

CHAPTER 7

PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

7.1 Introduction

This chapter contains the results of the data analysis that was done on the items that comprise the questionnaire.

7.2 Contents of the Chapter

The chapter consists of cross-classification tables as well as loglinear analysis tables that were compiled in cases where the saturated or the independent model applied. These tables are presented along with a detailed description of what was done in the analysis of the item concerned.

7.3 Approach to Presentation of Data

The approach taken here to presenting the results was based on the factor analysis done on the items that comprise the different sections of the questionnaire (i.e. sections 11, 12, 13 and 14. In the case of section 11, a total of 11 factors were extracted; sections 12 and 13 that comprised the second and third scale resulted in two factors each; section 14 produced a total of 4 factors).

The next step was to ensure that the presentation of the results of each analysis that was done on the various items that comprise a given factor was in accordance with the sequence in which these factors occurred in the questionnaire and the scale concerned.

The presentation of data analysis of each of the items contained in each factor began with those items that had high factor loadings and progressed to those with low factor loadings.

Loglinear analyses were done for all the questions. In addition, the lambda value, ℓ^* , was calculated for each item to determine the presence or absence of saturation. Where the saturated model applied, further loglinear analysis calculations were made to identify interaction effects. Where the independent model held, i.e. those items with lambda estimates that were not significant, further analysis of interaction was not required.

7.4 Results of Data Analysis

Now that the contents of the chapter and the approach to the presentation of data have been outlined, the next step is the actual presentation of the results of data analysis that was done on all four sections of the questionnaire. The first results to be presented are those of section 11 of the questionnaire.

7.4.1 Broadcasting Component

The first factor analysis revealed eleven factors that in total accounted for 24% of the variance in the overall response pattern in section 11 of the questionnaire.

7.4.1.1 Creation of Broadcasting Atmosphere

The factor extraction technique isolated 14 questions for inclusion in the first factor. Factor I was designated as Creation of Broadcasting Atmosphere. The individual items of this factor were duly analysed. The results of these analyses were as follows:

Table 7.1 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 11.35**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
Row %	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Column %	1.7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	.6%
Disagree	8	3	1	3	1	0	16
Row %	50%	18.8%	6.3%	18.8%	6.3%	0%	100%
Column %	3.3%	1.9%	.6%	11.1%	.9%	0%	2.2%
Neutral	28	9	20	4	9	7	77
Row %	36.4%	11.7%	26%	5.2%	11.7%	9.1%	100%
Column %	11.6%	5.7%	13%	14.8%	8%	33.3%	10.8%
Agree	105	70	71	11	56	11	324
Row %	32.4%	21.6%	21.9%	3.4%	17.3%	3.4%	100%
Column %	43.4%	44.3%	46.1%	40.7%	50%	52.4%	45.4%
Strongly agree	97	76	62	9	46	3	293
Row %	33.1%	25.9%	21.2%	3.1%	15.7%	1%	100%
Column %	40.1%	48.1%	40.3%	33.3%	41.1%	14.3%	41%
Total	242	158	154	27	112	21	714
Row %	33.9%	22.1%	21.6%	3.8%	15.7%	2.9%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 11.35 in Table 7.1 referred to a good radio announcer who is able to capture the imagination of listeners.

In this case, 86.4% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the content of the statement. Compared with the general norm, the subsamples responded as follows: African, 83.5%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 92.4%; White English-speaking, 86.4%; Coloured, 74%; Indian, 91.1%; ‘Other’, 66.7%.

The data were further analysed with regard to the second main effect: a reflection of the respondents’ population group. To measure whether ‘Population Group’ played a part in the cross-tabulation, a pretest of dependence or independence was done. In this regard ℓ^* was calculated at 34.63, which was insignificant ($\ell^* = 34.63 < X^2 = 37.566$ 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 7.2.

Table 7.2 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the independent model

Effect	ℓ	S_{ℓ}	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λ_{A_1}	-1.951764	0.383678	-5.086984	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{A_2}	-1.338863	0.300917	-4.449277	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{A_3}	0.174093	0.177900	0.978600	Insignificant
λ_{A_4}	1.608686	0.138918	11.580112	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{A_5}	1.507849	0.140389	10.740507	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_1}	1.014693	0.174738	5.806940	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_2}	0.600375	0.195256	3.074809	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_3}	0.569921	0.197672	2.883165	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_4}	-1.101477	0.365414	-3.014326	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_5}	0.256219	0.218294	1.173734	Insignificant
λ_{B_6}	-1.339731	0.416786	-3.214434	Significant at 0.1% level

Main effect A_i produced significant differences. In four of the five attitudinal categories – Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree and Strongly Agree – the observed frequencies 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, five significant deviations from the general trend were observed: among Africans, Afrikaans-speaking Whites, English-speaking Whites, Coloureds and those classified as ‘Other’.

Table 7.3 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 11.38**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	6	1	0	1	0	1	9
Row %	66.7%	11.1%	0%	11.1%	0%	11.1%	100%
Column %	2.5%	.6%	0%	3.6%	0%	4.5%	1.3%
Disagree	10	4	2	4	1	0	21
Row %	47.6%	19%	9.5%	19%	4.8%	0%	100%
Column %	4.1%	2.5%	1.3%	14.3%	.9%	0%	2.9%
Neutral	33	14	13	1	10	6	77
Row %	42.9%	18.2%	16.9%	1.3%	13%	7.8%	100%
Column %	13.5%	8.9%	8.4%	3.6%	9%	27.3%	10.8%
Agree	86	65	81	14	61	9	316
Row %	27.2%	20.6%	25.6%	4.4%	19.3%	2.8%	100%
Column %	35.2%	41.4%	52.6%	50%	55%	40.9%	44.1%
Strongly agree	109	73	58	8	39	6	293
Row %	37.2%	24.9%	19.8%	2.7%	13.3%	2%	100%
Column %	44.7%	46.5%	37.7%	28.6%	35.1%	27.3%	40.9%
Total	244	157	154	28	111	22	716
Row %	34.1%	21.9%	21.5%	3.9%	15.5%	3.1%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 11.38 that pertained to Table 7.3 referred to the radio listener who likes a radio announcer who can make people laugh.

In this case 85% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the content of the statement. Compared with the general trend, the subsamples produced the following results: African, 79.9%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 87.9%; White English-speaking, 90.3%; Coloured, 78.6%; Indian, 90.1%; 'Other', 68.2%.

To determine the interactive role of the subcategories 'Population Group', a test was done for the presence or absence of saturation. In this regard ℓ^* was calculated at 43.29, which was significant ($\ell^* = 43.29 > \text{critical } X^2 = 37.566$ with 20 degrees of freedom). The saturated model applied in this instance. Further loglinear analysis of the cross-tabulation was therefore necessary and duly reported in Table 7.4.

Table 7.4 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	ℓ	S_{ℓ}	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λA_1	-1.960121	0.312353	-6.275339	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2	-1.297361	0.251236	-5.163914	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_3	-0.126272	0.188525	-0.669789	Insignificant
λA_4	1.402975	0.124196	11.296459	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5	1.170754	0.131947	8.872911	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_1	1.250566	0.141163	8.859021	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.401297	0.217868	1.841927	Insignificant
λB_3	0.245855	0.233009	1.055131	Insignificant
λB_4	-0.875784	0.276932	-3.162451	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	-0.081339	0.261866	-0.310613	Insignificant
λB_6	-0.940594	0.276836	-3.397658	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_1B_1	0.242567	0.415578	0.583686	Insignificant
λA_1B_2	-0.699924	0.730464	-0.958191	Insignificant
λA_1B_3	-0.544482	0.735122	-0.740669	Insignificant
λA_1B_4	0.577157	0.750201	0.769336	Insignificant
λA_1B_5	-0.217288	0.744772	-0.291751	Insignificant
λA_1B_6	0.641967	0.750166	0.855767	Insignificant
λA_2B_1	0.090632	0.334056	0.271308	Insignificant
λA_2B_2	0.023611	0.446244	0.052911	Insignificant
λA_2B_3	-0.514095	0.553136	-0.929419	Insignificant
λA_2B_4	1.300692	0.477868	2.721865	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2B_5	-0.880048	0.721277	-1.220125	Insignificant
λA_2B_6	-0.020793	0.726846	-0.028607	Insignificant
λA_3B_1	0.113465	0.236932	0.478893	Insignificant
λA_3B_2	0.105284	0.316428	0.332727	Insignificant
λA_3B_3	0.186618	0.330380	0.564859	Insignificant
λA_3B_4	-1.256692	0.707658	-1.775847	Insignificant
λA_3B_5	0.251448	0.364229	0.690357	Insignificant
λA_3B_6	0.599877	0.409138	1.466197	Insignificant
λA_4B_1	-0.457942	0.168966	-2.710261	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4B_2	0.111367	0.239983	0.464062	Insignificant
λA_4B_3	0.486871	0.251402	1.936623	Insignificant
λA_4B_4	-0.146882	0.330506	-0.444416	Insignificant
λA_4B_5	0.530490	0.281252	1.886173	Insignificant
λA_4B_6	-0.523905	0.353630	-1.481506	Insignificant
λA_5B_1	0.011280	0.171912	0.065615	Insignificant
λA_5B_2	0.459660	0.242700	1.893943	Insignificant
λA_5B_3	0.385086	0.259127	1.486090	Insignificant
λA_5B_4	-0.474277	0.364209	-1.302211	Insignificant
λA_5B_5	0.315398	0.291183	1.083161	Insignificant
λA_5B_6	-0.697149	0.386344	-1.804477	Insignificant

Main effect A_i produced significant differences. In four of the five attitudinal categories – Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree and Strongly Agree – response patterns 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, three significant deviations from the general trend were observed: among Africans, Coloureds and those classified as ‘Other’.

Two significant interaction effects A_iB_j were observed, in A_2B_4 and A_4B_1 respectively. The

frequency of Coloured respondents in A₂B₄ (4 or 14.3% of this subgroup) who disagreed with the content of question 11.38 (ℓ/s equal to +2.72) was significantly higher than the group norm. In the case of A₄B₁, the frequency of African respondents (86 or 35.2% of this subgroup) who agreed with the content of question 11.38 (ℓ/s equal to -2.71) was significantly lower than the group norm.

Table 7.5 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 11.34**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
Row %	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Column %	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	.7%
Disagree	11	3	2	3	2	2	23
Row %	47.8%	13%	8.7%	13%	8.7%	8.7%	100%
Column %	4.5%	1.9%	1.3%	11.1%	1.8%	10%	3.2%
Neutral	34	12	20	1	5	4	76
Row %	44.7%	15.8%	26.3%	1.3%	6.6%	5.3%	100%
Column %	13.9%	7.6%	13.1%	3.7%	4.5%	20%	10.7%
Agree	96	64	66	14	58	9	307
Row %	31.3%	20.8%	21.5%	4.6%	18.9%	2.9%	100%
Column %	39.3%	40.8%	43.1%	51.9%	51.8%	45%	43.1%
Strongly agree	98	78	65	9	47	5	302
Row %	32.5%	25.8%	21.5%	3%	15.6%	1.7%	100%
Column %	40.2%	49.7%	42.5%	33.3%	42%	25%	42.4%
Total	244	157	153	27	112	20	713
Row %	34.2%	22%	21.5%	3.8%	15.7%	2.8%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 11.34 in Table 7.5 referred to a good sense of humour as a mark of a good radio announcer.

In this case 85.5% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the content of the statement. The subsample figures were: African, 79.5%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 90.5%; White English-speaking, 85.6%; Coloured, 85.2%; Indian, 93.8%; 'Other', 70%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To measure whether 'Population Group' played an interactive part, a test for saturation was done first. In this regard ℓ^* was calculated at 38.73, which was significant ($\ell^* = 38.73 > \text{critical } X^2 = 37.566$ with 20 degrees of freedom). The saturated model applied in this instance. Further loglinear analysis of the cross-tabulation was therefore required. The resultant

Question 11.36 referenced in Table 7.7 referred to the extent to which listeners adore a radio announcer who is creative with regard to programme presentation.

In the case under consideration, 83.1% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement in the questionnaire. Subgroup comparisons were as follows: African, 82.5%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 91.1%; White English-speaking, 75.2%; Coloured, 74%; Indian, 88.4%; 'Other', 71.4%.

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 the saturated model of the hierarchical loglinear analysis was traced in this instance. In this regard ℓ^* was calculated at 70.18, which was significant ($\ell^* = 70.18 > \text{critical } X^2 = 37.566$ with 20 degrees of freedom). Further loglinear analysis of the cross-tabulation was therefore necessary and duly reported in Table 7.8.

Table 7.8 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	ℓ	s_{ℓ}	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λA_1	-1.660740	0.297502	-5.582282	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2	-1.545210	0.283150	-5.457213	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_3	0.389327	0.147140	2.645963	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4	1.439826	0.125958	11.431001	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5	1.376814	0.127799	10.773277	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_1	1.173936	0.142336	8.247639	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.222657	0.233039	0.955450	Insignificant
λB_3	0.236779	0.257166	0.920724	Insignificant
λB_4	-0.821200	0.272466	-3.013954	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	0.161451	0.204744	0.788551	Insignificant
λB_6	-0.973630	0.277373	-3.510183	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_1B_1	0.332128	0.393425	0.844196	Insignificant
λA_1B_2	-0.662500	0.729170	-0.908567	Insignificant
λA_1B_3	-0.676630	0.737235	-0.917794	Insignificant
λA_1B_4	0.381351	0.74271	0.513459	Insignificant
λA_1B_5	0.091849	0.565067	0.162545	Insignificant
λA_1B_6	0.533779	0.744525	0.716939	Insignificant
λA_2B_1	0.216604	0.382688	0.566007	Insignificant
λA_2B_2	-0.084880	0.568643	-0.149268	Insignificant
λA_2B_3	-0.792150	0.731561	-1.082822	Insignificant
λA_2B_4	0.265827	0.737079	0.360649	Insignificant
λA_2B_5	-0.023680	0.557645	-0.042464	Insignificant
λA_2B_6	0.418255	0.738907	0.566046	Insignificant

Table 7.8 (Cont.) Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	ℓ	s_{ℓ}	ℓ/s	Conclusion
$\lambda_{A_3B_1}$	-0.331640	0.212295	-1.562166	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_2}$	-0.314670	0.318111	-0.989183	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_3}$	0.884229	0.295751	2.989775	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_3B_4}$	0.123047	0.389138	0.316273	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_5}$	-0.454140	0.311269	-1.458995	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_6}$	0.093153	0.409291	0.227596	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_1}$	-0.344900	0.173383	-1.989238	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_2}$	0.380068	0.255725	1.486237	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_3}$	0.427504	0.277206	1.542189	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_4}$	-0.416630	0.344930	-1.207868	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_5}$	0.441274	0.230235	1.916624	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_6}$	-0.487340	0.362870	-1.343015	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_1}$	0.127790	0.169785	0.752658	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_2}$	0.681971	0.253995	2.685057	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5B_3}$	0.157024	0.282265	0.556301	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_4}$	-0.353620	0.345606	-1.023188	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_5}$	-0.055330	0.241324	-0.229277	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_6}$	-0.557860	0.373209	-1.494766	Insignificant

Main effect A_1 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_1B_j were observed, in A_3B_3 and A_5B_2 . The frequency of English-speaking White respondents in A_3B_3 (37 or 24.2% of this subgroup) who were neutral with regard to the content of question 11.36 (ℓ/s equal to +2.99) was significantly higher than the group norm. With regard to A_5B_2 , the frequency of Afrikaans-speaking White respondents (80 or 51% in this subgroup) who strongly agreed with the content of question 11.36 (ℓ/s equal to +2.69) was significantly higher than the group norm.

Table 7.9 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 11.37**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	5	2	1	0	0	1	9
Row %	55.6%	22.2%	11.1%	0%	0%	11.1%	100%
Column %	2.2%	1.3%	.7%	0%	0%	5%	1.3%
Disagree	22	5	1	5	3	2	38
Row %	57.9%	13.2%	2.6%	13.2%	7.9%	5.3%	100%
Column %	9.6%	3.2%	.7**%	18.5%	2.7%	10%	5.5%
Neutral	72	20	32	4	12	8	148
Row %	48.6%	13.5%	21.6%	2.7%	8.1%	5.4%	100%
Column %	31.6%	12.7%	21.1%	14.8%	10.7%	40%	21.3%
Agree	75	68	67	13	59	5	287
Row %	26.1%	23.7%	23.3%	4.5%	20.6%	1.7%	100%
Column %	32.9%	43.3%	44.1%	48.1%	52.7%	25%	41.2%
Strongly agree	54	62	51	5	38	4	214
Row %	25.2%	29%	23.8%	2.3%	17.8%	1.9%	100%
Column %	23.7%	39.5%	33.6%	18.5%	33.9%	20%	30.7%
Total	228	157	152	27	112	20	696
Row %	32.8%	22.6%	21.8%	3.9%	16.1%	2.9%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 11.37 referred to in Table 7.9 was aimed at the adoration of listeners for a radio announcer who is witty in his or her programme presentation.

In the case of this variable, 71.9% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the content of the statement. The subgroups were calculated as follows: African, 56.6%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 82.8%; White English-speaking, 77.7%; Coloured, 66.6%; Indian, 86.6%; 'Other', 45%.

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 for the presence of saturation was done. In this regard ℓ^* was calculated at 119.55, which was significant ($\ell^* = 119.55 > \text{critical } X^2 = 37.566$ with 20 degrees of freedom). The saturated model applied in this instance. Further loglinear analysis of the cross-tabulation did not produce any significant difference, contrary to general expectations. Nevertheless, four borderline insignificant interactions were present. The findings of the main effect are duly reported in Table 7.10.

Table 7.10 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the independent model

Effect	ℓ	s_{ℓ}	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λ_{A_1}	-1.841833	0.296085	-6.220622	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{A_2}	-0.875317	0.217515	-4.024168	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{A_3}	0.555866	0.136226	4.080469	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{A_4}	1.273339	0.122258	10.415179	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{A_5}	0.887947	0.134818	6.586264	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_1}	1.231127	0.130760	9.415165	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_2}	0.503395	0.173653	2.898856	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_3}	0.094854	0.253812	0.373718	Insignificant
λ_{B_4}	-0.791573	0.235339	-3.363544	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_5}	0.034131	0.219692	0.155358	Insignificant
λ_{B_6}	-1.071933	0.254296	-4.215296	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, four significant deviations from the general trend were observed: among Africans, Afrikaans-speaking Whites, Coloureds and ‘Other’.

Table 7.11 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population group for **question 11.39**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	7	2	0	1	1	1	12
Row %	58.3%	16.7%	0%	8.3%	8.3%	8.3%	100%
Column %	2.9%	1.3%	0%	3.7%	.9%	4.5%	1.7%
Disagree	18	4	4	3	3	2	34
Row %	52.9%	11.8%	11.8%	8.8%	8.8%	5.9%	100%
Column %	7.4%	2.5%	2.6%	11.1%	2.7%	9.1%	4.7%
Neutral	45	14	25	3	13	7	107
Row %	42.1%	13.1%	23.4%	2.8%	12.1%	6.5%	100%
Column %	18.4%	8.9%	16.4%	11.1%	11.5%	31.8%	14.9%
Agree	94	82	84	11	69	7	347
Row %	27.1%	23.6%	24.2%	3.2%	19.9%	2%	100%
Column %	38.5%	51.9%	55.3%	40.7%	61.1%	31.8%	48.5%
Strongly agree	80	56	39	9	27	5	216
Row %	37%	25.9%	18.1%	4.2%	12.5%	2.3%	100%
Column %	32.8%	35.4%	25.7%	33.3%	23.9%	22.7%	30.2%
Total	244	158	152	27	113	22	716
Row %	34.1%	22.1%	21.2%	3.8%	15.8%	3.1%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

In Table 7.11 question 11.39 was addressed. It referred to a listener who regards a radio announcer who gives good but brief background information on music, artists, celebrities,

etc, as a person who makes radio listening a pleasant experience.

In this case, 78.7% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement.

Statistics for the subsamples were as follows: African, 71.3%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 87.3%; White English-speaking, 81%; Coloured, 74.0%; Indian, 85.0%; ‘Other’, 54.5%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents’ population group. To measure whether ‘Population Group’ played a part, the presence of saturation was once again looked for. In this regard ℓ^* was calculated at 49.57, which was significant ($\ell^* = 49.57 >$ critical $X^2 = 37.566$ with 20 degrees of freedom). The saturated model applied in this instance. However, further loglinear analysis of the cross-tabulation produced no significant interaction, contrary to expectations. The analysis produced a single borderline interaction. The ensuing results of the main effect are duly presented in Table 7.12.

Table 7.12 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the independent model

Effect	ℓ	s_{ℓ}	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λA_1	-1.813445	0.293223	-6.184525	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2	-0.827733	0.193139	-4.285685	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_3	0.292390	0.141580	2.065193	Insignificant
λA_4	1.406502	0.115393	12.188798	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5	0.942285	0.123833	7.609321	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_1	1.260365	0.122880	10.256877	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.376826	0.176932	2.129779	Insignificant
λB_3	0.286622	0.209762	1.366415	Insignificant
λB_4	-0.894819	0.241724	-3.701821	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	-0.014587	0.218128	-0.066874	Insignificant
λB_6	-1.014407	0.248095	-4.088785	Significant at 0.1% level

Main effect A_i produced significant differences. In four of the five attitudinal categories – Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree and Strongly Agree – subgroup responses 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, three significant deviations from the general trend were observed: among Africans, Coloureds and those classified as ‘Other’.

Table 7.13 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 11.42**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	6	1	0	1	0	0	8
Row %	75%	12.5%	0%	12.5%	0%	0%	100%
Column %	2.5%	.6%	0%	4%	0%	0%	1.1%
Disagree	12	4	3	1	2	0	22
Row %	54.5%	18.2%	13.6%	4.5%	9.1%	0%	100%
Column %	4.9%	2.5%	2%	4%	1.8%	0%	3.1%
Neutral	35	15	16	4	6	4	80
Row %	43.8%	18.8%	20%	5%	7.5%	5%	100%
Column %	14.3%	9.5%	10.7%	16%	5.4%	19%	11.3%
Agree	113	82	87	14	64	8	368
Row %	30.7%	22.3%	23.6%	3.8%	17.4%	2.2%	100%
Column %	46.3%	51.9%	58%	56%	57.1%	38.1%	51.8%
Strongly agree	78	56	44	5	40	9	232
Row %	33.6%	24.1%	19%	2.2%	17.2%	3.9%	100%
Column %	32%	35.4%	29.3%	20%	35.7%	42.9%	32.7%
Total	244	158	150	25	112	21	710
Row %	34.4%	22.3%	21.1%	3.5%	15.8%	3%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

The response to question 11.42 presented in Table 7.13 referred to a radio listener who regards programmes that listeners are interested in as important in any radio broadcast.

In the case of this variable, 84.5% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the content of the statement. The responses among subgroups were as follows: African, 78.3%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 87.3%; White English-speaking, 87.3%; Coloured, 76%; Indian, 92.8%; 'Other', 81%.

The data were further analysed with regard to the second main effect: a reflection of the respondents' population group. To measure whether 'Population Group' played a part in the cross-tabulation, a pretest of dependence or independence was done. In this regard ℓ^* was calculated at 36.27, which was not significant ($\ell^* = 36.27 < \text{critical } X^2 = 37.566$ with 20 degrees of freedom). The independent model of the hierarchical loglinear analysis applied in this instance. Further loglinear analysis of the cross-tabulation was not required. The findings of the main effects are reported in Table 7.14.

Table 7.14 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the independent model

Effect	ℓ	s_{ℓ}	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λ_{A_1}	-1.836285	0.353363	-5.196597	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{A_2}	-1.133196	0.266923	-4.245404	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{A_3}	0.129195	0.171092	0.755120	Insignificant
λ_{A_4}	1.651059	0.128809	12.817885	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{A_5}	1.189226	0.136684	8.700550	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_1}	1.048377	0.158733	6.604657	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_2}	0.612851	0.178456	3.434185	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_3}	0.568919	0.180729	3.147912	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_4}	-1.215779	0.357676	-3.399107	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_5}	0.277285	0.198588	1.396283	Insignificant
λ_{B_6}	-1.291653	0.495113	-2.608804	Significant at 0.1% level

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

Table 7.15 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 11.41**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	4	0	1	0	1	0	6
Row %	66.7%	0%	16.7%	0%	16.7%	0%	100%
Column %	1.6%	0%	.6%	0%	.9%	0%	.8%
Disagree	12	6	6	3	2	1	30
Row %	40%	20%	20%	10%	6.7%	3.3%	100%
Column %	4.9%	3.8%	3.9%	11.5%	1.8%	4.5%	4.2%
Neutral	45	23	39	1	14	10	132
Row %	34.1%	17.4%	29.5%	.8%	10.6%	7.6%	100%
Column %	18.5%	14.6%	25.3%	3.8%	12.5%	45.5%	18.5%
Agree	103	87	74	15	66	8	353
Row %	29.2%	24.6%	21%	4.2%	18.7%	2.3%	100%
Column %	42.4%	55.1%	48.1%	57.7%	58.9%	36.4%	49.4%
Strongly agree	79	42	34	7	29	3	194
Row %	40.7%	21.6%	17.5%	3.6%	14.9%	1.5%	100%
Column %	32.5%	26.6%	22.1%	26.9%	25.9%	13.6%	27.1%
Total	243	158	154	26	112	22	715
Row %	34%	22.1%	21.5%	3.6%	15.7%	3.1%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

In Table 7.15 question 11.41 was addressed. It referred to the notion that it is important for every radio announcer always to be himself or herself during a radio broadcast.

In the case under consideration, 76.5% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the content of the statement. The observations for the subgroups were as follows: African, 74.9%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 81.7%; White English-speaking, 70.2%; Coloured, 84.6%; Indian, 84.8%; 'Other', 50%.

The data were further analysed with regard to the second main effect: a reflection of the respondents' population group. To determine whether 'Population Group' played an interactive part in the cross-tabulation, a pretest of dependence or independence was done. In this regard ℓ^* was calculated at 42.66, which was significant ($\ell^* = 42.66 > \text{critical } X^2 = 37.566$ with 20 degrees of freedom). The saturated model applied in this instance. However, further loglinear analysis of the cross-tabulation produced no significant interaction, contrary to expectations. The analysis produced a single borderline interaction. The findings of the main effect are duly reported, as set out in Table 7.16.

Table 7.16 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the independent model

Effect	ℓ	s_{ℓ}	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λA_1	-1.956499	0.312986	-6.251075	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2	-0.809940	0.212562	-3.810371	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_3	0.403679	0.177500	2.274248	Insignificant
λA_4	1.542760	0.120357	12.818199	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5	0.820001	0.141667	5.788229	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_1	1.148860	0.143311	8.016551	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.438618	0.208979	2.098862	Insignificant
λB_3	0.469601	0.208326	2.254164	Insignificant
λB_4	-1.037034	0.279767	-3.706777	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	0.071376	0.221910	0.321644	Insignificant
λB_6	-1.091421	0.280504	-3.890928	Significant at 0.1% level

Main effect A_i produced significant differences. In four of the five attitudinal categories – Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree and Strongly Agree – observed patterns 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, three significant deviations from the general trend were observed: among Africans, Coloureds and those classified as 'Other'.

Table 7.17 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 11.7**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	8	1	1	1	2	3	16
Row %	50%	6.3%	6.3%	6.3%	12.5%	18.8%	100%
Column %	3.2%	.6%	.6%	3.6%	1.8%	13%	2.2%
Disagree	19	4	3	3	3	2	34
Row %	55.9%	11.8%	8.8%	8.8%	8.8%	5.9%	100%
Column %	7.6%	2.5%	1.9%	10.7%	2.7%	8.7%	4.7%
Neutral	56	13	16	3	7	4	99
Row %	56.6%	13.1%	16.2%	3%	7.1%	4%	100%
Column %	22.5%	8.2%	10.3%	10.7%	6.3%	17.4%	13.7%
Agree	102	81	85	14	59	8	349
Row %	29.2%	23.2%	24.4%	4%	16.9%	2.3%	100%
Column %	41%	51.3%	54.8%	50%	52.7%	34.8%	48.1%
Strongly agree	64	59	50	7	41	6	227
Row %	28.2%	26%	22%	3.1%	18.1%	2.6%	100%
Column %	25.7%	37.3%	32.3%	25%	36.6%	26.1%	31.3%
Total	249	158	155	28	112	23	725
Row %	34.3%	21.8%	21.4%	3.9%	15.4%	3.2%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 11.7 referred to a good radio announcer as someone who comes across naturally when he or she is on air. The results of this variable are contained in Table 7.17.

In this case, 79.4% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Subgroup percentages were as follows: African, 66.7%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 88.6%; White English-speaking, 87.1%; Coloured, 75%; Indian, 89.3%; 'Other', 60.9%.

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 ℓ^* was calculated at 49.33, which was significant ($\ell^* = 49.33 > \text{critical } X^2 = 37.566$ with 20 degrees of freedom). The saturated model of the hierarchical loglinear analysis applied in this instance. Further loglinear analysis of the cross-tabulation was therefore necessary. The ensuing results are presented in Table 7.18.

Table 7.18 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	ℓ	s_{ℓ}	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λ_{A_1}	-1.616210	0.272138	-5.938935	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{A_2}	-0.874790	0.195271	-4.479877	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{A_3}	0.037537	0.151034	0.248533	Insignificant
λ_{A_4}	1.448271	0.110492	4.057045	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{A_5}	1.005200	0.120534	8.339556	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_1}	1.305204	0.118229	11.039626	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_2}	0.223232	0.210363	1.061175	Insignificant
λ_{B_3}	0.183761	0.214840	0.855339	Insignificant
λ_{B_4}	-0.904980	0.241341	-3.749798	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_5}	0.044342	0.187673	0.236273	Insignificant
λ_{B_6}	-0.851560	0.211550	-4.025337	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_1B_1}$	0.129037	0.360486	0.357953	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_2}$	-0.868430	0.714300	-1.215778	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_3}$	-0.828960	0.715631	-1.158362	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_4}$	0.259776	0.724029	0.358792	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_5}$	0.003605	0.548811	0.006569	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_6}$	1.304975	0.494023	2.641527	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_2B_1}$	0.252615	0.255097	0.990270	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_2}$	-0.223560	0.417488	-0.535488	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_3}$	-0.471770	0.457748	-1.030633	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_4}$	0.616969	0.470768	1.310558	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_5}$	-0.332350	0.445644	-0.745775	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_6}$	0.158091	0.524211	0.301579	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_1}$	0.421197	0.189329	2.224683	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_2}$	0.042766	0.299577	0.142755	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_3}$	0.289877	0.293054	0.989159	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_4}$	-0.295360	0.454206	-0.650279	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_5}$	-0.397380	0.327244	-1.214323	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_6}$	-0.061090	0.399347	-0.152975	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_1}$	-0.389920	0.148395	-2.627582	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_4B_2}$	0.461532	0.230895	1.998883	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_3}$	0.549205	0.234486	2.342165	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_4}$	-0.165650	0.301560	-0.549310	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_5}$	0.323511	0.214761	1.506377	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_6}$	-0.778680	0.314444	-2.476371	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_1}$	-0.412940	0.163308	-2.528596	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_2}$	0.587691	0.239737	2.451399	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_3}$	0.461648	0.246166	1.875352	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_4}$	-0.415730	0.349041	-1.191064	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_5}$	0.402616	0.226757	1.775539	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_6}$	-0.623290	0.343310	-1.815531	Insignificant

Main effect A_i produced significant differences. In four of the five attitudinal categories – Strongly Disagree, Disagree and Agree – the observed frequencies differed significantly from the respective group norms. The exception was the category Neutral. In the case of main effect B_j relating to population group, three significant deviations from the general trend occurred: among Africans, Coloureds and those classified as ‘Other’.

Two significant interaction effects A_iB_j occurred, in A_1B_6 and in A_4B_1 . The frequency of

'Other' respondents in A₁B₆ (3 or 13% of this subgroup) who strongly disagreed with the content of question 11.7 (ℓ/s equal to +2.64) was significantly higher than the group norm. In the case of A₄B₁, the frequency of African respondents (102 or 41% in this subgroup) who agreed with the content of question 11.7 (ℓ/s equal to -2.63) was significantly lower than the group norm.

Table 7.19 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 11.26**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	9	0	1	2	3	1	16
Row %	56.3%	0%	6.3%	12.5%	18.8%	6.3%	100%
Column %	3.6%	0%	.7%	7.1%	2.7%	4.3%	2.2%
Disagree	23	4	3	5	7	2	44
Row %	52.3%	9.1%	6.8%	11.4%	15.9%	4.5%	100%
Column %	9.3%	2.5%	2%	17.9%	6.3%	8.7%	6.1%
Neutral	52	11	9	4	12	4	92
Row %	56.5%	12%	9.8%	4.3%	13%	4.3%	100%
Column %	21%	6.9%	5.9%	14.3%	10.7%	17.4%	12.7%
Agree	105	83	69	10	58	8	333
Row %	31.5%	24.9%	20.7%	3%	17.4%	2.4%	100%
Column %	42.3%	52.2%	45.1%	35.7%	51.8%	34.8%	46.1%
Strongly agree	59	61	71	7	32	8	238
Row %	24.8%	25.6%	29.8%	2.9%	13.4%	2.4%	100%
Column %	23.8%	38.4%	46.4%	25%	28.6%	34.8%	32.9%
Total	248	159	153	28	112	23	723
Row %	34.3%	22%	21.2%	3.9%	15.5%	3.2%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 11.26 referred to in Table 7.19 was aimed at a multicultural English radio station that requires radio presenters who can speak good English.

In this case, 79% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. The different subgroups responded as follows: African, 66.1%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 90.6%; White English-speaking, 91.5%; Coloured, 60.7%; Indian, 80.4%; 'Other', 69.6%.

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 ℓ^* was calculated at 64.36, which was significant ($\ell^* = 64.36 > \text{critical } X^2 = 37.566$ with 20 degrees of freedom). Further loglinear analysis of the crosstabulation was required and

duly reported in Table 7.20.

Table 7.20 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	ℓ	s_{ℓ}	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λ_{A_1}	-1.646950	0.27082	-6.097963	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{A_2}	-0.666960	0.179160	-3.722706	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{A_3}	-0.011140	0.144961	-0.076848	Insignificant
λ_{A_4}	1.313116	0.110645	11.867829	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{A_5}	1.011916	0.115670	8.748301	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_1}	1.291316	0.113776	11.349634	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_2}	0.151004	0.210047	0.718906	Insignificant
λ_{B_3}	0.046748	0.216528	0.215898	Insignificant
λ_{B_4}	-0.724300	0.198528	-3.648352	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_5}	0.299345	0.154330	1.939642	Insignificant
λ_{B_6}	-1.064110	0.246855	-4.310668	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_1B_1}$	0.241082	0.350899	0.687041	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_2}$	-0.815830	0.714045	-1.142547	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_3}$	-0.711580	0.715979	-0.993856	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_4}$	0.752622	0.552408	1.362439	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_5}$	0.134440	0.472114	0.284762	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_6}$	0.399284	0.725726	0.550186	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_1}$	0.199366	0.234160	0.851409	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_2}$	-0.409520	0.410627	-0.997304	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_3}$	-0.592950	0.452451	-1.310528	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_4}$	0.688927	0.379352	1.816062	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_5}$	0.001752	0.324738	0.005395	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_6}$	0.112446	0.534258	0.210471	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_1}$	0.359289	0.184519	1.947165	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_2}$	-0.053750	0.306420	-0.175412	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_3}$	-0.150160	0.323634	-0.463980	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_4}$	-0.190040	0.390926	-0.486127	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_5}$	-0.115080	0.265633	-0.433229	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_6}$	0.149766	0.417549	0.358678	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_1}$	-0.262250	0.146264	-1.792990	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_2}$	0.6429440	0.231468	2.777679	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_4B_3}$	0.562465	0.239416	2.349321	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_4}$	-0.598010	0.289917	-2.062693	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_5}$	0.136205	0.188023	0.724406	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_6}$	-0.481340	0.339964	-1.415856	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_1}$	-0.537470	0.159688	-3.365751	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5B_2}$	0.636177	0.237598	2.677535	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5B_3}$	0.892238	0.241441	3.695470	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5B_4}$	-0.653480	0.319894	-2.042802	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_5}$	-0.157300	0.205166	-0.766696	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_6}$	-0.180140	0.341633	-0.527290	Insignificant

Main effect A_i produced significant differences. In four of the five attitudinal categories – Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree and Strongly Agree – the observed frequencies 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, three significant deviations from the general trend were observed: among Africans, Coloureds and ‘Other’.

Four significant interaction effects A_iB_j occurred, in A_4B_2 , A_5B_1 , A_5B_2 and A_5B_3 , respectively. The frequency of Afrikaans-speaking White respondents in A_4B_2 (83 or 52.2% of this subgroup) who agreed with the content of question 11.26 (ℓ/s equal to +2.78) was significantly higher than the group norm. Regarding Africans, the frequency of those who strongly agreed with the content of question 11.26 (59 or 23.8% of this subgroup) was significantly lower than the group norm (ℓ/s equal to -3.67).

In the case of A_5B_2 , the frequency of Afrikaans-speaking White respondents (61 or 38.4% of this subgroup) who strongly agreed with the content of question 11.26 (ℓ/s equal to +2.68) was significantly higher than the group norm. Lastly, regarding A_5B_3 , the frequency of English-speaking White respondents (71 or 46.4% in this subgroup) who strongly agreed with the content of question 11.26 (ℓ/s equal to +3.70) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample.

Table 7.21 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 11.19**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	11	1	2	0	2	1	17
Row %	64.7%	5.9%	11.8%	0%	11.8%	5.9%	100%
Column %	4.4%	.6%	1.3%	0%	1.8%	4.5%	2.3%
Disagree	15	2	4	6	3	1	31
Row %	48.4%	6.5%	12.9%	19.4%	9.7%	3.2%	100%
Column %	6%	1.3%	2.6%	21.4%	2.7%	4.5%	4.3%
Neutral	60	16	21	1	10	5	113
Row %	53.1%	14.2%	18.6%	.9%	8.8%	4.4%	100%
Column %	23.8%	10.2%	13.7%	3.6%	8.9%	22.7%	15.6%
Agree	106	91	92	18	65	10	382
Row %	27.7%	23.8%	24.1%	4.7%	17%	2.6%	100%
Column %	42.1%	58%	60.1%	64.3%	58%	45.5%	52.8%
Strongly agree	60	47	34	3	32	5	181
Row %	33.1%	26%	18.8%	1.7%	17.7%	2.8%	100%
Column %	23.8%	29.9%	22.2%	10.7%	28.6%	22.7%	25%
Total	252	157	153	28	112	22	724
Row %	34.8%	21.7%	21.1%	3.9%	15.5%	3%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 11.19 referenced in Table 7.21 referred to a radio announcer who has a well-modulated voice that makes listening to the radio a pleasant experience.

In the case under consideration, 77.8% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with

the statement in the questionnaire. The responses among the subgroups were as follows: African, 65.9%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 87.9%; White English-speaking, 82.3%; Coloured, 75%; Indian, 86.6%; 'Other', 68.2%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To measure whether 'Population Group' played a part in this dimension, the presence of saturation was determined. In this regard ℓ^* was calculated at 51.83, which was significant ($\ell^* = 51.83 > \text{critical } X^2 = 37.566$ with 20 degrees of freedom). The saturated model applied in this instance. Further loglinear analysis of the cross-tabulation was therefore required, as set out in Table 7.22.

Table 7.22 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	ℓ	s_{ℓ}	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λ_{A_1}	-1.628050	0.278951	-5.836330	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{A_2}	-0.979104	0.219642	-4.457727	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{A_3}	0.045165	0.182788	0.247090	Insignificant
λ_{A_4}	1.585157	0.114027	13.901593	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{A_5}	0.682025	0.142000	4.802993	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_1}	1.391828	0.122369	11.374025	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_2}	0.165562	0.228383	0.724931	Insignificant
λ_{B_3}	0.434636	0.178818	2.430605	Insignificant
λ_{B_4}	-1.043638	0.278890	-3.742113	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_5}	0.147107	0.189114	0.777875	Insignificant
λ_{B_6}	-1.095495	0.276222	-3.965995	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_1B_1}$	0.375369	0.345716	1.085773	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_2}$	-0.796260	0.721346	-1.103853	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_3}$	-0.372187	0.547866	-0.679339	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_4}$	0.412940	0.738892	0.558864	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_5}$	-0.084658	0.551313	-0.153557	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_6}$	0.464797	0.737889	0.629901	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_1}$	0.036578	0.283288	0.129119	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_2}$	-0.752059	0.539231	-1.394688	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_3}$	-0.327986	0.413022	-0.794113	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_4}$	1.555754	0.427852	3.636197	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_2B_5}$	-0.328139	0.455751	-0.719996	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_6}$	-0.184149	0.717572	-0.256628	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_1}$	0.398603	0.213121	1.870313	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_2}$	0.303114	0.317708	0.954065	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_3}$	0.305973	0.273502	1.118723	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_4}$	-1.260275	0.708209	-1.779524	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_5}$	-0.148435	0.315506	-0.470466	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_6}$	0.401020	0.424356	0.945008	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_1}$	-0.572292	0.148722	-3.848066	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_4B_2}$	0.501392	0.244796	2.048203	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_3}$	0.243247	0.199234	1.220911	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_4}$	0.090105	0.321516	0.280250	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_5}$	0.183375	0.212811	0.861680	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_6}$	-0.445825	0.345932	-1.288765	Insignificant

Table 7.22 (Cont.) Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	ℓ	s_{ℓ}	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λA_5B_1	-0.238257	0.179369	-1.328306	Insignificant
λA_5B_2	0.743812	0.266837	2.787514	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5B_3	0.150951	0.232965	0.647956	Insignificant
λA_5B_4	-0.798523	0.470792	-1.696127	Insignificant
λA_5B_5	0.377856	0.242480	1.558298	Insignificant
λA_5B_6	-0.235840	0.408449	-0.577404	Insignificant

Main effect A_i produced significant differences. In four of the five attitudinal categories – Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree and Strongly Agree – response patterns 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, three significant deviations from the general trend were observed: among Africans, Coloureds and those classified as ‘Other’.

Three significant interaction effects A_iB_j occurred, in A_2B_4 , A_4B_1 and A_5B_2 respectively. The frequency of Coloured respondents in A_2B_4 (6 or 21.4% of this subgroup) who disagreed with the content of question 11.19 (ℓ/s equal to +3.64) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample. With regard to A_4B_1 , the frequency of African respondents (106 or 42.1% in this subgroup) who agreed with the content of question 11.19 (ℓ/s equal to -3.85) was significantly lower than the group norm. In the case of A_5B_2 , the frequency of Afrikaans-speaking White respondents (47 or 29.9% of this subgroup) who strongly agreed with the content of question 11.19 (ℓ/s equal to +2.79) was significantly higher than the group norm.

Table 7.23 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 11.9**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	17	5	0	3	2	2	29
Row %	58.6%	17.2%	0%	10.3%	6.9%	6.9%	100%
Column %	6.8%	3.2%	0%	10.7%	1.8%	9.1%	4%
Disagree	15	4	7	1	6	2	35
Row %	42.9%	11.4%	20%	2.9%	17.1%	5.7%	100%
Column %	6%	2.5%	4.5%	3.6%	5.4%	9.1%	4.8%
Neutral	41	12	17	6	16	6	98
Row %	41.8%	12.2%	17.3%	6.1%	16.3%	6.1%	100%
Column %	16.5%	7.6%	11%	21.4%	14.3%	27.3%	13.5%
Agree	96	79	84	15	59	7	340
Row %	28.2%	23.2%	24.7%	4.4%	17.4%	2.1%	100%
Column %	38.6%	50%	54.2%	53.6%	52.7%	31.8%	47%
Strongly agree	80	58	47	3	29	5	222
Row %	36%	26.1%	21.2%	1.4%	13.1%	2.3%	100%
Column %	32.1%	36.7%	30.3%	10.7%	25.9%	22.7%	30.7%
Total	249	158	155	28	112	22	724
Row %	34.4%	21.8%	21.4%	3.9%	15.5%	3%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 11.9 in Table 7.23 referred to a radio announcer who annoys most of the listeners by talking to them as if he or she were reading what to say to them.

In this case, 77.7% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement in the questionnaire. Percentages among the subgroups were: African, 70.7%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 86.7%; White English-speaking, 84.5%; Coloured, 64.3%; Indian, 78.6%; 'Other', 54.5%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To measure whether 'Population Group' played a part, testing for the presence of saturation was done. In this regard ℓ^* was calculated at 36.65, which was insignificant ($\ell^* = 36.65 < X^2 = 37.566$ 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 presented in Table 7.24.

Table 7.24 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the independent model

Effect	ℓ	S_{ℓ}	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λA_1	-1.151506	0.222243	-5.181293	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2	-0.992247	0.206456	-4.806094	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_3	0.027690	0.140846	0.196598	Insignificant
λA_4	1.272603	0.102558	12.408618	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5	0.843459	0.112076	7.525777	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_1	1.054344	0.113469	9.291912	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.599793	0.128045	4.684236	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_3	0.586408	0.128577	4.560753	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_4	-1.121885	0.245265	-4.574175	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	0.253884	0.142794	1.777974	Insignificant
λB_6	-1.372545	0.275775	-4.977047	Significant at 0.1% level

Main effect A_i produced significant differences. In four of the five attitudinal categories – Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree and Strongly Agree – the observed frequencies 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, five significant deviations from the general trend were observed: among Africans, Afrikaans-speaking Whites, English-speaking Whites, Coloureds and ‘Other’.

Table 7.25 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 11.31**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	14	4	2	3	1	0	24
Row %	58.3%	16.7%	8.3%	12.5%	4.2%	0%	100%
Column %	5.6%	2.5%	1.3%	11.5%	.9	0%	3.3%
Disagree	32	2	5	1	3	2	45
Row %	71.1%	4.4%	11.1%	2.2%	6.7%	4.4%	100%
Column %	12.7%	1.3%	3.3%	3.8%	2.7%	8.7%	6.3%
Neutral	69	24	31	7	19	8	158
Row %	43.7%	15.2%	19.6%	4.4%	12%	5.1%	100%
Column %	27.4%	15.3%	20.5%	26.9%	17.1%	34.8%	21.9%
Agree	89	86	75	13	57	7	327
Row %	27.2%	26.3%	22.9%	4%	17.4%	2.1%	100%
Column %	35.3%	54.8%	49.7%	50%	51.4%	30.4%	45.4%
Strongly agree	48	41	38	2	31	6	166
Row %	28.9%	24.7%	22.9%	1.2%	18.7%	3.6%	100%
Column %	19%	26.1%	25.2%	7.7%	27.9%	26.1%	23.1%
Total	252	157	151	26	111	23	720
Row %	35%	21.8%	21%	3.6%	15.4%	3.2%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	23%	100%

In Table 7.25 question 11.31 was addressed. The question referred to international or local music that has universal appeal and should feature prominently on a radio station that serves a multicultural audience.

In the case under consideration, 68.5% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Statistics for the subsamples were as follows: African, 54.3%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 80.9%; White English-speaking, 74.9%; Coloured, 57.7%; Indian, 79.3%; 'Other', 56.5%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To determine the interactive part of the subcategories 'Population Group', a test for the presence of saturation was done. In this regard ℓ^* was calculated at 66.87, which was significant ($\ell^* = 66.87 > \text{critical } X^2 = 37.566$ 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 necessary, as set out in Table 7.26.

Table 7.26 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	ℓ	S_ℓ	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λ_{A_1}	-1.368773	0.246066	-5.562625	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{A_2}	-1.078279	0.225194	-4.788223	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{A_3}	0.631031	0.121591	5.189784	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{A_4}	1.297438	0.111928	11.591720	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{A_5}	0.518584	0.144257	3.594862	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_1}	1.401455	0.109311	12.820805	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_2}	0.346791	0.173323	2.000837	Insignificant
λ_{B_3}	0.400037	0.168977	2.367405	Insignificant
λ_{B_4}	-1.077768	0.250437	-4.303549	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_5}	-0.034274	0.215073	-0.159360	Insignificant
λ_{B_6}	-1.036241	0.244042	-4.246158	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_1B_1}$	0.268084	0.305122	0.878612	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_2}$	0.069985	0.427341	0.163769	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_3}$	-0.676408	0.530219	-1.275714	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_4}$	1.206862	0.498630	2.420356	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_5}$	-0.935245	0.706283	-1.324179	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_6}$	0.066721	0.715637	0.093233	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_1}$	0.804267	0.259214	3.102714	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_2B_2}$	-0.913657	0.522287	-1.749339	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_3}$	-0.050612	0.388968	-0.130119	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_4}$	-0.182245	0.710958	-0.256337	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_5}$	-0.127127	0.471522	-0.269610	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_6}$	0.469374	0.549818	0.853690	Insignificant

Table 7.26 (Cont.) Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	ℓ	S_{ℓ}	ℓ/s	Conclusion
$\lambda_{A_3B_1}$	-0.136672	0.156720	-0.872078	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_2}$	-0.138060	0.231349	-0.596761	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_3}$	0.064627	0.219708	0.294150	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_4}$	0.054355	0.355917	0.152718	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_5}$	0.009390	0.272257	0.034489	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_6}$	0.146359	0.341133	0.429038	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_1}$	-0.548549	0.144921	-3.785159	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_4B_2}$	0.471826	0.198118	2.381540	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_3}$	0.281721	0.196075	1.436802	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_4}$	0.006987	0.313124	0.022314	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_5}$	0.441595	0.240484	1.836276	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_6}$	-0.653580	0.348221	-1.876912	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_1}$	-0.387130	0.181998	-2.127111	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_2}$	0.509906	0.229430	2.222491	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_3}$	0.380674	0.227861	1.670641	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_4}$	-1.085960	0.524938	-2.068740	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_5}$	0.611386	0.268329	2.278494	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_6}$	-0.028876	0.372913	-0.077434	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 occurred, in A_2B_1 , and A_4B_1 respectively. The frequency of African respondents in A_2B_1 (32 or 12.7% of this subgroup) who disagreed with the content of question 11.31 (ℓ/s equal to +3.10) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample. With regard to A_4B_1 , the frequency of African respondents (89 or 35.3% in this subgroup) who agreed with the content of question 11.31 (ℓ/s equal to -3.79) was significantly lower than the group norm.

Table 7.27 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 11.40**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	12	3	2	1	6	0	24
Row %	50%	12.5%	8.3%	4.2%	25%	0%	100%
Column %	4.9%	1.9%	1.3%	3.7%	5.4%	0%	3.4%
Disagree	31	9	5	2	6	2	55
Row %	56.4%	16.4%	9.1%	3.6%	10.9%	3.6%	100%
Column %	12.8%	5.7%	3.2%	7.4%	5.4%	9.1%	7.7%
Neutral	52	26	28	7	17	7	137
Row %	38%	19%	20.4%	5.1%	12.4%	5.1%	100%
Column %	21.4%	16.5%	18.2%	25.9%	15.2%	31.8%	19.1%
Agree	84	81	94	10	67	6	342
Row %	24.6%	23.7%	27.5%	2.9%	19.6%	1.8%	100%
Column %	34.6%	51.3%	61%	37%	59.8%	27.3%	47.8%
Strongly agree	64	39	25	7	16	7	158
Row %	40.5%	24.7%	15.8%	4.4%	10.1%	4.4%	100%
Column %	26.3%	24.7%	16.2%	25.9%	14.3%	31.8%	22.1%
Total	243	158	154	27	112	22	716
Row %	33.9%	22.1%	21.5%	3.8%	15.6%	3.1%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 11.40 in Table 7.27 referred to a radio listener who does not like to hear too much of the same music or discussion or topic when listening to the radio.

In this case, 69.9% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement.

Subgroup comparisons were as follows: African, 60.9%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 76%; White English-speaking, 77.2%; Coloured, 62.9%; Indian, 74.1%; 'Other', 59.1%.

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 ℓ^* was calculated at 61.61, which was significant ($\ell^* = 61.61 > \text{critical } X^2 = 37.566$ 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 necessary. The ensuing results are presented in Table 7.28.

Table 7.28 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	ℓ	S_{ℓ}	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λ_{A_1}	-1.426164	0.240433	-5.931648	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{A_2}	-0.701117	0.177726	-3.944932	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{A_3}	0.440195	0.117125	3.758335	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{A_4}	1.173698	0.108138	10.853705	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{A_5}	0.513387	0.116521	4.405961	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_1}	1.254400	0.103675	12.099349	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_2}	0.484821	0.142512	3.401966	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_3}	0.241824	0.165495	1.461216	Insignificant
λ_{B_4}	-1.060057	0.238128	-4.451627	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_5}	0.241235	0.137628	1.752805	Insignificant
λ_{B_6}	-1.162222	0.241832	-4.805907	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_1B_1}$	0.219103	0.308983	0.709110	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_2}$	-0.397613	0.452804	-0.878113	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_3}$	-0.560081	0.527994	-1.060772	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_4}$	0.048653	0.712807	0.068256	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_5}$	0.539120	0.370131	1.456565	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_6}$	0.150819	0.714053	0.211215	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_1}$	0.443138	0.220950	2.005603	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_2}$	-0.024047	0.299869	-0.080192	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_3}$	-0.368837	0.364082	-1.013060	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_4}$	0.016754	0.530916	0.031557	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_5}$	-0.185926	0.332829	-0.558623	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_6}$	0.118920	0.532588	0.223287	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_1}$	-0.180918	0.160437	-1.127658	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_2}$	-0.104488	0.207348	-0.503926	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_3}$	0.212617	0.221299	0.960768	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_4}$	0.128204	0.348062	0.368337	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_5}$	-0.285785	0.223092	-1.281019	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_6}$	0.230370	0.350606	0.657062	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_1}$	-0.434849	0.144171	-3.016202	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_4B_2}$	0.298362	0.174707	1.707785	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_3}$	0.690204	0.192142	3.592156	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_4B_4}$	-0.248624	0.319342	-0.778551	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_5}$	0.352191	0.173742	2.027092	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_6}$	-0.657284	0.361143	-1.820010	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_1}$	-0.046471	0.155424	-0.298995	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_2}$	0.227786	0.194227	1.172782	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_3}$	0.026097	0.224826	0.116076	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_4}$	0.055012	0.347859	0.158145	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_5}$	-0.419601	0.226052	-1.856214	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_6}$	0.157178	0.350405	0.448561	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, four significant deviations from the general trend were observed: among Africans, Afrikaans-speaking Whites, Coloureds and ‘Other’.

Two significant interaction effects A_iB_j occurred, in A_4B_1 , and A_4B_3 respectively. The frequency of African respondents in A_4B_1 (84 or 34.6% of this subgroup) who agreed with

the content of question 11.40 (ℓ/s equal to -3.02) was significantly lower than the group norm. With regard to A_4B_3 , the frequency of English-speaking White respondents (94 or 61% in this subgroup) who agreed with the content of question 11.40 (ℓ/s equal to $+3.59$) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample.

7.4.1.2 Emotional Reaction to an Announcer

The second factor consisted of responses to six questions from the questionnaire, with question 11.3 as the first contributor.

Table 7.29 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 11.3**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	7	2	2	1	2	1	15
Row %	46.7%	13.3%	13.3%	6.7%	13.3%	6.7%	100%
Column %	2.9%	1.3%	1.3%	3.6%	1.8%	4.8%	2.1%
Disagree	12	6	5	1	4	1	29
Row %	41.4%	20.7%	17.2%	3.4%	13.8%	3.4%	100%
Column %	4.9%	3.8%	3.2%	3.6%	3.6%	4.8%	4%
Neutral	39	32	35	5	19	6	136
Row %	28.7%	23.5%	25.7%	3.7%	14%	4.4%	100%
Column %	15.9%	20.4%	22.7%	17.9%	17%	28.6%	19%
Agree	100	71	77	12	59	8	327
Row %	30.6%	21.7%	23.5%	3.7%	18%	2.4%	100%
Column %	40.8%	45.2%	50%	42.9%	52.7%	38.1%	45.6%
Strongly agree	87	46	35	9	28	5	210
Row %	41.1%	21.9%	16.7%	4.3%	13.3%	2.4%	100%
Column %	35.5%	29.3%	22.7%	32.1%	25%	23.8%	29.3%
Total	245	157	154	28	112	21	717
Row %	34.2%	21.9%	21.5%	3.9%	15.6%	2.9%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

The response to question 11.3 presented in Table 7.29 referred to a radio listener who admires a radio announcer who is sensitive to the listeners.

In the case of this variable, 74.9% agreed or strongly agreed with the content of the statement. Compared with the general norm, the subsamples responded as follows: African, 76.3%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 74.5%; White English-speaking, 72.7%; Coloured, 75%; Indian, 77.7%; 'Other', 61.9%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To

determine the interactive part of the subcategories 'Population Group', the presence of saturation was again looked for. In this regard ℓ^* was calculated at 22.94, which was not significant ($\ell^* = 22.94 < \text{critical } X^2 = 37.566$ 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 presented in Table 7.30.

Table 7.30 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the independent model

Effect	ℓ	s_{ℓ}	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λA_1	-1.728781	0.317270	-5.448927	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2	-1.069194	0.238970	-4.474177	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_3	0.491890	0.141522	3.475714	Insignificant
λA_4	1.378464	0.120078	11.479738	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5	0.927621	0.128978	7.192087	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_1	1.066518	0.139772	7.630412	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.614761	0.156643	3.924599	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_3	0.590288	0.157991	3.736213	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_4	-1.112978	0.299159	-3.720356	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	0.268908	0.174801	1.538366	Insignificant
λB_6	-1.427497	0.352403	-4.050752	Significant at 0.1% level

Main effect A_i produced significant differences. In four of the five attitudinal categories – Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree and Strongly Agree – response patterns 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, five significant deviations from the general trend were observed: among Africans, Afrikaans-speaking Whites, English-speaking Whites, Coloureds and those classified as 'Other'.

Table 7.31 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 11.4**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	5	3	0	1	0	0	9
Row %	55.6%	33.3%	0%	11.1%	0%	0%	100%
Column %	2%	1.9%	0%	3.6%	0%	0%	1.3%
Disagree	14	10	6	1	6	0	37
Row %	37.8%	27%	16.2%	2.7%	16.2%	0%	100%
Column %	5.7%	6.4%	3.9%	3.6%	5.4%	0%	5.2%
Neutral	25	25	51	6	17	4	128
Row %	19.5%	19.5%	39.8%	4.7%	13.3%	3.1%	100%
Column %	10.2%	16%	33.1%	21.4%	15.3%	18.2%	17.9%
Agree	93	78	70	14	58	11	324
Row %	28.7%	24.1%	21.6%	4.3%	17.9%	3.4%	100%
Column %	37.8%	50%	45.5%	50%	52.3%	50%	45.2%
Strongly agree	109	40	27	6	30	7	219
Row %	49.8%	18.3%	12.3%	2.7%	13.7%	3.2%	100%
Column %	44.3%	25.6%	17.5%	21.4%	27%	31.8%	30.5%
Total	246	156	154	28	111	7	219
Row %	34.3%	21.8%	21.5%	3.9%	15.5%	3.2%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 11.4 in Table 7.31 referred to the extent to which radio listeners admire a radio announcer who is patient with listeners.

In this case, 75.7% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the content of the statement. The responses among the subgroups were as follows: African, 82.1%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 75.6%; White English-speaking, 63%; Coloured, 71.4%; Indian, 79.3%; 'Other', 81.8%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To measure whether 'Population Group' played a part in this second factor, the presence of saturation was tested for. In this regard ℓ^* was calculated at 60.26, which was significant ($\ell^* = 60.26 > \text{critical } X^2 = 37.566$ 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 7.32.

Table 7.32 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	ℓ	S_{ℓ}	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λ_{A_1}	-1.837470	0.291061	-6.313007	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{A_2}	-0.867950	0.225625	-3.846870	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{A_3}	0.441331	0.136915	3.223394	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{A_4}	1.417057	0.113070	12.532564	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{A_5}	0.847012	0.126736	6.683279	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_1}	1.049457	0.134153	7.822837	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_2}	0.644326	0.150969	4.267936	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_3}	0.364777	0.205337	1.776480	Insignificant
λ_{B_4}	-1.044290	0.270717	-3.857497	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_5}	0.128516	0.207820	0.618401	Insignificant
λ_{B_6}	-1.142790	0.274581	-4.161941	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_1B_1}$	0.108642	0.416596	0.260785	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_2}$	0.002949	0.481332	0.006127	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_3}$	-0.816120	0.719527	-1.134245	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_4}$	0.592953	0.740840	0.800379	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_5}$	-0.579850	0.720239	-0.805080	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_1B_6}$	0.691448	0.742260	0.931544	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_1}$	0.168743	0.297177	0.567820	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_2}$	0.237403	0.323323	0.734260	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_3}$	0.006126	0.388041	0.015787	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_4}$	-0.376570	0.717659	-0.524720	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_5}$	0.242387	0.389361	0.622525	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_2B_6}$	-0.278070	0.719125	-0.386678	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_1}$	-0.560720	0.208763	-2.685917	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_3B_2}$	-0.155590	0.219947	-0.707398	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_3}$	0.836911	0.244114	3.428361	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_3B_4}$	0.105914	0.386703	0.273890	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_5}$	-0.025440	0.276231	-0.092097	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_3B_6}$	-0.201060	0.430092	-0.467481	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_1}$	-0.222720	0.161003	-1.383328	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_2}$	0.006520	0.177606	0.036710	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_3}$	0.177855	0.226940	0.783709	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_4}$	-0.022510	0.324782	-0.069308	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_5}$	0.226064	0.231754	0.975448	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_4B_6}$	-0.165180	0.339679	-0.486283	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_1}$	0.506072	0.169020	2.994155	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda_{A_5B_2}$	-0.091260	0.199230	-0.458064	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_3}$	-0.204760	0.252744	-0.810148	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_4}$	-0.299770	0.383217	-0.782246	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_5}$	0.136863	0.251841	0.543450	Insignificant
$\lambda_{A_5B_6}$	-0.047120	0.373415	-0.126187	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, four significant deviations from the general trend were observed: among Africans, Afrikaans-speaking Whites, Coloureds and ‘Other’.

Three significant interaction effects A_iB_j occurred, in A_3B_1 , A_3B_3 and A_5B_1 respectively.

The frequency of African respondents in A₃B₁ (25 or 10.2% of this subgroup) who were neutral regarding the content of question 11.4 (ℓ/s equal to -2.69) was significantly lower than the group norm. With regard to A₃B₃, the frequency of English-speaking White respondents (51 or 33.1% in this subgroup) who were neutral towards the content of question 11.4 (ℓ/s equal to +3.43) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample. In the case of A₅B₁, the frequency of African respondents (109 or 44.3% of this subgroup) who strongly agreed with the content of question 11.4 (ℓ/s equal to +2.99) was significantly higher than the group norm.

Table 7.33 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 11.6**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	5	2	1	2	2	1	13
Row %	38.5%	15.4%	7.7%	15.4%	15.4%	7.7%	100%
Column %	2%	1.3%	.6%	7.1%	1.8%	4.5%	1.8%
Disagree	8	3	6	2	4	1	24
Row %	33.3%	12.5%	25%	8.3%	16.7%	4.2%	100%
Column %	3.1%	1.9%	3.9%	7.1%	3.5%	4.5%	3.3%
Neutral	31	17	28	2	8	6	92
Row %	33.7%	18.5%	30.4%	2.2%	8.7%	6.5%	100%
Column %	12.2%	10.7%	18.1%	7.1%	7.1%	27.3%	12.6%
Agree	95	80	84	9	67	9	344
Row %	27.6%	23.3%	24.4%	2.6%	19.5%	2.6%	100%
Column %	37.4%	50.3%	54.2%	32.1%	59.3%	40.9%	47.1%
Strongly agree	115	57	36	13	32	5	258
Row %	44.6%	22.1%	14%	5%	12.4%	1.9%	100%
Column %	45.3%	35.8%	23.2%	46.4%	28.3%	22.7%	35.3%
Total	254	159	155	28	113	22	731
Row %	34.7%	21.8%	21.2%	3.8%	15.5%	3%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 11.6 referenced in Table 7.33 referred to the extent to which a person admires a radio announcer who is polite when talking to the listeners.

In the case under consideration, 82.4% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the content of the statement. Subgroup comparisons were as follows: African, 82.7%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 86.1%; White English-speaking, 77.4%; Coloured, 78.5%; Indian, 87.6%; 'Other', 63.6%.

The data were further analysed with regard to the second main effect: a reflection of the respondents' population group. To measure whether 'Population Group' played a part in the cross-tabulation, a pretest of dependence or independence was done. In this regard ℓ^* was calculated at 25.73, which was not significant ($\ell^* = 25.73 < \text{critical } X^2 = 37.566$ with 20 degrees of freedom). The independent model of the hierarchical loglinear analysis applied in this instance. Further loglinear analysis of interaction in the cross-tabulation was not required. The main effects are reported in Table 7.34.

Table 7.34 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the independent model

Effect	ℓ	s_{ℓ}	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λA_1	-1.762018	0.332794	-5.294621	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2	-1.163114	0.259082	-4.489366	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_3	0.191395	0.160956	1.189114	Insignificant
λA_4	1.510695	0.124817	12.103279	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5	1.223043	0.129752	9.426005	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_1	1.069759	0.149341	7.163197	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.600004	0.169195	3.546228	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_3	0.580856	0.169656	3.423728	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_4	-1.137788	0.327270	-3.476603	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	0.259842	0.188143	1.381088	Insignificant
λB_6	-1.372673	0.363426	-3.777036	Significant at 0.1% level

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

Table 7.35 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 11.1**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	4	2	4	0	0	1	11
Row %	36.4%	18.2%	36.4%	0%	0%	9.1%	100%
Column %	1.6%	1.3%	2.6%	0%	0%	4.3%	1.5%
Disagree	9	3	1	1	3	1	18
Row %	50%	16.7%	5.6%	5.6%	16.7%	5.6%	100%
Column %	3.6%	1.9%	.6%	3.6%	2.7%	4.3%	2.5%
Neutral	36	14	9	5	3	2	69
Row %	52.2%	20.3%	13%	7.2%	4.3%	2.9%	100%
Column %	14.3%	8.8%	5.8%	17.9%	2.7%	8.7%	9.5%
Agree	122	88	83	15	75	13	396
Row %	30.8%	22.2%	21%	3.8%	18.9%	3.3%	100%
Column %	48.4%	55.3%	53.5%	53.6%	66.4%	56.5%	54.2%
Strongly agree	81	52	58	7	32	6	236
Row %	34.3%	22%	24.6%	3%	13.6%	2.5%	100%
Column %	32.1%	32.7%	37.4%	25%	28.3%	26.1%	32.3%
Total	252	159	155	28	113	23	730
Row %	34.5%	21.8%	21.2%	3.8%	15.5%	3.2%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 11.1 that pertained to Table 7.35 referred to a radio announcer having a good voice that makes listening to the radio a pleasant experience.

In this case, 86.5% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the content of the statement. Statistics for the subsamples were as follows: African, 80.5%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 88%; White English-speaking, 90.9%; Coloured, 78.6%; Indian, 94.7%; 'Other', 82.6%.

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, testing was done for the presence of saturation. In this regard ℓ^* was calculated at 7.44, which was not significant ($\ell^* = 7.44 < X^2 = 37.566$ with 20 degrees of freedom). The independent model of the hierarchical loglinear analysis applied in this instance. Further loglinear analysis of interaction in the cross-tabulation was not required. The main effects are presented in Table 7.36.

Table 7.36 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the independent model

Effect	ℓ	s_{ℓ}	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λ_{A_1}	-1.601254	0.333359	-4.803392	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{A_2}	-1.262563	0.285113	-4.428290	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{A_3}	0.075907	0.175585	0.432309	Insignificant
λ_{A_4}	1.823592	0.126472	14.418939	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{A_5}	1.303755	0.134689	9.679744	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_1}	1.051757	0.156577	6.717187	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_2}	0.591466	0.176924	3.343051	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_3}	0.565250	0.178488	3.166880	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_4}	-1.127220	0.343941	-3.277364	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_5}	0.263133	0.195826	1.343708	Insignificant
λ_{B_6}	-1.344386	0.376506	-3.570689	Significant at 0.1% level

Main effect A_i produced significant differences. In four of the five attitudinal categories – Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree and Strongly Agree – response patterns 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, five significant deviations from the general trend were observed: among Africans, Afrikaans-speaking Whites, English-speaking Whites, Coloureds and those classified as ‘Other’.

Table 7.37 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 11.2**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	27	7	6	1	6	3	50
Row %	54%	14%	12%	2%	12%	6%	100%
Column %	10.8%	4.4%	3.9%	3.6%	5.4%	13.6%	6.9%
Disagree	15	13	21	6	7	0	62
Row %	24.2%	21%	33.9%	9.7%	11.3%	0%	100%
Column %	6%	8.2%	13.5%	21.4%	6.3%	0%	8.6%
Neutral	26	24	30	4	17	7	108
Row %	24.1%	22.2%	27.8%	3.7%	15.7%	6.5%	100%
Column %	10.4%	15.1%	19.4%	14.3%	15.2%	31.8%	14.9%
Agree	72	60	43	7	36	2	220
Row %	32.7%	27.3%	19.5%	3.2%	16.4%	.9%	100%
Column %	28.9%	37.7%	27.7%	25%	32.1%	9.1%	30.3%
Strongly agree	109	55	55	10	46	10	285
Row %	38.2%	19.3%	19.3%	3.5%	16.1%	3.5%	100%
Column %	43.8%	34.6%	35.5%	35.7%	41.1%	45.5%	39.3%
Total	249	159	155	28	112	22	725
Row %	34.3%	21.9%	21.4%	3.9%	15.4%	3%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 11.2 in Table 7.37 referred to the radio listener who finds it difficult to tolerate any radio announcer who is rude.

In this case, 69.6% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Subgroup comparisons were as follows: African, 72.7%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 72.3%; White English-speaking, 63.2%; Coloured, 60.7%; Indian, 73.2%; 'Other', 54.6%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To measure the interactive part of the subcategories 'Population Group', the presence of saturation was determined. In this regard ℓ^* was calculated at 29.91, which was not significant ($\ell^* = 29.91 < \text{critical } X^2 = 37.566$ with 20 degrees of freedom). The independent model of the hierarchical loglinear analysis applied in this instance. Further loglinear analysis of interaction in the cross-tabulation was not required. The main effects are reported in Table 7.38.

Table 7.38 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the independent model

Effect	ℓ	s_ℓ	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λ_{A_1}	-0.848427	0.172657	-4.913945	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{A_2}	-0.611501	0.156055	-3.918497	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{A_3}	-0.071911	0.126665	-0.567726	Insignificant
λ_{A_4}	0.636583	0.100912	6.308298	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{A_5}	0.895256	0.094224	9.501358	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_1}	1.048032	0.092531	11.326280	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_2}	0.598317	0.104377	5.732269	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_3}	0.575371	0.105047	5.477272	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_4}	-1.137062	0.202528	-5.614345	Significant at 0.1% level
λ_{B_5}	0.248770	0.116500	2.135365	Insignificant
λ_{B_6}	-1.333429	0.220958	-6.034762	Significant at 0.1% level

Main effect A_i produced significant differences. In four of the five attitudinal categories – Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree and Strongly Agree – response distribution 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, five significant deviations from the general trend were observed: among Africans, Afrikaans-speaking Whites, English-speaking Whites, Coloureds and those classified as 'Other'.