

**Table 7.145** Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 14.3**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	33	21	1	0	13	2	70
Row %	47.1%	30%	1.4%	0%	18.6%	2.9%	100%
Column %	13.4%	13.7%	.7%	0%	11.6%	9.5%	9.8%
Disagree	45	20	9	4	23	4	105
Row %	42.9%	19%	8.6%	3.8%	21.9%	3.8%	100%
Column %	18.3%	13.1%	5.9%	14.8%	20.5%	19%	14.8%
Neutral	84	44	29	6	28	9	200
Row %	42%	22%	14.5%	3%	14%	4.5%	100%
Column %	34.1%	28.8%	19.1%	22.2%	25%	42.9%	28.1%
Agree	56	44	67	14	35	4	220
Row %	25.5%	20%	30.5%	6.4%	15.9%	1.8%	100%
Column %	22.8%	28.8%	44.1%	51.9%	31.3%	19%	30.9%
Strongly agree	28	24	46	3	13	2	116
Row %	24.1%	20.7%	39.7%	2.6%	11.2%	1.7%	100%
Column %	11.4%	15.7%	30.3%	11.1%	11.6%	9.5%	16.3%
Total	246	153	152	27	112	21	711
Row %	34.6%	21.5%	21.4%	3.8%	15.8%	3%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 14.3 referred to in Table 7.145 was aimed at the person who listens to an English radio station because he or she can identify with what the station represents.

In this case, 47.2% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement in the questionnaire. Statistics for the subsamples were as follows: African, 34.2%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 44.5%; White English-speaking, 74.4%; Coloured, 63%; Indian, 42.9%; 'Other', 28.5%.

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, the usual test for saturation was done. In this regard  $\ell^*$  was calculated at 109.66, which was significant ( $\ell^* = 109.66 > \text{critical } X^2 = 37.566$  with 20 degrees of freedom). The saturated model of the hierarchical loglinear analysis applied in this instance. Further analysis of the cross-tabulation was necessary and the results are contained in Table 7.146.

**Table 7.146** Estimated  $\lambda$  effects, standard deviations of  $\ell$  estimates and standardized  $\ell$  values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	$\ell$	$s_{\ell}$	$\ell/s$	Conclusion
$\lambda A_1$	-0.936351	0.223611	-4.187410	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_2$	-0.112080	0.133672	-0.838470	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3$	0.553882	0.110143	5.028754	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_4$	0.669122	0.111862	5.981674	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_5$	-0.147430	0.150258	-0.981179	Insignificant
$\lambda B_1$	1.221613	0.094347	12.948085	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_2$	0.760642	0.103349	7.359936	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_3$	0.122875	0.193084	0.636381	Insignificant
$\lambda B_4$	-1.213550	0.233079	-5.206604	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_5$	0.433894	0.112831	3.845521	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_6$	-1.325470	0.220721	-6.005183	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_1B_1$	0.641711	0.255480	2.511786	Insignificant
$\lambda A_1B_2$	0.650697	0.271985	2.392400	Insignificant
$\lambda A_1B_3$	-1.756060	0.693923	-2.530627	Insignificant
$\lambda A_1B_4$	-0.419630	0.706097	-0.594295	Insignificant
$\lambda A_1B_5$	0.497873	0.296222	1.680743	Insignificant
$\lambda A_1B_6$	0.385438	0.541262	0.712110	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_1$	0.100437	0.172927	0.580806	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_2$	-0.249520	0.206868	-1.206180	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_3$	-0.410260	0.306332	-1.339266	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_4$	0.115233	0.407970	0.282455	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_5$	0.216988	0.205513	1.055836	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_6$	0.227156	0.401038	0.566420	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_1$	0.058626	0.141563	0.414134	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_2$	-0.127030	0.161706	-0.785561	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_3$	0.093843	0.239690	0.391518	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_4$	-0.145270	0.356889	-0.407045	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_5$	-0.252270	0.182739	-1.380493	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_6$	0.372121	0.315498	1.179472	Insignificant
$\lambda A_4B_1$	-0.462080	0.151006	-3.060011	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_4B_2$	-0.242270	0.162882	-1.487396	Insignificant
$\lambda A_4B_3$	0.815999	0.223629	3.648896	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_4B_4$	0.586790	0.299426	1.959716	Insignificant
$\lambda A_4B_5$	-0.144360	0.175835	-0.820997	Insignificant
$\lambda A_4B_6$	-0.554050	0.394305	-1.405131	Insignificant
$\lambda A_5B_1$	-0.338670	0.200025	-1.693138	Insignificant
$\lambda A_5B_2$	-0.031850	0.210168	-0.151545	Insignificant
$\lambda A_5B_3$	1.256502	0.250599	5.013994	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_5B_4$	-0.137100	0.452197	-0.303186	Insignificant
$\lambda A_5B_5$	-0.318210	0.245608	-1.295601	Insignificant
$\lambda A_5B_6$	-0.430640	0.515306	-0.835698	Insignificant

Main effect  $A_i$  produced significant differences. The observed frequencies of 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, Afrikaans-speaking Whites, Coloureds, Indians and 'Other'.

Three significant interaction effects  $A_iB_j$  occurred with respect to question 14.3, in  $A_4B_1$ ,  $A_4B_3$  and  $A_5B_3$  respectively. The frequency of African respondents (56 or 22.8% of this subgroup) who agreed with the content of question 14.3 ( $\ell/s$  equal to -3.06) was significantly lower than the group norm. Regarding English-speaking Whites in  $A_4B_3$  (67 or 44.1% of this subgroup), the frequency of those who agreed with the content of question 14.3 ( $\ell/s$  equal to +3.65) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample. The frequency of English-speaking White respondents in  $A_5B_3$  (46 or 30.3% of this subgroup) who strongly agreed with the content of question 14.3 ( $\ell/s$  equal to +5.01) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample.

**Table 7.147** Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 14.4**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	41	31	4	1	13	2	92
Row %	44.6%	33.7%	4.3%	1.1%	14.1%	2.2%	100%
Column %	16.6%	20.4%	2.6%	3.7%	11.5%	9.5%	12.9%
Disagree	44	29	12	3	23	5	116
Row %	37.9%	25%	10.3%	2.6%	19.8%	4.3%	100%
Column %	17.8%	19.1%	7.9%	11.1%	20.4%	23.8%	16.3%
Neutral	95	54	59	8	45	5	266
Row %	35.7%	20.3%	22.2%	3%	16.9%	1.9%	100%
Column %	38.5%	35.5%	38.8%	29.6%	39.8%	23.8%	37.4%
Agree	51	24	46	13	22	5	161
Row %	31.7%	14.9%	28.6%	8.1%	13.7%	3.1%	100%
Column %	20.6%	15.8%	30.3%	48.1%	19.5%	23.8%	22.6%
Strongly agree	16	14	31	2	10	4	77
Row %	20.8%	18.2%	40.3%	2.6%	13%	5.2%	100%
Column %	6.5%	9.2%	20.4%	7.4%	8.8%	19%	10.8%
Total	247	152	152	27	113	21	712
Row %	34.7%	21.3%	21.3%	3.8%	15.9%	2.9%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

In Table 7.147 question 14.4 was addressed. It referred to a person's readily feeling a sense of belonging when listening to an English radio station.

In this case, 33.4% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement in the questionnaire. In other words, there was no majority support for the statement. Subgroups were judged as follows: African, 27.1%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 25%; White English-speaking, 50.7%; Coloured, 55.5%; Indian, 28.3%; 'Other', 42.8%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To determine whether 'Population Group' played a part in this factor, the suggested test for saturation was done. In this regard  $\ell^*$  was calculated at 90.10, which was significant ( $\ell^* = 90.10 > \text{critical } X^2 = 37.566$  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 7.148.

**Table 7.148** Estimated  $\lambda$  effects, standard deviations of  $\ell$  estimates and standardized  $\ell$  values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	$\ell$	$s_{\ell}$	$\ell/s$	Conclusion
$\lambda A_1$	-0.661980	0.190524	-3.474523	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_2$	-0.047320	0.129855	-0.364406	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3$	0.725347	0.107051	6.775714	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_4$	0.406682	0.107995	3.765748	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_5$	-0.422700	0.147793	-2.860081	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_1$	1.123896	0.092914	12.096089	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_2$	0.694161	0.100974	6.874651	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_3$	0.141959	0.125248	1.133423	Insignificant
$\lambda B_4$	-1.340080	0.243269	-5.508634	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_5$	0.352832	0.112198	3.144726	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_6$	-1.245760	0.202253	-6.159414	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_1B_1$	0.624346	0.223119	2.798265	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_1B_2$	0.774497	0.233435	3.317827	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_1B_3$	-0.993990	0.383510	-2.591823	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_1B_4$	-0.625250	0.700409	-0.892693	Insignificant
$\lambda A_1B_5$	0.246788	0.273405	0.902646	Insignificant
$\lambda A_1B_6$	-0.026420	0.521823	-0.050630	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_1$	0.080300	0.172279	0.466104	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_2$	0.093141	0.189591	0.491273	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_3$	-0.510050	0.246934	-2.065532	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_4$	-0.141300	0.452183	-0.312484	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_5$	0.202668	0.204782	0.989677	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_6$	0.275207	0.364503	0.755020	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_1$	0.077320	0.139274	0.555165	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_2$	-0.057840	0.155425	-0.372141	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_3$	0.309917	0.170035	1.822666	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_4$	0.066865	0.340196	0.196548	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_5$	0.101169	0.167424	0.604268	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_6$	-0.497460	0.357015	-1.393387	Insignificant
$\lambda A_4B_1$	-0.226070	0.152423	-1.483175	Insignificant
$\lambda A_4B_2$	-0.550100	0.183355	-3.000191	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_4B_3$	0.379686	0.176463	2.151647	Insignificant
$\lambda A_4B_4$	0.871037	0.310975	2.800987	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_4B_5$	-0.295790	0.193718	-1.526910	Insignificant
$\lambda A_4B_6$	-0.178790	0.357299	-0.500393	Insignificant
$\lambda A_5B_1$	-0.555920	0.224877	-2.472107	Insignificant
$\lambda A_5B_2$	-0.259720	0.236016	-1.100434	Insignificant
$\lambda A_5B_3$	0.814414	0.213370	3.816910	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_5B_4$	-0.171380	0.525468	-0.326147	Insignificant
$\lambda A_5B_5$	-0.254860	0.263676	-0.966565	Insignificant
$\lambda A_5B_6$	0.427443	0.397294	1.075886	Insignificant

Main effect  $A_i$  produced significant differences. Four of the five attitudinal categories, namely, Strongly Disagree, Neutral, Agree and Strongly Agree, differed significantly from the respective group norms. The exception was category 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, Coloureds, Indians and 'Other'.

Six significant interaction effects  $A_iB_j$  occurred, in  $A_1B_1$ ,  $A_1B_2$ ,  $A_1B_3$ ,  $A_4B_2$ ,  $A_4B_4$  and  $A_5B_3$  respectively. The frequency of African respondents in  $A_1B_1$  (41 or 16.6% of this subgroup) who strongly disagreed with the content of question 14.4 ( $\ell/s$  equal to +2.80) was significantly higher than the group norm. In the case of  $A_1B_2$ , the frequency of Afrikaans-speaking White respondents (31 or 20.4% in this subgroup) who strongly disagreed with the content of question 14.4 ( $\ell/s$  equal to +3.32) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample.

With regard to  $A_1B_3$ , the frequency of English-speaking White respondents (4 or 2.6% of this subgroup) who strongly disagreed with the content of question 14.4 ( $\ell/s$  equal to -2.59) was significantly lower than the group norm.

In the case of  $A_4B_2$ , the frequency of Afrikaans-speaking White respondents (24 or 15.8% of this subgroup) who agreed with the content of question 14.4 ( $\ell/s$  equal to -3.00) was significantly lower than the group norm. In the case of  $A_4B_4$ , the frequency of Coloured respondents (13 or 48.1% in this subgroup) who agreed with the content of question 14.4 ( $\ell/s$  equal to +2.80) was significantly higher than the group norm. Regarding  $A_5B_3$ , the frequency of English-speaking White respondents (31 or 20.4% in this subgroup) who strongly agreed with the content of question 14.4 ( $\ell/s$  equal to +3.82) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample.

**Table 7.149** Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 14.10**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	34	21	3	2	12	0	72
Row %	47.2%	29.2%	4.2%	2.8%	16.7%	0%	100%
Column %	13.9%	14%	2%	7.4%	10.7%	0%	10.2%
Disagree	35	23	13	3	21	2	97
Row %	36.1%	23.7%	13.4%	3.1%	21.6%	2.1%	100%
Column %	14.3%	15.3%	8.6%	11.1%	18.8%	9.5%	13.8%
Neutral	54	32	45	10	27	9	177
Row %	30.5%	18.1%	25.4%	5.6%	15.3%	5.1%	100%
Column %	22.1%	21.3%	29.8%	37%	24.1%	42.9%	25.1%
Agree	82	51	52	8	32	7	232
Row %	35.3%	22%	22.4%	3.4%	13.8%	3%	100%
Column %	33.6%	34%	34.4%	29.6%	28.6%	33.3%	32.9%
Strongly agree	39	23	38	4	20	3	127
Row %	30.7%	18.1%	29.9%	3.1%	15.7%	2.4%	100%
Column %	16%	15.3%	25.2%	14.8%	17.9%	14.3%	18%
Total	244	150	151	27	112	21	705
Row %	34.6%	21.3%	21.4%	3.8%	15.9%	3%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 14.10 that pertained to Table 7.149 referred to the notion that the English language enjoys a high status internationally, and that it therefore makes sense to listen to a good English radio station.

In the case of this variable 50.9% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the contents of the statement. Subgroup comparisons were as follows: African, 49.6%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 49.3%; White English-speaking, 59.6%; Coloured, 44.4%; Indian, 46.5%; 'Other', 47.6%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To measure whether 'Population Group' played a part in this dimension, testing for saturation was done. In this regard  $\ell^*$  was calculated at 67.43, which was significant ( $\ell^* = 67.43 >$  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 7.150.

**Table 7.150** Estimated  $\lambda$  effects, standard deviations of  $\ell$  estimates and standardized  $\ell$  values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	$\ell$	$s_{\ell}$	$\ell/s$	Conclusion
$\lambda_{A_1}$	-0.848570	0.195301	-4.344934	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_2}$	-0.307810	0.148592	-2.071511	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3}$	0.519681	0.101241	5.133108	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_4}$	0.640323	0.103681	6.175895	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5}$	-0.003610	0.130615	-0.027638	Insignificant
$\lambda_{B_1}$	1.171701	0.089236	13.130362	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_2}$	0.686121	0.099292	6.910134	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_3}$	0.355317	0.132896	2.673647	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_4}$	-0.144480	0.199507	-0.724185	Insignificant
$\lambda_{B_5}$	0.400853	0.107520	3.728172	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_6}$	-1.469510	0.246121	-5.970681	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_1B_1}$	0.546731	0.230122	2.375831	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_2}$	0.550473	0.249270	2.208340	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_3}$	-1.064630	0.429212	-2.480429	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_4}$	0.029696	0.522524	0.056832	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_5}$	0.276125	0.279503	0.987914	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_6}$	-0.338410	0.702712	-0.481577	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_1}$	0.034964	0.191199	0.182867	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_2}$	0.100691	0.210750	0.477775	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_3}$	-0.139050	0.256117	-0.542916	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_4}$	-0.105590	0.436236	-0.242048	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_5}$	0.294987	0.218572	1.349610	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_6}$	-0.186020	0.527011	-0.352972	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_1}$	-0.358890	0.143896	-2.494093	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_2}$	-0.396560	0.166417	-2.382930	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_3}$	0.275170	0.178566	1.540999	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_4}$	0.270887	0.291785	0.928379	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_5}$	-0.281190	0.178076	-1.579045	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_6}$	0.490564	0.332198	1.476722	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_1}$	-0.061800	0.136663	-0.452207	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_2}$	-0.051110	0.153420	-0.333138	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_3}$	0.299110	0.176605	1.693667	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_4}$	-0.072900	0.309255	-0.235728	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_5}$	-0.231930	0.172905	-1.341372	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_6}$	0.118609	0.351502	0.337435	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_1}$	-0.161020	0.174257	-0.924037	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_2}$	-0.203510	0.198485	-1.025317	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_3}$	0.629385	0.200833	3.133872	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5B_4}$	-0.122110	0.389807	-0.313258	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_5}$	-0.058000	0.209061	-0.277431	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_6}$	-0.084760	0.453933	-0.186724	Insignificant

Main effect  $A_i$  produced significant differences. The observed frequencies 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, Afrikaans-

speaking Whites, English-speaking Whites, Indians and ‘Other’.

A single significant interaction effect  $A_iB_j$  occurred, in  $A_5B_3$ . The frequency of English-speaking White respondents (38 or 25.2% of this subgroup) who strongly agreed with the content of question 14.10 ( $\ell/s$  equal to +3.13) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample.

**Table 7.151** Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 14.11**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	37	14	1	1	7	0	60
Row %	61.7%	23.3%	1.7%	1.7%	11.7%	0%	100%
Column %	15.2%	9.3%	.7%	3.7%	6.3%	0%	8.5%
Disagree	44	20	12	4	25	4	109
Row %	40.4%	18.3%	11%	3.7%	22.9%	3.7%	100%
Column %	18.1%	13.2%	7.9%	14.8%	22.5%	20%	15.5%
Neutral	71	39	34	7	23	5	179
Row %	39.7%	21.8%	19%	3.9%	12.8%	2.8%	100%
Column %	29.2%	25.8%	22.4%	25.9%	20.7%	25%	25.4%
Agree	56	54	66	10	45	7	238
Row %	23.5%	22.7%	27.7%	4.2%	18.9%	2.9%	100%
Column %	23%	35.8%	43.4%	37%	40.5%	35%	33.8%
Strongly agree	35	24	39	5	11	4	118
Row %	29.7%	20.3%	33.1%	4.2%	9.3%	3.4%	100%
Column %	14.4%	15.9%	25.7%	18.5%	9.9%	20%	16.8%
Total	243	151	152	27	111	20	704
Row %	34.5%	21.4%	21.6%	3.8%	15.8%	2.8%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 14.11 referred to the person who would continue listening to an English radio station as long as it catered for the needs and tastes of any English-speaking South African. The results of this variable are contained in Table 151.

In this case, 50.6% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement in the questionnaire. Compared with the general norm, the subsamples responded as follows: African, 37.4%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 51.7%; White English-speaking, 69.1%; Coloured, 55.5%; Indian, 50.4%; ‘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 possibility of saturation was



looked for. In this regard  $\ell^*$  was calculated at 101.33, which was significant ( $\ell^* = 101.33 > \text{critical } X^2 = 37.566$  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 7.152.

**Table 7.152** Estimated  $\lambda$  effects, standard deviations of  $\ell$  estimates and standardized  $\ell$  values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	$\ell$	$s_\ell$	$\ell/s$	Conclusion
$\lambda_{A_1}$	-1.222200	0.244872	-4.991179	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_2}$	-0.045460	0.132443	-0.343242	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3}$	0.435727	0.116325	3.745773	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_4}$	0.788345	0.105911	7.443467	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5}$	0.043585	0.128660	0.338761	Insignificant
$\lambda_{B_1}$	1.259519	0.094238	13.365298	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_2}$	0.704899	0.107084	6.582673	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_3}$	0.184718	0.191576	0.964202	Insignificant
$\lambda_{B_4}$	0.184718	0.226016	0.817278	Insignificant
$\lambda_{B_5}$	0.312789	0.122445	2.554527	Insignificant
$\lambda_{B_6}$	-1.322590	0.234698	-5.635284	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_1B_1}$	0.985420	0.271502	3.629513	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_1B_2}$	0.568179	0.306693	1.852599	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_3}$	-1.550700	0.700516	-2.213654	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_4}$	-0.226650	0.710707	-0.318908	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_5}$	0.267142	0.355186	0.752119	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_6}$	-0.043390	0.713516	-0.060812	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_1}$	-0.018040	0.171967	-0.104904	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_2}$	-0.251880	0.207528	-1.213716	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_3}$	-0.242530	0.285719	-0.848841	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_4}$	-0.017090	0.403341	-0.042371	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_5}$	0.363373	0.206382	1.760682	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_6}$	0.166171	0.408270	0.407013	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_1}$	-0.020740	0.148680	-0.139494	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_2}$	-0.065240	0.171215	-0.381041	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_3}$	0.317736	0.236764	1.341995	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_4}$	0.061337	0.340319	0.180234	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_5}$	-1.201200	0.199938	-6.007862	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_3B_6}$	-0.091880	0.377723	-0.243247	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_1}$	-0.610690	0.145946	-4.184356	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_4B_2}$	-0.092440	0.155407	-0.594825	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_3}$	0.628413	0.219177	2.867148	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_4B_4}$	0.065395	0.310419	0.210667	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_5}$	0.117350	0.170758	0.687230	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_6}$	-0.108020	0.342787	-0.315123	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_1}$	-0.335930	0.175848	-1.910343	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_2}$	-0.158610	0.196842	-0.805773	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_3}$	0.847080	0.239939	3.530397	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5B_4}$	0.117007	0.376426	0.310837	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_5}$	-0.546660	0.248937	-2.195977	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_6}$	0.077122	0.407058	0.189462	Insignificant

Main effect  $A_1$  produced significant differences. In three of the five attitudinal categories, namely, Strongly Disagree, Neutral and Agree, the observed frequencies 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, three significant deviations from the general trend were observed: among Africans, Afrikaans-speaking Whites and 'Other'.

Five significant interaction effects  $A_iB_j$  occurred, in  $A_1B_1$ ,  $A_3B_5$ ,  $A_4B_1$ ,  $A_4B_3$  and  $A_5B_3$  respectively. The frequency of African respondents in  $A_1B_1$  (37 or 15.2% of this subgroup) who strongly disagreed with the content of question 14.11 ( $\ell/s$  equal to +3.63) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample. In the case of  $A_3B_5$ , the frequency of Indian respondents (23 or 20.7% of this subgroup) who were neutral regarding the content of question 14.11 ( $\ell/s$  equal to -6.01) was significantly lower than the group norm.

With regard to  $A_4B_1$ , the frequency of African respondents (56 or 23% in this subgroup) who agreed with the content of question 14.11 ( $\ell/s$  equal to -4.19) was significantly lower than the group norm. In  $A_4B_3$ , the frequency of English-speaking White respondents (66 or 43.4% of this subgroup) who agreed with the content of question 14.11 ( $\ell/s$  equal to +2.87) was significantly higher than the group norm. In the case of  $A_5B_3$ , the frequency of English-speaking White respondents (39 or 25.7% in this subgroup) who strongly agreed with the content of question 14.11 ( $\ell/s$  equal to +3.53) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample.

**Table 7.153** Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 14.12**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	62	26	5	3	19	2	117
Row %	53%	22.2%	4.3%	2.6%	16.2%	1.7%	100%
Column %	26.1%	17.8%	3.3%	11.1%	17.1%	9.5%	16.8%
Disagree	51	23	6	9	31	8	128
Row %	39.8%	18%	4.7%	7%	24.2%	6.3%	100%
Column %	21.4%	15.8%	3.9%	33.3%	27.9%	38.1%	18.4%
Neutral	71	50	35	10	32	6	204
Row %	34.8%	24.5%	17.2%	4.9%	15.7%	2.9%	100%
Column %	29.8%	34.2%	23%	37%	28.8%	28.6%	29.4%
Agree	38	34	73	3	24	2	174
Row %	21.8%	19.5%	42%	1.7%	13.8%	1.1%	100%
Column %	16%	23.3%	48%	11.1%	21.6%	9.5%	25%
Strongly agree	16	13	33	2	5	3	72
Row %	22.2%	18.1%	45.8%	2.8%	6.9%	4.2%	100%
Column %	6.7%	8.9%	21.7%	7.4%	4.5%	14.3%	10.4%
Total	238	146	152	27	111	21	695
Row %	34.2%	21%	21.9%	3.9%	16%	3%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 14.12 referenced in Table 7.153 referred to the English-speaking South African who has a typical European lifestyle and finds that listening to an English radio station fits that lifestyle.

In this case, 35.4% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed and 35.2% disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement in the questionnaire. In other words, there was no majority support for the statement. Other observations were: African, 22.7%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 32.2%; White English-speaking, 69.7%; Coloured 18.5%, Indian, 26.1%; 'Other', 23.8%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To measure whether 'Population Group' played an interactive part in the cross-tabulation, the impact of saturation was calculated. In this regard  $\ell^*$  was calculated at 191.06, which was significant ( $\ell^* = 191.06 > \text{critical } X^2 = 37.566$  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, as set out in Table 7.154.

**Table 7.154** Estimated  $\lambda$  effects, standard deviations of  $\ell$  estimates and standardized  $\ell$  values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	$\ell$	$s_{\ell}$	$\ell/s$	Conclusion
$\lambda_{A_1}$	-0.319860	0.153677	-2.081378	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2}$	0.153282	0.113620	1.349076	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3}$	0.606682	0.103039	5.887887	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_4}$	0.129030	0.142646	0.904547	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5}$	-0.569130	0.157030	-3.624339	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_1}$	1.138023	0.091129	12.488044	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_2}$	0.671045	0.100804	6.656928	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_3}$	0.340363	0.127752	2.664248	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_4}$	-1.130300	0.203343	-5.558588	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_5}$	0.317991	0.118950	2.673317	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_6}$	-1.337120	0.218954	-6.106853	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_1B_1}$	0.700634	0.183753	3.812912	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_1B_2}$	0.298574	0.211081	1.414500	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_3}$	-1.019400	0.339602	-3.001749	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_1B_4}$	-0.059560	0.440103	-0.135332	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_5}$	0.337970	0.232832	1.451562	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_6}$	-0.258210	0.516672	-0.499756	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_1}$	0.032181	0.156364	0.205808	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_2}$	-0.297170	0.189354	-1.569389	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_3}$	-1.310230	0.302141	-4.336485	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_2B_4}$	0.565906	0.302141	1.872986	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_5}$	0.354374	0.188027	1.884697	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_6}$	0.654938	0.325949	2.009327	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_1}$	-0.090370	0.141237	-0.639846	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_2}$	0.025956	0.155470	0.166952	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_3}$	-0.000004	0.183735	-0.000022	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_4}$	0.217867	0.295563	0.737125	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_5}$	-0.067280	0.180717	-0.372295	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_6}$	-0.086140	0.347300	-0.248028	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_1}$	-0.237810	0.185933	-1.279009	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_2}$	0.117946	0.194079	0.607722	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_3}$	1.212727	0.193754	6.259107	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_4B_4}$	-0.508450	0.436374	-1.165170	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_5}$	0.122693	0.215769	0.568631	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_6}$	-0.707100	0.513499	-1.377023	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_1}$	-0.404640	0.230988	-1.751779	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_2}$	-0.145300	0.246945	-0.588390	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_3}$	1.116938	0.220211	5.072126	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5B_4}$	-0.215760	0.511272	-0.422006	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_5}$	-0.477760	0.337935	-1.413763	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_6}$	0.396524	0.448693	0.883731	Insignificant

Main effect  $A_i$  produced significant differences. 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  $A_1B_1$ ,  $A_1B_3$ ,  $A_2B_3$ ,  $A_4B_3$  and  $A_5B_3$

respectively. The frequency of African respondents in  $A_1B_1$  (62 or 26.1% of this subgroup) who strongly disagreed with the content of question 14.12 ( $\ell/s$  equal to +3.81) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample.

In the case of English-speaking White respondents in  $A_1B_3$  (5 or 3.3% in this subgroup), the frequency of those who strongly disagreed with the content of question 14.12 ( $\ell/s$  equal to -3.00) was significantly lower than the group norm. The frequency of English-speaking White respondents in  $A_2B_3$  (6 or 3.9% of this subgroup) who disagreed with the content of question 14.12 ( $\ell/s$  equal to -4.34) was significantly lower than the group norm. In the case of  $A_4B_3$ , the frequency of English-speaking White respondents (73 or 48% of this subgroup) who agreed with the content of question 14.12 ( $\ell/s$  equal to +6.23) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample. Similarly, the frequency of English-speaking White respondents in  $A_5B_3$  (33 or 21.7% of this subgroup) who strongly agreed with the content of question 14.12 ( $\ell/s$  equal to +5.07) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample.

**Table 7.155** Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 14.18**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	31	33	8	2	10	1	85
Row %	36.5%	38.8%	9.4%	2.4%	11.8%	1.2%	100%
Column %	12.9%	22%	5.2%	7.4%	8.9%	4.8%	12.1%
Disagree	36	26	9	4	17	3	95
Row %	37.9%	27.4%	9.5%	4.2%	17.9%	3.2%	100%
Column %	14.9%	17.3%	5.9%	14.8%	15.2%	14.3%	13.5%
Neutral	70	31	22	7	22	6	158
Row %	44.3%	19.6%	13.9%	4.4%	13.9%	3.8%	100%
Column %	29%	20.7%	14.4%	25.9%	19.6%	28.6%	22.4%
Agree	70	39	68	11	44	7	239
Row %	29.3%	16.3%	28.5%	4.6%	18.4%	2.9%	100%
Column %	29%	26%	44.4%	40.7%	39.3%	33.3%	33.9%
Strongly agree	34	21	46	3	19	4	127
Row %	26.8%	16.5%	36.2%	2.4%	15%	3.1%	100%
Column %	14.1%	14%	30.1%	11.1%	17%	19%	18%
Total	241	150	153	27	112	21	704
Row %	34.2%	21.3%	21.7%	3.8%	15.9%	3%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 14.18 referred to the person who listens to an English radio station regardless of where he or she is in South Africa. The results of this variable are contained in Table

7.155.

In this case, 51.9% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. The responses among subgroups were as follows: African, 43.1%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 40%; White English-speaking, 74.5%; Coloured, 51.8%; Indian, 56.3%; 'Other', 52.3%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population. To measure whether 'Population Group' played a part in this dimension, testing for saturation was once again done. In this regard  $\ell^*$  was calculated at 98.27, which was significant ( $\ell^* = 98.27 > \text{critical } X^2 = 37.566$  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 7.156.

**Table 7.156** Estimated  $\lambda$  effects, standard deviations of  $\ell$  estimates and standardized  $\ell$  values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	$\ell$	$s_{\ell}$	$\ell/s$	Conclusion
$\lambda_{A_1}$	-0.667500	0.185333	-3.601625	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_2}$	-0.275610	0.134959	-2.042176	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3}$	0.265266	0.109568	2.421017	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4}$	0.708153	0.098696	7.175093	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5}$	-0.030300	0.129619	-0.233762	Insignificant
$\lambda_{B_1}$	1.139728	0.087765	12.986133	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_2}$	0.710892	0.095932	7.410374	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_3}$	0.414728	0.114174	3.632421	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_4}$	-0.164070	0.199194	-0.823669	Insignificant
$\lambda_{B_5}$	0.322651	0.109601	2.943869	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_6}$	-1.123930	0.234588	-4.791081	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_1B_1}$	0.293311	0.224496	1.306531	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_2}$	0.784668	0.226090	3.470600	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_1B_3}$	-0.336230	0.304678	-1.103559	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_4}$	-0.143730	0.519106	-0.276880	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_5}$	-0.021010	0.286016	-0.073457	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_6}$	-0.577020	0.696293	-0.828703	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_1}$	0.050961	0.180200	0.282802	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_2}$	0.154375	0.195566	0.789375	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_3}$	-0.610330	0.266718	-2.288297	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_4}$	0.157536	0.391582	0.402307	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_5}$	0.117733	0.221811	0.530781	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_6}$	0.129710	0.449470	0.288584	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_1}$	0.175058	0.144452	1.211877	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_2}$	-0.210610	0.171918	-1.225061	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_3}$	-0.257400	0.196640	-1.308991	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_4}$	0.176272	0.322910	0.545886	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_5}$	-0.165320	0.194020	-0.852077	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_6}$	0.281978	0.359372	0.784641	Insignificant

**Table 7.156 (Cont.)** Estimated  $\lambda$  effects, standard deviations of  $\ell$  estimates and standardized  $\ell$  values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	$\ell$	$s_{\ell}$	$\ell/s$	Conclusion
$\lambda_{A_4B_1}$	-0.267830	0.136390	-1.963707	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_2}$	-0.423930	0.156987	-2.700415	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_4B_3}$	0.428183	0.155253	2.757969	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_4B_4}$	0.185370	0.285004	0.650412	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_5}$	0.084942	0.162138	0.523887	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_6}$	-0.006760	0.342578	-0.019733	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_1}$	-0.251520	0.178081	-1.412391	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_2}$	-0.304520	0.201237	-1.513241	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_3}$	0.775765	0.184328	4.208612	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5B_4}$	-0.375460	0.430415	-0.872321	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_5}$	-0.016360	0.212863	-0.076857	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_6}$	0.172074	0.408995	0.420724	Insignificant

Main effect  $A_i$  produced significant differences. The observed frequencies in two of the five attitudinal categories, namely, Strongly Disagree and Agree, differed significantly from the respective group norms. The exceptions were categories Disagree, Neutral 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, Indians and 'Other'.

Four significant interaction effects  $A_iB_j$  occurred, in  $A_1B_2$ ,  $A_4B_2$ ,  $A_4B_3$  and  $A_5B_3$  respectively. The frequency of Afrikaans-speaking White respondents in  $A_1B_2$  (33 or 22% of this subgroup) who strongly disagreed with the content of question 14.18 ( $\ell/s$  equal to +3.47) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample. In the case of  $A_4B_2$ , the frequency of Afrikaans-speaking White respondents (39 or 26% in this subgroup) who agreed with the content of question 14.18 ( $\ell/s$  equal to -2.70) was significantly lower than the group norm.

The frequency of English-speaking White respondents in  $A_4B_3$  (68 or 44.4% of this subgroup) who agreed with the content of question 14.18 ( $\ell/s$  equal to +2.76) was significantly higher than the group norm. Lastly, the frequency of English-speaking White respondents in  $A_5B_3$  (46 or 30.1% of this subgroup) who strongly agreed with the content of question 14.18 ( $\ell/s$  equal to +4.21) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample.

**Table 7.157** Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 14.2**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	125	69	10	2	31	5	242
Row %	51.7%	28.5%	4.1%	.8%	12.8%	2.1%	100%
Column %	50.6%	44.8%	6.6%	7.4%	27.4%	22.7%	33.8%
Disagree	58	44	13	13	34	8	170
Row %	34.1%	25.9%	7.6%	7.6%	20%	4.7%	100%
Column %	23.5%	28.6%	8.6%	48.1%	30.1%	36.4%	23.8%
Neutral	37	28	26	3	24	5	123
Row %	30.1%	22.8%	21.1%	2.4%	19.5%	4.1%	100%
Column %	15%	18.2%	17.1%	11.1%	21.2%	22.7%	17.2%
Agree	21	9	43	8	20	2	103
Row %	20.4%	8.7%	41.7%	7.8%	19.4%	1.9%	100%
Column %	8.5%	5.8%	28.3%	29.6%	17.7%	9.1%	14.4%
Strongly agree	6	4	60	1	4	2	77
Row %	7.8%	5.2%	77.9%	1.3%	5.2%	2.6%	100%
Column %	2.4%	2.6%	39.5%	3.7%	3.5%	9.1%	10.8%
Total	247	154	152	27	113	22	715
Row %	34.5%	21.5%	21.3%	3.8%	15.8%	3.1%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

The response to question 14.2 presented in Table 7.157 referred to listening to an English radio station because one considers oneself to be English.

In the case of this variable, 57.6% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement in the questionnaire. The observations for the subgroups were as follows: African, 74.1%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 73.4%; White English-speaking, 15.2%; Coloured, 55.5%; Indian, 57.5%; 'Other', 59.1%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To measure whether 'Population Group' played a part in this dimension, the normal test for saturation was done. In this regard  $\ell^*$  was calculated at 278.03, which was significant ( $\ell^* = 278.03 >$  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. The consequent results are presented in Table 7.158.



**Table 7.158** Estimated  $\lambda$  effects, standard deviations of  $\ell$  estimates and standardized  $\ell$  values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	$\ell$	$s_{\ell}$	$\ell/s$	Conclusion
$\lambda A_1$	0.320523	0.140399	2.282944	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2$	0.566982	0.106160	5.340825	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_3$	0.151480	0.129368	1.170923	Insignificant
$\lambda A_4$	-0.067860	0.140532	-0.482879	Insignificant
$\lambda A_5$	-0.971100	0.204585	-4.746682	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_1$	0.937447	0.112135	8.359986	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_2$	0.457059	0.130540	3.501295	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_3$	0.666490	0.110789	6.015850	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_4$	-1.242510	0.244417	-5.083566	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_5$	0.374341	0.127365	2.939120	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_6$	-1.192820	0.214785	-5.553554	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_1B_1$	1.040599	0.173263	6.005893	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_1B_2$	0.926780	0.192710	4.809195	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_1B_3$	1.214170	0.257915	-4.707636	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_1B_4$	-0.914610	0.523436	-1.747320	Insignificant
$\lambda A_1B_5$	0.209379	0.208257	1.005388	Insignificant
$\lambda A_1B_6$	-0.048010	0.374671	-0.128139	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_1$	0.026269	0.158980	0.165235	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_2$	0.230403	0.178705	1.289292	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_3$	-1.198270	0.221014	-5.421693	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_2B_4$	0.710737	0.310343	2.290166	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_5$	0.055293	0.183821	0.300798	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_6$	0.175537	0.319275	0.549799	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_1$	-0.007750	0.186159	-0.041631	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_2$	0.193920	0.206389	0.939585	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_3$	-0.089620	0.197304	-0.454223	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_4$	-0.340100	-0.452043	-0.752362	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_5$	0.122488	0.210139	0.582890	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_6$	0.121035	0.370679	0.326522	Insignificant
$\lambda A_4B_1$	-0.354810	0.214254	-1.656025	Insignificant
$\lambda A_4B_2$	-0.721720	0.275260	-2.621957	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_4B_3$	0.632827	0.189367	3.341802	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_4B_4$	0.860073	0.352169	2.442217	Insignificant
$\lambda A_4B_5$	0.159509	0.224733	0.709771	Insignificant
$\lambda A_4B_6$	-0.575910	0.510310	-1.128549	Insignificant
$\lambda A_5B_1$	-0.704330	0.340044	-2.071291	Insignificant
$\lambda A_5B_2$	-0.629410	0.391701	-1.606863	Insignificant
$\lambda A_5B_3$	1.869209	0.235223	7.946540	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_5B_4$	-0.316130	0.704364	-0.448816	Insignificant
$\lambda A_5B_5$	-0.546690	0.390654	-1.399423	Insignificant
$\lambda A_5B_6$	0.327325	0.531528	0.615819	Insignificant

Main effect  $A_i$  produced significant differences. Two of the five attitudinal categories, namely, Disagree and Strongly Agree, 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 groups.

Seven significant interaction effects  $A_iB_j$  occurred, in  $A_1B_1$ ,  $A_1B_2$ ,  $A_1B_3$ ,  $A_2B_3$ ,  $A_4B_2$ ,  $A_4B_3$  and  $A_5B_3$  respectively. The frequency of African respondents in  $A_1B_1$  (125 or 50.6% of this subgroup) who strongly disagreed with the content of question 14.2 ( $\ell/s$  equal to +6.01) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample. In the case of  $A_1B_2$ , the frequency of Afrikaans-speaking White respondents (69 or 44.8% in this subgroup) who strongly disagreed with the content of question 14.2 ( $\ell/s$  equal to +4.81) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample.

The frequency of English-speaking White respondents in  $A_1B_3$  (10 or 6.6% of this subgroup) who strongly disagreed with the content of question 14.2 ( $\ell/s$  equal to -4.71) was significantly lower than the group norm. Regarding  $A_2B_3$ , the frequency of English-speaking White respondents (13 or 8.6% in this subgroup) who disagreed with the content of question 14.2 ( $\ell/s$  equal to -5.42) was significantly lower than the group norm. In the case of  $A_4B_2$ , the frequency of Afrikaans-speaking White respondents (9 or 5.8% in this subgroup) who agreed with the content of question 14.2 ( $\ell/s$  equal to -2.62) was significantly lower than the group norm. The frequency of English-speaking White respondents in  $A_4B_3$  (43 or 28.3% of this subgroup) who agreed with the content of question 14.2 ( $\ell/s$  equal to +3.34) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample. Regarding  $A_5B_3$ , the frequency of English-speaking White respondents (60 or 39.5% of this subgroup) who strongly agreed with the content of question 14.2 ( $\ell/s$  equal to +7.95) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample.

**Table 7.159** Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 14.9**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	56	36	19	4	20	1	136
Row %	41.2%	26.5%	14%	2.9%	14.7%	.7%	100%
Column %	22.7%	23.7%	12.5%	14.8%	17.9%	4.8%	19.1%
Disagree	55	39	29	5	22	3	153
Row %	35.9%	25.5%	19%	3.3%	14.4%	2%	100%
Column %	22.3%	25.7%	19.1%	18.5%	19.6%	14.3%	21.5%
Neutral	63	32	39	7	27	6	174
Row %	36.2%	18.4%	22.4%	4%	15.5%	3.4%	100%
Column %	25.5%	21.1%	25.7%	25.9%	24.1%	28.6%	24.5%
Agree	42	33	39	8	31	7	160
Row %	26.3%	20.6%	24.4%	5%	19.4%	4.4%	100%
Column %	17%	21.7%	25.7%	29.6%	27.7%	33.3%	22.5%
Strongly agree	31	12	26	3	12	4	88
Row %	35.2%	13.6%	29.5%	3.4%	13.6%	4.5%	100%
Column %	12.6%	7.9%	17.1%	11.1%	10.7%	19%	12.4%
Total	247	152	152	27	112	21	711
Row %	34.7%	21.4%	21.4%	3.8%	15.8%	3%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 14.9 that pertained to Table 7.159 referred to the radio listener who feels comfortable listening to an English radio station because he or she will always be in the company of people who speak English.

In this case, 40.6% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement in the questionnaire. The different subgroups responded as follows: African, 45%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 49.4%; White English-speaking, 31.6%; Coloured, 33.3%; Indian, 37.5%; 'Other', 19.1%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To determine the interactive part of the subcategories 'Population Group', a test was done for the presence or absence of saturation. In this regard  $\ell^*$  was calculated at 45.51, which was significant ( $\ell^* = 45.51 > \text{critical } X^2 = 37.566$  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, as set out in Table 7.160.

**Table 7.160** Estimated  $\lambda$  effects, standard deviations of  $\ell$  estimates and standardized  $\ell$  values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	$\ell$	$s_{\ell}$	$\ell/s$	Conclusion
$\lambda_{A_1}$	-0.263525	0.165493	-1.592363	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2}$	0.053466	0.122618	0.436037	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3}$	0.298242	0.105225	2.834326	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_4}$	0.306765	0.102053	3.005938	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5}$	-0.394947	0.133275	-2.963399	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_1}$	1.116747	0.083445	13.383031	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_2}$	0.586098	0.096808	6.054231	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_3}$	0.626643	0.093808	6.680059	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_4}$	-1.128809	0.179208	-6.298876	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_5}$	0.307553	0.103437	2.973336	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_6}$	-1.508233	0.233580	-6.457030	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_1B_1}$	0.419382	0.193418	2.168268	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_2}$	0.508198	0.209254	2.428618	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_3}$	-0.171427	0.230558	-0.743531	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_4}$	0.025881	0.394233	0.065649	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_5}$	0.198957	0.232387	0.856145	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_6}$	-0.980990	0.691277	-1.419098	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_1}$	0.084372	0.158705	0.531628	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_2}$	0.271250	0.174871	1.551143	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_3}$	-0.065561	0.183152	-0.357960	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_4}$	-0.067967	0.350809	-0.193744	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_5}$	-0.022724	0.199581	-0.113859	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_6}$	-0.199369	0.445920	-0.447096	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_1}$	-0.024602	0.142482	-0.172667	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_2}$	-0.171352	0.169884	-1.008641	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_3}$	-0.014071	0.161385	-0.087189	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_4}$	0.023729	0.310237	0.076487	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_5}$	-0.062706	0.180285	-0.347816	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_6}$	0.249003	0.358072	0.695399	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_1}$	-0.438590	0.151056	-2.903493	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_4B_2}$	-0.149103	0.166806	-0.893871	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_3}$	-0.022594	0.159334	-0.141803	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_4}$	0.148738	0.297400	0.500128	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_5}$	0.066921	0.173013	0.386798	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_6}$	0.394630	0.343561	1.148646	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_1}$	-0.040560	0.183153	-0.221454	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_2}$	-0.458992	0.237453	-1.932980	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_3}$	0.273653	0.194584	1.406349	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_4}$	-0.130379	0.423234	-0.308054	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_5}$	-0.180447	0.240232	-0.751136	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_6}$	0.536727	0.410169	1.308551	Insignificant

Main effect  $A_i$  produced significant differences. 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 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.

A single significant interaction effect  $A_1B_j$  occurred in  $A_4B_1$ . The frequency of African respondents in  $A_4B_1$  (42 or 17% of this subgroup) who strongly agreed with the content of question 14.9 ( $\ell/s$  equal to  $-2.90$ ) was significantly lower than the group norm.

#### 7.4.4.3 Improving One's Use of English

Two questions were interrelated with factor III.

**Table 7.161** Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 14.1**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	31	37	72	2	32	5	179
Row %	17.3%	20.7%	40.2%	1.1%	17.9%	2.8%	100%
Column %	12.5%	24.2%	47.7%	7.4%	28.3%	23.8%	25.1%
Disagree	33	37	39	6	34	2	151
Row %	21.9%	24.5%	25.8%	4%	22.5%	1.3%	100%
Column %	13.3%	24.2%	25.8%	22.2%	30.1%	9.5%	21.2%
Neutral	77	32	27	9	24	3	172
Row %	44.8%	18.6%	15.7%	5.2%	14%	1.7%	100%
Column %	31%	20.9%	17.9%	33.3%	21.2%	14.3%	24.1%
Agree	52	30	8	5	13	4	112
Row %	46.4%	26.8%	7.1%	4.5%	11.6%	3.6%	100%
Column %	21%	19.6%	5.3%	18.5%	11.5%	19%	15.7%
Strongly agree	55	17	5	5	10	7	99
Row %	55.6%	17.2%	5.1%	5.1%	10.1%	7.1%	100%
Column %	22.2%	11.1%	3.3%	18.5%	8.8%	33.3%	13.9%
Total	248	153	151	27	113	21	713
Row %	34.8%	21.5%	21.2%	3.8%	15.8%	2.9%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 14.1 referred to in Table 7.161 was aimed at the person who listens to an English radio station in order to improve his or her English.

In this case, 46.3% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement in the questionnaire. Subgroup percentages were as follows: African, 25.8%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 48.4%; White English-speaking, 73.5%; Coloured, 29.6%; Indian, 58.4%; 'Other', 33.3%.

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 traced in this instance. In this regard  $\ell^*$

was calculated at 145.38, which was significant ( $\ell^* = 145.38 > \text{critical } X_2 = 37.566$  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 and duly reported in Table 7.162.

**Table 7.162** Estimated  $\lambda$  effects, standard deviations of  $\ell$  estimates and standardized  $\ell$  values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	$\ell$	$s_\ell$	$\ell/s$	Conclusion
$\lambda_{A_1}$	0.156585	0.131831	1.187771	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2}$	0.105312	0.130218	0.808736	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3}$	0.238148	0.115883	2.055073	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4}$	-0.192970	0.125355	-1.539388	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5}$	-0.307080	0.126373	-2.429949	Insignificant
$\lambda_{B_1}$	1.154846	0.083575	13.818080	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_2}$	0.692667	0.093299	7.424163	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_3}$	0.293259	0.121165	2.420328	Insignificant
$\lambda_{B_4}$	-1.111530	0.188095	-5.909407	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_5}$	0.315807	0.106860	2.955334	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_6}$	-1.345050	0.204949	-6.562852	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_1B_1}$	-0.569170	0.182469	-3.119270	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_1B_2}$	0.069936	0.181446	0.385437	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_3}$	1.135092	0.183422	6.188418	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_1B_4}$	-1.043640	0.198785	-5.250094	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_1B_5}$	0.301614	0.193200	1.561149	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_6}$	0.106172	0.367983	0.288524	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_1}$	-0.455380	0.179137	-2.542077	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_2}$	0.121209	0.180277	0.672349	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_3}$	0.573260	0.194734	2.943811	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_2B_4}$	0.106246	0.339162	0.313260	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_5}$	0.413511	0.190179	2.174325	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_6}$	-0.758850	0.504964	-1.502780	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_2}$	-0.156810	0.175103	-0.895530	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_3}$	0.072700	0.197363	0.368357	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_4}$	0.378875	0.298799	1.267993	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_5}$	-0.067630	0.193758	-0.349044	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_6}$	-0.486220	0.429877	-1.131068	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_1}$	0.297638	0.162538	1.831190	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_2}$	0.209770	0.183792	1.141345	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_3}$	-0.712580	0.276446	-2.577646	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_4B_4}$	0.222206	0.356541	0.623227	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_5}$	-0.249620	0.232228	-1.074892	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_6}$	0.232583	0.392104	0.593167	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_1}$	0.467835	0.162034	2.887264	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5B_2}$	-0.244110	0.210314	-1.160693	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_3}$	-1.068470	0.326617	-3.271324	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5B_4}$	0.336314	0.356900	0.942320	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_5}$	0.397870	0.251827	-1.579934	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_6}$	0.906307	0.333384	2.718508	Significant at 0.1% level

There were no significant differences regarding the main effect  $A_i$  for this question. 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, Coloureds,

Indians and 'Other'.

There were eight significant interaction effects  $A_1B_j$  that were observed, in  $A_1B_1$ ,  $A_1B_3$ ,  $A_1B_4$ ,  $A_2B_3$ ,  $A_4B_3$ ,  $A_5B_1$ ,  $A_5B_3$  and  $A_5B_6$  respectively. The frequency of African respondents in  $A_1B_1$  (31 or 12.5% of this subgroup) who strongly disagreed with the content of question 14.1 ( $\ell/s$  equal to -3.12) was significantly lower than the group norm. In the case of  $A_1B_3$ , the frequency of English-speaking White respondents (72 or 47.7% in this subgroup) who strongly disagreed with the content of question 14.1 ( $\ell/s$  equal to +6.19) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample.

The frequency of Coloured respondents in  $A_1B_4$  (2 or 7.4% of this subgroup) who strongly disagreed with the content of question 14.1 ( $\ell/s$  equal to -5.25) was significantly lower than the group norm. Regarding  $A_2B_3$ , the frequency of English-speaking White respondents (39 or 25.8% in this subgroup) who disagreed with the content of question 14.1 ( $\ell/s$  equal to +2.94) was significantly higher than the group norm.

In the case of  $A_4B_3$ , the frequency of English-speaking White respondents (8 or 5.3% in this subgroup) who agreed with the content of question 14.1 ( $\ell/s$  equal to -2.58) was significantly lower than the group norm. In the case of  $A_5B_1$ , the frequency of African respondents (55 or 22.2% in this subgroup) who strongly agreed with the content of question 14.1 ( $\ell/s$  equal to +2.89) was significantly higher than the group the norm. The frequency of English-speaking White respondents in  $A_5B_6$  (5 or 3.3% in this subgroup) who strongly agreed with the content of question 14.1 ( $\ell/s$  equal to -3.27) was significantly lower than the group norm. Regarding  $A_5B_6$ , the frequency of 'Other' respondents (7 or 33.3% in this subgroup) who agreed with the content of question 14.1 ( $\ell/s$  equal to +2.72) was significantly higher than the group norm.

**Table 7.163** Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 14.7**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	38	31	60	2	30	3	164
Row %	23.2%	18.9%	36.6%	1.2%	18.3%	1.8%	100%
Column %	15.4%	20.3%	39.7%	7.4%	26.5%	14.3%	23.1%
Disagree	45	36	41	12	36	4	174
Row %	25.9%	20.7%	23.6%	6.9%	20.7%	2.3%	100%
Column %	18.3%	23.5%	27.2%	44.4%	31.9%	19%	24.5%
Neutral	68	33	32	4	28	3	168
Row %	40.5%	19.6%	19%	2.4%	16.7%	1.8%	100%
Column %	27.6%	21.6%	21.2%	14.8%	24.8%	14.3%	23.6%
Agree	62	38	13	6	15	8	142
Row %	43.7%	26.8%	9.2%	4.2%	10.6%	5.6%	100%
Column %	25.2%	24.8%	8.6%	22.2%	13.3%	38.1%	20%
Strongly agree	33	15	5	3	4	3	63
Row %	52.4%	23.8%	7.9%	4.8%	6.3%	4.8%	100%
Column %	13.4%	9.8%	3.3%	11.1%	3.5%	14.3%	8.9%
Total	246	153	151	27	113	21	711
Row %	34.6%	21.5%	21.2%	3.8%	15.9%	3%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 14.7 referenced in Table 7.163 referred to the person who listens to an English radio station because it helps to refine his or her English.

In this case, 47.6% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. The different subgroups responded as follows: African, 33.7%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 43.8%; White English-speaking, 66.9%; Coloured, 51.8%; Indian, 58.4%; 'Other', 33.3%.

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 once again looked for. In this regard  $\ell^*$  was calculated at 101.06, which was significant ( $\ell^* = 101.06 > \text{critical } X^2 = 37.566$  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 7.164.



**Table 7.164** Estimated  $\lambda$  effects, standard deviations of  $\ell$  estimates and standardized  $\ell$  values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	$\ell$	$s_{\ell}$	$\ell/s$	Conclusion
$\lambda_{A_1}$	0.052389	0.140999	0.371556	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2}$	0.418989	0.106961	3.917213	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_3}$	0.159054	0.125582	1.266535	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4}$	0.144064	0.110200	1.307296	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5}$	-0.774500	0.156236	-4.957244	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_1}$	1.183391	0.084303	14.037353	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_2}$	0.697842	0.095241	7.327118	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_3}$	0.415520	0.116168	3.576889	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_4}$	-1.183140	0.199344	-5.935167	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_5}$	0.208165	0.123324	1.687952	Insignificant
$\lambda_{B_6}$	-1.321770	0.202111	-6.539822	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_1B_1}$	-0.272280	0.182570	-1.491373	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_2}$	0.009668	0.194094	0.049811	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_3}$	0.952347	0.189368	5.029081	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_1B_4}$	-0.850190	0.505407	-1.682189	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_5}$	0.466555	0.210334	2.218163	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_6}$	-0.306090	0.435753	-0.702439	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_1}$	-0.469810	0.152493	-3.080863	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_2B_2}$	-0.207400	0.165651	-1.252030	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_3}$	0.204975	0.174670	1.173499	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_4}$	0.574974	0.283425	2.028664	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_5}$	0.282277	0.183244	1.540443	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_6}$	-0.385010	0.384847	-1.000424	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_1}$	0.202974	0.156773	1.294700	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_2}$	-0.034480	0.181054	-0.190440	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_3}$	0.217074	0.193865	1.119717	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_4}$	-0.263700	0.389007	-0.677880	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_5}$	0.290898	0.202689	1.435194	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_6}$	-0.412760	0.431011	-0.957655	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_1}$	0.125591	0.146698	0.856119	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_2}$	0.121593	0.166009	0.732448	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_3}$	-0.668720	0.228530	-2.926180	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_4B_4}$	0.156752	0.338181	0.463515	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_5}$	-0.318270	0.223242	-1.425673	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_6}$	0.583063	0.314342	1.854868	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_1}$	0.413532	0.198634	2.081879	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_2}$	0.110624	0.236569	0.467618	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_3}$	-0.705670	0.337227	-2.092567	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_4}$	0.382173	0.439657	0.869253	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_5}$	-0.721450	0.368016	-1.960377	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_6}$	0.520802	0.440919	1.181174	Insignificant

Main effect  $A_i$  produced significant differences. Two of the five attitudinal categories, namely, Disagree and Strongly Agree, 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 population group, five significant deviations from the general trend were observed: among Africans, Afrikaans-speaking Whites, English-speaking Whites, Coloureds and 'Other'.

There were three significant interaction effects  $A_iB_j$  that occurred with respect to question

14.7. The first significant interaction occurred in A<sub>1</sub>B<sub>3</sub>, the second in A<sub>2</sub>B<sub>1</sub> and the third in A<sub>4</sub>B<sub>3</sub>. The frequency of English-speaking White respondents in A<sub>1</sub>B<sub>3</sub> (60 or 39.7% of this subgroup) who strongly disagreed with the content of question 14.7 (*ℓ/s* equal to +5.03) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample. In the case of African respondents in A<sub>2</sub>B<sub>1</sub> (45 or 18.3% of this subgroup), the frequency of those who disagreed with the content of question 14.7 (*ℓ/s* equal to -3.08) was significantly lower than the group norm. Regarding the English-speaking White respondents in A<sub>4</sub>B<sub>3</sub> (13 or 8.6% of this subgroup), the frequency of those who agreed with the content of question 14.7 (*ℓ/s* equal to -2.93) was significantly lower than the group norm.

#### 7.4.4.4 Use of European Presenters

Two questions, 14.5 and 14.6, resorted under factor IV.

**Table 7.165** Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 14.6**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	96	23	12	7	36	3	177
Row %	54.2%	13%	6.8%	4%	20.3%	1.7%	100%
Column %	39%	15.1%	7.9%	25.9%	32.4%	14.3%	25%
Disagree	69	39	32	12	36	6	194
Row %	35.6%	20.1%	16.5%	6.2%	18.6%	3.1%	100%
Column %	28%	25.7%	21.1%	44.4%	32.4%	28.6%	27.4%
Neutral	53	47	51	4	27	6	188
Row %	28.2%	25%	27.1%	2.1%	14.4%	3.2%	100%
Column %	21.5%	30.9%	33.6%	14.8%	24.3%	28.6%	26.5%
Agree	20	27	37	3	12	4	103
Row %	19.4%	26.2%	35.9%	2.9%	11.7%	3.9%	100%
Column %	8.1%	17.8%	24.3%	11.1%	10.8%	19%	14.5%
Strongly agree	8	16	20	1	0	2	47
Row %	17%	34%	42.6%	2.1%	0%	4.3%	100%
Column %	3.3%	10.5%	13.2%	3.7%	0%	9.5%	6.6%
Total	246	152	152	27	111	21	709
Row %	34.7%	21.4%	21.4%	3.8%	15.7%	3%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

In Table 7.165 question 14.6 was addressed. It referred to the preference for listening to an English radio station that broadcasts programmes that are typically European.

In this case, 52.4% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement in the questionnaire. The responses among the subgroups were as follows: African, 67%;

White Afrikaans-speaking, 40.8%; White English-speaking, 29%; Coloured, 70.3%; Indian, 64.8%; ‘Other’, 42.9%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents’ population group. To measure whether ‘Population Group’ played an interactive part in the cross-tabulation, testing was done for the presence of saturation. In this regard  $\ell^*$  was calculated at 129.43, which was significant ( $\ell^* = 129.43 > \text{critical } X^2 = 37.566$  with 20 degrees of freedom). The saturated model of the hierarchical loglinear analysis applied in this instance. Further analysis of the cross-tabulation was necessary. The findings are reported in Table 7.166.

**Table 7.166** Estimated  $\lambda$  effects, standard deviations of  $\ell$  estimates and standardized  $\ell$  values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	$\ell$	$S_{\ell}$	$\ell/s$	Conclusion
$\lambda_{A_1}$	0.212942	0.127541	1.669596	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2}$	0.614742	0.106768	5.757736	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_3}$	0.448503	0.118902	3.772039	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_4}$	-0.110470	0.136353	-0.810177	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5}$	-1.165710	0.226285	-5.151512	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_1}$	0.979593	0.106837	9.169043	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_2}$	0.754334	0.103174	7.311280	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_3}$	0.708632	0.105889	6.692215	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_4}$	-1.206050	0.232022	-5.197998	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_5}$	0.000356	0.192193	0.001852	Insignificant
$\lambda_{B_6}$	-0.236880	0.208225	-1.137616	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_1}$	0.782622	0.162072	4.828854	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_1B_2}$	-0.420970	0.196781	-2.139282	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_3}$	-1.025860	0.235016	-4.365065	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_1B_4}$	0.349824	0.348803	1.002927	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_5}$	0.781021	0.242355	3.222632	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_1B_6}$	-0.466640	0.432872	-1.078009	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_1}$	0.050581	0.151758	0.333300	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_2}$	-0.294710	0.163465	-1.802894	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_3}$	-0.446830	0.171848	-2.600147	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_2B_4}$	0.487020	0.304937	1.597117	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_5}$	0.379221	0.232096	1.633897	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_6}$	-0.175300	0.340358	-0.515046	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_1}$	-0.046990	0.165888	-0.283263	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_2}$	0.055812	0.166473	0.335262	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_3}$	0.185499	0.166172	1.116307	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_4}$	-0.445350	0.402978	-1.105147	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_5}$	0.257778	0.245582	1.049662	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_6}$	-0.009060	0.344358	-0.026310	Insignificant

**Table 7.166 (Cont.)** Estimated  $\lambda$  effects, standard deviations of  $\ell$  estimates and standardized  $\ell$  values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	$\ell$	$S_{\ell}$	$\ell/s$	Conclusion
$\lambda_{A_4B_1}$	-0.462580	0.210775	-2.194663	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_2}$	0.062784	0.196143	0.320093	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_3}$	0.423567	0.187178	2.262910	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_4}$	-0.174060	0.447414	-0.389036	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_5}$	0.005824	0.288589	0.020181	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_6}$	0.144453	0.395436	0.365301	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_1}$	-0.323640	0.327168	-0.989217	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_2}$	0.594768	0.285079	2.086327	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_3}$	0.863614	0.277196	3.115536	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5B_4}$	-0.217440	0.706724	-0.307673	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_5}$	-1.423850	0.694668	-2.049684	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_6}$	0.506538	0.537571	0.942272	Insignificant

Main effect  $A_i$  produced significant differences. 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'.

Five significant interaction effects  $A_iB_j$  occurred, in  $A_1B_1$ ,  $A_1B_3$ ,  $A_1B_5$ ,  $A_2B_3$  and  $A_5B_3$  respectively. The frequency of African respondents in  $A_1B_1$  (96 or 39% of this subgroup) who strongly disagreed with the content of question 14.6 ( $\ell/s$  equal to +4.83) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample. In the case of  $A_1B_3$ , the frequency of English-speaking White respondents (12 or 7.9% in this subgroup) who strongly disagreed with the content of question 14.6 ( $\ell/s$  equal to -4.37) was significantly lower than the group norm.

Regarding  $A_1B_5$ , the frequency of Indian respondents (36 or 32.4% in this subgroup) who strongly disagreed with the content of question 14.6 ( $\ell/s$  equal to +3.22) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample. In the case of  $A_2B_3$ , the frequency of the English-speaking White respondents (32 or 21.1% in this subgroup) who disagreed with the content of question 14.6 ( $\ell/s$  equal to -2.60) was significantly lower than the group norm. Finally, regarding  $A_5B_3$ , the frequency of English-speaking White respondents (20 or 13.2% in this subgroup) who strongly agreed with the content of

question 14.6 ( $\ell/s$  equal to +3.12) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample.

**Table 7.167** Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 14.5**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	76	33	17	9	40	6	181
Row %	42%	18.2%	9.4%	5%	22.1%	3.3%	100%
Column %	31.1%	21.6%	11.2%	33.3%	35.4%	27.3%	25.5%
Disagree	69	39	34	10	34	4	190
Row %	36.3%	20.5%	17.9%	5.3%	17.9%	2.1%	100%
Column %	28.3%	25.5%	22.4%	37%	30.1%	18.2%	26.7%
Neutral	58	42	42	3	30	7	182
Row %	31.9%	23.1%	23.1%	1.6%	16.5%	3.8%	100%
Column %	23.8%	27.5%	27.6%	11.1%	26.5%	31.8%	25.6%
Agree	22	29	37	4	5	3	100
Row %	22%	29%	37%	4%	5%	3%	100%
Column %	9%	19%	24.3%	14.8%	4.4%	13.6%	14.1%
Strongly agree	19	10	22	1	4	2	58
Row %	32.8%	17.2%	37.9%	1.7%	6.9%	3.4%	100%
Column %	7.8%	6.5%	14.5%	3.7%	3.5%	9.1%	8.2%
Total	244	153	152	27	113	22	711
Row %	34.3%	21.5%	21.4%	3.8%	15.9%	3.1%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 14.5 in Table 7.167 referred to the person who listens to an English radio station because he or she can identify with white radio presenters.

In this case, 52.2% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Percentages among the subgroups were: African, 59.4%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 47.1%; White English-speaking, 33.6%; Coloured, 70.3%; Indian, 65.5%; 'Other', 45.5%.

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 tested for. In this regard  $\ell^*$  was calculated at 87.38, which was significant ( $\ell^* = 87.38 > \text{critical } X^2 = 37.566$  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 and the results are contained in Table 7.168.

**Table 7.168** Estimated  $\lambda$  effects, standard deviations of  $\ell$  estimates and standardized  $\ell$  values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	$\ell$	$s_{\ell}$	$\ell/s$	Conclusion
$\lambda A_1$	0.405046	0.107200	3.778414	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_2$	0.455205	0.110560	4.117267	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_3$	0.345577	0.119641	2.888450	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_4$	-0.290740	0.139992	-2.076833	Insignificant
$\lambda A_5$	-0.915090	0.192896	-4.743955	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_1$	1.080813	0.092486	11.686234	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_2$	0.662184	0.102244	6.476507	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_3$	0.708501	0.098293	7.208051	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_4$	-1.254400	0.229331	-5.469823	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_5$	0.071094	0.138133	0.514678	Insignificant
$\lambda B_6$	-1.268200	0.204655	-6.196770	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_1B_1$	0.193534	0.143415	1.349468	Insignificant
$\lambda A_1B_2$	-0.222060	0.171249	-1.296708	Insignificant
$\lambda A_1B_3$	-0.931670	0.199855	-4.661730	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_1B_4$	0.395235	0.322162	1.226821	Insignificant
$\lambda A_1B_5$	0.561399	0.189293	2.965767	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_1B_6$	0.003568	0.339561	0.010508	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_1$	0.046749	0.147761	0.316383	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_2$	-0.105170	0.167907	-0.626359	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_3$	-0.288690	0.170026	-1.697917	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_4$	0.450437	0.316347	1.423870	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_5$	0.348722	0.195776	1.781230	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_6$	-0.452060	0.386479	-1.169688	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_1$	-0.017290	0.158187	-0.109301	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_2$	0.078569	0.171903	0.457054	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_3$	0.032252	0.169583	0.190184	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_4$	-0.643910	0.442153	-1.456306	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_5$	0.333186	0.204908	1.626027	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_6$	0.217188	0.329545	0.659054	Insignificant
$\lambda A_4B_1$	-0.350370	0.203896	-1.718376	Insignificant
$\lambda A_4B_2$	0.344512	0.197700	1.742600	Insignificant
$\lambda A_4B_3$	0.541817	0.187911	2.883370	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_4B_4$	0.280091	0.409183	0.684513	Insignificant
$\lambda A_4B_5$	-0.822260	0.337519	-2.436189	Insignificant
$\lambda A_4B_6$	0.006207	0.435953	0.014238	Insignificant
$\lambda A_5B_1$	0.127375	0.249147	0.511244	Insignificant
$\lambda A_5B_2$	-0.095850	0.287962	-0.332856	Insignificant
$\lambda A_5B_3$	0.646290	0.245584	2.631645	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_5B_4$	-0.481850	0.696463	-0.691853	Insignificant
$\lambda A_5B_5$	-0.421050	0.389293	-1.081576	Insignificant
$\lambda A_5B_6$	0.225091	0.523786	0.429738	Insignificant

Main effect  $A_1$  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  $B_3$  relating to population group, five significant deviations from the general trend were observed: among Africans, Afrikaans-speaking Whites, English-speaking Whites, Coloureds and 'Other'.

Four significant interaction effects  $A_iB_j$  occurred, in  $A_1B_3$ ,  $A_1B_5$ ,  $A_4B_3$  and  $A_5B_3$  respectively. The frequency of English-speaking White respondents in  $A_1B_3$  (17 or 11.2% of this subgroup) who strongly disagreed with the content of question 14.5 ( $\ell/s$  equal to  $-4.66$ ) was significantly lower than the group norm. In the case of  $A_1B_5$ , the frequency of Indian respondents (40 or 35.4% of this subgroup) who strongly disagreed with the content of question 14.5 ( $\ell/s$  equal to  $+2.97$ ) was significantly higher than the group norm.

The frequency of English-speaking White respondents in  $A_4B_3$  (37 or 24.3% of this subgroup) who agreed with the content of question 14.5 ( $\ell/s$  equal to  $+2.88$ ) was significantly higher than the group norm. Similarly, in the case of  $A_5B_3$ , the frequency of English-speaking White respondents (22 or 14.5% in this subgroup) who strongly agreed with the content of question 14.5 ( $\ell/s$  equal to  $+2.63$ ) was significantly higher than the group norm.