Table 7.39 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal
categories and population groups for **question 11.8**

Scale Point	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	Total
Strongly disagree	6	1	1	2	1	2	13
Row %	46.2%	7.7%	7.7%	15.4%	7.7%	15.4%	100%
Column %	2.4%	.6%	.6%	7.1%	.9%	8.7%	1.8%
Disagree	22	17	20	5	7	4	75
Row %	29.3%	22.7%	26.7%	6.7%	9.3%	5.3%	100%
Column %	8.7%	10.8%	12.9%	17.9%	6.3%	17.4%	10.3%
Neutral	65	50	58	6	24	10	213
Row %	30.5%	23.5%	27.2%	2.8%	11.3%	4.7%	100%
Column %	25.8%	31.6%	37.4%	21.4%	21.4%	43.5%	29.3%
Agree	88	60	59	8	54	4	273
Row %	32.2%	22%	21.6%	2.9%	19.8%	1.5%	100%
Column %	34.9%	38%	38.1%	28.6%	48.2%	17.4%	37.5%
Strongly agree	71	30	17	7	26	3	154
Row %	46.1%	19.5%	11%	4.5%	16.9%	1.9%	100%
Column %	28.2%	19%	11%	25%	23.2%	13%	21.2%
Total	252	158	155	28	112	23	728
Row %	34.6%	21.7%	21.3%	3.8%	15.4%	3.2%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

The response to question 11.8 presented in Table 7.39 referred to the listener who wants to feel that the radio announcer is talking to him or her during the broadcast.

In this case, 58.7% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement in the questionnaire. Statistics for the subsamples were as follows: African, 63.1%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 57%; White English-speaking, 49.1%; Coloured, 53.6%; Indian, 71.4%; 'Other', 30.4%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To measure whether 'Population Group' played a part in this second factor, testing was done for the presence of saturation. In this regard $\ell*$ was calculated at 32.39, which was insignificant ($\ell* = 32.39 <$ 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 presented in Table 7.40.

Table 7.40 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	-2.016673	0.328513	-6.138792	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2	-0.257115	0.160702	-1.599949	Insignificant
λA_3	0.783017	0.122316	6.401591	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4	1.031186	0.116814	8.827589	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5	0.459587	0.131257	3.501428	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_1	1.059498	0.130671	8.108134	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.591141	0.148203	3.988725	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_3	0.576218	0.148421	3.882321	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_4	-1.137439	0.286041	-3.976489	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	0.247969	0.164937	1.503416	Insignificant
λB_6	-1.337388	0.315087	-4.244504	Significant at 0.1% level

Main effect A_i produced significant differences. In four of the five attitudinal categories – 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 those classified as 'Other'.

7.4.1.3 Duty of Public Broadcaster

The third factor involved three questions from the questionnaire.

Table 7.41 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 11.15**

| Scale Point | Population Group | | | | | | Total |
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	5	7	11	2	6	1	32
Row %	15.6%	21.9%	34.4%	6.3%	18.8%	3.1%	100%
Column %	2%	4.4%	7.2%	7.1%	5.3%	4.3%	4.4%
Disagree	15	22	37	2	9	4	89
Row %	16.9%	24.7%	41.6%	2.2%	10.1%	4.5%	100%
Column %	6%	13.9%	24.2%	7.1%	8%	17.4%	12.2%
Neutral	46	44	27	4	22	4	147
Row %	31.3%	29.9%	18.4%	2.7%	15%	2.7%	100%
Column %	18.3%	27.8%	17.6%	14.3%	19.5%	17.4%	20.2%
Agree	92	61	52	9	40	5	259
Row %	35.5%	23.6%	20.1%	3.5%	15.4%	1.9%	100%
Column %	36.5%	38.6%	34%	32.1%	35.4%	21.7%	35.6%
Strongly agree	94	24	26	11	36	9	200
Row %	47%	12%	13%	5.5%	18%	4.5%	100%
Column %	37.3%	15.2%	17%	39.3%	31.9%	39.1%	27.5%
Total	252	158	153	28	113	23	727
Row %	34.7%	21.7%	21%	3.9%	15.5%	3.2%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 11.15 that pertained to Table 7.41 referred to the notion that it is the duty of every radio station to broadcast programmes that could mould listeners to be responsible citizens.

In this case, 63.1% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. The responses among the subgroups were as follows: African, 73.8%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 53.8%; White English-speaking, 51%; Coloured, 71.4%; Indian, 67.3%; 'Other', 60.8%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To measure whether 'Population Group' played a part in this factor, the normal testing for saturation was done. In this regard $\ell*$ was calculated at 56.63 which was significant ($\ell* = 56.63 >$ 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 consequent results are reported in Table 7.42.

Table 7.42 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	-1.198130	0.199826	-5.995866	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2	-0.323380	0.146949	-2.200627	Insignificant
λA_3	0.190894	0.123986	1.539642	Insignificant
λA_4	0.742086	0.106301	6.980988	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5	0.588525	0.101321	5.808519	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_1	0.837754	0.114837	7.295157	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.617525	0.109996	5.614068	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_3	0.698309	0.102928	6.784442	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_4	-1.130950	0.208911	-5.413549	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	0.265996	0.122270	2.175480	Insignificant
λB_6	-1.288640	0.230693	-5.585952	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_1B_1	-0.634670	0.358043	-1.772608	Insignificant
λA_1B_2	-0.077970	0.322876	-0.241486	Insignificant
λA_1B_3	0.293228	0.286295	1.024216	Insignificant
λA_1B_4	0.417736	0.527874	0.791356	Insignificant
λA_1B_5	0.119405	0.341502	0.349647	Insignificant
λA_1B_6	-0.117720	0.698732	-0.168477	Insignificant
λA_2B_1	-0.410820	0.237750	-1.727950	Insignificant
λA_2B_2	0.192405	0.216684	0.887952	Insignificant
λA_2B_3	0.631496	0.195131	3.236267	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2B_4	-0.457020	0.510210	-0.895749	Insignificant
λA_2B_5	-0.349880	0.275800	-1.268600	Insignificant
λA_2B_6	0.393821	0.412178	0.955463	Insignificant
λA_3B_1	0.195504	0.179812	1.087269	Insignificant
λA_3B_2	0.371281	0.177874	2.087326	Insignificant
λA_3B_3	-0.197860	0.189363	-1.044871	Insignificant
λA_3B_4	-0.278140	0.392547	-0.708552	Insignificant
λA_3B_5	0.029663	0.208761	0.142091	Insignificant
λA_3B_6	-0.120450	0.404560	-0.297731	Insignificant
λA_4B_1	0.337460	0.154635	2.182300	Insignificant
λA_4B_2	0.146774	0.158219	0.927664	Insignificant
λA_4B_3	-0.093640	0.157045	-0.596262	Insignificant
λA_4B_4	-0.018400	0.307351	-0.059866	Insignificant
λA_4B_5	0.076309	0.176994	0.431139	Insignificant
λA_4B_6	-0.448500	0.373626	-1.200398	Insignificant
λA_5B_1	0.512527	0.150949	3.395365	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5B_2	-0.632490	0.184685	-3.424696	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5B_3	-0.633230	0.176979	-3.577995	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5B_4	0.335828	0.292147	1.149517	Insignificant
λA_5B_5	0.124509	0.177212	0.702599	Insignificant
λA_5B_6	0.292850	0.320946	0.912459	Insignificant

Main effect A_i produced significant differences. In three of the five attitudinal categories – Strongly Disagree, Agree and Strongly Agree – the observed frequencies differed significantly from the respective group norms. The exceptions were categories Disagree and Neutral. Regarding 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, namely, in A_2B_3, A_5B_1, A_5B_2 and A_5B_3 respectively. The frequency of English-speaking White respondents in A_2B_3 (37 or 24.2% of this subgroup) who disagreed with the content of question 11.15 (ℓ/s equal to +3.24) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample. In the case of A_5B_1, the frequency of African respondents (94 or 37.3% of this subgroup) who strongly agreed with the content of question 11.15 (ℓ/s equal to +3.40) also significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample.

Regarding A_5B_2, the frequency of Afrikaans-speaking White respondents (24 or 15.2% of this subgroup) who strongly agreed with the content of question 11.15 (ℓ/s equal to –3.43) was significantly lower than the group norm. Similarly, in the case A_5B_3 the frequency of English-speaking White respondents (26 or 17% of this subgroup) who strongly agreed with the content of question 11.15 (ℓ/s equal to -3.18) was significantly lower than the group norm.

Table 7.43 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 11.16**

Scale Point	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	Total
Population Group							
Strongly disagree	10	4	9	1	5	1	30
Row %	33.3%	13.3%	30%	3.3%	16.7%	3.3%	100%
Column %	4%	2.5%	5.9%	3.6%	4.5%	4.5%	4.1%
Disagree	11	13	24	3	6	3	60
Row %	18.3%	21.7%	40%	5%	10%	5%	100%
Column %	4.4%	8.2%	15.7%	10.7%	5.4%	13.6%	8.3%
Neutral	58	44	32	5	15	5	159
Row %	36.5%	27.7%	20.1%	3.1%	9.4%	3.1%	100%
Column %	23%	27.7%	20.9%	17.9%	13.5%	22.7%	21.9%
Agree	93	65	60	7	51	8	284
Row %	32.7%	22.9%	21.1%	2.5%	18%	2.8%	100%
Column %	36.9%	40.9%	39.2%	25%	45.9%	36.4%	39.2%
Strongly agree	80	33	28	12	34	5	192
Row %	41.7%	17.2%	14.6%	6.3%	17.7%	2.6%	100%
Column %	31.7%	20.8%	18.3%	42.9%	30.6%	22.7%	26.5%
Total	252	159	153	28	111	22	725
Row %	34.8%	21.9%	21.1%	3.9%	15.3%	3%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

In Table 7.43 question 11.16 was addressed. It referred to the notion that it is the responsibility of any radio station in the country to promote good societal values, which are the foundation of every nation.

In this case, 65.7% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the content of the statement. Statistics for the subsamples were as follows: African, 68.6%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 61.7%; White English-speaking, 57.5%; Coloured, 67.9%; Indian, 76.5%; 'Other', 59.1%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To measure whether 'Population Group' played a part in this factor, the usual preceding test was done. In this regard $\ell*$ was calculated at 30.29, which was not significant ($\ell* = 30.29 <$ 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 presented in Table 7.44.

Table 7.44 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	-1.289330	0.220003	-5.860051	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2	-0.601159	0.165188	-3.639241	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_3	0.373124	0.117314	3.180558	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4	0.955120	0.100738	9.481229	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5	0.562245	0.111118	5.059891	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_1	1.069253	0.102905	10.390681	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.610286	0.116118	5.255740	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_3	0.570061	0.117589	4.847911	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_4	-1.123491	0.223189	-5.033810	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	0.249828	0.130040	1.921163	Insignificant
λB_6	-1.375938	0.251587	-5.469035	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'.

Table 7.45 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal
categories and population groups for **question 11.14**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	7	11	9	2	4	3	36
Row %	19.4%	30.6%	25%	5.6%	11.1%	8.3%	100%
Column %	2.8%	7.1%	5.9%	7.1%	3.5%	13%	5%
Disagree	21	25	39	3	9	3	100
Row %	21%	25%	39%	3%	9%	3%	100%
Column %	8.3%	16%	25.5%	10.7%	8%	13%	13.8%
Neutral	58	44	27	8	20	5	162
Row %	35.8%	27.2%	16.7%	4.9%	12.3%	3.1%	100%
Column %	22.9%	28.2%	17.6%	28.6%	17.7%	21.7%	22.3%
Agree	85	53	50	5	46	6	245
Row %	34.7%	21.6%	20.4%	2%	18.8%	2.4%	100%
Column %	33.6%	34%	32.7%	17.9%	40.7%	26.1%	33.7%
Strongly agree	82	23	28	10	34	6	183
Row %	44.8%	12.6%	15.3%	5.5%	18.6%	3.3%	100%
Column %	32.4%	14.7%	18.3%	35.7%	30.1%	26.1%	25.2%
Total	253	156	153	28	113	23	726
Row %	34.8%	21.5%	21.1%	3.9%	15.6%	3.2%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 11.14 in Table 7.45 referred to the notion that it is the duty of every radio station to broadcast programmes that teach the country's citizens to behave in a way that is socially acceptable.

In the case of this variable, 58.9% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement in the questionnaire. Subgroup comparisons were as follows: African, 66%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 48.7%; White English-speaking, 51%; Coloured, 53.6%; Indian, 70.8%; 'Other', 52.2%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To measure whether 'Population Group' played a part in this factor, testing for the presence of saturation was done. In this regard $\ell*$ was calculated at 45.88, which was significant ($\ell* = 45.88 >$ 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 7.46.

Table 7.46 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 A₁	-1.044000	0.166736	-6.261395	Significant at 0.1% level
λ A₂	-0.276950	0.137289	-2.017277	Insignificant
λ A₃	0.306997	0.107382	2.858924	Significant at 0.1% level
λ A₄	0.595284	0.106371	5.596300	Significant at 0.1% level
λ A₅	0.418671	0.102251	4.094542	Significant at 0.1% level
λ B₁	0.916199	0.100874	9.082608	Significant at 0.1% level
λ B₂	0.637499	0.098778	6.453856	Significant at 0.1% level
λ B₃	0.616320	0.100586	6.127294	Significant at 0.1% level
λ B₄	-1.107210	0.193786	-5.713571	Significant at 0.1% level
λ B₅	-1.123001	0.127767	-8.789445	Significant at 0.1% level
λ B₆	-1.185810	0.189730	-6.249987	Significant at 0.1% level
λ A₁B₁	-0.590140	0.301864	-1.954986	Insignificant
λ A₁B₂	0.140549	0.264432	0.531513	Insignificant
λ A₁B₃	-0.038940	0.279938	-0.139102	Insignificant
λ A₁B₄	0.180505	0.511230	0.353080	Insignificant
λ A₁B₅	-0.356550	0.374337	-0.952484	Insignificant
λ A₁B₆	0.664579	0.439471	1.512225	Insignificant
λ A₂B₁	-0.258580	0.209938	-1.231697	Insignificant
λ A₂B₂	0.194475	0.201513	0.965074	Insignificant
λ A₂B₃	0.660340	0.187682	3.518398	Significant at 0.1% level
λ A₂B₄	-0.181080	0.430972	-0.420167	Insignificant
λ A₂B₅	-0.312680	0.274990	-1.137060	Insignificant
λ A₂B₆	-0.102480	0.429164	-0.238790	Insignificant
λ A₃B₁	0.173397	0.156862	1.105411	Insignificant
λ A₃B₂	0.175844	0.162423	1.082630	Insignificant
λ A₃B₃	-0.291330	0.180183	-1.616856	Insignificant
λ A₃B₄	0.215800	0.308361	0.699829	Insignificant
λ A₃B₅	-0.098120	0.209423	-0.468525	Insignificant
λ A₃B₆	-0.175590	0.351470	-0.499587	Insignificant
λ A₄B₁	0.267318	0.148992	1.794177	Insignificant
λ A₄B₂	0.073659	0.156912	0.469429	Insignificant
λ A₄B₃	0.036569	0.159483	0.229297	Insignificant
λ A₄B₄	-0.542490	0.353370	-1.535190	Insignificant
λ A₄B₅	0.446506	0.179826	2.482989	Insignificant
λ A₄B₆	-0.281560	0.331635	-0.849006	Insignificant
λ A₅B₁	0.408000	0.146668	2.781793	Significant at 0.1% level
λ A₅B₂	-0.584530	0.183320	-3.188577	Significant at 0.1% level
λ A₅B₃	-0.366640	0.175673	-2.087059	Insignificant
λ A₅B₄	0.327270	0.289846	1.129117	Insignificant
λ A₅B₅	0.320839	0.185868	1.726166	Insignificant
λ A₅B₆	-0.104950	0.330336	-0.317707	Insignificant

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

Three significant interaction effects A_iB_j occurred, namely in A_2B_3, A_5B_1 and A_5B_2 respectively. The frequency of English-speaking White respondents in A_2B_3 (39 or 25.5% of this subgroup) who disagreed with the content of question 11.14 (ℓ/s equal to +3.52) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample. Regarding A_5B_1, the frequency of African respondents (82 or 32.4% in this subgroup) who strongly agreed with the content of question 11.14 (ℓ/s equal to +2.78) was significantly higher than the group norm. In the case of A_5B_2, the frequency of Afrikaans-speaking White respondents (23 or 14.7% of this subgroup) who strongly agreed with the content of question 11.14 (ℓ/s equal to -3.19) was significantly lower that the group norm.

7.4.1.4 Over–and/or Underselling by Announcers

The fourth factor consisted of the responses to five questions from the questionnaire, with question 11.11 as the first contributor.

Table 7.47 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 11.11**

| Scale Point | Population Group | | | | | | Total |
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	15	4	0	2	5	1	27
Row %	55.6%	14.8%	0%	7.4%	18.5%	3.7%	100%
Column %	6.2%	2.5%	0%	7.1%	4.5%	4.5%	3.8%
Disagree	30	20	16	4	10	1	81
Row %	37%	24.7%	19.8%	4.9%	12.3%	1.2%	100%
Column %	12.3%	12.7%	10.3%	14.3%	8.9%	4.5%	11.3%
Neutral	95	36	41	5	24	12	213
Row %	44.6%	16.9%	19.2%	2.3%	11.3%	5.6%	100%
Column %	39.1%	22.9%	26.5%	17.9%	21.4%	54.5%	29.7%
Agree	74	63	63	12	48	7	267
Row %	27.7%	23.6%	23.6%	4.5%	18%	2.6%	100%
Column %	30.5%	40.1%	40.6%	42.9%	42.9%	31.8%	37.2%
Strongly agree	29	34	35	5	25	1	129
Row %	22.5%	26.4%	27.1%	3.9%	19.4%	.8%	100%
Column %	11.9%	21.7%	22.6%	17.9%	22.3%	4.5%	18%
Total	243	157	155	28	112	22	717
Row %	33.9%	21.9%	21.6%	3.9%	15.6%	3.1%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 11.11 referred to in Table 7.47 was aimed at the radio listener who cannot stand a radio announcer who sensationalises issues on radio.

In the case of this variable, 55.2% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the

content of the statement. The responses among the subgroups were as follows: African, 42.4%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 61.8%; White English-speaking, 63.2%; Coloured, 60.8%; Indian, 65.2%; 'Other', 36.3%.

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 53.17, which was significant ($\ell* = 53.17 >$ 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 did not produce any significant difference, contrary to general expectations. Three borderline interactions (nevertheless insignificant) were present. The findings of the main effect were duly reported, as set out Table 7.48.

Table 7.48 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	-1.418790	0.239849	-5.915347	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2	-0.341879	0.179389	-1.905797	Insignificant
λA_3	0.702283	0.117096	5.997498	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4	0.997114	0.110097	9.056686	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5	0.061275	0.171632	0.357014	Insignificant
λB_1	1.181952	0.107132	11.032670	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.642063	0.131142	4.895937	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_3	0.351983	0.193440	1.819598	Insignificant
λB_4	-0.928301	0.200347	-4.633466	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	0.351085	0.134102	2.618044	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_6	-1.598782	0.305421	-5.234683	Significant at 0.1% level

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

Table 7.49 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal
categories and population groups for **question 11.17**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	51	11	12	3	10	2	89
Row %	57.3%	12.4%	13.5%	3.4%	11.2%	2.2%	100%
Column %	20.2%	6.9%	7.8%	10.7%	9%	9.1%	12.3%
Disagree	60	22	30	7	14	6	139
Row %	43.2%	15.8%	21.6%	5%	10.1%	4.3%	100%
Column %	23.8%	13.8%	19.5%	25%	12.6%	27.3%	19.1%
Neutral	66	26	48	10	30	7	187
Row %	35.3%	13.9%	25.7%	5.3%	16%	3.7%	100%
Column %	26.2%	16.4%	31.2%	35.7%	27%	31.8%	25.8%
Agree	47	53	39	7	42	3	191
Row %	24.6%	27.7%	20.4%	3.7%	22%	1.6%11	100%
Column %	18.7%	33.3%	25.3%	25%	37.8%	3.6%	26.3%
Strongly agree	28	47	25	1	15	4	120
Row %	23.3%	39.2%	20.8%	.8%	12.5%	3.3%	100%
Column %	11.1%	29.6%	16.2%	3.6%	13.5%	18.2%	16.5%
Total	252	159	154	28	111	22	726
Row %	34.7%	21.9%	21.2%	3.9%	15.3%	3%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

In Table 7.49 question 11.17 was addressed. It referred to too much open sex talk on radio that would put most listeners off.

In this case, 42.8% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Statistics for the subsamples were as follows: African, 29.8%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 62.9%; White English-speaking, 41.5%; Coloured, 28.6%; Indian, 51.3%; 'Other', 21.8%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To determine whether 'Population Group' played a part in this factor, testing for saturation was next done. In this regard $\ell*$ was calculated at 64.72, which was significant ($\ell* = 64.72 >$ 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 7.50.

Table 7.50 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	ℓ	S_ℓ	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λA_1	-0.568590	0.152175	-3.736422	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2	0.107129	0.110954	0.965526	Insignificant
λA_3	0.441351	0.101068	4.366872	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4	0.324276	0.117476	2.760360	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5	-0.304160	0.167128	-1.819922	Insignificant
λB_1	1.159546	0.085217	13.606980	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.593405	0.100515	5.903646	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_3	0.607859	0.098934	6.144086	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_4	-1.261490	0.224080	-5.629641	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	0.237622	0.110652	2.147471	Insignificant
λB_6	-1.336950	0.203749	-6.561750	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_1B_1	0.620785	0.184096	3.372072	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_1B_2	-0.347010	0.255447	-1.358442	Insignificant
λA_1B_3	-0.274450	0.248812	-1.103042	Insignificant
λA_1B_4	0.208603	0.449813	0.463755	Insignificant
λA_1B_5	-0.086530	0.266515	-0.324672	Insignificant
λA_1B_6	-0.121400	0.510196	-0.237948	Insignificant
λA_2B_1	0.107581	0.147881	0.727484	Insignificant
λA_2B_2	-0.329580	0.190329	-1.731633	Insignificant
λA_2B_3	-0.033880	0.176242	-0.192236	Insignificant
λA_2B_4	0.380178	0.339551	1.119649	Insignificant
λA_2B_5	-0.425780	0.220806	-1.928299	Insignificant
λA_2B_6	0.301486	0.340764	0.884735	Insignificant
λA_3B_1	-0.131330	0.138443	-0.948621	Insignificant
λA_3B_2	-0.496750	0.177008	-2.806370	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_3B_3	0.101901	0.154807	0.658245	Insignificant
λA_3B_4	0.402630	0.309929	1.299104	Insignificant
λA_3B_5	0.002135	0.177260	0.012044	Insignificant
λA_3B_6	0.121414	0.323265	0.375587	Insignificant
λA_4B_1	-0.353760	0.158752	-2.228381	Insignificant
λA_4B_2	0.332521	0.164561	2.020655	Insignificant
λA_4B_3	0.011337	0.171680	0.066036	Insignificant
λA_4B_4	0.163031	0.341738	0.477064	Insignificant
λA_4B_5	0.455682	0.176628	2.579897	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4B_6	-0.608810	0.429275	-1.418228	Insignificant
λA_5B_1	-0.243270	0.212388	-1.145404	Insignificant
λA_5B_2	0.840814	0.205365	4.094242	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5B_3	0.195088	0.222146	0.878197	Insignificant
λA_5B_4	-1.154440	0.688312	-1.677205	Insignificant
λA_5B_5	0.054499	0.249943	0.218046	Insignificant
λA_5B_6	0.307311	0.406294	0.756376	Insignificant

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

Four significant interaction effects A_iB_j occurred, in A_1B_1, A_3B_2, A_4B_5 and A_5B_2 respectively. The frequency of African respondents in A_1B_1 (51 or 20.2% of this subgroup) who strongly disagreed with the content of question 11.17 (ℓ/s equal to +3.37) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample. In the case of Afrikaans-speaking Whites in A_3B_2, the frequency of those who were neutral with regard to the content of question 11.17 (26 or 16.4% of this subgroup) was significantly lower than the group norm (ℓ/s equal to -2.81).

With regard to Indians in A_4B_5, the frequency of those who agreed with the content of question 11.17 (42 or 37.8% of this subgroup) was significantly higher than the group norm (ℓ/s equal to +2.58). The frequency of Afrikaans-speaking White respondents in A_5B_2 (47 or 29.6% of this subgroup) who strongly agreed with the content of question 11.17 (ℓ/s equal to +4.09) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample.

Table 7.51 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 11.5**

Scale Point	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	Total
Population Group							
Strongly disagree	26	6	0	2	3	3	40
Row %	65%	15%	0%	5%	7.5%	7.5%	100%
Column %	10.2%	3.8%	0%	7.1%	2.7%	13%	5.5%
Disagree	18	4	2	1	4	1	30
Row %	60%	13.3%	6.7%	3.3%	13.3%	3.3%	100%
Column %	7.1%	2.5%	1.3%	3.6%	3.6%	4.3%	4.1%
Neutral	13	5	6	6	5	1	36
Row %	36.1%	13.9%	16.7%	16.7%	13.9%	2.8%	100%
Column %	5.1%	3.1%	3.9%	21.4%	4.5%	4.3%	4.9%
Agree	80	42	45	7	39	6	219
Row %	36.5%	19.2%	20.5%	3.2%	17.8%	2.7%	100%
Column %	31.5%	26.4%	29.2%	25%	34.8%	26.1%	30%
Strongly agree	117	102	101	12	61	12	405
Row %	28.9%	25.2%	24.9%	3%	15.1%	3%	100%
Column %	46.1%	64.2%	65.6%	42.9%	54.5%	52.2%	55.5%
Total	254	159	154	28	112	23	730
Row %	34.8%	21.8%	21.1%	3.8%	15.3%	3.2%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 11.5 in Table 7.51 referred to the notion that it was a waste of time to listen to a radio announcer who did not know what he or she was talking about.

In this case, 85.5% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the content of the statement. Compared with the general norm, the subsamples responded as follows: African, 77.6%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 90.6%; White English-speaking, 94.8%; Coloured, 67.9%; Indian, 89.3%; 'Other', 78.3%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To measure whether 'Population Group' played a part in this dimension, the presence of saturation was tested for. In this regard $\ell*$ was calculated at 33.44, which was insignificant ($\ell* = 33.44 <$ 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 presented in Table 7.52.

Table 7.52 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the independent model

Effect	ℓ	s_ℓ	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λA_1	-0.708719	0.195853	-3.618627	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2	-1.008091	0.220012	-4.581982	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_3	-0.830238	0.204803	4.053837	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4	0.966098	0.115700	8.350026	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5	1.580948	0.103671	15.249665	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_1	1.060930	0.120947	8.771859	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.593123	0.137097	4.326302	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_3	0.567872	0.138079	4.112660	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_4	-1.138584	0.265337	-4.291086	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	0.243453	0.153133	1.589814	Insignificant
λB_6	-1.326794	0.287959	-4.607580	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'.

Table 7.53 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal
categories and population groups for **question 11.10**

Scale Point	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	Total
			Population Group				
Strongly disagree	9	3	1	1	2	1	17
Row %	52.9%	17.6%	5.9%	5.9%	11.8%	5.9%	100%
Column %	3.5%	1.9%	.6%	3.6%	1.8%	4.3%	2.3%
Disagree	18	10	10	2	5	4	49
Row %	36.7%	20.4%	20.4%	4.1%	10.2%	8.2%	100%
Column %	7.1%	6.3%	6.5%	7.1%	4.5%	17.4%	6.7%
Neutral	42	30	45	5	9	7	138
Row %	30.4%	21.7%	32.6%	3.6%	6.5%	5.1%	100%
Column %	16.5%	19%	29%	17.9%	8%	30.4%	18.9%
Agree	91	71	62	14	65	5	308
Row %	29.5%	23.1%	20.1%	4.5%	21.1%	1.6%	100%
Column %	35.8%	44.9%	40%	50%	58%	21.7%	42.2%
Strongly agree	94	44	37	6	31	6	218
Row %	43.1%	20.2%	17%	2.8%	14.2%	2.8%	100%
Column %	37%	27.8%	23.9%	21.4%	27.7%	26.1%	29.9%
Total	254	158	155	28	112	23	730
Row %	34.8%	21.6%	21.2%	3.8%	3.8%	3.2%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

The response to question 11.10 presented in Table 7.53 referred to a good radio announcer as someone who does not talk a lot about himself or herself on air.

In this case, 72.4% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the content of the statement. The responses among the subgroups were as follows: African, 72.8%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 72.7%; White English-speaking, 63.9%; Coloured, 71.4%; Indian, 85.7%; 'Other', 47.8%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To measure whether 'Population Group' played a part in this factor, testing for saturation was performed. In this regard $\ell*$ was calculated at 26.20, which was not significant ($\ell* = 26.20 <$ 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 7.54.

Table 7.54 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	-1.719495	0.289103	-5.947690	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2	-0.664797	0.185281	-3.588047	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_3	0.373349	0.131715	2.834522	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4	1.177547	0.110506	10.655955	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5	0.833398	0.117897	7.068865	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_1	1.065549	0.123744	8.610914	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.593182	0.140172	4.231815	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_3	0.572052	0.141187	4.051733	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_4	-1.121303	0.265828	-4.218152	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	0.246750	0.156526	1.576415	Insignificant
λB_6	-1.356230	0.303307	-4.471476	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 7.55 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 11.18**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	32	4	8	3	9	1	57
Row %	56.1%	7%	14%	5.3%	15.8%	1.8%	100%
Column %	12.7%	2.5%	5.3%	10.7%	8%	4.8%	7.9%
Disagree	52	20	44	10	27	7	160
Row %	32.5%	12.5%	27.5%	6.3%	16.9%	4.4%	100%
Column %	20.6%	12.7%	29.1%	35.7%	24.1%	33.3%	22.2%
Neutral	86	28	41	7	31	5	198
Row %	43.4%	14.1%	20.7%	3.5%	15.7%	2.5%	100%
Column %	34.1%	17.7%	27.2%	25%	27.7%	23.8%	27.4%
Agree	51	67	45	6	31	6	206
Row %	24.8%	32.5%	21.8%	2.9%	15%	2.9%	100%
Column %	20.2%	42.4%	29.8%	21.4%	27.7%	28.6%	28.5%
Strongly agree	31	39	13	2	14	2	101
Row %	30.7%	38.6%	12.9%	2%	13.9%	2%	100%
Column %	12.3%	24.7%	8.6%	7.1%	12.5%	9.5%	14%
Total	252	158	151	28	112	21	722
Row %	34.9%	21.9%	20.9%	3.9%	15.5%	2.9%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 11.18 that pertained to Table 7.55 referred to the broadcasting of issues or topics

on radio that are emotionally draining, such as violence and killings, that make radio listening an unpleasant experience.

In the case of this variable 42.5% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Compared with the general norm, the subsamples responded as follows: Africans, 32.5%; Afrikaans-speaking Whites, 67.1%; English-speaking Whites, 38.4%; Coloureds, 28.5%; Indians, 40.2%; 'Other', 38.1%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To measure whether 'Population Group' played a part in this factor, testing for saturation was done. In this regard $\ell*$ was calculated at 69.37, which was significant ($\ell* = 69.37 >$ 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 7.56.

Table 7.56 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	ℓ	S_ℓ	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λA_1	-0.950140	0.188734	-5.034281	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2	0.391223	0.104752	3.638607	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_3	0.426884	0.110558	3.861177	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4	0.505421	0.108695	4.649901	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5	-0.373380	0.157733	-2.367165	Insignificant
λB_1	1.192735	0.088402	13.492172	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.461804	0.121695	3.794766	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_3	0.535070	0.109587	4.882605	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_4	-1.088290	0.194726	-5.588827	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	0.345325	0.111137	3.107201	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_6	-1.446640	0.241584	-5.988145	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_1B_1	0.568449	0.226185	2.513204	Insignificant
λA_1B_2	-0.780060	0.381647	-2.043931	Insignificant
λA_1B_3	-0.160180	0.304720	-0.525663	Insignificant
λA_1B_4	0.482351	0.449552	1.072959	Insignificant
λA_1B_5	0.147347	0.296042	0.497723	Insignificant
λA_1B_6	-0.257910	0.699434	-0.368741	Insignificant
λA_2B_1	-0.287410	0.147325	-1.950857	Insignificant
λA_2B_2	-0.511990	0.202502	-2.528321	Insignificant
λA_2B_3	0.203203	0.165220	1.229893	Insignificant
λA_2B_4	0.344959	0.290027	1.189403	Insignificant
λA_2B_5	-0.095410	0.182657	-0.522345	Insignificant
λA_2B_6	0.346636	0.348860	0.993625	Insignificant
λA_3B_1	0.180036	0.141115	1.275811	Insignificant
λA_3B_2	-0.211180	0.191162	-1.104717	Insignificant
λA_3B_3	0.096926	0.170917	0.567094	Insignificant
λA_3B_4	-0.047380	0.320170	-0.147984	Insignificant
λA_3B_5	0.007085	0.180837	0.039179	Insignificant
λA_3B_6	-0.025500	0.381851	-0.066780	Insignificant

Table 7.56 (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
$\lambda\, A_4B_1$	-0.421020	0.150656	-2.794578	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda\, A_4B_2$	0.582774	0.166790	3.494058	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda\, A_4B_3$	0.111478	0.167144	0.666958	Insignificant
$\lambda\, A_4B_4$	-0.280070	0.334102	-0.838277	Insignificant
$\lambda\, A_4B_5$	-0.071450	0.179704	-0.397598	Insignificant
$\lambda\, A_4B_6$	0.078287	0.363412	0.215422	Insignificant
$\lambda\, A_5B_1$	-0.040060	-0.202045	-0.198273	Insignificant
$\lambda\, A_5B_2$	0.920449	0.212533	4.330852	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda\, A_5B_3$	-0.251430	0.250764	-1.002656	Insignificant
$\lambda\, A_5B_4$	-0.499870	0.507959	-0.984075	Insignificant
$\lambda\, A_5B_5$	0.012423	0.247036	0.050288	Insignificant
$\lambda\, A_5B_6$	-0.141520	0.527700	-0.268183	Insignificant

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

Three significant interaction effects A_iB_j occurred with respect to question 11.18, in A_4B_1, A_4B_2 and A_5B_2 respectively. The frequency of African respondents in A_4B_1 (51 or 20.2% of this subgroup) who agreed with the content of question 11.18 (ℓ/s equal to -2.80) was significantly lower than the group norm. Regarding Afrikaans-speaking Whites in A_4B_2 (67 or 42.4% of this subgroup), the frequency of those who agreed with the content of question 11.18 (ℓ/s equal to +3.49) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample. Again, in the case of Afrikaans-speaking White respondents in A_5B_2 (39 or 24.7% of this subgroup), the frequency of those who strongly agreed with the content of question 11.18 (ℓ/s equal to +4.33) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample.

7.4.1.5 Programme Relevance to Needs and Tastes of Listeners

Two questions were interrelated with factor V.

Table 7.57 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal
categories and population groups for **question 11.21**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	41	3	12	5	17	2	80
Row %	51.3%	3.8%	15%	6.3%	21.3%	2.5%	100%
Column %	16.3%	1.9%	7.9%	18.5%	15.2%	9.1%	11.1%
Disagree	53	20	26	7	23	7	136
Row %	39%	14.7%	19.1%	5.1%	16.9%	5.1%	100%
Column %	21.1%	12.8%	17.1%	25.9%	20.5%	31.8%	18.9%
Neutral	60	48	49	8	34	6	205
Row %	29.3%	23.4%	23.9%	3.9%	16.6%	2.9%	100%
Column %	23.9%	30.8%	32.2%	29.6%	30.4%	27.3%	28.5%
Agree	62	63	51	4	27	6	213
Row %	29.1%	29.6%	23.9%	1.9%	12.7%	2.8%	100%
Column %	24.7%	40.4%	33.6%	14.8%	24.1%	27.3%	29.6%
Strongly agree	35	22	14	3	11	1	86
Row %	40.7%	25.6%	16.3%	3.5 %	12.8%	1.2%	100%
Column %	13.9%	14.1%	9.2%	11.1%	9.8%	4.5%	11.9%
Total	251	156	152	27	112	22	720
Row %	34.9%	21.7%	21.1%	3.8%	15.6%	3.1%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 11.21 referred to in Table 7.57 was aimed at the radio announcer who is perceived to be 'too white' and would have difficulty attracting black and white listeners.

In this case, 41.5% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the content of the statement. Statistics for the subsamples were as follows: African, 38.6%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 54.5%; White English-speaking, 42.8%; Coloured, 25.9%; Indian, 33.9%; 'Other', 31.8%.

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 adjudged. In this regard $\ell*$ was calculated at 53.96, which was significant ($\ell* = 53.96$ > critical $X^2 = 37.566$ with 20 degrees of freedom). The saturated model of the hierarchical loglinear analysis applied in this instance. Further loglinear analysis of the cross-tabulation was required and the results are contained in Table 7.58.

Table 7.58 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	ℓ	S_ℓ	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λA_1	-0.607760	0.156662	-3.879435	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2	0.195333	0.108721	1.796645	Insignificant
λA_3	0.529249	0.104218	5.078288	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4	0.432758	0.113872	3.800390	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5	-0.549580	0.175233	-3.136281	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_1	1.212232	0.085644	14.154313	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.360038	0.130223	2.764780	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_3	0.561235	0.103753	5.409338	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_4	-1.055970	0.180490	-5.850573	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	0.357854	0.107094	3.341494	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_6	-1.435390	0.239256	-5.999390	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_1B_1	0.429192	0.192585	2.228585	Insignificant
λA_1B_2	-1.333570	0.412661	-3.231636	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_1B_3	-0.148480	0.253172	-0.586479	Insignificant
λA_1B_4	0.593257	0.364108	1.629343	Insignificant
λA_1B_5	0.403211	0.234513	1.719355	Insignificant
λA_1B_6	0.056390	0.526537	0.107096	Insignificant
λA_2B_1	-0.117180	0.148854	-0.787214	Insignificant
λA_2B_2	-0.239550	0.210317	-1.138995	Insignificant
λA_2B_3	-0.178380	0.182824	-0.975692	Insignificant
λA_2B_4	0.126638	0.311440	0.406621	Insignificant
λA_2B_5	-0.097600	0.190094	-0.513430	Insignificant
λA_2B_6	0.506062	0.348800	1.450866	Insignificant
λA_3B_1	-0.327040	0.142541	-2.294357	Insignificant
λA_3B_2	0.302007	0.177786	1.698711	Insignificant
λA_3B_3	0.121431	0.158885	0.764270	Insignificant
λA_3B_4	-0.073750	0.298149	-0.247360	Insignificant
λA_3B_5	-0.040650	0.171902	-0.236472	Insignificant
λA_3B_6	0.017996	0.360869	0.049869	Insignificant
λA_4B_1	-0.197760	0.149025	-1.327026	Insignificant
λA_4B_2	0.670431	0.178127	3.763781	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4B_3	0.257926	0.164407	1.568826	Insignificant
λA_4B_4	-0.670400	0.375498	-1.785362	Insignificant
λA_4B_5	-0.174680	0.186295	-0.937653	Insignificant
λA_4B_6	0.114486	0.363774	0.314717	Insignificant
λA_5B_1	0.212790	0.211955	1.003940	Insignificant
λA_5B_2	0.600678	0.247591	2.426090	Insignificant
λA_5B_3	-0.052500	0.255925	-0.205138	Insignificant
λA_5B_4	0.024253	0.438260	0.055339	Insignificant
λA_5B_5	-0.090280	0.272019	-0.331889	Insignificant
λA_5B_6	-0.694930	0.695273	-0.999507	Insignificant

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

Two significant interaction effects A_iB_j occurred, in A_1B_2 and A_4B_2. The frequency of

Afrikaans-speaking White respondents in A_1B_2 (3 or 1.9% of this subgroup) who strongly disagreed with the content of question 11.21 (ℓ/s equal to -3.23) was significantly lower than the group norm. In the case of A_4B_2, the frequency of Afrikaans-speaking White respondents (63 or 40.4% of this subgroup) who agreed with the content of question 11.21 (ℓ/s equal to +3.76) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample.

Table 7.59 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **Question 11.20**

Scale Point	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	Total
Strongly disagree	50	3	6	4	18	2	83
Row %	60.2%	3.6%	7.2%	4.8%	21.7%	2.4%	100%
Column %	19.8%	1.9%	3.9%	14.8%	16.2%	9.1%	11.5%
Disagree	48	17	25	5	23	6	124
Row %	38.7%	13.7%	20.2%	4%	18.5%	4.8%	100%
Column %	19%	11%	16.3%	18.5%	20.7%	27.3%	17.2%
Neutral	67	48	38	8	34	7	202
Row %	33.2%	23.8%	18.8%	4%	16.8%	3.5%	100%
Column %	26.6%	31%	24.8%	29.6%	30.6%	31.8%	28.1%
Agree	59	62	58	8	25	6	218
Row %	27.1%	28.4%	26.6%	3.7%	11.5%	2.8%	100%
Column %	23.4%	40%	37.9%	29.6%	22.5%	27.3%	30.3%
Strongly agree	28	25	26	2	11	1	93
Row %	30.1%	26.9%	28%	2.2%	11.8%	1.1%	100%
Column %	11.1%	16.1%	17%	7.4%	9.9%	4.5%	12.9%
Total	252	155	153	27	111	22	720
Row %	35%	21.5%	21.3%	3.8%	15.4%	3.1%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

In Table 7.59 question 11.20 was addressed. This question referred to the radio announcer who is perceived to be 'too black' and would have difficulty attracting black and white listeners.

In this case, 43.2% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement in the questionnaire. The different subgroups responded as follows: Africans, 34.5%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 56.1%; White English-speaking, 54.9%; Coloured, 37%; Indian, 32.4%; 'Other', 31.8%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To measure whether 'Population Group' played a part in this dimension, testing for saturation was done. In this regard $\ell*$ was calculated at 72.73, which was significant ($\ell* = 72.73 >$

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 7.60.

Table 7.60 Estimated λ effects, standard deviations of ℓ estimates and standardized ℓ values for the loglinear analysis of the saturated model

Effect	ℓ	S_ℓ	ℓ/s	Conclusion
λA_1	-0.696390	0.163928	-4.248146	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2	0.084904	0.116661	0.727784	Insignificant
λA_3	0.552439	0.103773	5.323533	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4	0.567439	0.105575	5.374748	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5	-0.508390	0.182203	-2.790239	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_1	1.221105	0.087584	13.942101	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.371381	0.131490	2.824405	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_3	0.534926	0.111705	4.788738	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_4	-1.088870	0.191780	-5.677704	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	0.375373	0.108147	3.470952	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_6	-1.413910	0.239746	-5.897533	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_1B_1	0.728882	0.194329	3.750763	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_1B_2	-1.234800	0.415591	-2.971190	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_1B_3	-0.705200	0.318178	-2.216369	Insignificant
λA_1B_4	0.513133	0.398588	1.287377	Insignificant
λA_1B_5	0.552963	0.236666	2.336470	Insignificant
λA_1B_6	0.145024	0.528745	0.274280	Insignificant
λA_2B_1	-0.093240	0.157589	-0.591666	Insignificant
λA_2B_2	-0.281500	0.222821	-1.263346	Insignificant
λA_2B_3	-0.059380	0.193153	-0.307425	Insignificant
λA_2B_4	-0.045020	0.354415	-0.127026	Insignificant
λA_2B_5	0.016790	0.194723	0.086225	Insignificant
λA_2B_6	0.462340	0.364657	1.267876	Insignificant
λA_3B_1	-0.227280	0.140108	-1.622177	Insignificant
λA_3B_2	0.288955	0.177798	1.625187	Insignificant
λA_3B_3	-0.108210	0.170274	-0.635505	Insignificant
λA_3B_4	-0.425500	0.304580	-1.397006	Insignificant
λA_3B_5	-0.059880	0.171609	-0.348933	Insignificant
λA_3B_6	0.148956	0.347290	0.428910	Insignificant
λA_4B_1	-0.369430	0.144281	-2.560490	Insignificant
λA_4B_2	0.529888	0.173516	3.053828	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4B_3	0.299652	0.160440	1.867689	Insignificant
λA_4B_4	-0.057550	0.305199	-0.188565	Insignificant
λA_4B_5	-0.382360	0.184560	-2.071738	Insignificant
λA_4B_6	-0.020190	0.361263	-0.055887	Insignificant
λA_5B_1	-0.038940	0.224443	-0.173496	Insignificant
λA_5B_2	0.697458	0.248410	2.807689	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5B_3	0.573134	0.237236	2.415881	Insignificant
λA_5B_4	-0.368020	0.514974	-0.714638	Insignificant
λA_5B_5	-0.127520	0.276546	-0.461117	Insignificant
λA_5B_6	-0.736130	0.697063	-1.056045	Insignificant

Main effect A_i produced significant differences. In four of the five attitudinal categories – Strongly Disagree, Neutral, Agree and Strongly Agree – the observed frequencies differed significantly from the respective group norms. The exception was the category Disagree.

In the case of the main effect B_j relating to the various population groups, namely Africans, Afrikaans-speaking Whites, English-speaking Whites, Coloureds, Indians and 'Other', significant deviations from the general trend were observed in all six population groups.

There were four significant interaction effects A_iB_j that occurred with respect to question 11.20. The first significant interaction occurred in A_1B_1, the second in A_1B_2, the third in A_4B_2 and the last in A_5B_2. The frequency of African respondents A_1B_1 (50 or 19.8% of this subgroup) who strongly disagreed with the content of question 11.20 (ℓ/s equal to +3.75) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample. In the case of Afrikaans-speaking White respondents in A_1B_2 (3 or 1.9% of this subgroup), the frequency of those who strongly disagreed with the content of question 11.20 (ℓ/s equal to -2.97) was significantly lower than the group norm.

Regarding Afrikaans-speaking White respondents in A_4B_2 (62 or 40% of this subgroup), the frequency of those who agreed with the content of question 11.20 (ℓ/s equal to +3.05) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample. In the case of Afrikaans-speaking White respondents in A_5B_2 (25 or 16.1% of this subgroup), the frequency of those who strongly agreed with the content of question 11.20 (ℓ/s equal to +2.81) was significantly higher than the group norm.

7.4.1.6 Impartiality of Announcers

The sixth factor consisted of the responses to four questions from the questionnaire with, question 11.30 as the first contributor.

Table 7.61 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal
categories and population groups for **question 11.30**

Scale Point	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	Total
			Population Group				
Strongly disagree	6	1	2	2	0	0	11
Row %	54.5%	9.1%	18.2%	18.2%	0%	0%	100%
Column %	2.4%	.6%	1.3%	7.7%	0%	0%	1.5%
Disagree	16	7	6	2	1	0	32
Row %	50%	21.9%	18.8%	6.3%	3.1%	0%	100%
Column %	6.3%	4.4%	3.9%	7.7%	.9%	0%	4.4%
Neutral	33	29	26	3	11	7	109
Row %	30.3%	26.6%	23.9%	2.8%	10.1%	6.4%	100%
Column %	13.1%	18.4%	17%	11.5%	9.8%	31.8%	15.1%
Agree	115	98	95	11	75	11	405
Row %	28.4%	24.2%	23.5%	2.7%	18.5%	2.7%	100%
Column %	45.6%	62%	62.1%	42.3%	67%	50%	56%
Strongly agree	82	23	24	8	25	4	166
Row %	49.4%	13.9%	14.5%	4.8%	15.1%	2.4%	100%
Column %	32.5%	14.6%	15.7%	30.8%	22.3%	18.2%	23%
Total	252	158	153	26	112	22	723
Row %	34.9%	21.9%	21.2%	3.6%	15.5%	3%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 11.30 referenced in Table 7.61 referred to the need for an English radio station that caters for a multicultural audience to broadcast topical issues that both blacks and whites can relate to.

In the case under consideration, 79% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the content of the statement. Subgroup comparisons were as follows: African, 78.1%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 76.6%; White English-speaking, 77.8%; Coloured, 73.1%; Indian, 89.3%; 'Other', 68.2%.

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 38.80, which was significant ($\ell* = 38.80 >$ critical X2 = 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 7.62.

Table 7.62 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	-1.681914	0.280765	-5.990469	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2	-1.011022	0.239273	-4.225391	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_3	0.382463	0.143377	2.667534	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4	1.621253	0.114575	14.150146	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5	0.689223	0.133878	5.148142	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_1	1.230911	0.129849	9.479557	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.395143	0.205455	1.923258	Insignificant
λB_3	0.483396	0.171987	2.810654	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_4	-0.819142	0.225161	-3.638028	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	-0.224739	0.258000	-0.871081	Insignificant
λB_6	-1.065570	0.274988	-3.874969	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_1B_1	0.031173	0.391116	0.079703	Insignificant
λA_1B_2	-0.924820	0.715301	-1.292911	Insignificant
λA_1B_3	-0.319925	0.546831	-0.585053	Insignificant
λA_1B_4	0.982613	0.565811	1.736645	Insignificant
λA_1B_5	-0.304938	0.732126	-0.416510	Insignificant
λA_1B_6	0.535894	0.738284	0.725864	Insignificant
λA_2B_1	0.341110	0.299546	1.138757	Insignificant
λA_2B_2	0.350199	0.383695	0.912701	Insignificant
λA_2B_3	0.107795	0.379623	0.283953	Insignificant
λA_2B_4	0.311721	0.546411	0.570488	Insignificant
λA_2B_5	-0.975830	0.717239	-1.360537	Insignificant
λA_2B_6	-0.134998	0.723523	-0.186584	Insignificant
λA_3B_1	-0.328456	0.200385	-1.639125	Insignificant
λA_3B_2	0.378099	0.259186	1.458794	Insignificant
λA_3B_3	0.180647	0.236932	0.762442	Insignificant
λA_3B_4	-0.676300	0.441818	-1.530721	Insignificant
λA_3B_5	0.028580	0.337787	0.084610	Insignificant
λA_3B_6	0.417427	0.379386	1.100270	Insignificant
λA_4B_1	-0.318821	0.155183	-2.054484	Insignificant
λA_4B_2	0.356981	0.223688	1.595888	Insignificant
λA_4B_3	0.237637	0.193735	1.226609	Insignificant
λA_4B_4	-0.615806	0.301337	-2.043579	Insignificant
λA_4B_5	0.709384	0.275028	2.579316	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4B_6	-0.369377	0.340183	-1.085819	Insignificant
λA_5B_1	0.274995	0.174005	1.580386	Insignificant
λA_5B_2	-0.160463	0.261040	-0.614707	Insignificant
λA_5B_3	-0.206156	0.234063	-0.880771	Insignificant
λA_5B_4	-0.002231	0.330509	-0.006750	Insignificant
λA_5B_5	0.542801	0.301833	1.798349	Insignificant
λA_5B_6	-0.448949	0.429135	-1.046172	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, English-speaking Whites, Coloureds and 'Other'.

A single significant interaction effect A_iB_j was observed, in A_4B_5. The frequency of Indian

respondents in A_4B_5 (75 or 67% of this subgroup) who agreed with the content of question 11.30 (ℓ/s equal to +2.58) was significantly higher than the group norm.

Table 7.63 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 11.33**

Scale Point	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	Total
				Population Group			
Strongly disagree	4	0	5	1	0	0	10
Row %	40%	0%	50%	10%	0%	0%	100%
Column %	1.6%	0%	3.2%	3.7%	0%	0%	1.4%
Disagree	17	7	9	3	1	2	39
Row %	43.6%	17.9%	23.1%	7.7%	2.6%	5.1%	100%
Column %	6.9%	4.5%	5.8%	11.3%	.9%	9.5%	5.4%
Neutral	47	31	23	4	7	7	119
Row %	35.9%	26.1%	19.3%	3.4%	5.9%	5.9%	100%
Column %	19.1%	19.7%	14.9%	14.8%	6.3%	33.3%	16.6%
Agree	114	92	91	12	70	9	388
Row %	29.4%	23.7%	23.5%	3.1%	18%	2.3%	100%
Column %	46.3%	58.6%	59.1%	44.4%	62.5%	42.9%	54.1%
Strongly agree	64	27	26	7	34	3	161
Row %	39.8%	16.8%	16.1%	4.3%	21.1%	1.9%	100%
Column %	26%	17.2%	16.9%	25.9%	30.4%	14.3%	22.5%
Total	246	157	154	27	112	21	717
Row %	34.3%	21.9%	21.5%	3.8%	15.6%	2.9%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 11.33 in Table 7.63 referred to issues or topics of national importance that could definitely arouse a great deal of interest among both black and white listeners.

In this case, 76.6% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement in the questionnaire. Statistics for the subsamples were as follows: African, 72.3%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 75.8%; White English-speaking, 76%; Coloured, 70.3%; Indian, 92.9%; 'Other', 57.2%.

The second main effect was a reflection of the respondents' population group. To measure whether 'Population Group' played a part in this factor, the presence of saturation was looked for. In this regard ℓ^* was calculated at 44.61, which was significant ($\ell^* = 44.61 >$ 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 7.64.

Table 7.64 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	-1.748870	0.288319	-6.065747	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2	-0.786810	0.211494	-3.720247	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_3	0.368131	0.139666	2.635795	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4	1.535086	0.113800	13.489332	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5	0.632457	0.137501	4.599654	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_1	1.144789	0.135699	8.436238	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.391346	0.203899	0.919313	Insignificant
λB_3	0.694064	0.140483	4.940555	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_4	-0.865010	0.239197	-3.616308	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	-0.304010	0.259363	-1.172141	Insignificant
λB_6	-1.061180	0.254209	-4.174439	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_1B_1	-0.257780	0.438840	-0.587412	Insignificant
λA_1B_2	-0.890630	0.718152	-1.240169	Insignificant
λA_1B_3	0.416086	0.417016	0.997770	Insignificant
λA_1B_4	0.365726	0.728959	0.501710	Insignificant
λA_1B_5	-0.195280	0.735823	-0.265390	Insignificant
λA_1B_6	0.561892	0.734023	0.765496	Insignificant
λA_2B_1	0.227075	0.278770	0.814560	Insignificant
λA_2B_2	0.093214	0.366724	0.254182	Insignificant
λA_2B_3	0.041810	0.316147	0.132249	Insignificant
λA_2B_4	0.502276	0.475728	1.055805	Insignificant
λA_2B_5	-1.157340	0.709252	-1.631775	Insignificant
λA_2B_6	0.292977	0.548080	0.534552	Insignificant
λA_3B_1	0.089070	0.193573	0.460136	Insignificant
λA_3B_2	0.426352	0.254997	1.671988	Insignificant
λA_3B_3	-0.174860	0.218340	-0.800861	Insignificant
λA_3B_4	-0.364980	0.409586	-0.891095	Insignificant
λA_3B_5	-0.366370	0.367366	-0.997289	Insignificant
λA_3B_6	0.390801	0.363745	1.074382	Insignificant
λA_4B_1	-0.191830	0.160973	-1.191691	Insignificant
λA_4B_2	0.347198	0.223410	1.554084	Insignificant
λA_4B_3	0.033551	0.167691	0.200076	Insignificant
λA_4B_4	-0.433320	0.307470	-1.409308	Insignificant
λA_4B_5	0.769257	0.277440	2.772697	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4B_6	-0.524840	0.336238	-1.560918	Insignificant
λA_5B_1	0.133480	0.186037	0.717492	Insignificant
λA_5B_2	0.023876	0.257556	0.092702	Insignificant
λA_5B_3	-0.316580	0.212286	-1.491290	Insignificant
λA_5B_4	-0.069690	0.352567	-0.197665	Insignificant
λA_5B_5	0.949751	0.298294	3.183943	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5B_6	-0.720820	0.455962	-1.580877	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, English-speaking Whites, Coloureds and 'Other'.

Two significant interaction effects A_iB_j occurred with regard to question 11.33. The first

significant effect occurred in A_4B_5 and the second in A_5B_5. In the first instance, the frequency of Indian respondents in A_4B_5 (70 or 62.5% of this subgroup) who agreed with the content of question 11.33 (ℓ/s equal to +2.77) was significantly higher than the group norm. In the second instance, the frequency of Indian respondents in A_5B_5 (34 or 30.4%) who strongly agreed with the content of question 11.33 (ℓ/s equal to +3.18) significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample.

Table 7.65 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 11.22**

Scale Point	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	Total
Population Group							
Strongly disagree	7	2	4	0	2	1	16
Row %	43.8%	12.5%	25%	0%	12.5%	6.3%	100%
Column %	2.8%	1.3%	2.6%	0%	1.8%	4.5%	2.2%
Disagree	14	13	10	3	6	3	49
Row %	28.6%	26.5%	20.4%	6.1%	12.2%	6.1%	100%
Column %	5.6%	8.3%	6.5%	11.1%	5.4%	13.6%	6.8%
Neutral	41	24	28	4	15	5	117
Row %	35%	20.5%	23.9%	3.4%	12.8%	4.3%	100%
Column %	16.3%	15.3%	18.3%	14.8%	13.5%	22.7%	16.2%
Agree	93	85	87	12	63	7	347
Row %	26.8%	24.5%	25.1%	3.5%	18.2%	2%	100%
Column %	37.1%	54.1%	56.9%	44.4%	56.8%	31.8%	48.1%
Strongly agree	96	33	24	8	25	6	192
Row %	50%	17.2%	12.5%	4.2%	13%	3.1%	100%
Column %	38.2%	21%	15.7%	29.6%	22.5%	27.3%	26.6%
Total	251	157	153	27	111	22	721
Row %	34.8%	21.8%	21.2%	3.7%	15.4%	3.1%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

The response to question 11.22 presented in Table 7.65 referred to the notion that an English radio station catering for a multicultural audience should strive to broadcast programmes that both blacks and whites could relate to.

In this case, 74.7% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement in the questionnaire. The responses among the subgroups were as follows: African, 75.3%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 75.1%; White English-speaking, 72.6%; Coloured, 74%; Indian, 79.3%; 'Other', 59.1%.

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 $\ell*$ was calculated at 38.15, which was significant ($\ell* = 38.15 >$ 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 reported in Table 7.66.

Table 7.66 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	-1.629777	0.250945	-6.494559	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2	-0.500264	0.156377	-3.199089	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_3	0.238409	0.129356	1.843046	Insignificant
λA_4	1.252992	0.105009	11.932234	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5	0.638638	0.115441	5.532159	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_1	1.062905	0.115563	9.197624	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.458869	0.155059	2.959319	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_3	0.516816	0.134644	3.838389	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_4	-1.006342	0.232816	-4.322478	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	0.094801	0.165744	0.571972	Insignificant
λB_6	-1.127049	0.235730	-4.781101	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_1B_1	0.096590	0.356434	0.270990	Insignificant
λA_1B_2	-0.552138	0.529708	-1.042344	Insignificant
λA_1B_3	0.083062	0.417943	0.198740	Insignificant
λA_1B_4	0.219926	0.714669	0.307731	Insignificant
λA_1B_5	-0.188069	0.532934	-0.352894	Insignificant
λA_1B_6	0.340633	0.715623	0.475995	Insignificant
λA_2B_1	-0.339776	0.244856	-1.387656	Insignificant
λA_2B_2	0.190151	0.269890	0.704550	Insignificant
λA_2B_3	-0.130160	0.275966	-0.471652	Insignificant
λA_2B_4	0.189025	0.453393	0.416912	Insignificant
λA_2B_5	-0.218970	0.334912	-0.653814	Insignificant
λA_2B_6	0.309732	0.454896	0.680885	Insignificant
λA_3B_1	-0.003934	0.182807	-0.021520	Insignificant
λA_3B_2	0.064583	0.225870	0.285930	Insignificant
λA_3B_3	0.160786	0.206693	0.777898	Insignificant
λA_3B_4	-0.261966	0.405599	-0.645874	Insignificant
λA_3B_5	-0.041352	0.253860	-0.162893	Insignificant
λA_3B_6	0.081885	0.381937	0.214394	Insignificant
λA_4B_1	-0.199490	0.149189	-1.337163	Insignificant
λA_4B_2	0.314597	0.182621	1.722677	Insignificant
λA_4B_3	0.279907	0.165312	1.693204	Insignificant
λA_4B_4	-0.177936	0.303542	-0.586199	Insignificant
λA_4B_5	0.379150	0.196014	1.9343001	Insignificant
λA_4B_6	-0.596226	0.342509	-1.740760	Insignificant
λA_5B_1	0.446613	0.156277	2.857829	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5B_2	-0.017193	0.207522	-0.082849	Insignificant
λA_5B_3	-0.393593	0.204197	-1.927516	Insignificant
λA_5B_4	0.030952	0.333323	0.092859	Insignificant
λA_5B_5	0.069245	0.224437	0.308528	Insignificant
λA_5B_6	-0.136023	0.359355	-0.378520	Insignificant

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 the respective group norms. The exception was the category Neutral. Regarding the main effect B_j relating to population group, five significant deviations from the general trend were observed: among Africans, White Afrikaans-speakers, White English-speakers, Coloureds and 'Other'.

A single significant interaction effect A_iB_j occurred in A_5B_1 The frequency of African respondents in A_5B_1 (96 or 38.2% of this subgroup) who strongly agreed with the content of question 11.22 (ℓ/s equal to +2.86) was significantly higher than the group norm.

Table 7.67 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal
categories and population groups for **question 11.32**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	15	1	5	0	0	0	21
Row %	71.4%	4.8%	23.8%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Column %	6.1%	.6%	3.3%	0%	0%	0%	2.9%
Disagree	34	23	37	5	8	1	108
Row %	31.5%	21.3%	34.3%	4.6%	7.4%	.9%	100%
Column %	13.9%	14.6%	24.3%	18.5%	7.1%	4.8%	15.1%
Neutral	74	33	42	5	20	11	185
Row %	40%	17.8%	22.7%	2.7%	10.8%	5.9%	100%
Column	30.3%	20.9%	27.6%	18.5%	17.9%	52.4%	25.9%
Agree	88	81	54	14	56	5	298
Row %	29.5%	27.2%	18.1%	4.7%	18.8%	1.7%	100%
Column %	36.1%	51.3%	35.5%	51.9%	50%	23.8%	41.7%
Strongly agree	33	20	14	3	28	4	102
Row %	32.4%	19.6%	13.7%	2.9%	27.5%	3.9%	100%
Column %	13.5%	12.7%	9.2%	11.1%	25%	19%	14.3%
Total	244	158	152	27	112	21	714
Row %	34.2%	22.1%	21.3%	3.8%	15.7%	2.9%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

The response to question 11.32 presented in Table 7.67 referred to a good radio announcer being impartial in almost everything he or she says or does on radio.

In this case, 56% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the content of the statement. Subgroup comparisons were as follows: African, 49.6%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 64%; White English-speaking, 44.7%; Coloured, 63%; Indian, 75%; 'Other', 42.8%.

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 $\ell*$ was calculated at 68.28, which was significant ($\ell* = 68.28 >$ 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 consequent results are presented in Table 7.68.

Table 7.68 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
$\lambda\,A_1$	-1.710540	0.281272	-6.081444	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda\,A_2$	-0.103180	0.178189	-0.579048	Insignificant
$\lambda\,A_3$	0.660098	0.121703	5.423843	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda\,A_4$	1.092316	0.116310	9.391419	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda\,A_5$	0.061281	0.144392	0.424407	Insignificant
$\lambda\,B_1$	1.272348	0.109710	11.597375	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda\,B_2$	0.374321	0.195702	1.912709	Insignificant
$\lambda\,B_3$	0.687098	0.130730	5.255856	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda\,B_4$	-1.038810	0.236917	-4.384700	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda\,B_5$	0.056430	0.201902	0.279492	Insignificant
$\lambda\,B_6$	-1.351390	0.275246	-4.909700	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda\,A_1B_1$	0.716125	0.331382	2.161026	Insignificant
$\lambda\,A_1B_2$	-1.093900	0.713730	-1.532652	Insignificant
$\lambda\,A_1B_3$	0.202764	0.410124	0.494397	Insignificant
$\lambda\,A_1B_4$	0.319230	0.726113	0.439642	Insignificant
$\lambda\,A_1B_5$	-0.776010	0.715455	-1.084638	Insignificant
$\lambda\,A_1B_6$	0.631813	0.739508	0.854369	Insignificant
$\lambda\,A_2B_1$	-0.072930	0.218059	-0.334451	Insignificant
$\lambda\,A_2B_2$	0.434235	0.281850	1.540660	Insignificant
$\lambda\,A_2B_3$	0.596883	0.227266	2.626363	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda\,A_2B_4$	0.321307	0.399848	0.803573	Insignificant
$\lambda\,A_2B_5$	-0.303930	0.338398	-0.898144	Insignificant
$\lambda\,A_2B_6$	-0.97555	0.706759	-1.380315	Insignificant
$\lambda\,A_3B_1$	-0.058500	0.155726	-0.375660	Insignificant
$\lambda\,A_3B_2$	0.031973	0.239227	0.133651	Insignificant
$\lambda\,A_3B_3$	-0.039640	0.182820	-0.216825	Insignificant
$\lambda\,A_3B_4$	-0.441970	0.378072	-1.169010	Insignificant
$\lambda\,A_3B_5$	-0.150910	0.259949	-0.580537	Insignificant
$\lambda\,A_3B_6$	0.659072	0.344866	1.911096	Insignificant
$\lambda\,A_4B_1$	-0.317440	0.148684	-2.134998	Insignificant
$\lambda\,A_4B_2$	0.497696	0.220823	2.253823	Insignificant
$\lambda\,A_4B_3$	-0.220550	0.173271	-1.272862	Insignificant
$\lambda\,A_4B_4$	0.155432	0.300377	0.517456	Insignificant
$\lambda\,A_4B_5$	0.446490	0.231155	1.931561	Insignificant
$\lambda\,A_4B_6$	-0.561600	0.401604	-1.398392	Insignificant
$\lambda\,A_5B_1$	-0.267240	0.192364	-1.389241	Insignificant
$\lambda\,A_5B_2$	0.130014	0.266732	0.487433	Insignificant
$\lambda\,A_5B_3$	-0.539440	0.241884	-2.230160	Insignificant
$\lambda\,A_5B_4$	-0.353980	0.449788	-0.786993	Insignificant
$\lambda\,A_5B_5$	0.784377	0.260570	3.010235	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda\,A_5B_6$	0.246287	0.434289	0.567104	Insignificant

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

Two significant interaction effects A_iB_j were observed, in A_2B_3 and A_5B_5 respectively. The frequency of English-speaking White respondents A_2B_3 (37 or 24.3% of this subgroup) who disagreed with the content of question 11.32 (ℓ/s equal to +2.63) was significantly higher than the group norm. In the case of A_5B_5, the frequency of Indian respondents (28 or 25% in this subgroup) who strongly agreed with the content of question 11.32 (ℓ/s equal to +3.01) also significantly exceeded the general norm of the complete sample.

7.4.1.7 Reaction to Known and Foreign Cultural Components

The seventh factor involved two questions from the questionnaire.

Table 7.69 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 11.27**

Scale Point	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	Total
Strongly disagree	10	12	10	1	4	1	38
Row %	26.3%	31.6%	26.3%	2.6%	10.5%	2.6%	100%
Column %	4%	7.5%	6.5%	3.6%	3.6%	4.5%	5.2%
Disagree	20	16	5	3	3	3	50
Row %	40%	32%	10%	6%	6%	6%	100%
Column %	8%	10.1%	3.3%	10.7%	2.7%	13.6%	6.9%
Neutral	55	23	22	6	10	4	120
Row %	45.8%	19.2%	18.3%	5%	8.3%	3.3%	100%
Column %	22%	14.5%	14.4%	21.4%	8.9%	18.2%	16.6%
Agree	112	79	69	11	66	10	347
Row %	32.3%	22.8%	19.9%	3.2%	19%	2.9%	100%
Column %	44.8%	49.7%	45.1%	39.3%	58.9%	45.5%	47.9%
Strongly agree	53	29	47	7	29	42	169
Row %	31.4%	17.2%	27.8%	4.1%	17.2%	.4%	100%
Column %	21.2%	18.2%	30.7%	25%	25.9%	18.2%	23.3%
Total	250	159	153	28	112	22	724
Row %	34.5%	22%	21.1%	3.9%	15.5%	3%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 11.27 that pertained to Table 7.69 referred to the radio listener who would not mind a radio announcer who speaks English with an accent as long as his or her pronunciation is good.

In the case of this variable, 71.2% of the respondents agreed with the content of the statement. Compared with the general norm, the subsamples responded as follows: African, 66%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 67.9%; White English-speaking, 75.8%; Coloured, 64.3%; Indian, 84.8%; 'Other', 63.7%.

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 looked for. In this regard $\ell*$ was calculated at 27.36, which was insignificant ($\ell* = 27.36 <$ 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, as set out in Table 7.70.

Table 7.70 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
$\lambda\,A_1$	-1.016607	0.196529	-5.172809	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda\,A_2$	-0.755449	0.177576	-4.254229	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda\,A_3$	0.121810	0.127569	0.954856	Insignificant
$\lambda\,A_4$	1.185517	0.095716	12.385777	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda\,A_5$	0.464729	0.114486	4.059265	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda\,B_1$	1.061500	0.101663	10.441360	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda\,B_2$	0.608451	0.114677	5.305781	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda\,B_3$	0.570503	0.115951	4.920208	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda\,B_4$	-1.130362	0.221670	-5.099301	Significant at 0.1% level
$\lambda\,B_5$	0.258489	0.127945	2.020313	Insignificant
$\lambda\,B_6$	-1.368581	0.246193	-5.558976	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 7.71 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 11.25**

Scale Point	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	Total
Population Group							
Strongly disagree	12	11	11	0	2	1	37
Row %	32.4%	29.7%	29.7%	0%	5.4%	2.7%	100%
Column %	4.8%	6.9%	7.2%	0%	1.8%	4.5%	5.1%
Disagree	25	27	10	4	6	1	73
Row %	34.2%	37%	13.7%	5.5%	8.2%	1.4%	100%
Column %	10.1%	17%	6.6%	14.3%	5.4%	4.5%	10.1%
Neutral	65	24	21	3	21	6	140
Row %	46.4%	17.1%	15%	2.1%	15%	4.3%	100%
Column %	26.2%	15.1%	13.8%	10.7%	18.8%	27.3%	19.4%
Agree	101	65	78	15	59	11	329
Row %	30.7%	19.8%	23.7%	4.6%	17.9%	3.3%	100%
Column %	40.7%	40.9%	51.3%	53.6%	52.7%	50%	45.6%
Strongly agree	45	32	32	6	24	3	142
Row %	31.7%	22.5%	22.5%	4.2%	16.9%	2.1%	100%
Column %	18.1%	20.1%	21.1%	21.4%	21.4%	13.6%	19.7%
Total	248	159	152	28	112	22	721
Row %	34.4%	22.1%	21.1%	3.9%	15.5%	3.1%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 11.25 referred to Table 7.71 was aimed at the radio listener who would not mind a radio announcer who speaks with an accent as long as his or her English is good.

In the case under consideration, 65.3% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. The responses among the subgroups were as follows: African, 58.8%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 61%; White English-speaking, 72.4%; Coloured, 75%; Indian, 74.1%; 'Other', 63.6%.

The data were analysed further 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 31.67, which was insignificant ($\ell* = 31.67 <$ 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 presented in Table 7.72.

Table 7.72 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	-1.084471	0.194951	-5.562788	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2	-0.437835	0.149692	-2.924906	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_3	0.217889	0.117925	1.847691	Insignificant
λA_4	1.073983	0.093201	11.523299	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5	0.230432	0.117570	1.959956	Insignificant
λB_1	1.049823	0.096299	10.901702	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.605884	0.108404	5.589130	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_3	0.560514	0.109909	5.099801	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_4	-1.104073	0.207990	-5.308298	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	0.256051	0.121042	2.115390	Insignificant
λB_6	-1.368199	0.232870	-5.875377	Significant at 0.1% level

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

7.4.1.8 Getting Facts about Events that have Taken Place

Two questions were interrelated with factor VIII.

Table 7.73 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal
categories and population groups for **question 11.24**

Scale Point	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	Total
Population Group							
Strongly disagree	9	6	3	0	1	0	19
Row %	47.4%	31.6%	15.8%	0%	5.3%	0%	100%
Column %	3.6%	3.8%	2%	0%	.9%	0%	2.6%
Disagree	20	11	3	1	5	0	40
Row %	50%	27.5%	7.5%	2.5%	12.5%	0%	100%
Column %	8.1%	6.9%	2%	3.6%	4.5%	0%	5.5%
Neutral	68	47	42	6	19	7	189
Row %	36%	24.9%	22.2%	3.2%	10.1%	3.7%	100%
Column %	27.4%	29.6%	27.5%	21.4%	17.1%	31.8%	26.2%
Agree	104	69	71	18	61	9	332
Row %	31.3%	20.8%	21.4%	5.4%	18.4%	2.7%	100%
Column %	41.9%	43.4%	46.4%	64.3%	55%	40.9%	46%
Strongly agree	47	26	34	3	25	6	141
Row %	33.3%	18.4%	24.1%	2.1%	17.7%	4.3%	100%
Column %	19%	16.4%	22.2%	10.7%	22.5%	27.3%	19.6%
Total	248	159	153	28	111	22	721
Row %	34.4%	22.1%	21.2%	3.9%	15.4%	3.1%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

The response to question 11.24 presented in Table 7.73 referred to on-the-scene reporting of events during news coverage as something that any radio listener would like.

In the case under consideration, 65.6% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the content of the statement. Statistics for the subsamples were as follows: African, 60.9%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 59.8%; White English-speaking, 68.6%; Coloured, 75%; Indian, 77.5%; 'Other', 68.2%.

The data were analysed further 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 $\ell*$ was calculated at 17.79, which was not significant ($\ell* = 17.79 <$ 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 7.74.

Table 7.74 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	-1.517719	0.258199	-5.878098	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2	-0.828073	0.190938	-4.336869	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_3	0.690978	0.116857	5.913022	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4	1.255895	0.104182	12.054818	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5	0.398918	0.125883	3.168958	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_1	1.034924	0.118154	8.759111	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.590343	0.133275	4.429510	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_3	0.554922	0.134518	4.125262	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_4	-1.114706	0.257625	-4.326855	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	0.228521	0.149687	1.526659	Insignificant
λB_6	-1.294006	0.276814	-4.674641	Significant at 0.1% level

Main effect A_i produced significant differences. The observed frequencies in all the 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'.

Table 7.75 Cross-tabulation of five attitudinal categories and population groups for **question 11.23**

Scale Point	Population Group						Total
	African	White-Afrikaans	White-English	Coloured	Indian	Other	
Strongly disagree	9	4	6	0	2	0	21
Row %	42.9%	19%	28.6%	0%	9.5%	0%	100%
Column %	3.6%	2.5%	3.9%	0%	1.8%	0%	2.9%
Disagree	15	12	12	2	5	2	48
Row %	31.3%	25%	25%	4.2%	10.4%	4.2%	100%
Column %	6%	7.5%	7.9%	7.1%	4.5%	9.1%	6.6%
Neutral	58	34	22	8	15	7	144
Row %	40.3%	23.6%	15.3%	5.6%	10.4%	4.9%	100%
Column %	23%	21.4%	14.5%	28.6%	13.4%	31.8%	19.9%
Agree	102	61	72	15	66	6	322
Row %	31.7%	18.9%	22.4%	4.7%	20.5%	1.9%	100%
Column %	40.5%	38.4%	47.4%	53.6%	58.9%	27.3%	44.4%
Strongly agree	68	48	40	3	24	7	190
Row %	35.8%	25.3%	21.1%	1.6%	12.6%	3.7%	100%
Column %	27%	30.2%	26.3%	10.7%	21.4%	31.8%	26.2%
Total	252	159	152	28	112	22	725
Row %	34.8%	21.9%	21%	3.9%	15.4%	3%	100%
Column %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Question 11.23 in Table 7.75 referred to getting facts about events that have taken place or

are taking place, during the news coverage on radio as the most important thing to any radio listener.

In this case, 70.6% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. The responses among the subgroups were as follows: African, 67.5%; White Afrikaans-speaking, 68.6%; White English-speaking, 73.7%; Coloured, 64.3%; Indian, 80.3%; 'Other', 59.1%.

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 determined. In this regard $\ell*$ was calculated at 13.15, which was insignificant ($\ell* = 13.15 < $ 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 7.76.

Table 7.76 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	-1.470329	0.249840	-5.885082	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_2	-0.732371	0.181811	-4.028200	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_3	0.372610	0.124013	3.004604	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_4	1.178037	0.102935	11.444475	Significant at 0.1% level
λA_5	0.652053	0.115145	5.662886	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_1	1.059164	0.113056	9.368490	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_2	0.598394	0.127783	4.682892	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_3	0.553550	0.129430	4.276829	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_4	-1.111765	0.245993	-4.519499	Significant at 0.1% level
λB_5	0.249470	0.142555	1.749991	Insignificant
λB_6	-1.348813	0.274529	-4.913189	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'.