80.4	81.2
Not disclosed	1	1.0	0
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.10 – Frequency as to why the organisation was established as a social enterprise? (Question 5)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
To benefit from funding/grants/increased income	35	34.3	37.2
In order to respond to social needs	34	33.3	36.2
The structure naturally suited the needs of the organisation	10	9.8	10.6
Creating employment/retaining staff	15	14.7	16.0
Did not disclose	8	7.9	0
Total	102	100	100

Table F.11 - Frequency as to the use of volunteers on boards of directors or management (Question 6a)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
Yes	96	94.1	98.0
No	2	2.0	2.0
Not disclosed	4	3.9	0
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.12 – Frequency as to the use of volunteers in the operations of the social enterprise (Question 6b)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
Yes	38	37.3	38
No	62	60.8	62
not disclosed	2	2.0	0
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.13 – Frequency as to the legal structure used by respondent social enterprises (Question 7)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
Company limited by guarantee	87	85.3	86.1
Company limited by shares	5	4.9	5.0
Co-operative	6	5.9	5.9
Trust	1	1.0	1.0
Other	2	2.0	2.0
Not disclosed	1	1.0	0
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.14 – Frequency as to the sectoral composition of the boards of management/directors of respondent social enterprises (Question 8)

Sector	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents
Community/voluntary	431	46.4
Local development	102	10.9

Local Authority	51	5.6
Public agencies	55	6
Private sector	140	15
Trade Unions	6	0.6
Education sector	33	3.5
Financial institutions	18	2
Other (incl. Public reps)	93	10
Totals	929	100

Table F.15 – Frequency of the main income source of respondent social enterprises (summary of Question 9)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
Traded income	26	25.5	26.3
Grants/others	73	71.6	73.7
Not disclosed	3	2.9	0
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.16 – Frequency of traded income as proportion of total income (Question 9a)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
>25%	41	40.2	41.8
26-50%	38	37.3	38.8
51-74%	10	9.8	10.2
>75%	4	3.9	4.1
100%	5	4.9	5.1
Not disclosed	4	3.9	0
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.17 – Frequency of grant aid as proportion of total income (Question 9b)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
>25%	11	10.8	11.2
26-50%	19	18.6	19.4
51-74%	36	35.3	36.7
>75%	32	31.4	32.7
Not disclosed	4	3.9	0
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.18 – Frequency of public-sector contracts as proportion of total income (Question 9c)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
None	87	85.3	86.1
>25%	13	12.7	12.9
26-50%	1	1.0	1.0
Not disclosed	1	1.0	0
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.19 – Frequency of donations as proportion of total income (Question 9d)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
None	70	68.6	69.3
>25%	30	29.4	29.7
26-50%	1	1.0	1.0
Not disclosed	1	1.0	0
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.20 – Frequency of other income sources as proportion of total income (Question 9e)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
None	99	97.0	98.0
>25%	1	1.0	1.0
26-50%	1	1.0	1.0
Not disclosed	1	1.0	0
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Figure F.2 – Identity of main sources of grant aid (Question 10)

	Number of times identified by respondents
Pobal/Community Services Programme	88
Local authorities	26
APCs/Leader Companies	14
Health Service Executive (HSE)	14
Rural Transport Initiative	3
Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform	2
Other grant aid sources	29
Number of respondent social enterprises (n) = 102	

Table F.21 – Frequency of projected total income per social enterprise for 2006 (Question 11)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
Under €20K	7	6.9	12.5
€20-50K	9	8.8	16.1
€51-100k	15	14.7	26.8
€101-200k	14	13.7	25.0
€201-300k	4	3.9	7.1
Greater than €300k	7	6.9	12.5
Not disclosed	46	45.1	0
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.22 – Frequency of the relative importance of achieving social objectives for social enterprises (Question 12)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
More	41	40.2	41.0
Less	1	1.0	1.0
Equally as	58	56.9	58.0
Not disclosed	2	2.0	0
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.23 – Frequency of the relative importance of campaigning for positive social change/social justice for social enterprises (Question 13)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
Yes	84	82.4	82.4
No	5	4.9	4.9
Unsure	13	12.7	12.7
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.24 – Frequency as to the relative influence of social partnership for social enterprise in Ireland (Question 14)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
Positive	66	64.7	66.0
Negative	2	2.0	2.0
Neutral	15	14.7	15.0
No opinion	17	16.7	17.0
Not answered	2	2.0	0
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.25 – Frequency of responses to the statement that ‘Volunteerism has declined compared to 20 years ago’ (Question 15a)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
True	71	69.6	70.3
False	12	11.8	11.9
Unsure	18	17.6	17.8
Not answered	1	1.0	0
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.26 – Frequency of responses to the statement that ‘Patterns of volunteerism have changed compared to 20 years ago’ (Question 15b)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
True	83	81.4	82.2
False	4	3.9	4.0
Unsure	14	13.7	13.8
Not answered	1	1.0	0
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.27 – Frequency of responses to the statement that ‘Volunteers are more discerning about the type of work they will do’ (Question 15c)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
True	83	81.4	82.2
False	5	4.9	4.9
Unsure	13	12.7	12.9
Not answered	1	1.0	0
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.28 – Frequency of responses to the statement that ‘Volunteers will make a financial contribution rather than contribute time’ (Question 15d)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
True	55	53.9	54.5
False	13	12.7	12.9
Unsure	33	32.4	32.6
Not answered	1	1.0	0
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.29 – Frequency of responses as to the relative strength of social enterprises with regard to the delivery of goods and service (Question 16a)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
Stronger	80	78.4	79.2
Weaker	4	3.9	4.0
Unsure	17	16.7	16.8
Not answered	1	1.0	0
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.30 – Frequency of responses as to the relative strength of social enterprises at campaigning for social reform (Question 16b)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
Stronger	47	46.1	46.5
Weaker	25	24.5	24.8
Unsure	29	28.4	28.7
Not answered	1	1.0	0
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.31 – Frequency of responses as to the relative strength of social enterprises at sustaining community services (Question 16c)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
Stronger	84	82.4	83.2
Weaker	7	6.9	6.9
Unsure	10	9.8	9.9
Not answered	1	1.0	0
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.32 – Frequency of responses as to the relative strength of social enterprises at protecting social assets (Question 16d)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
Stronger	59	57.8	59.0
Weaker	10	9.8	10.0
Unsure	31	30.4	31.0
Not answered	2	2.0	0
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.33 – Frequency of responses as to the relative strength of social enterprises at empowering disadvantaged groups/individuals (Question 16e)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
Stronger	72	70.6	72.0
Weaker	9	8.8	9.0
Unsure	19	18.6	19.0
Not answered	2	2.0	0
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.34 – Frequency of responses as to the relative strength of social enterprises as a platform for public consultation (Question 16f)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
Stronger	48	47.1	47.6
Weaker	17	16.7	16.8
Unsure	36	35.3	35.6
Not answered	1	1.0	0
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.35 – Comparison of the frequencies of those who thought that social enterprises were ‘stronger’ as compared to other community-based organisations in the sub questions raised in Question 16

	Frequency	Percentage
Sustaining community services	84	83.2
Delivering goods and services to disadvantaged individuals and communities	80	79.2
Empowering disadvantaged individuals or communities	72	72
Protecting social assets and buildings	59	59
A platform for public consultation	48	47.6
In campaigning for social change	47	46.5

Table F.36 – Frequency of responses as to the relative importance of the existence of grant aid for the social economy (Question 17a)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
Unimportant	1	1.0	1.0
Marginally important	1	1.0	1.0
Neutral	3	2.9	3.0
Somewhat important	8	7.8	7.9
Important	13	12.7	12.9
Very important	75	73.5	74.2
Not answered	1	1.0	0
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.37 – Frequency of responses as to the relative importance of local community development structures for social economy (Question 17b)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
Unimportant	2	2.0	2.0
Not very important	3	2.9	3.0
Neutral	2	2.0	2.0
Somewhat important	19	18.6	19.0
Important	18	17.6	18.0
Very important	55	53.9	55.0
Unsure	1	1.0	1.0
Not answered	2	2.0	0
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.38 – Frequency of responses as to the relative importance of supportive local authorities for social economy (Question 17c)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
Unimportant	2	2.0	2.0
Not very important	4	3.9	4.0
neutral	7	6.9	6.9
Somewhat important	15	14.7	14.8
Important	24	23.5	23.8
Very important	47	46.1	46.5
Unsure	2	2.0	2.0
Not answered	1	1.0	0
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.39 – Frequency of responses as to the importance of local partnership arrangements for social economy (Question 17d)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
Unimportant	1	1.0	1.0
Marginally important	1	1.0	1.0
Not very important	5	4.9	5.1
Neutral	6	5.9	6.1
Somewhat important	22	21.6	22.2
Important	22	21.6	22.2
Very important	38	37.3	38.4
Unsure	4	3.9	4.0
Not answered	3	2.9	0
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.40 – Frequency of responses as to the importance of links to business for social economy (Question 17e)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
Unimportant	2	2.0	2.0
Marginally important	1	1.0	1.0
Not very important	10	9.8	9.9
Neutral	15	14.7	14.8
Somewhat important	18	17.6	17.8
Important	19	18.6	18.8
Very important	32	31.4	31.7
Unsure	4	3.9	4.0
Not answered	1	1.0	0
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.41 – Frequency of responses as to the importance of personal commitment individuals/groups for the social economy (Question 17f)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
Unimportant	1	1.0	1.0
Marginally important	2	2.0	2.0
Not very important	3	2.9	3.0
Neutral	5	4.9	4.9
Somewhat important	11	10.8	10.9
Important	23	22.5	22.8
Very important	54	52.9	53.4
Unsure	2	2.0	2.0
Not answered	1	1.0	0
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.42 – Frequency of responses as to the importance of strong local community or local cohesion for the social economy (Question 17g)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
Unimportant	3	2.9	3.0
Marginally important	1	1.0	1.0
Not very important	1	1.0	1.0
Neutral	5	4.9	4.9
Somewhat important	15	14.7	14.9
Important	20	19.6	19.8
Very important	55	53.9	55.4
Unsure	1	1.0	1.0
Not answered	1	1.0	0
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.43 – Frequency of responses as to the importance of value for money considerations for social economy (Question 17h)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
Unimportant	1	1.0	1.0
Marginally important	1	1.0	1.0
Not very important	6	5.9	6.0
Neutral	10	9.8	10.0
Somewhat important	19	18.6	19.0
Important	18	17.6	18.0
Very important	40	39.2	40.0
Unsure	5	4.9	5.0
Not answered	2	2.0	0
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.44 – Frequency of responses as to the importance of local political support for the social economy (Question 17i)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
Unimportant	6	5.9	6.0
Marginally important	3	2.9	3.0
Not very important	7	6.9	7.0
Neutral	7	6.9	7.0
Somewhat important	29	28.4	29.0
Important	11	10.8	11.0
Very important	34	33.3	34.0
Unsure	3	2.9	3.0
Not answered	2	2.0	0
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.45a – Frequency of responses as to the importance of market failures for social enterprises (Question 17j)

	Frequency	Percentage of total respondents	Valid Percent
Unimportant	2	2.0	2.0
Marginally important	2	2.0	2.0
Not very important	3	2.9	3.0
Neutral	10	9.8	10.0
Somewhat important	12	11.8	12.0
Important	21	20.6	21.0
Very important	42	41.2	42.0
Unsure	8	7.8	8.0
Not answered	2	2.0	0
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Table F.45b – Combined frequency of responses as to the importance of market failures for social enterprises (Question 17j)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Important	75	73.5	75
Unimportant	7	6.9	7
Neutral/unsure	18	17.6	18
Not disclosed	2	2.0	0
Total	102	100.0	100.0

Figure F.3 – Aggregate percentage of ‘very important’ and ‘important’ responses to sub questions raised in Question 17 rated by priority

	%
The existence of grant aid	87.1
Personal commitment by individual/group	76.2
Strong sense of local community/local cohesion	74.3
Strong local development structures	73
Proactive local authorities	70.3
Addressing market failures	63
Strong local partnership arrangements	61.3
Value-for-money considerations	58
Links to business	50.5
Local political support	45

Table F.46 – Crosstabulation of main good or service provided by respondent social enterprises by region

	Dublin	Rest of east coast	Midlands	West	South	North-west	Total
Tourism/cultural/heritage and recreation	3	3	4	6	4	8	28
Enterprise/employment service or centre	5	3	0	0	0	0	8
General service including transport	6	5	2	8	6	7	34
Community centre/facility	7	3	1	1	2	2	16
Childcare/education and training	5	5	0	0	5	1	16
Total	26	19	7	15	17	18	102

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	33.405 ^a	20	.030
Likelihood Ratio	39.073	20	.007
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.569	1	.059
N of Valid Cases	102		

a. 23 cells (76.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .55.

Symmetric Measures

	Value	Asymp. Std. Error ^a	Approx. T ^b	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal Phi	.572			.030
Nominal by Nominal Cramer's V	.286			.030
Interval by Interval Pearson's R	-.188	.095	-1.914	.058 ^c
Ordinal by Ordinal Spearman Correlation	-.189	.096	-1.925	.057 ^c
N of Valid Cases	102			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

c. Based on normal approximation.

Table F.47 – Crosstabulation between good or service provided by respondent social enterprise and the main income source of the social enterprise

	Traded	Grants/others	Total
Tourism/cultural/heritage and recreation	8	19	27
Enterprise/employment service or centre	6	2	8
General service including transport	4	30	34
Community centre/facility	4	12	16
Childcare/education and training	4	10	14
Total	26	73	99

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.713 ^a	4	.008
Likelihood Ratio	12.816	4	.012
N of Valid Cases	99		

a. 3 cells (30.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.10.

Symmetric Measures^a

	Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal Phi	.372	.008
Cramer's V	.372	.008
N of Valid Cases	99	

a. Correlation statistics are available for numeric data only.

Table F.48 – Crosstabulation between main good or service provided by respondent social enterprises and whether they were located in an urban or rural area

	Urban	Rural	Total
Tourism/cultural/heritage and recreation	6	22	28
Enterprise/employment service or centre	7	1	8
General service including transport	10	24	34
Community centre/facility	8	8	16
Childcare/education and training	10	6	16
Total	41	61	102

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.145 ^a	4	.002
Likelihood Ratio	17.785	4	.001
N of Valid Cases	102		

a. 2 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.22.

Symmetric Measures^a

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.410	.002
	Cramer's V	.410	.002
	N of Valid Cases	102	

a. Correlation statistics are available for numeric data only.

Table F.49 – Crosstabulation between main social objective identified and the relative importance of market failure for social enterprises

	Important	Unimportant	Neutral/unsure	Total
Community development and facilities	16	1	3	20
Education, training and childcare	8	1	3	12
Local economic/enterprise development	19	3	4	26
Promote tourism, heritage, recreation and arts	18	2	3	23
General services to the community	14	0	5	19
Total	75	7	18	100

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.131 ^a	8	.845
Likelihood Ratio	5.259	8	.730
N of Valid Cases	100		

a. 10 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .84.

Symmetric Measures^a

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.203	.845
	Cramer's V	.144	.845
	N of Valid Cases	100	

a. Correlation statistics are available for numeric data only.

Table F.50 – Crosstabulation between main social objective identified by social enterprises and the main income source of the social enterprises

	Traded	Grants/others	Total
Community development and facilities	4	16	20
Education, training and childcare	4	7	11
Local economic/enterprise development	11	15	26
Promote tourism, heritage, recreation and arts	5	18	23
General services to the community	2	17	19
Total	26	73	99

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.114 ^a	4	.130
Likelihood Ratio	7.271	4	.122
N of Valid Cases	99		

a. 2 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.89.

Symmetric Measures^a

	Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal Phi	.268	.130
Cramer's V	.268	.130
N of Valid Cases	99	

a. Correlation statistics are available for numeric data only.

Table F.51 – Crosstabulation between main social objective identified by social enterprises and whether they are located in urban or rural areas

	Urban	Rural	Total
Community development and facilities	11	10	21
Education, training and childcare	7	5	12
Local economic/enterprise development	12	14	26
Promote tourism, heritage, recreation and arts	7	17	24
General services to the community	4	15	19
Total	41	61	102

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.434 ^a	4	.115
Likelihood Ratio	7.669	4	.104
N of Valid Cases	102		

a. 1 cells (10.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.82.

Symmetric Measures^a

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.270	.115
	Cramer's V	.270	.115
	N of Valid Cases	102	

a. Correlation statistics are available for numeric data only.

Table F.52 – Crosstabulation between the main social objective identified by the social enterprises and their location on a regional basis

	Dublin	Rest of east coast	Midlands	West	South	North-west	Total
Community development and facilities	7	6	1	3	2	2	21
Education, training and childcare	3	3	0	0	5	1	12
Local economic/enterprise development	10	4	3	3	3	3	26
Promote tourism, heritage, recreation and arts	4	3	1	5	3	8	24
General services to the community	2	3	2	4	4	4	19
Total	26	19	7	15	17	18	102

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.624 ^a	20	.259
Likelihood Ratio	24.668	20	.214
N of Valid Cases	102		

a. 27 cells (90.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .82.

Symmetric Measures^a

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.481	.259
	Cramer's V	.241	.259
	Contingency Coefficient	.434	.259
	N of Valid Cases	102	

a. Correlation statistics are available for numeric data only.

Table F.53 – Crosstabulation between main income source and whether the social enterprises were located in an urban or rural area

	Urban	Rural	Total
Traded	17	9	26
Grants/others	23	50	73
Total	40	59	99

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.138 ^a	1	.003		
Continuity Correction ^b	7.785	1	.005		
Likelihood Ratio	9.060	1	.003		
Fisher's Exact Test				.005	.003
N of Valid Cases	99				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.51.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures^a

	Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal Phi	.304	.003
Cramer's V	.304	.003
N of Valid Cases	99	

a. Correlation statistics are available for numeric data only.

Table F.54 – Crosstabulation between the main income source of the social enterprises examined and whether respondents felt that social enterprises were stronger or weaker than other community-based organisations in the delivery of goods and services

	Stronger	Weaker	Unsure	Total
Traded	21	1	4	26
Grants/others	58	2	12	72
Total	79	3	16	98

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.451 ^a	3	.930
Likelihood Ratio	.700	3	.873
N of Valid Cases	99		

a. 5 cells (62.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .26.

Symmetric Measures^a

	Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal Phi	.067	.930
Cramer's V	.067	.930
N of Valid Cases	99	

a. Correlation statistics are available for numeric data only.

Table F.55 - Crosstabulation between the main income source of the social enterprises examined and whether there was a specific reason/event for the establishment of the social enterprise

	Yes	No	Total
Traded	6	20	26
Grants/others	13	59	72
Total	19	79	98

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.308 ^a	1	.579		
Continuity Correction ^b	.071	1	.790		
Likelihood Ratio	.300	1	.584		
Fisher's Exact Test				.574	.385
N of Valid Cases	98				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.04.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures^a

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.056	.579
	Cramer's V	.056	.579
	N of Valid Cases	98	

a. Correlation statistics are available for numeric data only.

Table F.56 – Crosstabulation between the main income source of the social enterprises examined and whether they were established for a specific target group

	Community/general public	Established for specific target group	Total
Traded	15	10	25
grants/others	47	25	72
Total	62	35	97

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.224 ^a	1	.636		
Continuity Correction ^b	.054	1	.817		
Likelihood Ratio	.222	1	.637		
Fisher's Exact Test				.638	.405
N of Valid Cases	97				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.02.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Symmetric Measures^a

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.048	.636
	Cramer's V	.048	.636
	N of Valid Cases	97	

a. Correlation statistics are available for numeric data only.

Table F.57 - Crosstabulation between the main income source of the social enterprises examined and their regional location

	Dublin	Rest of east coast	Midlands	West	South	North-west	Total
Traded	10	7	2	0	6	1	26
Grants/others	16	11	5	15	10	16	73
Total	26	18	7	15	16	17	99

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.531 ^a	5	.019
Likelihood Ratio	18.150	5	.003
N of Valid Cases	99		

a. 5 cells (41.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.84.

Symmetric Measures^a

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.370	.019
	Cramer's V	.370	.019
	N of Valid Cases	99	

a. Correlation statistics are available for numeric data only.

Table F.58 – Crosstabulation between the main income source of the social enterprises examined and the length of service of the respondent

	Under 1 year	1-3 years	4-6 years	Greater than 7 years	Total
Traded	3	6	9	7	25
Grants/others	4	25	27	14	70
Total	7	31	36	21	95

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.328 ^a	3	.507
Likelihood Ratio	2.259	3	.520
N of Valid Cases	95		

a. 1 cells (12.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.84.

Symmetric Measures^a

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.157	.507
	Cramer's V	.157	.507
	N of Valid Cases	95	

a. Correlation statistics are available for numeric data only.

Table F.59 – Crosstabulation between the regional location of the social enterprises examined and the importance of market failure as a rationale for social enterprises

	Important	Unimportant	Neutral/unsure	Total
Dublin	21	2	3	26
Rest of east coast	13	2	3	18
Midlands	4	0	3	7
West	12	0	3	15
South	13	1	3	17
North-west	12	2	3	17
Total	75	7	18	100

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.164 ^a	10	.801
Likelihood Ratio	6.979	10	.727
Linear-by-Linear Association	.236	1	.627
N of Valid Cases	100		

a. 12 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .49.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Asymp. Std. Error ^a	Approx. T ^b	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.248			.801
	Cramer's V	.176			.801
Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	.049	.094	.484	.629 ^c
Ordinal by Ordinal	Spearman Correlation	.054	.096	.538	.592 ^c
N of Valid Cases		100			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

c. Based on normal approximation.

Table F.60 – Crosstabulation between the main good or service provided by the social enterprises examined and the importance of market failure for social enterprises

	Important	Unimportant	Neutral/unsure	Total
Tourism/cultural/heritage and recreation	20	2	5	27
Enterprise/employment service or centre	6	1	1	8
General service including transport	25	2	7	34
Community centre/facility	13	1	2	16
Childcare/education and training	11	1	3	15
Total	75	7	18	100

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.097 ^a	8	.998
Likelihood Ratio	1.075	8	.998
Linear-by-Linear Association	.011	1	.917
N of Valid Cases	100		

a. 9 cells (60.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .56.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Asymp. Std. Error ^a	Approx. T ^b	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.105			.998
	Cramer's V	.074			.998
Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	-.010	.100	-.104	.918 ^c
Ordinal by Ordinal	Spearman Correlation	-.018	.100	-.176	.861 ^c
N of Valid Cases		100			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

c. Based on normal approximation.

Table F.61 – Crosstabulation between whether the social enterprise was established to serve a specific target group and the importance of market failure for social enterprises

	Important	Unimportant	Neutral/unsure	Total
Community/general public	50	4	8	62
Established for specific target group	25	3	8	36
Total	75	7	16	98

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.698 ^a	2	.428
Likelihood Ratio	1.657	2	.437
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.677	1	.195
N of Valid Cases	98		

a. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.57.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Asymp. Std. Error ^a	Approx. T ^b	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.132			.428
	Cramer's V	.132			.428
Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	.131	.104	1.299	.197 ^c
Ordinal by Ordinal	Spearman Correlation	.130	.104	1.290	.200 ^c
N of Valid Cases		98			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

c. Based on normal approximation.

Table F. 62 – Crosstabulation between the main social objective of the organisation and whether there was a specific event/reason for the establishment of the social enterprise

	Yes	No	Total
Community development and facilities	4	16	20
Education, training and childcare	2	10	12
Local economic/enterprise development	6	20	26
Promote tourism, heritage, recreation and arts	5	19	24
General services to the community	2	17	19
Total	19	82	101

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.283 ^a	4	.864
Likelihood Ratio	1.393	4	.845
N of Valid Cases	101		

a. 5 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.26.

Symmetric Measures^a

	Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal Phi	.113	.864
Cramer's V	.113	.864
N of Valid Cases	101	

a. Correlation statistics are available for numeric data only.

Table F.63 – Crosstabulation between the main social objective or mission of the social enterprises and whether they served a specific target group

	Yes	No	Total
Community development and facilities	4	16	20
Education, training and childcare	2	10	12
Local economic/enterprise development	6	20	26
Promote tourism, heritage, recreation and arts	5	19	24
General services to the community	2	17	19
Total	19	82	101

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.283 ^a	4	.864
Likelihood Ratio	1.393	4	.845
N of Valid Cases	101		

a. 5 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.26.

Symmetric Measures^a

	Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal Phi	.113	.864
Cramer's V	.113	.864
N of Valid Cases	101	

a. Correlation statistics are available for numeric data only.