Table 7.108 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	ℓ	S_ℓ	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λA_1	-0.836765	0.180018	-4.648230	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2	-0.398695	0.150411	-2.650704	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_3	0.452971	0.113766	3.981603	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4	0.632389	0.103967	6.082594	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5	0.150101	0.126140	1.189956	Insignificant
λB_1	1.133273	0.091572	12.375759	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.641857	0.102328	6.272545	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_3	0.507885	0.113192	4.486934	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_4	-1.328435	0.239693	-5.542235	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	0.264141	0.120023	2.200753	Insignificant
λB_6	-1.218722	0.196246	-6.210175	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_1B_1	-0.029966	0.241412	-0.124128	Insignificant
λA_1B_2	0.210135	0.258291	0.813559	Insignificant
λA_1B_3	-0.503191	0.327339	-1.537217	Insignificant
λA_1B_4	-0.458629	0.696509	-0.658468	Insignificant
λA_1B_5	-0.259447	0.329764	-0.786766	Insignificant
λA_1B_6	1.041095	0.382341	2.722949	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2B_1	-0.026203	0.201395	-0.130108	Insignificant
λA_2B_2	0.224050	0.215735	1.038543	Insignificant
λA_2B_3	0.100193	0.232874	0.430246	Insignificant
λA_2B_4	-0.203552	0.524730	-0.387918	Insignificant
λA_2B_5	-0.186691	0.268876	-0.694339	Insignificant
λA_2B_6	0.092199	0.435585	0.211667	Insignificant
λA_3B_1	-0.066938	0.151468	-0.441928	Insignificant
λA_3B_2	0.251634	0.161945	1.553824	Insignificant
λA_3B_3	0.176514	0.174134	1.013668	Insignificant
λA_3B_4	-0.138927	0.381655	-0.364012	Insignificant
λA_3B_5	0.026354	0.190805	0.138120	Insignificant
λA_3B_6	-0.248641	0.355978	-0.698473	Insignificant
λA_4B_1	-0.246357	0.144254	-1.707800	Insignificant
λA_4B_2	-0.160407	0.161460	-0.993478	Insignificant
λA_4B_3	0.107097	0.164985	0.649132	Insignificant
λA_4B_4	0.637166	0.307077	2.074939	Insignificant
λA_4B_5	0.090557	0.176892	0.511934	Insignificant
λA_4B_6	-0.428060	0.352969	-1.212741	Insignificant
λA_5B_1	0.369463	0.158485	2.331217	Insignificant
λA_5B_2	-0.525416	0.209451	-2.508539	Insignificant
λA_5B_3	0.119381	0.193190	0.617946	Insignificant
λA_5B_4	0.163943	0.385525	0.425246	Insignificant
λA_5B_5	0.329224	0.198432	1.659128	Insignificant
λA_5B_6	-0.456597	0.427811	-1.067287	Insignificant

Main effect A_i produced significant differences. The observed frequencies in four of the five attitudinal categories, namely, Never, Seldom, Sometimes and Often, differed significantly from the respective group norms. The exception was the category Always. In the case of the main effect B_j relating to population group, five significant deviations from the general trend were observed: among Africans, Afrikaans-speaking Whites, English-speaking Whites, Coloureds and 'Other'.

A single significant interaction effect A_iB_j occurred in A_1B_6. The frequency of 'Other' respondents in A_1B_6 (5 or 23.8% of this subgroup) who would never agree with the content of question 12.4 (ℓ/s equal to +2.72) was significantly higher than the group norm.

7.4.3 Possibility of Embracing Other Radio Stations

The third factor analysis was directed at questions 13.1 to 13.11. The resultant statistical analysis produced two factors containing six and five questions respectively.

7.4.3.1 Unification of Population Groups

The first of the six questions in this factor was question 13.7. The content of questions 13.1 and 13.9 were rather diametrical to the remaining questions extracted as part of factor I.

Table 7.109 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 13.7**

	Population Group						
Scale Point	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	Total
Strongly disagree	5	3	0	0	0	1	9
Row %	55.6%	33.3%	0%	0%	0%	11.1%	100%
Column %	2.1%	1.9%	0%	0%	0%	4.8%	1.3%
Disagree	10	17	12	1	5	3	48
Row %	20.8%	35.4%	25%	2.1%	10.4%	6.3%	100%
Column %	4.2%	11%	8.2%	4.2%	4.6%	14.3%	6.9%
Neutral	42	56	59	6	10	9	182
Row %	23.1%	30.8%	32.4%	3.3%	5.5%	4.9%	100%
Column %	17.6%	36.4%	40.4%	25%	9.2%	42.9%	26.3%
Agree	93	60	51	11	64	2	281
Row %	33.1%	21.4%	18.1%	3.9%	22.8%	.7%	100%
Column %	39.1%	39%	34.9%	45.8%	58.7%	9.5%	40.6%
Strongly agree	88	18	24	6	30	6	172
Row %	51.2%	10.5%	14%	3.5%	17.4%	3.5%	100%
Column %	37%	11.7%	16.4%	25%	27.5%	28.6%	24.9%
Total	238	154	146	24	109	21	692
Row %	34.4%	22.3%	21.1%	3.5%	15.8%	3%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 13.7 referenced in Table 7.109 referred to the great need for a radio station that could unite all South Africans.

In this case, 65.5% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the content of the statement. Compared with the general norm, the subsamples responded as follows: African, 76.1%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 50.7%; White English-speaking, 51.3%;

Coloured, 70.8%; Indian, 86.2%; 'Other', 38.1%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To measure whether 'Population Group' played a part in this factor, the presence of the saturated model of the hierarchical loglinear analysis was again looked for. In this regard ℓ^* was calculated at 149.27, which was significant ($\ell^* = 149.27 >$ critical $X^2 = 37.566$ with 20 degrees of freedom). The saturated model of the hierarchical loglinear analysis applied in this instance. Further loglinear analysis of the cross-tabulation was therefore necessary. The findings are reported in Table 7.110.

Table 7.110 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	ℓ	S_ℓ	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λA_1	-1.832260	0.290352	-6.310478	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2	-0.562140	0.195807	-2.870888	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_3	0.738421	0.126579	5.833677	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4	0.017849	0.140149	0.127357	Insignificant
λA_5	0.638146	0.129112	4.942577	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_1	1.048322	0.134066	7.819467	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.704775	0.146998	4.794453	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_3	0.450861	0.199308	2.262132	Insignificant
λB_4	-1.087320	0.270916	-4.013495	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	0.010817	0.211474	0.051150	Insignificant
λB_6	-1.127450	0.255040	-4.420679	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_1B_1	0.109770	0.416568	0.263510	Insignificant
λA_1B_2	-0.057510	0.480101	-0.119787	Insignificant
λA_1B_3	-0.902210	0.717830	-1.256857	Insignificant
λA_1B_4	0.635975	0.740912	0.858368	Insignificant
λA_1B_5	-0.462160	0.721302	-0.640730	Insignificant
λA_1B_6	0.676110	0.735256	0.919557	Insignificant
λA_2B_1	-0.467200	0.295914	-1.578837	Insignificant
λA_2B_2	0.406975	0.273367	1.488750	Insignificant
λA_2B_3	0.312583	0.320388	0.975639	Insignificant
λA_2B_4	-0.634140	0.709216	-0.894142	Insignificant
λA_2B_5	-0.122840	0.392826	-0.312708	Insignificant
λA_2B_6	0.504604	0.477462	1.056846	Insignificant
λA_3B_1	-0.332680	0.186469	-1.784104	Insignificant
λA_3B_2	0.298552	0.189802	1.572966	Insignificant
λA_3B_3	0.604651	0.231898	2.607401	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_3B_4	-0.142940	0.383843	-0.372392	Insignificant
λA_3B_5	-0.730260	0.303306	-2.407668	Insignificant
λA_3B_6	0.302655	0.341706	0.885718	Insignificant
λA_4B_1	0.182824	0.182119	1.003871	Insignificant
λA_4B_2	0.088117	0.197909	0.445240	Insignificant
λA_4B_3	0.179512	0.241784	0.742448	Insignificant
λA_4B_4	0.183763	0.347350	0.529043	Insignificant
λA_4B_5	0.846613	0.248724	3.403825	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4B_6	-1.480850	0.525298	-2.819067	Significant at 0.1% level

Table 7.110 (Cont.) Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	ℓ	S_ℓ	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λA_5B_1	0.507265	0.174470	2.907463	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5B_2	-0.736150	0.227490	-3.235966	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5B_3	0.179512	0.253597	-0.707863	Insignificant
λA_5B_4	0.183763	0.384685	0.477697	Insignificant
λA_5B_5	0.846613	0.526857	1.606912	Insignificant
λA_5B_6	-1.480850	0.373675	-3.962936	Significant at 0.1% level

Main effect A_i produced significant differences. In four of the five attitudinal categories, namely, Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral and Strongly Agree, the observed frequencies differed significantly from the respective group norms. The exception was the category Agree. In the case of the main effect B_j relating to population group, four significant deviations from the general trend were observed: among Africans, Afrikaans-speaking Whites, Coloureds and 'Other'.

Six significant interaction effects A_iB_j occurred, in A_3B_3, A_4B_5, A_4B_6, A_5B_1, A_5B_2 and A_5B_6 respectively. The frequency of English-speaking White respondents in A_3B_3 (59 or 40.4% of this subgroup) who were neutral regarding the content of question 13.7 (ℓ/s equal to +2.61) was significantly higher than the group norm.

With regard to A_4B_5, the frequency of Indian respondents (64 or 58.7% in this subgroup) who agreed with the content of question 13.7 (ℓ/s equal to +3.40) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample. The frequency of 'Other' respondents in A_4B_6 (2 or 9.5% of this subgroup) who agreed with the content of question 13.7 (ℓ/s equal to -2.82) was significantly lower than the group norm. In the case of A_5B_1, the frequency of African respondents (88 or 37% in this subgroup) who strongly agreed with the content of question 13.7 (ℓ/s equal to +2.91) was significantly higher than the group norm.

The frequency of Afrikaans-speaking respondents in A_5B_2 (18 or 11.7% of this subgroup) who strongly agreed with the content of question 13.7 (ℓ/s equal to -3.24) was significantly lower than the group norm. Lastly, in the case of A_5B_6, the frequency of 'Other' respondents (6 or 28.6% of this subgroup) who strongly agreed with the content of question 13.7 (ℓ/s equal to –3.96) was significantly lower than the group norm.

Table 7.111 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 13.8**

	Population Group						
Scale Point	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	Total
Strongly disagree	7	6	5	0	2	1	21
Row %	33.3%	28.6%	23.8%	0%	9.5%	4.8%	100%
Column %	2.9%	3.9%	3.4%	0%	1.8%	5.3%	3%
Disagree	21	33	10	1	5	3	73
Row %	28.8%	45.2%	13.7%	1.4%	6.8%	4.1%	100%
Column %	8.8%	21.6%	6.7%	4.2%	4.5%	15.8%	10.5%
Neutral	57	45	49	5	19	6	181
Row %	31.5%	24.9%	27.1%	2.8%	10.5%	3.3%	100%
Column %	23.8%	29.4%	32.9%	20.8%	17%	31.6%	26%
Agree	84	57	59	13	57	6	276
Row %	30.4%	20.7%	21.4%	4.7%	20.7%	2.2%	100%
Column %	35%	37.3%	39.6%	54.2%	50.9%	31.6%	39.6%
Strongly agree	71	12	26	5	29	3	146
Row %	48.6%	8.2%	17.8%	3.4%	19.9%	2.1%	100%
Column %	29.6%	7.8%	17.4%	20.8%	25.9%	15.8%	20.9%
Total	240	153	149	24	112	19	697
Row %	34.4%	22%	21.4%	3.4%	16.1%	2.7%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

The response to question 13.8 presented in Table 7.111 referred to the definite need for a multicultural radio station that would help nurture or develop a unique South African culture that black and white South Africans could be proud to share.

In this case, 60.5% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this point of view. Compared with the general trend, the subsamples produced the following results: African, 64.6%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 45.1%; White English-speaking, 57%; Coloured, 75%; Indian, 76.8%; 'Other', 47.4%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To measure whether 'Population Group' played a part in this factor, the presence of saturation was looked for. In this regard ℓ^* was calculated at 108.98, which was significant ($\ell^* = 108.98 > \text{critical } X^2 = 37.566$ with 20 degrees of freedom). The saturated model of the hierarchical loglinear analysis applied in this instance. Further loglinear analysis of the cross-tabulation was required, as set out in Table 7.112.

Table 7.112 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	ℓ	S_ℓ	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λA_1	-1.417000	0.238873	-5.932022	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2	-0.498430	0.188209	-2.648279	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_3	0.590818	0.122036	4.841342	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4	0.068151	0.109668	0.621430	Insignificant
λA_5	0.256462	0.136491	1.878966	Insignificant
λB_1	1.121687	0.114638	9.784600	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.700868	0.124245	5.641016	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_3	0.604186	0.130090	4.644369	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_4	-0.266940	0.270098	-0.988308	Insignificant
λB_5	0.107765	0.168402	0.639927	Insignificant
λB_6	-1.267560	0.245428	-5.164692	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_1B_1	-0.182490	0.347050	-0.525832	Insignificant
λA_1B_2	0.084183	0.363679	0.231476	Insignificant
λA_1B_3	-0.001460	0.383513	-0.003807	Insignificant
λA_1B_4	0.260236	0.723265	0.359807	Insignificant
λA_1B_5	-0.421330	0.527748	-0.798355	Insignificant
λA_1B_6	0.260852	0.714418	0.365125	Insignificant
λA_2B_1	-0.002440	0.246395	-0.009903	Insignificant
λA_2B_2	0.870363	0.236810	3.675364	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2B_3	-0.226880	0.292309	-0.776165	Insignificant
λA_2B_4	-0.658330	0.708148	-0.929650	Insignificant
λA_2B_5	-0.423600	0.369973	-1.144948	Insignificant
λA_2B_6	0.440896	0.471263	0.935563	Insignificant
λA_3B_1	-0.093160	0.167782	-0.555244	Insignificant
λA_3B_2	0.091267	0.179769	0.507690	Insignificant
λA_3B_3	0.273106	0.181873	1.501630	Insignificant
λA_3B_4	-0.138150	0.401178	-0.344361	Insignificant
λA_3B_5	-0.177850	0.239589	-0.742313	Insignificant
λA_3B_6	0.044792	0.367278	0.121957	Insignificant
λA_4B_1	-0.182730	0.151754	-1.204120	Insignificant
λA_4B_2	-0.149680	0.166072	-0.901296	Insignificant
λA_4B_3	-0.018510	0.169790	-0.109017	Insignificant
λA_4B_4	0.340033	0.329921	1.030650	Insignificant
λA_4B_5	0.443426	0.201252	2.203337	Insignificant
λA_4B_6	-0.432540	0.363355	-1.190406	Insignificant
λA_5B_1	0.460822	0.174654	2.638485	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5B_2	-0.896130	0.245964	-3.643338	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5B_3	-0.026260	0.209848	-0.125138	Insignificant
λA_5B_4	0.196211	0.405809	0.483506	Insignificant
λA_5B_5	0.579360	0.232122	2.495929	Insignificant
λA_5B_6	-0.314000	0.453097	-0.693008	Insignificant

Main effect A_i produced significant differences. In three of the five attitudinal categories, namely, Strongly Disagree, Disagree and Neutral, observed response patterns differed significantly from the respective group norms. The exceptions were categories Agree and Strongly Agree. In the case of the main effect B_j relating to population group, four significant deviations from the general trend were observed: among Africans, Afrikaans-speaking Whites, English-speaking Whites and 'Other'.

Three significant interaction effects A_iB_j occurred, in A_2B_2, A_5B_1 and A_5B_2 respectively. The frequency of Afrikaans-speaking White respondents in A_2B_2 (33 or 21.6% of this subgroup) who disagreed with the content of question 13.8 (ℓ/s equal to +3.68) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample. With regard to A_5B_1, the frequency of African respondents (71 or 29.6% in this subgroup) who strongly agreed with the content of question 13.8 (ℓ/s equal to +2.64) was significantly higher than the group norm. Lastly, the frequency of Afrikaans-speaking White respondents in A_5B_2 (12 or 7.8% of this subgroup) who strongly agreed with the content of question 13.8 (ℓ/s equal to –3.64) was significantly lower than the group norm.

Table 7.113 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 13.11**

	Population Group						
Scale Point	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	Total
Strongly disagree	8	6	4	0	3	1	22
Row %	36.4%	27.3%	18.2%	0%	13.6%	4.5%	100%
Column %	3.3%	3.9%	2.6%	0%	2.7%	4.8%	3.1%
Disagree	19	19	17	2	7	3	67
Row %	28.4%	28.4%	25.4%	3%	10.4%	4.5%	100%
Column %	7.9%	12.3%	11.3%	8.3%	6.3%	14.3%	9.6%
Neutral	54	52	53	4	19	5	187
Row %	28.9%	27.8%	28.3%	2.1%	10.2%	2.7%	100%
Column %	22.5%	33.8%	35.1%	16.7%	17.1%	23.8%	26.7%
Agree	89	64	52	12	61	9	287
Row %	31%	22.3%	18.1%	4.2%	21.3%	3.1%	100%
Column %	37.1%	41.6%	34.4%	50%	55%	42.9%	40.9%
Strongly agree	70	13	25	6	21	3	138
Row %	50.7%	9.4%	18.1%	4.3%	15.2%	2.2%	100%
Column %	29.2%	8.4%	16.6%	25%	18.9%	14.3%	19.7%
Total	240	154	151	24	111	21	701
Row %	34.2%	22%	21.5%	3.4%	15.8%	3%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 13.11 in Table 7.113 referred to a radio station that serves a multicultural audience, which would definitely promote understanding between blacks and whites.

In the case of this variable, 60.6% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the content of the statement. The subsamples figures were: African, 66.3%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 50%; White English-speaking, 51%; Coloured, 75%; Indian, 73.9%; 'Other', 57.2%.

The data were further analysed with regard to second main effect: a reflection of the respondents' population group. To measure whether 'Population Group' played an interactive part in the cross-tabulation, testing for the presence of saturation was done. In this regard ℓ^* was calculated at 85.25, which was significant ($\ell^* = 85.25 >$ critical $X^2 =$ 37.566 with 20 degrees of freedom). The saturated model of the hierarchical loglinear analysis applied in this instance. Further loglinear analysis of the cross-tabulation was therefore required. The ensuing results are presented in Table 7.114.

Table 7.114 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	ℓ	s_ℓ	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λA_1	-1.408170	0.232463	-6.057609	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2	-0.390890	0.158515	-2.465950	Insignificant
λA_3	0.507595	0.124271	4.084581	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4	0.097775	0.102003	0.958550	Insignificant
λA_5	0.193682	0.132047	1.466766	Insignificant
λB_1	1.082481	0.109699	9.867738	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.614737	0.122275	5.027495	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_3	0.604466	0.128220	4.714288	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_4	-1.196300	0.243836	-4.906166	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	0.161353	0.148093	1.089538	Insignificant
λB_6	-1.266740	0.242618	-5.221130	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_1B_1	-0.062390	0.331588	-0.188155	Insignificant
λA_1B_2	0.117405	0.359909	0.326207	Insignificant
λA_1B_3	-0.277520	0.405410	-0.684542	Insignificant
λA_1B_4	0.136947	0.712301	0.192260	Insignificant
λA_1B_5	-0.122090	0.450757	-0.270855	Insignificant
λA_1B_6	0.207391	0.711885	0.291327	Insignificant
λA_2B_1	-0.216700	0.228235	-0.949460	Insignificant
λA_2B_2	0.252809	0.234539	1.077897	Insignificant
λA_2B_3	0.152123	0.242847	0.626415	Insignificant
λA_2B_4	-0.187180	0.527694	-0.354713	Insignificant
λA_2B_5	-0.292207	0.313176	-0.933044	Insignificant
λA_2B_6	0.288728	0.459566	0.628262	Insignificant
λA_3B_1	-0.068610	0.169594	-0.404554	Insignificant
λA_3B_2	0.361126	0.178786	2.019879	Insignificant
λA_3B_3	0.390713	0.182506	2.140823	Insignificant
λA_3B_4	-0.392520	0.410824	-0.955446	Insignificant
λA_3B_5	-0.192030	0.228703	-0.839648	Insignificant
λA_3B_6	-0.098930	0.384947	-0.256996	Insignificant
λA_4B_1	-0.159140	0.144258	-1.103162	Insignificant
λA_4B_2	-0.021410	0.159635	-0.134118	Insignificant
λA_4B_3	-0.218510	0.168567	-1.296280	Insignificant
λA_4B_4	0.115910	0.311563	0.372027	Insignificant
λA_4B_5	0.384228	0.181028	2.122478	Insignificant
λA_4B_6	-0.101330	0.328009	-0.308924	Insignificant
λA_5B_1	0.504814	0.170475	2.961220	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5B_2	-0.711260	0.238819	-2.978239	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5B_3	-0.146790	0.209175	-0.701757	Insignificant
λA_5B_4	0.326856	0.370724	0.881669	Insignificant
λA_5B_5	0.221969	0.228676	0.970670	Insignificant
λA_5B_6	-0.295850	0.451121	-0.655811	Insignificant

Main effect A_i produced significant differences. In two of the five attitudinal categories, namely, Strongly Disagree and Neutral, response distribution, differed significantly from the respective group norms. The exceptions were the categories Disagree, Agree and Strongly Agree. In the case of the main effect B_j relating to population group, five significant deviations from the general trend were observed: among Africans, Afrikaans-speaking Whites, English-speaking Whites, Coloureds and 'Other'.

Two significant interaction effects A_iB_j occurred, in A_5B_1, and A_5B_2 respectively. The frequency of African respondents in A_5B_1 (70 or 29.2% of this subgroup) who strongly agreed with the content of question 13.11 (ℓ/s equal to +2.96) was significantly higher than the group norm. In the case of A_5B_2, the frequency of Afrikaans-speaking White respondents (13 or 8.4% in this subgroup) who strongly agreed with the content of question 13.11 (ℓ/s equal to –2.98) was significantly lower than the group norm.

Table 7.115 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups **for question 13.5**

	Population Group						
Scale Point	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	Total
Strongly disagree	12	3	4	0	2	1	22
Row %	54.5%	13.6%	18.2%	0%	9.1%	4.5%	100%
Column %	5%	1.9%	2.7%	0%	1.8%	5%	3.1%
Disagree	11	15	11	3	7	3	50
Row %	22%	30%	22%	6%	14%	6%	100%
Column %	4.6%	9.7%	7.3%	12.5%	6.3%	15%	7.1%
Neutral	48	48	41	7	23	5	172
Row %	27.9%	27.9%	23.8%	4.1%	13.4%	2.9%	100%
Column %	20%	31.2%	27.3%	29.2%	20.5%	25%	24.6%
Agree	92	69	69	8	56	4	298
Row %	30.9%	23.2%	23.2%	2.7%	18.8%	1.3%	100%
Column %	38.3%	44.8%	46%	33.3%	50%	20%	42.6%
Strongly agree	77	19	25	6	24	7	158
Row %	48.7%	12.0%	15.8%	3.8%	15.2%	4.4%	100%
Column %	32.1%	12.3%	16.7%	25%	21.4%	35%	22.6%
Total	240	154	150	24	112	20	700
Row %	34.3%	22%	21.4%	3.4%	16%	2.9%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 13.5 that pertained to Table 7.115 referred to a radio station that serves a multicultural audience and would definitely help to promote tolerance between the various population groups in South Africa.

In this case, 65.2% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Subgroup comparisons were as follows: African, 70.4%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 57.1%; White English-speaking, 62.7%; Coloured, 58.3%; Indian, 71.4%; 'Other', 55%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To measure whether 'Population Group' played a part in this factor, the presence of saturation was determined. In this regard ℓ^* was calculated at 81.21, which was significant ($\ell^* = 81.21 >$ critical $X^2 = 37.566$ with 20 degrees of freedom). The saturated model of the hierarchical loglinear analysis applied in this instance. Further loglinear analysis of the cross-tabulation was done but produced no significant interaction. Four borderline but insignificant interactions occurred. The findings of the main effects are reported in Table 7.116.

Table 7.116 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the independent model

Effect	ℓ	S_ℓ	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λA_1	-1.501529	0.242823	-6.183636	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2	-0.504193	0.154333	-3.266916	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_3	0.579113	0.117154	4.943177	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4	0.968159	0.115745	8.364586	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5	0.458451	0.117467	3.902807	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_1	1.078568	0.109651	9.836372	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.525926	0.138554	3.795820	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_3	0.544793	0.131832	4.132479	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_4	-1.062211	0.230928	-4.599750	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	0.150235	0.161477	0.930380	Insignificant
λB_6	-1.237305	0.239896	-5.157672	Significant at 0.1% level

Main effect A_i produced significant differences. The observed frequencies in all five attitudinal categories – Never, Seldom, Sometimes, Often and Always – differed significantly from the respective group norms. In the case of the main effect B_j relating to population group, five significant deviations from the general trend were observed: among Africans, Afrikaans-speaking Whites, English-speaking Whites, Coloureds and 'Other'.

Table 7.117 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 13.1**

	Population Group						
Scale Point	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	Total
Strongly disagree	16	16	13	0	5	3	53
Row %	30.2%	30.2%	24.5%	0%	9.4%	5.7%	100%
Column %	6.6%	10.3%	8.7%	0%	4.4%	13.6%	7.5%
Disagree	24	33	25	3	9	2	96
Row %	25%	34.4%	26%	3.1%	9.4%	2.1%	100%
Column %	9.9%	21.3%	16.7%	12%	8%	9.1%	13.6%
Neutral	48	28	24	3	16	3	122
Row %	39.3%	23%	19.7%	2.5%	13.1%	2.5%	100%
Column %	19.8%	18.1%	16%	12%	14.2%	13.6%	17.2%
Agree	86	55	60	11	57	8	277
Row %	31%	19.9%	21.7%	4%	20.6%	2.9%	100%
Column %	35.4%	35.5%	40%	44%	50.4%	36.4%	39.1%
Strongly agree	69	23	28	8	26	6	160
Row %	43.1%	14.4%	17.5%	5%	16.3%	3.8%	100%
Column %	28.4%	14.8%	18.7%	32%	23%	27.3%	22.6%
Total	243	155	150	25	113	22	708
Row %	34.3%	21.9%	21.2%	3.5%	16%	3.1%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 13.1 that pertained to Table 7.117 referred to the person who could listen to any radio station as long as he or she understands the language that is used during the broadcast.

In this case, 61.7% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. The subgroups were calculated as follows: African, 63.8%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 50.3%; White English-speaking, 58.7%; Coloured, 76%; Indian, 73.4%; 'Other', 63.7%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To determine the part of the subcategories of 'Population Group', the usual testing for saturation was done. In this regard ℓ^* was calculated at 57.40, which was significant ($\ell^* = 57.40 >$ critical $X^2 = 37.566$ with 20 degrees of freedom). The saturated model of the hierarchical loglinear analysis applied in this instance. Further loglinear analysis of the cross-tabulation was therefore required and duly reported in Table 7.118.

Table 7.118 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	ℓ	S_ℓ	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λA_1	-0.828950	0.183641	-4.513970	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2	-0.318240	0.149700	-2.125852	Insignificant
λA_3	-0.173430	0.136355	-1.271901	Insignificant
λA_4	0.880756	0.097307	9.051312	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5	0.339870	0.109340	3.108378	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_1	1.070080	0.093984	11.385768	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.716846	0.099371	7.213835	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_3	0.645706	0.102122	6.322888	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_4	-1.297070	0.234532	-5.530461	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	0.144100	0.127513	1.130081	Insignificant
λB_6	-0.279670	0.209026	-1.337968	Insignificant
λA_1B_1	-0.100520	0.250507	-0.401266	Insignificant
λA_1B_2	0.252714	0.252578	1.000538	Insignificant
λA_1B_3	0.116214	0.264800	0.438875	Insignificant
λA_1B_4	-0.505960	0.695648	-0.727322	Insignificant
λA_1B_5	-0.337690	0.353809	-0.954442	Insignificant
λA_1B_6	0.575248	0.453813	1.267588	Insignificant
λA_2B_1	-0.205760	0.207621	-0.991037	Insignificant
λA_2B_2	0.465925	0.199004	2.341285	Insignificant
λA_2B_3	0.259433	0.209847	1.236296	Insignificant
λA_2B_4	0.081943	0.453812	0.180566	Insignificant
λA_2B_5	-0.260610	0.279841	-0.931279	Insignificant
λA_2B_6	-0.340920	0.511174	-0.666935	Insignificant
λA_3B_1	0.242476	0.175943	1.378151	Insignificant
λA_3B_2	0.056813	0.194807	0.291637	Insignificant
λA_3B_3	-0.026200	0.202201	-0.129574	Insignificant
λA_3B_4	-0.162870	0.449587	-0.362266	Insignificant
λA_3B_5	0.069943	0.234626	0.298104	Insignificant
λA_3B_6	-0.180270	0.436824	-0.412683	Insignificant
λA_4B_1	-0.128470	0.134721	-0.953600	Insignificant
λA_4B_2	-0.222250	0.147691	-1.504831	Insignificant
λA_4B_3	-0.064100	0.147517	-0.434526	Insignificant
λA_4B_4	0.182227	0.309894	0.588030	Insignificant
λA_4B_5	0.386216	0.167160	2.310457	Insignificant
λA_4B_6	-0.153630	0.313620	-0.489860	Insignificant
λA_5B_1	0.192177	0.147288	1.304770	Insignificant
λA_5B_2	-0.553200	0.185282	-2.985719	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5B_3	-0.285350	0.178265	-1.600707	Insignificant
λA_5B_4	0.404659	0.334767	1.208778	Insignificant
λA_5B_5	0.142146	0.196743	0.722496	Insignificant
λA_5B_6	0.099574	0.342669	0.290584	Insignificant

Main effect A_i produced significant differences. In three of the five attitudinal categories, namely, Strongly Disagree, Agree and Strongly Agree, observed response patterns differed significantly from the respective group norms. The exceptions were categories Disagree and Neutral. In the case of the main effect B_j relating to population group, four significant deviations from the general trend were observed: among Africans, Afrikaans-speaking Whites, English-speaking Whites and Coloureds.

A single significant interaction effect A_iB_j occurred, in A_5B_2. The frequency of Afrikaans-speaking White respondents (23 or 14.8% of this subgroup) who strongly agreed with the content of question 13.1 (ℓ/s equal to –2.99) was significantly lower than the group norm.

Table 7.119 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 13.9**

	Population Group						
Scale Point	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	Total
Strongly disagree	10	0	4	1	6	2	23
Row %	43.5%	0%	17.4%	4.3%	26.1%	8.7%	100%
Column %	4.2%	0%	2.6%	4.2%	5.4%	9.5%	3.3%
Disagree	26	22	21	6	11	4	90
Row %	28.9%	24.4%	23.3%	6.7%	12.2%	4.4%	100%
Column %	10.8%	14.3%	13.9%	25%	9.8%	19%	12.8%
Neutral	71	45	58	7	26	5	212
Row %	33.5%	21.2%	27.4%	3.3%	12.3%	2.4%	100%
Column %	29.6%	29.2%	38.4%	29.2%	23.2%	23.8%	30.2%
Agree	97	57	51	7	47	8	267
Row %	36.3%	21.3%	19.1%	2.6%	17.6%	3%	100%
Column %	40.4%	37%	33.8%	29.2%	42%	38.1%	38%
Strongly agree	36	30	17	3	22	2	110
Row %	32.7%	27.3%	15.5%	2.7%	20%	1.8%	110%
Column %	15%	19.5%	11.3%	12.5%	19.6%	9.5%	15.7%
Total	240	154	151	24	112	21	702
Row %	34.2%	21.9%	21.5%	3.4%	16%	3%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 13.9 in Table 7.119 referred to the opinion that South Africa can best be served by radio stations that serve different population groups.

In this instance, 53.7% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Statistics for the subsamples were as follows: African, 55.4%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 56.5%; White English-speaking, 45.1%; Coloured, 41.7%; Indian, 61.6%; 'Other', 47.6%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To determine the interactive part of the subcategories 'Population Group', a test for the presence of saturation was done. In this regard ℓ^* was calculated at 59.67, which was significant ($\ell^* = 59.67 >$ critical $X^2 = 37.566$ with 20 degrees of freedom). The saturated model of the hierarchical loglinear analysis applied in this instance. Further loglinear analysis of the cross-tabulation once again did produce a single borderline interaction. The

findings of the main effects are presented in Table 7.120.

Table 7.120 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the independent model

Effect	ℓ	S_ℓ	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λA_1	-1.478118	0.237290	-6.229163	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2	-0.012147	0.129154	-0.094051	Insignificant
λA_3	0.650123	0.115224	5.642253	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4	0.897099	0.107883	8.315481	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5	-0.056960	0.150580	-0.378271	Insignificant
λB_1	1.089237	0.105415	10.332846	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.361309	0.189359	1.908064	Insignificant
λB_3	0.544178	0.128517	4.234288	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_4	-1.150643	0.231620	-4.967805	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	0.370707	0.125310	2.958319	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_6	-1.214788	0.219155	-5.543054	Significant at 0.1% level

Main effect A_i produced significant differences. In three of the five attitudinal categories, namely, Strongly Disagree, Neutral and Agree, observed response patterns differed significantly from the respective group norms. The exceptions were categories Disagree and Strongly Agree. In the case of the main effect B_j relating to population group, five significant deviations from the general trend were observed: among Africans, White English speakers, Coloureds, Indians and 'Other'.

7.4.3.2 Viability and/or Sustainability of a Multicultural Radio Station

The remaining five questions formed factor II.

Table 7.121 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 13.4**

	Population Group						
Scale Point	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	Total
Strongly disagree	91	22	37	7	36	6	199
Row %	45.7%	11.1%	18.6%	3.5%	18.1%	3%	100%
Column %	38.1%	14.4%	24.8%	29.2%	32.4%	28.6%	28.6%
Disagree	63	71	76	12	41	7	270
Row %	23.3%	26.3%	28.1%	4.4%	15.2%	2.6%	100%
Column %	26.4%	46.4%	51%	50%	36.9%	33.3%	38.7%
Neutral	45	34	30	4	14	3	130
Row %	34.6%	26.2%	23.1%	3.1%	10.8%	2.3%	100%
Column %	18.8%	22.2%	20.1%	16.7%	12.6%	14.3%	18.7%
Agree	25	16	4	0	17	5	67
Row %	37.3%	23.9%	6%	0%	25.4%	7.5%	100%
Column %	10.5%	10.5%	2.7%	0%	15.3%	23.8%	9.6%
Strongly agree	15	10	2	1	3	0	31
Row %	48.4%	32.3%	6.5%	3.2%	9.7%	0%	100%
Column %	6.3%	6.5%	1.3%	4.2%	2.7%	0%	4.4%
Total	239	153	149	24	111	21	697
Row %	34.3%	22%	21.4%	3.4%	15.9%	3%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 13.4 referred to a radio station that is designed to broadcast to a multicultural audience and would definitely not succeed in South Africa. The results of this variable are contained in Table 7.121.

In this case, 67.3% of the respondents strongly disagreed or disagreed with the statement in the questionnaire. The responses among subgroups were as follows: African, 64.5%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 60.8%; White English-speaking, 75.8%; Coloured, 79.2%; Indian, 69.3%; 'Other', 61.9%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To measure whether 'Population Group' played a part in this factor, testing for saturation was once again done. In this regard ℓ^* was calculated at 111.81, which was significant ($\ell^* = 111.81 >$ critical $X^2 = 37.566$ with 20 degrees of freedom). The saturated model of the hierarchical loglinear analysis applied in this instance. Further loglinear analysis of the cross-tabulation was therefore necessary, as set out in Table 7.122.

Table 7.122 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	ℓ	S_ℓ	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λA_1	0.625801	0.117270	5.336412	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2	1.016956	0.107863	9.428219	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_3	0.179831	0.138088	1.302293	Insignificant
λA_4	-0.493130	0.183289	-2.690451	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5	-1.329470	0.238200	-5.581318	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_1	1.214319	0.104369	11.634863	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.727854	0.115952	6.277201	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_3	0.221260	0.169411	1.306055	Insignificant
λB_4	-1.299780	0.269761	-4.818265	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	0.310397	0.143153	2.168288	Insignificant
λB_6	-1.174050	0.236394	-4.966497	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_1B_1	0.517306	0.149336	3.464041	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_1B_2	-0.725810	0.196569	-3.692393	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_1B_3	0.300659	0.215693	1.393921	Insignificant
λA_1B_4	0.156687	0.370036	0.423437	Insignificant
λA_1B_5	0.184123	0.196512	0.936956	Insignificant
λA_1B_6	-0.123190	0.359947	-0.342245	Insignificant
λA_2B_1	-0.551340	0.148785	-3.705615	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2B_2	0.054672	0.154834	0.353101	Insignificant
λA_2B_3	0.629319	0.197124	3.192503	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2B_4	0.304528	0.333166	0.914043	Insignificant
λA_2B_5	-0.076980	0.187467	-0.410632	Insignificant
λA_2B_6	-0.360190	0.343395	-1.048909	Insignificant
λA_3B_1	-0.050680	0.179194	-0.282822	Insignificant
λA_3B_2	0.155478	0.193748	0.802475	Insignificant
λA_3B_3	0.536909	0.233157	2.302779	Insignificant
λA_3B_4	0.043041	0.430233	0.100041	Insignificant
λA_3B_5	-0.314370	0.247776	-1.268767	Insignificant
λA_3B_6	-0.370360	0.448937	-0.824971	Insignificant
λA_4B_1	0.034491	0.231837	0.148773	Insignificant
λA_4B_2	0.074669	0.255539	0.292202	Insignificant
λA_4B_3	-0.805030	0.394405	-2.041125	Insignificant
λA_4B_4	-0.670290	0.706843	-0.948287	Insignificant
λA_4B_5	0.552750	0.266229	2.076220	Insignificant
λA_4B_6	0.813426	0.403408	2.016385	Insignificant
λA_5B_1	0.360001	0.295905	1.216610	Insignificant
λA_5B_2	0.441001	0.321628	1.371152	Insignificant
λA_5B_3	-0.661840	0.527920	-1.253675	Insignificant
λA_5B_4	0.166045	0.723029	0.229652	Insignificant
λA_5B_5	-0.345510	0.451471	-0.765298	Insignificant
λA_5B_6	0.040324	0.711254	0.056694	Insignificant

Main effect A_i produced significant differences. The observed frequencies in four of the five attitudinal categories, namely, Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree and Strongly Agree, differed significantly from the respective group norms. The exception was the category Neutral. In the case of the main effect B_j relating to population group, four significant deviations from the general trend were observed: among Africans, Afrikaans-speaking Whites, Coloureds and 'Other'.

Four significant interaction effects A_iB_j occurred, in A_1B_1, A_1B_2, A_2B_1 and A_2B_3 respectively. The frequency of African respondents in A_1B_1 (91 or 38.1% of this subgroup) who strongly disagreed with the content of question 13.4 (ℓ/s equal to +3.46) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample. In the case of A_1B_2, the frequency of Afrikaans-speaking White respondents (22 or 14.4% in this subgroup) who strongly disagreed with the content of question 13.4 (ℓ/s equal to –3.69) was significantly lower than the group norm.

In the case of A_2B_1, the frequency of African respondents (63 or 26.4% of this subgroup) who disagreed with the content of question 13.4 (ℓ/s equal to -3.71) was significantly lower than the group norm. Lastly, the frequency of English-speaking White respondents in A_2B_3 (76 or 51% of this subgroup) who disagreed with the content of question 13.4 (ℓ/s equal to +3.19) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample.

Table 7.123 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 13.3**

	Population Group						
Scale Point	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	Total
Strongly disagree	82	23	37	4	35	6	187
Row %	43.9%	12.3%	19.8%	2.1%	18.7%	3.2%	100%
Column %	34%	14.7%	24.5%	16.7%	31.3%	28.6%	26.5%
Disagree	74	65	70	14	41	9	273
Row %	27.1%	23.8%	25.6%	5.1%	15%	3.3%	100%
Column %	30.7%	41.7%	46.4%	58.3%	36.6%	42.9%	38.7%
Neutral	39	42	32	3	12	3	131
Row %	29.8%	32.1%	24.4%	2.3%	9.2%	2.3%	100%
Column %	16.2%	26.9%	21.2%	12.5%	10.7%	14.3%	18.6%
Agree	32	19	8	1	20	1	81
Row %	39.5%	23.5%	9.9%	1.2%	24.7%	1.2%	100%
Column %	13.3%	12.2%	5.3%	4.2%	17.9%	4.8%	11.5%
Strongly agree	14	7	4	2	4	2	33
Row %	42.2%	21.2%	12.1%	6.1%	12.1%	6.1%	100%
Column %	5.8%	4.5%	2.6%	8.3%	3.6%	9.5%	4.7%
Total	241	156	151	24	112	21	705
Row %	34.2%	22.1%	21.4%	3.4%	15.9%	3%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 13.3 in Table 7.123 referred to a radio station that is designed to broadcast to a multicultural audience and would definitely not be suitable for South Africa.

In the case under consideration, 65.2% of the respondents strongly disagreed or disagreed

with the statement. The observations for the subgroups were as follows: African, 64.7%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 56.4%; White English-speaking, 70.9%; Coloured, 75%; Indian, 67.8%; 'Other', 71.5%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To measure whether 'Population Group' played a part in this factor, testing for the presence of saturation was done. In this regard ℓ^* was calculated at 83.79, which was significant ($\ell^* = 83.79 >$ critical $X^2 = 37.566$ with 20 degrees of freedom). The saturated model of the hierarchical loglinear analysis applied in this instance. Further loglinear analysis of the cross-tabulation was therefore necessary and duly reported in Table 7.124.

Table 7.124 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	ℓ	S_ℓ	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λA_1	0.483039	0.122479	3.943852	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2	1.048084	0.101837	10.291780	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_3	0.093466	0.141588	0.660127	Insignificant
λA_4	-0.583830	0.209404	-2.788056	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5	-1.040740	0.186477	-5.581064	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_1	1.197773	0.101536	11.796535	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.689526	0.116704	5.908332	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_3	0.460123	0.134674	3.416569	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_4	-1.334630	0.252314	-5.289560	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	0.329116	0.133554	2.464292	Insignificant
λB_6	-1.341910	0.249997	-5.367704	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_1B_1	0.227853	0.154876	1.471196	Insignificant
λA_1B_2	-0.535120	0.199525	-2.681970	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_1B_3	0.169702	0.194286	0.873465	Insignificant
λA_1B_4	-0.260170	0.415285	-0.626485	Insignificant
λA_1B_5	0.245138	0.195101	1.256467	Insignificant
λA_1B_6	0.152572	0.371435	0.410764	Insignificant
λA_2B_1	-0.439850	0.141009	-3.119304	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2B_2	-0.061280	0.154733	-0.396037	Insignificant
λA_2B_3	0.242235	0.167392	1.447112	Insignificant
λA_2B_4	0.427552	0.310487	1.377037	Insignificant
λA_2B_5	-0.161680	0.178217	-0.907209	Insignificant
λA_2B_6	-0.007010	0.333334	-0.021030	Insignificant
λA_3B_1	-0.125730	0.185502	-0.677782	Insignificant
λA_3B_2	0.456623	0.192324	2.374238	Insignificant
λA_3B_3	0.414093	0.210908	1.963382	Insignificant
λA_3B_4	-0.158280	0.459174	-0.344706	Insignificant
λA_3B_5	-0.435730	0.254980	-1.708879	Insignificant
λA_3B_6	-0.151000	0.457905	-0.329763	Insignificant
λA_4B_1	0.353733	0.245881	1.438635	Insignificant
λA_4B_2	0.340684	0.268925	1.266836	Insignificant
λA_4B_3	-0.294910	0.325246	-0.906729	Insignificant
λA_4B_4	-0.579600	0.708033	-0.818606	Insignificant
λA_4B_5	-0.752387	0.274745	-2.738492	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4B_6	-0.572320	0.707210	-0.809265	Insignificant

Table 7.124 (Cont.) Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	ℓ	S_ℓ	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λA_5B_1	-0.016030	0.259716	-0.061721	Insignificant
λA_5B_2	-0.200930	0.315173	-0.637523	Insignificant
λA_5B_3	-0.531140	0.383026	-1.386694	Insignificant
λA_5B_4	0.570467	0.540587	1.055273	Insignificant
λA_5B_5	-0.400130	0.382633	-1.045728	Insignificant
λA_5B_6	0.577740	0.539509	1.070863	Insignificant

Main effect A_i produced significant differences. In four of the five attitudinal categories, namely, Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree and Strongly Agree, the observed response patterns differed significantly from the respective group norms. The exception was category Neutral. In the case of the main effect B_j relating to population group, five significant deviations from the general trend were observed: among Africans, Afrikaans-speaking Whites, English-speaking Whites, Coloureds and 'Other'.

Three significant interaction effects A_iB_j occurred, in A_1B_2, A_2B_1, and A_4B_5, respectively. The frequency of Afrikaans-speaking White respondents in A_1B_2 (23 or 14.7% of this subgroup) who strongly disagreed with the content of question 13.3 (ℓ/s equal to -2.68) was significantly lower than the group norm. In the case of African respondents (74 or 30.7% in this subgroup), the frequency of those who disagreed with the content of question 13.3 (ℓ/s equal to -3.12) was significantly lower than the group norm. Lastly, the frequency of Indian respondents (20 or 17.9% of this subgroup) who agreed with the content of question 13.3 (ℓ/s equal to -2.74) was significantly lower than the group norm.

Table 7.125 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 13.10**

	Population Group						
Scale Point	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	Total
Strongly disagree	50	16	28	6	27	3	130
Row %	38.5%	12.3%	21.5%	4.6%	20.8%	2.3%	100%
Column %	20.8%	10.3%	18.5%	25%	24.1%	14.3%	18.5%
Disagree	66	55	72	13	34	9	249
Row %	26.5%	22.1%	28.9%	5.2%	13.7%	3.6%	100%
Column %	27.5%	35.5%	47.7%	54.2%	30.4%	42.9%	35.4%
Neutral	64	45	33	2	26	3	173
Row %	37%	26%	19.1%	1.2%	15%	1.7%	100%
Column %	26.7%	29%	21.9%	8.3%	23.2%	14.3%	24.6%
Agree	44	26	14	2	19	6	111
Row %	39.6%	23.4%	12.6%	1.8%	17.1%	5.4%	100%
Column %	18.3%	16.8%	9.3%	8.3%	17%	28.6%	15.8%
Strongly agree	16	13	4	1	6	0	40
Row %	40%	32.5%	10%	2.5%	15%	0%	100%
Column %	6.7%	8.4%	2.6%	4.2%	5.4%	0%	5.7%
Total	240	155	151	24	112	21	703
Row %	34.1%	22%	21.5%	3.4%	15.9%	3%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 13.10 referred to in Table 7.125 was intended to elicit whether a radio station that serves a multicultural audience would definitely be seen as a threat to the cultures of the different population groups in South Africa.

In the case of this variable, 53.9% of the respondents strongly disagreed or disagreed with the statement in the questionnaire. Subgroup percentages were as follows: African, 48.3%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 45.8%; White English-speaking, 66.2%; Coloured, 79.2%; Indian, 54.5%; 'Other', 57.2%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To determine the interactive part of the subcategories 'Population Group', the presence of saturation was assessed. In this regard ℓ^* was calculated at 75.67, which was significant ($\ell^* = 75.67 >$ critical $X^2 = 37.566$ with 20 degrees of freedom). The saturated model of the hierarchical loglinear analysis applied in this instance. Further loglinear analysis of the cross-tabulation was required. The consequent results are presented in Table 7.126.

Table 7.126 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated mode

Effect	ℓ	S_ℓ	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λA_1	0.310394	0.129515	2.396587	Insignificant
λA_2	0.890255	0.101313	8.787174	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_3	0.181875	0.146693	1.239834	Insignificant
λA_4	-0.051660	0.141604	0.364820	Insignificant
λA_5	-1.150840	0.220124	-5.228144	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_1	1.193354	0.097365	12.256499	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.711813	0.108047	6.587994	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_3	0.456033	0.128668	3.544261	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_4	-1.421510	0.256285	-5.546599	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	0.393185	0.120411	3.265358	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_6	-1.332870	0.240219	-5.548562	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_1B_1	0.018161	0.168525	0.107764	Insignificant
λA_1B_2	-0.639730	0.218163	-2.932349	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_1B_3	0.175664	0.204358	0.859590	Insignificant
λA_1B_4	0.512765	0.378510	1.354693	Insignificant
λA_1B_5	0.221440	0.200585	1.103971	Insignificant
λA_1B_6	-0.269020	0.449399	-0.598622	Insignificant
λA_2B_1	-0.464070	0.141250	-3.285451	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2B_2	-0.164850	0.152834	-1.078621	Insignificant
λA_2B_3	0.360265	0.162856	2.212169	Insignificant
λA_2B_4	0.526094	0.317589	1.656525	Insignificant
λA_2B_5	-0.327190	0.175142	-1.868141	Insignificant
λA_2B_6	0.069728	0.326436	0.213604	Insignificant
λA_3B_1	0.213540	0.177188	1.205161	Insignificant
λA_3B_2	0.342862	0.190339	1.801323	Insignificant
λA_3B_3	0.288487	0.210576	1.369990	Insignificant
λA_3B_4	-0.637330	0.530422	-1.201553	Insignificant
λA_3B_5	0.112923	0.213422	0.529107	Insignificant
λA_3B_6	-0.320500	0.454647	-0.704943	Insignificant
λA_4B_1	0.072384	0.181023	0.399861	Insignificant
λA_4B_2	0.027832	0.203119	0.137023	Insignificant
λA_4B_3	-0.335430	0.243568	-1.377151	Insignificant
λA_4B_4	-0.403790	0.529038	-0.763253	Insignificant
λA_4B_5	0.032802	0.223047	0.147063	Insignificant
λA_4B_6	0.606180	0.372250	1.628422	Insignificant
λA_5B_1	0.159966	0.277635	0.576174	Insignificant
λA_5B_2	0.433868	0.291625	1.487760	Insignificant
λA_5B_3	-0.489010	0.398945	-1.225758	Insignificant
λA_5B_4	0.002244	0.712940	0.003148	Insignificant
λA_5B_5	-0.020690	0.351805	-0.058811	Insignificant
λA_5B_6	-0.086400	0.707324	-0.122151	Insignificant

Main effect A_i produced significant differences. In two of the five attitudinal categories, namely, Disagree and Strongly Agree, the observed frequencies differed significantly from the respective group norms. The exceptions were categories Strongly Disagree, Neutral and Agree. In the case of the main effect B_j relating to the various population groups – Africans, Afrikaans-speaking Whites, English-speaking Whites, Coloureds, Indians and 'Other' – significant deviations from the general trend were observed in all six population groups.

Two significant interaction effects A_iB_j occurred with respect to question 13.10, in A_1B_2 and A_2B_1 respectively. The frequency of Afrikaans-speaking White respondents (16 or 10.3% of this subgroup) who strongly disagreed with the content of question 13.10 (ℓ/s equal to –2.93) was significantly lower than the group norm. In the case of A_2B_1, the frequency of African respondents (66 or 27.5% of this subgroup) who disagreed with the content of question 13.10 (ℓ/s equal to -3.29) was significantly lower than the group norm.

Table 7.127 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 13.2**

	Population Group						
Scale Point	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	Total
Strongly disagree	62	28	29	4	25	4	152
Row %	40.8%	18.4%	19.1%	2.6%	16.4%	2.6%	100%
Column %	25.7%	18.1%	19.3%	16%	22.3%	18.2%	21.6%
Disagree	77	56	58	10	34	6	241
Row %	32%	23.2%	24.1%	4.1%	14.1%	2.5%	100%
Column %	32%	36.1%	38.7%	40%	30.4%	27.3%	34.2%
Neutral	47	39	35	6	22	6	155
Row %	30.3%	25.2%	22.6%	3.9%	14.2%	3.9%	100%
Column %	19.5%	25.2%	23.3%	24%	19.6%	27.3%	22%
Agree	42	19	22	5	26	5	119
Row %	35.3%	16%	18.5%	4.2%	21.8%	4.2%	100%
Column %	17.4%	12.3%	14.7%	20%	23.2%	22.7%	16.9%
Strongly agree	13	13	6	0	5	1	38
Row %	34.2%	34.2%	15.8%	0%	13.2%	2.6%	100%
Column %	5.4%	8.4%	4%	0%	4.5%	4.5%	5.4%
Total	241	155	150	25	112	22	705
Row %	34.2%	22%	21.3%	3.5%	15.9%	3.1%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 13.2 in Table 7.127 referred to the person who might find it difficult to listen to a radio announcer who is not from the same population group as the one to which that person belongs, regardless of the announcer's ability to speak the person's home language fluently.

In this instance, 55.8% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the in the statement in questionnaire. The different subgroups responded as follows: African, 57.7%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 54.2%; White English-speaking, 58%; Coloured, 56%; Indian, 52.7%; 'Other', 45.5%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To determine the interactive part of the subcategories 'Population Group', testing for the presence of saturation was done. In this regard ℓ^* was calculated at 44.56, which was significant ($\ell^* = 44.56 >$ critical $X^2 = 37.566$ with 20 degrees of freedom). The saturated model of the hierarchical loglinear analysis applied in this instance. However, further loglinear analysis of the cross-tabulation produced no significant interaction. The results are duly reported in Table 7.128.

Table 7.128 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the independent model

Effect	ℓ	S_ℓ	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λA_1	0.156576	0.124278	1.259885	Insignificant
λA_2	0.695277	0.103645	6.708254	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_3	0.310829	0.112150	2.771547	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4	0.061913	0.119773	0.516920	Insignificant
λA_5	-1.224592	0.216829	-5.647732	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_1	1.078300	0.095059	11.343481	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.659660	0.102827	6.415241	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_3	0.526736	0.113155	4.654995	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_4	-1.228426	0.225353	-5.451119	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	0.294321	0.120118	2.450266	Insignificant
λB_6	-1.330591	0.229264	-5.803750	Significant at 0.1% level

Main effect A_i produced significant differences. In three of the five attitudinal categories, namely, Disagree, Neutral and Strongly Agree, observed response patterns differed significantly from the respective group norms. The exceptions were categories Strongly Disagree and Agree. In the case of the main effect B_j relating to population group, five significant deviations from the general trend were observed: among Africans, White Afrikaans-speakers, White English-speakers, Coloureds and 'Other'.

Table 7.129 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 13.6**

	Population Group						
Scale Point	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	Total
Strongly disagree	15	8	9	1	2	1	36
Row %	41.7%	22.2%	25%	2.8%	5.6%	2.8%	100%
Column %	6.2%	5.2%	6%	4.2%	1.8%	4.8%	5.1%
Disagree	28	33	38	4	17	3	123
Row %	22.8%	26.8%	30.9%	3.3%	13.8%	2.4%	100%
Column %	11.6%	21.3%	25.3%	16.7%	15.3%	14.3%	17.5%
Neutral	72	35	56	7	38	6	214
Row %	33.6%	16.4%	26.2%	3.3%	17.8%	2.8%	100%
Column %	29.9%	22.6%	37.3%	29.2%	34.2%	28.6%	30.5%
Agree	79	40	30%	8	33	8	198
Row %	39.9%	20.2%	15.2%	4%	16.7%	4%	100%
Column %	32.8%	25.8%	20%	33.3%	29.7%	38.1%	28.2%
Strongly agree	47	39	17%	4	21	3	131
Row %	35.9%	29.8%	13%	3.1%	16%	2.3%	100%
Column %	19.5%	25.2%	11.3%	16.7%	18.9%	14.3%	18.7%
Total	241	155	150	24	111	21	702
Row %	34.3%	22.1%	21.4%	3.4%	15.8%	3%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

In Table 7.129 question 13.6 was addressed. It referred to the radio listener who says that nothing would change his or her loyalty to a favourite radio station.

In this case, 46.9% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. The responses among the subgroups were as follows: African, 52.3%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 51%; White English-speaking, 31.3%; Coloured, 50%; Indian, 48.6%; 'Other', 52.4%. High percentages of responses occurred in the category Neutral.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To measure whether 'Population Group' played a part in this dimension, the presence of saturation was determined. In this regard ℓ^* was calculated at 72.96, which was significant ($\ell^* = 72.96 >$ critical $X^2 = 37.566$ with 20 degrees of freedom). The saturated model of the hierarchical loglinear analysis applied in this instance. Further loglinear analysis of the cross-tabulation was therefore necessary. The resultant analysis produced no significant interaction. Four insignificant borderline interactions were observed. The findings are presented in Table 7.130.

Table 7.130 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the independent model

Effect	ℓ	S_ℓ	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λA_1	-1.309895	0.228675	-5.728195	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2	0.041197	0.133495	0.308603	Insignificant
λA_3	0.615898	0.110372	5.580202	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4	0.596280	0.106931	5.576306	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5	0.056520	0.133632	0.422953	Insignificant
λB_1	1.117764	0.097902	11.417172	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.707209	0.108780	6.501278	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_3	0.629376	0.110353	5.703298	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_4	-1.229951	0.229613	-5.356626	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	0.151456	0.152516	0.993050	Insignificant
λB_6	-1.375854	0.240420	-5.722710	Significant at 0.1% level

Main effect A_i produced significant differences. The observed response patterns in three of the five attitudinal categories, namely, Strongly Disagree, Neutral and Agree, differed significantly from the respective group norms. The exceptions were categories Disagree and Strongly Agree. In the case of the main effect B_j relating to population group, five significant deviations from the general trend were observed: among Africans, White Afrikaans-speakers, White English-speakers, Coloureds and 'Other'.

7.4.4 Influence of English and European Culture

The fourth factor analysis brought out four factors that in total explained 54.1% of the variance found in the overall response pattern in section 14 of the questionnaire.

7.4.4.1 Quality of English Language Usage

The first factor consisted of the responses to seven questions from the questionnaire, with question 14.14 as the first contributor.

Table 7.131 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 14.14**

	Population Group						
Scale Point	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	Total
Strongly disagree	39	36	36	4	22	4	141
Row %	27.7%	25.5%	25.5%	2.8%	15.6%	2.8%	100%
Column %	16%	23.8%	23.7%	15.4%	19.6%	22.2%	20.1%
Disagree	58	44	46	9	28	1	186
Row %	31.2%	23.7%	24.7%	4.8%	15.1%	.5%	100%
Column %	23.9%	29.1%	30.3%	34.6%	25%	5.6%	26.5%
Neutral	78	46	46	8	43	7	228
Row %	34.2%	20.2%	20.2%	3.5%	18.9%	3.1%	100%
Column %	32.1%	30.5%	30.3%	30.8%	38.4%	38.9%	32.5%
Agree	46	16	16	4	13	4	99
Row %	46.5%	16.2%	16.2%	4%	13.1%	4%	100%
Column %	18.9%	10.6%	10.5%	15.4%	11.6%	22.2%	14.1%
Strongly agree	22	9	8	1	6	2	48
Row %	45.8%	18.8%	16.7%	2.1%	12.5%	4.2%	100%
Column %	9.1%	6%	5.3%	3.8%	5.4%	11.1%	6.8%
Total	243	151	152	26	112	18	702
Row %	34.6%	21.5%	21.7%	3.7%	16%	2.6%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

In Table 7.131 question 14.14 was addressed. It referred to the high status the listener enjoys in South African society that strengthens his or her need to listen to an English radio station constantly.

In this case, 46.6% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Compared with the general norm, the subsamples responded as follows: African, 39.9%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 52.9%; White English-speaking, 54%; Coloured, 50%; Indian, 44.6%; 'Other', 27.8%.

The data were further analysed with regard to the second main effect: a reflection of the respondents' population group. To measure whether 'Population Group' played a part in this factor, the presence of saturation was once again looked for. In this regard ℓ^* was calculated at 60.09, which was significant ($\ell^* = 60.09 >$ critical $X^2 = 37.566$ with 20 degrees of freedom). The saturated model of the hierarchical loglinear analysis applied in this instance. However, further analysis of the cross-tabulation produced no significant interaction. The ensuing results are reported in Table 7.132.

Table 7.132 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the independent model

Effect	ℓ	S_ℓ	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λA_1	0.173657	0.125849	1.379884	Insignificant
λA_2	0.258402	0.159800	1.617034	Insignificant
λA_3	0.691376	0.105755	6.537525	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4	-0.156822	0.132117	-1.186993	Insignificant
λA_5	-0.966612	0.194588	-4.967480	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_1	1.191364	0.093119	12.793995	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.624518	0.109316	5.712961	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_3	0.609851	0.110878	5.500198	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_4	-1.198864	0.227355	-5.273093	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	0.299516	0.121137	2.472539	Insignificant
λB_6	-1.526386	0.250073	-6.103762	Significant at 0.1% level

Main effect A_i produced significant differences. The observed frequencies in two of the five attitudinal categories, namely, Neutral and Strongly Agree, differed significantly from the respective group norms. The exceptions were categories Strongly Disagree, Disagree and Agree. In the case of the main effect B_j relating to population group, five significant deviations from the general trend were observed: among Africans, Afrikaans-speaking Whites, English-speaking Whites, Coloureds and 'Other'.

Table 7.133 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 14.15**

	Population Group						
Scale Point	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	Total
Strongly disagree	47	45	40	3	25	3	163
Row %	28.8%	27.6%	24.5%	1.8%	15.3%	1.8%	100%
Column %	19.2%	29.8%	26.1%	11.5%	22.5%	15%	23.1%
Disagree	45	38	46	5	28	3	165
Row %	27.3%	23%	27.9%	3%	17%	1.8%	100%
Column %	18.4%	25.2%	30.1%	19.2%	25.2%	15%	23.4%
Neutral	68	43	50	11	27	8	207
Row %	32.9%	20.8%	24.2%	5.3%	13%	3.9%	100%
Column %	27.8%	28.5%	32.7%	42.3%	24.3%	40%	29.3%
Agree	60	16	12	5	27	3	123
Row %	48.8%	13%	9.8%	4.1%	22%	2.4%	100%
Column %	24.5%	10.6%	7.8%	19.2%	24.3%	15%	17.4%
Strongly agree	25	9	5	2	4	3	48
Row %	52.1%	18.8%	10.4%	4.2%	8.3%	6.3%	100%
Column %	10.2%	6%	3.3%	7.7%	3.6%	15%	6.8%
Total	245	151	153	26	111	20	706
Row %	34.7%	21.4%	21.7%	3.7%	100%	2.8%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

The response to question 14.15 presented in Table 7.133 referred to the person who always finds listening to an English radio station a 'cool' thing to do.

In the case under consideration, 46.5% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the content of the statement. Compared with the general trend, the subsamples produced the following results: African, 37.6%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 55%; White English-speaking, 56.2%; Coloured, 30.7%; Indian, 47.7%; 'Other', 30%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To measure whether 'Population Group' played a part in this dimension, the usual test was done. In this regard ℓ^* was calculated at 80.52, which was significant ($\ell^* = 80.52 >$ critical $X^2 =$ 37.566 with 20 degrees of freedom). The saturated model of the hierarchical loglinear analysis applied in this instance. Further analysis of the cross-tabulation was required. The ensuing results are presented in Table 7.134.

Table 7.134 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	ℓ	S_ℓ	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λA_1	0.150292	0.131319	1.144480	Insignificant
λA_2	0.242184	0.122395	1.978708	Insignificant
λA_3	0.634311	0.097504	6.505487	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4	-0.084050	0.128607	-0.653541	Insignificant
λA_5	-0.942740	0.168026	-5.610679	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_1	1.194569	0.085956	13.897448	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.591714	0.104256	5.675587	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_3	0.461439	0.116878	3.948040	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_4	-1.161360	0.199094	-5.833225	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	0.262471	0.122418	2.144056	Insignificant
λB_6	-1.348560	0.207880	-6.487204	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_1B_1	-0.138050	0.169760	-0.813207	Insignificant
λA_1B_2	0.421318	0.180770	2.330685	Insignificant
λA_1B_3	0.433810	0.191259	2.268181	Insignificant
λA_1B_4	-0.533390	0.431151	-1.237130	Insignificant
λA_1B_5	0.162774	0.209537	0.776827	Insignificant
λA_1B_6	-0.346460	0.435278	-0.795951	Insignificant
λA_2B_1	-0.273430	0.164112	-1.666118	Insignificant
λA_2B_2	0.160350	0.179028	0.895670	Insignificant
λA_2B_3	0.481680	0.181691	2.651094	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2B_4	-0.114450	0.360962	-0.317069	Insignificant
λA_2B_5	0.184211	0.199818	0.921894	Insignificant
λA_2B_6	-0.438350	0.432669	-1.013130	Insignificant

Table 7.134 (Cont.) Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated

Effect	ℓ	S_ℓ	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λA_3B_1	-0.252710	0.135840	-1.860350	Insignificant
λA_3B_2	-0.108160	0.159228	-0.679278	Insignificant
λA_3B_3	0.172935	0.163836	1.055537	Insignificant
λA_3B_4	0.281878	0.284928	0.989296	Insignificant
λA_3B_5	-0.244280	0.187037	-1.306052	Insignificant
λA_3B_6	0.150353	0.313681	0.479318	Insignificant
λA_4B_1	0.340489	0.162079	2.100760	Insignificant
λA_4B_2	-0.378410	0.219280	-1.725693	Insignificant
λA_4B_3	-0.535820	0.243328	-2.202048	Insignificant
λA_4B_4	0.211784	0.363116	0.583241	Insignificant
λA_4B_5	0.474079	0.204977	2.312840	Insignificant
λA_4B_6	-0.112110	0.434467	-0.258040	Insignificant
λA_5B_1	0.323710	0.217476	1.488486	Insignificant
λA_5B_2	-0.095090	0.281463	-0.337842	Insignificant
λA_5B_3	-0.552600	0.342882	-1.611633	Insignificant
λA_5B_4	0.154182	0.513367	0.300335	Insignificant
λA_5B_5	-0.576770	0.372684	-1.547611	Insignificant
λA_5B_6	0.746575	0.447722	1.667497	Insignificant

Main effect A_i produced significant differences. The observed frequencies in two of the five attitudinal categories, namely, Neutral and Strongly Agree, differed significantly from the respective group norms. The exceptions were categories Strongly Disagree, Disagree and Agree. In the case of the main effect B_j relating to population group, five significant deviations from the general trend were observed: among Africans, Afrikaans-speaking Whites, English-speaking Whites, Coloureds and 'Other'.

A single significant interaction effect A_iB_j occurred, in A_2B_3. The frequency of English-speaking White respondents (46 or 30.1% of this subgroup) who disagreed with the content of question 14.15 (ℓ/s equal to +2.65) was significantly higher than the group norm.

Table 7.135 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 14.16**

	Population Group						
Scale Point	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	Total
Strongly disagree	64	37	57	3	29	2	192
Row %	33.3%	19.3%	29.7%	1.6%	15.1%	1%	100%
Column %	26.2%	24.2%	37.5%	11.1%	25.9%	10.5%	27.2%
Disagree	50	32	42	10	31	3	168
Row %	29.8%	19%	25%	6%	18.5%	1.8%	100%
Column %	20.5%	20.9%	27.6%	37%	27.7%	15.8%	23.8%
Neutral	61	41	34	6	33	7	182
Row %	33.5%	22.5%	18.7%	3.3%	18.1%	3.8%	100%
Column %	25%	26.8%	22.4%	22.2%	29.5%	36.8%	25.7%
Agree	43	37	12	7	13	4	116
Row %	37.1%	31.9%	10.3%	6%	11.2%	3.4%	100%
Column %	17.6%	24.2%	7.9%	25.9%	11.6%	21.1%	16.4%
Strongly agree	26	6	7	1	6	3	49
Row %	53.1%	12.2%	14.3%	2%	12.2%	6.1%	100%
Column %	10.7%	3.9%	4.6%	3.7%	5.4%	15.8%	6.9%
Total	244	153	152	27	112	19	707
Row %	34.5%	21.6%	21.5%	3.8%	15.8%	2.7%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 14.16 that pertained to Table 7.135 referred to listening to an English radio station because it helps the listener to speak English like an English citizen.

In this case, 51% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with statement in the questionnaire. The subsample figures were: African, 46.7%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 45.1%; White English-speaking, 65.1%; Coloured, 48.1%; Indian, 53.6%; 'Other', 26.3%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To determine the interactive part of the subcategories 'Population Group', statistical testing for saturation was done. In this regard ℓ^* was calculated at 72.62, which was significant ($\ell^* = 72.62 >$ critical $X^2 = 37.566$ with 20 degrees of freedom). The saturated model of the hierarchical loglinear analysis applied in this instance. Further analysis of the cross-tabulation was therefore necessary and duly reported in Table 7.136.

Table 7.136 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	ℓ	s_ℓ	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λA_1	0.155031	0.141724	1.093894	Insignificant
λA_2	0.318149	0.116746	2.725138	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_3	0.423877	0.107017	3.960838	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4	-0.047920	0.121142	-0.395569	Insignificant
λA_5	-0.849120	0.180372	-4.707604	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_1	1.166592	0.087475	13.336290	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.564958	0.109492	5.159811	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_3	0.473957	0.111972	4.232817	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_4	-1.245850	0.226042	-5.511586	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	0.411915	0.106345	3.873384	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_6	-1.371570	0.209724	-6.539881	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_1B_1	0.163637	0.171373	0.954859	Insignificant
λA_1B_2	0.217306	0.195617	1.110875	Insignificant
λA_1B_3	0.740440	0.187142	3.956568	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_1B_4	-0.484190	0.447096	-1.082967	Insignificant
λA_1B_5	0.126727	0.210418	0.602263	Insignificant
λA_1B_6	-0.763940	0.509363	-1.499795	Insignificant
λA_2B_1	-0.246340	0.157044	-1.568605	Insignificant
λA_2B_2	-0.090990	0.183028	-0.497137	Insignificant
λA_2B_3	0.271941	0.176274	1.542718	Insignificant
λA_2B_4	0.556663	0.316395	1.759393	Insignificant
λA_2B_5	0.030300	0.182273	0.166234	Insignificant
λA_2B_6	-0.521590	0.431657	-1.208344	Insignificant
λA_3B_1	-0.153220	0.145062	-1.056238	Insignificant
λA_3B_2	0.051114	0.169051	0.302358	Insignificant
λA_3B_3	-0.045100	0.176454	-0.255591	Insignificant
λA_3B_4	-0.059890	0.352981	-0.169669	Insignificant
λA_3B_5	-0.012910	0.173966	-0.074210	Insignificant
λA_3B_6	0.219981	0.328573	0.669504	Insignificant
λA_4B_1	-0.031090	0.164350	-0.189169	Insignificant
λA_4B_2	0.420261	0.181262	2.318528	Insignificant
λA_4B_3	-0.614750	0.236490	-2.599476	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4B_4	0.566060	0.343940	1.645810	Insignificant
λA_4B_5	-0.472660	0.228331	-2.070065	Insignificant
λA_4B_6	0.132166	0.392480	0.336746	Insignificant
λA_5B_1	0.267000	0.225725	1.182855	Insignificant
λA_5B_2	-0.597700	0.326451	-1.830903	Insignificant
λA_5B_3	-0.352550	0.312403	-1.128510	Insignificant
λA_5B_4	-0.578660	0.692106	-0.836086	Insignificant
λA_5B_5	0.328530	0.264563	1.241784	Insignificant
λA_5B_6	0.933361	0.414607	2.251195	Insignificant

Main effect A_i produced significant differences in three of the five attitudinal categories, namely, Disagree, Neutral and Strongly Agree. The observed frequencies of those three attitudinal categories differed significantly from the respective group norms. The exceptions were categories Strongly Disagree and Agree. Regarding the main effect B_j relating to population group, significant deviations from the general trend were observed in all six groups: among Africans, Afrikaans-speaking Whites, English-speaking Whites, Coloureds, Indians and 'Other'.

Two significant interaction effects A_iB_j occurred, in A_1B_3 and A_4B_3 respectively. The frequency of English-speaking White respondents (57 or 37.5% of this subgroup) who strongly disagreed with the content of question 14.16 (ℓ/s equal to +3.96) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample. With regard to A_4B_3, the frequency of English-speaking White respondents (12 or 7.9% in this subgroup) who agreed with the content of question 14.16 (ℓ/s equal to –2.60) was significantly lower than the group norm.

Table 7.137 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 14.19**

	Population Group						
Scale Point	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	Total
Strongly disagree	32	30	21	3	13	1	100
Row %	32%	30%	21%	3%	13%	1%	100%
Column %	13.1%	19.9%	14%	11.1%	11.6%	5%	14.2%
Disagree	42	37	23	5	19	1	127
Row %	33.1%	29.1%	18.1%	3.9%	15%	.8%	100%
Column %	17.2%	24.5%	15.3%	18.5%	17%	5%	18%
Neutral	81	42	61	8	36	9	237
Row %	34.2%	17.7%	25.7%	3.4%	15.2%	3.8%	100%
Column %	33.2%	27.8%	40.7%	29.6%	32.1%	45%	33.7%
Agree	56	27	26	8	36	7	160
Row %	35%	16.9%	16.3%	5%	22.5%	4.4%	100%
Column %	23%	17.9%	17.3%	29.6%	32.1%	35%	22.7%
Strongly agree	33	15	19	3	8	2	80
Row %	41.3%	18.8%	23.8%	3.8%	10%	2.5%	100%
Column %	13.5%	9.9%	12.7%	11.1%	7.1%	10%	11.4%
Total	244	151	150	27	112	20	704
Row %	34.7%	21.4%	21.3%	3.8%	15.9%	2.8%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 14.19 referenced in Table 7.137 referred to the fact that the English language enjoys a high status internationally, which makes one feel good about listening to a good English radio station.

In this case, 34.1% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed and 32.2% disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement in the questionnaire. In other words, there was no majority support for the statement. The comparable figures for the subgroups were: African, 36.5%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 27.8%; White English-speaking 30.0%; Coloured, 40.7%; Indian, 39.2%; 'Other', 45%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To measure whether 'Population Group' played a part in this dimension, the presence of saturation was determined. In this regard ℓ^* was calculated at 61.25, which was significant (ℓ^* = 61.25 > critical X^2 = 37.566 with 20 degrees of freedom). The saturated model of the hierarchical loglinear analysis applied in this instance. Further analysis of the cross-tabulation was therefore necessary. No significant interaction was traced. Two borderline cases occurred. The consequent results are presented in Table 7.138.

Table 7.138 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the independent model

Effect	ℓ	S_ℓ	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λA_1	-0.401647	0.174864	-2.296911	Insignificant
λA_2	-0.157824	0.166289	-0.949095	Insignificant
λA_3	0.686380	0.102357	6.705746	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4	0.367209	0.108103	3.396844	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5	-0.494117	0.153846	-3.211764	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_1	1.159793	0.091021	12.742038	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.686584	0.101060	6.793825	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_3	0.634535	0.102463	6.192821	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_4	-1.071041	0.187032	-5.726512	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	0.287023	0.116072	2.472801	Insignificant
λB_6	-1.696894	0.280432	-6.051000	Significant at 0.1% level

Main effect A_i produced significant differences. The observed frequencies in three of the five attitudinal categories, namely, Neutral, Agree and Strongly Agree, differed significantly from the respective group norms. The exceptions were categories Strongly Disagree and Disagree. In the case of the main effect B_j relating to population group, five significant deviations from the general trend were observed: among Africans, Afrikaans-speaking Whites, English-speaking Whites, Coloureds and 'Other'.

Table 7.139 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 14.13**

	Population Group						
Scale Point	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	Total
Strongly disagree	53	30	32	4	23	1	143
Row %	37.1%	21%	22.4%	2.8%	16.1%	.7%	100%
Column %	21.6%	19.9%	21.1%	14.8%	20.9%	4.8%	20.3%
Disagree	61	36	27	7	24	8	163
Row %	37.4%	22.1%	16.6%	4.3%	14.7%	4.9%	100%
Column %	24.9%	23.8%	17.8%	25.9%	21.8%	38.1%	23.1%
Neutral	69	46	55	10	38	5	223
Row %	30.9%	20.6%	24.7%	4.5%	17%	2.2%	100%
Column %	28.2%	30.5%	36.2%	37%	34.5%	23.8%	31.6%
Agree	39	27	19	5	21	6	117
Row %	33.3%	23.1%	16.2%	4.3%	17.9%	5.1%	100%
Column %	15.9%	17.9%	12.5%	18.5%	19.1%	28.6%	16.6%
Strongly agree	23	12	19	1	4	1	60
Row %	38.3%	20%	31.7%	1.7%	6.7%	1.7%	100%
Column %	9.4%	7.9%	12.5%	3.7%	3.6%	4.8%	8.5%
Total	245	151	152	27	110	21	706
Row %	34.7%	21.4%	21.5%	3.8%	15.6%	3%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

The response to question 14.13 presented in Table 7.139 referred to the radio listener who resolutely listens to an English radio station in order to maintain a high standard of English because he or she takes pride in speaking good English.

In this case, 43.4% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. The different subgroups responded as follows: African, 46.5%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 43.7%; White English-speaking, 38.9%; Coloured, 40.7%; Indian, 42.7%; 'Other', 42.9%.

The data were further analysed with regard to the second main effect: a reflection of the respondents' population group. To measure whether 'Population Group' played a part in the cross-tabulation, a pretest of dependence or independence was done. In this regard ℓ^* was calculated at 51.17, which was significant ($\ell^* = 51.17 >$ critical $X^2 = 37.566$ with 20 degrees of freedom). The saturated model of the hierarchical loglinear analysis applied in this instance. Further analysis of the cross-tabulation was therefore required. No significant interaction was noticed in the calculations. Three insignificant but borderline cases were present. The results are reported in Table 7.140.

Table 7.140 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the independent model

Effect	ℓ	S_ℓ	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λA_1	-0.089265	0.169186	-0.527615	Insignificant
λA_2	0.383172	0.110395	3.470918	Insignificant
λA_3	0.620847	0.109638	5.662699	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4	0.075825	0.120422	0.629661	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5	-0.990579	0.214862	-4.610303	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_1	1.173756	0.094047	12.480526	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.669719	0.105329	6.358353	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_3	0.682456	0.103864	6.570669	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_4	-1.200256	0.225428	-5.324343	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	0.227289	0.128778	1.764968	Insignificant
λB_6	-1.552973	0.268550	-5.782808	Significant at 0.1% level

Main effect A_i produced significant differences. The observed frequencies in three of the five attitudinal categories, namely, Disagree, Neutral and Strongly Agree, differed significantly from the respective group norms. The exceptions were categories Strongly Disagree and Agree. In the case of the main effect B_j relating to population group, five significant deviations from the general trend were observed: among Africans, Afrikaans-speaking Whites, English-speaking Whites, Coloureds and 'Other'.

Table 7.141 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 14.8**

	Population Group						
Scale Point	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	Total
Strongly disagree	71	42	43	7	32	0	195
Row %	36.4%	21.5%	22.1%	3.6%	16.4%	0%	100%
Column %	28.7%	27.5%	28.7%	25.9%	28.8%	0%	27.5%
Disagree	58	38	41	8	32	4	181
Row %	32%	21%	22.7%	4.4%	17.7%	2.2%	100%
Column %	23.5%	24.8%	27.3%	29.6%	28.8%	20%	25.6%
Neutral	62	45	36	7	31	9	190
Row %	32.6%	23.7%	18.9%	3.7%	16.3%	4.7%	100%
Column %	25.1%	29.4%	24%	25.9%	27.9%	45%	26.8%
Agree	40	22	21	4	15	3	105
Row %	38.1%	21%	20%	3.8%	14.3%	2.9%	100%
Column %	16.2%	14.4%	14%	14.8%	13.5%	15%	14.8%
Strongly agree	16	6	9	1	1	4	37
Row %	43.2%	16.2%	24.3%	2.7%	2.7%	10.8%	100%
Column %	6.5%	3.9%	6%	3.7%	.9%	20%	5.2%
Total	247	153	150	27	111	20	708
Row %	34.9%	21.6%	21.2%	3.8%	15.7%	2.8%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 14.8 in Table 7.141 referred to the person who listens to an English radio station

like most of the educated élite in South Africa.

In the case of this variable, 53.1% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the content of the statement. The responses among the subgroups were as follows: African, 52.2%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 52.3%; White English-speaking, 56%; Coloured, 55.5%; Indian, 57.6%; 'Other', 20%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To measure whether 'Population Group' played an interactive part, a test for the presence of saturation was done. In this regard ℓ^* was calculated at 45.37, which was significant ($\ell^* = 47.37 >$ critical $X^2 = 37.566$ with 20 degrees of freedom). The saturated model of the hierarchical loglinear analysis applied in this instance. Further analysis of the cross-tabulation was therefore required and duly reported in Table 7.142.

Table 7.142 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	ℓ	S_ℓ	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λA_1	0.269667	0.163126	1.653121	Insignificant
λA_2	0.464647	0.118007	3.937453	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_3	0.589874	0.109064	5.408512	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4	-0.089632	0.137199	-0.653299	Insignificant
λA_5	-1.234554	0.221797	-5.566144	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_1	1.189813	0.098088	12.130057	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.620412	0.116654	5.318395	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_3	0.667475	0.110754	6.026645	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_4	-1.121021	0.224295	-4.997976	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	0.022169	0.192338	0.115261	Insignificant
λB_6	-1.378847	0.240571	-5.731559	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_1B_1	0.210668	0.189321	1.112756	Insignificant
λA_1B_2	0.255058	0.209092	1.219836	Insignificant
λA_1B_3	0.231525	0.205320	1.127630	Insignificant
λA_1B_4	0.204732	0.357825	0.572157	Insignificant
λA_1B_5	0.581367	0.264729	2.196084	Insignificant
λA_1B_6	-1.483352	0.691709	-2.144474	Insignificant
λA_2B_1	-0.186549	0.156272	-1.193746	Insignificant
λA_2B_2	-0.040005	0.178991	-0.223503	Insignificant
λA_2B_3	-0.011083	0.172991	-0.064067	Insignificant
λA_2B_4	0.143284	0.328955	0.435573	Insignificant
λA_2B_5	0.386387	0.239577	1.612788	Insignificant
λA_2B_6	-0.292037	0.407158	-0.717257	Insignificant

Table 7.142 (Cont.) Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	ℓ	S_ℓ	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λA_3B_1	-0.245085	0.148140	-1.654415	Insignificant
λA_3B_2	0.003844	0.168433	0.022822	Insignificant
λA_3B_3	-0.266363	0.171027	-1.557432	Insignificant
λA_3B_4	-0.115475	0.336636	-0.343026	Insignificant
λA_3B_5	0.229411	0.236156	0.971438	Insignificant
λA_3B_6	0.393665	0.328924	1.196827	Insignificant
λA_4B_1	-0.003834	0.180062	-0.021293	Insignificant
λA_4B_2	-0.032270	0.211166	-0.152818	Insignificant
λA_4B_3	-0.125854	0.210037	-0.599199	Insignificant
λA_4B_4	0.004415	0.403868	0.010932	Insignificant
λA_4B_5	0.182980	0.276517	0.661731	Insignificant
λA_4B_6	-0.025441	0.451673	-0.056326	Insignificant
λA_5B_1	0.224798	0.278913	0.805979	Insignificant
λA_5B_2	-0.186630	0.351349	-0.531181	Insignificant
λA_5B_3	0.171771	0.316042	0.543507	Insignificant
λA_5B_4	-0.236957	0.702481	-0.337314	Insignificant
λA_5B_5	-1.380148	0.692939	-1.991731	Insignificant
λA_5B_6	1.407164	0.448381	3.138322	Significant at 0.1% level

Main effect A_i produced significant differences. The observed frequencies in three of the five attitudinal categories, namely, Disagree, Neutral and Strongly Agree, differed significantly from the respective group norms. The exceptions were categories Strongly Disagree and Agree. In the case of the main effect B_j relating to population group, five significant deviations from the general trend were observed: among Africans, Afrikaans-speaking Whites, English-speaking Whites, Coloureds and 'Other'.

A single significant interaction effect A_iB_j occurred in A_5B_6. The frequency of 'Other' respondents (4 or 20% of this subgroup) who strongly agreed with the content of question 14.8 (ℓ/s equal to +3.14) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample.

Table 7.143 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal Categories and population groups for **question 14.17**

	Population Group						
Scale Point	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	Total
Strongly disagree	64	40	13	3	13	5	138
Row %	46.4%	29%	9.4%	2.2%	9.4%	3.6%	100%
Column %	27.7%	27.6%	8.5%	11.1%	11.6%	23.8%	20%
Disagree	55	32	25	7	24	2	145
Row %	37.9%	22.1%	17.2%	4.8%	16.6%	1.4%	100%
Column %	23.8%	22.1%	16.3%	25.9%	21.4%	9.5%	21%
Neutral	74	46	31	6	28	9	194
Row %	38.1%	23.7%	16%	3.1%	14.4%	4.6%	100%
Column %	32%	31.7%	20.3%	22.2%	25%	42.9%	28.2%
Agree	20	21	54	10	36	4	145
Row %	13.8%	14.5%	37.2%	6.9%	24.8%	2.8%	100%
Column %	8.7%	14.5%	35.3%	37%	32.1%	19%	21%
Strongly agree	18	6	30	1	11	1	67
Row %	26.9%	9%	44.8%	1.5%	16.4%	1.5%	100%
Column %	7.8%	4.1%	19.6%	3.7%	9.8%	4.8%	9.7%
Total	231	145	153	27	112	21	689
Row %	33.5%	21%	22.2%	3.9%	16.3%	3%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 14.17 in Table 7.143 referred to the person whose home language is mainly English and who finds it appropriate to listen to an English radio station.

In this case, 41% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Percentages among the subgroups were: African, 51.5%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 49.7%; White English-speaking, 24.8%; Coloured, 37%; Indian, 33%; 'Other', 33.3%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population. To measure whether 'Population Group' played a part in this factor, testing for saturation was done. In this regard ℓ^* was calculated at 168.14, which was significant ($\ell^* = 168.14 >$ critical $X^2 = 37.566$ with 20 degrees of freedom). The saturated model of the hierarchical loglinear analysis applied in this instance. Further analysis of the cross-tabulation was required, as set out in Table 7.144.

Table 7.144 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	ℓ	s_ℓ	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λA_1	-0.014560	0.131826	-0.110449	Insignificant
λA_2	0.122659	0.134712	0.910528	Insignificant
λA_3	0.519130	0.107694	4.820417	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4	0.254756	0.116103	2.194224	Insignificant
λA_5	-0.881980	0.210608	-4.187780	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_1	1.042427	0.096564	10.795193	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.535057	0.114201	4.685222	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_3	0.692748	0.102999	6.725774	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_4	-1.201080	0.227429	-5.281121	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	0.382474	0.111927	3.417174	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_6	-1.451630	0.245379	-5.915869	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_1B_1	0.502171	0.166447	3.017002	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_1B_2	0.539537	0.187542	2.876886	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_1B_3	-0.742080	0.231318	-3.208051	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_1B_4	-0.314600	0.444058	-0.708466	Insignificant
λA_1B_5	-0.431810	0.235429	-1.834141	Insignificant
λA_1B_6	0.446782	0.390309	1.144688	Insignificant
λA_2B_1	0.213397	0.171746	1.242515	Insignificant
λA_2B_2	0.179169	0.196064	0.913829	Insignificant
λA_2B_3	-0.225380	0.198766	-1.133896	Insignificant
λA_2B_4	0.395477	0.348950	1.133334	Insignificant
λA_2B_5	0.044070	0.205167	0.214801	Insignificant
λA_2B_6	-0.606730	0.522599	-1.160986	Insignificant
λA_3B_2	0.145603	0.167594	0.868784	Insignificant
λA_3B_3	-0.406740	0.172807	-2.353724	Insignificant
λA_3B_4	-0.155140	0.353187	-0.439257	Insignificant
λA_3B_5	-0.198250	0.182108	-1.088640	Insignificant
λA_3B_6	0.500873	0.333175	1.503333	Insignificant
λA_4B_1	-0.930300	0.193795	-4.800433	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4B_2	-0.374140	0.200802	-1.863228	Insignificant
λA_4B_3	0.412629	0.162013	2.546888	Insignificant
λA_4B_4	0.620056	0.316158	1.961222	Insignificant
λA_4B_5	0.317438	0.178524	1.778125	Insignificant
λA_4B_6	-0.045680	0.410418	-0.111301	Insignificant
λA_5B_1	0.101074	0.265809	0.380250	Insignificant
λA_5B_2	-0.490170	0.344697	-1.422032	Insignificant
λA_5B_3	0.961578	0.251097	3.829508	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5B_4	-0.545790	0.700594	-0.779039	Insignificant
λA_5B_5	0.268550	0.296646	0.905288	Insignificant
λA_5B_6	-0.295240	0.706625	-0.417817	Insignificant

Main effect A_i produced significant differences. The observed frequencies in two of the five attitudinal categories, namely, Neutral and Strongly Agree, differed significantly from the respective group norms. The exceptions were categories Strongly Disagree, Disagree and Agree. In the case of the main effect B_j relating to the various population groups – Africans, Afrikaans-speaking Whites, English-speaking Whites, Coloureds, Indians and 'Other' – significant deviations from the general trend were observed in all six groups.

Five significant interaction effects A_iB_j occurred, in A_1B_1, A_1B_2, A_1B_3, A_4B_1 and A_5B_3 respectively. The frequency of African respondents (64 or 27.7% of this subgroup) who strongly disagreed with the content of question 14.17 (ℓ/s equal to +3.01) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample. In the case of A_1B_2, the frequency of Afrikaans-speaking White respondents (40 or 27.6% in this subgroup) who strongly disagreed with the content of question 14.17 (ℓ/s equal to +2.88) was significantly higher than the group norm.

The frequency of English-speaking White respondents in A_1B_3 (13 or 8.5% of this subgroup) who strongly disagreed with the content of question 14.17 (ℓ/s equal to –3.21) was significantly lower than the group norm. In the case of A_4B_1, the frequency of African respondents (20 or 8.7% of this subgroup) who agreed with the content of question 14.17 (ℓ/s equal to –4.80) was significantly lower than the group norm. Lastly, the frequency of English-speaking White respondents (30 or 19.6% of this subgroup) who strongly agreed with the content of question 14.17 (ℓ/s equal to +3.83) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample.

7.4.4.2 Identification with English Culture

The second factor involved eight questions from the questionnaire.