

### 7.4.1.9 Knowledge and Professionalism of the Radio Announcer

The ninth factor consisted of the responses to two questions from the questionnaire, with question 11.43 as the first contributor.

**Table 7.77** Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 11.43**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	7	1	0	1	0	0	9
Row %	77.8%	11.1%	0%	11.1%	0%	0%	100%
Column %	2.9%	.6%	0%	3.8%	0%	0%	1.3%
Disagree	9	3	0	2	5	0	19
Row %	47.4%	15.8%	0%	10.5%	26.3%	0%	100%
Column %	3.7%	1.9%	0%	7.7%	4.5%	0%	2.7%
Neutral	51	13	19	4	9	9	105
Row %	48.6%	12.4%	18.1%	3.8%	8.6%	8.6%	100%
Column %	20.8%	8.2%	12.4%	15.4%	8%	45%	14.7%
Agree	124	77	70	12	65	8	356
Row %	34.8%	21.6%	19.7%	3.4%	18.3%	2.2%	100%
Column %	50.6%	48.7%	45.8%	46.2%	58%	40%	49.9%
Strongly agree	54	64	64	7	33	3	225
Row %	24%	28.4%	28.4%	3.1%	14.7%	1.3%	100%
Column %	22%	40.5%	41.8%	26.9%	29.5%	15%	31.5%
Total	245	158	153	26	112	20	714
Row %	34.3%	22.1%	21.4%	3.6%	15.7%	2.8%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

In Table 7.77 question 11.43 was addressed. It referred to professionalism, as evidenced by good interviewing skills on the part of the radio announcer, as an important aspect of any radio broadcast.

In this case 81.4% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Statistics for the subsamples were as follows: African, 72.6%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 89.2%; White English-speaking, 87.6%; Coloured, 73.1%; Indian, 87.5%; 'Other', 55%.

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 the presence of saturation was done. In this regard  $\ell^*$  was calculated at 60.15, which was significant ( $\ell^* = 60.15 > \text{critical } X^2 = 37.566$  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 therefore necessary, as presented in Table 7.78.

**Table 7.78** 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
$\lambda_{A_1}$	-1.801190	0.310675	-5.797666	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_2}$	-1.192440	0.251420	-4.742821	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_3}$	0.411483	0.145468	2.828684	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_4}$	1.566376	0.122972	12.737664	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5}$	1.015787	0.141688	7.169182	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_1}$	1.251332	0.137145	9.124153	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_2}$	0.307737	0.221753	1.387747	Insignificant
$\lambda_{B_3}$	0.144851	0.257563	0.562391	Insignificant
$\lambda_{B_4}$	-0.823460	0.251998	-3.267724	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_5}$	0.169999	0.216762	0.784266	Insignificant
$\lambda_{B_6}$	-1.050460	0.281643	-3.729757	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_1B_1}$	0.370257	0.402077	0.920860	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_2}$	-0.632060	0.731361	-0.864224	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_3}$	-0.469170	0.743003	-0.631451	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_4}$	0.499140	0.741092	0.673520	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_5}$	-0.494320	0.729863	-0.677278	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_6}$	0.726136	0.751690	0.966005	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_1}$	0.012819	0.340089	0.037693	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_2}$	-0.142200	0.484680	-0.293390	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_3}$	-1.077920	0.720240	-1.496612	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_4}$	0.583535	0.562059	1.038210	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_5}$	0.506366	0.423548	0.195534	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_6}$	0.117384	0.729198	0.160977	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_1}$	0.143498	0.192375	0.745929	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_2}$	-0.279780	0.300499	-0.931051	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_3}$	0.262593	0.312647	0.839903	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_4}$	-0.327240	0.416964	-0.784816	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_5}$	-0.509770	0.319040	-1.597825	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_6}$	0.710686	0.366229	1.940551	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_1}$	-0.122940	0.162333	-0.757332	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_2}$	0.344179	0.242253	1.420742	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_3}$	0.411755	0.276353	1.489960	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_4}$	-0.383520	0.318047	-1.205860	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_5}$	0.312499	0.239702	1.303698	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_6}$	-0.561990	0.365569	-1.537302	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_1}$	-0.403650	0.188380	-2.142743	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_2}$	0.709846	0.254353	2.790791	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5B_3}$	0.872733	0.286112	3.050320	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5B_4}$	-0.371930	0.360440	-1.031878	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_5}$	0.185209	0.261492	0.708278	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_6}$	-0.992230	0.471092	-2.106234	Insignificant

Main effect  $A_i$  produced significant differences. The observed frequencies in all five attitudinal categories – Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree and Strongly Agree – differed significantly from the respective group norms. In the case of the main effect  $B_j$  relating to population group, three significant deviations from the general trend were observed: among Africans, Coloureds and ‘Other’.

Two significant interaction effects  $A_iB_j$  were observed, in  $A_5B_2$  and in  $A_5B_3$ . The frequency of Afrikaans-speaking White respondents in  $A_5B_2$  (64 or 40.5% of this subgroup) who strongly agreed with the content of question 11.43 ( $\ell/s$  equal to +2.79) was significantly higher than the group norm. In the case of  $A_5B_3$ , the frequency of English-speaking White respondents (64 or 41.8% in this subgroup) who strongly agreed with the content of question 11.43 ( $\ell/s$  equal to +3.05) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample.

**Table 7.79** Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 11.44**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	7	2	2	1	3	0	15
Row %	46.7%	13.3%	13.3%	6.7%	20%	0%	100%
Column %	2.9%	1.3%	1.3%	3.8%	2.7%	0%	2.1%
Disagree	10	7	0	1	6	0	24
Row %	41.7%	29.2%	0%	4.2%	25%	0%	100%
Column %	4.1%	4.5%	0%	3.8%	5.4%	0%	3.4%
Neutral	34	17	35	4	4	6	100
Row %	34%	17%	35%	4%	4%	6%	100%
Column %	13.9%	10.8%	23%	15.4%	3.6%	28.6%	14%
Agree	108	79	77	14	71	10	359
Row %	30.1%	22%	21.4%	3.9%	19.8%	2.8%	100%
Column %	44.1%	50.3%	50.7%	53.8%	63.4%	47.6%	50.4%
Strongly agree	86	52	38	6	28	5	215
Row %	40%	24.2%	17.7%	2.8%	13%	2.3%	100%
Column %	35.1%	33.1%	25%	23.1%	25%	23.8%	30.2%
Total	245	157	152	26	112	21	713
Row %	34.4%	22%	21.3%	3.6%	15.7%	2.9%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 11.44 referenced in Table 7.79 referred to a good radio announcer as someone who is able to say constructive things to the listeners during a radio broadcast.

In the case under consideration, 80.6% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the content of the statement. The responses among the subgroups were as follows: African, 79.2%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 83.4%; White English-speaking, 75.7%; Coloured, 76.9%; Indian, 88.4%; 'Other', 71.4%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population. To measure whether 'Population Group' played a part, the presence of saturation was determined. In this regard  $\ell^*$  was calculated at 52.01, which was significant ( $\ell^* = 52.01 > \text{critical } X^2 =$

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 7.80.

**Table 7.80** 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
$\lambda A_1$	-1.472420	0.259255	-5.679428	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_2$	-1.204180	0.257104	-4.683630	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_3$	0.202322	0.149448	1.353795	Insignificant
$\lambda A_4$	1.555728	0.113800	13.670721	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_5$	0.918540	0.130139	7.058146	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_1$	1.171379	0.130745	8.959264	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_2$	0.547705	0.169820	3.225209	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_3$	0.235090	0.226024	1.040111	Insignificant
$\lambda B_4$	-1.047470	0.275002	-3.808954	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_5$	0.163423	0.174942	0.934155	Insignificant
$\lambda B_6$	-1.070130	0.273961	-3.906140	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_1B_1$	0.036064	0.363557	0.099198	Insignificant
$\lambda A_1B_2$	-0.593020	0.535514	-1.107385	Insignificant
$\lambda A_1B_3$	-0.280410	0.555899	-0.504426	Insignificant
$\lambda A_1B_4$	0.308999	0.730454	0.423023	Insignificant
$\lambda A_1B_5$	0.196723	0.471036	0.417639	Insignificant
$\lambda A_1B_6$	0.331664	0.730062	0.454296	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_1$	0.124499	0.337520	0.368864	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_2$	0.391499	0.377898	1.035991	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_3$	-1.241800	0.712680	-1.742437	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_4$	0.040759	0.729693	0.055858	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_5$	0.621630	0.392552	1.583561	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_6$	0.063424	0.729301	0.086965	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_1$	-0.058230	0.204736	-0.284415	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_2$	-0.127700	0.255785	-0.499247	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_3$	0.907049	0.274906	3.299488	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_3B_4$	0.020551	0.434378	0.047311	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_5$	-1.190340	0.379029	-3.140498	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_3B_6$	0.448681	0.393420	1.140463	Insignificant
$\lambda A_4B_1$	-0.255860	0.156434	-1.635578	Insignificant
$\lambda A_4B_2$	0.055128	0.193844	0.284394	Insignificant
$\lambda A_4B_3$	0.342100	0.244858	1.397136	Insignificant
$\lambda A_4B_4$	-0.080090	0.328437	-0.243852	Insignificant
$\lambda A_4B_5$	0.332642	0.199780	1.665042	Insignificant
$\lambda A_4B_6$	-0.393900	0.344570	-1.143164	Insignificant
$\lambda A_5B_1$	0.153540	0.171478	0.895392	Insignificant
$\lambda A_5B_2$	0.274112	0.210215	1.303960	Insignificant
$\lambda A_5B_3$	0.273069	0.263196	1.037512	Insignificant
$\lambda A_5B_4$	-0.290200	0.387236	-0.749414	Insignificant
$\lambda A_5B_5$	0.039355	0.229370	0.171579	Insignificant
$\lambda A_5B_6$	-0.449860	0.403378	-1.115232	Insignificant

Main effect  $A_i$  produced significant differences. The observed frequencies in four of the five attitudinal categories – 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'.

Two significant interaction effects  $A_iB_j$  were observed, in  $A_3B_3$  and in  $A_3B_5$ . The frequency of English-speaking White respondents in  $A_3B_3$  (35 or 23% of this subgroup) who were neutral regarding the content of question 11.44 ( $\ell/s$  equal to +3.30) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample. In the case of  $A_3B_5$ , the frequency of Indian respondents (4 or 3.6% in this subgroup) who were neutral regarding the content of question 11.44 ( $\ell/s$  equal to -3.14) was significantly lower than the group norm.

#### 7.4.1.10 Reaction to Known and Foreign Aspects of Music

Two questions were interrelated with factor X.

**Table 7.81** Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 11.28**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	34	7	9	1	9	2	62
Row %	54.8%	11.3%	14.5%	1.6%	14.5%	3.2%	100%
Column %	13.8%	4.4%	6%	3.7%	8.1%	9.1%	8.7%
Disagree	47	26	34	12	18	2	139
Row %	33.8%	18.7%	24.5%	8.6%	12.9%	1.4%	100%
Column %	19%	16.5%	22.7%	44.4%	16.2%	9.1%	19.4%
Neutral	85	51	42	9	36	12	235
Row %	36.2%	21.7%	17.9%	3.8%	15.3%	5.1%	100%
Column %	34.4%	32.3%	28%	33.3%	32.4%	54.5%	32.9%
Agree	53	47	45	4	39	5	193
Row %	27.5%	24.4%	23.3%	2.1%	20.2%	2.6%	100%
Column %	21.5%	29.7%	30%	14.8%	35.1%	22.7%	27%
Strongly agree	28	27	20	1	9	1	86
Row %	32.6%	31.4%	23.3%	1.2%	10.5%	1.2%	100%
Column %	11.3%	17.1%	13.3%	3.7%	8.1%	4.5%	12%
Total	247	158	150	27	111	22	715
Row %	34.5%	22.1%	21%	3.8%	15.5%	3.1%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 11.28 in Table 7.81 referred to the notion that traditionally African music would alienate any white or black listener to an English radio station that broadcasts to black and white listeners.

In this case, 39% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement.

Subgroup comparisons were as follows: African, 32.8%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 46.8%; White English-speaking, 43.3%; Coloured, 18.5%; Indian, 43.2%; 'Other', 27.2%.

High percentages of responses occurred in the category Neutral.

The second main effect is 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 53.35, which was significant ( $\ell^* = 53.35 > \text{critical } X^2 = 37.566$  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 therefore necessary. The ensuing results are presented in Table 7.82.

**Table 7.82** 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
$\lambda A_1$	-0.831630	0.194620	-4.273096	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_2$	0.192235	0.135779	1.415793	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3$	0.804696	0.104525	7.698598	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_4$	0.456130	0.123567	3.691358	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_5$	-0.621440	0.208646	-2.978442	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_1$	1.232728	0.097072	12.699110	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_2$	0.664760	0.114957	5.782684	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_3$	0.661127	0.112295	5.887413	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_4$	-1.377920	0.267371	-5.153588	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_5$	0.314777	0.123020	2.558747	Insignificant
$\lambda B_6$	-1.495480	0.259212	-5.769332	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_1B_1$	0.533655	0.229701	2.323259	Insignificant
$\lambda A_1B_2$	-0.478830	0.319269	-1.499770	Insignificant
$\lambda A_1B_3$	-0.223880	0.297707	-0.752015	Insignificant
$\lambda A_1B_4$	-0.382060	0.709269	-0.538667	Insignificant
$\lambda A_1B_5$	0.122470	0.301916	0.405643	Insignificant
$\lambda A_1B_6$	0.428644	0.546595	0.784208	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_1$	-0.166420	0.173400	-0.959746	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_2$	-0.190500	0.201826	-0.943882	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_3$	0.081395	0.191073	0.425989	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_4$	1.078986	0.341986	3.155059	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_2B_5$	-0.208240	0.222464	-0.936062	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_6$	-0.595220	0.528512	-1.126219	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_1$	-0.186380	0.136939	-1.361044	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_2$	-0.129230	0.160255	-0.806402	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_3$	-0.319760	0.163577	-1.954798	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_4$	0.178843	0.347210	0.515086	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_5$	-0.127560	0.175694	-0.726035	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_6$	0.584082	0.324265	1.801249	Insignificant
$\lambda A_4B_1$	-0.310170	0.161049	-1.925936	Insignificant
$\lambda A_4B_2$	0.137655	0.175193	0.785733	Insignificant
$\lambda A_4B_3$	0.097803	0.174545	0.560331	Insignificant
$\lambda A_4B_4$	-0.283520	0.424799	-0.667422	Insignificant
$\lambda A_4B_5$	0.301052	0.185357	1.624174	Insignificant
$\lambda A_4B_6$	0.057180	0.395168	0.144698	Insignificant

**Table 7.82 (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
$\lambda_{A_5B_1}$	0.129310	0.246860	0.523819	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_2}$	0.660910	0.255462	2.587117	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5B_3}$	0.364439	0.264275	1.379014	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_4}$	-0.592250	0.713245	-0.830360	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_5}$	-0.087720	0.311142	-0.281929	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_6}$	-0.474690	0.710227	-0.668364	Insignificant

Main effect  $A_i$  produced significant differences. The observed frequencies of four of the five attitudinal categories, namely, Strongly Disagree, Neutral, Agree and Strongly Agree, differed significantly from the respective group norms. The exception was the 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, English-speaking Whites, Coloureds and 'Other'.

Two significant interaction effects  $A_iB_j$  occurred with respect to question 11.28, in  $A_2B_4$ , and  $A_5B_2$  respectively. The frequency of Coloured respondents in  $A_2B_4$  (12 or 44.4% of this subgroup) who disagreed with the content of question 11.28 ( $\ell/s$  equal to +3.16) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample. In the case of Afrikaans-speaking White respondents,  $A_5B_2$ , (27 or 17.1% of this subgroup), the frequency of those who strongly agreed with the content of question 11.28 ( $\ell/s$  equal to +2.59) was significantly higher than the group norm.

**Table 7.83** Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 11.29**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	40	13	18	3	7	2	83
Row %	48.2%	15.7%	21.7%	3.6%	8.4%	2.4%	100%
Column %	15.9%	8.2%	12%	10.7%	6.4%	9.1%	11.5%
Disagree	50	50	49	11	24	5	189
Row %	26.5%	26.5%	25.9%	5.8%	12.7%	2.6%	100%
Column %	19.9%	31.6%	32.7%	39.3%	21.8%	22.7%	26.3%
Neutral	89	50	45	8	39	11	242
Row %	36.8%	20.7%	18.6%	3.3%	16.1%	4.5%	100%
Column %	35.5%	31.6%	30%	28.6%	35.5%	50%	33.7%
Agree	51	37	30	4	36	3	161
Row %	31.7%	23%	18.6%	2.5%	22.4%	1.9%	100%
Column %	20.3%	23.4%	20%	14.3%	32.7%	13.6%	22.4%
Strongly agree	21	8	8	2	4	1	44
Row %	47.7%	18.2%	18.2%	4.5%	9.1%	2.3%	100%
Column %	8.4%	5.1%	5.3%	7.1%	3.6%	4.5%	6.1%
Total	251	158	150	28	110	22	719
Row %	34.9%	22%	20.9%	3.9%	15.3%	3.1%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 11.29 that pertained to Table 7.83 referred to traditionally European music that would alienate any black or white listener to an English radio station that caters for black and white listeners.

In the case under consideration, 37.8% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the content of the statement. Compared with the general norm, the subsamples responded as follows: African, 35.8%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 39.8%; White English-speaking, 44.7%; Coloured, 50%; Indian, 28.2%; 'Other', 31.8%.

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 the cross-tabulation, a test was done for the presence or absence of saturation. In this regard  $\ell^*$  was calculated at 35.24, which was insignificant ( $\ell^* = 35.24 < \text{critical } X^2 = 37.566$  with 20 degrees of freedom). The independent model of the hierarchical loglinear analysis applied in this instance. Further loglinear analysis of the interaction in the cross-tabulation was not required. The main effects were presented in Table 7.84.



**Table 7.84** Estimated  $\lambda$  effects, standard deviations of  $\ell$  estimates and standardized  $\ell$  values for the loglinear analysis of the independent model

Effect	$\ell$	$s_{\ell}$	$\ell/s$	Conclusion
$\lambda A_1$	-0.386660	0.141437	-2.733797	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_2$	0.441978	0.105560	4.186984	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_3$	0.687577	0.098385	6.988636	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_4$	0.280376	0.111135	2.522842	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_5$	-1.023272	0.184628	-5.542345	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_1$	1.074659	0.090601	11.861447	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_2$	0.611264	0.102346	5.972525	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_3$	0.559297	0.103932	5.381374	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_4$	-1.121434	0.197626	-5.674527	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_5$	0.247505	0.114763	2.156662	Insignificant
$\lambda B_6$	-1.371292	0.221780	-6.183118	Significant at 0.1% level

Main effect  $A_i$  produced significant differences. The observed frequencies in all five attitudinal categories – Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree and Strongly Agree – 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 those classified as ‘Other’.

#### 7.4.1.11 Teaching or Educating the Audience

The eleventh factor involved two questions from the questionnaire.

**Table 7.85** Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 11.13**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	25	12	10	2	8	4	61
Row %	41%	19.7%	16.4%	3.3%	13.1%	6.6%	100%
Column %	10.2%	7.7%	6.5%	7.1%	7.1%	18.2%	8.5%
Disagree	56	37	39	7	14	3	156
Row %	35.9%	23.7%	25%	4.5%	9%	1.9%	100%
Column %	22.8%	23.9%	25.5%	25%	12.5%	13.6%	21.8%
Neutral	91	49	60	7	33	9	249
Row %	36.5%	19.7%	24.1%	2.8%	13.3%	3.6%	100%
Column %	37%	31.6%	39.2%	25%	29.5%	40.9%	34.8%
Agree	51	42	32	9	36	5	175
Row %	29.1%	24%	18.3%	5.1%	20.6%	2.9%	100%
Column %	20.7%	27.1%	20.9%	32.1%	32.1%	22.7%	24.4%
Strongly agree	23	15	12	3	21	1	75
Row %	30.7%	20%	16%	4%	28%	1.3%	100%
Column %	9.3%	9.7%	7.8%	10.7%	18.8%	4.5%	10.5%
Total	246	155	153	28	112	22	716
Row %	34.4%	21.6%	21.4%	3.9%	15.6%	3.1%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

The response to question 11.13 presented in Table 7.85 referred to the radio listener who is annoyed by a radio presenter who intellectualizes on issues on radio.

In the case under consideration, 30.3% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the content of the statement and 34.9% agreed or strongly agreed with it. In other words, there was no majority support for the statement. Compared with the general norm, the subsamples of respondents who agreed were as follows: African, 30%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 36.8%; White English-speaking, 28.7%; Coloured, 42.8%; Indian, 50.9%; 'Other', 27.2%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To determine the interactive part of the subcategories 'Population Group', loglinear modelling was used. In this regard  $\ell^*$  was calculated at 37.07, which was insignificant ( $\ell^* = 37.07 < \text{critical } X^2 = 37.566$  with 20 degrees of freedom). The independent model of the hierarchical loglinear analysis applied in this instance. Further loglinear analysis of the interaction in the cross-tabulation was not required. The main effects are reported in Table 7.86.

**Table 7.86** Estimated  $\lambda$  effects, standard deviations of  $\ell$  estimates and standardized  $\ell$  values for the loglinear analysis of the independent model

Effect	$\ell$	$s_{\ell}$	$\ell/s$	Conclusion
$\lambda A_1$	-0.718757	0.157207	-4.572042	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_2$	0.218035	0.109986	1.982389	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3$	0.685728	0.095043	7.214924	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_4$	0.332608	0.105892	3.141012	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_5$	-0.517611	0.145049	-3.568525	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_1$	1.052620	0.086377	12.186346	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_2$	0.589746	0.097767	6.032158	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_3$	0.575957	0.098172	5.866815	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_4$	-1.124305	0.187760	-5.987990	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_5$	0.263592	0.108364	2.432468	Insignificant
$\lambda B_6$	-1.357609	0.208545	-6.509909	Significant at 0.1% level

Main effect  $A_i$  produced significant differences. In four of the five attitudinal categories, namely, Strongly Disagree, Neutral, Agree and Strongly Agree, response patterns differed significantly from the respective group norms. The exception was the 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, English-speaking Whites, Coloureds and those classified as 'Other'.

**Table 7.87** Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 11.12**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	13	5	0	2	1	0	21
Row %	61.9%	23.8%	0%	9.5%	4.8%	0%	100%
Column %	5.2%	3.2%	0%	7.1%	.9%	0%	2.9%
Disagree	29	11	6	5	7	7	65
Row %	44.6%	16.9%	9.2%	7.7%	10.8%	10.8%	100%
Column %	11.6%	7%	3.9%	17.9%	6.4%	30.4%	9%
Neutral	48	15	26	4	9	4	106
Row %	45.3%	14.2%	24.5%	3.8%	8.5%	3.8%	100%
Column %	19.3%	9.5%	16.9%	14.3%	8.3%	17.4%	14.7%
Agree	75	66	67	14	54	5	281
Row %	26.7%	23.5%	23.8%	5%	19.2%	1.8%	100%
Column %	30.1%	41.8%	43.5%	40%	49.5%	21.7%	39%
Strongly agree	84	61	55	3	38	7	248
Row %	33.9%	24.6%	22.2%	1.2%	15.3%	2.8%	100%
Column %	33.7%	38.6%	35.7%	10.7%	34.9%	30.4%	34.4%
Total	249	158	154	28	109	23	721
Row %	34.5%	21.9%	21.4%	3.9%	15.1%	3.2%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

The response to question 11.12 presented in Table 7.87 referred to the notion that a radio listener would hate to feel that he or she is at a lecture when listening to a radio broadcast.

In this case, 73.4% of the respondents agree or strongly agree with the statement.

Compared with the general norm, the subsamples responded as follows: African, 63.8%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 80.4%; White English-speaking, 79.2%; Coloured, 50.7%; Indian, 84.4%; 'Other', 52.1%.

The main effect is a reflection of the respondents' population group. To measure whether 'Population Group' played a part in this factor, testing for saturation was done. In this regard  $\ell^*$  was calculated at 53.44, which was significant ( $\ell^* = 53.44 > \text{critical } X^2 = 37.566$  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 and duly reported in Table 7.88.

**Table 7.88** 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
$\lambda_{A_1}$	-1.619190	0.264214	-6.128328	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_2}$	-0.254080	0.140794	-1.804622	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3}$	0.037410	0.138364	0.270374	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4}$	1.061102	0.111427	9.522845	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5}$	0.774739	0.126530	6.122967	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_1}$	1.279905	0.105164	12.170562	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_2}$	0.572737	0.131289	4.362414	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_3}$	0.221931	0.199699	1.111328	Insignificant
$\lambda_{B_4}$	-0.945140	0.207333	-4.558560	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_5}$	-0.076500	0.203703	-0.375547	Insignificant
$\lambda_{B_6}$	-1.052930	0.230534	-4.567352	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_1B_1}$	0.473794	0.323693	1.463714	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_2}$	0.225450	0.400232	0.563298	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_3}$	-1.033180	0.709104	-1.457022	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_4}$	0.827031	0.553115	1.495224	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_5}$	-0.734750	0.710242	-1.034507	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_6}$	0.241684	0.718397	0.336421	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_1}$	-0.088970	0.194462	-0.457519	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_2}$	-0.351200	0.257998	-1.361251	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_3}$	-0.606540	0.345701	-1.754522	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_4}$	0.378210	0.368714	1.025754	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_5}$	-0.153950	0.334067	-0.460836	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_6}$	0.822482	0.351072	2.342773	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_1}$	0.123441	0.177981	0.693563	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_2}$	-0.332540	0.237040	-1.402886	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_3}$	0.568310	0.259902	2.186632	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_4}$	-0.136430	0.394045	-0.346229	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_5}$	-0.194130	0.313407	-0.619418	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_6}$	-0.028630	0.406731	-0.070391	Insignificant

**Table 7.88 (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
$\lambda_{A_4B_1}$	-0.453960	0.148151	-3.064171	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_4B_2}$	0.125370	0.169862	0.738070	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_3}$	0.491214	0.226729	2.166525	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_4}$	0.092645	0.277695	0.333621	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_5}$	0.573941	0.233363	2.459434	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_6}$	-0.829180	0.372427	-2.226423	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_1}$	-0.054270	0.158023	-0.343431	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_2}$	0.332953	0.181504	1.834411	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_3}$	0.580218	0.237281	2.445278	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_4}$	-1.161440	0.430663	-2.696865	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5B_5}$	0.508906	0.247328	2.057616	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_6}$	-0.206340	0.345599	-0.597050	Insignificant

Main effect  $A_i$  produced significant differences. Three of the five attitudinal categories, namely, Strongly Disagree, Agree and Strongly Agree, 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 occurred: among Africans, Afrikaans-speaking Whites, Coloureds and 'Other'.

Two significant interaction effects  $A_iB_j$  occurred, in  $A_4B_1$  and  $A_5B_4$ . The frequency of African respondents in  $A_4B_1$  (75 or 30.1% of this subgroup) who agreed with the content of question 11.12 ( $\ell/s$  equal to  $-3.07$ ) was significantly lower than the group norm. In the case of Coloured respondents, in  $A_5B_4$ , the frequency of those who strongly agreed with the content of question 11.12 (3 or 10.7% of this subgroup) was significantly lower than the group norm ( $\ell/s$  equal to  $-2.70$ ).

## 7.4.2 Audience Component

### 7.4.2.1 Emotional and Mental Experience of an English Radio Station as a Multicultural Service

Six questions from the second section of the questionnaire were grouped to form the first factor in the second of the series of four factor analyses. As a common component the six questions referred to the listeners' emotional and mental experience of an English radio station as a multicultural broadcasting mechanism.

**Table 7.89** Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 12.7**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Never	8	6	3	0	3	1	21
Row %	38.1%	28.6%	14.3%	0%	14.3%	4.8%	100%
Column %	3.2%	3.8%	2%	0%	2.7%	4.5%	2.9%
Seldom	16	17	11	2	3	5	54
Row %	29.6%	31.5%	20.4%	3.7%	5.6%	9.3%	100%
Column %	6.5%	10.8%	7.2%	7.7%	2.7%	22.7%	7.5%
Sometimes	42	49	35	4	9	2	141
Row %	29.8%	34.8%	24.8%	2.8%	6.4%	1.4%	100%
Column %	17%	31.2%	23%	15.4%	8%	9.1%	19.7%
Often	61	56	54	8	40	6	225
Row %	27.1%	24.9%	24%	3.6%	17.8%	2.7%	100%
Column %	24.7%	35.7%	35.5%	30.8%	35.7%	27.3%	31.4%
Always	120	29	49	12	57	8	275
Row %	43.6%	10.5%	17.8%	4.4%	20.7%	2.9%	100%
Column %	48.6%	18.5%	32.2%	46.2%	50.9%	36.4%	38.4%
Total	247	157	152	26	112	22	716
Row %	34.5%	21.9%	21.2%	3.6%	15.6%	3.1%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

The response pattern of question 12.7 included as Table 7.89 referred to the person who would always feel that it is important to have an English radio station to serve both black and white listeners in South Africa.

In this case, 69.8% of the respondents often agreed or always agreed with the statement in the questionnaire. Compared with the general norm, the subsamples responded as follows: African, 73.3%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 54.2%; White English-speaking, 67.7%; Coloured, 77%; Indian, 86.6%; 'Other', 67.3%.

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 determined. In this regard  $\ell^*$  was calculated at 79.77, which was significant ( $\ell^* = 79.77 >$  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 7.90.

**Table 7.90** 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
$\lambda_{A_1}$	-1.431067	0.236106	-6.061121	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_2}$	-0.541655	0.164924	-3.284270	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_3}$	0.134446	0.148342	0.906325	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4}$	0.838411	0.112239	7.469872	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5}$	0.999864	0.106107	9.423167	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_1}$	1.055142	0.112848	9.350117	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_2}$	0.739417	0.119972	6.163246	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_3}$	0.544061	0.139834	3.890763	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_4}$	-0.113713	0.242204	-0.469493	Insignificant
$\lambda_{B_5}$	-0.017195	0.168272	-0.102186	Insignificant
$\lambda_{B_6}$	-1.207714	0.244032	-4.948998	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_1B_1}$	0.012895	0.334724	0.038524	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_2}$	0.040938	0.361062	0.113382	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_3}$	-0.456853	0.449658	-1.016001	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_4}$	0.102309	0.712719	0.143547	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_5}$	0.104403	0.459298	0.227310	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_6}$	0.196310	0.713342	0.275198	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_1}$	-0.183369	0.241856	-0.758174	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_2}$	0.192981	0.242244	0.796639	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_3}$	-0.046982	0.276905	-0.169668	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_4}$	-0.093956	0.528604	-0.177744	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_5}$	-0.785008	0.427093	-1.838026	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_6}$	0.916336	0.400388	2.288620	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_1}$	0.105610	0.194483	0.543029	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_2}$	0.575486	0.195248	2.947462	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_3B_3}$	0.434370	0.215748	2.013321	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_4}$	-0.076910	0.417406	-0.184257	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_5}$	-0.362498	0.297195	-1.219731	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_6}$	-0.676056	0.524515	-1.288916	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_1}$	-0.225150	0.159528	-1.411351	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_2}$	0.005053	0.166414	0.030364	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_3}$	0.164041	0.181984	0.901403	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_4}$	-0.087727	0.338851	-0.258896	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_5}$	0.425193	0.210886	2.016222	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_6}$	-0.281408	0.363834	-0.773452	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_1}$	0.290015	0.144521	2.006733	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_2}$	-0.814456	0.181672	-4.483112	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5B_3}$	-0.094575	0.180375	-0.524324	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_4}$	0.156285	0.311150	0.502282	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_5}$	0.617912	0.200378	3.083732	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5B_6}$	-0.155179	0.338186	-0.458857	Insignificant

Main effect  $A_i$  produced significant differences. The observed frequencies in four of the five attitudinal categories, namely, Never, Seldom, Often and Always, differed significantly from the respective group norms. The exception was the category Sometimes. 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  $A_3B_2$ ,  $A_5B_2$  and  $A_5B_5$  respectively. The frequency of Afrikaans-speaking White respondents in  $A_3B_2$  (49 or 31.2% of this subgroup) who would sometimes agree with the content of question 12.7 ( $\ell/s$  equal to +2.95) was significantly higher than the group norm. In the case of  $A_5B_2$ , the frequency of Afrikaans-speaking White respondents (29 or 18.5% of this subgroup) who always agreed with the content of question 12.7 ( $\ell/s$  equal to -4.48) was significantly lower than the group norm. Lastly, regarding  $A_5B_5$ , the frequency of Indian respondents (57 or 50.9% of this subgroup) who always agreed with the content of question 12.7 ( $\ell/s$  equal to +3.08) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample.

**Table 7.91** Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 12.9**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Never	12	10	4	0	3	2	31
Row %	38.7%	32.3%	12.9%	0%	9.7%	6.5%	100%
Column %	4.8%	6.4%	2.6%	0%	2.7%	9.1%	4.3%
Seldom	16	16	10	1	2	1	46
Row %	34.8%	34.8%	21.7%	2.2%	4.3%	2.2%	100%
Column %	6.5%	10.3%	6.5%	3.8%	1.8%	4.5%	6.4%
Sometimes	48	55	32	3	18	5	161
Row %	29.8%	34.2%	19.9%	1.9%	11.2%	3.1%	100%
Column %	19.4%	35.3%	20.9%	11.5%	16.2%	22.7%	22.5%
Often	55	54	62	11	33	6	221
Row %	24.9%	24.4%	28.1%	5%	14.9%	2.7%	100%
Column %	22.2%	34.6%	40.5%	42.3%	29.7%	27.3%	30.9%
Always	117	21	45	11	55	8	257
Row %	45.5%	8.2%	17.5%	4.3%	21.4%	3.1%	100%
Column %	47.2%	13.5%	29.4%	42.3%	49.5%	36.4%	35.9%
Total	248	156	153	26	111	22	716
Row %	34.6%	21.8%	21.4%	3.6%	15.5%	3.1%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 12.9 in Table 7.91 referred to the person who would always regard a



multicultural English radio station as a sign of progress in South Africa.

In this case, 66.8% of the respondents often agreed or always agreed with the content of the statement. The responses among subgroups were as follows: African, 69.4%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 48.1%; White English-speaking, 69.9%; Coloured, 84.6%; Indian, 79.2%; 'Other', 63.7%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To measure whether 'Population Group' played an interactive part in this factor, the preceding testing for saturation was done. In this regard  $\ell^*$  was calculated at 90.61, which was significant ( $\ell^* = 90.61 > \text{critical } X^2 = 37.566$  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 7.92.

**Table 7.92** 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
$\lambda_{A_1}$	-1.117635	0.211618	-5.281380	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_2}$	-1.021741	0.228957	-4.462589	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_3}$	0.378556	0.134128	2.822349	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_4}$	0.856376	0.112618	7.604225	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5}$	0.904445	0.110510	8.184282	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_1}$	1.134414	0.110280	10.286670	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_2}$	0.777976	0.116560	6.674468	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_3}$	0.572456	0.134884	4.244062	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_4}$	-1.266346	0.272168	-4.652810	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_5}$	-0.008032	0.178888	-0.044900	Insignificant
$\lambda_{B_6}$	-1.210469	0.245185	-4.936962	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_1B_1}$	0.022901	0.288570	0.079360	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_2}$	0.197017	0.302265	0.651802	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_3}$	-0.513753	0.394932	-1.300864	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_4}$	-0.061246	0.715439	-0.085606	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_5}$	-0.220947	0.450680	-0.490253	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_6}$	0.576025	0.545796	1.055385	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_1}$	0.214689	0.287364	0.747098	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_2}$	0.571127	0.289833	1.970538	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_3}$	0.306644	0.321886	0.952648	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_4}$	-0.157140	0.720758	-0.218020	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_5}$	-0.722306	0.526705	-1.371367	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_6}$	-0.213016	0.711008	-0.299597	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_1}$	-0.086996	0.177429	-0.490314	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_2}$	0.405574	0.178451	2.272747	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_3}$	0.069498	0.204156	0.340416	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_4}$	-0.458825	0.467327	-0.981807	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_5}$	0.074622	0.255361	0.292222	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_6}$	-0.003875	0.388718	-0.009969	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_1}$	-0.428684	0.158470	-2.705143	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_4B_2}$	-0.090595	0.163316	-0.554722	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_3}$	0.253076	0.174138	1.453307	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_4}$	0.362638	0.340760	1.064204	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_5}$	0.202937	0.223161	0.909375	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_6}$	-0.299374	0.363952	-0.822565	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_1}$	0.278087	0.144182	1.928722	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_2}$	-1.083126	0.194530	-5.567912	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5B_3}$	-0.115465	0.179696	-0.642557	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_4}$	0.314569	0.340069	0.925015	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_5}$	0.665694	0.210907	3.156339	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5B_6}$	-0.059761	0.339593	-0.175978	Insignificant

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’.

Three significant interaction effects  $A_iB_j$  occurred, in  $A_4B_1$ ,  $A_5B_2$  and  $A_5B_5$  respectively. The frequency of African respondents in  $A_4B_1$  (55 or 22.2% of this subgroup) who often

agreed with the content of question 12.9 ( $\ell/s$  equal to -2.71) was significantly lower than the group norm. In the case of A<sub>5</sub>B<sub>2</sub>, the frequency of Afrikaans-speaking White respondents (21 or 13.5% of this subgroup) who always agreed with the content of question 12.9 ( $\ell/s$  equal to -5.57) was also significantly lower than the group norm. Lastly, regarding A<sub>5</sub>B<sub>5</sub>, the frequency of Indian respondents (55 or 49.5% of this subgroup) who always agreed with the content of question 12.9 ( $\ell/s$  equal to +3.16) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample.

**Table 7.93** Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 12.8**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Never	13	17	6	1	6	3	46
Row %	28.3%	37%	13%	2.2%	13%	6.5%	100%
Column %	5.3%	10.9%	3.9%	3.8%	5.4%	13.6%	6.4%
Seldom	20	28	13	1	3	0	65
Row %	30.8%	43.1%	20%	1.5%	4.6%	0%	100%
Column %	8.1%	17.9%	8.6%	3.8%	2.7%	0%	9.1%
Sometimes	56	58	54	4	15	8	195
Row %	28.7%	29.7%	27.7%	2.1%	7.7%	4.1%	100%
Column %	22.7%	37.2%	35.5%	15.4%	13.4%	36.4%	27.3%
Often	54	36	45	9	36	5	185
Row %	29.2%	19.5%	24.3%	4.9%	19.5%	2.7%	100%
Column %	21.9%	23.1%	29.6%	34.6%	32.1%	22.7%	25.9%
Always	104	17	34	11	52	6	224
Row %	46.4%	7.6%	15.2%	4.9%	23.2%	2.7%	100%
Column %	42.1%	10.9%	22.4%	42.3%	46.4%	27.3%	31.3%
Total	247	156	152	26	112	22	715
Row %	34.5%	21.8%	21.3%	3.6%	15.7%	3.1%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 12.8 that pertained to Table 7.93 referred to the strong ties a listener would have with an English radio station that served both black and white listeners in South Africa.

In this instance, 57.2% of the respondents often agreed or always agreed with the statement in the questionnaire. The observations for the subgroups were as follows: African, 64%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 34%; White English-speaking, 52%; Coloured, 76.9%; Indian, 78.5%; 'Other', 50%.

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 again looked for. In this regard  $\ell^*$  was calculated at 111.76, which was significant ( $\ell^* = 111.76 > \text{critical } X^2 = 37.566$  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 therefore necessary and duly reported in Table 7.94.

**Table 7.94** 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
$\lambda_{A_1}$	-0.861103	0.190356	-4.523645	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_2}$	-0.875902	0.218620	-4.006504	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_3}$	0.500275	0.120208	4.161745	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_4}$	0.587072	0.113953	5.151878	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5}$	0.649659	0.111533	5.824814	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_1}$	1.102729	0.103953	10.607957	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_2}$	0.787366	0.107170	7.346888	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_3}$	0.594591	0.120672	4.927332	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_4}$	-1.344869	0.267549	-5.026627	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_5}$	0.085485	0.150200	0.569141	Insignificant
$\lambda_{B_6}$	-1.225302	0.234226	-5.231281	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_1B_1}$	-0.217830	0.267611	-0.813980	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_2}$	0.365797	0.255059	1.434166	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_3}$	-0.482881	0.333569	-1.447620	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_4}$	-0.335180	0.708253	-0.473249	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_5}$	0.026225	0.345350	0.075937	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_6}$	0.643865	0.467157	1.378263	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_1}$	0.227753	0.069083	3.296802	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_2B_2}$	0.879588	0.259559	3.388779	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_2B_3}$	0.305109	0.294840	1.034829	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_4}$	-0.320381	0.716367	-0.447230	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_5}$	-0.652122	0.444402	-1.467415	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_6}$	-0.439948	0.704600	-0.624394	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_1}$	-0.118806	0.161876	-0.733932	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_2}$	0.231649	0.163207	1.419357	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_3}$	0.352966	0.173850	2.030290	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_4}$	-0.310264	0.424072	-0.731630	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_5}$	-0.418862	0.239753	-1.747056	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_6}$	0.263316	0.336328	0.782914	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_1}$	-0.241970	0.158126	-1.530235	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_2}$	-0.332073	0.171425	-1.937133	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_3}$	0.083847	0.173899	0.482159	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_4}$	0.413869	0.350453	1.180954	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_5}$	0.369809	0.201150	1.838474	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_6}$	-0.293485	0.376367	-0.779784	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_1}$	0.350850	0.144557	2.427070	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_2}$	-1.144964	0.203123	-5.636801	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5B_3}$	-0.259041	0.180474	-1.435337	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_4}$	0.551954	0.337921	1.633382	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_5}$	0.674948	0.191041	3.533001	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5B_6}$	-0.173749	0.357453	-0.486075	Insignificant

Main effect  $A_1$  produced significant differences. The observed frequencies in all five attitudinal categories – Never, Seldom, Sometimes, Often and Always – differed



Question 12.10 in Table 7.95 referred to the person who would always feel a sense of great pleasure to be part of the listeners of an English radio station that serves both black and white listeners.

In this case, 58% of the respondents often agreed or always agreed with the content of the statement. Subgroups percentages were as follows: African, 63.4%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 35.4%; White English-speaking, 54.6%; Coloured, 73.1%; Indian, 77.4%; ‘Other’, 63.6%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents’ population group. To measure whether ‘Population Group’ played an interactive part in this dimension, testing for the presence of saturation was done. In this regard  $\ell^*$  was calculated at 106.85, which was significant ( $\ell^* = 106.95 > \text{critical } X^2 = 37.566$  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 7.96.

**Table 7.96** 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
$\lambda_{A_1}$	-1.215813	0.230593	-5.272549	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_2}$	-0.656040	0.173631	-3.778358	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_3}$	0.515138	0.120540	4.273586	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_4}$	0.703460	0.107584	6.538705	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5}$	0.653254	0.111223	5.873372	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_1}$	1.148692	0.101714	11.293352	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_2}$	0.794195	0.106804	7.436004	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_3}$	0.528242	0.126331	4.181412	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_4}$	-1.067788	0.239125	-4.465397	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_5}$	-0.018449	0.169583	-0.108790	Insignificant
$\lambda_{B_6}$	-1.284892	0.242986	-5.287926	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_1B_1}$	0.315936	0.287104	1.100424	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_2}$	0.670433	0.288947	2.320263	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_3}$	-0.226765	0.378210	-0.599574	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_4}$	-0.140171	0.710116	-0.197392	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_5}$	-0.596364	0.525206	-1.135486	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_6}$	-0.023068	0.711425	-0.032425	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_1}$	-0.020693	0.233246	-0.088717	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_2}$	0.473566	0.229905	2.059833	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_3}$	-0.093390	0.282874	-0.330147	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_4}$	-0.006797	0.530319	-0.012817	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_5}$	-0.462990	0.390917	-1.184369	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_6}$	0.110306	0.532072	0.207314	Insignificant

**Table 7.96 (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
$\lambda_{A_3B_1}$	-0.198619	0.161843	-1.227233	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_2}$	0.277768	0.162495	1.709394	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_3}$	0.403139	0.178737	2.255487	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_4}$	-0.261684	0.381603	-0.685749	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_5}$	-0.076023	0.241353	-0.314987	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_6}$	-0.144581	0.384034	-0.376480	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_1}$	-0.405633	0.152897	-2.652982	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_4B_2}$	-0.495068	0.169282	-2.924516	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_4B_3}$	0.156548	0.171593	0.912322	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_4}$	0.338451	0.314689	1.075509	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_5}$	0.402134	0.212258	1.894553	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_6}$	0.003569	0.348812	0.010232	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_1}$	0.309010	0.143213	2.157695	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_2}$	-0.926699	0.191665	-4.834993	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5B_3}$	-0.239533	0.186388	-1.285131	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_4}$	0.070204	0.336840	0.208419	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_5}$	0.733243	0.207851	3.527734	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5B_6}$	0.053776	0.349951	0.153667	Insignificant

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’.

Four significant interaction effects  $A_iB_j$  occurred with regard to question 12.10, in  $A_4B_1$ ,  $A_4B_2$ ,  $A_5B_2$  and  $A_5B_5$  respectively. The frequency of African respondents in  $A_4B_1$  (53 or 21.5% of this subgroup) who often agreed with the content of question 12.10 ( $\ell/s$  equal to  $-2.65$ ) was significantly lower than the group norm. In the case of  $A_4B_2$ , the frequency of Afrikaans-speaking White respondents (34 or 21.9% of this subgroup) who often agreed with the content of question 12.10 ( $\ell/s$  equal to  $-2.93$ ) was significantly lower than the group norm.

Regarding  $A_5B_2$ , the frequency of Afrikaans-speaking White respondents (21 or 13.5% of this subgroup) who always agreed with the content of question 12.10 ( $\ell/s$  equal to  $-4.84$ ) was significantly less than the group norm. Lastly, in the case of  $A_5B_5$ , the frequency of

Indian respondents (49 or 44.1% of this subgroup) who always agreed with the content of question 12.10 ( $\ell/s$  equal to +3.53) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample.

**Table 7.97** Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 12.6**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Never	11	8	2	0	1	1	23
Row %	47.8%	34.8%	8.7%	0%	4.3%	4.3%	100%
Column %	4.5%	5.1%	1.3%	0%	.9%	4.3%	3.2%
Seldom	10	15	6	1	4	2	38
Row %	26.3%	39.5%	15.8%	2.6%	10.5%	5.3%	100%
Column %	4%	9.6%	3.9%	3.8%	3.6%	8.7%	5.3%
Sometimes	42	46	25	5	7	2	127
Row %	33.1%	36.2%	19.7%	3.9%	5.5%	1.6%	100%
Column %	17%	29.3%	16.3%	19.2%	6.3%	8.7%	17.7%
Often	42	54	60	8	36	8	208
Row %	20.2%	26%	28.8%	3.8%	17.3%	3.8%	100%
Column %	17%	34.4%	39.2%	30.8%	32.1%	34.8%	29%
Always	142	34	60	12	64	10	322
Row %	44.1%	10.6%	18.6%	3.7%	19.9%	3.1%	100%
Column %	57.5%	21.7%	39.2%	46.2%	57.1%	43.5%	44.8%
Total	247	157	153	26	112	23	718
Row %	34.4%	21.9%	21.3%	3.6%	15.6%	3.2%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 12.6 in Table 7.97 referred to the person who would be happy to see a multicultural English radio station succeed in South Africa.

In the case of this variable, 73.8% of the respondents often agreed or always agreed with the content of the statement. The different subgroups responded as follows: African, 74.5%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 56.1%; White English-speaking, 78.4%; Coloured, 77%; Indian, 89.2%; 'Other', 78.3%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To measure whether 'Population Group' played an interactive part in this dimension, the possible presence of saturation was traced. In this regard  $\ell^*$  was calculated at 96.50, which was significant ( $\ell^* = 96.50 > \text{critical } X^2 = 37.566$  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 presented in Table 7.98.



**Table 7.98** 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
$\lambda_{A_1}$	-1.477330	0.264691	-5.581338	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_2}$	-0.858771	0.207006	-4.148532	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_3}$	0.166537	0.153632	1.083999	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4}$	0.921490	0.117228	7.860665	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5}$	1.248074	0.111044	11.239455	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_1}$	1.087252	0.121153	8.974206	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_2}$	0.887219	0.122876	7.220442	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_3}$	0.439417	0.166921	2.632485	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_4}$	-1.104320	0.268983	-4.105538	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{B_5}$	-0.124156	0.215476	-0.576194	Insignificant
$\lambda_{B_6}$	-1.185413	0.259736	-4.563915	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_1B_1}$	0.448896	0.336115	1.335543	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_2}$	0.330475	0.356413	0.927225	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_3}$	-0.608017	0.538326	-1.129459	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_4}$	0.242573	0.730947	0.331861	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_5}$	-0.737591	0.712995	-1.034497	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_6}$	0.323666	0.727595	0.444844	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_1}$	-0.264973	0.298999	-0.886200	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_2}$	0.340525	0.276563	1.231275	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_3}$	-0.127964	0.359516	-0.355934	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_4}$	-0.375986	0.712091	-0.528003	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_5}$	0.030144	0.425619	0.070824	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_6}$	0.398254	0.549714	0.724475	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_1}$	0.144804	0.199186	0.726979	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_2}$	0.435809	0.198160	2.199278	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_3}$	0.273845	0.243590	1.124205	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_4}$	0.208144	0.409665	0.508083	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_5}$	-0.435548	0.345030	-1.262348	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_6}$	-0.627053	0.531917	-1.178855	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_1}$	-0.610149	0.172669	-3.533634	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_4B_2}$	-0.158802	0.167686	-0.947020	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_3}$	0.394361	0.200355	1.968311	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_4}$	-0.076805	0.357721	-0.214706	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_5}$	0.447108	0.251304	1.779152	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_6}$	0.004288	0.350821	0.012223	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_1}$	0.281424	0.147296	1.910602	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_2}$	-0.948010	0.176251	-5.378750	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5B_3}$	0.067776	0.196801	0.344388	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_4}$	0.002075	0.331491	0.006260	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_5}$	0.695888	0.238497	2.917806	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5B_6}$	-0.099153	0.334162	-0.296721	Insignificant

Main effect  $A_i$  produced significant differences. The observed frequencies in four of the five attitudinal categories, namely, Never, Seldom, Often and Always, differed significantly from the respective group norms. The exception was the category Sometimes. 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  $A_4B_1$ ,  $A_5B_2$  and  $A_5B_5$  respectively. The frequency of African respondents in  $A_4B_1$  (42 or 17% of this subgroup) who often agreed with the content of question 12.6 ( $\ell/s$  equal to -3.53) was significantly lower than the group norm. In the case of  $A_5B_2$ , the frequency of Afrikaans-speaking White respondents (34 or 21.7% of this subgroup) who always agreed with the content of question 12.6 ( $\ell/s$  equal to -5.37) was significantly lower than the group norm. Regarding  $A_5B_5$ , the frequency of Indian respondents (64 or 57.1% in this subgroup) who always agreed with the content of question 12.6 ( $\ell/s$  equal to +2.92) was significantly higher than the group norm.

**Table 7.99** Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 12.5**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Never	14	7	4	0	2	3	30
Row %	46.7%	23.3%	13.3%	0%	6.7%	10%	100%
Column %	5.7%	4.5%	2.6%	0%	1.8%	13.6%	4.2%
Seldom	16	18	15	1	6	0	56
Row %	28.6%	32.1%	26.8%	1.8%	10.7%	0%	100%
Column %	6.5%	11.5%	9.8%	3.8%	5.4%	0%	7.8%
Sometimes	49	56	46	5	16	8	180
Row %	27.2%	31.1%	25.6%	2.8%	8.9%	4.4%	100%
Column %	19.9%	35.9%	30.1%	19.2%	14.4%	36.4%	25.2%
Often	57	51	46	11	35	5	205
Row %	27.8%	24.9%	22.4%	5.4%	17.1%	2.4%	100%
Column %	23.2%	32.7%	30.1%	42.3%	31.5%	22.7%	28.7%
Always	110	24	42	9	52	6	243
Row %	45.3%	9.9%	17.3%	3.7%	21.4%	2.5%	100%
Column %	44.7%	15.4%	27.5%	34.6%	46.8%	27.3%	34%
Total	246	156	153	26	111	22	714
Row %	34.5%	21.8%	21.4%	3.6%	15.5%	3.1%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

In Table 7.99 question 12.5 was addressed. It referred to the person who would always have the highest regard for an English radio station that caters for the needs and tastes of black and white South African audiences.

In this case, 62.7% of the respondents often agreed or always agreed with the content of the statement in the questionnaire. The responses among the subgroups were as follows: African, 67.9%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 48.1%; White English-speaking, 57.6%; Coloured, 76.9%; Indian, 78.3%; 'Other', 50%.

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 saturation was applied. In this regard  $\ell^*$  was calculated at 79.11, which was significant ( $\ell^* = 79.11 >$  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 7.100.

**Table 7.100** 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
$\lambda A_1$	-1.208020	0.211636	-5.708008	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_2$	-0.808062	0.213743	-3.780531	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_3$	0.532690	0.118129	4.509392	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_4$	0.725843	0.113147	6.415044	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_5$	0.757548	0.112645	6.725092	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_1$	1.107543	0.106405	10.408750	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_2$	0.692446	0.117887	5.873811	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_3$	0.596003	0.129363	4.607214	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_4$	-1.260945	0.265612	-4.747319	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_5$	0.050961	0.164970	0.308911	Insignificant
$\lambda B_6$	-1.186007	0.234867	-5.049696	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_1B_1$	0.237677	0.279619	0.850003	Insignificant
$\lambda A_1B_2$	-0.040373	0.330657	-0.122099	Insignificant
$\lambda A_1B_3$	-0.503545	0.393737	-1.278887	Insignificant
$\lambda A_1B_4$	-0.032895	0.713333	-0.046115	Insignificant
$\lambda A_1B_5$	-0.651650	0.515276	-1.264662	Insignificant
$\lambda A_1B_6$	0.990782	0.476224	2.080496	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_1$	-0.028749	0.247794	-0.116020	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_2$	0.504131	0.274425	1.837045	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_3$	0.418253	0.287387	1.455365	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_4$	-0.432850	0.713961	-0.606266	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_5$	0.047004	0.364790	0.128852	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_6$	-0.507788	0.703102	-0.722211	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_1$	-0.250270	0.164145	-1.524689	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_2$	0.298359	0.168815	1.767373	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_3$	0.198092	0.181353	1.092301	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_4$	-0.164164	0.397503	-0.412988	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_5$	-0.312918	0.244282	-1.280970	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_6$	0.230902	0.335591	0.688046	Insignificant
$\lambda A_4B_1$	-0.292192	0.156990	-1.861214	Insignificant
$\lambda A_4B_2$	0.011680	0.167471	0.069743	Insignificant
$\lambda A_4B_3$	0.004939	0.178148	0.027724	Insignificant
$\lambda A_4B_4$	0.431140	0.336481	1.281320	Insignificant
$\lambda A_4B_5$	0.276688	0.212014	1.305046	Insignificant
$\lambda A_4B_6$	-0.432255	0.376124	-1.149235	Insignificant
$\lambda A_5B_1$	0.333532	0.145435	2.293341	Insignificant
$\lambda A_5B_2$	-0.773797	0.191721	-4.036058	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_5B_3$	-0.117738	0.180143	-0.653581	Insignificant
$\lambda A_5B_4$	0.198764	0.348120	0.570964	Insignificant
$\lambda A_5B_5$	0.640878	0.202733	3.161192	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_5B_6$	-0.281639	0.357802	-0.787136	Insignificant



Question 12.2 that pertained to Table 7.101 referred to the person who would feel happy to be part of an English radio station that serves a multicultural audience.

In the case under consideration, 55% of the respondents often agreed or always agreed with the statement in the questionnaire. Percentages among the subgroups were: African, 60.5%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 34.9%; White English-speaking, 58.5%; Coloured, 67.8%; Indian, 63%; 'Other', 54.5%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To measure whether 'Population Group' played a part in this factor, saturation in the data set was traced. In this regard  $\ell^*$  was calculated at 63.33, which was significant ( $\ell^* = 63.33 >$  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 7.102.

**Table 7.102** 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
$\lambda A_1$	-1.106329	0.204548	-5.408652	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_2$	-0.695128	0.188983	-3.678257	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_3$	0.659452	0.109506	6.022063	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_4$	0.644777	0.106561	6.050778	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_5$	0.497227	0.113009	4.399889	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_1$	1.043014	0.103399	10.087274	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_2$	0.768579	0.103798	7.404565	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_3$	0.526267	0.121678	4.325079	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_4$	-1.262236	0.260732	-4.841124	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_5$	0.155780	0.142658	1.091982	Insignificant
$\lambda B_6$	-1.231405	0.214333	-5.745289	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_1B_1$	-0.029865	0.283160	-0.105470	Insignificant
$\lambda A_1B_2$	0.704103	0.260733	2.700475	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_1B_3$	-0.388586	0.361885	-1.073783	Insignificant
$\lambda A_1B_4$	-0.209521	0.710025	-0.295090	Insignificant
$\lambda A_1B_5$	-0.528925	0.435706	-1.213949	Insignificant
$\lambda A_1B_6$	0.452796	0.531125	0.852522	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_1$	-0.153384	0.256361	-0.598313	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_2$	0.392985	0.244646	1.606341	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_3$	0.298825	0.267399	1.117525	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_4$	-0.620722	0.705699	-0.879585	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_5$	0.040703	0.316830	0.128470	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_6$	0.041595	0.525327	0.079179	Insignificant

**Table 7.102 (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
$\lambda_{A_3B_1}$	-0.030257	0.150707	-0.200767	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_2}$	0.137018	0.153069	0.895139	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_3}$	-0.002605	0.174398	-0.014937	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_4}$	0.104139	0.352545	0.295392	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_5}$	0.007879	0.199979	0.039399	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_6}$	-0.214373	0.344837	-0.621665	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_1}$	-0.155003	0.151391	-1.023859	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_2}$	-0.525706	0.170131	-3.090007	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_4B_3}$	0.361744	0.164418	2.200148	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_4}$	0.341958	0.337122	1.014345	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_5}$	0.022555	0.198381	0.113695	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_6}$	-0.045547	0.329776	-0.138115	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_1}$	0.370310	0.149314	2.480076	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_2}$	-0.708398	0.187815	-3.771786	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5B_3}$	-0.269375	0.190264	-1.415796	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_4}$	0.384148	0.345738	1.111096	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_5}$	0.457787	0.193547	2.365250	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_6}$	-0.234469	0.364757	-0.642809	Insignificant

Main effect  $A_1$  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  $B_1$  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  $A_iB_j$  were observed, in  $A_1B_2$ ,  $A_4B_2$  and  $A_5B_2$  respectively. The frequency of Afrikaans-speaking White respondents in  $A_1B_2$  (19 or 12% of this subgroup) who never agreed with the content of question 12.2 ( $\ell/s$  equal to +2.70) was significantly higher than the group norm. With regard to  $A_4B_2$ , the frequency of Afrikaans-speaking White respondents (32 or 20.3% in this subgroup) who often agreed with the content of question 12.2 ( $\ell/s$  equal to -3.09) was significantly lower than the group norm. In the case of  $A_5B_2$ , the frequency of Afrikaans-speaking White respondents (23 or 14.6% in this subgroup) who always agreed with the content of question 12.2 ( $\ell/s$  equal to -3.77) was significantly lower than the group norm.

**Table 7.103** Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 12.1**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Never	17	17	6	1	4	2	47
Row %	36.2%	36.2%	12.8%	2.1%	8.5%	4.3%	100%
Column %	6.8%	10.7%	3.9%	3.6%	3.6%	9.1%	6.5%
Seldom	19	15	10	2	5	2	53
Row %	35.8%	28.3%	18.9%	3.8%	9.4%	3.8%	100%
Column %	7.6%	9.4%	6.5%	7.1%	4.5%	9.1%	7.3%
Sometimes	81	63	50	6	40	7	247
Row %	32.8%	25.5%	20.2%	2.4%	16.2%	2.8%	100%
Column %	32.5%	39.6%	32.7%	21.4%	36%	31.8%	34.2%
Often	63	41	56	9	25	6	200%
Row %	31.5%	20.5%	28%	4.5%	12.5%	3%	100%
Column %	25.3%	25.8%	36.6%	32.1%	22.5%	27.3%	27.7%
Always	69	23	31	10	37	5	175
Row %	39.4%	13.1%	17.7%	5.7%	21.1%	2.9%	100%
Column %	27.7%	14.5%	20.3%	35.7%	33.3%	22.7%	24.2%
Total	249	159	153	28	111	22	722
Row %	34.5%	22%	21.2%	3.9%	15.4%	3%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

The response to question 12.1 presented in Table 7.103 referred to the person who readily feels at home when listening to an English radio station that caters for a multicultural audience.

In this case, 51.9% of the respondents often agreed or always agreed with the content of the statement. Statistics for the subsamples were as follows: African, 53%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 40.3%; White English-speaking, 56.9%; Coloured, 67.8%; Indian, 55.8%; 'Other', 50%.

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 an interactive part in the cross-tabulation, a test was done for the absence or presence of saturation. In this regard  $\ell^*$  was calculated at 30.01, which was insignificant ( $\ell^* = 30.01 < X^2 = 37.566$  with 20 degrees of freedom). The independent model of the hierarchical loglinear analysis applied in this instance. Further loglinear analysis of the interaction in the cross-tabulation was not required. The main effects results are contained in Table 104.

**Table 7.104** Estimated  $\lambda$  effects, standard deviations of  $\ell$  estimates and standardized  $\ell$  values for the loglinear analysis of the independent model

Effect	$\ell$	$s_{\ell}$	$\ell/s$	Conclusion
$\lambda A_1$	-0.912733	0.180311	-5.061993	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_2$	-0.786322	0.170204	-4.619880	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_3$	0.751413	0.099763	7.531981	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_4$	0.541330	0.105643	5.124145	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_5$	0.406314	0.110038	3.692488	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_1$	1.060378	0.094760	11.190144	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_2$	0.612498	0.106618	5.744790	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_3$	0.573229	0.107890	5.313087	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_4$	-1.121517	0.205831	-5.448727	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_5$	0.249961	0.119552	2.090814	Insignificant
$\lambda B_6$	-1.374549	0.231102	-5.947802	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 7.105** Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 12.3**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Never	10	16	3	0	1	3	33
Row %	30.3%	48.5%	9.1%	0%	3%	9.1%	100%
Column %	4%	10.1%	2%	0%	.9%	13.6%	4.6%
Seldom	15	18	13	2	4	1	53
Row %	28.3%	34%	24.5%	3.8%	7.5%	1.9%	100%
Column %	6.1%	11.4%	8.6%	7.7%	3.6%	4.5%	7.4%
Sometimes	69	50	45	7	14	5	190
Row %	36.3%	26.3%	23.7%	3.7%	7.4%	2.6%	100%
Column %	27.9%	31.6%	29.8%	26.9%	12.5%	22.7%	26.5%
Often	67	54	56	7	41	8	233
Row %	28.8%	23.2%	24%	3%	7.4%	3.4%	100%
Column %	27.1%	34.2%	37.1%	26.9%	36.6%	36.4%	32.5%
Always	86	20	34	10	52	5	207
Row %	41.5%	9.7%	16.4%	4.8%	25.1%	2.4%	100%
Column %	34.8%	12.7%	22.5%	38.5%	46.4%	22.7%	28.9%
Total	247	158	151	26	112	22	716
Row %	34.5%	22.1%	21.1%	3.6%	15.6%	3.1%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 12.3 in Table 7.105 referred to the person who would be glad to be part of the loyal listenership of an English radio station that serves as a unifying force for all South



Africans through its varied and interesting programmes.

In the case of this variable, 61.4% of the respondents often agreed or always agreed with the statement. Subgroup comparisons were as follows: African, 61.9%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 46.9%; White English-speaking, 59.6%; Coloured, 65.4%; Indian, 83%; '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 testing for saturation was done. In this regard  $\ell^*$  was calculated at 82.74, which was significant ( $\ell^* = 82.74 > \text{critical } X^2 = 37.566$  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 and the results are contained in Table 7.106.

**Table 7.106** 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
$\lambda A_1$	-1.269936	0.231998	-5.473909	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_2$	-0.774867	0.197879	-3.915863	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_3$	0.542531	0.120500	4.502332	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_4$	0.844323	0.111337	7.583490	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_5$	0.657949	0.116224	5.661042	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_1$	1.098754	0.110495	9.943925	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_2$	0.829938	0.110358	7.520415	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_3$	0.522385	0.139511	3.744400	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_4$	-1.104492	0.238654	-4.628005	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda B_5$	-0.143969	0.207537	-0.693703	Insignificant
$\lambda B_6$	-1.202616	0.237120	-5.071761	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda A_1B_1$	-0.008235	0.315217	-0.026125	Insignificant
$\lambda A_1B_2$	0.730584	0.290399	2.515794	Insignificant
$\lambda A_1B_3$	-0.635839	0.447157	-1.421959	Insignificant
$\lambda A_1B_4$	-0.107575	0.710006	-0.151513	Insignificant
$\lambda A_1B_5$	-1.068097	0.700160	-1.525504	Insignificant
$\lambda A_1B_6$	1.089162	0.486530	2.238633	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_1$	-0.097839	0.267136	-0.366252	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_2$	0.353298	0.258625	1.366063	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_3$	0.335429	0.287608	1.166271	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_4$	0.090503	0.537998	0.168222	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_5$	-0.176872	0.418995	-0.422134	Insignificant
$\lambda A_2B_6$	-0.504519	0.699079	-0.721691	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_1$	0.110820	0.160799	0.689183	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_2$	0.057552	0.167418	0.343762	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_3$	0.259745	0.190269	1.365146	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_4$	0.025868	0.349212	0.074075	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_5$	-0.241507	0.281945	-0.856575	Insignificant
$\lambda A_3B_6$	-0.212479	0.379573	-0.559784	Insignificant

**Table 7.106 (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
$\lambda_{A_4B_1}$	-0.220387	0.154613	-1.425411	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_2}$	-0.167279	0.159097	-1.051428	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_3}$	0.176641	0.179811	0.982370	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_4}$	-0.275924	0.346157	-0.797107	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_5}$	0.531216	0.241978	2.195307	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_6}$	-0.044268	0.334592	-0.132304	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_1}$	0.215642	0.153942	1.400800	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_2}$	-0.974157	0.197526	-4.931791	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5B_3}$	-0.135976	0.195105	-0.696938	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_4}$	0.267125	0.322170	0.829143	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_5}$	0.955262	0.240003	3.980209	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5B_6}$	-0.327897	0.378237	-0.866909	Insignificant

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’.

Two significant interaction effects  $A_iB_j$  were observed, in  $A_5B_2$  and  $A_5B_5$ . In the case of  $A_5B_2$ , the frequency of Afrikaans-speaking White respondents (20 or 12.7% of this subgroup) who always agreed with the content of question 12.3 ( $\ell/s$  equal to  $-4.93$ ) was significantly lower than the group norm. Regarding  $A_5B_5$ , the frequency of Indian respondents (52 or 46.4% in this subgroup) who always agreed with the content of question 12.3 ( $\ell/s$  equal to  $+3.98$ ) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample.

**Table 7.107** Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 12.4**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Never	18	14	6	1	6	5	50
Row %	36%	28%	12%	2%	12%	10%	100%
Column %	7.4%	9.4%	4.2%	3.8%	5.4%	23.8%	7.2%
Seldom	28	22	17	2	10	3	82
Row %	34.1%	26.8%	20.7%	2.4%	12.2%	3.7%	100%
Column %	11.5%	14.8%	11.8%	7.7%	9%	14.3%	11.8%
Sometimes	63	53	43	5	29	5	198
Row %	31.8%	26.8%	21.7%	2.5%	14.6%	2.5%	100%
Column %	25.8%	35.6%	29.9%	19.2%	26.1%	23.8%	28.5%
Often	63	42	48	13	37	5	208
Row %	30.3%	20.2%	23.1%	6.3%	17.8%	2.4%	100%
Column %	25.8%	28.2%	33.3%	50%	33.3%	23.8%	29.9%
Always	72	18	30	5	29	3	157
Row %	45.9%	11.5%	19.1%	3.2%	18.5%	1.9%	100%
Column %	29.5%	12.1%	20.8%	19.2%	26.1%	14.3%	22.6%
Total	244	149	144	26	111	21	695
Row %	35.1%	21.4%	20.7%	3.7%	16%	3%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 12.4 referenced in Table 7.107 referred to the person who would not need to make excuses to anyone for being a loyal listener to an English radio station that caters for the needs of black and white South Africans.

In the case of this variable, 52.5% of the respondents often agreed or always agreed with the statement in the questionnaire. Compared with the general norm, the subsamples responded as follows: African, 55.3%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 40.3%; White English-speaking, 54.1%; Coloured, 69.2%; Indian, 59.4%; 'Other', 38.1%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To determine the interactive part of the subcategories 'Population Group', testing for saturation was done. In this regard  $\ell^*$  was calculated at 85.94, which was significant ( $\ell^* = 85.94 > X^2 = 37.566$  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 and the results are reported in Table 7.108.